JACKSONVILLE HOUSING AUTHORITY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING

TAKEN: Friday, April 25, 2025
TIME: 10:10 a.m. to 11:21 a.m.
PLACE: Jacksonville Housing Authority
1300 North Broad Street
Jacksonville, Florida 32202
(and via videoconference)

Taken by Carol DeBee Martin, court reporter.

Carol DeBee Martin
Jacksonville Court Reporting, Inc.
1620 Bartram Road, Apt. 6111
Jacksonville, Florida 32207
(904) 465-0787 (cell)
debeemartin@aol.com

APPEARANCES:
CHAIRWOMAN LISA STRANGE WEATHERBY
COMMISSIONER HARRIET BROCK
COMMISSIONER HANK ROGERS
COMMISSIONER HEATHER HOROVITZ
COMMISSIONER ANDREA REYES
EVANN MORRIS
ANTONIO PEREZ
CHERON CORBETT, CEO
MAMIE DAVIS, CFO
SUDELTA HENSON, Comptroller
VICTOR FIGUEROA, COO
ELAINE SPENCER
JULIE ST. CLAIR
CRYSTAL BLACKMER
LINDA FITZGERALD
SATONIA HART
DIARRA WEATHERS
DANIEL MITCHELL
HARRY M. "Reece" WILSON, IV, ESQ. (OGC)
ADINA TEODORESCU, ESQ. (OGC)
SHUNTHENIA "Shaun" BROWN

VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE
COMMISSIONER CALEENA SHIRLEY
ROSLYN MIXON-PHILLIPS
INEEDA JACOBS
CORDELIA PARKER
STEPHEN BLAKE (King Risk Partners) (Speaker)
EVEADA FINKLEA
DANIESHA SMITH
JENNIFER MAHONEY
CHRISTINE PEREAU
WILLIAMS
ASH
PAMELLA PANNELLA
TONY
SANDRA BAKER
FRANK OCEAN
ALYCE DECKLER

– – –

P R O C E E D I N G S

April 25, 2025 10:10 a.m.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: We'll go ahead and call the meeting to order. I don't have a book. So I'm just going to go.

Apologies for being late. Some people playing bumper cars on the Mathews Bridge had a much worse day today.

So, first of all, do we have any public comments online or in the room?

(no response)

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Okay. Hearing none, the next order of business is approval of the minutes. I hope everybody had a chance to look at them.

Do I hear a motion to approve?

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: I'll make a motion.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Okay. A second?

COMMISSIONER BROCK: I second.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Thank you.

All in favor say, "Aye."

COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Aye.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Oppossed say, "No."

(no response)

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Great. I will defer my comments to the end other than to say how excited I am. I'm sorry. I wasn't here for the proper welcoming of our new CEO, Cheron. I'm very excited. Thank you so much.

And the agency financial overview, Ms. Mamie.

MS. DAVIS: Yes, yes.

Good morning. In your books, you should have been given a thick handout, and this is a continuation of a discussion that we've had for a while on the budget comparisons and how we are doing compared to budget.

And you know the situation we have with the budget, that we had to make it comparable to our system on how we gather information, and this is our best presentation of it this far. It is 95 percent of where it needs to be, and I expect next month it will be 100 percent.

The first page -- you're looking at a comparison first with the Central Office of the actual expenditures versus the budget month-to-date and with a variance, and we also give you an actual year-to-date comparison with the budget.

We have a summary for Central Office,

Page 5

Public Housing, the Housing Choice Voucher, and, on the second page, we give that information from the RADs, Affordable Housing, which are the six units.

For most of these, the expenses are exceeding income mainly because we had many expenses last year that didn't get paid until this fiscal year. So, in paying those expenses, we had those.

We have taken a look at this, though, and we'll make a decision before next month whether a budget revision will be needed. We've given you details following those summaries that shows just the details of all of the items for properties as well as the other areas that were summarized.

We have rolled out those budgets to the various department heads. We thought we had done that before, but we have definitely done it this time -- given them what those budgets are.

The budgets are on the Yardi system. So, for our properties, of course, they can go and pull those, and the director knows that information. And so the properties have been using this for a few months now.

Again, this is a good basis for us,

Page 6

because this is what we were used to. By next month -- and then, in just a couple of months start working on the 2026 budget, and, hopefully, we won't have many of the problems that we had this year.

Other things that are going on -- the auditors will be on-site Monday next week for four days, and they will be doing in-depth auditing in payables, procurement, finishing tenant files and payroll.

And this is the Berman Hopkins auditors auditing the overall housing authority. We reported last month, and, hopefully, you got these reports at some point.

We provided those reports of the RADs. They are on the calendar year, and those reports have all been issued. Only one matter is pending with a RAD, and it's still with the auditors -- a tax return for Hogan Creek -- that hopefully we get real soon. But that's the only matter that's pending with the 2024 matters with them.

And Berman Hopkins would like to meet with the Finance Committee, and, Ms. Weatherby, I think we discussed that. So, hopefully, if you're available Monday or some times next

Page 7

week, they would like to meet with us.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Okay.

MS. DAVIS: So we we can schedule that.

Another huge matter is -- and I think this is going to be discussed a little later maybe in more depth -- it's time to renew our property insurance.

And, because the premium amount is over the amount that can be paid without this board's approval, we'd like to come to this board at some point for approving that.

Looking at the 2025 and 2024 comparisons of coverage, the premiums have not changed that much, and we get this coverage through the Florida Public Housing Authority Insurance Fund, which is something that we are a member of.

As a matter of fact, I think this organization was instrumental in starting that organization close to the start of this when it became an independent agent.

And I've asked Mr. Steven Blake, at a time that's appropriate, if he could come and give us a historical overview of that organization and also of the coverage and how they -- it's calculated and any other information that

Page 8

would be helpful to this group.

Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Any questions? Comments?

(no response)

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Okay. Hearing none --

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Oh, I'm sorry.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: -- I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: I'm sorry. I do. Were you done, Ms. Davis? Was the agency overview done?

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: I think so.

MR. WILSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Okay. All right. Thank you.

Through the Chair, so just first feedback.

And thank you for everything, Ms. Davis.

For me, it's helpful, especially if we're looking at budget comparisons -- I want to see comparisons of last year.

So like I know we've talked about this a lot but probably before you got here. So I do want to see the variances, the actuals to budget, but I want to know how we're doing --

COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Correct.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: -- like this month last year so we can start to look at trends.

And the more that we do that I think that helps us, you know, change course or just have better conversations in here.

Before you got here, we did have a finance presentation. A lot of that wasn't the best use of our time, but I think that there is some benefit to really looking at some visuals to help us to see trends, particularly when we have huge swings, so we can really have conversations around why that's happening.

I think that would be helpful. I know we had a lot going on this month, but, for me, I'd really like to see these in Excel with a couple of days before the meeting so we can -- like I like to look at -- like do an analysis on my own in Excel. It's just hard for me to see numbers on paper like this. So, if we could do that, that would be really helpful.

The insurance -- are we talking about that later in this meeting, or ...

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: (shook head negatively) (sic)

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Okay. So you said

the premiums haven't changed, but I know the cost of insurance is rising across the state.

Is the total cost then for next year's coverage in line with last year's, or can we have a little bit more color there?

MS. DAVIS: Yes. What we have is the Jacksonville Housing Authority -- the coverage that includes all of our public housing units, and that cost was $1,296,967 in 2024. In 2025, it is $1,332,966.

It includes a little bit more than it did last year. It includes Franklin Arms. That was billed separately last year at 26474 (phonetic), and it also includes the JUI -- the JWB 33 homes that were billed separately as $15,332.

So the separate billings this year includes that for the Jacksonville Housing Authority.

Brentwood Park Apartments -- $199,177 is that amount, and, in 2024, it was $189,696. So it's up a little. And then we have Westwood, and Westwood was added in 2024. And the full year premium last year was $206,000. This year it's $174,428.

And so, for total premiums of 2025 of

$1,709,020, and, for 2024, $1,734,469. So just -- there is a little decrease based on that.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Okay. Again, through the Chair and because Mr. Blake was introduced, what is his role?

Is he a broker?

Like how does that work for our agency?

MS. DAVIS: Well, we are actually a member of this association, and Steven Blake is the Account Executive of King Risk Partners. And that's the administrator of the fund here, and so his role is administrative of the fund of which we serve on the board of the organization.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Okay. Is that -- this is just new to me.

Is that normal for ...

Maybe, Ms. Waller, you can answer this.

How is it normally done?

Do agencies ...

I guess we are a part of a pool.

MS. CORBETT: So there is multiple ways, right?

One, you can be a part of a larger pool, or, two, you can actually procure through,

of course, procurement srvices for independent insurance brokerage firms.

Like, for example, a brokerage firm -- historically what I've seen is that we've had a dedicated brokerage firm that we've utilized to basically put out their quotes, request various quotes from various insurance providers, like Chubb, a magnitude of providers, too, as well.

And then they will come back with the best quotes for us, and then we will continue to utilize our brokerage firm going forward.

Every year we would do those annual renewals, but much of it, as it relates to property insurance, is always vetted in advance from a budgetary standpoint.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Yes.

MS. CORBETT: So you're really anticipating every year, given -- right -- because I think this policy is set to expire the end of April?

MS. DAVIS: May 1st. It's from May 1st to May 1st.

MS. CORBETT: All right. So it's going to expire the end of April for commencement of May 1 to the end of April of 2026. We can talk

Page 13

about that later, too.
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Is he prepared to talk about that now, or is he --
MS. MORRIS: He's online.
MS. CORBETT: Yes. That's fine.
MR. BLAKE: Yes. You want to know --
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: It's the Chair's choice.
COMMISSIONER ROGERS: No. I just had a --
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Sorry.
CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: I don't (sic) have it on the agenda, but that's fine. I think it's important.
MS. CORBETT: And so I guess later, on this agenda the way this was set up, is that it's under, "New Business." It has, "Presentation," that's listed.
But I do believe this would be an appropriate time to probably discuss this, because I recognize that this is a cost of 1.3 million.
CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Yes.
MS. DAVIS: So the total cost is 1.7, but we're talking four separate policies. And I think only one exceeds the limit that needs to get this board's approval.

Page 14

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: So I think --
COMMISSIONER ROGERS: So I guess -- through the Chair, I guess my question would be, just so I'm clear, which I'm probably not -- but I don't recall -- and correct me if I'm wrong. I'm trying to make sure I remember -- this coming before the board last year.
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Me either.
COMMISSIONER ROGERS: So, how did we do it last year if this is --
MS. DAVIS: Well, I wasn't here last year.
COMMISSIONER ROGERS: -- this did not come before the board last year. So I'm not clear how --
MS. CORBETT: Right. So, for anyone that's in the room -- so, as it relates to when you say, "procurement --" we can say from the assessment management side, too, as well -- historically, what has been the best practices in regards to making sure that adequate property insurance coverage is in place for all -- so, within this process -- it has to be procured, right?
We can't just select a firm to go with, but, in addition to that, we have to be able to provide, you know, a list of all of our assets,

Page 15

right, so they can give us an appropriate quote.
So, does anyone from a historical standpoint even know how it was done?
Historically -- because my recommendation is that normally we would have this out on the street, and/or, if we are going with those that we have an existing partnership with, you know, making sure all of those assets are properly listed and we have a specific amount of coverage.
Because every asset within our portfolio is totally different. I'm not even sure if this covers our scattered site locations, too, as well, but I need to make sure that, you know, procurement is involved in this process in addition to our Property PH Portfolio Team, as well, ahead of that.
So anyone can chime in in regards to historically how this process was handled.
MS. DAVIS: This year we did receive -- I don't know if Mr. Blake is there.
If it's appropriate to hear his presentation, I think that would be useful.
COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Yes, yes. Go.
Before -- I'm sorry. I'm sorry.

Page 16

Before he continues, I want to make sure I'm clear before the presentation on the historical -- how we have done it in the past, what has happened in the past -- before the presentation.
I need to understand what happened last year being that I can tell you that this did not come before this board since I've been here.
And so, being that it did not come before the board and it was clearly paid out and approved, how was that being done?
So any --
MS. DAVIS: As far as the history, I think that Mr. Blake probably has more history than most people with this.
COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Okay.
(inaudible crosstalk)
MS. MIXON-PHILLIPS: My only comment I was going to say, if I could --
CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Yes.
MS. MIXON-PHILLIPS: -- okay -- my only comment is, through our look-back, we saw where the premium was paid in June of 2024 I believe it was. We did not see a board action relative to that payment, unless Commissioner Brock remembers.

COMMISSIONER BROCK: (shook head negatively)
MS. MIXON-PHILLIPS: I know that she's been on the board a few years.
I think, due to the relationship and partnership with the organization, that this was not procured in past years.
When I discussed it with Mamie a week or so -- a while back -- I said, because of the amount, that this is something that definitely we wanted Ms. Corbett to be a part of the discussion as well as that we should bring it before the board for action.
I don't know that there is, but there may be some -- some policy in place somewhere that would allow for this to continue in that way. But we were not able to find it.
So I thought it appropriate that it come back through the board, and let Ms. Corbett have some input. So --
MS. CORBETT: May I give a --
CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Commissioner Reyes.
COMMISSIONER REYES: I know this came up in one or two of the last Finance Committee Meetings.
What is the board requirement for approval?
MS. CORBETT: 250-.

MS. MIXON-PHILLIPS: 250-.
COMMISSIONER REYES: 250- or more. Correct. Right. So there's three separate policies, and only one of them is over the 250-?
MS. DAVIS: There are four separate policies, and only one is over 250,000.
COMMISSIONER REYES: Okay.
MS. CORBETT: So recommendation, solution or just -- and so we're -- so what's interesting about this dynamic is that we need to, one, make sure that the drop-dead date for the cancellation expiration of these policies are the end of April, which is this month, right?
And, is there an opportunity with whoever is providing us insurance -- the brokerage firm -- to at least have it going month-to-month?
And then, two, with procurement, an emergency piggyback potentially with an organization that has an insurance broker that can quickly mobilize for us, because this ends the end of the month, right?
And this is about 1.3 million dollars that's being pitched, but I do understand the importance of having property insurance. So that's -- and maybe we can talk about this policy.

Can it roll month-to-month so we can still have the coverage?
And then, for Mr. Weathers, what other public housing authority or maybe the city that we can do an emergency potential piggyback?
Presenting it to the board, of course, for approval and/or denial what we can do, because at least those processes we know have been fully vetted.
CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Commissioner Brock.
COMMISSIONER BROCK: Thank you, Madam Chair.
And, to answer what Ms. Phillips said, no. It had never came before the board that I can recall in previous years. So ...
And then I want to say Commissioner Reyes may be correct, the reason it didn't is because the approval amount is a little more.
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: So, if I can, I was just looking through my email. I think that we never saw it taken together -- that total. I'm looking back at an old email from 2024. We've always looked at them individually, so Brentwood Park insurance, Westwood insurance.
Because I was looking for this name,

the FPHASIF, and that probably has not been the right way to do it.
Because, "Oh, we have 100,000 here. That's fine. You know, 200,000."
But we're talking about a total cost of 1.7 million. So, just for the record, it sounds like we're not paying attention, but that's not the case. It was just we were looking at individual insurance policies.
COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Got it. Perfect.
CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Can you tell if they were all under 250- in 2024?
And they were all --
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Everything I'm looking at is, yes.
COMMISSIONER BROCK: Yeah. Uh-huh.
COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Perfect.
CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: -- thank you. Good point.
COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Perfect.
CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Other questions? Comments?
Commissioner Rogers, do we have permission for Mr. Blake to begin his presentation?
(People laughed.)

COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Go right ahead. Go ahead, Mr. Blake.

COMMISSIONER REYES: Are we in proper posture?

COMMISSIONER ROGERS: You absolutely are.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: I'm sorry. I want to make a correction for the record, because there are a lot of things in this. There is one that is for 1.296 million.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: In '24?

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: It does say, "'24."

MS. DAVIS: Right. That's 2024. 1.296 million. That's correct.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: But that was total, or --

MS. DAVIS: That is for the Public Housing Authority, and that's all of the properties considered public housing.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: So that was well above 250-.

MS. DAVIS: Right. And that's the one that's being brought -- that we know needs to be brought before the board.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Got it.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Good catch.

MS. DAVIS: And that amount this year is $1,332,966.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Good point. Mr. Blake.

MR. BLAKE: Good morning, y'all. Thank you so much for your time this morning. I appreciate you-all.

Again, my name is Stephen Blake. I am with King Risk Partners. We are the third-party administrator for the Florida Public Housing Authority Self Insurance Fund, formerly Hunt Insurance Group.

We went through an acquisition two-and-a-half years ago. So we were purchased by King Risk Partners, and, again, we've been the administrator now since the inception of FPHASIF depending on when you joined the fund. It's kind of two acronyms -- two ways of saying it there.

But, yes. If I could give just a brief history on the fund, you know, this fund was set up really by Ms. Ellen Ramsey, which I'm sure you-all are very familiar with.

After the '04-'05 hurricane season, property insurance in Florida basically evaporated to a large extent, and particularly

housing authorities either could not find coverage or the coverage that was available was just too expensive.

So Ms. Ramsey teamed up with the housing association, FAHRO, and a couple other members that were really struggling with property insurance, including the Tampa Housing Authority, Key West Monroe Housing Authority and the Broward County Housing Authority, and formed FPHASIF. And it was through Ms. Ramsey's efforts that we were able to get this off the ground.

Jacksonville Housing Authority has been an active member since the beginning, and we do hold a HUD procurement waiver, which, of course, allows our members to avoid going out for competitive bid.

Believe it or not, we ran into a very similar market in 2022, 2023 mostly due to Hurricane Ian hitting Florida, but also a pretty steep increase in inflation and interest rates, which were causing a lot of capacity to exit the state and put their money elsewhere.

Basically, you had a lot of reinsurers, carriers that had been involved in the property market in Florida and decided to put their money

in banks and earn a little bit better return. Because they did not want to invest in the Florida property market.

Thankfully, we are starting to see that improve quite a bit. The rates overall I think are up about 3 percent for the Jacksonville public.

You know, kind of your big Schedule of Values -- and I did hear someone mention the scattered sites. We do have an SOV, a Schedule of Values, that we provide each year, and we start that renewal process in about October.

And that's a long process. We start by sending out the Schedule of Values to our members, and we have them go through and verify that all the properties we have are still correct. We ask for any updates to values, any updates to any other properties that might need to be added.

So that's a little bit of history for the fund. You know, right now, as you-all mentioned, the program does renew on May 1.

We don't necessarily -- we don't really have a way to pay monthly. Roughly 87 percent of that premium that goes into the fund is paid for hurricane season, which starts, of course, June 1 and ends November 30th. So that's where most of the premium goes is into that hurricane season premium.

So right now there is not a way to pay monthly. I can tell you, from a procurement standpoint on our side, we use a London broker for the property, and each year they go out and approach several markets all over London -- whoever is willing to write habitational risk in Florida.

Unfortunately, there is still a very limited number of carriers or reinsurers that are willing to invest in habitational coverage in Florida. It's a very tough class of business. Small fires. Obviously, the catastrophes are a huge concern.

So each year that London property broker will go out and approach as many markets as possible in order to get the best possible rates, and they will bring those rates to our board, our Board of Directors of FPHASIF.

And that meeting is usually done in late January-early February. We've been moving it back a little bit more closer to March 1 to try and get the best possible rate, but we do have to

send in bind orders.

I'm going to start sending those in really -- I was hoping to today -- Monday at the latest -- because it does take a couple days to get everything bound with London.

Right now the reinsurance is about 60-percent London placement and about 40-percent domestic placement, and, basically, there's also a domestic broker involved in South Florida, the CRC. And they will approach all of the domestic markets available.

And what you'll see year-to-year is London has been more competitive the last couple of years -- really since 2023. So more of our placement is in the London market right now.

Like I mentioned, about 60 percent will probably be in the London market. We're down probably 35 to 40 percent in the domestic market. So -- and that will fluctuate year-to-year based on everyone's appetite.

So, again, the fund is extremely strong. We've gone through some hard markets before, and, when others have decided to leave the state, FPHASIF has been there.

We've got 24 housing authority members in

Florida. We still work closely with FAHRO, and, you know, we're always looking to continue to grow in the state and support our housing authority members as best we can.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Questions? Comments?

(no response)

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Anybody?

(heads shook negatively)

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Thank you for the presentation. It was nice to hear it from you.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Yes.

Do you have a question?

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: No.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Okay. Thank you. That was very informative.

So, if we don't have any further questions or comments, do we --

MS. CORBETT: Yes. I just have a quick question.

So, Mr. Blake -- so, back in October, did you receive from this agency a list of all of our current assets, right, to be able to come up with the quote that you did?

Did you receive from our agency these additional properties that were added in, or did you just use the list from last year?

MR. BLAKE: I did use the list from last year, but I do think I got approval. I can go back and look. I did come over and meet with the housing authority a couple months ago -- myself and our executive director -- and we did kind of talk through the list.

So, as far as I know, everything is still up to date. Ms. Davis does have a copy of the current Schedule of Values that we would be binding coverage with, and I'm happy to resend or share that, again.

But, yes. We do have a Schedule of Values which shows all of your properties that are covered under the fund.

Just to kind of give just a quick recap, we've got roughly $218,000,000 of insured values with the Jacksonville Housing Authority. That's the larger premium invoice.

And then, with Brentwood Park, we've got about -- that's valued at about just under $33,000,000 for that property. And then the Westwood -- I don't have the insured value in front of me, but that total premium is coming back at 199- -- excuse me -- 181187 (phonetic), which that was the largest decrease.

And, just to kind of reiterate, we have a blended rate within FPHASIF. So it is a pool. We are sharing the risk. We are sharing the coverage with ultimately four members.

However, on some of the newer properties, like Westwood, we will use an independent broker to go out and shop those for us on an annual basis, and the reason we do that is because usually, on something that's been newer that's had updates, like Westwood, we can get a little bit better rate for it.

Because it's a single property, we can pull that out, and we use Amlance (phonetic) for that. And they approach about 20 to 30 different carriers every year to try and get the best available rates for you.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Interesting.

Yes. Commissioner Reyes.

COMMISSIONER REYES: I have a question through the Chair to Ms. Cheron.

So, when you say -- because you asked him a question about using a list from last year.

So, when you say, "last year," were you referring to 2023 or the start of our fiscal year 2024?

MS. CORBETT: So I'm just trying to just -- so, if the insurance policy, for example -- it would have ended last year at the end of April, right?

It would have commenced May 1, right?

So it would commence May 1, 2024 to end in April. At that particular time, there was a list that would have been provided in order to be able to get those rates, and so it's important just to make sure anything on that list is provided.

Are there new properties?

Public housing -- what's within that Public Housing Portfolio that were added in there and/or potentially removed?

Maybe we sold off a building, right?

Was that asset removed?

Or maybe we added two new buildings.

And, were those assets added in?

So, what list -- which means that, in order for this entity to even provide us with a rate, they would have had to have had a new list as of October, correct, at least submitted to you-all by October or November of 2024, correct?

Right?

That's your process, right?

MR. BLAKE: Yes, ma'am.

MS. DAVIS: A list was provided to us, and we went through that list. And I do believe we did some updates, but, if we didn't, I know they were in a later list.

Westwood was added, because Westwood is the newest acquired property. As a matter of fact, insurance was gotten for Westwood at the point it was acquired, which was in February of 2024, for a short year, from February until the end of April or 1st of May, and then a full year's premium from May 1, 2024 through this year, April 30. So that property was added. So was Franklin Arms, and that's one of the latest ones, too. So it includes all of those properties.

With the JUI JWB, those are new properties, too. There are 33 separate sites, and they were bundled different last year. But now they're included with the overall housing authority package, but those 33 properties are included.

So it includes the inventory, and they provided that list to us. As they indicated,

they came over. They met with Ms. Phillips, an accountant, Rebecca Williams, or my staff, who has the list -- and the list of cars and everything else that we have that we have insured -- and we went over that list.

And I also attended the board meeting that they had discussing the rate increase of FPHASIF over last year and what went into that. So ...

MS. CORBETT: And I'll say this.

And, thank you.

I think that where -- I'm assuming. I don't speak for the commissioners. But, for me, where I would be right now is just, you know, "When indeed after that process, right, was this -- this initiative -- this potential dollar amount even communicated with the Board of Commissioners so that they can be aware?"

And given that, you know, we probably already passed that budgetary process to you, as well. So that would be one of the concerns.

And then, two, again, we're at an impasse right now, that, you know, we just had an issue happen, you know, at another location.

This insurance is set to expire the end of

April. Clearly, we need property insurance, but I'm just assuming others was not maybe here present fully aware of the need for this insurance although this process took place.

And so my question is, Mr. Blake, you have it seems like this consortium of other public housing authorities that are within the State of Florida.

Would there even be a potential opportunity for an emergency piggyback, given we don't know necessarily know how these services were procured historically, right?

But we do understand -- and thank you, Ms. Davis -- that insurance payments were paid out, right?

But they were paid out in lesser amounts historically that may have been under 250,000 and so forth, too, as well.

"So, is there an opportunity for a potential piggyback," is probably where we're at, or it would almost be --

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Yeah. If I can. through the Chair.

MS. CORBETT: -- yes.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: So I just want a

little bit more context for the record, because I think like Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Rogers.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: -- I know that.

(People laughed.)

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: I just have so much smart stuff to say right now I forgot your name. I'm sorry.

Because it's probably also bothering you, because I know we really want to make sure that we're doing the best we can when we're in this room.

So all of this would have come before the board, if you'll remember, right when we were having that transition around Ms. Dunn leaving and Ms. Phillips coming in.

So I was looking through our history. We would have had these resolutions appear in front of us in June, and then I couldn't find the discussion in July. Because we had an emergency meeting to vote in Ms. Phillips as the interim, and so it became less important.

But I do now recall the conversation. We were pleased that the premium was staying flat from the year before, and, since, you know,

living in Florida, "Oh, great. So our insurance is not going up."

We were comfortable with the decision that we made to renew last year, and then, again, moved on to the priority of, "We need leadership."

I'm comfortable. I think that the procurement and this whole process -- there's an opportunity to improve it. We cannot not have insurance.

COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Right.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: So, based on, you know, the discussion today and where we've been in the past with this relationship, I am comfortable saying that we will renew for the year and then just explore what our best options are moving forward.

Is there any huge -- yes. This guy wants to talk.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ROGERS: No, no, no.

And, through the Chair to Commissioner Horovitz, I'm in support of that.

And, actually, my question that I wrote down prior to your statement was, being that this is not an action item that's before us or a

resolution before us, how do we then move forward?

Well, we have this --

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: I think it is; isn't it?

COMMISSIONER ROGERS: It's not a resolution.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Oh, doesn't it need to be?

COMMISSIONER ROGERS: It does.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ROGERS: So, would it be an emergency item for Monday?

MR. WILSON: What you can do --

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Public comment.

MR. WILSON: -- is one of you guys could open -- could make a motion. Just open it in public comment, and the fact that it's opened in public comment removes it from having to be on the agenda.

So, if you want to take it up so it makes a motion, second, public comment, then you would vote on it.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: So you're saying on Monday at the board meeting.

MR. WILSON: You can do it today or Monday. Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: I'm a little nervous about the time frame.
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: I would make a motion that it's to make the recommendation coming out of finance to go before the board in Monday's regular board meeting to renew the insurance coverage covering ...
Do we need to list the properties of this coverage?
Because we do still have separate policies.
CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Doesn't this include them all?
MS. DAVIS: I think the one that needs to be but not listed is the one for the Jacksonville Housing Authority. That's the way that one is listed.
There are, like I said, four policies. That's the only one that exceeds the 250,000.
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Right.
MS. DAVIS: And, also, for the record, we didn't get the estimate until after the March meeting. So this is the first opportunity it could have been brought to the board.
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Taken together?
It should be together. I'm not sure why

they ever were separated. I don't know if there is a reason for it, but I believe we have already approved separate policies. Last year these came together.
Why don't we have insurance resolutions coming out of this finance meeting for the board on Monday?
CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Any other comments?
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: I'm sorry. I have a resolution.
COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Yes. I think we have a motion on the table. So I think we have to --
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: And have public comment for that.
COMMISSIONER ROGERS: -- sorry.
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Public comment now?
MR. WILSON: Is your motion -- I didn't hear if I understood it.
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Sorry.
The motion is to approve the renewal of FPHASIF 2025 insurance coverage.
COMMISSIONER REYES: I would second.
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Okay. So, because it's not on the agenda, is there any public comment in the room or online?

(no response)
CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Hearing none -- let's try one more time.
Any public comment in the room or online?
(no response)
CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Okay. Hearing none, all in favor say, "Aye."
COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Aye.
(inaudible crosstalk)
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Is there any discussion?
CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Okay. Discussion?
Sorry.
COURT REPORTER: Who all said, "Aye"?
I heard you, Commissioner Rogers, but I didn't hear --
COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Yes. I take my, "Aye," back since we didn't have the discussion.
(People laughed.)
COMMISSIONER REYES: Okay. Just to be sure, this is to be able to talk about it and then have it on the board meeting on Monday, correct?
COMMISSIONER ROGERS: No. I think --
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: No. So this

committee is recommending -- so it came out of finance. That's what we're trying to do.
COMMISSIONER REYES: Okay.
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: We can have it just put it on the agenda for Monday, but I think we should have the discussion here.
I know I heard Ms. Waller saying we should take them all together, and then I keep on hearing that we have four separate policies.
Looking back at last year, we had Westwood property separte, Franklin separate and then FPHASIF property insurance. I don't recall why we did it that way.
To me, that's three separate policies.
What's the fourth?
COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Franklin Arms?
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: No. That should have been rolled up.
CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Well, Westwood was added separately, and Franklin Arms was added separately.
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: But I think under the FPHASIF insurance.
What is the name of the fourth one, in your opinion, Mr. Blake?

MR. BLAKE: So my understanding is the fourth would be we write the general liability for the 33 single-family homes.
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Okay.
COMMISSIONER BROCK: Which is the JUI properties.
COMMISSIONER REYES: Which are the, what?
COMMISSIONER BROCK: JUI properties.
MR. BLAKE: And we've always -- until last year, we've always had two invoices total for Jacksonville Housing Authority. One for the JHA portfolio, a second one for the Brentwood Park, and then, when we added Westwood, again, we were able to get a more favorable rate in the market.
That was originally added to FPHASIF in February, but, once it came up for renewal in May, we were able to save the Jacksonville Housing Authority a substantial amount of dollars to pull that out and write it separately with the market. So that's why that one is separate.
And then, based on the general liability for those 33 single-family homes, that's really a separate policy, because, obviously, it's not a property policy. So I think that's where the

fourth policy ...
Just to clarify, too, I think the board probably knows this. We do not write Hogan Towers. That was pulled out as a RAD property several years ago, and that one is not in the JHA Portfolio.
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: I have a follow-up through the Chair.
So, did you just say that Westwood was rolled into the FPHASIF, and that got us a more favorable rate?
MR. BLAKE: No.
So, when Westwood was purchased in February, there was some underwriting items that we couldn't get clarified.
So, for expedient's sake, we added it to the FPHASIF coverage. It's a little bit easier to add properties, because the underwriting in Florida can be so challenging with needing updates and things like that.
So we added Westwood in February, but I immediately put that out for market for 5-1. And we were able to get a much better rate for Westwood effective 5-1 last year. And that's why --

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Okay. And that's separate.
MR. BLAKE: -- I went to -- yes, ma'am.
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: I'm sorry. I can talk all day. Cut me off.
CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: No, no, no. It's important. No, not yet.
MR. WILSON: Excuse me. I'm sorry to interrupt, Madam Chair. I just wanted to make sure to clarify the amount that we were authorizing, the amount of the premium that we're -- maybe that's for Mr. Blake to say or Ms. Davis -- what the board is authorizing to spend for the premium to be.
COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Yes. Because I heard two different numbers.
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: What is the amount?
MR. BLAKE: Sure. I can -- so the renewal for the JHA property -- again, that's an insured value of $218,000,000. That renewal premium is $1,332,966.
We're also asking for approval for general liability for the 33 single-family homes. That's $2,333.
We're asking for approval for Brentwood Park,

and that is 199,177.
And then Westwood -- the renewal premium is 181,187.
MR. WILSON: And, what is the total of that? Do you have that number?
MR. BLAKE: I do not. I can add it up for you. I'm sorry.
MS. DAVIS: Would you please repeat Westwood?
I had a different number.
MR. BLAKE: I'm showing 181,187 for the renewal.
COMMISSIONER ROGERS: And, clarification. Where is Franklin Arms in this one?
MR. BLAKE: That is on the JHA Portfolio.
COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Okay.
CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: And Hogan Towers -- did you say Hogan Towers was separate?
COMMISSIONER ROGERS: On the RAD.
MR. BLAKE: That's a RAD written separately.
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: 1.75563.
COMMISSIONER REYES: What other properties are included under the JHA property?
So we have Franklin Arms, and what else?
MS. CORBETT: Do you have that list?

Page 45

I'm sorry.
MS. DAVIS: All of the public housing?
I'm sure I can ...
MS. CORBETT: Stephen, do you have that list that you can just show on the screen, right, just to make sure that everything is properly covered?
MR. BLAKE: I'm sorry.
What was that?
You broke up a little bit.
MS. CORBETT: Do you have a list that you can even show on the screen and populate just to make sure everything is properly covered before any type of, you know, action is even finalized, if it's not to exceed amount?
MR. BLAKE: Yes, ma'am. I would be glad to send a Schedule of Values back over to Ms. Davis right now.
Would that --
COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Through the Chair --
CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Yes.
COMMISSIONER ROGERS: -- so the motion on the table so I'm clear is really for us to have a resolution for Monday's meeting.
So this is just to move this out of finance

Page 46

-- or make a recommendation to finance to have staff prepare something for Monday for us to vote on.
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Yes.
COMMISSIONER ROGERS: So that's the motion.
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Well, the motion is really to make the recommendation out of this committee that we approve it on Monday.
We can write the resolution and have it for open discussion on Monday.
COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Correct.
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: But then, for the record, we would say then, "Did we discuss it in finance?"
So we don't need to make any action today. We don't. We will need to probably have a resolution ready for Monday.
MR. WILSON: Okay. And what I'm hearing through the board is maybe the not to exceed amount is that 1.775- is what we --
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: No. It's 1.3-, because the other policies are separate.
COMMISSIONER ROGERS: No. He said, "1.7-."
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: 1.7- is the total,

Page 47

but we have four separate policies.
The total relationship doesn't exceed 1.7-, but this policy is only 1.33-.
MR. WILSON: Yes. I was trying to clarify if you wanted to roll them all together in one resolution or to leave those that are within the executive's authority out so we can prepare the right resolution on that.
MS. CORBETT: I was looking at maybe not to exceed, right, 1.8-. 1.8- will cover all of the policies collectively. So that, going forward in the future for economy as a scale, we're putting it out for all policies given the -- just to be clear, Stephen, collectively all of the policies, even the ones that you did individual policies for rolled up with all of our Jacksonville Housing Authority properties doesn't exceed 1.8 million dollars collectively, all of the policies together. Again, this is including the ones that you went out independently for.
So that's what we want to be clear of what that final dollar amount ...
And, with Ms. Davis, because you haven't paid all -- you haven't paid any of the other

Page 48

individual policies, right, that were 250- or less, right?
MS. DAVIS: No, no.
MS. CORBETT: So, what is that?
They would need to understand what -- that not to exceed amount potentially if we roll them all together and so that, at least in the future, right, when we're bidding out whatever the case may be, we're looking at all of the properties. And we don't have the one-alls and that the board is fully aware of all of the assets properly insured and taken care of.
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Sure. But I am hearing, though, that there are some cost savings, that there's benefit to having some of them separate.
Isn't that what you said, Mr. Blake?
MR. BLAKE: Correct.
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Right. So we do want to understand what the full insurance cost is, but I don't mind that they're separate. We just need to be looking at them together.
Yes. I find that the total relationship, the total insurance cost, which is actually not completely right, because we still have

Hogan Creek, which is outside of this -- however it's written, 1.4-, -5, -7 --

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Okay. Did I hear Mr. Blake make a comment --

MR. BLAKE: Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: -- regarding the total number?

MR. BLAKE: Oh, my total comes to $1,715,663.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: So not to exceed 1.8-.

Is that what we're looking at?

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: And, Reece, do we need to have a vote?

MR. WILSON: Yes. There is a motion and second on the table. So, after discussion, that would be appropriate.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Okay. All right.

Any further discussion?

(no response)

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: All in favor say, "Aye."

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Aye.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Oh, I'm sorry.

Commissioner Reyes.

COMMISSIONER REYES: I just want to be very clear. So -- because, again, it's not in writing or in any physical presentation.

So, under FPHASIF, there are four different policies. First is general liability, and it has to do with the 33 single-family units.

Then we have Brentwood Park. Then we have Westwood, and then, under the JHA property, we also have Franklin Arms.

Are there any others under the JHA property?

MR. BLAKE: Yes. There is about 24 locations.

(inaudible crosstalk)

COMMISSIONER REYES: Got it. Got it. Okay. So the JHA property has its own individual properties, and that's the one that's 1.3 million.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Yes.

COMMISSIONER REYES: Okay. And that's the one that didn't come to the board last year.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: It did.

COMMISSIONER REYES: It did?

COMMISSIONER ROGERS: It did.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Yes.

COMMISSIONER REYES: Okay, okay. And then

the total is not to exceed the 1.8-. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Thank you. Good point.

Okay. Any further discussion?

(no response)

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: All in favor say, "Aye."

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Aye.

COMMISSIONER REYES: Aye.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Opposed say, "No."

(no response)

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Okay. The motion passes.

COMMISSIONER SHIRLEY: Aye.

(People laughed.)

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Who was that?

COMMISSIONER REYES: Commissioner Shirley.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Thank you, Commissioner Shirley.

Okay. All right. Good discussion.

So we'll move back up to resolutions for approval.

Mr. Weathers, is that you?

MR. WEATHERS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Well, I think -- Madam Chair, I think we're on to our, "Old Business," with the, "Contract Updates."

Are we going to do that at this time?

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: What does that include?

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Okay.

MS. CORBETT: It's going to be your roof replacement, HVAC. It's in, "Old Business," "HVAC."

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Yes. We have the two resolutions, right?

COMMISSIONER BROCK: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Uh-huh.

MR. WEATHERS: So, for the first part under, "Old Business," this is to provide an update regarding a discussion that this particular committee has had about replacing the HVAC here at 1300 Broad Street.

So, as this group is well aware of, there have been chronic issues with the current climate control in this particular building. Several months ago, if you recall, we were all sitting in here with heaters, portable heaters and coats, because it was too cold.

Several weeks ago, we were all coming in in various states of dress or undress with fans, because it was uncomfortably warm.

(People laughed.)

MR. WEATHERS: So there is an update on that. We have since had repair technicians come out and do some additional work. As you can tell, now the climate is very comfortable. So we have a working solution apparently. It goes to our thermostats that are allowing our climate to be comfortable for everyone here.

We had talked about, if you recall -- and you may have a package -- a sheet in your package about what the cost of HVAC replacement would be.

And, essentially, the HVAC replacement, as initially discussed, came in three parts. One would be the actual materials themselves, two 40-ton AC units. Then there is an installation component requiring specialized equipment and cranes so that the material could be installed at the top of the building, and then, finally, there was a component regarding the thermostats which would interact with the new HVAC units to make everything work in a

holistic and effective manner.

So, what we did -- we were fortunate enough actually to have an HVAC technician who was on the original team that installed these HVAC units come in this past week, and he was intimately familiar of the actual schematics of how things work in this particular building.

So he was able to make some adjustments and repairs to our thermostats which has greatly improved both the comfortable level and the effectiveness of the current AC units.

However, in discussion with both Ms. Phillips in the past and with Ms. Corbett recently, we still want to move forward with actually purchasing current HVAC units for the rooftop in order to ensure we don't find ourselves in this position, again.

The good news is, based upon the recent repair, the thermostat component of replacing the HVAC units is not as critical right now, and that is something that can be deferred at a later date.

By doing so, that would allow the agency to move forward purchasing the actual 2-ton AC units themselves and renting the crane and specialized

equipment necessary to install them at a significantly lesser amount -- effectively less than half. The total amount comes to about $245,000 roughly.

So, if anyone has any additional questions about that, Ms. Corbett may want to add some additional information, but, all in all, I think one of the concerns in the past had been a debate about the cost -- the soft costs of purchasing new equipment to regulate the HVAC here.

I think there was a discussion about potentially moving to another building or something of that nature, but all in all I think this update here will hopefully provide a solution that short-term will work out well for this particular agency and particularly the site here in terms of having cost reduced by half given the new information.

Are there any questions?

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: So, through the Chair -- and I'm glad we're seeing this, because it's something that we've all talked about a lot. We certainly want to make sure that our employees are comfortable and that we have a work environment where everyone feels healthy and can

do their jobs while not too hot or not too cold.

So I'm confused about this breakdown. I'm understanding how we got to the 245-, because we're taking out that thermostat cost.

Did we put this out to bid?

Was this a competitive bid process?

MR. WEATHERS: So, under the simplified threshold acquisition requirements by HUD, we did put this out, not for solicitation. It was competitively bid.

The three vendors who competitively bid on this were Carrier Corporation, Bill Williams and W. W. Gay. So we got back three separate -- two separate quotes. One vendor opted to no quote.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Okay. If you take out the thermostat piece, because we're choosing to defer that for, how long, like when does that have to be done?

Are we talking about a few months or a year?

Because that's half the total.

MR. WEATHERS: So I would defer a little bit of that question maybe to Director Mitchell, perhaps.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Okay.

MR. WEATHERS: But it's my understanding that we can almost indefinitely put off the thermostat component provided that there aren't any major malfunctions.
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Sure. I'll hold that for him.
But, while you're there, how did the other two parts compare to the quotes?
Because we've talked about this before, too. We need to be comparing quotes apples to apples. So, if you take the oranges out, are they still the most competitive?
MR. WEATHERS: So the second quote that came in from Bill Williams -- they provided one, and I believe it may be in your packet. There is a total lump sum of $587,000, which was the other cost alternative. Bill Williams Air Conditioning. So --
MS. CORBETT: Which means that -- so you're basically saying that that was more than the one you received from Carrier.
Did Carrier come in at 515-?
MR. WEATHERS: Correct.
MS. CORBETT: And the other one came in at 587-.

MR. WEATHERS: Almost $65,000 more.
MS. CORBETT: So this was done as an IFB, and Carrier came in at a much lower rate even if you remove the $270,000 that Carrier had quoted for the thermostats.
MR. WEATHERS: Correct.
MS. CORBETT: Are they still the lowest?
MR. WEATHERS: Correct.
MS. CORBETT: Okay.
MR. WEATHERS: That is correct.
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: What stands out to me -- and, if they're still the lowest, that's great -- is the thermostat piece that we're putting off that we're going to get for how long is the highest part of the quote.
So, are we being -- not to say, "baited," but drawn to them, because the other parts are low?
And they're kind of burying a lot of the increase in that next part that they're going to have to do sooner or later?
Am I off base here?
Is anyone else feeling the same way?
(heads nodded affirmatively)
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Okay. All right.

MS. CORBETT: And so I'll speak a little bit to the thermostats, right, and then I'll have you chime in.
So I think what was interesting is that historically -- so we're going to continue to first monitor what's going on with the thermostats.
What's interesting about the way the thermostats are set up is that they do actual --
(Ms. Morris gave Ms. Corbett her microphone.)
MS. CORBETT: -- thank you.
It's like, "It's free. Take yours back."
(People laughed.)
MS. CORBETT: All right. Thermostats, right?
So I would say that this solicitation went out as an IFB, right?
We found that the lowest responded collectively was Carrier, right?
And I recall that that was probably like 515,000. Even if you remove the thermostats, which was about 270,000, approximately -- came back in as a quote -- I think what's

interesting is that we had a service provider to come out and actually look into the issues of the thermostats, right?
And so we discovered that the problem was -- at least right now what we were informed is that we have this copper piping that's actually in those thermostats originally, right?
And then, when there was a replacement, we discovered, when it was a leak, someone actually used PVC to replace a portion of the copper. You can't do that. So that was creating the leak.
We do believe that hopefully that that's resolved. I'm going to have Daniel to speak more to that, especially as we think about preventative maintenance. If this matter comes up, again, at least, in the future, we'll understand that preventative maintenance may be a potential cause of $270,000 or less depending on if they do every room.
(Commissioner Shirley entered the room.)
MR. MITCHELL: Yes, ma'am. You're correct. The total issue in the beginning was the AC units up top were dilapidated, and coils were destroyed. So that's what the main issue was.

And then we started digging into the thermostats going out. This is a pneumatic system where there's not a lot of subject matter experts.

So the individuals coming from the facility -- the contractor we were hiring wasn't too familiar with this system. So they ended up bringing back an individual who retired from that company and actually was, like Mr. Weathers stated, part of the original crew that installed this.

So he has spent three days going through this entire system, and stated, "This is a great system if it's working properly."

And that's why -- I don't know if you hear the air coming over here right now -- there is a couple more items he has got to work on, but he's ensured us that, you know, we can get by without worrying about the heavy cost of the majority.

But that heavy cost for the pneumatics -- it entails a lot. It's not just running thermostat wires. Everything in the ceiling above every thermostat has to be changed out. So that's a lot more labor-intensive than

just changing out the rooftop units.

MS. CORBETT: So it could be a delayed cost.

MR. MITCHELL: So it could be a delayed cost, and it could be --

MS. CORBETT: But we're monitoring it.

MR. MITCHELL: -- if the subject matter expert gets it right, there is maybe never a reason to change it. Because, you know, it's been working fine since this building was created until, you know, recently when a couple issues have come up.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Just a follow-up through the Chair.

So, in your expert opinion, is this the best approach?

MR. MITCHELL: It is. For now, it would be financially better for the agency right now.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Thank you.

Questions? Comments?

Commissioner Rogers.

COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Based on the way this is -- because it says, "2025-JHA-14," are we going to look at this as a resolution for Monday, or is this a recommendation?

Because we have -JHA-13 in here and -12 in here.

So, is this a proposed resolution?

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: That's my understanding.

MR. WEATHERS: I don't believe it would qualify necessarily as a proposed resolution because of the dollar amount of the threshold. The new totals of both the cranes to install and the actual AC units themselves are going to total around $245,000.

MS. CORBETT: So this is more of an FYI just to keep you-all informed about closing out, "Old Business," and what the new cost can be. And then if, in the future, there is an issue with the thermostats, you'll see that as a separate cost if we have to revisit that in the future. So it's just as an FYI.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: So, through the Chair, why do we have a resolution before us then?

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: It's not.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: I'm looking at -JHA-14.

Aren't you, too?

COMMISSIONER ROGERS: But that's what this says.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Oh, I'm looking at a resolution.

Is that not --

COMMISSIONER BROCK: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER ROGERS: But, is it --

COMMISSIONER REYES: This references --

MS. MIXON-PHILLIPS: The resolution was originally drafted based on the quotes for the entire system that included the thermostats. It was on Tuesday that I believe his name is Billy came in, the technician who was able to find the problem with the thermostats.

That resolution was based on if we were required to do the entire system when it was determined on Tuesday, in his expert opinion, that we did not need the thermostats.

Then we no longer need an action as it falls before the $250,000 threshold.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: And I don't think of it as a resolution.

Do you have a different vision?

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: No. It's not in the agenda. It's just --

COMMISSIONER REYES: It's old business.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: -- it's in my files. This is just an old business kind of comment.

We have a lot of information to look at, and so, when we're taking the time to review things, if there is something that we don't need to spend our time on, I think a notification would be helpful. Because it's a waste of our time.

COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Got it.

MS. CORBETT: Noted.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: I think it was an important discussion. I feel much better informed.

Okay. So it's not a resolution. So we don't have to have a motion to approve.

Is that correct, Reece?

COMMISSIONER ROGERS: That's correct.

MR. WILSON: That's correct.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: And, Mr. Weathers, anything else for us?

MR. WEATHERS: Not under, "Old Business," unless you want me to just go right to --

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Yes. Let's do that.

MR. WEATHERS: -- okay. So today we do have two resolutions to discuss. The first one is

2025-JHA-12. This is a resolution to authorize an amendment to an existing contract previously approved by the board for roof replacements for Riviera roofs.

Essentially, a quick summary is that the roofs at our Riviera place facility were all replaced recently. This committee did approve the contract for it, initially, in the amount of $323,248.

Now, in the process of replacing those roofs, there were some additional costs that were incurred by the vendor, Devore Capital. Quite frankly, these roofs were in such a condition that they had not been maintained in quite some time.

Anyone familiar with construction or roof replacements knows you really don't know the ture condition of the roof until you actually start to tear it off and replace it.

So, in the course of doing so, I believe a picture is worth a thousand words, and, in this case $44,000, is -- I'm going to kind of run through some of the pictures so you can kind of see what the condition was once the roof was pulled off.

Essentially, you can see that a lot of additional lumber and structural improvements were required. It wasn't a simple tear-off. There was a lot of structural work that required a lot of additional lumber to be used in that process.

So, when it was all said and done, the original NTE for the contract needs to be raised by an additional 44,000 or so dollars -- $44,536 -- to a new not to exceed of 367,784. So that is why this resolution is coming before the board today.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Okay.

Commissioner Shirley.

COMMISSIONER SHIRLEY: Given that this is not something that gets bid out or anything like that, how do we qualify that 44,000?

Is that number then verified and determined by staff to be based on the scope of those additional items to be a valid number, or how --

MR. WEATHERS: Correct. So what has happened and what typically happens, Commissioner, is we actually have the wherewithal, when we have our preconstruction meetings when the vendors

actually come out and look at the property, and there's always a caveat.

Like I just said, "Hey, we don't know exactly what it's going to look like."

So we actually negotiated the price for additional lumber by how many beams we needed or how many sheets of plywood we needed, and then, as we go along, what the vendor is always required to do is to document, with our construction manager, exactly how much lumber is being utilized.

And then we marry that with the prenegotiated costs in our contract, which was in the previous contract on Page 12 or so or 15, to verify that the actual change order request meets what was originally negotiated in the contract.

COMMISSIONER SHIRLEY: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: I have two, quick things.

First, can you scroll down to make sure the resolution that's there is the same as the one I'm looking at?

That attachment there -- is that important?

I asked this question before. I think that, if we're having references to documents that like we are signing, I want to make sure I've reviewed that.

Is that --

MR. WILSON: Oh, sorry. Sorry about the Document ID Number.

COMMISSIONER HORIVITZ: -- yeah.

Is that -- it has a separate link in my --

MR. WILSON: That's OGC's like document management system.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: -- okay.

That should come out, right?

I never noticed that before.

MR. WILSON: I can take that out.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Yes.

The second question is, based on some of those pictures, it looks like there would be unit damage.

Do we have any like -- because those pictures look like we have like real leaks into units.

Do we know that?

MR. MITCHELL: In the beginning, yes, we had a couple issues where water damage was in the sheetrock, and we do have a pending issue where that particular roof -- when they were removing the damaged wood, an individual from the

roofing company fell through and went through the ceiling. And we have a pending issue with that just so you would know.

COMMISSIONER BROCK: Man.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Is that person okay?

MR. MITCHELL: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: It also seems like something that shouldn't happen.

Should we talk about that some other time?

It seems like they should know how to not fall through the roof.

MS. CORBETT: Policy regulation.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: I mean it's things like -- I mean --

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: We might be getting a little off track. That's all right.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: -- yes. I'm actually concerned about their ability to do the job, but I'm going to assume this is a very reputable company.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: And accidents happen.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Yes. But, when we're --

MR. WEATHERS: That's why all of our

contracts include workers' comp for accidents.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: -- yes. Thank you.

MR. WEATHERS: Because accidents do happen.

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Yes, yes, yes.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Okay. Other questions? Comments?

(no response)

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: So I presume we need a motion to approve.

MR. WILSON: A motion to approve.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Yes.

Do I hear a motion?

Commissioner Brock.

COMMISSIONER BROCK: Yes. I make a motion.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Second?

COMMISSIONER SHIRLEY: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Okay. Any further discussion?

(no response)

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Okay. All in favor say, "Aye."

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Aye.

COMMISSIONER REYES: Aye.

COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Aye.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Opposed say, "No."

(no response)

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: The motion passes. All right.

MR. WEATHERS: Okay. The second resolution brought before the committee this morning is resolution 2025-JHA-13, and this is to authorize the award of the contract to Devore Capital for roof replacement at the Oaks of Durkeeville.

For clarification, for this particular group, if you recall, we actually had had previous work begin previously approved by this board by another vendor to replace roofs at the Oaks of Durkeeville.

The roof replacement at Durkeeville is being done in two phases. There is a Phase 1, and then this is the second phase.

So, if this sounds familiar about replacing the roofs of Oaks of Durkeeville, it's because we did have a Phase 1 with a different vendor.

Right?

So this is Phase 2. Again, with a solicitation of this nature, it was publicly solicited through IFB and sealed bids. The lowest winner that was reasonable and responsible, according to the scope of work by

our Mod Dev Department, was Devore Capital.
The total value of the contract that we would like to award is -- pardon me. My glasses are a little foggy -- $286,639.99.
CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Questions?
Commissioner Reyes.
COMMISSIONER REYES: Thank you, Mr. Weathers. If I heard you correctly, you said that this is Phase 2 of this roof replacement and that we used a different vendor in Phase 1; is that correct?
MR. WEATHERS: Correct.
COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Correct.
COMMISSIONER REYES: Okay. And, is that standard?
Is it because it's a different skill set that's required that we're not keeping the same vendor?
Are we just --
MR. WEATHERS: No, ma'am. Well, we could simply just carry it over. Ideally, I think what you're asking is we perhaps could have done both phases together as one --
COMMISSIONER REYES: Yes.
MR. WEATHERS: -- and utilized the same vendor for all of the roofs.

But, in this case, the Mod Dev Department basically opted to kind of do it in two phases. So we did 13 buildings I think at Oaks of Durkeeville and then another 13 buildings at a later date.
So, no. In that case, we simply can't go back to the vendor that we used before. We had to have an open bid, again, for Phase 2.
COMMISSIONER REYES: Got it.
COMMISSIONER ROGERS: And the vendor that we -- through the Chair to Mr. Weathers, the vendor that we had -- because I had to go back to my notes -- was Jenkins.
And, have they completed Phase 1?
MR. WEATHERS: Correct.
COMMISSIONER ROGERS: So Phase 1 has been completed.
MR. WEATHERS: They are done, yes.
COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Okay. And now we're into Phase 2. Got it. Thank you.
COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: I just have a -- through the Chair, just to kind of go back to my comment before, I really wasn't trying to be funny.
I know that we always go to the lowest bid

-- almost always -- but I think that sometimes, when it comes to things like roofs, I mean experience and being efficient and doing a really good job -- like I think that we need to be considering that in how we're evaluting bids.
Because having people like hurting themselves on a job -- like I know accidents do happen, but a roof is a very important part of our assets. And so I think it's not just the lowest number I think is really important.
MR. WEATHERS: So that's a fair point. Looking forward, we can review the potential for instead of issuing IFBs using RFQs, which would involve, as you are familiar with, similar to the culture compensation study with Gallagher and an Evaluation Committee where you're actually scoring vendors based on specific criteria.
I can definitively say, however, that the general industry practice with that is with a firm, fixed price, and then they're just general and straightforward things across the industry is use an IFB.
I will say, as you guys know, we've had several roofing projects. I think probably

including these resolutions today it's maybe the fourth or fifth one. This is really the first incident we've had where an actual worker has kind of fallen through the roof.
I can honestly say Devore Capital is a highly valued and reputable roofing company. I think it actually speaks more to the condition of the property as it does to the competency of the particular roofer in this case, but it's definitely something we can look at going forward.
MS. CORBETT: We use IFBs to quickly mobilize some of these. Not that it's an emergency, but we don't -- we need to quickly mobilize and get it done.
MR. WEATHERS: Absolutely.
MS. CORBETT: That's normally when you roll out the IFB.
MR. WEATHERS: That is one of the pros of using an IFB. Correct.
CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Okay. We are running overtime, and we still have a shade meeting.
So any other questions? Comments?
(no response)
CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Can I get a motion to

approve the resolution?

COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Motion to approve the resolution.

COMMISSIONER BROCK: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Any further discussion?

(no response)

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: All in favor say, "Aye."

COMMISSIONER HOROVITZ: Aye.

COMMISSIONER REYES: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SHIRLEY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROCK: Aye.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Opposed say, "No."

(no response)

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Okay. The motion passes.

We are at, "Closing Comments."

"CEO Comments"?

MS. CORBETT: I don't have any comments.

CHAIRWOMAN WEATHERBY: Okay. All right.

The meeting stands adjourned.

(Whereupon, the proceedings in the above-titled cause concluded at 11:21 a.m.)

– – –

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF FLORIDA)
COUNTY OF DUVAL)

I, Carol DeBee Martin, Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public, certify that I was authorized to and did stenographically report to the best of my ability the foregoing proceedings and that the transcript is a true and complete record of my stenographic notes.

Dated this 5th day of May, 2025.

Carol DeBee Martin
Notary Public State of Florida
My Commission: HH 588635
Expires: 12-29-2028