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STIPULATIONS
The following deposition of MARCOS MARCHENA was taken on oral examination, pursuant to notice, for purposes of discovery, and for use as evidence, and for other uses and purposes as may be permitted by the applicable and governing rules. Reading and signing is not waived.

Thereupon,

## MARCOS MARCHENA

was called as a witness, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: I do.
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. MITZ
Q Good afternoon, Mr. Marchena.
A Good afternoon.
Q State your full name for the record.
A Marcos Marchena.
Q And when were you admitted to the Florida Bar?
A $\quad 1985$.
Q Are you a member of any other bars?
A No state bars.
I'm a member of -- I think I'm still a member of the Orange County Bar, which is a volunteer bar.
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Q Where are you employed?
A I'm employed at Marchena and Graham. It is a law firm in Orlando.

Q What capacity?
A One of the partners.
Q And you represent clients, I am assuming?
A Yes, ma'am.
Q What areas of law do you typically practice?
A Real estate, business and airport law. We also do a few other things, but those are the primary areas where I practice.

Q I did do a little bit of research on your website. I noticed that your bio reflected that you have experience in the negotiation of complex commercial transactions?

A Yes. That's part of the business in real estate.

Q So acting as bond counsel would also be in that realm?

A Yes. Although I don't do much of that personally. I have and can, but one of my partners primarily does that work.

Q Does the work that you just described involve any specialized knowledge, training or education?

A Well, obviously it involves law school, and
then beyond that it's just been a matter of developing experience in the practice.

Q Have you represented any governmental agencies or entities?

A Yes.
Q Can you give us an idea of what sort of --
A I represented Orange County School Board in real estate transactions. My firm, though not I directly, represented the Property Appraiser of Orange County for some time. We no longer do that. I've served for some time as counsel to the Greater Orlando Aviation Authority. And for the last probably I want to say eight years I've served as outside general counsel.

Q Okay. So in representing $I$ guess the Greater Orlando Aviation Authority, would you have been responsible and are you responsible for being familiar with various state and federal statutes, regulations?

A I am.
Q And how long have you served as the general counsel?

A I guessed a little bit. Maybe eight or ten years. I don't think it is ten. Maybe eight.

Q And do you deal with contractors and competitive bidding and those sorts of things?

A Yes.
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Q Are you familiar with any legal restrictions on the various kinds of airport revenues?

A Absolutely.
Q And does the Aviation Authority receive federal funding?

A They receive very limited airport improvement funds from time to time.

But they also are authorized by the federal government to collect through the airlines what's called passenger facility fees -- PFC, passenger facility charges, which are charging on every one of the tickets that we buy. And those funds have to be used for specific purposes as well.
$Q$ Does the aviation authority receive funds designated for capital projects or buildings?

A Yes.
They also can receive funds specifically from Florida DOT for specific projects.

Q And does the Aviation Authority have any revenues restricted to operational uses?

A No, ma'am. I don't believe so.
Q Can you estimate what the approximate dollar amount is of the largest capital project that the airport in which you have been involved?

A The airport right now is carrying out the
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construction of an additional terminal facility that when completed will cost somewhere in the neighborhood of $\$ 2.1$ billion, $\$ 2.2$ billion.

Q On that project were you tasked with determining the source of funding and the appropriateness of it?

A No, ma'am.
Q Did someone else do that?
A Yes.
Q Who was that?
A The finance department and the Aviation Authority also utilizes an outside firm to assist the finance department in making sure that the uses of the funds are appropriate.

Q And is that information then provided to you?
A Not --
I mean, I'm --
There is an attorney --
Let me back up.
I oversee or work with a number of law firms. There is another law firm in Orlando who has a construction specialist that deals more directly with that.

I'm generally aware of that, but I don't get involved too directly in the issue of sources of funds.

It's not my area of focus.
Q Did you previously serve as the vice chairman of the UCF Foundation, the board?

A Yes. For one year.
Q When was that?
A For one or two years.
It was before $I$ came onto the Board of Trustees. So it might have been 2009, 2010.

Q Okay. And in that capacity did you have to get familiar with either statutes or BOG regulations?

A No.
Q And so what year did you join the UCF Board?
A $\quad 2011$.
Q And which committees have you served on?
A I have served on the Facilities and Finance Committee. I believe I served on the Labor and Compensation Committee. At one time I think I served also on the Nominating Committee.

Q Which committees did you chair?
A The Finance and Facilities Committee.
Q All right.
A That was I think starting in '14 -- early '14.
Q And when did you stop being the chair for that committee?

A When I became chairman of the board in July of ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.
'15.
Q Okay. All right. Would it be fair to say that your experience, one as an attorney, and two with prior board experience, and your experience as an attorney representing governmental entities or agencies has put you on notice that there may be restrictions on certain classes of funds?

A Yes.
Q Did Bill Merck offer you any training or orientation when you came onto the board?

A Bill Merck did not.
There was a board member orientation that was conducted by a couple of folks in the president's department. I also came to Tallahassee at one point and received a general orientation from staff at the Board of Governors.

Q So let's first talk about the orientation that you received from the president's department.

Do you recall what was covered?
A (Witness shakes head).
Q How about the orientation given by the BOG staff?

A No. Very, very limited in terms of my memory. MR. RUBOTTOM: Let me ask some follow-ups.

BY MR. RUBOTTOM
$Q$ Do you recall either one of those people offering training -- groups offering training going into the BOG regulations about funding restrictions or appropriations or any of that?

A No, sir.
Q Do you think that is something that we could beef up in Florida?

A Absolutely. Absolutely.
Any time a real problem like this develops there are two things to do, one is to determine why and how it happened and correct it; and the other one is to take the necessary steps to try to make sure that it doesn't happen again.

MR. RUBOTTOM: Thank you very much.
BY MS. MITZ
Q I thought I read somewhere that you had asked for additional training or maybe that you had asked for training to be provided to the Board at some point.

A After I became chairman, as the budget processes occurred from year to year, I began to realize that we as a board didn't really understand the budget process, at least not in the detail that we should -- or that I thought that we should. So I set up a retreat -a board retreat, that we usually would do those on half
days, and focus just on one or two subjects. And we had one of those sessions.
$Q$ Did that happen in 2017? Does that sound about right?

A It may have been in -- I don't think it was '16. I'm sure it was '17. Because by then $I$ was in full mode of updating the delegation of authority to the president to try to make sure that the board's authority was beefed up and more clear than it had been before I became chairman.

Q Do you recall what was discussed during that retreat?

A Frankly my recollection of that retreat comes from just snippets of what $I$ saw in the Brian Cave report. I remember there was a PowerPoint. We spent a lot of time on process. Towards the end there was discussion of the fact that funding for capital projects had been diminishing, and that's sort of what $I$ recall. BY MR. RUBOTTOM

Q That had been an ongoing discussion for the previous -- I mean since the recession? We listened to board meetings that were related to the building and that came up repeatedly.

A Sure. That was a general statement from time to time. But it was specifically mentioned with a
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number of slides showing the decline in PECO funding so-and-so forth at that particular budget retreat.

Q We got the January 9 th meeting here from the BOG folks. Similar --

A Yeah. Yeah. Yeah.
Q -- the funding --
BY MS. MITZ
Q Was E\&G ever defined for you at any training, retreat?

A No, ma'am.
Q And were carryforward funds ever defined or explained to you?

A No, ma'am.
In fact, $I$ can tell you pointblank that $I$, and I suspect most of the other trustees understood carryforwards to be all of the funds that the university had unspent this year carried forward to the next, not specifically to E\&G. That might have been something that the internal finance staff understood, but certainly not we on the board.

Q Okay. So when you heard Bill Merck or Tracy Clark refer to carryforward in relation to the Trevor Colbourn Hall building, what did you understand that to mean?

A I understood all of the funds of the
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university being carried -- that were carried forward from one year to the next.

Q And so did you also understand that that was appropriate funding that you could use for a building?

A Absolutely.
We don't know each other very well, but if you look at my background you'll see I approach every service and a public board from an honesty and integrity standpoint. And if -- I fully expect the staff that is bringing a matter forward to fully inform the board or a committee if there's any issue with the funding.

So I completely expected -- and I think our board was reasonable in expecting Bill Merck and his staff to put directly in front of us if there was -even what they considered to be a gray area.

By the way, there are a number of other examples where staff would bring to me issues that they thought maybe could be done, not in terms of an E\&G issue, but other issues, that they thought perhaps it could be done but there was a gray area. And without hesitation each time $I$ said, no, if there's a gray area in there we are not going to do it, either go figure it out, talk to the BOG staff, otherwise we are not going to do it.

Q Would those sort of discussions happen in

[^0]board meetings or like in preparation for board meetings?

A The example I'm thinking of in particular happened in preparation for a board meeting. This was -- the most recent example that $I$ can remember was in early 2018.

If a lease -- the staff explained to me that if a lease is an operational lease it can be approved by the Board of Trustees without Board of Governor's approval.

But if a lease is a capital lease, then it has to have Board of Trustees' approval and Board of Governors' approval.

Q Okay.
A They were looking to do a building, and it was questionable whether it was considered an operational lease or a capital lease.

Staff went so far as to get an opinion from a CPA that said it was an operational lease. I asked to see the opinion. I read the opinion. And I said this is close to the line and we are not going to do this, go talk to the Board of Governors' staff. That's just the most recent example that $I$ can remember.

BY MR. RUBOTTOM
Q Do you know if they talked to the Board of ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

Governors' staff?
A They did.
Q Was this a Kinsley thing?
A This was Kinsley. But I think they also spoke with Vikki Shirley, as general counsel.

Q That's one of the things that we keep struggling with, it's who they go to for answers.

A They spoke with both.
Q Okay.
BY MS. MITZ
Q Did they come back with the --
A They came back to me. The Board of Governors' staff says that they think that you're right, that this is a capital lease -- or too close to a capital lease.

So it was going to come to the Board of Trustees and then go to the Board of Governors, which was the appropriate set of steps.

BY MR. RUBOTTOM
Q To follow that. I keep learning -- or learning new accounting concepts that $I$ tried to stay away from --

A Me too.
Q What is the dividing line on that issue? Is it the length of the lease? Is it whether the lease itself is intended to finance the purchase of the
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building? What kind of standard is there on that?
A The crux is the latter, whether the lease is really just intended to finance the purchase of the building.

And there are three criteria that they look at, and if $I$ remember correctly, the third criteria addressed whether the total amount of the lease payments reduced to net present value were at least 90 percent of the amount of the cost of the building.

And basically when I looked at it, I looked at it and said -- and saw that the discount rate to determine net present value was somewhat arbitrary. And I said, look, if you just shift that discount rate some -- a little bit one way or another this could fall out of that -- that's too close, I won't support that. BY MR. RUBOTTOM

Q I had a really good question to follow up with that and I can't remember what it was.

Let's move on. Thank you. That's very helpful.

Is that an accounting standard or is there some legal standard?

A It was an accounting standard that the CPA put into the opinion.

Q Right. But I'm trying to get to whether it is ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.
permissible or not. Is that an accounting concept or a BOG regulation or --

A No. Strictly an accounting concept. Well, let me back up.

I think the Board of Governors' regulation is that if it is a capital lease it has to be approved by them. Whether it is a capital lease is an accounting determination.

BY MS. MITZ
Q So why did staff bring this to you to begin with? Is it because you were the chairman of the board at the time?

A Yes.
Q When you were chairing the Finance and Facilities Committee, did Bill Merck meet with you regularly to prepare for the meetings?

A Initially --
Well, actually, no, he did not.
I started asking tough questions in meetings.
Again, we don't know each other.
My focus was to make the board much more responsible for the decisions of the university rather than just approving staff's recommendations. So I would ask tough questions. And I think Bill realized that unless he briefed me in advance on some of the more
important issues that $I$ was going to be calling them on the carpet.

I constantly questioned, for example, construction delivery methods. I know something about construction. So I realized that the facility staff liked to utilize construction management contracts. Those are fine where you have a complex project where construction management is important.

But simpler projects, there's a cost to the university that can be avoided if you just design the building, bid it out, and then have it constructed. It's called design, bid, build.

So I would push back on the staff regarding those issues. And over time Bill would call me and say, hey, can we brief you on a couple of the items that are going to be coming before the Finance Committee this coming week?

I remember one time John Pittman called me and said we are -- we have a BOT regulation that allows some leases up to $\$ 25,000$, as long as they are operational leases, and some of the staff thinks that's too restrictive and we want to bring forward a regulation, because even leasing a vehicle becomes too restricted if a vehicle is $\$ 45,000$, so on and so forth, so we want to bring a regulation forward that will change that to a
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million dollars. I said, wow, wait a minute, John, this is a big jump between 25 or 50 to a million, what is staff looking to do between those numbers? He really couldn't come up with any great examples. I said we are not going to do that. If you want to bring forward a change to the regulation to increase it to $\$ 50,000$ I'll be happy to support it, but I'm not going to support a regulation that takes it up to a million dollars; that is taking the board's responsibility for oversight away, and I'm simply not going to do that.

Q Do you remember when that happened? Do you remember what year?

A I became -I can't remember if $I$ was chairman of the board or chairman of the board of the Finance and Facilities Committee. It might have been in '15 or so when that occurred.

Q Okay. And do you recall how long you had been Chair of Finance and Facilities before Bill Merck got it and knew that he had to start preparing you ahead of time?

A Probably --
You know, since we only met once every month and a half or so, I'd say probably it took him five or six months to figure it out.
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Q Okay. And did he prepare you once you became chair of the full board or was it the same idea, like only when issues were --

A Well, he would discuss matters with the Finance and Facilities chairman, not with me, unless I saw an issue when it was coming to the board and said, wait a minute, $I$ want to get briefed on this. And I would get briefed -- I would ask for briefings on a variety of subjects coming from various committees, from different staff.

I generally made my request through the chief of staff to the president. But with Bill a lot of times I went directly to Bill Merck.

Q Okay.
A I would --
And, again, we don't know each other, but when I became chairman of the board I talked to the prior two board chairs and said give me a sense of the time requirement that I'm going to have compared to a regular board member. And they both said about three to one. And over time I joked with them that they lied to me because it was really five to seven times the amount of time.

And if you looked at my background, I mean I served on the Valencia Board, served on the Florida
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Transportation Commission and chaired it. I put a lot of time and a lot of effort into the public service that I do.

Q Okay. Did Bill Merck ever tell you that using certain funds on a capital project might result in an audit hit or audit comments?

A Never.
And I told the investigator that I would be happy to sign an affidavit or go under oath. And I guess I'm under oath today.

MR. RUBOTTOM: You are today. Yes, sir.
THE WITNESS: He did not tell me that.
Had he even hinted at that I would have bulked as I did any time they brought me anything that was gray.

BY MR. RUBOTTOM
Q You just started talking a little bit about the bidding in the facilities department.

A Yes.
Q Did you actually request -- we heard mention that you may have requested an audit of the department based on that.

A I did.
Q Do you remember what year that occurred?
A I think I finally pushed it through in late
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2016.

I had started -- I had started talking with Bill Merck and with John Hitt at different times about a need for review -- I wasn't discussing back then an operational audit -- but a need for review of facilities. Since before I became chairman of the Finance and Facilities Committee --

Q You were just a trustee?
A I was a trustee.
And I remember probably six or eight months into being a trustee a -- I think it was a parking garage project coming before the board or the committee, I can't remember which, for review. And I asked what is the construction delivery method for this? And Miss Kernek said it's construction management. I said, gosh, that's a simple project, I mean, it is regular walls, there's not a whole lot of complexities, you know; what is it that is so unusual about this project that requires construction management? She went into a long explanation which left me sort of, you know, thinking.

Fast forward. I don't know how many months later but they brought forward construction of a building that was basically the mirror image of another building that they had just built before I came on the board. I again asked what's the construction delivery
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method. They again said construction management. Well, we know what it costs, and how it just got built, why do we need a construction management.

And I began to be concerned that facilities didn't have the expertise in its staffing to be able to use different construction delivery methods. And my focus was try to maximize the use of funds for the university.

So I started suggesting to Bill Merck, hey, you ought to have somebody do a review of the Facilities Department. And it sort of fell on deaf ears multiple times until $I$ eventually -- when $I$ was board chair after I was trying to really make sure that the board was focused and properly receiving proper information, one issue came up leading to a Finance and facilities Committee regarding construction, and that's when $I$ actually said to the committee I suggest that an operational audit be undertaken of the Facilities. And that was -- it took forever, but it got done.

Q Do you recall was there a report done?
A There was indeed a report. It came back to the committee. There were a number of action items that were to be implemented. And I believe that the consultant came back six months later and gave the committee an updated report on how many of the action
items had been implemented and what other ones needed to still be put in place.

Q And were your concerns I guess corroborated? Did they determine that UCF's method was not the best for UCF?

A Well, by then they had begun to do some projects at my prodding with, you know, design bid built. But they were still the smaller projects. I thought they could be used for the bigger projects. So they identified some improvements that should be made.

Q Okay. And do you know if Facilities followed up on those recommendations?

A My understanding that Facilities was doing that.

I know at one point a number of people got moved out and others got moved in because of a determination that perhaps they needed higher quality, more knowledgeable individuals as a result of those -that report and those activities.

Q Okay. Have you brought forward any other concerns about any other departments?

A Departments in general, no.
Again, because many of their departments -for example, the academic departments don't really come

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.
and report to the board other than general reports.
Q Right.
A But I certainly have identified over the years matters that needed more attention, most of them in a positive way.

For example, I worked really hard to get the board to focus on and approve additional funding for the development of more distance-learning courses and adapted learning courses, which is sort of a mix-type use.

And just by way of example I worked very hard after I became chairman to secure the approvals of the downtown campus because of the benefits that we saw were going to occur to the students that would be moved to that campus and the ability for more of those students to be able to do internships because of the types of businesses that would be located close to the Orlando downtown campus. I worked hard in trying to get the approvals for a hospital -- a teaching hospital to be built adjacent to the medical school with no funds being put up by the university and all funds being put up by a private entity but with the university having an equity interest -- not the university directly, but a DSO having an equity interest in that entity and having a much larger representation on the board of that entity
than the equity interest represented.
I don't know if you guys know, but $I$ am the first one in my family to have graduated from college, so that focus of access to me has been very important while at the same time trying to push up the quality of the university.

So all of those have been items that I brought forward at one time or another, either in private meetings that then resulted in public discussions or in public meetings that resulted in things being continued to be moved forward.

Q Very good. Okay.
Have you brought forward any complaints about any specific employee at any time?

A I have not ever brought a complaint about a specific employee.

I did mention to Bill Merck at one time because of the continued issues in Facilities that I did not have great confidence in Lee Kernek's ability to successfully manage that department.

Q Do you know if anything came from that?
A No.
MS. MITZ: Thank you.
BY MR. RUBOTTOM
Q A couple of follow-ups before $I$ get into my
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next line.
You talked about the delegation doctrine that you worked on. I will say it is pretty obvious from the public record that you took a lot of initiatives.

A Yes, sir.
Q Did President Hitt resist that work on the delegation doctrine?

A Yes, sir.
Q What about --
A He didn't do it actively. It was more a matter of slope plane.

No secret that, you know, the Board of Trustees didn't exist before 2000. John Hitt had been president from '92 or '93 to 2000 reporting directly to the Board of Regents. You know, that relationship was still developing, and here comes along this guy who says, what do you mean you can approve, you know, all of these contracts without board review and approval; wait a minute, we need to change that.

And I wanted --
If you read that, it wasn't just about limiting the president's authority with respect to contracts --

I think there was a good policy behind the changes that were made --
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Q We are going to get into more details on that. I was asking about Dr. Hitt's resistance.

A It was more passive resistance than active resistance.

Q Was Rick Shell his chief of staff at that time?

A He was.
Q Did you find him resisting --
A Rick was a very appropriate employee. If I said, you know, I want this to come to the board on $X$ date, Dr. Shell would make sure that it happened. He may have had an opinion as to what $I$ was suggesting be done. I never found him to be resisting anything that the board was trying to do.

Q As you know Dr. Hitt refused to come down here. We don't know -- it is a little harder by email from Wisconsin.

A Yeah. Yeah.
Q But Mr. Shell is somebody that has been out of the country.

Do you think that it would help us in our investigation to interview Mr. Shell with respect to some of those high-level decisions that are behind our investigation?

A It's difficult for me to say.
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I do know that Rick spent a lot of time administering things rather than in any decision-making capacity.

Q Was it your impression he was the kind of chief of staff who was knowledgeable about everything that the boss was doing and ready to execute when decisions were made? Would he, for instance, sit in on a meeting between Merck and Hitt or were --

A No. My understanding he did not sit in on those meetings.

Q The president would come out and tell him what was wanted?

A Go do this, go do that.
Q That's helpful. I appreciate that.
I am curious about the source of the
initiative that you did know. It sounds like you had that sense when you came on the board and certainly chairing the committee.

You were a BOG appointee, correct?
A Yes, sir.
Q Was that initiative somewhat motivated by the BOG expressing expectations or desire that you be that kind of trustee or is that your personal style?

A A little bit of both.
Q Um-hum.
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A Based upon my normal service on boards, I like to have, you know, clarity on responsibilities -- and limitations or responsibilities.

But what finally said to me you got to do this, Governor Scott had a university -- it wasn't a retreat, it was some type of conference. I believe it was in Orlando -- that was trying to focus the universities on job creation, employment, so on and so forth. And one of the Board of Governors' members gave a presentation, Alan Levine --

Q Yes. I know him.
A -- gave a presentation. And in his presentation he highlighted the fact that, hey, you know, what authority is delegated to the president is delegated by the Board of Trustees.

So I went back and I said to Scott Cole I need to see the delegation of authority from the board. And I got a copy of the delegation of authority from the board and I started reading it. I found it confusing and somewhat ambiguous. I began right away to work on how is it that I improve this.

Now, there were some things that we could not change because by statute the president was given the responsibilities --

Q Exactly.
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A -- but I spent a lot of time working on that. I asked the Governance Committee to spend time working on that. There was a lot of back and forth.

The Board of Governors also decided that they wanted to take a look at the delegation of authority as a whole. And I served on a committee of chairs with other chairs as well as -- I think it was Ned Longback who was vice chair of the board at the time, to try to develop not a delegation of authority but sort of what things ought to be covered in the delegation of authority.

Two of the things that are in the delegation of authority of UCF, that $I$ don't know if it made it into the others, but $I$ certainly recommended to that group it should be included was the fact that the president should not be able to fire, demote or adversely impact the compensation of either the general counsel or the head of internal audit. Because I consider those two positions to be reporting to the board. They work with the president but they report to the board.

Q Yes.
A So $I$ was constantly trying to take steps to implement the necessary safeguards to make sure that the board's governance was appropriate.

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

Q Thank you.
That word governance is something that -- I have not been part of the education world but $I$ have been here a long time and the word governance has been often spoken of since Governor Bush's initiative. I think Mr. Levine was one of his staffers or appointees for various things as a younger man.

And one of the things that $I$ think that we are exploring in this investigation and that $I$ know our chairs are trying to get to the bottom of -- because they don't have the time that Carine and I have to devote to the details -- but maybe a lack of actual governance that's going on between the legislature and the presidents.

So we are going to get into some details that you might not be aware, but $I$ hope you see they are consistent with the things you are talking about with respect to the delegation doctrine.

I believe you said earlier you became chair of Finance and Facilities in early'14.

A That's my understanding.
Q At that time what was your understanding of the various forms or sources of funding for capital projects, and throughout your chairmanship what was your understanding?

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

A I didn't know that there was a restriction on

Q I am not getting into that. What did you think the sources of capital funding --

A I know that, for example, that there were funds that came from the state, there was tuition, and there were ancillary or auxiliary funds -- auxiliary funds which come from transportation, health --

Q Right.
A -- other types of fees.
And I remember one of the times that a project to be funded by university funds came before us I asked Bill Merck what is this? And he stood in front of me --

By the way, that memory was prompted by something that $I$ read in the report of Brian Cave.
-- he stood in front of me with his fingers about a half inch from his thumb and he said the university takes a small management fee from all of the ancillary funds or auxiliary funds. I think he said it was 3 or 4 percent. And he said -- and he moved his hand like this (indicating) and said when you're talking a small slice of a large amount of money it throws off a lot of funds every year.

So my understanding going forward was that
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when we were doing university-funded projects that's where those funds generally were coming from, that coupled with investment returns and interest.

Q Those are all valuable answers and relevant to our investigation.

But just more basic, and I know there has been workshops that do this, we usually hear in answer to that question, PECO is for capital outlay -- takes capital outlay. We know donations for those purposes can be used that way. We know about the CITF capital, whatever, trust fund, student-related fee that I guess we bond, or whatever. And we know about bonding of various revenue bonds. That usually is the scope, the zone when you see that.

Are you aware that the master plan --
I guess you should know the board approves a new master plan every five years.

A Yes.
Q Are you aware the master plan that it addresses sources of funding for capital projects?

A Yes. I know it is addressed in the master plan.

Q Are you aware that the master plan doesn't address those kind of university funds or carryforward funds or anything other than this kind of category of ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.
classic capital funding?
A No, I didn't know that that was not included in the master plan.

Q Weren't you on the Valencia State College Board?

A I was.
Q Were you --
In that role did you hear about -- I can't remember what they call it, FundOne, FundSeven, but a similar operational capital duality?

A No. And I don't know if that was the same -done the same way back then.

But I was on the Valencia board from '99 to 2004, so it is ancient history.

Q Well, that's fine. I think --
I hope it is obvious that the House -- the leadership in the House is interested in all these issues throughout the system. And this has been an investigation -- a committee to focus in on one institution but the lessons are applicable everywhere.

A Absolutely.
I guarantee you that as a result of what UCF has gone through all, not only UCF, but all of our sister institutions are going through the process of making sure that everyone, including trustees, are much
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more informed and educated about the details of the funding.

Q I know that's one of the Speaker's goals for sure. We have done our own survey of this committee of all institutions.

You would be surprised how many list university, internal, carryforward, or whatever. So we are trying to get more information on those.

You don't recall that.
But would it surprise you that no form of carryforward is mentioned in that planning document as a funding source?

A It would not surprise me.
Q Okay. Are you conscious or have you ever been aware of the legal requirement that every capital project has to be consistent with the master plan?

A I'm familiar with the requirement that in order for a project to be constructed it must appear on the master plan.

Q Okay. Well, you might not recall, but it really is a land-use planning document.

A Um-hum.
Q It substitutes for the regular land-use planning laws. You might have a similar carve-out at the airport. I don't know.
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But it plays a very broad role. Funding is not a key role in that. But it is mentioned in the statute and mentioned in the regulation.

So we went to look at the planning documents to try to understand -- and I think we were finding out things that the auditor mentioned independently which $I$ think are relevant to where we are going. We will be talking about a couple of those things.

You mentioned the investment earnings. You were chair of the Finance and Facilities Committee. It is my understanding that the committee reviews the investment policy and reviews changes.

A Um-hum.
Q And I know that Trustee Seay has been doing some work on the investment portfolio a little bit.

During that time did you have any sense of what Department's money was in that? Because when people talk about investment earnings, the regulation is very clear that earnings on E\&G has to be E\&G use.

So were you -- did you feel like the committee understood whose money was in there and how those allegations were changing from month to month?

A Our focus was on making sure that the investments were within whatever policies needed to be in, because we know that the state doesn't allow funds
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to be invested in certain items, so we bring in the financial advisor as well as the finance people each quarter to show us how those were performing and to make sure that the allocations were appropriate and maximizing the returns. We were not focused on which funds happened to be -- were these state funds versus not state funds, because it was not an item that we were attuned to, if you will.

Q You might recall in the September 20th board meeting $I$ think that the staff presented you all a refunding plan that went into more detail than had been mentioned previous to that. There was actually documents produced during that timeframe. I can't remember if they were put before you. It showed kind of allocations of investment gains over a certain period of time where they were trying to show that the gains assigned to Trevor Colbourn Hall had not come from E\&G or any restricted funds.

What's frustrating about that list is it shows about half of the total investment portfolio as being other funds. I think I've seen a 15,000 row spreadsheet that supposedly sets out the various ownership shares in this fund.

Did you have concerns about whose money that was, whether or not it was E\&G or federal? Did you have

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.
concerns about whose earnings were being swept in to try to cover this deficiency?

A My direction to the staff at the time was let's identify appropriate funds to be able to replenish the restricted funds that were spent.

And obviously we had put an interim CFO and VP of administration to work in those positions, so I know that they were peddling as hard as they could at the time.

Q Right.
A But I did not -- I'm not a CPA, so I didn't have the education or the knowhow to be able to look at those --

Q Right.
A -- thousands of accounts other than to look at them and say does this meet the legal requirements.

Q Right.
A And our direction to them at the time, you know, was let's make -- let's move quickly; whatever is wrong, we need to fix.

Q Right.
A And, in fact, there were one or two board members that said, wait a minute, don't move so fast. I said, no, no, no, we want to move fast if it's wrong, it can't be wrong, we need to fix it.
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And then subsequently that same staff figured out, hey, there were some funds that were not spent that were budgeted that also need to be correct.

So first they took care of the spent, then they went back to address the budgeted.

Q Back to the investment --
I am not trying to go into the decisions of the refunding. I'm just trying to ask you with $\$ 600$ million invested, significant earnings through most times, I think the fourth quarter this year was pretty bad, this last year, but does that raise for you -- do you think that's another area of funds that maybe the board hasn't engaged in the budgeting process of how we are using this, what are the proper allocations of those earnings and how should those earnings be used?

A So two things: The board was very focused on the investment returns from those and were they being successful and were there any managers that were not performing that needed to be pulled out.

Q I assume also the security of the investments --

A And the security of the investment.
Q -- the classification, the different pools?
A Until the issue came that up raised to our level that, hey, some of these funds can't be used for
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some of these other items. We were not focused on that side of the allocation.

I'm confident that now the Finance and Facilities Committee will be focused on that allocation.

Q Yeah.
A In fact, Trustee Seay came forward with a report showing how the investments were liquidated in order to make sure that the replenishing of the funds was actually performed in cash and not just in allocation.

Following up -- and obviously I am not on the board any more, but I'm sure the board will continue to follow up on auditing to make sure that the interest from E\&G was properly utilized.

Q Yes, sir. I think she told me that she has a major project on that.

But what we just --
Number one, it appears that there's only been a couple of liquidations over the ten or nine years that those funds have been invested that way.

One of them was for the global building which seems to have been a pet of Mr . Merck. He called us six or eight weeks ago and had this wide-ranging conversation. First we let him talk. But we were -- he was talking about this project and how he funded it with
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auxiliary funds.
I noticed -- we were looking through some board meetings getting ready for this deposition -- and I don't remember which it was, and I'm not trying to cross-examine you on that, but I want to ask you do you recall where he liquidated some investment earnings and used that cash for the global project? Because it was fully disclosed in the board meeting as auxiliary investment earnings. I just didn't know if you recalled that.

A I don't have independent recollection of that one particular meeting.

Q Okay. Okay. But it may be -- would you agree it may be an area that the board needs to be more engaged in the budgeting of those, not just the supervision, but the budgeting of the earnings?

A Yes.
I think the board was doing a very good job of tracking investments and making sure that the returns to the university were good and that the downside risk to the university was protected.

I agree that the board and boards need to do a better job now that $I$ understand the difference in the allocation of those investments in how those investments will be spent.
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$Q$ One of the things that I think we learned as a general principle without understanding the details is that the finance department kept that money invested but they kept re-allocating shares to make cash available for different people or, you know, one department, or subdepartment would buyout, you know, basically the -trading shares internally to make cash available for the needs. So it almost looks like it is all reserve funds or it is sufficient. But the accounting of those funds just appear to be a nightmare.

Do you think that's something that the board ought to be getting clarity on and maybe trying to raise those to a different level to where there's transparency on whose money is being shifted around?

A I take that as the same question that you asked me right before.

Q Okay.
A I think the board needs to have information, clarity and take action on how those funds will be spent.

If I may, I think it's important to distinguish between the board seeing the allocation of those funds and the budgeting of those funds and the details of doing those transfers and liquidations and so on and so forth. That is clearly a staff function.
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Q I understand.
A And what we haven't gotten into and we may or we may not is there are a set of functions that are clearly within the responsibility of the staff, within the governance of board and staff that you will not be able to have the board go deeply enough into those management activities simply because, number one, it is not their expertise; and number two, it is the allocation of time would basically require that it become their full-time job.

Q Right.
A So what's important to have is people with honesty and integrity in those positions.

And what upset me the most throughout this whole matter has been that Bill Merck chose not to be truthful with the committee or the board.

And in every other arena $I$ worked in, either as a board member or as an attorney it is reasonable for the board to be able to rely on the honesty and truthfulness and completeness of the information that staff brings before it as opposed to obscure and talking half truths and, you know, reference auxiliary funds when they are using something else or talk about carryforwards when he knows very well that to most board members that just meant money going from one year to the
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next.
Q Right.
A I had multiple community people come to me while the investigation was going on -- after Bill Merck started saying, gosh, the building was in horrible shape and life safety, and it needed to be done, I had a number of people come to me and say, you know, look, the building needed to be replaced, it was in terrible shape, you know, you guys have got to go easy on Merck and the others.

I was not persuaded. To a person I said, absolutely not, staff has an obligation to be truthful with the board and not to keep any information from the board that would impact their decision.

In fact, the report says that after this issue Came up Bill Merck told multiple people I didn't tell the board because I knew they would have said no. That has been my nature in this board and any other board in which I have served.

Q I understand all that. Thank you. But can you -What you described to somebody that maybe shouldn't also have had the delegation he had to manage $\$ 600$ million with or without consultants and properly vetted fund managers, and we are talking 30 or 40 people

[^1]like that. The school board is in that business. It makes me pause.

I don't know if you read the investment policy statute, but it really -- there's all these restrictions. Any other thing?

So you have this individual recommending an investment policy to board members who may or may not have somebody with Mr. Garvey's experience sitting in the room ask.

Can you see how that -- from a governance, just protecting the public funds that those can get kind of scary from this 100-foot level?

A Some clarity certainly is warranted in connection with what the statute allows.

Q Thank you for being extensive with that. It slowed us down a little bit. I appreciate it, because I think there is a lot of information there that's helpful to the committee.

Did you see the budgets put before the board as coming from the CFO?

A Yes, sir.
Q Okay. Did you consider from the CFO because that was an officer presenting to the committee and the board --

A Yes, sir.
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We seldom had John Hitt address the budget to the committee or the board. John was generally in the room but it was clear that his budget and finance individual was Bill Merck and he was the one that responded to all the questions.

Q Did you consider the president and/or his office as having approval authority on the budgets that were presented to the board for the board's approval?

A Yes, sir.
Q Okay. In your conversation --
These premeeting conversations with Merck from time to time, did you ever ask about the president's views on any budget issue that you were interested in?

A I did. And of course the answer each time was that it would not be in the budget if the president was not supportive of it.

Q But you had an opportunity to verify that with the president?

Sometimes in the meetings where --
A Or I had conversations with him from time to time.

Q Okay.
A Yes.
$Q$ What about particular new construction projects, did you ever ask Merck about the president's

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.
commitment to those items?
A Each time that a new significant project would come up the discussion started with, you know, talked to Dr. Hitt, we think this is a good project, and here is why.

Q It would be accurate to say that in those board discussions the CFO was representing the entire administration?

A Yes.
Q Does that work similarly with the Aviation Authority? Do you attend their meetings?

A I attend all their meetings.
The difference is that the CEO at the Aviation Authority is a CPA, so he is very cautious of what the CFO brings forward.

Q Do you know whether or not whether Merck is a CPA?

A I don't.
Q I'll let Carine --
We have some questions about board meetings.
What time is it right now?
MS. MITZ: 4:08.
MR. RUBOTTOM: Let's keep going and see what we can get done in the next hour.

If somebody needs a break, let us know.

BY MS. MITZ
Q Since August or September of last year, have you listened to any of the audio recordings of the pertinent meetings?

A No.
Q I would like to take an opportunity to just kind of restate some of the things that Mr. Merck said in these meetings about funding in general to get an idea if you recall it and maybe what you thought about it when you heard the comments.

On April 22, 2015 at the Finance and Facilities meeting there was a discussion about combining the Colbourn Hall renovation along with the new construction of Trevor Colbourn Hall. And Mr. Merck told the committee at that time because the state had stopped PECO funding and the CITF fees were not enough that they had to get, quote, creative. And he also told the board that they, meaning the Finance Department had put together funding that, quote, wasn't typical by any stretch. And then he also said that being a large university they had large-cash balances to use and they would use those until the state could help.

Do you recall him saying those things?
A If it's on the tape, I don't question it.
Q Okay.
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A I don't have an independent recollection of those comments.

Q The that meeting, in April of '15, you would have been the chair, right?

A That's correct.
Q The recording doesn't reflect that you or any trustee had any questions after he made those comments. Did those things sound right to you, we don't have the monies, we are going to have to get creative, we put together funding that wasn't typical? Were those things that would have been red flags?

A Those were things that we had heard previously with respect to other projects and were an indication that we are continuing to use university funds, auxiliaries, the management fee of auxiliaries, the investment generation, the interest.

Each trustee that serves on that committee, if you talk to them, will tell you what I'm going to tell you. They absolutely expected that if there was any issue with the funding, regardless of how creative that Bill Merck would have -- had an obligation to tell us there's a potential problem.

The other reason why creative, if that's a word that he used, was not -- would not have been a red flag or unusual to us, long before $I$ was a trustee the
university built the Convocation Center, which is an arena that's used for graduation, basketball, with residential and so on and so forth. I don't know the details, but my understanding is it was a very unusual financing that was done within the law and within the regulations.

Q Okay.
A So we were used to seeing Bill Merck find creative ways to get things done within the rules. It was not a red flag saying, hey, this guy is potentially doing something wrong.

Q Thank you for that explanation. Okay. So I think it is also at that meeting -- later on in the meeting when I think you asked the question where the additional money was coming from, and Mr. Merck had Tracy Clark replied. She said carryforward funds are what we are using for Colbourn Hall and Trevor Colbourn Hall. Mr. Merck asked her to elaborate. She told the board they had accumulated carryforward funds over the last several years and that's what they were using.

Had you ever heard that before, that capital project was being funded with carryforward funds?

A Yes.
$Q$ Do you recall which project --
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A No.
Q -- or what year?
A I don't. I just heard --
Again, my general understanding was that carryforwards were all funds being carried forward, unless Merck or Miss Clark had said, and by the way, we are concerned about our ability to use those funds. There was no reason for the committee to believe there was anything amiss.

Q Okay.
BY MR. RUBOTTOM
Q Let me try to characterize your answer and you tell me if I'm right or not.

So when you heard them say carryforward in these various meetings, you had the broad general view of the term, and you presumed or assumed that they were meaning carryforward funds of the proper flavor or color, the proper source and not -- you assumed they couldn't possibly mean an improper source?

A I'm used to working with staff that is meticulous about the right sources of funds.

And until this issue came up I had no reason to believe that Bill Merck would choose to use restricted funds and hide it from the committee.

I don't have any independent recollection, but
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there was one meeting, $I$ don't remember if it was that one in April or the one in '14 where they came to the committee again talking about a change in the project, you know, the project needing to get bigger in some fashion. And I asked the question to Bill Merck, do we have the funding to do that?

Well, I think the investigator asked me when I was being interviewed, well, did you think to ask do we have the right funding to do that? I said, no.

Do we have the funding to do that by implication means the right funding. I am not asking him do we have the wrong funding to do that; right?

Q Yeah. Yeah. Okay.
BY MS. MITZ
Q I think you happen to have your packet open to the same page.

This is what I would like you to take a look at. This is from the Brian Cave exhibits. It is an excerpt of a transcript of May 22nd, 2014.

If you could just take a look at that and get familiar with it. I just have two questions for you.

A Hang on. Yes.
$Q$ Okay. When he says, quote, We "talked this morning about no -- hugh -- money coming from the state
right now for construction so we are basically having to take this out of our hide as well," what discussion was he referring to that morning?

A I don't remember if that item was briefly mentioned at the Facilities Committee meeting.

Because the way the board meetings are held, the morning are committee meetings, and a number of committees meet one after another one. And then at 1:00 o'clock the board meeting begins. So there was probably a brief discussion regarding that.

Q Okay. So the lines following Mr. Merck's comments --

Can I just take a look at this real quick?
A Yes.
Q So you say --
So Merck is talking, and then you say, "But they have assured us we have identified the funding to be able to accomplish that, right? So I would move to the board -- to approve moving forward with the Colbourn Hall renovation."

A This is one of the situations where a lot of times you think reading something is not going to prompt a witness. In this case it actually brought a memory to mind.

Q Okay.

A I did not -- I didn't see this I don't believe when I was interviewed by the investigator. And when $I$ read it in the report it clicked.

What this transcript doesn't show is the board is sitting in $a \operatorname{U}$, and there is a table in front of the board. And for these items Bill Merck and potentially Tracy Clark and/or Lee Kernek are sitting at that table, and what this doesn't show is that when $I$ say, "But they have assured us we have identified the funding to be able to accomplish that, right," then I looked at Bill Merck, and he nodded in the affirmative --

Q I --
A -- at that time in order to confirm to the board that, yes, we have the right funding.

BY MR. RUBOTTOM
Q Thank you. Because that helps on the audio. It looks like you were -- you were representing on his behalf. But you are telling us that you were challenging him and he gave an affirmative nod.

A That's correct.
Q He was acknowledging to you that the funding was proper?

A That's correct.
MR. RUBOTTOM: Are we going to put this in?
MS. MITZ: I would like to mark that.
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MR. RUBOTTOM: We don't want all of this paper. We want this one. I think that's a pretty critical matter.
(Exhibit No. 1 marked for
identification.)
BY MR. RUBOTTOM
Q These are details that the Brian Cave investigation was unable to draw out.

A Of course.
Q That's one reason we keep digging. We know there were some questions not asked. We appreciate your patience.

I would like to show you the 2014, '15 university operating budget that went before the full board on May 22, 2015. If you can take a look at that, particularly the attachment.

MR. RUBOTTOM: Can I go ahead --
MS. MITZ: Yes.
MR. RUBOTTOM: I think I meant to.
MS. MITZ: Yeah.
BY MR. RUBOTTOM
Q Okay. So would you acquaint yourself with Attachment D.

A Okay.
Q Can you say for the record what the heading --

A It says, "University Central Florida Summary of 2013-14 Expenditures as of March 31, 2014, 75 percent of the year."

Q And, again, we are exploring and trying to develop a record on some of the budget practices and maybe some deficiencies that are in the category that you and I talked about earlier.

Does the first line reference E\&G for that?
A Yes, sir.
Q Okay. What does the footnote one --
A "2013, '14 operating budget includes carryforward funds for which spending authority was approved in a previous year."

Q Okay. Would this tell you -- an outside observer coming in and looking at the details there is a possibility that carryforward means E\&G in this budgetary context?

A If I were looking back at a record then I can see how it would do that. I had no reason to think about at the time whether carryforwards in particular meant E\&G or all funds.

Q I understand.
A It wasn't pertinent to any decision we were making at the time.

Q I understand. I don't know if you recall me

When you first walked up to my conversation with Dr. Whittaker on the $9 t h$ I was addressing this very question --

A Okay.
Q Because the reason why it comes up a lot more in staff is that the BOG regulation does not require the board to budget the carryforward funds. And so these have been accumulating funds in all the universities that the administrations are spending. They only have to report the expenditures.

The way I read that footnote, they are telling you that this expenditure for the first three-quarters includes some of that kind of money. They mention that the board has previously approved that money in a previous operating budget.

We can talk about that in a minute, the kind of approval.

But staff is working with this carryforward number every day, all day. And the same thing is going on at the BOG --

A Um-hum.
Q -- and so would it surprise you to know that UCF staff both in the audit department and in the accounting department, accounting and finance people
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that there are staff of either -- that carryforward always means E\&G or the broader view you described, I think Mr. Taft described that view, would it surprise you to know even the audit staff there are people that just automatically carryforward means E\&G --

A It wouldn't surprise me to learn there are different opinions.

Q I think --
THE COURT REPORTER: ExCuse me.
MR. RUBOTTOM: He is supposed to be
testifying, not me.
Okay. Thank you.
BY MR. RUBOTTOM
Q So $I$ want to put this budget in as Exhibit 2. (Exhibit No. 2 marked for
identification.)
BY MR. RUBOTTOM
Q Yeah. I do want you to read the last sentence.

This is my understanding of kind of the substance of your motion you approved.

The last sentence of that paragraph on the front page --

A "This request includes approval to amend the budget if the actual allocation differs."
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Q That seems like a pretty broad delegation -A It is. And if you go to 2017 -Is it 2017?

There was a budget that came before us. I don't remember if it was CIP or if it was the general budget where as we were modifying the delegation of authority I caught this language --
$Q$ We will look at it in a minute. I think you will see broader language there.

A -- where I say, wait a minute, wait a minute, this delegation of authority doesn't mean anything if after we approve a budget the president can change it however he wants.

So we started modifying those motions to limit the president's ability to move money around within the specific parameters of what had been approved.

Now, again, $I$ don't remember if it was the
general project, the general budget or capital
improvement budget, but we started doing that --
Q Okay.
A -- again, at my urging.
Q Okay. What $I$ want to show you now is -- this is the same day, actually. This is the committee meeting. Apparently they put different documents in front of you for the committee and the full board on the
budget.
I want you to look at --
Yeah. Just starting inside on page two. Does that page include an explanation of terms?

MS. MITZ: No --
BY MR. RUBOTTOM
Q I'm sorry. The second-to-last page is where it is. I thought it was right here. Go on past the charts.

Right. Yes, sir.
Does that include an explanation of terms?
A It does.
Q Okay.
A It has about six or seven terms.
Q Okay. Do you see the definition of education, in general?

A Yes, sir.
Q And you see the definition of auxiliary?
A May I read the two?
Q Yes, sir. Please.
A Yes, sir.
Q Okay. So do you recall that those were a part of the committee package each year at budget time?

A If they were in the packet, I'm sure they were. I don't have independent recollection.

Q Does that appear to you to be a good working definition of those terms for the work that you had to do as the board when you are looking at the budget of auxiliary enterprises and E\&G?

A I would find the definitions to be more complete if they included the restrictions of the use of the funds.

Q I think that's a common refrain that we hear. We heard that from staff. We heard that from Mr. Merck.

You as an attorney -- I think if you think back to the discussions from the BOG level about delegations you understand the universities only have the authority that the constitution and laws give them.

A That's right.
Q Unlike the state legislature, universities are delegates of state powers, and those delegations are the constitution and the statutes. And so it's the same issue raised with the regulation.

Have you read Regulation 9.007 since it came up --

A Um-hum.
Q -- and it has much more detail. People are saying what's prohibited. It looks to me like it is one of those inclusio unius, exclusio alterius, in the idea that you are only delegated to do what you are
authorized to do.
Do you think that maybe people have been poorly trained to think there needs to be a prohibition to restrict them?

A I don't know that it is poor training to be clearer in the limitations of authority.

I think that just as I tried to be much clearer in the delegation of authority to the president, the clearer the authorities are the better and less problems will arise.
$Q$ If it was the legislature's view that the delegations are limited by the words on the page and there is no other authority given, how do you think that interpretation could be best communicated throughout the system -- with the BOG be equipped to write guidance documents to say these questions have come up in the past and it has always been the legal interpretation those things are prohibited?

I know the IRS does letter rulings --
A Absolutely.
$Q$ Do you think there could be that kind of guidance?

A Yes.
$Q$ But you do understand if you have people out being creative and they think there is no prohibition, I
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can do it, then it is difficult for the legislature to see --

A It is --
Q -- specific delegation?
THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry --
THE WITNESS: There is always room for interpretation. The more examples that are given, the more parameters that are created, the more training that is done, the clearer all this will become.

BY MR. RUBOTTOM
Q This is just one more, and I think this issue may have come up in the past.

At the June 27 th meeting of the committee, 2016, it is our understanding that Mr. Merck told the committee when the state isn't providing PECO funds that the staff tries to figure out other ways to make it happen, including internal sources.

Do you remember times where they used internal sources as that catchall term?

A Yes. I don't remember that particular meeting, but I remember that term being used.

Q What did you assume that term referred to when it was used?

A Back to Merck's finger and thumb, the
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management fee on auxiliary, the investment returns, the interest, et cetera.

Q Okay. Thank you very much. Okay.
As a trustee you had been delegated from the BOG the responsibility of financial management. Do you think you asked enough questions concerning funding for capital projects at UCF?

A I wish you would have had an opportunity to sit in on some of the meetings that $I$ attended over the years, that I participated in over the years.

I have prided myself in being a very engaged board member. I have asked staff more questions than almost any other trustee on this board and perhaps many, many other boards. I'm not a CPA. I'm not a financial individual. I ask questions about do we have the funding to do this.

Bob Garvey asked a lot of questions about budgeting and investing and proper funding to the point where each trustee brings to the table their own set of strengths --

Q Exactly.
A -- and weaknesses, of course.
And I think I have tried very hard to exercise due diligence over the matters that have come before the board.
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And I want to be clear here, if Bill Merck had not chosen to keep information from the board this would not have occurred.

There were no questions that we could ask reasonably short of cross examining him, which I don't think is expected by a board member, that would have gotten us the information that we needed to be able to stop this particular action.

Q Thank you.
Now, let's go and look at --
Did you --
We talked about the delegations. It is your
testimony that you began to address those. You addressed it in one of the budget meetings. You addressed it generally on your $\$ 2$ million limit, or whatever it was that you did in 2017 --

A Yes, sir. Yes, sir.
Q Did you consider the audit -- the discussion and the audit finding about the capital outlay projects? Have you given any thought to that since the information was put out?

A You are talking about the audit finding in this particular --

Q The Trevor Colbourn Hall audit fund, one of the things they mentioned is capital outlay budgets.
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Have you given any thought to that about the discussion by the auditor?

A I have given some follow-up to just about each one of the items.

I do have the auditor's report here if we need to refer to that.

Q Okay. Well, if you recall the discussion. I just want to reference it generally.

Have you --
Had the board done anything since that audit finding to begin to clarify the capital outlay budget concerns that were raised?

A The items that we have taken with respect to going forward -- action on going forward include a much more detailed agenda item as opposed to these summary fashion agenda items --

Q Yes, sir.
A -- that includes a section that has to identify the fiscal impact of the approval to the university, the source of funds for the university, and any restrictions that exist on the use of those funds.

Instead of second action, instead of waiting until a project has been finished to then have it audited either by internal audit or by the state auditor general, the board implemented a policy that immediately
after the board approves a project and before the project begins, internal audit has to verify that the source of funds that was presented to the board is the source of funds that's going to be utilized, number one; and number two that it is an appropriate source of funds.

Q Okay.
A They also have the ability to check, do spot checks during the project, and of course they continue to have after-the-fact audit.

We separated responsibilities between the CFO and the VP of administration to make sure that --

I think part of the problem was the fact that facilities reported directly to the CFO. So you had within the same department or the same silo the people who wanted the money for the project and the people who were allocating the money for the project. So we separated those responsibilities.

So $I$ don't know that that answers directly your question.

Q We can get back to it.
We will look at a couple capital outlay budgets. I wanted to get on the same factual page.

I forgot to mark Exhibit 3, May 22, university operating budget information that was presented to the
committee on that day.
(Exhibit No. 3 marked for
identification.)
BY MR. RUBOTTOM
Q So this is going to be our Exhibit 4. This is a capital outlay budget for the '16, '17 fiscal year.

I don't know if you have gone back and reviewed any of these.
(Exhibit No. 4 marked for
identification.)
BY MR. RUBOTTOM
$Q$ Do you recognize that? That was approved by the full board I think on May 31st, 2016.

A I don't recognize it in particular, but I'm sure it was presented to us.

Q On the front page, does that have the president's signature on it?

A No.
MS. MITZ: Authorization at the bottom.
MR. RUBOTTOM: Where?
MS. MITZ: The background information paragraph, that last sentence gives the president the authority.

MR. RUBOTTOM: Yeah. This is the delegation
issue. Yeah. That might be the one that you
recall. Yeah. That last sentence. BY MR. RUBOTTOM

Q Does that look like unbridled authority to you?

A It does.
Q Let's look --
A Remember, I said it wasn't until '17, once we had adopted modified delegation of authority that I caught this and said, wait a minute --

Q I understand.
A -- if we are now giving the president limited authority in the general delegation, then these provisions have to be changed.

Q And I appreciate that you caught that and talked about it.

Actually, I don't think this document was ever referred to by anybody, any project. We can't find anybody that worked there and understood what this document was for.

A Okay.
Q I think it was just one of those they do it every year. We found it interesting early on. I was encouraged to see the auditor had the same concern.

For instance, here is Colbourn Hall
renovation, and Trevor Colbourn Hall, both projects on
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there separately. This is the '16, '17 fiscal year. The funded -- shows zero funded for those projects for that fiscal year, does it not?

A Yes, sir.
Q And that was actually the year when, in fact, you all adopted this probably the same day you voted to demolish Colbourn Hall.

But it is probably reasonable to have a zero there.

But this is the fiscal year that the Colbourn Hall construction was begun. So the capital budget adopted by the board had zero funds --

A Well, but here in the front, there is a sentence that says, "The attached university central Florida 2016, 2017 capital outlay budget lists the projects approved during the legislative session and by the Governor."

Q Um-hum.
A So I am assuming that that wasn't something that was --

Q Well, that was the staff understanding of the document. We will look at a statute in a second that will help you understand why we have been concerned about this all fall. I think you have picked up on some of the problems.

But, again, the initial response of the audit didn't really address it. I think Dr. Whittaker filed a supplemental response since then that goes a little deeper.

A Um-hum.
Q But that's '16, '17. I will mark that as Exhibit 4.

We will run through a couple more of these just to --

So Exhibit 5 is the '17, '18. So this is May of 2017. It continued to have that broad delegation.
(Exhibit No. 5 marked for

```
identification.)
```

THE WITNESS: Did you look at the minutes?
MS. MITZ: We don't have them.
MR. RUBOTTOM: We will look at them.
THE WITNESS: If you would.
Again, $I$ can't recall if it was the general budget or these.

BY MR. RUBOTTOM
2 Right. Okay.
A But we -- I began to raise an issue regarding those.

Q Okay. But, again, I think Colbourn renovation is gone here now. But --
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Yeah. They got the demolition and the main project as one.

But, again, the building was already underway

It was getting ready to have ground broken. Certainly most of the construction was going to happen in that fiscal year.

And, again, the board funded budget was zero for that. And it doesn't show any other sources of funds for that project.

I know there is some lists where a building might show up on sources as a wish list on a capital improvement plan.

This is the budget for the year for capital projects and there is basically no money and no source from which money was actually being taken. BY MS. MITZ

Q Do you recall how staff was presenting this to you and why they would -- like how they justified all zeros?

A I'm sorry. I don't. I don't have a memory of that particular document.

BY MR. RUBOTTOM
Q I think --
If you will read the first sentence, which
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adds a little more flavor to what you read on the other one a while ago. This does cite the statute. Must adopt annual capital outlay projects that designates proposed expenditures by project.

A Yeah.
Q Clearly the university was not including those University funded projects --

A That second sentence that I read from the Exhibit 4 is also in here.

Q Yes, sir.
A Anticipated to be approved during the legislative session.

Q Sure. That's the staff's gloss on the statute.

I start with the statute --
A Yeah.
Q And it was interesting to listen to the staff describe their understanding of their document, because I think that second sentence is a fair representation. So that's Exhibit 5.

This is the next year, when the building was almost done, but it was still under work -- underway. I will mark it as 6.
(Exhibit No. 6 marked for

```
identification.)
```
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BY MR. RUBOTTOM
Q I think you changed the delegation statement here. But it still has the same content in the budget itself.

A Where is that --
Q Delegation language is here.
A Okay.
Q Okay.
A Yeah.
Q Okay.
A Yes.
Q That would limit activities.
But, again, we have Trevor Colbourn with zero funded, when the building was probably three-fourths finished. There was more to be spent in July and August before that --

I don't know if they finished paying all the bills or not.

But in this current fiscal year there were expenditures for that and there's no budget funded. I doubt you got a $\$ 2$ million -- I doubt they brought you a $\$ 2$ million expenditure brought back to the board while the building was being completed this year.

So, again, it is a curiosity. I think the auditor hit on it. I can understand why the board
didn't see it.
But you would agree that's a deficient use of a --

Well, let's look at the statute real quick. Here is the statute. I will mark it as 7. (Exhibit No. 7 marked for
identification.)
BY MR. RUBOTTOM
Q It is a very simple statute.
A Is this a higher education statute? At the end it talks about each district school board.

Q I know it does.
For background it will be interesting to know that when the legislature recodified the statutes they brought a few statutes in to all of the boards because there is this unified view of the role of these boards.

I don't know about this one, but some of them may have been school district laws. But then when the legislature applied similar laws to all the colleges and universities, this is the kind of statute that may have resulted. It is a clear statute. It is clear that the statute applies to all of the boards.

And you would agree if this applies to university boards that this capital outlay budget has been deficient because it doesn't show all sources of
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funds and all projects?
A If it applies, yes, sir.
Q But what made sense to me, and I don't want to know if it made sense to you, and that's Exhibit 7, the statute, this looks like the legislature expects a capital budget every year for all capital outlay expenditures.

We don't even know yet if other universities have been doing it. It is one of our early discoveries.

You would agree that's something that we can work on reforming --

A Absolutely.
Q -- and getting it up to speed?
A Yes, sir.
Q Thank you. Would it surprise you to know that Mr. Merck took no interest in this document whatsoever? I mean, he expressed -- when he called us two months ago, he expressed complete -- "no, staff did that." And when we talked to staff, they said, "no, he didn't care about that."

A I don't want to express an opinion on what Mr. Merck thought or didn't think.

Q Thank you.
Now, to the delegation policy that you adopted October 27, 2017.

Was that your initiative?
A Yes, sir.
Q Who did you work with on that before you presented it to the board?

A I did a pretty good amount of work on it myself. Scott Cole the general counsel did a pretty good amount of work on it. I think I considered two or three different variations.

And when $I$ was comfortable, presented it -- I asked Scott to, you know, send it to Dr. Hitt and have him look at it. I think Dr. Hitt sat on it for a while.

And then Scott came back to me and said Dr. Hitt has some concerns. We went back and forth a little bit.

I had a breakfast meeting with Dr. Hitt at one time where we discussed it head on. And his comment to me was, Marcos, you are taking my legs out from under me with that delegation. I said, I don't know, that's just good policy, we need to have clarity between what the board will review and approve and what the president will have authority to do on his or her own.

He ended up being concerned about a particular matter that perhaps had to do with -- I think perhaps the salary in one of the athletic arenas. And afterwards I told him I would look at that.
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I then told Scott Cole to go ahead and send it to the chairman of the Governance Committee as an item that $I$ recommended for their review and discussion. I certainly wasn't saying, you know, I approve it and therefore it shall be.

And there was at least one meeting at which this was extensively discussed. People had an opportunity to think about it, consider it.

It came back at another meeting to that same committee. The committee ended up recommending approval, and then it eventually went to the board.

Q I didn't get this clarification earlier. This Governance Committee is a governance committee of the Board of Trustees?

A Yes.
Q There is so much governing going on it is hard to keep it straight.

A Yes. I'm trying to remember the full name of the committee, Nominating and Governance --

Q Okay. Thank you.
I think we discussed why that was a good idea.
Four days after the board approved that approximately $\$ 20$ million was transferred from E\&G to the construction. I don't know if you have seen the dates on those various transfers.
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A No.
Q But $\$ 20$ million for three downtown related capital outlay projects.

Did you realize at the time that this delegation would allow the president to allocate and transfer $E \& G$ funds into capital accounts?

A We did not --
As you can see, not having fully understood the restrictions on the various accounts, we did not address individual fund accounts within the delegation --

Q Right.
A -- so I would not have known that.
Q Okay. But as long as such transactions were legal, it wasn't your intention to tie up the moving of funds? It was just that contracts to spend them --

A That's correct.
Q Not the preparatory shifting of funds?
A Yes.
Q Thank you. That helps a lot.
Do you think that they were in a rush to do that with your initiative on delegation or do you think that's just happenstance? That was the last big transfer. I think there was something in five figures later on.
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A I don't know. I don't want to hazard a guess. MR. RUBOTTOM: Yeah. Okay.

I'll let Carine go for the next session. Where are we?

MS. MITZ: Almost 5:00 o'clock.
MR. RUBOTTOM: We are getting closer to the end. We might be able to wrap up in 30 minutes. (Discussion off the record.)

BY MS. MITZ
Q On September 18th of last year President Whittaker was informed about the $\$ 20$ million transfer that we just talked about that just occurred a few days after the delegation of authority was adopted as well as another $\$ 12$ million in prior transfers all of which had been transferred or programmed to be used but hadn't yet been spent. When did President Whittaker tell you about that?

A When you say September of '18 --
Q Yes.
A I don't recall exactly when he would have informed me about that.

Q Do you recall that he did inform you about that?

A Which $\$ 20$ million --
MR. RUBOTTOM: The total extra 32 that wasn't
spent.
THE WITNESS: The budgeted but unspent? BY MS. MITZ

Q Correct.
A I don't recall when $I$ was informed about that.
I recall that when the Trevor Colbourn Hall
issue came up, and $I$ realized this is not just a mistake, this is an improper allocation, use of these funds, Bill Merck was gone so we put these two new people on there. My first direction was we need to find out if we've spent any other funds in a similar fashion.

So in addition to the -- the staff went to work. This new staff went to work trying to figure out what had happened.

So they identified I think it was another 13-plus million dollars. I said get it out, we are not hiding anything, let's go to the board so the board will direct staff to transfer these funds back into E\&G.

It wasn't until sometime after that that someone came to me, I don't remember if it was Whittaker or who it was, and said we've also identified some funds that were budgeted but unspent, to which I said obviously we are not going to spend those and we are going to put those back.

So I did not view those having to be put back

[^2]as big of an issue because the funds were there, they were not getting spent, nobody for a second was going to think about spending those funds. So I was still much more focused on making sure anything spent had been replaced.

Q Okay. Do you recall whether President Whittaker advised you at any time before November of 2018 that 85-million-plus had been transferred from E\&G to construction under President Hitt and presumably with CFO Merck's participation?

A Before November?
Q Correct.
A I don't recall.
Q Do you have any thoughts or can you say whether Mr. Merck deceived just the board or if he deceived some of the employees who were working for him?

A All $I$ can tell you is what I've read in the Brian Cave report.

I steered very clear of discussing this issue other than with Dr. Whittaker to take the corrective actions that needed to be taken, and Scott Cole to make sure that the corrective actions were being taken while the investigation was going on. So beyond what the investigation says $I$ don't know if he deceived other employees.
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Q Okay. That's fair.
I think you were asked about this email during your Brian Cave investigation. But I would like to ask about it, too.

A Okay.
Q This is an email --
If you look towards the back, the original email I think was an email from Robert Taft notifying the trustees of the audit findings.

A Sure.
Q I mean to cut to the chase. It seemed like your response initially was more focused on the finding regarding President Hitt's contractor compensation, and maybe another finding. You didn't see in this email chain to address Trevor Colbourn Hall.

Can you explain why that didn't seem to be an issue at the time of your emails?

A I was absolutely convinced that there was a simple mistake, explanation for that that would be easily explained.

And it wasn't until I got a phone call from either -- I think it was President Whittaker who said we are looking into this issue, we think this may be a real significant issue. I said beyond just an error? He said, yes. It wasn't until then. So I completely
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anticipated that that was a simple mistake.
Q Okay. Do you recall how long after you received the email about the audit findings that you had that phone call with President Whittaker, or discussion?

A It was within a day or two.
Q Okay.
A It was within a day or two.
This was Friday, according to this email. I would have expected that by Monday Dr. Whittaker was calling me.

BY MR. RUBOTTOM
Q Do you know if his call to you was after the call with Marcia Krizer? That seems to be with staff it became a crisis --

A I don't recall if it was --
Q -- if it was before or after --
A I don't recall before or after.
Q Did you have --
MR. RUBOTTOM: I'm sorry. We are going to mark that as Exhibit 8. (Exhibit No. 8 marked for
identification.)
BY MS. MITZ
Q Did you have any participation at the decision to hire the outside firm to conduct the investigation
into Trevor Colbourn Hall?
A Only at the board meeting.
Q Okay.
A I met the Brian Cave attorney about an hour before the board meeting for the first time.

I had asked Scott Cole to try to find a law firm, number one, that had not done business with UCF before; number two, that had experience in these arenas and was highly regarded.

And when $I$ was walking in for the meeting that morning, $I$ walked in, met this gentleman. I said, so you know since I chaired the Finance and Facilities Committee for a number of meetings I'm going to ask Trustee Seay, who is the chair of the Audit Committee, I am going to ask the board to designate her to interface with you. That was the first time I met him.

Q Okay. I was surprised to read when we got the Brian Cave report, I think on the first or second page, that part of their charge to look into other projects had been removed.

Did you have any involvement in that decision?
A When $I$ was at the second -- the second time that they interviewed me they said as we were finishing, they said we have been talking with Trustee Seay about focusing on Trevor Colbourn Hall, because otherwise
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there is no way we are going to get this done in a reasonable period of time, we want to make sure that's okay. And I said, that's okay.

I was wanting to get to an understanding of what happened in Trevor Colbourn Hall as quickly as we could. Frankly, this was the second time they interviewed me -- I think was early December, because it was towards the end of their interviews. And for me that was already a really long time to not know what had happened. So $I$ was trying to get to the end as quickly as possible.

Q All right. So I would like to talk to you a little bit about what happened on the December 12th meeting. I believe it is in that meeting when the carryforward summary that was due to the BOG was discussed and there was $\$ 40$ million allocated to the Constellation Scholarship and $\$ 20$ million to deferred maintenance.

How did that come about? I understand from deposing witnesses that you and President Whittaker and maybe another member of administration talked about that. Initially the cost for the scholarship was lower, and then you decided from 20 million to 25 million to 40 million. Does that sound correct?

A I didn't have a conversation with anyone other
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than Dr. Whittaker about that.
He was having conversations with -- he indicated to me that Provost Elizabeth Dooley was looking at what would be a good use for those funds.

And in her department they had identified the use for scholarships because of what it would do to first-year retention, four-year graduation rate, reduction of debt by graduating students. And they had initially suggested or proposed $\$ 25$ million.

I had a regular standing meeting with Dr. Whittaker when he -- where he discussed that with me. And I said is that figure enough to have a real impact? And he said let me go back and take a look at it.

He called me sometime later and said we have decided that a better allocation would be $\$ 40$ million.

Q Okay. And so that was a decision that you guys arrived at and then you presented it to the board as part of the package that was going to the BOG, but not necessarily for approval of the allocation to the scholarship fund.

A Yes.
Q Okay. Have you since learned that that is something that requires board approval?

A Yes.
Q Okay.
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A And the idea at the time was that Dr. Dooley in a committee of staff, faculty, and students that she had put together was going to better define how those $\$ 40$ million were going to be allocated towards the type of students, whether it was going to be one-year scholarships, four-year scholarships for some students, et cetera, and they were going to bring that plan back to the board for approval.

Q Okay.
BY MR. RUBOTTOM
Q Let me follow-up. Where would your delegation doctrine have kicked in in that whole development process?

A Not until the expenditure would have been -would have kicked in. Right?

Because an allocation, but is not being spent


I'm just going off the top of my head. I'm not suggesting that the delegation is perfect. But that's where $I$ think it would have kicked in.

Q Well, let me tell you -- let me ask you about something.

To my knowledge this is the first time that boards have been asked to vote on these fund composition reports.
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These are reports that administration has been filing with the BOG every August and sometimes they do these updates.

A And they presented them to the board.
Q And those had very funny labels and tags.
A Okay.
Q That $\$ 40$ million was represented on that form as an expenditure. Now, I think I understand the logic behind that.

But does that surprise you that that kind of an idea would be presented as an expenditure?

A I would have thought it would have been presented as a commitment --

Q Yes, sir.
A -- not an expenditure.
Q One would --
We have been surveying all the universities on how they characterize these things. That's just one of the issues that has come up.

A Certainly.
Q But you chaired that board meeting, and that document was in front of you, and it said -- I think it said expenditures and encumbrances. There is clearly no contract out there.

But it just didn't occur to you that that's an
odd representation of that particular number?
A No. Because of the procedure that we discussed --

I was more focused on the procedure that would be utilized to identify how the funds would be spent.

Q I understand you may not have ever reviewed a document like that before.

But to your knowledge who put together that document, would that have been Kathy Mitchell or Tracy Clark? Do you have an idea?

A I would have expected that it would have been perhaps led by Kathy Mitchell and with the assistance of Tracy Clark, but also with input from other departments. That covered a lot of different areas, if I recall correctly.

Q Right. But understand this is a concern that we are asking -- the BOG created this form. They do give them some guidance.

Apparently transfers from E\&G including these capital transfers -- capital project transfers are reported in the $E \& G$ budget reporting as expenditures that are transfers and distributions even though they are still sitting in the university accounts for months.

Does that seem a little unusual to you?
A I guess it depends on what is a real -- what
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has been contracted for versus what has been allocated as a commitment for a future expenditure.

Q Right. Okay. Well, thank you.
I don't need you to verify all of my observations, but I do think it would be interesting to you.

Okay. I'm sorry.
BY MS. MITZ
Q So the January 24th, '19 board meting, you mentioned -- and I think it was approved -- a form that you would have staff use from that point on.

You mentioned that it had come from your prior experience I think with another board.

A Yeah.
Q Which board are we talking about now?
A That is the -- I mentioned it earlier today. The agenda memorandum format.

Q Which board did you bring that from?
A It's used at the airport.
Q Does it require a lot more specificity than UCF had?

A Absolutely.
Q When was the first time that you saw that form at the Aviation Authority? Years ago?

A Years ago.
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Q Okay. You talked a lot today about how you felt that you were not getting enough information and you were pushing for more especially with Merck.

Why didn't you make that suggestion with using that form a year, two, three years earlier?

A Different types of institutions, different approaches to doing things.

You know, I generally don't come onto a board and turn things upside down. Staff has a method of doing things and you begin to analyze is this the right way to do it, is there a better way to do it, and it takes time to develop that understanding. So no other reason than that.
$Q$ Okay. So also at that meeting Trustee Walsh moved to extend the Brian Cave investigation. I guess he did that previously and you guys addressed it at that meeting.

Can you summarize your position and why you ultimately voted against the motion to extend the investigation?

A Certainly. I understood the motion to mean extending the legal investigation into what had happened at Trevor Colbourn Hall. He had raised issues such as, you know, who was -- how did the state auditor decide to -- you know, was it a whistleblower, were there
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kickbacks from a contractor to any --
And when you looked at the investigation, the supporting documentation, there was no -- it was clear as to how or why the inspector general had decided to include this in their audit, it is just a big project that had been done and they wanted to understand that; and number two, there was no indication whatsoever that anyone had stolen any money here.

We had already spent like $\$ 700,000--1$ don't know the final number, $\$ 750,000$ in this legal investigation. I thought it was far more productive for us to focus on auditing what had transpired on those other arenas. The same players had been involved, the same timeframe had been involved, the same type of transactions, it was obvious from the work that Trustee Seay had done. So I didn't think a legal investigation was required into those issues. I thought an audit of those issues would be a better approach.

Q Okay. As part of his -- Trustee Walsh's argument $I$ guess to expand the investigation, he also addressed the possible role of the General Counsel's Office. He asked the board to look into that office because he opined that they had been involved in all sorts of things in giving legal advice to various people.
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Do you think in that regard he raised a valid concern?

A If he understood the role that the general counsel had played at UCF and perhaps other entities where -- at least with respect to finance, my understanding was that the General Counsel's Office would have respond to questions but not get involved as a volunteer or uninvited, if you will. We changed that now.

So looking at what happened then I didn't think would be useful because of the way that the system was being utilized.

We have now changed the system. I think if something like this were to happen again, clearly you would look into the general counsel's role.

Q If Mr. Cole had knowledge that E\&G had been used for capital projects, do you think he would have had a responsibility to tell the board about it?

A If he had knowledge and he knew that it was in violation of the restrictions?

Q Correct.
A Absolutely.
Q Okay.
BY MR. RUBOTTOM
Q Let me ask if you think he had a duty to the ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.
board and to the university especially when he is on the circulation of the draft regulations from the BOG, do you think he has a responsibility to know that even though that might be an administrative silo of the CFO -- so when he heard about that, he would have had at least a duty of inquiry to determine that?

A I think that if the system were -- that we have in place had been in place, the answer would be yes. The system that was in place at the time I can't give you the same answer.

Q Can you describe that new system? We haven't heard anything about that.

A Well, now, in addition to the agenda memorandum that specifically identifies the fiscal impact to the university, where the sources come from, and any restrictions of the use of those sources, each project comes with a certification from the president, the general counsel and the CFO that certifies to the board that the proposed funds to be utilized for this particular project are consistent with the laws and the regulations that apply.

And I recommended that by the way to -- or I mentioned that to the Board of Governors early on in this process. And Chair Longback asked all the universities to adopt that same procedure.
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Q Do you think it would be beneficial to engage the general counsel in training the finance staff and be sure that all of our general counsels and their staff throughout the system have training from the BOG as to which laws --

I mean, $I$ don't find very many. It is about an hour's work for a lawyer to read through these things.

A Yes, sir, I think it would be helpful to the general counsels to be involved in that process.

Q Let me ask you a hard question.
You worked with Scott Cole. He has been general counsel for some time. Do you think if that certification had been in place and let's presume that Dr. Hitt knew it was questionable but directed that the expenditure happen anyway, do you think that Scott Cole would refuse to sign that kind of certification with Dr. Hitt and Mr. Merck?

A I do.
Q Okay. Thank you.
BY MS. MITZ
Q So since this all came out in say September of last year, have you counseled or offered any advice to President Whittaker about how to handle this matter publicly?
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A Publicly?
Q Yes.
A No.
BY MR. RUBOTTOM
Q How to handle it publicly or advise publicly? MS. MITZ: Okay.

BY MS. MITZ
Q Have you counseled him on how to present the facts of what occurred to say the BOG or to the media?

A I haven't counseled.
But we certainly have had preparations with his staff _-

Q Sure.
A -- that were preparations for me as well. I needed to understand the facts fully.

Q Sure.
A It wasn't me counseling him so much as preparation sessions.

Q Got it. To get the facts?
A Yes.
Q Got it. Okay.
Are you aware of anybody advising him to withhold any information, by him I mean the president, either from the Board of Trustees or from the BOG?

A No.

Q Have you had any contact with Dr. Hitt since he resigned?

A I saw Dr. Hitt at the groundbreaking for the teaching hospital back in late October, and it was in the morning, and he told me that day he was going to be interviewed by the investigator. I saw him that night because $I$ was one of the presentors of a recognition to him for being a champion in diversity in athletics, and that's the last that I interacted with him.

Q So no conversations about his involvement in this matter?

A None.
Q Okay. Would you be surprised to hear that he hasn't been completely cooperative with this investigation?

A Not terribly surprised because I know that he wasn't doing all that well.

Q Medically?
A Yeah.
Q Got it. Okay. Great.
I don't have any more questions.
BY MR. RUBOTTOM
Q I got a couple of follow-ups.
You said you gave direction to somebody to identify other E\&G funds. Did you give that direction
to the president?
A To the president.
Q Okay.
A To the president. There may have been others in the room, but my direction was to the president.

Q Where can we get a copy of the form that you were talking about? It is not in the meeting materials.

A Is that the agenda memorandum?
Q Yes, sir. I guess it is kind of a format or something.

A Yeah. It was --
But, I mean, I gave it to each board member as a sheet of paper. And my understanding is that it was attached to the minutes of the meeting on the 24 th .

Q Again, we haven't looked at minutes so much.
A lot of these meetings were --
A On January 24th, when the board took up each of my recommendations, my understanding is that the minutes had a copy of that form attached.

Q When you talked to Dr. Hitt about that he was going to be interviewed, did he express any remorse or sadness about the circumstance that had come up?

A He did not.
Q Were you concerned about the divergence between his interview -- the apparent interview
testimony based on what the Brian Cave people say and the letter that he sent subsequently?

A Absolutely I was. I even, you know, stated publicly that $I$ didn't find the letter very credible. It didn't sound like Dr. Hitt.
$Q \quad$ So do you think it's possible somebody in Orlando wrote that for him?

A I think it's very possible that someone wrote that for him.

Q It didn't read like Dr. Hitt's writing?
A It did not read like Dr. Hitt. Dr. Hitt -The statements didn't sound like Dr. Hitt. The fact that he misspelled Whittaker in one place, it's not something that Dr. Hitt would have done. It did not read like Dr. Hitt.

Q Leaving out the general counsel, do you think Dr. Hitt and Bill Merck would have signed that certification for this project?

A That's a tough question.
I think --
I don't believe they would have. I think faced with the reality of having to put their signature on a piece of paper to which they could not, you know shade in any way, I think the likelihood is that perhaps they would not.
$Q$ And this is the only time we expect to be able to have you under oath and interview you.

A Yes, sir.
Q And so $I$ just want to ask you a probably more difficult question. I think it is on the meeting of the 19th. I cannot remember.

But it sounded to us listening to the board meeting that you kind of fronted your presentation on the Brian Cave report with an emphasis on your own exoneration and the board's exoneration.

Can you explain why that was upfront for you?
A Actually, it was upfront because it was short and $I$ wanted to get it out of the way.
$2 \quad$ Okay.
A And then $I$ had to get to all of the discipline that $I$ was recommending as well as the corrective steps. So it didn't make sense to end with that but start with that.

It was important to me because if you've read about me $I$ have spent all of my practice and even my civic life very much relying on my integrity and my honesty. The thought that someone would claim that $I$ had not acted with integrity was simply abhorring to me. So it was important if that was a finding that the board was not aware that we had done something that this staff
had done something that shouldn't be done. I needed to state that. The reason $I$ was upfront is the reason I gave earlier.

Q Did you think that there was specific allegations that members of the board had acted without integrity?

A No, I did not.
But, you know, in any of these circumstances with --

When Bill Merck sent in a letter saying that he had discussed it with all these people, including boards of trustee members, had mentioned me by name, then $I$ considered there is an allegation regarding me by the guy who is really at fault for all of this --

Q So it is in response to the Merck letter --
A -- and the guy that has failed or refused to participate in the investigation. So I wanted to make sure that that was absolutely clear.

Q So it was in response to the public statements that Mr. Merck had made?

A Yes, sir.
MR. RUBOTTOM: Thank you. I appreciate that.
I think we are through.
One thing that's come up to witnesses that
have been in some of these depositions if they had
ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.
counsel, they wanted it on the record, and I would like to tell you that we agree that this deposition has not involved full cross-examination and we understand that might limit its use in judicial proceedings.

Anything else?
MS. MITZ: We have just been asking everybody to agree to not discuss the deposition, the questions asked and answers given until we conclude our investigation. We would ask that of you as well.

THE WITNESS: That's fine.
THE COURT REPORTER: Do you want this transcribed?

MR. RUBOTTOM: Yes.
MS. MITZ: No rush.
THE WITNESS: I'll read.
(Thereupon, the deposition was adjourned at
5:33 p.m.)
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