Page 1

SCHOOL BOARD OF BROWARD COUNTY

AUDIT COMMITTEE MEETING

KC WRIGHT ADMINISTRATION CENTER

BOARD ROOM

600 SE 3RD AVENUE

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA

THURSDAY, APRIL 22nd, 2021

11:30 a.m. - 1:55 p.m.

HELD VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS
all attendees present via virtual platform

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 1 COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: 2 MR. ROBERT MAYERSOHN, CHAIR MR. ANDREW MEDVIN, VICE CHAIR 3 MS. REBECCA DAHL MS. HAGEN DISCH 4 MS. MARY FERTIG DR. NATHALIE LYNCH-WALSH 5 MS. PHYLLIS SHAW MS. STEPHANIE SHIMM 6 7 OFFICE OF THE CHIEF AUDITOR STAFF: 8 MR. JORIS JABOUIN, Chief Auditor MS. ALI ARCESE, Manager, Property and Inventory Audits 9 MS. ANN CONWAY, Manager, Internal Funds Audits MS. JENNIFER HARPALANI, Manager, IT Audits 10 MS. MEREDITH ARLOTTA, Manager, Operational Audits MR. ERIC SEIFER, Auditor III 11 MS. RAYSA LUGO, Auditor III MR. BRYAN ERHARD, System Support Specialist II 12 MS. MICHELE MARQUARDT, Executive Secretary MS. WANDA RADCLIFF, Clerk Spec B 13 14 DISTRICT STAFF: 15 MS. JUDITH MARTE, Chief Financial Officer, Office of 16 the Chief Financial Officer DR. JERMAINE FLEMING, Acting Chief Strategy & 17 Operations Officer, Office of the Chief Strategy Operations Officer 18 MR. PHILLIP DUNN, Chief Information Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer MS. MARY COKER, Director Procurement & Warehousing Services 20 MR. MAXIMO ROSARIO, Director, Network Integration MS. AYMARA R. SCHMIDT, Manager, Business Process & 21 Perf. Imp., Facility Planning & Real Estate MR. MICHAEL J. CANN, Teacher, Exceptional Student 22 Education 23 24

United Reporting, Inc. (954) 525-2221

25

	Page 3
1	INVITED GUESTS:
2	
	MR. RODERICK HARVEY, CPA, HCT DR. FRED HICKS, IT Consultant for HCT
	MR. TIMOTHY BASS, Court Reporter, United Reporting
_	ADDITIONAL GUESTS:
	MS. CHARLOTTE GREENBARG MS. DENIECE WILLIAMS, Director of Account Management, Garth Solutions
	MR. MATTHEW SHANBOM, Student
	MS. LINDA FERRARA MR. JOHN MORENO-ESCOBAR
	MS. DEBBIE ESPINOZA MR. SCOTT TRAVIS, Sun-Sentinel
	Ms. VERONICA NEWMEYER
11	
12	
13	
L 4	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Thereupon, the following proceedings were had: 1 2 Okay. So good morning MR. MAYERSOHN: 3 everybody. Welcome to today's Informal Audit Committee Meeting, Thursday, April 22nd at 11:30 4 5 If we can all, I guess, stand, rise for the 6 Pledge. 7 (Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance was 8 recited.) 9 MR. MAYERSOHN: All right. Since this is an 10 informal meeting we don't -- there's not a quorum that is required, but just for attendance 11 12 purposes can we record through who the attendees are or do we have to make that announcement? 13 14 MR. JABOUIN: I can probably announce the 15 names of the members and have them respond as to 16 whether or not they are present or not. 17 MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. 18 MR. JABOUIN: Okay. Mr. Moses Barnes is 19 excused. 20 Ms. Rebecca Dahl? 21 MS. DAHL: Here. 22 MR. JABOUIN: Mr. Anthony De Meo? 23 (No response.) 24 MR. JABOUIN: Ms. Hagen Disch?

Here.

25

MS. DISCH:

	Page 5
1	MR. JABOUIN: Ms. Mary Fertig?
2	(No response.)
3	MR. JABOUIN: Mr. Michael Gauci?
4	(No response.)
5	MR. JABOUIN: Dr. Nathalie Lynch-Walsh?
6	DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Here.
7	MR. JABOUIN: Mr. Robert Mayersohn?
8	MR. MAYERSOHN: Here.
9	MR. JABOUIN: Mr. Andrew Medvin?
10	MR. MEDVIN: Here.
11	MR. JABOUIN: Ms. Connie Pou is excused.
12	Ms. Phyllis Shaw?
13	(No response.)
14	MR. JABOUIN: And Ms. Stephanie Shimm?
15	MS. SHIMM: Here.
16	MR. JABOUIN: Thank you.
17	And, Mr. Mayersohn, if I could please
18	acknowledge certain members of the cabinet and
19	those who'll be participating in the meeting.
20	Mr. Phillip Dunn?
21	(No response.)
22	MR. MAYERSOHN: Whoever is not speaking, if
23	you can mute, because we hear some background.
24	MR. JABOUIN: Dr. Jermaine Fleming?
25	DR. FLEMING: Good morning.

MR. JABOUIN: And Ms. Mary Coker? 1 2 MS. COKER: Good morning. Present. 3 MR. JABOUIN: And Mr. Maximo Rosario? MR. ROSARIO: Good morning. This is Max. 4 5 I'm here. 6 MR. JABOUIN: And I notice Ms. Fertig is here 7 as well. 8 MS. FERTIG: Good morning. MR. MAYERSOHN: And then do we have to cover 9 10 some of your staff that's here, Mr. Jabouin. 11 MR. JABOUIN: Yeah, so myself, Joris Jabouin, 12 the Chief Auditor, and then with me is Ms. 13 Jennifer Harpalani. If you can indicate present? 14 MS. HARPALANI: Hi there. Good morning. 15 MR. JABOUIN: And I see Chief Information Officer, Mr. Dunn. 16 17 MR. DUNN: Good morning all. Thank you. 18 MR. JABOUIN: And the individuals from HCT, 19 if I could please have Mr. Roderick Harvey? 20 MR. HARVEY: Good morning. 21 MR. JABOUIN: And also Dr. Fred Hicks.

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

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. And do we have to

I guess some of them are members of the

announce any of the other people that are on

DR. HICKS: Here.

22

23

24

25

1 public or interested parties.

MR. JABOUIN: I would advise that we do not necessarily need to go through the entire list, just the individuals that will be participating in the meeting. We will, when we put the minutes together, indicate the names of those who are present.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. All right.

Obviously, since this is an informal meeting, it says here, approval of the agenda, but since we can't vote on approval, we'll have to eliminate that item.

Chief Auditor Administrative Matters?

MR. JABOUIN: Thank you, Mr. Mayersohn.

I'm Joris Jabouin, the Chief Auditor. As Mr. Mayersohn indicated, this is an informational meeting. So there is no in-person quorum requirement. This is a fully virtual meeting and no official business will be conducted at this meeting. There's no motions that are needed that will be passed. The significant item on the agenda is the HCT report, IT Technology Devices. District staff and HCT certified public accountants are here in the meeting to answer any of the Committees' questions. No motion is

needed for transmission as this agenda item will be placed on the May 6th, 2021 meeting and at that time we will seek any final questions and transmission to the school board. We are taking minutes for this meeting. Our court reporter, Mr. Tim Bass, is here in the meeting. To make it easier for him, as I did, if you could please announce your name before you speak, at least for the first time.

We did receive some emails from Ms. Disch as well as Ms. Pou that I forwarded to the committee. In order to maybe avoid the perception that these could be seen as conversations we're going to attach those to the minutes when they are compiled.

We do have some timeframes on the agenda. These are primarily for your guidance. We have forwarded them to district staff so they can come in and leave the meeting. We do value the member's time. This is the second special meeting that we've asked for in the fiscal year and we thank you for attending and dedicating your time to us.

And then I wanted to mention with respect to the district's School Board Advisory Committee

training program we do have -- all of the Audit
Committee Members have completed it. I still
have two of the pending acknowledgment forms.

The next meeting, which is the in-person meeting
I will seek to print them out and send them to
those Committee Members so we can have those.

Given the role of this committee I'd like to make sure that we have all the documents together.

And then I also wanted to mention that we do have the Auditor General Audit has commenced the last week of March. There was a lot of information requested that district staff is gathering for them as they do their audit. It is a top priority to us and it does impact the member's time, the employees' time.

And I do see Ms. Shaw has joined the meeting, if we can acknowledge her presence as well?

I believe that there is a question for me. There's a hand up.

MS. FERTIG: I had a question. Did you transcribe the minutes of the last meeting yet where we discussed this audit?

MR. JABOUIN: So the minutes to the last meeting just became available to us and we have not had a chance to review the March 11th meeting

1 yet.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. That would have been helpful, I think, today to have those. But if you can just send those as soon as you get them? Thank you.

MR. JABOUIN: Thank you.

And, Mr. Chair, this concludes my comments.
Mr. Mayersohn, you are on mute.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Dr. Lynch-Walsh, you had a question?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Yes. Did we get the bid opening participants lists?

MR. JABOUIN: So, Dr. Lynch-Walsh, we do have with us Mary Fertig -- Mary Coker, the Director of Procurement and Warehousing Services, who can talk to you about those particular aspects.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: No, no, because she wasn't working for the district. But in her last response it said that there was a participant list. So either there is one or there is not one. It's a yes or no question. Is there a list or not? And, if there is one, where is it?

Because that was on my list of requests.

We all have the ITB responses, but I'm asking whether there is a list or isn't a list? And if

1 there is, where is it?

I'm not asking for Ms. Coker to recount what happened.

MR. JABOUIN: So we will cover this when we get to agenda item number 7. Thank you, Dr. Walsh.

This concludes my comments, Mr. Mayersohn.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. Is there any comments from the public? If you're a member of the public and would like to speak, please, raise your hand.

MR. JABOUIN: Sure. Mr. Mayersohn, comments from the public were due to us two hours before this meeting and we did not receive any before that timeframe.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. Okay. That's fine.

Audit Committee Chair Comments. I'm going to try something a little new and, hopefully, you can bear with me and be a little patient. As I was talking to Mr. Jabouin over the last, probably month, month and a half, I have been, as some of you are probably, watching some of the state legislative committee hearings and they run through things a little differently where they ask questions, leave it to questions, and then

follow it up by comments or debate or however they determine it.

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 what I'd like to do is try to first start off with questions as we approach, especially, this is one item, we can see how it works, and if it works successfully, we can do it moving forward. If not, we can readdress it. What I'm trying to achieve is to take the time that we have and kind of narrow down some of the issues more succinctly than mixing up comments and questions and comments and questions. questions are very simple, very direct. Giving everybody an opportunity to ask questions, as many as, you know, you feel you need, as well as then making comments, which, at this meeting, we're not making any motions or any recommendations, but in the future something like that we can then have discussion about how we want to proceed with something or, you know, move something forward.

Ms. Fertig, you have a question?

MS. FERTIG: I have a question when you start taking questions. So --

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. And seeing that, let's move on to the HCT Report.

Ms. Fertig, you, obviously, had a question, so you can start.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. So on page 9 --

MR. JABOUIN: I'm sorry, Ms. Fertig. Is it possible for me to introduce the report? There are certain matters to deal with.

MS. FERTIG: Yeah, I'm sorry.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. JABOUIN: No, it's not your fault. wasn't aware that it was time for me to maybe introduce the report. So this is Agenda Item Number 7. This is the HCT IT Technology Devices Report. Committee Members who attended the May 14th, 2020 Audit Committee meetings or they viewed the June 9th, 2020 school board meetings will note that this is the next product that would need to be looked at after the Recordex Simplicity Touch Interactive Flat Panels Report. So Audit Committee members as well as school board members asked my office to review additional technology asset purchases that were done during the tenure of the former chief information officer. So we identified the transactions that the former CIO may have had some sort of involvement in, and this was the largest one. So it made sense that this is the

project that got looked at. Now, the Recordex itself, that's its own separate report. It has its own action plan. It has its own recommendation. It has its own management responses. And it's part of our audit plan to follow up on those. And we intend to have that report presented to this committee. So this report is related to Bid 16-059E. And these are primarily Lenovo desktops and laptops and CDI tablets. So this report was chosen for that particular reason.

Now, it makes sense that based on the findings of this report that we follow up with -- we would need to take a more current bid, one from like 2020 where there has been time to look at activity as opposed to this one from 2016 which has a reason why it was selected. Part of the reason is, if you take a look at the tenure of our current director of Procurement and Warehousing Services, she started in March of 2016 when this bid was going on in December of 2015. So that's the reason why we should take a more current bid to take a look at when I do the follow-up, any additional work. And it does not necessarily need to be information technology,

even though that's going to be one of them, but there are other areas in the district where we can take a look at the process as Ms. Coker has implemented a variety of procedures since she's been here.

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

The report objectives, which were my directions to HCT based on the comments and the area that I thought that needed to be reviewed, was to take a look to see if the purchases related to this bid were in accordance with the district policies, namely 3320, 5306, 5306.1. And then if the purchases under this bid were in compliance with the technology portion of the SMART Bond. And then, as also discussed, because this was a significant piece of the Recordex audit is whether or not EDCO Education had any involvement in the purchases related to this bid, and then to review that the district's technology requirements were adhered to as it pertained to this bid, and then also take a look at this -this transaction and the structure to make sure that it was in line with the SMART Bond technology funding.

Now, if you flip through the report you'll see some of the significant points by HCT. So if

you take a look at page 18, this is where they indicate the noninvolvement of EDCO as they did their work. And then on page 19 is where they commented on the different vendors that bid and the fact that they exceed the specifications of the district. And then on page 19, as well, towards the bottom, they mentioned that the purchases that were done were in line with what the bid called for in the post procurement and the subsequent periods after that. And then on page 25 it's important to note that the report states that the district purchased the best quality products for the budget allocation that they had available during 2016 to 2018.

The findings, those are on pages 13 and 15, but there are no issues with respect to the policies that we discussed.

And, in closure, there are some significant strategic points that I'd like to point out to the committee. Pages 4 through 6 of the report links the strategic plan, the SMART Bond and several district initiatives, such as the computer refresh initiative, the computer gap initiative, and those were part of the strategic planning of the district and the district worked

1

with the Gartner Group with respect to the plan.

So HCT, they looked at some of their -- the

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. SHAW: Thank you.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Was that your only question,

service tickets to gain information about some of the service issues and Dr. Hicks was part of that review for HCT. And they interviewed a variety of different persons. So, Ms. Fertig, and to the committee, as you

meeting Mr. Roderick Harvey, who is the partner of HCT, and then we also have Dr. Fred Hicks, as well.

And that does conclude my introduction. Thank you.

ask your questions, we do have with us in the

MS. SHAW: Mr. Chair, before -- I don't mean to interrupt, but since this is a recorded meeting, and I don't know if there are any attorneys on board, have we asked everyone or let them know that they will be recorded?

MR. JABOUIN: We did indicate at the beginning of the meeting, Ms. Shaw, that we were going to start the recording, but those of you who joined the meeting later may not have heard that portion.

Ms. Shaw?

MS. SHAW: I have other questions, but I'll wait. Thank you.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Ms. Fertig, you're on mute.

MS. FERTIG: Thank you. I'm going to start with some questions, just a few, and then I'll follow up later, if that's okay, after I hear everyone else's. But on page 9 of 32, the director -- sentence 2 under the first paragraph, the director explained in his response that the bid was presented before the TAC Committee several times, blah, blah, blah. The director discussed, I'm sorry, it's the next -- the specifications and the cost maximum imposed by SBBC management.

So can you tell us who SBBC management is?

MR. JABOUIN: Mr. Harvey, if you can respond
to Ms. Fertig for us?

MR. HARVEY: Good morning. Thank you for that.

We view the SBBC management as the various departments so TAC Committee would be and then also the folks that head up the department of technology were folks that we would consider to be in the management team.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. I'm not sure this clearly states that, because it says the director explained his response -- the bid was presented before the TAC and he discussed the specification and the cost maximum was imposed by the management. So you're saying they're part of the management. Is there someone else who would be included in that management?

MR. HARVEY: From my understanding there were several departments that participated unilaterally on a linear basis with this bid, Procurement. Of course, the IT department would be part of those people who would make sure. I believe the board would have given some guidance on the amounts for the budget -- for the budget for the cost spent.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. If we could note, Mr. Mayersohn, I would just ask that we -- if we could just get a couple sentences in this I think it would be helpful to people reading it rather than just a blanket SBBC management.

And then there's been -- and another thing that's pertinent about this, there's been an ongoing conversation about whether TAC was involved with this or not involved with this. So

at what meetings -- can we get a list of meetings where this was discussed? Not us having to go find it, but have the meetings listed where these specifications were actually discussed?

Going down to TAC hired an independent -now, TAC's an advisory committee, right,
Technology Advisory Committee? TAC hired an
independent consulting firm to review and assist
with the process. Can you explain to me how TAC
hired them; what their budget was; what their
process was for selecting the consultant?

MR. HARVEY: Good question. So the spirit of the comment is that the TAC Committee, which is noted in the minutes, had access to Gartner, Gartner Consulting Group. That group, I would imagine, may have been hired or the process of hiring was maybe through another department of the school board. But the spirit of the comment is that Gartner Consulting was hired by the district. I'm not aware of the on-boarding process, but with the goal to assist TAC with the implementation and review and the crafting and the implementation of Bid 16-059E.

MR. JABOUIN: And just to add to that, Ms. Fertig, the TAC does not make any hiring, no

different than this committee does. So the district is the one that hired Gartner.

MS. FERTIG: So I believe that that sentence should read differently, then, because it specifically says, TAC hired an independent consulting firm to review and assist with the process. And I know that Gartner was on -- I just know anecdotally, I'll just tell you, they were retained by the school board well before this bid, so I guess that's an outstanding question of when they were hired and how much input they had into the technology program. But I don't believe that it's correct to say that an advisory committee hired and independent -- and, Mr. Mayersohn, I'll get back to questions.

Sorry. I just want to see these corrections made so we can have a more accurate document.

Okay. TAC had direct involvement and knowledge of Bid 16-059E. And I guess my question on that is, is it direct involvement because it came to one of their meetings? I'm still unclear on this because we're seeing that they were -- they discussed the specifications imposed by management, which may or may not include TAC, in the previous paragraph, and then

in this paragraph they hired an independent consultant but really they had access to the independent consultant the school board hired.

And then in this paragraph they had direct involvement and knowledge. And I'd just like to know what the extent of that direct involvement and knowledge was.

I'll go on to the next questions. I don't know if you're going to take this by sections, Mr. Mayersohn, but if anybody else has questions on that section I'm happy to stop and let them ask.

MR. JABOUIN: Quick question, Ms. Fertig, would you like HCT to respond to that last point that you made about TAC's involvement?

MS. FERTIG: Sure.

MR. JABOUIN: Mr. Harvey, I know you looked at the January 2015 TAC meeting and the February 2015 TAC meeting and the March and so forth and you did see discussion with the TAC, keeping them in the loop, can you describe that to the committee and respond to Ms. Fertig's question?

MR. HARVEY: Yes. Thank you for that. So I also want to bring in Policy 5306.1 that talks about the requirement of TAC to be involved. So,

from a procedural policy standpoint, their involvement is important. Based on those minutes enumerated by the Chief Auditor we saw where TAC was involved from the beginning at the creation of the bid, also reviewing the bid throughout the process, and then ultimately agreeing or having involvement to make sure that the final bid was in accordance with -- or given their input, let me say that, say it that way, with Bid 16-059E.

MS. FERTIG: And could you tell us at what meeting they were given that final -- the ability for final input?

MR. HARVEY: I reviewed the minutes going back to December of 2014. My notes here talk about the minutes that went through September 21, 2015. And at that meeting in the minutes it discussed the protest policy or that no protest had come forward as a result of Bid 16-059E.

MS. FERTIG: So that would be the September of 2016?

MR. HARVEY: Yes. Yes. I'm sorry.

MR. JABOUIN: Hold on a second. The bid was approved in November of 2015.

MS. FERTIG: No. No. Excuse me.

MR. JABOUIN: Or December.

MS. FERTIG: No, the bid -- let me just --1 2 let me tell you why I'm asking these questions. 3 The bid was issued November 2015. It was opened December 2015 and it went to the board February 4 5 9th, 2016. And I'm asking these for a specific 6 reason. At our last meeting it was stated or 7 inferred, however you took it, that there were 8 problems with the previous purchasing person, not 9 Ms. Coker. And, in fact, the previous purchasing 10 person, although her name was on the bid issued 11 November 2015, Ms. Ruby Crenshaw, was no longer 12 in the employ of the school board. She had 13 resigned October 6th, 2015. So, in fact, I want 14 to know when this went to the TAC committee to 15 get a complete picture of just exactly who was involved with this bid. I, personally, think 16 17 that it's wrong to implicate Ms. Crenshaw if she, 18 in fact, did not have anything to do with the 19 bid. And so I'm' going to be asking more questions along that line, but I want to know, 20 21 when was the last TAC -- the last TAC meeting 22 prior to November of 2015 in which this matter was discussed? 23

Sorry, I -- is that clear? I just want to know when was the last time they discussed it

24

25

1

before the bid was actually sent out?

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: I think Mr. Harvey can research that for you. I know that my notes indicate that in March of 2015 there was some lengthy discussion. So, Mr. Harvey, as you research that, I did notice a good amount of discussion at the March 2015 TAC meeting.

MR. HARVEY: That's -- that's correct. will research. But they definitely talked about it in March and April of 2015.

MS. FERTIG: And, obviously, what concerned me is there's a lengthy gap between that and the bid being issued, particularly with the director of purchasing having then resigned prior to the bid going out. So I would have thought that it, maybe, would have been a little closer to when the bid was actually put out.

Okay. Can I ask -- do you want me to stop with this section or can I go ahead and ask some other questions?

You can -- I'm trying to get MR. MAYERSOHN: to questions we can then have discussions about this whole bid scenario, because there's a lot of information.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. MR. MAYERSOHN: So if we could focus on just questions, and just as a note, in DemandStar the bid was released November 10th, 2015, it closed

December 3rd, 2015.

MR. JABOUIN: And only to add to that point, it's also important to remember that Ms. Coker started her employment in March of 2016 after the bulk of this bid -- after this bid had already been done.

MS. FERTIG: And I think -- and I think I said that, that she was not there, but it was stated at the last meeting that the previous purchasing director, it was inferred that she had something to do with it and, in fact, she might have had something to do with it, but though her name is on the letterhead of the bid going out November 10th, it is not -- she was no longer in the employ of the school board. So I just think that's an important fact to note. And, in fact, it was Mr. Woods who sat with Mr. Hunter at the table on the February 9th meeting, so --

Okay. I have a question for Ms. Coker if she's on, if we're allowed to keep -- oh, I'm sorry, Ms. Shaw, I think, has a question on something. Yeah.

1 MR. MAYERSOHN: Ms. Shaw?

MS. SHAW: On the dates, could we get a chronological order of events that took place, because, I mean, we have bits and pieces of what happened, but a chronological order I think would be so much easier than asking the auditors who may not have looked at the chronological order, including TAC, et cetera, et cetera, you know, so they may not be able to give us all of that. So I would like a chronological order of the various statements.

MR. JABOUIN: Mr. Harvey, we had provided a chronological order in the previous project you did for us, so something in that manner would probably suffice for Ms. Shaw' request.

MR. HARVEY: Yes.

MS. FERTIG: And I, actually -- I, actually, started trying to put that together and then found there were a few gaps I couldn't fill in. So hence my questions today.

Okay. I have questions for Coker unless I see Dr. Lynch-Walsh, do you want to comment on what we were just talking about or can I move on to Ms. Coker?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Well, if we're doing

1 questions --

MS. FERTIG: Well, I have questions. I mean, mine are all questions.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Yeah, well, before we get too far gone I have sort of an overarching question which is, were the ITB responses reviewed by HCT, meaning, the responses that we now all have on the audit committee?

MR. JABOUIN: Mr. Harvey?

MR. HARVEY: Yes. Yes, we reviewed the ITBs that --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: No, I mean the completed responses from the vendors.

MR. HARVEY: From the vendors who submitted?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Yes.

MR. HARVEY: Yes, we have those and we've reviewed those responses.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. Because then my follow-up question to that is, where is the pricing sheet for Dell? That does not seem to be included in their ITB response. It is for HP, it is for Lenovo, but I couldn't find it in the document we were provided, so I'm not sure how you could speak to pricing if you couldn't see the Dell pricing and summary sheet. So was that

missing from yours?

MR. HARVEY: I will scroll through and see.

I don't have it noted as missing, but I can
double check and make sure as we go through this
meeting.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. And then --

MR. JABOUIN: I'm sorry to interrupt, Dr.

Lynch-Walsh. I'm trying to keep track of those.

Can you kindly repeat what your request was? I'm sorry to ask you to do that.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: The most important thing, I'm asking them whether they had the bid summary sheet for the Dell ITB because it is not in the documents that we received. So first we established -- I asked them whether they actually had the ITB responses from the vendors that submitted, the documents we all just got provided after I had to try every trick in the book to get them, and then within that whether they had the bid summary sheet for Dell, because it is not, unless I can't see straight anymore, in that document. So how could they have spoken to pricing if it's not in there unless they got a different document than what we were provided?

United Reporting, Inc. (954) 525-2221

Okay. I put that on my list.

MR. JABOUIN:

Thank you, Dr. Lynch-Walsh.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MAYERSOHN: Dr. Lynch-Walsh, did you have another question?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I have questions. This sort of goes -- this goes against how my thought process works. I work from general to specific and in order. I don't like taking questions out of context. So if we're gonna go through the different observations, I have questions. I have a lot of questions, comments that summarize my conclusions. But there's a lot in here that I can only pose as a comment, because otherwise I'd be asking questions like, can you explain why you didn't adhere to attestation standards regarding agreed upon procedures, because those procedures say that you don't have opinions or conclusions which suggest that you wouldn't then make recommendations. And, as I put in my email from a few weeks ago, there are words that are considered vague and ambiguous that in 215A this engagement should not include conclusions or opinions and should avoid vague or ambiguous language. So for me to pose that as a question, I would say, why did you not follow these standards in developing this report?

1 MR. MAYERSOHN: Well, that's a question.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Yes.

MS. FERTIG: I have a few questions on mine, too.

MR. MAYERSOHN: So let's just go to Dr. Walsh's questions and then I'll go back to Ms. Fertig.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. Thank you.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: If we go in order I'm beginning with page 1 of the report which has to do --

MR. MAYERSOHN: I understand that, but let's have the question answered and then we'll go back to Ms. Fertig.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. It would be easier for me to go in order. Thank you. Okay.

MR. MAYERSOHN: So can we get Dr. Walsh's question answered?

MR. HARVEY: Yes, the guidance, and I will double-check the date, the guidance, the AICPA guidance that Mrs. Lynch-Walsh speaks of, I believe, was implemented, became effective, after the date of our report.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I'm sorry. I have to interrupt.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Dr. Walsh, let him -- let him go and then you can -- go ahead.

MR. HARVEY: We believe that that guidance was effective for reports issued after the date of our report and so we believe that our report as presented is within the AICPA guidelines for type of a task report.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. So let me say that again. Some what -- there were some changes between SSAE 18 and 19 and 19 kicks in for reports dated after July 15th, 2021. This is why I put all of this into a detailed email.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Dr. Walsh --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I'm trying, but it's not possible, because their answer -- okay. So can you explain what differences between -- what standard are you adhering to and what changed between the two standards that is allowing you to make -- to draw conclusions, opinions and make recommendations and use ambiguous or vague language?

MR. MAYERSOHN: There you go.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: You're killing me.

MR. HARVEY: Let me try to answer it this way, because I think what you said, if I heard

you right, you said that the AUP or the guidance or the guidance you gave went into effect July 15th of 2021. And so --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: What changed -- what changed between 18 and 19 that is allowing you -- because I'm not aware, when I read it, it didn't seem like what changed -- what changed was some minor things. So what do you believe changed between these two? Because in 2015A this type of engagement should not conclude conclusions or opinions and should avoid vague or ambiguous language and that does not appear to have changed between 18 and 19. So what are you following that --

MR. JABOUIN: Here's something that's very important to note. Regarding the opinions of HCT, as part of the objectives, I wanted their opinions regarding quality -- regarding the quality of the Lenovo product. That was one of the discussion items that came up during the committee meetings of the school board. And so I want their opinions on that.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. But then my question then is to you, Mr. Jabouin, is it possible that you don't understand the purpose of AUPs?

Because they specifically prohibit opinions.

That is specifically -- in black and white that's the very thing you don't put in agreed upon procedures. So then the level that they were -- the standard -- this is the wrong engagement then.

MR. JABOUIN: Dr. Lynch-Walsh, so that this doesn't sort of digress into the wrong angle, what I want to mention is the objectives that HCT had included having an opinion because I needed their opinion on the quality of the Lenovo product.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: And I'm not misunderstanding what you're saying. I am saying that contradicts what agreed upon procedures are about.

MR. JABOUIN: But that was my request to them in the objectives.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Then you can't do an AUP. But I'll let another accountant explain that to you.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Let Ms. Disch go, because I think she's got something that she wants to say.

MS. DISCH: Yeah, I just wanted to piggyback off of what Dr. Lynch-Walsh was saying and that

if that is the objective, it should be stated in the objective that you want them to issue an opinion, which would be an audit, not an AUP, which all the numbers in the report would have been significantly more examined. But past that, the opinions that they gave would require expert -- expert knowledge.

They just went and said we think that these are the best products; based on what? We think that these are the best available at the time -- I put these in my questions. Are you experts in Lenovo and 2016 to 2019 like computers that can also be tablets? Did you use experts to derive these opinions?

MR. HARVEY: Mr. Fred Hicks can give a little bit on his background. He is our expert as relates to technology. So can I have Mr. Hicks talk a little bit about his experience and background and his level of attainment?

DR. HICKS: Good morning. Going back to Dr. Walsh's question and aligning with what we were asked to do in terms of providing an opinion, if you examine my resume you will see that I have been in a C level, and I apologize for pausing, but last week I was actually hospitalized with

COVID, so I may get short on breath. Almost 30 years of C level decision making purchasing technology for -- starting with the Broward Children's -- Children's Services Council, the Work Force Development Board in Broward and Early Learning Coalition here in Miami-Dade County and Monroe. I recently obtained as early as January my doctorate in cyber security.

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

Having served with Mr. Harvey and his team for several years I think my opinion matters as it relates to the technological purchases. if you take a step back and examine what I commented on, it is all based on the allocated budget for the school board purchases at that If I were in the decision making capacity I would have opted for a tier higher, investing a little bit more per student to ensure the viability and strength of the equipment would last even longer. The fact that they wrapped everything with a robust set of protectors, if you will, in enclosed cases, huge kudos to the school board for making that decision to extend the life based on the budget that they received and they bought very prudent equipment in terms of not wasting the taxpayer dollars. I live in

Sunrise and my children go to school in Sunrise and I admire the fact that, hey, they went for a tablet that is as robust as the budget would allow. They did not get exorbitant and they went for the warranties that were available at the time.

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 my pull-back opinion is, you might look at the microcosm of each individual question and see how we went in and said, yes, I think they did a pretty good job here, in my own personal opinion and my professional experience I may have opted for a little bit more in terms of money allocated, pushing the envelope. For example, one of your questions was the equipment should last four to five years and I'm pushing to say, when we're dealing with students who are on the go, I'm estimating that, look, that's nice, but two to three years would probably be a best timeframe to start that new procurement so that the kids will see new equipment maybe every three and a half years in their hands. If I'm a ninth grader, by the time I start my senior year and now I'm dealing with chemistry and complex math applications on my tablet, if I'm looking at a software in a package that's two and a half,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2324

25

∠5

three years old, productivity, even in any industry is going to say that that student is not going to be as productive as he or she could be.

MS. DISCH: I assume the software package is something different than the actual hardware that is being purchased?

DR. HICKS: Correct.

MS. DISCH: And the accountant in me is dying when it appears that you're saying in your opinion which you also quoted best practice but didn't state what that best practice is based off of, and the accountant in me is just like slowly dying because I would bet nearly anything that the accounting department is depreciating these things over a five-year life and yet their auditor comes in and tells us 2.52. So there's a clear disconnect with what you're saying -- just based off of a MACRS depreciation model, like on Google, so that is just -- and then, so if you are the expert and these are opinions based off of an expert part of the audit team and the opinion is the objective of the report, I would have thought to have a lot of documentation supporting your expert opinion and there wasn't enough.

I did include quite a bit of DR. HICKS: documentation and in the back-and-forth editing we were told to take some of that documentation I still have original drafts that look and away. show, look, we looked at PC World magazine, we looked at top industry results even from 2015 leading up through 2018 showing where the equipment was in the purchasing, the life cycle and the expectations, and in the back and forth a lot of that dissertation style support was actually sifted out of the original writing. I concur and I would've loved to have seen some of those footnotes and some of those articles that point to this is why.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. JABOUIN: Just to add to what Mr. Hicks is saying, in the report process, the report could have been 50 times longer, and so we do summarize the report out. So some of the data that sometimes is asked for by the committee, those aren't things that you would normally put in an audit committee report, otherwise, it gets to be very lengthy. So Mr. Hicks did provide us with a substantial amount of information and we included what we thought was the pertinent information, but not the detail. There's a lot

I could not disagree with notion

Thank you for your perspective.

Okay. Ms. Disch did you have

Yeah, I have a question for Mr.

more. And when you give an opinion that's not

based in the report and all I have is the report

to review, I immediately discredit the opinion.

any additional questions relating to this or --

sent over my questions, so as it's appropriate

MS. DISCH: Not to this, but I, obviously,

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: My question hasn't been

MR. JABOUIN: I disagree with that, Ms.

MS. DISCH: Well, as an accountant that's my

1

of detail underneath --

MS. DISCH:

Disch, respectfully.

MR. JABOUIN:

MR. MAYERSOHN:

MR. JABOUIN:

Lenovo product?

MS. DISCH: You're welcome.

I'll bring them back up. Thank you.

perspective.

answered.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

whether or not your opinions were your personal

Hicks to make sure he clarifies for the committee

opinions or your professional opinions on the

DR. HICKS: My professional opinions.

MR. JABOUIN: Thank you. And your 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. HICKS: Yes. Based on the information that I was given and some knowledge of some of the modules, hands-on with some of them, but, again, having seen the breadth of both Apple as well as Microsoft Surfaces, the Lenovos were a

solid purchase. I admire the school board for

making that decision for the budget at hand.

information, do you view them as being factual?

MR. JABOUIN: Thank you.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. Before Ms. Fertig and Dr. Lynch-Walsh go, Ms. Dahl, did you have any questions related to this?

MS. DAHL: Mr. Mayersohn, I'm a little confused about, are you asking us to do questions as we go along? I probably am going to echo with what Dr. Lynch-Walsh had said. If we could go through it chronologically, then we ask questions when we have them? Because I think when we start flipping around we will not be able to get that feeling or information that we need to have. I appreciate the fact that you're following something that somebody else did, I guess the state legislators, but I don't feel that that's appropriate at this time. Thank you.

> MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. Well, we can go

through the findings one by one if that's more in line. That's why I said, I'm just -- I'm just trying to narrow down and make things run a little bit smoother, because sometimes we get lost in conversation. So, I mean, I'll throw it out and go back to --

MR. JABOUIN: Why don't we go to page 13?

That would be a good place to start, on page 13 of the report?

MS. FERTIG: Let me ask you a question. I began on page 9. Did anybody have anything before page 9? Because I have gone chronologically. On page 9, I think I'm up to -- I don't know what page I'm up to, but if there was something before page 9, then that's fine. But I think before we get into the findings I wanted to have some of the background of what their comments were and I still have one background question before we actually go to the findings. So --

MR. MAYERSOHN: Why don't you ask the background question?

MS. FERTIG: Thank you. It's to Ms. Coker.

At the last meeting we raised questions about the actual opening of the bids. And it's going to be

discussed in some of the findings so that's why I wanted to have this conversation up front.

Ms. Coker, did you review the -- did you review the sign-in sheets of that meeting?

MS. COKER: For the bid opening?

MS. FERTIG: Yes.

MS. COKER: So, no, I have not reviewed the sign-in sheets of the bid opening meeting that took place in December of 2015, because they are not available in the file.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. Did you review the minutes of the bid opening in December of 2015?

MS. COKER: No.

MS. FERTIG: Why?

MS. COKER: Because they don't exist.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. Did you listen to the tape of the meeting from 2015, December 2015?

MS. COKER: No. It goes back to my response about saying that in the past or back then, though part of the requirement for the bid was to receive the bids by 2:00 p.m., there was no formal process as it relates to bid opening, formality to sign-in sheets, et cetera.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. So, in fact, there are no minutes of the meeting, there is no sign-in sheet

for the meeting, there is actually no record of the meeting and I will get to this -- I'm sorry, I will ask a question, Mr. Mayersohn, when I finish my comments. There's no minutes, there's no recording and there are no sign-in sheets from the opening of these bids and which the two winning bids were not timestamped; is that correct.

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

That is correct, but I want to MS. COKER: note that there is no Policy 3320 that states that these procedures are required to be done. Therefore, in procurement best practices, obviously, you would want to have those, which is the reason why we have those now, to be able to justify the actions that took place. Unfortunately, back then those were not formally, they were not in a formal procedure. I do want to state, though, that I am making every effort, though we looked in the files themselves, they were not available, those documents that are being requested. We have taken a step further just to make sure at least for my own benefit to go ahead and obtain records or copies of our -in our building at TSSC where these bid openings are held, we do have a sign-in sheet that every

guest must sign in when they arrive as a visitor. So I'm hoping that I can get those. I understand they are from 2015, so I'm at the mercy of what back then was happening at the security in our front office. And the next step that we're taking, also, just to be able to satisfy the request is we've reached out to the vendors that participated and are asking them to provide a written affidavit of their presence for that meeting. So, hopefully, we will be able to have more information. But as of now there are no documents that I can validate having reviewed in the file.

MS. FERTIG: And it was always anticipated that this would be a bid in which you took the lowest price; is that right?

MS. COKER: This is an ITB; correct.

MS. FERTIG: And so, consequently, there is absolutely, from what you're telling me, not a single piece of proof; not timestamped bids; not a sign-in sheet; not minutes; not a recording; there is no evidence whatsoever that the meeting was held and that the bids were opened and processed at exactly the time they were supposed to be; is that correct?

MS. COKER: That is correct. But I want to note also that there was one bid that was rejected because apparently it was received after that 2:00 p.m. timeframe, which I believe it was stated that it was 3:30.

MS. FERTIG: At 3:00 p.m.; yes. And that is of absolutely more concern to me than probably — I mean, this whole conversation I find to be very irregular. I understand, Ms. Coker, I want to say again for the record, I understand you were not here and this was not you. And I also will state for the record because it was misstated last time, Ms. Crenshaw was not here. Though her name was on the bid, she was not in the employ of the Broward County School Board when the Invitation to Bid was sent out.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Is that a question, Ms. Fertig?

MS. FERTIG: That is a question. So I will make it a question unless you want me to shut up and let Ms. Shaw speak because her hand's up.

MR. MAYERSOHN: I hear where you're going, but let Ms. Shaw speak because she's itching to go and then I've got something to say on the bid document, but, go ahead. Go ahead, Ms. Shaw.

MS. SHAW: Thank you. So if there's no formal policy in place for the procurement, if there were no -- if it were best practice and apparently the best practice was not listed in the procurement document, why then was a bid rejected? Because there wouldn't be -- if we don't have any reason at all to document when those bids were actually received, any document after how long -- if you know Florida statute says so, why then would a bid be rejected, on what basis, documented basis in some kind of policy was that bid rejected?

And I have a bunch of questions on this but I'm just going to leave it at one because as Hagen said, the accountant in her was dying, mine is dead.

MS. COKER: I appreciate your question. I hope you're not directing that question in reference to my actions. I see you're very excited. So I will answer, because I was not present, again, I can assure that there is a procurement policy in place, 3320, and in no policy does it state that you have to record the -- or have a -- it doesn't state that you have to have timestamps. It doesn't state that

you have to -- I'm talking about the policy. We have procedures, procedures that indicate what those steps are and what those work instructions are for those processes. But under Policy 3320 it does not state anywhere that we receive bids by 2:00 p.m. and you have to have a checklist and you have to have all of those things that you are asking for, which would very much validate that those processes were indeed followed and those actions or events did take place. So it's part of a procedure. I just want to highlight when I say that there was no formal procedure. there is a policy and there has been a policy which does not include those specifics. about the things that we can and can't do.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. JABOUIN: A policy is designed to be very high level. The procedures need to include some of the aspects that Ms. Coker mentioned on that end. And we do -- and given that there's a timeframe for when the bids are due and they're not timestamped and we don't have the sign-in sheets for the bid meeting as Dr. Lynch-Walsh asked, that is something that when we select the new bids to look at, the controls that Ms. Coker has indicated she's put in place, that is going

to be tested when we select the new contracts that we look for.

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

MS. SHAW: So then -- and, Ms. Coker, you're absolutely right, this is not directed at you in no way. We understand you came in afterwards and we're just hoping that those documents -- when you put out a bid -- I put out a bid last year, actually, yes, last year. When you put out a bid, they are supposed to have the bid in and by what time the document -- when you're going to be opening the bid, whether it's going to be done in front of an attorney or a city clerk or whatever the case may be, all of these will be listed in the bid document. It means that whether you want to call it it's not in 3320 or Florida statute, it should be in your policy somewhere. whatever it is in your bid, those are what -those are part of the policies that you're applying, whether it's written or unwritten, it's This is what -in your bid.

MS. COKER: Yes, they are.

MS. SHAW: Which means, if you said to me a bid is due at 2:00 and you don't timestamp my bid and everybody else's bid at 2:00, how does the committee or whoever is reviewing it know those

bids actually came in at 2:00? And if you're not adhering to some kind of policy whether it's written in your bid document or it's in your house somewhere how do you reject someone then being late?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. JABOUIN: The bid document clearly states 2:00. The bid document says 2:00.

MS. COKER: Yeah, the ITB clearly states there was going to be a bidders conference held prior and the date of the bid, which should have been the bid opening. And the bid documents also as part of the ITB contractual terms and conditions, it does state that the bids will be opened at 2:00 p.m. You are correct, Ms. Shaw, that the fact of the matter is that some documents were timestamped. And when I arrived to the school district they were timestamping them on memo notepads, the stickies, that's how they would -- and they would stick them onto the file. So, again, it wasn't a formal procedure, hence why I cannot locate. Some vendors were timestamped, others were not. But what we were trying to demonstrate in the previous meeting is that we did have a pre-bidders conference sign-in sheet that demonstrated that all the vendors were

in attendance. So I'm hoping and praying that with the additional research that I am conducting that we may find, you know, a positive outcome in locating or confirming that indeed there was a bid opening and that I can confirm those in attendance. If not, there's not much more that we can do but to assume that there was no documents.

MS. FERTIG: But I thought at the last meeting, and this is my one follow-up question, Mr. Mayersohn, at the last meeting I thought you said that you know they must have turned their bid in on time because they were at the bidders meeting. I was looking for the minutes so I could verify that, but, unfortunately, the minutes that were published end with -- end just before this conversation, half minutes were presented.

MS. COKER: I can state that you are correct.

I did state that. And I was referring to the pre-bidders conference document, which includes all of the vendors present for that pre-bidders conference.

MS. FERTIG: So, in fact, we don't know that they turned their bid in on time because there

was no bidders meeting. And that's the point I've been trying to get to. So, thank you, I will move to the next item.

MR. MAYERSOHN: So, just to follow up on that, if I may, Ms. Coker? Are you aware that the district did an audit in 2011 regarding -- and this is obviously facilities and construction management bidding and bid opening process.

MS. COKER: No, I was not aware that there was an audit; no.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. And in that audit there was the -- I guess management response came up with bid receiving procedures. And in that exhibit it talks about some of the things that you were talking about, sticky files, you know, on timestamps, minimizing the size of the bid, including only items that were necessary, but it gave a list of procedures. Now, again, granted this is for facilities management division, understanding you weren't there at the time, but there was some procedures that seemed to be established. Whether or not they were adhered to, different story, but there were procedures.

MS. COKER: And I want to highlight that back in 2011 the procurement of construction sourcing

and facilities was not part of the Procurement and Warehousing Services Departments, it was overseen by facilities, themselves. So, unfortunately, you know, we didn't share best practices back then, but that department has absolutely nothing to do with the Procurement and Warehousing Services Department.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. So in the invitation to bid documents, when a bidder signs the, I guess the document in their submittal, does that mean that they agree to all the general conditions as well?

MS. COKER: Yes.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. So in the Invitation to Bid in Section 3, General Conditions, is there anything that would say that a bidder is required or must have their bid timestamped?

MS. COKER: No.

MR. MAYERSOHN: If you refer to on the Invitation to Bid document --

MS. COKER: I'm sorry, I don't have those documents. I mean, it says that it must be turned in by 2:00 p.m.

MR. MAYERSOHN: It says bid submitted, complete bid must be submitted in sealed envelope

with bid name, number clearly typed or written on the front of the envelope. Bids must be timestamped in Procurement Warehouse on or before 2:00 p.m. to be considered. So it does state that in the bid documents. I'm just reading it for you. So would you agree that that's a correct statement?

MS. COKER: Yes, that is a correct statement; yes.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. Would you also --

MS. COKER: But as a bidder I would want to make sure that someone gave me a receipt of me turning in my bid, a proof that I turned it in timely. I would have wanted to as a bidder and that is something that should have taken place. And, again, back then, there were bids that were stamped and there were some that were not.

MR. MAYERSOHN: No, I understand.

MS. COKER: I cannot answer as to why they were not.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Right. Would you also agree with the statement that's in this General Conditions, it says, Mistakes, bidders are expected to examine the specifications, delivery schedule, bid prices and extensions and

instructions pertaining to supplies and services. Failure to do so will be at bidder's risk. Would you say that's -- I mean, I'm reading it to you. Based upon your knowledge of the General Conditions, would you say that's correct?

MS. COKER: Yes.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. On Item Number 37 on the General Conditions it says, Submittal of Bids. It says all bidders are reminded that it is the sole responsibility of the bidder, and bidder is in capitalized letters, to assure that their bid is timestamped in Procurement and Warehousing on or before 2:00 p.m. eastern standard time on the due date. Would you say that's a fair statement?

MS. COKER: Yes, sir.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. Now, in this -- in the General Conditions it also says that the School Board of Broward County reserves the right to reject any bid that fails to comply with these submittal requirements. So if a bid was not submitted with a timestamp, which it says must, in your opinion, what would be the recourse or rationale if a bidder failed to have a timestamp but yet the Broward County School Board, I guess,

waived that compliance?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm not sure if the Broward MS. COKER: County School Board waived the compliance because I want to believe because some were stamped that all of them should have been stamped. Unfortunately, we cannot validate that because we cannot locate specific vendors that apparently responded and turned in the bid but do not have a timestamp. Should -- we currently in today's process where we do indeed timestamp a document and record it and have them sign it, if indeed they did not have it, then I would disqualify But because we are assuming that some -because some were, that that process at some point should have been done correctly, maybe we cannot say that the board knew that they weren't timestamped, but we still went ahead and awarded it; right? I don't think that's the position of the board or I want to believe that that might not have been the position at that time based on what I would have done with how our processes are today. But, again, this is all hearsay because there's no one to validate what actually took place and if indeed they were not timestamped. They could have been easily timestamped and the

little papers got lost. They could have not been timestamped and we, unfortunately, because we can't prove otherwise will have to go with the fact that they were not timestamped, which would then lead us to not having have them awarded or considered to be responsible and responsive.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MAYERSOHN: Right. So just one last, I guess, follow-up question. In the backup that was submitted to the school board, in the revised copy of the recommendation for the award, there was a note that said that the one vendor was rejected because of a timestamp. In today's -and, again, I can't -- we're not talking about, obviously, because you weren't there and you didn't prepare it, but in today's, I'll call it procedures, if you, as the director of procurement, had a situation and for some reason the timestamp wasn't there, wasn't qualified, you know, there was an issue, the clock went out or, you know, power failure, whatever it may be, is that -- would you denote these irregularities on your submission for recommendation?

MS. COKER: They would have been recommended as nonresponsive.

MR. MAYERSOHN: So if the power outage went

out and a person brought their bid in at 1:59 and couldn't get it electronically timestamped?

MS. COKER: We have other mechanisms today that would allow for us to be able to justify whether or not, the fact that they were present, the fact that there's a witness as well. We don't only have just the purchasing agent, we have two people from our staff to validate. Just to avoid having a purchasing agent, you know, have one opinion versus another vendor we have two people present. So we have mechanisms.

So, if indeed today -- and we do this, and this happens a lot, believe it or not, where they come and it might have been 2:01 and they're like my clock says 2:00, this one says 2:03, you know, we're very specific in ensuring that we have the means by which we can justify if the vendor indeed turned it in on time. And that would have been shared in the rec tabulation at the time of recommendation. So -- and we've done it with recent bids where we've, you know, had to disqualify them for specific reasons. But in your example, if the lights went off and there was an emergency, obviously, there's always mitigation to that and -- I'm always, for myself,

personally, giving the vendors the opportunity.

Because I know the difficulty it is in responding to these bids because they're very, very long and tedious. So I try to be as human as possible ensuring that I'm always compliant with the policy and state regulations. So we would make sure that everyone in the room is aware of the situation, there's a consensus, and if, indeed, we did not, I want to highlight that the bidders always have the opportunity to file a protest. They have three days to do so. Therefore, in this particular case, no bidder filed a protest.

That only means that --

MR. MAYERSOHN: That doesn't mean anything.

MS. COKER: It gives indication to me that there may not have been any irregularities, but, again, you're absolutely right it doesn't prove anything.

MR. JABOUIN: We can't rely on that, obviously. We need to do it right. I mean, just because the bidders didn't protest is not sufficient.

And the thing is, though, as I mentioned during the beginning of this, though, Ms. Coker has implemented a lot of the controls. And when

we select a bid that's from a different period, like let's just say the year 2000, then we'll be able to see quite a bit of her improvements.

MS. COKER: 2000?

MR. JABOUIN: No, we'll take a bid for -because we have to make sure there's enough data
after the purchases start, so I think fiscal year
2000 will be a good year to select a bid.

MS. COKER: The school year 2000 or 2020?

MR. JABOUIN: Oh, my goodness. 2020. I'm 20

years behind. I did say 2000. Okay. Thank you.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Ms. Fertig, did you want to continue? Are you done with your background?

MS. FERTIG: The background, what we just got is what I wanted to get out, and I just want to say one thing. I think we're doing this audit for a very specific reason and always you hope with these audits you are able to change what you find to be mistakes --

MR. MAYERSOHN: Those are comments.

MS. FERTIG: -- so you don't make the same mistakes. That's my comment. But I want to go back to what -- we're not doing this because we're looking for that. We're doing this in response to an audit that showed a lot of

problems. And we picked the largest single purchase of \$81 million, 10 percent of the bond to audit. So in that context, yes, I'm ready to move on to the actual findings. And though I don't know much more that we could say than there was no bid sheets -- I mean, there was no opening, absolutely no documentation of what was done right. And I agree with you, Mr. Mayersohn, this was attached to the board agenda. This is what they saw. And I can't even imagine what it's based on.

Okay. I'm done. I'm ready for -- I'll let somebody else start with questions.

MR. MAYERSOHN: All right. Dr. Lynch-Walsh, are you ready to go with page -- starting on page 13?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: No, because I was back on page 9. I actually will have to double back to page 1 because we still have a huge problem there in terms of the type of engagement this was. But I'll save that for later.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Let's put that in the parking lot.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Yeah. That's going to be a huge problem.

So I'm on page 9, because when Mary asked the question I started flipping through the pages very quickly, and my initial questions that I did send in pertain to page 9.

By the way I've just been made aware the minutes have been posted somewhere from our last meeting, I just don't know where.

MS. FERTIG: They're incomplete minutes because they only cover the first half of the meeting, Dr. Lynch-Walsh, so -- which I find curious that we would publish incomplete minutes, but, okay.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: There's a lot of curious -they are many curious things occurring, so why
not?

Okay. So -- and in all my paper shuffling here I may have misplaced that pile.

So my questions had to do, just taking us back to the TAC minutes -- oh, I found that file. And so I got a response to my questions. My question specifically asked about where TAC participated in the inception, drafting and bid specifications of the bid. And I asked for the agendas and minutes from the TAC meetings where the participation listed on page 9 occurred, and

you've already addressed the Gartner thing.

Obviously, we all know as volunteers that

volunteer groups cannot hire consultants, we were

just trying to clarify whether everybody else

knew that.

So my question here is, why are there minutes attached to this response that are after -- if we're trying to determine that they were involved in the inception, drafting and bid specifications, that's a level of detail, why, first of all, was I provided with at least three sets of minutes that are after the bid was awarded? I guess, let me leave it at that as my first question.

We have February 11th, 2019 in here. We have March 14th, 2016. And I believe I saw a 2020 date in here. All dates well after the award date of this particular ITB. So why are they in here, in this response?

MR. JABOUIN: Mr. Harvey?

MR. MAYERSOHN: Mr. Harvey or Mr. Hicks?

MR. HARVEY: Yes, thank you. I'm logging in again. We noted that there were several minutes that TAC was involved. Those minutes were attached to kind of show their involvement after.

We've also noted the minutes that happened -that occurred, again, 12/8/2014, 2/9/2015,
3/9/2015, which would have been more consistent
with your request.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: That is attached here?

MR. HARVEY: I'm not sure what you have
that's attached, but we sent over some minutes
that were after the fact. But we also noted
other minutes where TAC reviewed, discussed the
bid 16059E.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Yes, but I specifically asked for where they participated in the inception, drafting and bid specifications. And maybe I'm confused as to what the word participation means, because -- and maybe TAC was, too, because what they asked at the March 14th, 2016, they had a concern that since we meet only once a month and there are items that are moving quickly, how can IT best inform TAC in the interim? IT can engage us early on as part of the requirement gathering stage of RFP/RFI. This way TAC has some input into the process.

So, if they thought that they had, in fact, been involved in the inception, drafting and bid specifications, don't you think this is an odd

observation to make right after the bid was awarded?

MR. HARVEY: I don't think that's an odd observation. I think it relates to TAC wanting to be a part of the cradle to grave. But in those minutes that go back to 2014 it does show that TAC was involved with the help of Gartner with the inception, the crafting, consistent with Policy 5306 -- 5306-1, that they were involved.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Which minutes are you citing?

MR. HARVEY: There are several minutes that I will point you to. 12/8/2014, 2/9/2015, 3/9/2015 and then also 4/13/2015, which, obviously, you don't have in your hand.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: No, I do. And here's my problem. I reviewed these minutes long before I asked for them and I'm not drawing the same conclusion, so we're gonna have to agree to disagree on the definition of TAC being involved. I do -- I will say that they seem to be more involved on the last one. So it's possible that those two different bids, in terms of your review of the minutes, that if you went back and reviewed what happened in 2019 meetings is more

consistent with them being involved as opposed to what happened to them before. Because when it was happening to them before, and there are minutes where they are complaining that things are being brought to TAC after it's a done deal. It's in a set of minutes somewhere. Because I do have all of the minutes associated with this bid. And even beforehand I have all of the minutes. I think I have them for all the years at this point.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Dr. Lynch-Walsh, is that a question?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I did ask a question. But, as you know, I can't -- I can't -- my brain does not work out of context. It just can't do it. But I do have another question.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. So that was that. We've answered the Gartner question.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Before you continue, Mr.

Jabouin, is there a way, and I don't need it now,
but for our next meeting, to have the contract
that Gartner had with the district at that time?

Because I don't know what their -- I don't know
what their engagement is and --

MR. JABOUIN: Mr. Mayersohn, I'm trying to keep a list as the meeting goes on as to what the committee may want. We probably are headed to a situation where, if there are too many things, I won't be able to get them in time to have for the May 6th meeting, but I put that on my list as something to get, is the Gartner contract, which may date way before this stuff. But if that's what you'd like, I put it on my list.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Yeah, because the only thing I've seen is a 2002 award that Gartner has. I don't have any -- that was just in school board minutes. It didn't say any information on what their engagement was, but they were awarded a contract for consulting.

MR. JABOUIN: Noted.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Go ahead, Dr. Walsh.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. So I'm now up to page 12 because I'm trying get caught up to Mary.

So on page 12, the table there for Lenovo and CDI, and I have a reference to page 16 for some reason, the difference between amount awarded and spent, for me, it has amount awarded, the total PO spent, total invoices applied. Why -- why wasn't there a breakdown by group? Because

Lenovo was awarded groups 1, 2 and 4, CDI was awarded group 3. And if we're looking at award versus spent and the difference, once I broke it down, Lenovo, the difference is about 23.8 million in terms of what they got awarded versus spent, but CDI, which you can't tell from looking at this table, was awarded 12 million for tablets but the district only purchased 40,000 in tablets, which is a difference between award and spend of 11.9 million. So why -- why not break it down by group to be even more clear in terms of what was actually spent versus awarded?

Because, to me, the way this comes across, and just to --

MR. MAYERSOHN: Wait. Wait. That's your question. So go ahead. I'm -- go ahead.

MR. HARVEY: So, again, we do have the underlying data that can support that request. We reflected it this way at a high level. We also noted that CDI received a lot less. There was an email sent that some of their items, CDI I'm referring to was discontinued and so --

MR. JABOUIN: Yeah, can I please have Max
Rosario comment on that, Mr. Mayersohn, as far as
the CDI situation, Max?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Well, I think that we're getting into a different page. I'm strictly asking about this table and the way the data was presented. Because, to me, it looks like we're not being transparent. Yes, you said drastically lower, but that's vague. What's specific is 11.9 million lower than what was awarded. So T appreciate that you said drastically lower but especially because you are auditors, and just so you know, my background is in accounting, I'm a degreed accountant who has passed the CPA exam and has done financial reporting, so I would never put a table like this together without setting it up the way that I said. Because if you're going to say drastically lower you have to quantify it, unless someone's trying to sort of obscure the -- what drastically lower actually adds up to. I'm not saying you did that. saying that, hopefully, you can understand how that might be a conclusion one of us might come So that gets me to page 12. to.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HARVEY: Point noted.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. Thank you. I have a lot of comments about conclusions and opinions.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Let's stick with the

1 questions and then we can --

MS. COKER:

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I'm getting there. I think I might be up to page 15, so it brings me back full circle. Okay. So in -- so I think we hit on where it says there's not a standardized process.

I requested the ability to share a document. I haven't received that ability, but -- because I was going to pull up the ITB which had the instructions which are referenced in an email, so it says -- and this has to do more with Ms.

Coker's response, and I kind of think we need to clarify this because I'm a little concerned here because this contradicts what was said at the last meeting or in this written response.

So then is this -- is this an error and then will this error be fixed? Because this comment on page 15 says, current staff did manage to locate the list of attendees of this public bid opening which included the list of all participants. So if that's -- is this an error that can be fixed if there actually is a list of basically the bidders conference which occurs before, long before the bid opening date?

United Reporting, Inc. (954) 525-2221

Correct. And I think I mentioned

that earlier, that when I made that statement and when this management response was prepared months ago that was the intention, that --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: That was your belief at the time is that it was --

MS. COKER: Yes. Yes.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. I just want to clarify. Because if that's a mistake, I want to know whether that can be removed from this report as part of your response or it can be amended in some way? Because otherwise we have something in here that's misleading, unintentionally.

MR. JABOUIN: I'll speak with Mr. Harvey after this meeting on that. Either we could have some sort of addendum, memorandum from Ms. Coker to clarify that, but I hear your point.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. Then my last question on this page is for HCT, were you aware of all of the prior bids? Because this group asked for everything essentially that Hunter touched and then it got -- the scope of what we were trying to audit got reduced until we were left with one bid number which was this bid number. And I'm asking, were you aware of the Dell bid protest and the rejection of all bids

and the piggyback contracts and the post-award board memo? So, essentially, are you aware that the process by which Lenovo became the district's laptop of choice followed somewhat closely the way Recordex became the smart boards of choice, in that it started with a post-award board memo where they went right under that million dollars, then we had a lot of piggyback confusion, whether they may have been operating with or without a contract, then there was a Dell bid protest where Dell was winning the protest process by all accounts, because I have read those documents, and then in 2015 -- so if we had looked at things from 2015 instead of being limited to this one bid we would have discovered and we would have backed into all of these other -- other Lenovo bids, were you aware of the recommendation to reject all proposals that happened on January 21, 2015 and all of the piggybacks and the Dell protest?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HARVEY: So we looked at this work very specifically based on the guidelines in the AUP. Through reading the minutes I am aware of the Dell -- the Dell bid protest, but that was just due to review of the minutes. So we looked at

this bid, 16-059E and the procedures laid out in the AUP only.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. Thank you. That's my last question. Then I think I'm caught up to where Ms. Fertig left off.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Ms. Fertig, do you have any follow-up questions?

MS. FERTIG: Just one quick comment. When we asked -- when we sent this to the board it was with a request to cover audits over a specific period of time. I believe the board's choice was to start with one specific audit, the largest purchase, and do that, with the clarification in my mind being that they would add others if after doing this one they felt there was a need to. So I just want to add that on so we're not closing the door and saying this was one audit.

I don't want to make anyone nervous by saying that, Mr. Jabouin, so I will just say I'm ready to discuss the four things and I --

MR. JABOUIN: I want to mention, I didn't want to say this because I thought that Mr.

Harvey answered the question but that actually is correct. There was a reason why this was selected. I do want to say, Ms. Fertig, though,

we're going to move on to some more current bids and not necessarily in this department as we go on. Because you can see that Ms. Coker has implemented some very good procedures as she has discussed. And I think that although I erroneously said the year 2000 before that, we need to take some more current bids and see how those are looking as opposed to these that were done years ago. Still important, but we need to select some other types of contracts. Large, as well, and a variety of different departments, including IT and some other departments as well to look at the process.

MS. FERTIG: And I agree with that, but I just want to clarify that the reason we were doing these particular audits for this particular thing is because of the irregularities that were known under the previous CIO. And I believe Ms. Shaw correctly expanded the scope of it to cover a period of time. When I read this audit and am reminded that this was current through 2019 of when we were using this money, \$80 million, \$81 million, 10 percent of our bond. It's not like it's something that ended in 2015. This behavior was ongoing. In fact, some of your findings

addressed occurred after 2016 with the adoption of the board. So okay.

MS. COKER: And I also want to say something, if I can, that this -- the origination of this audit was not to audit Procurement and Warehousing Services' procuring processes. That was not the intention of the bid. My department gets audited yearly by the state, by different sectors. So we're constantly being audited and we're used to that. But particularly this bid was -- this was not the reasoning behind this bid. At least that was my understanding.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. Are there -- let me go this way. Are there any more -- I know we have a lot of comments, but are there any more questions?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Yes.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. Ms. Dahl, did you have any questions? Because I know you were --

MS. DAHL: Not at this point. Thank you.

MR. MAYERSOHN: All right. Dr. Lynch-Walsh.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. On objective number 3, page 18, it says we researched if EDCO Education had any involvement in the purchases related to bids -- to this bid, basically. Have

1 you ever heard of AlertPoint?

MR. HARVEY: No, I have not heard of AlertPoint.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Have you ever heard of David Allen?

MR. HARVEY: No, I have not heard of David Allen.

MR. JABOUIN: I'm sorry, Mr. Harvey, you have heard of David Allen.

MR. HARVEY: Okay.

MR. JABOUIN: He is the -- he was part of the previous report --

MR. HARVEY: Okay. Okay.

MR. JABOUIN: -- that you worked on.

MR. HARVEY: Okay. Okay.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. Would it surprise you to find that there is a Juan Cardenal who last worked at AlertPoint and prior to that was listed as the senior account executive Southeast K-12 and Higher-Ed Lenovo Computer Systems from July 2015 to September 2019? He actually worked there from October 2010 to July 2015.

MR. HARVEY: Can you repeat the question?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Well, I'm not sure that you'll be able to answer it since you were

United Reporting, Inc. (954) 525-2221

unfamiliar with the words AlertPoint and the name David Allen which was tied to Recordex and Tony Hunter, and now the -- this Juan Cardenal last worked at AlertPoint, which is the David Allen company where Tony Hunter last worked, and prior to that he was a senior account executive for Lenovo. So I'm guessing none of these ring a bell.

MR. JABOUIN: What is your question?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Well, I asked has he ever -- has he ever heard of him?

MR. JABOUIN: I have a -- although the other report's not on the agenda, I have an interest in what you're saying but I can't tie it to this report.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: The question -- so EDCO -the common denominator is AlertPoint -- well,
David Allen is the common denominator between
AlertPoint and EDCO. So if we're looking for a
connection, and there may not be a direct
connection, but there is a direct connection to
EDCO as a name, but if you were looking for the
name David Allen you would find AlertPoint, and
if you were looking for who works for AlertPoint
you would find this guy who last worked at

AlertPoint and that he worked for Lenovo as a senior account executive for Southeast K-12 and Higher-Ed, according to LinkedIn. And, in fact, in his LinkedIn page mentions that he was responsible, closed \$81 million project with Broward County Public Schools.

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 since this was all readily available, I'm kind of curious, because it seems as though in your conclusion you said, after performance of a thorough review of bid documentation and interviews with several BCPS staff there was no indication and documentation or mentioning during interviews of any involvement of EDCO Education in the purchases related to 16-059. So I'm just pointing out that there were a lot of common factors -- there was a common denominator and some common variables in terms of the people They may not have worked for EDCO, but involved. they were related. So that was my question. quess the answer is, no, you haven't heard of any of them.

MR. JABOUIN: If you can email me some of those names outside of this I would appreciate it for our other report. Thank you.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I have to do your audit?

1 Okay.

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: Well, I would like to get some advice from you at some point, but if you choose not to, that's fine.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. Dr. Walsh, any further questions?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Yes, Mr. Mayersohn.

MR. HARVEY: Can I make a comment, a point?

MR. MAYERSOHN: Yes, you can, Mr. Harvey.

MR. HARVEY: Good day to everyone. And I'm going to ask for you guys' apologies in advance. There is a stark difference between an audit and an AUP report. Both of them are attest functions. An audit is you give an opinion directly, it is overarching and you can delve into various areas, i.e., some of the things mentioned by Ms. Lynch-Walsh. With an AUP, Agreed Upon Procedures engagement you stick very narrowly to the procedures as designed and as performance. And so in our engagement here we would look at and perform work based on those procedures that are listed. We would not and this was not, even though it's being used generically, an audit. It is an attest engagement. And to your point, under SSAE 18 or

1

19, that applies and that's apparent.

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. And I couldn't agree more, which is why I kept questioning why I saw recommendations, opinions and conclusions, but Mr. Jabouin clarified that he specifically wanted your opinion, which then confuses everybody, because this should have been an audit, which takes me back to page 1 of the report and why this wasn't an audit to begin with.

I do have other questions.

May I reply to that? MR. HARVEY:

Mr. Harvey, just a minute. MR. MAYERSOHN:

Ms. Disch, I saw you raise your hand and then lower it. Did you have a question?

MS. DISCH: Sorry. Yes, I was just going to further comment on that, that we all agree that an AUP is very different from an audit, but Dr. Lynch-Walsh already iterated, you don't give opinions in an AUP, and that guidance hasn't changed nearly ever. So the whole basis of this report is very confusing to me. And I would like to know why an opinion was provided in the AUP and that opinion was also not in the objectives of the report itself. But I've already stated that comment and I think it's just an open

question that I really think needs to be clarified.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MAYERSOHN: Mr. Jabouin, do you have any comments to that?

The objectives that were MR. JABOUIN: Yes. graded were based on some of the comments from the different meetings, the audit committee and school board meetings. And so what I did is I -when I met with Mr. Harvey I indicated what I needed done. And I did want to know, for example, the thoughts around the Lenovo computer because there were some questions about the quality of them during the course of the meetings. And so thus procedures were designed for Mr. Hicks to take a look at the -- at the help desk tickets that arrived and so forth. at the end of the day, as the customer, there were certain things that I felt needed to be covered, and one of them was the quality component of the Lenovo product and that did require an opinion.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. Dr. Walsh?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Yes, I have questions on objective 4, but I've also requested the ability to share a document, because it's a lot easier to

demonstrate what I'm talking about if we can all see it.

MR. JABOUIN: Unfortunately, if your document wasn't part -- the only thing that we can put up are the meeting documents --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: That's what I was referring to before.

MR. JABOUIN: -- like the report. Would you like me to go to a page in the report?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I would like to see the Lenovo response.

MR. JABOUIN: Okay. I will put that up shortly. Thank you.

Would you care to go to your question while I pull that up?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I'd like you to pull it up first. I know you have -- this starts to get into control issues. Because in any other committee, we can share documents.

MS. FERTIG: I also have a question on this objective, Mr. Mayersohn, when you get to that.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. So why don't we --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: So beginning with page 19 of the Lenovo response --

MR. JABOUIN: One moment.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: You can start on page 18.

It starts getting into system specifications.

MR. JABOUIN: Can I please get a confirmation that you can see the --

MR. MAYERSOHN: Yeah. Yeah.

MR. JABOUIN: Okay. Page 19 you indicated, Dr. Walsh?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I asked for the Lenovo response that is the HCT report.

MR. JABOUIN: Yes. Can you please tell me what page you're referring to?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I asked for the Lenovo response to the ITB. This is the HCT report.

MR. JABOUIN: Oh, I'm sorry. So since the -I'm sorry. I thought what I mentioned was, the
documents that are on the agenda is what I'll put
up on the screen.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: We now all have these -are you telling me that I can't share a public
document with the people that you've sent it to,
that you're going to prohibit me as a member of
the audit committee from everybody being able to
look at this page at the same time? And to what
end would you do that?

MR. JABOUIN: All right. So this wasn't in

part of the meeting documents. Those are the ones that I'll put up on the screen, the meeting documents.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Mr. Mayersohn, could you pull up --

MR. MAYERSOHN: Wait. Mr. Jabouin, since this is an informational meeting I -- I, personally, don't see a problem with putting up information.

MR. JABOUIN: Okay. So I will search for the Lenovo response, which I don't have handy.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I have it very handy. All I need is the ability to share my screen.

MR. JABOUIN: I will locate it.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Dr. Walsh, while Mr. Jabouin's looking for that, let's just go to Ms. Fertig's question.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. Thank you. On page 19 of 32, I want to know if maybe there's a way to rephrase this question. I'm not sure it's accurate given what we've seen today. But my question would be, I'm going to read the sentence, "we note the technology devices were based on a specification of the dollars to be extended based on TAC's recommendations and

specifications". So I would like to see the actual TAC recommendation that recommended these specifications. Because I've seen there are minutes, I don't see anything, actually, like a motion passed, this is what we would like to see or something. But if there is something and I just have overlooked it I would either like to see that or see this rephrased. And this next part, "we reviewed Bid 16- --

MR. MAYERSOHN: So wait. So Ms. Fertig, I guess my question -- I guess the question you're asking --

MS. FERTIG: So is there something? My question is, is there a specific document that shows that TAC actually made the recommendation for these specifications?

MR. MAYERSOHN: Mr. Harvey?

MR. HARVEY: Yes, we will review -- I have made a note of that to provide once we -- once we pull all our documents and provide to the chief auditor. I have noted that one.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay.

MS. FERTIG: Thank you. Okay. Going to the next paragraph, "we reviewed the bid to ascertain if all vendors received fair review and

consideration". And it goes on to talk about the bid process, it appears adequate. I think after what we've discovered today, that there are no minutes, there are no sign-in sheets, there is no recording, there is actually no documentation of what happened with the processing of this bid by the staff other than the initial meeting, I really feel like that we need to reconsider what's in this portion and I'm asking if there's something you based it on other than -- is there some other element I'm missing that shows how fairly this bid was handled?

MR. MAYERSOHN: Mr. Harvey?

MR. HARVEY: So I want to respond in two ways. One is, we reviewed the bids that were accepted and put forward, whatever that process is or was. It appears -- now, I'm out on a limb, that your question, the spirit of your question would be, well, was the bid that was disqualified or the other bids, bidders, was the totality looked at? We only narrowly looked at what had gone through the window and provided to us as these are the vendors, the bidders that submitted, here's their documents and then we took it from there. And based on that we

concluded if those vendors were treated in a fair and accurate manner.

COURT REPORTER: Excuse me. This is the court reporter. I was dropped. I just got back in but I can't hear anyone.

MR. JABOUIN: Mr. Bass, you can't hear us?

MR. MAYERSOHN: Mr. Bass, can you hear us

now?

MR. JABOUIN: Michele, can you contact him and give him the dial-in number so he can call on his phone?

MS. MARQUARDT: Yes, I'm texting with him now. And I did just let him back in the meeting because he was dropped.

MR. JABOUIN: Okay.

MS. MARQUARDT: So I will see -- I'm sure he -- he says he can hear us.

MR. JABOUIN: He's nodding now.

MS. MARQUARDT: If he wants to disconnect and get back in?

MR. JABOUIN: Mr. Bass, can you hear us now?

COURT REPORTER: I'm back in and the audio

just came back on when she was explaining that to

you. So thank you.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Was that your break that you

1 were taking?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COURT REPORTER: Absolutely. A little stressful, but, yes.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. Ms. Fertig, go ahead.

All right. So when I'm reading MS. FERTIG: down the context, we object to purchase of Lenovo laptops made under the said method requirements and then we list a lot of things. We list that TAC actually made the specific recommendations of the specifications that we want to see. But, also, we've now ascertained that many of the things that should have been followed were not followed. And -- and so I really -- I really don't know that this section accurately represents that and I'm wondering if there's a way, given what you've now found out, to do that. And I'll just leave it at that, because when we come -- we're not voting today, but you could anticipate that when we vote I might bring that up.

MR. HARVEY: Can I have Mr. Hicks weigh in on your question and give you some commentary now?

MS. FERTIG: Sure.

DR. HICKS: We're going to absolutely review what you point out to ensure that we are as most

accurate as possible. We thought that as part of the release of the request for proposals, if you will, that those specifications were, in fact, from internal. But we will ensure that we have some documentation that says, yes, this is who made those recommendations. Otherwise, we will revise accordingly.

MS. FERTIG: Thank you so much. And I think that's the real question that we've had, ongoing question for numerous of our audits, has TAC actually made the actual recommendations; or have they been told; or have they had a consultant make it; or what -- who is actually at SBBC management? I'm still -- I'm still wondering about that.

Okay. Well, then I'm going to just say this section as a whole troubles me and I hope on May 6th that we can find some resolution on it. And -- and I want to go to your recommendation.

Did you as part of this process review the minutes or watch the meeting on February 9th, 2016?

DR. HICKS: I did not.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. That is the board meeting where this was considered and it was five-four

vote on this matter and there were many, many questions from the board and there was a lot of conversation regarding what level of -- and this is actually referred to in two places in your audit, but I'm only going to call it out on page 20 and we'll email you the other section, about having surveys to determine customer satisfaction. There was a survey performed in which I think there were 49 responses. Somewhere here I have the minutes of that meeting. there were a lot of board members concerned that this had not been properly vetted by the end user and they had -- there were promises made that that would be occurring. If that didn't occur between when that was represented to the board, February 9th, 2016, and today, that would be a glaring error. And I see Mr. Rosario actually did point out that you have some surveys in place, but this was one of the main concerns of the board as they discussed this item, was the lack of information received and opinion received from the public on how the Lenovos that had been purchased were holding up and how -- and performing. So I just would suggest to you that maybe you want to read those minutes and/or watch

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

that meeting of February 9th, 2016. Thank you. And I just defer to Nathalie.

DR. HICKS: Thank you very much.

MR. MAYERSOHN: So, Ms. Fertig, so your question is, would you consider reviewing that meeting prior to our next meeting?

MS. FERTIG: You know, you're so much better at asking my questions than I am. I'm just going to say, go for it.

DR. HICKS: I perceived the same question.

MS. FERTIG: Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Hicks.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Ms. Shaw and then I'm gonna go back to Dr. Lynch-Walsh who has been waiting very patiently.

MS. SHAW: Thank you. So my question is, I don't really believe that this should be coming back to us next week. I think there's a lot and I'm hoping that, Mr. Jabouin, that you may be able to talk with the auditors. Based on some of these discussions, we're going to be here all day, which I'm going to have to get off in about another 11 minutes. And only basically two people have really spoken so far.

Is there any way, based on the questions and

everything and also the listing that was sent out, that you may be able to sit with the auditors and have them go back through and take a look at this report? I don't think this report should come to us on the 5th. I think we should allow them some time now that we're having this dialogue to kind of now take a step back and take a look at the report.

MR. JABOUIN: So, Ms. Shaw, there is no time sensitivity to this report. I mean, if you think about it, all these happened a while ago. So, as I started to list some of the points from the audit committee members, I was sort of wondering if I'd be able to accomplish all that within the timeframe where the package needs to go out for the next meeting next Thursday.

So it's probably best, and I won't be able to do it tomorrow, but if I meet up with Mr. Harvey on Monday and we can debrief on this and what the next step is and what's being requested as well, and then if it seems like we can get it in for the May 6th meeting, then we will. And, if not, we will do it at a subsequent meeting.

So the answer is, most likely, yes, Ms. Shaw, but let me go ahead and take a look at them. I

do have that document ready for Dr. Lynch-Walsh.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Dr. Lynch-Walsh?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Yes, and we're also going to need the Dell response, as well.

So on page -- so, like I was saying, on page -- and, Mr. Mayersohn, we really must have a conversation about committee members not having the autonomy to share documents. Because it doesn't happen to me on any other committee but this.

So we're looking for page 19. And my questions have to do and tie to page 19, interestingly enough, of the HCT report as well.

No, let's show the top of the page because there's something specific I'm looking for.

Right there. Thank you.

So what Lenovo was bidding on in group 1A, we have the laptops that are non-touch, this is group 1A and then touch is 1B. Model N22 is not the current production model and so -- because it doesn't ship until March 2016, so to avoid gaps they're going to ship the ThinkPad 11e, the current district standard for student laptops that meet or exceeds the specs listed below at no additional cost to SBBC until N22 begins

1 shipping.

Now, I do have the Excel spreadsheet that shows what the district purchased under this bid. What I found concerning, and my first -- so the N22 laptop, the bid is 199. What's the operating system? The district specs are Windows 10, 64-bit.

Wait, we keep going past that. We keep going past --

MR. JABOUIN: I'm trying to help you out, Dr. Lynch-Walsh.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: -- what I'm trying to get to, which is that big blank where it should specify what operating system comes with the model N22. My question is, what is it? Because the product information that follows the specifications -- well, actually, it doesn't have to do with the N22, it has to do with the thing that, the 11e. So what is the -- if the district's minimum specifications are Windows 10, 64-bit and the stuff in yellow has to do with N22, what is N22's operating system? Windows 6, 7, 8, 10?

MR. DUNN: It's Windows 10 64-bit as well.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Where is that? Where do we

find that? Because it's not in here and this is in their response.

MR. JABOUIN: If I can kindly mention, that response was from Mr. Phillip Dunn, our chief information officer, just for the record.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: That's lovely. Also, didn't work here at the time. My question is, why is it not here on this page? And I don't think he can answer that because he only got hired less than what, two years ago?

MR. JABOUIN: As was Ms. Coker, as well.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: My question is, why is it blank?

MR. MAYERSOHN: Dr. Walsh, I guess your question is, and this would be to Coker --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: No.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Just wait a second.

Ms. Coker, if you received a bid like this, where the information was not included, would the bid be rejected?

MS. COKER: I don't believe that the information was not included.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I can't find it.

MR. MAYERSOHN: It's not included in the bid documents.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. So my question is -MR. MAYERSOHN: Wait. Wait. Wait. Go
ahead, Ms. Coker.

MS. COKER: I can't answer that because, as Mr. Dunn said, it has it. I mean, I don't know. I can't answer that.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Right. But all I'm saying is, in your procedures and practices and standards as it is today, if you were to receive this bid that lists no -- nothing in the operating system, would the bid be rejected or accepted?

MS. COKER: No, this could be considered definitely a technicality. It really depends on if -- again, if there was a presentation where you had the actual laptop in front of you, I mean, there are so many other factors that could have allowed for the information to have been known that it was indeed a 10, 64-bit. So it really depends on what the purchasing agent did from having read this, but we have also processes that we can go through and we check with legal when we have questions. And I've seen in the past where this can definitely be considered a technicality.

1 MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. Who was the purchasing agent on this bid?

MS. COKER: James Williams.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Who was the purchasing agent for Recordex?

MS. COKER: Why should I just answer that?

MR. JABOUIN: Why is that significant to this report?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Same dude. Same interesting things happening. In fact, at one point I think TAC was told that he's going to be the purchasing agent for all things technology with Mr. Hunter.

All right. Anyway, so the operating system, how can you say -- this is like when you hire people that don't meet minimum qualifications.

How do you know that the computer -- if it isn't listed in the bid documents, how then can you do a bid tabulation sheet comparing all of the minimum requirements? And, also, how was HCT, what did they look at to determine that it did meet or exceed if you can't speak to this particular -- I mean, not for nothing, an operating system is a huge -- if you have an

operating system that can't run your software, that's a problem.

So that's on page 19 of the Lenovo response.

On page 20 we have the ThinkPad 11e, which is the one that they were saying they were going to ship until the N22 was available. Notice that on this one it does say Windows 10 pro 64. All of a sudden we now know what the operating system is for the one that they're saying they're going to send. The one that the bid was based on, which, again, the price of the N22 was 199, that's the bid that was being -- that's the amount that went into the decision that was made. The ThinkPad is 349 and we have no problem sharing all the specs on this one.

Then the next page gives you -- tells you for some reason that Windows 8 is recommended for the 11e and Yoga 11e, that's on page -- that's the next page after this. And then there's ThinkPads -- there's another page and it has warranty information in there, which I have questions on that, as well. And then we get into group 1B, which is the laptop touch. So say -- which is 229 as per the bid and the Think Pad 11e Yoga is what the district actually paid. But,

again, on page 21 -- that's the next page I need, please. Stop right there. So for the N23, understand the N22 and the N23 is the models that were supposed to be purchased, again, we don't have the Windows -- we don't know -- it's not in here.

So while Mr. Dunn may be -- may have been told or is familiar with or whatever, it's not in the bid document so that someone can determine whether or not it conforms.

I find it -- me, I can't understand why this isn't in here. So my second question, why isn't the 11e on the chart of actual purchases? Did the district buy any? Because the whole point of, they did buy 11e Yogas, but the substitute for the N22, they don't seem to have bought any, and it isn't on HCT's chart, so maybe they didn't. I don't know why Windows 8 would be recommended and what is N23's operating system?

The reason I ask these questions is, there's a reason they're called "Lenonos" and I'm beginning to wonder if it has to do with what was actually bought. And just from a paperwork standpoint, this seems very sloppy.

So how were they able to determine whether

they met or exceeded? So did someone at HCT just happen to know that this was Windows 10 and that's why they drew the conclusion?

DR. HICKS: Yes.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: And as far as Dell goes --

DR. HICKS: Can I kindly address some of your other concerns that you raised?

If you wouldn't mind going back to the top of the document where she highlights N22s? We also made note of the similar concerns in our first version of the report, especially highlighting the fact that Windows 8 was a concern immediately after I read it. And when we looked at this they said that they would be available December 3rd, 2015. What was the first date of purchase for the --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: This says not in current production but they'll begin shipping in March.

DR. HICKS: Correct. What was the first date of the school board's purchases; in 2016?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Somewhere in there. Yeah. So they never purchased the -- they did purchase N22s. They purchased them all day long. So they never did the 11e?

DR. HICKS: Correct. And that was one of the

other concerns that I said for the budget, it looks like they were erring on the side of being more frugal, spending less per device per student, and that was one of my other concerns. And it highlighted above, like you mentioned Lenovos, the "Lenonos", if you will, yes, common phrase, especially during that window. And during the 2016-2018 purchasing window the competition to go against the Lenovos was quite fierce. Their reputation of "Lenonos" proved even stronger afterwards because of the competition out there in the industry.

I apologize for pausing, I'm trying to maintain my breathing.

One of the concerns that, if you'll scroll down even further, the capacity of the 128-gigabyte solid state drives is at a minimum what was available at the time. Students who may have more robust needs, teachers who may have more robust needs would need to upgrade relatively quickly in order to keep pace with some of the requirements that are out there for storage and/or any documents that he or she produced.

And you are correct, when I looked

horizontally across, my eyes glanced, excuse me, right across the operating system requirement? Because when you look on-line at that model it does come with the home version of the 64-bit version of Windows 10.

But your observation in terms of sloppy paperwork, from what I understand, this was not submitted directly by Lenovo, this was a summary spreadsheet created internally, and there may have been some --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: No, this is -- this is their document.

DR. HICKS: I thought someone just mentioned that this was prepared by someone internally, this summary document.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: This one was. But the board document --the board backup is prepared internally. I wanted the source document so that I could confirm with my own eyes whether they, you know, met -- I wanted to see the pricing for each category and -- but now looking at this, I don't understand why -- I know, you know, Mary is saying this would have been a technicality, I just don't know how you can verify it. It's not complete paperwork.

MS. FERTIG: Please clarify that that would be Mary Coker saying that it would be a technicality.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Coker. Sorry.

MS. FERTIG: Thank you.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Let's not mix our Marys up.

I focused on Group 1, because by the time I got
these documents I had to pick and choose where to
spend my time.

So the next thing my next question has to do with the warranty. On your report you talk about warranty. I'm trying to find it.

Yeah. Okay. So on page 23, Warranty

Details, it says -- I'm trying to find it. It

says -- in about the middle of page 23 it says,

we found the warranty -- we were provided

warranty information associated with the Lenovo

laptops -- desktops, laptops and Windows devices

as well as tablets.

My question is, what were provided? Were you provided the document we were just looking at?

So you said what is covered, details of the coverage, various levels of warranties, who provides the replacements and you have a comment about the reliability of equipment after the

one-year warranty expires engenders the need to purchase equipment with a high history of reliability beyond the basic one-year warranty.

Why is that in there when the bid spec is for a minimum three-year warranty?

DR. HICKS: Even though that the manufacturer provided their one-year standard warranty, the distributor in this case assured in writing that they would warranty the equipment up to three years.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Yeah, three years on-site reflects -- the pages we were just looking at, on the bottom says three-year on-site.

DR. HICKS: Yes.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: In the products pages it does say that the battery has a one-year warranty. I was confused as to why you guys were focused on a one-year warranty when the price of the product includes a three-year on-site warranty, theoretically.

DR. HICKS: I was focused on the warranty because at base purchase, if -- and I don't want to throw things out of kilter too far, if you're looking at an Apple device and in this case compared it to a Lenovo, Apple will warranty

their equipment, especially their first version of their iPads, automatically, for up to two to three years, depending on which version you purchase. But all of the other industry's tablets, if you will, or laptops, if you will, go with that one-year warranty on the merchantability of the product itself. that it's up to the resellers to decide to go to the three-year marker. After three years, and this goes to back to the alignment of the recommendation, between two to three years we should look to rotate the equipment for not only the teachers but also the administrators and the students who own one of these procured devices, not only to stay current, but to also align with the warranties that are available. If and when we see hard drives starting to fail after two to three years, screens break and other keyboards start to fall apart, the school board, like everybody else, would be relegated to have to purchase additional warranties or additional parts and then the productivity diminishes tremendously.

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

And, again, I apologize, but I need to take a drink of water.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: All right. Thank you.

So I'm on page 25 sort of in the middle of the page. Actually, your explanations are explaining a lot of your conclusions, which I don't have so much an issue with the conclusions except that they shouldn't be in an AUP.

So on mid page 25 there's a Tableau breakdown of the various Lenovo ticketed issues. My question is why not break it down by model?

DR. HICKS: You know, we had it in by model, originally, and we were told to take it out. I do have some Tableau presentations with different views.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: And I think this is -- I've lost track of how many times you've made that statement. And being told to take something out on the exact opposite of something I would have said put in is causing me a great level of concern, but not on your part.

MS. FERTIG: Can I just interrupt and ask if we could -- it might save us some time here if we could just see the original version of what this looked like?

DR. HICKS: I'm not sure that we --

MS. FERTIG: I'm sorry, that's not to you --

I'm sorry, Dr. Hicks, I was just asking Mr.

Mayersohn at the appropriate time to direct that question to the auditor. Sorry. It just seems like so many of the things today have come down to, you did have it in, but it got changed.

MR. JABOUIN: And I want to also mention though, sometimes there is — there is information that is difficult to understand in some of these besides the items that are there. And so there was some information that there wasn't any explanation for in some of these tables. And so, to me, some of them caused more confusion and they probably would have led to some more questions. And so in that process these items are in work papers. I'm sure they can be provided.

MR. HARVEY: And I would also like to say that that is a decision I would make, is what we present in our report. In this case we chose a document that was concise. We didn't put in all of the extraneous exhibits and documents. We wanted to have something that has a higher level of readability.

As it relates to drafts, we don't publicize or put forward our drafts. Of course, we're

willing to supplement what questions are to make the board aware of, you know, information requested or to try to close any gaps in knowledge.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Go ahead, Dr. Lynch-Walsh.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. So before I lose track of it --

MR. MAYERSOHN: Just before you continue, I have another meeting in about 10 minutes. We can continue on. Mr. Medvin can certainly chair the meeting. I don't know what the other committee members want to do. So before we continue I just want to let everybody know, does everybody want to continue?

MR. JABOUIN: So Mr. Dunn and I will both have to leave at 2:00 as well.

MS. FERTIG: And I'm going to have to leave shortly after that and I feel like there's so much additional information. Ms. Shaw raised the possibility earlier of being able to give them a chance to get this information in the report and bring it back to us at a time when the information is there. And, certainly, not to —no indication that HCT was responsible for this in any way, I don't want to imply that, but I'm

just wondering if the best course is to defer this until we know we can actually -- the rest of this conversation until we know we can actually have some of the information.

So I'm sorry to interrupt, Nathalie, great job, but I just -- I just -- I don't know.

There's so much here.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: No, I agree with you, and I actually, some of my other questions fall along the lines, you know, why is this being presented this way? And based on the answers they've given, I kind of get a better picture of why things are looking the way they are.

But I do have one more -- my one question about the Dell response, in the document we were given, can someone verify whether their bid summary is in there? Because, unlike Lenovo, I couldn't find that bid summary in the Dell response, which suggests that either you guys didn't have it or we have two different documents.

MR. HARVEY: So I have that note request from you in my notes to review and find and also discuss with the -- we'll go back and look and verify.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Right. But that's not -but that's as it pertains to you. We were sent a
document from -- the Dell response, the Dell bid
summary, at least, I can't find it.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Right. Hold on. Ms. Coker, did you want to make a comment?

MS. COKER: Yes. Thank you. Dr.

Lynch-Walsh, I can confirm that, indeed, the

document is in the file. I have a copy of it.

So I was going to forward it, I'm not sure, I

guess when it was scanned and turned over, I had

my staff go to the office and rescan the

documents that are there in the file, and there

is a bid summary sheet with pricing from Dell.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. Because we have the complete document, Group 1, Group 2, Group 3, Group 4, and then something called last part.

But no bid summary do I see in here, so --

MS. COKER: I'm going to send it over to Mr. Jabouin and then he can distribute accordingly. But it does exist.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: It does exist. That's great to know.

MS. COKER: Yes.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Mr. Jabouin, in the other

information that you send out, and I know we've asked for a lot, on the bid itself there's a -- there's a regular bid and then there's a revised bid. If you can send those two pieces of information out to the committee members, that would also be appreciated.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. JABOUIN: Sure. Ms. Coker, this is what you and I discussed earlier today.

I also wanted to mention something to the committee and this is something for HCT and I to talk through. So some of the charts that Mr. Hicks has created, what I wanted to mention is that there needs to be a corresponding narrative to them. And so one of the things that I talked about with Mr. Harvey is, just like you see here where there is some narrative here, so we're going to have to make sure that all of the data has a narrative. Because if something is presented as a chart and not explained, then it just leads to some unknown questions. So those were some of the issues on there where when I looked at some of the charts I didn't understand what some of the data was and where is that in the report? So you can't just put a chart in there without actually explaining it. And so

those were some of the issues that led to that. So we'll make sure that there is an explanation to everything that's there.

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

MS. SHAW: Mary said earlier, this is Phyllis Shaw, and I mentioned earlier, you know, we have 20 pages of questions plus all of the questions here and I'm pretty sure others may have questions. Some of those questions arise and that brought about more questions for the rest of I would really recommend that this is the team. not considered for our next meeting but at a later meeting allowing the team to kind of take a step back and look at it. And just to -- to -to echo what Mary said, this is not on the accounting firm. You know, they did what they were supposed to do. You know, obviously, they didn't need to list their opinions, but that's neither here nor there. And I think allowing them to kind of go back and look at those questions based on this almost two-hour meeting and see if there is a way to, you know, for you Mr. Jabouin to work with them and come up with something that you believe can be presented to the school board without them having another three or four hours of questions. You know,

let's see if we can do that.

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

Sure. I mean, ultimately, Ms. MR. JABOUIN: Shaw, if the -- I mean, despite the timeframes that we talked about, if the document is not ready by the May 6th meeting, then it won't be presented. And for that matter, if it's not ready by the June meeting it's not going to be presented. It will be presented when it's finished. So I will go through and I'll meet with Mr. Harvey early next week and go through my notes from the meeting and sort of talk to him about what the appropriate approach is. And, I mean, given the fact that this has to go out next Thursday, I don't think it's likely that it will be ready.

But, Mr. Mayersohn, to some of your bigger questions as far as this meeting, yes, both Mr. Dunn and I and several people on the call have entered the chat that they need to leave, so it really is a matter of picking it up whenever the report is ready.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Well, I think, Mr. Jabouin, you have some direction from some of our questions, concern and comments. I know that Dr. Lynch-Walsh probably has a list of questions, as

well. I don't know if it would suffice for us to again submit questions and get answers or just wait to see what transpires in conversations you have in the next few days with HCT and see where we go from there.

MR. JABOUIN: Probably.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Then the report and your findings or conversations could be presented at the May meeting. Because, again, this is something that --

MR. JABOUIN: I think at the May meeting I can provide the committee with an update as to what happened subsequent to this meeting and, you know, the fact that I met with Mr. Harvey and how we're going to go forward with that. I can at least, verbally, go over that part, because I think the committee would like to know that.

But, ultimately, it appears that this discussion will continue at the appropriate meeting.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Right. So Dr. Lynch-Walsh, because I know you have a list of questions, do you have something to say?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Yes, a couple of things.

So the bid summary sheet for Dell, can we expect that in our inboxes sometime soon after Ms. Coker

provides it to you, Mr. Jabouin?

MR. JABOUIN: Possibly.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: No, no, no. Today is not the day. It's the day after we just had two key arrests happening. There is no reason. It should have been in the documents that we were sent. I realize you don't like to give it up, but you've got to give it up.

MR. JABOUIN: I think I've answered your question Dr. Lynch-Walsh. Do you have another question?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: No. Mr. Mayersohn?

MR. MAYERSOHN: Yes, Dr. Lynch-Walsh.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I would like you to translate. This is the bid summary for Dell. It's public documents.

MR. JABOUIN: I will try, Dr. Lynch-Walsh.

MR. MAYERSOHN: So here's -- here's what I would suggest to help -- to kind of help us along. Mr. Jabouin, when you send out our bid packet next Thursday --

MR. JABOUIN: Our board package; yeah.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Board packet. Can you include if there are -- and what I would recommend is, anybody that wants documents,

because, again, it's going to take some time, I don't know how quickly they're available for some of them or others may take some work, but items that are just a matter of forwarding, if that can be done sooner than later. If items that somebody may make a request that they want some additional things, if we can get that done at the latest by Thursday before we send out the -- our meeting packet, that would be appreciated.

MS. FERTIG: And I think digitally, too, Mr. Mayersohn if we could get all of that so we can search it while we are on our computers, which is sometimes an easier way to do it as well as getting the hard copy, it would be -- it would certainly probably make it easier for you to transmit and easier for us to take a look at.

MR. MAYERSOHN: You're talking about a link.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Yeah. I mean, a lot of these documents that he's sent, it's been very helpful, and I think it's important that we're all operating off the same set and that we don't -- you know, some of us were there at the meeting in 2016, so, you know, we might have recall of events, but we need to all start from the same point. So if we can just get that, the

minutes of the meeting, things that you can go and look up but it takes a lot of time and just email those to us it would probably be an efficient way to handle it.

MR. JABOUIN: Yes, I'll send those electronically as well. Regarding Dr.
Lynch-Walsh, what happens is, I will try to get to that stuff as much as I reasonably can. What happens is, following this I have a series of other meetings and that's why I can't meet with Mr. Harvey tomorrow and so forth, because there's a lot of work that's been accumulating over the course of the last few days. But I will try to get you the information as soon as I can. And just like Mr. Mayersohn indicated, it will at least be in the packet. That would be my response to your question Dr. Lynch-Walsh.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. Mr. Mayersohn, I have this also under a public records request. Once the second that Ms. Coker sends it, it's not like there aren't administrative assistants in this department who can then forward it to the audit committee because it was omitted somehow from the Dell ITB response. This is a huge -- this is a problem. Let's not gloss over what's

occurring right in front of our eyes. Mr.

Jabouin is debating as though he can arbitrarily comply with a public records request.

MR. JABOUIN: Dr. Lynch-Walsh, I will try to

DR. NATHALIE LYNCH-WALSH: I have the floor, Mr. Jabouin. I have the floor. Stop talking, please.

MR. JABOUIN: I responded to your question.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: You don't have the option to not comply.

MR. JABOUIN: I will comply.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I don't know what's in that document, but you don't have the option to not comply.

MR. JABOUIN: I will try. If I can, I will get it to you later today.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Mr. Mayersohn, I believe I have the floor.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Go ahead, Dr. Lynch-Walsh.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. So it shouldn't -- I don't know why he has such an issue with public records, that's one thing. The other thing is, I don't have such a problem with the conclusions that were drawn on this report, I have a problem

with it not being an audit and there being opinions, recommendations and conclusions. So if there's a way to sort this out and change it from agreed upon procedures to what it should have been, which is an audit, that would satisfy me. Because the very last page of this thing has a conclusion I can't argue with, but it has no business in agreed upon procedures.

MR. JABOUIN: So I will let Mr. Harvey make that particular decision. So when -- when I approached him at the meeting that we had in August on this I did indicate that I needed to have some opinions such as on the Lenovo product. And so he did deliver on that. And then I'll let him determine the substance of that. And if he determines that there's some additional work that he needs to do, then he can communicate that to me as well.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Ms. Shaw, did you have something to say?

MS. SHAW: My only issue if you turn it into an audit is that you might be limited to all of the information versus the agreed upon procedures. That's my only -- that's my only concern. I understand, you know, they've already

completed the work for the agreed upon and, you know, so they may not have to really do a lot, you know, for the audit, but keep in mind the audit is a bit more limited in terms of, you know, what they would be doing. So we may want to really think about that.

MR. JABOUIN: Yeah, I'll go over that with Mr. Harvey, but he's provided what I was looking for as far as opinions on the different objectives.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. Ms. Fertig, did you have any last comments? Because you still have your hand raised.

MS. FERTIG: I know, I tried to put it down at one point. But, no, I think -- I need to go and it sounds like many of the people on this call need to go. Thank you to HCT for your initial audit and I think every time we meet it leads us to a new place and so I'm looking forward to the next -- I'm looking forward to the next conversation with more information. A more informed conversation.

MR. HARVEY: Thank you.

MR. MAYERSOHN: I want to -- before we all go
I just want to thank everybody for their

patience. Dr. Hicks, Mr. Harvey, I want to thank you for participating, Mr. Bass, as always, greatly appreciated, obviously, some of the district staff that is on as well. This is -- you know, the good thing about this audit committee and the people that are on it is, we continue to look at these audits and try to do, again, what is in the best interest of the constituents of Broward County and our students. And I applaud you for that and thank you for that and greatly appreciate it. So sometimes it takes us a little bit longer but we'll get to where we need to get to. And thank you everybody, again, and we will see you all, I guess, in May.

That being said, the meeting is adjourned.

(Meeting was concluded at 1:55 p.m.)

United Reporting, Inc. (954) 525-2221

1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 2 STATE OF FLORIDA 3 COUNTY OF BROWARD 4 I, Timothy R. Bass, Court Reporter and Notary 5 Public in and for the State of Florida at Large, hereby certify that I was authorized to and did 7 stenographically report the foregoing proceedings, and that the transcript is a true and complete record of 8 my stenographic notes thereof. 10 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither an 11 attorney, nor counsel for the parties to this cause, 12 nor a relative or employee of any attorney or party 13 connected with this litigation, nor am I financially interested in the outcome of this action. 14 15 Dated this 3rd day of May, 2021, Fort 16 Lauderdale, Broward County, Florida. 17 18 19 TIMOTHY R. BASS Court Reporter 20 21 22 23 24

25

A a.m 1:13 4:5
a.m 1:13 4:5 ability 23:11 70:7,8
81:24 84:13
able 27:9 41:19 44:14
45:6,10 58:4 60:3
60:18 67:5 76:25
83:22 91:20 92:2,14
92:17 99:25 108:20
absolutely 45:19 46:7
49:4 53:6 59:17
61:7 88:2,24
accepted 86:16 96:12
access 20:14 22:2
accomplish 92:14
account 3:6 76:19
77:6 78:2
accountant 34:20
38:8,12 40:8 47:15
69:11
accountants 7:24
accounting 38:14
69:10 112:15
accounts 72:12
accumulating 117:12
accurate 21:17 84:21
87:2 89:1
accurately 88:14
achieve 12:8
acknowledge 5:18
9:17
acknowledgment 9:3
Acting 2:16
action 14:3 122:14
actions 44:15 47:19
48:10
activity 14:16
actual 38:5 42:25
61:4 85:2 89:11
96:16 99:13
add 20:24 26:5 39:15
73:14,16
addendum 71:15
additional 3:5 13:20
14:24 40:13 51:2
93:25 105:21,21
108:19 116:7
119:16
address 100:6
addressed 63:1 75:1
adds 69:18

adequate 86:2
adhere 30:14
adhered 15:19 52:22
adhering 32:17 50:2
adjourned 121:15
ADMINISTRATI
1:8
administrative 7:13
117:21
administrators
105:13
admire 37:2 41:7
adoption 75:1
advance 79:11 advice 79:3
advice 79:3 advise 7:2
advisory 8:25 20:6,7
21:14
affidavit 45:9
agenda 7:10,22 8:1
8:16 11:5 13:10
61:9 77:13 83:16
agendas 62:24
agent 58:7,9 96:20
97:3,6,13
ago 30:19 71:3 74:9
92:11 95:10
agree 53:11 54:6,21
61:8 65:19 74:14
80:2,16 109:8
agreed 30:15 34:3,15
79:18 119:4,8,23
120:1
agreeing 23:6
ahead 25:19 32:2
44:23 46:25,25 56:17 67:17 68:16
68:16 88:4 92:25
96:3 108:5 118:20
AICPA 31:20 32:6
AlertPoint 76:1,3,18
77:1,4,17,19,23,24
78:1
ALI 2:8
align 105:15
aligning 35:21
alignment 105:10
Allegiance 4:7
Allen 76:5,7,9 77:2,4
77:18,23
allocated 26.12 27.12

allocated 36:13 37:13

allocation 16:13 allow 37:4 58:4 92:6 allowed 26:23 96:18
allowing 32:18 33:5 112:12,18
ambiguous 30:20,22 32:20 33:11
amended 71:10 amount 25:6 39:23
67:22,23 98:12 amounts 19:15 and/or 90:25 101:23
Andrew 2:2 5:9 anecdotally 21:8
angle 34:8 ANN 2:9
announce 4:14 6:24 8:8
announcement 4:13 answer 7:24 32:15,24
47:20 54:19 76:25 78:20 92:24 95:9 96:4,6 97:7
answered 31:13,18 40:18 66:19 73:23
115:9 answers 109:11 114:2
Anthony 4:22 anticipate 88:19
anticipated 45:14 anybody 22:10 42:11 115:25
Anyway 97:15
apart 105:19 apologies 79:11 apologize 35:24
101:13 105:24 apparent 80:1
apparently 46:3 47:4 56:7
appears 33:12 appears 38:9 86:2,17 114:18
applaud 121:10 Apple 41:5 104:24,25
applications 37:24 applied 67:24 applies 80:1
applying 49:19

appreciate 41:21 47:17 69:8 78:23 121:11 appreciated 111:6 116:9 121:3 approach 12:4 113:12 approached 119:11 appropriate 40:15 41:24 107:2 113:12 114:19 **approval** 7:10,11 approved 23:23 **April** 1:12 4:4 25:10 arbitrarily 118:2 ARCESE 2:8 area 15:8 areas 15:2 79:16 **argue** 119:7 **ARLOTTA** 2:10 arrests 115:5 arrive 45:1 arrived 50:16 81:16 articles 39:13 ascertain 85:24 ascertained 88:11 asked 8:21 13:19 17:17 29:15 35:22 39:19 48:23 62:1,21 62:23 64:12,16 65:18 71:20 73:9 77:10 83:8,12 111:2 asking 10:24 11:2 24:2,5,19 27:6 29:12 30:13 41:14 45:8 48:8 69:3 71:24 85:12 86:9 91:8 107:1 **aspects** 10:16 48:18 asset 13:20 assist 20:8,21 21:6 assistants 117:21 associated 66:7 103:17 **assume** 38:4 51:7 assuming 56:13 assure 47:21 55:11 assured 104:8 attach 8:14 attached 61:9 63:7,25 64:5,7

attainment 35:19 **attendance** 2:1 4:11 51:1,6 attended 13:12 **attendees** 1:17 4:12 70:19 attending 8:22 attest 79:13,24 attestation 30:14 attorney 49:12 122:11,12 attorneys 17:17 audio 87:22 audit 1:3 4:3 9:1,10 9:13,22 11:17 13:13 13:18 14:5 15:16 28:8 35:3 38:21 39:21 52:6,10,11 60:16,25 61:3 71:22 73:12,17 74:20 75:5 75:5 78:25 79:12,14 79:24 80:7,9,17 81:7 83:22 90:5 92:13 117:23 119:1 119:5,22 120:3,4,18 121:5 **audited** 75:8,9 **auditor** 2:7,8,10,11 6:12 7:13,15 9:10 23:3 38:16 85:21 107:3 **auditors** 27:6 69:9 91:20 92:3 **audits** 2:8,9,9,10 60:18 73:10 74:16 89:10 121:7 **August** 119:12 **AUP** 33:1 34:19 35:3 72:22 73:2 79:13,17 80:17,19,22 106:6 **AUPs** 33:25 authorized 122:6 automatically 105:2 autonomy 93:8 **available** 9:24 16:14 35:10 37:5 43:10 44:20 78:7 98:6 100:14 101:18 105:16 116:2 **Avenue** 1:10,24 avoid 8:12 30:22

board's 73:11 100:20 case 49:13 59:12 33:11 58:9 93:21 87:6,7,21 121:2 65:1 66:7 70:19,24 award 57:10 63:17 122:4.19 71:23,23,25 72:10 **boards** 72:5 104:8.24 107:19 67:11 68:2,9 **battery** 104:16 72:15,24 73:1 75:7 **bond** 15:14.22 16:21 cases 36:21 **BCPS** 78:11 awarded 56:17 57:5 75:10,12,25 78:10 61:2 74:23 category 102:21 63:13 65:2 67:14,22 **bear** 11:19 85:9,24 86:2,6,12 **book** 29:18 caught 67:19 73:4 67:23 68:1,2,5,7,12 began 42:11 86:19 94:3,5 95:18 **bottom** 16:7 104:13 cause 122:11 **beginning** 17:20 23:4 69:7 95:20,24 96:10,11 **bought** 36:24 99:16 **caused** 107:12 aware 13:9 20:20 31:10 59:24 82:23 97:3,19,20 98:10,12 99:23 **causing** 106:18 33:6 52:5,9 59:7 99:22 98:24 99:9 104:4 **brain** 66:14 **CDI** 14:9 67:21 68:1 **begins** 93:25 62:5 71:18,24 72:2 109:16,18 110:3,14 breadth 41:5 68:6,20,21,25 72:17.23 108:2 behavior 74:24 110:18 111:2,3,4 break 68:10 87:25 **CENTER** 1:8 **AYMARA** 2:20 **belief** 71:4 114:24 115:15,20 105:18 106:9 certain 5:18 13:6 **believe** 9:18 19:14 bidder 53:9,16 54:11 breakdown 67:25 81:18 В 21:3,13 31:22 32:3 54:14 55:10,11,24 106:7 certainly 108:10,23 **B** 2:12 32:5 33:8 46:4 56:4 59:12 breath 36:1 116:15 back 21:15 23:14 **CERTIFICATE** 56:19 58:13 63:16 bidder's 55:2 breathing 101:14 31:6,13 35:20 36:12 73:11 74:18 91:17 **bidders** 50:9 51:13 bring 22:24 40:16 122:1 39:9 40:16 42:6 88:19 108:22 95:21 112:23 52:1 54:23 55:9 certified 7:23 43:18,19 44:16 45:4 118:18 59:9,21 70:23 86:20 **brings** 70:3 certify 122:6,10 52:24 53:5 54:16 **bell** 77:8 86:23 **broke** 68:3 cetera 27:8,8 43:23 60:23 61:17,18 **bidding** 52:8 93:17 **benefit** 44:22 brought 58:1 66:5 chair 2:2,2 10:7 62:19 65:6,24 70:3 **bids** 42:25 43:21 44:6 11:17 17:14 108:10 best 16:12 35:9.10 112:9 80:8 87:4.13.20.22 37:18 38:10,11 44:7 45:20,23 47:8 **Broward** 1:1 36:3,5 chance 9:25 108:21 87:23 91:14,18 92:3 44:12 47:3,4 53:4 48:5,20,24 50:1,13 46:15 55:19,25 56:2 **change** 60:18 119:3 92:7 100:8 105:10 64:19 92:17 109:1 54:2,16 55:9 58:21 78:6 121:9 122:3,16 **changed** 32:17 33:4,5 108:22 109:24 121:8 59:3 65:23 71:19,25 **BRYAN** 2:11 33:7,7,8,12 80:20 112:13,19 72:17 74:1,7 75:25 **bet** 38:13 **budget** 16:13 19:15 107:5 back-and-forth 39:2 **better** 91:7 109:12 86:15.20 19:15 20:10 36:14 changes 32:9 **backed** 72:16 **big** 94:13 36:23 37:3 41:8 **bevond** 104:3 105:7 **CHARLOTTE** 3:6 background 5:23 **bid** 10:11 14:8,14,21 **bigger** 113:16 101:1 chart 99:13,17 35:16,19 42:17,19 14:23 15:10,12,17 bit 35:16,18 36:17 **building** 44:24 111:19,24 42:22 60:13,14 15:20 16:4,9 18:11 37:12 39:1 42:4 **bulk** 26:8 **charts** 111:11,22 69:10 19:3,11 20:23 21:10 60:3 120:4 121:12 **bunch** 47:13 **chat** 113:19 **backup** 57:8 102:17 21:19 23:5,5,7,9,18 bits 27:4 **business** 2:20 7:19 check 29:4 96:22 **Barnes** 4:18 23:22 24:1,3,10,16 **black** 34:2 119:8 checklist 48:6 base 104:22 24:19 25:1,13,15,17 **blah** 18:12,12,12 buy 99:14,15 chemistry 37:23 **based** 14:12 15:7 25:23 26:3,8,8,16 **blank** 94:13 95:13 chief 2:7,8,15,16,16 \mathbf{C} 23:2 35:9 36:13,23 29:12,20 43:5,8,12 **blanket** 19:21 2:17,18,18 6:12,15 38:11,18,20 40:4 C 35:24 36:2 43:20,22 44:24 board 1:1,9 8:4,25 7:13.15 13:21 23:3 41:2 55:4 56:20 cabinet 5:18 85:20 95:4 45:15 46:2,14,16,24 13:14,19 17:17 61:11 72:22 79:21 **call** 49:15 57:15 47:5,10,12 48:22 19:14 20:18 21:9 children 37:1 81:6 84:24,25 86:10 49:7,7,9,9,11,14,17 22:3 24:4.12 26:18 87:10 90:5 113:18 Children's 36:4,4 86:25 91:20,25 120:17 49:20,23,23,24 50:3 33:21 36:5,14,22 **choice** 72:4,5 73:11 98:10 109:11 called 16:9 99:21 **choose** 79:3 103:8 50:6,7,10,11,11 41:7 46:15 55:19,25 112:20 51:5,13,25 52:8,13 56:3,16,19 57:9 110:17 **chose** 107:19 **basic** 104:3 52:16 53:9,15,17,20 CANN 2:21 61:9 67:12 72:2,6 **chosen** 14:10 capacity 36:15 **basically** 70:23 75:25 53:24,25 54:1,5,13 73:9 75:2 81:8 chronological 27:3,5 91:23 101:16 54:25 55:12,20,21 89:24 90:2,11,15,20 27:7,10,13 **basis** 19:11 47:11,11 capitalized 55:11 56:8 58:1 60:1,5,8 102:17,17 105:19 chronologically 80:20 **Cardenal** 76:17 77:3 61:6 62:22,23 63:9 108:2 112:24 41:17 42:13

115:22,23

care 82:14

CIO 13:23 74:18

Bass 1:22,23 3:3 8:6

63:12 64:10,13,24

r
circle 70:4
citing 65:11
city 49:12
clarification 73:13
clarified 80:5 81:2
clarifies 40:20
clarify 63:4 70:13
71:8,16 74:15 103:1
clear 24:24 38:17
68:11
clearly 19:1 50:6,8
54:1
clerk 2:12 49:12
clock 57:19 58:15
close 108:3
closed 26:3 78:5
closely 72:4
closer 25:16
closing 73:16
closure 16:18
Coalition 36:6
Coker 2:19 6:1,2
10:14 11:2 15:3
24:9 26:6,22 27:21
27:24 42:23 43:3,5
43:7,13,15,18 44:9
45:17 46:1,9 47:17
48:18,24 49:3,21
50:8 51:19 52:5,9
52:24 53:13,18,21
54:8,11,19 55:6,16
56:2 57:23 58:3
59:15,24 60:4,9
70:25 71:6,15 74:3
75:3 95:11,15,18,21
96:3,4,13 97:4,7
103:2,4 110:5,7,19
110:24 111:7
114:25 117:20
Coker's 70:12
come 8:18 23:18
58:14 69:20 88:18
92:5 102:4 107:4
112:22
comes 38:16 68:13
94:14
coming 91:17
commenced 9:10
comment 20:13,18
27:22 30:12 60:22
68:24 70:17 73:8

70.9 90.17 25
79:8 80:16,25
103:24 110:6
commentary 88:22
commented 16:4 36:13
comments 10:7 11:7
11:8,12,17 12:1,10
12:11,15 15:7 30:10
42:18 44:4 60:20
69:24 75:15 81:4,6
113:24 120:12
committee 1:3 2:1 4:4
8:12,25 9:2,6,7
11:17,23 13:12,13
13:18 14:7 16:20
17:7 18:11,22 20:6
20:7,13 21:1,14
22:22 24:14 28:8
33:21 39:19,21
40:20 49:25 67:3
81:7 82:19 83:22
92:13 93:7,9 108:11
111:5,10 114:12,17
117:23 121:6
Committees' 7:25
common 77:17,18
78:15,16,17 101:6
communicate 119:17
company 77:5
compared 104:25
comparing 97:20
competition 101:9,12
compiled 8:15
complaining 66:4
complete 24:15 53:25
102:25 110:16
122:8
completed 9:2 28:12
120:1
complex 37:23
compliance 15:13
56:1,3
compliant 59:5
comply 55:20 118:3
118:11,12,15
component 81:20
computer 16:23,23 76:20 81:11 97:18
computers 35:12
116:12
110.12

concern 46:7 64:17

100:12 106:19
113:24 119:25
concerned 25:11
70:13 90:11
concerning 94:4
concerns 90:19 100:7
100:10 101:1,4,15
concise 107:20
conclude 17:12 33:10 concluded 87:1
121:16
concludes 10:7 11:7
conclusion 65:19
69:20 78:9 100:3
119:7
conclusions 30:11,16
30:21 32:19 33:10
69:24 80:4 106:4,5
118:24 119:2
concur 39:12
conditions 50:13 53:12,15 54:23 55:5
55:8,18
conducted 7:19
conducting 51:2
conference 50:9,24
51:21,23 70:23
confirm 51:5 102:19
110:8
confirmation 83:3
confirming 51:4
conforms 99:10 confused 41:14 64:14
104:17
confuses 80:6
confusing 80:21
confusion 72:8
107:13
connected 122:13
connection 77:20,21
77:21
Connie 5:11
consensus 59:8
consequently 45:18 consider 18:24 91:5
consideration 86:1
considered 30:20
54:4 57:6 89:25
96:13,24 112:11
consistent 64:3 65:8
((.1

constituents 121:9 construction 52:7.25 **consultant** 3:3 20:11 22:2.3 89:12 consultants 63:3 **consulting** 20:8,15,19 21:6 67:15 contact 87:9 **context** 30:8 61:3 66:15 88:6 continue 60:13 66:20 108:8,10,12,14 114:19 121:7 contract 66:22 67:7 67:15 72:10 contracts 49:1 72:1 74:10 contractual 50:12 contradicts 34:15 70:14 **control** 82:18 controls 48:24 59:25 conversation 19:24 42:5 43:2 46:8 51:17 90:3 93:7 109:3 120:21,22 conversations 8:14 114:3,8 **CONWAY** 2:9 **copies** 44:23 **copy** 57:10 110:9 116:14 **correct** 21:13 25:8 38:7 44:8,9 45:17 45:25 46:1 50:14 51:19 54:7,8 55:5 70:25 73:24 100:19 100:25 101:25 corrections 21:16 **correctly** 56:15 74:19 corresponding 111:13 cost 18:14 19:5,16 93:25 Council 36:4 **counsel** 122:11 **County** 1:1 36:6 46:15 55:19,25 56:3 78:6 121:9 122:3,16 **couple** 19:19 114:23

constantly 75:9

course 19:12 81:13 107:25 109:1 117:13 **court** 1:21 3:3 8:5 87:3,4,22 88:2 122:4,19 **cover** 6:9 11:4 62:9 73:10 74:19 coverage 103:23 covered 81:19 103:22 **COVID** 36:1 **CPA** 3:2 69:11 cradle 65:5 **crafting** 20:22 65:8 **created** 102:9 111:12 creation 23:4 **Crenshaw** 24:11,17 46:13 **curious** 62:11,13,14 78:8 **current** 14:14,19,23 70:18 74:1,7,21 93:20,23 100:17 105:15 currently 56:9 **customer** 81:17 90:7 **cyber** 36:8 **cycle** 39:8

D

Dahl 2:3 4:20,21 41:11,13 75:18,20 data 39:18 60:6 68:18 69:3 111:17.23 date 31:20,23 32:4 50:10 55:14 63:17 63:18 67:8 70:24 100:15,19 dated 32:11 122:15 dates 27:2 63:17 **David** 76:5,6,9 77:2,4 77:18,23 day 79:10 81:17 91:22 100:23 115:4 115:4 122:15 days 59:11 114:4 117:13 **De** 4:22 **dead** 47:16 deal 13:6 66:5 **dealing** 37:16,23

66:1

debate 12:1
debating 118:2
S
DEBBIE 3:9
debrief 92:19
December 14:21
23:14,25 24:4 26:4
43:9,12,17 100:14
decide 105:8
decision 36:2,15,22
41:8 98:13 107:18
119:10
dedicating 8:22
defer 91:2 109:1
definitely 25:9 96:14
96:24
definition 65:20
degreed 69:11
deliver 119:14
delivery 54:24
Dell 28:20,25 29:13
29:20 71:25 72:10 72:11,19,24,24 93:4
100.5 100.15 10
100:5 109:15,18
110:3,3,14 114:24
115:15 117:24
delve 79:15
DemandStar 26:2
demonstrate 50:23
82:1
demonstrated 50:25
DENIECE 3:6
denominator 77:17
77:18 78:16
denote 57:21
department 18:23
19:12 20:17 38:14
53:5,7 74:2 75:7
117:22
departments 18:22
19:10 53:2 74:11,12
depending 105:3
depends 96:14,20
l =
depreciating 38:14
depreciation 38:18
derive 35:13
describe 22:21
designed 48:16 79:19
81:14
desk 81:16
desktops 14:9 103:18
despite 113:3
despite 113.3

detail 39:25 40:1
63:10
detailed 32:12
details 103:14,22
determine 12:2 63:8
90:7 97:22 99:9,25
119:15
determines 119:16
developing 30:25
Development 36:5
device 101:3 104:24
devices 7:22 13:11
84:23 103:18
105:14
dial-in 87:10
dialogue 92:7
difference 67:22 68:3
68:4,9 79:12
differences 32:16
different 16:4 17:6
21:1 29:24 30:9
38:5 52:23 60:1
65:23 69:2 74:11
75:8 80:17 81:7
106:12 109:20
120:9
differently 11:24 21:4
difficult 107:8
difficulty 59:2
digitally 116:10
digress 34:8
diminishes 105:22
direct 12:12 21:18,20
22:4,6 77:20,21
107:2
directed 49:4
directing 47:18
direction 113:23
directions 15:7
directly 79:15 102:8
director 2:19,20 3:6
10:14 14:19 18:9,10
18:12 19:2 25:13
26:13 57:16
disagree 40:2,6 65:20
Disch 2:3 4:24,25
8:10 34:22,24 38:4
38:8 40:2,7,8,11,12
40:14 80:13,15
disconnect 38:17

87:19

1	
discontinued 68:22	
discovered 72:15	
86:3	
discredit 40:5	
discuss 73:20 109:24 discussed 9:22 15:14	
16:17 18:13 19:4	
20:2,4 21:23 23:17	
24:23,25 43:1 64:9	de
74:5 90:20 111:8	u
discussion 12:18	
22:20 25:5,6 33:20	de
114:18	u
discussions 25:22	de
91:21	de
disqualified 86:19	de
disqualify 56:12	D
58:22	ע
dissertation 39:10	
distribute 110:20	
distributer 10.20	
district 2:14 7:23	
8:18 9:12 10:18	
15:2,11 16:6,12,22	
16:25,25 20:20 21:2	
50:17 52:6 66:23	
68:8 93:23 94:3,6	
98:25 99:14 121:4	
district's 8:25 15:18	
72:3 94:20	
division 52:19	
doctorate 36:8	
document 21:17	
28:23 29:22,24	
46:25 47:5,7,8	
49:10,14 50:3,6,7	
51:21 53:10,20	
56:10 70:7 81:25	
82:3 83:20 85:14	
93:1 99:9 100:9	
102:12,15,17,18	
103:21 107:20	
109:15 110:3,9,16	
113:4 118:14	
documentation 38:23	
39:2,3 61:7 78:10	
78:12 86:5 89:5	
documented 47:11	
documents 9:8 29:14	
29:17 44:20 45:12	
49:6 50:11,16 51:8	

53:9,22 54:5 72:12
82:5,19 83:16 84:1
84:3 85:20 86:24
93:8 95:25 97:19
101:23 103:8
107:21 109:21
110:13 115:6,16,25
116:19
doing 27:25 60:16,23
60:24 73:15 74:16
120:5
dollars 36:25 72:7
84:24
door 73:17
double 29:4 61:18
double-check 31:20
Dr 2:4,16 3:3 5:5,6,24
5:25 6:21,22 10:9
10:11,13,17 11:5
17:4,10 27:22,25
28:4,12,15,18 29:6
29:7,11 30:1,2,4
31:2,5,9,15,17,24
32:1,8,13,14,23
33:4,23 34:7,13,19
34:25 35:20,20 38:7
39:1 40:17,24 41:2
41:11,16 48:22
61:14,17,24 62:10
62:13 64:5,11 65:10
65:16 66:11,13,18
67:17,18 69:1,23
70:2 71:4,7,17 73:3
75:17,21,22 76:4,16
76:24 77:10,16
78:25 79:5,7 80:2
80:17 81:22,23 82:6
82:10,16,23 83:1,7
83:8,12,18 84:4,12
84:15 88:24 89:23
91:3,10,11,14 93:1
93:2,3 94:10,12,25
95:6,12,14,16,23
96:1 97:2,5,10
100:4,5,6,17,19,21
100:25 102:11,13
102:16 103:4,6
104:6,11,14,15,21
106:1,10,14,24
107:1 108:5,6 109:8
110:1,7,15,22
, , - ,

113:24 114:20,23 115:3,10,12,13,14 115:17 116:18 117:6,17,18 118:4,6 118:10,13,18,20,21 121:1 **drafting** 62:22 63:9 64:13,24 **drafts** 39:4 107:24,25 **drastically** 69:5,8,15 69:17 draw 32:19 drawing 65:18 drawn 118:25 drew 100:3 drink 105:25 drives 101:17 105:17 **dropped** 87:4,14 **dude** 97:10 due 11:13 48:20 49:23 55:14 72:25 **Dunn** 2:18 5:20 6:16 6:17 94:24 95:4 96:5 99:7 108:15 113:18 dying 38:8,13 47:15 \mathbf{E} earlier 71:1 108:20 111:8 112:4,5 early 36:5,7 64:20 113:10 easier 8:7 27:6 31:15 81:25 116:13,15,16 **easily** 56:25 eastern 55:13 echo 41:15 112:14 **EDCO** 15:16 16:2 75:23 77:16,19,22 78:13,18 editing 39:2 **Education** 2:22 15:16 75:24 78:13 effect 33:2 **effective** 31:22 32:4 efficient 117:4 **effort** 44:18 either 10:20 71:14 85:7 109:19

electronically 58:2

117:6

element 86:11 eliminate 7:12 else's 18:8 49:24 **email** 30:18 32:12 68:21 70:10 78:22 90:6 117:3 **emails** 8:10 emergency 58:24 **employ** 24:12 26:18 46:14 employee 122:12 employees' 9:15 employment 26:7 enclosed 36:21 **ended** 74:24 **engage** 64:20 engagement 30:21 33:10 34:5 61:20 66:25 67:14 79:18 79:20.25 engenders 104:1 **ensure** 36:17 88:25 89.4 **ensuring** 58:16 59:5 **entered** 113:19 entire 7:3 enumerated 23:3 **envelope** 37:13 53:25 54:2 **equipment** 36:18,24 37:14,20 39:8 103:25 104:2,9 105:1.12 **ERHARD** 2:11 **ERIC** 2:10 **erring** 101:2 erroneously 74:6 error 70:16,17,21 90:17 **especially** 12:4 69:9 100:11 101:7 105:1 ESPINOZA 3:9 **essentially** 71:20 72:2 established 29:15 52:22 **Estate** 2:21 estimating 37:17 et 27:8,8 43:23 events 27:3 48:10 116:24 **everybody** 4:3 12:13

49:24 63:4 80:6 83:22 105:20 108:13,13 120:25 121:13 evidence 45:22 exact 106:17 exactly 24:15 45:24 exam 69:11 examine 35:23 36:12 54:24 examined 35:5 **example** 37:13 58:23 81:11 exceed 16:5 97:23 exceeded 100:1 exceeds 93:24 **Excel** 94:2 Exceptional 2:21 excited 47:20 excuse 23:24 87:3 102:1 excused 4:19 5:11 **executive** 2:12 76:19 77:6 78:2 **exhibit** 52:14 exhibits 107:21 **exist** 43:15 110:21,22 exorbitant 37:4 expanded 74:19 **expect** 114:24 expectations 39:9 expected 54:24 experience 35:18 37:11 **expert** 35:7,7,16 38:20,21,24 **experts** 35:11,13 expires 104:1 **explain** 20:9 30:13 32:16 34:20 **explained** 18:10 19:3 111:19 explaining 87:23 106:4 111:25 explanation 107:11 112:2 explanations 106:3 **extend** 36:22 extended 84:25

extensions 54:25

extent 22:6

extraneous 107:21 eyes 102:1,19 118:1 F facilities 52:7,19 53:1 53:3 Facility 2:21 fact 16:5 24:9.13.18 26:14,19,19 36:19 37:2 41:21 43:24 50:15 51:24 57:4 58:5,6 64:8,23 74:25 78:3 89:3 97:11 100:12 113:13 114:14 factors 78:16 96:17 factual 41:1 **fail** 105:17 **failed** 55:24 **fails** 55:20 **failure** 55:2 57:20 **fair** 55:15 85:25 87:1 **fairly** 86:12 **fall** 105:19 109:9 familiar 99:8 far 28:5 68:24 91:24 100:5 104:23 113:17 120:9 **fault** 13:8 February 22:18 24:4 26:21 63:15 89:21 90:16 91:1 feel 12:14 41:23 86:8 108:18 **feeling** 41:20 **felt** 73:15 81:18 FERRARA 3:8 **Fertig** 2:4 5:1 6:6.8 9:20 10:2,14 12:21 12:22 13:1,3,4,7 17:7 18:4,5,18 19:1 19:17 20:25 21:3 22:13,16 23:10,19 23:24 24:1 25:11,25 26:10 27:17 28:2 31:3,7,8,14 41:10 42:10,23 43:6,11,14 43:16,24 45:14,18 46:6,18,19 51:9,24 60:12,14,21 62:8

82:20 84:18 85:10 85:13,23 88:4,5,23 89:8,24 91:4,7,11 103:1,5 106:20,25 108:17 116:10 120:11.14 Fertig's 22:22 84:17 **fierce** 101:10 **file** 43:10 45:13 50:20 59:10 62:19 110:9 110:13 **filed** 59:12 files 44:19 52:15 **fill** 27:19 **final** 8:3 23:7,11,12 **financial** 2:15,16 69:12 financially 122:13 **find** 20:3 28:22 46:8 51:3 60:19 62:10 76:17 77:23,25 89:18 95:1,23 99:11 103:12,14 109:18 109:23 110:4 **findings** 14:13 16:15 42:1,16,20 43:1 61:4 74:25 114:8 **fine** 11:16 42:15 79:4 **finish** 44:4 **finished** 113:9 **firm** 20:8 21:6 112:15 first 8:9 12:3 18:9 29:14 62:9 63:11,14 82:17 94:4 100:10 100:15,19 105:1 fiscal 8:21 60:7 five 37:15 **five-four** 89:25 five-year 38:15 **fixed** 70:17,22 FL 1:25 **Flat** 13:17 Fleming 2:16 5:24,25 **flip** 15:24 **flipping** 41:19 62:2 **floor** 118:6,7,19 Florida 1:11 47:9 49:15 122:2,5,16 **focus** 26:1 **focused** 103:7 104:18 104:21

folks 18:23,24 **follow** 12:1 14:6,13 18:7 30:24 52:4 **follow-up** 14:24 28:19 51:10 57:8 73:7 **followed** 48:9 72:4 88:12.13 **following** 4:1 33:13 41:21 117:9 **follows** 94:16 footnotes 39:13 **Force 36:5** foregoing 122:7 formal 43:22 44:17 47:2 48:12 50:20 formality 43:23 formally 44:16 **former** 13:21,23 **forms** 9:3 Fort 1:11,25 122:15 forth 22:19 39:9 81:16 117:11 **forward** 12:7,20 23:18 86:16 107:25 110:10 114:15 117:22 120:20,20 **forwarded** 8:11,18 forwarding 116:4 **found** 27:19 62:19 88:16 94:4 103:16 four 37:15 73:20 112:25 **Fred** 3:3 6:21 17:10 35:15 **front** 43:2 45:5 49:12 54:2 96:16 118:1 **frugal** 101:3 full 70:4 **fully** 7:18 functions 79:14 **funding** 15:23 **Funds** 2:9 **further** 44:21 79:5 80:16 101:16 122:10 **future** 12:17 \mathbf{G}

gain 17:3

gap 16:23 25:12

73:5,6,8,25 74:14

gaps 27:19 93:21
108:3
Garth 3:7
Gartner 17:1 20:14
20:15,19 21:2,7
63:1 65:7 66:19,23
67:7,11
<i>'</i>
gathering 9:13 64:21
Gauci 5:3
general 9:10 30:6
53:11,15 54:22 55:4
55:8,18
generically 79:24
getting 69:2 70:2 83:2
116:14
give 27:9 35:15 40:3
79:14 80:18 87:10
88:22 108:20 115:7
115:8
given 9:7 19:14 23:8
23:11 41:3 48:19
84:21 88:16 109:12
109:16 113:13
gives 59:15 98:16
giving 12:12 59:1
glanced 102:1
glaring 90:17
gloss 117:25
go 7:3 20:2 22:8
25:19 29:4 30:8
31:5,6,9,13,16 32:2
32:2,22 34:22 37:1
37:17 41:11,15,16
41:25 42:6,7,19
44:23 46:24,25,25
57:3 60:22 61:15
65:6 67:17 68:16,16
74:2 75:13 82:9,14
84:16 88:4 89:19
91:9,14 92:3,15,25
96:2,22 101:9 105:5
105:8 108:5 109:24
110:12 112:19
113:9,10,13 114:5
113.9,10,13 114.3
118:20 120:7,15,17
120:24
goal 20:21
goes 30:5,5 43:18
67:2 86:1 100:5
105:10
105:10

going 8:14 11:17
14:21 15:1 17:21
18:5 20:5 22:9
23:13 24:19 25:15
26:16 35:20 38:2,3
41:15 42:25 46:22
47:14 48:25 49:10 49:11 50:9 61:24
69:15 70:9 74:1
79:11 80:15 83:21
84:22 85:23 88:24
89:16 90:5 91:8,21
91:22 93:3,22 94:8
94:8 97:12 98:5,9
100:8 108:17
110:10,19 111:17
113:7 114:15 116:1 gonna 30:8 65:19
91:13
good 4:2 5:25 6:2,4,8
6:14,17,20 18:19
20:12 25:6 35:20
37:10 42:8 60:8
74:4 79:10 121:5
goodness 60:10 Google 38:19
graded 81:6
grader 37:22
granted 52:18
grave 65:5
great 106:18 109:5
110:23
greatly 121:3,11
GREENBARG 3:6
group 17:1 20:15,15 67:25 68:2,11 71:19
93:17,19 98:23
103:7 110:16,16,16
110:17
groups 63:3 68:1
guess 4:5 6:25 21:10
21:19 41:22 52:12
53:10 55:25 57:8
63:13 78:20 85:11 85:11 95:14 110:11
121:14
guessing 77:7
guest 45:1
GUESTS 3:1,5

guidance 8:17 19:14

31:19,20,21 32:3

33:1,2 80:19 **guidelines** 32:6 72:22 guy 77:25 guys 104:17 109:19 guys' 79:11 half 11:21 37:21,25 51:17 62:9 hand 9:19 11:11 41:8 hand's 46:21 **handle** 117:4 **handled** 86:12 hands 37:21 **hands-on** 41:4 **handy** 84:11,12 happen 93:9 100:2 **happened** 11:3 27:5 64:1 65:25 66:2 72:18 86:6 92:11 114:13 **happening** 45:4 66:3 97:11 115:5 happens 58:13 117:7 117:9 happy 22:11 hard 105:17 116:14 hardware 38:5 **Harpalani** 2:9 6:13 6:14 Harvey 3:2 6:19,20 20:12 22:17,23 23:13,21 25:2,5,8 28:16 29:2 31:19 63:20,21,22 64:6 76:2,6,8,10,13,15 76:23 79:8,9,10 85:18 86:13,14 88:21 92:18 107:17

H

HCT 3:2,3 6:18 7:22 **Hagen** 2:3 4:24 47:15 65:15 80:13 120:13 17:9 18:17.19 19:9 27:12,16 28:9,10,14 32:3,24 35:15 36:9 65:3,12 68:17 69:22 71:13 72:21 73:23 80:11.12 81:9 85:17

7:23 12:25 13:11 15:7,25 17:2,5,10 22:14 28:7 33:17 34:9 71:18 83:9,13 93:13 97:21 100:1 108:24 111:10 114:4 120:17 HCT's 99:17 **head** 18:23 **headed** 67:3 hear 5:23 18:7 46:22 71:16 87:5,6,7,17 87:21 heard 17:22 32:25 76:1,2,4,6,9 77:11 78:20 hearings 11:23 hearsay 56:22 **held** 1:16 44:25 45:23 50:9 **help** 65:7 81:16 94:10 115:19,19 **helpful** 10:3 19:20 116:20 hev 37:2 Hi 6:14 Hicks 3:3 6:21,22 17:4,10 35:15,17,20 38:7 39:1,15,22 40:20,24 41:2 63:21 81:15 88:21,24 89:23 91:3,10,12 100:4,6,19,25 102:13 104:6,14,21 106:10,24 107:1 111:12 121:1 high 48:17 68:19 104:2 **higher** 36:16 107:22 **Higher-Ed** 76:20 78:3 **highlight** 48:11 52:24 59:9 highlighted 101:5 highlighting 100:11 highlights 100:9 hire 63:3 97:16 **hired** 20:5,7,10,16,19 21:2,5,11,14 22:1,3 95:10

hiring 20:17,25 **history** 104:2 hit 70:4 **Hold** 23:22 110:5 **holding** 90:23 home 102:4 hope 47:18 60:17 89:17 hopefully 11:18 45:10 69:19 hoping 45:2 49:6 51:1 91:19 horizontally 102:1 hospitalized 35:25 hours 11:13 112:25 **house** 50:4 **HP** 28:21 **huge** 36:21 61:19,25 97:25 117:24 human 59:4 **Hunter** 26:20 71:20 77:3,5 97:14

I'm' 24:19 **i.e** 79:16 identified 13:22 II 2:11 **III** 2:10,11 **imagine** 20:16 61:10 immediately 40:5 100:12 Imp 2:21 **impact** 9:14 implementation 20:22,23 implemented 15:4 31:22 59:25 74:4 implicate 24:17 **imply** 108:25 **important** 16:11 23:2 26:6,19 29:11 33:16 74:9 116:20 **imposed** 18:14 19:5 21:24 improvements 60:3 **in-person** 7:17 9:4 **inboxes** 114:25 **inception** 62:22 63:9 64:13,24 65:8 include 21:25 30:21

109:22 111:15

113:10 114:14

120:23 121:1

117:11 119:9 120:8

intention 71:3 75:7 55:7 90:20 July 32:11 33:2 76:21 known 74:18 96:19 39:1 48:14,17 115:24 **Interactive** 13:17 items 33:20 52:17 76:22 **included** 19:8 28:21 **interest** 77:13 121:8 64:18 68:21 107:9 June 13:14 113:7 34:10 39:24 70:20 **interested** 7:1 122:14 107:15 116:3,5 justify 44:15 58:4,17 lack 90:21 95:19,22,24 interesting 97:11 iterated 80:18 K laid 73:1 includes 51:21 104:19 interestingly 93:13 J K-12 76:20 78:2 **including** 27:8 52:17 **interim** 64:20 J 2:21 **KC** 1:8 33:12 74:12 **internal** 2:9 89:4 **Jabouin** 2:8 4:14,18 **keep** 26:23 29:8 67:2 incomplete 62:8,11 **internally** 102:9,14 4:22,24 5:1,3,5,7,9 94:8,8 101:21 120:3 independent 20:5,8 102:18 5:11,14,16,24 6:1,3 keeping 22:20 21:5,14 22:1,3 **interrupt** 17:15 29:7 6:6,10,11,11,15,18 kept 80:3 **indicate** 6:13 7:6 16:2 31:25 106:20 109:5 6:21 7:2,14,15 9:23 key 115:4 105:5 17:19 25:3 48:2 interviewed 17:5 keyboards 105:18 10:6,13 11:4,12,20 119:12 **interviews** 78:11,13 **indicated** 7:16 48:25 13:4,8 17:19 18:17 kicks 32:10 **introduce** 13:5,10 20:24 22:13,17 kids 37:20 introduction 17:12 73:12 81:9 83:6 117:15 23:22,25 25:2 26:5 **killing** 32:23 late 50:5 indication 59:15 **Inventory** 2:8 27:12 28:9 29:7,25 kilter 104:23 investing 36:16 78:12 108:24 kind 12:9 47:11 50:2 33:15,24 34:7,17 individual 37:8 **invitation** 46:16 53:8 63:25 70:12 78:8 **individuals** 6:18 7:4 53:14.20 39:15 40:6,10,19,25 122:16 **INVITED** 3:1 41:9 42:7 48:16 92:7 109:12 112:12 lead 57:5 **industry** 38:2 39:6 50:6 59:19 60:5,10 112:19 115:19 invoices 67:24 101:12 63:20 66:21 67:1.16 kindly 29:9 95:3 industry's 105:4 **involved** 19:25,25 **inferred** 24:7 26:13 22:25 23:4 24:16 68:23 71:13 73:19 100:6 73:21 76:8,11,14 knew 56:16 63:5 inform 64:19 63:8,24 64:24 65:7 77:9,12 78:22 79:2 know 12:14,19 17:16 65:9,20,22 66:1 **informal** 4:3,10 7:9 80:5 81:3,5 82:3,8 17:18 21:7,8 22:6,9 **information** 2:18,18 78:18 82:12,25 83:3,6,10 22:17 24:14,20,25 6:15 9:12 13:22 involvement 13:24 83:14,25 84:6,10,14 25:3 27:8 42:14 15:17 21:18,20 22:5 14:25 17:3 25:24 47:9 49:25 51:3,12 legal 96:22 39:23,25 41:1,2,20 22:6,15 23:2,7 87:6,9,15,18,21 91:19 92:9 94:10 51:24 52:15 53:4 45:11 67:13 84:9 63:25 75:24 78:13 95:3,11 97:8 107:6 57:19,20 58:9,15,21 90:21 94:16 95:5,19 iPads 105:2 108:15 110:20,25 59:2 61:5 62:7 63:2 95:22 96:18 98:21 irregular 46:9 111:7 112:22 113:2 66:14.24.24 69:10 103:17 107:8,10 irregularities 57:21 113:22 114:6,11 71:9 75:14,19 80:22 101:10 108:2,19,21,23 59:16 74:17 115:1,2,9,17,20,22 81:10 82:17 84:19 109:4 111:1,5 issue 35:2 57:19 117:5 118:2,4,7,9 88:14 91:7 96:5 117:14 119:23 106:5 118:22 118:12,16 119:9 97:18 98:8 99:5,18 120:21 119:21 120:7 100:2 102:20,22,22 **informational** 7:16 issued 24:3,10 25:13 **Jabouin's** 84:16 102:24 106:10 84:7 32:4 **James** 97:4 108:2,11,13 109:2,3 **informed** 120:22 issues 12:9 16:16 **January** 22:18 36:7 109:6,10 110:23 initial 62:3 86:7 17:4 82:18 106:8 72:18 111:1 112:5,15,16 120:18 111:21 112:1 **Jennifer** 2:9 6:13 112:21,25 113:24 **initiative** 16:23,24 ITB 10:24 28:6,21 **Jermaine** 2:16 5:24 114:1.14.17.21 29:13,16 45:17 50:8 initiatives 16:22 **iob** 37:10 109:6 116:2,22,23 118:13 **input** 21:12 23:8,12 50:12 63:18 70:9 **JOHN** 3:8 118:22 119:25 101:6.9 83:13 117:24 64:22 joined 9:16 17:22 120:2,3,5,14 121:5 instructions 48:3 **ITBs** 28:10 **Joris** 2:8 6:11 7:15 knowledge 21:19 55:1 70:10 **itching** 46:23 **Juan** 76:17 77:3 22:5,7 35:7 41:3 **Integration 2:20** item 7:12,21 8:1 11:5 **JUDITH** 2:15 55:4 108:4 12:5 13:10 52:3 113:1 117:25 **intend** 14:6

letterhead 26:16 letters 55:11 level 34:4 35:19,24 36:2 48:17 63:10 68:19 90:3 106:18 107:22 levels 103:23 **life** 36:23 38:15 39:8 **lights** 58:23 **limb** 86:17 **limited** 72:14 119:22 120:4 **LINDA** 3:8 **line** 15:22 16:8 24:20 42:2 **linear** 19:11 lines 109:10 **link** 116:17 **LinkedIn** 78:3,4 links 16:21 **list** 7:3 10:20,21,23 10:25,25 20:1 29:25 52:18 67:2,6,9 70:19,20,22 88:8,8 92:12 112:17 113:25 114:21 **listed** 20:3 47:4 49:13 62:25 76:19 79:22 93:24 97:19 **listen** 43:16 listing 92:1 lists 10:12 96:10 litigation 122:13 **little** 11:18,19,24 25:16 35:15,18 36:17 37:12 41:13 42:4 57:1 70:13 88:2 121:12 live 36:25 locate 50:21 56:7 70:19 84:14 locating 51:4 **logging** 63:22 **long** 47:9 59:3 65:17 70:24 100:23 longer 24:11 26:17 36:19 39:17 121:12 **look** 14:15,18,23 15:3 15:9,20 16:1 37:7 37:17 39:4,5 48:24 49:2 74:13 79:21

81:15 83:23 92:4,8 92:25 97:22 102:3 105:12 109:24 112:13,19 116:16 117:2 121:7 looked 13:16 14:1 17:2 22:17 27:7 39:5,6 44:19 72:13 72:21,25 86:21,21 100:13 101:25 106:23 111:22 **looking** 37:24 51:14 60:24 68:2,6 74:8 77:19,22,24 84:16 93:11,15 102:21 103:21 104:12,24 109:13 120:8,19,20 looks 69:4 101:2 **loop** 22:21 lose 108:6 lost 42:5 57:1 106:15 **lot** 9:11 25:23 30:10 30:11 38:23 39:10 39:25 58:13 59:25 60:25 61:23 62:13 68:20 69:24 72:8 75:15 78:15 81:25 88:8 90:2,11 91:18 106:4 111:2 116:18 117:2,12 120:2 **loved** 39:12 lovely 95:6 **lower** 69:6,7,8,15,17 80:14 **lowest** 45:16 **LUGO** 2:11 Lynch-Walsh 2:4 5:5 5:6 10:9,11,13,17 27:22,25 28:4,12,15 28:18 29:6,8,11 30:1,2,4 31:2,9,15 31:21,24 32:8,14,23 33:4,23 34:7,13,19 34:25 40:17 41:11 41:16 48:22 61:14 61:17,24 62:10,13 64:5,11 65:10,16 66:11,13,18 67:18 69:1,23 70:2 71:4,7 71:17 73:3 75:17,21

75:22 76:4,16,24

77:10,16 78:25 79:7 79:17 80:2,18 81:23 82:6,10,16,23 83:1 83:8,12,18 84:4,12 91:14 93:1,2,3 94:11,12,25 95:6,12 95:16,23 96:1 97:2 97:5,10 100:5,17,21 102:11,16 103:4,6 104:11,15 106:1,14 108:5,6 109:8 110:1 110:8,15,22 113:25 114:20,23 115:3,10 115:12,13,14,17 116:18 117:7,17,18 118:4,6,10,13,18,20 118:21

 \mathbf{M} **MACRS** 38:18 magazine 39:5 main 90:19 **maintain** 101:14 **making** 12:15,16 36:2 36:15,22 41:8 44:18 **manage** 70:18 **management** 3:6 14:4 18:15,16,21,25 19:6 19:7,8,21 21:24 52:8,12,19 71:2 89:14 **Manager** 2:8,9,9,10 2:20 manner 27:14 87:2 manufacturer 104:6 March 9:11,25 14:20 22:19 25:4,7,10 26:7 63:16 64:16 93:21 100:18 marker 105:9 MARQUARDT 2:12 87:12,16,19 **MARTE** 2:15 Mary 2:4,19 5:1 6:1 10:14.14 62:1 67:19 102:22 103:2 112:4 112:14 Marys 103:6 math 37:23 matter 24:22 50:15 90:1 113:6,20 116:4

matters 7:13 13:6 36:10 **MATTHEW 3:7** Max 6:4 68:23,25 **Maximo** 2:20 6:3 maximum 18:14 19:5 **Maversohn** 2:2 4:2,9 4:17 5:7,8,17,22 6:9 6:23 7:8,14,16 10:8 10:9 11:7,8,12,16 12:24 17:25 18:4 19:18 21:15 22:10 25:21 26:1 27:1 30:2 31:1,5,12,17 32:1,13,22 34:22 40:12 41:10,13,25 42:21 44:3 46:17,22 51:11 52:4,11 53:8 53:14,19,24 54:10 54:18,21 55:7,17 57:7,25 59:14 60:12 60:20 61:8,14,22 63:21 66:11,17,20 67:1,10,17 68:15,24 69:25 73:6 75:13,18 75:21 79:5,7,9 80:12 81:3,22 82:21 82:22 83:5 84:4,6 84:15 85:10,17,22 86:13 87:7,25 88:4 91:4,13 93:2,6 95:14,17,24 96:2,7 97:1 107:2 108:5,8 110:5,25 113:16,22 114:7,20 115:12,13 115:18,23 116:11 116:17 117:15,18 118:18,20 119:19 120:11.24 mean 17:14 27:4 28:2 28:12 42:5 46:8 53:11,22 55:3 59:14 59:20 61:6 92:10 96:5,17 97:24 113:2 113:3,13 116:18 meaning 28:7 means 49:14,22 58:17 59:13 64:15 mechanisms 58:3,11 Medvin 2:2 5:9,10

meet 64:17 92:18 93:24 97:17,23 113:9 117:10 120:18 meeting 1:3 4:4,10 5:19 7:5,9,17,18,20 7:24 8:2,5,6,19,21 9:4,4,16,21,24,25 11:14 12:15 17:9,16 17:20,22 22:18,19 23:11,16 24:6,21 25:7 26:12,21 29:5 42:24 43:4,8,17,25 44:1,2 45:10,22 48:22 50:23 51:10 51:11,14 52:1 62:7 62:10 66:22 67:2,6 70:15 71:14 82:5 84:1,2,7 86:7 87:13 89:21,24 90:10 91:1 91:6,6 92:16,22,23 108:9,11 112:11,12 112:20 113:5,7,11 113:17 114:9,11,13 114:19 116:9,23 117:1 119:11 121:15,16 meetings 13:13,14 20:1,1,3 21:21 33:21 62:24 65:25 81:7,8,14 117:10 member 11:9 83:21 member's 8:20 9:15 members 2:1 4:15 5:18 6:25 9:2,6 13:12,18,19 90:11 92:13 93:7 108:12 111:5 memo 50:18 72:2,6 memorandum 71:15 mention 8:24 9:9 34:9 73:21 95:3 107:6 111:9,12 **mentioned** 16:7 48:18 59:23 70:25 79:17 83:15 101:5 102:13 112:5 mentioning 78:12 mentions 78:4 Meo 4:22 merchantability

108:10

105:7
mercy 45:3
MEREDITH 2:10
met 81:9 100:1
102:20 114:14
method 88:7
Miami-Dade 36:6
Michael 2:21 5:3
Michele 2:12 87:9
microcosm 37:8
Microsoft 1:16 41:6
mid 106:7
middle 103:15 106:2
million 61:2 68:5,7,10
69:7 72:7 74:22,23
78:5
mind 73:14 100:8
120:3
mine 28:3 31:3 47:15
minimizing 52:16
minimum 94:20
97:17,21 101:17
104:5
minor 33:8
minute 80:12
minutes 7:5 8:5,15
9:21,23 20:14 23:2
23:13,15,16 43:12
43:25 44:4 45:21
51:14,16,17 62:6,8
62:11,19,24 63:6,12
63:23,24 64:1,7,9
65:6,10,12,17,24
66:4,6,7,8 67:13
72:23,25 85:4 86:4
89:21 90:10,25
91:23 108:9 117:1
misleading 71:12
misplaced 62:17
missing 29:1,3 86:11
misstated 46:12
mistake 71:8
mistakes 54:23 60:19
60:22
misunderstanding
34:14
mitigation 58:25
mix 103:6
mixing 12:10
model 38:18 93:19,20
94:15 102:3 106:9

N
N22 93:19,25 94:5,15
94:18,22 98:6,11
99:3,16
N22's 94:22
N22s 100:9,23
N23 99:2,3
N23's 99:19
name 8:8 24:10 26:16
46:14 54:1 77:1,22
77:23
names 4:15 7:6 78:23
narrative 111:13,16
111:18
narrow 12:9 42:3
narrowly 79:19 86:21
Nathalie 2:4 5:5 91:2
109:5 118:6
nearly 38:13 80:20
necessarily 7:3 14:25
74:2
necessary 52:17
need 7:3 12:14 13:16
14:14,25 41:20
48:17 59:20 66:21
70:12 73:15 74:7,9 84:13 86:8 93:4
99:1 101:20 104:1
99.1 101.20 104:1

105:24 112:17
113:19 116:24
120:15,17 121:13
needed 7:20 8:1 15:8
34:10 81:10,18
119:12
needs 81:1 92:15
101:19,20 111:13
119:17
neither 112:18
122:10
nervous 73:18
Network 2:20
never 69:13 100:22
100:24
new 11:18 37:19,20
48:24 49:1 120:19
NEWMEYER 3:10
nice 37:17
ninth 37:21
nodding 87:18
non-touch 93:18
noninvolvement 16:2
nonresponsive 57:24
normally 39:20
Notary 122:4
note 13:15 16:11
19:17 26:2,19 33:16
44:10 46:2 57:11
84:23 85:19 100:10
109:22
noted 20:14 29:3
63:23 64:1,8 67:16
68:20 69:22 85:21
notepads 50:18
notes 23:14 25:3
109:23 113:11
122:9
notice 6:6 25:6 98:6
notion 40:2
November 23:23 24:3
24:11,22 26:3,17
number 11:5 13:11
54:1 55:7 71:23,24
75:22 87:10
numbers 35:4
numerous 89:10
0
object 88:6
25,10

38:22 75:22 81:24
82:21
objectives 15:6 33:17
34:9,18 80:23 81:5 120:10
obscure 69:17
observation 65:1,4
102:6
observations 30:9
obtain 44:23
obtained 36:7
obviously 7:9 13:1
25:11 40:14 44:13
52:7 57:14 58:24
59:20 63:2 65:14
112:16 121:3
occur 90:14
occurred 62:25 64:2
75:1
occurring 62:14
90:14 118:1
occurs 70:23 October 24:13 76:22
odd 64:25 65:3
office 2:7,15,17,18
13:19 45:5 110:12
officer 2:15,16,17,17
2:18,18 6:16 13:22
95:5
official 7:19
oh 26:23 60:10 62:19
83:14
okay 4:2,17,18 6:23
7:8 10:2 11:8,16,16
12:24 13:3 18:7
19:1,17 21:18 25:18
25:25 26:22 27:21
28:18 29:6,25 31:8
31:15,16 32:8,15
33:23 40:12 41:10
41:25 43:11,16,24 52:11 53:8,14 54:10
55:7,17 60:11 61:12
62:12,16 66:17,18
67:18 69:23 70:4
71:7,17 73:3 75:2
75:13,18,22 76:10
76:13,13,15,15,16
79:1,5 80:2 81:22
82:12,22 83:6 84:10
84:18 85:22,23

87:15 88:4 89:16,24 96:1 97:1,2 103:13 108:6 110:15 117:18 118:21 120:11 **old** 38:1 **omitted** 117:23 on-boarding 20:20 **on-line** 102:3 **on-site** 104:11,13,19 once 64:18 68:3 85:19,19 117:20 one-year 104:1,3,7,16 104:18 105:6 ones 84:2 **ongoing** 19:24 74:25 89:9 open 80:25 **opened** 24:3 45:23 50:14 **opening** 10:12 42:25 43:5,8,12,22 44:6 49:11 50:11 51:5 52:8 61:7 70:20,24 openings 44:24 **operating** 72:9 94:5 94:14,22 96:11 97:15,25 98:1,8 99:19 102:2 116:21 Operational 2:10 Operations 2:17,17 opinion 34:10,11 35:3 35:22 36:10 37:7,10 38:10,22,24 40:3,5 55:23 58:10 79:14 80:6,22,23 81:21 90:21 **opinions** 30:16,22 32:19 33:11,16,18 33:22 34:1 35:6,14 38:20 40:21,22,22 40:24 69:24 80:4,19 112:17 119:2,13 120:9 opportunity 12:13 59:1,10 **opposed** 14:16 66:1 74:8 **opposite** 106:17 **opted** 36:16 37:11 option 118:10,14

objective 35:1,2

policies 15:11 16:17 pricing 28:20,24,25 order 8:12 27:3,5,7 part 14:5,17 16:24 **person** 24:8,10 58:1 29:23 102:20 27:10,13 30:7 31:9 17:4 19:6,13 33:17 personal 37:10 40:21 49:18 110:14 31:16 101:21 38:21 43:20 48:10 **personally** 24:16 59:1 policy 22:24 23:1,17 **primarily** 8:17 14:9 original 39:4,11 49:18 50:12 53:1 84:8 44:10 47:2,12,22,23 106:22 64:20 65:5 71:10 persons 17:6 48:1,4,13,13,16 print 9:5 originally 106:11 76:11 82:4 84:1 perspective 40:9,10 49:16 50:2 59:6 prior 24:22 25:14 50:10 71:19 76:18 85:9 89:1,20 106:19 origination 75:4 pertain 62:4 65:9 **outage** 57:25 110:17 114:16 pertained 15:19 **portion** 15:13 17:23 77:5 91:6 outcome 51:3 122:14 participant 10:19 pertaining 55:1 86:9 priority 9:14 participants 10:12 pose 30:12,23 **outside** 78:23 pertains 110:2 **pro** 98:7 outstanding 21:10 70:21 pertinent 19:23 39:24 **position** 56:18,20 **probably** 4:14 11:21 overarching 28:5 participated 19:10 **Phillip** 2:18 5:20 95:4 positive 51:3 11:22 27:15 37:18 79:15 45:8 62:22 64:12 **phone** 87:11 possibility 108:20 41:15 46:7 67:3 **phrase** 101:7 overlooked 85:7 participating 5:19 **possible** 13:5 32:15 92:17 107:13 7:4 121:2 **Phyllis** 2:5 5:12 112:4 33:24 59:4 65:22 overseen 53:3 113:25 114:6 participation 62:25 pick 103:8 89:1 116:15 117:3 P 64:15 **picked** 61:1 Possibly 115:2 problem 61:19,25 **p.m** 1:13 43:21 46:4,6 particular 10:16 **picking** 113:20 **post** 16:9 65:17 84:8 98:2,14 48:6 50:14 53:23 14:11 59:12 63:18 **picture** 24:15 109:12 **post-award** 72:1,6 117:25 118:24,25 54:4 55:13 121:16 **problems** 24:8 61:1 74:16.16 97:24 piece 15:15 45:20 **posted** 62:6 pace 101:21 119:10 procedural 23:1 pieces 27:4 111:4 Pou 5:11 8:11 package 37:25 38:4 piggyback 34:24 72:1 particularly 25:13 power 57:20,25 procedure 44:17 92:15 115:22 75:10 72:8 **practice** 38:10,11 48:11,12 50:20 packet 115:21,23 parties 7:1 122:11 piggybacks 72:19 procedures 15:4 47:3,4 116:9 117:16 partner 17:9 pile 62:17 **practices** 44:12 53:5 30:15,15 34:4,15 Pad 98:24 **place** 27:3 42:8 43:9 parts 105:22 96:8 44:11 48:2,2,17 page 13:3 16:1,3,6,11 party 122:12 44:15 47:2.22 48:10 praying 51:1 52:13,18,21,23 18:8 31:10 42:7,8 passed 7:21 69:11 pre-bidders 50:24 48:25 54:15 56:24 57:16 73:1 74:4 42:11,12,13,14,15 85:5 90:19 120:19 51:21,22 79:18,19,22 81:14 61:15,15,18,19 62:1 patience 121:1 placed 8:2 **prepare** 57:15 96:8 119:4,8,24 62:4,25 67:19,20,21 **patient** 11:19 places 90:4 **prepared** 71:2 102:14 **proceed** 12:19 69:2,21 70:3,18 plan 14:3,5 16:21 patiently 91:15 102:17 proceedings 4:1 71:18 75:23 78:4 pausing 35:24 101:13 17:1 presence 9:17 45:9 122:7 80:8 82:9.23 83:1.6 PC 39:5 **planning** 2:21 16:25 **present** 1:17 4:16 6:2 process 2:20 15:3 83:11,23 84:18 90:5 pending 9:3 platform 1:17 6:13 7:7 47:21 20:9,11,16,21 21:7 93:5,6,11,12,14 **people** 6:24 19:13,20 **please** 5:17 6:19 8:7 51:22 58:5,11 23:6 30:6 39:16 95:8 98:3,4,16,18 58:8,11 78:17 83:20 11:10 68:23 83:3,10 107:19 43:22 52:8 56:10,14 98:19,20 99:1,1 91:24 97:17 113:18 99:2 103:1 118:8 presentation 96:15 64:22 70:6 72:3,11 103:13,15 106:2,3,7 120:16 121:6 **Pledge** 4:6,7 presentations 106:12 74:13 86:2,16 89:20 119:6 **plus** 112:6 107:14 perceived 91:10 **presented** 14:7 18:11 pages 16:15,20 62:2 percent 61:2 74:23 **PO** 67:24 19:3 32:6 51:18 processed 45:24 104:12.15 112:6 point 16:19 22:14 69:4 109:10 111:19 processes 48:4,9 perception 8:13 paid 98:25 Perf 2:21 26:5 39:14 52:1 112:23 113:6,8,8 56:21 75:6 96:21 **Panels** 13:17 **perform** 79:21 56:15 65:13 66:10 114:8 processing 86:6 **paper** 62:16 performance 78:9 69:22 71:16 75:20 pretty 37:10 112:7 **procured** 105:14 papers 57:1 107:15 79:20 79:3,8,25 88:25 **previous** 21:25 24:8,9 procurement 2:19 paperwork 99:23 performed 90:8 90:18 97:12 99:14 26:12 27:13 50:23 10:15 14:19 16:9 102:7,25 performing 90:24 116:25 120:15 74:18 76:12 19:12 37:19 44:12 paragraph 18:9 **period** 60:1 73:11 pointing 78:15 price 45:16 98:11 47:2,5,22 52:25 21:25 22:1,4 85:24 74:20 points 15:25 16:19 104:18 53:1,6 54:3 55:12 parking 61:22 periods 16:10 92:12 **prices** 54:25 57:17 75:5

procuring 75:6 **produced** 101:24 product 13:15 33:19 34:12 40:23 81:20 94:16 104:19 105:7 119:13 production 93:20 100:18 productive 38:3 productivity 38:1 105:22 **products** 16:13 35:9 104:15 professional 37:11 40:22,24 program 9:1 21:12 **prohibit** 34:1 83:21 **project** 14:1 27:13 78:5 promises 90:13 **proof** 45:20 54:13 properly 90:12 **Property 2:8 proposals** 72:18 89:2 protectors 36:20 **protest** 23:17,17 59:10,12,21 71:25 72:10,11,20,24 **prove** 57:3 59:17 **proved** 101:10 **provide** 39:22 45:8 85:19,20 114:12 **provided** 27:12 28:23 29:17,24 63:11 80:22 86:22 103:16 103:20,21 104:7 107:16 120:8 **provides** 103:24 115:1 providing 35:22 **prudent** 36:24 **public** 7:1,23 11:9,10 11:13 70:19 78:6 83:19 90:22 115:16 117:19 118:3,22 122:5 publicize 107:24 **publish** 62:11 published 51:16 pull 70:9 82:15,16 84:5 85:20

pull-back 37:7 **purchase** 41:7 61:2 73:13 88:6 100:15 100:22 104:2,22 105:4.21 purchased 16:12 38:6 68:8 90:23 94:3 99:4 100:22.23 **purchases** 13:20 15:9 15:12,17 16:8 36:11 36:14 60:7 75:24 78:14 99:13 100:20 purchasing 24:8,9 25:14 26:13 36:2 39:8 58:7,9 96:20 97:3,5,13 101:8 purpose 33:25 purposes 4:12 **pushing** 37:13,15 put 7:5 25:17 27:18 29:25 30:18 32:12 34:3 35:11 39:20 48:25 49:7,7,8 61:22 67:6,9 69:13 82:4,12 83:16 84:2 86:16 106:18 107:20.25 111:24 120:14 **putting** 84:8

qualifications 97:17 qualified 57:18 quality 16:13 33:18 33:19 34:11 81:13 81:19 quantify 69:16 **question** 9:18,20 10:10,21 12:21,22 13:1 17:25 20:12 21:11,20 22:13,22 26:22,24 28:6,19 30:3,23 31:1,13,18 33:23 35:21 37:8 40:17.19 42:10.19 42:22 44:3 46:17,19 46:20 47:17,18 51:10 57:8 62:2.21 63:6,14 66:12,13,16 66:19 68:16 71:18

73:4,23 76:23 77:9

0

77:16 78:19 80:14 81:1 82:14,20 84:17 84:20,22 85:11,11 85:14 86:18,18 88:22 89:9,10 91:5 91:10,16 94:15 95:7 95:12,15 96:1 99:12 103:10,20 106:9 107:3 109:14 115:10,11 117:17 118:9 questioning 80:3 **questions** 7:25 8:3 11:25,25 12:4,11,11 12:12,13,23 17:8 18:2,6 21:15 22:8 22:10 24:2,20 25:20 25:22 26:2 27:20,21 28:1,2,3 30:4,7,9,10 30:13 31:3,6 35:11 37:14 40:13,15 41:12.14.17 42:24 47:13 61:13 62:3,18 62:20 70:1 73:7 75:16,19 79:6 80:10 81:12,23 90:2 91:8 91:25 93:12 96:23 98:22 99:20 107:14 108:1 109:9 111:20 112:6,6,8,8,9,20,25 113:17,24,25 114:2 114:21 quick 22:13 73:8 quickly 62:3 64:19 101:21 116:2 quite 39:1 60:3 101:9

R R 1:22 2:20 122:4,19 RADCLIFF 2:12 raise 11:10 80:13 raised 42:24 100:7 108:19 120:13 rationale 55:24 RAYSA 2:11 reached 45:7 read 21:4 33:6 72:12 74:20 84:22 90:25 96:21 100:13

quorum 4:10 7:17

quoted 38:10

readability 107:23 readdress 12:7 readily 78:7 reading 19:20 54:5 55:3 72:23 88:5 ready 61:3,12,15 73:19 93:1 113:5,7 113:15,21 real 2:21 89:9 realize 115:7 really 22:2 81:1 86:8 88:13,13 91:17,24 93:6 96:14,20 112:10 113:20 120:2,6 reason 14:11,17,18 14:22 24:6 44:14 47:7 57:17 60:17 67:22 73:24 74:15 98:17 99:20,21 115:5 reasonably 117:8 reasoning 75:11 reasons 58:22 **Rebecca** 2:3 4:20 rec 58:19 recall 116:24 **receipt** 54:12 receive 8:10 11:14 43:21 48:5 96:9 received 29:14 36:23 46:3 47:8 68:20 70:8 85:25 90:21,21 95:18 receiving 52:13 recited 4:8 recommend 112:10 115:25 recommendation 14:4 57:10,22 58:20 72:17 85:2,15 89:19 105:11 recommendations 12:17 30:18 32:20 80:4 84:25 88:9 89:6,11 119:2 recommended 57:23 85:2 98:17 99:19

reconsider 86:8

record 4:12 44:1

46:10,12 47:23

56:11 95:5 122:8 **recorded** 17:15.18 **Recordex** 13:16 14:1 15:15 72:5 77:2 97:6 **recording** 17:21 44:5 45:21 86:5 records 44:23 117:19 118:3,23 recount 11:2 recourse 55:23 **reduced** 71:22 refer 53:19 **reference** 47:19 67:21 referenced 70:10 referred 90:4 **referring** 51:20 68:22 82:6 83:11 reflected 68:19 reflects 104:12 **refresh** 16:23 regarding 30:14 33:16,18,18 52:6 90:3 117:6 regular 111:3 regulations 59:6 reject 50:4 55:20 72:18 rejected 46:3 47:6,10 47:12 57:12 95:20 96:11 rejection 71:25 **related** 14:8 15:10,17 41:12 75:25 78:14 78:19 **relates** 35:17 36:11 43:22 65:4 107:24 relating 40:13 relative 122:12 relatively 101:21 release 89:2 released 26:3 relegated 105:20 reliability 103:25 104:3 relv 59:19 remember 26:6 **reminded** 55:9 74:21 removed 71:9 repeat 29:9 76:23 rephrase 84:20

rephrased 85:8 researched 75:23 54:21 55:19 56:18 replacements 103:24 resellers 105:8 57:7 59:17,20 61:8 **reply** 80:11 reserves 55:19 61:14 65:1 72:7 resigned 24:13 25:14 **report** 7:22 12:25 75:21 83:25 88:5 13:5,10,12,17 14:2 resolution 89:18 93:16 96:7 97:15 14:7,8,10,13 15:6 respect 8:24 16:16 99:2 102:2 106:1 15:24 16:11,20 17:1 110:1,5 114:20 30:25 31:10,23 32:5 respectfully 40:7 118:1 112:24 32:5,7 35:4 38:22 **respond** 4:15 18:17 ring 77:7 Schools 78:6 22:14,22 86:14 rise 4:5 39:16,16,18,21 40:4 risk 55:2 **SCOTT** 3:9 40:4 42:9 71:9 **responded** 56:8 118:9 76:12 77:15 78:24 responding 59:2 **Robert** 2:2 5:7 79:13 80:8,21,24 response 4:23 5:2,4 robust 36:20 37:3 5:13,21 10:19 18:10 82:8,9 83:9,13 92:4 101:19,20 **Roderick** 3:2 6:19 92:4,8,10 93:13 19:3 28:21 43:18 **SE** 1:10,24 52:12 60:25 62:20 17:9 **sealed** 53:25 97:9 100:11 103:11 107:19 108:21 63:7,19 70:12,15 **role** 9:7 111:24 113:21 71:2,10 82:11,24 room 1:9 59:7 114:7 118:25 122:7 83:9,13 84:11 93:4 Rosario 2:20 6:3,4 **report's** 77:13 95:2,4 98:3 109:15 68:24 90:17 **reporter** 1:21,22 3:3 109:19 110:3 **rotate** 105:12 8:5 87:3,4,22 88:2 117:17.24 **Ruby** 24:11 run 11:23 42:3 98:1 122:4,19 responses 10:24 14:5 90.6 **REPORTER'S** 122:1 28:6,7,13,17 29:16 sections 22:9 S **reporting** 1:23 3:3 90:9 sectors 75:9 sat 26:20 responsibility 55:10 69:12 **responsible** 57:6 78:5 satisfaction 90:8 reports 32:4,11 satisfy 45:6 119:5 represented 90:15 108:24 save 61:21 106:21 represents 88:15 responsive 57:6 saw 23:3 61:10 63:16 reputation 101:10 rest 109:2 112:9 80:3.13 request 27:15 29:9 **result** 23:18 **saying** 19:6 34:14,14 34:17 45:7 64:4 results 39:6 34:25 38:9,17 39:16 68:18 73:10 89:2 **resume** 35:23 43:19 69:18.19 109:22 116:6 retained 21:9 73:17,18 77:14 93:5 117:19 118:3 review 9:25 13:19 96:7 98:5,9 102:23 requested 9:12 44:21 15:18 17:5 20:8,22 103:2 70:7 81:24 92:20 21:6 40:5 43:3,4,11 savs 7:10 19:2 21:5 108:3 65:23 72:25 78:10 47:10 50:7 53:22,24 requests 10:23 85:18,25 88:24 54:23 55:8,9,18,22 **require** 35:6 81:21 89:20 109:23 seek 8:3 9:5 58:15,15 70:5,11,18 **required** 4:11 44:11 **reviewed** 15:8 23:13 75:23 87:17 89:5 53:16 28:7.10.17 43:7 100:17 103:14,15 requirement 7:18 45:12 64:9 65:17,25 96:23 103:15 104:13 22:25 43:20 64:21 85:9,24 86:15 **SEIFER** 2:10 **SBBC** 18:15.16.21 102:2 **reviewing** 23:5 49:25 19:21 89:13 93:25 requirements 15:19 91:5 **scanned** 110:11 55:21 88:7 97:21 revise 89:7 scenario 25:23 101:22 revised 57:9 111:3 schedule 54:25 rescan 110:12 **RFP/RFI** 64:21 SCHMIDT 2:20 research 25:2,5,9 **right** 4:9 7:8 20:6 school 1:1 8:4,25 51:2 33:1 45:16 49:4

13:14,18 20:18 21:9 117:5 22:3 24:12 26:18 sends 117:20 33:21 36:14,22 37:1 senior 37:22 76:19 41:7 46:15 50:17 77:6 78:2 55:18,25 56:3 57:9 sense 13:25 14:12 60:9 67:12 81:8 sensitivity 92:10 100:20 105:19 sent 25:1 40:15 46:16 64:7 68:21 73:9 83:20 92:1 110:2 scope 71:21 74:19 115:7 116:19 **sentence** 18:9 21:3 screen 83:17 84:2,13 84:23 screens 105:18 sentences 19:19 scroll 29:2 101:15 separate 14:2 **September** 23:15,19 76:21 **search** 84:10 116:12 **series** 117:9 **second** 8:20 23:22 **served** 36:9 95:17 99:12 117:20 service 1:23 17:3,4 Secretary 2:12 services 2:19 10:15 **section** 22:11 25:19 14:20 36:4 53:2,7 53:15 88:14 89:17 55:1 Services' 75:6 set 36:20 66:6 116:21 sets 63:12 security 36:8 45:4 **setting** 69:14 see 6:15 9:16 12:5 SHANBOM 3:7 15:9,25 21:16 22:20 **share** 53:4 70:7 81:25 27:22 28:24 29:2,21 82:19 83:19 84:13 35:23 37:8,20 47:19 93:8 60:3 74:3,7 82:2,10 **shared** 58:19 83:4 84:8 85:1,4,5,8 **sharing** 98:14 85:8 87:16 88:10 **Shaw** 2:5 5:12 9:16 90:17 102:20 17:14,20,24 18:1,2 105:17 106:22 26:24 27:1,2 46:21 110:18 111:15 46:23,25 47:1 49:3 112:21 113:1 114:3 49:22 50:14 74:19 114:4 121:14 91:13,16 92:9,24 seeing 12:24 21:22 108:19 112:4,5 113:3 119:19,21 seen 8:13 39:12 41:5 Shaw' 27:15 67:11 84:21 85:3 **sheet** 28:20,25 29:13 29:20 43:25 44:25 45:21 50:25 97:20 select 48:23 49:1 60:1 110:14 114:24 60:8 74:10 **sheets** 43:4,8,23 44:5 selected 14:17 73:25 48:22 61:6 86:4 selecting 20:11 **Shimm** 2:5 5:14,15 send 9:5 10:4 62:4 **ship** 93:21,22 98:6 **shipping** 94:1 100:18 98:10 110:19 111:1 111:4 115:20 116:8 **short** 36:1

1 41 02 12 100 10
shortly 82:13 108:18
show 39:5 63:25 65:6
93:14
showed 60:25
showing 39:7
shows 85:15 86:11
94:3
shuffling 62:16
shut 46:20
side 101:2
sifted 39:11
sign 45:1 56:11
sign-in 43:4,8,23,25
44:5,25 45:21 48:21
50:24 86:4
significant 7:21 15:15
15:25 16:18 97:8
significantly 35:5
signs 53:9
similar 100:10
simple 12:12
Simplicity 13:17
single 45:20 61:1
sir 55:16
sit 92:2
situation 57:17 59:8
67:4 68:25
size 52:16
sloppy 99:24 102:6
slowly 38:12
smart 15:14,22 16:21
72:5
smoother 42:4
software 37:25 38:4
98:1
sole 55:10
solid 41:7 101:17
Solutions 3:7
somebody 41:22
61:13 116:6
someone's 69:16
somewhat 72:4
soon 10:4 114:25
117:14
sooner 116:5
sorry 13:4,7 18:13
21:16 23:21 24:24
26:24 29:7,10 31:24
44:2 53:21 76:8
80:15 83:14,15
103:4 106:25 107:1
100100.20 107.11
1

107:3 109:5
sort 13:24 28:5 30:5
34:8 69:16 71:15
92:13 106:2 113:11
119:3
sounds 120:16
source 102:18
sourcing 52:25
Southeast 76:19 78:2
speak 8:8 11:10
28:24 46:21,23
71:13 97:23
speaking 5:22
speaks 31:21
spec 2:12 104:4
special 8:20 Specialist 2:11
specialist 2:11 specific 24:5 30:6
56:7 58:16,22 60:17
69:6 73:10,12 85:14
88:9 93:15
specifically 21:5 34:1
34:2 62:21 64:11
72:22 80:5
specification 19:4
84:24
specifications 16:5
18:14 20:4 21:23
54:24 62:23 63:10
64:13,25 83:2 85:1
85:3,16 88:10 89:3
94:17,20
specifics 48:14
specify 94:14
specs 93:24 94:6
98:14
spend 68:10 103:9
spending 101:3
spent 19:16 67:23,24
68:3,6,12
spirit 20:12,18 86:18
spoken 29:22 91:24
spreadsheet 94:2
102:9
SSAE 32:10 79:25
staff 2:7,14 6:10 7:23
8:18 9:12 58:8
70:18 78:11 86:7

stamped 54:17 56:4,5

stand 4:5
standard 32:17 34:5
55:14 93:23 104:7
standardized 70:5
standards 30:14,25
32:18 96:9 standpoint 23:1
99:24
stark 79:12
start 12:3,22 13:2
17:21 18:5 37:19,22
41:18 42:8 60:7
61:13 73:12 83:1
105:19 116:24
started 14:20 26:7
27:18 62:2 72:6
92:12
starting 36:3 61:15
105:17
starts 82:17 83:2
state 11:23 38:11
41:23 44:18 46:12
47:23,24,25 48:5
50:13 51:19,20 54:4
59:6 75:8 101:17
122:2,5
stated 24:6 26:12
35:1 46:5 80:24
statement 54:7,8,22 55:15 71:1 106:16
statements 27:11
states 16:12 19:2
44:10 50:6,8
statute 47:9 49:15
stay 105:15
stenographic 1:22
122:9
stenographically
122:7
step 36:12 44:21 45:5
92:7,20 112:13
Stephanie 2:5 5:14
steps 48:3
stick 50:19 69:25
79:18
stickies 50:18
sticky 52:15
stop 22:11 25:18 99:2
118:7
storage 101:23 story 52:23
Sivi y 32.23

straight 29:21 strategic 16:19,21,24 **Strategy** 2:16,17 strength 36:18 stressful 88:3 strictly 69:2 **stronger** 101:11 structure 15:21 student 2:21 3:7 36:17 38:2 93:23 101:4 students 37:16 101:18 105:14 121:9 **stuff** 67:8 94:21 117:8 **style** 39:10 submission 57:22 **submit** 114:2 submittal 53:10 55:8 55:21 submitted 28:14 29:17 53:24,25 55:22 57:9 86:24 102:8 subsequent 16:10 92:23 114:13 substance 119:15 substantial 39:23 substitute 99:15 successfully 12:6 succinctly 12:10 **sudden** 98:8 **suffice** 27:15 114:1 sufficient 59:22 suggest 30:17 90:24 115:19 suggests 109:19 **Suite** 1:24 summarize 30:10 39:18 **summary** 28:25 29:12,20 102:8,15 109:17,18 110:4,14 110:18 114:24 115:15 **Sun-Sentinel** 3:9 **Sunrise** 37:1,1 supplement 108:1 supplies 55:1 **support** 2:11 39:10 68:18

supporting 38:24 **supposed** 45:24 49:9 99:4 112:16 sure 9:8 11:12 15:21 19:1,13 22:16 23:7 28:23 29:4 40:20 44:22 54:12 56:2 59:7 60:6 64:6 76:24 84:20 87:16 88:23 106:24 107:15 110:10 111:7,17 112:2,7 113:2 Surfaces 41:6 surprise 76:16 survey 90:8 surveys 90:7,18 system 2:11 83:2 94:6 94:14,22 96:11 97:15,25 98:1,8 99:19 102:2 **Systems** 76:20

table 26:21 67:20 68:7 69:3,13 **Tableau** 106:7,12 tables 107:12 tablet 37:3,24 **tablets** 14:10 35:13 68:7,9 103:19 105:5 tabulation 58:19 97:20 TAC 18:11.22 19:4 19:24 20:5,7,9,13 20:21,25 21:5,18,25 22:18,19,20,25 23:3 24:14,21,21 25:7 27:8 62:19,21,24 63:24 64:9,15,19,22 65:4,7,20 66:5 85:2 85:15 88:9 89:10 97:12 **TAC's** 20:6 22:15 84:25 take 12:8 14:14,18,22 14:23 15:3,9,20 16:1 22:9 36:12 39:3 48:10 60:5 74:7 81:15 92:3,7,7 92:25 105:24

106:11 16 112:12	60:11
106:11,16 112:12 116:1,3,16	73:3
taken 44:21 54:15	82:13
takes 80:8 117:2	87:24
121:11	91:11
talk 10:16 23:14	103:5
35:18 86:1 91:20	120:1
103:11 111:11	120.1
113:11	theoret
talked 25:9 111:14	thereof
113:4	thing 1
talking 11:20 27:23	34:3
48:1 52:15 57:13	63:1
	82:4
82:1 116:17 118:7	
talks 22:24 48:14	118:2 121:5
52:14	
tape 43:17	things
task 32:7	38:15
taxpayer 36:25	48:7,
Teacher 2:21	66:4
teachers 101:19	73:20
105:13	88:8,
team 18:25 36:9	104:2
38:21 112:10,12	109:1
TEAMS 1:16	114:2
technicality 96:14,25	think 1
102:23 103:3	24:16
technological 36:11	26:18
technology 7:22 13:11,20 14:25	34:23
	37:9
15:13,18,23 18:24 20:7 21:12 35:17	56:18
36:3 84:23 97:13	65:3,
	70:2,
tedious 59:4	74:5
tell 18:16 21:8 23:10	86:2
24:2 68:6 83:10	91:18
telling 45:19 83:19	95:9
tells 38:16 98:16	106:1
tenure 13:21 14:18	113:1
terms 35:22 36:24	114:1
37:12 50:12 61:20	116:1
65:23 68:5,11 78:17	120:1
102:6 120:4	ThinkP
tested 49:1	98:13
texting 87:12	ThinkP
thank 5:16 6:17 7:14	thorou
8:22 10:5,6 11:5	though
17:13,24 18:3,5,19	30:5
22:23 30:1 31:8,16	51:9,
40:10,16,25 41:9,24	83:15
42:23 47:1 52:2	though

(0.11 (2.22 (0.22
60:11 63:22 69:23 73:3 75:20 78:24
82:13 84:18 85:23
87:24 89:8 91:1,3 91:11,11,16 93:16
103:5 106:1 110:7
120:17,23,25 121:1
120:17,23,23 121:1
theoretically 104:20
thereof 122:9
thing 19:22 29:11
34:3 59:23 60:16
63:1 67:10 74:17
82:4 94:18 103:10
118:23,23 119:6
121:5
things 11:24 33:8
38:15 39:20 42:3
48:7,15 52:14 62:14
66:4 67:4 72:13
73:20 79:16 81:18
88:8,12 97:11,13
104:23 107:4
109:13 111:14
114:23 116:7 117:1
think 10:3 19:19
24:16 25:2 26:10,10
26:18,24 27:5 32:25
34:23 35:8,9 36:10
37:9 41:18 42:13,16
56:18 60:7,16 64:25
65:3,4 66:9 69:1
70:2,4,12,25 73:4
74:5 80:25 81:1
86:2 89:8 90:9
91:18 92:4,5,10
95:9 97:12 98:24
106:14 112:18
113:14,22 114:11
114:17 115:9
116:10,20 120:6,15
120:18
ThinkPad 93:22 98:4
98:13
ThinkPads 98:20
thorough 78:10
thought 15:8 25:15
30:5 38:23 39:24
51:9,11 64:23 73:22
83:15 89:1 102:13
thoughts 81:11

three 37:18,20 38:1 59:11 63:11 104:9 104:11 105:3,9,11 105:18 112:25 three-year 104:5,13 104:19 105:9 throw 42:5 104:23 Thursday 1:12 4:4 92:16 113:14 115:21 116:8 ticketed 106:8 tickets 17:3 81:16 tie 77:14 93:12 tied 77:2 tier 36:16 Tim 8:6
time 8:3,9,20,23 9:15 9:15 12:8 13:9 14:15 24:25 35:10 36:15 37:6,22 41:24 45:24 46:13 49:10 51:13,25 52:20 55:14 56:20 58:18 58:19 66:23 67:5 71:5 73:11 74:20 83:23 92:6,9 95:7 101:18 103:7,9 106:21 107:2 108:22 116:1 117:2 120:18
timeframe 11:15 37:19 46:4 48:20 92:15 timeframes 8:16 113:3 timely 54:14 times 18:12 39:17 106:15
timestamp 49:23 55:22,24 56:9,10 57:12,18 timestamped 44:7 45:20 48:21 50:16 50:22 53:17 54:3 55:12 56:17,24,25 57:2,4 58:2 timestamping 50:17 timestamps 47:25 52:16 Timothy 1:22 3:3 122:4,19

today 10:3 27:20 56:22 58:3,12 84:21 86:3 88:18 90:16 96:9 107:4 111:8 115:3 118:17 today's 4:3 56:9 57:12,15 **told** 39:3 89:12 97:12 99:8 106:11,16 **tomorrow** 92:18 117:11 **Tony** 77:2,5 top 9:14 39:6 93:14 100:8 total 67:23,24 totality 86:20 touch 13:17 93:19 98:23 touched 71:21 track 29:8 106:15 108:7 training 9:1 transaction 15:21 transactions 13:23 transcribe 9:21 transcript 122:8 translate 115:15 transmission 8:1.4 **transmit** 116:16 transparent 69:5 transpires 114:3 **TRAVIS** 3:9 treated 87:1 tremendously 105:23 trick 29:18 tried 120:14 troubles 89:17 true 122:8 try 11:18 12:3 29:18 32:24 59:4 108:3 115:17 117:7,13 118:4,16 121:7 trying 12:8 25:21 27:18 29:8 32:14 42:3 50:23 52:2 63:4,8 67:1,19 69:16 71:22 94:10 94:12 101:13 103:12,14 **TSSC** 44:24 turn 119:21

Page 136 turned 51:12,25 53:23 54:13 56:8 58:18 110:11 **turning** 54:13 **two** 9:3 11:13 32:18 33:9 37:18,25 44:6 58:8,11 65:23 86:14 90:4 91:23 95:10 105:2,11,17 109:20 111:4 115:4 two-hour 112:20 **type** 32:7 33:9 61:20 **typed** 54:1 types 74:10 U **ultimately** 23:6 113:2 114:18 unclear 21:22 underlying 68:18 underneath 40:1 understand 31:12 33:25 45:2 46:9.10 49:5 54:18 69:19 99:3,11 102:7,22 107:8 111:22 119:25 understanding 19:9 52:20 75:12 unfamiliar 77:1

49:5 54:18 69:19 99:3,11 102:7,22 107:8 111:22 119:25 understanding 19:9 52:20 75:12 unfamiliar 77:1 unfortunately 44:16 51:15 53:4 56:6 57:2 82:3 unilaterally 19:11 unintentionally 71:12 United 3:3 unknown 111:20 unwritten 49:19 update 114:12 upgrade 101:20 use 32:20 35:13 user 90:12

vague 30:20,22 32:20 33:11 69:6 validate 45:12 48:8 56:6,23 58:8 value 8:19 variables 78:17 variety 15:4 17:5

74:11 various 18:21 27:10 79:16 103:23 106:8 **vendor** 57:11 58:10 58:17 **vendors** 16:4 28:13 28:14 29:16 45:7 50:21,25 51:22 56:7 59:1 85:25 86:23 87:1 verbally 114:16 **verify** 51:15 102:24 109:16,25 VERONICA 3:10 version 100:11 102:4 102:5 105:1,3 106:22 versus 58:10 68:3,5 68:12 119:23 **vetted** 90:12 viability 36:18 **VICE** 2:2 view 18:21 41:1 viewed 13:14 views 106:13 **virtual** 1:17 7:18 visitor 45:1 volunteer 63:3 volunteers 63:2 vote 7:11 88:19 90:1 **voting** 88:18 \mathbf{W}

wait 18:3 68:15.15 84:6 85:10 94:8 95:17 96:2,2,2 114:3 **waiting** 91:14 waived 56:1,3 Walsh 11:6 32:1,13 67:17 79:5 81:22 83:7 84:15 95:14 Walsh's 31:6,17 35:21 **WANDA** 2:12 want 12:19 21:16 22:24 24:13,20,24 25:18 27:22 33:22 34:9 35:2 44:9,13 44:17 46:1,9,20 48:11 49:14 52:24

54:11 56:4,19 59:9 60:12,15,22 67:3 71:7,8 73:16,18,21 73:22,25 74:15 75:3 81:10 84:19 86:14 88:10 89:19 90:25 104:22 107:6 108:12,13,13,25 110:6 116:6 120:5 120:24,25 121:1 wanted 8:24 9:9 33:17 34:24 42:17 43:2 54:14 60:15 80:5 102:18,20 107:22 111:9,12 wanting 65:4 wants 34:23 87:19 115:25 Warehouse 54:3 Warehousing 2:19 10:15 14:20 53:2,7 55:13 75:6 warranties 37:5 103:23 105:16,21 warranty 98:21 103:11,12,13,16,17 104:1,3,5,7,9,17,18 104:20,21,25 105:6 wasn't 10:17 13:9 38:24 50:20 57:18 57:18 67:25 80:9 82:4 83:25 107:11 **wasting** 36:25 watch 89:21 90:25 watching 11:22 water 105:25 way 23:9 32:25 49:5 62:5 64:22 66:21 67:8 68:13,19 69:3 69:14 71:11 72:5 75:14 84:19 88:16 91:25 108:25 109:11,13 112:21 116:13 117:4 119:3 ways 86:15 **we'll** 7:11 31:13 60:2 60:5 90:6 109:24 112:2 121:12 we're 8:14 12:16

21:22 26:23 27:25

30:8 37:16 45:5

49:6 57:13 58:16 60:16,23,24,24 63:8 65:19 68:2 69:1.4 73:16 74:1 75:9,10 77:19 88:18,24 91:21 92:6 93:3,11 107:25 111:16 114:15 116:20 we've 8:21 28:16 45:7 58:20,21 64:1 66:19 84:21 86:3 88:11 89:9 111:1 week 9:11 35:25 91:18 113:10 weeks 30:19 weigh 88:21 welcome 4:3 40:11 went 23:15 24:4,14 33:2 35:8 37:2,4,9 56:17 57:19,25 58:23 65:24 72:7 98:12 weren't 52:20 56:16 57:14 whatsoever 45:22 **white** 34:2 Williams 3:6 97:4 **willing** 108:1 window 86:22 101:7 101:8 Windows 94:6,20,22 94:24 98:7,17 99:5 99:18 100:2.12 102:5 103:18 winning 44:7 72:11 witness 58:6 wonder 99:22 wondering 88:15 89:14 92:13 109:1 Woods 26:20 word 64:14 words 30:19 77:1 work 14:24 16:3 30:6 36:5 48:3 66:15 72:21 79:21 95:7 107:15 112:22 116:3 117:12 119:16 120:1 worked 16:25 76:14 76:18,21 77:4,5,25

working 10:18 works 12:5,6 30:6 77:24 **World** 39:5 would've 39:12 wouldn't 30:17 47:6 100:8 **wrapped** 36:19 WRIGHT 1:8 writing 39:11 104:8 written 45:9 49:19 50:3 54:1 70:15 wrong 24:17 34:5,8 X Y **yeah** 6:11 13:7 26:25 28:4 34:24 40:19 50:8 61:24 67:10 68:23 83:5,5 100:21 103:13 104:11 115:22 116:18 120:7 year 8:21 37:22 49:7 49:8 60:2,7,8,9 74:6 yearly 75:8 years 36:2,10 37:15 37:18,21 38:1 60:11 66:9 74:9 95:10 104:10.11 105:3.9 105:11,18 **yellow** 94:21 Yoga 98:18,25 Yogas 99:15 \mathbf{Z} 0 1 **1** 31:10 61:19 68:1 80:8 103:7 110:16 **1:55** 1:13 121:16 1:59 58:1 **10** 61:2 74:23 94:6,20 94:23,24 96:19 98:7 100:2 102:5 108:9 10th 26:3,17 **11** 91:23 **11.9** 68:10 69:6 **11:30** 1:13 4:4

11e 93:22 94:19 98:4 98:18.18.24 99:13 99:15 100:24 11th 9:25 63:15 **12** 67:19,20 68:7 69:21 **12/8/2014** 64:2 65:13 **128-gigabyte** 101:17 **13** 16:15 42:7,8 61:16 14th 13:13 63:16 64:17 **15** 16:15 70:3,18 15th 32:11 33:3 **16** 67:21 **16-** 85:9 **16-059** 78:14 **16-059E** 14:8 20:23 21:19 23:9,18 73:1 **16059E** 64:10 **18** 16:1 32:10 33:5,13 75:23 79:25 83:1 **19** 16:3.6 32:10.10 33:5,13 80:1 82:23 83:6 84:18 93:11,12 98:3 **199** 94:5 98:11 1A 93:17,19 1B 93:19 98:23 2 **2** 18:9 68:1 110:16

2.52 38:16 **2/9/2015** 64:2 65:13 **2:00** 43:21 46:4 48:6 49:23,24 50:1,7,7 50:14 53:23 54:4 55:13 58:15 108:16 **2:01** 58:14 2:03 58:15 20 60:10 90:6 98:4 112:6 200 1:24 **2000** 60:2,4,8,9,11 74:6 2002 67:11 **2010** 76:22 2011 52:6,25 2014 23:14 65:6 **2015** 14:22 22:18,19 23:16,23 24:3,4,11 24:13,22 25:4,7,10

78:1,18

			1490 130	_
26.2 4 20.6 42.0 12	530 6 15.11 65.0			
26:3,4 39:6 43:9,12	5306 15:11 65:9			
43:17,17 45:3 72:13	5306-1 65:9			١
72:14,19 74:24	5306.1 15:11 22:24			١
76:21,22 100:15	5th 92:5			١
2015A 33:9	6			١
2016 14:16,21 16:14				١
23:20 24:5 26:7	6 16:20 94:22			١
35:12 63:16 64:17	600 1:10			١
75:1 89:22 90:16	633 1:24			١
91:1 93:21 100:20	64 98:7			١
116:23	64-bit 94:7,21,24			١
2016-2018 101:8	96:19 102:4			١
2018 16:14 39:7	6th 8:2 24:13 67:6			١
2019 35:12 63:15	89:18 92:22 113:5			١
65:25 74:21 76:21				١
2020 13:13,14 14:15	7			
60:9,10 63:16	7 11:5 13:11 94:23			J
2021 1:12 8:2 32:11				
33:3 122:15	8			١
21 23:15 72:18 99:1	8 94:23 98:17 99:18			
215A 30:20	100:12			١
229 98:24	80 74:22			١
22nd 1:12 4:4	81 61:2 74:22 78:5			١
23 103:13,15				١
23.8 68:4	9			١
25 16:11 106:2,7	9 13:3 18:8 42:11,12			١
23 10.11 100.2,7	42:13,15 61:18 62:1			١
3	62:4,25			١
3 53:15 68:2 75:23	9th 13:14 24:5 26:21			١
110:16	89:21 90:16 91:1			١
3/9/2015 64:3 65:13				١
3:00 46:6				١
3:30 46:5				
30 36:1				
32 18:8 84:19				
3320 15:11 44:10				
47:22 48:4 49:15				
33301 1:25				
349 98:14				
37 55:7				
3rd 1:10,24 26:4				
100:14 122:15				
4				
4 16:20 68:1 81:24				
110:17				
4/13/2015 65:14				
40,000 68:8				
49 90:9				
5				
50 39:17				
	•	<u> </u>	•	┙