

SCHOOL BOARD OF BROWARD COUNTY
SPECIAL AUDIT COMMITTEE MEETING – VIRTUAL
THURSDAY, JULY 11, 2024

Transcript

July 11, 2024, 1:33PM

□ **Bryan Erhard** started transcription

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 0:08
OK.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 0:08
See. Alright.

OK, so let's call this special Audit Committee meeting to order at 9:33 AM on July 11th.

And 1st order of business, we're going to say the Pledge of Allegiance, I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with Liberty and justice for all.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 0:26
I delete them should apply for the United States of America.

+15***30** 0:28
76 you freaking.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 0:31
Thanks.
With the the visible.
Well.

+15***30** 0:36
And.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 0:38
Thank you all very much, Mr Rhodes.
Can we do a roll call of the Audit Committee members and any staff and consultants?

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 0:43

Sure.

OK, so to start with the audit Committee members, we have Ruth Carter-Lynch.

Rebecca Dahl.

Anthony De Meo.

+15***30** 1:02

Present by phone.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:04

Oh, there he is.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 1:04

And Mary fertig.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:08

Now she couldn't make this one.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 1:10

OK.

And New Audit Committee member Matthew Friedman.

I see him on the screen, but I didn't hear his response.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:21

Yeah, out there.

MF **Matthew Friedman** 1:22

It's fine.

I can hear you hear me now.

OK. Perfect.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 1:24

Yet yes, we can.

Thank you.
Umm Dr Nathalie Lynch-Walsh.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:30
Here I think.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 1:31
Robert Mayersohn.

BM **Bob Mayersohn** 1:34
I'm here.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 1:35
OK, Andrew Medvin.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:39
I think he couldn't make today either.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 1:41
OK, Pavel menzul.
Lew Naylor.
Phyllis Shaw.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:53
Well, if she is warning.

PS **P. Shaw** 1:53
Good morning, I'm here.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 1:55
OK.
Thank you.
And Peter Turso.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:58
Think he couldn't make either meeting?

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 2:02
OK.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 2:03
I I'm.
I'm on.
I'm sorry, I just came on for who?
Mary Fertig.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:07
Ohh OK there you are.


EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 2:09
Thank you, absolute.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:12
OK.
And then I think Lou is going to try to join and I think that was everybody else.
We no longer have Jacqueline.
She got replaced after our last meeting and I know Medvin and Turso couldn't make it at all.
All right.
So I think we're good to go.
Are there any members of the public that are online?
Mr Rhodes.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 2:42
Madam Chair, if I, if I may, I I am waiting for staff to let me know, but I see no of a public waiting to make any comment, but I wanted to mention that we have and and please, if you would, chief fire official. Nathan.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:52
OK.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 2:59
Said did I say that correctly?

 **Nathan B. Sade** 3:02
And good morning.
It's Sunday, but Sade works also.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 3:05
OK.
Nathan Sade is one of the staff that is here today for the discussion.
Also cheap.
Jamie Alberti.
He is here for the discussion as well, and Manuel Castaneda is here in Mr Bradford's place for the purposes of this discussion as well.
And then of course, we have Mr Harvey representing HCT.
We do have a Wanda Paul is representing Dr Hepburn today.
From what I have been told and I see that she's on here and I think in terms of the folks that we had invited from staff and from the audit committee as well as the eight, the the folks at HCT, we've gone through that list.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 3:50
OK.
Thank you very much.
Just so follow up question.
Uh, Mr Bradford couldn't make it today.
Uh, is he?
Is he not available at all?
And I ask because he's on the board item request back in 2019 and that's something we're going to have to clear up in this audit because there's an assertion that he was not here, but he was.
He's on the agenda request form in 2019 that approved the role of board contract.

So it would have been helpful to have him at one of these discussions.
Would he be available at any other point in time, or was he just not available today?
Do you know?



Manuel Castaneda 4:41

I can address that.

He's not.

He's not available today and he's out of town.

I mean, I can represent as much as I can for IT or any other conditions, although I I I wouldn't be able to represent what happened in 2019 with a lot of accuracy.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 4:54

Right.

But he could cause he was absolutely here.

So is he out of town?

Just this week, or is he out of town next week as well?



Manuel Castaneda 5:05

I can.

I can investigate that.

I don't.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 5:08

OK.



Manuel Castaneda 5:08

I don't know much about except today.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 5:11

Alright, thank you.

OK, so we do have an agenda for today.

Let me go pull up.

Umm from online?

One second.

There we go.

All right.

So we had started through the the audit and staff is added.

Ohh let me hit refresh.

JH **Jennifer Harpalani** 5:43

She was also.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 5:45

OK.

JH **Jennifer Harpalani** 5:45

She's she's good.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 5:48

So we we had gotten some additional information and we added staff, added.

The actual E2 is where this contract got approved.

There was a staff follow up from 42319 in response to an email from the NOW board chair and addendum.

#2 is highlighted here because there are a lot of questions I was going to go through the audit report systematically, but I'm going to go through mine because it has highlights that which basically serve as my notes.

Let's see.

And then if anyone has any questions, will go through those.

So we had just started when we ran out of time at our last meeting, I believe. Uh.

And I think we had just asked about that.

And just to clarify, Mr Harvey, you guys not only reviewed this RFP, you also reviewed the ITB, that has been put out.

RH **R. Harvey(Guest)** 6:58

Good morning, everyone.

Good morning.

Board chair all the Committee Chair, Roderick car before HCT.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 7:00

Warnings.

RH **R. Harvey(Guest)** 7:03

Yes, we did do a preliminary a high level review of the ITB that was subsequent, although it was not a part of the main scope which was RFP 19-123E.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 7:20

OK.

Thank you.

Umm alright, so I don't know what happens with as far as once an audit is issued, but there is something that we need to address in finding #9.

Umm, it says the inappropriate purchase of UPS units.

So just to be clear, and I think we, we had started on this last time, the UPS units are in the RFP as a requirement.

In fact, they're all over as a requirement in that RFP.

So can you clarify?

Unless you you're now seeing that that was in fact a part of the RFP, because it's saying that it arises due to the change in scope specifications and installation.

And I'm going to pull up the RFP.

When you say change in scope, do you mean in the three different versions of the RFP or are you talking about some subsequent date?

RH **R. Harvey(Guest)** 8:30

Right.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 8:30

Mr Harvey? Yeah.

RH **R. Harvey(Guest)** 8:30

So if I get yes, ma'am.

Thank you for that.

If I could provide a little color.

So in our opinion, the initial spirit of the RFP was an intercom enhancement and maintenance system.

With the Advent or the add-on of the Pentium device that require an independent continuous source of power, that would not be interrupted that then with the

Pentium device trying to move it to a moving it to a ECS require the vendor to go out and purchase the UPS, which we also say are still was purchased and remain at the various locations to the point some are in boxes, unopened and unused and that is the spirit of that comment.

And if the report needs to be revised or or changed, we could discuss that with the task assigned audit Director and we're here to serve.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 9:21

Uh.

OK, so I think you may have misunderstood my my comment.

RH **R. Harvey(Guest)** 9:37

OK, please rethink.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 9:37

So in the RFP, understand this is the RFP from 2019, this these are what's required.

RH **R. Harvey(Guest)** 9:42

OK.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 9:47

Umm, this is the in the scope, right?

So for your statement, for the finding that you had that it was an add-on or it came by way of the Penton device, that would mean that we wouldn't find it in the RFP correct because pardon.

RH **R. Harvey(Guest)** 10:07

Potentially.

Yeah, no, potentially, yes, I I'm following your line of theory.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 10:12

OK, except, except that it is a requirement of the scope of services.

RH **R. Harvey(Guest)** 10:12

Your line of umm.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 10:16

It's in this RFP, so that would lead people to secure UPS because it's in here.
So every time I hit ups.

RH **R. Harvey(Guest)** 10:26

OK.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 10:30

Uninterruptible power supply awardee shall provide an approximately size ups for all intercom head end components to accommodate unavoidable power fluctuations or outages.

Awarding shall install UPS on the AC voltage supply, taking care to arrest damaging elect blah blah blah and so on and so forth.

And by the way, conduit is also required in here.

So my point is, my concern is that you guys in your audit mention that this UPS is coming because of the Penton device when in fact it's part of this original given that there were three iterations of it.

But this is the RFP from 2019, so it it was required initially in the RFP which then renders.

The hold on and I'm gonna close out a couple of these because I can't get to your Audit here otherwise.

It then renders that observation inaccurate because it was absolutely required.

Hang on this saying so.

My point is, so hold on if anyone knows how to unpin this thing, because as many times as I try to get it out of my life, it stays there and it renders me on able to easily get back to what I'm looking at. Umm.

 **Jaime R. Alberti** 12:00

And turn on.

You turn on pin something in teams.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 12:04

I'm trying to get it out so I'm trying to get it off of the header because of course that's where all my tabs are. Umm.



Jaime R. Alberti 12:10

Ohh pop out baby.



NL Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 12:15

It pop out where?

I mean, you guys are looking at my screen.



Jaime R. Alberti 12:17

Uh, nevermind.



NL Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 12:19

There's that's not an option.

So hang on, give me one second to stop sharing so I can go grab the item that I want.

So, having said all that, I'm going back to the audit.



BM Bob Mayersohn 12:33

Try right clicking.



NL Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 12:35

Hold on.

Uh, well, right now I stopped sharing.

So I'm going to go back to the audit.

As I figure out which one there, there we go.

Compliance.

Nope, that's that one.

All right.

So, Mr Harvey, you said you would discuss that with, oh, with the chief auditor?



RH R. Harvey(Guest) 12:56

Yes.

And I'm making notes as you, umm, I'm making notes as you share information.

So thank you for that.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 13:04

OK.

Because that that's kind of a huge thing, at least from my perspective.

OK.

Umm the complete installation work and we'll get back to this ITB because there's as far as the sight B goes, I I do have questions as far as why we're funding an intercom project for 10 million, if it it if everything was fine and we initially had 15 million, why do we have 10 million, ten million, ten million, 10 million and 3,000,000 for an intercom project in last year's DEFP?

What are we funding exactly?

If we've stripped out the unnecessary things and all we had to do was finish putting it intercom systems, why did we go from 15 million to 50?

But that's that's a another question that will be coming up and then we I think I've done it again.

One second.

Is this doesn't go away fast enough.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 14:13

Madam Chair, I just wanted to bring to your attention that Umm Omar Shim has joined the meeting and he's got a limited amount of time due to conflicts that he might be able to stay.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 14:14

Yes.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 14:26

So with regard to the question you were just asking about the funding over those years, he might be able to answer that question for us.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 14:33

Umm well, I was trying not to go out of order but I don't know that he knows exactly what they're funding.


So are you.


Does he?


Because we have this discussion with a Facilities Task Force.

 **+15*****30** 14:49
It's.


 **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 14:49
Umm.


 **Manuel Castaneda** 14:49
Shoot.

 **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 14:50
Is he able to provide anymore information than what we had then?

 **Dave G. Rhodes** 14:55
I think we should.
Uh, give him the floor and let him answer that.

 **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 14:58
OK Mr Shim.

 **Omar R. Shim** 14:58
Sorry, can you repeat the question?
Yes.
Can you repeat the question?

 **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 15:02
Give me one second.
What is?
What are we paying for?
Because they initially the intercom project, which you know, despite everything we know, we're just putting in run of the mill intercoms, what is the?
Then so we have a carryover budget of 9.8 million, which is for the rest of the 15.

That's my first question and then the the rest of it is and you can see on screen we have 10 million, ten million, 10 million, ten million and three million.



Manuel Castaneda 15:37

It.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 15:38

What is that?

What are these amounts?

What are these budget amounts covering?



Omar R. Shim 15:43

Well, I'll start off by just saying that, you know, I don't, I don't know the details, but I would just say that these are not run of the mill systems because we have run of the mill systems that that are currently operating it in all of our schools.

What these are to integrate to do more integration?

Umm to the intercom system and to update them.

That's about as much as I know, and I know that we have begun doing a lot more with new contracts that, you know, I'll let somebody from IT or somewhere else address that, that.



Manuel Castaneda 16:15

Yeah.

I I can provide more context if you if you like.



Omar R. Shim 16:19

But yeah.

Yeah. Thanks.



Manuel Castaneda 16:23

If, if I may, Madam Chair.

Uh, as far as what those capital funding amounts are for all 220 schools were assessed as far as interconnects and we collaborated.

We work with the safety and security team to to make sure schools were assessed and were grouped into different levels of need from large need, where systems

needed to be replaced cause they're nearing end of life to just medium scope repairs to just minor repairs.

So of those and and and yes, we had a lot of challenges in the past in the past five years, but I will and and and I was going to mention this later as we talked about what the current events are, but I'll give the statistics now.

We have 69 active projects and we have 33 that I would consider with boots on the ground.

These are projects where we are either replacing the intercom system with a new state of the art IP based system or repairs to existing systems, and that's what the funding is for and our expectation is yes.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 17:26

What way?

But but at the hold on.

That's my point.

In theory, the 15 million was supposed to do that, so that is the question why?

Why are we now adding?

Uh, what is that 43 million on top of the 15?

If they were already assessed back in 2019.

What is?

What is it that we're at doing differently now that was not assessed as a need before putting out that RFP?

What are we funding now?

Because the 15 million and and we're kind of going on having to go a little out of order here.

But the 15 million was supposed to do exactly what you say.

This additional funding is now accommodating, so either the 15 million was not enough to do what actually needed to be done.

Or we're doing or or it was.

It sounds like it was not enough to do what needed to be done, and that's a huge difference to go from 15 million to 52 and that's after having expended some funds.

And now, because we're sort of flipping this all around might be a good time to remind everybody, uh, now that we have these additional updates, this is what staff in in response to a board member, what it's because I this is a pretty direct question.

What exactly is the 15 million paying for specifically?

Are we getting the telecenter you for emergency response?

The intercom project will cover the overlay, to digitize the public address system, allowing the capability to manage and standardized sensually through the network as well as cover additional speakers for interior and exterior areas to provide full coverage across campus.

The proposed awardee is rolling in the name of their digitized overlays, the telecenter you following board approval, we intend to implement the telecenter you at all high school centers, colleges, Community Schools, and high school combination sites.

The breakdown of the total cost is a combination of the funds planned within the DFP, which was approved by the board in 2018, as well as the Educational Facilities Security grant.

Immediately following the award, each site will be visited to survey exact needs, proposal for the specific needs are of each site will be created.

Below is a breakdown at the main components necessary to provide a full solution. Campus controllers, associated components, administrative consoles, classroom call buttons, fixed panic buttons, interior and exterior speakers, horns, cabling, hardware, software installation, licensing, configuration, programming, field, pre post testing and training.

Umm.

And then important here, aside from daily non emergency paging functions and communications, the telecenter you will give BCPS the following Smart response in the event of an emergency lockdown evacuation district wide notifications are initiated targeting a school.

Multiple schools or the district?

A district administrator would be able to do a an all call page to one school, many schools or all schools from his or her office.

There are multiple ways that a lockdown can be initiated with a single action, allowing school administrators to focus on students, such as a handset on campus from an integrated phone on campus, from any computer computer within a browser, or from physical panic buttons.

And then it also delivers prerecorded messages to deliver custom instructions, emergency tones, emails can all be launched with a single touch tailored to each scenario and district.

Standard prerecorded messages can be loaded to each school from a central

management server, bringing standard messaging across the district.

There are no signatures on this memo, which is why I've done a follow up Public Records request for emails to see what who.

This was an attachment for UMM, but that's what it was supposed to pay for and the word integration was used at the top of this response because the problem that that has hammered this project is you have you have fire on one side and you have intercom but there's no integration and it seems like now we're addressing integration, which was a concern for multiple people, was not a concern at the front end of this project, but became a concern.

And yet the the reason I keep harping on this is that there were people that were demoted.

There is someone that's being forced out the door.

And so there were people that are being marked as doing things that are unnecessary when if you're now addressing the issue that has always been the problem, which is the the lack of integration, then what?

What did everybody spend 2023 doing?

Because it's to me this this starts smelling like we that we misidentified the problem, and now we we're trying to.

Pretend there was no problem and just move forward and have the board approve another 40 plus \$1,000,000 to fix the problem that everybody that knew standards and codes said was a problem years ago.

So we have this document we also have.

Let's see the act.

All of the documents associated with the contract.

Actually this just has and just yes.



Manuel Castaneda 23:39

Madam, Madam Chair.

But if I may respond to your initial thank you very much and it's and and and this is just my assumption like I I'm not able to speak in detail of what happened in 2019 since I arrived last year.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 23:44

Umm.



Manuel Castaneda 23:54

But I can't say with with, with, with 100% confidence that the \$15 million was not meant to address all schools.

It was meant to address some schools.

If you just take that figure and divide it by the 220 schools, that would mean we would be able to achieve full upgrades and replacement of intercoms at 68,000 and change per school, which is impossible.

I will say though, that a lot of the things that you mentioned in red in that document and the integration of these systems is now being handled as part of the scope of our projects that we're working on.

And and I I can others here can speak with how the integrations between fire and and and intercom and this and the procedures and all these that are going.

But I can say that the modern systems that we're working on and this, this all is due to our work with the building department, with our partners and PPO where new specifications have been approved that allow us to install modern IP based network connected systems instead of the old specifications, which basically required analog systems that were, yeah, really based on last centuries technology.

So we're going in the right direction now.

Those additional funds are what we anticipate as necessary in order to finish all schools and make sure that they're in a COM systems are repaired up to date and and and expanded to the full capability.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 25:28

So it's not just going back to the schools that they, because the impression we're being given is that IT beat the ITB is to finish the work that was started from the RFP. The RFP was limited in scope to high schools and the senders, and the combination schools.

So either we're finishing that or we now have launched a whole thing where we're going and updating intercom systems at elementary and middle, which is what it is. That what you're saying?



Manuel Castaneda 26:02

Yes, ma'am.

We are engaged with uh middle schools and they're part of our project plan.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 26:07

OK.

So we'll come.

We'll come back to that because this is about getting through the audit again and I don't wanna get sure.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 26:13

Now, can I just ask her click?

Can I just ask for a clarification so when I'm sorry when you said there were 69 active projects and 33 boots on the ground, which I'm sorry who?

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 26:17

Yes, don't have.

Umm.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 26:26

I don't know who I'm directing this to, but is that when you're when you're saying you're addressing all of the projects?

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 26:29

Cat man Manny Castaneda.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 26:33

Uh.

Is that what's left of the projects to do 69 or is that 69 + 33?

Oh, I wasn't sure.

Exactly.

 **Manuel Castaneda** 26:43

Let me let me make thank thank you for that question.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 26:44

Yeah.

Thank you.



Manuel Castaneda 26:46

I can respond.

So of the 220 Schools assessed, UH-87 were considered large scope projects.

In other words, would require significant A repairs or complete what we call rip and replace 122 were classified as medium scope means that the systems were still upgradable, that were still still in decent shape, but they needed some repairs, wiring, cabling, replace and add speakers, etcetera.

And then the rest, which we're 11, we're considered minor in scope and could be handled just as minor repairs through our partners at PPO.

So after that assessment was done, 69 because we've had, we've had challenges over the years that the the audit discusses and and and I'm gonna say that the audit in my opinion and in the opinion of many others is as has hit some of the issues that have occurred over the last five years right now.



EXT - Mary Fertig 27:37

But.

I I apologize for interrupting, but that was the assessment done in in 2019 or in 2023.



Manuel Castaneda 27:45

I'm sorry please.

This assessment, and Chief Alberti, I don't know if you could help me on this.

I know this was done in coordination with your area security managers and I it predates me, but I know it was before 2023.



EXT - Mary Fertig 28:05

OK so.



Manuel Castaneda 28:06

Do you recall that it it would?



Jaime R. Alberti 28:07

Yeah, it was.

It was we, the coordination between principles. Mary.

It was sometime in the fall between area managers and principals because we knew

that the IT was coming and the fall, so we wanted to have that list of schools and assessed before that, ITB would have been approved so they can that assessment done.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 28:20

OK, so that.

So that would be like fall of 2023.

 **Jaime R. Alberti** 28:31

That's correct.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 28:32

OK.

Thank you.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 28:34

OK.

 **Manuel Castaneda** 28:35

Thank you, chief.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 28:35

And since we have Omar here, there is one more line item because this is getting into the ITB and the end of the story.

But since Omar is still here, I just want to ask about this other line item in the DEFP.

It says fire alarm operational analysis because we just passed a motion at our last meeting asking for the district to sort of determine the functionality of all of its fire alarms and intercom systems and also emergency communication.

Uh, systems.

So what is this Omar?

What was the funding and there may be other people on this call that know exactly what this was.

What was this funding for, and has this occurred?

Fire alarm operational analysis.

Although this is each year, So what is this?
Is Omar still with us?

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 29:39
Yeah, he's checking things out.

OS **Omar R. Shim** 29:41
Yeah, I'm just looking at our notes to see how that was.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 29:41
OK.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 29:42
And.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 29:49
Now.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 29:50
It says down like is this.
Would this be similar or what they just described happened in the fall of 2023?

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 29:57
That's what I'm thinking, except that notice it's over the next few years.
So I'm so now this says non facility Omar goes capital.
I'm not sure what bucket this comes out of, but I would imagine that Mister Alberti should be able to answer this question because.

OS **Omar R. Shim** 30:14
Look.
Well, I'll.
I'll just I can just tell you what what was submitted in our notes and and I'm looking at it just says consultants will evaluate the vulnerability of the fire alarm system districtwide and prioritized systems based on the evaluation needs and code driven requirements for fire alarm district wide, a fire risk analysis is a preventative

measurement that's spots potential risks before they become hazards that could cause serious damage to people in places.


NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 30:18
Uh-huh.

OS **Omar R. Shim** 30:43
In the case of fire safety risk analysis reduces the likelihood of a fire taking place, which puts less strain on fires.
So I think the funding there was to do the analysis and and minor repairs as a sort of maintaining the system start the district.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 31:00
OK.

OS **Omar R. Shim** 31:01
I hope that's helpful and and if and if anybody can help me Nathan or anybody else that's good.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 31:01
I appreciate.
Yeah.

 **Nathan B. Sade** 31:08
Good morning, everybody.
Madam Chair, some I I sorry, I'm fairly new to the organization.
I I do see the funding there.
I know action hasn't been taken on that funding as of yet as far as a full analysis for the fire alarm operation, I know a part of the the smart Bond project was for full fire alarm replacement of 98 dates.
Umm which is a, you know, a little around 40% of of the the the sites we have.
Umm, I will look into you and and proceed and and put out a bid to to perform that analysis for the remaining sites.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 31:50

Well, both the.

Yeah.

Hold that thought, because to Mary's point, we're trying to determine exactly what.

So there was an assessment on intercoms, it seems in the fall of 23 and then

there was funding in last year's DEFP for a fire alarm operational analysis.

So and it's being spread out over five years, I guess it depends on which year you're in.

They'll either know or not know.

Both assessments are sounding like something that would have been helpful to have had in 2019 before throwing out an RFP for an intercom project.

But so hold that thought till we get back to the ITB, I just wanted to ask the question because Omar was only available for a short period of time.

So I'm going to switch back to the audit because we also don't want to keep Mr Harvey waiting.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 32:42

And.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 32:47

So let me go crack that open again and share.

Seconds.

OK so.

That was we kind of got off on this on that finding.

So my question real question start, we have a timeline here and one of the questions I have, we know that the safe Haven report was released in August of 2019.

Umm.

And let's see, there's a legal department directive for Roland board basis of design and to change spec on 6/6 of 2019.

Was that directive in this audit?

Mr Harvey.

RH **R. Harvey(Guest)** 33:41

When you say directive, uh, no, no, no, it's not in this audit.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 33:45

So how do you know it exists?
Did you see something in writing?

RH **R. Harvey(Guest)** 33:49

Oh yes.

I mean, we saw it as a part of our investigative work, but it was not within the scope of the audit.

But yes, we we obtained many documents that of which that was won.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 34:00

OK, so speaking as one audit committee member, if you're going to mention something, it definitely is helpful to have the that in the appendices.

Umm because otherwise it I mean this is fairly a fairly big thing to have occurred legal department directive for Roland basis of design and to change specs that's kind of huge I it's also curious to me that when it was approved that the board member follow up was not in here umm and then another the safe haven reports and all this also starts getting into the people that were interviewed.

I have quite a few pages here.

Let's see.

But getting.

Let's see and I'll double back to this ties into the timeline.

So you interviewed the Chief fire official at the time, Matt Decker.

Perla Macri, who's no longer here.

Uh, OK uh, this interview with Matt Bradford.

It says we interviewed him.

RH **R. Harvey(Guest)** 35:21

Yes.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 35:22

His role was that of CIO in November 22, following the departure of Phil Dunn, former CIO. Umm.

Given that his tenure as CIO began during the latter part of RFP19-123E, he deferred and responding to many of the questions we asked him.

What does the latter part of RFP19-123E mean exactly?

RH **R. Harvey(Guest)** 35:48

The install the actual work up of it per hour notes while he in that role he didn't have a significant part of the scope.

The initial review of the vendors and was really functional in the role of CIO doing the back half of the install in the work up of this RFP.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 36:19

OK.

Umm.

So E2, I don't think we have.

I thought we had all the documents cause there.

I'll have to pull them up separately, so yeah.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 36:32

Madam Chair, if you look at that, if you look at that item on the agenda in the parentheses, you'll see supporting docs in the title, and that's where those supporting docs will come up.

I have 483.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 36:44

Ohh gosh.

OK, good.

All righty.

So this is the request form.

That I just pulled up and pulling up again.

So this is from 4232019.

Do you?

Did you know that Matthew Bradford's name was on this document?

This is the board approving the RFP.

RH **R. Harvey(Guest)** 37:11

Right.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 37:11
Mr Harvey.

RH **R. Harvey(Guest)** 37:11
I understand.

Yes, I understand that he is a fairly long term employee of the district.

What we honed in on is his exact tenure as the chief assigned CIO, which I believe was for a short period.

That is where we focused in when he was at the top of the IT department.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 37:33
Right.

But do you know why his name was on here back in 2019?

RH **R. Harvey(Guest)** 37:39
I don't.

I can't say why it was on there.

I see that it is on there.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 37:42

So I'm gonna I, if memory serves, he was on here because he was the task assigned Chief Information Officer back in 2019 following the departure of Tony Hunter.

RH **R. Harvey(Guest)** 37:58
OK, I I cannot.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 37:59
And right.

RH **R. Harvey(Guest)** 38:00

I cannot add or dispute that statement regarding who came in after Tony Hunter as far as the task assigned.

So so are you saying he was the task assigned CIO twice?

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 38:10

OK.

I believe so.

And then also remember there is an email on page 30 of your report from July 2019 and he is listed as task assigned.

CIO Matt Bradford.

I pointed this out at the last meeting.

So he was still task assigned in July of 2019 because I want to say Tony Hunter departed along with Leo Bobadilla from the district in January or February of 2019.

So I E.

RH **R. Harvey(Guest)** 38:51

I let me let me just make one point because I believe I don't know that name Hunter draws some polarization in our review of this.

Nothing came up or was pulled into any of Tony Hunters.

His his name didn't come up or or was a part of any of our work, or our review, or anything we found regarding his association with this.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 39:15

And it probably wouldn't, because he was already gone by the time this became an idea.

RH **R. Harvey(Guest)** 39:21

OK.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 39:22

Because he, he, Tony Hunter of Lenovo and Record X Spain.

OK, so I'm just pointing that out.

So then we have, because just for you know, accuracy purposes.

OK.

Mary Coker no longer here, Mr Albin.

He was interviewed.

We observed him having felt pressured despite him having provided feedback to his supervisor.

That work, which began in July 2019, was not proper.
I may have touched on this at the last meeting because, umm.
His you did not.
And I think you said you did an interview as supervisor which is supervisor or ultimately would have been Shelly Maloney.
Who?

RH **R. Harvey(Guest)** 40:07

You.
You gave me.
You didn't mention that at the last meeting.
We did not enter your shirt, Shirley or Shelly Maloney.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 40:10

Right.
Shelly, Shelly.
OK.
And we'll get back to that in a second.
In a in a bit here.
So these are all the other people that were interviewed.
And actually I hold on.

RH **R. Harvey(Guest)** 40:27

And also the people that declined to be interviewed.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 40:28

Natalie.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 40:30

Yes.
And I'm getting to to Craig Dawrf here.
Yes, Mary.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 40:35

That I I'm I'm getting concerned with the time so I I I'm just gonna request we had

several questions that we I think that they that the Mr Rhodes was going to get answered for us at our last meeting and I E.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 40:38
Yeah, I'm trying to get through.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 40:53
Kind of.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 40:53
I don't think he got any answers.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 40:53
I'm wondering if we.
Well, we just, I I feel like from what?
Chief Alberti just told us.
And and I'm sorry, the other gentleman that they have done an analysis as recently as fall 2023 and we did not have that information last time on all of the various at every school.
If that's correct, I just want to check that off the list.
We had some other questions about whether or not they were able to pursue recovery of any of the funds.
Umm.
And because there's a, it's I'm looking at.
These are contracts.
There's gonna be a statute problem on that.
So I I just, I don't want to lose track of where we were last time.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 41:36
No, no, I know exactly where we were, but the problem is that the there's also a larger issue at play here and there are people's jobs at play here.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 41:36
Umm, so.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 41:46

They the money.

So Roland Borg is still the vendor and it's very curious and I wanna focus on Roland Borg for a second because we we also have an audit that was put out that has some holes in it that I wish to fill.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 41:52

I understand I I.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 42:02

Umm.

As we move forward, because we also talked about reporting this all to the state as far as what had gone on with this project, because don't lose sight of we had an RFP that was put out that did not address standards and codes, which they now seemed to be doing and instead of being transparent and owning that, they did not address standards and codes.

In 2019 we had umm, somewhere in here at mentions that they turn something over to SIU.

So I'm gonna be asking whether Matt Decker was investigated, and because what we have here, the the biggest thing we have here is a cover up that they're in the background now addressing as though there was not an attempt to cover up the problems from 2019.

So Craig to work is the business development manager for Roland board.

Did you, Mr Harvey?

I don't it.

I know you mentioned the office, the Safe Havens report.

Did you know that Craig Dorf appeared at the MSD Commission in?

I believe June of 2018.

RH **R. Harvey(Guest)** 43:18

No, I was not aware of that.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 43:20

OK, A are and that is significant because it is.
Did you know that he was a parent of a student at MST?

RH **R. Harvey(Guest)** 43:30

No, I didn't.

Not well, no, I don't.

I don't believe I know that he he may have said something to that effect, but I I don't believe that resonates in my mind right now.

So I'm I'm gonna say lean to.

No, I didn't know that.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 43:44

OK.

So because first we have him appearing at MSD, then we have the safe havens report coming out and then we have this hastily put together RFP and I'm going to put and in Full disclosure the day after, the Sun Sentinel reported on the intercom project, I got a phone call from Craig Dorf trying to explain to me that they do in fact offer an emergency communication system.

I don't know why he would feel the need to call the Audit committee chair the day after an article appears in the Sun Sentinel, but he did.

Uh, so getting backed because in your audit you asked the question why was there so much focus on it being rolling board and I and there are answers to that.

Or at least more questions to to that, one of which starts starts in 20.

In 2019.

18 sorry, uh, I'm gonna go pull the intercom project.

Let's see.

And I've yeah.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 45:08

Well, while you're doing that, I I just again, I don't wanna lose sight regardless of of some of these other things.

I think we had some, we had some important issues we raised last time which if there were monies to be recovered, what was the process for doing that and things like that?

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 45:22

It could, Carl, I don't.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 45:23

I don't wanna lose sight of that going.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 45:25

And not recovering any money the the there's not gonna be any money recovered because they didn't actually do anything that we didn't tell them to do most likely.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 45:25

I don't wanna get so much into the, huh?

PS **P. Shaw** 45:38

This is Phyllis.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 45:38

But but go ahead so.

PS **P. Shaw** 45:39

Good morning, but.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 45:39

Well, that's your analysis.

I had my question and and I think Mr Rhodes was gonna we're gonna response.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 45:45

So right, so we can ask him, Mr Rhodes, did you get a response on that?

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 45:45

I don't know if he did, but.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 45:51

Any monies being recovered?

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 45:51

No, we did not get a response from that and we did all we also did not get a response on the fact that that was part of a motion that was sent to the board.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 46:01

OK.

Did we get a response on having an expert look at the the scope of the RFP?

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 46:06

No, we did not.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 46:08

OK. Umm.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 46:09

If you, if you remember correctly, I think there were four bullet points to the item that was sent before the board for the motion and in that motion one of the questions was the question of any possible cost recovery as well as expert for the RFP as well as the item that was just mentioned.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 46:13

Motion.

Right.

And then we passed another motion, which they've started addressing, which is they did an assessment which, if they they didn't assessment on intercoms in the fall of 23. And then there's money for fire alarm assessments.

But I wanted again, since Mr Harvey is here because we can have staff back at a later date, but we can't keep dragging in Mr Hardy.

So this is from this is Craig Dawrf in front of the MSD Commission and on June 7th, 2018, the Safe Havens report comes out in August.

Umm, but I mentioned this because he's saying there are two primary mass communication devices you have fire and you have the intercom and then he talks about how old the intercom system is at MSD and they haven't been able to automate the process of a code red.

You should be able to press a button.

Uh.

Then he starts trying to opine on the specifications for Broward County as well as the majority of districts.

Not only in Florida, but around the country require outside speakers, hallway speakers and remember, at our last when we looked at this the last time I shared two articles on standards and codes 1 from 2018 and 1 from 2019, where they talk about UL 2572 and NFPA a 2470 or 72, I believe so.

Those are things that were already known.

He in this and I'm not sure if I sent this, but I can.

Require speakers and hallway speakers that the schools don't have a lot of times we overlook that communication system in there because we have mindset.

It was when we went to school.

It's no longer just for making morning announcements.

It's a critical communication system to lock down the school, make a weather alert, make different actions, all automated software driven, push of a button so that we can have an issue in our schools.

We can lock it down quickly and let people take cover.

Are you thinking about the RFP and what the specifications were?

They mentioned a lockdown, so it's so the catalyst for telecenter you is potentially him going in front of the MSD Commission.

This would have been the first time that he talks about telecenter you.

Uh, this could have been an even more tragic situation because at that school, when the fire alarm went off, people evacuated.

They were outside and when a minute and 1/2 went and we finally announced the code red, they didn't hear it.

They got back in school or back in the classrooms by administrators running around saying we have a code red get back in.

There's a code over fire alarms.

There's no code over intercom and they clash that that's technically not not true.

So I wanna make sure I bring this to your attention.

Hopefully other people think that just because in healthcare facilities there's a code over the communications systems, maybe there should be the same kind of governing body over the communication systems that they have in our schools.

Thank you for our time.

So there is and if you're going to because the bottom line is, if you're going to use your intercom system, or if you're in a school and you intend to have an emergency communication system, that's where NFPA 72 and UL 2572 come into play.

So he, he clearly knows that there's different codes, but doesn't seem to know that if you're going to use your intercom system as part of an emergency communication system that triggers.

UL 2572.

That's June 7th, 2018.

RH **R. Harvey(Guest)** 50:25

I mean.

Madam Chair, if I hear you correctly, are you saying that you believe his discussion at the MSD Commission some kind of way bled itself onto the specs and scope of bid? 19-123 am I correct in in that and hearing you they say and hearing you what you're saying?

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 50:48

Ah, but that that I think a reasonable person might at least ask the question, especially when we also had the board member asking whether they're getting the Roland board.

Telecenter you as their communication system before it was awarded.

So between June of 2018 and they put together the RFP, they were starting in February of 2019 and it was awarded in April.

Safe havens.

If you look at the language in safe havens, it's even consistent with it starts sounding like telecenter you, so I would also ask the question whether he had any communication with the safe havens people, or they may have just seen his comments or heard his comments.

Or they may have been at the MSD Commission meeting.

I I don't know, but there is in terms of your the timeline this happened first, this happened before the safe Havens report came out.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 51:55

And, Madam Chair, if I may.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 51:57

Yes.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 51:58

Umm, while we have the fire official here, I understand that he was not here for all times.

Relevant, but I'm interested to find out if he has any input regarding the code type questions that we were talking about as to whether or not the system that was listed in this RFP as well as the system that is being worked on now that we've talked about earlier, if those things would all meet the requirements of NFPA and UL 2572.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 52:32

Umm, that seems a fair.

Yeah, since he's here, is it?

You said it's not safe, right?

It's saddy.

 **Nathan B. Sade** 52:41

It's study, sorry.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 52:43

Got it. OK.

 **Nathan B. Sade** 52:44

So.

Right now we're are emergency emergency communications system has to meet.

UL has to meet at FPA and it has to be, you know, hardened conduit, battery backup tested.

It is a, you know, and of the compass is much more than just a intercoms.

It's it's for all kinds of events and you have to have those narratives with like an SOP with those events and it it is a much more of a system.

What is going on now in the systems we're putting in are intercom separate from fire alarm?

A lot of the fire alarm systems we have are all new ones actually are with voice

capabilities, but fire alarms with voice aren't technically emerging communication systems, but they do have the capability of paging to all the areas ohm.

To have why I see some of this is requesting where the intercom now can take precedence.

You cannot do that with an intercom system.

You have to have an emergency communication system to take precedence to shut down a fire alarm system, do whatever you want to be the head and system.

The way we're doing it here, and the narrative of the the school, is we're having a separate intercom system, stand alone from a fire alarm system.

The intercom system would still be functional during a fire alarm system, but they're they're completely different and it's in.

This is also good cause there's redundancy.

You have two options.

If one systems failing, you have a you know another that you can put messages through.

Umm.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 54:27

And, Madam Chair, if I'm a follow up a little bit on that point because at some at some point I'll probably be talking with Mr Harvey over finding #9 and what kind of language we might need to update where that's concerned to get that to correct that.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 54:29

Yeah.

Umm yes.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 54:44

And one of the things that I wanted to ask you, Mr Sade, is the UPS reference that we talked about earlier in the RFP, the the RFP, that's the scope of this Audit.

Would a UPS system like that generally be included in the specs because there was a plan to integrate these two systems that we were just talking about?

Or is it that a UPS would also be needed to ensure proper backup power for an intercom system?



Nathan B. Sade 55:17

It depends on the way it's being installed, but I'm uh the the.

So fire alarm systems have battery backup systems, but they're not necessarily like secondary UPS like your computer might have.

I know Intercom systems might do that for their head and devices and and their data closets or whatever the UPS system on the intercom system is is just to make sure if there's a power outage or anything like that.

You still have the capabilities of voicing and messaging.

You know the site.

You have a severe weather that might take down the power or anything else like that no UPS.

You have no communication.

Fire alarm systems do have the battery system, the battery backup, so you'll fire alarm with voice.

You would still be able to talk to the system with the power went down, so I I.



Dave G. Rhodes 55:59

And is that a different power source than the UPS?



Nathan B. Sade 56:04

So.

I'm not an expert on intercom systems.

From my experience, I've seen intercom systems usually have standalone UPS where it's a secondary device, just like for your PC or it's in a rack and fire alarm system.

It's integrated into it and it's a a lead acid battery that's in on the notification circuits and the alarm panel and it's inside the system.

It's not a secondary unit.



Dave G. Rhodes 56:31

OK, now wasn't trying to get that technical, although I appreciate the explanation.

I'm just trying to make sure that we have an understanding of where we would go

with the way that the current finding is written to make it more accurate and correct.

And I appreciate your comments.

NL

Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 56:46

OK, because it seems clear that, uh, which is explains why it's in the RFP, that a UPS device would have been necessary in order to provide backup.

Umm.

Power for the intercom systems.

Regardless of the Pentagon, and had nothing to do necessarily with the Penton device.

But while we're on the technical side of it, because you mentioned we have two standalone systems and I want to take us back again to 2019, let me make sure I crack this open because one of the things I went into my vault of things and pulled up.

Let's see different presentations or?

Documents.

Because that this is all about uh, whether we are adhering to whether we we are operating in silos or not.

Which the district tends to do.

So let me go pull.

So these are two things from 20 well one thing from 2019, let's see, we have a memo which I may not be able to pull up as easily.

And these are online.

So this was September 25th, 2018 School Board workshop and it talks about what we have now.

What is Smart?

What does fire code require?

Exploring beyond smart.

Umm.

So they knew who's getting the fire, new fire alarms, what they're going to be able to do.

Items not originally contemplated in smart and again this just to be this is September.

So this is after the safe Havens report came out. Umm.

Requirements not contemplated memo.

This was at which she put out they do we have positive alarm sequence fire alarm systems, Mr Sorry.



Nathan B. Sade 59:08

I know we do not.

The older systems I know that we might have had then conventional and maybe even old.

They wouldn't have the capabilities.

All the newer systems that are being installed, all the voice systems do have the capabilities of performing positive alarm sequencing.

But what that is also a lot of training on each of the school or site levels for staff to be able to do that properly, umm.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 59:36

And what does that do?

The positive alarm sequencing.



Nathan B. Sade 59:40

It allows for if you have.

And allows for the site to verify if the device that was triggered, Umm was umm is an actual fire or smoke or or what it is prior, you know within a certain within 180 seconds before contacting the fire department and before you know, you know pushing out the full fire alarm.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:00:09

OK.

So you're saying the new ones being installed don't have it, but have the ability to have that programmed?



Nathan B. Sade 1:00:19

The new ones have have the ability for it, but it's not.


It's a programming aspect and it's a a training aspect and a procedure thing and it it will take a lot of resources to.

Uh umm to put you know that out.


Like when, whenever if a fire alarm panel goes off, there's, you know, a addressable system.

We'll say, you know, smoke detector or room 213 or or pull station or whatever it is.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:00:46
Mm-hmm.

 **Nathan B. Sade** 1:00:46
So this will happen with the positive numbers.
If somebody will have to go verify very quickly that's familiar with the system, you have to read the panel.
You have to know, be familiar with campus.
You have to get to that area.
Really quickly to verify.
Is this a threat or not?
And if you don't have that in place, you don't have the overlap to training.
You cannot do it.
There's there's a a very large liability with that it it can be done it just it will take some some effort.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:01:11
OK, so if we have two stand alone systems, what happens if the events that unfolded on 214, 2018 were to happen again where and there and there's an additional scenario like you just said, if someone pulls a false alarm, but my understanding is that there was smoke in the hallway and the smoke triggered the fire alarm.
What happens now with two standalone systems that would, what happens now with two standalone systems?

 **Nathan B. Sade** 1:01:43
So if a fire alarm is triggered from a device going off a pull station, smoke whatever it may be, it will, it will shut down certain aspects that the directive we have right now is to shut down the the class bells, the the recall on, but not the actual intercom system.
So the voice on it.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:02:04
But hold on.
But OK, so and you weren't here.
But I'm.

I'm I would imagine you're familiar with what happened.

So again, the smoke from the gun figure triggered the fire alarm system is what happens now that would prevent everybody once the fire alarm goes off.

How do people know?

How to staff and kids know not to evacuate if they're in danger.

The the 2nd that they go out of the classroom and start spilling in the hallways.



Nathan B. Sade 1:02:41

So we will be putting out, we put out a directive and we will be putting out a a lot more on that on the procedure of performing a troll and exiting.

This was started by one of my predecessors, but there's the code doesn't require it.

It doesn't push for a quick, quick evacuation and it states that you know you need to evacuate in a timely, orderly fashion.

So you know, but we're going to put into play just a slow down on the procedures to feel to look and to listen before exiting and before going you know to to just kind of really push that into our drills.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:03:24

OK, so so if somebody outside of the building in question knows that there's an active shooter.

Before this has how is that communicated?



Jaime R. Alberti 1:03:40

Tell us is alert that that trigger elissa's alert and everybody is a mandatory reporter.



Nathan B. Sade 1:03:42

I or through you can you can.



Jaime R. Alberti 1:03:47

If they need to call a lockdown, they can.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:03:48

Well, wait, I thought.

And then no, but roll the roll and telecenter you is supposed to do that.

So why would we need a list's alert?
If you have the role in telecenter you.



Nathan B. Sade 1:03:59

The more ways of notifying people, the better you know you can use the intercom system in the school.

You can use the fire alarm voice system in a school.

You, you know, we also have.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:04:09

How would they use OK, so take me through the so that they can use the intercom system but you.

But is Roland Center is the telecenter you and emergency UL 2570 twos certified or compliant emergency communication system.



Nathan B. Sade 1:04:26

I am not familiar with that system, I apologize.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:04:29

Who's just said that?

Uh, Mr Sagan?



Nathan B. Sade 1:04:31

Uh. Correct.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:04:35

You're not familiar with telecenter you.



Nathan B. Sade 1:04:38

I'm not familiar with the rolling or intercoms and and and devices like that.

I'm I'm I'm my my Forte is is fire and fire alarm systems and.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:04:46

OK.

So then how would they deliver the message through the fire alarm system?



Nathan B. Sade 1:04:52

Well, through an intercom system you can pick it up in voice and do everything. I'm not familiar with that particular type of intercom system with the voice.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:04:59

That's the one they're putting into the schools, but it's not so. So you said at the top of this response, if it's an emergency communication system, it has to be UL 2572 compliant or certified or or one or the other.



Nathan B. Sade 1:05:16

So where?

Yes, it has to be.

NFPA has to be UL compliant.

All the devices have to be listed, it has to be if it's an emergency communication system.

We're not required to install in which communication system, but if we do, if.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:05:30

Yes, I understand.

But if you're going to it, but again, this is Broward's County where we had MSD.

And just to wrap up with this thing from 2018, exploring beyond ability to make live announcements, ability to override system with additional instructions, lockdowns, ability to use special effects, fire alarm installs, new fire alarm design, wiring.

So in 2018, integration with other systems fire alarm replacement needs safe havens review.

This is from September 2018.



Nathan B. Sade 1:06:15

To do that, you need an emergency communication system.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:06:18

OK.

But that is not what and so this is a question for Mr Alberti.



Nathan B. Sade 1:06:22

If you.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:06:26

Then Mr Sade, since I appreciate that you're fire alarm.

Mr Alberti is the Roland board telecenter you and emergency communication system.

That's UL 2572.



Jaime R. Alberti 1:06:40

So doctor Lechowicz, I don't recall ever hearing about the telling you until you mentioned it today.

I don't know if that is part of the new installation systems, but I have not heard of that until today.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:06:48

Well, how?



Jaime R. Alberti 1:06:54

What I do know is that the audit caught umm, you know, was able to dive into some of the things that Doctor Phillips and I were discovering and and figuring out that delays.

But this whole thing has been triggered because of the delays in getting this original work done.

We discovered that the original work was classified.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:07:13

But we don't know what the original but.



Jaime R. Alberti 1:07:16

Remember the agency having jurisdiction?

Being the fire official here in Broward County, that code is to be interpretive depending on the individual, the background and the intent of how we're trying to implement something.

So at that time, I believe that's what happened is the interpretation of the code was you need this emergency communications system to be placed and that's why that's code kind of began to change, hence why Mr Harvey and associated were doing. The how to do their their work because it went on the completely different path. So I'm not really sure what the.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:07:48

OK, so did then let me stop you before you say too much.

Well, you know what?

Sometimes I'm accused of stopping people before they say exactly what we want them to say.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 1:07:57

Then can I just ask, are we?

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:07:58

So yeah.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 1:08:00

I'm I'm getting confused.

Are we still talking finding #9?

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:08:06

No, Mary.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 1:08:08

I where are we in the which of the findings are we on?

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:08:12

We're kind of going globally at this point because we're because of who we have here.

Mary, I'm trying to if you have specific questions because we had these, we did not have somebody here prior to be able to answer code specific questions.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 1:08:19

I OK, I E.

Yeah.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:08:29

I'm trying to maximize having Mr Sade here and he's been very helpful.

I think he's also been helpful to Mr Harvey.

But if you have something specific within the audit that you'd like to ask, please ask it, because otherwise I'm trying to maximize the use of the people that are here in clarifying some things, because the next thing I'm going to go to is the Penton versus audio enhancement products because they're using the audio enhancement products called the Epic System.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 1:09:02

I.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:09:03

It's very technical, but it yes.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 1:09:05

Natalie.

Natalie, what you're finding as far as information is great, but we're here to look at this audit and I wanna make sure we stick to the I wanted to make sure that we stick.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:09:12

That is part of OK. Mary. Mary.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 1:09:16

Can I just finish the sentence?

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:09:16

Mary. Sure.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 1:09:18

Because you've been now, we've been now meeting for an hour and 12 minutes and I don't know that there have been a lot of other questions we had left this.

I thought with some specific requests and I'm glad these people came on.
We found out a lot more information, but umm, I don't.
I don't know how far beyond this audit we can go and maybe Mr Rhodes can clarify that.
Umm.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:09:44
I'm not.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 1:09:44
And and finding out information.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:09:44
I haven't gone beyond the Mary.
I'm not going beyond.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 1:09:47
OK.
So you're on finding went.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:09:50
No, no, no.
Listen, listen, Mary, there's a lot of holes in the audit.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 1:09:50
So if you could just.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:09:57
Which some of it was was.
The scope of the audit, but there's a lot of technical questions because they what what they came along in 2023.
There's this narrative that's being pushed.
That's something changed.
When if you go back to the RFP, there are multiple mentions in the RFP of an emergency communication system.

Mr Sade has clarified that in order to be an emergency communication system, that's where UL 2572 comes in, but that was not part of what the district was doing in 2019 and it should have been.

And so the whole thing with the Penton device and my next technical question that I'm trying to get at between Mr Sade, who is the only person I can speak to fire here is whether it gets to certification versus compliance because the only because from the get go with the RFP, the desire was always for an emergency communication system.

The problem was and if you look at the addendum #2 is that the people in charge had zero idea how to get there and so they ignored standards codes and rushed to put out this RFP.

And then when it could not get a permit big based on what they were trying to do. Matt Decker came up with the Penton device, which from what I'm reading the only potential problem was if he was trying to create a certified system which, given the condition of most of the intercoms and fire alarm systems that needed to be replaced, might have been the opt.

The only option if you didn't upgrade the other things because if you have a fire alarm system that just does the Horn style then you would need to make your intercom system UL2572 certified.

If you now upgrade everything then you have the option to be compliant, which it seems is the direction they're moving.

I'm trying to get clarity on that because I understand that the one of the things missing from the timeline is a trip that was made by the chief building, Perla, Matt and Shelly to Joris Jabouin, who was the chief auditor at the time.

And that is not mentioned in this timeline at all.

And then the same day, hold up the same day that they made that trip to Joris to voice concerns, Matt got demoted.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 1:12:42
OK, I.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:12:51
And Alberti attempted to investigate Matt for having this Penton device and if anything got misdirected in this entire process, it was the misdirection, slash apparent cover up of the cake up that was made in 2019.

So I am not at all.

I'm trying to help Mr Harvey because I think that that HCT had a lot of question marks that we can help fill in because this audit is almost the exact opposite of what, what, what actually transpired.

And they hint at it throughout the audit.

I have a ton of stickies.

Most of my questions are getting answered by what Mr Sade is providing in terms of clarity as far as fire.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 1:13:47

Madam Chair.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:13:47

Because.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 1:13:47

I just wanted to know that I wanted to note that Phyllis has set put in the chat that she's had her hand raised and several couple times it hasn't been called on.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:13:54

I can't see when I'm sharing, so I need so hold on.

I, Mary, as you may or may not know, I cannot see if I'm sharing my screen.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 1:14:02

I'm sorry I didn't.

I was just telling you because it came up on my screen as you were talking just now.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:14:06

Yeah, Mr Rhodes, is there someone that can let let me know.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 1:14:10

Yeah, in fact, that was what I was just about to do.

I was gonna let you know that Phyllis had her hand up first initially, and that Chief Alberti has his hand up second.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:14:16

Uh-huh.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 1:14:18

But Phyllis jumped back off again, and now she's listed as two, but I think she was the first person with her hand up, and then she fell Berg.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:14:24

OK.

She alright.

So, Phyllis, I'm sorry I can't see when I'm sharing a screen.

See there.

PS **P. Shaw** 1:14:30

Good morning.

Listen, I I'm.

I'm having some issues.

First of all, was the scope of, was the scope of the audit addressed?

You know what was given to the company?

Was it addressed because we're going down this rabbit hole, this memory lane, and we're spend the last little bit over an hour and we haven't accomplished anything.

I have to get off in the next less than 45 minutes and while I I love the history lesson,

I think we need to get to either the rest of the audit committee members, the report

itself, address in the the questions if there are additional questions we can send it out to Mr Rhodes and the team to answer.

But we're going down this rabbit hole and they seem to not get into where we we need.

We need to go and I don't.

There are no questions to the audit committee as to what issues, questions that they have.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:15:29

Well, if you guys have questions, I'm getting what I need out of this.

I'm I'm I and it like I said.

PS P. Shaw 1:15:36

I'm sorry, Madam Chair.

You're running the the meeting.

You're the chair.

One in the meeting.

So first and foremost, those questions need to go to the audit committee, and once the those questions are finished and you have questions, you can you can ask, but you're running the meeting.

NL Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:15:41

No.

OK.

Do you have a question?

I've.

Mary asked questions we don't have answers to any of the motions we passed.

We have a partial answer to the motion that was passed at our last meeting.

So as I'm poking through looking for things absolutely, if you guys have a question and please ask it.

So does anyone have a an additional question?

Because then I'm going to ask about the Penton because this is about standards and codes.

EF EXT - Mary Fertig 1:16:21

I think I think.

NL Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:16:23

You did ask, but Phyllis did ask about the scope, so I'm gonna pull up the scope, but it's important.

EF EXT - Mary Fertig 1:16:25

So yes, thank you.

If we could ask Mr Harvey.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 1:16:30
That.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:16:33
But no, no did.

Well, there's so involves Mr Shade as well, because the scope you need to be clear on what you mean by scope, cause you can ask for something.

But then, if you don't address, if you don't know how to get it, then what does that mean?

So I'm gonna pull up the scope again.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 1:16:54

And by the way, the next hand up is cheap Alberti.

And if the timing of your comments cheap, Alberti are germane to this part of the discussion, please feel free to jump in while she's looking that up.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:16:58
OK.

Well, I I'm on the I'm on it.

I'm just looking for the word emergency.

Uh, OK, because Phyllis wanted.

 **Jaime R. Alberti** 1:17:13

OK.

I just wanted to comment cause.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:17:16

Phyllis wanted her question answered.

Was the scope addressed?

We asked for an expert to.

To review the scope of services, which is why I keep asking Mr Sade technical questions.

So this is the scope now, Phyllis.

Who are you looking for an answer from?

PS **P. Shaw** 1:17:39

I met the scope for the audit when HCT was given work to be done.

What word?

What were they given to do and have they accomplished that now?

If there are other things outside of the scope of the audit that was not addressed, then this is where we tell Mister Rhodes, listen, we wanted these responses.

They were not addressed in the Audit cause they were not part of the scope of the audit and these are the additional things that we need addressed because if there were not given particular information or or items to address in the scope for the audit, they are not gonna yield those responses, even though the audit, the purpose of the audit is not to determine perfection.

#1 #2.

So we need to get back to that to make sure we're not spending time going down this place where it didn't matter if it was addressed, because if they weren't asked to address it wouldn't have been addressed in the 1st place, if that makes sense.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 1:18:36

And if I if I might add a chief, Alberti was trying to say something a moment ago, we might wanna hear from him.

And then I would love to respond to Micha's comments.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:18:46

Well, I think her comment was to Mr Harvey, but Shaw, are you asking Mr Harvey, or do you want Mr Rhodes to answer the that question?

PS **P. Shaw** 1:18:56

Mr Mr Rhodes, Mr Rose is the person who would be given the work to be done, so he would determine what was included as part of the work that needed to be done.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:19:08

OK, so do you want to hear from Mr Alberti?

And then we can hear from Mr Rhodes.

PS **P. Shaw** 1:19:13

That's fine.

Thank you.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:19:15

OK, alright, Mr alberding.

 **Jaime R. Alberti** 1:19:19

Alright, I just real quick.

Madam Chair, you spoke earlier about the desire to do the ECS from the get go, which I can I I can disagree more.

I don't.


Think this is the whole reason why this investigation and audit took place is because their original intent was just to repair intercoms.

It changed.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:19:39

That's actually not even are you.

Are you familiar with the scope of the RFP?

 **Jaime R. Alberti** 1:19:45

Well, it changed the the, the, the.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:19:47

No, no.


But I'm talking about what's in the RFP when it went out.

I'm it's on screen right now, that's why I wanted to to stop you before you.

But you know what?

Proceed.

Keep going.

 **Jaime R. Alberti** 1:20:01

No, that was it.

I I think that it even budgeted.

I don't think it was budgeted for where they intended it later to design it as a British

communications system and This is why we're standing here today is because originally it wasn't attendant killing.

 **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:20:13

Right.

But it's the opera, but it's the so understand that when Craig De Worth called me after the the he insisted that they do in fact have an emergency communication system.

But as Mr Shade, who is the fire expert, pointed out, if you are going to have an emergency communication system then you need to comply with UL 2572.

Now the word emergency.

 **Jaime R. Alberti** 1:20:42

If.

 **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:20:45

The things that are consistent with an emergency communication systems, sounding emergencies, signals, conduit.

Let's see to the classrooms, emergency announcements.

Mr Sade, have you had a chance to review this RFP?

 **Nathan B. Sade** 1:21:07

I am reviewing it as we speak but I have not had a chance but I a lot of this looks like the the verbiage of the language that would have been in the school board's design standards for intercoms cause even though intercoms aren't required to run a conduit, it's just a better system.

 **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:21:22

Well, don't write.

 **Nathan B. Sade** 1:21:22

A better way of doing it for the life of the.

 **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:21:26

Right.

It's the word emergency, though, because if you're going to use your intercom system for an emergency communication system, then what happens?
What do you need if you're going to do that?



Nathan B. Sade 1:21:40

Per NFPA 72 of its an emergency system, it needs to be compliant with the the fire code.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:21:47

And how is it? How?



+15***30** 1:21:56

OK.



Nathan B. Sade 1:21:56

This is bad or line is broken.

The panel will notify you.

Hey, there's a break in the circuit.

There's a lot of checks and balances within the system you know to to let you know it's it's constantly working.

An intercom system lets you know it's constantly working to people, are using it day to day paging this not if it's not working in area.

You know the site users will let you know a fire alarm system isn't always active, so it needs all those extra things in place.

You know, like a smart system to report back to say, hey, you know, the system's fully functional or the panel real, it's in trouble if any of its components lines or circuits aren't working.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:22:33

OK.

Can you explain this?

These are this is item 49 and the RFP, the interface unit supplied at each system shall also include a contact closure type input to allow the override slash muting function to be controlled via connection from the fire alarm system.



Nathan B. Sade 1:22:50

So that just means that the fire alarm system has a relay that can shut down either the whole intercom system or aspects of the intercom system cause per code the fire alarm system is supposed to take precedence.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:23:02

Do our two standalone systems do that?



Nathan B. Sade 1:23:06

So our directive cause the threats.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:23:10

That's it.

So I I so can we start with a yes or no and then you can explain.



Nathan B. Sade 1:23:12

No, it was so no.

It's yes and no.

So our systems do not shut down the intercom voice capabilities.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:23:18

OK.



Nathan B. Sade 1:23:21

Our systems will the fire alarm will not shut down the intercom voice, but the fire alarm will shut down if the class bells or the recall Bell is on the intercom system, it will shut down those aspects cause you don't wanna fire alarm.



+15***30** 1:23:33

That's it.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:23:35

OK.

Can you repeat?

Can you repeat that?
So the fire alarm will not shut down.

 **Nathan B. Sade** 1:23:41

The.
The voice aspects of the intercom system.

 **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:23:47

OK.
But it will shut down.

 **Nathan B. Sade** 1:23:48

Of our systems, but it will shut down the class changing bells.

 **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:23:54

Umm.

 **Nathan B. Sade** 1:23:55

And the recall Bell and the reason for that is you don't want, you know, people to be outside during a fire alarm and have the cost bells go off.
And that's considered competing or even somebody activate the recall Bell until the fire alarm.
You know, everything was verified to be safe in the system was reset.

 **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:24:14


OK, so that so the yet so it can be controlled, it won't.
So no for voice?
The voice intercom messages and yes, for the bells.


 **Nathan B. Sade** 1:24:27

Correct.
Correct.
On some areas and some sites, the bell system can be completely separate and some sites the bells and class Belt class change notifications are alerts or tones are done to the intercom system.


 **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:24:33
OK.


 **Nathan B. Sade** 1:24:45
It varies.


 **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:24:46
And is this just for the new fire alarm systems or the old ones as well?

 **Nathan B. Sade** 1:24:51
And this is the way that it's been it's been done here for my understanding.
I've talked with you facilities and the the the service people that maintain the systems
and this was has always been the directive.


 **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:25:04
What has always been the directive?

 **Nathan B. Sade** 1:25:06
Do not shut down the intercom voice capabilities during a fire alarm.
And to stop the change the class bells and the recall Bell.


 **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:25:17
OK.
So are they integrated or not?
I'm confused.


 **Nathan B. Sade** 1:25:24
Not an integrated system.
Where per say you can now use the intercom system.
Talk over the fire alarm speak system.
It's not integrated where the fire alarm now can utilize the intercom speakers.
The only integration is a relay off of the fire alarm side to the intercom side when the
fire alarm is activated to shut down those aspects or.
Anything else that might be considered competing but microphone voice is not?


NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:25:53
OK. Umm.

 **Nathan B. Sade** 1:25:57
And I wanna clarify one thing, if if I may so during a fire alarm, yes the the the if it's a horn system or the voice system, it will continue to go.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:25:58
I said.
Sure.


 **Nathan B. Sade** 1:26:09
And while the intercoms are still active, you can still use the intercom.

 **+15*****30** 1:26:10
OK.

 **Nathan B. Sade** 1:26:17
But those intercom systems are always next to the fire alarm systems.
So if the threat is not a fire and it is a different type of threat, you are able to silence at the panel the fire alarm, the alarms they on, and now you're intercom voice can be heard throughout the site.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:26:39
OK, but that would require somebody doing that at the panel in question.

RH **R. Harvey(Guest)** 1:26:45
I need to talk.

 **Nathan B. Sade** 1:26:46
But the panels are always located next to each other.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:26:50

Right.

But if somebody's shooting up a hallway, how does that work?



Nathan B. Sade 1:26:54

Well, if you're in the office and you, you get you see the cameras or you know what's going on, you you can do it from wherever you are.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:27:01

OK.



Nathan B. Sade 1:27:01

Umm, we also have.

I mean, there's a lot more in place nowadays with, you know, single point of entry the the metal detectors going out.

A lot of training, like the the, the, the school and all has taken a lot of other steps that all you know will help reduce threats.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:27:20

OK, so audio enhancement is that they the EPIC system is referenced for the deaf and hard of hearing project, but it as part of what is happening now with Roland Borg and finishing quote unquote finishing up the intercom project.

And this May is audio and or is there an audio enhancement?

Product that's being used as a just for deaf and hard of hearing.

Or is it being used more broadly?



Manuel Castaneda 1:28:00

I can address that if you if you wish, because we are actively working on projects that involve audio enhancements beyond the DHH schools.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:28:02

OK.




Manuel Castaneda 1:28:09


What?

Audio Enhancement offers is School communication systems that actually meet the


new specifications that we've that the building department has put out. They are, uh, IP based network devices so they can integrate and connect uh using our existing network wiring.


 **+15*****30** 1:28:28
1.


 **Manuel Castaneda** 1:28:29
They are much less expensive to install, to maintain, and they have a lot of capabilities now that they're basically computer devices for you to include visual notifications, more granular programming, more granular integration, so that that's that's one of the systems that in DHH is going to, which is, by the way, the four DHH schools will be done by the opening of schools.
Uh, it's gonna demonstrate its full capability in other schools is also being installed without the need for all of the the visual notifications.
Just some in certain areas.

 **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:29:09
So this this White Paper mentions audit so.

 **R. Harvey(Guest)** 1:29:09
Great.

 **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:29:14
Well, First off, you mentioned new building department specs.
I don't think I've ever seen those.
Mr Rhodes, can we get those new quote unquote new specs?


 **Dave G. Rhodes** 1:29:25
I could certainly request them and follow up.


 **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:29:27
OK.
Umm, so this White Paper again, I'm reading this as a nearly person here mentions compliance versus certification to UL2572 the the Penton device that was.


That came into play.


Would that have given the district UL 2572 certification or compliance?


 +15*****30 1:29:52
Call.


 **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:29:54
And what are we doing now?
Because it sounds like we're trying to get UL2572 compliant.
Uh.

 **R. Harvey(Guest)** 1:30:05
Is it possible?
Is it possible this is Harvey?

 **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:30:08
I'm sorry.
Yeah. Yes.

 **R. Harvey(Guest)** 1:30:09
Is it?
Is it possible here soon for me to have?
Maybe a 2 minute umm time frame to just go over a few things.

 **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:30:19
Umm.
About compliance versus certification or a couple of things on the audit.

 **R. Harvey(Guest)** 1:30:26
A couple things on the Audit that's been mentioned as we've gone through this thread of communication that I would just like to put you know on the record as we continue this robust discussion.

 **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:30:37
OK.

I I would like to get an answer to this and then we can move to that so that we don't lose track of this question because this is fairly this, the Penton device was.

Mentioned repeatedly as being unnecessary, but now they're using audio at this audio enhancement product and I'm just trying to see what this does.

Is it the same as the Penton device?

Is it different?

Is it offering complete?

It says it can only do Compliance, not certification.

So I'm just trying to get some clarification and I'm I'm not sure how much Mr Shade can provide.

Since this is well, it does crossover into fire, Mr Sade or.

Umm Mr Alberti, since you and Doctor Phillips, who is no longer with the districts, were the ones that notice that the Penton device was unnecessary.

Can you explain between the two of you, Mr Sade and Mr Alberti?

How is this different?



Jaime R. Alberti 1:31:43

Uh.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:31:44

What does this do and how is it different from the Penton device and are?



Jaime R. Alberti 1:31:49

Well, the Penton device, so you have to understand that the requirement for emergency communication system is not needed.

Good.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:32:01

We know that it's not required but it but, but it does come into play if you're going to have an emergency communication system, we understand this.



Jaime R. Alberti 1:32:02

That's it's not needed.

OK, so.

Not necessarily, right.

So not necessarily, because what Nathan just described could be is a way to get that done right.

So you look around school districts across this Penton devices or this requirement of and FS1 and two year old 2572, it's not needed for for educational facilities as a matter of fact, it's listed in all the memos that the auditor did.

So that's listed there.

So Audien Hazmat is a more newer, robust intercom system that also integrates with teachers in the classrooms and provides them audio in the classroom.

So it's it's just a newer, I guess state of the are the latest and greatest of of intercom and and audio in the classroom.

So I don't know if Manny, this is where you can kind of pick up and talk a little bit more about what it does, but it also what it does, it also provides us and you know from the DHH schools, it will have the ability to alert others of there's an emergency in schools through each individual classroom. Manny.



Manuel Castaneda 1:33:13

Yes.

And and and and.

Thank you, Chief Alberti.

The the whole nature of the painting layer, from my understanding was trying to make an intercom system become an emergency communication system.



+15***30** 1:33:20

OK.



Manuel Castaneda 1:33:28

But that's the whole nature of the issue that we're facing.

The original RFP was not for emergency communication systems.

It was for an intercom system.

Uh, and the change in scope, the was significant in order to make it into an ECS, and that's not what the board approved.

I think that's the whole nature of the audit and the whole nature of the problems that we face.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:33:51

That that may be the nature of the audit, but I'm gonna bring up the Lori Alhadeff board member response again without without the narrative.

Can you guys just answer the question?

What does this epic system do that's different from the Penton device?

Can we answer the the Penton?

It sounds like the Penton device.



Manuel Castaneda 1:34:11

It.



NL Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:34:12

You're confirming my suspicion that the Penton device would have created an intercom system that was UL 2572 certified.



Manuel Castaneda 1:34:23

That I'm that I cannot speak to.

I would have to check and see if there is any UL certification.



NL Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:34:26

Well, that's kind of the crux of the question. Uh-huh.



Manuel Castaneda 1:34:30

The what I do know is the pending the vice is trying to solve the problem of making an intercom system into an ECS at the A system is not.

We are not deploying it as an emergency communication system, so there really is no relation.



NL Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:34:44

Then you may want to tell Craig to Worf that because he assured me that the UL the Telecenter you was an emergency communication system.

Just saying yes, Sir. Yes.



DR Dave G. Rhodes 1:34:54

Madam Chair, Madam Chair.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 1:34:56
I've had my hand up for some time.
Is there any chance that any of the rest of us can comment?

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:35:01
Mary, I cannot see your hand if I'm sharing the screen.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 1:35:05
I I and I.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 1:35:06
I I was.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:35:08
So someone has to tell me that your hand is up.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 1:35:09
I was.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 1:35:09
Go ahead. I'm.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:35:12
I can't.
I I cannot see it on, so I'm gonna stop sharing the screen because when I stop sharing the screen then I can see people and see that hands are up and Mr Harvey wanted to minutes.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 1:35:17
Let let me.
Let me have a let me let me have a second.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:35:25
So I don't think we're gonna answer my technical questions, Mr Rhodes.

DR Dave G. Rhodes 1:35:26

If I can have a.

NL Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:35:31

And then yes, I know Mr Harvey wanted two minutes and Mary has her hand up.

DR Dave G. Rhodes 1:35:35

But one of the things I wanted to say was that was going to note that Mary had her hand up, but I wanted to wait until the discussion took a pause where it wouldn't be interrupting the folks in the middle of their responses.

But yeah, Mary does have her hand up.

Also, I would like to have a moment to.

Address Miss Shaw's and Fertig.

Request that the chief auditor chime in as well as to discuss and hand over the the the floor.

If I could to Mr Harvey to talk about the scope of his work, because that was put together before I got back here and started working together with them.

+15***30** 1:36:01

It's.

DR Dave G. Rhodes 1:36:12

So if I could only make one observation and that was that when there was discussions that were going on, you know every couple weeks there would be discussions between our office and HCT where we were making note of the fact that NFP, NFPA references and URL 2572 references were not found in the RFP.

+15***30** 1:36:16

Yeah.

DR Dave G. Rhodes 1:36:36

And so I understand how there are different words in there using the word emergency, using different words that can conjure up this idea, that this RFP included all that, but we didn't find anything that was specific enough to say this is this is the

the answer, this is this can be defended.

It's a bulletproof analysis of this without also being experts in that field.

For that reason, I wanted to state to Miss Shaw that I'm starting on page four of the audit.

There's the performance audit objectives that identify what it is that HCT was asked to look at.

I think we've heard from staff as well as from the chair that there are some bits of confusion that lie in the wording of the RFP that left something to the imagination of staff that felt that they wanted to try to turn this into an emergency communication system, but that the document and what was awarded per that document only allowed them to do certain enhancements and maintenance and repairs to the intercom system.

With that in mind, I agree on both sides that with the benefit of hindsight, there is more to this, but I believe also with what it is that was found based on the objective that were agreed to by the Chief Auditor and HCT that they did the best that they could do with the available staff that were still A employed or in a position to be able to provide information.

AM Anthony De Meo (Guest) 1:37:54

On based on the objective, yeah.

+15***30** 1:37:56

Yeah, 3.

I think.

AM Anthony De Meo (Guest) 1:38:03

Bill pay 44.

DR Dave G. Rhodes 1:38:07

So that's the chief auditor's perspective on this part.

But I think that there's some gaps that can be filled in by Mr Harvey talking about how the scope was determined and developed before I ever even came back to this district.

NL Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:38:22

OK.

So, Mr Harvey, you asked for a couple of minutes.

Mary, do you have any objection to Mr Harvey and his two minutes?

Or do you want?

Do you have your question 1st?

And then we'll let Mr Harvey speak.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 1:38:37

Lester Harvey was clearly in front of me, so I would like to hear what he says has to say.

Thank you.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:38:42

OK.

Oh, you're muted, Mr Harvey.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 1:38:46

Grab your your microphones off.

Take a.

RH **R. Harvey(Guest)** 1:38:49

Thank you so much for that, Madam Chair, and I thank Mr Rhodes for his comment. Because what I would like to do is pull us back or pull us to the report and the written document to yes, give a spot on answer to board Member Shaw is we along with well actually Mr Jabouin put together the audit scope of what he think the objective should be based on his understanding and what he wanted to have done.

AM **Anthony De Meo (Guest)** 1:38:55

But.

RH **R. Harvey(Guest)** 1:39:15

We agreed that we could perform that Audit based on the objectives given, and we did what I would like to do because there's been a string of discussion points is pull us back to the report and reference page 30, which I think is a very strong page, but more than that on page 31, there is an email and then this report we put a lot of

emails since people had left, people were gone, but we used the email search function to be able to have the email stand in the stead of what people discussed the email.

I would like to put forth is an email from Victoria Stanford and where she clearly talks about the changes.

I think one of the facts that we all should agree and can agree is the fact is that there were two interpretations of what this RFP was.

Whether you are pro or con, there are clearly 2 interpretations and that is played out very clearly and on page 31 in my mind by Victoria Stanford and followed up on page 33, where she also is is a excerpt of a conversation where she labels it misconceptions about the intercom project project and so we believe this emails on 31 and 33 demonstrate the fact that there are two competing philosophies whether you're pro or con Dr on what this was and that led to the overspend that led to finding three, finding 5 and finding six which discusses.

AM Anthony De Meo (Guest) 1:40:07

You. You.

With.

Yeah.

Yes.

RH R. Harvey(Guest) 1:40:54

The outcome of the changes in philosophy, which rotated around whoever was the chief fire official, attacked fire official at that time in, in coordination with the lack of involvement from the IT function.

Whoever was at that time on page 57, we note and our research that Mister Matthew Bradford was assigned CIO from January 2019 to August 2019.

If there are other times that he was the guy, then we are not aware of that.

So those are the things that I wanted to pull us to the report within the as the lawyers would say, within the four corners of the paper that we put forward to let you all know what we found through in the course of our work.

And again, I will end with Mr Rose if there are additional informations and ideologies and things that have come to bear after we are more than happy to work along to close those gaps, assist with those gaps, increase the scope, whatever you would desire us do.

But those are a couple minutes I wanted to put forward to this body to pull us back to the report.

Thank you.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:42:06

Alright.

Thank you, Mr Harvey.

Miss fertig?

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 1:42:15

Sorry, I was going back between the report and the findings.

Thank you.

I just wanna make sure that we we we're well into this and I appreciate the information you're getting out.

There's no there's no doubt.

When I look at these findings that, you know, we're we we're we're looking at something that really kind of started in 2018 nineteen where in 2024 there's been a reanalysis, there's a new bed I would like to look at this audit and see what we can do to ensure that we don't make some of the mistakes of the past because there are a number of things that are clearly outlined.

The two findings that Mister Harvey just brought up five and six?

Umm I I don't know who did what and and I don't know that we can.

I I'm gonna have to trust that the district has some expertise or is gonna seek that expertise and we're kind of a system we need today.

I don't even know that what was relevant in 2019 as relevant anymore and you know, I could just point out that it's, it's amazing that only four years had transpired between 2014 and 2018 and and fire alarms weren't included that this some of this wasn't included in the smart program.

So lots of missteps along the way.

I'm concerned that there's equipment sitting around in schools.

It's not being used.

I'm concerned that we had a vendor and I think we talked about this at length at the last meeting that we had a vendor, the projects weren't getting done.

We have that vendor again and I don't.

I never did get a clear a clear real clear understanding of what monies were

expended if the entire amount was expended and the job wasn't done, then what are we doing about that?

But we've rehired the same person as their credit.

What's going on with that?

I I hope before we finish today that we get a that we can at least forward something on this.

Maybe what we did at the last meeting is sufficient, but.

Clearly there are a number of things that could have been done better in this process, and this is a critical fire safety student safety area that we have got to make sure it gets addressed correctly.

So if we can just try to get some recommendations, it's 1117.

So that's the only reason I'm saying and I appreciate all the information you've gotten, but I would like to just come up with some overall themes of what we would like to communicate to the board about this audit.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:44:29

OK, well.

I think we, we've everything we've asked for for the most part, they haven't responded.

The question of what's been expended versus what was left over, I think there was nine point something million that was a carryover which suggests that of the 15 possibly 17 million that they've expended, about half of it, but getting confirmation would be useful.

Now that we've clarified, though, that the UPS backups were in fact part of the original RFP and had nothing to do with the Penton device coming into play.

The question then comes down to.

Well, uh, who directed Roland, but who purchased the UPS in advance and usually when you buy something in advance or in bulk, you get a better price.

But to your point of getting money back, the only way I could see getting money back is if and somebody can correct me.

If Roland board did not get well like a mistake was made in ordering the UPS and there may not have been a mistake.

So the question in terms of whether we get any money back, I I think we can all agree that the UPS, the backup systems were part of the RFP.

So if somebody purchased them in advance of the installation, is that a problem?
And where is it we're expecting to get money back from.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 1:46:15

If I might respond to that for a second, Madam Chair, I finding #7 identifies one thing that this is a pretty standard way to look at it, although I wanna make clear that that's not what I am stating happened or accusing anyone to have participated in this.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:46:17

Sure. Yes.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 1:46:33

But generally, when it comes to invoicing, you would have to have the amount of work completed for the amount of money that you're billing in accordance with some form of a schedule of values.

And in this situation, finding seven shows that 38 or 35.8% of the work was completed and \$10.7 million or 71% of the RFP amount was spent.

So we do know that whether that results in any money that could or should come back to us or if the root cause is that materials were ordered without a directive from the the staff, we may be able to say that this was something that they took upon themselves, even though their early parts of their scope of work were not being completed timely to justify ordering additional materials, whether it was a cost savings or a supply chain issue, the the bottom line of it is, is that the auditors were set to look at this RFP to.

AM **Anthony De Meo (Guest)** 1:47:08

E.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 1:47:34

Determine was money wasted was the were the terms and conditions of the RFP followed, and if so, was this a successful project?

What does not a successful project and I guess kind of at that higher level, that's where those questions are again with the benefit of hindsight, we're looking at some

other things that I actually discouraged the firm from coming forward with some findings that had to do with identifying.

AM Anthony De Meo (Guest) 1:47:55
Like.

DR Dave G. Rhodes 1:48:02
Anything that would resemble either a bid, steering or bid rigging, because although there were red flags that suggest that that may have been in effect, there was not enough documentation and evidence to support putting a finding like that in there. And so here we are now kind of looking backward a little bit deeper into that as a possibility.
And we see that there's some different facts and things that are were were available and we're not necessarily considered or have become available since then and created a slightly new direction in this discussion.

AM Anthony De Meo (Guest) 1:48:26
You.

DR Dave G. Rhodes 1:48:37
So with that in mind, I was trying to kind of also go off of some comments that Mister Demeo had made, meaning that there was some unresolved matters.


AM Anthony De Meo (Guest) 1:48:43
Even.


NL Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:48:46
Yeah, I see those.


DR Dave G. Rhodes 1:48:48
I'll leave that to you, Madam Chair, but those are some things that.


NL Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 1:48:50
No, I think I'd like to, I don't know how many of us are on the call, but if they look at Mr Demayo's comments, I think those work as follow up along with a like I said, bid


rigging might be a strong word, but bid steer bid, steering, uh.
And I don't know if that's where the state comes in or a follow up audit to Miss Shaw's point did because they their objective was not necessarily they were supposed to look at whether they followed the procurement rules.
They did have a question about why the focus on Roland Borg, which is one reason that I focused on the timeline in the beginning.
Mr Harvey also put a comment in the chat on page something about page 101, No finding 101 on page 57.
So I was going to look for that, but I I think we should take Mr Demeo's comments and use that as follow up.

 **R. Harvey(Guest)** 1:49:44
Page 56.

 **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:49:53
Uh.
Let's see. Uh.
See 5.

 **Bob Mayersohn** 1:49:59
You have you have a, Mr Castaneda that has his hand raised.

 **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:50:04
OK.
Oh, how come I can't see?
That's weird.
It's not showing me people's hands raised in.
Across the top here, but miss.

 **Manuel Castaneda** 1:50:17
You may want to if you if you choose the people button, that that might give you a better view of cancer race.

 **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:50:24

Uh, well, I I'm switching between chat.

I see Mr Demaio has his hand up, actually, and I don't know in what order.

 **Manuel Castaneda** 1:50:27

And.

 **NL Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:50:31

Cause usually it would show you and I'm not.

I don't know if it's because of the version.

 **BM Bob Mayersohn** 1:50:34

Yeah, that's true.

It's Mr Castaneda.

And then Mr Demayo.

 **NL Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:50:39

OK, Mr Castaneda.

 **Manuel Castaneda** 1:50:40

And thank you.

I just wanted to respond and I'm sorry, I I don't.

I can't see your last name Mary's comments, if I may.

 **NL Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:50:47

Fertig.

 **Manuel Castaneda** 1:50:48

Thank you very much, but I I wanted to and and the whole purpose of an audit is to figure out, OK, what went wrong and let's let's not do that again.

And what can we do better?

 **EF EXT - Mary Fertig** 1:50:58

Right.

 **Manuel Castaneda** 1:50:59

How can we fix this in the future?

And I wanted to discuss what we've learned, at least from this audit and on the IT side.

And we're working with our partners in safety and security and PPO.

So first of all I I wanna point out that in the management responses, I think almost all of them we agreed with these audit findings.

Yeah, you know, I know the UPS one might be a little debatable because actually doctor Lynch-Walsh you, you brought up an excellent point.

UPS are necessary regardless of systems.

It may not be necessary to a certain extent, but they are necessary.

But but I I see that as a minor issue in reality.

And here's what I wanna focus on.

Besides the the the numbers I gave earlier as to the number of schools that were currently active on, we have made significant progress though audit found that inefficient project management was one of the the findings.

One of the issues we agree, so we've reorganized the project the, the, the project team.

We have shifted the way that we're handling these projects to more of a turn key model, which means that the vendors are more responsible for subcontracting and for their all the work as associated with the intercom installations.

While we have overall management responsibility on the project and with coordinating with our partners and with schools to ensure that principals are satisfied with their systems, are properly trained with their in their systems, et cetera, we're we've also are working with our partners and PPO and procurement.

Now that there's new specifications and there's been so many questions about this bid that we've been talking about of coming up with a new RP that addresses the new specifications, the new IP based modern communication systems, and in clarifies exactly what is in scope and also addresses repairs to older systems.

And then let's see all the vendors come and show us what they have and then we can do a Committee based just like in any RFP evaluation process and we wanna get it right this time.

And we have new leadership and procurement that I think will help help make that so.

And the last thing I wanted to mention is we've been talking a lot about how fire systems work within acom systems, et cetera, and we're working closely with the

systems that we're currently installing with our safety and security team and with Mr Sade and ensuring that the proper procedures standard operating procedures are followed and that folks are trained in these newer systems that are being installed to understand how to use the newer fire alarm system, when to use the voice capability there, when to use the intercom system so that they are not caught flat footed in. In an emergency situation, so those are the things that we've learned and we're trying to apply now.

And of course, anything else we can learn and anything else you can help us with as the audit committee, we would definitely appreciate.

So we can incorporate it into our road map.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:54:07

All right.

Thank you, Mr Demayo.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 1:54:09

Matt, Madam Chair and Anthony De Meo has his hand up.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:54:13

Yep, calling on him now, Mr Demayo.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 1:54:14

OK.

AM **Anthony De Meo (Guest)** 1:54:17

Yes.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

First of all, I think.

The information that has brought been brought for in this meeting was supremely helpful and interesting, and particularly Mr Sades the.

Responses very helpful.

I do think that.

None of us being expert in this area.

Uh, that we should go back to our original plan.

I think one of the members of the committee suggested uh and that is.

Gauge an expert.

Also, I would say that and my questions speak for themselves, but I wanna give you a little background.

I would also say that the audit stands on.

Its on its own, it's documented.

Mr Harvey. Good.

They're very good job of explaining.

I think the the HCT.

You know, provided us with some good insight to, you know, what processes didn't work and so forth.

I don't think the scope of the audit addresses one of our really key and serious questions and I'm not sure that it should, and that is is the original intent of the board at the time that contract was, uh, let the RFP was let, now I'm going to sue that they would want a system that communicated, did all the things a manager that you raised and that it should work and and and that you know we should have a good system that will help.

I don't think you can ever prevent what happened on in 2018, but I think you can improve what we did from, you know those reports and and I think the system should be designed to do that and be state of the art and meets the general accepted features for such a system.

So the only way to resolve that I think is to have a consultant and expert in this area tell us, does it meet the the, the intent, the intentions of the school board and we're the intentions of the school board.

Sufficient.

In other words, maybe six years later, it does need to be addressed.

So I I think.

Together, Madam Chair, you and Mr Rhodes could address the audit as it exists and come up with some recommendations.

I don't think we need any more time on that, but as far as these other issues.

Umm yeah.

With regard to the funding, it sounds like the funding I might have missed that, but it sounds like the additional funding is for the remaining 220 schools.

I think the the ones that weren't on the rollout of the 53 and some additions, it sounds like the Pentagon system was designed to fill the gap.

I think Mr Sade may have pointed that out.

Uh to make it a community, you know, communication system now, whether or not it meets with UL2572 or it needs to, I think that's beyond the scope of this committee. I think we really need an expert to tell us that.

So those are my questions.

If if we I don't know how you wanna proceed on that nature, I'll leave it up to you if you wanna put motion or if you and Mr Rhodes follow up.

But that's my those are my comments.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 1:58:21

Thank you very much, Mr Demayo.

I I think your comments in the chat work like I said for follow up they lay on top of our initial questions.

I did ask for the new design specifications and I agree we and as much as we've read and have absorbed in the documents that we've reviewed, we're still not experts and I've gotten a lot of clarity in terms of Penton versus EPIC.

Umm, but without an A consultant?

Umm, I think we're still going round and round a bit and it might help clarify for some of the staff members and certainly the school board having an expert review review the intent of the board and is it sufficient and I would get would with Mr Rhodes to sort of compile these questions.

We can't pass a motion because we're on teams.

That's why I said if everyone agrees with the unresolved matters and requests from the last meeting.

Umm.

And I think getting an expert would address the technical questions that I have, and I think we've gotten clarity on the funding.

So I see Mary has her hand up because yeah, my next step would be to sort of debrief with Mr Rhodes since.

We can't pass a motion here and we have passed enough motions that sending this as the additional.

Next steps your comments from the chat and then pursuing some answers and #1 being getting a consultant would be what I would be looking to do.

Mary, you have your hand up.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 2:00:10

Yeah.

I just wanted Nathalie.

I know you've been in these meetings too, but I wanted to share with the rest of the audit committee in case you did not watch the board meetings.

There's been a lot of conversation about the role of advisory boards and I know I've gotten into some conversations with various board members about ohh you know the uniqueness of this committee and what we're charged to do.

But I just wanted to share that what was kind of has been stated at very at board meetings is that we make recommendations, but the board makes the decision, I I think they've even gotten to the point where they're like, well, make a motion that it's a recommendation.

I mean, obviously most of us have been on here for a while.

We know it's a recommendation, but I just wanna clarify that anything we do with getting a consultant is gonna have to go to the board ohm.

And I I just didn't I I just wanted to make sure and and you may want to elaborate on this, Natalie, that they're they've been I this is.

I've never seen it get get so much conversation, but there's been a lot of conversation about the role of of advisory boards, so.

I I think yes, we've come.

We've come up with a lot of things in my own mind.

We've clarified them as we stayed at them as that we recommend the board this.

We recommend the board.

Look at that.

But I just wanted to make that statement because it was so clearly articulated about a month ago by a couple people, so.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:01:37

Right.

And what Mary saying, right that we we can only make recommendations and that's gonna get demonstrated on the fund balance policy, which I'm just gonna ask for a brief update there.

But are you in agreement with Mr Demayo's list?

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 2:02:02

The motions we've passed, I think.

Yes, have have captured our conversation.

The only thing I wanted to say about a consultant is that I'm assuming that whatever consultant we get about state of the art systems would be working with staff to do this, and they may or may not have one.

I don't know and I don't know that we need to have anymore conversation if they don't have one, then hopefully.

But I thought I understood, Mr Castanio say they were gonna, you know, open this up and look at what state of the art now and and just try to move on with that.

Umm, I don't know.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:02:37

Given that it was.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 2:02:38

I don't know that we're gonna fix the past, but hopefully we're gonna do better.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:02:42

It's not about fixing. Uh.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 2:02:44

I I mean, hopefully we do better.

That's the whole reason we're here to look at the umm, you know, to look at what could have been done differently and and make those changes and get the project done.

So anyways, thank you.

Yes, I think Mr Demayo as usual has done an excellent job.

And so have you.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:03:02

OK.

Thank you, Mr Mayersohn.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 2:03:04

Thank you.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:03:06

Unless someone was ahead of you.

But I'm looking and it looks like you're the only person.

BM **Bob Mayersohn** 2:03:11

I'm the only one.

I'm the only one left.

Sorry, I caught bits and pieces of it halfway and halfway out.

My only point is I think we all agree we've spent a lot of time on this.

You know, I would agree with Mr Demayo's comments as well, but I, but I I also wanna say this is as being I guess more sensitive to this issue.

Umm is that I think this started out one way and as technology changed and more people got involved in different iterations of what was needed came about.

That's where all this got lost into the scope of work.

What it was intended to be, what it wasn't intended to be, what it should be, and I and I just think that from a standpoint of, I think, as Mr Castaneda said, look, staff agrees with all these recommendations.

Umm.

And and again, that's to me, that's we.

You know, what?

Do you agree or disagree?

It's how do we move forward in future issues of when we create an RFP, if you have devices that are only last three to five years and you're you're taking four years to implement it, it doesn't make sense.

So I think that's really where staff and management needs to provide a response and maybe that's a follow up on these type of issues of when they're technical issues, how do we use either the expertise of in house people or consultants so that we're able to work very similarly to you know we've been talking about a 911 system and different piece apps and having them integrated and there's a device and I don't wanna get off tangent but there's a device that would obviously solve that problem that has been solved before and I'm talking Broward County not.

Broward County schools.

That's been trying to been implemented for the last four years and the testing issues have been gone back and forth, but I don't want to digress.

So I just think that we need to be mindful when we get into the these technology issues, understanding the long term solutions versus the short term solutions cause. The reality is I gotta.

I get a device today in two weeks.

It's obsolete, so however management figures that out in the scope of work and an RFP, I think that's what I'm getting from this audit, more so than who's right, who's wrong, if there's any issues that can be resolved by, like I said, further questions, you know based upon which Mr Demayo was saying and I think Michelle was asking, uh, you know, Mr Harvey said, he's certainly willing to help umm at A at a nominal cost, but the that's another story.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:06:13

Alright, so I think I don't see any other hands.

Hold on.

Let me see what's in the chat.

OK, just to thank you to Mr.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 2:06:24

We just had a Lew Naylor sighting.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:06:27

Ohh Lou, you have your hand up.

LN **Lew Naylor** 2:06:30

Yeah.

My my question, it's just to ask about the the scoring and the recommendation procedure the the, how are the, how's the committee selected?

I see an intern principal on there.

I don't know what her her background is.

Umm.

Also on the the actual tabulation whether.

It uses whole numbers or there's rounding that could affect the actual final scoring.

I I actually worked the scoring now go after 2 digits beyond the decimal points and it really didn't impact it, but I don't know if that's going to be the case for future valuations.

So that's the thing that I noticed while I was looking at some of these documents.
Thank you.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:07:26

OK, so I don't think we have someone from procurement here, but just just to be clear, this was an all staff internal evaluation committee.

MS **Mauricio R. Stradiotti** 2:07:33

Yeah.

Excuse me.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:07:40

No.

MS **Mauricio R. Stradiotti** 2:07:41

Chair uh my Mauricio R Stradiotti today, newly appointed director of procurement.
I can't answer to that question.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:07:48

OK.

And you were here before, right?

You're not new, really.

MS **Mauricio R. Stradiotti** 2:07:51

I was here.

I was here before that time, so answering to.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:07:52

OK.

At were you here in 20?

Were you here in 2019?

MS **Mauricio R. Stradiotti** 2:07:57

Yes, I was.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:07:58

Oh, OK, even better, alright, yes.

MS **Mauricio R. Stradiotti** 2:07:59

Yeah.

Yeah.

OK, so the evaluation committee usually you know, we try to have the the experts or submit subject matter experts.

Usually we have people from the the the area or areas that are requesting the goods or services for the the beads, right, ITB or air B.

Uh and also are usually we we all try to to to get someone from outside if necessary.

In this case, I'm not sure I, but I I think I heard that you had also a principle which is good because the principles they can come and they have the the also outside view of what's needed in the schools and even in some cases we can have people from from for example the fire department and outside of the OK the district as well.

So, especially in things that are more complex this this is common right?

So answering to our question, the selection of the people that are going to be on the on the evaluation committee can be a more diverse Committee, but usually we need to have some subject matter experts that are have the ability to read the first of all, they need to understand the requirements of the Earth.

P usually are the people that put together those requirements.

Then they need to have the ability to read those the the proposals from the vendors and then they need to be able then to score the proposals according to the requirements that you're put together, right?

So this is pretty much how the process works regarding the rounding of these cores and things like that.

When we have situations and I'm just picking this out of my brain, I don't remember having any issues with the rounding, but the in cases.

Where we have no, you know, like ties and things like that.

Our policy and even they status they they tell us and they really dictate how the process should go.

Uh, and again I I just joined the the district a few weeks ago and coming back from the private side, I don't don't remember 100% of of everything, but there are some some certain rules that we need to follow in case that you have a tie in this coloring

and things like that that we we must follow.

Not sure if I answer all of your questions.

If I wasn't clear, or if it didn't answer any of aspects of your questions, please let me know because I want to make sure that you I provide a full answer to our points.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:10:54

Mr Naylor, did that answer your question?

LN **Lew Naylor** 2:10:58

I, in a roundabout way.

My question though is if you look at the scoring that this intern principal.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:11:04

The hand scoring the hand scoring 1.

Hold on.

LN **Lew Naylor** 2:11:07

The the score details page four or five? Umm.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:11:07

Let me see.

Uh, are you? Look.

LN **Lew Naylor** 2:11:14

She she under, she underscored.

Uh NDR.

Significantly, compared to every other member of the committee and.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:11:25

Wait, which one?

Just so I can pull up the right person.

LN **Lew Naylor** 2:11:29

It uh.

It was a Ingrid.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:11:34

Oh OK.

I was on the right person.

LN **Lew Naylor** 2:11:35

Yeah.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:11:36

Oh, I see.

What you mean, yeah.

LN **Lew Naylor** 2:11:39

You see?

You see what I'm saying?

So I mean in that case, do you does the evaluation committee take?

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:11:41

Uh-huh.

LN **Lew Naylor** 2:11:50

And eliminate like the high and the low, yeah.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:11:51

By and low they do.

On the construction side, I guess they need to answer the question.

Did they do that here?

I don't know.

MS **Mauricio R. Stradiotti** 2:12:00

Uh.

LN **Lew Naylor** 2:12:00

But anyway it it you know, if you I could skew it significantly depending on the other scores.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:12:01
Yeah.

LN **Lew Naylor** 2:12:07
Thank you.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:12:08
OK.

MS **Mauricio R. Stradiotti** 2:12:09
Yeah, it.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:12:09
Yeah, I don't know if that would have changed anything, but that is a question because on the for the construction procurements, at least when I've set on Cusack, they throw out the high and low scores.
This.

MS **Mauricio R. Stradiotti** 2:12:23
Yeah.
And the excuse my I just want to to jump in again.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:12:23
I.

MS **Mauricio R. Stradiotti** 2:12:26
So I remember that were some discussions at that time or if I I can catch my brain, what what was happened that time.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:12:26
Yeah.

MS **Mauricio R. Stradiotti** 2:12:36
I remember there was or it I guess so it was some type of discussions about, you

know, considering those aspects the same way that you have in construction.

Uh, uh chair.

But I'm I'm not sure if it this was done in this case, we will need to go back and then I need to take a detailed look on this.

Also, I'm not sure I don't remember.

Again, I'm really trying to pick it up my brain here on that, but.

I I believe that if if we we may have this as a rule in the therapy or in the evaluation and then if we have, we could apply, if we don't have, we could not apply.

But again, I'm just picking things out of my brain, so to properly answer your question, I would need to go back, maybe as a follow up and just to take a look to see what was the case, what was the rule for this specific case at that time.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:13:31

Well, and would it have changed anything but moving forward, I think to Mr Naylor's point then, that should be because it can skew the outcome if a number of people do it on an evaluation committee, especially one where it's all internal and it's possible that there's an idea of who the desired vendor is.

When you write, you write an RFP that matches a product, and then you have multiple.

You have the person that's sort of the driver and it sitting on the selection committee.

I can tell you from sitting on Cusack, it's that often staff knows who we're trying to get.

Umm.

And that works easier when you have internal in addition to the principle, there was an assistant principle, so you already have two people that are not subject matter experts or anything close to it, and this is a was very complex and very technical.

So moving forward, maybe not having, uh, two people, because then you're giving up yet another seat and the people that couldn't make it were the subject matter experts to some extent anyway.

Alright, so let's see.

I don't see anybody's hands anything in the chat, so I think we know what our follow up issues are.

The issue of BID steering given the timeline, that's something else.

Just so we don't have because what that points to is we had potentially a vendor that

was known to a number of people that ended up getting an award for an RFP that was written to their product essentially under the guise of an emergency communication system, which they still insist that they offer independent of codes and standards.

So what shouldn't happen in the future?

Is anybody interfering with what is in the best interest of the district, whether well intentioned or not, that everything gets written so that the best the company best able to provide the product or service is the one that's selected and we're all clear on what it is we're trying to select?

Because that did not happen here, or else we wouldn't have spent so much time talking about it and HCT wouldn't have had so many question marks.

Umm, I think they had a all of these observations.

So anyway, just to wrap that up, I I, I spoke too soon.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 2:16:13
Natalie.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:16:15
Something's gotta somebody.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 2:16:16
Sorry, I just wanted to say on that last point you brought, obviously we can't vote on anything today.
So if you, Dave, could work whatever up with whatever supporting documentation for the August, August 8th, 9th 8.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:16:20
Yes.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 2:16:29
8.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:16:30
8th yes.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 2:16:31

Thank you.

Meeting uh when we have whole Committee.

I don't how can I just ask how many audit committee members are still on this meeting?

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:16:40

I see, including me, I see 4 you, Lou.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 2:16:44

OK.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:16:45

But Robert, so four of us.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 2:16:49

OK.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:16:50

And just so you know, there's a meeting scheduled for next week.

To recap and follow up on teams.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 2:16:57

Uh, there is.

We have another meeting on the 18th.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:17:00

Yeah.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 2:17:01

I saw that on the Audit committee site, but I was thinking we were picking between the two dates, OK?

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:17:07

I well that was in case we had follow up and because we can't talk to each other outside of sunshine, the little little strategic planning.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 2:17:09

I OK.

Yeah. OK.

OK.

Thank you.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:17:17

OK, so and also in case we didn't get to some things, so things to think about that we can attack next week nominating committee, I'm going to need volunteers.

We don't have to.

A.

Let we just need to come to consensus.

We need, like an odd number of people they would meet before a regular meeting on August 8th, but let me tell the guys that are here.

We're good on HTTT for today.

We have follow up questions.

We did pass a motion in at our last meeting asking for a basically for the district to determine the functionality of its intercoms.

Fire alarms and emergency communication system and we haven't gotten a response to that.

But we asked for it by July 15th.

I don't know where we are on that response.

If someone can summarize, but between all of the assessments that are going on, the new design specifications, people trying to write new RFP's, there should be something that staff can put together.

That sort of addresses where we are because going it sounds like we're now upgrading the intercoms, which to Mary's point, fire alarms were part of the smart program.

Intercoms were not.

So the idea that the two were going to work together didn't become a thing until 2018 or now.

So thank you all very much.

We're gonna move on to our next couple items, Sir.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 2:18:45

Matt.

Madam Chair, before, before we move on, can I ask one question to the fire official?

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:18:51

Sure.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 2:18:51

OK.

Because this kind of goes back to what Mr Naylor was saying and about the basic idea of how the subject matter experts or end users are concerned.

And my question is going forward, if we as a district intend to solicit and emergency communication system, I wanna start out by saying I understand it that it's been stated and I've read that it's not required that a school district have this type of system.

But is it required that if a school's district decides to have this kind of system that it would meet the necessary NFPA requirements and UL 2572 requirements to the point that those items should show up in an RFP language rather than relying on words like emergency or the other things that kind of gave us clues to what was really being looked for versus that that was ultimately approved by the board?

 **Nathan B. Sade** 2:19:50

I yes.

So the code does stay.

It is not required to have emergency emergency communication system, but if you do have an emergency communications system, you must follow all codes for that system.

So you cannot call a system and emergency communications system and not have it fully compliant with the National Fire Code building codes or any other codes or statutes that might may affect it.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 2:20:15

OK.

And so just to just to make that point even more clear it I I just wanna make sure am I understanding that that would mean that in an RFP if that was the intent and what was to be delivered that there should be references in that RFP to NFPA standards and to UL 2572 standards?

 **Nathan B. Sade** 2:20:38

Umm.

I mean, yeah.

Yes, it should say this is the system we want, but the subject of the RFP also should have mentioned emergency communication system and not intercom upgrades or repairs or enhancements.

 **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:20:48

It had enhancements, enhancements.

 **Dave G. Rhodes** 2:20:51

Right.

And and I appreciate that clarification.

I wanted the group to benefit from that response.

 **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:20:57

Ohh, but Mr Rhodes, because Mr Shade mentioned building code, there's also I believe it's maybe it's fire.

 **Nathan B. Sade** 2:20:57

Thank you.

 **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:21:06

No, I think it is a building code 101 and we get into things like a risk assessment and all of that which I believe they did and that also speaks to whether you should have an emergency communication system.

So there's a lot of code related issues.

It's not just NFPA and UL, but also like he mentioned, the building code and there are other fire codes as well which we can compile all of that.

So if you're looking for a framework for things that RFP should comply with, if they are going out for an emergency communication system in the future, then we can, you know, make sure that we get a full list of instead of just generically stating it has to comply with all codes, fire building, intercom, emergency communication name, some of them named them because.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 2:21:59

I understood and and my my follow up to that is that there are two specific authorities having jurisdiction in that comment that you just made, one being the fire official, one being the building official.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:22:00

Yeah, OK.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 2:22:11

So anything in an RFP that would require that subject matter expert input should be the things that would point out to your your .101, or if it's NFPA or any other requirements that would be a part of the fire code versus the building code.

 **Nathan B. Sade** 2:22:26

I would just like to interject quickly.

You don't have to per se.

Call out every code in in the RP.

You just have to say that the device must be code compliant cause there's so many to list that's, you know, really up to the designer.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:22:32

I know.

 **Nathan B. Sade** 2:22:40

Everybody else to to include all that and our standards also do have that in place also.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 2:22:47

Yeah, I appreciate that.

That's the global response to my question.
That may have been a little too specific.
I appreciate that.



Nathan B. Sade 2:22:53

No problem.
Thank you.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 2:22:54

Alright.
OK.
Thank you all very much.



Dave G. Rhodes 2:22:58

I have a good day.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 2:22:59

Here. Alrighty.



Jaime R. Alberti 2:23:01

Thank you.



Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 2:23:06

OK, so uh, let's see.

We're on.

I mentioned item 5.

I hope everybody's not trying to leave, so nominating committee Anita 3 volunteers, we have to come to consensus.

So if people want to volunteer for the nominating committee to meet on August 8th, so you want to make sure you're available in person because they need to meet in person, item number 6 on the agenda has all of our tentative audit committee meeting dates.

We can vote on, I think the rest of them in August, but the first ones, August 8th, we need to have a meeting in order to set the remaining dates.

But see Committee updates, proposed fund balance policy.

Mr Rhodes did send me a an updated policy proposed policy from staff and remember that our motion was to for them to incorporate the manatee count, Manatee County policy language, which was pretty straightforward and based on what I saw the other day.

It's still not doing that clearly or completely, so we can look at that next week.

I knew we weren't gonna have time to dig into that, but I'll have Mr Rhodes send.

What staff submitted booster club revenues and expenditures.

Mr Rhodes, have we gotten?

Revenues and expenditures yet.

Oh, you're muted.

I you're mute, mute, unmute, Sir.

Roads.

Can you unmute and say whatever you just said?

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 2:25:02

Yeah.

I'm apologize about that.

Yeah.

So so I had received information about 9 schools and the original information that we had that showed all of the various booster clubs at all the schools across the district.

I expected a much greater list of information from them.

I had immediately reached back out to them and requested that they let me know whether or not this was all we would we're expecting, or if this was a partial delivery.

I still have not heard back from them, so I can follow up with them on that prior to our next meeting.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:25:34

Can you send the group what you have gotten for both of these items and?

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 2:25:37

Yes, I can.

Yes, I can.

I'll send it to the entire audit committee.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:25:41

OK, great.

So they at least know we're getting responses.

They're just incomplete, essentially.

And then I'm gonna pull up the Manatee County real quick.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 2:25:47

Mm-hmm.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:25:53

Uh one was that?

Ohh shoot fund balance policy because I see that Miss Motiwala is still I think on here and so I can point out the because I I can't tell what the issue is and again what we do is advisory in nature.

They don't have to take any of our recommendations, but if they don't, when this goes before the board, they should have to explain why they decided not to take a recommendation.

So this is probably one of the shortest policies I've ever seen.

Uh the Superintendent, it it and it starts out establishing who's responsible?

The Superintendent has the responsibility of administering the budget once adopted by the school board.

Simple, straightforward.

Opens the policy.

The Superintendent shall monitor the fund balances and shall report the balances to the board monthly.

Our concerns were centered around the lack of accountability and responsibility on the part of the Superintendent and that they are not planning to report these things monthly.

These two sentences, if they were at the beginning of whatever staff is proposing to give to the to recommend to the board, would address the concern, UMM, as required by state law and board and whatever our board policy.

I don't think there's a separate policy the Board shall maintain a general fund ending fund balance that is sufficient to address normal contingencies.

I think they tried to incorporate and got rid of some of the language that was

concerning last time, but in what they submitted their suggesting that once you hit 5% you're gonna maintain 5%.

I don't know how you guarantee that happening.

Umm.

And then I think the rest of this is in there anyway, but it's really the superintendent's responsibility and.

This mid section here being being done clearly.

I mean it says preferably 5% and no less than 3% and then what they sent it's saying that once you once you get to 5% you have to maintain it well.

The groups been concerned about getting to 5% to start with how in the world are we going to get to some place that we don't know how we get to and then maintain it once we get there so.

We'll look at that in detail at on the 18th and just address any follow up because that's the reason for the additional meeting is to see what we get back in terms of the HCT questions.

So we can discuss them publicly and then prepare for August 8th.

DR Dave G. Rhodes 2:28:54

Madam Chair.

NL Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 2:28:55

And yes, Sir.

Is it just you and Mina?

DR Dave G. Rhodes 2:28:57

Miss Motiwala did have her hand up, and I'm not certain if she let it down because her question was answered, but Miss Motiwala might need to be addressed.

NL Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 2:29:00

OK.

DR Dave G. Rhodes 2:29:06

So she can speak.

NL Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 2:29:07

OK, I see Mary has her hand up.
Ohh and there was Miss Motiwala on camera.
Did you wanna speak and did she come? Hi.

EM Erum I. Motiwala 2:29:15

Good, good afternoon.

I didn't know if you had a question or you were making a comment, but I just wanted to point out and the revised Fund balance policy that we worked with legal on, we didn't incorporate on page 2, the first paragraph states the Superintendent of the responsibility of administering the school board adopted budget, the school, the Superintendent, will plan to attain a general fund ending balance of 5%, which is what the board wanted in there.

And then we didn't incorporate the three percent 2% rule as well.

NL Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 2:29:46

For.

So here's the thing.

Yeah, the reason I keep bringing up the Manatee County one is it's very clear and it's in the front.

It's not buried back there and then the monthly is those first two sentences.

If those had just been at the beginning, so I can't tell if you guys are purposely not taking the recommendation and you're not obligated if there's some.

EM Erum I. Motiwala 2:30:12

It's not, so I would like to clarify here and I would like to interject.

Sorry, but it's not that we do not want the recommendation.

As I mentioned, we did discuss with legal, we have a certain format that's followed for all policies as what I was informed and that's the format that was followed for the introductory paragraph and that's the structure of the legal also felt comfortable with.

So we just followed, you know, the format that we were asked to follow, but the information the feedback was taken and it was incorporated and to this revised policy.

NL Nathalie Lynch-Walsh 2:30:51

OK, that that tells a story right there.
Actually that it's not you.
It's legal because, well, at least part of it.
So Mary, you have your hand up.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 2:31:04

Yeah.

Thanks.

I'm actually that clarified what I was gonna say because I was gonna say can we find out if they saw what we if we recommended it and they haven't taken it?

I don't know that we can spend anymore time other than you speaking speaking at, you know.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:31:16

That's what I'm saying, right?

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 2:31:19

I mean I I think I think, but if they have incorporated it then fine, let's move on to something else.

I'm sure we'll think of something else, right?

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:31:25

That they. Yeah.

No, it's not incorporated in the same manner.

Plus the monthly reporting it has not been incorporated.

EM **Erum I. Motiwala** 2:31:33

The monthly reporting is as required by Rule 6A, so page 2 General Fund section A. Number two, we referenced the requirement by Rule 6A Dash 1.008 Florida Administrative Code, which speaks to the monthly requirement.

So we wanna make sure that at all times we're complying with that rule because that's what dictates a monthly reporting.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:31:50

E.

So the Manatee County policy was developed by Neola, which I think you should be familiar with.

They do it for many, many counties, so it's standard boilerplate.

And if you look at other counties, that's fairly standard boilerplate.

So uh, there's legal and then they also hired Coward and Coward, which I think this may have slipped past Coward and Coward because of the time they reviewed it too.

EM **Erum I. Motiwala** 2:32:22

It did not slip past them either.

We we have this.

Yeah, we have discussed it with them.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:32:29

OK.

Well, that's good to know too.

So right to Mary's point, we made a recommendation.

I think you guys have submitted it at least twice, if not three times.

It still would not satisfy the group.

I believe you guys are taking it to the board on the 23rd.

EM **Erum I. Motiwala** 2:32:46

Correct.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:32:47

OK.

So I'll all we can do at this point is I will, you know, keep furthering letting the board know of the concerns.

If you guys are pushing, if it's going to legal and legal just keeps, then it's legal.

That's resisting just taking boilerplate language or somebody else.

We we don't know and we can't force anybody to take recommendations verbatim.

So I think we're good.

This would be by the time we get to August, unless the board pumps the brakes on it, it won't be an issue because if the board would have already passed something.

So all I can do is the chair is reiterate the audit committee's concerns and potentially

write the thing the way I we would have recommended it be written and see which one the board goes for.

EM **Erum I. Motiwala** 2:33:34
OK.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:33:35
So thank you for popping in or sticking with us.

EM **Erum I. Motiwala** 2:33:39
Thank you.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:33:40
OK, alrighty.
So that's it on the follow up, you're going to send everybody what was sent.
Do we have any additions?
I see something in the chat.
Don't know what it is.
But I don't see.
Oh, hold on.
And then Mary, put your hand up again.
Here is your hand up again or still.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 2:34:03
Yes, it's up because I just want it to take the opportunity if this is the right time to thank Dave for what an excellent job he is doing and and for being so responsive and also for his staff.
So thank you, Dave.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 2:34:19
Thank you, Mary.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:34:19
Actually yes.
Ditto, and that that reminded me of something because at the workshop the other

day, apparently a long after we all left the the board chair brought up the chief auditor position and said that the job description was with the audit committee. Well, we already passed a motion communicated to the board and we had a brief discussion at our last meeting on this.

The board has the option, I think, to retasked assign Mr Rhodes the current job description.

As it stands, he does not meet the qualifications for the proposed staff changes he would, but we don't know what would happen.

You know, is what their intentions are.

Umm, because we also toyed with the idea of doing a cost benefit analysis of the entire audit department.

So I think we do have to make a statement to the school board because I don't know if somebody's going to bring an item on the 23rd.

So since we meet again on the 18th, or if you have anybody has any thoughts and I will send out what are our motion was and what I provided to the school board.

Because either they retasked assign him, they change the job description.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 2:35:41

Now they did.

Did you see allies chat in the chat?

The job descriptions on the agenda with recommended change for the July 23rd.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:35:51

Ohh, see speak of the devil.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 2:35:53

She is so good.

She's right on it, OK?

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:35:56

Right.

Because they said it was with us.

So hold on to that thought.

Let's let's go to the we close some of this other stuff and.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 2:36:05

Madam Chair, while you're while you're looking that up, can I make a comment?

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:36:08

Sure.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 2:36:09

Umm I I wanted to say there there may be a little bit of confusion.

Not that it.

Not that it really changes anything all that much, but on the day that they approved my task assignment after the contract negotiations were done, one of the board members said so.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:36:27

Umm.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 2:36:30

Does that mean he has a one year contract and the answer to that question was yes. My thought is, is there a difference between the way that a board direct report and a contractual relationship works versus the typical period of turnaround that someone would need to be task assigned?

Because I never verified that that was a one year contract, I was kind of surprised to hear that myself.

I thought it was kind of until further notification, but somebody did ask that question and it was determined that it was a one year contract, so that may be something worth looking into in the process of determining when and how this process would be ultimately resolved.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:37:16

Oh well, that's that's an interesting.

So when did your when was your contract approved?

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 2:37:24

It was approved.

I believe it was August 16th, but it was retroactively approved.

I'm sorry.

April 16th and retroactively approved to April 12.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:37:30

OK, I was going to say.

OK, regular school board regular school board meeting, I guess.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 2:37:37

Uh, yes, I think it was.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:37:38

Yeah. OK.

Uh, what would that have been a BH item?

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 2:37:45

I think I think it was like maybe BB2 or B5 something like that.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:37:50

I'll get there because this is significant because if you're not subject to the same because it's almost like they signed a contract with you and your task is signs, uh.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 2:38:01

There are some.

There are some if then ends, but that's all a matter of what would you know what they would decide between now and then?

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:38:09

OK.

Well, hold on.

Let's see term lot of that for a term commencing and terminating upon any of the following events, whichever occurs first commencements and the term of of an interim or resignation or termination.

OK.

So we're not resigning and there's no talk of terminating, uh commencements of the

term and assumptions of duties of the chief auditor.

Well, commencement or of an interim chief auditor?

Good Lord, this is very convoluted.

Uh, where does it say a year?

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 2:38:54

That's why I was confused because I didn't see it myself that it said a year.

But when one of the board members said so, is this a year contract?

I believe that it was David Azzarito who responded in the affirmative.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:39:05

Well, then you better.

We better check twice, then.

OK, cool.

Because yeah, it says nothing about that.

And you can, I believe you can be retasked assigned, but where task assignments and contracts.

Umm.

Intersect would seem to be the issue.

Uh, what's this?

If the task returns to his position after June 30th, will renew his contract as director through June 30th, 2025.

OK.

During the term of employment, shall not want turned to original position struction.

I I guess there needs to be a question of whether you need to be task assigned again or not.

Or whether you just continue until they decide because A.

The reason I bring this up is there seemed to be consensus on the audit committee that everyone was satisfied with what you've been doing and I don't think we've conveyed that to the board.

So the since we've lost most of the people, we still have Mayersohn, I think Mary was or isn't Mary, you still here?

BM **Bob Mayersohn** 2:40:30

Yeah, Mary still on.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:40:31

Mary is still here.

I don't want the.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 2:40:33

But I have to get off in a second so.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:40:35

Yeah.

And I'm.

I'm almost done.

I just wanted to make sure that we convey to the board that that the audit committee, I don't think I would get any objections based on the last conversation that we are more than satisfied with Mr Rhodes's performance, my concern being that possibility that.

They might make the changes and again I haven't looked at the changes that would render him qualified, but also other people.

And then we would be getting a a new chief auditor that is not, Mr Rhodes.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 2:41:12

That that could be the case, but they did remove the requirement for a public accounting certificate.

Umm.

And they've maintained the requirements of one of the.

Certifications that I currently hold, but again to your point, that could open the door to a whole lot of other people that were less than what the audit committee originally wanted the.

Certifications and education requirements to meet.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:41:43

Right.

I speaking for myself.

I'm fine with if if the only reason to water down the requirements is to make to have Mr Rhodes be able to continue, then I'm OK with that.

But again, it opens a door, so things to think about we can discuss on the 18th.

But see, because that's before the 23rd.

But then I think we need to weigh in, either individually or as a group or both on Mr Rhodes versus an unknown quantity.

So I just wanna bring bring that up and then I'm.

BM **Bob Mayersohn** 2:42:15

So so here.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:42:20

See.

Umm.

Right.

BM **Bob Mayersohn** 2:42:40

In in and again, I want to preface I'm not an attorney, nor am I a human resource person, but it would just seem that the only reason why quote unquote the school board or I say this was Broward schools would be involved is that they are the fiscal agent to provide the chief auditor any benefits or you know salary, whatever may be an office space team, you know, etcetera, etcetera.

So I would assume that the board has the autonomy to make those decisions.

I mean, I know like I said, as a A Commissioner, we we hire an outside counsel, a firm, you know, they are not, they are not employees of the city, but they are are direct appointment.

So either a we can, if we don't like or we, you know, do like the the attorney that the firm sends, we can either keep the attorney, we can say we don't like the attorney and, you know, the form gets a new one or terminate the firm and get a whole new attorney.

Umm, similar to our city manager, they're a employee of the city, but they're a direct report to the Commission.

So again, they have a contract, they have an agreement.

Umm, the Commission has the right to to do whatever they want, you know, continue employment, terminate, do whatever it may be.

So.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:44:19

Well, yeah.

BM **Bob Mayersohn** 2:44:20

So that would be, to me, a legal question based upon.

Umm, the school board and and again, you know, Mr Rhodes, I'm not advising you of anything necessarily, but, you know, if you're if you have a employment contract, you know, sometimes you may wanna have yourself a legal entity or a legal person.

Look at it to make sure that it fits.

You know, within what your needs are.

I mean, I know Mr Jabouin had one.

You know, when he formulated his contract.

So I don't know where the task assignment comes.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:45:01

Hmm.

BM **Bob Mayersohn** 2:45:02

Because it's not that, I mean, unless it gives you the ability to go back two, your current employment.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:45:11

I does.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 2:45:11

Well, it it, it does allow for that.

And then the other thing was was that there was a different mindset with negotiating this contract as a task assigned to determine whether or not they were going to change the job description.

That would allow me to apply if it were advertised or in the event that they wanted to just simply direct appoint me.

Those were a couple of things that were discussed during the way the process rolled out, but I'm really just kind of over here standing by and if they were to say we want you to be the permanent based on the fact that you meet the requirements of the

job description, that would go into a whole new.
Negotiation process again.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:45:53

I I just want to point something out to you guys as I'm staring at this contract.

BM **Bob Mayersohn** 2:45:53

Right.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:45:58

I think this was written in such a way that here are the three ways that it terminates and and pay very close attention to a.

They employ roads as a task, assigned chief auditor and roads accepts employment as the task assigned chief auditor for SBBC for a term commencing April 12th and terminating upon any one of the following events, whichever occurs first.

Commencement of the term and assumption of duties of the Chief Auditor or of an interim chief auditor, meaning he becomes the actual chief auditor or interim chief auditor instead of task assigned.

Resignation or termination?

I don't think B or C are happening, but A would make him, in effect, the chief auditor.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 2:46:50

And then for for a friendly amendment, it would be that commencement of the term and assumption of duties of the chief auditor, that could be a new chief auditor.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:46:50

Unless.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 2:47:01

That's the way I read that to begin with, as well as an interim in the in the event that they say we found somebody that meets the qualifications but is only gonna be a short term until we advertise.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:47:13

That's not how I'm interpreting this.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 2:47:14

So, well, you know what I think?

I think the important thing is that we have we, we I think we discussed this at our last I thought we discussed at our last meeting how well things were going but.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:47:27

We did.

That's what I'm saying.

Yeah, we did.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 2:47:29

Yeah, I.

So I would just say ohh I think we have some direction here and we are meeting next Thursday.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:47:38

Yes.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 2:47:39

I apologize, but I'm gonna have to get off.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:47:41

Yep.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 2:47:41

I don't know who that leaves.

Maybe, Bob, are you still on Lou?

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:47:46

I think he's gone.

BM **Bob Mayersohn** 2:47:47

No, I think is gone.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 2:47:48
OK.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:47:49
It's you, me and Mayerson.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 2:47:51
OK, so I probably we should wait anyways on any further business you think?

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:47:54
Yeah.
Yep.
Well, we're done.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 2:47:58
OK, alright.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:47:58
It's just when you brought up the you.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 2:48:01
No, I did.
I just.

BM **Bob Mayersohn** 2:48:02
Right did right.

EF **EXT - Mary Fertig** 2:48:02
I just think you're doing great.
I got all the confidence and Dave and and I think he's doing a great job.

BM **Bob Mayersohn** 2:48:04
They look right.
The only thing I would caution Mr Rhodes on and again take it for what it's worth.

Umm and I don't know.

I, like I said, I haven't read this whole contract or agreement or whatever may be, but if for some reason that the district decides to take a different direction and still maintain your employment, that somebody who comes in May say, Gee, I wanna bring in my own team or my own people.

And thank you very much and bye bye. Umm.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:48:41

They can't do that until June of 25 because this guarantees he would return and that that's how task assignments work is they can't.

BM **Bob Mayersohn** 2:48:48

No, no, no.

I I I get it, but I'm just saying is to the point of somebody could come in and January and in six months Mr Rhodes is gone.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:48:49

Yeah, in there.

Ah.

BM **Bob Mayersohn** 2:48:59

I think that would be a detriment to the audit department.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:49:00

It.

I agree, yeah.

BM **Bob Mayersohn** 2:49:05

That that's my.

That's my point.

So somewhere in that, if somebody were to do that, that there would be a a compensation package for that.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:49:19

Hmm, OK.

BM **Bob Mayersohn** 2:49:21

Then and that's I mean that's like I said, it just protects the individual.
Umm, but you know somebody comes in and says I want to clean house.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:49:33

Right. So.

BM **Bob Mayersohn** 2:49:34

Then you got someone who's working there, you know, their tails off to try to make things right, and they get caught on the short end of the stick.
That's all.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 2:49:45

Well, to that to that point, I just wanted to say that while I'm doing the work that is helping to keep things on track and to make some improvements along the way, I'm also keeping in mind that I wanna make it a better place than I found it in the event that they do, either move me back down or clean house altogether.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:49:45

OK.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 2:50:02

I'm a grown man.
I'm prepared for all those things, but I do appreciate and hear your comments, Mr Mayersohn.
I and I appreciate them.

BM **Bob Mayersohn** 2:50:10

OK.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:50:11

Alright. Well.
Umm, yeah.
So I think we have some follow up and I'm good.

So that's all we have on the agenda for today.

So I'm gonna adjourn at 12.

Well, hold on.

I'm sharing so I can't see.

Does anybody ohh there's something in the chat.

Let me just make sure job description, you know, recommended changes.

OK.

Thank you, Allie.

So yeah.

Umm, so I'm gonna adjourn at 1223.

We don't vote because we're on teens and.

Mr Rhodes, I'll get with you on the follow up from this meeting because there there was a lot going on with the intercom audit.

DR **Dave G. Rhodes** 2:50:55

And and a need for us to meet a timeline for getting next weeks agenda published, whatever that's gonna look like.

NL **Nathalie Lynch-Walsh** 2:51:06

OK.

Yeah, I think.

The motions the follow up.

Uh.

His next weekend, the 18th.

So basically we would just be Meeting to kind of recap and.

So we would have H CT, the nominating committee, whoever you know, we need to finalize that.

So the three people that are Meeting know who they are.

And the dates are August 8th.

Will put that out officially.

We can vote on the remaining dates, umm, and then our updates on the fund balance and any other.

● **Bryan Erhard** stopped transcription