Page 1

SCHOOL BOARD OF BROWARD COUNTY

AUDIT COMMITTEE MEETING

KC WRIGHT ADMINISTRATION CENTER

BOARD ROOM

600 SE 3RD AVENUE

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 13, 2022 11:00 A.M. - 1:48 P.M.

Court Reporter:
Timothy R. Bass, Stenographic Reporter
Bass Reporting Service, Inc.
633 SE 3rd Avenue, Suite 200
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301

United Reporting, Inc. (954) 525-2221

Page 2 COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: 2 MR. ANDREW MEDVIN, CHAIR MS. MARY FERTIG, VICE CHAIR 3 MS. REBECCA DAHL MS. ITOHAN IGHODARO (Telephonic) 4 DR. NATHALIE LYNCH-WALSH MR. ROBERT MAYERSOHN 5 MS. PHYLLIS SHAW (Telephonic) MS. JACLYN STRAUSS 6 OFFICE OF THE CHIEF AUDITOR STAFF: 8 MR. JORIS JABOUIN, Chief Auditor MS. ALI ARCESE, Audit Director MS. ANN CONWAY, MANAGER, Internal Funds Audits MR. ERIC SEIFER, Auditor III 10 MS. MICHELE MARQUARDT, Executive Secretary (Telephonic) MS. JENNIFER DAILEY, Clerk Spec C 11 MS. WANDA RADCLIFF, Clerk Spec B 12 DISTRICT STAFF: 13 MR. SAM BAYS, Task Assigned Executive Director Capital 14 Program, Office of Chief Facilities & Construction Management 15 MR. MARK DORSETT, Executive Director, Physical Plant Operations 16 MS. MARY COKER, Director, Procurement & Warehousing Services 17 MR. RON EGGENBERGER, Manager, Grounds, Custodial/Grounds Services 18 MR. ROBERT MALONEY, Manager, Facilities Support Services 19 MS. PAM NORWOOD, Manager, PPO Finance 20 INVITED GUESTS: 21 MR. DAVID LUKER, Director, RSM 22 MR. MATTHEW BLONDELL, Business Risk Consulting, RSM MR. CHRIS GUMS, Risk Advisory Services, RSM 23 MS. KATHLEEN LANGAN, AECOM MS. ASHLEY CARPENTER, Atkins 24 MR. JOSE MONTE DE OCA, MDO Consultants, LLC

25 MR. TIM BASS, Court Reporter, United Reporting

MR. JULIO MIRANDA, MDO Consultants, LLC

Page 3 1 2 Thereupon, the following proceedings were had: 3 4 MR. MEDVIN: Good morning everyone. Let's 5 get started. We know we're running a bit late. 6 Let's start with the Pledge of Allegiance. 7 Please rise. 8 (Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance was 9 recited.) 10 MR. MEDVIN: Would you do a roll call, 11 please? 12 MR. JABOUIN: Thank you. Good morning. Ms. Rebecca Dahl? 13 14 MS. DAHL: Here. 15 MR. JABOUIN: Welcome back, Ms. Dahl. 16 MS. DAHL: Thank you. 17 MR. JABOUIN: Mr. Anthony De Meo is excused. 18 Ms. Mary Fertig? 19 MS. FERTIG: Here. 20 MR. JABOUIN: On the phone, Ms. Itohan 21 Ighodaro? 22 (No response.) MR. JABOUIN: Dr. Nathalie Lynch-Walsh? 23 24 DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Here. 25 MR. JABOUIN: Ms. Evelyn Nicaragua?

United Reporting, Inc. (954) 525-2221

	Page 4
1	(No response.)
2	MR. JABOUIN: Mr. Robert Mayersohn?
3	MR. MAYERSOHN: I'm here.
4	MR. JABOUIN: Mr. Andrew Medvin?
5	MR. MEDVIN: Here.
6	MR. JABOUIN: Ms. Phyllis Shaw, on the phone?
7	(No response.)
8	MR. JABOUIN: Ms. Phyllis Shaw, on the phone?
9	(No response.)
10	MR. JABOUIN: Ms. Jaclyn Strauss.
11	MS. STRAUSS: Here.
12	MR. JABOUIN: Ms. Shaw?
13	MS. SHAW: Hi, I'm here.
14	MR. JABOUIN: Can you please state your name
15	on who said that they were here?
16	MS. SHAW: Phyllis Shaw.
17	MR. JABOUIN: Thank you Ms. Shaw.
18	Ms. Ighodaro, are you on?
19	(No response.)
20	MR. JABOUIN: And do we have a third person
21	on the phone?
22	MS. MARQUARDT: Michele Marquardt, Office of
23	the Chief Auditor.
24	MR. JABOUIN: And I'm Joris Jabouin, Chief
25	Auditor.

1 MS. ARCESE: Ali Arcese, Audit Director.

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. SEIFER: Eric Seifer, Office of the Chief Auditor.

MS. RADCLIFF: Wanda Radcliff, Office of the Chief Auditor.

MS. DAILEY: Jennifer Dailey, Office of the Chief Auditor.

MS. CONWAY: Ann Conway, Office of the Chief Auditor.

MR. JABOUIN: And we have Mr, Tim Bass, the court reporter, as well.

All right. So with respect to the agenda, Mr. Medvin?

MR. MEDVIN: May I have approval of the agenda?

MS. FERTIG: Can I just raise something first?

MR. MEDVIN: Please.

MS. FERTIG: Is it possible to reorder some of those to make sure we get through a few of these items? We're starting late and I don't know what our hard stop time is, but do some of these audits really need to be discussed? So I would like to see us maybe prioritize.

MR. JABOUIN: Yeah, I think I can provide

ر ک

The items that need to be approved are Item Number 8, the Internal Funds Audits. We do need to have the Audit Plan approved as well as -- that's Number 12 and Number 13, the Florida Auditor General.

some commentary that will help with that.

Outside, we do have consultants from MDO

Consultants that are here on the asphalt

complaint. There are some scheduling challenges

for them in the November meeting.

We also have the individuals from PPO that are here as well.

So I would say, Ms. Fertig, Items Number 8, 12, 13, 9 and 10.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. And my thought was, I would like to see us take the 9, 10 and 11 first to try to get through those.

I mean, if we have to have something, then I guess we'll move that up, but I really feel like some of these audits need to be moved quickly.

So if we're not going to finish today, let's get done what we can and get a meeting date very quickly.

MS. STRAUSS: I agree. I just want everyone to know I have a hard stop at 1:45. I need to

1 pick my children up from school.

2.1

MR. JABOUIN: And we have another hard stop.
Mr. Bass needs to leave at 1:45. So that is a
hard stop.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I budget until 2 or 3:00, knowing this group, particularly with a packed agenda.

However, I will not be voting to transmit this asphalt repair audit because there's a lack of context. I did bring the asphalt audit from 2017. We had a discussion in 2018. Somebody went to jail over asphalt issues. And I don't see the bid that's being referred to in here. So unless there's a copy of the bid hiding in there, there's a lot going on in that one and there's no way I'm voting. As the, also, chair of the Facilities Task Force, we've had issues.

As far as property and Inventory on PPO, 9 and 10 are related issues.

The RSM Review already went to the board and that was a disaster because it hadn't come here first. And there are two issues related to that one, is the process by which it wound up there, and, two, we haven't discussed it, but, three, we also have to get back to what RSM is actually

supposed to be holding AECOM accountable for, which is contractually driven. Because we seem to have really gone off the rails on that.

2.1

And then there's the Audit Plan, which we have tried historically to add things to the Audit Plan and it never happens. So, frankly, I don't care what's in the Audit Plan at this point because come November we'll just -- we can amend it or get board members to amend it.

So I'm fine with it going through whatever, literally, is in there today. Because it doesn't matter. It's been proven that it really doesn't matter what our input is on Policy or Audit Plan. So I'm not going to waste time fighting over the Audit Plan.

But I will not be voting for Asphalt Repairs.

And since we essentially have an audit that says that PPO doesn't adhere to procurement policies, but then are beating up Procurement, I'm a fairly logical individual, so it's sort of like where you have to take those two together, because both A and B can't be true. You can't have a department that has a historical lack of compliance and then somehow try to rope Procurement, which is subject to their lack of

1 compliance.

MR. MEDVIN: We're not discussing audits yet.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Well, so I'm giving you the context for why I'm not supporting them.

MR. MEDVIN: Okay.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: So I do not believe that we are going to get through all of this, but --

MS. FERTIG: Even if you're not going to support it, then we need to defer it.

So if we can just move those up and maybe do the Administrative Matters, Public Speakers and so forth later on, just so that we can just -- the ones that we're going to dispose of quickly, then we've got addressed.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Right. So I don't see us disposing quickly because we don't have all the working facts on the Asphalt Repairs. I don't see the bid. There's a lack of context.

MS. FERTIG: Then that would, to my mind, be a motion to defer, but we would still have the opportunity to say what we want to see before we proceed.

But I'm just going to just ask you. Can I -- do you want me to move at this or do you want me to just start with Number 8?

MR. JABOUIN: If you can please start with Number 8 that has no exceptions, because the Auditor General is asking for us to complete those.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

MS. FERTIG: Yeah, and do 8, 9, 10 11, 12.

MR. JABOUIN: I think based on Dr. Lynch-Walsh's comments, if the rest of the

members agree, you'd go from 8 to 12 to 13.

MS. FERTIG: I want to bring 9 up because if there's -- I'd want to have the advantage of a discussion when the item's called so that if we are gonna move to defer we've all got a common expectation of what documents we expect to see when we bring it back.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: That's fine with me.

MR. JABOUIN: If I may ask, if you think you will swiftly approve 8, 12 and 13, then that will leave plenty of time for discussion on 9, 10 and 11.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: We don't have everything we need for 9.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Can we start moving this agenda as opposed to discussing it? Otherwise, we're --

MS FERTIG: Okay. Well, I was -- we were

Page 11 moving to approve, so I'm moving to approve it 1 2 reordered starting with Number 8, moving 3 --3 well, 4, 5, 6 -- 6 and 7 down to the bottom of 4 the agenda. 5 DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Let's just say we're 6 starting with 8 and see where it goes from there. 7 MR. MEDVIN: May I have a second, please? 8 MR. MAYERSOHN: Second. 9 MR. MEDVIN: Second by Mr. Mayersohn. 10 All in favor? 11 COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye. 12 MR. MEDVIN: Opposed? 13 (No response.) 14 MR. MEDVIN: Okay. Motion carries. 15 MR. JABOUIN: Number 3. 16 MS. DAHL: I thought we weren't going to do 17 that. 18 MR. MEDVIN: May I have a motion to approve 19 the minutes of the last meeting? 20 MR. MAYERSOHN: Motion to approve. 21 MS. FERTIG: Second. 22 MR. MEDVIN: Any discussion? 23 (No response.) 24 MR. MEDVIN: All in favor?

United Reporting, Inc. (954) 525-2221

Aye.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

25

Page 12 MR. MEDVIN: All opposed? 1 2 (No response.) 3 MR. MEDVIN: Motion carries. 4 So we'll go to Number 8. 5 MR. JABOUIN: Okay. So Agenda Item Number 8, 6 this is a report of internal funds of all 7 The table of contents has the schools schools. 8 that were reviewed. There were no exceptions. 9 And in the interest of time I kindly ask the 10 board members to proceed to any questions and 11 transmission. 12 MR. MAYERSOHN: Motion to approve. 13 DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Second. 14 MR. MEDVIN: Any discussion? 15 (No response.) 16 MR. MEDVIN: All in favor. 17 COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye. 18 MR. MEDVIN: All opposed? 19 (No response.) 20 MR. MEDVIN: Okay. Motion carries to 21 transmit the report. 22 MR. MAYERSOHN: I do just want to thank Mr. 23 Jabouin for putting the addendum in the back, so 24 thank you for that.

United Reporting, Inc. (954) 525-2221

MS. FERTIG: Yes, thank you.

25

MR. JABOUIN: Per Ms. Fertig we'll move on to Number 9.

2.1

Would you care to have the outsiders come in, the consultants?

MS. FERTIG: If there's a chance they're not going to be here when we meet again, absolutely, I'd like to hear the presentation from the consultants and then we can --

MR. JABOUIN: Mr. Dorsett is retiring on October 25 and he is outside?

MS. FERTIG: Well, let's hear their presentation and then move to our concerns. Is that okay?

MR. JABOUIN: Can somebody go get them?

MR. MAYERSOHN: Can we do 12 and 13 to get those out of the way? Let's do those first. I mean, that would be my recommendation. Because Dr. Lynch-Walsh said the Audit Plan is what it is.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Whatever it is. I haven't even looked at it. Don't care. Amend it later, fix it later. I'm on to the bigger picture.

MR. MAYERSOHN: If we get those out of the way and then we've covered what we know we need to.

MR. JABOUIN: Agenda Item 12, the Audit Plan.
You need a motion.

MR. MEDVIN: May I have a motion?

MR. MAYERSOHN: Motion to approve.

MS. DAHL: I move.

2.1

MS. FERTIG: Are there any changes in this that you've made?

Did you want to speak to your adjustments really quickly?

MR. JABOUIN: Yes, I think it is worthy of mentioning one significant adjustment, is there is an audit for the grand jury controls that I added since you saw it last. One of the important reasons for approval is that I need to get the funding for that. And so moving forward with it will allow me to -- to make that request. So that is something that I thought that was important to add on that front since the Superintendent came out with a report that she'll be updating the board on, and there are certain aspects of it that I can corroborate, verify and test.

Ms. Fertig, that's the main addition that I thought was significant.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. Thank you.

MR. MEDVIN: There's a motion on the floor.

Is there a second?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I second.

MR. MEDVIN: Second by Dr. Lynch-Walsh.

Any other discussion?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I'd just like to make a statement that the only reason I'm approving this is that my input does not matter and the input of the audit committee doesn't matter. So there's no point in discussing it any further.

MR. MEDVIN: Do you have a comment to that?

MR. JABOUIN: No, I'm ready to go to Number

13 13.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MEDVIN: All in favor of approving the audit?

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. MEDVIN: Opposed?

(No response.)

MR. MEDVIN: Motion carries.

20 | 13.

MR. JABOUIN: Okay. Just give me one moment on Number 13, please.

Okay. So Agenda Item Number 13, this is a report of the Auditor General. The Auditor General performs several audits here. So the

committee has seen an operational audit before that had three observations. There was also a financial audit that had no observations and a single audit that had no observations.

2.1

Now this audit covers multiple districts.

There is one finding that relates to the School

Board of Broward County.

And this has to deal with the late submission of regulatory reports that were filed by three schools, Sheridan, McFatter and Atlantic Tech.

This was due to they being unaware of the timing and the deadlines for those reports, even though the reports, themselves, have the due dates on there.

So there are other schools that are -- other districts that are mentioned in this report, but this is the issue regarding School Board of Broward County. There was an exit meeting on that that I attended with different members of the district as well the Superintendent and Chair Mayersohn at the time but that is the issue with respect to Broward County.

The response indicates that, from Associate Superintendent Wanza, that was used to prepare the Superintendent Cartwright response, that

training has occurred for those particular schools. That's the issue with Number 13.

That's an Auditor General finding that we need to have transmitted to the board.

MR. MEDVIN: Any questions?

2.1

MS. FERTIG: It just seems peculiar that it's those three schools.

MR. JABOUIN: Sure. I can provide you --

MS. FERTIG: Thank you.

MR. JABOUIN: So these three schools are the tech schools where students qualify for the Florida Student Assistant Grant. That is -- I used to get that when I was a college student as well. So that's unique to those particular schools, that grant, as far as -- so the other schools don't have that reporting requirement like they do.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. So that's, that particular program is the one that --

MR. JABOUIN: Yes, they were auditing just the FSAG and those were the reports. Now, there's a few non-reportable comments that I'm aware of because of my involvement with the Auditor General, because when they're here they utilize a good chunk of my time, and I'm

following up on those as well.

2.1

MR. MEDVIN: Thank you.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Thank you. Nathalie Lynch-Walsh.

So this would suggest the absence of procedure that would let people know that they were supposed to do this. So my question would be, where are the procedures, related procedures, and can we have a copy of those?

And then also, is it in their job description?

And are these brand new people that suddenly became responsible for these things?

MR. JABOUIN: Yeah, so Dr. Wanza is not able to attend because she's dealing with the -- the district's strategies regarding the verdict.

With respect to those schools, these are, indeed, new principals. I don't understand why they would miss the deadline because the form, itself, has the due date on it.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Somebody would have to give you the form if you're new. Hence, we get back to the question of procedures.

MR. JABOUIN: So I'll find out about procedures, but, to me, the form has the date. I

don't find an excuse on that front.

we send reminders out on everything and get robocalls constantly in this, you know, parenting community. I'm just thinking that there's somebody who should have a list of deadlines to make sure we're in compliance with them.

MR. JABOUIN: I concur. I don't find this an

MS. FERTIG: So there should -- is there

somebody -- I mean, somebody within the district

who keeps a schedule of deadlines? And, I mean,

excusable exceptions.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. So then a follow-up

would be us getting the procedures.

MS. FERTIG: And finding out if somebody in the district is responsible for monitoring that.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Right. And that would be indicated in the procedures.

MS. FERTIG: I mean, obviously, the principal should know, too, but, I mean --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Right, the procedures could be district level, school level, who's responsible for what and by when or annually they are given a schedule of dates. This is not -- it's not rocket science.

MR. MEDVIN: Well, maybe we should ask Dr.

Wanza to give us a report on what the procedures are.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I would like to see it in writing. Procedures, by definition, are in writing.

MS. FERTIG: So can I move to transmit with a follow-up from Dr. Wanza on the procedures?

MR. JABOUIN: So noted.

2.1

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Just to be -- she's no longer in charge, but Wanza or whoever is responsible.

MR. JABOUIN: She is responsible for those schools. So she's the Associate Superintendent for those particular schools. And I can seek a follow-up from her to provide information with respect to the procedures, the job description.

I'm assuming, Ms. Fertig, that you mean overall deadlines and not just this FSAG?

MS. FERTIG: Not just this one; no. I'm talking about every deadline we have for reports whether it's federal, state or local. There should be, you know, some kind of matrix.

But -- and so if it's not Dr. Wanza, Dr. Wanza or the appropriate person is my motion if you're writing it down.

MR. JABOUIN: Yes. The motion is that Dr. Wanza provide information on the procedures, the job description and indicate if someone is responsible for monitoring the deadlines.

2.1

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Strike the word information. We're looking for the procedures, not a story about them, but the procedures. And not a story about job descriptions, but the job descriptions.

Information isn't the same as the actual document.

MS. FERTIG: And the first part of my motion was to transmit with the understanding that at the next meeting we'll get all this stuff you just mentioned.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Right.

MS. SHAW: This is Phyllis.

MR. MEDVIN: Go ahead, Phyllis.

MS. SHAW: A friendly amendment?

MS. FERTIG: Sure.

MS. SHAW: And could we add, if possible, those are the only schools because FSAG only goes to college students and if there are any other schools who are involved, whoever had to do it or something to that degree.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I think the motion would capture that because it's procedures district-wide.

MS. FERTIG: District-wide; yeah.

MS. SHAW: Well, yes, but because those were the only schools that were mentioned I want to make sure that it is understood that this is something we want district-wide.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. I'll put district-wide procedures in my motion.

MR. MEDVIN: The issue is more than this particular report. We're looking for procedures to be listed for all reports. I think that's the best way to look at it.

All in favor of the motion?

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. MEDVIN: Opposed?

(No response.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

25

MR. MEDVIN: Motion carries.

MR. JABOUIN: 12 and 13.

Are we ready for Number 9?

MR. MEDVIN: Yes. Thank you.

MR. JABOUIN: All right. I will introduce

Observation Number 9 in one moment.

They're all in here, so why don't we ask them

1 to announce themselves.

MR. DORSETT: Mark Dorsett, Executive Director, Physical Plant Operations.

MR. BAYS: Good morning. Sam Bays, Task
Assigned Executive Director Office of Capital
Programs, formerly the Director of Physical Plant
Operations.

MR. JABOUIN: And I will introduce some more later, but right now if I could have our consultants, Mr. Jose Monte de Oca.

Oh, I'm sorry, Ron, please. Thank you. I did see you.

MR. EGGENBERGER: Ron Eggenberger, Grounds Manager, Physical Plant Operations.

MR. MONTE DE OCA: Good morning Audit

Committee members. My name is Jose Monte de Oca.

I'm the president of MDO Consultants.

MR. MIRANDA: Good morning. Julio Miranda, MDO.

MS. COKER: Mary Coker, Director of Procurement & Warehousing Services.

MR. JABOUIN: So the origin of this project is from a complaint that the district received from the Office of the Inspector General of Florida Department of Education in 2021.

So the complaint was filed by the Office of Inspector General by a gentleman named Allen Johnson. Johnson was and is still a subcontractor for one of our vendors, Atlantic Southern Paving & Sealcoating.

2.1

Now, there were many points in the complaint that Mr. Johnson covered. He had some points regarding Facilities, regarding Physical Plant Operations, Procurement and Audit. District staff, and I was involved in meetings with them, reviewed the complaint. The complaint's conclusion was, as communicated to the Inspector General, was that it was based on incomplete information and a lack of familiarity with an understanding of the district's policies and procedures. The district prepared a response which was a reasonable response that I concurred with and I signed off on the response.

Now, I know, through my own reviews, that there are issues in those areas from an audit standpoint, but I realize that the information that was provided to Mr. Johnson was through public records requests and so his specific requests were provided to him. But if you needed more information he may not have necessarily

known to request it. But I was aware of the historical issues and I know issues with respect to those areas. So in the Audit Plan that you approved, I have audits that would cover those areas and those concerns.

2.1

However, I also wanted to mention, though, as far as Mr. Johnson, he is a person that did wear a wire and it was reported that he gave bribes to Richard Ellis who was someone who used to work in PPO. Ellis was sentenced and Johnson had some other legal issues with the district. But notwithstanding that, there are valid, general audit concerns that a chief auditor needs to note, and that's why we have contracts in the plan that looks into those areas and those concerns and more.

But, nevertheless, though, he did make some allegations that I thought needed to have their own review. So I contacted Mr. Monte de Oca from MDO. And so the strategy was, let's take a look at our contracts ourselves. Let's take a look at some of the things that Johnson brought out that he didn't have the understanding of as far as our procedures and practices and so forth, and let's look at those from an audit standpoint and those

are in the plan.

2.1

2.2

The second one is, let's look at some of those allegations separately. There's one allegation that says that the district was overbilled by \$25,000. I want to know is it 25; is it 50; is it more? Those are the buzz words that I constantly look for when allegations come up from whatever sources. Is there fraud; is there potential fraud; and so forth.

And, hence, I discussed this project with MDO Consultants to look into those particular allegations while we had the separate audit going on. MDO is headed by Mr. Montes de Oca. He is a professional auditor with more than 30 years of audit experience. The last decade of his tenure he was a chief auditor for Miami-Dade County Public Schools, a gentleman who is knowledgeable in audit and controls. So we engaged him to do the work and we do have -- we went through the process where Mr. -- Mr. Dorsett, Mr. Eggenberger was involved in some exit meetings.

So I do want to mention that there is a demand letter that's included in this report.

Subsequent to the printing of the report legal was able to respond back to them as we continue

to pursue that. I did not get a chance to put that in the package. I will submit that to the committee members subsequent to this meeting.

2.1

2.2

Let me go ahead and introduce Mr. Montes de Oca for any commentary or any statement he wishes to say before audit committee member questions.

MR. MONTES DE OCA: Good morning ladies and gentlemen. I'm glad to be able to assist Broward County Public Schools in this endeavor. I was assisted on it by the gentleman to my right, Julio Miranda, who is a CPA, as well as I am, and a fraud examiner with experience with over 50 years of experience.

So we were engaged, as Mr. Jabouin noted, to look into these allegations. We looked into four allegations. We found two of them were not accurate and in so doing we brought some -- we noted some concerns -- we had some concerns over internal controls, which are not in the report. We provided four recommendations which have been addressed, in my opinion, entirely by the administration.

I think there were two major savings to the district and those were, as noted in the report, there were -- we looked at eight sites and we

found two of them where overcharges had occurred. The company went out and remeasured and agreed that the district had been overcharged and provided two checks amounting to somewhat over \$5,000. We also had measured improvement in the redesigning of the verification form, which in our opinion was one of the reasons why these overcharges occurred. And as noted in the report the redesigned form should address those concerns.

2.1

We also had -- we noted that the company was charging \$1.58 per yard for disposing of the asphalt when the repairs had taken place. In our opinion those -- that \$1.58 per yard should have been -- is already included on the either the \$105, depending on the size of the repair, if it's under 15 yards, or \$170 per yard if it's over 15 yards.

I would be pleased to answer any questions the audit committee may have.

MR. MEDVIN: I'll start out. In your review of these allegations did you consider or find out any information about the potential liability of this individual who made them?

MR. MONTE DE OCA: The individual who made

1 the allegations?

MR. MEDVIN: Yes. I mean, did you do any investigation to see if he was credible or not?

MR. MONTE DE OCA: I did not do any investigation as to his credibility. However, I did look at the records that he pointed out and that was the basis for my findings and my conclusions.

MR. MEDVIN: All right. And the other thing, if I could find the page, I mean, the issue of the dollar-and-change charge, was that on the original bid or the contract?

Because I think that, obviously, was a point of confusion.

MR. MONTE DE OCA: It is. And we contacted -- the vendor was contacted and he claims that the \$1.58 was not included in the price. It's noted in the report sometimes the \$1.58 was not charged. Most of the times it was.

It is our opinion that the \$1.58 should have been included, and, therefore, the district should not have paid the \$1.58. And when we looked at over 400 invoices we determined that the amount overcharged in our opinion was over \$24,000.

Typically, they

MR. MEDVIN: And most of these jobs are, 1 2 basically, relatively small repair type jobs? 3 MR. MONTE DE OCA: Yes. 4 were -- most of the ones we looked at, if memory 5 serves me correctly, were over 15 yards, 15 6 square yards. And that's where the price range 7 If it's under 15 square yards it's \$105. varies. 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

If it's over 15 square yards it's \$70 -- I'm sorry, the other way around. If it's smaller it's 70, if it's a larger one then the price increases.

MR. MEDVIN: Well, in a normal job of that type is it customary for the contractor to remove the waste asphalt or is that something that the owner would be responsible for?

MR. MONTE DE OCA: Again, looking at -reading the bid, we are of the opinion that the price per yard included the removal of the material, and, therefore, the \$1.58 per yard should not have been charged.

> MR. MEDVIN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. MONTE DE OCA: You're welcome.

MR. MEDVIN: Nathalie, do you have anything?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Until I see the bid, itself, I don't really have any questions.

> United Reporting, Inc. (954) 525-2221

mean, you're talking to somebody that had to recalculate interview scores to show that the district's HR staff can't add. And I'm not saying they can't add, but I'm saying we are listening to opinions about a bid we haven't seen.

2.1

MR. MEDVIN: Well, does anybody know where to find that page in the report, that listed -- that listed the \$1.58 line item?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: No, no, I want the bid.

MR. MEDVIN: I know what you're talking about, but I was referring to that and I can't find it.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Oh, that they're referring to? That's a different problem.

MR. MEDVIN: And it was in the report. Does anybody no what page?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I mean, I'm on DemandStar trying to pull the bid, but either way, I haven't read it.

MS. FERTIG: Yeah, I don't think that would work because we're gonna all want the same material. Thank you for trying, but --

MR. MEDVIN: All right. I'm referring to the bid summary sheet, but that's not the full bid.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I want the whole thing. When the asphalt audit, I had all the bids, read them all, and I will not be comfortable speaking to this until I've read the entire bid. Because based on my 11 years of experience with this district, the first thing that made my eyebrow go up was the very first sentence on this letter. After receiving allegations of irregularities in the procurement of asphalt repairs during 2021, and I stop right there. Because if you're reading this, you're like, oh, wait, 2021 is when this stuff was happening? But, no, once you read past the cover you realize that these things date back to 2018.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

Also, the word "procurement" is -- implies in this district the procurement department, not necessarily all the cast of characters that's involved in the work being done, which would include PPO and the people that sign off. And then we also have, if you're potentially overpaying, that they're signing off and that's more of a payables issue. But that bothered me.

Then there's things about splitting purchases. That's been a problem historically. So recommending that PPO not split purchases is

like recommending, you know, that the sun should rise and set every day. Of course they shouldn't split purchases, but -- and then the other thing is, you know, the way this is being couched. Mr. Dorsett is on his way out the door and we have a habit around here of having findings, having faux outrage, and then we blame the person that's out the door when they had nothing to do with it.

Because Mr. Dorsett only took over as the executive director as a result of the Council of Great City Schools scathing PPO review.

2.1

So there's a lot of context that is missing here. And, actually, we haven't seen an update on the -- on PPO's progress with the recommendations from the Council of Great City Schools.

So this is a systemic problem and there are common denominators. And the way we do task assignments around here created the effect of Mr. Dorsett being executive director with nobody in the director position. Because when some people are task assigned you get to abandon post number 1 and go over to post number 2 and they left a hole there. So everybody's known Mr. Dorsett's retiring. There no succession plan. So who

1 knows what's going on over there?

2.1

And that's a whole other problem. I think there's managers missing over there. And that came up at a board meeting and still nothing is being done.

So, one, I want the bid, but also --

MS. FERTIG: And you want an update, just as an aside, on the recommendations.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Right. Where are we on the recommendations? Because I believe it was a three-year plan and may have been three years already or getting close.

So -- and I think we need a definition of "procurement". Because what I see happening is that come -- when this goes to the board, the person that's going to be in the line of fire is going to be Mary Coker because the word "procurement" is here. And I sense a disturbance in the force here, because the Superintendent threw her under the bus or tried to when they just did those resignations and retirements even though that department is not in the grand jury report.

So, based on experience, I sense a disturbance -- I sense some unsettling reasons

why this is being couched this way.

2.1

Meanwhile, this is a systemic problem that started years ago and is still out of control because there's nobody, you've got poor Mr.

Dorsett trying to be executive director and manger running around putting out fires because nothing's being solved, and then he's going to retire, and what then?

But the bid, I don't like discussing terms of a bid without having the bid in front of me. I don't know why we would be asked to do that either.

MS. COKER: Through the Chair, can I provide a copy of it? Is that something --

MR. MEDVIN: Please.

MS. COKER: I mean, I can get a link sent now to us to look at it. Would that be --

MS. FERTIG: Well, I appreciate that, but I was just going to ask now that we've had an opportunity to talk about it -- and thank you for this report. Thank you for having it done.

Thank you for the great report.

I was just gonna move to defer this until we had -- I'm assuming when you want the bid you want a chance to look at it and kind of read the

United Reporting, Inc. (954) 525-2221

1 report --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Read it.

MS. FERTIG: -- which we wouldn't have if we got it right this second.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Correct.

MS. FERTIG: Can I just make the motion now to defer this until -- until -- until whenever, next meeting, with the understanding that we're going to get a copy of the bid and also an update of the -- of the progress on the Council of Great City Schools --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Council of Great City Schools' recommendation?

MS. FERTIG: Yeah.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Second.

MR. MAYERSOHN: The only concern that I have is that Mr. Dorsett is retiring. So at your next meeting that we have discussions on this he won't be here to answer any questions.

MS. FERTIG: And I am hoping he has wonderful retirement because he deserves it.

MR. MAYERSOHN: So, I mean, that's a concern.

I mean, one of the -- and I'll just bring this

up, you know, on, I guess, it's the -- Mr.

Dorsett's response to Ms. Marte on allegation

United Reporting, Inc. (954) 525-2221

number 3, it says recommendation to recommend the practice of splitting purchase orders should not be allowed by the district. The response being, it is not the practice of PPO to split work orders.

2.1

Okay. So if it's not the practice, then it says PPO will develop, you know, an SOP and distribute it to all PPO employees.

That, to me, is troubling, if you're telling me that it's not the practice. Then there should have already been an SOP that everybody knows it's not a practice or is that just an assumption that it's not a practice?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: What page is that on?

MR. MAYERSOHN: The last page.

MS. FERTIG: Do you want him to speak to that?

MR. MAYERSOHN: If he could.

I mean if it's not a standard practice, then there should be a standard operating procedure.

MR. DORSETT: Good afternoon. Mark Dorsett, Executive Director. That is correct. It is not a practice to split work orders. That's an effort to circumvent the procurement process.

And we all agree with that. So that's a standard

product that we have at PPO. We've had people that try to split work orders in order to avoid the three-quote process or whatever process they are.

2.1

So the process is a part of the purchasing procedure. It is in there that if a product is -- or a service exceeds \$5,000 you must acquire three quotes. And Mary Coker can speak more to that.

MR. MAYERSOHN: I guess, I mean -- but I guess my question is, if everybody knows that this is not the standard practice, then there should be a standard operating procedure that's already written, which is what you're explaining to me is part of the purchasing process that's already written, everybody should know about it. So if somebody tries to circumvent that process there should be some sort of progressive discipline to that.

MS. COKER: I would like to comment on that. Because this is not about the purchasing process. We're not talking about the threshold of purchasing that if you place a purchase requisition that's over \$5,000, those thresholds are not related to any of this because this is a

bid.

What that means is, when you have a current bid in place, Policy 3320 clearly explains you must use a bid. So there is no threshold to have because the bid allows you to issue a purchase order for \$50,000, \$200,000, whatever the work order of that project is. So this is not a purchasing issue.

Operationally, at the user level, the orders being placed are by project. And because there is a standard, a framework purchase order, procurement purchasing department does not see invoices, does not see those projects and/or orders. It's a one-purchase order and as the work is being given to the vendor per project, per order, however they give it to the vendor, then that is what I believe this audit is referencing, which is the breaking of those projects to do what? I didn't understand that. I just wanted to clearly state that it's not a purchasing threshold issue.

MR. DORSETT: No. And let me clarify it. It is not a purchasing issue. We -- we -- we instruct staff all the time, if a project requires -- whatever that dollar amount is, it

should be on one work order, regardless of what it is. So I was just referring to why some people circumvent that process, whether there's a bid or not, you have some people -- some situations that allow -- that make the opportunity for -- for staff to do that.

2.1

We -- the management team, we are aware that in some situations these things happen. When they do happen we try to take action against it. Some of these things, you know, for some reason or another they're not caught all the time, but when we notice them we bring that to the attention of the end user and we correct that issue and that's what we were stating in the report.

MR. MAYERSOHN: So I'm still -- I guess, I'm confused. Is that -- if you know that this is not the standard practice, okay, management understands it's not the standard practice, it's not what you guys do or it's, again, prohibited being done, that there should be some, whether it's procedural, administrative, whatever it may be there, to have it in writing. Because this is not -- you know, we're not starting new and it's been uncovered. This has been -- I mean, you've

been here for 30 years, you know, obviously, in different roles.

MR. DORSETT: Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

MR. MAYERSOHN: But if you're saying that this is not the standard practice, that should have already been addressed in an administrative policy 10 years ago, 30 years ago, and everybody should understand that. That's what I'm confused about, why are you -- because, again, the statement says, we are now writing a policy to ensure that this doesn't take place. I would be concerned or question, and, again, you know the Superintendent's designee is not here, but is this something that was written 20 years ago or 10 years ago or just never was addressed? Because I'm sure this is not the first time that somebody has decided to split purchase orders.

And I'm not asking -- I mean, again, this is more of, to me, you know, finding material weaknesses as the gentlemen over here have discussed. How do we address those material weaknesses? If we're starting to write a policy now, why wasn't that administrative policy written 10 years ago when I'm sure we could find audits or whatever that reveal that purchase

orders were split? So --

MR. MEDVIN: Ms. Strauss?

MS. STRAUSS: Thank you. So I'm newer to this committee, so I'm coming in definitely not deep in the trenches; right? So, essentially, from an outsider as a CPA looking in from a professional perspective, first and foremost, my biggest concern of what I just saw between Mrs. Coker and yourself is, it doesn't appear to me that the left hand is speaking to the right hand; okay? Like you were like, okay, and whatever that process is, whoever it goes to, I-don't-really-know type of situation, and it goes.

Well, I think that we all need to take a step back and really have a processes flow chart on the way everything is supposed to happen. That's first and foremost. It's the most basic thing to do that many large organizations miss. Because we're all operating in our silos and just out, you know, worrying about our department, controlling cost, whatever our objective is, placing orders, you know, taking three bids according to policy, comparing those, whatever the case may be. But I don't know that everybody

on board and on your team knows what the full picture is. I think that, moving forward, could very much eliminate some of the confusion and, quite honestly, inappropriate utilization of funds.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

Now, in regards to splitting purchase orders, everyone is on the take. I don't think that anyone can deny that. Anyone, when they come to do work with any government agency, in my opinion and from what I've seen in my professional experience, everybody knows there are deep pockets; okay? And they're going to be on the take. And you said that a way around it is they split these purchase orders. Right? People have figured it out. It's not rocket science. there needs to be internal controls within your department, specifically, to find that these things are reviewed. No dollar should be slipping through the cracks because they're my tax dollars as well as the rest of the Broward County residents' tax dollars. And I think everyone's sick of misuse of funds.

I don't expect things to be perfect, certainly, but what is the threshold that our auditor is going to define as allowable to slip

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

through the cracks? What is that dollar amount? Mr. Auditor, do you have a threshold for that?

Because, I mean, I know I would have a very low threshold as far as this type of stuff is concerned. Because it's enough already, that thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars have been absolutely wasted by people on the take simply because the appropriate internal controls are not in place and, clearly, the departments are not speaking and don't understand each other's roles.

MR. JABOUIN: So in response to your question, Ms. Strauss, this is the reason why the audits are done, so these issues can be identified and that they can be dealt with.

MS. STRAUSS: Okay. But as Mr. Mayersohn pointed out, things like this in past audits have probably come up; okay? Probably I would say there's a 99 percent chance if we were to go back and pull previous audits, this splitting of work orders and all this stuff was probably there. Why wasn't anything done?

look at the Audit Plan on pages 29 where the

MR. JABOUIN: So, Ms. Strauss, please take a

process is getting looked at in the audits that I mentioned that are going on.

2.1

2.2

So when these issues come up they are considered serious and there are historical issues as to why this is a higher audit risk area and those historical issues are part of it. So the audits are done, the findings are identified, the processes are looked at on that end.

MS. STRAUSS: Okay. So what have you done in the past?

MR. JABOUIN: One moment. I am not done.

So when this complaint was brought up, it was reviewed, the district responded to it, and then the audit since required us to take a look at these allegations while looking at the entire process. And that is what is getting done.

MS. STRAUSS: That is getting done now. But you've been here for how many years?

MS. FERTIG: Can I -- can I respond to something that I think came to this in another audit?

So when we -- yeah, I'm just gonna take it away from PPO and go to some of the school audits where we've seen purchases done inappropriately or --

MS. STRAUSS: Beating the system. Or trying to beat the system.

MS. FERTIG: Well, in any event, in those contexts, and we've seen the difference in the reports over the years, there were internal reports and property reports and so forth, we've seen a difference in areas where you've put an annual training in place.

So I guess my question to you is, what annual training do you have and then I'm sure Dr.

Lynch-Walsh --

MS. STRAUSS: Turn on your thing. They can't hear you.

MS. FERTIG: I'm sorry. I'm asking what annual training they have. I'm sorry about that. I have microphone issues. And then I forgot my next one, which I'm sure you're going to cover, but what are the consequences when someone doesn't follow this? But those are the kinds of issues that have been laid out in the school-related property inventory audits to correct some of the problems we've seen there. I just don't know what the answer is for PPO as far as whether they do trainings, whether they have consequences and so forth.

MS. STRAUSS: So the accountability remediation.

2.1

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Promotion is the consequence.

MS. STRAUSS: That's lovely. That's encouraging, Nathalie.

MS. FERTIG: So is there annual training? Is there a type of training that you do with people on record keeping and procurement?

MR. DORSETT: With regard to the staff that's out there performing the work that provides the service for us, there is no training for that.

You know, as far as them cutting work orders. We have our standard process where we go out and we do estimates and we meet with them there, we determine what that cost would be. So it's a case by case situation when it comes to requesting that work. But as far as a training for staff or maintenance mechanics to follow that process, there is no training for that.

MS. FERTIG: So I guess what I'm looking for is annually train them on what they are supposed to -- okay. I'm sorry.

MS. COKER: I just wanted to chime in on the procurement side. Thank you for the question.

Regarding the Procurement & Warehousing side, we have annual training for purchase requisitioners. Everyone who has access to SAP to create a purchase requisition, which is, you know, a PR in SAP requires to have the annual training. It's done on Canvas. And the following new school year, if you have not completed that training on Canvas I get the report and you're not allowed to get access to SAP.

2.1

2.2

Within that training it talks about the different thresholds and things that are required as part of backup for purchase requisitions. In the case of a bid, there is no backup needed as you're using an existing bid that would be current. As long as there's funds and spending authority available, the requisition could be issued, approved, and then the purchase order is complete. And we also have a standard operating procedures that has been in effect since 2018 and we have work instructions as well.

MR. DORSETT: See, the maintenance mechanics, they don't do purchase reqs and -- they don't follow that procedure. These are the guys that's out there performing the service. After all of

the internal stuff is done, they go out there and perform the work. So to say that -- and are they trained? Absolutely. They are trained for what they are doing, that physical work. A lot of them are licensed mechanics or so forth and so on. So as far as processing paperwork into the system, yeah, our internal staff, we follow that process and there's a training for that. But as far as the physical maintenance guys out there that's performing this work, I -- I -- I'm not aware of any training for that.

MR. MEDVIN: Dr. Lynch-Walsh?

2.1

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Thank you. Getting back to Mr. Mayersohn's comments, because we're using words interchangeably that do not mean the same thing. And, also, I'm not quite sure, because the recommendation was we recommend the practice of splitting purchases should not be allowed by district. The response says, it is not the practice of PPO to split work orders. So do "purchases" and "work orders" mean the same thing from your perspective, the perspective of the auditors? When you said "purchases" did you mean work orders?

MR. MONTE DE OCA: When I say "purchases"

it's the amount of -- if I may, through the Chair, provide an example?

For instance, the threshold for the level of authorization which is what happened here was \$5,000. Anything over \$5,000 needed an additional authorization, and correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Dorsett. What happened here is the employee, for whatever reason, whether to expedite the process or to avoid going to the person that has authority to authorize over \$5,000 decided to make it into two purchase orders.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: A purchase order or a work order?

MR. BAYS: Work orders.

MR. DORSETT: He's talking about work orders.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. I just want to be precise.

MS. STRAUSS: Nathalie, I just want to quickly point out, we have somebody shaking their head yes and someone no. So there's clear disagreement.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: So we'll get clarity on that. Okay. That's one thing.

All right. So --

MS. FERTIG: Can we resolve that issue that orders and purchase orders are the same?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: No, no, they're not. They're not the same at all.

2.1

MS. FERTIG: They are not the same. So we're talking two different things. Thank you.

MS. COKER: The process that the auditor is discussing is an internal PPO process and that's the process I alluded to to say that whatever the processes is. I apologize for having said it that way.

PPO has an internal process which is what this gentleman is describing. That is not the purchasing process, because I don't have an internal process that says anything over 5,000 needs a director's signature. That is a PPO internal process.

Therefore, a work order and a purchase order is not same thing.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Right. Okay. So if I can have the floor back because everyone keeps taking it.

All right. So we need clarification on that before we should be transmitting this thing.

But, also, last night we had to have a short

primer on the difference between policy process and procedures and then practice.

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 the policy could be the speed limit. you have a purchasing policy. I don't think that PPO has a policy. And these are things that we should have. So then you have a process. this case the process of getting asphalt repairs. In a -- in terms of a speed limit, the process of driving your car from A to B. The procedure is step by step what you're supposed to be doing. So if you're driving and you need to get from point A to point B, you're coming to KCW from Plantation, you're going down Pine Island and you turn left on Broward and stay on it until 3rd and go over the bridge to grandma's house. So that's the procedure. But let's say I know the speed limit is 35 and Nathalie has the practice of driving 50, am I following policy? No. following -- I'm going through the process, am I following procedures? No, because part of the procedure would say that you stay between this speed and that speed.

So a practice just means you're doing -- you may be following policy and procedure but you might not be. So when they say, we recommend the

practice of splitting, whether it be -- from their perspective of splitting -- when they say practice, that's their observation. There is definitely a practice, but it is not part of the standard operating procedure and there seems to be a lack of policy.

Now, getting back, because we seem to be straying from what their observations pertain to, they mention in the second -- the second big paragraph the cost of removal was already included in the approved bid price. I don't know how we got talking about mechanics and all that type of thing, but I'm guessing they don't approve -- they don't approve invoices, that the guys out in the field are not approving.

So we had this problem with the termite audit. Remember, they knew what the costs were supposed to be and they kept approving it. They kept overpaying repeatedly.

MS. FERTIG: Can you just get an answer to that last question you asked, because I'd like to hear it? Mr. Dorsett?

MR. DORSETT: Can you repeat the question, please?

MS. FERTIG: The question was whether the

guys actually doing the work that he was mentioning --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Oh, you mentioned, you somehow got out to the guys in the field, the mechanics, and you said they don't do paperwork or --

MR. DORSETT: Yeah, normally, that's handled by someone from the foreman level assigning that work. What the auditors were speaking about, again, that's where I started, we were talking about work orders. I was explaining that there is a practice of us not allowing the splitting of work orders. So work orders -- if you -- if a work order exceeds \$5,000 you need approval to move forward with that.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Is that written anywhere?

MR. DORSETT: Yes, it is. Yes, it is. And I
can provide you with that. But as far as --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. Right, because you're saying that you're going to develop an SOP, and to Mr. Mayersohn's point, he was -- it sounds like there's nothing written. But whatever's written we should have as part of this conversation. Because a practice is just you doing something. It's not something dictated in

writing. A policy and procedure, by definition, should be in writing. Although, this district is known for claiming that there's a policy or a procedure and we're like, well, where is it?

Well, it doesn't exist because it's not in writing. So you can't hold people accountable to things that aren't in writing. But if that is in writing, that would be helpful, and I'm requesting that for the continued discussion.

2.1

Okay. So -- and, also, to point out, it is not the people generating the work orders, just like with the termite audit, it's the same cast of characters. We saw the same names signing off on overcharges over and over again.

MR. JABOUIN: I'm sorry to interrupt, Dr. Lynch-Walsh. Could you please -- I'm trying to take note of what you're requesting. Can you kindly repeat that again?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I'm requesting the -whatever's written in PPO as far as the \$5,000
limit, whether we call them a procedure, an SOP,
or somebody's notes. Whatever we want to call
them, I'm requesting that. I'm kind of shocked
that that wouldn't be included in here. That's
something I would expect to see because at least

it's in writing.

2.1

2.2

Okay. So then moving on in the letter, so it says -- because it says, in our opinion the cost of removal was already included in the approved bid price, and Procurement seems to be taking a hit here, but I am guessing that the person with the authority to sign off before this thing gets paid should know what the contract says or doesn't say. And we have the bid, but then I don't know if that would also get us the actual contract. So that would be another piece of the puzzle that's missing, potentially.

Is that an additional piece of the -
MS. COKER: Just for clarification purposes,
this is an ITB and the ITB, itself, the document,
is the contract. So there is no additional
contract. The ITB, itself, is the actual
contract.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: So then the only other thing would be the invoices. And the work orders, invoices --

MS. COKER: Invoices. And, by the way, Mr. Jabouin, I do have access to the link. I have the link for the bid. But I know -- I would send it to you, but if I send it to you it would only

be good for internal staff. Therefore, I'm not going to send the link. I'm going to actually send you the document that you may forward to the committee members. Because if I send you the link it would only be valid for internal employees, because it's through internal email.

2.1

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. So getting back to this statement, cost removal was already included in the approved bid price. Who at management level is supposed to be familiar with the terms and whether or not the cost of removal should be in there or not?

MR. DORSETT: Okay. That was a subject for some discussion as well, because it wasn't really clear in the contract that the removal was included. So Ron Eggenberger, the manager for custodial grounds, contacted the procurement department to determine what is a viable solution because it wasn't clear in the bid.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. So before he signed the first one or does he not sign it? Like I would think that before you sign and pay the first time, especially when your department that has a tendency to pay too much for termite inspections, because that was an audit where

people just kept (indicating) for years, without looking at it, and it was crystal clear that they shouldn't have been, so before or clearly after, because it looks like the district is getting some money back.

MR. DORSETT: Ron, can you speak to the issue with regard to whether the \$1.58 was included in the contract and your communication with the procurement department on that?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: That's actually not what I asked.

Are you responsible for signing off on these invoices?

MR. EGGENBERGER: Yes.

2.1

MR. DORSETT: Yes, he is.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: So did you raise the question before you paid the first one?

MR. EGGENBERGER: Yes. The question came to me from Atlantic Southern Paving regarding that line item. They felt that that line item was not inclusive with the removal of the asphalt. So, after reviewing the bid and going through the language and speaking with a member of Procurement, in my opinion, it was a separate item. When you have the chance to look at the

bid, when you look at the line items, it's a menu, for lack of a better term. So you would, based on the project and what the scope of work you're performing, then you utilize those line items and that's how it's estimated.

2.1

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: But then how do invoices get paid to the point where the vendor is now reimbursing the district based on their findings?

If you contacted and got clarity prior to paying the first invoice that had that -- that had the fee that was already included, if you did it beforehand, how did they get paid to the point where the district is now being reimbursed?

Because I would expect that if you raise the question before paying that they would then correct it and then there would be no overpayment for the auditors to find.

MR. EGGENBERGER: The bid went back out where we did clean up, where we changed the language to make it clearer for that line item. It was then -- I don't want to go too deep into it all, but we ended up having to reject that bid and we're still utilizing the original bid. So we're -- that is a legal issue. I don't feel like I'm comfortable to speak to that, but --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: That's not what I'm asking at all. So, basically, it sounds like what you're telling me is that it didn't get caught before payments were made to the vendor.

2.1

I only base this on the logic that we're getting money back. So that implies -- actually, that doesn't imply, that indicates that payments -- overpayments had to have been made on something that was already included in the bid price, that you were being -- you overpaid and then it got caught. Or else there wouldn't be -- or else why are we getting these reimbursements?

MR. MONTE DE OCA: Through the Chair, if I may clarify? These are two different issues.

One is \$1.58 where the payments are included in there. The reimbursement was for repairs that were billed at a larger amount than the work that had taken place. In other words, they are two different issues. These two are two different issues.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. Thank you for that clarification.

MR. MONTE DE OCA: And by the way, while I have the floor, when we use the term "procurement process" it's a generic term of procuring

something, not necessarily the Procurement Department.

2.1

2.2

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I have no doubt that that's your meaning of the word, but that's not the district's interpretation of it.

Did you, in fact, go to the -- include the Procurement Department in any of this?

MR. MONTE DE OCA: Yes, we visited with them. And, if I may add, the complaint or the allegation title is Appearance of Irregularities Regarding the Procurement Process for so on and so forth. So that's where we generated the term procurement process. Again, it was the procurement of asphalt materials by PPO. And that's the way we intended it to be used. If I created some confusion by that, I apologize for it.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. It's more a happy coincidence for some people that was created. So the 24,000 of overcharges that are due to the 1.58, is that being reimbursed?

MR. MONTE DE OCA: No, ma'am. The reimbursement was 5,000-and-change.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Right. I see that. I'm looking at your letter. But it says you

identified overcharge totals of more than 24,000.

2.2

MR. MONTE DE OCA: And those were based on the \$1.58.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. So what's happening with those?

MR. MONTE DE OCA: We -- the district contacted the vendor and the vendor has provided a reply on -- on Appendix H. G, I'm sorry.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Hold on. It's not easy to find the appendices. G? Is the response that they are fighting it?

MR. MONTE DE OCA: There is -- through the Chair, the response is that they do not agree with us and my understanding is that they're --

MR. JABOUIN: Yeah, I can add to that. So they don't agree with us, but it's not really --we're still pursuing it, obviously, because we think that that's correct. So a letter has gone out from legal that I will forward to the audit committee based on that opinion that you have. And I'm trying to find that page for you. But there is another letter. We are continuing to pursue that. Appendix G is --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I found it.

MR. JABOUIN: That's the letter from them and

there is a reply to that letter because we disagree with it that I will send to the Audit Committee?

2.1

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. Yeah, this is starting to sound like the termite audit.

So, basically, the 24 grand is in dispute, and, hence, the need to see the bid, to see from start to finish what was said. And what happened before the bid gets developed? Shouldn't there be something documented as to what's to be included and not included?

And I'm not saying that Ms. Coker generates that, because last I checked Ms. Coker doesn't work in PPO and wouldn't know anything necessarily about asphalt removal. That's on PPO to know, to make sure that things are clear before it goes to Procurement.

MS. COKER: Through the Chair? There's a scope of work that my staff works with PPO in generating and creating the scope of work and the scope of services. So that -- the needs of the department are created by the department and that's compiled by PPO and then we put it into the template and then we go out to bid.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. And the bid in

question was developed when?

MS. COKER: In 2018.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. Because we're kind of short on dates sometimes in this report.

MS. COKER: The bid that I will be providing a copy is ITB 18-123C, which is bid in question. As Mr. Eggenberger referred to, yes, we do have a new bid based on some of the recommendations from a previous finding that we will be incorporating as changes to the new bid that would come out in 2023 because this one expires in, I believe it's in May of '23. So we are going to start working on the new bid in January of this -- of the new year.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. So adding to the things we would like to see, the needs that led to the ITB from PPO, in terms of -- because somewhere it should specify asphalt removal and removal and disposal or be clear so that you know what you need to put into the ITB. So is there something documented in writing?

Okay. All right. If we could have that, as well, basically, the scope of services from PPO, that would be great.

All right. And the reason I wasn't clear on

whether you included the Procurement Department is it said, it was made -- the completion of our investigation was made possible by the cooperation and support received from the staff of the Office of the Chief Auditor and Physical Plant Operations team, but didn't mention Procurement, so I wasn't clear.

2.1

MR. MONTE DE OCA: Through the Chair? The reason we didn't mention it is because our interaction with Procurement was not nearly as thorough as it was with PPO. We visited the Procurement Department once to discuss the bid and that was the extent of our engagement with that department.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. Those are all my questions regarding -- or comments as far as -- and requests for additional backup before I would ever entertain transmitting this.

MR. JABOUIN: Those are a copy of the bids, and I'll work with Procurement to get the link and provide the documents, what is written in PPO regarding \$5,000 limits and the scope of services. Those are the items that I have.

MR. MEDVIN: Ms. Strauss?

MS. STRAUSS: Yeah, so I just want to ask, I

mean, we're focusing on, you know, one situation here, it sounds like there was a termite situation that this is like, you know --

2.1

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Oh, yeah, and the earlier asphalt audits.

MS. STRAUSS: Earlier asphalt audits. So, you know, it's like Groundhog Day.

So my request, or my suggestion, I don't know how we get this done, is I want to understand everybody's roles, their level of accountability, and what course of actions will be taken if policy is not followed.

So I think that this district is trying to get better. If we continue to rely on what's already in place it clearly is not working. So I would like to see and make a recommendation that we revisit these processes and fix it.

So if you would like our professional input and our advice, obviously, you don't work for us, we're just the audit committee with a dotted line to the school board, but I am, personally, asking that we fix it. Because this is a broken system. Or else you guys wouldn't be experiencing Groundhog Day on this committee over and over again. I mean, who can imagine how much money

this has cost us?

2.1

So what are we going to do to get better? That's what I want to know.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: So there's an audit follow-up that's in policy --

MS. STRAUSS: Okay.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: -- that does not always get followed.

MS. STRAUSS: Okay.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: But in -- and I'm going off of the original one, so Policy 1002.1 --

MS. STRAUSS: Uh-huh.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: -- number 11, unless that's changed, and -- actually, yeah, the Chief Auditor of the Office of the Chief Auditor will follow up with departments, slash, divisions to obtain a current status on the action taken on each audit recommendation of the audit report. The current status will be performed periodically and will contain for each accepted recommendation on which action has been completed a brief description of the action taken, for each accepted recommendation on which further action is necessary, a brief description of the action plan and the established target date of completion,

for each rejected recommendation a statement of the specific reasons why the recommendation is not adopted and a description of any alternative course of action that is being considered. And that ties back to --

MR. JABOUIN: A brief interruption. These are all in the Audit Plan. The document that I submitted includes that. Also, I just wanted to mention --

MS. STRAUSS: But auditing a broken system doesn't do anything clearly.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: That is different from a follow-up.

MS. STRAUSS: Correct.

MR. JABOUIN: I ask that one person speaks, please.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Well, I have the floor, so I'll take it back.

So there's a difference between performing an audit -- to Ms. Strauss's point, performing an audit of a broken process and following up on whether or not they tried to fix said process.

So I do not want to gloss over this last bullet point which is still in even the proposed policy because it hasn't been adhered to.

In fact, the reason I don't care what's in the Audit Plan is that we would try to get this exact type of thing done in the Audit Plan and it wouldn't happen. So it is in policy that there has to be follow-up.

MR. JABOUIN: So the plan includes follow-up, just like the policy says. And there are audits that are ongoing right now that is looking at that particular process from budget, to request, to procurement, to contract, to bid, to payment. That is the process that is getting looked at. In the audit world it's called from procurement to pay. Those are part of the plan.

MS. STRAUSS: So you're looking at it and what are you going to do?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: And accountability.

MR. JABOUIN: We're going to do the audit and we will also look at the processes because that's fundamental.

MS. STRAUSS: You're looking. Looking. But as a conclusion of your looking what are you doing?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Right, the action taken.

MS. STRAUSS: Right. That's what I want to know.

MR. JABOUIN: So, obviously, there are recommendations if there are findings. But at the same time the process is looked at and recommendations to change the process and revisit the process will also be part of it, because that makes sense. Because you don't want to have a flawed process continue into perpetuity. You have to fix it. And that is what needs to be done.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Didn't you just say that?

MS. STRAUSS: That's what I thought.

MR. JABOUIN: And that's how I'm responding to you.

MR. MEDVIN: Ms. Fertig?

MS. FERTIG: Yeah. Thank you.

So I want to go back to where Mr. Mayersohn began. We've looked at split purchases in all kinds of areas. It's not just with this area. I believe we had it in technology. We've seen it in a number of areas. We know the district has a certain number of -- you know, a level of purchases that you can do under certain circumstances. So I believe there is policy on this. And I'm assuming we'll be seeing that in our next meeting. If there is not a policy then

that will tell us that.

2.1

And, Ms. Coker, thank you for coming today because I know you can shed light on all of this, but when in the past -- and to go back to when the, you know, standard operating policies were being broken for -- for coaches selling tickets at games and all, a lot of this did come back to training, so I'm really unclear after today's conversation, who is splitting these purchases in PPO and what their level is and what their training is. And I also want to see the -- I also want to see the purchase on -- this is not exclusive to this, you just haven't sat through where it happened on something else. And there are rules.

So the question becomes, what are you doing to make sure people know what the rules are? And then what are you doing if they're not followed? It's very simple, kind of, to me, I am not quite sure.

So, in any event, Ms. Coker, I'm going to be quiet, but I don't think that's what it -- I don't think this is exclusive to this department, but I'm really unsure who in this department is calling the shots on when they split that

purchase order, because somebody would have to be.

2.2

MS. COKER: So, thank you for that explanation. Again, I know that a lot of times people use purchase orders for everything. So, for me, it's very important that it's -- there is a Policy 3320, which talks about the breaking of purchases when, obviously, you know that they're not that amount and you break them down to be under the threshold.

Again, as I said earlier, specifically, this is -- this is not about breaking up purchase orders. Because when you look at the purchase orders that were audited, the purchase orders were within the threshold of the bid. The bid, itself, doesn't limit you. If you have a hundred thousand dollars of spend authority in budget and the department issues a purchase requisition for \$25,000, it will be processed because it is accordingly able to be processed under the terms and conditions and the policy of procurement.

What we're discussing here is not purchase order splitting, which does happen across the district a lot, and that falls under my responsibility. When I receive a purchase

requisition from any department that I can clearly see that they've broke it down to 4,999 and I get five orders of 4,999 for the same service the same day, then, obviously, that is my responsibility to not allow for that to happen and that is breaking of the purchases so that they don't go over the threshold.

2.1

What happens here is internally they have their own process, which, if it is \$5,000, I guess, they have to get approval from the director and so on and so forth.

So I believe it's not a breaking of purchase orders, but mostly breaking of their work orders and/or purchases, if you will, internally.

Because I don't have a problem with this bid or with the department issuing the purchase orders that have been issued because they have a framework, blanket purchase order, which means they have a check, that as long as they keep placing work orders and invoices keep coming in and they're approved and there is budget, they can continue to do what they have to do. So it is a breaking of the work orders within the department, not breaking of the purchase orders.

MR. DORSETT: Right. And that is clear.

This audit has cleared that up. Basically, we're talking about work orders, not necessarily purchase orders, to your point, Mary.

We have -- we've had situations where internally, staff, mechanics, I know we said we shouldn't be talking about mechanics, but in order to circumvent situations, in order to circumvent getting that approval level from the manager or a supervisor they will cut two work orders to -- to not follow.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: So, but following Mary's logic, if it's for the same location at the same time for the same thing, if Mary can spot somebody attempting shenanigans shouldn't PPO be able -- and if someone's really working hard you may miss it, but following the same logic that procurement does, and especially since people have seen these things over and over, if it's two work orders that look very similar for the same school, same time, same issue, isn't it on the person above them before they pay it to say, hey, what was this?

MR. DORSETT: And, again, like I've mentioned to you before, you know, there have been situations where staff did catch situations where

they split work orders and we address that when we find it. But there are situations where it may have for some reason gotten missed. And I think this situation here, you have an individual who, of course, we all know what happened there, he actually split work orders for whatever reason. He was caught doing it. And that's why he's where he is right now, you know.

2.1

So -- and if it wasn't a process or a legal issue, he wouldn't be where he is. But he did that, he had an ulterior motive. That employee is no longer with the district and we're trying to correct the process and move forward.

MR. MEDVIN: Mr. Mayersohn?

MR. MAYERSOHN: Yeah. So, Ms. Coker, what was the total amount of spend authority on this bid?

MS. COKER: I apologize, I don't have it, but if you give me two minutes I can get it for you.

I don't have the actual amount of the entire bid --

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay.

MS. COKER: -- but I will have that information for you.

MR. MAYERSOHN: So was it in a three-year bid

1 with options to renew?

MS. COKER: Yes, it was an ITB, an Invitation to Bid, with options to renew, and we have exercised the last option which expires in June of '23. Therefore, we're gonna go back out to bid shortly and we will take into consideration all the recommendations made by the auditors as it relates to ensuring that there is clear line items, because --

MR. MAYERSOHN: Right. So as you're researching it, answer me the question of what was the initial bid amount, and was there a request for any additional spend authority? So did it come back to the board and say, hey, we've spent whatever it is, \$5 million and now we need another 5 million?

MS. COKER: I can have that to you in five minutes.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. So that's number one.

Number two, and this is more to Ms. Strauss's point is that, there are businesses, there are organizations out there that have spent multiple millions and trillions of dollars. I'm wondering in the sense of looking at best practices. We operate looking at this by paper. We need to get

up to using electronics where something that becomes duplicative may be easier to identify through an electronic means than my eyes looking here and going, well, let's see what looks similar in the sense of, as you said, splitting work orders or purchase orders or whatever you want to include in them.

2.1

I think we need to look at trying to upgrade as a district in the technology aspect. And that's not just for this. This is for everything that we've seen. Because the common thread has been, even from the grand jury report, that, you know, the district is still operating with paper and pencil. And I think Mr. Jabouin has mentioned that numerous times as well. We need to take a serious look at trying to figure that out, because inevitably the cost that it may cost to find a program may, in turn, save us tons of money on the other end. So those are my comments.

MR. MEDVIN: Ms. Fertig?

MS. FERTIG: Yeah, I just wanted to say, on the next audit that's coming up, I'm assuming we're doing Property & Inventory on PPO next, and there was that comment about the manual process,

and I just was struck reading that, because last year we had that conversation, the year before we had that conversation and the year before and they're always going to be putting a system in.

I mean, it's 2022.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Maximo.

MS. FERTIG: Huh?

2.1

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Maximo.

MS. FERTIG: So it just -- yes, I agree with you, it's -- until they get that done we'll be having this conversation next year.

So are we ready to make a motion because we're gonna run out of time with Ms. Strauss's --

MS. STRAUSS: I was just going to say we have 45 minutes.

MR. MAYERSOHN: I think Ms. Coker has an answer to my question.

MS. COKER: Thank you, through the Chair.
Yes, so the total amount of the bid at hand here,
IT18-123C, the total amount is \$3.498 million and
we came to the board for an additional spend
request of \$898,000. So the total, including the
\$898,000 was \$3.498 million. And that was from
2018 all the way to '23.

MR. MAYERSOHN: And what was the initial

1 amount of the bid?

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. COKER: \$898,000.

MR. MAYERSOHN: That was the total in 2018 when it was awarded, was 800 --

MS. COKER: No. So before the additional spend request of \$898,000, so subtract 898 from the 3.4, that was the original amount.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Like 2-point-something.

MS. COKER: Yes.

MR. MAYERSOHN: 6? Right? 2.6?

MS. COKER: So we came to the board to ask for in '22, 898. And then the new amount, including the 898,000, including the original amount, is a total of 3.498.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay.

MS. COKER: All the way through 2023.

MR. MEDVIN: I'd like to get a motion to defer transmitting of this item until we see the documents.

MS. FERTIG: I think I moved to defer, but then we stopped.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: And I seconded it.

MS. FERTIG: Yeah, I think we had the motion.

I think.

MR. MAYERSOHN: We had the motion and then --

Thank you gentlemen for the audit.

MS. DAHL:

25

1 Thank you.

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: Is there a deferral for Number 9, as well?

MS. FERTIG: You know, it makes sense because, as Nathalie said, she's asking -- you know we added the request for the update of the Great City Schools.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: You mean 10? We just did 9.

MR. JABOUIN: Number 9 was deferred. Was 10 also deferred?

MR. MAYERSOHN: No.

MR. JABOUIN: What would the committee like to do with Number 10?

MS. FERTIG: I mean, if we're going to --

MR. MEDVIN: We could do it quickly.

MS. FERTIG: Okay.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: We may need additional information again.

MR. MAYERSOHN: I mean, my only comment on Number 10 is, if we're going to defer it, is that somebody from the Superintendent's office be here.

MS. FERTIG: Be here. Yeah.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Because it may get lost in

1 the translation.

2.1

MS. FERTIG: And, actually, I would like that, because at the bottom of page 12, this is what we were just talking about, these assets are at higher risk of being misplaced, lost, or prone to theft because the current manual process does not track assets in real-time. So I would kind of like to hear where we are on --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Maximo? The thing that's supposed to track all things assets.

MS. FERTIG: So -- but I'm happy to discuss this, I just -- I just, when I made these questions last night --

MR. MEDVIN: I think we should get through Number 11.

MR. JABOUIN: Which is next.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Oh, she has nothing to do with this. This is all --

MS. FERTIG: PPO should create and maintain a professional inventory system that enables them, every effort should be made to continue to locate, I mean, there's just a lot that's going to come back.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Right. So, you know what, we do need to defer this because we need the

Council of Great City Schools initial, an update on what's been done. The Facilities Task Force has been asking for, I think, two years for an update on Maximo's implementation, which was supposed to be implemented, I don't know, so many years ago.

Mr. Bays, you were tasked with implementing Maximo, when was that supposed to be in place?

MS. FERTIG: And the other thing that we asked, we asked on the record keeping, well, this is keeping a semiannual inventory. So I just think some of this stuff would be included.

So are we good with deferring and then we can go to the next one? Is that okay, Mr. Medvin, if we do that or do you want to --

MR. MEDVIN: Yes.

2.1

MS. FERTIG: Okay. So I'm gonna move to defer.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Second.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Mr. Jabouin?

MR. JABOUIN: I'm sorry, Mr. Mayersohn?

MR. MAYERSOHN: Where are we -- because we talked about this before about Property & Inventory, about getting it up to speed, whatever we are. Where are you at with that process?

MR. JABOUIN: So are you referring to the process where it's gonna get looked at from beginning to end?

MR. MAYERSOHN: Correct.

2.1

MR. JABOUIN: So there was a meeting on that this morning that I missed because I was preparing for this meeting, but it is proceeding, where they're working with a consultant to look at the inventory process and identify the key controls.

Now, the semiannual inventory will be a key control, because if that is working effectively, then our audits should find exceptions, that they're working on on that end. And so this particular audit, I would say that if we were doing the semiannual inventory, we would expect to see those things in there.

But it is proceeding, as far as your question.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Am I reading this right, there was a whole vehicle missing? Did I see that?

MS. ARCESE: It was a golf cart. I think it was disposed of incorrectly. It was not missing,

- 1 it's just it was disposed of without the proper
 2 documentation.
- MR. MEDVIN: So let's get to the RSM SMART Bond.
- 5 MR. MAYERSOHN: So we're gonna defer this?
- 6 MR. MEDVIN: Yeah.
- 7 MR. MAYERSOHN: So are we going to vote on 8 it, deferring it?
- 9 DR. LYNCH-WALSH: We didn't vote.
- MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay.
- DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I seconded it.
- 12 MS. FERTIG: I moved it.
- 13 MR. MEDVIN: Okay. All in favor?
- 14 COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.
- MR. MEDVIN: Opposed?
- 16 (No response.)
- 17 MR. JABOUIN: So I did get a text from Ms.
- 18 | Ighodaro that she's not on. I texted Ms. Shaw.
- 19 Ms. Shaw, are you on?
- 20 MS. SHAW: I am.
- 21 MR. JABOUIN: Okay. Thank you.
- 22 Okay. Thank you very much.
- 23 So Agenda Item Number 11, this is the RSM
- 24 Program Management Quarter 1 report that's
- 25 periodically done by RSM on the program manager

and the owner's representative.

So the normal process is to take these reports to the audit committee, then the school board and Chair Alston and I do agree with that process.

At the July 19th school board meeting when the previous report was being presented I was asked by the board and I confirmed that with the chair at the time to take those to a workshop. So that's what we did. If it wasn't for that direction, we would not have done so. But, nevertheless, the -- even though the board approved it at the workshop, before going to the board we are bringing it to the audit committee, so that way your comments can be absorbed before it goes on to the board.

So as you look through the report, and Mr. Luker, Mr. Blondell and Mr. Gums are here, there are four new observations. But there are a number of prior observations, particularly on the prior open findings on the contract time modification from February of 2020.

You know, during the discussions with the board I did indicate to them that that is an area of frustration from an audit standpoint, and yet

I understand some of the challenges that the business faces. So I do have Mr. Luker and his team from RSM to answer any questions on the report.

Mr. Chair?

2.1

MR. MEDVIN: Do you gentlemen have any comment to start?

MR. LUKER: We don't have any comments unless you'd like for us to walk through the report.

And we're happy to do that if that's your request.

MS. STRAUSS: Can you guys introduce yourselves, please?

MR. LUKER: Sure. David Luker, Director, RSM.

MR. GUMS: Chris Gums, RSM supervisor.

 $\mbox{MR.}$ BLONDELL: Matt Blondell, Director, RSM.

MS. LANGAN: Kathleen Langan, AECOM, Program Director.

MR. MEDVIN: I'm going to start. I really made a concerted effort to read this whole thing. And on the screen sometimes it was a little small. And in reading it I was thinking about the whole process. To go along, I think, with Ms. Strauss's comments about the prior audit was

regarding systemic things, I think it's important that I, as a member of the committee, understand and everybody understands some of the procedures. So if you will go along with me a little bit I'll ask you a couple of very basic questions to help me get a better understanding about this.

2.1

And this thing was dealing mostly with change orders; is that correct?

Okay. Now, every time there's a change order, does that mean previously at some point in time there was a contract and a bidding process done establishing the original project as far as following procedure?

MR. LUKER: Yes, sir, that's correct. The change orders that we reviewed as a part of our process were all preceded by a procurement process and an executed contract with a prime contractor to perform the work.

MR. MEDVIN: And because these are major repairs and new buildings and what have you, this is something that would go through the whole procedure and the board would approve it, as a matter of course? Before a contract starts, the board's approved it; is that your understanding?

MR. LUKER: Yes, sir, that's my

1 understanding.

2.1

MR. MEDVIN: Okay. And in preparing that contract for the board on the same procedures that were detailed in here in the meetings and the re-meetings and over and over and over again, does every project at its original formation go through that same, what appears to me, extremely tedious and long procedure?

MR. LUKER: I would defer to management to respond to their process for procuring contracts at inception, but would generally respond that, yes.

MR. MEDVIN: It's a general question.

MR. LUKER: Yes, sir, projects follow a very robust initial procurement and evaluation process before the contractors are selected and contracted with.

MR. MEDVIN: Okay. And my hope would be that in that process the appropriate architects and experts and people involved would have planned out this project in really good detail and cost estimates so when it's ready to start everybody knows where they stand; right?

Now, I also believe it's inevitable that with any major project there will be changes.

Somebody wants something new, the contractor
discovers additional problems, whatever it is, I
think it's part of the normal process.

2.1

Now, reading this, and reading your findings, it seems when that almost guaranteed event occurs, we have a major bog-down in the process of approving it, getting it through. And I think that's basically what you were auditing.

And my comment is, what can we do to streamline the procedure?

Because I think, in construction, time is money and I think a lot of money has been wasted, just in the time value of money. And I think this has come up before in various areas and it's always been a problem. I would like to hear your opinion and your expertise and maybe your suggestions to improve the whole procedure from top to bottom. Because I think we have some major difficulties. And I think Dr. Lynch-Walsh may agree with me on that and have a comment or two, I don't know, but I'm willing to hear from her now.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. Thank you.

I appreciate that you read this thing in detail, but I need to add some context. And I

think a document -- because, once again, we may need to defer something. Everybody needs the contract for AECOM and RFQ FY20-192. Because some of these reviews are so far removed from what we should be looking at. You do not hear me crying about change orders because the question that we asked is, are the change orders out of control for the program? There's some -- is Ashley -- there she is. So the answer is always, no, they're like one -- one percent?

2.1

Okay. The question that nobody asks because we fixate on change orders, and I'll get to why we really have change orders on this program in a second is, look at them on a school-by-school basis. Is there a correlation between the oldest, decrepit schools where there are things that are claimed to be unforeseen but should have been foreseen when you're forcing a renovation on a building that you have a Castaldi on for 20 years and should be demolishing and rebuilding, but we're continuing this crazy narrative that renovations were the way to go, so let's now beat up on the change order process?

Understand that throughout the life of this SMART Program we had to continuously look for

someone to blame so that the blame didn't fall on the shoulders of the people actually responsible for this steaming pile of pooh and fraud that was perpetuated on the people of Broward County, in that, 800 million was never going to do what needed to be done. All 800 million has brought us is a generation of kids and teachers and staff in buildings that we can't potentially fix. Because in order to then demolish and rebuild a building that you put a new roof and an HVAC on you need to ask the state. And the person you would ask was just deemed not qualified for the Facilities Chief position, but that's a whole other bit of drama. So the Office of Facilities for the Department of Education, when you stick a roof on and an HVAC, isn't going to let you turn around and demolish it, even though you should. It's like Building 6 at Stranahan, they're still trying to get the kiln to work, that building should have been demolished.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

So when you start opening buildings up and if you saw the front end -- so we had 800 million was the ask, they never got the final needs assessment report from Jacobs and refuse to just admit that, there's still -- until this district

admits to the mistakes that were made and says, mea culpa, we totally screwed up, we forced 800 million to look like something that it wasn't, we put in roof repairs for roofing estimates, which is why every time a project goes to the board for award there's millions of dollars more in additional funding needed because we're still in the DEFP. And Laurie Rich-Levinson would not let Judith Marte put in a line item to show that these are the additional funds needed to finish the project. They are still in at the 2014 estimates. Anyone who has done budgeting knows that your budget is based on your best estimate, and our best estimate is not the 2014 estimates that are roofing repairs, not the actual replacements that need to be done. And, I mean, replace of a roof, because God forbid we replace the whole building.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

So that has been the problem. So, first, and they were too confident about when they could start building. They claimed they could do that in 2015. Didn't happen. Then they didn't get the program manager in place until they got Heery. And, remember, by the time AECOM came the majority of, I want to say maybe 70 percent of

design was already in the hopper. Yeah, so, anyway, so it was all in design. So to your point, yes, in theory, but you've got to understand that design work didn't start in 2015 or '16. There was like a two-year delay because of who was running Procurement. You couldn't get anything out of Procurement. And they flooded the design market. And so you have competent architects up here that got work first, and then because of how things worked, you can't overload them, yeah, at the end some lesser experienced architects got work. And everything was done at the front end with haste, with poorly designed scopes because everything was hastily done to push it out the door.

2.1

So, yes, in a perfect world where everybody gets together and agrees on scope it shouldn't have this degree of change orders, especially when you're using CM at Risk, which they're using for some of the larger projects. There's a lot of hard bids. But this isn't a perfect world.

If you were writing a playbook for how to screw up a bond program, we wrote it.

So first it was, let's blame the architects, then it came out that the architectural reviews

being done by Heery in Atlanta, by people that didn't know Florida building code, were not adding any value. That was in an earlier RSM review. That should factor in to where we are today with change orders. Because nobody -- you could say renovate media center. Okay. What does that mean? We're designing on the fly. As projects are happening is when decisions are now being made. So don't be surprised by change orders. Be surprised that there aren't more.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

And they're still within -- well within industry standards because they do hash things out before going for the additional funding. And then it's when they open things up or you have to look at type. So I said look at schools. at which schools have change orders. When it was Falcon Cove and Cypress Bay they ate the entire contingent -- both sets of contingency budgets But where you want to look and where I've up. heard from architects, because they were told to stay within budget, there are people practically flogged to stay within budget, and then when that doesn't work is when you also have the change order because then the truth wins out and people are like yeah, we keep trying to make this work.

Markham, they were going to dismantle a brand new HVAC system to avoid the additional cost of creating one big door and they were going to force it through the two old doors until I pointed out that they were supposed to replace the entire building per the DEFP.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

So there's a whole pack of foolishness that's been going on behind the scenes where architects were being told to adhere to budget. There's lack of communication. Contractors are being told to adhere to budget, so they force the subs to do things without being compensated. actually have to respond to a sub that keeps coming back to me because they got approved for a change order and then were told to eat the cost, which is why, long story short, you don't hear the Facilities Task Force jumping up and down about change orders in term of the amount. They're insignificant. We've literally spent more money talking about it than the actual value of change orders.

But it is important to look at which schools have them, why they have them, to see if it provides a hint as to whether the scope was really what it should be.

So that's -- that's one issue as far as change orders go, because -- and could the process be better? Sure. Is there some paper and a lot of manpower involved? That could be changed.

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

But the amount of change orders, that is not what's holding this up. First it was the architects, then we came for the building department. Now we're coming for the change order process.

At some point we have to understand it was -if you fail to plan you plan to fail. And we are seeing the inevitable outcome of failing to plan. There's no getting around it. There's no massaging it. There's no blaming somebody else. I don't know who's going to be the next person that somebody tries to blame. It's a mess. It's a complete cockup of it didn't follow best practices, policies haven't been followed, people have been vilified. There's incompetence from soup to nuts. There was the way they prioritized roofs as PPO sat around looking at work orders and that's how they got prioritized, because they could never produce anything otherwise.

So it isn't just about change orders. But we

could spend the next half hour talking about change orders but that ain't going to be it either.

2.1

MR. MEDVIN: Okay. Thank you. Okay.

MS. FERTIG: Well, I would kind of like to address the issue that's in this report on change orders, which is not the number of change orders or the cost of the change orders, but the fact that their average duration is 335 days and I --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Because of confusion of what the scope is. They're still deciding.

MS. FERTIG: I'm sorry, I think that should be a concern. And I don't want to minimize it or make excuses.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: You can't undo it though.

MS. FERTIG: We sat here -- we can. We can move forward, which we're gonna have to do as a district. And the whole point of their work, which they have done an excellent job of pointing out things that we can do better and processes that we can change, and that's what we've been sitting here talking about all day, so I don't want to ignore it.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: The scope's already out there. It's been in design for 10,000 years.

1 MS. FERTIG: So just as with roofs, we talked 2 about why are projects taking so long.

MS. SHAW: Excuse me. Ms. Fertig, can you use your mike?

MS. FERTIG: Yes. I'm so sorry. I just discovered I wasn't. Can you hear me? Hello?

MS. SHAW: Yes. That's better. Thank you.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. So, just as with roofs, we discovered that a major reason for the delays on these schools was the length of time it was taking to get through the permitting process on roofs, I want to talk about the fact that the average duration of a change order is 335 days.

And Observation 4 that projects being updated and change orders going to the board when they're behind time is not happening. So I just want to see what can we do to make sure -- we're not going to be able to go. Nathalie, you and I sat here and we begged them not to move forward in 2014 and we lost; okay? But what we can do is try to improve the processes. If we save a month, if we save two months.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Paper. Can you get it off of paper? Because there's so much paper involved in that.

MS. FERTIG: Well, I have real concerns about the first one and I would just like to hear from -- from RSM if they have any suggestions and where you think this is now.

MR. LUKER: Sure. Thank you. David Luker, again.

I think the thing that jumped out to me the most with respect to the first finding is, on the table to the right, the Individual Process Owner Data, this gives you an idea, the far-right column, Total Days in Queue (Average), gives you an idea of where the change order sat for the longest periods of time.

Now, there are multiple rounds of review and back and forth. So it is logical that the PM would be the primary person that would be responsible for pushing the change order through the process, but I think that also creates the biggest opportunity for us to create additional layers of accountability utilizing e-Builder and automation opportunities in e-Builder to hold those PMs accountable to pushing that paperwork through the process.

I know that AECOM and Atkins have spent some time now improving the change order workflow and

updating their process for pushing change orders all the way from RFI to an executed change order, so they may be able to speak to what automations have been built in. But I think that project manager accountability is really the most impactful thing we could do at this point.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. So let me ask Ms. Langan if she can respond to that?

I'm sorry. I was just going to say, if you've made changes, if you could just say that.

MR. MEDVIN: Please.

MS. LANGAN: Yes. Kathleen Langan, Program Director.

Yeah, so we -- Mr. Luker is correct. We at some time, actually, back in the State of the Program in December of '20, we identified similar issues that RSM has now brought forward. We actually identified for 192 days that it took from start to finish.

So this is something that we have been working on. As everybody knows, the e-Builder process has been being worked on to improve and automate the processes. You know, we still in Facilities have what's called a red folder. And these red folders get stacked up on my desk, as

I'm sure they do Mr. Bays and others, and they go around Facilities for maybe six signatures. So there is still work to be done in the OCP and the bond project process. But we have actually just launched the new PCO and the change order process.

2.1

The automation will now notify each person who has a change order in their court that they have them in for this many days and it has to be moved.

What I would offer is -- so that's -- maybe you want to give more detail, but, basically, we have finalized the automation of PCOs and COs and we expect that the improvement will be significant because of, as Mr. Luker identified, people are getting pings. And, you know, when you have 40 projects per team leader, it's helpful to have automation for sure.

So that's being done. If you look at our management response it gives a very detailed level of everything that's going on to improve the processes.

Mr. Luker is right that the project manager will typically have in his court the change order for the most time. And that is because he is

required to get all the backup, every bit of backup. And it's a lot. It's a tremendous amount of backup that we have to bug the contractor for and we've actually recommended now that the project manager move the change order back to the contractor if he owes -- if he owes backup. They're negotiating pricing. They're confirming that the scope is correct. They're doing all kinds of work. So it's typical that it would be there the longest.

2.1

Do you want to add anything?

MS. CARPENTER: Sure, I'd like to.

Ashley Carpenter with Atkins. It says it's on but maybe I can sit closer. With the e-Builder workflow it is now -- that AECOM's team built, it is now live and the -- some additional automation and things that have taken place, to your point, Nathalie, about paper, the workflow is now generating all the district forms related to the change orders. So the contractor puts in the data and then all the forms are automatically generated and put into the process automatically. Everything -- the process precedes all the way from the time the contractor even thinks of something in his mind related to a change order,

all the way through passed board approval, with the generation of Capital putting it in SAP and Purchasing preparing or modifying the purchase order. So it's the entire soup-to-nuts process that is within one trackable, auditable process in e-Builder, so there aren't any gaps now between, oh, well, yes, they've finished the e-Builder process, but then through paper and emails and it goes through the board process, it's just all much more integrated and tied in now, which I believe will help and that will give the vendors and anybody on the project team the ability to always be able to see where that is. Plus it's automated. Some processes that previously were done through red folders, like Kathleen mentioned. For instance, architect proposals and negotiations and amendments, those were typically handled through emails and meetings and things outside of e-Builder and now the whole entire process is in e-Builder, so I think there's a lot more controls that are in place through the new workflows.

MS. FERTIG: So is it -- can I just follow up?

MR. MEDVIN: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

MS. FERTIG: My question to that was, and I know this is probably a tough question to answer, so I probably shouldn't ask it, but do you see -- do you have an idea of what kind of a time savings you might have on this? So if the average is 335 days now, which is nearly a year on a change order, what's it going to be now that you finally have the automation? And I don't mean "finally" you, because you've heard us talk today about automation across the board. So what do you project -- how do you project that this will change the timeframe for delivery to the schools?

2.1

MS. LANGAN: I don't know that we have a specific projection right now. What we do have, at the board meeting when the audit was presented we have some follow-up, and one of them is a question on, what does the workflow look like? And you can't see this, but this is, basically, what it looks like.

What we will now do based on the board's questions are, and we're meeting tomorrow to, actually, put a timeline of each element of the process that we expect it to take and that we will track. And so we're going to be very

conscious of this. We will follow what we think the timelines are going to be and we'll be able to start tracking and reporting on it. Right now we don't have a sense of it because e-Builder has always been set up after the fact rather than virtual.

2.2

MS. FERTIG: Okay. Thank you. I do have a question when we get to Number 4.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Yes, my comment or question is still on 1. Did you do anything like this when Heery was here?

MR. LUKER: Thank you for the question. I was, actually, just messaging back and forth with Mr. Blondell to try to recall whether this had come up in previous audits and what we recommended in previous audits. I would have to get back to you. But we have consistently reviewed change orders as a part of our audits at least annually. I would imagine that we've had a scope that has touched that, but I would have to get back with you.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Right. So, but, here's my thing with this. Because the problem with the board members that were removed is we had a constant wanting to blame somebody, and AECOM has

been the most recent scapegoat that, you know -I remember the -- I think it was the July 26th or
something or both or the one before that. And my
point is, nobody cared. No board member cared
about how long change orders were taking. Nobody
looked at how much paper was involved in the
Building Department or any process. If you want
to see another paper process, try getting your
bill paid. There's a bunch of paper and a bunch
of approvals that it has to go through.

2.1

So Heery was here from the beginning through 2020. They did not put in a proposed -- they did not put in a response to RFQ in 2020. They were done. They took their 70 million and left.

So the point is, so, yes, are these numbers great? No. Do they surprise me? No. Because we have paper-based processes and we have things that are so messed up, projects with scopes that are so messed up, that it'll take you through the completion of the project to finally get something moving. But there was no outrage over -- and no look-ahead and no holding Heery accountable or the board or the superintendent for the paper-based processes in any of the departments along the way that are causing

1 delays.

2.1

MS. FERTIG: Well, I don't necessarily agree with that because I think we've been discussing this right along. And I'm not blaming anybody --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I'm not saying you were.

MS. FERTIG: -- for the processes.

But I think when we have data in front of us, regardless of what the company is or who the employee is, you said earlier -- as you said earlier, we always like to blame the person who left. I think it's our responsibility to look at the data in front of us and see what can we do to put things in places that are going to address these issues so we don't see them on the next audit. And I see a number of things here. And they're routine things. And, listen, someone said, how are we ever going to fix this? Well, we're never gonna have a perfect world so there will always be an audit committee.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Right. But it can't be fixed. The point is -- but it can't. Because it was so messy from the beginning.

MS. FERTIG: Are you telling me or Rebecca?

Because we sat here with you. I'm just kidding.

That was a joke.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: No, no, no. I'm saying that the data is what the data is. But what I'm saying is, whether we can shave days, should it take a year, no, but are we going to have others that are taking longer?

2.1

So I would think -- I don't know if this is the first time you've done this, but if we're gonna compare the delays and the process, because everybody over in OCP -- remember, there's a whole other piece to this, which is the Office of Capital Programs. And there's not two people working over there. So everybody kept trying to tinker with the change order process. Did any of them bring to the board we need to automate something? And they had years to do it.

MS. FERTIG: I'm just trying to look at the audit before us.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I know, but I don't want it taken out of context.

MS. FERTIG: I think we are. I think every time we get on this and I -- well, I'm not gonna say what I'm thinking. But I think -- I think we have different standards for different people. We have some data in front of us. There's some things we can do. We can make sure we get some

forms signed when they're supposed to be signed. If you're supposed to update a plan, whenever you're supposed to update it by, it should be updated by then. Those are some very clear findings in here. And I know you're aware of them. I know you work hard. You do a good job. That's not the issue. The issue is, I'm sure that, internally, you're fixing some of this.

MS. LANGAN: Agreed. If I could just go back and reiterate. Totally agree. Because when we came in -- AECOM came in and the State of the Program, as I said, in December of 2020, we recognized this problem and started immediately to address the how to figure out, within the systems that district had, what could we do to improve the 196 days. So as the process has gone along, it has taken us over 12 months to get all of those processes fixed and updated in e-Builder to the point where we have just launched the final cost and financial portions of this system. It's been a huge effort, much more than we ever anticipated.

So we expect it will improve and it's important to improve. I mean, this isn't the first data that we've seen.

1 MS. FERTIG: Right.

MS. LANGAN: So we've been working on it and I think RSM would back us up. I'm sorry to take your spot.

MS. STRAUSS: Yeah, I just -- I agree, Mrs. Fertig. And, Nathalie, with all due respect, I know you've been intimately involved in this process, nobody is disputing that from the very beginning this whole thing was a disaster. But all we can do is try and move forward. It's now money wasted, down the toilet. That's the sum cost. Done. It's unfortunate that every Broward County taxpayer has suffered.

But, to your point, and I do have an appreciation for how long technology does take to implement as I own a tech startup company, it's a long time; okay? And so I just think that if you could just provide the answer. We want to see that things are getting better. And I'm confident it will get better with technology. But taking the amount of days for a change order, and, Nathalie, it could be insignificant, right, a change order is not something that Facilities Task Force harps on because of whatever it may or may not mean, whatever, I'm not disputing that,

but it's something that's getting better. Time is money. I think we'll all agree on that.

2.1

2.2

So if you could let us know, with the implementation of these systems, what improvement in the form of days are we going to see so we can equate that to money. Because time is money.

So, by the way, the cost of implementing that system, what was it? How long is it going to take for us to get our ROI on that? Because I know it's expensive to do these implementations. So then we can make very reasonable, well-informed decisions around what processes do we implement moving forward we'll have an ROI that's worth it; okay? Because continuing to ask outside consultants and this and that and lawyers and this -- that's expensive, too.

So if we can just all agree on systems that are gonna work, that there's an ROI on to improve whatever we can on this horrible disaster is the only thing we can do. We cannot continue to harp on the past. It's done. What's done is done.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: It's done but it's trickling -- it's cycling through.

So, seeing this updated -- so the first thing that's confusing about this report, and I don't

like the departure we made, is this is either a quarterly report or it's not. So it says fiscal year 2022-23 Q1. We are still in Q1. So -- and then it says September 2022, and I'm not sure this actually clarifies when the dates stop in here. Like all your other reports are pretty clear as to what period you were looking at. There are dates in here, but it's never clear what dates we're looking at in here.

2.1

MR. LUKER: Sure. I'd like to answer your first question and then answer this question.

So I was able to find prior recommendations issued under Heery's management with respect to automating workflows including RFI and PCO and change order processes. And I think we've also seen some follow-up reports in 2020, I think, when Atkins and Ashley first came on talking about some of the similar automation initiatives using e-Builder to streamline some of those workflows. So we have looked at that in the past. I'm happy to follow up and share the specifics of where those recommendations were and what they --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Well, you know I have all these.

1 MR. LUKER: I know you do.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

But to answer your question, currently, about this report, the sample -- the populations that we pulled our samples from for these transactions were not limited to only one quarter's worth of data. For example, the change orders' population was data that was for the entire year of 2022.

And so -- go ahead.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: You mean fiscal year '22.

MR. LUKER: Calendar year of '22.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Well, we're still in --

MR. LUKER: Correct. Starting in January of

MR. GUMS: Through -- Chris Gums, RSM supervisor, through the July 19th board meeting.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Through the what, July 19th?

MR. GUMS: July 19th board meeting.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay.

MR. LUKER: And the reason that we picked that timeframe was because we've heard feedback in the past that some of the data we've provided has been dated. So we wanted to make sure that we were picking the most current change orders that we possibly could that would have been all

the way through the change order process to do this evaluation.

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: Okay. But to the point of evaluating AECOM on a quarterly basis, if you're doing this table every quarter then we have to be comparing apples to apples and oranges to It can't be nine months this time from oranges. that year, three months this time from this year. Because then we can't tell if they're improving. Because I'm -- when I look at these I go we're putting roofs on things we're gonna end up having to beg the state to demolish and possibly consolidate, but if it would make everybody else happy, if you're going to do this on a quarterly basis, then it needs to be clear that for this quarter, if they're saying we're implementing X, Y and Z, you should be able to see some sort of improvement by comparing quarter to quarter.

So if it went through July, and getting to the date of this, July 19th is the first month of the current year, so then what, pray tell, period would we be looking at? And one of the things I think I emailed about getting clarity on is, when do we get this report and what period will it cover? Because I'm getting tired of having to

look at dates in the report to figure out, because when we look at their report, we get monthly reports. I'm used to quarterly results. We departed from that and now it's just sort of whatever timeframe somebody asks them to look at, and yet it will still have Q1 or Q3 or Q4.

2.1

So I would like to see some consistency in terms of what we're getting. Because now the next one would be July 20th through September?

MR. LUKER: And, if I may, I appreciate the comments and I think the reason that we've maybe departed from a very structured period of samples is because of the dynamic nature of the scope of work that we perform each quarter. The scope of work does have some standard components to it, so there are, for example, Atkins and AECOM invoices that we do a review over after they've already been processed. That, the timeframe for those invoices is always in a, you know, following the three-month process. But there are unique -- there are unique elements of our scope that -- I can stop.

MR. MEDVIN: I hate to interrupt you. We have a hard stop time of 1:45 which is almost here.

- 1 DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Some people do.
- 2 MR. MEDVIN: We're gonna lose our quorum.
 - MS. FERTIG: We're losing our quorum.
- DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I'm fine deferring this one, too.
- 6 MS. FERTIG: Okay. So I'm gonna move to defer before we lose our quorum.
 - MR. MAYERSOHN: I'll second.
 - MR. MEDVIN: All in favor?
- 10 COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.
- MR. MEDVIN: All opposed?
- 12 (No response.)

3

8

9

- MR. MEDVIN: Okay. So 1:45 was a hard time for several individuals.
- MS. DAHL: I'm sorry, but the agenda says 1:15.
- MR. MEDVIN: When have we been on time?
- 18 MS. DAHL: Never, but I have a chauffeur now.
- 19 I can't drive.
- MR. MAYERSOHN: We were once -- once upon a time we were on time.
- MR. MEDVIN: All right. Well, motion for adjournment?
- MS. FERTIG: Move to adjourn.
- 25 MR. MEDVIN: We could talk but we have to

1 adjourn the meeting.

2.2

MR. JABOUIN: We lose our court reporter as well.

MR. MEDVIN: The court reporter has to leave also.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I just want to ask for one thing before we lose Mr. Bass then. Or I just want to ask about one thing.

MPUs. So if I have one complaint, there is a major concern, because we find the MPUs very helpful to know what's going on at the schools, but if we're three months behind, then we don't know what's going on and we're no better than BOC at knowing what's going on.

So any recommendations for how to get those reports? Coming from an accounting background, the world comes to an end at month's end and you put in whatever, whether it be invoices, purchase orders, any paperwork from month end or progress updates at month end and all work ceases, you keep the month open and then it's done.

But what has been happening historically is that project managers are putting in stuff for -- let's say we're in October and today is October 13th, they're still putting in or haven't yet put

in the stuff for September. It's like, no, no, you're doing this now in October, you put in October's date for stuff you're doing today and you should have been done with --

MS. LANGAN: Could I just comment real quick before everybody has to go?

So you're right. Over the last -- over the course of the summer we got way behind. And primarily because, you know, we completed 181 projects this summer that we had to get occupancy. Everybody was out in the field.

Nobody focused on MPUs. I can tell you that we have submitted our August report and we are finishing up with MPUs this week, by Monday, for the September report.

So we will get back on track and hopefully be submitting our monthly reports within, you know, the first two, two and a half weeks of the following month.

We have to wait until the following month.

We don't get contractor schedules until at least
the 5th. So we're forecasting in a lot of cases.

So it's important that, you know, the 5th of the
month is what we've told contractors we have to
have the schedules. Some comply, some don't. If

they don't we -- you know, we work through that.

But that's the reason for at least having for the first two weeks of the following month.

And I'll just commit to you that now that we're back on track I think that you're gonna be happier with the reports.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Right. Because I'm getting the impression people think I'm easier on you guys, but it's because I understand. I'm not gonna blame you for stuff Heery created or a board member.

MS. FERTIG: I'm really uncomfortable with substantive conversation with no quorum.

MR. MEDVIN: Okay. We've got to stop. The reporter has an appointment. He has to leave.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: We're not voting on anything.

MS. FERTIG: We will ultimately be voting on this and we do not have a quorum. So I --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. I'll just repeat everything I just said next time and that'll cure it. That's how you cure it is you say it all over again. That is how it works.

MR. MEDVIN: I think we're adjourned. Thank you all.

Page 121 (Meeting was concluded at 1:48 p.m.) 1 2 3 4 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 5 STATE OF FLORIDA COUNTY OF BROWARD 6 7 I, Timothy R. Bass, Court Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Florida at Large, hereby certify that I was authorized to and did stenographically report the foregoing proceedings, and 11 that the transcript is a true and complete record of 12 my stenographic notes thereof. 13 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither an 14 attorney, nor counsel for the parties to this cause, 15 hor a relative or employee of any attorney or party 16 connected with this litigation, nor am I financially 17 linterested in the outcome of this action. 18 Dated this 18th day of October, 2022, Fort 19 Lauderdale, Broward County, Florida. 20 2.1 22 TIMOTHY R. BASS Court Reporter 23 24 25

A
A.M 1:17
abandon 33:22
ability 104:13
able 18:14 26:25 27:8
72:20 74:15 99:18
101:3 104:13 106:2
113:12 115:17
absence 18:5
absolutely 13:6 44:8
49:3
absorbed 86:15
accepted 67:20,22
access 48:3,9 56:23
accountability 47:1
66:10 69:16 100:20
101:5
accountable 8:1 55:6
100:22 107:23
accounting 118:16
accurate 27:17
acquire 38:8
action 40:9 67:17,21
67:22,23,24 68:4
69:23 121:17
actions 66:11
actual 21:10 56:10
56:17 75:20 93:15
96:20
add 8:5 14:18 21:21
31:3,4 61:9 62:15
90:25 103:11
added 14:13 81:6
addendum 12:23
adding 64:15 95:3
addition 14:23
additional 50:6 56:13
56:16 65:17 76:13
78:21 79:5 81:18
90:2 93:7,10 95:13
96:2 100:19 103:16
address 28:9 41:21
75:1 80:19,23 98:6
108:13 110:14
addressed 9:14 27:21
41:6,15 80:21
adhere 8:18 96:9,11
adhered 68:25
adjourn 117:24
118:1
adjourned 120:24

adjournment 117:23
adjustment 14:11
adjustments 14:8
administration 1:12
27:22
administrative 9:11
40:22 41:6,23
admit 92:25
admits 93:1
adopted 68:3
advantage 10:10
advice 66:19
Advisory 2:22
AECOM 2:23 8:1
87:18 91:3 93:24
100:24 106:25
110:11 115:4
116:16
AECOM's 103:15
afternoon 37:21
agency 43:9
agenda 5:12,15 7:7
10:23 11:4 12:5
14:1 15:23 85:23
117:15
ago 35:3 41:7,7,14,15
41:24 80:1 83:6
agree 6:24 10:8 37:25
62:13,16 78:9 86:4
90:20 108:2 110:10
111:5 112:2,17
agreed 28:2 110:9
agrees 94:17
ahead 21:18 27:4
114:8
ain't 98:2
Ali 2:8 5:1
allegation 26:4 36:25
61:10
allegations 25:18
26:3,7,12 27:15,16
28:22 29:1 32:8
45:15
Allegiance 3:6,8
Allen 24:2
allow 14:16 40:5 73:5
allowable 43:25
allowed 37:3 48:9
49:18
77.10

allowing 54:12

allows 39:5

alluded 51:9

11.
Alston 86:4
alternative 68:3
amend 8:8,9 13:21 amendment 21:19
amendments 104:17
amount 29:24 39:25
44:1 50:1 60:17
72:9 75:16,20
76:12 78:19,20
79:1,7,12,14 96:18
97:6 103:3 111:21
amounting 28:4
and/or 39:13 73:14
Andrew 2:2 4:4
Ann 2:9 5:8
announce 23:1
annual 46:8,9,15
47:7 48:2,5
annually 19:22 47:22 106:19
answer 28:19 36:19
46:23 53:20 76:11
78:17 87:3 91:9
105:2 111:18
113:10,11 114:2
Anthony 3:17
anticipated 110:22
anybody 31:7,17
104:12 108:4
anyway 94:2
apologize 51:10
61:16 75:18
appear 42:9
Appearance 61:10
appears 89:7 appendices 62:10
Appendix 62:8,23
apples 115:6,6
appointment 120:15
appreciate 35:18
90:24 116:10
appreciation 111:15
appropriate 20:24
44:9 89:19
approval 5:14 14:14
54:14 73:10 74:8
104:1
approvals 107:10
approve 10:17 11:1,1
11:18,20 12:12 14:4 53:14,14
14:4 53:14,14 88:22
00.22

approved 6:2,4 25:4 48:18 53:11 56:4 57:9 73:21 86:13 88:24 96:14 **approving** 15:7,14 53:15,18 90:7 **Arcese** 2:8 5:1,1 84:24 architect 104:16 **architects** 89:19 94:9 94:12,24 95:20 96:8 97:8 architectural 94:25 area 45:5 70:18 86:24 areas 24:20 25:3,5,15 46:7 70:18,20 90:14 **Ashley** 2:23 91:9 103:13 113:17 aside 34:8 asked 35:11 53:21 58:11 83:10,10 86:8 91:7 **asking** 10:3 41:18 46:14 60:1 66:21 81:5 83:3 asks 91:11 116:5 **aspect** 77:9 aspects 14:21 **asphalt** 6:8 7:9,10,12 8:16 9:17 28:13 30:14 32:2,9 52:7 58:21 61:14 63:15 64:18 66:5,6 assessment 92:24 assets 82:4,7,10 **assigned** 2:13 23:5 33:22 assigning 54:8 assignments 33:19 **assist** 27:8 Assistant 17:12 assisted 27:10 Associate 16:23 20:13 assuming 20:17 35:24 70:24 77:23 assumption 37:12 ate 95:17 **Atkins** 2:23 100:24 103:13 113:17 authorized 121:9

116:16 Atlanta 95:1 **Atlantic** 16:10 24:4 58:19 attempting 74:14 **attend** 18:15 **ATTENDANCE** 2:1 attended 16:19 attention 40:13 **attorney** 121:14,15 audit 1:5 2:8 5:1 6:4 7:9,10 8:4,6,7,13 8:15,17 13:18 14:1 14:12 15:9,15 16:1 16:3,4,5 23:15 24:9 24:20 25:3,13,25 26:12,15,18 27:6 28:20 32:2 39:17 44:25 45:5,14,21 53:17 55:12 57:25 62:19 63:2,5 66:20 67:4,17,18 68:7,20 68:21 69:2,3,12,17 74:1 77:23 80:25 84:15 86:3.14.25 87:25 105:16 108:15,19 109:17 auditable 104:5 **audited** 72:14 auditing 17:20 68:10 90:8 **auditor** 2:7,8,9 4:23 4:25 5:3,5,7,9 6:6 10:3 15:24,24 17:3 17:24 25:13 26:14 26:16 43:25 44:2 51:7 65:5 67:14,15 auditors 49:23 54:9 59:17 76:7 audits 2:9 5:23 6:3 6:20 9:2 15:25 25:4 41:25 44:15,18,21 45:1,7,23 46:21 66:5,6 69:7 84:13 106:15,16,18 **August** 119:13 authority 48:17 50:10 56:7 72:17 75:16 76:13 authorization 50:4,6 authorize 50:10

automate 101:23 5:10 7:3 118:7 108:10 120:10 95:2 96:6 97:8 60:13 62:13 63:18 109:14 121:7,22 **blaming** 97:15 108:4 107:7 65:8 78:18 80:15 **blanket** 73:18 automated 104:14 **Bay** 95:17 **buildings** 88:20 92:8 86:4,9 87:5 automatically 103:21 Bays 2:13 23:4,4 **Blondell** 2:22 86:18 92:21 **challenges** 6:9 87:1 87:17,17 106:14 103:22 50:15 83:7 102:1 **built** 101:4 103:16 chance 13:5 27:1 automating 113:14 beat 46:2 91:22 board 1:3,12 7:20 8:9 **bullet** 68:24 35:25 44:20 58:25 automation 100:21 **beating** 8:19 46:1 12:10 14:20 16:7 **bunch** 107:9,9 **change** 70:4 88:7,9 102:7,13,18 103:17 beg 115:12 16:17 17:4 34:4,15 **bus** 34:20 88:15 91:6,7,12,13 105:8,10 113:18 began 70:17 **business** 2:22 87:2 91:23 94:18 95:5,9 43:1 66:21 76:14 automations 101:3 **begged** 99:19 businesses 76:21 78:21 79:11 86:4,6 95:16,23 96:15,18 available 48:17 beginning 84:3 86:8,12,14,16,24 **buzz** 26:6 96:21 97:2,6,9,25 **Avenue** 1:13,24 107:11 108:22 88:22 89:3 93:5 98:2,6,7,8,21 99:13 \mathbf{C} 111:9 average 98:9 99:13 99:15 104:1,9 99:15 100:12,17,25 C 2:10 100:11 105:6 **believe** 9:6 34:10 105:10,16 106:24 101:1,2 102:5,8,24 Calendar 114:10 avoid 38:2 50:9 96:2 39:17 64:11 70:19 107:4,23 109:14 103:5,20,25 105:7 call 3:10 55:21,22 **award** 93:6 70:23 73:12 89:24 114:15,18 120:11 105:12 106:18 **called** 10:11 69:12 awarded 79:4 104:11 board's 88:24 105:21 107:5 109:13 101:24 aware 17:23 25:1 best 22:14 76:24 **BOC** 118:13 111:21,23 113:15 **calling** 71:25 40:7 49:11 110:5 93:13,14 97:18 **bog-down** 90:6 114:6,24 115:1 Canvas 48:6,8 Aye 11:11,25 12:17 better 59:2 66:14 **bond** 85:4 94:23 **changed** 59:19 67:14 **Capital** 2:13 23:5 15:16 22:16 80:5 67:2 88:6 97:3 102:4 97:5 bothered 32:22 104:2 109:11 85:14 117:10 98:20 99:7 111:19 **changes** 14:6 64:10 **bottom** 11:3 82:3 capture 22:2 89:25 101:10 111:20 112:1 В car 52:9 90:18 characters 32:17 118:13 **B** 2:11 8:22 52:9,12 care 8:7 13:3,21 69:1 55:13 **bid** 7:13.14 9:18 **brand** 18:12 96:1 back 3:15 7:25 10:14 29:12 30:17,24 **break** 72:9 cared 107:4,4 **charge** 20:10 29:11 12:23 18:22 26:25 Carpenter 2:23 31:5,10,19,25,25 **breaking** 39:18 72:7 **charged** 29:19 30:20 32:14 42:16 44:20 103:12,13 32:4 34:6 35:9.10 72:12 73:6.12.13 charging 28:12 49:13 51:21 53:7 carries 11:14 12:3.20 35:10,24 36:9 39:1 73:23,24 **chart** 42:16 57:7 58:5 59:18 39:3,4,5 40:4 48:14 bribes 25:8 15:19 22:19 80:8 chauffeur 117:18 60:6 68:5,18 70:16 cart 84:24 48:15 53:11 56:5,9 **bridge** 52:15 **check** 73:19 71:4,7 76:5,14 Cartwright 16:25 checked 63:13 56:24 57:9,19 **brief** 67:21,24 68:6 80:13 82:23 96:14 case 42:25 47:17,17 58:22 59:1,18,22 **bring** 7:10 10:9,14 checks 28:4 100:15 101:15 48:14 52:7 59:23 60:9 63:7,9 36:23 40:12 109:14 **chief** 2:7,8,14 4:23,24 103:6 106:13,17,21 cases 119:22 63:24,25 64:5,6,8 bringing 86:14 5:2,5,7,8 25:13 **broke** 73:2 110:9 111:3 119:16 64:10,13 65:12 cast 32:17 55:12 26:16 65:5 67:14 120:5 Castaldi 91:19 69:10 72:15,15 **broken** 66:22 68:10 67:15 92:13 background 118:16 73:15 75:17,21,25 catch 74:25 68:21 71:6 children 7:1 caught 40:11 60:3.11 backup 48:13,14 76:3,6,12 78:19 **brought** 25:22 27:17 **chime** 47:24 75:7 65:17 103:1,2,3,7 79:1 45:12 92:6 101:17 **Chris** 2:22 87:16 base 60:5 cause 121:14 **bidding** 88:11 **Broward** 1:3 16:7,18 114:14 **based** 10:6 24:13 **bids** 32:2 42:23 65:19 **causing** 107:25 **chunk** 17:25 16:22 27:8 43:20 32:5 34:24 59:3,8 52:14 92:4 111:12 ceases 118:20 circumstances 70:23 94:21 62:2,20 64:8 93:13 center 1:12 95:6 big 53:9 96:3 121:6,19 circumvent 37:24 105:21 **certain** 14:20 70:21 **bigger** 13:22 **budget** 7:5 69:9 38:17 40:3 74:7,8 basic 42:18 88:5 70:22 biggest 42:8 100:19 72:17 73:21 93:13 City 33:11,15 36:11 **basically** 30:2 60:2 certainly 43:24 **bill** 107:9 95:21,22 96:9,11 36:12 81:7 83:1 63:6 64:23 74:1 CERTIFICATE **billed** 60:17 budgeting 93:12 **claimed** 91:17 93:21 90:8 102:12 105:19 **bit** 3:5 88:4 92:14 budgets 95:18 121:4 claiming 55:3 **basis** 29:7 91:15 **bug** 103:3 **certify** 121:9,13 **claims** 29:16 103:1 115:4,15 chair 2:2,2 7:16 clarification 51:23 blame 33:7 92:1,1 **building** 91:19 92:10 Bass 1:23,24 2:25 16:20 35:13 50:2 94:24 97:17 106:25 56:14 60:22 92:18,19 93:18,21

clarifies 113:5
clarify 39:22 60:14
clarity 50:23 59:9
115:23
clean 59:19
clear 50:21 57:15,19
58:2 63:16 64:19
64:25 65:7 73:25
76:8 110:4 113:7,8
115:15
cleared 74:1
clearer 59:20
clearly 39:3,20 44:10
58:3 66:15 68:11
73:2
Clerk 2:10,11
close 34:12
closer 103:14
CM 94:19
coaches 71:6
cockup 97:18
code 95:2
coincidence 61:19
Coker 2:16 23:20,20
34:17 35:13,16
38:8,20 42:9 47:24
51:7 56:14,22
63:12,13,18 64:2,5
71:2,21 72:3 75:15
75:18,23 76:2,17
78:16,18 79:2,5,9
79:11,16
college 17:13 21:23
column 100:11
COLUMN 100.11
come 7:21 8:8 13:3
26:7 34:15 43:8
44:19 45:3 64:10
71:7 76:14 80:13
82:23 90:14 106:15
comes 47:17 118:17
comfortable 32:3
59:25
coming 42:4 52:12
71:2 73:20 77:23
96:14 97:9 118:16
comment 15:11
38:20 77:25 81:20
87:7 90:9,20 106:9
119:5
commentary 6:1
27:5
comments 10:7 17:22

49:14 65:16 77:20 86:15 87:8,25 116:11 commit 120:4 committee 1:5 2:1 11:11,25 12:17
15:9,16 16:1 22:16 23:16 27:3,6 28:20 42:4 57:4 62:20 63:3 66:20,24 80:5 81:13 85:14 86:3 86:14 88:2 108:19 117:10
common 10:12 33:18 77:11 communicated 24:12
communication 58:8 96:10
community 19:7 company 28:2,11 108:8 111:16 compare 109:8 comparing 42:24
115:6,18 compensated 96:12 competent 94:8 compiled 63:23
complaint 6:9 23:23 24:1,6,11 45:12 61:9 118:9 complaint's 24:11
complete 10:3 48:19 97:18 121:11 completed 48:8 67:21 119:9
completion 65:2 67:25 107:20 compliance 8:24 9:1
19:9 comply 119:25 components 116:15 concern 36:16,22
42:8 98:13 118:10 concerned 41:12 44:6
concerns 13:12 25:5 25:13,16 27:18,18 28:10 100:1 concerted 87:21
concluded 121:1 conclusion 24:12

69:21

1: 20.0
conclusions 29:8
concur 19:10
concurred 24:17
conditions 72:21
confident 93:20
111:20
confirmed 86:8
confirming 103:8
confused 40:17 41:8
confusing 112:25
confusion 29:14 43:3
61:16 98:10
connected 121:16
conscious 106:1
consequence 47:4
consequences 46:18
46:25
consider 28:22
consideration 76:6
considered 45:4 68:4
consistency 116:7
consistently 106:17
consolidate 115:13
constant 106:25
constantly 19:6 26:7
construction 2:14 90:11
consultant 84:8
consultants 2:24,24
6:7,8 13:4,8 23:10
23:17 26:11 112:15
Consulting 2:22
contacted 25:19
29:15,16 57:17
59:9 62:7
contain 67:20
contents 12:7
contents 12.7 context 7:10 9:4,18
33:12 90:25 109:19
contexts 46:4
contingency 95:18
contingent 95:18
continue 26:25 66:14
70:7 73:22 82:21
112:20
continued 55:9
continuing 62:22
91:21 112:14
continuously 91:25
contract 29:12 56:8
56:11,16,17,18
57:15 58:8 69:10
57.15 50.0 07.10

86:21 88:11,17,23
89:3 91:3
contracted 89:17
contractor 30:13
88:18 90:1 103:4,6
103:20,24 119:21
contractors 89:16
96:10 119:24
contracts 25:14,21
89:10
contractually 8:2
control 35:3 84:12
91:8
controlling 42:22
controls 14:12 26:18
27:19 43:16 44:9
84:10 104:21
conversation 54:24
71:9 78:2,3,11
120:13
Conway 2:9 5:8,8
cooperation 65:4
copy 7:14 18:9 35:14
36:9 64:6 65:19
correct 36:5 37:22
40:13 41:3 46:22
50:6 59:16 62:18
68:14 75:13 84:4
88:8,14 101:14
103:8 114:12
correctly 30:5
correlation 91:15
corroborate 14:21
COs 102:13
cost 42:22 47:16
53:10 56:3 57:8,11
67:1 77:17,17
89:21 96:2,15 98:8
110:20 111:12
112:7
costs 53:17
couched 33:4 35:1
Council 33:10,15
36:10,12 83:1
counsel 121:14
County 1:3 16:7,18
16:22 26:16 27:9
43:21 92:4 111:13
121:6,19
couple 88:5
course 33:2 66:11 68:4 75:5 88:23
68:4 75:5 88:23

119:8 **court** 1:23 2:25 5:11 102:8,24 118:2,4 121:7,22 **Cove** 95:17 **cover** 25:4 32:13 46:17 115:25 **covered** 13:24 24:7 covers 16:5 **CPA** 27:11 42:6 cracks 43:19 44:1 **crazy** 91:21 **create** 48:4 82:19 100:19 **created** 33:19 61:16 61:19 63:22 120:10 **creates** 100:18 **creating** 63:20 96:3 credibility 29:5 credible 29:3 crying 91:6 crystal 58:2 **culpa** 93:2 **cure** 120:21,22 **current** 39:2 48:16 67:17,18 82:6 114:24 115:21 currently 114:2 custodial 57:17 **Custodial/Grounds** 2:17 customary 30:13 **cut** 74:9 **cutting** 47:13 **cycling** 112:23 Cypress 95:17 D

Dahl 2:3 3:13,14,15 3:16 11:16 14:5 80:25 117:15,18 **Dailey** 2:10 5:6,6 data 100:10 103:21 108:7,12 109:2,2 109:24 110:25 114:6,7,22 date 6:22 18:20,25 32:13 67:25 115:20 119:3 **dated** 114:23 121:18 dates 16:13 19:23

64:4 113:5,8,9

116:1
David 2:21 87:14
100:5
day 33:2 66:7,24 73:4
80:16 98:22 121:18
days 98:9 99:13
100:11 101:18
102:9 105:6 109:3
110:16 111:21
112:5
de 2:24 3:17 23:10,15
23:16 25:19 26:13
27:4,7 28:25 29:4
29:15 30:3,16,22
49:25 60:13,23
61:8,22 62:2,6,12
65:8
deadline 18:19 20:20
deadlines 16:12 19:4
19:8 20:18 21:4
deal 16:8
dealing 18:15 88:7
dealt 44:16
decade 26:15
December 101:16
110:12
decided 41:17 50:11
deciding 98:11
decisions 95:8 112:12
decrepit 91:16
deemed 92:12
deep 42:5 43:11
59:21
defer 9:9,20 10:12
*
35:23 36:7 79:18 79:20 81:21 82:25
83:18 85:5 89:9
91:2 117:7
deferral 80:18,24
81:2
deferred 81:10,11
deferring 83:13 85:8
117:4
define 43:25
definitely 42:4 53:4
definition 20:4 34:13
55:1
55:1 DEFP 93:8 96:6
55:1 DEFP 93:8 96:6 degree 21:25 94:18
55:1 DEFP 93:8 96:6 degree 21:25 94:18 delay 94:5
55:1 DEFP 93:8 96:6 degree 21:25 94:18 delay 94:5 delays 99:9 108:1
55:1 DEFP 93:8 96:6 degree 21:25 94:18 delay 94:5

delivery 105:12 demand 26:23 DemandStar 31:18 demolish 92:9,17 115:12 demolished 92:20 demolishing 91:20 denominators 33:18 deny 43:8 departed 116:4,12 department 8:23 23:25 32:16 34:22
39:12 42:21 43:17 57:18,23 58:9 61:2 61:7 63:22,22 65:1 65:12,14 71:23,24 72:18 73:1,16,24 92:15 97:9 107:7 departments 44:10 67:16 107:25 departure 113:1
depending 28:16 describing 51:13 description 18:11 20:16 21:3 67:21 67:24 68:3 descriptions 21:8,9 deserves 36:21 design 94:1,2,4,8 98:25
designed 94:13 designee 41:13 designing 95:7 desk 101:25 detail 89:21 90:25 102:12 detailed 89:4 102:20 determine 47:16 57:18
determined 29:23 develop 37:7 54:20 developed 63:9 64:1 dictated 54:25 difference 46:4,7 52:1 68:19 different 16:19 31:15 41:2 48:12 51:6 60:14,19,19 68:12 109:23,23
109:23,23 difficulties 90:19 direction 86:11

director 2:8,13,15,16

2:21 5:1 23:3,5,6
23:20 33:10,20,21
35:5 37:22 73:11
87:14,17,19 101:13
director's 51:16
disagree 63:2
disagreement 50:22
disaster 7:21 111:9
112:19
discipline 38:19
discovered 99:6,9
discovers 90:2
discuss 65:12 82:11
discussed 5:23 7:24
26:10 41:21
discussing 9:2 10:23
15:10 35:9 51:8
72:22 108:3
discussion 7:11 10:11
10:18 11:22 12:14
15:5 55:9 57:14
discussions 36:18
86:23
dismantle 96:1
disposal 64:19
dispose 9:13
disposed 84:25 85:1
disposing 9:16 28:12
dispute 63:6
dispute 63:6 disputing 111:8,25
disputing 111:8,25
disputing 111:8,25 distribute 37:8
disputing 111:8,25 distribute 37:8 district 2:12 16:20
disputing 111:8,25 distribute 37:8 district 2:12 16:20 19:3,15,21 23:23
disputing 111:8,25 distribute 37:8 district 2:12 16:20 19:3,15,21 23:23 24:9,16 25:11 26:4
disputing 111:8,25 distribute 37:8 district 2:12 16:20 19:3,15,21 23:23
disputing 111:8,25 distribute 37:8 district 2:12 16:20 19:3,15,21 23:23 24:9,16 25:11 26:4
disputing 111:8,25 distribute 37:8 district 2:12 16:20 19:3,15,21 23:23 24:9,16 25:11 26:4 27:24 28:3 29:21 32:6,16 37:3 45:13
disputing 111:8,25 distribute 37:8 district 2:12 16:20 19:3,15,21 23:23 24:9,16 25:11 26:4 27:24 28:3 29:21 32:6,16 37:3 45:13 49:19 55:2 58:4
disputing 111:8,25 distribute 37:8 district 2:12 16:20 19:3,15,21 23:23 24:9,16 25:11 26:4 27:24 28:3 29:21 32:6,16 37:3 45:13 49:19 55:2 58:4 59:8,13 62:6 66:13
disputing 111:8,25 distribute 37:8 district 2:12 16:20 19:3,15,21 23:23 24:9,16 25:11 26:4 27:24 28:3 29:21 32:6,16 37:3 45:13 49:19 55:2 58:4 59:8,13 62:6 66:13 70:20 72:24 75:12
disputing 111:8,25 distribute 37:8 district 2:12 16:20 19:3,15,21 23:23 24:9,16 25:11 26:4 27:24 28:3 29:21 32:6,16 37:3 45:13 49:19 55:2 58:4 59:8,13 62:6 66:13 70:20 72:24 75:12 77:9,13 92:25
disputing 111:8,25 distribute 37:8 district 2:12 16:20 19:3,15,21 23:23 24:9,16 25:11 26:4 27:24 28:3 29:21 32:6,16 37:3 45:13 49:19 55:2 58:4 59:8,13 62:6 66:13 70:20 72:24 75:12 77:9,13 92:25 98:18 103:19
disputing 111:8,25 distribute 37:8 district 2:12 16:20 19:3,15,21 23:23 24:9,16 25:11 26:4 27:24 28:3 29:21 32:6,16 37:3 45:13 49:19 55:2 58:4 59:8,13 62:6 66:13 70:20 72:24 75:12 77:9,13 92:25 98:18 103:19 110:15
disputing 111:8,25 distribute 37:8 district 2:12 16:20 19:3,15,21 23:23 24:9,16 25:11 26:4 27:24 28:3 29:21 32:6,16 37:3 45:13 49:19 55:2 58:4 59:8,13 62:6 66:13 70:20 72:24 75:12 77:9,13 92:25 98:18 103:19 110:15 district's 18:16 24:15
disputing 111:8,25 distribute 37:8 district 2:12 16:20 19:3,15,21 23:23 24:9,16 25:11 26:4 27:24 28:3 29:21 32:6,16 37:3 45:13 49:19 55:2 58:4 59:8,13 62:6 66:13 70:20 72:24 75:12 77:9,13 92:25 98:18 103:19 110:15 district's 18:16 24:15
disputing 111:8,25 distribute 37:8 district 2:12 16:20 19:3,15,21 23:23 24:9,16 25:11 26:4 27:24 28:3 29:21 32:6,16 37:3 45:13 49:19 55:2 58:4 59:8,13 62:6 66:13 70:20 72:24 75:12 77:9,13 92:25 98:18 103:19 110:15 district's 18:16 24:15 31:3 61:5
disputing 111:8,25 distribute 37:8 district 2:12 16:20 19:3,15,21 23:23 24:9,16 25:11 26:4 27:24 28:3 29:21 32:6,16 37:3 45:13 49:19 55:2 58:4 59:8,13 62:6 66:13 70:20 72:24 75:12 77:9,13 92:25 98:18 103:19 110:15 district's 18:16 24:15 31:3 61:5 district-wide 22:3,4,8
disputing 111:8,25 distribute 37:8 district 2:12 16:20 19:3,15,21 23:23 24:9,16 25:11 26:4 27:24 28:3 29:21 32:6,16 37:3 45:13 49:19 55:2 58:4 59:8,13 62:6 66:13 70:20 72:24 75:12 77:9,13 92:25 98:18 103:19 110:15 district's 18:16 24:15 31:3 61:5 district-wide 22:3,4,8 22:9
disputing 111:8,25 distribute 37:8 district 2:12 16:20 19:3,15,21 23:23 24:9,16 25:11 26:4 27:24 28:3 29:21 32:6,16 37:3 45:13 49:19 55:2 58:4 59:8,13 62:6 66:13 70:20 72:24 75:12 77:9,13 92:25 98:18 103:19 110:15 district's 18:16 24:15 31:3 61:5 district-wide 22:3,4,8 22:9 districts 16:5,16
disputing 111:8,25 distribute 37:8 district 2:12 16:20 19:3,15,21 23:23 24:9,16 25:11 26:4 27:24 28:3 29:21 32:6,16 37:3 45:13 49:19 55:2 58:4 59:8,13 62:6 66:13 70:20 72:24 75:12 77:9,13 92:25 98:18 103:19 110:15 district's 18:16 24:15 31:3 61:5 district-wide 22:3,4,8 22:9 districts 16:5,16 disturbance 34:18,25
disputing 111:8,25 distribute 37:8 district 2:12 16:20 19:3,15,21 23:23 24:9,16 25:11 26:4 27:24 28:3 29:21 32:6,16 37:3 45:13 49:19 55:2 58:4 59:8,13 62:6 66:13 70:20 72:24 75:12 77:9,13 92:25 98:18 103:19 110:15 district's 18:16 24:15 31:3 61:5 district-wide 22:3,4,8 22:9 districts 16:5,16 disturbance 34:18,25 divisions 67:16
disputing 111:8,25 distribute 37:8 district 2:12 16:20 19:3,15,21 23:23 24:9,16 25:11 26:4 27:24 28:3 29:21 32:6,16 37:3 45:13 49:19 55:2 58:4 59:8,13 62:6 66:13 70:20 72:24 75:12 77:9,13 92:25 98:18 103:19 110:15 district's 18:16 24:15 31:3 61:5 district-wide 22:3,4,8 22:9 districts 16:5,16 disturbance 34:18,25
disputing 111:8,25 distribute 37:8 district 2:12 16:20 19:3,15,21 23:23 24:9,16 25:11 26:4 27:24 28:3 29:21 32:6,16 37:3 45:13 49:19 55:2 58:4 59:8,13 62:6 66:13 70:20 72:24 75:12 77:9,13 92:25 98:18 103:19 110:15 district's 18:16 24:15 31:3 61:5 district-wide 22:3,4,8 22:9 districts 16:5,16 disturbance 34:18,25 divisions 67:16
disputing 111:8,25 distribute 37:8 district 2:12 16:20 19:3,15,21 23:23 24:9,16 25:11 26:4 27:24 28:3 29:21 32:6,16 37:3 45:13 49:19 55:2 58:4 59:8,13 62:6 66:13 70:20 72:24 75:12 77:9,13 92:25 98:18 103:19 110:15 district's 18:16 24:15 31:3 61:5 district-wide 22:3,4,8 22:9 districts 16:5,16 disturbance 34:18,25 divisions 67:16 document 21:11

documented 63:10
64:21
documents 10:13
65:21 79:19
doing 27:17 49:4
52:10,23 54:1,25
69:22 71:16,18
75:7 77:24 84:16
103:9 115:5 119:2
119:3
dollar 39:25 43:18
44:1
dollar-and-change
29:11
dollars 43:20,21 44:7
72:17 76:23 93:6
door 33:5,8 94:15
96:3
doors 96:4
Dorsett 2:15 13:9
23:2,2 26:20 33:5,9
33:20 35:5 36:17
37:21,21 39:22
41:3 47:10 48:22
50:7,16 53:22,23
54:7,17 57:13 58:6
58:15 73:25 74:23
80:9,12
Dorsett's 33:24 36:25
dotted 66:20
doubt 61:3
Dr 2:4 3:23,24 7:5
9:3,6,15 10:6,15,20
11:5 12:13 13:18
13:20 15:3,4,6 18:3
18:14,21 19:12,16
19:20,25 20:3,7,9
20:23,23 21:1,5,16
22:1 30:24 31:10
31:14,18 32:1 34:9
36:2,5,12,15 37:14
46:10 47:3 49:12
49:13 50:13,17,23
51:3,20 54:3,16,19
55:15,19 56:19
57:7,20 58:10,16
59:6 60:1,21 61:3
61:18,24 62:4,9,24
63:4,25 64:3,15
65:15 66:4 67:4,7
67:10,13 68:12,17
,

documentation 85:2

69:16,23 70:10 74:11 78:6,8 79:22 80:20 81:8,18 82:9 82:17,24 83:19 84:21 85:9,11 90:19,23 98:10,15 98:24 99:23 106:9 106:22 108:5,20 109:1,18 112:22 113:24 114:9,11,16 114:19 115:3 117:1 117:4 118:6 120:7 120:16,20 drama 92:14 **drive** 117:19 driven 8:2 **driving** 52:9,11,18 **due** 16:11,13 18:20 61:20 111:6 duplicative 77:2 **duration** 98:9 99:13 **dynamic** 116:13 \mathbf{E}

e-Builder 100:20,21 101:21 103:15 104:6,8,19,20 106:4 110:18 113:19 **earlier** 66:4,6 72:11 95:3 108:9,10 easier 77:2 120:8 **easy** 62:9 **eat** 96:15 **Education** 23:25 92:15 **effect** 33:19 48:20 effectively 84:12 **effort** 37:24 82:21 87:21 110:21 Eggenberger 2:17 23:13,13 26:20 57:16 58:14,18 59:18 64:7 80:15 eight 27:25 **either** 28:15 31:19

35:12 98:3 113:1 electronic 77:3 electronics 77:1 element 105:23 elements 116:21 eliminate 43:3

Ellis 25:9,10 **email** 57:6 **emailed** 115:23 emails 104:9,18 **employee** 50:8 75:11 108:9 121:15 **employees** 37:8 57:6 enables 82:20 encouraging 47:6 endeavor 27:9 **ended** 59:22 **engaged** 26:18 27:14 engagement 65:13 **ensure** 41:11 ensuring 76:8 entertain 65:18 entire 32:4 45:15 75:20 95:17 96:6 104:4,20 114:7 entirely 27:21 equate 112:6 Eric 2:9 5:2 especially 57:23 74:17 94:18 **essentially** 8:17 42:5 established 67:25 establishing 88:12 **estimate** 93:13.14 estimated 59:5 estimates 47:15 89:22 93:4,12,14 evaluating 115:4 evaluation 89:15 115:2 Evelyn 3:25 event 46:3 71:21 90:5 everybody 37:11 38:11,16 41:7 42:25 43:11 88:3 89:22 91:2 94:16 101:21 109:9,12 115:13 119:6,11 everybody's 33:24 66:10 everyone's 43:22 exact 69:3 examiner 27:12 **example** 50:2 114:6 116:16 exceeds 38:7 54:14 excellent 98:19 **exceptions** 10:2 12:8

19:11 84:13 **exclusive** 71:13,23 excusable 19:11 excuse 19:1 99:3 excused 3:17 excuses 98:14 **executed** 88:17 101:2 **executive** 2:10,13,15 23:2,5 33:10,20 35:5 37:22 exercised 76:4 exist 55:5 existing 48:15 exit 16:18 26:21 **expect** 10:13 43:23 55:25 59:14 84:16 102:14 105:24 110:23 expectation 10:13 expedite 50:9 **expensive** 112:10,16 experience 26:15 27:12,13 32:5 34:24 43:11 experienced 94:11 experiencing 66:23 expertise 90:16 experts 89:20 expires 64:11 76:4 explaining 38:14 54:11 explains 39:3 explanation 72:4 **extent** 65:13 extremely 89:7

F
faces 87:2
Facilities 2:14,18
7:17 24:8 83:2
92:13,14 96:17
101:24 102:2
111:23
fact 61:6 69:1 98:8
99:12 106:5
factor 95:4
facts 9:17
fail 97:12,12
failing 97:13
fairly 8:20

eyebrow 32:6

eyes 77:3

fall 92:1 falls 72:24 familiar 57:10 familiarity 24:14 far 7:18 17:15 25:7 25:23 44:5 46:23 47:13,18 49:6,9 54:18 55:20 65:16 84:18 88:12 91:4 97:1 **far-right** 100:10 faux 33:6 **favor** 11:10,24 12:16 15:14 22:15 80:4 85:13 117:9 February 86:22 **federal** 20:21 fee 59:11 feedback 114:21 feel 6:19 59:24 **felt** 58:20 **Fertig** 2:2 3:18,19 5:16,19 6:13,15 9:8 9:19 10:5,9,25 11:21 12:25 13:1,5 13:11 14:6,23,25 17:6,9,18 19:2,14 19:18 20:6,17,19 21:12,20 22:4,9 31:21 34:7 35:18 36:3,6,14,20 37:16 45:19 46:3,14 47:7 47:21 51:1.5 53:20 53:25 70:14,15 77:21,22 78:7,9 79:20,23 80:1,9,21 81:4,15,17,24 82:2 82:11,19 83:9,17 85:12 98:5,12,16 99:1,3,5,8 100:1 101:7 104:23 105:1 106:7 108:2,6,23 109:16,20 111:1,6 117:3,6,24 120:12 120:18 field 53:15 54:4 119:11 **fighting** 8:14 62:11 **figure** 77:16 110:14 116:1

Falcon 95:17

filed 16:9 24:1 **final** 92:23 110:20 finalized 102:13 **finally** 105:8,9 107:20 Finance 2:19 **financial** 16:3 110:20 financially 121:16 **find** 18:24 19:1.10 28:22 29:10 31:8 31:13 41:24 43:17 59:17 62:10,21 75:2 77:18 84:13 113:12 118:10 **finding** 16:6 17:3 19:14 41:19 64:9 100:8 **findings** 29:7 33:6 45:7 59:8 70:2 86:21 90:4 110:5 **fine** 8:10 10:15 117:4 **finish** 6:21 63:8 93:10 101:19 finished 104:7 finishing 119:14 **fire** 34:16 **fires** 35:6 **first** 5:17 6:16 7:22 13:16 21:12 32:6,7 41:16 42:7,18 57:21,23 58:17 59:10 93:19 94:9 94:24 97:7 100:2,8 109:7 110:25 112:24 113:11,17 115:20 119:18 120:3 **fiscal** 113:2 114:9 five 73:3 76:17 **fix** 13:22 66:17.22 68:22 70:8 92:8 108:17 **fixate** 91:12 **fixed** 108:21 110:18 **fixing** 110:8 **FL** 1:25 **flawed** 70:7 flogged 95:22 flooded 94:7 floor 15:1 51:21 60:24 68:17 80:18 Florida 1:13 6:5

17:12 23:25 95:2 121:5,8,19 **flow** 42:16 fly 95:7 **focused** 119:12 focusing 66:1 **folder** 101:24 **folders** 101:25 104:15 follow 46:19 47:19 48:24 49:7 67:15 74:10 89:14 97:18 104:23 106:1 113:21 **follow-up** 19:12 20:7 20:15 67:5 68:13 69:5,6 105:17 113:16 **followed** 66:12 67:8 71:18 97:19 **following** 3:2 18:1 48:7 52:18,19,20 52:24 68:21 74:11 74:16 88:13 116:19 119:19.20 120:3 foolishness 96:7 **forbid** 93:17 **force** 7:17 34:19 83:2 96:4,11,17 111:24 **forced** 93:2 **forcing** 91:18 forecasting 119:22 foregoing 121:10 foreman 54:8 **foremost** 42:7,18 foreseen 91:18 **forgot** 46:16 form 18:19,22,25 28:6,9 112:5 formation 89:6 formerly 23:6 forms 103:19,21 110:1 Fort 1:13,25 121:18 **forth** 9:12 25:24 26:9 46:6,25 49:5 61:12 73:11 100:15 106:13 **forward** 14:15 43:2 54:15 57:3 62:19 75:13 98:17 99:19 101:17 111:10

figured 43:15

112:13	83:24 90:7 97:14	35:23 45:22 76:5	happy 61:18 80:10	huge 110:21
found 27:16 28:1	102:16 107:8	78:13 83:17 84:2	82:11 87:10 113:21	Huh 78:7
62:24	111:19 112:1	85:5 98:17 108:18	115:14	hundred 72:16
four 27:15,20 86:19	115:19,23,25 116:8	109:8,21 112:18	hard 5:22 6:25 7:2,4	hundreds 44:7
framework 39:11	120:7	115:11 117:2,6	74:15 94:21 110:6	HVAC 92:10,16 96:2
73:18	give 15:21 18:21 20:1	120:5,10	116:24 117:13	
frankly 8:6	39:16 75:19 102:12	good 3:4,12 17:25	harp 112:20	I
fraud 26:8,9 27:12	104:11	23:4,15,18 27:7	harps 111:24	I-don't-really-know
92:3	given 19:23 39:15	37:21 57:1 80:16	hash 95:12	42:13
friendly 21:19	gives 100:10,11	83:13 89:21 110:6	haste 94:13	idea 100:10,12 105:4
front 14:18 19:1	102:20	gotten 75:3	hastily 94:14	identified 44:16 45:7
35:10 92:22 94:13	giving 9:3	government 43:9	hate 116:23	62:1 101:16,18
108:7,12 109:24	glad 27:8	grand 14:12 34:22	head 50:21	102:15
frustration 86:25	gloss 68:23	63:6 77:12	headed 26:13	identify 77:2 84:9
FSAG 17:21 20:18	go 10:8 12:4 13:14	grandma's 52:15	hear 13:7,11 46:13	Ighodaro 2:3 3:21
21:22	15:12 21:18 27:4	grant 17:12,15	53:22 82:8 90:15	4:18 85:18
full 31:25 43:1	32:6 33:23 44:20	great 33:11,15 35:22	90:21 91:5 96:16	ignore 98:23
fundamental 69:19	45:23 47:14 49:1	36:10,12 64:24	99:6 100:2	III 2:9
funding 14:15 93:7	52:15 59:21 61:6	81:7 83:1 107:16	heard 95:20 105:9	imagine 66:25
95:13	63:24 70:16 71:4	Groundhog 66:7,24	114:21	106:19
funds 2:9 6:3 12:6	73:7 76:5 83:14	grounds 2:17 23:13	Heery 93:24 95:1	immediately 110:13
43:5,22 48:16	87:24 88:4,21 89:6	57:17	106:11 107:11,22	impactful 101:6
93:10	91:22 97:2 99:18	group 7:6	120:10	implement 111:16
further 15:10 67:23	102:1 107:10 110:9	guaranteed 90:5	Heery's 113:13	112:13
121:13	114:8 115:10 119:6	guess 6:19 36:24	Hello 99:6	implementation 83:4
FY20-192 91:3	God 93:17	38:10,11 40:16	help 6:1 88:5 104:11	112:4
	goes 11:6 21:22	46:9 47:21 73:10	helpful 55:8 102:18	implementations
G	34:15 42:12,14	guessing 53:13 56:6	118:11	112:10
G 62:8,10,23	63:17 86:16 93:5	GUESTS 2:20	hey 74:21 76:14	implemented 83:5
games 71:7	104:9	Gums 2:22 86:18	Hi 4:13	implementing 83:7
gaps 104:6	going 6:21 7:15 8:10	87:16,16 114:14,14	hiding 7:14	112:7 115:16
general 6:6 10:3	8:14 9:7,8,13,23	114:18	higher 45:5 82:5	implies 32:15 60:6
15:24,25 17:3,24	11:16 13:6 26:12	guys 40:20 48:24	hint 96:24	imply 60:7
23:24 24:2,13	34:1,16,17 35:7,19	49:9 53:15 54:1,4	historical 8:23 25:2	important 14:14,18
25:12 89:13	36:9 43:12,25 45:2	66:23 87:12 120:9	45:4,6	72:6 88:1 96:22
generally 89:11	46:17 50:9 52:13	H	historically 8:5 32:24	110:24 119:23
generated 61:12	52:19 54:20 57:2,2		118:22	impression 120:8
103:22	58:22 64:12 67:2	H 62:8	hit 56:6	improve 90:17 99:21
generates 63:12	67:10 69:15,17	habit 33:6	hold 55:6 62:9	101:22 102:21
generating 55:11	71:21 77:4 78:4,14	half 98:1 119:18	100:21	110:16,23,24
63:20 103:19	81:15,21 82:22	hand 42:10,10 78:19	holding 8:1 97:7	112:18
generation 92:7	85:7 86:13 87:20	handled 54:7 104:18	107:22	improvement 28:5
104:2	92:5,16 95:13 96:1	happen 40:8,9 42:17	hole 33:24	102:14 112:4
generic 60:25	96:3,8 97:16 98:2	69:4 72:23 73:5	honestly 43:4	115:18
gentleman 24:2	99:15,18 101:9	93:22 hannand 50:4.7	hope 89:18	improving 100:25
26:17 27:10 51:13	102:21 105:7,25	happened 50:4,7	hopefully 119:16	115:9
gentlemen 27:8	106:2 108:13,17	63:8 71:14 75:5	hoping 36:20	inappropriate 43:4
41:20 80:25 87:6	109:4 112:5,8	happening 32:12 34:14 62:4 95:8	hopper 94:1	inappropriately
getting 19:13 34:12	115:14 118:11,13		horrible 112:19	45:24 incention 80:11
45:1,16,17 49:13	118:14	99:16 118:22	hour 80:1 98:1	inception 89:11 include 32:19 61:6
52:7 53:7 57:7 58:4	golf 84:24	happens 8:6 73:8	house 52:15	77:7
60:6,12 69:11 74:8	gonna 10:12 31:22	happier 120:6	HR 31:3	11.1
	-	-	-	-

included 26:23 28:15 29:17,21 30:18 53:11 55:24 56:4 57:8,16 58:7 59:11 60:9,15 63:11,11 65:1 83:12 includes 68:8 69:6 including 78:22 79:13,13 113:14 inclusive 58:21 incompetence 97:20 incomplete 24:13 incorporating 64:9 incorrectly 84:25 increases 30:11 **indicate** 21:3 86:24 indicated 19:17 **indicates** 16:23 60:7 indicating 58:1 individual 8:20 28:24 28:25 75:4 100:9 individuals 6:11 117:14 industry 95:12 inevitable 89:24 97:13 inevitably 77:17 information 20:15 21:2,6,10 24:14,21 24:25 28:23 75:24 81:19 initial 76:12 78:25 83:1 89:15 initiatives 113:18 **input** 8:13 15:8,8 66:18 insignificant 96:19 111:22 inspections 57:25 **Inspector** 23:24 24:2 24:12 **instance** 50:3 104:16 **instruct** 39:24 instructions 48:21 integrated 104:10 intended 61:15 interaction 65:10 interchangeably 49:15 interest 12:9 interested 121:17 internal 2:9 6:3 12:6

27:19 43:16 44:9 46:5 49:1,7 51:8,12 51:15,17 57:1,5,6 **internally** 73:8,14 74:5 110:8 interpretation 61:5 interrupt 55:15 116:23 interruption 68:6 interview 31:2 intimately 111:7 **introduce** 22:23 23:8 27:4 87:12 **inventory** 7:18 46:21 77:24 82:20 83:11 83:24 84:9,11,16 investigation 29:3,5 65:3 **Invitation** 76:2 **INVITED** 2:20 **invoice** 59:10 invoices 29:23 39:13 53:14 56:20,21,22 58:13 59:6 73:20 116:16.19 118:18 involved 21:24 24:10 26:21 32:18 89:20 97:4 99:24 107:6 111:7 involvement 17:23 irregularities 32:8 61:10 **Island** 52:13 **issue** 16:17.21 17:2 22:11 29:10 32:22 39:5,8,21,23 40:14 51:1 58:6 59:24 74:20 75:10 97:1 98:6 110:7,7 issued 48:18 73:17 113:13 issues 7:12,17,19,22 24:20 25:2,2,11 44:15 45:3,5,6 46:16,20 60:14,19 60:20 72:18 101:17 108:14

issuing 73:16

IT18-123C 78:20

64:17,20 76:2

ITB 56:15,15,17 64:6

it'll 107:19

item 6:2 12:5 14:1 15:23 31:9 58:20 58:20,25 59:20 79:18 85:23 93:9 item's 10:11 items 5:21 6:2,13 59:1,5 65:23 76:9 Itohan 2:3 3:20

J **Jabouin** 2:8 3:12,15 3:17.20.23.25 4:2.4 4:6,8,10,12,14,17 4:20,24,24 5:10,25 7:2 10:1,6,16 11:15 12:5,23 13:1,9,14 14:1,10 15:12,21 17:8,10,20 18:14 18:24 19:10 20:8 20:12 21:1 22:20 22:23 23:8.22 27:14 44:13,24 45:11 55:15 56:23 62:15,25 65:19 68:6,15 69:6,17 70:1,12 77:14 80:17,22 81:2,10 81:13 82:16 83:20 83:21 84:1.5 85:17 85:21 118:2 **Jaclyn** 2:5 4:10 **Jacobs** 92:24 iail 7:12 **January** 64:13 114:12 Jennifer 2:10 5:6 **iob** 18:10 20:16 21:3 21:8.8 30:12 98:19 110:6 **jobs** 30:1,2 **Johnson** 24:3,3,7,22 25:7.10.22 joke 108:25 **Joris** 2:8 4:24 **Jose** 2:24 23:10.16 **Judith** 93:9 Julio 2:24 23:18 27:11

jumping 96:17 **June** 76:4 iury 14:12 34:22 77:12

K **Kathleen** 2:23 87:18 101:12 104:16 **KC** 1:12 KCW 52:12 **keep** 73:19,20 95:25 118:21 **keeping** 47:9 83:10 83:11 keeps 19:4 51:21 96:13 **kept** 53:18,19 58:1 109:12 key 84:9,11 **kidding** 108:24 kids 92:7 kiln 92:19 kind 20:22 35:25 55:23 64:3 71:19 82:7 98:5 105:4 kindly 12:9 55:18 kinds 46:19 70:18 103:9 knew 53:17 **know** 3:5 5:22 6:25 13:24 18:6 19:6,19 20:22 24:19 25:2 26:5 31:7.11 33:1.4 35:11 36:24 37:7 38:16 40:10,17,24 41:1,12,19 42:21 42:23,25 44:4 46:23 47:13 48:5 52:16 53:11 56:8 56:10,24 63:14,16 64:19 66:1.3.7.8 67:3 69:25 70:20 70:21 71:3,5,17 72:4,8 74:5,24 75:5 75:8 77:13 81:4.6 82:24 83:5 86:23 90:21 95:2 97:16 100:24 101:23

102:16 105:2,14

107:1 109:6,18

112:3,10 113:24

63:1

110:5,6 111:7

118:11,13 119:9,17 119:23 120:1 **knowing** 7:6 118:14 knowledgeable 26:17 known 25:1 33:24 55:3 knows 34:1 37:11 38:11 43:1.11 89:23 93:12 101:21 L lack 7:9 8:23,25 9:18

114:1 116:19

24:14 53:6 59:2 96:10 ladies 27:7 **laid** 46:20 **Langan** 2:23 87:18 87:18 101:7,12,12 105:14 110:9 111:2 119:5 language 58:23 59:19 large 42:19 121:8 larger 30:10 60:17 94:20 **late** 3:5 5:21 16:8 Lauderdale 1:13,25 121:19 launched 102:5 110:19 Laurie 93:8 **lawvers** 112:15 layers 100:20 leader 102:17 **leave** 7:3 10:18 118:4 120:15 **led** 64:16 **left** 33:23 42:10 52:14 107:14 108:11 legal 25:11 26:24 59:24 62:19 75:9 length 99:10 lesser 94:11 **let's** 3:4.6 6:21 11:5 13:11,16 25:20,21 25:24 26:2 52:16 77:4 80:3 85:3 91:22 94:24 118:24 letter 26:23 32:7 56:2 61:25 62:18,22,25

July 86:6 107:2

jumped 100:7

114:15,16,18

115:19,20 116:9

level 19:21,21 39:9
50:3 54:8 57:10
66:10 70:21 71:10
74:8 102:21
liability 28:23
licensed 49:5
life 91:24
light 71:3
limit 52:3,8,17 55:21
72:16
limited 114:5
limits 65:22
line 31:9 34:16 58:20
58:20 59:1,4,20
66:20 76:8 93:9
link 35:16 56:23,24
57:2,5 65:20
list 19:8
listed 22:13 31:8,9
listen 108:16
listening 31:5
literally 8:11 96:19
litigation 121:16
little 87:22 88:4
live 103:16
LLC 2:24,24
local 20:21
locate 82:22
location 74:12
logic 60:5 74:12,16
logical 8:20 100:15
long 48:16 73:19
89:8 96:16 99:2
107:5 111:15,17
112:8
longer 20:10 75:12
109:5
longest 100:13
103:10
look 22:14 25:20,21
25:25 26:2,7,11
27:15 29:6 35:17
35:25 44:25 45:14
58:25 59:1 69:18
72:13 74:19 77:8
72:13 74:19 77:8
91:14,25 93:3
95:15,15,15,19
96:22 102:19
105:18 108:11
109:16 115:10
116:1,2,5

look-ahead 107:22
looked 13:21 27:15
27:25 29:23 30:4
45:1,8 69:11 70:3
70:17 84:2 107:6
113:20
looking 21:6 22:12
30:16 42:6 45:15
47:21 58:2 61:25
69:8,14,20,20,21
76:24,25 77:3 91:5
97:22 113:7,9
115:22
looks 25:15 58:4 77:4
105:20
lose 117:2,7 118:2,7
losing 117:3
lost 81:25 82:5 99:20
lot 7:15 33:12 49:4
71:7 72:4,24 82:22
90:12 94:20 97:4
103:2 104:21
119:22
lovely 47:5
low 44:5
Luker 2:21 86:18
87:2,8,14,14 88:14
88:25 89:9,14 100:5,5 101:14
100:5,5 101:14
102:15,23 106:12
113:10 114:1,10,12
114:20 116:10
Lynch-Walsh 2:4
3:23,24 7:5 9:3,6
9:15 10:15,20 11:5
12:13 13:18,20
15:3,4,6 18:3,4,21
19:12,16,20 20:3,9
21:5,16 22:1 30:24
31:10,14,18 32:1
34:9 36:2,5,12,15
37:14 46:11 47:3
49:12,13 50:13,17
50:23 51:3,20 54:3
54:16,19 55:16,19
56:19 57:7,20
58:10,16 59:6 60:1
60:21 61:3,18,24
62:4,9,24 63:4,25
64:3,15 65:15 66:4
67:4,7,10,13 68:12

68:17 69:16,23

70:10 74:11 78:6,8 79:22 80:20 81:8 81:18 82:9,17,24 83:19 84:21 85:9 85:11 90:19,23 98:10,15,24 99:23 106:9,22 108:5,20 109:1,18 112:22 113:24 114:9,11,16 114:19 115:3 117:1 117:4 118:6 120:7 120:16,20 Lynch-Walsh's 10:7
M
ma'am 61:22 main 14:23
maintain 82:19
maintenance 47:19
48:22 49:9
major 27:23 88:19
89:25 90:6,19 99:9
118:10
majority 93:25
MALONEY 2:18
management 2:14
40:7,18 57:9 85:24
89:9 102:20 113:13
manager 2:9,17,18
2:19 23:14 57:16 74:9 85:25 93:23
101:5 102:23 103:5
managers 34:3 118:23
manger 35:6
manpower 97:4
manual 77:25 82:6
Mark 2:15 23:2

matrix 20:22
Matt 87:17
matter 8:12,13 15:8
15:9 88:23
Matters 9:11
MATTHEW 2:22
Maximo 78:6,8 82:9
83:8
Maximo's 83:4
Mayersohn 2:4 4:2,3
10:22 11:8,9,20
12:12,22 13:15,23
12:12,22 13:15,23
14:4 10:21 30:10
36:22 37:15,18
38:10 40:16 41:4
44:17 70:16 75:14
75:15,22,25 76:10
76:19 78:16,25
79:3,8,10,15,25
80:13 81:12,20,25
83:20,21,22 84:4
84:20 85:5,7,10
117:8,20
Mayersohn's 49:14
54:21
McFatter 16:10
MDO 2:24,24 6:7
23:17,19 25:20
26:10,13
mea 93:2
mean 6:18 13:17
19:3,4,18,19 20:17
29:2,10 31:1,18
35:16 36:22,23
37:19 38:10 40:25
41:18 44:4 49:15
49:21,23 66:1,25
78:5 81:8,15,20
82:22 88:10 93:16
95:7 105:9 110:24
111:25 114:9
meaning 61:4
means 39:2 52:23
73:18 77:3
measured 28:5
mechanics 47:19
48:22 49:5 53:12
54:5 74:5,6
media 95:6
Medvin 2:2 3:4,10
4:4,5 5:13,14,18
9:2,5 11:7,9,12,14
1

11:18,22,24 12:1,3 12:14,16,18,20 14:3 15:1,4,11,14 15:17,19 17:5 18:2 19:25 21:18 22:11 22:17,19,22 28:21 29:2,9 30:1,12,21 30:23 31:7,11,16 31:24 35:15 42:2 49:12 65:24 70:14 75:14 77:21 79:17 80:3,6,8 81:16 82:14 83:14,16 85:3,6,13,15 87:6 87:20 88:19 89:2 89:13,18 98:4 101:11 104:25 116:23 117:2,9,11 117:13,17,22,25 118:4 120:14,24 meet 13:6 47:15 meeting 1:5 6:10,22 11:19 16:18 21:14 27:3 34:4 36:8,18 70:25 84:5,7 86:6 105:16,22 114:15 114:18 118:1 121:1 meetings 24:10 26:21 89:4 104:19 member 27:6 58:23 88:2 107:4 120:11 members 2:1 8:9 10:8 11:11,25 12:10,17 15:16 16:19 22:16 23:16 27:3 57:4 80:5 85:14 106:24 117:10 **memory** 30:4 mention 25:6 26:22 53:9 65:6,9 68:9 mentioned 16:16 21:15 22:6 45:2 54:3 74:23 77:15 104:16 mentioning 14:11 54:2 menu 59:2 **Meo** 3:17 mess 97:17 messaging 106:13

messed 107:18,19

37:21

4:22

74:3,13

Mary's 74:11

41:19,21

materials 61:14

market 94:8

Markham 96:1

Marte 36:25 93:9

Mary 2:2,16 3:18

massaging 97:15

23:20 34:17 38:8

material 30:19 31:23

Marquardt 2:10 4:22

messy 108:22 Miami-Dade 26:16 Michele 2:10 4:22 microphone 46:16 mike 99:4 million 76:15,16 78:20,23 92:5,6,22 93:3 107:14 millions 76:23 93:6 mind 9:19 103:25 minimize 98:13 minutes 11:19 75:19 76:18 78:15 Miranda 2:24 23:18 23:18 27:11 misplaced 82:5 missed 75:3 84:6 missing 33:12 34:3 56:12 84:22,25 mistakes 93:1 misuse 43:22 modification 86:22 modifying 104:3 moment 15:21 22:24 45:11 Monday 119:14 money 58:5 60:6 66:25 77:19 90:12 90:12,13 96:20 111:11 112:2,6,6 monitoring 19:15 21:4 Monte 2:24 23:10,15 23:16 25:19 28:25 29:4,15 30:3,16,22 49:25 60:13,23 61:8,22 62:2,6,12 65:8 Montes 26:13 27:4,7 month 99:22 115:20 118:19,20,21 119:19,20,24 120:3 month's 118:17 **monthly** 116:3 119:17 months 99:22 110:17 115:7,8 118:12 morning 3:4,12 23:4 23:15,18 27:7 84:6 motion 9:20 11:14,18 11:20 12:3,12,20 14:2,3,4 15:1,19

20:24 21:1,12 22:1 22:10,15,19 36:6 78:12 79:17.23.25 80:8 117:22 **motive** 75:11 move 6:19 9:10,24 10:12 13:1,12 14:5 20:6 35:23 54:15 75:13 83:17 98:17 99:19 103:5 111:10 117:6,24 moved 6:20 79:20 85:12 102:10 moving 10:22 11:1,1 11:2 14:15 43:2 56:2 107:21 112:13 **MPUs** 118:9,10 119:12,14 multiple 16:5 76:22 100:14

N

name 4:14 23:16 **named** 24:2 names 55:13 narrative 91:21 **Nathalie** 2:4 3:23 18:3 30:23 47:6 50:19 52:17 81:5 99:18 103:18 111:6 111:22 **nature** 116:13 **nearly** 65:10 105:6 necessarily 24:25 32:17 61:1 63:15 74:2 108:2 necessary 67:24 need 5:23 6:2,3,20,25 9:9 10:21 13:24 14:2,14 17:3 34:13 42:15 51:23 52:11 54:14 63:7 64:20 76:15,25 77:8,15 81:18 82:25,25 90:25 91:2 92:11 93:16 109:14 needed 24:24 25:18 48:14 50:5 92:6 93:7.10 needs 7:3 25:13 43:16 51:16 63:21

64:16 70:8 91:2

92:23 115:15 negotiating 103:7 negotiations 104:17 **neither** 121:13 never 8:6 41:15 92:5 92:23 97:24 108:18 113:8 117:18 nevertheless 25:17 86:12 new 18:12,18,22 40:24 48:7 64:8,10 64:13,13 79:12 86:19 88:20 90:1 92:10 96:2 102:5 104:22 **newer** 42:3 Nicaragua 3:25 **night** 51:25 82:13 nine 115:7 non-reportable 17:22 normal 30:12 86:2 90:3 normally 54:7 **NORWOOD** 2:19 **Notary** 121:7 note 25:14 55:17 **noted** 20:8 27:14.18 27:24 28:8,11 29:18 **notes** 55:22 121:12 nothing's 35:7 **notice** 40:12 **notify** 102:7 notwithstanding 25:12 **November** 6:10 8:8 **number** 6:3,5,5,13 9:25 10:2 11:2,15 12:4.5 13:2 15:12 15:22,23 17:2 22:21,24 33:22,23 37:1 67:13 70:20 70:21 76:19,20 80:23,24 81:2,10

0 objective 42:22 observation 22:24 53:3 99:14 observations 16:2,3,4 53:8 86:19,20 obtain 67:16 obviously 19:18 29:13 41:1 62:17 66:19 70:1 72:8 73:4 Oca 2:24 23:10,15,16 25:19 26:13 27:5.7 28:25 29:4.15 30:3 30:16,22 49:25 60:13,23 61:8,22 62:2,6,12 65:8 occupancy 119:11 occurred 17:1 28:1,8 **occurs** 90:6 **OCP** 102:3 109:9 **October** 1:16 13:10 118:24,24 119:2 121:18 **October's** 119:3 offer 102:11 **office** 2:7,14 4:22 5:2 5:4,6,8 23:5,24 24:1 65:5 67:15 81:22 92:14 109:10 **oh** 23:11 31:14 32:11 54:3 66:4 82:17 104:7 okay 6:15 9:5 10:25 11:14 12:5,20 13:13 14:25 15:21 15:23 17:18 19:12 22:9 30:21 37:6 40:18 42:11,11 43:12 44:17,19 45:9 47:23 50:17 50:24 51:20 54:19 55:10 56:2 57:7,13 57:20 60:21 61:18 62:4 63:4,25 64:3 64:15,22 65:15 67:6,9 75:22 76:19 79:15 80:22 81:17 83:14,17 84:20 85:10,13,21,22 88:9 89:2,18 90:23

91:11 95:6 98:4,4 99:8,20 101:7 106:7 111:17 112:14 114:19 115:3 117:6,13 120:14,20 **old** 96:4 **oldest** 91:16 **once** 32:12 65:12 91:1 117:20,20 one-purchase 39:14 ones 9:13 30:4 ongoing 69:8 open 86:21 95:14 118:21 **opening** 92:21 **operate** 76:25 operating 37:20 38:13 42:20 48:19 53:5 71:5 77:13 operational 16:1 **Operationally** 39:9 **Operations** 2:15 23:3 23:7,14 24:9 65:6 **opinion** 27:21 28:7 28:14 29:20,24 30:17 43:9 56:3 58:24 62:20 90:16 opinions 31:5 opportunities 100:21 opportunity 9:21 35:20 40:6 100:19 **opposed** 10:23 11:12 12:1,18 15:17 22:17 80:6 85:15 117:11 **option** 76:4 **options** 76:1,3 oranges 115:6,7 **order** 38:2 39:6,7,11 39:14,16 40:1 48:18 50:13,14 51:18,18 54:14 72:1,23 73:18 74:7 74:7 88:10 91:23 92:9 95:24 96:15 97:10 99:13 100:12 100:17,25 101:2 102:5,8,24 103:5 103:25 104:4 105:7 109:13 111:21,23 113:15 115:1

81:14,21 82:15

106:8 108:15

numbers 107:15

numerous 77:15

nuts 97:21

85:23 86:20 98:7

andons 27.0 5 02 20.0	n m 1.17 121.1	05:21 24 07:10	nload 20:10	nonulation 114.6
orders 37:2,5,23 38:2	p.m 1:17 121:1	95:21,24 97:19	placed 39:10	population 114:6
39:9,14 41:17 42:1	pack 96:7	102:16 109:11,23	places 108:13	populations 114:3
42:23 43:6,14	package 27:2	117:1 120:8	placing 42:23 73:20	portions 110:20
44:22 47:13 49:20	packed 7:6	percent 44:20 91:10	plan 6:4 8:4,6,7,13	position 33:21 92:13
49:21,24 50:12,15	page 29:10 31:8,17	93:25	8:15 13:18 14:1	possible 5:19 21:21
50:16 51:2,2 54:11	37:14,15 62:21	perfect 43:23 94:16	25:3,15 26:1 33:25	65:3
54:13,13 55:11	82:3	94:21 108:18	34:11 44:25 67:24	possibly 114:25
56:21 72:5,13,14	pages 44:25	perform 49:2 88:18	68:7 69:2,3,6,13	115:12
72:14 73:3,13,13	paid 29:22 56:8	116:14	97:12,12,13 110:2	post 33:22,23
73:16,20,23,24	58:17 59:7,12	performed 67:19	planned 89:20	potential 26:9 28:23
74:2,3,10,19 75:1,6	107:9	performing 47:11	Plant 2:15 23:3,6,14	potentially 32:20
77:6,6 88:8,15 91:6	PAM 2:19	48:25 49:10 59:4	24:8 65:6	56:12 92:8
91:7,12,13 94:18	paper 76:25 77:13	68:19,20	Plantation 52:13	PPO 2:19 6:11 7:18
95:5,10,16 96:18	97:3 99:23,24,24	performs 15:25	playbook 94:22	8:18 25:10 32:19
96:21 97:2,6,22,25	103:18 104:8 107:6	period 113:7 115:21	please 3:7,11 4:14	32:25 33:11 37:4,7
98:2,7,7,8 99:15	107:8,9	115:24 116:12	5:18 10:1 11:7	37:8 38:1 45:23
101:1 103:20	paper-based 107:17 107:24	periodically 67:19	15:22 23:11 35:15	46:23 49:20 51:8
106:18 107:5 114:24 118:19	paperwork 49:6 54:5	85:25 periods 100:13	44:24 53:24 55:16 68:16 87:13 101:11	51:12,16 52:5 55:20 61:14 63:14
orders' 114:6	100:22 118:19	perious 100:13 permitting 99:11	pleased 28:19	63:15,19,23 64:17
		pernetuated 92:4	Pledge 3:6,8	64:23 65:11,21
organizations 42:19 76:22	paragraph 53:10 parenting 19:6	perpetuated 92:4 perpetuity 70:7	plenty 10:18	71:10 74:14 77:24
origin 23:22	part 21:12 38:5,15	perpetuity 70.7 person 4:20 20:24	Plus 104:14	82:19 97:22
original 29:12 59:23	45:6 48:13 52:20	25:7 33:7 34:16	PM 100:15	PPO's 33:14
67:11 79:7,13	53:4 54:23 69:13	50:10 56:6 68:15	PMs 100:22	PR 48:5
88:12 89:6	70:5 88:15 90:3	74:21 92:11 97:16	pockets 43:12	practically 95:21
other's 44:12	106:18	100:16 102:7	point 8:7 15:10 29:13	practice 37:2,4,6,10
outcome 97:13	particular 17:1,14,19	108:10	50:20 52:12,12	37:12,13,19,23
121:17	20:14 22:12 26:11	personally 66:21	54:21 55:10 59:7	38:12 40:18,19
outrage 33:7 107:21	69:9 84:15	perspective 42:7	59:12 68:20,24	41:5 49:17,20 52:2
outside 6:7 13:10	particularly 7:6	49:22,22 53:2	74:3 76:21 88:10	52:17,23 53:1,3,4
104:19 112:15	86:20	pertain 53:8	94:3 97:11 98:18	54:12,24
outsider 42:6	parties 121:14	phone 3:20 4:6,8,21	101:6 103:18 107:4	practices 25:24 76:24
outsiders 13:3	party 121:15	Phyllis 2:5 4:6,8,16	107:15 108:21	97:19
overall 20:18	party 121:13 passed 104:1	21:17,18	110:19 111:14	pray 115:21
overbilled 26:5	Paving 24:5 58:19	physical 2:15 23:3,6	115:3	preceded 88:16
overcharge 62:1	pay 57:22,24 69:13	23:14 24:8 49:4,9	pointed 29:6 44:18	precedes 103:23
overcharged 28:3	74:21	65:5	96:5	precise 50:18
29:24	payables 32:22	pick 7:1	pointing 98:19	prepare 16:24
overcharges 28:1,8	paying 59:10,15	picked 114:20	points 24:6,7	prepared 24:16
55:14 61:20	payment 69:10	picking 114:24	policies 8:19 24:15	preparing 84:7 89:2
overload 94:10	payments 60:4,7,15	picture 13:22 43:2	71:5 97:19	104:3
overpaid 60:10	PCO 102:5 113:14	piece 56:11,13	policy 8:13 39:3 41:7	presentation 13:7,12
overpaying 32:21	PCOs 102:13	109:10	41:10,22,23 42:24	presented 86:7
53:19	peculiar 17:6	pile 92:3	52:1,3,4,5,18,24	105:16
overpayment 59:16	pencil 77:14	Pine 52:13	53:6 55:1,3 66:12	president 23:17
overpayments 60:8	people 18:6,12 32:19	pings 102:16	67:5,11 68:25 69:4	pretty 113:6
owes 103:6,6	33:21 38:1 40:3,4	place 28:13 38:23	69:7 70:23,25 72:7	previous 44:21 64:9
owner 30:15 100:9	43:14 44:8 47:8	39:3 41:11 44:10	72:21	86:7 106:15,16
owner's 86:1	55:6,11 58:1 61:19	46:8 60:18 66:15	pooh 92:3	previously 88:10
	71:17 72:5 74:17	83:8 93:23 103:17	poor 35:4	104:15
P	89:20 92:2,4 95:1	104:22	poorly 94:13	price 29:17 30:6,10
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

,
30:18 53:11 56:5
57:9 60:10
pricing 103:7
primarily 119:9
primary 100:16
prime 88:17
primer 52:1
principal 19:18
principals 18:18
printing 26:24
prior 59:9 86:20,21
87:25 113:12
prioritize 5:24
prioritized 97:21,23
probably 44:19,19
44:22 80:22 105:2
105:3
problem 31:15 32:24
33:17 34:2 35:2
53:16 73:15 90:15
93:19 106:23
110:13
problems 46:22 90:2
procedural 40:22
procedure 18:6
37:20 38:6,13
48:24 52:9,16,21
52:24 53:5 55:1,4
55:21 88:13,22
89:8 90:10,17
procedures 18:8,8,23
18:25 19:13,17,20
20:1,4,7,16 21:2,6
21:7 22:2,10,12
24:16 25:24 48:20
52:2,20 88:3 89:3
proceed 9:22 12:10
proceeding 84:7,18
proceedings 3:2
121:10
process 7:23 26:20
37:24 38:3,3,5,15
38:17,21 40:3
42:12 45:1,16
47:14,20 49:8 50:9
51:7,8,9,12,14,15
51:17 52:1,6,7,8,19
60:25 61:11,13
68:21,22 69:9,11
70:3,4,5,7 73:9
75:9,13 77:25 82:6
83:25 84:2,9 86:2,5
00.20 02,5 00.2,5
-

87:24 88:11,16,17 89:10,15,19 90:3,6 91:23 97:3,10 99:11 100:9,18,23 101:1,22 102:4,6 103:22,23 104:4,5 104:8,9,20 105:24 107:7,8 109:8,13 110:16 111:8 115:1 116:20 processed 72:19,20 116:18 processes 42:16 45:8 51:10 66:17 69:18 98:20 99:21 101:23
102:22 104:14 107:17,24 108:6 110:18 112:12 113:15
processing 49:6 procurement 2:16
8:18,19,25 23:21 24:9 32:9,15,16 34:14,18 37:24 39:12 47:9,25 48:1 56:5 57:17 58:9,24 60:24 61:1,7,11,13 61:14 63:17 65:1,7 65:10,12,20 69:10 69:12 72:21 74:17 88:16 89:15 94:6,7 procuring 60:25 89:10
produce 97:24 product 38:1,6
professional 26:14 42:7 43:10 66:18 82:20
program 2:14 17:19 77:18 85:24,25 87:18 91:8,13,25 93:23 94:23 101:12 101:16 110:12
Programs 23:6
109:11
progress 33:14 36:10 118:19
progressive 38:18
prohibited 40:20
project 23:22 26:10
20.7 10 15 24 50.2

39:7,10,15,24 59:3

88:12 89:6,21,25

93:5,11 101:4
102.4.22.102.5
102:4,23 103:5
104:12 105:11,11
107:20 118:23
projection 105:15
projects 39:13,19
89:14 94:20 95:8
99:2,14 102:17
107:18 119:10
Promotion 47:3
prone 82:5
proper 85:1
property 7:18 46:6
46:21 77:24 83:23
proposals 104:17
proposed 68:24
107:12
proven 8:12
provide 5:25 17:8
20:15 21:2 35:13
50:2 54:18 65:21
111:18
provided 24:22,24
27:20 28:4 62:7
114:22
provides 47:11 96:24
providing 64:5
public 9:11 24:23
26:17 27:9 121:8
pull 31:19 44:21
pulled 114:4
purchase 37:2 38:23
39:5,11 41:17,25
43:6,14 48:2,4,13
48:18,23 50:11,13
51:2,18 71:12 72:1
72:5,12,13,14,18
72.3,12,13,14,10
72:22,25 73:12,16
73:18,24 74:3 77:6
104:3 118:18
purchases 32:24,25
33:3 45:24 49:18
49:21,23,25 70:17
70:22 71:9 72:8
73:6,14
purchasing 38:5,15
38:21,23 39:8,12
39:21,23 51:14
52:4 104:3
purposes 56:14
pursue 27:1 62:23
pursuing 62:17
-

push 94:15 pushing 100:17,22 101:1 put 22:9 27:1 46:7 63:23 64:20 92:10 93:4,9 103:22 105:23 107:12,13 108:13 118:18,25 119:2 puts 103:20 putting 12:23 35:6 78:4 104:2 115:11 118:23,25 puzzle 56:12
0
Q1 113:3,3 116:6 Q3 116:6 Q4 116:6 qualified 92:12 qualify 17:11 quarter 85:24 115:5 115:16,18,18 116:14 quarter's 114:5 quarterly 113:2
115:4,14 116:3 question 18:7,23
38:11 41:12 44:14 46:9 47:25 53:21 53:23,25 58:17,18 59:15 64:1,6 71:16 76:11 78:17 80:17 84:19 89:13 91:6 91:11 105:1,2,18 106:8,9,12 113:11 113:11 114:2

:6 :11 5:5 :14 21 ,18 :16 :17 :6 8 :11 questions 12:10 17:5 27:6 28:19 30:25 36:19 65:16 82:13 87:3 88:5 105:22 **Queue** 100:11 quick 80:17 119:5 quickly 6:20,23 9:13 9:16 14:9 50:20 81:16 **quiet** 71:22 quite 43:4 49:16 71:19 quorum 117:2,3,7 120:13,19 quotes 38:8

K
R 1:23 121:7,22
Radcliff 2:11 5:4,4
rails 8:3
raise 5:16 58:16
59:14
range 30:6
re-meetings 89:5
read 31:20 32:2,4,12
35:25 36:2 87:21
90:24
reading 30:17 32:11
78:1 84:21 87:23
90:4,4
ready 15:12 22:21
78:12 80:22 89:22
real 100:1 119:5
real-time 82:7
realize 24:21 32:13
really 5:23 6:19 8:3
8:12 14:9 30:25
42:16 57:14 62:16
71:8,24 74:15
87:20 89:21 91:13
96:25 101:5 120:12
reason 15:7 40:10
44:14 50:8 64:25
65:9 69:1 75:3,7
99:9 114:20 116:11
120:2
reasonable 24:17
112:11
reasons 14:14 28:7
34:25 68:2
Rebecca 2:3 3:13
108:23
rebuild 92:9
rebuilding 91:20
recalculate 31:2
recall 106:14
receive 72:25
received 23:23 65:4
receiving 32:8
recited 3:9
recognized 110:13
recommend 37:1
49:17 52:25
recommendation
13:17 36:13 37:1
49:17 66:16 67:18
.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,

67:20,23 68:1,2

recommendations	64:19	requesting 47:18	reviewed 12:8 24:11	run 78:13
27:20 33:15 34:8	remove 30:13	55:9,17,19,23	43:18 45:13 88:15	running 3:5 35:6
34:10 64:8 70:2,4	removed 91:4 106:24	requests 24:23,24	106:18	94:6
76:7 113:12,22	renew 76:1,3	65:17	reviewing 58:22	74.0
118:15	renovate 95:6	required 45:14 48:12	reviews 24:19 91:4	S
recommended 103:4	renovation 91:18	103:1	94:25	Sam 2:13 23:4
106:16	renovations 91:22	requirement 17:16	revisit 66:17 70:4	sample 114:3
recommending 32:25	reorder 5:19	requires 39:25 48:5	RFI 101:2 113:14	samples 114:4
33:1	reordered 11:2	requisition 38:24	RFQ 91:3 107:13	116:12
record 47:9 83:10	repair 7:9 28:16 30:2	48:4,17 72:18 73:1	Rich-Levinson 93:8	SAP 48:3,5,10 104:2
121:11	repairs 8:16 9:17	requisitioners 48:3	Richard 25:9	sat 71:13 97:22 98:16
records 24:23 29:6	28:13 32:9 52:7	requisitions 48:13	right 5:12 9:15 19:16	99:18 100:12
red 101:24,25 104:15	60:16 88:20 93:4	researching 76:11	19:20 21:16 22:23	108:24
redesigned 28:9	93:15	residents' 43:21	23:9 27:10 29:9	save 77:18 99:21,22
redesigning 28:6	repeat 53:23 55:18	resignations 34:21	31:24 32:10 34:9	savings 27:23 105:5
referencing 39:18	120:20	resolve 51:1	36:4 42:5,10 43:14	saw 14:13 42:8 55:13
referred 7:13 64:7	repeatedly 53:19	respect 5:12 16:22	50:25 51:20,23	92:22
referring 31:12,14,24	replace 93:17,17 96:5	18:17 20:16 25:2	54:19 61:24 64:22	saying 31:4,4 41:4
40:2 84:1	replacements 93:16	100:8 111:6 113:13	64:25 69:8,23,24	54:20 63:12 108:5
refuse 92:24	reply 62:8 63:1	respond 26:25 45:19	73:25 75:8 76:10	109:1,3 115:16
regard 47:10 58:7	report 12:6,21 14:19	89:10,11 96:13	79:10 82:24 84:21	says 8:18 26:4 37:1,7
regarding 16:17	15:24 16:16 20:1	101:8	89:23 100:9 102:23	41:10 49:19 51:15
18:16 24:8,8 48:1	22:12 26:23,24	responded 45:13	105:15 106:3,22	56:3,3,8 61:25 69:7
58:19 61:11 65:16	27:19,24 28:8	responding 70:12	108:4,20 111:1,22	93:1 103:13 113:2
65:22 88:1	29:18 31:8,16	response 3:22 4:1,7,9	117:22 119:7 120:7	113:4 117:15
regardless 40:1 108:8	34:23 35:21,22	4:19 11:13,23 12:2	rise 3:7 33:2	scapegoat 107:1
regards 43:6	36:1 40:15 48:9	12:15,19 15:18	risk 2:22,22 45:5	scathing 33:11
regulatory 16:9	64:4 67:18 77:12	16:23,25 22:18	82:5 94:19	scenes 96:8
reimbursed 59:13	85:24 86:7,17 87:4	24:16,17,18 36:25	Robert 2:4,18 4:2	schedule 19:4,23
61:21	87:9 92:24 98:6	37:3 44:13 49:19	robocalls 19:6	schedules 119:21,25
reimbursement	112:25 113:2 114:3	62:10,13 80:7	robust 89:15	scheduling 6:9
60:16 61:23	115:24 116:1,2	85:16 102:20	rocket 19:24 43:15	school 1:3 7:1 16:6
reimbursements	119:13,15 121:10	107:13 117:12	ROI 112:9,13,18	16:17 19:21 45:23
60:12	reported 25:8	responsibility 72:25	roles 41:2 44:12	48:7 66:21 74:20
reimbursing 59:8	reporter 1:23,23 2:25	73:5 108:11	66:10	86:3,6
reiterate 110:10	5:11 118:2,4	responsible 18:13	roll 3:10	school-by-school
reject 59:22	120:15 121:7,22	19:15,22 20:11,12	Ron 2:17 23:11,13	91:14 school-related 46:21
rejected 68:1	REPORTER'S 121:4	21:4 30:15 58:12	57:16 58:6	schools 12:7,7 16:10
related 7:19,22 18:8	reporting 1:24 2:25	92:2 100:17	roof 92:10,16 93:4,17	16:15 17:2,7,10,11
38:25 103:19,25	17:16 106:3	rest 10:7 43:20	roofing 93:4,15	
relates 16:6 76:8	reports 16:9,12,13	result 33:10	roofs 97:22 99:1,8,12	17:15,16 18:17 20:13,14 21:22,24
relative 121:15	17:21 20:20 22:13	results 116:3	115:11	22:6 26:17 27:9
relatively 30:2 rely 66:14	46:5,6,6 80:18 86:3	retire 35:8 retirement 36:21	ROOM 1:12 rope 8:24	33:11,16 36:11
reny 66:14 remeasured 28:2	113:6,16 116:3 118:16 119:17	80:10	rope 8:24 rounds 100:14	81:7 83:1 91:16
remediation 47:2	120:6	retirements 34:21	routine 108:16	95:15,16 96:22
remember 53:17	representative 86:1	retiring 13:9 33:25	RSM 2:21,22,22 7:20	99:10 105:13
93:24 107:2 109:9	reqs 48:23	36:17	7:25 85:3,23,25	118:11
reminders 19:5	request 14:16 25:1	reveal 41:25	87:3,15,16,17 95:3	Schools' 36:13
removal 30:18 53:10	66:8 69:9 76:13	review 7:20 25:19	100:3 101:17 111:3	science 19:24 43:15
56:4 57:8,11,15	78:22 79:6 81:6	28:21 33:11 95:4	114:14	scope 59:3 63:19,20
58:21 63:15 64:18	87:11	100:14 116:17	rules 71:15,17	63:21 64:23 65:22
			<u> </u>	

,	İ	1	1	1
94:17 96:24 98:11	sentenced 25:10	sir 88:14,25 89:14	105:15	39:20 92:11 101:15
103:8 106:20	separate 26:12 58:24	sit 103:14	specifically 43:17	110:11 115:12
116:13,14,21	separately 26:3	sites 27:25	72:11	121:5,8
scope's 98:24	September 113:4	sitting 98:22	specifics 113:22	statement 15:7 27:5
scopes 94:14 107:18	116:9 119:1,15	situation 42:13 47:17	specify 64:18	41:10 57:8 68:1
scores 31:2	serious 45:4 77:16	66:1,3 75:4	speed 52:3,8,16,22	stating 40:14
screen 87:22	serves 30:5	situations 40:5,8 74:4	52:22 83:24	status 67:17,19
screw 94:23	service 1:24 38:7	74:7,25,25 75:2	spend 72:17 75:16	stay 52:14,21 95:21
screwed 93:2	47:12 48:25 73:4	six 102:2	76:13 78:21 79:6	95:22
SE 1:13,24	80:10	size 28:16	98:1	steaming 92:3
Sealcoating 24:5	services 2:16,17,18	slash 67:16	spending 48:16	stenographic 1:23
second 11:7,8,9,21	2:22 23:21 63:21	slip 43:25	spent 76:15,22 96:19	121:12
12:13 15:2,3,4 26:2	64:23 65:23	slipping 43:19	100:24	stenographically
36:4,15 53:9,9	set 33:2 106:5	small 30:2 87:23	split 32:25 33:3 37:4	121:10
83:19 91:14 117:8	sets 95:18	smaller 30:9	37:23 38:2 41:17	step 42:15 52:10,10
seconded 79:22	shaking 50:20	SMART 85:3 91:25	42:1 43:14 49:20	stick 92:15
85:11	share 113:21	solution 57:18	70:17 71:25 75:1,6	stek 92.13 stop 5:22 6:25 7:2,4
Secretary 2:10	shave 109:3	solved 35:7	splitting 32:23 37:2	32:10 113:5 116:22
see 5:24 6:16 7:13	Shaw 2:5 4:6,8,12,13	somebody 7:11 13:14	43:6 44:21 49:18	116:24 120:14
9:15,18,21 10:13	4:16,16,17 21:17	18:21 19:3,3,8,14	53:1,2 54:12 71:9	stopped 79:21
11:6 20:3 23:12	21:19,21 22:5	31:1 38:17 41:17	72:23 77:5	stopped 79.21 story 21:7,8 96:16
29:3 30:24 34:14	85:18,19,20 99:3,7	50:20 72:1 74:14	spot 74:13 111:4	Stranahan 92:18
	she'll 14:19	81:22 90:1 97:15	_	
39:12,13 48:22	shed 71:3	97:17 106:25 116:5	square 30:6,7,8 stacked 101:25	strategies 18:16
55:25 61:24 63:7,7				strategy 25:20
64:16 66:16 71:11	sheet 31:25	somebody's 55:22 someone's 74:15	staff 2:7,12 24:10	Strauss 2:5 4:10,11
71:12 73:2 77:4	shenanigans 74:14		31:3 39:24 40:6	6:24 42:2,3 44:14
79:18 84:17,22	Sheridan 16:10	somewhat 28:4	47:10,19 49:7 57:1	44:17,24 45:9,17
96:23 99:17 104:13	shocked 55:23	SOP 37:7,11 54:21	63:19 65:4 74:5,25	46:1,12 47:1,5
105:3,19 107:8	short 51:25 64:4	55:21	92:7	50:19 65:24,25
108:12,14,15	96:16	sorry 23:11 30:9	stand 89:23	66:6 67:6,9,12
111:18 112:5	shortly 76:6	46:14,15 47:23	standard 37:19,20,25	68:10,14 69:14,20
115:17 116:7	shots 71:25	55:15 62:8 83:21	38:12,13 39:11	69:24 70:11 78:14
seeing 70:24 97:13	shoulders 92:2	98:12 99:5 101:9	40:18,19 41:5	87:12 111:5
112:24	show 31:2 93:9	111:3 117:15	47:14 48:19 53:5	Strauss's 68:20 76:20
seek 20:14	sick 43:22	sort 8:20 38:18	71:5 116:15	78:13 87:25
seen 16:1 31:6 33:13	side 47:25 48:1	115:17 116:4	standards 95:12	straying 53:8
43:10 45:24 46:4,7	sign 32:19 56:7 57:21	sound 63:5	109:23	streamline 90:10
46:22 70:19 74:18	57:22	sounds 54:22 60:2	standpoint 24:21	113:19
77:11 110:25	signature 51:16	66:2	25:25 86:25	Strike 21:5
113:16	signatures 102:2	soup 97:21	start 3:6 9:25 10:1,22	struck 78:1
Seifer 2:9 5:2,2	signed 24:18 57:20	soup-to-nuts 104:4	28:21 63:8 64:12	structured 116:12
selected 89:16	110:1,1	sources 26:8	87:7,20 89:22	student 17:12,13
selling 71:6	significant 14:11,24	Southern 24:5 58:19	92:21 93:21 94:4	students 17:11 21:23
semiannual 83:11	102:15	speak 14:8 37:16	101:19 106:3	stuff 21:14 32:12
84:11,16	signing 32:21 55:13	38:8 58:6 59:25	started 3:5 35:3	44:5,22 49:1 83:12
send 19:5 56:24,25	58:12	101:3	54:10 110:13	118:23 119:1,3
57:2,3,4 63:2	silos 42:20	Speakers 9:11	starting 5:21 11:2,6	120:10
sense 34:18,24,25	similar 74:19 77:5	speaking 32:3 42:10	40:24 41:22 63:5	sub 96:13
70:6 76:24 77:5	101:16 113:18	44:11 54:9 58:23	114:12	subcontractor 24:4
81:4 106:4	simple 71:19	speaks 68:15	starts 88:23	subject 8:25 57:13
sent 35:16	simply 44:9	Spec 2:10,11	startup 111:16	submission 16:8
sentence 32:7	single 16:4	specific 24:23 68:2	state 4:14 20:21	submit 27:2
	<u> </u>	l 	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

,	systems 110:15 112:4 term 59:2 60:24,25 57:22 62:18 66:13 101:15 102:25				
submitted 68:8	systems 110:15 112:4	term 59:2 60:24,25	57:22 62:18 66:13	101:15 102:25	
119:13	112:17	61:12 96:18	71:22,23 75:4 77:8	103:24 105:4 109:7	
submitting 119:17		termite 53:16 55:12	77:14 78:16 79:20	109:21 111:17	
subs 96:11	T	57:24 63:5 66:2	79:23,24 82:14	112:1,6 115:7,8	
subsequent 26:24	table 12:7 100:9	terms 35:9 52:8	83:3,12 84:24	116:24 117:13,17	
27:3	115:5	57:10 64:17 72:20	87:24 88:1 90:3,7	117:21,21 120:21	
substantive 120:13	take 6:16 8:21 25:20	116:8	90:11,12,13,18,19	timeframe 105:12	
subtract 79:6	25:21 40:9 41:11	test 14:22	91:1 98:12 100:4,7	114:21 116:5,18	
succession 33:25	42:15 43:7,13 44:8	text 85:17	100:18 101:4	timeline 105:23	
suddenly 18:12	44:24 45:14,22	texted 85:18	104:21 106:1 107:2	timelines 106:2	
suffered 111:13	55:17 68:18 76:6	thank 3:12,16 4:17	108:3,7,11 109:6	times 29:19 72:4	
suggest 18:5	77:16 80:3 86:2,9	12:22,24,25 14:25	109:20,20,22,22	77:15	
suggestion 66:8	105:24 107:19	17:9 18:2,3 22:22	111:3,17 112:2	timing 16:11	
suggestions 90:17	109:4 111:3,15	23:11 30:21 31:23	113:15,16 115:23	Timothy 1:23 121:7	
100:3	112:9	35:20,21,22 42:3	116:11 120:5,8,24	121:22	
Suite 1:24	taken 28:13 60:18	47:25 49:13 51:6	thinking 19:7 87:23	tinker 109:13	
sum 111:11	66:11 67:17,22	60:21 70:15 71:2	109:22	tired 115:25	
summary 31:25	69:23 103:17	72:3 78:18 80:10	thinks 103:24	title 61:10	
summer 119:8,10	109:19 110:17	80:12,15,25 81:1	third 4:20	today 6:21 8:11 71:2	
sun 33:1	talk 35:20 99:12	85:21,22 90:23	thorough 65:11	95:5 105:10 118:24	
superintendent	105:9 117:25	98:4 99:7 100:5	thought 6:15 11:16	119:3	
14:19 16:20,24,25	talked 83:23 99:1	106:7,12 120:24	14:17,24 25:18	today's 71:8	
20:13 34:19 107:23	talking 20:20 31:1,11	theft 82:6	70:11	toilet 111:11	
Superintendent's	38:22 50:16 51:6	theory 94:3	thousand 72:17	told 95:20 96:9,11,15	
41:13 81:22	53:12 54:10 74:2,6	thereof 121:12	thousands 44:7,7	119:24	
supervisor 74:9	82:4 96:20 98:1,22	thing 29:9 32:1,6	thread 77:11	tomorrow 105:22	
87:16 114:15	113:17	33:3 42:18 46:12	three 7:24 16:2,9	tons 77:18	
support 2:18 9:9 65:4	talks 48:11 72:7	49:16,21 50:24	17:7,10 34:11 38:8	top 90:18	
supporting 9:4	target 67:25	51:19,24 53:13	42:23 115:8 118:12	total 75:16 78:19,20	
supposed 8:1 18:7	task 2:13 7:17 23:4	56:7,20 69:3 74:13	three-month 116:20	78:22 79:3,14	
42:17 47:22 52:10	33:18,22 83:2	82:9 83:9 87:21	three-quote 38:3	100:11	
53:18 57:10 82:10	96:17 111:24	88:7 90:24 100:7	three-year 34:11	totally 93:2 110:10	
83:5,8 96:5 110:1,2	tasked 83:7	101:6 106:23 111:9	75:25	totals 62:1	
110:3	tax 43:20,21	112:20,24 118:7,8	threshold 38:22 39:4	touched 106:20	
sure 5:20 17:8 19:9	taxpayer 111:13	things 8:5 18:13	39:21 43:24 44:2,5	tough 105:2	
21:20 22:7 41:16	teachers 92:7	25:22 32:13,23	50:3 72:10,15 73:7	track 82:7,10 105:25	
41:24 46:10,17	team 40:7 43:1 65:6	40:8,10 43:18,23	thresholds 38:24	119:16 120:5	
49:16 63:16 71:17	87:3 102:17 103:15	44:18 48:12 51:6	48:12	trackable 104:5	
71:20 87:14 97:3	104:12	52:5 55:7 63:16	threw 34:20	tracking 106:3	
99:17 100:5 102:1	tech 16:10 17:11	64:16 74:18 82:10	THURSDAY 1:16	train 47:22	
102:18 103:12	111:16	84:17 88:1 91:16	tickets 71:6	trained 49:3,3	
109:25 110:7 113:4	technology 70:19	94:10 95:12,14	tied 104:10	training 17:1 46:8,10	
113:10 114:23	77:9 111:15,20	96:12 98:20 103:17	ties 68:5	46:15 47:7,8,12,18	
surprise 107:16	tedious 89:8	104:19 107:17	Tim 2:25 5:10	47:20 48:2,6,8,11	
surprised 95:9,10	Telephonic 2:3,5,10	108:13,15,16	time 5:22 8:14 10:18	49:8,11 71:8,11	
swiftly 10:17	tell 71:1 115:9,21	109:25 111:19	12:9 16:21 17:25	trainings 46:24	
system 46:1,2 49:7	119:12	115:11,22	39:24 40:11 41:16	transactions 114:4	
66:22 68:10 78:4	telling 37:9 60:3	think 5:25 10:6,16	57:23 70:3 74:13	transcript 121:11	
82:20 96:2 110:20	108:23	14:10 22:1,13	74:20 78:13 86:9	translation 82:1	
112:8	template 63:24	27:23 29:13 31:21	86:21 88:9,11	transmission 12:11	
systemic 33:17 35:2	tendency 57:24	34:2,13 42:15 43:2	90:11,13 93:5,24	transmit 7:8 12:21	
88:1	tenure 26:15	43:7,21 45:20 52:4	99:10,16 100:13,25	20:6 21:13	
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

word 21:5 32:15

34:17 61:4

120:9 112:2,13 transmitted 17:4 120:16,18 transmitting 51:24 understanding 21:13 we're 3:5 5:21 6:21 \mathbf{W} 65:18 79:18 24:15 25:23 36:8 9:2.13 10:24 11:5 wait 32:11 119:20 tremendous 103:2 62:14 88:6,24 89:1 19:9 21:6 22:12 walk 87:9 trenches 42:5 understands 40:19 31:22 36:8 38:22 trickling 112:23 88:3 Wanda 2:11 5:4 40:24 41:22 42:20 want 6:24 9:21,24,24 **tried** 8:5 34:20 68:22 understood 22:7 49:14 51:5 55:4 10:9.10 12:22 14:8 tries 38:17 97:17 undo 98:15 59:23,23 60:5 trillions 76:23 22:6,8 26:5,22 unforeseen 91:17 62:17 64:3 66:1.20 31:10,22 32:1 34:6 troubling 37:9 unfortunate 111:12 69:17 72:22 74:1 true 8:22 121:11 34:7 35:24,25 **unique** 17:14 116:20 75:12 76:5 77:24 37:16 50:17.19 truth 95:24 116:21 78:13 81:15,21 55:22 59:21 65:25 try 6:17 8:24 38:2 United 2:25 85:5 87:10 91:21 66:9 67:3 68:23 40:9 69:2 99:21 unsettling 34:25 93:7 95:7 97:9 69:24 70:6,16 106:14 107:8 **unsure** 71:24 98:17 99:17 105:22 71:11,12 77:7 111:10 **update** 33:13 34:7 105:25 108:18 80:13 83:15 93:25 trying 31:19,23 35:5 36:9 81:6 83:1,4 109:7 113:9 114:11 95:19 98:13,23 46:1 55:16 62:21 110:2.3 115:10,11,16 116:8 99:12,16 102:12 66:13 75:12 77:8 **updated** 99:14 110:4 117:2,3 118:12,13 103:11 107:7 77:16 92:19 95:25 110:18 112:24 118:24 119:22 109:18 111:18 **updates** 118:20 120:5,16,24 109:12,16 **updating** 14:20 101:1 118:6,8 turn 46:12 52:14 we've 7:17 9:14 upgrade 77:8 wanted 25:6 39:20 77:18 92:16 10:12 13:24 35:19 47:24 68:8 77:22 two 7:22,24 8:21 **use** 39:4 60:24 72:5 38:1 45:24 46:4,6 114:23 27:16.23 28:1.4 99:4 46:22 70:17.19 50:11 51:6 60:14 user 39:9 40:13 **wanting** 106:25 74:4 76:14 77:11 wants 90:1 96:19 98:21 103:4 utilization 43:4 60:18,19,19 74:9 **Wanza** 16:24 18:14 utilize 17:25 59:4 74:18 75:19 76:20 106:19 108:3 20:1,7,10,23,24 80:18 83:3 90:21 utilizing 59:23 110:25 111:2 100:20 21:2 96:4 99:22 109:11 113:15 114:21,22 Warehousing 2:16 119:18,18 120:3 116:11 119:24 V 23:21 48:1 two-year 94:5 120:14 valid 25:12 57:5 wasn't 41:23 44:23 **type** 30:2,13 42:13 weaknesses 41:20,22 **value** 90:13 95:3 57:14,19 64:25 44:5 47:8 53:13 wear 25:7 96:20 65:7 75:9 86:10 69:3 95:15 week 119:14 **typical** 103:9 varies 30:7 93:3 99:6 weeks 119:18 120:3 various 90:14 waste 8:14 30:14 typically 30:3 102:24 **welcome** 3:15 30:22 wasted 44:8 90:12 vehicle 84:22 104:18 80:14 **vendor** 29:16 39:15 111:11 well-informed U 39:16 59:7 60:4 way 7:16 13:16,24 112:12 **Uh-huh** 67:12 62:7.7 22:14 30:9 31:19 went 7:12,20 26:19 ulterior 75:11 **vendors** 24:4 104:12 33:4.5.18 35:1 28:2 59:18 115:19 ultimately 120:18 verdict 18:16 42:17 43:13 51:11 weren't 11:16 unaware 16:11 verification 28:6 56:22 60:23 61:15 whatever's 54:23 unclear 71:8 **verify** 14:21 78:24 79:16 86:15 55:20

uncomfortable

uncovered 40:25

understand 18:18

66:9 87:1 88:2

39:19 41:8 44:11

91:24 94:4 97:11

120:12

viable 57:18

vilified 97:20

virtual 106:6

visited 61:8 65:11

voting 7:8,16 8:16

vote 80:3 85:7,9

VICE 2:2

words 26:6 49:15 60:18 work 25:9 26:19 31:22 32:18 37:4 37:23 38:2 39:6,15 40:1 43:9 44:21 47:11,13,18 48:21 49:2,4,10,20,21,24 50:13,15,16 51:18 54:1,9,11,13,13,14 55:11 56:20 59:3 60:17 63:14,19,20 65:20 66:19 73:13 73:20,23 74:2,9,19 75:1,6 77:6 88:18 92:19 94:4,9,12 95:23,25 97:22 98:18 102:3 103:9 110:6 112:18 116:14,15 118:20 120:1 worked 94:10 101:22 **workflow** 100:25 103:15,18 105:18 workflows 104:22 113:14.20 **working** 9:17 64:12 66:15 74:15 84:8 84:12,14 101:21 109:12 111:2 works 63:19 120:23 **workshop** 86:9,13 world 69:12 94:16,21 108:18 118:17 worrying 42:21 worth 112:14 114:5 worthy 14:10 wouldn't 36:3 55:24 60:11 63:14 66:23 69:4 75:10 **wound** 7:23 **WRIGHT** 1:12 write 41:22 writing 20:4,5,25 40:23 41:10 55:1,2 55:6,7,8 56:1 64:21 94:22 written 38:14,16 41:14,24 54:16,22 54:23 55:20 65:21

91:22 97:21 101:2

107:25 112:7 115:1

103:23 104:1

we'll 6:19 8:8 12:4

13:1 21:14 50:23

70:24 78:10 106:2

119:8

willing 90:21

wins 95:24

wire 25:8

wish 80:9

wishes 27:5

wonderful 36:20

wondering 76:23

wrong 50:7	105 28:16 30:7	25 13:10 26:5	898,000 78:22,23	
wrote 94:23	11 6:16 10:5,19 32:5	25,000 26:5 72:19	79:2,6,13	
	67:13 82:15 85:23	26th 107:2		
<u>X</u>	11:00 1:17	29 44:25	9	
X 115:16	12 6:5,14 10:5,8,17	3	9 6:14,16 7:18 10:5,9 10:18,21 13:2	
Y	13:15 14:1 22:20 82:3 110:17	3 11:2,15 37:1	22:21,24 80:23,24	
Y 115:17	13 1:16 6:5,14 10:8	3.4 79:7	81:3,9,10	
yard 28:12,14,17	10:17 13:15 15:13	3.498 78:20,23 79:14	99 44:20	
30:18,19	15:20,22,23 17:2	3:00 7:5		
yards 28:17,18 30:5	22:20	30 26:14 41:1,7		
30:6,7,8	13th 118:25	3320 39:3 72:7		
yeah 5:25 10:5 18:14	15 28:17,18 30:5,5,7	33301 1:25		
22:4 31:21 36:14	30:8	335 98:9 99:13 105:6		
45:22 49:7 54:7	16 94:5	35 52:17		
62:15 63:4 65:25	170 28:17	3rd 1:13,24 52:14		
66:4 67:14 70:15	18-123C 64:6			
75:15 77:22 79:23	181 119:9	4 11.2 00.14 106.0		
81:24 85:6 94:1,11	18th 121:18	4 11:3 99:14 106:8		
95:25 101:14 111:5	192 101:18	4,999 73:2,3		
year 48:7 64:14 78:2	196 110:16	40 102:17		
78:2,3,11 105:6 109:4 113:3 114:7	19th 86:6 114:15,17	400 29:23 45 78:15		
114:9,10 115:8,8	114:18 115:20	45 / 6:13		
115:21	2	5		
years 26:14 27:13	2 7:5 33:23	5 11:3 76:15,16		
32:5 34:11 35:3	2-point-something	5,000 28:5 38:7,24		
41:1,7,7,14,15,24	79:8	50:5,5,11 51:15		
45:18 46:5 58:1	2.6 79:10	54:14 55:20 65:22		
80:11 83:3,6 91:20	20 41:14 91:19	73:9		
98:25 109:15	101:16	5,000-and-change		
	200 1:24	61:23		
Z	200,000 39:6	50 26:6 27:12 52:18		
Z 115:17	2014 93:11,14 99:20	50,000 39:6		
	2015 93:22 94:4	5th 119:22,23		
0	2017 7:11			
1	2018 7:11 32:14	6		
1 33:23 85:24 106:10	48:20 64:2 78:24	6 11:3,3 79:10 92:18		
1.58 28:12,14 29:17	79:3	600 1:13		
29:18,20,22 30:19	2020 86:22 107:12,13	633 1:24		
31:9 58:7 60:15	110:12 113:16	7		
61:21 62:3	2021 23:25 32:9,11	7 11:3		
1:15 117:16	2022 1:16 78:5 113:4	70 30:8,10 93:25		
1:45 6:25 7:3 116:24	114:7 121:18	107:14		
117:13	2022-23 113:3			
1:48 1:17 121:1	2023 64:11 79:16	8		
10 6:14,16 7:19 10:5	20th 116:9 22 79:12 114:9,10,13	8 6:3,13 9:25 10:2,5,8		
10:18 41:7,15,24	23 64:12 76:5 78:24	10:17 11:2,6 12:4,5		
81:8,10,14,21	23 64:12 76:5 78:24 24 63:6	800 79:4 92:5,6,22		
10,000 98:25	24 ,000 29:25 61:20	93:2		
1002.1 67:11	62:1	898 79:6,12		
	02.1			