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MR. RABINOWITZ: All right. I think we can call the meeting to order.

The first order of business is to approve the minutes from the prior meeting of October 5th.

Do I hear a motion to approve the minutes?
MS. REECE: Moved.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Second, anybody?
MS. SIEGEL: Second.
MR. RABINOWITZ: All those in favor say aye. COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. RABINOWITZ: I think it's unanimous.
We'll recess the business aspect of the meeting at this point to accept public comments. I think that one person signed in. If they want to approach the podium that would be fantastic.

MR. SIRBOLA: Okay. I was expecting to talk at the end rather than the beginning.

Hello, is there a time? What's the time?
MR. RABINOWITZ: Yeah, sorry, I didn't announce it earlier. You have four minutes. MR. SIRBOLA: Well, first off I want to be
real clear, I'm in favor, as is everyone, of having more resources for kids, and I want to be clear, as well, that the kids will see the money. There's no situation where they won't be seeing construction funds and other funds they require. However, that doesn't mean that we don't need to assess our situation so that that money is effective. And, in order to do that, we have to be honest with ourselves and our situation.

When I reviewed the materials, it was very clear that if anything materially affected the financial viability of the Bond, there was clear procedures to be followed, which included, I think, the notifying agent was the District Advisory Council was one of the options. When I tried contacting them there was no response. And this is true, also, at the School District. Aside from the issues and what they weren't responding to, it's the lack of response. It's the fact of, whether it was valid or not, there is a long history of just, we'll ignore it. It lowers our -- you know, it's a legal -- I'm not saying you're doing it on purpose, but it's also done in industry, as well.

We don't want to do that with our kids. Our
kids -- it's like a hospital, you know, it's not the same thing. I made the point that up in Palm Beach, for example -- well, let's just get right to it here. What we're talking about is chronic post traumatic stress disorder. It's a spectrum disorder. It doesn't mean that our kids are being shot, it means that they're being micro-stressed over and over and they're suffering that here. There's a billion dollar lawsuit in Compton, California. That's the type of thing that, if it happens here, will materially affect the Bond and its viability moving into the future.

Another example is what's going on in Washington where they said charters aren't really public. That's pretty clear to me when I say things like $I$ did just the other night to the School Board about how in our charters, they're being made to sign blood contracts, where if they become pregnant they have to go to a little pregnancy boot line and leave their school. There are also, in some charter schools, they are being, literally, assaulted once a month with full assault gear, dogs, guns drawn, and they're being trained not to duck and hide but that
they'll have a better chance of, quote unquote, survival. I don't know how those words can be used with an eight-year-old, chance of survival if they attack the attacker. And this is, actually, happening without, apparently, our awareness.

And, you know, so all of these things are relevant. They really do count. But they're not negatives. This complex PTSD is a unifying way for us to view all of these ills we've been viewing separately and appropriating -misappropriating blame.

When kids can't pass a test and don't know the answer to the test, it is not because we spent too much time trying to teach them the answers. It still makes my brain hurt to say.

So the difficulty here is that this trauma isn't a psychological foo-fooey something that we're coddling kids. When we present them with two things that are opposite, it damages their ability to learn. It, literally, damages their brains. It affects their ability to learn.

Look up traumaandlearning.org, traumaandlearning.org.

So, you know, when I talk about trauma, I'm
talking about learning, which is why we're here, and why the Bond exists and why we're discussing the Bond.

So, what happens is, this affects our kids minds, how we treat them. And this is real and this affects how the money is spent.

For example, we need to make room, I think, for some changes in how our physical facilities are constructed. And if we don't have proper public input and proper relationship with our school district and that relationship -MR. SHIM: 20 seconds.

MR. SIRBOLA: Thank you. And that relationship -- I'll get back to my real concern isn't even the issue of the PTSD, it's the issue of the neglect for even once these things are brought forward, I'm surprised we weren't the first in line for that lawsuit. Our kids are in distress.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Thank you.
MR. SIRBOLA: We don't gnaw on ourselves, we cut, because we're not animals. And our kids are in need. So, please, respond. Thank you.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Thank you.
MR. SIRBOLA: And it should be at the end
next time.
MR. RABINOWITZ: We'll reconvene the business meeting at this time and accept the quarterly reports. The first individual on the agenda is Tony Hunter.

MR. HUNTER: So, I'm not exactly sure in terms of what the Committee is looking for, but we certainly, as a part of our quarterly report, want to report out that we have -- in fact, I have folders for the Committee, let's first of all do that.

I think this information was previously distributed, but just in case, I'll put it in your hands.

So this quarterly report is as of September 30th, 2015. And as of that time we had, actually, started the work as it relates to technology in 60 of our schools. We had ordered 18,167 computing device and had received and installed 4,108. As of that time we had ordered 3,965 individual access points and received and installed 385 of those.

I will remind the Oversight Committee that there are some specific goals around technology that we're expected to meet. One of those is to
adhere to a minimum of a $3.5-$ to-1 student to computer ratio. So many of the schools will start out at a much higher rate, but at a minimum the Bond is supposed to get them to the 3.5-to-1.

In addition to that, we are to make sure that there is an access point in every one of the classrooms for wireless access, and then to upgrade, as necessary, the infrastructure, that being the cabling within the building, any exterior cabling as well as file servers, network switches and those things that are necessary to support the schools.

There is also a core infrastructure piece of the Bond which involves the work of upgrading the core infrastructure to support all of the schools, the core infrastructure being back in the data center at TSSC.

So that's the work that has been completed as of 9/30/2015 and I think that's where I'm supposed to stop tonight in terms of the quarterly report.

In front of you you have the data. You have a data sheet that shows each school, what their current status was at that time, whether or not they were in process or completed, and a
breakdown of what their starting point was for that student to computer ratio. And if the work has been completed, it also shows where they ended.

Additionally, there is a sheet in there, a map that, again, I want to remind the Committee that we do have a website up that keeps the community aware of where we are in this process and that website, using yellow, green and red dots will indicate whether or not the work has been completed, started or not yet started.

And then, finally, the last part of your packet is a detailed sheet that once if you would go -- anyone that goes to the website and selects one of those dots are able to pull up a detailed sheet for that school. And we use Hawks Bluff Elementary School here as an example since it was completed to show the current status of the work and the expenditures and where they started around, the computer ratio, and where they ended. Okay.

MR. RABINOWITZ: If the Committee has any questions of Mr. Hunter, please, feel free to ask.

MS. REECE: Sure. Thank you for your
presentation. I do have two questions.
How do you deal with replacements? Some of these -- I believe you explained at the last Board meeting that some schools have parent organizations that get funds, that's why their ratios are a little higher, so how do you deal with replacements of the those computers; how is the replacement?

MR. HUNTER: So I want to step back for a moment. I think the question is around why are schools winding up beyond the $3.5-$ to-1.

MS. REECE: Right.
MR. HUNTER: I want to start with the fact that the student to computer ratio was a snapshot that was taken long before the Bond was issued. So it was at that point in time. Between that time and the time that we get to the campus to start installing many factors could lead to the fact that schools have received additional equipment. Some may have received equipment through grant funds, some could receive equipment through title funds, some could have received equipment from PTA, PTO councils or whatever. But the dollar amount that was approved for the Bond for their computers, they're still entitled
to use all of that money for computers for those students. If computers are outdated as it relates to replacement, then we have a process in place through our warehousing group where that equipment is properly inventoried, marked for surplus and then the warehouse team picks that up and handles it through the District's normal disposal process.

MS. REECE: So they're not necessarily replaced once they're antiquated? So if you get a grant for a computer, it doesn't mean that the School Board is going to pay to replace that one when it's at end of life?

MR. HUNTER: No, it's really -- no, not necessarily to replace that, since it's end of life, but it's all about making sure that the students have what they need. So if that computer could still be used on the campus, the principal will make the decision to hold onto that. If it's out -- if it's end of life, then we will work with the school to make sure the proper paperwork is filled out and it's disposed of through the warehousing surplus process.

MS. REECE: One more. The second question is, it looks like you have a lot of computers on
order. With technology changing all the time, are you really able to install them quick enough or are we going to have an antiquated technology by the time it's installed?

MR. HUNTER: Great question. There is a four-week lead time on -- from the time that we order, per contract, the equipment has to be delivered and installed within four weeks.

MS. REECE: Four weeks.
MR. HUNTER: Yeah, so equipment is not sitting for long periods of time without going to schools. It's just that we're deploying quite a bit.

MS. REECE: Thank you very much.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Any other questions?
I want to follow that up. When I'm looking at the report that you provided to us, it indicates that over 18,000 computers have been ordered and 4,100 have been received. That's a gap of roughly 14,000 computers. That's a big number. And I imagine that's a big dollar amount.

MR. HUNTER: Correct.
MR. RABINOWITZ: And based upon what you just said with the four-week lead time, does that
mean, because we're now sitting here in December, that the additional 14,000 computers have already been received and installed in the schools?

MR. HUNTER: It does. Today, if we were looking at those numbers today, that number would look something like 34,000 ordered and about 19,000 delivered.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Okay. Fair enough. I assume we'll get that report at the next meeting. MR. HUNTER: You'll get that report at the next meeting. That's correct.

MR. RABINOWITZ: And, if I understood you correctly, as well, you indicated that once a dollar amount is allocated for a specific school, in fact let's use your example that you provided to us, that there was $\$ 152,000$ budgeted for Hawks Bluff Elementary, that all of those dollars, regardless of the money that's raised through other sources must still be utilized for that specific school?

MR. HUNTER: Per the Bond -- per the general obligation Bond, we must spend the money for the purpose that it was allocated, which includes for that school for the specific technology. The Bond is very specific in terms of what money goes
for computers, what amount goes for wireless, what amount goes for infrastructure. So anything that's sitting in the computer budget can only be used for computers at that school per the Bond.

Now, I will say, I would ask the Committee to, please, keep in mind that the $3.5-$ to-1 was just an entry point. The District really would love to be at a 1-to-1 for all of our students, but when that snapshot was taken, it just didn't seem feasible. Today, because of price of technology and additional computers coming on, we're able to exceed that in many cases.

MR. RABINOWITZ: So if the ratio is, actually, exceeded and all of the Bond dollars for an allocated school had not been spent, those dollars can't flow back into a general pool for other schools' benefits, though; am I understanding you correctly?

MR. HUNTER: No. At that point -- when we get to the end of this year, we will go back to the Board of Education, we will give a report to let them know in terms of what's been spent, and if there's any additional dollars that have not been spent, we will look for direction from the Board in terms of how to proceed with that.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Okay. Thank you.
Any other questions?
Thank you very much.
MR. SIRBOLA: Does the public have the option to speak at all?

MR. RABINOWITZ: No. I'm sorry.
MR. SIRBOLA: Thank you.
MR. RABINOWITZ: The agenda indicates that you, again, Mr. Hunter, are on the clock with regard to charter schools or Ms. Brown.

MS. BROWN: So Tony and I might tag team off on this one a little bit.

So, Leslie Brown, Chief Portfolio Services Officer, and the charter school department reports up in my division. We have 104 charter schools and part of the Bond project was to allow technology to be purchased through and by the charter schools. So Tony's team and my team, as well as a committee, worked together to take a look at some of the standards and some of the processes that we would use for those dollars. There was a committee that was developed. Our auditor was on it to make sure that they were looking at those processes to monitor for data on student enrollment. Of course, the charter
school office, the I.T. office, legal, also, helped us look at all of our processes, portfolio services, my team, as well as risk management.

So, what we did is we spent some really great time thinking of how to effectively identify the dollars and what those dollars could be used for and whether or not they fit state statute and the purpose of the Bond.

So, a couple of the questions that I had received, I think, from the Committee or through one of the reports was, how were the charter schools allocated the funding?

So, what we did is, there was a total \$80 million allocation for technology in the total Bond project, and we took that 80 million and we, actually, provided the benchmark enrollment date of 2014 -- I'm sorry, the FTE date of how many students were sent up to the state for FTE funding, and we divided that total number and we took a look at a calculation of per student number for technology.

Then what we did is we took a look at that date, that enrollment date at each of the charter schools, and we took that percentage of $\$ 80$ million per student allocation and applied it to
each of the charter schools.
So, there was an allocation originally established based on a proportionate share of the technology dollars based on a first due allocation on the total amount that was allocated for the project.

So, then the next question came about as to how -- how could the charter schools, actually, use that money and then how did charter schools, actually, qualify to be able to get that money?

So, there were a couple of things that we took a look at. At the state level there are lots of avenues that charter dollars are, actually, flowed through the District to charters, so we took a look at several models to make sure that we were matching what the state expectations are for, actually, passthrough purposes for funding to charter schools.

So, first of all, we took a look at the Race To The Top dollars and there was an, actual, rule set as to how dollars flowed through, what the criteria was for a charter school to be eligible for those dollars. So that was our first, kind of, what shall we say, funnel, to make sure that any dollars that were going out through the Bond
also followed the Race To The Top dollar initiative.

We, also, took a look at the rules for charter schools, state and federal, what is it, the charter school planning grants, and there are rules attached to how charter schools, how that money flows through the districts and, actually, goes out to the charter schools. And then we, also, took a look at state required surveys for district and charter schools to make sure that the charter schools completed both of those surveys in order to be eligible for the money.

So what happened was, out of that, sort of, circle of criteria, there were some that were consistent through all of them. One is, they had to be operating for three or more years or meet -- and/or meet the accreditation standards of Advanced Ed, which is a similar accreditation process that we use.

They also had to have financial stability. And what that means is we worked with our auditor's office and they check their monthlies every single month, as well as an annual audit has to be approved. And if our auditing team is seeing anything within that sequence of checks
and balances and the auditing process, if there's anything that looks like it needs to be addressed, we call them in for a financial corrective action meeting. And then if they're in financial corrective action or in some kind of a state financial emergency, they were not eligible for the dollars at all.

The other thing is, they could not be in what we call corrective action for any academic issues that were going on at the charter. Sometimes charters have some struggling points, and so what we do is we do a monitoring process for all of our charter schools. And through that monitoring process, if it is determined that a charter school is in corrective action for not serving ESL for not serving ESE, for not following the reading plan, for not doing their operations appropriately, if a charter school was in any corrective action at all, they were not eligible for those funds.

And then in every single charter there, actually, are academic goals that a charter school must meet in order to continue to operate, if they were not meeting their academic goals, they, also, were not eligible.

So what happened is, after we sifted the schools through all of these, whether we want to call them funnels, there, actually, were 64 schools that showed up as being eligible. There, actually, were some charter schools that didn't really like our rules because we work with the auditor on how they needed to keep their inventory and how they would be turning their inventory in and how it would be checked, some of the charter schools begged off. They said, we're not interested in those dollars. Okay?

At the beginning we did not tell charter schools exactly how much money they were going to get. We really told them the rules, and if they were interested in following the rules, then we applied that 2014 benchmark date to the per student allocation and we shared with the charter schools an allocation per student that they would be eligible for.

The next part of the process was they, actually, had to complete two state-required processes. They had to complete the Florida Innovates Survey. That is an online survey that every single school, including Broward County public schools, state, county public schools;
everybody has to do it, but, P.S., sometimes the charter schools don't. If they didn't do it, off the chart, you're not allowed, because that, actually, gave the charter school and us the information about what they had in their schools and how ready they were for any additional technology.

The second thing that they had to do was they had to complete a digital classroom plan, which was a brand new state statute two years ago. So, in order to be eligible for the digital classroom money from the state, we felt that was an appropriate requirement, also, to be eligible for Bond technology dollars. So, if they did not do a digital classroom plan and get that submitted and approved by the state, they, also, were not eligible for the Bond technology dollars.

So, the eligibility piece was a great, great process. I just really appreciate all the different departments we worked with to try to come up with that.

So, how were charter schools -- how was it determined as to what they could buy? So, as you could imagine, there was lots of conversation. We went out to the principals' meetings, we
included the charter schools in these conversations, we were not trying to subterfuge or not have all kinds of input in this process. So, when we went out, there was lots of requests for infrastructure, for networking, for anything that might attach to a building. We went back to state statutes and we found, which we have known this forever, but it, actually, fit beautifully, was in State Statute 1002.33, Section 8E, the assets that a charter school uses taxpayers dollars for, they, actually, if the charter school closes or is terminated must revert to the School District. So we applied that rule and said that, because everything has to revert if something happens to the charter school, we have to have the ability to recover any of the technology Bond assets if something happens to the school. So in that actual state statute it says that, in the event that a charter school is dissolved or terminated, all District School Board property and improvements, furnishings, equipment purchased with public funds, shall automatically revert back to the School District. So, in that process, in working with Tony's team and I.T., how do we control what charter
schools are able to buy? Okay?
So, again, we went along with absolutely no infrastructure, no wires, no electrical outlets that were going to not be able to be recoverable and we started at the student level first. So we took a look at any devices that a charter school might need, technology-wise, that were, actually, on bids that our great I.T. team had already established, so that was the first priority.

The second priority was technology that teachers could use within the classroom or a teacher laptop, teacher desktop, again, based on the appropriate approved bids that the I.T. department has done.

And then the last piece was anything in the classroom that, again, could be recoverable. So it might be a projector, a cart, a promethium board, those types of devices that would allow instructional use of technology. We did not allow technology to be bought for administrative purposes. It was student, teacher, classroom only.

So how did we design something that allows us to stay somewhat in control of where the money went is the I.T. team, actually, developed an
online ordering system and every single charter school got an access code where they went in and they -- I have to tell you, it took a lot of planning on their part, we sent out the catalog first so that they could see all the devices that were allowed to be purchased, and then they went in online and the system, actually, was calculating as they're shopping. It was, put it in your cart, put it in your cart, put it in your cart, and they got it down pretty darn close to the last penny.

So the other purpose for doing that is because then we, actually -- then it gets shifted to our business service center, where they are developing the purchase orders, the inventory is already defined and so that whole cycle of -from conception, eligibility, to ordering, to, actually, now, it's back in Tony's shop with the delivery, the set up and the signing off and paying the vendors for those devices that are going to the schools.

So I have copies if anybody -- maybe I can just put them on the record or something for those questions that were posed to us.

Tony, did $I$ miss anything?

MR. HUNTER: No, I think you covered it.
Thank you.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Do the members of the Committee have any questions for Mrs. Brown?

MS. REECE: This is just a school, like how charter schools run, question. Do they usually have their own I.T. staff or does your team support that.

MR. HUNTER: Charter schools have their own staff.

MS. REECE: But in this case the School Board is volunteering to provide this extra service?

MR. HUNTER: Well, the School Board has responsibility for oversight of the Bond program. So, to the extent that we need to administer the program we are participating.

MS. REECE: Okay. Thank you.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Anyone else?
MS. LEWERS: Yes. My question is, we have some of our schools that have not received anything yet and all the charter schools have gotten something or are in the process. How did charter schools bump in front of some of our schools? I'm just curious.

MR. HUNTER: Yeah, excellent question.

So charter schools -- our schools, we are installing over the next couple of years just because of the number of schools. With charter schools, it was a smaller pot of money and a smaller group of schools. So they had a specific window of time to order all of their equipment. So their equipment was ordered during the month of September. By the end of September all of their equipment orders were in and so they are now receiving their equipment. It really was for the District a much more efficient way to handle that so that we could, in fact, as Ms. Brown has indicated, manage the process, oversee the inventory and make sure that all the rules were followed.

Now, I will say that I.T. is not doing the installation for charter schools. Their I.T. staff, they are responsible for that. So we do not have staff out installing, configuring or setting up equipment for charter schools.

MS. BROWN: I think one of the other pieces is the timing with some of Tony's great work on the infrastructure is, charter schools could only order what their either little or big school could handle in their infrastructure. There was
no waiting for more bandwidth or -- because they were ordering pretty small devices. They were not ordering, you know, big large infrastructure systems.

MR. HUNTER: And that's a great point. Because you'll remember Ms. Brown mentioned that charter schools were not able to order cabling or wiring or access points.

In our case, for the rest of the schools, we're not deploying the equipment until the infrastructure is in place to support the equipment. And that's what, actually, is delaying. The pulling of cables or installing wireless access points takes a lot longer than placing an order and installing a computer. So, if that's what we were doing we would be much farther along now. But now we need to go into each building, identify what the infrastructure needs are, make sure that we take care of those. Because it makes no sense to put a lot of extra computers in a room in a school that requires wireless access without adequate wireless access there to support it.

MS. LEWERS: Okay. Thank you.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Chief, you had a question.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: I'm good.
MR. RABINOWITZ: I have a couple questions unless you had some questions.

You mentioned earlier that it's a smaller percentage of money. I agree. It appears to be about 10 percent of the Bond amount, $\$ 80$ million, which, in my mind, is still a big number. And I understand that 64 schools were selected through different eligibility parameters to receive the money, but was the amount of money, the $\$ 80$ million, established before we knew the number of schools or did we know the number of schools that would meet the eligibility requirements first? Do you understand my question?

MR. HUNTER: So the 80 million, I want to make sure that we're clear, the 80 million is not for charter schools. That's the total technology budget.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Oh, the total. Okay. The total. Thank you. Okay. I got scared for a second.

MR. HUNTER: Okay.
MS. BROWN: No, no, no.
MR. HUNTER: No. I do believe that the charter school budget was around $\$ 12$ million, a
little over 12 million.
MR. RABINOWITZ: And here's my other question, if charter schools have their own I.T. departments that are installing whatever equipment that they get as a result of this initiative, who makes sure that when they get the equipment that it's actually utilized for students versus the administration; who does that?

MS. BROWN: So that is a part of, you know, our auditing process is that we will be asking them to confirm that that's what it's being used for.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Well, I appreciate that someone's asking the question, but does someone, physically, go to these schools and make sure that this computer with this specific serial number is being utilized for the kids versus being utilized for administration?

MS. BROWN: We, actually, do annual audits. I mean, we walk about every single school every single year. So that is on the review tool for charter schools. I can't say that I would be able to tell if somebody used a computer tomorrow in an administrative office versus in the
classroom, but it is a part of our auditing tool. MR. RABINOWITZ: And my last question is this. And I appreciate the fact that you and Mr. Hunter are not, obviously, walking schools yourselves doing the audits, I understand there's probably a team that does that. My other question is, if a school is going to be buying a computer, for example, a charter school, are they questioned at all about the same ratios that are being applied to other schools? I mean, is that taken into consideration? Or how is it determined that they get this -- I understand they got a certain amount of money, but, you know, how is it determined that they should spend it on this or that for the kids?

MR. HUNTER: Ms. Brown will have to help me out here, but if you are referring to the student to computer ratio that $I$ referred to earlier, charter schools are not held to that. And Ms. Brown can speak much more to this than $I$, but charter schools are independent in their operation. So the District, to my knowledge, does not have the ability, per state statute, to, actually, dictate that. We do have a responsibility to oversee the
use of the general obligation Bond funds to make sure they are used according to what the voters voted, but I don't think, and Ms. Brown can speak to that, that we could, actually, give them a student to computer ratio that they had to comply with.

MS. BROWN: And so, just on top of that, charter schools, actually, don't have to follow our curriculum. They don't have to follow how our schools are organized. They don't have to follow the reading plan that the state requires us to follow. So, by applying the 3-to-1 ratio might be very different to what their instructional practices are at their school. So that's why when we were developing this model it was students, teachers and classroom. And the devices, again, I can't tell if you, Jeff, the administrator, is using it one day and Leslie, the teacher, is using it the next day, but that -- we're not allowed, by state statute, to go in and tell the charter school what to do in their classrooms.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Any other questions?
CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Is there an obligation for you to give computer equipment to the charter
schools or was that some decision that was made internally?

MS. BROWN: So it was a part of the Bond referendum. It was, actually, a part that the community, actually, voted for or against.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Okay.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Any other questions?
MS. SIEGEL: I just have one. So you stated that there were 64 charters that were eligible but some dropped out. What was the total number that received?

MS. BROWN: So, my apologies, it was 64 total including the ones that dropped out and the ones that were not eligible. And that's out of 104.

MS. SIEGEL: Thank you.
MS. BROWN: So, again, that pure student ratio, we did not change it. We kept it the same pure student. So the total amount that, actually, goes out to the charters of the eligible per student is less than that 12 million. That will just stay in the Bond pile because those that were eligible got what they deserved.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Mr. Chairman, from a pure instructional viewpoint, was there priority given
to higher grade levels for this technology or was it evenly applied across the board for all the grades?

MS. BROWN: It was evenly applied.
CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Okay.
MS. BROWN: So an elementary charter school has the same allocations as a high school charter school. Of course, the enrollment is much higher in a high school, so, again, it would create a larger --

MR. RABINOWITZ: I've got a question to follow up on that. Who set the parameters for the allocation of the funds within the charter school? In other words, you said it's equally divided amongst the grades, but then who determined, you know, if the school got, let's use a round number, $\$ 120,000$ and each grade got, you know, $\$ 10,000$ for their technology component, how was that determined?

MS. BROWN: Sure. We used the Race To The Top model. The Race To the Top model was based on a pure-student allocation based on an enrollment percentage of the total District. So when we knew there was an $\$ 80$ million pot, total, we divided that by the total enrollment of the

District and then applied the same rules as Race To The Top. So if Leslie Brown Charter School had 10 kids in it and the allocation was $\$ 300$ I got \$3,000.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: One more question. Did you determine what the individual computer components and programs were for each grade level or did you just come out with a standard computer for everybody?

MS. BROWN: So we don't determine what the program -- this has nothing to do with software. The computers were blank. Go ahead, Tony. Help me.

MR. HUNTER: So there was a catalog of technology items that could be purchased that had already been negotiated -- prices had already been negotiated by the District through its RFP or bid process, and we made that catalog available to charter schools and they could pick and choose from that catalog based on what they felt their needs were. So some would need a laptop, some might need a desktop, some might need an interactive board or, you know, things like that. But they would have to choose from the catalog and the catalog was developed from

District approach technologies that had been approved through our RFP process.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: But you didn't define the programs that each level of school, grade school would use; none of the instructional pieces were built into that?

MS. BROWN: There's no software built in it.
CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Did you give Microsoft Excel to second graders or did you give that to high schoolers?

MR. HUNTER: No, as it relates to charter schools, they only received the hardware. So if a computer ships with the Windows operating system on it, that's what they get. If they want Microsoft Excel or Word or Acrobat or anything like that, they have to install it at their cost. So the Bond does not allow us to purchase software. So we only purchase the hardware.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Okay. Thank you.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Any other questions?
Thank you very much.
The next report was concerning the construction report from Mr. Moquin, if I pronounced that appropriately.

MR. MOQUIN: Yes. Good evening. Jeff

Moquin, Chief of Staff.
The report on the construction aspect of the Bond program was largely involving the development of the infrastructure over the past few months relative to deliver a program of this magnitude.

For the reporting period relative to this quarterly report, the two big milestones were really the on-boarding of two of the strategic business partners to execute the program, one being Heery International as the owner rep, who will be delivering project management services, and then Atkins North America, who is going to be giving us the cost and program controls. So those two firms are on-boarding.

As we stated in the summary report we focused on the infrastructure and the E-Builder system that was part of Atkins' contract that we are in the process now of implementing, talking about some of the project starter meetings and then, ultimately, culminating with the very first three projects went to the Board for approval for advertisement on November 3rd for Stranahan High School, Blanche Ely and Northeast.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Any questions?

United Reporting, Inc.

MS. REECE: When you say that the projects went to the Board for approval, just to go up for an RFP or what was the approval?

MR. MOQUIN: Yes. Our process that we have internally requires the Board to, basically, authorize the release of the RFP. So all three of them were requests for design/builder services for those three large renovation projects.

MS. REECE: Where are the amounts of those projects? Are they somewhere in here?

MR. MOQUIN: Yeah, they ranged from 14.8 to \$16 million.

Yeah, these are three of our most critical, largest projects that we will roll out throughout the entire Bond program.

MS. REECE: Thank you.
CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Mr. Moquin, wasn't there some previous allocation for those schools that they had some deterioration going on currently, it was part of a previous construction.

MR. MOQUIN: That's one of the messages that we're trying to convey. Before the Bond had been approved our Board had asked us to develop a five-year capital program as if the Bond wasn't going to be approved. And so there were certain
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projects that had been approved assuming the Bond hadn't gotten done. And then when the Bond was approved, we went back and amended the program. What we are doing is we have taken the existing millage in those projects and combined them with the Bond and that's what we call our SMART Program. So if you, actually, look at our five-year capital program or what we've branded the SMART Program, it's actually $\$ 984$ million. So it's a combination of the $\$ 800$ million of Bond and the $\$ 184$ million of existing millage.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Yeah, there was some significant discussion about that, I'm sure, and there has been some public concern.

MR. MOQUIN: Well, I think the concern that I have heard as I go out and talk to some of the community members was the thought that there was a supplanting effort. And we've tried to demonstrate it's, actually, supplementing. And, again, the allocation of these funds was not based on schools getting an equal percentage or per-student allocation. It was purely driven based on need. So, if the need existed, there's a project there to resolve the issue with the school.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Thank you.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Any other questions?
MS. REECE: I do have one. And it's probably not for this meeting, but in a future meeting would there be a way to see, maybe in a one-liner, the school and the total budget, like the unspent balance in the project, something with a little higher level? It's hard to look at each project, individually, and kind of put context. Do you have like a one -- like a schedule where you can see on one page? Like, for Stranahan it would say, they have appropriated an unspent $\$ 15$ million. Next year they're going to get another two million; you know what I mean, so you can see each -MR. MOQUIN: Yeah, and we can, absolutely, do something like that for the entire program. Additionally, one of the things that the team is working on right now is taking all of the Year 1 projects and, actually, developing a master calendar. So we'll be able to, most likely before your next meeting, you'll be able to see a calendar of all the Year 1 projects, when we anticipate on going to the Board for release of the RFP, when we're anticipating award and the
like, so you'll get to see as we ramp up now -like I was just telling the Board Tuesday, you know, we brought those first three projects in November. Tuesday night there were eight more projects that are going out. And I've told them, be prepared, every meeting now you're going to see the program starting to ramp up and more and more projects, you know, being let out on the streets.

So we'll have more data for you in the next quarterly report.

The only other thing that $I$ will point out that's moving along really well, too, for the Year 1 is the $\$ 100,000$ school choice priority, where schools have $\$ 100,000$ to do a capital project of their choice. We have had -- the process dictates that it will -- the school will make those determinations in consult with their PTA or their SAT Committee and there will be a school-wide vote given a choice of two projects in terms of determining what the ultimate use of those allocations will be. So we have had preliminary meetings with all of the Year 1 projects. They are in various stages of either going to vote or we're trying to formulate a cost
estimate and a scope of the project. What we're finding and we'll hopefully simplify the process moving forward is that a lot of the schools are, actually, choosing the same thing. So what we're seeing is a lot of schools wanting to have electronic marquee, more playgrounds or shade structures installed. So we're, actually, working with our PPO team and our procurement team to make sure that we have the capacity to deliver those projects really quickly through vendor pools. And so that's moving along well, too.

MS. SIEGEL: You said the school was voting. Was that staff at the school or staff and families?

MR. MOQUIN: We've modeled it after what they call the unified dress code where it's both the staff and the parents of students voting, so trying to make it, truly, a school community decision, both of staff and parents.

MS. SIEGEL: And are the students included in the vote?

MR. MOQUIN: Are the students included in the vote?

MS. GABY: No, the parents vote. The parents
vote based on how many students they have, the enrollees.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Can you just say your name so we have it on the record?

MS. GABY: Marlane Gaby with the Heery team.
MS. SIEGEL: With the what team?
MS. GABY: Heery.
MR. MOQUIN: She's the team lead for the schools for the south region.

MS. LEWERS: If a student is part of the SAC and SAF they do vote. Is she saying there's no student participation?

MR. MOQUIN: Well, there is student participation on a lot of the SACs and SAF. The SAF isn't really doing the voting, per se. What they're doing is determining the choices that will go out to vote. So, in some instance, there is student participation in trying to narrow down what the choice would be.

MS. LEWERS: Thank you.
CHIEF DIPETRILLO: I have one question. In reference to Ms. Reece's comment about a running total on the Bond expenditures, the first group looks like about 45 million and then you just said you had some others out there. Could you
provide us with a running total? We know it's not expended until the project is completed, but what is, actually, being allocated or encumbered at that point against your goal for each year?

MR. MOQUIN: Absolutely.
CHIEF DIPETRILLO: All right. Thank you.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Anyone else?
Thank you very much.
Mr. Shim.
MR. SHIM: Thank you. And good evening. Omar Shim, Director of Capital Budget.

The purpose of the budget activity report is to provide financial activity for projects in the SMART Program for the quarter ending September 30th, 2015.

The budget activity report may give some indication of the project activity, but it doesn't give the status of the projects and technology and should be used in conjunction with the construction and I.T. status reports. The budget activity report is organized in a logical way with the introduction that provides some background and some historical context. There is a glossary of terms to provide, you know, some definitions and notes that provide specifics
about the numbers in the actual tables. So the introduction and the notes are an integral part of the report and will provide the context for the tables, you know, the numbers that you see.

On page 4, the general obligation Bond was approved by the public on November 4th, about a year ago, 2014. And, although the GOB funds were approved 10 months prior to the reporting period, in order to make funding available for the SMART Program, the last fiscal year and our current fiscal year is Year 1 and 2 of the actual SMART Program. So you'll see in that table that it, actually, is Year 1 and 2, which totals 449 or $\$ 450$ million is what's currently in our current budget for the SMART Program.

Now, on page 6 I just want to kind of go over some of the definitions, and, particularly, you hear about the Bond and the SMART Program, well, the SMART Program, as Mr. Moquin indicated, includes $\$ 800$ million for the GOB funding and $\$ 187$ million after we approved all the addendums that were approved during the amendment into categories of the SMART Program. It stands for Safety, Music and Arts, Athletic, Renovation and Technology projects totalling 987 million. The

District Educational Facilities Plan was amended on May 19th, 2015 to incorporate the SMART Program into our capital plan and we just recently adopted the plan, which didn't change any of the projects in the SMART Program that was amended on May 19th.

To effectively deliver projects at any particular school, the Facilities Department may need to combine several categories of the SMART Program into one project to deliver the project that encompasses scope of individual categories. Now, the way that we report that out on the expenditures is that we -- of a combined project, is that we provide expenses that are a percentage of the budget. So, if there's a project that incorporates a safety project and a renovation project and it's in one project, the way that we report the expenses out is a proportion of the budget. And that may or may not, actually, reflect the reality of it, but it's difficult to, actually, show expenses on each of those categories in an actual contract because you don't know if the guy -- if the workers are going there to work on one or the other. So that's just a note on how the expenses are allocated in
the categories.
As it pertains to the program management fee allocation, the projects that are being managed by the external consultants, as you know there's a program manager with Heery and as our owner representative and the cost -- the cost of program management managers are included in the project budgets and the expenses will be prorated as a proportion of the project budgets assigned to the project manager. So that's just how those are shown.

On page 7, I wanted to point out that the planned issuance of these bonds is based, initially, in our plan over five series to align with the needs of the projects in the SMART Program. The actual amounts that will be issued may vary from that plan based upon the actual execution of the projects and the cash flow projects that are in here. And so you can see in that table on Roman numeral 7 that -- how the Bond issue is planned out.

The first year of 162.7 about 167 million, we already issued, I think, it's in June and then the others are planned. The second year is planned this year. So that's --

On page 1 of the report it provides an overview of the 450 million that's budgeted in the SMART Program for Years 1 and 2 in the categories that were mentioned. This table also shows that there is 356.2 million in $G O B$ and 93.7 million in Non-GOB funding for those two years.

It shows that the 450 million allocated for Years 1 and 2 projects, 92.4 million of the budgeted projects reflect financial activity. Projects with financial activity are those that have expenditures and/or purchase orders or other commitments on those projects. Also shown on the table are the original budgets and the current budgets. These columns are shown if they have any changes from the original budget. At this time in this report there were no changes, so the current budget figures are the same as the original budget figures.

On page 3 of the report a summary of the expenditures and commitments for the $\$ 92.4$ million in active projects, financially active projects, are shown for the SMART Program. The District had 3.7 million in expenditures last fiscal year that ended on June 30th, 2015 and 4.9 million for the first quarter of this year that
ended September 30th, 2015. This totals 8.6 million in expenditures for the SMART Program up through September.

The increased rate in expenditures is expected to continue as the District ramps up its operation to deliver projects of technology.

The District commitments were 25.5 million as of September 30th, 2015, which includes purchase orders, contracts and requisitions. And out of the 92.4 million in projects that show financial activity, there were uncommitted price balances of 58.2 million after commitments and expenditures.

This table also breaks down the financial activity into the SMART categories and into GOB or Non-GOB funding.

The details that are shown between pages 5 and 18 are the actual financial activity on a project by project level. And this report shows the original budget and the current budget. And, as I mentioned, there's no changes on those as of this time. And it shows prior year expenditures commitments, the current year expenditure and the remaining balance for each product. This detail rolls up to the 92.4 million summarized for the
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financial active projects shown on page 3.
Page 19 to 53 provides a budget -- the budget summary and detailed list of the remaining projects in the SMART Program for Years 1 and 2.

So that just gives you, kind of, like a guideline of the report, and if you have any questions I'm willing to take them.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Questions?
Ms. Reece, go ahead. Ladies first.
MS. REECE: First of all, this is what I was looking for. So this is what $I$ was hoping for where it shows the unspent balance and at a project level versus the school level was hard for me to kind of determine. So now that I know what it is, this is exactly what I was looking for.

So I have a question about project management. You have the contracts in this, right, that you just entered into the agreements for project management. What percent of each budget is that and how is that incorporated into the budgets versus what the quote came back at?

MR. MOQUIN: What we are doing right now for each of the projects to go forward is we're allocating five percent of the project budget to
account for the administrative consultant costs for both Heery and Atkins.

MS. REECE: And what's the role of School Board staff versus the project manager; how is that relationship going to work?

MR. MOQUIN: The way that the structure of the School Board staff, it's really to monitor and oversee. So rather than having project management and project managers, per se, they've -- we've structured the department to sort of be pre-construction, then a construction unit, and then sort of a program controls oversight. So it's, basically, three units where on the pre-construction side it's around certain disciplines and expertise to sort of like recognizing that a lot of the projects are either mechanical or architectural, so there's an architectural discipline, there's a mechanical discipline, recognizing there's a lot of HVAC projects, et cetera. Then on the construction side there are, basically, two construction managers whose role is to provide the oversight to Heery.

MS. REECE: So you have more contracts -- I'm sorry. I know you explained it, but I'm just
trying to clarify. You have a contract manager that's managing the contract and then your staff is doing certain architectural work?

MR. MOQUIN: No, the entire staff, internal staff, is largely geared to provide monitoring and oversight of the strategic business partners, not to necessarily execute the work.

MS. REECE: And the RFPs are created by staff or by the contractor now?

MR. MOQUIN: Both.
MS. REECE: Okay. And you think five percent is going to be sufficient to provide all of that service?

MR. MOQUIN: Well, the way that the contracts are set up is they're a fee for service with a cap based on the total construction costs. So, in terms of the development of these first three, in recognizing that we're going to be doing sort of a straight line allocation of those costs across all the projects, that's the number that we're using at this juncture. Clearly, we'll have to monitor that as we get into execution of the project and the program.

MS. REECE: Okay. That was my questions.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Anybody else?

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Yeah, I have one question. MR. RABINOWITZ: Please.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: There was an awkward piece in the paper in August and Mr. Runcie and Ms.

Korn responded to some of the projects. I'm looking at the project total, there's $\$ 450$ million in the first two years, that's roughly 50 percent or nearly 50 percent of the Bond in the first two years. That's a fairly significant capital investment right up front. You said you had some more staff and you hired some more staff. Do you have enough people to be able to get these projects off the ground before you get backlogged on the first couple of years before you get to year three and you have to start letting out more contracts? Do you think you can handle the capacity of 450 million for the projects right up front?

MR. MOQUIN: Well, that's part of the reason why we amended our overall strategy for the department as a whole; right? The beauty of the new model, relying on the strategic business partners, is that it's scaleable. So, clearly, we're going to be able to tap that expertise, as well as those resources on an as-needed basis and
to bring on certain skill sets when they're needed, and then when they're no longer needed, go ahead and excuse them from the project, per se. So that's part of the reason why, rather than having to bring on a whole bunch of internal staff and ramp them up and then when the programs slow down or, you know, the way that the previous chief facilities officer structured the department is he believes it's the right size regardless of the size of the capital program and then depending on how much revenue exists to address needs, capital needs, then we can ramp up the strategic business partners on an as-needed basis, scale it up and down.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: That answers my question. Thank you.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Any other questions?
I have a couple. I say this being a huge sports fan, and possibly, Mr. Shim, you can't answer this question, but I'm curious, and I'm happy to see that there's almost $\$ 12$ million allocated for music and art and only almost four million for athletics, that to me, in my mind, is a good thing, knowing that $I$ have two little girls that aren't in athletics, but when $I$ look
at the financially active projects, why is there, basically, a small utilization of those allocated funds in Years 1 and 2? At this point it appears there's only about $\$ 169,000$ being utilized for music and art, yet they've already almost utilized a third of the athletics budget; if you know? I'm just curious.

MR. SHIM: I mean, I'm -- just from the financial perspective, I mean, I think it's within the implementation of how, you know, what we did is we are in the beginning stages, and so each area is gearing up to do a lot of this deployment. And so it is within those implementation plans of the functional departments of how they implemented it. And so whether or not we were in a position at this specific time to actually push those pieces out the door, but I believe that we're moving forward with those pieces, so even -- even if the music piece wasn't, you know, there at the time of this report, I think it's being, you know, getting in position to do that.

MR. RABINOWITZ: So if I understand you, hopefully, by the next meeting we're going to have -- we'll see some more movement on the music
and arts side?
MR. SHIM: Well, I'll certainly have the right person to answer your question.

MR. RABINOWITZ: I appreciate that.
Thank you.
MS. LEWERS: Why don't we go -- and I know I did ask Pat on this one, my members are asking me when we're going to get an itemized list of what we're spending at each school. I know you told us a total amount of what's going to what, but an actual itemized amount, when will the public know what we're getting for 160,000 at whatever school, what are we actually spending on? Because we say computers and that's it but we never have to say exactly what we're getting. Because I can't tell my husband I'm going to the store to buy a dress or something for that amount. He wants to know what I, actually, bought for that amount.

MR. HUNTER: We can certainly get that for you. We can provide -- for any projects that are completed we can provide the itemized lists. We can show you exactly -- in fact, what we haven't done is assigned a dollar amount to it, but if you will look at the report that I gave you
earlier, and let's look at a couple of the completed schools, if you will go down to Challenger Elementary School -- or let's go to Chapel Trail, if you don't mind, Chapel Trail Elementary School, you will see that we ordered 324 computers and we received 324 computers, that their beginning was student to computer ratio was 9.3-to-1 and after receiving and installing those computers they were at 1.3-to-1. You will also see over in the wireless access point area for Chapel Trail that it was in process at that time and 71 of the access points had been ordered but zero had been received. So, now -- and the Committee will have to tell me whether or not you want more detail down to actual models and those kind of things, we can pull that, but this particular table shows exactly and will continue to show exactly what has been ordered and installed per school. Is that what you were looking for?

MS. LEWERS: Yes.
MR. HUNTER: Okay.
CHIEf DIPETRILLO: Mr. Chairman, going back to the original question, I think -- and I think I heard it because I was trying to listen and
look at things at the same time, but didn't you say that besides the parents that were involved in some of the processes in developing your technology plan that the teachers and the students that the overall administration within each school, their decision making process was the one that identified the computers and the numbers and the technology that was necessary?

MR. HUNTER: I think you're referring to the $\$ 100,000$ choice program.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: No, actually in developing the plan.

MR. HUNTER: Oh, developing the strategic plan?

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Developing the numbers for each location.

MR. HUNTER: So the way that works is that a team from I.T., as well as our instructional technology team and professional development goes to meet with a team from the school that the principal pulls together, whomever he or she deems they would like to, and, together, we kind of talk through what the options are. We kind of go over the entire program with the school. We leave that with them and they have up to a week
later to report back what they would like to order. So we go over with the school the catalog, all of the options, what they can buy, you know, and answer any questions they may have around the use of that technology. And then we give them a week to get back with us and let us know what they would like to order and at that point we start the ordering process.

MR. RABINOWITZ: But that total choice is theirs in the end? But do you guide them if they order something that's not compatible?

MR. HUNTER: The choice is theirs with guidance. So they have to purchase equipment and technology that's on an approved list.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: They're not going to buy something that's not compatible with something else or usable.

MR. HUNTER: That's correct. So there is
guidance there. But we do leave a great deal -they determine exactly which classrooms, what -how they want, what they want to buy for students, what they want to buy for teachers, et cetera.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: I mean, obviously, you have experience in doing this, so, you know,
second graders aren't going to use something that a 12th grader would use, essentially.

MR. HUNTER: Yeah, that's true. But we rely -- at that point we rely more upon the instructional leadership of the school to determine what's appropriate for those grade levels.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Okay.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Any other questions?
CHIEF DIPETRILLO: No, I thought maybe there was a menu that said if you were in 12 th or 11 th you can only pick these things, but he explained it well.

MR. RABINOWITZ: TaxWatch is on the clock. Do you want to take a break for a few minutes, for five minutes, or do we want to just trudge on through?

Okay. Why don't we break for five minutes, 10 minutes.
(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken).
MR. RABINOWITZ: All right. We'll call the meeting back to order.

MR. NAVE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Bob Nave. I'm Vice President of Research for Florida TaxWatch and we had an opportunity to
review the quarterly reports submitted by the District. And, again, we received the four reports that have been presented tonight on October 3rd, and then on November 4 th we received the revised SMART Program Technology SBBC Schools Report that was revised to include footnotes that outlined the student to computer ratio and the wireless access points standards that Mr. Hunter talked about earlier. And because we had never looked at one of these before, I had to figure out, well, what do $I$ use to guide my review of this? And the Resolution that was adopted by the Board provides the guidance to the Bond Oversight Committee and the direction is clear. When we review these quarterly reports, our task is to make sure that the Bond revenues are being spent for the purposes set forth in the Bond program as approved by the Board.

So I went to the District Educational Facilities Plan that was amended in May to include not only the $\$ 800$ million from the general obligation Bond, but $\$ 184$ million in other moneys. And that's what I reviewed these quarterly reports against. And I hope that's what you reviewed the reports against.

Facilities Construction, Mr. Moquin talked about the progress in facilities construction and it's primarily the on-boarding of two strategic business partners, one for the project management and then one for the cost and other controls management. And there's a statement in the report that talked about the owner's representative establishing a central coordinated repository of data. And we thought that was not only a good idea, but it was also consistent with one of the Best Practices that we presented at the last meeting about maintaining a single database where Committee members can get all the information they need. So we think that was a good thing.

I don't see real well, so I have to look at it for just a second to make sure we're on the same slide.

So there was another provision in there where the owner's representative discussed establishing performance metrics that would be used to determine whether this program is operating efficiently and to identify areas that require improvement. And we looked at that and TaxWatch is recommending to the Oversight Committee that
you be allowed to participate in establishing those metrics to make sure that any key performance metrics, anything that's going to measure the success of this program, that you are involved in the process and you have an opportunity to review and concur with those.

There was also mention made of the use of E-Builder, which is a web-based project management tool that will be used to report all the project schedules, expenditures and the key performance indicators. And TaxWatch recommends that the Committee invite folks from Atkins to demo this project to you so that you have a comfort level with it and so that you know whether the use of this will give you all the information you need to answer the questions you have. So we think asking them to demo that is a good thing.

There was mention made earlier about project charter meetings to -- which if the reports are used to discuss different project delivery methods and to make sure that the work is being done as efficiently and effectively as possible. TaxWatch recommends that the purpose of these charter meetings be revised consistent with one
of our recommended Best Practices, to make sure that they also look for opportunities to implement cost-saving measures.

There was mention made, also, of expanding on delivery methods ostensibly to attract a wide range of potential proposers to execute the projects. TaxWatch thinks that's a good thing. We think that's necessary to ensure the participation of women and minority-owned businesses and businesses that have been historically underutilized. So we think that's a good thing.

There's mention, also, of the co-location or the relocation of the District Building Department to the Rock Island Administration Center in the beginning of 2016. We think having all the key players co-located in the same facility will help the process. We think that will be critical to the success of the SMART Program.

One thing we saw in the contracts with the strategic business partners were references to allegations of potential Sunshine Law violations during the evaluation process for both hires. And TaxWatch recommends that the Committee
request a briefing by the District's General Counsel so that you better understand the nature of the allegations, the steps taken to resolve the concerns, and what the District's going to do to mitigate the likelihood of having to repeat future evaluation and selection processes. Moving on to the technology -MR. RABINOWITZ: Mr. Nave, can I just interrupt you for just a moment? Before moving on to that, I mean, I think it would be more beneficial to, basically, cover each section and if members of the Committee have questions about the section concerning facilities construction that we handle it that way. So I'd rather open it up to the Committee to ask you questions about facilities construction before we move and go over the balance of the report, if that's okay with you, as well.

MR. NAVE: You're the Chairman.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Fair enough. Thank you. Any questions of Mr. Nave about the facilities construction review that they performed?

MS. REECE: Are you going to be asking us to vote on his recommendations? I mean, are we
going to be discussing one by one and then voting?

MR. RABINOWITZ: Well, let's ask him questions first and then we can address.

No questions?
CHIEF DIPETRILLO: I do have one. You did in -- let me go back and see which one it was. You talked about in page 3 under cost and program controls manager, you talked about the E-Builder program, a web-based capital program management construction project software. Is that something the School Board would be familiar with or is this something new on the market that, you know, you're recommending that it's better than the process they're using now?

MR. MOQUIN: The good thing about this particular solution, before we incorporated the requirement to provide a solution through the contract, staff had already started to kind of conduct their own search in terms of replacing the existing systems that we have, currently, for project management, and that was the system that staff was eyeing, thought that would be a good solution. It turns out that both Heery and Atkins are very familiar with the solution, so we
feel comfortable that that's going to be the right solution for this program and we're more than happy to have them -- we anticipate that full implementation will be done by the beginning of March. So we'd be more than happy to come out and do some kind of a demo relative to the system at your next meeting.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Is that cost contemplated in the Bond or is that something in addition to the Bond?

MR. MOQUIN: It's infused into Atkins' contract. So it's contemplated. It was a requirement of their contract to provide the solution since they're going to be the prime strategic partner over the cost estimating, scheduling, program management, that sort of thing, so --

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: All right. Thank you.
MS. REECE: I have a follow-up on that.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Sure.
MS. REECE: So do you have certain projects that you manage inhouse, as well, in addition to what Atkins is managing?

MR. MOQUIN: I'm going to say no at this juncture. There are certain projects that are
legacy projects, where inhouse staff is working to go bring closure to them. There are -- this school, for example, is a legacy project where we do have a District project manager kind of overseeing the completion of a partial phase replacement of this school where we're at.

The real issue is that currently, at least through mid-January, we have two program managers. Before this most recent RFP we had contracted with URS and they are providing project management services over projects that had been previously approved and then DEFP before the award or the approval of the Bond and now Heery is going to be our owner rep going forward. So the question that we're having is how we're -the internal discussions about, is the transition of those projects that they are overseeing and whether or not we want to go ahead and incorporate them into Heery's contract or if we want to try to utilize some of the internal staff to bring closure to them.

MS. REECE: So, ultimately, everything would be in the one E-Builder system, though?

MR. MOQUIN: Yes. Absolutely.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Chief?

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: This may be a little off of the previous question I asked earlier, I'm not sure if this is a good time to ask, but since we're on facilities, you said you had five percent set aside for management fees for these projects; is that a total allocation from the entire Bond project; and is that scaleable; or is it emphatically five percent for every project no matter what the size.

MR. MOQUIN: Again, what we're doing is we're just trying to take what the proposed costs are and then work into a percentage against the work that we anticipate them overseeing. So, taking the cap, if you will, that they projected as a percentage of the cost of construction that that cost is supposed to oversee, it's roughly five percent, and that's how we're using that number.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: But if the project is \$100 million and a project is $\$ 50,000$, obviously, you have a little more leverage when you're dealing with a \$100 million project; do you get a reduction in those fees?

MR. MOQUIN: Again, that's not how they're paid. They're paid for a fee for service for the work that they, actually, perform. The five
percent is just a way for us, from an accounting standpoint, to apply the cost to the project rather than trying to say, how many hours did you spend on Stranahan; how many hours did you spend on this project? The administrative burden associated with that would be tremendous. So we just rather have said, let's go ahead and do a straight line allocation of what the actual costs are on a percentage basis across all of the projects.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Thank you.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Any other questions? CHIEF DIPETRILLO: No, I'm good.

MR. RABINOWITZ: I have one question.
Mr. Nave, with regard to a member of the Committee, this Committee, participating in the key performance metrics, how do you envision that, actually, happening? Would there be a subcommittee created that would interface with whoever at the District relative to that circumstance or a liaison; what would be your recommendation?

MR. NAVE: In our Best Practices document we -- we recommended an appropriate size of this group that would permit subcommittees to be
formed. So I think putting a subcommittee together, two or three of the Committee members or whatever number you think is appropriate would be a good way to go about that. It's just -- the intent is to make sure that if key performance measures are going to be established, then TaxWatch believes the Committee should be at the table, how you get there and how many you get there would certainly be up to you.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Okay. I have somebody in mind who is not on the Committee yet, but --

Any other questions, comments, concerns relative to this?

Are there any motions relative to the recommendations at this time of the TaxWatch's recommendations concerning facilities construction; or do you guys want to handle it at the end?

MS. REECE: Let's go section by section. And I do have one more concern. It's not a question, but, why do you think that we -- our board should be involved in issues about Sunshine Law and RFPs, is that like -- I don't know if that's within the scope of our duties.

MR. NAVE: It may not be and it may be
something that you choose to take a pass on. I just -- given the fact that bids are going to be let and that there's going to be a very public procurement process and these are very large dollar projects, the fact that the two that have been done so far had allegations of Sunshine Law, if $I$ were on the Committee I would just be curious as to what was the nature of the violations or the allegations. It's clear in the report that the District's decision to start over and rebid was done in an abundance of caution, so they probably erred on the side of safety, but I would want to know that.

MS. REECE: Thank you.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Chief, did you have a comment.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: No, I think I'm good. MR. CARLAND: Mr. Chair, Committee, I'm Paul Carland, General Counsel for the School Board. I'm happy to address that issue tonight if you would like me to. I could do it now. I don't think it would take too long.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Go for it.
MR. CARLAND: Okay. As was noted, there were the two procurements that went out relative to
the program consultants that facilities wanted. They were a little bit different than the ordinary that we've done through our procurement office before, in that we had somewhat different personnel involved in the screening committees than we would normally have in your procurement office. When those committees met and went through the process to select the appropriate consultant there was a concern that there had been some Sunshine violations. Now, when we looked at that issue, the meetings for those particular -- where the concerns arose were, in fact, publicly advertised meetings. And, remember, Sunshine Law, basically, has two requirements, that you have a publicly noticed meeting and that you provide minutes after the meeting has occurred. The concern -- again, because they were already publicly noticed, the concern was that there was not enough active discussion amongst the Committee members when they were doing their voting. And that, therefore, there was some concern that the public was not fully apprised of the process by which the committee was reaching its decision.

So when we reviewed that, again, it was
indicated, in an abundance of caution, as the Sunshine permits, we recommended that there be a cure meeting whereby the committee, actually, re-met and rescored and publicly announced the scores during the course of the open meeting.

When the procurements, actually, came to the Board for award, I provide a memorandum to the Board outlining what the concerns were, how we cured those under the Sunshine Law, also, discussed with the Board on the record what I had outlined in the memo. We were very careful, as well, when the agenda items came to the Board to provide, again, all of the documentation over and above what ordinarily would come to the Board, so that the public, even if their first intersection was the Board's review and approval, that they, again, had open access to all the documentation. Our office did consult with the Attorney General's Office, Pat Gleason, when we developed the cure process, and so we feel like the Sunshine concerns were completely addressed. The memo that was provided to the Board is a public document. I'm happy to provide that to the Committee, if you would like.

MR. NAVE: And, Mr. Chairman, I would add
that Pat Gleason, for those of you who don't know, Pat is the state's resident expert on all things Sunshine Law and open government. And if she is comfortable with the cure, then it's a good cure.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Anybody else have comments about that issue?

No?
Thank you very much.
MR. CARLAND: Yes, sir.
MR. RABINOWITZ: We have the report in front of us concerning facilities construction. Are there any motions from the Committee relative to the recommendations made by TaxWatch?

I, actually, had one other question on -there was a comment about bringing Heery and Atkins together in the Rock Island Administrative Center; I mean, is that even feasible from a space perspective in getting the personnel there?

MR. MOQUIN: Yeah, we believe so, with some minor modifications around the infrastructure, primarily around some of the wireless access issues. So we believe there's going to have to be a small investment. But that's currently where the Building Department is housed and there
is available space within that center. It's an old elementary school. And, so, we're working on implementing that.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Okay. Thank you.
CHIEF DIPETRILLO: One quick question on that point.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Sure.
CHIEF DIPETRILLO: When you do bring them together, they are your subcontractor; correct? Atkins is your subcontractor?

MR. MOQUIN: They're both prime contractors for different aspects.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: They're not in competition with each other, there's no --

MR. MOQUIN: No, no, no, no.
CHIEF DIPETRILLO: They're strictly representatives of the Board here and the District; correct?

MR. MOQUIN: Yes.
CHIEF DIPETRILLO: They're working directly for you.

MR. MOQUIN: Yes.
CHIEF DIPETRILLO: There's not going to be any issues with one of your two parties working as far as projects, conflicts of interest, et
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cetera?

MR. MOQUIN: No. I mean, we've been working together now for a couple months very well, kind of outlining delineation of roles and responsibilities relative to project execution. I think we're in a really good place.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: All right. That answers my question.

Thank you.
MS. REECE: Has staff looked at these recommendations and do they have an opinion?

MR. MOQUIN: I did look at them. I don't really have issue with any of them. You know, we are more than happy to demo the E-Builder system and relative to participation in the development of performance metrics, I think what might be easier is, perhaps, once we develop the framework of what we believe we're going to use, is, maybe, come and share that and then talk about gaps or other aspects of the program performance that the Committee would be interested in seeing and then potentially, you know, developing our dashboard even further. As opposed to, you know, trying to organically do that from scratch, let us go kind of show you what we're thinking and then see if
there's any gaps where we can supplement it. MR. RABINOWITZ: When do you think that can, actually, take place?

MR. MOQUIN: March.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Okay. So, I suppose we could table the idea of creating a committee until that point in time after we have an idea of what they will have to present to us.

Okay. Thank you.
Move on to technology, Mr. Nave.
MR. NAVE: Thank you. Mr. Hunter outlined the report for the schools that are under the direction of the District, and his report itemized the number of additional computers that have been ordered for each school, the number that have been received, the number of wireless access points ordered and installed. And, again, it's all geared towards achieving or exceeding the standard of, you know, three and a half students per computer and one wireless access point per classroom.

And this gives me pause to wonder whether I thought that slide was so important that I needed to put it in there twice or whether I made a mistake. So let's assume it's a mistake.
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For 12 of the schools that were identified in Mr. Hunter's report a sufficient number of computers had been ordered and received to meet the 3.5-to-1 standard. Five of the schools, though, have final student to computer ratios below 2.1. And having one computer per every two students is better than having one computer for every three or three and a half students. I'm certainly not going to argue that, but it does suggest that more computers were purchased than were needed to achieve the desired standards and it begs the question, what's the proper thing to do in a situation like that? If those cost savings could be reverted and reallocated to meet other needs, then that would be a good thing. If not, then having more computers per student, then, certainly, that's a good thing, as well. So, you've got countervailing good things here.

MS. REECE: So I believe that question was already addressed, that it can't be moved based on Bond covenants; correct? That it was guaranteed to each school, the technology funds, so it's got to be spent within that school regardless if they have 1 -to-1 or 3 -to-1?

MR. HUNTER: Yes, that's the commitment that
the Board has made to the schools, that those dollars will be available to the schools.

MS. REECE: Okay.
MR. RABINOWITZ: I'll follow it up.
Is there any way to go back to the Board? I mean, it just seems inequitable in some areas that you have greater participation, whether it be the school being more active in getting dollars from other places, that some districts don't have the same benefits -- or, excuse me some schools don't have the same benefit that others do.

I mean, is there no way to address that?
MR. HUNTER: Most certainly we can take that conversation back to the Board as a recommendation of the Oversight Committee. I would be more than happy to do that. But I need to know, specifically, what the Oversight Committee is asking the board to consider. MR. RABINOWITZ: I think that the Committee, correct me if I'm wrong, is suggesting that while there was a fixed dollar amount that was allocated for technology for each school, that once certain recommended ratios are already achieved, that the amount of money that was
allocated for a specific school could be lowered and possibly reallocated to another school for whatever other needs may be necessary. That may make some departments of the District crazy, but that's kind of our job.

MR. HUNTER: Let me -- so, yes, we'll be happy. I was just asking our General Counsel if there was anything legally that precluded us from having that conversation with the Board or having the Board consider that at this time. He said there was not. So we'll take that as an action item to take back to the Board. We'll get that -- I'll work with our Chief of Staff to determine the appropriate time, whether or not that's a workshop or agenda item. More than likely, he will direct us there.

MR. MOQUIN: Again, I'm just kind of brainstorming out loud, but this Committee, we were planning on you going to a workshop anyway to kind of report out. I think that that could be something that you could present to the Board on behalf of the Committee in terms of your consideration from the first quarterly report of things you want them to consider moving forward. So it might be even more appropriate in that
forum, the Committee, if it's something that they want the Board to consider, to present it at that time.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Okay.
MS. REECE: If I may, to my point earlier about computer replacement, that's sort of where I was going, too. If you have an equal replacement for schools each year, if you get computers through grants or other sources you'd want to make sure that whatever your baseline is that you would be able to replace it periodically.

MR. HUNTER: Yeah, currently the District does not have a standard refresh schedule. Our funding for technology is based on available funds each year and those funds could be a combination of things from capital funds to grants to -- and this year, of course, the general obligation Bond. But there is not a standard refresh plan that guarantees a certain number of dollars to refresh computers or any technology for that matter on an annual basis.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Any other comments?
Chief?
CHIEF DIPETRILLO: One question. It was my
perception from an earlier meeting that you had when you first talked about this, that some of the reasons the ratios are out of balance is because some of the schools already had a fairly aggressive program and the age of the computers may or may not have been taken into consideration. When you did your analysis and you looked at the age of the computers and the number of students I know that that varies each year, so looking for a range is probably more appropriate here, but $I$ do share the Committee members' concerns that some schools have a higher ratio than others, and it could, on the surface to the taxpayer or the citizen, the students think that it was an unfair distribution, so --

MR. HUNTER: Yeah. And I would also ask the Oversight Committee to consider that perhaps the initial ratio was not low enough, that, given instructional need, that perhaps $3.5-$ to-1 should really be 2.5-to-1. I don't know and we can have that conversation, but $I$ think in conversation with the Board that we should consider both sides of that coin.

MR. RABINOWITZ: I think that you're right. I mean, ideally, we would like to see 1-to-1 for
students in Broward County. There's no question about that. But when we're allocating these dollars for schools, I think it's the obligation of this Committee to ask the appropriate questions and try to effectuate equity for all schools.

MS. LEWERS: I just have a quick question on, I guess it's page 5. We ordered 1,673 desktop computers but we only received one.

MR. HUNTER: What now? I'm sorry.
MS. LEWERS: On page 5.
MR. HUNTER: Of the TaxWatch report?
MS. LEWERS: Yes. And I'm just curious, you know, what's slowing down how we're receiving the technology? It says 1,673 desktop computers were ordered and only one has been received; so what slows that process down?

MR. HUNTER: Well, yeah, on that page we're referring to charter schools, and, remember, that this report is as of a certain date and time. So as of $9 / 30$, so as of 5:00 that day, we took a snapshot and said, tell me what's in the building. Had we taken that snapshot a day later, a lot more computers would be there.

MS. LEWERS: So we're not having a problem
with receiving anything?
MR. HUNTER: No, no.
MS. LEWERS: Okay.
MR. NAVE: And the recommendations that come out of that, the first recommendation we have just done, and that is ask the District to explain the apparent purchase of more computers than are necessary. The follow-up recommendation, that would be looking at the other schools for which computers have been ordered, what will the final student to computer ratios be for those schools. So that's information that we recommend that you request of the District.

MS. REECE: If I may interject one more thing. Are we doing this too late in the process when, obviously, the computers have already been ordered? Sort of -- I'm not sure that by the time we meet with the Board and recommend changes, is it too late, because you guys -- you guys are doing an incredible job with moving forward with the program. So, is it almost an afterthought at this point? I'm not sure.

MR. HUNTER: I can't answer the timing question, but we are certainly open to consider
any recommendations coming from the Committee, itself. Now, what we can't do -- I mean, I won't say what we can't do. What might be difficult is to go back, you know, to schools that have already spent all of their money, unless the Board -- again, the Board would have to direct us in terms of doing that. So -MR. RABINOWITZ: Any other comments, questions, concerns?

Nope? Okay.
MR. NAVE: Moving on. There was one -- at least one school that we identified, Cooper City Elementary School, for which -- Sue, if you could back up one, please -- that nothing had been ordered and there was no explanation as to why that the project hasn't begun. And the obvious recommendation is to just get a better understanding from the District, is there a problem here; what is the problem; or why haven't we moved forward on that project?

MR. RABINOWITZ: Questions?
MS. LEWERS: Did we find out why?
CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Yeah, is there an answer? MR. HUNTER: Well, I can tell you it's all been ordered and installed now.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: That's a good answer. MR. HUNTER: But what I don't know is, as of the date of this report, and I think that's something that on a quarterly basis we'll continue to wrestle with, is that if we -- if we're going to give you data as of a certain cutoff, we're going to be in process. And in process here means that we've started the ordering process with the school. And remember what I said earlier, and I'm not saying that this is the case with Cooper City, but just to remind the Committee that I mentioned earlier, that we meet with the school and then they have seven days to get us the information back that they want to order. At the time that meeting takes place, the process begins. So, I'm not saying that that's the case here, I'm just saying that we were somewhere in the process.

MS. LEWERS: But we still don't know what caused that school not to be online and to place the order; we don't know what caused this?

MR. HUNTER: Yes.
MS. LEWERS: I know that you're saying you're going back to when this report was, but what caused the initial concern or problem?

MR. HUNTER: Yeah, I'm not sure that there was a problem. Honestly, I'm not aware that there was a problem. We were probably just in that process at the point of ordering their equipment.

MR. NAVE: Mr. Chairman, the fact that it's been ordered and delivered makes our concern go away. We just -- we saw it. We raised the issue.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Thank you.
MR. NAVE: Moving on to the charter schools, the Amended District Education Facility Plan and SMART Program allocates $\$ 12$ million for charter school technology, which, as we heard Ms. Brown talk about earlier, she outlined how those moneys were allocated to the schools. When one looks at the activity that was reported, it's obvious that a lot of stuff is being purchased and installed in the schools. When you add this to the numbers that Mr. Hunter offered earlier, I think we're in excess of 25,000 computer devices and then with that you add the accessories, the peripherals and the wireless access points, so it becomes clear then that, you know, the Bond moneys are being spent for the purposes outlined in the Bond
programs. But the concern we had is that there's nothing in the reports that identifies, specifically, how these moneys were to be spent. Charter school technology is a broad category. It can include anything. There has to be some basis for -- and I think Ms. Brown kind of laid it out earlier, maybe that solves or answers the question, but you want to be able, I think, to compare the actual spend to the plan spend. So there had to be some plan for how that money was going to be spent and that's what TaxWatch would expect to compare it to. So -- so the recommendation is to get as much information as we can regarding the planned technology expenditures for the charter schools. And it's also unclear or it was unclear at the time we wrote the report whether the student computer ratios and the wireless access point standards applied to the charter schools like they apply to the District controlled schools. And, again, the recommendation would be to request clarification on that policy.

And that's pretty much it. In looking at this, I mean, this was our first pass. It was the District's first pass at putting the reports
together. It was our first pass, our collective first pass in reviewing the reports and so it has been a learning experience, $I$ think, for all of us. And I think what is clear in all of this is that the District is moving forward aggressively in doing the technology upgrades and buying the stuff, getting it installed and making technology more accessible for the teachers and the students.

The quarterly reports do a good job of showing what's been purchased for every financial project and it gives you a good idea of the path of the Committee today. But, again, what is missing is that link back to the planned spend. Because I think if we're going to do what we want to do, and you asked earlier for an itemized list of the things and that's kind of what we're hinting at here is, that we need to see, we need to make sure that what is, actually, being purchased is what was planned to be purchased.

And I think as we go forward into the second quarterly report we've offered some recommendations, one for the technology spend that gets at, let's look at these listings, let's see what's planned to be purchased, let's look at
what we're actually buying, let's see how those match. Also, any measures that would have the effect of saving cost, and, again, maybe just buying at $3.5-$ to-1 or $3-t o-1$ or $2.5-$ to-1 generates cost savings that could be reallocated to meet other needs and we've talked about that issue, a description of how the acquisition and installation of this technology will achieve the desired standards. Mr. Hunter has laid that out tonight and I think we all have a better understanding of how those purchases are going to achieve the three and a half and the 1-to-1 standards.

Other things that would be good to know as we go forward, if there are -- if we miss opportunities to save money, then I think we need to identify those. Any changes in the planned spend, those are things that need to be brought, I think, to the Committee's attention. Contracts for women and minority-owned businesses, and I don't know where the District buys the technology and who they get it from, but $I$ think it's important to look at how much of this money is going to businesses that are historically underutilized and making sure that these
businesses in Broward County are being able to participate in this program.

And then, finally, I think there should be a certification from someone that every dollar spent on this program is consistent with the intent of this. Somebody has got to put their signature on the line that says, every dollar spent has been spent properly. And, again, any -- any non-certified expenditure, I think those need to be publicly disclosed and we recommend that.

And we make the same kind of recommendations with respect to the facilities side of it, getting a better idea of the -- and I think maybe the -- the web-based software program that we're going to use to track these kinds of things, maybe that gives us all the information we need, maybe that helps us answer questions and will help us get a better understanding of how the projects' actual scope and budget and timeline compare to the planned scope, budget and timeline.

And, again, the other recommendation we made with respect to cost-saving measures, the certification of disclosure of the contracts to
minority women-owned businesses, things like that, they would apply to the construction side, as well.

So, that completes our recommendations.
If there are other questions and comments, I guess the first question, and I'll reserve the right to ask that is, you've had a chance to look at our report, does it meet your expectations? Is this what you're looking for from us?

MR. RABINOWITZ: I thought so. Just one man's opinion.

MR. NAVE: Let the record show that everyone is nodding in agreement.

Well, I appreciate that. I'll be glad to answer any other questions or if you have comments.

MR. RABINOWITZ: If I said no, would you take a pay cut? I'm just kidding. Just kidding.

MR. HUNTER: I would like to share one comment with the Committee as it relates to cost savings that $I$ think is important here, as well. Taking a look at the procurement vehicles that we were using for the technology, our wireless access points and cable RFP's were fairly recent within the last year, and so we thought were very

[^0]timely. Our computer RFP or solicitation vehicle has been in place for about two and a half or three years, so the District has gone out on a new solicitation that will be presented to the Board in January, all with the idea of making sure that we're getting the most cost-effective solutions for the District as possible. So I did want you to be aware of that.

As a part of that solicitation, the large computer manufacturers to deliver to the School District the size of Broward are probably not going to fall into the small business category, so we split the solicitation into equipment delivery and warranty and then we did a separate solicitation for installation configuration services that would provide an opportunity for small minority-size businesses to compete for that business, as well. So both solicitations have gone on the street, both closed within the last week and both will be presented to the Board at the January Board meeting.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Thank you. Ms. Reece.
MS. REECE: I have a question about your certification recommendation. In government finance, generally, you're -- in your CAFR
you're, essentially, certifying that your expenses -- are you saying something beyond that? MR. NAVE: I'm sorry. I'm not sure I'm understanding what you said.

MS. REECE: Okay. So your recommendation was that somebody signs their name that it's an eligible expense. I'm assuming your audit covers that, is what I'm saying. So maybe it's a question for staff. Your audit -- does your audit confirm that Bond-eligible expenditures are spent in the Bond fund or how is that?

MR. LEONG: The annual audit report is certified that the financial statement presented is fairly presented and a certified public accountant signed their name and certified it. And I think that Mr. Nave is talking about that, what he was talking about, at least I'm guessing, is that in the technology area he's also saying in the construction area that someone certify that the spending dollars, for example, in the technology area spending is what the Board intended to spend. So I think that's the difference between what you're talking about and the audit.

MR. NAVE: What we're looking for, we just --
it could be one sentence. It could just be a general sentence to certify that all of the Bond funds have been expended consistent with the purposes laid out in the Bond program as approved by the School Board.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Is there any problem giving that certification in a report?

MR. MOQUIN: I'm just, again, thinking out loud. We have certain forms now that exist to attest to certain things and I'm thinking we have like this collaboration form when we're bringing financial information forward. We might be able to replicate something like that where we take, you know, the head of technology, the head of facilities and then somebody representing finance to, sort of, attest that, you know, the expenditures are consistent with the DEFP and the SMART Program and that sort of thing. I don't think that would be too much to ask for.

MR. NAVE: And that's, essentially, what we are asking for.

MS. REECE: Okay. That's what I was trying to understand.

MR. RABINOWITZ: The other recommendation
within the report was providing cost data. Is
that kind of information readily available; can it be provided to TaxWatch to make sure that -you know, I'm looking at the report 66 wireless access points were ordered and what that expense was so that they could confirm that that was done; can that be provided?

MR. HUNTER: I believe it's there as part of the financial report. But the question is, would you like to see that as part of the technology report as opposed to -- what we did under the financial column, and Mr. Shim can respond to that, we put all of the financials together for facilities, as well as technology. So there is, in fact, a section in technology that shows those expenditures. We're happy to do that over on the technology report, if that's where you would prefer to see it.

I just want to make sure I'm correct, first.
MR. SHIM: Yes. That's correct. The
financials do reflect all of the technology expenditures and what -- the current commitment as of that date. So you can -- you would have to look in two places if you want to see per piece what was there.

MR. HUNTER: And I believe it's broken down
in the financial report, and $I$ don't have my copy here today, but I do believe it's broken down by category, if I'm not mistaken. I'll double check that for you.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Mr. Nave, was there something else that you were looking for? MR. NAVE: Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. What our recommendation is getting at in comparing the plan to the actual is not so much to make sure that it's a dollar for dollar match, but if the technology program at a certain school is designed to increase the number of computers and computers only and the District were to spend it on peripherals or accessories or wireless stuff or network upgrades or something that wasn't in the program, then that's the kind of thing that -- and that's the level of which $I$ think we would want to look at that. I'm not an accountant. I don't want to have to go, well, they spent $\$ 12$ more than they were allocated, I'm more concerned that if the money is to be allocated to a certain school to buy computers, that they're buying computers and not something else. So to be able to compare the planned spend to the actual spend as far as the scope, that's
more of what I'm interested in.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Well, can the District provide that level of detail that he's looking for as he just explained it; or do you think it's already there?

MR. HUNTER: I think it's here. We'll be happy to work with a couple different formats and, you know, to make sure that we're presenting it in a way that it clearly shows what we're doing. But I think between the reports the information is there. But we'll certainly take a look at the -- I don't have a problem taking a look at the format.

MR. NAVE: I think it's just a matter -- I think as we go through this, the section report, I think, will be better than the first report, I think the third report will be better than the second, and after that they should all be about the same level of quality. We should figure it out by then. I'm sure the information is there. I think it's an issue of it wasn't presented in this report, so $I$ felt compelled to flag it.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Any other comments?
MR. HUNTER: I do want to mention, though, I've heard the conversation around benchmarking
to, you know, several times and there is not a -again, the snapshot, the original snapshot was at a certain date and time and on that date and time we identified what the number of computers, number of access points, et cetera, at the time a year and a half later, two years, if we go to that campus that number will, in most cases has changed. So that's why we're using the 3.5-to-1 and the one access per classroom because that doesn't change. We're still looking for that. I mean, I want the Committee to be aware that simple things like from one year to another enrollment changes in schools. And so that will, in fact, impact the student to computer ratio.

Part of the renovation program, not that this has hit us yet, if they're adding classrooms, then additional access points are going to be needed, if they're repurposing rooms, those kinds of things. So, if we are looking -- and so it's our intent to make sure that at the end of the program the equity is that every school has an access point in every classroom and that every school has a minimum of $3.5-$ to-1 student to computer ratio. But I'm not so sure that we can stick with the benchmark that was taken two years
ago to determine whether or not we've done that. MR. RABINOWITZ: Thank you.

MR. NAVE: And I would agree. I think the important thing is that the District has set standards and the intent is to meet or exceed the standards and that's what we want to look at.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Ms. Siegel, did you have a comment?

MS. SIEGEL: Yes. Along the lines that you were saying, some sort of certification that if we say we're buying computers, we're buying computers, would that also include, and they're going for their intended purpose?

MR. NAVE: I think it should include that it's consistent with the purposes outlined in the Bond program as approved by the Board. I think that's the key. You know, if the intent is to buy computers and the District is buying cars, then, you know, they want to certify that buying a car is consistent with the Bond program, then someone would -- I guess would sign that and take their chances.

MR. RABINOWITZ: I think Ms. Reece has another question.

MS. REECE: What's the value of the
certification? Who does that serve or, I mean -MR. RABINOWITZ: The public.

MS. SIEGEL: Yes, it's an accountability. MR. NAVE: Exactly.

MS. SIEGEL: I think that's something that, at least most of the families who send their children want that accountability, knowing that you said you're buying $X$ amount and this ratio for the students and we want to make sure that that has been adhered to and it's consistent with the plan, and like you said, computers to computers, we're not buying cars.

MR. RABINOWITZ: All done?
Well, thank you very much. We appreciate TaxWatch's efforts.

The next item on the agenda is the nomination of a new member and I think the Chief is the proponent of someone.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Well, in the last couple of meetings we talked about the number of people on the board and how to fill some of the open spots, that we had to look out into the community for people with certain levels of expertise that could help with both the Committee, itself, and the District. I've had the pleasure of working
with the person I'm nominating for a position on the board, Mr. Bruce Bernard. He's here this evening. I would like to have him stand up, if he could, for a moment. Mr. Bernard's got over 40 years experience in public works and other projects. He has managed capital projects, himself. He has done construction work. He has worked with vendors. He has been in government. He has been in the private sector. I think he'd be a good fit for our Committee. He understands the implications of -- and the things that the TaxWatch folks are concerned about, about accountability. He also knows how to deal with staff and some of the folks here, having had that responsibility in some of his previous employment. I know he managed a $\$ 20$ million Bond project for me and it worked out very well.

So I think that he has the right stuff, so to speak, for our Committee.

So I would like to advance his recommendation for position on the board.

MR. RABINOWITZ: If General Counsel has a comment?

MR. CARLAND: Yes, Mr. Chair and Committee Members, what $I$ want to just point out, again, is
that the Committee was created by way of resolution from the School Board, which was very specific as to the number of individuals on the Committee and from whence they are to be brought forward the persons.

What I would just suggest to the Committee is that you make this request or nomination part of your -- kind of mold it or fold it into your next item, as well, as part of your consideration for your recommendations to the Board on amending the Resolution.

MR. RABINOWITZ: So, is your suggestion that there be a motion such that there be a presentation to the Board to amend the Resolution to permit us, as a Committee, to nominate individuals that are not otherwise characterized within the Resolution?

MR. CARLAND: Right. I mean, I know your next item is to discuss other points of the Resolution that you would like to see some changes in. This request to add a person to the Committee, I think, would be part and parcel of that same request, just, obviously, looking at Section 3 that you would like some flexibility in terms of appointing people, the number of people
to sit on the board with you and how they're brought forward.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Okay. So what we would need to do, functionally, is amend Section 3 of the Resolution concerning membership to include individuals that the Committee believes would be a valuable addition to our Committee.

MR. CARLAND: Right.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Okay. I think we have to entertain a motion in that regard.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: I'll so move.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Do we have a second?
MS. LEWERS: Second.
MS. REECE: I would like to discuss, do we need to amend -- because, right now, we have a really hard time reaching quorum, so do we need to amend so we don't have all of these listed if they're not all going to be able to appoint someone?

That would be the time to do all of that; right?

MR. CARLAND: Well, again, these are recommendations that you're going to make to the School Board. The School Board's going to have to review the Resolution based upon your
recommendation as to membership.
So, again, what I'm suggesting is that your motion be to ask the Board to consider amending Section 3 to give you the flexibility to add members to assist you in your work. You know, as this Resolution is currently put forward, it's very prescriptive, the Board was very prescriptive as to the number of individuals that would serve and their affiliations. And so what I hear the Committee suggesting is that you would like the Board to authorize -- change Section 3 and give you some authority to appoint members that you believe would be helpful to you in doing your work.

MS. REECE: And remove the number if we can't fill the spots; right? We wouldn't want to have that large of a quorum if we only have five.

MR. CARLAND: Right. Whatever the number ends up being, if you want to ask the Board to give you, maybe say, six additional slots up to 15 or if you want to ask the Board to add just three more, whatever your request is, I think you can formulate that and then, obviously, quorum changes depending on what your number of membership is.

But what I clearly hear the Committee talking about in this discussion is that you feel a need or you have the desire to have some flexibility to bring on members from the community that you believe would help you in doing your work.

MR. RABINOWITZ: So the motion is clear on the record, because somebody may actually read this one day, the motion is that the -- it's Section 3, Subsection 1, would be adding another letter, I guess it would be letter J, that the Committee would be permitted to add one member to be nominated and approved by the majority of the Committee, something to that effect. Is that the motion, so it's clear on the record?

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: One or more depending on the number necessary, to a maximum. I think we talked about that in the past, no more than a certain number. I think we were contemplating what TaxWatch had said, but I believe their concern -- we spoke about that, but I don't remember correctly, I don't remember the number, what 11 or 12 , but they had a fairly high number we thought was a little bit unwieldy, but inasmuch as there's five or six of us sitting here and there is supposed to be nine as a
starter, and the other members of those organizations refused to appoint somebody, we're at a -- you know, we're in a quagmire. So, I think it's incumbent on us to go back to the Board and say, listen, if we can't get somebody from here, we need to add some more who can perform and have the expertise. So, I don't know if I'd set a number on it, it's not my choice, but, you know, I would entertain that with the other members of the board.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Would that amendment to the Resolution be something that your office could draft or do we have to draft the proposed amendment? I mean, for mine, I did it, I'm a lawyer, so --

MR. CARLAND: Right. Well, we'll, certainly, staff, you know, my office will work with finance, we'll certainly articulate it for you. We just need to be clear what it is your desire is to go to the Board with.

So I think you've got a really good start. What I'm understanding is, as you stated, the motion would be to add letter $J$ under Section 3 Subsection 1 to permit the Committee to add members upon your nomination and vote, you know,
as you need to do your work. But right now it's kind of open ended, you've had some discussion on whether or not you would want to close that up to a maximum. I can tell you that when the Board was debating the Resolution, the Board did have some discussion and was concerned about the Committee being too large and it being unwieldy. So my advice to the Committee is you may want to consider putting a cap on the additional members that you would want to be able to add because that was a concern of the Board. But it's up to you what you want to recommend.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Ms. Reece.
MS. REECE: Just a suggestion and just to throw out there, kind of thinking out loud, since certain committees or certain like A or D might not be able to, could our motion be that we could recommend a substitution to the Board, so it would keep with the same number, but if somebody wouldn't be able to be appointed by a certain organization, then our Committee could recommend a substitution to the Board?

MR. CARLAND: Right. That's certainly another way of looking at it.

MS. REECE: Right. So it would still be I.,
but we would recommend substitutions and stick within their framework.

I don't know how you guys feel.
MR. CARLAND: So the suggestion now, what I'm hearing is, rather than adding members, the Committee would like to have the flexibility to substitute if one of the enumerated groups is unable or unwilling to appoint someone.

MR. RABINOWITZ: That would be a friendly amendment.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Yes, I would accept that amendment.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Okay. Based upon Mrs. Reece's friendly amendment to the motion to permit the nomination and approval by majority vote of the Committee, is there a second?

MS. LEWERS: I second.
MR. RABINOWITZ: So all those in favor say aye.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.
MR. RABINOWITZ: It's unanimous. The motion carries.

MS. REECE: I do have a question for Counsel. What's the timeframe once the Chair hands the motion to the District are we talking about? Is
this even going to be looked at anytime soon? I know the calendars are pretty filled up. What's the odds of, actually, getting it on?

MR. CARLAND: Well, I think Mr. Nave made a really great observation tonight, which is this is new to everyone. This is going to be new to the Board, too. So the next action item or the next regular meeting of the School Board is January 20th. So that would be the absolute earliest that the Board could consider amending the Resolution. What we don't know is, you know, is the Board going to want to maybe have a discussion about your recommendations at a workshop before we bring something to them to vote on? You probably want to do that and might even invite some of the committee members to be able to come and kind of just talk them through what your suggestions or requests are so they understand it better. That might be one way to handle it and then we could put it on for them to vote on to, actually, amend it.

MS. LEWERS: Okay. And then I know this might be a hard task. Section 3, Membership, and I know from that particular workshop, are we able to get minutes? I'm just curious and I think I
watched it, also, it was pretty long, on how we got down to these A through -- what is that, I? I. Just for ours, I would want to go back through, especially, if we are planning to go in front of the Board just to see how we got down to these particular groups and whatever groups, actually, did put in for it. Because I remember it was like 20 or whatever it was and they got knocked off the list. Are we able to see that or hear that or --

MR. MOQUIN: With every workshop there's a staff follow-up. Part of the staff follow-up is a synopsis of the discussion. I don't know to what extent it's going to capture all of the discussion, but it normally identifies the salient points that the Board was considering.

You know, my recollection of having sat through those things is that there was a concern that they were -- they didn't want the Committee to be too large, they wanted it to be -- they didn't want to participate in any sort of way in terms of appointing anybody to the Committee because they wanted it to be at arm's length from the District. And that's why they wanted organizations as opposed to people and then let
the organization identify someone. And then, finally, there was a lot of talk about conflict of interest and those sort of things to try to make sure that this Committee, from an integrity standpoint, was the highest it could possibly be recognizing that on a quarterly basis you are going to be providing on behalf of the community kind of your thoughts on where the District stands with executing the program.

MS. LEWERS: Now, when that happened was there any -- and I don't remember seeing or I could have missed it from A through I, did they have a backup plan if, you know, A couldn't participate then a committee that was kicked off of the list or didn't make it through the cut could jump up to that spot, was that ever a consideration?

MR. MOQUIN: I mean, my only recollection and some of the discussions that we've had from a practical standpoint is that a couple of committees have come back to us and felt that because of the provisions around who is capable of being able to participate from not, you know, doing any business with the District and what have you, that they felt that that precluded
anyone in their organization from actually participating.

So, I think, we contemplated all along that there was going to be the potential need to have replacement organizations to round out the membership. And then the question was, how do we facilitate that? And the thought was, it would probably be best to have the Committee perhaps recommend some replacement organizations to keep the District out of it, you know, to sort of keep our hands out of it.

MS. LEWERS: And my last question is, when the District did come in to make this document and for membership was there ever consideration for individuals, instead of actually coming from an organization or a group? Was that ever a consideration?

MR. MOQUIN: Again, I'm going off my personal recollection that there was a desire to have organizations as opposed to people because there were a lot of people who had interest in being on the Committee and were advocating to be on the Committee. And so the thought was, hey, let's pick professional organizations that have some either interest in this Bond or expertise in
these areas and then they would identify their representative on behalf of the organization is how it was contemplated, originally.

MR. CARLAND: And I would just add to that just for completeness, I mean, I believe an earlier iteration of a draft Resolution did include opportunities for direct appointments and the Board immediately went to the discussion that Mr. Moquin just had, which is, we don't -- we would like -- we would rather have third party organizations that we think are important do the appointments. So that's how we got away from that and got to the list that you see here.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Mr. Chairman, I had some concerns because what was relayed to us during the last organizational period when we were putting this together was that they were having difficulty soliciting people from these organizations because of either conflict of interest concerns we talked about in one of our last meetings and that they may never appoint anybody. So I was looking to say at some point did you sunset that opportunity? Did you move on to somebody else to get a committee that was working? And that was my concern. And in
looking at some of the -- in this particular case, just Mr. Bernard as an example, the Engineering Contractors Association of South Florida, we're talking about a gentleman who works in engineering, things like that, I was looking toward these categories. But without a nomination from those associations, that was a pretty narrowly defined opportunity. If they decided not to participate, we're left out in the cold.

So the question now becomes, do you look for somebody with that level of expertise that may not be a part of that organization and do we make recommendations based on that? That was one of the reasons why I reached out to Mr. Bernard to begin with, because $I$ felt that that was an opening that wasn't filled here.

So is that, in your mind, and I'll ask Counsel, whether or not that would qualify as an individual appointment even if what you said earlier, they were trying to avoid?

MR. CARLAND: Well, I think what -- the motion that you just passed, actually, is a good alternative that $I$ think will be of interest to the Board because what you've said is, if we
contact these organizations, and, again, they're unable or unwilling to fill their slot, then the suggestion is, you know, give us that opportunity, Board, then to bring forward in our own group a nomination and approve and I believe -- I don't know what the rest of the staff thinks, but $I$ think the Board will think that's an, actual, probably good compromise.

MR. RABINOWITZ: And as a matter of everyone's edification I spoke with Mr. Shim about this specific issue outside the balance of the Committee because he had spoken with some of those organizations and I'd welcome him to comment on that now.

MR. SHIM: Yes. I did touch base with the Engineering Contractors Association, the NAACP and the Broward County Minority Builders Coalition, and the Broward County Minority Builders Coalition and the Engineering Contractors Association, they declined to participate. And I, also, asked them about the whole recusal thing, to see if they wouldn't participate if there was some aspect of the Resolution that was changed to address that issue, and they said, no, that they are
declining. They didn't want to participate for some reason.

The NAACP, they kind of gave us mixed messages. You know, we have documentation showing that they did decline to participate and I think Mr. Nave also confirmed that he spoke with them and that they declined, but we got a strange e-mail saying that they didn't decline and I followed up with the e-mail by a phone call and a series of e-mails and I never got a response back. So at this point I'm kind of -you know, I don't know what their position is other than that they haven't really responded.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Well, $I$ would think that a lack of response is a negative. At least where I come from it is. So, you know, I would encourage that we move forward with some type of recommendation, if there's a period of time greater than 90 days or 180 days we're without that level of expertise, that has a significant impact on a recommendation. So that's why I'm trying to accomplish, as far as helping, not only our Committee, but the School Board and staff, as well.

MR. MOQUIN: Again, not to be repetitive, but

I was aware that at least two organizations did not have an interest in participating at all because they are representative of areas that might do business in the program and didn't want to have that -- you know, they would be in violation of the conflict of interest provisions of the Resolution. So, again, I think that the Committee has, you know, three opportunities in front of it. You know, one is, you could recommend replacement organizations to serve in those roles, recognizing that they have said no; you could recommend to modify the membership from nine to a smaller number, to seven, and say, you know what, that fixes some of your quorum issues, you know, instead of five, you know, quorum, you only need four; or you could recommend kind of like the motion that is out there on table now that you're discussing, that in lieu of some organizations the Committee would like the Board to consider allowing us up to the maximum number of nine is recommend individuals who have the expertise in these certain areas, in lieu of the organizations appointing somebody, the Committee, itself, would appoint somebody kind of with that experience and background.

And, again, it's going to be a recommendation to the Board for consideration. I, too, would recommend that you discuss that at a workshop before we just put an item on the agenda because I think this is something that warrants, you know, considerate dialogue and, you know, the dais, through an item, isn't necessarily the best vehicle to facilitate that dialogue. So, I mean, the next item on your agenda is talking about the School Board workshop because the Resolution speaks to you having a workshop with the Board. We've already talked about the issue of the student to computer ratio being a consideration that you might want to talk about. I think that's another perfect venue. I mean, you're going to come, you're going to give our quarterly update, you're going to talk about some considerations from the review of the quarterly report and then, potentially, talk about recommendations to revisions of the Resolution given the practical attendance issues and quorum issues you face.

MR. SHIM: And I just want to back up a second and say that $I$ did in an abundance of caution, extend an invitation to the NAACP for
this meeting. But, of course --
CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Do I need to amend my motion again or --

MR. RABINOWITZ: No, the motion has been approved. The motion passed.

The other issue on the agenda under this amendment to Resolution section concerns other organizations considered for membership.

In light of the fact that there were other organizations that were considered, you know, who else down the line, if you could tell us, what other organizations were considered? Is there any way you could tell us that?

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: I know one.
MR. MOQUIN: I think the Police Chiefs Association was and there was some issue as people were trying in an abundance of caution to talk about concerns was, you know, we have an SRO program in our schools, and so, you know, the District funds municipal law enforcement representatives in the majority of our schools, and so is that a conflict because if they're getting revenue from the District and now somebody from their association is going to speak, so the Board, in an abundance of caution,
eliminated that from consideration. So that's one that $I$ know that was talked about.

MR. CARLAND: One of the other organizations that was on the original list that was removed was a member from the Associate Builders and Contractors, Inc., Florida East Coast Chapter. And I think they -- again, I think there was too much of a possibility of conflict for any of those folks, so those were the two that I had removed from the original police.

MS. BROWN: The other one that we did contact when we were struggling with membership from the NAACP, we did contact the Urban League as we were reaching out and they, also, were unable to provide a Committee member.

MR. NAVE: What about organizations like Broward College or the universities, groups that have public works capitals and program experience that aren't in a position to compete against the School Board for projects?

MR. RABINOWITZ: I think that the recommendation from this Committee back to the District would be they need to revisit the membership parameters from this Committee. Because, otherwise, we're going to have a
potential problem getting a committee every single time we meet.

I think they need to go back to the drawing board a little bit.

I know they're going to love to hear that.
MR. CARLAND: Again, just speaking for myself, but $I$ think -- you know, I think the Resolution that you passed tonight or the motion that you passed tonight to give you some flexibility within the nine is probably a really good starting place for that conversation with the Board.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Okay.
MR. CARLAND: Because I think the Board will appreciate that the Committee is kind of taking control of its work and that you're coming forward and saying, look, we'll do the work to fill the slot if the organization that you've asked won't do it. So $I$ think this is a really good start.

MR. RABINOWITZ: The next item on the agenda was actually my proposed amendment to the Resolution. Specifically, it's on page 10 under Section Number. I made two proposed amendments. Number 10 -- and I raised the concern because
while a member of the Board of Governors of the Florida Bar, I'm also a partner in a very large law firm that represents countless contractors around the state of which I would have no knowledge of participation. I do a lot of healthcare litigation. I don't represent a lot of developers anymore, notwithstanding the fact that my bio may say that. I have done that in the past, but my work, primarily, doesn't concern that.

So I hope that you guys -- I say guys, ladies and gentlemen of our Committee have had an opportunity to review this. I welcome your comment, as well, before I make my own motion to adopt this so we can present this to the Board.

Does anybody have any comments, questions, concerns, discussions about my proposed amendment to the Resolution?

Because, as I noted, you know, I think that if there's an eligibility issue, if there's an issue concerning a conflict that a perspective member knows about, that's one thing. And the example I gave, if one of my law partners up in Tallahassee is representing Stiles that I have no involvement with, I would never know that he is
representing them in something, obviously, that nothing to do with the moneys coming out of this Bond Oversight Committee's consideration, I, personally, don't see that as an issue, you know. And the example $I$ can give is, my firm is representing a construction company concerning an employment dispute in another aspect of the state having nothing to do with Broward County and, certainly, nothing to do with these moneys, I don't see that as being an eligibility issue, number one. Number two, to the extent that it comes to a member's attention that a conflict does exist, that there's already a parameter set for recusal of the Committee member from voting on a specific issue, but, as $I$ noted in what would be Number 11 under Section 10, that that conflict and recusal does not automatically make the individual member ineligible to continue serving in the absence of a majority vote of the members asking that the person remove himself from the Committee.

MS. LEWERS: I guess my only question is now, out of the membership list back on Section 3, does that now open up the door to the people that you called who said they couldn't participate
because of their conflict of interest?
MR. SHIM: That was one of my questions to them when I did speak with them, is that if we made changes to the Resolution that addressed or had a recusal process if they would still be interested in participating and they both said no.

MS. LEWERS: Okay. Thank you.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Any other questions, comments, discussion?

So my motion would be to amend the Resolution as set forth within the documents you have been provided and then present the proposed amendment to the Board for their prospective approval.

MS. LEWERS: I have one more question. I apologize. But I'm going to go back to, maybe, Counsel, what was the purpose, was it put in to protect -- what was the reason why it was originally put in that way? What was the Board looking to, why that wording was, actually, put in? What was the purpose why it was put in there, the actual how it is? Now.

MR. CARLAND: Are we talking about the specific Section 10?

MS. LEWERS: That is correct. Yes. Not allowing --

MR. CARLAND: Well, I mean, this is kind of general language relative to conflicts presented, you know, through ethics rules. I think that the bigger issue and the discussion that $I$ had with the Chair offline was, unlike some of the other conflicts that, you know, you can, under the general ethics code kind of recuse yourself from like voting conflicts, the way the Board has structured the Resolution in creating a committee, if you go back to the membership section, there's some eligibility criteria, that, as I interpret the Resolution, can't be waived.

MS. LEWERS: Okay.
MR. CARLAND: One of them being, specifically on page 3, Item 7, that you can't have an active contract or be seeking a contract with the District, so forth, for the duration of the Bond and once no longer, the member's no longer active the restrictions apply for two years.

Those are -- those are conflict criteria that are -- in my opinion, again, not waiveable the way they've structured it. That's eligibility criteria. So if you fall afoul of that restriction, then it's not something you can
waive. You're just no longer eligible. And so I think the Chair's attempt, and the discussion that the Board will need to have is, you know, are there going to be situations where you can recuse yourself from that particular motion from the Committee because maybe a conflict might exist?

MS. LEWERS: Okay. Thank you.
MR. CARLAND: Yep.
MR. RABINOWITZ: So the motion is on the table.

MS. SIEGEL: I second it.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Thank you.
All those in favor say aye. COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Thank you. The motion carries.

The next item on the agenda is News Related Articles.

MS. REECE: What about the list of recommendations; was that part of changing the Resolution?

MR. RABINOWITZ: You know what, you're right, that's on there. I apologize. I apologize. We had skipped over something.
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As part of the proposed changes TaxWatch provided to us and staff provided to us back and forth between TaxWatch's Best Practices and proposed amendments to the Resolution, prior to the hearing -- this meeting, I, actually, had discussions with staff, as well, about these issues, discussed it with them and they had their own comments, not recommendations.

So we can go line item by line item. I think that's the best way to go.

The first item would be a prospective amendment to Section 6.3 of the Resolution to permit the general public to be recognized to speak on motions.

I had no objection to that.
Any discussion?
MR. NAVE: Mr. Chairman, can I clarify something --

MR. RABINOWITZ: Please.
MR. NAVE: -- just to make sure we all understand what was being recommended here. And it wasn't so much that the public would be recognized to speak on a motion, per se, but this whole thing kind of gets at what $I$ think is a critical question here and that's how much public
input does the Bond Oversight Committee want and how is that public input going to be structured? And I think if you look at the meeting, the public hearings, the workshops, the briefings on this, they all kind of tie in together. And what we were trying to lay out here was kind of the way the legislature does business. If there's a bill presented or an amendment to a bill presented, the committee hears -- there are questions from the members, there are debates, and then the members of the public have an opportunity to speak before action is taken on that bill. And that's what we're laying out here.

It may be that the Committee doesn't want to do that, but maybe the Committee wants the public to have an opportunity to speak. We started this meeting after the adoption of the minutes with a public hearing. One member of the public, Mr. Sirbola, had an opportunity to speak, and on his parting shot he suggested that we save the public comment to the end.

And as a member that spoke, if there's anything in this meeting that peeks his interest or any member of the public, you know, would
invite them to want to make a comment, their opportunity is already passed and they don't get another shot. So I think if we are going to have public comment, later in the meeting is better than earlier.

With respect to whether this Committee wants to have members of the public give their advice before you take an action, that's up to you. Some of the bond oversight committees we looked at did that. Others did not. Broward County has a way of structuring public input and staff, the Resolution and everything is kind of consistent with that. So there may be some areas you want to deviate, there may be some areas where you want to stick to what the county does.

But on this one particular area it wasn't that someone from the public questioned a motion that's been made and seconded. If a motion is made and seconded, it's on the table. So this Committee has to decide whether they want to get public input before they vote on that or whether they want to leave public input until the end of the meeting or keep it at the beginning of the meeting.

MR. RABINOWITZ: I think that's just an issue
for the Chair, myself, to determine when on the agenda that is actually permitted, though. I don't think that's necessarily an issue for resolution to -- an amendment to the Resolution; am I correct?

MR. CARLAND: Well, what $I$ would comment, and if you go back and look at Section 6 of the Resolution, the Board did structure, expressly, public comment to occur in what it's calling a public hearing setting apart from what the Board called public -- the Committee meetings, I guess. And I remember the discussion of the Board at the time was the Board was concerned that the Committee had a lot of, you know, work to get through, you had a lot of detailed reports to review, you needed to have discussion on that and the Board, I believe, thought it was be helpful to the Committee by saying, let you do your work through the meeting process and then have a separate hearing opportunity for the public to come forward and comment on all of the documentation you've looked at and all of your discussions. And, so, you know, I think if the Committee does want to do it differently and we're already going to go back to the Board to
talk about the Resolution, I think it would be appropriate for the Committee to entertain a motion to recommend changes to Section 6 on when and how you want to receive public comment.

MS. REECE: Do you want to do one at the beginning and one at the end? I don't know. To Bob's point, having --

MS. LEWERS: Well, I think it would be better at the end because, like me, when I go to a meeting, you get all the meat while everyone's talking and your questions come, actually, after you've heard all of your speakers, so at the end is when you're ready to go back and say, hey, you know, when you talked about this, this is what I felt, so --

MR. CARLAND: And if the Committee -- if the Committee is happy with the general structure of kind of keeping public comment in the hearing context, I would agree with the Chair, that if it's just a matter of deciding where you do the hearing, that doesn't require a change in the Resolution. That's really, again, as the Chair indicated, kind of his responsibility with staff to just kind of put things in the order on the agenda that he thinks are appropriate.

So, if that's the direction the Committee is going, then, yes, I think that's something the Chair can handle with staff.

MR. RABINOWITZ: I think we just table the issue at this point in time. We can determine it as our hearings, obviously, grow longer and more detailed. Okay?

MS. REECE: So no change to that?
MR. RABINOWITZ: No change. Unless there's a motion to do it.

The next issue is with regard to term limits. Is there any discussion or comment about -- what was TaxWatch's specific -- I mean, I have the synopsis of it, but what was TaxWatch's recommendation?

MR. NAVE: One of the things we found in looking at some of the practices of other bond oversight committees was we saw several of those that did not have a term limit. They all had the staggered terms, which this Committee does, but what we saw in some of the other bond oversight committees was that, if you have a member -- and it may be particularly important here given the problem we've had filling out the membership, if you've got a member, if one of you guys at the
end of your term says, no, I want to keep doing this and you have been coming to the meetings and you've been participating and you've been shepherding this thing through and you want to stay a part of it, what's the benefit of booting you off and bringing someone different? That's the issue.

So it may be that someone, you guys maybe -maybe you can't wait for your term to end. I don't know. But if it does end and you want to stay a part of it and the Committee thinks you have been valuable, then what's the harm?

MR. RABINOWITZ: I think we all can't wait for Mr. Bernard to start.

I spoke to the staff about this, as well. I mean, this is all new to us and I think this is another issue that we can address at a later date and time when we all feel how this plays out. So, again --

MS. REECE: I would like to entertain, if we're going to modify the Resolution, if we're going to go to the Board to modify it anyway, I think it would be a good one to include. But it's just my take because we've had such a hard time filling the positions.

MS. LEWERS: Do you want to make the motion so I can second it?

MS. REECE: Yeah, I make a motion to accept the second agreement of TaxWatch, which is -- I want to make sure I'm --

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Can you repeat that again? I'm sorry. I didn't hear it.

MS. REECE: So I'm making a motion to go with TaxWatch's second recommendation, which is to eliminate term limits.

MS. LEWERS: Second.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Okay. There's a second for the motion, so the motion's, technically, on the table.

All those in favor say aye.
MS. REECE: Aye.
MS. LEWERS: Aye.
MR. RABINOWITZ: All those opposed say nay.
CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Nay.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Nay.
You didn't say anything.
MS. SIEGEL: No, I'm sorry, I'm still thinking about it.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Okay. We need it clear on the record. So we need to make sure those who
said aye and those who said nay are clear.
So, Ms. Siegel, you're the only one -- I didn't hear you and I don't know if our court reporter actually, got it, as well.

MS. SIEGEL: No, he didn't, because I didn't speak out loud. I was still reviewing it.

MR. RABINOWITZ: You're the tiebreaker, technically.

MS. SIEGEL: I know. I should have done it when everybody else did it.

MR. CARLAND: And just as a reminder, generally, silence is an affirmative vote. So always be careful, if you're voting nay and you intend to vote nay, you need to verbalize it.

MR. NAVE: If I can clarify, maybe the way to go and the proper way would be no term limits, but keep the fact that the term can expire, but it just doesn't necessarily have to, that if a member wants to stay and they're doing a great job then that can be waived.

MR. CARLAND: Well I'll piggyback on that, because this is just discussion, but if the majority of the Committee is interested in having this discussion with the Board, a compromise may be that a term limit might be waived by a super
majority vote of the Committee. That way the Committee, itself, is determining whether or not it's going to continue to have someone serve or not if they have been productive and helpful.

MS. LEWERS: But I have another question. How did they determine what groups got to serve two and what groups got to serve three?

MS. BROWN: It was a staggering. It was really all about making sure there was staggering.

MS. LEWERS: Okay. But how did they, yes, they were staggering, but it was just --

MS. BROWN: It was just random.
MR. CARLAND: It was just an effort to try to achieve that result.

MS. REECE: So we would still have terms, but you wouldn't limit out, right, is what my motion is; right?

MR. CARLAND: Well, your motion, which is on the floor right now, is to recommend eliminating term limits altogether.

MS. REECE: Oh, no, I think we should still have terms is what I meant. I mean, I thought that was what was his recommendation was, but we shouldn't have like -- well, we still should have
two and three-year terms and they should be staggered, but if you want to leave you can leave, but if you don't want to leave you don't have to. That's what $I$ meant to get to.

MS. LEWERS: That's what $I$ was seconding. MS. REECE: I thought that's what Bob's recommendation was.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: I'm glad we're clarifying that.

MR. CARLAND: What I understood the motion to be was a motion to eliminate the term on this. If you look at Section 3.5 , the section sentence -- third sentence, Members may only serve on the Committee for two consecutive terms.

MS. REECE: Yes, that's what $I$ was trying to -- that's correct then. So I still think there should be terms, but you shouldn't -- the two consecutives was what $I$ wanted to take away. MR. CARLAND: Okay. So that's what's on the floor.

MS. SIEGEL: Okay. So -- all right.
MR. RABINOWITZ: So it currently exists that a single member can't serve more than a total of --

MS. SIEGEL: Two consecutive.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Correct. Which would be four years or six.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Mr. Chairman, in reference to that, and I do understand what both Ms. Lewers and Ms. Reece have said that they're concerned that some members will be on longer if they have consecutive terms for three years and some will only be on for four years. So -- and I'm contemplating the Bond is going to last and the project is going to last probably greater than five years, probably closer to seven or eight years. By that time all of those are done. So, if you have a member who is initially part of this my all in this group all way the through to the end and they get right up to year four and somebody else gets up to year six because they have a longer period of time, I think I heard from the Committee members we'd like the ability to override that and give that member the opportunity to finish out another greater period of time. Instead of putting consecutive terms of only two, maybe allowing us to add to that in a majority vote to give an additional term or a longer period. I don't quite understand the two or three other than the fact that you like to
have members.
MR. MOQUIN: I can explain it. From a practical standpoint, the two or three is only the initial term. If you read there, it says after that everybody's on a three-year term. The purpose of staggering it so that it wasn't just a three-year term is because if all nine were replaced at the same time we would be, basically, at a point where the Committee is starting from scratch having to learn the process versus having half the membership having some historical knowledge to help bring on the new members so that they can gain some expertise in the process. CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Yeah, but, again, that's my concern, is if you've got somebody serving here for five or seven or six years, whatever that number is, and they've got all this experience and knowledge, and then just as you're getting to the end of the Bond, at that point we want the ability to keep that person.

MR. MOQUIN: I'm not speaking against the motion. I'm just saying the philosophy behind it.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: No, I understand what you're saying and I understand the philosophy
behind it. It works that way in most organizations so you don't lose the expertise.

But I think I heard the Committee say that they'd like the option to override that. Is that not correct?

MR. CARLAND: That was my suggestion. So that isn't part of your motion, currently.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Right. Technically, there's no amendment to the motion because nobody's actually made it. But my comment was, we can address this in two years. We don't need to make this decision today.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Okay.
MR. RABINOWITZ: That's why I recommended in the beginning we just can table the issue.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: All right.
MR. RABINOWITZ: But if you guys want to make the motion and approve it, you're welcome to.

MS. REECE: Yeah, and if I may, the reason I thought we'd do it now is it takes a big deal to have a workshop and to amend the Resolution. So if it's something that we're supportive of $I$ think we should do it now, because it's a whole process to have another workshop and to take it to the Board again. I mean, these are
recommendations that TaxWatch has put before us, so I think we should either go with them or not. So that was my logic behind moving forward right now.

MR. CARLAND: So where you are is you have, actually, a vote hanging in the air. You have four votes, you need your fifth to decide what's the result of your motion.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Or does somebody want to make an amendment to the motion based upon what General Counsel recommended -- or commented about, I should say.

MR. CARLAND: I'm not a member of this Committee.

MR. RABINOWITZ: I know.
CHIEF DIPETRILLO: I thought under Robert's Rules of Order only the prevailing side can make an amendment; is that not correct?

MR. CARLAND: You don't have a prevailing side yet.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Well, I thought the absence of a vote meant a positive.

MR. CARLAND: Well, technically speaking, you haven't finished yet because the Chair did not, actually, announce the vote. So it's still kind
of hanging there. And, remember, under Robert's Rules that as long as you don't all object and you understand what you're doing you can do it. So if, at this point in time, if the Committee would like to revisit the vote with a friendly amendment that what you're recommending is an added provision that the Committee can, by vote, waive the term limit, you could do that and then take a new vote.

MS. LEWERS: Now, I would have to agree to it.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: It would have to come from you if you voted in the positive.

MS. REECE: No, I would have to agree to it. But it can come from anyone right now.

MS. LEWERS: And what is the motion that I would have to make?

MS. REECE: That we would vote it.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Right. What the Chair has asked you to entertain is a friendly amendment at this point -- unless there's an objection, a friendly amendment to the motion on the floor, which is that you add a provision in Section 3.5 that authorizes the Committee to waive the term limits.

MS. LEWERS: So I make a friendly motion to

MR. CARLAND: A friendly amendment.
MS. LEWERS: A friendly amendment to --
MR. CARLAND: To add a section to -- a sentence to 3.5, allowing the Committee, by vote, super majority, if you want, or regular, by vote to waive the term limits.

MS. LEWERS: Okay. I agree with what he just said.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Perfect.
MS. REECE: And I accept the amendment. I accept the amendment.

MR. CARLAND: Okay. So, Mr. Chair, I would recommend that you just start over with the vote now that you've had a friendly amendment.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Based upon the friendly amendment that was just made, all those in favor say aye.

MS. REECE: Aye.
MS. SIEGEL: Aye.
MS. LEWERS: Aye.
CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Aye.
MR. RABINOWITZ: All those say nay, which would be me.

Okay. Moving on. Mr. Nave, if you could enlighten us one more time about what you meant with regard to public hearings.

MR. NAVE: Public hearings, the bond oversight committees that we looked at kind of held the public hearings to be a more formal process than just a public comment. And we saw a number of the bond oversight committees that permitted public comment during the meetings, generally, near the end of the meetings where the public could just make comments. The public hearing was a more formal process and it might be limited to a single issue or a couple of issues that warranted, you know, testimony and experts coming in and it's just -- I think it's a matter of degree of formality.

The way we have it now, there's not much of a distinction between public comment and public hearings. The public hearing we had first thing this morning or this afternoon, essentially, is a period of public comment. So it's -- I think it's -- in TaxWatch's view, the public hearing is a more formal proceeding than a public comment period. Even though you get public comments in both.

MS. LEWERS: So, basically, a person -- Mr. Chair.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Please.
MS. LEWERS: So, basically, a person that comes up to the microphone will talk on an actual topic and stay on the topic that we're discussing. Well, I mean, how can you hold somebody to -- we pray and hope that they stay on the topic, but --

MR. NAVE: Well, that's kind of what would happen in the period of public comment. In the public hearing there's more structure, there's more formality and the purpose of the public hearing is pretty limited. It may be a big issue that the Committee just, for whatever reason, determines that it needs to be elevated in visibility and importance.

The period of public comment would just be something, say, in every meeting the public has the opportunity to speak.

MR. RABINOWITZ: I'm not quite sure how it's any different.

MS. LEWERS: I guess my concern is when a person comes up to the microphone, even if we tell them it's a public hearing, how would we
implement them to, actually, do that? I mean, guess that's what my concern is. When someone comes up to the microphone isn't going to necessarily stick on what we want them to do. So how do we limit them or staff, whoever comes up to the microphone to say, hey, this is what we need you to stick to; how do we accomplish that goal, I guess? It sounds really good, but how do we -- you know, people come to the microphone and they don't stay on topic.

MR. NAVE: In that scenario the public hearing would be just a separate and dependent event. I guess my recommendation would be, do what you're doing now, just move the public hearing to the end of the meeting so the public has an opportunity to digest what we're doing here before they speak and then that simplifies this a great deal.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Any other discussion about the issue?

Is there any motion to change anything in the Resolution based upon what we just heard?

Hearing none, let's move on.
Currently, the Resolution allows, I guess, for public comment to be permitted on agenda
items during workshops, and I take that TaxWatch's recommendation is to not permit public comment during workshops; am I understanding that correctly?

MR. NAVE: Correct. And our thinking, what we saw with the other bond oversight committees, workshops are for your benefit. If there's really an issue, you know, like amending this Resolution is a workshop issue for the Board. There may be issues that you want a workshop. And the intent is to, you know, to improve your understanding and your information level and you can invite District staff to workshops, you can invite experts, you can invite people in, but the intent is not so much to hear from the public what they think about something but to help you better understand the issue. So, it's not something that, you know, public comment like we had here earlier in the meeting would be helpful. MS. LEWERS: Do you, currently, have workshops where you have no public comment? MR. MOQUIN: Can I offer some input? MR. RABINOWITZ: Please. MR. MOQUIN: I'm not sure that in terms of how the sequence of events is laid out or how
it's contemplated is kind of where we're going now. So the thought was, you guys would have meetings and you'd bring staff and TaxWatch here and you'd ask all your questions and you'd kind of formulate your opinion on how things are going, then you'd have a public hearing. And that would be -- and there would be no public input during your meetings, right, because that's your time to kind of get all of your questions answered, review all the data and whatnot. Then you'd have a public hearing where it would just be members of the public could come and they could say their feelings about how the bond is going. And then the workshop isn't necessarily for your benefit, it's for the Board's benefit. It's a School Board workshop. So that you would then come before our School Board and then you would report out, hey, we reviewed the first quarterly reports, things appear to be going, we had a public hearing, Mr. Sirbola had some issues on 1 and 3 not being appropriate, and then the public comment at the workshop is just the Board's process, that's for all of their agenda items at the conclusion of their deliberation, they allow the public three minutes to sort of
say, hey, I was at that hearing and that's not what public said. You know, the public didn't think things were going well. So that's kind of how the Resolution was contemplated and the distinction between your meetings, the hearing and then the workshop.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Everybody get that?
CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Mr. Chairman, being in government for 43 years $I$ think that's generally the way it works. So my recommendation would be to leave it alone. Let's go with what the Board established.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Okay. Is there any other motion different than what the Chief recommended? No? Not having a motion, let's move on. There's a comment -- or there's a topic concerning briefings.

Mr. Nave, can you enlighten us about that issue?

MR. NAVE: Yeah. Again, the bond oversight committees we looked at reserve the right to conduct briefings on specific issues. Again, it's to help them better understand the issues. It's an opportunity to bring in District staff. It's an opportunity to bring in outside experts.

So it's just another tool that other committees avail themselves to better understand issues.

MR. RABINOWITZ: I think did General Counsel
have comment about that?
MR. CARLAND: Right. And I would just note for the Committee that, again, if you look in Section 6, Subsection 7, the Resolution, in its current form, does permit the Chair or Vice Chair to convene additional meetings as necessary.

So, I think, to address Mr. Nave's concern, if you feel like you need an additional time or meeting to discuss something or you want to give direction to staff that you want to have a specific meeting with specific information, you already have the authority to do that.

MR. MOQUIN: Right. So you may decide in lieu of getting an E-Builder overview or a demonstration as part of your quarterly review of all this data, you just have a special meeting where you say, hey, we want to have a special meeting to, you know, be able to get a demonstration of the software tool or what have you and not make it part of the quarterly review meeting.

```
        MR. RABINOWITZ: So you're saying it's
```

already in there.
MR. CARLAND: I think so.
MR. NAVE: And that is consistent with what we're saying.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Does anybody have any further comments or discussion or can we move on from the topic?

Great.
With regard to the agendas, Mr. Nave, what was your recommendation?

MR. NAVE: Again, the bond oversight committees we looked at generally somewhere between 48 and 72 hours before the meeting make their agendas available. If you want to get them sooner, I don't see a problem with that. The School Board, if they've given seven days and you're comfortable with seven days and the members want it seven days, then this is a no-brainer.

MR. RABINOWITZ: I think it -- any discussion about it?

I think it's fine the way that it is.
What was the last topic concerning audits?
MR. NAVE: The last issue was just making sure that when the financial auditors and the
performance auditors are hired that members of the Committee are just allowed to participate in the screening. It's not an approval thing, it's just having you at the table so that you have a comfort level with the auditors that are being hired. We found that to be a common practice of several other bond oversight committees. I think here the financial auditors have already been hired. It may be a moot point here. But at some point that may change and members of this Committee might want to just be a part of the process just to be informed.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Comments? Discussions?
MS. LEWERS: I agree.
MS. REECE: Does that require a change to the Resolution or would staff just facilitate to allow us to go to those meetings if somebody was interested?

MR. CARLAND: The Resolution Section 8 specifically excludes the selection of audit firms from the responsibility of the Committee. If I'm hearing Mr. Nave correctly, I'm not -what I'm not hearing is that he's saying that you should be responsible for the selection, but that you provide input if you wish to. I mean we do
have public solicitation processes for the selection of audit firms and we have Mr. Riley here from our audit department internally. I certainly think that the Committee either through comment at the Committee meetings here or if you so choose to come to our audit committee or whenever you want to get feedback, I think those public opportunities are going to be present and feedback is present. But if you think you need more in that area, I mean, you would need to seek a change to --

MR. RABINOWITZ: If someone makes the motion to participate in that, that person is going to be the person that will be involved in the selection and the participation.

MS. REECE: Warning. The Chair will ensure that you --

MR. RABINOWITZ: Does anybody want to make a motion?

MS. REECE: No.
CHIEF DIPETRILLO: I make a motion we move on.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Seconded and everybody says aye.

I think we've gotten through everything
concerning amendments or Resolution.
MS. BROWN: There are two more.
MR. RABINOWITZ: There's two more. Committee budget. Mr. Nave.

MR. NAVE: Some of the Bond oversight committees we looked at had a budget. And, you know, it's clear in the Resolution that the members of this Committee are not compensated for being a member of it. It's unclear what -- what the budget would cover. But in our Best Practices we raised the idea that the Bond Oversight Committee would be free to go on tours, go onsite. But if you wanted to look at a certain school, to get a boots-on-the-ground kind of view of what's going on in that school, then maybe there's some cost incurred in just the travel or a lunch or something like that. So some of the bond oversight committees felt the need to request funding. And if this Committee feels like it, you know, needs some money for that, then that's your call. I would leave it up to, you know, the General Counsel to guide you as to what is compensation or what is not. So -MR. RABINOWITZ: We'll take comments from General Counsel first.

MR. CARLAND: Well, you know, the analysis -the Resolution really doesn't address kind of expenses, I think is what we're talking about. I -- you know, the Resolution does have a support section. It's my impression that the Board intended the District and staff to provide what you need. If you need additional resources or you need additional reviews or whatever, I think the Board expects that you would give that direction or recommendation to staff and that if staff is concerned about where the funding would be coming from, then staff would be responsible through our budget process and what have you to make sure that we find those funds or at least have a conversation with you about what that expense might entail and whether or not you really wanted to ask somebody to continue with that. I don't know if any other staff members have any other comment.

MR. RABINOWITZ: I think the Chief has some comments.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: I was kind of contemplating from our discussion on this item before that we would be like Mr. Rooney from the movie, $I$ forget the name of it, but we're all
riding in a school bus to go out to see, you know, some site somewhere. So I was hoping that we would -- you know, instead of all of us getting in a -- as a group, we could be, you know, marshalled out somewhere, have a little seance with the folks at whatever the site is, get some feedback to see where things were going and looking at that as the -- you know, the way we would have a budget or some funds or finances. I really -- the last time $I$ rode in a school bus, they didn't have seatbelts or anything, so I'm not too crazy about that.

MR. MOQUIN: The new ones now have seatbelts air-conditioning, as well as propane fuel, so we're going green these days.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Well, again, I don't know what facilities you have for that, but if we did a site visit or if we needed some experts in here or wanted somebody to come in how would we go about that? So I thought that the budget -- a million dollars would be just fine.

MR. RABINOWITZ: We know you're saying that in jest.

MR. MOQUIN: I would just echo what Counsel said, if there's something the Committee needs,
you know, we'll make it happen. If you want to go on a tour, we'll arrange -- you know we'll meet at KCW and -- I mean, we do things like that, but $I$ think it sets a difficult --

MR. RABINOWITZ: Bad precedent.
MR. MOQUIN: It sets a bad precedent because we have a lot of committees that work on behalf of the School District, and, typically, what we do is we provide the level of the support that committee needs through staff.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: So if we wanted to fly out to Las Vegas and look at a site, you'd be good with that?

MR. MOQUIN: Absolutely. As long as I can go with you. Let's make it in March during the first week of March Madness.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Is there any other discussion about this topic before -- I suppose there's no motion; correct?

MS. REECE: No.
CHIEF DIPETRILLO: No, I think we're good.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Okay. The last item is about membership. We covered that ad nauseam.

So, moving on in the agenda is news related articles. Does anybody have any that they wanted
to address with us?
CHIEF DIPETRILLO: No, I think I brought that up earlier that there was one and that I thought it was handled very well by the Chair of the School Board and Mr. Runcie, who I would like to congratulate for his recent award as the Superintendent of the Year in Florida and is up for nomination, I think, nationwide, as well.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Are you looking for a ticket to Las Vegas?

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Yes, I am. And I know that's a result of his staff, and the work that they've done on this was one of the reasons he was given that honor, so my accomplishments to the Board and staff.

MR. RABINOWITZ: The next item on the agenda is the next meeting dates. There are a number of workshop dates. I don't know what the topics are.

MR. MOQUIN: So, again, in accordance with the Resolution, the thought is now that you've had your first quarterly meeting to review the updates, you've had your first public hearing, is that at some point in the near future we would schedule you to, actually, go to a workshop so
that you could, basically, do, you know, a report out on, you know, where we are. So these are dates that were available. It's a very dynamic -- the $2 / 9$ meeting is in all likelihood going to get taken away. So I would not target the February 9th meeting.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Do we have to indicate -I'm sorry. Do we have to indicate now -- I mean, obviously, I'm the person who would be reporting out.

MR. MOQUIN: Probably.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Do I have to indicate now what date?

MR. MOQUIN: No.
MR. RABINOWITZ: By when do I have to do it to make it -- I imagine this is an agenda.

MR. MOQUIN: Yeah, we have a calendar that we maintain. It's fluid. Items are going on and coming off on a regular basis. So there's opportunity for you on all three of the dates with the exception of the February 9th because in all likelihood I'm going to have to convert that into a Board meeting because the February 3rd or 2nd Board meeting I need to cancel, so --

MR. RABINOWITZ: Okay. I can tell you now

I'm open on the 12th, but we can nail that date down at a later date and I'll talk to staff about it, which date works best.

The next thing we need to accomplish is setting our next quarterly meeting.

What month, Mr. Shim?
MR. SHIM: Yes. I, actually, did a little bit of work to try to look at, you know, everything kind of following out similar to the end of the quarter and the soonest we could develop the quarterly reports after that, giving sort of like a six-week period after that for us to develop the reports having gone through our quarter ending process and everything else.

So I have a little handout that provides some windows of that and --

MR. RABINOWITZ: Why don't you just tell us what the prospective dates you have in mind are. MR. SHIM: Yeah, sure. So, for the next quarter, the week of February 15th. The only thing is that February 15 th is a holiday and I think, based upon our -- our planning calendar that the 17 th is a workshop -- a Board workshop day, so the 15 th wouldn't work but the -- and the 17th is probably a bad day. So that week.

MR. RABINOWITZ: So what is your
recommendation relative to when we should schedule our next quarterly meeting? Maybe I'm missing it.

MR. SHIM: The 16th.
MR. RABINOWITZ: I'm expecting cake because my birthday falls on the 12th. I want everybody to sing happy birthday.

MS. REECE: He said the 16th. I can't do the 16th. I have a commission meeting.

MR. SHIM: So the other dates would be the 18th and 19th.

MS. REECE: I could do the 19th.
MS. LEWERS: I can do the 16th and the 19th. I can't do the 18th.

MS. SIEGEL: I'm open.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Anybody else?
CHIEF DIPETRILLO: I'm good. Pick one.
MR. RABINOWITZ: So are we talking about the 19th being okay for everybody? Do we really want to do it on a Friday?

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: I'd rather not.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Okay. So what was our alternative?

MS. REECE: Could we do it the next week?

MR. SHIM: Yes, the next week.
MS. REECE: The 25th.
MS. SIEGEL: The 25th is, actually, an early release day.

MR. MOQUIN: We're not bound by time, as you can see.

MR. RABINOWITZ: 25th?
MS. REECE: That works for me.
MR. RABINOWITZ: 25th?
CHIEF DIPETRILLO: I'm good.
MR. RABINOWITZ: 25 th it is.
I have a question. Is there anything that dictates whether we do it here or the other location?

MR. SHIM: It would be based upon the availability of the other location and we're going to try to have it there and I think that would help. What I may do is I may circulate, I'll circulate like an -- some dates for the later meetings, the other meeting throughout the year, maybe it would be best to kind of nail them all down. That way, we can reserve the room ahead of time and just have it be cyclical.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Are you suggesting we set the next meeting now after the 25 th?

MR. SHIM: To reserve the room, yes. To reserve the room and, you know, for planning purposes.

MS. REECE: I've got nothing on my calendar in June. It's too far out.

MR. SHIM: So for the quarter ending in March we could do the week of May 16 th, which happens to be my birthday.

MR. MOQUIN: So it looks like we're going to have cake as a regular part of the meeting.

MS. REECE: May what?
MR. SHIM: May 16th, that week.
MR. RABINOWITZ: My mother's birthday.
MS. REECE: The 17th is the only bad day for me that week.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: I'm good on the 16th.
MS. LEWERS: I'm good on the 16th.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Monday the 16th? That week's not going to be good for me. I, actually, have a Board of Governors meeting. That week I'm going to be out three days already. My wife will kill me if I'm out another night. That's on the record.

MS. REECE: The 23rd?
MR. RABINOWITZ: What week are we looking at
now?
MS. BROWN: The 23rd.
MR. RABINOWITZ: The 23rd? That's fine by me.

CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Yeah, I'm only available on Monday.

MS. REECE: Monday the 23rd?
MR. RABINOWITZ: The 23rd?
MS. LEWERS: That's good.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Okay.
MR. SHIM: Okay. The next one would be for the quarter ending in -- on June 30th, so that would be August 15th would be the six-week mark after that quarter.

MS. LEWERS: When do we go back to school, the 15 th or the 22 nd?

MR. MOQUIN: The 22nd.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Bruce, are you checking your calendar, too? No?

MS. LEWERS: 15th is good for me. Well, wait a minute. That's going to be teachers back; right? So I take it back, it will not be a good day. I'm a band parent so I'll be at the school. Actually, it will be a long day.

MS. REECE: I can do Tuesday.

MR. MOQUIN: Tuesdays would be bad for you getting the boardroom because that's their -MS. REECE: I could do Thursday of that week. MR. RABINOWITZ: Thursday of what week are we talking about?

MS. REECE: August 18th.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Fine by me. August 18th?
Yes? Yes?
MS. LEWERS: I'm going to say no again because usually Thursday and Friday is like freshman invasion in the school and the band is there so I won't be available if we do that week because that's all back to school.

MR. RABINOWITZ: We need you. Let's pick another day.

MS. REECE: The following week or no?
MR. RABINOWITZ: When does school restart?
MR. MOQUIN: On the 22 nd.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Do we want to do it the first week of school?

MS. LEWERS: They're busy. That's your busiest week; right?

MR. MOQUIN: The first few days, the Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday are usually pretty busy in terms of working out any glitches. Touch wood,
the last two years have been smooth.
MR. HUNTER: First week of school; I would ask if we could avoid that.

MR. RABINOWITZ: I thought so.
CHIEF DIPETRILLO: How about the 29th?
MR. RABINOWITZ: Second week of school is
that bad for you, too?
MR. HUNTER: No, that's fine.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Monday the 29th?
MS. LEWERS: Yeah, that works for me. That's good.

MS. REECE: That works for me.
MS. BROWN: The day after my birthday.
MR. RABINOWITZ: See what I started?
MR. MOQUIN: We have a cake.
MS. REECE: We may have to revisit that budget issue. Mine's September 4th so we could do a double birthday.

MR. SHIM: Okay. So we have the August 29th for that?

MS. REECE: Yes.
MR. SHIM: And so the final one would be for the quarter ending in September and that would put us at November 14 th for the six-week mark.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Okay.

MS. LEWERS: I'm good on the 14th.
MS. REECE: Yeah, me, too.
CHIEF DIPETRILLO: I'm good.
MS. SIEGEL: November 14th?
MR. RABINOWITZ: I'm just amazed that you guys, actually, have calendars a year out in advance. That's impressive.

MS. REECE: I bet some of these will be rescheduled. These are tentative; right?

MR. SHIM: Well, at this point they're just good planning and to reserve the room.

So everybody is good with the 14 th.
MR. RABINOWITZ: Yep.
MS. LEWERS: Yeah.
MR. RABINOWITZ: All right. Discussion about anything?

MS. LEWERS: No.
MR. RABINOWITZ: No?
Believe it or not, I looked up Robert's Rules, there needs to be a motion to adjourn the meeting.

MS. LEWERS: I make a motion to adjourn the meeting.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Is there a second?
CHIEF DIPETRILLO: Second.

|  | Page 169 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | MR. RABINOWITZ: All those in favor say aye. |
| 2 | COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye. |
| 3 | MR. RABINOWITZ: Thank you everybody. |
| 4 | (Meeting was concluded at 9:40 p.m.) |
| 5 |  |
| 6 |  |
| 7 |  |
| 8 |  |
| 9 |  |
| 10 |  |
| 11 |  |
| 12 |  |
| 13 |  |
| 14 |  |
| 15 |  |
| 16 |  |
| 17 |  |
| 18 |  |
| 19 |  |
| 20 |  |
| 21 |  |
| 22 |  |
| 23 |  |
| 24 |  |
| 25 |  |
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| 97:20 106:22 | 165:7,8 | $548: 1783: 8,11$ |  |
| 120,000 33:17 | 25,000 87:21 | 5:00 83:21 |  |
| 12th 59:2,11 161:1 | $\mathbf{2 5 . 5} 48: 7$ | 50 52:7,8 |  |
| 162:7 | 25th 163:2,3,7,9,11 | 50,000 68:19 |  |
| 14,000 12:20 13:2 | 163:25 | 53 49:2 |  |
| $14.837: 11$ | 29th 167:5,9,19 | 58.2 48:12 |  |
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