

# DOMES Meeting Minutes – September 28, 2022

---

**Meeting Date:** September 28, 2022  
**Facilitator:** Dan Schebler, Director of Operations

**Time:** 3:00pm  
**Location:** Santa Rosa County Board of Commissioners Administrative Complex / Boardroom

---

## **Attendees:**

- Dan Schebler (Chief Operating Officer (COO))
- Brad Baker (Santa Rosa County)
- Craig Coffey (Okaloosa County)
- Melissa Thomason (Walton County)

Mr. Schebler opened the meeting and stated the meeting is being recorded via Teams. Mr. Schebler turned the meeting over to Mr. Brad Baker, President of DOMES.

## **Public Forum Comments:**

- No public comments

## **Approval of the Minutes**

- August 24, 2022
  - 1) Mr. Coffey stated his name was misspelled and asked for correction
  - 2) Under the Options mentioned in the minutes – You do not ever pay a dollar amount for options. Basically, we should rephrase that to say, “we should not try to pay a dollar amount.”

Mr. Coffey stated he has no other changes and motioned to approve; Ms. Thomason seconded. All approved.

## **Agenda Items**

### **Discussion on Item I (Financial Audit Report)**

Mr. Schebler opened and stated the audit was presented to the DOMES Board last month in writing and during discussion the DOMES Board asked that the auditors attend the October meeting for further discussion. Present today from Durst & Jordan CPA Firm, are the auditors Josh Durst, Whitney Brunner and Casey Simmons

Mr. Schebler stated this is the first third party external audit performed for DOMES. Up to the point of 2019 – 2020 Santa Rosa County Finance managed the books for DOMES. An outside accounting firm now manages the books for DOMES day to day operations and assist in providing the financial reports the DOMES Board receives monthly. Mr. Schebler advised he thought it important have a full audit done for DOMES in 2021. Mr. Schebler then turned the meeting over to Josh Durst for insight and to answer questions.

Mr. Durst stated he is the managing partner for Durst & Jordan, and with him today is Whitney Bruner, auditor manager and Casey Simmons, audit staff. Mr. Durst stated the three of them worked on the

## DOMES Meeting Minutes – September 28, 2022

---

audit engagement with Ms. Bruner performing most of the field work with Ms. Simmons, he later stepped in at the engagement level to do partner level review of the findings. Mr. Durst went on to state, all audits in our office are subjected to three levels of CPA review. Durst & Jordan is a five CPA firm, and they do a lot of not-for-profit and governmental auditing as well. Mr. Durst stated for a first year audit, things look very good. Mr. Durst went on to provide a high level overview of the audit with the engagement team here to provide feedback and answer any questions.

- DOMES paid for an independent auditor report located on pages 1 & 2 of the DRAFT audit report provided to the Board
- The audit report for 2021, if you look the opinion –says DOMES has an unqualified opinion. Unqualified means the audit is good and means the financials are in accordance with GAP, there were no disagreements or miscommunications with management.
- Page 3 is the Statement of Financial Position. The cash position was very strong at the end of the year it finished at \$2,361,400.00 million

### **Noncurrent assets**

- \$479 thousand dollars in property and equipment
- \$111 thousand in construction in progress.
- There is no debt.

### **Liability side of the Statement of Financial**

- Normal trade accounts payable, were about \$145 thousand, we accrued salaries and wages, which is just the function of the year end timing of the payroll. Then there is an accrued vacation liability. I do want to come back and talk about the accrued vacation liability. That is one of the things over the course of the audit we had conversation about. There is no debt outside of that, the organization this current place to December 31, 2021, has no long term debt or liabilities. So, the net asset position or the equity position is \$2,475,000 million. Page 4 is the statement of activities.

### **The total revenues for the year**

- \$5.9 million came from county grants.
- \$66,449 in in-kind contributions, which you are allowed to receive, because you are operating currently as a 501C (3).
- Inmate autopsy fees were also included in their as well and program services and general administrative expenses.
- Page 5. Program services are expenses directly related to all the different types of programs we are required to provide as part of medical examination support and then the general and administrative costs that breaks down what would essentially be overhead required to provide those services. The breakout of those for 2021 were about \$3 million in program services and \$1.1 million in general and administrative, so you are running at about 25% if we were talking in the context of overhead rate, you are running at about 25% overhead rate. Ideally, in the not-for-profit world your gold star standard would be around 20%, however 25% is not out of line. For new or younger organizations, it is a little hard to be around this range. You typically see the percent be a little bit higher because it has not reached its revenue potential. These are pretty good numbers for an organization that has not been around very long.
- Page 6 is the last really financial statement, which is the statement of cash flows. What is being measured against is the overall changing cash positive. The bottom of the statement cash flow

## DOMES Meeting Minutes – September 28, 2022

---

is \$1,905,069 million dollars. The confirms the beginning and ending cash are accounted for in the report.

- Page 7 are the footnotes disclosures based upon the information in the report we just discussed. If there are any concerns or questions in regard to the footnotes from pages 7-10 we can answer any questions. There were no non-standard accounting disclosures in those pages. This is the end of the circulated audit report.
- The other piece of correspondence presented is required for Durst & Jordan to provide at the end of the audit. We communicated every finding regardless of whether it was material to the financial statements or not. You will see we even included all of the audit adjustments that we booked or posted over the course of the audit in this package. This is a conservative approach and Mr. Schebler agreed.
- Page 1 of the document communicates those charge with governance. The first page is standard accounting language. Observations were made to estimates in the financials, meaning these are not really per se exact numerical numbers that we wrote checks for. Appreciation expense would be one of those; allocation of functional expenses, estimates of in-kind contributions. We do apply some estimates and in your case you do not have a lot of those
- Page 2 references appendices; Appendix A which is corrected and uncorrected misstatements and then we make another reference to Appendix B which were our other audit findings. We provided you with a copy of Appendix A –journal entries, these were noted to show the DOMES Board and readers of this document to be able to identify exactly what was posted as an adjustment

Ms. Bruner stated there were a lot of cash to accrual type entries, there were a lot of big dollar items that were expensed off that were assets obviously. There were things that we reported as in-kind contributions, such as if one of the counties donated a vehicle we have to show an estimated value on-kind for that. There was a lot of stuff being separated from when the county administrator was doing it to when the organization became a non-profit on its own, so there were a lot of prior year adjustments to have a comparative. A comparison from year to year must be done to explain why the changes are made. If something is not a comparative the why must be identified. It was noted that there were a lot of things in the prior year requiring cleanup to make more sense of the current year as well.

Mr. Coffey stated he had a questions:

- 1) Are these statements prepared on full accrual – *Mr. Durst stated that is correct, these documents were prepared on a full accrual basis*
- 2) Moving forward will you all be preparing the month to month statements? *Mr. Durst no- Mr. Schebler added that is a different company*

Mr. Coffey stated he would like to do a modified accrual basis – accrual I find is almost a useless thing to look at in real time whereas modified accrual at least you are almost on a cash basis and then you file accruals at the end of the year.

Mr. Durst stated these are very good questions and some thoughts on that and this is me probably going outside the scope of the audit report, to say here is the way a CPA is going to look at it, here is the way maybe the general public sees it and here is the way a Board member sees it as well because you are right the accrual methodology for purposes of trying to manage your business or your not-for-profit on

## DOMES Meeting Minutes – September 28, 2022

---

a month to month basis is tricky because it's not really a useful tool in terms of monthly financial management. Unfortunately, the audit guidelines in GAP says in the GAP world there is not really a such thing as modified accrual, conceptually there is, but for audit purposes they kind of say you have to pick if you are going to be cash basis or you are going to be accrual basis. What we see a lot of not-for-profits do is the audit report is written on accrual basis. Internally you can manage and present financials on a modified or really a cash basis if that is a better reflection of how you operate month-to-month. What we see, that is fairly common in these audit reports, is if you are not going to go to modified accrual in the sense that you are doing government accounting per se, you are a not-for-profit but you are not a governmental entity. What we will see is a cash basis or modified accrual information presented as a summary at the end of the audit cycle that say hey this is what the accrual basis financials look like, here is what we would have seen if we had looked at this on a cash basis or a modified accrual basis of accounting.

Mr. Coffey stated that is what he is struggling the financial statements on the government side even with issues we have with them, we know what is modified and what is real. I see when you do it for the cities you operate on a modified accrual.

Mr. Durst replied that is correct.

Mr. Coffey asked Mr. Durst if he is aware of the DOMES operating agreement, the interlocal and how we are operated and funded? Mr. Durst replied yes, they reviewed that during the audit. Mr. Coffey stated essentially you have 100% government fund. It is weird for me to switch to non-profit. Mr. Coffey stated in regard to the statement about 25% being a typical non-profit. We are not a typical non-profit. If we paid 30% administrative, it is what is. We have a function and we are not taking donations trying to keep our administrative costs low. One of the questions I have is regarding the large cash carry forward. We fund these things and some of the entities may have paid ahead of the upcoming fiscal year. Can you explain why it is such a big balance? It is classified as basically unencumbered funds like there are no restrictions, and I would say that is not really the case. The donor restrictions are specifically for services that are government property tax dollars, so I do not like the classification that we put them under but that is a second point. Why is the large balance there? Is that because people contributed earlier for the next fiscal year and will just carry over? We would not normally have \$1.9 million dollars left over from the funds we contribute or we should not have or else we should be getting repaid or a credit for the following year.

Mr. Durst stated our understanding of that available cash balance is that at the discretion of the counties that essentially can remain in the financial statement as unencumbered if the county should elect to approve it to be that way.

Mr. Schebler stated from year to year the DOMES board approved that carry forward, but this is due to the calendar year change. We started the calendar year with \$1.9 million because everybody made there fall or October contributions. That is what we talked about last meeting, aligning audit, fiscal years.

Mr. Coffey stated ok, he understands. Then proceeded to ask, so we are working toward that goal. That makes perfect sense. I am good with it now, I forgot calendar year.

## DOMES Meeting Minutes – September 28, 2022

---

Mr. Coffey asked a question about page 11, Appendix B, it says material weakness identified? Says yes. Reportable conditions... matter, says yes, could you talk about that.

Mr. Durst stated Appendix B is the majority of findings we do want to make recommendations; this is where management would need by the end of the next audit year based on these recommendations make a response. We did have a large number of adjusting journal entries and so typically what you would want to see is that the sum value we are adjusting journal entries would be under a certain threshold so that the financials at any given moment and even though they are at an accrual basis and management may be operating on a modified accrual cash basis that those adjustments would not be as vast as they were. We posted all of those and to Ms. Bruner's earlier statement some of these were from the prior period and reclassified adjustments to bring it to a current year presentation.

Mr. Coffey stated we are a fairly new organization and we do not have a lot of policies. We are struggling as a Board to give the medical examiner's team as much autonomy as possible but not be derelict in our overall responsibilities in the financial aspect. One of the things we have not seen a lot of is financial policies. We have talked about them and Dan being a former county administrator who is used to having structured policies in government and there is a balance we have to achieve. How much time did you, there are controls that get test, do you test those policies, do you review those policies, do you adhere to those policies? Are there any comments or guidance on policies they should have?

Mr. Durst responded, yes, if you look at the top of page 12 the very next note addresses that specifically, so we did note during the audit that we do not yet have a sufficient system of internal controls that would meet all of the criteria we would typically expect to see in place. Now that does not mean that the lack of such controls resulted in material misstatement in the financial statements because we were able to apply other substantive procedures to be sure that even though this control might not have been functioning as it was intended we had some other type of substantive procedure we could perform or our record keeping was such that we were able to deduce what should have occurred had the control been in place. Now some of what you are up against there is that your internally and at the general and administrative level you are somewhat limited there based on the number of available staff you have in financial services you have within the organization, segregation of duties. We did make recommendations there. In our recommendations we are happy to make recommendations and provide feedback on a very thorough broad evaluation for internal controls but what we did in that next paragraph is we summarized the ones where we really thought that we need to focus on quickly, meaning before we reach the next level of growth so that these can be isolated and identify good policies and write good policies around these. They are:

- 1) Approval on invoice for non-recurring purchases – whether it is dual signatures on checks, review of bank reconciliations, starting procurement policies
- 2) The biggest thing facing DOMES right now on the internal side is that there really needs to be someone independent of DOMES doing the bank reconciliations; someone different from the person entering the transactions and data. That can almost in certain circumstances can operate on the premises as a dual signature or approval because that is a new set of eyes on it that was not involved in the preparation of the financial transactions within that month.

Mr. Coffey stated going back to policies, obviously again, I think the one thing that could hurt us as a new organization if we had some kind of financial scandal it could reflect on all of us as appointees and

## DOMES Meeting Minutes – September 28, 2022

---

the medical examiners. The accruals of vacation we have some kind of policies for. I do not think we have seen those, \$400,000 is a big number, I think we have seen those for a couple of years, I do not know, do we hire a third party or do you do that?

Mr. Durst stated with this one they assisted with the accrual because we knew it was going to be a big number. Typically, with a new organization who has not booked one yet, we were involved in assisting with that calculation as well. Mr. Durst added essentially the way you calculate it is you go to your sick policy and the first question you have to ask is:

- 1) Is it use it or lose it? If you cannot lose it, then you have to look and say what is the most that earned on the books right now whether we have paid it or not?

That accrual is tricky, because everyone would have to walk in and quit that same day to meet that obligation, but the good news is that liability is probably not going to change a lot. The charge that you have to take in earnings for it now annually should be a much smaller number.

Mr. Coffey then asked how many employees does DOMES have?

Mr. Schebler replied twenty-seven employees.

Mr. Coffey stated \$220 thousand dollars for twenty-seven employees seems high.

Ms. Bruner stated that a lot of it is because the medical examiner's salaries are in there. The hourly amount they are allowed to accrue is very comparative across all the other businesses.

Mr. Coffey asked in the accrued salary and wages, is that from one partial pay period. Is there any other money owed?

Mr. Durst responded that is a timing issue, we were five days in on a 10 day pay period. The accrued vacation is one the taxpayer loves to pick on because it is a big number. It is a good representation of what is earned and unpaid on December 31, 2021.

Ms. Thomason asked Mr. Schebler, don't we have a policy for what the caps are?

Mr. Durst stated yes, and this accrual is in accordance with that policy. Essentially took the payroll runs and broke it down or if we are to cease funding and we had to honor that obligation.

Mr. Coffey stated his last concern, "without donor restrictions" I would argue they are with donor restrictions because they have to be spent within a submitted budget, so would that not be with donor restrictions? We are not technically donors or grants.

Ms. Bruner stated it is basically because its contract for services. When DOMES is able to solicit money from others that would contribute because they are a non-profit it would have donor restrictions but because you all are paying for a contract service there is no donor restriction, it is not a contribution or grant.

## DOMES Meeting Minutes – September 28, 2022

---

Mr. Durst stated you really have to kind of look at the operating agreement and the legal documents that brought DOMES into agreement, this is something that calls in a legal question than an accounting question. If you meet the criteria for contract for services, again the accounting guidance on this, it used to say you can take restrictions and say are they permanent, temporary or unrestricted? Even the AICPA came along three years ago and said it is now you are either restricted or unrestricted, which is it? The funding still has to be used for medical examiner purposes. It cannot be used for other purposes. It does call into question something that may be a bigger conversation, which is do we meet and are we comfortable saying we meet the legal definitions of an entity established and operating as a contract for services entity to county governments. Without that you would then be having a conversation around fund accounting, it starts to look more like a fund accounting question. In our audit opinion based on the documents we have today this presentation is okay and adequate. DOMES is not under any deadline per se. We had this conversation with Dan and stated we can go the governmental route with the audit and look as though we are doing modified cash accrual or fund accounting essentially but now once you are down that path to the point of no return. You can go from here to there but once you are down that governmental fund accounting path you cannot go back here. The legal structure does look as though it was set up for what the presentation would be today. I do not know how many of you remember Team Santa Rosa it was the economic arm of the county, and it was a private organization for a number of years. We did an audit on it and we felt like there were some taxpayers and constituents that did not like our audit, so they hired a second firm, they were the auditors for the county too, and they did an audit and said no this presentation even though they are funded with taxpayer dollars because it is not a component unit. This was a continuous conversation and since they could not get a consensus, Team Santa Rosa ended becoming a governmental entity again. It was no longer able to take private funding. We considered this situation closely in auditing DOMES. Now can you elect to use the other presentation and not be a governmental agency? Yes. We could prepare the financial statement on a fund basis accounting, cost wise you are looking at a higher cost to account for and present financials in that context. It calls into point that legal question for an attorney.

Mr. Coffey stated he was not proposing we move to government accounting; I was proposing that we go to some type of modified accrual or some other standard and considered some of the funds be restricted.

Mr. Durst stated we suggested something along those lines too where you provide a supplemental report within this audit report to provide a presentation along those lines.

Ms. Thomason asked about the uninsured cash, and if a qualified public depository is being used.

Mr. Schebler responded yes and that is something that is common in this environment is to see that comment on audits because you are more than \$250 thousand in a bank account we have exceeded the FDIC limit that threshold unless you want me to open ten more bank accounts.

Mr. Durst stated you see the FDIC limitations quite a bit with non-profits. We have seen some non-profit clients going to their commercial bank and asking can you find an out-of-state bank that you can potentially partner with so we can leave everything on deposit here, but either use overnight sweeps or have co-insurance come through like a sister organization potentially in another state. This one is tricky right now because they do not really want your deposits. They would rather you produce transactional fees that they can produce revenue from, they are not interested in holding a large number of deposits

## DOMES Meeting Minutes – September 28, 2022

---

so it has become a struggle. We are seeing that comment on a lot of our foundations too. They are starting to struggle in meeting that FDIC criteria.

Mr. Baker asked, in talking with our office of management and budget there was obviously a concern over the amount of journal entries but I think you can work through them and understand that. Based on some events and circumstances we need to really firm up your recommendation on the use of the credit card and how we process those statements and make sure we are tagging them to the right itemizations. In the county we purchase the majority of our stuff with a purchase card. We just have to make sure the checks and balances are in place with dual viewers. I do not think we have a policy on that but we need to visit creating one sooner than later. I like his recommendations about large accounts. Maybe we can nominate Mr. Coffey to be the second signer on all the large checks.

Mr. Schebler stated that he would bring to the board the recurring large checks to look for approval for the year. I write a large check to NMS or toxicology contractor anywhere between \$15 to \$25 thousand dollars every month. I do not know if you want a second signature on that. We validate all of those.

Mr. Baker stated the recurring bills are not that big of a deal but anything outside of that should come to the board for approval.

Mr. Coffey agreed with Mr. Baker. Mr. Coffey stated that he thinks we do it similar to the county and then we have different approval thresholds. All things like your rent and regular expenses are ok, but anything over \$50,000 would come to the board for approval. That would give you more autonomy.

Mr. Durst stated we are working on a modified plan for presentation then you could potentially say here is what we plan to spend that cash on. You can disclose as much as you like in a financial statement.

Mr. Baker stated when we line up the fiscal year you will not see \$2 million dollars.

### **Discussion on Item II (Interlocal Agreement)**

Mr. Coffey provided Mr. Schebler a draft this morning and Mr. Schebler sent it out to the DOMES board members and asked that the board review it. If there is a direction you want Mr. Schebler to go in please let me know. This will be go through the four county attorney's and be finalized by the four county boards and the DOMES attorney. We have engaged a local attorney firm on the advice of several of the county attorneys, Lockland, Jones, Sabon.

Mr. Baker stated he did not see the interlocal agreement and asked Mr. Schebler to check to be sure the email went out the email you had for me is wrong.

Mr. Coffey stated he took a stab at somethings, he put the formula in there. Take the current one and do a compare contrast document with strike through underline so you can see what is different. We are trying to get SRC out of the equation, we tried to come up with amortize formula for the operating budget, we tried to bring some clarity to the annual budget process, how you handle carry over reserves, how you handle large capital expenditures. I had some other sections I deleted that I was working on for the large capital project, because that was going to be a special section, but obviously we are not there yet, this was really to try to clean up things



## DOMES Meeting Minutes – September 28, 2022

---

Mr. Schebler asked, it looks like the formula you had was based upon the number of deaths, is that correct?

Mr. Coffey stated yes, he thought based on past conversation that the number of deaths would be used.

Mr. Schebler stated deaths would be based on the health departments number of deaths reported, that is one way and district 19 uses it

Mr. Coffey stated you could take the number of cases and use the same formulary. I do like the county of origin and trying to use that.

Mr. Schebler stated that 90% of the residents that pass away we somehow touch one way or another

Mr. Coffey stated the biggest thing he likes is that it is on a yearly basis and it is systematic whether we use cases or deaths at least we have a formula we all agree on. Right now, there is no formula in the interlocal agreement

Mr. Schebler stated he will work with the county attorneys. He asked the DOMES board to provide their feedback. I will give you a week to let me know if there is anything specific with you and your county attorneys. I will be working with the final version

Mr. Coffey added that it does not show transport services on scene, medical on scene, management credit, I tried to address your concerns in Walton County, so we could keep those in the budget. Beyond scene management that was a little trickier because it was so intertwined. The ME's office would be there some and not for others, so I just threw out a credit for Walton. That could change.

Mr. Schebler added that he thinks they have moved beyond that, and Ms. Thomason has realized that transport is not as easy to find and contract. I think we would look at, since we are looking at it as a district as a scene credit, we would look at modifying our scene protocol across the district, so everyone gets the same service.

### **Discussion on Item II (Task Order)**

I mentioned it in the previous meeting, I expect to finalize that, and I will circulate it via email. I have gotten input from Escambia and Walton Counties to add two and I will give one more option to the administrators, there is not a sunshine thing. If there is anything else let me know. That will be complete and issued this week. I thought it was important to have the discussion today but we did not have all the attendance we desired but it is ok.

Mr. Coffey stated the concern on the task order is Escambia county, I know they are not here today and I know we obligated to look at some options and I have heard two options and then I hear might be others. How many are there?

Mr. Schebler stated there are four options total, 1a and 1b in Escambia, Sacred Heart Campus. The proposals for Baptist campus were due October 20<sup>th</sup>.

## DOMES Meeting Minutes – September 28, 2022

---

Mr. Coffey stated he does not want more options; he wants the current ones flushed out as best we can.

Mr. Schebler stated he spoke with Mr. Gilmore about the concerns and has talked with administration at Escambia as well to make sure we have everything in the assessment that is everything that could be in on the table. There are three options, because one option has an A & B. The first option is Santa Rosa County and the second option is Walton County has offered free land in their industrial park at Exit 70 at Mossy Head and Escambia County has offered an option on Sacred Heart Campus and we are working with them on a building which would be a renovate of 29,000 sq. ft. and also they've asked us to look at continuing to be able to do autopsies in the current facility and expanding it in some way and then having a separate administrative space.

Mr. Coffey asked is the Santa Rosa site tied specifically to the site we have been discussing.

Mr. Schebler stated yes.

Mr. Coffey stated the only reason I am concerned about that is that it could not finalize for us and we would be out.

Mr. Baker stated SRC did not have an alternate site but he would talk with the administrator to see if there is an alternate site available. We are trying to work through some details on that as well. What is the amount on the task order.

Mr. Schebler stated he asked that they keep it under \$50,000 thousand dollars so Dr. Oleske can sign that out, it is not a written policy, but it is what the board is mentioned is that \$50,000 thousand be a threshold. I do not have a final number on the task order yet. Mr. Caldwell and I have been back and forth about this three times.

Mr. Coffey asked is there a tight timeframe?

Mr. Schebler said the timeframe is 60 days. As he mentioned in the previous meeting if you get through one of those sites and there is something that makes the site no longer feasible then report out on that immediately.

Ms. Thomason stated that Commissioner Barker and Commissioner Glidewell wanted me to reiterate that the land would be free land and would not be tied to Waltons contribution in anyway.

### **Discussion on Item II (Task Order)**

Monthly financials have been provided you will see in the email. We are at 98% execution because of those journal entries and because of the accrual charge, without those, we will be at 97-98% execution.

Mr. Coffey stated he has a lot going on and as much as you can pack in there. I apologize for not attending.

Mr. Schebler stated he will send you the monthly financial and we will have the end of the year financials at the next board meeting

# DOMES Meeting Minutes – September 28, 2022

---

## **Discussion on Item IV (DOMES Other Business)**

### **Other Business**

To your point Mr. Coffey, we will execute the contract with the landowner that has a 60 day due diligence period. The board approved 120 days in May so 60 days in September will take us through closing required by the end of the calendar year. At the 45<sup>th</sup> day of the inspection period we would lose our earnest money which is \$10,000 thousand dollars. So, we are going to secure the property at least for the next 45 days.

Mr. Coffey asked is he willing to give you any longer or does he really want 60 days.

Mr. Schebler stated he is pretty firm on 60 days but the price we discussed has remained and an appraisal has been ordered and should be ready be delivered the middle of next month

Mr. Coffey stated that is great. So, from the standpoint of the four evaluations and the operations for closure the title work. Have the attorneys have looked at the option? Have you sent it to the DOMES board yet? I would like to have legal look at it.

Mr. Schebler stated the title is in the works and he will send the option to the board for review.

Mr. Coffey asked if there is specific performance in the option where they can sue you to buy it after a certain date?

Mr. Schebler stated yes after the 45<sup>th</sup> day you can terminate up to the 60<sup>th</sup> day but you forfeit that earnest money.

Mr. Coffey asked so the analysis wont' be done by the 45<sup>th</sup> day

Mr. Schebler stated no it will not be complete, but this is a piece of property that SRC is interested in for potential other uses.

Mr. Coffey asked is the contract assignable?

Mr. Schebler stated yes it is. We are positioned well to have those four options evaluated in a timely manner and be ready to move forward in December to execute the \$500,000 thousand dollars we receive from the state.

There is one other quick note. We will have a grant agreement with FDLE coming to you next month. We were awarded \$500,000 thousand dollars in the local support grant initiative for a rapid DNA machine that will help us quickly identify those that can be to complete the final disposition paperwork for the families.

Mr. Coffey asked the grant agreement with the state is that signed yet?

## DOMES Meeting Minutes – September 28, 2022

---

Mr. Schebler stated the grant with the state is signed and has been sent back to the state. We will not start charging against it until we have a schematic design. That is all I have on this agenda.

Mr. Coffey thanked Mr. Schebler for all his hard work and thank Dr. Oleske for her time today.

Mr. Schebler stated they would try to schedule the next DOMES meetings between December and hopefully get all twenty commissioners at some point to brief out the assessment and get a decision to move forward. If there is anything I can do is get them together please let me know.

Mr. Coffey stated present to all four Boards

**Next DOMES Meeting Date** – October 26, 2022 at 3:00pm  
Okaloosa County Administrative Complex  
302 N. Wilson Street, Suite 302  
Crestview, FL 32563

**Adjourned:** 4:06pm

### **Next Steps:**

- Mr. Schebler to provide recurring monthly statements for advance approval