

THE SCHOOL BOARD OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA
AUDITOR SELECTION COMMITTEE MEETING

KC WRIGHT ADMINISTRATION CENTER
BOARD ROOM
600 SE 3RD AVENUE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2026
9:21 A.M. - 10:35 A.M.

Court Reporter:
Timothy R. Bass, Stenographic Reporter
Bass Reporting Service, Inc.
633 South Andrews Avenue, Suite 500
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301

United Reporting, Inc.
(954) 525-2221

1 COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

- 2 MR. ROBERT MAYERSOHN (TEAMS)
MS. PHYLLIS SHAW (TEAMS)
3 MR. ANDREW MEDVIN, CPA
MR. ANTHONY DE MEO, CPA
4 MS. DEBRA HIXON, School Board

5
DISTRICT STAFF:

- 6 MR. DAVE RHODES, Chief Auditor
7 MR. MARK MAGLI, Executive Director, Audits
MS. NAKIA GOULDBOURNE, Manager, Internal Funds
8 MR. BRYAN ERHARD, System Support Specialist II
MR. DEREK TILLMAN, Executive Secretary
9 MS. BELINDA DEFOOR, Purchasing Agent III

10 INVITED GUESTS:

- 11 MR. TIM BASS, Court Reporter, United Reporting
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 Thereupon, the following proceedings were had:

2 - - -

3 MS. HIXON: Everyone please stand for the
4 Pledge of Allegiance.

5 (Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

6 MS. HIXON: Thank you. You may be seated.

7 Next, we'll have roll call.

8 MR. RHODES: So roll call, I'm going to start
9 with our Teams participants. And first I'll call
10 Phyllis Shaw?

11 MS. SHAW: Good morning. Thank you.

12 MR. RHODES: Okay. And then Robert
13 Mayersohn?

14 MR. MAYERSOHN: I'm here.

15 MR. RHODES: Okay. And in the room, Andrew
16 Medvin?

17 MR. MEDVIN: I'm here.

18 MR. RHODES: And Chair, Debbie Hixon?

19 MS. HIXON: Here.

20 MR. RHODES: For the record, we have myself,
21 Dave Rhodes, the Chief Auditor. We have
22 Executive Director of Audits, Mark Magli. We
23 have Belinda Defoor, representing Procurement
24 today. And then we have some other various staff
25 from the Office of the Chief Auditor that are

1 providing some support and as necessary their
2 identities will be made known, out of necessity
3 if only when we scream out their names.

4 But other than that, let's go ahead and open
5 up the discussion to begin with and I'll turn it
6 back over to the Chair. Thank you.

7 MS. HIXON: Thank you. I think I have to go
8 through here. So can I have a motion and a
9 second to approve the agenda for the February
10 2nd, 2026 Auditor Selection Committee?

11 MR. MEDVIN: So moved.

12 MS. SHAW: Motion, Phyllis Shaw.

13 MR. MAYERSOHN: We don't have a quorum so we
14 can't do it.

15 MS. SHAW: Oh, that's right, we can't vote.

16 MS. HIXON: Okay. So can't do that. Sorry.
17 Thank you.

18 Any public comment?

19 Okay. We can't approve the minutes yet, so
20 we'll go to the Overview of the Selection
21 Process. So, first, I'm guessing Mr. Rhodes is
22 going to do this, can you review the Rules of the
23 Auditor General - Chapter 10.800?

24 MR. RHODES: So I'll summarize because we've
25 all been through these documents several times.

1 But the statute says a committee has to be
2 convened, including a member, preferably the
3 chair of the board, and when this committee
4 initially convened Mrs. Hixon was the chair and
5 this group voted to keep her for continuity
6 purposes as the chair for this committee even
7 though there's a new chair that's been voted in
8 with the board.

9 The RFQ, per state statute, is supposed to be
10 vetted and ultimately recommendations and
11 revisions are made when needed by the actual
12 committee members. But for purposes today,
13 myself and Mrs. Defoor will be available to
14 provide some level of assistance to the committee
15 when things are being discussed with regard to
16 these revisions and changes.

17 The other thing is is that Mr. John Wesley
18 White will not be in attendance today because of
19 an emergency that came up in his professional
20 world and so we intend to pass on the recording
21 of this to him for any of the areas that are
22 important to what Procurement is going to update
23 and either provide back to us. So, for example,
24 if this committee gets to the point where they
25 reach agreement on what should and shouldn't be

1 included in this RFQ, we could talk about the
2 idea of whether or not when those updates are
3 made in the RFQ would we then send them back out
4 to the committee members so that they could look
5 at them and give their approval that this did
6 meet the requirements and the discussions that
7 were had and that way the RFQ could then be free
8 to be issued out to the public at a time after
9 that. And if that wasn't the case, if there's
10 further discussion, just another meeting would
11 have to be convened to be able to have those
12 final discussions before that RFQ could be
13 issued.

14 That's the -- that's the general version of
15 what it is that's contained in -- in the agenda
16 with regard to the auditor general's information,
17 the statutory information and the charge of this
18 committee.

19 So if there's any additional questions, I'll
20 be happy to field those. Other than that we can
21 get into the nuts and bolts of the RFQ.

22 MS. HIXON: Okay. Anybody have any questions
23 on that piece?

24 (No response.)

25 MS. HIXON: Okay. Then we will go into the

1 Development of the RFP26-089 - External
2 Independent Financial Auditing Services.

3 MR. RHODES: As a -- as an advisory capacity
4 I would take a look at the revisions that were
5 ultimately discussed and then summarized by Mr.
6 De Meo that is identified on the agenda down near
7 the bottom. Hang on one second, let me get to
8 where I can see what that document is called
9 specifically.

10 MR. MEDVIN: Suggested Revisions.

11 MS. HIXON: Suggested Revisions.

12 MR. RHODES: Is that it? Okay. So as long
13 as we can see that, at the bottom there's a point
14 breakdown that leaves Scope of Work Service 4.3.2
15 at a 0. I'm just making the recommendation for
16 purposes of keeping this consistent with what
17 would normally be seen by CPA firms that would be
18 responding to this type of an RFQ that we leave
19 some of the standard language from the prior RFQ.
20 Because these services have not changed much at
21 all. And even though some of the scope of
22 services have been feathered into the new what
23 was being called last time a methodology section
24 has now been identified as an audit approach
25 section. There's 50 points for that and there's

1 0 points for the Scope of Work section. So I
2 just think it may behoove this committee to, A,
3 include that language from the prior RFQ to make
4 sure that there's some continuity, and that it
5 also invites and include as many different
6 possible firms that might be interested in this
7 that are used to seeing and identifying their
8 scope of services. The points breakdown from 50
9 points in the Section 4.3.3 versus the 0 points
10 that are currently recommended in 4.3.2, that's
11 something that would certainly be the will of the
12 committee, but I just wanted to point that part
13 out so that this would not be confusing to past
14 participants as well as any future firms that are
15 interested in getting involved in the process.

16 MS. HIXON: Does anybody have any comments on
17 that?

18 MR. MEDVIN: Not to that.

19 MS. HIXON: Do you agree?

20 MR. MEDVIN: With that point, yes, but --

21 MS. HIXON: Okay.

22 MR. MEDVIN: -- I have a few other
23 comments --

24 MS. HIXON: Okay. Go right ahead.

25 MR. MEDVIN: -- if I may?

1 In reading this whole document over there
2 seems to be a lot of boilerplate items related to
3 diversity and that type of situation, which I
4 know has been there forever and I have no problem
5 with it. My only question, due to the current
6 political climate, are any of those possibly
7 problematic?

8 MS. HIXON: Mr. Rhodes?

9 MR. RHODES: This committee is ultimately the
10 group that decides that, the answer to that
11 question. And what I recall hearing over the
12 last couple meetings was that this committee
13 thought that that was a lesser weighted component
14 of the scope features that are going to be
15 included in this RFQ than what was previously
16 recommended by Procurement and their sub group,
17 SDDC and I think EDOC. But it was -- from my
18 recollection it was a clear change that this
19 committee wanted to put more focus on the primary
20 services that this is seeking to -- to solicit
21 and that the minority participation is still
22 there, it just happens to have less weight. So
23 it's not proposing that there would be less
24 participation, just that the weight of the
25 scoring would be less focused on minority

1 participation.

2 MR. MEDVIN: That's really not my concern.
3 I'm all for minority participation and we've done
4 it for years.

5 MR. RHODES: Mm-hmm.

6 MR. MEDVIN: But I just don't want some
7 outside influence or source challenging it.
8 Because that's what it is. I mean, there are
9 certain segments around that say we shouldn't do
10 any of that. And I'm just -- I don't want to
11 catch a problem with it. So I'm asking, is part
12 of the standard school board policy some of the
13 language that's in the document? I got the
14 feeling some of it was. I'm not sure. And
15 that's really my point.

16 MR. RHODES: Well, what we have, the document
17 that Mr. De Meo put forth for this committee,
18 again, summarizing other input as well as his own
19 input, is a recommendation based on that. But
20 this committee ultimately will be the one to
21 decide what the breakdown of those points are in
22 these relative areas for scoring purposes. That
23 will help ensure that the fundamental firm, the
24 primary firm that we get would be scored in a way
25 that this committee would see to be the most

1 important to get the best services for the
2 district. And so these numbers in my -- both my
3 opinion and my understanding were simply a
4 starting point for the committee to make that
5 determination.

6 MS. HIXON: I think his question wasn't just
7 about the points but throughout the document the
8 wording that relates to minorities and things of
9 that nature.

10 MR. MEDVIN: Right. Exactly.

11 MS. HIXON: And his question is, does that
12 coincide with the current administration,
13 federally, in terms of what we can and can't do
14 since they've gotten rid of the -- right; that
15 was your question?

16 MR. MEDVIN: Yes. Absolutely.

17 MR. RHODES: Thank you for that
18 clarification. And, again, this committee would
19 be charged with requesting that the procurement
20 specialists who are aware of what these different
21 bits of language are in the document and where
22 it's based on compliance versus where it's based
23 on current preferences, you could certainly have
24 them put together something that would make sure
25 that it's consistent, it's compliant, and it's in

1 line with the current climate that we're talking
2 about.

3 MS. HIXON: So we have Ms. Defoor -- Ms.
4 Defoor here. Can you speak to that? Or have we
5 changed anything in our other procurement
6 documents based on the way that has been worded
7 recently?

8 MS. DEFOOR: We have not changed anything
9 related to supplier diversity. For the EDOC we
10 have not changed anything. It falls in line with
11 what we've done in the past.

12 This did go to the committee, the EDOC
13 committee and they did vote for --

14 MS. SHAW: Also we have some hands up,
15 please.

16 MS. DEFOOR: We did vote for the 10 points.
17 We did vote for the 10 points or they did for the
18 supplier outreach -- diversity outreach program
19 participation. I would need to go back to their
20 committee to change that amount if the board --
21 if the members decided to reduce that.

22 MS. HIXON: And, again, I don't think it's so
23 much about the points there, it was -- the
24 question was, in the actual document do we need
25 to be concerned about wording regarding minority

1 business participation in light of the DEI
2 mandates that are coming down from the federal
3 government?

4 MS. DEFOOR: In my personal opinion we need
5 to be careful with how we word things. For this
6 particular RFP I transferred the common language
7 that we typically use, and that can be eliminated
8 if everyone wishes to take that out.

9 MS. HIXON: Okay. Great. Thank you.

10 Ms. Shaw.

11 Ms. Shaw, you had your hand up?

12 MS. SHAW: Yes, my apologies. Mayersohn had
13 his hand up first.

14 MS. HIXON: Oh, okay. Mr. Mayersohn?

15 MR. MAYERSOHN: One thing that I would like
16 to make is on page 12 of 65, Section 3.5, Price
17 Adjustments, it says that after the first three
18 years of the contract a request for price
19 adjustment justifying, blah, blah, blah, may be
20 submitted in writing 30 days before the third
21 anniversary of the contract. I'd like to change
22 that to 180 days, being that if the board decides
23 they don't want the adjustment or they don't want
24 the price increase, they have time to go out for
25 another bid. Otherwise, you're basically locked

1 in where if the vendor says, hey, in 30 days I'm
2 going to increase my price, you know, 2.99
3 percent, what does the board do?

4 So I'd like to make it as long as possible,
5 especially after that third year or before the
6 third year if there is -- you know, if the vendor
7 feels there's a necessity to increase the price
8 for years 4 and 5.

9 MS. HIXON: Thank you. And I think I would
10 agree with that, because as we know it takes
11 longer than 30 days for the board to get any
12 documentation back. So that would make it less
13 of a stress point.

14 Does anybody else have any discussion on Mr.
15 Mayersohn's change?

16 (No response.)

17 MR. MAYERSOHN: The other thing that I would
18 add to it is, this obviously is something that
19 would force either the vendor or the district to
20 make sure that this is done on a timely basis, is
21 is that if the vendor doesn't submit a price
22 increase request 180 days prior to this third
23 anniversary date, that they are stuck with the
24 price for years 4 and 5.

25 MS. HIXON: Okay. Thank you. Any-- anybody

1 want to weigh in on that?

2 (No response.)

3 MS. HIXON: Everybody's okay with that
4 change?

5 MR. MEDVIN: Yes.

6 MS. HIXON: Thank you. Okay, Ms. Shaw.

7 MS. SHAW: Thank you. Mayersohn took it a
8 little bit further than I wanted to but I totally
9 agree on changing it. I was going to make a
10 similar suggestion. So thank you on that.

11 I wanted to go back to the minority or what
12 is now the Florida-based preferences, because we
13 want to make sure that through the entire
14 document everything is clear. Because what we
15 don't want is for anybody to file any complaints
16 to the -- I think there's a diversity outreach
17 department or whatever in Tallahassee, but we
18 also want to make sure the document is clear and
19 it includes the Florida-based preferences versus
20 the women/minority preferences, which is what the
21 S -- I think it's SB 1532 noted. So I want to
22 make sure that that is clear throughout the
23 document.

24 MS. HIXON: Okay. Anything else?

25 MS. SHAW: Thank you.

1 MS. HIXON: Thank you. So Ms. Defoor, are
2 you -- are you aware of what Ms. Shaw was
3 speaking about?

4 MS. DEFOOR: Yes, ma'am. I can adjust the
5 verbiage so that it reads more in line with SB
6 1532.

7 MS. HIXON: Okay. And then, Mr. Medvin, that
8 would take care of the concerns that you had?

9 MR. MEDVIN: Yeah, I just want us to be in
10 compliance and I don't want any future problems.

11 MS. HIXON: Correct. I think we all agree.
12 Okay. Did you have any other things that you
13 wanted to see changed in here.

14 MR. MEDVIN: I want to comment on one of the
15 scope items.

16 MS. HIXON: Okay. Go ahead.

17 MR. MEDVIN: 4.3.2.1 right on page, I guess
18 page 17 of 65, the scope of the audit, and it
19 specifically says that it will exclude financial
20 audits of school internal accounts and the
21 financial account activity of the component
22 units. Component units will include all charter
23 schools. Now, I know in the past, you know, in
24 comments with the auditors we had talked about
25 this question of the charter school's audits and

1 apparently they're required to have their own
2 audits which were encompassed, I guess, in the
3 auditor's procedures. I was glancing through the
4 draft CAFR over the weekend and there is an
5 attachment that includes a balance sheet,
6 un-audited, of the charter schools, and the
7 balance sheet was a little over \$900 million. I
8 believe that now becomes very material, and I
9 think due to the fact that the charter schools
10 are part of the school board and it's a big chunk
11 of money, I think the audit should include some
12 part or procedures where they look at that in a
13 little bit more detail than making a schedule up
14 that I don't even know if they prepare it.

15 And, like I said, I didn't study all the
16 numbers yet, 900 million to me is probably a
17 material number on the financial statements that
18 the auditors prepare.

19 MS. HIXON: Mr. Rhodes.

20 MR. RHODES: Currently, we sign off on a
21 document at the end of their audit that
22 identifies that they will be utilizing the
23 financial information from our financial audits
24 of internal funds audits.

25 MR. MEDVIN: Well, I'm not questioning the

1 internal funds, it's the charter school portion.

2 MR. RHODES: Well, that was kind of a lead-in
3 to the idea that we also have found in the recent
4 past that we have a little less input and no
5 control over charter schools because they each
6 have their own respective boards and/or
7 management companies that cover several charter
8 schools.

9 So we can always look at the information
10 because they do have a requirement that they have
11 to provide us their annual external audit that we
12 can look at and we can take a look at some of
13 these things. Whether or not every item that's
14 included in what the charter schools provide us
15 would be included in this document, I think it
16 would generally be more of their overall
17 solvency, financial health, and I don't know that
18 every one of them has internal funds, for
19 example, again, audits that they're doing, much
20 less anything over and above what they would
21 normally put in their external auditor's scope.

22 MR. MEDVIN: Well, again, I'm not concerned
23 about the internal funds. I know your office
24 does it, it's statutorily required, and they're
25 controlled. And maybe the materiality isn't that

1 great, but, to me, if a balance sheet item is
2 \$900 million, that's material. The whole concept
3 of the charter schools, the school board it's my
4 understanding is responsible, however, they're
5 completely independently run, it's still part of
6 the same pot at this point. And I think it
7 behooves us to make sure that that audit explains
8 that, exposes that, and those numbers are
9 reliable. And from what I understand the
10 external auditors, other than seeing the reports
11 that may or may not be submitted by the charter
12 schools, do nothing and can do nothing at this
13 point. And I think that's -- I think that's
14 problematic and it could get worse.

15 MS. HIXON: Ms. Shaw.

16 MS. SHAW: Oh, hi, yes. So the problem with
17 the component unit of the charter schools or even
18 in my government where pension funds, et cetera,
19 where they have to do their own audits, and then,
20 of course, they provide a copy of their audit to
21 the local government similar to the charter
22 school providing a copy, we can't enforce them or
23 make them do the audit. Their audit needs to
24 stand on its own. And, unfortunately, there's
25 really nothing we can do. We can add additional

1 requirements from them in terms of the audit and
2 if there is an issue with their audit when it's
3 completed by external audit, then we may have
4 some recourse, but there's really nothing we can
5 do as a component unit, they just have to get
6 their audit done and provide us with a copy of
7 their -- hopefully, it's a clean audit, and
8 that's it.

9 So to increase our scope to try and have some
10 kind of audit done by us, by the school district,
11 that's going to be holding us up and creating
12 more issues for us than -- than anything else.
13 Really and truly, because this is a component
14 unit they are required to get an external audit
15 done. They're required to provide a copy of that
16 audit to the school board and I think that's all
17 we can pretty much hold them to as a component
18 unit.

19 MR. MEDVIN: Well, that's probably true, but
20 as -- from the point of view of the auditor, I
21 would have potential doubt of what I'm putting in
22 my statement. And I think that's where the
23 problem is. I mean, this is a significant dollar
24 amount as opposed to the whole balance sheet of
25 the school board, the school system. And I think

1 the auditor has to do something more to satisfy
2 themselves. If I'm the auditor, I would have a
3 problem with this.

4 MR. RHODES: May I?

5 MS. HIXON: Mr. Rhodes.

6 MR. RHODES: Okay. Thank you. Through the
7 Chair, the concern that you're expressing is a
8 concern that we have. But our lack of ability to
9 make this happen causes us to rely on the numbers
10 and their external auditors' reports. And that's
11 something that we've had to deal with for a very
12 long time.

13 Just to give you an example, if we go knock
14 on their door and we tell them, we want to do a
15 financial audit of your school and you have to
16 pay us to do it because we don't have the budget
17 to go out and do that, that's one of the things
18 that we've always had a problem with regard to
19 the charter schools is the, who pays for it as
20 well as what's allowable?

21 So I understand the concern about that and I
22 do share the concern, but at this point I've seen
23 the walls that we hit when we come up to that
24 point, so much so that -- and I just mentioned
25 this the other day, the Office of the Inspector

1 General, when they came with their interlocal
2 agreement, they had a list of exclusions of
3 groups and/or agencies or -- I can't think of the
4 other word right now, essentially, fundraising
5 groups that circle around different schools
6 because they're a part of it, the idea of it is
7 is that that ended up in a part of a list that
8 they excluded for the same reasons that I'm
9 expressing.

10 MR. MEDVIN: Well, it may be excluded, but if
11 I'm the auditor I think that may be a reason to
12 qualify my opinion or put some very significant
13 additional disclosures in there.

14 MR. RHODES: So we do look at, currently,
15 it's either 87 or 88 charter school annual audits
16 from their external auditors and we look through
17 those for various reasons.

18 MR. MEDVIN: Who's we? Your office?

19 MR. RHODES: Our office looks at those. So
20 we look at a report that's been done by another
21 firm and we rely on the opinions that they have
22 and the numbers that they include so we can help
23 to identify if a school is financially in some
24 type of trouble or if there is some other
25 opinions or findings that they list that might

1 cause us to have to take another look at their
2 sponsor agreement.

3 MR. MEDVIN: But, again, as the external
4 auditor who's not doing that, they're relying,
5 again, on you. One of the things I think from
6 what you're saying is, they're relying on your
7 office to review these things.

8 MR. RHODES: They're only relying on our
9 office for the things, the work that we do within
10 the traditional schools. Other than that they
11 would be looking at what is our --

12 MR. MEDVIN: Right. But I believe you just
13 said that you are reviewing these individual
14 outside audits done by the charter schools.

15 MR. RHODES: Yes.

16 MR. MEDVIN: And you're either saying there's
17 a problem or there's not, based upon your
18 opinion, but it's based on what they give you.

19 MR. RHODES: True. So we're relying on the
20 external firm and then the firms that we would be
21 talking about --

22 MS. HIXON: Right. But our external auditor
23 is doing that. They're basically -- because you
24 haven't put up a red flag about a particular
25 auditor, or if you have it's not material enough,

1 it just basically goes. And it's an item on our
2 balance sheet that's there and it's not audited.

3 MR. RHODES: So I would -- I guess what I
4 would do is recommend that there is language
5 updates that this committee believes would be
6 helpful in closing that gap. We would then be
7 able to find out whether or not that's something
8 that we could legally enforce. And that would be
9 the way that I would look at it to start with.

10 MR. MEDVIN: Okay. And if you look at the
11 draft copy we're all looking at, it's there. You
12 know, there's a schedule in there that, to me, is
13 pretty substantial. It lists -- you know, it
14 lists all the schools in a columnar form and
15 there's a total. So it's there and it's
16 significant, which leads me to my other question,
17 I guess, as part of the scope. I almost got the
18 impression in our meeting the other day that the
19 CAFR was the property of the external auditors.

20 MR. RHODES: I'm sorry, say that again?

21 MR. MEDVIN: That the CAFR was the purview,
22 the property of the external auditor. I mean, I
23 got that impression from -- from the talking.
24 And my understanding of the CAFR document is it
25 includes the outside auditor's report and

1 opinion. But then there's a lot of other stuff
2 in there which are unaudited and it's -- like
3 going through it quickly it looks like it's all
4 the same because the letterhead on the top of
5 each page looks the same, but a lot of it has
6 nothing to do with what the external auditor did.
7 But yet I got the feeling, and I thought I saw
8 somewhere that it talked about it, but I couldn't
9 find it, that they're involved with that report.
10 And I think that should be clarified, do they
11 have anything to do with that report other than
12 that their report is part of it? Because I
13 believe the CAFR as a whole is a product of the
14 school board.

15 MR. RHODES: Indeed.

16 MR. MEDVIN: Okay.

17 MR. RHODES: It is.

18 MR. MEDVIN: And so I think maybe it should
19 be clarified what their role is. Because I got
20 the impression just from listening and a little
21 bit of banter that we had at the meeting that
22 they were controlling this document, and that
23 they had more to it, and then in going through it
24 there was a lot of stuff in there that could be
25 certainly mistaken to be part of the audit just

1 by its physical appearance and a little unaudited
2 maybe in the bottom, and the comments, see notes,
3 see accompanying notes, which of course is very
4 important to any of the audited portion
5 financials. So to me it was a little confusing
6 and I don't know what the external auditor's job
7 is as far as that document goes other than to
8 say, here's our financial report. I'm not sure
9 what else. And it's just an impression I got
10 just from the conversations and I thought Mr.
11 Castaneda was very possessive of the document.
12 He had that in his hands and he was like, I've
13 got it, if you want it, I'll give it to you.

14 MR. RHODES: In its most basic form my
15 understanding has always been that they are there
16 to look at whether or not we have fairly stated
17 our financial positions and whether or not there
18 are any findings or going concerns that they
19 would want to report up to the board that
20 ultimately make it to --

21 MR. MEDVIN: But is that part of their normal
22 financial statement, which, of course, is there,
23 or is that additional scope of what they're
24 doing? And I think that, to me, seemed a little
25 gray and I think it should be clear.

1 MR. RHODES: The language that's in the prior
2 RFQ, I think, referred to that being a part of
3 their standard scope of work as opposed to some
4 additional scope of work. That is the primary
5 function of what they're there to do as well as
6 the --

7 MR. MEDVIN: Well, are they really supposed
8 to do any part of the CAFR other than here's our
9 financials, put it in there?

10 MR. RHODES: Oh, I don't think they're
11 supposed to be doing any part of the CAFR. I
12 think they're just supposed to be evaluating and
13 analyzing it.

14 MR. MEDVIN: It didn't seem clear to me.
15 That's my point.

16 MR. RHODES: Okay. I don't see language in
17 the draft of the RFQ that, I think, shares that
18 or mirrors that confusion, but if there is, this
19 would be the time for the committee to --

20 MR. MEDVIN: I thought I saw it. I couldn't
21 find it. I may be mistaken. But in looking at
22 the document itself, which will come up in our
23 meeting on Friday, I got that time feeling that
24 there's a little bit of crossover, maybe a
25 confusion in understanding the document.

1 MR. RHODES: So you're talking about their
2 draft report versus the language of the RFQ.

3 MR. MEDVIN: Listen, the RFQ, you know,
4 there's a lot more in there already than, you
5 know, than their report.

6 MR. RHODES: Okay. Again, from an advisory
7 standpoint, I would merely state that if there
8 are areas within the RFQ that that language is
9 consistent with what you thought that you saw
10 with the draft, that there would be steps made to
11 clarify and close those gaps. And that's -- from
12 my role, that's the only thing that for purposes
13 of this committee that I can recommend.

14 MR. MEDVIN: It should be very clear, the
15 auditor reports to the outside auditors, the
16 balance is reported by the school board staff.

17 MS. HIXON: Okay. Anything else?

18 MR. MEDVIN: No.

19 MS. HIXON: Okay. Mr. De Meo.

20 MR. DE MEO: You know, I think Andrew has a
21 point, and we raised this at our last meeting, if
22 it could be made clear to us how the auditors
23 arrive at their scope, and that is general
24 counsel telling us that the school board is not
25 responsible for those audits, and to make sure

1 that -- that Florida Statute 218.39 or 9(1)
2 doesn't apply to -- because \$900 million under
3 component auditing requires -- 10 percent -- if a
4 component is 10 percent or more you're required
5 to audit it. So it meets the requirement for
6 scope. The question is, what is the exclusion
7 that provides us, the school board, with the
8 authority to exclude it? Maybe it's the auditor
9 general. Maybe it's Florida statutes. But I
10 think our general counsel should weigh in on that
11 and I think the RFP, if it's not clear, should
12 properly refer to that so as not to cause any
13 confusion about whether or not these charter
14 schools should be included.

15 MR. RHODES: That review of that information
16 from months back is ongoing and that will be
17 brought to the next audit committee meeting. But
18 we can still reach out to general counsel and
19 have them provide some form of an opinion that's
20 more specific to the questions that are being
21 asked here of this particular committee.

22 So what you're ultimately saying is 218.39 or
23 39(1), whichever level you're looking at, that
24 applies to us and this committee to be able to
25 put this RFQ together; how does how does that or

1 does that not apply to the reports that are
2 ultimately provided by the charter schools for
3 use and inclusion in the analysis by this
4 external firm? Do I have that correct?

5 MR. DE MEO: Yes.

6 MR. RHODES: Okay.

7 MS. HIXON: Okay. Mr. Melvin, do you have
8 anything else. Medvin, sorry.

9 MR. MEDVIN: No.

10 MS. HIXON: Mr. De Meo.

11 MR. DE MEO: I'm sorry?

12 MS. HIXON: Your turn to talk about things
13 that you --

14 MR. DE MEO: Well, I see that the hand out is
15 here that I provided. Just a brief note. In my
16 email to Mr. Rhodes, we have a whole section on
17 which we allot or allocate, I forget, 25 or 50
18 points for mere compliance. And if they don't
19 comply, they can't audit us. I would assign 0
20 points to that and 50 points to Audit Approach.
21 In the guidance from the auditor general on
22 procurement of these types of contracts they talk
23 about Audit Approach. And they talk about making
24 sure that you give proper weight to the Audit
25 Approach and the Qualifications and Experience.

1 And that's where I think the weight of these
2 points should be.

3 And so I think I provided, I think -- yeah, I
4 did provide. You can see what I provided,
5 Proposer's Experience, 20 points; Scope of Work,
6 0. They either meet it or they -- they're CPAs,
7 they're licensed, they have a clean -- if they
8 don't, they can't audit us. So Scope of Work, I
9 think, should be reduced to 0, unless there's a
10 couple of items in there that could be a
11 differentiator with regard to proposers.

12 Audit Approach, on the other hand, and which
13 encompasses -- Audit Approach and Proposer's
14 Experience I've weighted 70 percent in total. I
15 think that's important.

16 And we did talk about Supplier Diversity
17 Outreach, that we thought perhaps that -- and I
18 don't know what the term for that is now, but I
19 think we talked about relegating that to 10
20 percent.

21 So you can see my thoughts, they're on paper,
22 and I'm happy to discuss them any further with
23 anyone.

24 MS. HIXON: Is there anybody who would like
25 to weigh in on Mr. De Meo's suggestions?

1 I know that Mr. Rhodes had some thoughts.

2 MR. RHODES: My only concern was, because
3 when I looked at your revisions and
4 recommendations for revisions, I felt like I saw
5 Scope items that were basically peppered and
6 feathered through the Approach or Methodology
7 items that you were talking about.

8 However, with firms responding to our
9 district, Palm Beach, Miami-Dade, just for
10 example, I think that they're going to pretty
11 typically see something that's referenced and
12 scored in the area of Scope of Work. And just to
13 make sure that we don't alienate other potential
14 firms or vendors from participating in the
15 process, I think we might want to consider, even
16 though we provide a smaller amount of weight with
17 the points that would be there, there may be a
18 need for us to include some basic level of Scope
19 of Work that they would comply with and provide
20 in their proposals so that we would be able to
21 understand what level of score that they would
22 get based on whatever that amount would have been
23 set aside for.

24 MR. DE MEO: I'm sorry. Through the Chair?
25 I don't have a problem with that except that, you

1 know, it's been a while since I've read that and
2 I don't know where that is, what is it Section 2
3 or 3?

4 MR. RHODES: It's 4.3.2 which is page 4
5 before the Audit Approach section that you've
6 identified.

7 MR. DE MEO: So is there anything in there --
8 there's a table, it says, yes, can fully comply,
9 no, cannot fully comply. If they can't fully
10 comply can they -- do they qualify to audit us?

11 MR. RHODES: According to this, depending on
12 which area you do or do not comply with can be a
13 fatal flaw. We've had that happen before where
14 something was identified as a fatal flaw and then
15 after legal looked and opined on it they
16 identified that it was not, in fact, a fatal
17 flaw.

18 But one of the points that you and I had
19 discussed at one point was the idea of making
20 this more of a narrative and less of a pass/fail
21 table. And so my point was really more like
22 looking at 4.3.2 and capturing the narrative that
23 is above the table and identifying have the firms
24 provided the documentation that complies with
25 that for them to at least declare their Scope of

1 Services. And let's say, for example, going back
2 to your table and some of the scoring numbers
3 that you laid out, say that that's worth 5 or 6
4 points for them to lay out the table of what
5 their Scope of Services is going to be, which is
6 then called out in more detail in the language
7 that you put in 4.3.3 where you've identified a
8 Methodology or an audit Approach, whichever it
9 turns out to be called, which would certainly be
10 worth more points because based on the way you
11 described it before and the way the committee
12 discussed it before, it made sense that those are
13 the things that this committee is desiring to see
14 out of any firms that would be responding to an
15 RFP or RFQ that we would put out for them.

16 MR. DE MEO: Yeah, I see a couple of
17 discretionary items, but, you know, if you think
18 we should weight some points for that, that's
19 fine. I think it should be small because, for
20 example, one area that we might engage someone
21 even if they said, no, they could not fully
22 comply is they couldn't -- couldn't be completed
23 by November 15th. If we thought that was
24 unreasonable, you know, that is within our
25 discretion as long as they meet the six months or

1 whatever that deadline is.

2 All right. Same thing with the Awardee
3 keeping abreast of new and upcoming accounting
4 standards, a narrative about how they would do
5 that might distinguish one firm from another.

6 So I'm open for that.

7 MR. RHODES: Now, I wanted to ask Ms. Defoor,
8 is there the ability within this table to make
9 certain items pass-or-fail items or are they all
10 pass-or-fail items?

11 MS. DEFOOR: Typically, what we do is the
12 committee, the evaluation committee members, if
13 it's a "no" type line item, then they're
14 disqualified. If it's a wishy-washy one, then
15 they'll reduce the points that they apply to this
16 section.

17 MR. RHODES: So, with that in mind, my point
18 was, the ones that are definitely pass/fail
19 should be called pass/fail.

20 MR. DE MEO: Yeah.

21 MR. RHODES: The others should be identified
22 as those that could result in a certain level of
23 points that would have been available for that
24 area. And then we have a fair playing field for
25 everybody who's looking at it and they understand

1 it, as well as we get the ability to understand
2 their version of the scope. Because I agree with
3 you, if you can't get the report done by November
4 15th and that's what's stated in here, then that
5 could be a pass/fail because we need this done by
6 this point in time. Or maybe we have that and
7 then a request for an extension, because in some
8 cases, like this year and last year, we had
9 situations where it went further because of some
10 action this group was taking that was causing
11 some pause on their part as well as this year the
12 fact that the reassignment of the contract was
13 done so late it created some unnecessary hardship
14 for the group trying to get it done in time.

15 So we might want to look at it and say, it's
16 a pass or fail, but there's a possibility of
17 adding, at the agreement of both parties, some
18 extension in that area.

19 MS. HIXON: If you look at it there's six
20 items in there, so if we made it 6 points they
21 could have a point for each item and then you
22 could reduce the other one to 44 points. So the
23 Scope 6 and Audit Approach 44.

24 MR. DE MEO: That makes sense.

25 MR. RHODES: My follow-up question to that

1 would be based on looking at the document that --
2 that you had provided us, Mr. De Meo. Would that
3 mean that it would be 44 points for the
4 Methodology, which is what they renamed the title
5 in the working RFP, 44 points for that and 6
6 points for Scope?

7 MR. DE MEO: Yeah. And perhaps within the
8 Scope some of those would be 0 because they have
9 to comply. They have to comply with 218.39, they
10 have to be CPAs. But like the date, the 15th,
11 you know, 6 points I think in that area makes
12 sense, and just in how you allocate it.

13 MR. RHODES: So, Ms. Defoor, would we -- I'm
14 kind of repeating this now that we have a little
15 bit more clarity. Would we be able to make clear
16 notes on this, which are the pass and fails, like
17 do you or do you not have a CPA versus those
18 where we'd be looking at a date sensitive time or
19 something else that is a variance of those 6
20 points that they get?

21 MS. DEFOOR: It would be very easy to make
22 two charts, one that is patterned after the
23 current yes or no and then make the second chart
24 pass/fail. I just need to know which of those
25 six bullets need to be the pass/fail.

1 MR. RHODES: From your list can we get that
2 and the existing RFP proposal or draft? Can we
3 get from those six items that are in there which
4 ones that this committee would identify as being
5 pass/fail versus something that could be scored?

6 MR. DE MEO: Yeah, I think it's pretty -- I
7 think that 4.3.2.1 is pass/fail; right?

8 I think 4.3.2.2, I don't think there's any
9 wiggle room there. I think they have to -- a
10 management letter is required by statute and by
11 professional pronouncements. So, you know, the
12 recommendations are not required, but they're
13 typical.

14 4.3.2.3 the 15th is a date that I think we
15 impose. It makes sense to me, but I don't think
16 it is statutory. So that could be discretionary,
17 you know.

18 MR. RHODES: And I'm just asking that Ms.
19 Defoor go ahead and make notes of these things so
20 that the updated draft or the first version
21 that's intended to go out with approval of this
22 committee would be on point with what it is
23 you're looking at.

24 MR. DE MEO: And then 4.3.2.4 with regard to
25 the single audit, single audit's required, unless

1 it's waived. It's either got to be done by the
2 auditor general or by us, so that's kind of a
3 mandatory, I think.

4 4.3.2.5 I think is discretionary. That's
5 where somebody could distinguish themselves about
6 how they keep abreast. Do they do internal
7 education; how do they keep their auditors up to
8 date and so on?

9 4.3.2.6 is also discretionary, I think.
10 That's another place where there might be a
11 qualitative difference between a firm or firms,
12 you know, the size of the firm and so on.

13 That's how I see it. I don't know if that
14 helps.

15 MS. HIXON: Mr. Mayersohn.

16 MR. MAYERSOHN: So I guess --

17 MS. HIXON: We can't hear you.

18 MR. MAYERSOHN: Can you hear me now?

19 MS. HIXON: No.

20 MR. MAYERSOHN: No?

21 MS. HIXON: You sound like you're in a
22 tunnel.

23 MR. MAYERSOHN: Can you hear me now?

24 MS. HIXON: Yeah, that's better.

25 MR. MAYERSOHN: I'm in Tallahassee in a

1 tunnel.

2 MR. DE MEO: Did you spill your mimosa again
3 on the speaker or what?

4 MR. MAYERSOHN: Yeah, on the computer. But I
5 guess in response to Mr. De Meo's point, is he
6 looking for just a check, fully comply or not
7 fully comply, or is it something that could be a
8 narrative? So if somebody is -- if there's
9 wiggle room for something I would like to see
10 what the response is from a narrative perspective
11 than necessarily from a check or not a check.

12 The other thing is raising the point total of
13 something, like when I say the cost, you know,
14 somebody could be, again, if the numbers were
15 allowable points for cost of service, if firms
16 are equally qualified but one firm accelerates
17 over another in different areas, but their cost
18 is higher, it may end up that they may be the top
19 ranked firm even though their cost is a higher
20 element. So that's my concern about trying to
21 make those maximum points for Cost for Service,
22 maybe 30 points, maybe 25 points, but something a
23 little higher than just 20 points because it
24 seems that that would be where we're not
25 considering it a valuable entity. So that's just

1 my commentary.

2 MS. HIXON: Okay. Does anybody have thoughts
3 on that?

4 MS. DEFOOR: It would be very easy for me,
5 once I separate the charts, to detail out on the
6 -- the ones that are discretionary, that they
7 could write something with regards to that so
8 that you would get your explanation.

9 MS. DIXON: Would that be on the ones that
10 are the pass/fail; because I think that's what he
11 was saying. If we're not going to give points to
12 the section, he'd still like to see some kind of
13 narrative about whether -- like why did they
14 comply or why did they not comply.

15 MR. RHODES: So, in other words, if he wants
16 more weight to be on the Cost of Services that
17 would necessarily take some points away from a
18 different area and that would mean the discussion
19 would be based on what other area would those
20 points come from; is that what I'm hearing?

21 MS. HIXON: Yeah, well, there was two -- Mr.
22 Mayersohn brought up two points. One was, if
23 we're doing the pass/fail, he'd still like them
24 to have to write a narrative even if they weren't
25 being scored on it to know why they -- why yes or

1 why no. And then the second point was that he
2 felt Cost of Services should be a higher number.

3 MR. RHODES: So in addition to the way you
4 were talking about changing up and separating out
5 those tables, is there an ability to put an area
6 where a narrative for a no or for a yes, I think
7 more particularly it was pointing at a no, where
8 that could be used to identify any circumstances
9 that might support why there's a no and if that's
10 something that could be scored or -- because if
11 it's a pass or fail, I'm not seeing or
12 understanding how it would be auditable. If
13 you've already failed but you gave some level of
14 explanation that wouldn't -- that wouldn't be
15 persuasive for me to continue to go in and audit
16 the response. And I'm just going to say --

17 MR. MAYERSOHN: Yeah, if I could -- if I
18 could just interject on that? I'm not looking
19 for -- the ones that are pass/fail to me are very
20 simple. Either you pass or you fail, we don't
21 need a narrative. But the ones that -- that we
22 kind of look and say, okay, it's important, but,
23 you know, maybe you fully can't comply and
24 there's a reason for it, I'd like to see some
25 sort of narrative. Or that you can fully comply,

1 maybe a narrative that would, you know, provide
2 you more of an explanation of, yeah, we can
3 definitely get you this on time, here's our way
4 to communicate from a deadline. You know, our
5 goal is to communicate any changes 60 days in
6 advance if we're having difficulty. That would
7 kind of help, at least from my perspective, maybe
8 judge and rate a potential vendor of, you know,
9 how they do it could be a benefit to the district
10 and give them, you know, two more points than
11 somebody else who just wrote no or yes.

12 MR. RHODES: From a functional standpoint is
13 that both possible and has that type of
14 information been captured in RFP responses in the
15 past?

16 MS. DEFOOR: Yes, we can do that. That's not
17 a problem. And on a few of my RFPs, or RFQs, or
18 RFIs I have done it where they can write a
19 narrative for each bullet. That way we know
20 exactly where they stand.

21 MS. HIXON: Okay. So if we make that section
22 6 points, that means each of the three would be
23 worth 2 points apiece. There are six items in
24 there, three we said were pass/fail, three could
25 be awarded points. So that would be 2 points for

1 each of those three.

2 And then Mr. Mayersohn wanted Cost of
3 Services to be higher than 20. So any
4 suggestions on where we would -- what we would
5 reduce to make that?

6 And, Mr. Mayersohn, did you have a thought on
7 what you wanted that number to be?

8 MR. MAYERSOHN: I mean, again, I would like
9 to see it to be 30 points. But I don't know
10 where -- you know, I don't have any thoughts of
11 where we take it from. Do we take it from, you
12 know, Methodology? Do we take it from, you know,
13 somewhere else? That, I have not -- I don't
14 have an -- I hate to say I don't have an opinion
15 of, but -- is Supplier Diversity Outreach
16 Program, is that 15? Is that -- is that
17 something that can be changed to maybe 10?

18 MS. HIXON: It's 10. It's already 10.

19 MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. But it says 15 on
20 here.

21 MS. HIXON: I think we heard Ms. Defoor say
22 that the committee met and they agreed to 10.

23 MS. DEFOOR: To 10; yes. I can go back to
24 the EDOC committee and see if they will reduce it
25 if -- if everyone wants me to.

1 MR. DE MEO: Madam Chair? Although in -- in
2 other forums and circumstances I think Bob's
3 point is something I would agree with, that you
4 want -- compensation, cost is important.

5 The auditor, the GFOA, refers to this issue,
6 how difficult it is to find auditors for school
7 districts because, for a lot of reasons, it's
8 complex, there's only a few firms that -- really
9 good firms that do it. And, you know, and school
10 districts are looking for the lowest costs
11 possible. So you eliminate a lot of bidders.

12 So if you've got qualified firms and then you
13 attribute -- if you have a firm that is not as
14 good as another firm but they lowball the cost,
15 they could sneak in. And I think we should -- I
16 think the reality is is that cost is not as
17 important a factor as the Audit Approach. And I
18 wouldn't call it Methodology. They refer in the
19 GFOA and the guidance from the auditor general as
20 Audit Approach. And so I think that's important.

21 So I would leave it where it's at, but, you
22 know, if you want to raise it, that's fine. I
23 don't think it's going to matter.

24 MS. HIXON: So if I make a suggestion, a
25 compromise, we have Audit Approach down to 44, if

1 we made that 40 and the Cost of Services 24,
2 that's kind of a compromise in between. It goes
3 up a little bit but it doesn't take that much
4 away.

5 MR. MAYERSOHN: Madam Chair, you can take off
6 -- the Supplier & Diversity Outreach is now 10.
7 You can take that 5 and put it in the Cost of
8 Service, so that's 25.

9 MS. HIXON: Well, not based on -- so if you
10 look at what Mr. De Meo put out, so it was
11 Proposer's Experience & Qualifications was 20;
12 Scope of Work was 0, which we now made to 6;
13 Audit Approach was 50, which is now 44; Cost of
14 Services was 20, and then Supplier Outreach
15 Program Participation was 10. So on his proposal
16 of changes he already had it down to 10. So
17 that's the numbers I'm looking at.

18 So if you left the Proposer's Experience &
19 Qualifications as 20; Scope of Work was at 6; if
20 you made the Audit Approach 40, you could make
21 Cost of Services 24 and leave the Supplier
22 Diversity Outreach at 10, which would give you
23 100.

24 MR. MAYERSOHN: I'm good with that.

25 MS. HIXON: Okay. Anybody else have a

1 concern about that or everybody's okay with that?

2 (No response.)

3 MS. HIXON: Okay. Does anybody have any
4 other -- Mr. De Meo, did you have anything else
5 you wanted to add?

6 MR. DE MEO: No. I would refer, though --
7 I'm sorry, I have to put my glasses on to see
8 your name. That's what happens when you get to
9 be a geezer like me.

10 Okay, Belinda, so if you look at G -- the
11 Auditor Selection Guidance under Florida Auditor,
12 page 6 -- page 7, Technical Qualifications, it
13 says the GFOA Handbook indicates that if a point
14 system is used to evaluate proposals, total point
15 should be divided between two categories for
16 technical qualifications or proposers, one,
17 expertise and experience, which we covered, and,
18 two, Audit Approach. And that's -- so that's the
19 basis of that terminology that I suggest; okay?
20 But I don't have --

21 MS. DEFOOR: May I ask what page that was
22 again?

23 MR. DE MEO: Yeah, that's page 6 -- scusi,
24 page 7 of the Auditor Selection Guidance,
25 floridaauditor.gov. And that was something

1 referenced, I believe, in what Mr. Rhodes sent
2 out. But if you need that reference I'll provide
3 it.

4 MS. DEFOOR: Okay.

5 MR. DE MEO: Yeah. And I'm okay with the
6 allocation of points as you --

7 MS. HIXON: Great. Anybody else?

8 I will go through what I heard, just to
9 review.

10 MR. RHODES: May I just ask for a
11 clarification while we're still on this?

12 So in the current draft that we have, the
13 section that's called Methodology, based on what
14 he was requesting, would now be Audit Approach?

15 MS. DEFOOR: Audit Approach; right.

16 MR. RHODES: And then the other thing was the
17 idea of the points being updated and then also I
18 can get with you after the meeting so that I can
19 walk you to our site which would show you the
20 very document he was talking about where he was
21 reading off of that page because that's on our
22 electronic agenda. It's kind of hard to find now
23 because they kind of changed where everybody is.
24 So I can walk you through that and you can see
25 that document yourself.

1 MS. DEFOOR: Wonderful.

2 MR. RHODES: Sorry about that. Thank you.

3 MS. HIXON: Okay. So just to make sure I
4 caught everything, first, page 12 of 65 we're
5 going to change 30 days to 180 days and also
6 indicate that if the vendor doesn't submit the
7 price change within those 180 days they can't
8 change the price for years 4 and 5.

9 Also, we're going to go through the document
10 and make sure that it's referencing Florida-based
11 preferences, as opposed to indicating diversity.

12 On page 17 of 65 there was a concern
13 regarding excluding charter schools. So if we
14 are going to exclude them we want to make sure
15 that we include the statute that says we're
16 allowed to exclude them.

17 There were some CAFR concerns. I don't know
18 what that means, but -- so we're going to look at
19 that. I don't think it was in this document,
20 though.

21 We're going to change the points for Scope of
22 Work to 6 points, which then reduces Audit
23 Approach to 40 and then Cost of Services will go
24 up to 30. And we're going to have two charts in
25 the Scope of Work, one that's just a pass/fail

1 that has three items. There are three other
2 items that will be scored with 2 points and they
3 will have to include a narrative along with their
4 answer.

5 Did I catch everything?

6 MR. RHODES: It all sounds good to me.

7 I just wanted to clarify, the three areas
8 that have 2 points, that is 0, 1 or 2 available
9 for those based on the responses that are given;
10 is that correct?

11 MS. HIXON: I guess so.

12 MR. RHODES: So up to 2 points for each of
13 those. I just wanted to make that clear.

14 MR. DE MEO: Well, if it's pass/fail --

15 MR. RHODES: Well, no, the 2 points are only
16 for the ones that are not pass/fail.

17 MR. DE MEO: Right. Right.

18 MR. RHODES: I just wanted to make sure that
19 wasn't being stated that it's an automatic 2
20 points, if they --

21 MS. HIXON: That why they have the narrative.
22 So it could be scored 0, 1 or 2.

23 MR. RHODES: And then just under other
24 question while we're on this, earlier you
25 mentioned SB 1532 when we were talking about

1 Florida-based.

2 MS. DEFOOR: Yes, that was what was spoken on
3 the lady that was up there.

4 MR. RHODES: Yeah, I just wanted some
5 clarification on that because I generally think
6 that that means that it's a Senate bill that's
7 been passed and that's usually what SB and then
8 that series of numbers would be. I just wanted
9 to clarify if that's the reference or if I'm
10 misstating that.

11 MS. HIXON: Ms. Shaw? It was Ms. Shaw that
12 mentioned that. Can you clarify the statute for
13 the Florida-based preferences that you were
14 discussing?

15 MS. SHAW: I am so sorry, it kind of got a
16 little noisy where I am. Give me one second to
17 see if I can go --

18 All right. Let me try now. So SB 1532 they
19 removed anything mentioning race, gender
20 specifics and what it applied or what it added
21 was, instead of including minority-owned business
22 or participation in minority-owned businesses in
23 2025 the legislation did change that to
24 include -- to include what I said earlier. And I
25 think what they're trying to get away from is

1 what someone discussed earlier where now we're
2 talking about minority or women-owned businesses,
3 and that's the focus of this S 1532.

4 MR. RHODES: Ms. Shaw, I wasn't sure if you
5 broke up, but I thought earlier it was identified
6 as SB 1532. I was just trying to confirm whether
7 or not this is a Senate bill that was passed or
8 if that reference that you made was from a
9 different source of criteria.

10 MS. SHAW: Yes, it's from -- yes, it's a
11 Senate bill; yes; 1532.

12 MR. RHODES: Thank you very much.

13 MR. MAYERSOHN: Ms. Shaw, that Senate bill
14 never passed.

15 MS. SHAW: While it didn't, we want to be
16 mindful that -- of the legislature trying to make
17 changes and I think it's important that we're not
18 including, especially with everything that's
19 going on, certain aspects and certain words in
20 this. So we've just got to be mindful of that.

21 MR. MAYERSOHN: But it says here it died in
22 its committee and see CS/CS/HB 1255 is the bill
23 of reference which may include some -- some of
24 those things that were included in here in that
25 Senate bill. But I don't see any -- I don't see

1 any -- at this point, just kind of reading
2 through the summary, I mean, this talks about
3 School Readiness eligibility, Bright Futures. It
4 doesn't talk about Supplier & Diversity,
5 specifically.

6 MR. DE MEO: Yeah, Florida -- the closest I
7 could find was Florida Statute 287.084 and that
8 kind of speaks to it. I don't think it has all
9 the things that Ms. Shaw mentioned, but that --
10 that, I think, governs. But you might check with
11 general counsel.

12 MR. RHODES: That was going to be my next
13 comment, that if you guys would like at the same
14 time I'm checking with general counsel on 218.39
15 and 39(1) I can check on this House and Senate
16 bill as well as 287.084 and find out which is the
17 most applicable so we can be sure that whatever
18 we put on the street is both fair and defensible.

19 MS. SHAW: Sounds good. And just for error,
20 if we're finished, on page 20 of 65 instead of
21 account, junior account, senior account, this
22 should be accountant. So just a scrivener's
23 error on that.

24 MS. HIXON: Okay. Thank you. Any other --
25 does anybody have any --

1 MR. MAYERSOHN: And just to kind of -- it
2 says here, again, in the summary in 1532,
3 eliminate minority set-asides, merchant vendor
4 disqualification lists, extended dependent
5 coverage for fallen first responder children,
6 restructures the supplier diversity office and
7 establishes a 5 percent preference for
8 Florida-based businesses and state contracts.

9 MR. RHODES: Can you repeat that criteria
10 reference one more time, please?

11 MR. MAYERSOHN: So it says eliminate minority
12 set-asides, purchase vendor disqualifications
13 lists, extended dependent coverage for fallen
14 first responders children, restructures the
15 supplier diversity office and establishes a 5
16 percent price preference for Florida-based
17 businesses and state contracts.

18 MR. RHODES: And is that the Senate bill or
19 House bill? Can you cite that for me so I can
20 write that down?

21 A. This was Senate Bill 1532; however, it did
22 not pass.

23 MS. SHAW: You're right, that didn't pass
24 last year. But there was some continual
25 reference to it. That's the only reason I

1 brought it up.

2 MR. MAYERSOHN: Right.

3 MR. RHODES: Thank you.

4 MS. HIXON: Okay. Anybody have anything
5 else?

6 MR. DE MEO: May I point out, too, that that
7 statute limits how much points you can give. So
8 I think we should pay attention to it for certain
9 areas. I think in the aggregate we're fine, but
10 it does limit, there's specific, like MBEs and so
11 on there's a limit, so we should be mindful of
12 that.

13 MS. HIXON: Okay. Thank you.

14 Mr. Rhodes, do you need anything else from
15 us?

16 MR. RHODES: I'm sorry, say that again?

17 MS. HIXON: Do you need anything else from
18 us?

19 MR. RHODES: If you folks feel that you've
20 provided the input necessary to Procurement, what
21 we could do is, we could ask Ms. Defoor when I
22 could follow up with her to get that additional
23 information or an updated draft that could or may
24 not be ready for publishing, I could share it
25 with this committee, and then you could decide

1 whether or not this is camera ready, ready to go
2 to the public or if there's another meeting
3 that's necessary.

4 MS. HIXON: Ms. Defoor.

5 MS. DEFOOR: If you can get me the response
6 from legal by Wednesday, I could have you a
7 complete full draft by Friday.

8 MR. RHODES: Okay. That's all I have.

9 MS. SHAW: Could -- we're having a meeting on
10 Friday. Could we have a final overview included
11 as part of our special meeting on Friday if
12 you're available and others? Just so we can do a
13 quick final look-over and make sure, you know,
14 there is nothing that's going to create any
15 issues for us and for the school board.

16 MR. RHODES: Mrs. Shaw, I don't think that
17 Ms. -- Mrs. Hixon was included in the Friday
18 meeting since that's a special audit committee
19 meeting. And a second point of concern is that I
20 don't currently have a clear understanding of how
21 quickly legal will be able to turn around the
22 information that I'm looking to get to Ms. Defoor
23 and if that would happen before Friday.

24 MS. HIXON: And my son has a doctor's
25 appointment, so I won't be here on Friday.

1 MS. SHAW: No problem. Thank you.

2 MS. HIXON: Thank you.

3 Anybody have anything else?

4 MR. MAYERSOHN: Yeah, can we approve the
5 minutes and the other stuff?

6 MS. HIXON: Oh, yes. Thank you for reminding
7 me.

8 So first can we have a motion and a second to
9 approve the agenda for the February 2nd Auditors
10 Selection --

11 MR. MEDVIN: So moved.

12 MS. HIXON: It's been moved and --

13 MS. SHAW: Phyllis Shaw, motion to approve.

14 MS. HIXON: Seconded. Any --

15 MR. DE MEO: You probably need somebody
16 present to second it.

17 MR. MAYERSOHN: Yes, I'll second it.

18 MS. HIXON: No, you have to be in the room.

19 MR. DE MEO: Second.

20 MS. HIXON: Okay. It's been moved and
21 seconded.

22 All those in favor of approving the agenda
23 for today say, aye.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

25 MS. HIXON: Any opposed say, no.

1 (No response.)

2 MS. HIXON: Motion carries.

3 Can I have approval of the minutes of the
4 October 30th, 2025 Auditor Selection Committee
5 Meeting.

6 MR. MEDVIN: So moved.

7 MS. HIXON: Moved and --

8 MR. DE MEO: Seconded.

9 MS. HIXON: Seconded.

10 All those in favor of approving the minutes
11 say, aye.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

13 MS. HIXON: Any opposed say, no.

14 (No response.)

15 MS. HIXON: Motion carries unanimously.

16 And I think those were all that we had to
17 vote on.

18 MR. MAYERSOHN: Did we want to make a motion
19 to the suggested changes that would be.

20 MS. SHAW: Yes, I was thinking the same
21 thing, Robert.

22 MS. HIXON: Yes, we can do that. Yes.

23 Can I have a motion and a second to approve
24 the changes that I read? Anybody need me to read
25 them again? We're all good?

1 (No response.)

2 MS. HIXON: So we had one, two, three, four,
3 five, six, the six changes that were recommended
4 by the Committee. Can I have a motion and a
5 second to approve them?

6 MR. MEDVIN: So moved.

7 MR. DE MEO: Seconded.

8 MS. HIXON: Moved and seconded to approve the
9 changes.

10 Any discussion?

11 (No response.)

12 MS. HIXON: All those in favor of making the
13 changes recommended by the committee members say,
14 aye.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

16 MS. HIXON: Any opposed say, no.

17 (No response.)

18 MS. HIXON: Motion carries.

19 And with that, we are completed.

20 So seeing no other business I adjourn this
21 meeting.

22 Thank you all for coming out today.

23 (Meeting was concluded at 10:35 a.m.)

24

25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

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

STATE OF FLORIDA
COUNTY OF BROWARD

I, Timothy R. Bass, Court Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Florida at Large, hereby certify that I was authorized to and did stenographically report the foregoing proceedings, and that the transcript is a true and complete record of my stenographic notes thereof.

Dated this 10th day of February, 2026, Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Florida.



TIMOTHY R. BASS
Court Reporter

46:5 challenging 10:7 change 9:18 12:20 13:21 14:15 15:4 49:5,7,8,21 51:23 changed 7:20 12:5,8 12:10 16:13 44:17 48:23 changes 5:16 43:5 46:16 52:17 58:19 58:24 59:3,9,13 changing 15:9 42:4 Chapter 4:23 charge 6:17 charged 11:19 chart 37:23 charter 16:22,25 17:6 17:9 18:1,5,7,14 19:3,11,17,21 21:19 22:15 23:14 29:13 30:2 49:13 charts 37:22 41:5 49:24 check 40:6,11,11 53:10,15 checking 53:14 Chief 2:6 3:21,25 children 54:5,14 chunk 17:10 circle 22:5 circumstances 42:8 45:2 cite 54:19 clarification 11:18 48:11 51:5 clarified 25:10,19 clarify 28:11 50:7 51:9,12 clarity 37:15 clean 20:7 31:7 clear 9:18 15:14,18 15:22 26:25 27:14 28:14,22 29:11 37:15 50:13 56:20 climate 9:6 12:1 close 28:11 closest 53:6 closing 24:6 coincide 11:12 columnar 24:14 come 21:23 27:22	41:20 coming 13:2 59:22 comment 4:18 16:14 53:13 commentary 41:1 comments 8:16,23 16:24 26:2 committee 1:4 2:1 4:10 5:1,3,6,12,14 5:24 6:4,18 8:2,12 9:9,12,19 10:17,20 10:25 11:4,18 12:12 12:13,20 24:5 27:19 28:13 29:17,21,24 34:11,13 35:12,12 38:4,22 44:22,24 52:22 55:25 56:18 57:24 58:4,12 59:4 59:13,15 common 13:6 communicate 43:4,5 companies 18:7 compensation 45:4 complaints 15:15 complete 56:7 60:8 completed 20:3 34:22 59:19 completely 19:5 complex 45:8 compliance 11:22 16:10 30:18 compliant 11:25 complies 33:24 comply 30:19 32:19 33:8,9,10,12 34:22 37:9,9 40:6,7 41:14 41:14 42:23,25 component 9:13 16:21,22 19:17 20:5 20:13,17 29:3,4 compromise 45:25 46:2 computer 40:4 concept 19:2 concern 10:2 21:7,8 21:21,22 32:2 40:20 47:1 49:12 56:19 concerned 12:25 18:22 concerns 16:8 26:18 49:17	concluded 59:23 confirm 52:6 confusing 8:13 26:5 confusion 27:18,25 29:13 consider 32:15 considering 40:25 consistent 7:16 11:25 28:9 contained 6:15 continual 54:24 continue 42:15 continuity 5:5 8:4 contract 13:18,21 36:12 contracts 30:22 54:8 54:17 control 18:5 controlled 18:25 convened 5:2,4 6:11 conversations 26:10 copy 19:20,22 20:6 20:15 24:11 correct 16:11 30:4 50:10 cost 40:13,15,17,19 40:21 41:16 42:2 44:2 45:4,14,16 46:1,7,13,21 49:23 costs 45:10 counsel 28:24 29:10 29:18 53:11,14 County 1:3 60:3,11 couple 9:12 31:10 34:16 course 19:20 26:3,22 Court 1:23 2:11 60:4 60:14 cover 18:7 coverage 54:5,13 covered 47:17 CPA 2:3,3 7:17 37:17 CPAs 31:6 37:10 create 56:14 created 36:13 creating 20:11 criteria 52:9 54:9 crossover 27:24 CS/CS/HB 52:22 current 9:5 11:12,23	12:1 37:23 48:12 currently 8:10 17:20 22:14 56:20 <hr/> D <hr/> date 14:23 37:10,18 38:14 39:8 Dated 60:10 Dave 2:6 3:21 day 21:25 24:18 60:10 days 13:20,22 14:1 14:11,22 43:5 49:5 49:5,7 De 2:3 7:6 10:17 28:19,20 30:5,10,11 30:14 31:25 32:24 33:7 34:16 35:20 36:24 37:2,7 38:6 38:24 40:2,5 45:1 46:10 47:4,6,23 48:5 50:14,17 53:6 55:6 57:15,19 58:8 59:7 deadline 35:1 43:4 deal 21:11 Debbie 3:18 DEBRA 2:4 decide 10:21 55:25 decided 12:21 decides 9:10 13:22 declare 33:25 defensible 53:18 definitely 35:18 43:3 Defoor 2:9 3:23 5:13 12:3,4,8,16 13:4 16:1,4 35:7,11 37:13,21 38:19 41:4 43:16 44:21,23 47:21 48:4,15 49:1 51:2 55:21 56:4,5 56:22 DEI 13:1 department 15:17 dependent 54:4,13 depending 33:11 DEREK 2:8 described 34:11 desiring 34:13 detail 17:13 34:6 41:5 determination 11:5	Development 7:1 died 52:21 difference 39:11 different 8:5 11:20 22:5 40:17 41:18 52:9 differentiator 31:11 difficult 45:6 difficulty 43:6 Director 2:7 3:22 disclosures 22:13 discretion 34:25 discretionary 34:17 38:16 39:4,9 41:6 discuss 31:22 discussed 5:15 7:5 33:19 34:12 52:1 discussing 51:14 discussion 4:5 6:10 14:14 41:18 59:10 discussions 6:6,12 disqualification 54:4 disqualifications 54:12 disqualified 35:14 distinguish 35:5 39:5 district 2:5 11:2 14:19 20:10 32:9 43:9 districts 45:7,10 diversity 9:3 12:9,18 15:16 31:16 44:15 46:6,22 49:11 53:4 54:6,15 divided 47:15 DIXON 41:9 doctor's 56:24 document 7:8 9:1 10:13,16 11:7,21 12:24 15:14,18,23 17:21 18:15 24:24 25:22 26:7,11 27:22 27:25 37:1 48:20,25 49:9,19 documentation 14:12 33:24 documents 4:25 12:6 doing 18:19 23:4,23 26:24 27:11 41:23 dollar 20:23 door 21:14
---	---	--	---	--

doubt 20:21
draft 17:4 24:11
 27:17 28:2,10 38:2
 38:20 48:12 55:23
 56:7
due 9:5 17:9

E

earlier 50:24 51:24
 52:1,5
easy 37:21 41:4
EDOC 9:17 12:9,12
 44:24
education 39:7
either 5:23 14:19
 22:15 23:16 31:6
 39:1 42:20
electronic 48:22
element 40:20
eligibility 53:3
eliminate 45:11 54:3
 54:11
eliminated 13:7
email 30:16
emergency 5:19
encompassed 17:2
encompasses 31:13
ended 22:7
enforce 19:22 24:8
engage 34:20
ensure 10:23
entire 15:13
entity 40:25
equally 40:16
ERHARD 2:8
error 53:19,23
especially 14:5 52:18
essentially 22:4
establishes 54:7,15
et 19:18
evaluate 47:14
evaluating 27:12
evaluation 35:12
everybody 35:25
 48:23
everybody's 15:3
 47:1
exactly 11:10 43:20
example 5:23 18:19
 21:13 32:10 34:1,20
exclude 16:19 29:8

49:14,16
excluded 22:8,10
excluding 49:13
exclusion 29:6
exclusions 22:2
Executive 2:7,8 3:22
existing 38:2
experience 30:25
 31:5,14 46:11,18
 47:17
expertise 47:17
explains 19:7
explanation 41:8
 42:14 43:2
exposes 19:8
expressing 21:7 22:9
extended 54:4,13
extension 36:7,18
external 7:1 18:11,21
 19:10 20:3,14 21:10
 22:16 23:3,20,22
 24:19,22 25:6 26:6
 30:4

F

fact 17:9 33:16 36:12
factor 45:17
fail 36:16 42:11,20
failed 42:13
fails 37:16
fair 35:24 53:18
fairly 26:16
fallen 54:5,13
falls 12:10
far 26:7
fatal 33:13,14,16
favor 57:22 58:10
 59:12
feathered 7:22 32:6
features 9:14
February 1:14 4:9
 57:9 60:10
federal 13:2
federally 11:13
feel 55:19
feeling 10:14 25:7
 27:23
feels 14:7
felt 32:4 42:2
field 6:20 35:24
file 15:15

final 6:12 56:10,13
financial 7:2 16:19,21
 17:17,23,23 18:17
 21:15 26:8,17,22
financially 22:23
financials 26:5 27:9
find 24:7 25:9 27:21
 45:6 48:22 53:7,16
findings 22:25 26:18
fine 34:19 45:22 55:9
finished 53:20
firm 10:23,24 22:21
 23:20 30:4 35:5
 39:11,12 40:16,19
 45:13,14
firms 7:17 8:6,14
 23:20 32:8,14 33:23
 34:14 39:11 40:15
 45:8,9,12
first 3:9 4:21 13:13
 13:17 38:20 49:4
 54:5,14 57:8
five 59:3
FL 1:25
flag 23:24
flag 33:13,14,17
Florida 1:3,12 29:1,9
 47:11 53:6,7 60:2,5
 60:11
Florida-based 15:12
 15:19 49:10 51:1,13
 54:8,16
floridaauditor.gov
 47:25
focus 9:19 52:3
focused 9:25
folks 55:19
follow 55:22
follow-up 36:25
following 3:1
force 14:19
foregoing 60:7
forever 9:4
forget 30:17
form 24:14 26:14
 29:19
Fort 1:12,25 60:10
forth 10:17
forums 45:2
found 18:3
four 59:2

free 6:7
Friday 27:23 56:7,10
 56:11,17,23,25
full 56:7
fully 33:8,9,9 34:21
 40:6,7 42:23,25
function 27:5
functional 43:12
fundamental 10:23
fundraising 22:4
funds 2:7 17:24 18:1
 18:18,23 19:18
further 6:10 15:8
 31:22 36:9
future 8:14 16:10
Futures 53:3

G

G 47:10
gap 24:6
gaps 28:11
geezer 47:9
gender 51:19
general 4:23 6:14
 22:1 28:23 29:9,10
 29:18 30:21 39:2
 45:19 53:11,14
general's 6:16
generally 18:16 51:5
getting 8:15
GFOA 45:5,19 47:13
give 6:5 21:13 23:18
 26:13 30:24 41:11
 43:10 46:22 51:16
 55:7
given 50:9
glancing 17:3
glasses 47:7
go 4:4,7,20 6:25 8:24
 12:12,19 13:24
 15:11 16:16 21:13
 21:17 38:19,21
 42:15 44:23 48:8
 49:9,23 51:17 56:1
goal 43:5
goes 24:1 26:7 46:2
going 3:8 4:22 5:22
 9:14 14:2 15:9
 20:11 25:3,23 26:18
 32:10 34:1,5 41:11
 42:16 45:23 49:5,9

49:14,18,21,24
 52:19 53:12 56:14
good 3:11 45:9,14
 46:24 50:6 53:19
 58:25
gotten 11:14
GOULDBOURNE
 2:7
government 13:3
 19:18,21
governs 53:10
gray 26:25
great 13:9 19:1 48:7
group 5:5 9:10,16
 36:10,14
groups 22:3,5
guess 16:17 17:2 24:3
 24:17 39:16 40:5
 50:11
guessing 4:21
GUESTS 2:10
guidance 30:21 45:19
 47:11,24
guys 53:13

H

hand 13:11,13 30:14
 31:12
Handbook 47:13
hands 12:14 26:12
Hang 7:7
happen 21:9 33:13
 56:23
happens 9:22 47:8
happy 6:20 31:22
hard 48:22
hardship 36:13
hate 44:14
health 18:17
hear 39:17,18,23
heard 44:21 48:8
hearing 9:11 41:20
help 10:23 22:22 43:7
helpful 24:6
helps 39:14
hey 14:1
hi 19:16
higher 40:18,19,23
 42:2 44:3
hit 21:23
Hixon 2:4 3:3,6,18,19

4:7,16 5:4 6:22,25 7:11 8:16,19,21,24 9:8 11:6,11 12:3,22 13:9,14 14:9,25 15:3,6,24 16:1,7,11 16:16 17:19 19:15 21:5 23:22 28:17,19 30:7,10,12 31:24 36:19 39:15,17,19 39:21,24 41:2,21 43:21 44:18,21 45:24 46:9,25 47:3 48:7 49:3 50:11,21 51:11 53:24 55:4,13 55:17 56:4,17,24 57:2,6,12,14,18,20 57:25 58:2,7,9,13 58:15,22 59:2,8,12 59:16,18 hold 20:17 holding 20:11 hopefully 20:7 House 53:15 54:19	24:25 including 5:2 51:21 52:18 inclusion 30:3 increase 13:24 14:2,7 14:22 20:9 Independent 7:2 independently 19:5 indicate 49:6 indicates 47:13 indicating 49:11 individual 23:13 influence 10:7 information 6:16,17 17:23 18:9 29:15 43:14 55:23 56:22 initially 5:4 input 10:18,19 18:4 55:20 Inspector 21:25 intend 5:20 intended 38:21 interested 8:6,15 interject 42:18 interlocal 22:1 internal 2:7 16:20 17:24 18:1,18,23 39:6 INVITED 2:10 invites 8:5 involved 8:15 25:9 issue 20:2 45:5 issued 6:8,13 issues 20:12 56:15 item 18:13 19:1 24:1 35:13 36:21 items 9:2 16:15 31:10 32:5,7 34:17 35:9,9 35:10 36:20 38:3 43:23 50:1,2	keeping 7:16 35:3 kind 18:2 20:10 37:14 39:2 41:12 42:22 43:7 46:2 48:22,23 51:15 53:1,8 54:1 knock 21:13 know 9:4 14:2,6,10 16:23,23 17:14 18:17,23 24:12,13 26:6 28:3,5,20 31:18 32:1 33:1,2 34:17,24 37:11,24 38:11,17 39:12,13 40:13 41:25 42:23 43:1,4,8,10,19 44:9 44:10,12,12 45:9,22 49:17 56:13 known 4:2	limit 55:10,11 limits 55:7 line 12:1,10 16:5 35:13 list 22:2,7,25 38:1 Listen 28:3 listening 25:20 lists 24:13,14 54:4,13 little 15:8 17:7,13 18:4 25:20 26:1,5 26:24 27:24 37:14 40:23 46:3 51:16 local 19:21 locked 13:25 long 7:12 14:4 21:12 34:25 longer 14:11 look 6:4 7:4 17:12 18:9,12,12 22:14,16 22:20 23:1 24:9,10 26:16 36:15,19 42:22 46:10 47:10 49:18 look-over 56:13 looked 32:3 33:15 looking 23:11 24:11 27:21 29:23 33:22 35:25 37:1,18 38:23 40:6 42:18 45:10 46:17 56:22 looks 22:19 25:3,5 lot 9:2 25:1,5,24 28:4 45:7,11 lowball 45:14 lowest 45:10	matter 45:23 maximum 40:21 Mayersohn 2:2 3:13 3:14 4:13 13:12,14 13:15 14:17 15:7 39:15,16,18,20,23 39:25 40:4 41:22 42:17 44:2,6,8,19 46:5,24 52:13,21 54:1,11 55:2 57:4 57:17 58:18 Mayersohn's 14:15 MBEs 55:10 mean 10:8 20:23 24:22 37:3 41:18 44:8 53:2 means 43:22 49:18 51:6 Medvin 2:3 3:16,17 4:11 7:10 8:18,20 8:22,25 10:2,6 11:10,16 15:5 16:7 16:9,14,17 17:25 18:22 20:19 22:10 22:18 23:3,12,16 24:10,21 25:16,18 26:21 27:7,14,20 28:3,14,18 30:8,9 57:11 58:6 59:6 meet 6:6 31:6 34:25 meeting 1:4 6:10 24:18 25:21 27:23 28:21 29:17 48:18 56:2,9,11,18,19 58:5 59:21,23 meetings 9:12 meets 29:5 Melvin 30:7 member 5:2 members 2:1 5:12 6:4 12:21 35:12 57:24 58:12 59:13,15 mentioned 21:24 50:25 51:12 53:9 mentioning 51:19 Meo 2:3 7:6 10:17 28:19,20 30:5,10,11 30:14 32:24 33:7 34:16 35:20 36:24 37:2,7 38:6,24 40:2 45:1 46:10 47:4,6
<hr/> I <hr/> idea 6:2 18:3 22:6 33:19 48:17 identified 7:6,24 33:6 33:14,16 34:7 35:21 52:5 identifies 17:22 identify 22:23 38:4 42:8 identifying 8:7 33:23 identities 4:2 II 2:8 III 2:9 important 5:22 11:1 26:4 31:15 42:22 45:4,17,20 52:17 impose 38:15 impression 24:18,23 25:20 26:9 include 8:3,5 16:22 17:11 22:22 32:18 49:15 50:3 51:24,24 52:23 included 6:1 9:15 18:14,15 29:14 52:24 56:10,17 includes 15:19 17:5	<hr/> J <hr/> job 26:6 John 5:17 judge 43:8 junior 53:21 justifying 13:19	<hr/> L <hr/> lack 21:8 lady 51:3 laid 34:3 language 7:19 8:3 10:13 11:21 13:6 24:4 27:1,16 28:2,8 34:6 Large 60:5 late 36:13 Lauderdale 1:12,25 60:11 lay 34:4 lead-in 18:2 leads 24:16 leave 7:18 45:21 46:21 leaves 7:14 left 46:18 legal 33:15 56:6,21 legally 24:8 legislation 51:23 legislature 52:16 lesser 9:13 let's 4:4 34:1 letter 38:10 letterhead 25:4 level 5:14 29:23 32:18,21 35:22 42:13 licensed 31:7 light 13:1	<hr/> M <hr/> ma'am 16:4 Madam 45:1 46:5 Magli 2:7 3:22 making 7:15 17:13 30:23 33:19 59:12 management 18:7 38:10 Manager 2:7 mandates 13:2 mandatory 39:3 Mark 2:7 3:22 material 17:8,17 19:2 23:25 materiality 18:25	<hr/> K <hr/> KC 1:11 keep 5:5 39:6,7

47:23 48:5 50:14,17 53:6 55:6 57:15,19 58:8 59:7 Meo's 31:25 40:5 merchant 54:3 mere 30:18 merely 28:7 met 44:22 methodology 7:23 32:6 34:8 37:4 44:12 45:18 48:13 Miami-Dade 32:9 million 17:7,16 19:2 29:2 mimosa 40:2 mind 35:17 mindful 52:16,20 55:11 minorities 11:8 minority 9:21,25 10:3 12:25 15:11 52:2 54:3,11 minority-owned 51:21,22 minutes 4:19 57:5 58:3,10 mirrors 27:18 misstating 51:10 mistaken 25:25 27:21 Mm-hmm 10:5 MONDAY 1:14 money 17:11 months 29:16 34:25 morning 3:11 motion 4:8,12 57:8,13 58:2,15,18,23 59:4 59:18 moved 4:11 57:11,12 57:20 58:6,7 59:6,8	41:17 necessary 4:1 55:20 56:3 necessity 4:2 14:7 need 12:19,24 13:4 32:18 36:5 37:24,25 42:21 48:2 55:14,17 57:15 58:24 needed 5:11 needs 19:23 never 52:14 new 5:7 7:22 35:3 noisy 51:16 normal 26:21 normally 7:17 18:21 Notary 60:4 note 30:15 noted 15:21 notes 26:2,3 37:16 38:19 60:9 November 34:23 36:3 number 17:17 42:2 44:7 numbers 11:2 17:16 19:8 21:9 22:22 34:2 40:14 46:17 51:8 nuts 6:21	ongoing 29:16 open 4:4 35:6 opined 33:15 opinion 11:3 13:4 22:12 23:18 25:1 29:19 44:14 opinions 22:21,25 opposed 20:24 27:3 49:11 57:25 58:13 59:16 outreach 12:18,18 15:16 31:17 44:15 46:6,14,22 outside 10:7 23:14 24:25 28:15 overall 18:16 overview 4:20 56:10	pays 21:19 pension 19:18 peppered 32:5 percent 14:3 29:3,4 31:14,20 54:7,16 personal 13:4 perspective 40:10 43:7 persuasive 42:15 Phyllis 2:2 3:10 4:12 57:13 physical 26:1 piece 6:23 place 39:10 playing 35:24 please 3:3 12:15 54:10 Pledge 3:4,5 point 5:24 7:13 8:12 8:20 10:15 11:4 14:13 19:6,13 20:20 21:22,24 27:15 28:21 33:19,21 35:17 36:6,21 38:22 40:5,12 42:1 45:3 47:13,14 53:1 55:6 56:19 pointing 42:7 points 7:25 8:1,8,9,9 10:21 11:7 12:16,17 12:23 30:18,20,20 31:2,5 32:17 33:18 34:4,10,18 35:15,23 36:20,22 37:3,5,6 37:11,20 40:15,21 40:22,22,23 41:11 41:17,20,22 43:10 43:22,23,25,25 44:9 48:6,17 49:21,22 50:2,8,12,15,20 55:7 policy 10:12 political 9:6 portion 18:1 26:4 positions 26:17 possessive 26:11 possibility 36:16 possible 8:6 14:4 43:13 45:11 possibly 9:6 pot 19:6	potential 20:21 32:13 43:8 preferably 5:2 preference 54:7,16 preferences 11:23 15:12,19,20 49:11 51:13 prepare 17:14,18 present 57:16 pretty 20:17 24:13 32:10 38:6 previously 9:15 price 13:16,18,24 14:2,7,21,24 49:7,8 54:16 primary 9:19 10:24 27:4 prior 7:19 8:3 14:22 27:1 probably 17:16 20:19 57:15 problem 9:4 10:11 19:16 20:23 21:3,18 23:17 32:25 43:17 57:1 problematic 9:7 19:14 problems 16:10 procedures 17:3,12 proceedings 3:1 60:7 process 4:21 8:15 32:15 procurement 3:23 5:22 9:16 11:19 12:5 30:22 55:20 product 25:13 professional 5:19 38:11 program 12:18 44:16 46:15 pronouncements 38:11 proper 30:24 properly 29:12 property 24:19,22 proposal 38:2 46:15 proposals 32:20 47:14 Proposer's 31:5,13 46:11,18 proposers 31:11
<hr/> N <hr/> NAKIA 2:7 name 47:8 names 4:3 narrative 33:20,22 35:4 40:8,10 41:13 41:24 42:6,21,25 43:1,19 50:3,21 nature 11:9 near 7:6 necessarily 40:11	<hr/> O <hr/> obviously 14:18 October 58:4 office 3:25 18:23 21:25 22:18,19 23:7 23:9 54:6,15 Oh 4:15 13:14 19:16 27:10 57:6 okay 3:12,15 4:16,19 6:22,25 7:12 8:21 8:24 13:9,14 14:25 15:3,6,24 16:7,12 16:16 21:6 24:10 25:16 27:16 28:6,17 28:19 30:6,7 41:2 42:22 43:21 44:19 46:25 47:1,3,10,19 48:4,5 49:3 53:24 55:4,13 56:8 57:20 once 41:5 ones 35:18 38:4 41:6 41:9 42:19,21 50:16	<hr/> P <hr/> page 13:16 16:17,18 25:5 33:4 47:12,12 47:21,23,24 48:21 49:4,12 53:20 Palm 32:9 paper 31:21 part 8:12 10:11 17:10 17:12 19:5 22:6,7 24:17 25:12,25 26:21 27:2,8,11 36:11 56:11 participants 3:9 8:14 participating 32:14 participation 9:21,24 10:1,3 12:19 13:1 46:15 51:22 particular 13:6 23:24 29:21 particularly 42:7 parties 36:17 pass 5:20 36:16 37:16 42:11,20 54:22,23 pass-or-fail 35:9,10 pass/fail 33:20 35:18 35:19 36:5 37:24,25 38:5,7 41:10,23 42:19 43:24 49:25 50:14,16 passed 51:7 52:7,14 patterned 37:22 pause 36:11 pay 21:16 55:8		

47:16
proposing 9:23
provide 5:14,23
 18:11,14 19:20 20:6
 20:15 29:19 31:4
 32:16,19 43:1 48:2
provided 30:2,15
 31:3,4 33:24 37:2
 55:20
provides 29:7
providing 4:1 19:22
public 4:18 6:8 56:2
 60:5
publishing 55:24
purchase 54:12
Purchasing 2:9
purposes 5:6,12 7:16
 10:22 28:12
purview 24:21
put 9:19 10:17 11:24
 18:21 22:12 23:24
 27:9 29:25 34:7,15
 42:5 46:7,10 47:7
 53:18
putting 20:21

Q

qualifications 30:25
 46:11,19 47:12,16
qualified 40:16 45:12
qualify 22:12 33:10
qualitative 39:11
question 9:5,11 11:6
 11:11,15 12:24
 16:25 24:16 29:6
 36:25 50:24
questioning 17:25
questions 6:19,22
 29:20
quick 56:13
quickly 25:3 56:21
quorum 4:13

R

R 1:23 60:4,14
race 51:19
raise 45:22
raised 28:21
raising 40:12
ranked 40:19
rate 43:8

reach 5:25 29:18
read 33:1 58:24,24
Readiness 53:3
reading 9:1 48:21
 53:1
reads 16:5
ready 55:24 56:1,1
reality 45:16
really 10:2,15 19:25
 20:4,13 27:7 33:21
 45:8
reason 22:11 42:24
 54:25
reasons 22:8,17 45:7
reassignment 36:12
recall 9:11
recited 3:5
recollection 9:18
recommend 24:4
 28:13
recommendation
 7:15 10:19
recommendations
 5:10 32:4 38:12
recommended 8:10
 9:16 59:3,13
record 3:20 60:8
recording 5:20
recourse 20:4
red 23:24
reduce 12:21 35:15
 36:22 44:5,24
reduced 31:9
reduces 49:22
refer 29:12 45:18
 47:6
reference 48:2 51:9
 52:8,23 54:10,25
referenced 32:11
 48:1
referencing 49:10
referred 27:2
refers 45:5
regard 5:15 6:16
 21:18 31:11 38:24
regarding 12:25
 49:13
regards 41:7
related 9:2 12:9
relates 11:8
relative 10:22

relegating 31:19
reliable 19:9
rely 21:9 22:21
relying 23:4,6,8,19
reminding 57:6
removed 51:19
renamed 37:4
repeat 54:9
repeating 37:14
report 22:20 24:25
 25:9,11,12 26:8,19
 28:2,5 36:3 60:7
reported 28:16
Reporter 1:23,23
 2:11 60:4,14
REPORTER'S 60:1
Reporting 1:24 2:11
reports 19:10 21:10
 28:15 30:1
representing 3:23
request 13:18 14:22
 36:7
requesting 11:19
 48:14
required 17:1 18:24
 20:14,15 29:4 38:10
 38:12,25
requirement 18:10
 29:5
requirements 6:6
 20:1
requires 29:3
respective 18:6
responder 54:5
responders 54:14
responding 7:18 32:8
 34:14
response 6:24 14:16
 15:2 40:5,10 42:16
 47:2 56:5 58:1,14
 59:1,11,17
responses 43:14 50:9
responsible 19:4
 28:25
restructures 54:6,14
result 35:22
review 4:22 23:7
 29:15 48:9
reviewing 23:13
revisions 5:11,16 7:4
 7:10,11 32:3,4

RFIs 43:18
RFP 13:6 29:11 34:15
 37:5 38:2 43:14
RFP26-089 7:1
RFPs 43:17
RFQ 5:9 6:1,3,7,12
 6:21 7:18,19 8:3
 9:15 27:2,17 28:2,3
 28:8 29:25 34:15
RFQs 43:17
Rhodes 2:6 3:8,12,15
 3:18,20,21 4:21,24
 7:3,12 9:8,9 10:5,16
 11:17 17:19,20 18:2
 21:4,5,6 22:14,19
 23:8,15,19 24:3,20
 25:15,17 26:14 27:1
 27:10,16 28:1,6
 29:15 30:6,16 32:1
 32:2 33:4,11 35:7
 35:17,21 36:25
 37:13 38:1,18 41:15
 42:3 43:12 48:1,10
 48:16 49:2 50:6,12
 50:15,18,23 51:4
 52:4,12 53:12 54:9
 54:18 55:3,14,16,19
 56:8,16
rid 11:14
right 4:15 8:24 11:10
 11:14 16:17 22:4
 23:12,22 35:2 38:7
 48:15 50:17,17
 51:18 54:23 55:2
Robert 2:2 3:12
 58:21
role 25:19 28:12
roll 3:7,8
room 1:11 3:15 38:9
 40:9 57:18
Rules 4:22
run 19:5

S

S 15:21 52:3
satisfy 21:1
saw 25:7 27:20 28:9
 32:4
saying 23:6,16 29:22
 41:11
says 5:1 13:17 14:1

16:19 33:8 44:19
 47:13 49:15 52:21
 54:2,11
SB 15:21 16:5 50:25
 51:7,18 52:6
schedule 17:13 24:12
school 1:3 2:4 10:12
 16:20 17:10 18:1
 19:3,22 20:10,16,25
 20:25 21:15 22:15
 22:23 25:14 28:16
 28:24 29:7 45:6,9
 53:3 56:15
school's 16:25
schools 16:23 17:6,9
 18:5,8,14 19:3,12
 19:17 21:19 22:5
 23:10,14 24:14
 29:14 30:2 49:13
scope 7:14,21 8:1,8
 9:14 16:15,18 18:21
 20:9 24:17 26:23
 27:3,4 28:23 29:6
 31:5,8 32:5,12,18
 33:25 34:5 36:2,23
 37:6,8 46:12,19
 49:21,25
score 32:21
scored 10:24 32:12
 38:5 41:25 42:10
 50:2,22
scoring 9:25 10:22
 34:2
scream 4:3
scrivener's 53:22
scusi 47:23
SDDC 9:17
SE 1:12
seated 3:6
second 4:9 7:7 37:23
 42:1 51:16 56:19
 57:8,16,17,19 58:23
 59:5
seconded 57:14,21
 58:8,9 59:7,8
Secretary 2:8
section 7:23,25 8:1,9
 13:16 30:16 33:2,5
 35:16 41:12 43:21
 48:13
see 7:8,13 10:25

16:13 26:2,3 27:16 30:14 31:4,21 32:11 34:13,16 39:13 40:9 41:12 42:24 44:9,24 47:7 48:24 51:17 52:22,25,25 seeing 8:7 19:10 42:11 59:20 seeking 9:20 seen 7:17 21:22 segments 10:9 Selection 1:4 4:10,20 47:11,24 57:10 58:4 Senate 51:6 52:7,11 52:13,25 53:15 54:18,21 send 6:3 senior 53:21 sense 34:12 36:24 37:12 38:15 sensitive 37:18 sent 48:1 separate 41:5 separating 42:4 series 51:8 service 1:24 7:14 40:15,21 46:8 services 7:2,20,22 8:8 9:20 11:1 34:1,5 41:16 42:2 44:3 46:1,14,21 49:23 set 32:23 set-asides 54:3,12 share 21:22 55:24 shares 27:17 Shaw 2:2 3:10,11 4:12,12,15 12:14 13:10,11,12 15:6,7 15:25 16:2 19:15,16 51:11,11,15 52:4,10 52:13,15 53:9,19 54:23 56:9,16 57:1 57:13,13 58:20 sheet 17:5,7 19:1 20:24 24:2 show 48:19 sign 17:20 significant 20:23 22:12 24:16 similar 15:10 19:21 simple 42:20	simply 11:3 single 38:25,25 site 48:19 situation 9:3 situations 36:9 six 34:25 36:19 37:25 38:3 43:23 59:3,3 size 39:12 small 34:19 smaller 32:16 sneak 45:15 solicit 9:20 solvency 18:17 somebody 39:5 40:8 40:14 43:11 57:15 son 56:24 sorry 4:16 24:20 30:8 30:11 32:24 47:7 49:2 51:15 55:16 sort 42:25 sound 39:21 sounds 50:6 53:19 source 10:7 52:9 South 1:24 speak 12:4 speaker 40:3 speaking 16:3 speaks 53:8 special 56:11,18 Specialist 2:8 specialists 11:20 specific 29:20 55:10 specifically 7:9 16:19 53:5 specifics 51:20 spill 40:2 spoken 51:2 sponsor 23:2 staff 2:5 3:24 28:16 stand 3:3 19:24 43:20 standard 7:19 10:12 27:3 standards 35:4 standpoint 28:7 43:12 start 3:8 24:9 starting 11:4 state 5:9 28:7 54:8,17 60:2,5 stated 26:16 36:4 50:19	statement 20:22 26:22 statements 17:17 statute 5:1,9 29:1 38:10 49:15 51:12 53:7 55:7 statutes 29:9 statutorily 18:24 statutory 6:17 38:16 stenographic 1:23 60:9 stenographically 60:7 steps 28:10 street 53:18 stress 14:13 stuck 14:23 study 17:15 stuff 25:1,24 57:5 sub 9:16 submit 14:21 49:6 submitted 13:20 19:11 substantial 24:13 suggest 47:19 suggested 7:10,11 58:19 suggestion 15:10 45:24 suggestions 31:25 44:4 Suite 1:24 summarize 4:24 summarized 7:5 summarizing 10:18 summary 53:2 54:2 supplier 12:9,18 31:16 44:15 46:6,14 46:21 53:4 54:6,15 support 2:8 4:1 42:9 supposed 5:9 27:7,11 27:12 sure 8:4 10:14 11:24 14:20 15:13,18,22 19:7 26:8 28:25 30:24 32:13 49:3,10 49:14 50:18 52:4 53:17 56:13 system 2:8 20:25 47:14	T table 33:8,21,23 34:2 34:4 35:8 tables 42:5 take 7:4 13:8 16:8 18:12 23:1 41:17 44:11,11,12 46:3,5 46:7 takes 14:10 talk 6:1 30:12,22,23 31:16 53:4 talked 16:24 25:8 31:19 talking 12:1 23:21 24:23 28:1 32:7 42:4 48:20 50:25 52:2 talks 53:2 Tallahassee 15:17 39:25 Teams 2:2,2 3:9 technical 47:12,16 tell 21:14 telling 28:24 term 31:18 terminology 47:19 terms 11:13 20:1 thank 3:6,11 4:6,7,17 11:17 13:9 14:9,25 15:6,7,10,25 16:1 21:6 49:2 52:12 53:24 55:3,13 57:1 57:2,6 59:22 thereof 60:9 thing 5:17 13:15 14:17 28:12 35:2 40:12 48:16 58:21 things 5:15 11:8 13:5 16:12 18:13 21:17 23:5,7,9 30:12 34:13 38:19 52:24 53:9 think 4:7 8:2 9:17 11:6 12:22 14:9 15:16,21 16:11 17:9 17:11 18:15 19:6,13 19:13 20:16,22,25 22:3,11 23:5 25:10 25:18 26:24,25 27:2 27:10,12,17 28:20 29:10,11 31:1,3,3,9	31:15,19 32:10,15 34:17,19 37:11 38:6 38:7,8,8,9,14,15 39:3,4,9 41:10 42:6 44:21 45:2,15,16,20 45:23 49:19 51:5,25 52:17 53:8,10 55:8 55:9 56:16 58:16 thinking 58:20 third 13:20 14:5,6,22 thought 9:13 25:7 26:10 27:20 28:9 31:17 34:23 44:6 52:5 thoughts 31:21 32:1 41:2 44:10 three 13:17 43:22,24 43:24 44:1 50:1,1,7 59:2 TILLMAN 2:8 TIM 2:11 time 6:8 7:23 13:24 21:12 27:19,23 36:6 36:14 37:18 43:3 53:14 54:10 timely 14:20 times 4:25 Timothy 1:23 60:4,14 title 37:4 today 3:24 5:12,18 57:23 59:22 top 25:4 40:18 total 24:15 31:14 40:12 47:14 totally 15:8 traditional 23:10 transcript 60:8 transferred 13:6 trouble 22:24 true 20:19 23:19 60:8 truly 20:13 try 20:9 51:18 trying 36:14 40:20 51:25 52:6,16 tunnel 39:22 40:1 turn 4:5 30:12 56:21 turns 34:9 two 37:22 41:21,22 43:10 47:15,18 49:24 59:2 type 7:18 9:3 22:24
---	--	--	---	---

35:13 43:13 types 30:22 typical 38:13 typically 13:7 32:11 35:11	voted 5:5,7	Wonderful 49:1 word 13:5 22:4 worded 12:6 wording 11:8 12:25 words 41:15 52:19 work 7:14 8:1 23:9 27:3,4 31:5,8 32:12 32:19 46:12,19 49:22,25 working 37:5 world 5:20 worse 19:14 worth 34:3,10 43:23 wouldn't 42:14,14 45:18 WRIGHT 1:11 write 41:7,24 43:18 54:20 writing 13:20 wrote 43:11	1255 52:22 15 44:16,19 1532 15:21 16:6 50:25 51:18 52:3,6 52:11 54:2,21 15th 34:23 36:4 37:10 38:14 17 16:18 49:12 180 13:22 14:22 49:5 49:7	5 5 14:8,24 34:3 46:7 49:8 54:7,15 50 7:25 8:8 30:17,20 46:13 500 1:24
U ultimately 5:10 7:5 9:9 10:20 26:20 29:22 30:2 un-audited 17:6 unanimously 58:15 unaudited 25:2 26:1 understand 19:9 21:21 32:21 35:25 36:1 understanding 11:3 19:4 24:24 26:15 27:25 42:12 56:20 unfortunately 19:24 unit 19:17 20:5,14,18 United 2:11 units 16:22,22 unnecessary 36:13 unreasonable 34:24 upcoming 35:3 update 5:22 updated 38:20 48:17 55:23 updates 6:2 24:5 use 13:7 30:3 usually 51:7 utilizing 17:22	W waived 39:1 walk 48:19,24 walls 21:23 want 10:6,10 13:23 13:23 15:1,13,15,18 15:21 16:9,10,14 21:14 26:13,19 32:15 36:15 45:4,22 49:14 52:15 58:18 wanted 8:12 9:19 15:8,11 16:13 35:7 44:2,7 47:5 50:7,13 50:18 51:4,8 wants 41:15 44:25 wasn't 6:9 11:6 50:19 52:4 way 6:7 10:24 12:6 24:9 34:10,11 42:3 43:3,19 we'll 3:7 4:20 we're 12:1 23:19 24:11 40:24 41:11 41:23 43:6 48:11 49:4,9,15,18,21,24 50:24 52:1,17 53:20 55:9 56:9 58:25 we've 4:24 10:3 12:11 21:11,18 33:13 52:20 Wednesday 56:6 weekend 17:4 weigh 15:1 29:10 31:25 weight 9:22,24 30:24 31:1 32:16 34:18 41:16 weighted 9:13 31:14 went 36:9 weren't 41:24 Wesley 5:17 whichever 29:23 34:8 White 5:18 wiggle 38:9 40:9 wishes 13:8 wishy-washy 35:14 women-owned 52:2 women/minority 15:20	X Y yeah 16:9 31:3 34:16 35:20 37:7 38:6 39:24 40:4 41:21 42:17 43:2 47:23 48:5 51:4 53:6 57:4 year 14:5,6 36:8,8,11 54:24 years 10:4 13:18 14:8 14:24 49:8	2 2 1:14 33:2 43:23,25 50:2,8,8,12,15,19 50:22 2.99 14:2 20 31:5 40:23 44:3 46:11,14,19 53:20 2025 51:23 58:4 2026 1:14 4:10 60:10 218.39 29:1,22 37:9 53:14 24 46:1,21 25 30:17 40:22 46:8 287.084 53:7,16 2nd 4:10 57:9	6 6 34:3 36:20,23 37:5 37:11,19 43:22 46:12,19 47:12,23 49:22 60 43:5 600 1:12 633 1:24 65 13:16 16:18 49:4 49:12 53:20
V valuable 40:25 variance 37:19 various 3:24 22:17 vendor 14:1,6,19,21 43:8 49:6 54:3,12 vendors 32:14 verbiage 16:5 version 6:14 36:2 38:20 versus 8:9 11:22 15:19 28:2 37:17 38:5 vetted 5:10 view 20:20 vote 4:15 12:13,16,17 58:17	Z 0 0 7:15 8:1,9 30:19 31:6,9 37:8 46:12 50:8,22	3 3 33:3 3.5 13:16 30 13:20 14:1,11 40:22 44:9 49:5,24 30th 58:4 33301 1:25 39(1) 29:23 53:15 3RD 1:12	7 7 47:12,24 70 31:14	
	1 1 50:8,22 10 12:16,17 29:3,4 31:19 44:17,18,18 44:22,23 46:6,15,16 46:22 10.800 4:23 10:35 1:14 59:23 100 46:23 10th 60:10 12 13:16 49:4	4 4 14:8,24 33:4 49:8 4.3.2 7:14 8:10 33:4 33:22 4.3.2.1 16:17 38:7 4.3.2.2 38:8 4.3.2.3 38:14 4.3.2.4 38:24 4.3.2.5 39:4 4.3.2.6 39:9 4.3.3 8:9 34:7 40 46:1,20 49:23 44 36:22,23 37:3,5 45:25 46:13	8 87 22:15 88 22:15	
	9 9(1) 29:1 9:21 1:14 900 17:7,16 19:2 29:2		9	