

Meeting Minutes
Triumph Gulf Coast, Inc.
Walton County Commission Chambers
Freeport Business Park
842 Highway 20 East, Unit 118
Freeport, Florida 32439
March 24, 2026
10:30 a.m. CT

Members Present:

Jay Trumbull, Sr., Chair
Bryan Corr, Sr.
David Humphreys, Vice-Chair
Charles Rigdon
Leslie Weiss, Treasurer

Call to Order & Welcome Roll Call

Chair Jay Trumbull, Sr. called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m. CT. Ms. Susan Skelton, Executive Director, called roll and announced the presence of a quorum.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

On a motion by Mrs. Leslie Weiss and seconded by Mr. Charles Rigdon, the January 28, 2026, Meeting Minutes were approved without objection.

Treasurer's Report

Mrs. Jennifer Davidson, CPA, noted that copies of the January and February financial statements were provided. She stated that no vote would be taken on the statements at this time, as they will be reissued to incorporate accruals for audit purposes. Mrs. Davidson reported that the total accrual for the year is estimated at approximately \$27 million. Of that amount, approximately \$5 million relates to grantee expenses incurred prior to 2025. She explained that this resulted from the timeline established for grantees, which allowed reimbursement requests for up to 18 months, creating an influx of older invoices. Discussions are ongoing with Warren Averett regarding how the \$5 million related to pre-2025 activity should be presented in the financial statements. She stated that the plan is to have the accrual finalized and information turned over to the auditors by the end of the month. At that point, finalized December, January, and February financial statements will be presented to the Board.

Mrs. Davidson then reviewed the January information, noting that January and February asset balances are very similar, totaling approximately \$640 million. For January, the budget-to-actual comparison for administrative costs showed the organization was under budget by approximately \$35,000. Grant distributions for January totaled approximately \$1.3 million, with funds distributed to Okaloosa County and Wakulla County.

Mrs. Davidson next reviewed the February information. Total assets remained at approximately \$640 million. For the two months ended year-to-date for 2026, total grant distributions were approximately \$3.1 million, which included distributions to Bay, Okaloosa, and Wakulla Counties.

Administrative costs totaled approximately \$200,000. For February, the budget-to-actual comparison showed administrative costs were approximately \$38,000 under budget for the month. For the year-to-date period, administrative costs were approximately \$73,000 under budget.

Mrs. Davidson explained that a budget amendment is being proposed to cover AI-related costs and additional insurance costs, both of which will be discussed further during the meeting. She noted that these amendments will allow room for those costs going forward.

Mrs. Weiss asked whether there is also an amendment for additional staff. Ms. Skelton confirmed that there will be three items included in the amendment: the AI component, the contract extension item, and the insurance costs. She further stated her understanding that both the AI costs and personnel expenses will be funded from the compliance line and asked Mrs. Davidson to confirm. Mrs. Davidson confirmed that this is correct. Ms. Skelton noted that this is the reason for the large compliance line reflected in the budget. Mrs. Davidson added that these costs are related to compliance generally, and that the Board had previously set aside funds that may be used to cover grant compliance line items specifically. She emphasized the intent to ensure these costs are covered by that administrative set-aside. Ms. Skelton clarified that this refers to the \$5 million legislative appropriation that is still being spent down.

Mr. David Humphreys asked about the current interest rate. Mrs. Davidson responded that she could pull the latest prime statement and provide a copy.

Mrs. Weiss made a motion to approve the proposed budget amendment and Mr. Bryan Corr seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously on roll call vote. (5-0)

Staff Report

Ms. Skelton reported that the legislature has completed its 60-day regular session but did not pass a budget. As a result, all items considered during the regular session are now dead, and any future items will need to be refiled. She stated that the group is currently awaiting the start of the budget process. Leadership in both houses is still working on allocations, which must be completed before moving forward. She added that the budget discussions will also include a tax package, making it a significant portion of the remaining legislative workload. Ms. Skelton further reported that the Governor has called a special session on reapportionment scheduled for April 20. She noted that there is an anticipated U.S. Supreme Court ruling from a case in Louisiana and that the outcome may impact how the reapportionment session proceeds. At this time, there is uncertainty regarding how that session will unfold.

AI Implementation Project Update

Ms. Skelton explained that the proposed project is primarily an automation and AI implementation, with most of the work focused on automating existing processes. She reported that staff had ongoing discussions with Gray Lopez and reached out to BDO, Grant Thornton, and Deloitte. BDO responded with a questionnaire, which was completed, but no further response was received. Grant Thornton did not provide a substantive response. Deloitte engaged in positive discussions and presentations; however, their proposed scope exceeded current needs and came at a significantly higher cost.

As a result, staff continued negotiations with Gray Lopez and, after several weeks of contract discussions, reached a point of comfort with the proposed agreement. Ms. Skelton stated that,

although the final document was not yet ready, staff is requesting Board authorization for an expenditure of up to \$300,000, with the expectation that actual costs will be lower, and authorization for the Chair to execute the final contract once completed. She noted that remaining items under negotiation include timeline, deliverables, and exit provisions.

Mrs. Sallie Neese, Legal Counsel, provided an overview of the contract structure, which consists of three documents:

- A Master Services Agreement (MSA) covering general terms such as termination, intellectual property, confidentiality, warranties, governing law, and dispute resolution.
- Scope of Work 2 (SOW-2) addressing process development, including design, build, testing, deployment, and hypercare, as well as scope, fees, and milestone timelines.
- A future Scope of Work 3 (SOW-3) for maintenance and support following deployment, with tiered service options (with the middle “managed support” tier selected initially, subject to adjustment).

Ms. Skelton explained that, as part of the Scope of Work (SOW-2) for the automation project, the contract includes provisions addressing potential change orders during development.

She noted that minor adjustments or small modifications would generally not require a formal change order. However, if a change order is necessary, it would follow a written and documented process. Ms. Skelton further stated that the contract contemplates authorizing the Executive Director to approve change orders up to a specified threshold, which had not yet been determined. She recommended establishing a cumulative limit of \$5,000 over the life of the contract to allow for efficient day-to-day operations. She explained that this approach would avoid the need to convene Board meetings for minor adjustments (e.g., small-dollar changes), while still requiring Board approval if the cumulative threshold is exceeded. Ms. Skelton added that the contractor has indicated that minor, non-substantive adjustments may be accommodated without cost. She recommended that the Board include the approved change order authority as part of the motion to proceed with the contract.

Mr. Rigdon raised concerns regarding potential hidden costs associated with AI implementation, noting uncertainty about how unforeseen issues may arise during implementation and whether such issues would trigger change orders. Ms. Skelton responded that the contractor would be required to disclose such costs and that whether a change order is required would depend on the nature and scope of the change, particularly if it alters the substance of the contract or product. She emphasized that legal counsel, including Sallie Neese, Glenn Lovett, and Scott Remington of Clark Partington, have thoroughly reviewed the contract and identified potential risks, and that staff is comfortable with the proposed agreement.

Mr. Rigdon also raised a concern regarding scaling, noting that with most processes your price comes down, but with AI, the more you request from them and the more data they put in, your cost goes up. Mrs. Henderson clarified that this component is not included in the Gray Lopez contract, but instead is part of the organization’s existing Microsoft services through Digital Boardwalk. She explained that you will see an up and down depending on how many times we must utilize AI, and that different months may have different associated costs. She added that staff is working with grantees to reduce duplicative document uploads to help manage those costs. Ms. Skelton added that initial discussions with Gray Lopez included a 10,000-page unit, but staff determined that won’t work, and the current pricing is based on a 20,000-page unit. She noted that this can be adjusted over time depending on workflow volume, particularly as current filings stabilize.

Mrs. Neese added that the contract includes a provision allowing termination with or without cause upon 30 days' written notice, providing an option to exit the agreement if it does not serve the organization's interests.

Ms. Gail Gray (Gray Lopez) introduced herself, noting that she was joining remotely and provided background on her experience, including work with the City of Los Angeles, State of Nevada, City of Las Vegas, and several Florida local governments. She explained that Gray Lopez is a continuation of her prior work following a merger and offered to answer any questions to provide confidence and peace of mind.

Ms. Skelton stated that since initial introductions, staff has had many conversations, all of which have been collaborative. She stated that staff feels confident that Gray Lopez is the right fit, describing the firm as responsive and appropriately scaled for the organization's needs. Mrs. Weiss stated that she had been involved in many of the discussions and that the initial fact-finding process was immense in helping define what the Board needed. She noted that we don't know what to ask because we don't know what we don't know, and that the vendor helped guide that process. She added that the project aligns with the Board's support of AI initiatives and that automating document review makes so much more sense than manual review. Ms. Skelton added that discussions with Deloitte were helpful and demonstrated that the Board is on the right path, though Deloitte's offering was not aligned with current needs. She noted that the selected solution is comparable but more appropriately scaled. Chair Trumbull stated that the Board had previously agreed on the need for the project and that evaluating additional vendors helped address prior concerns about reviewing only one option. He noted that the process helped confirm that pricing seems to be in line.

Mr. Scott Remington stated that, based on his understanding, the project is more accurately described as an automation contract within the Microsoft environment, serving as a stepping stone into AI. He explained that it will help structure data and position the organization for future use of more advanced AI tools, while also allowing the Board to exit the project if it does not deliver expected value.

Ms. Skelton added that completing this process now would benefit the incoming Board, as the most difficult decisions will have already been made.

Ms. Skelton reiterated that the contract contemplates allowing the Executive Director to approve change orders up to a certain amount and recommended a cumulative limit of \$5,000 to allow for day-to-day functionality without requiring Board approval for minor adjustments. Mr. Humphreys suggested increasing the threshold so that you can kind of keep rolling without too many road bumps. Mr. Rigdon stated that \$5,000 is a little low. Ms. Skelton responded that staff would be comfortable with either a higher fixed amount or a percentage-based approach, noting that similar agreements often include a 5% threshold. Chair Trumbull noted that the Board could burn through \$5,000 in a hurry, and discussion followed regarding alternatives. Mr. Rigdon suggested that a 5% threshold would equate to approximately \$15,000 based on the contract amount. Ms. Skelton confirmed that 5% is consistent with thresholds used in other agreements and would be acceptable to staff.

Mr. Rigdon made a motion to approve moving forward with Gray Lopez for the automation project; authorize the Executive Director to approve change orders up to 5% of the contract amount; and authorize the Chair to execute the contract upon completion of final

documentation. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Weiss and the motion passed unanimously on roll call vote. (5-0)

Next, Ms. Skelton directed the Board to the recommendations included in the meeting packet regarding the continuation of staff contracts. She stated that the recommendation is to extend professional staff contracts through December 2029 with the exception of Dr. Frank Fuller, who has requested to remain on a year-to-year basis. His contract would be renewed through December 31, 2027.

She further recommended, effective immediately, the promotion and contract extension through December 2029 of Mrs. Therese Baker to the position of Compliance Director, noting that Mrs. Baker will oversee the recently approved automation/AI project.

Ms. Skelton also requested approval to adjust Randy Lewis's contract to account for additional workload, as outlined in the meeting materials.

Mrs. Weiss asked whether Mr. Lewis's contract requires a specific end date. Ms. Skelton clarified that Mr. Lewis's contract operates on an annual renewal basis. Ms. Skelton added that the proposed adjustments with the exception of newly hired staff, are based on personnel evaluations conducted in October. She noted that newly hired Mrs. April Branscombe has shown strong promise and that staff is pleased with her performance.

Mr. Rigdon made a motion to approve the proposed contract extensions for professional contractors through the end of December 2029, except for Dr. Fuller through December 2027; the promotion of Mrs. Baker to Compliance Director, including a corresponding pay increase; and the amendment of Mr. Randy Lewis's contract to account for additional workload. The motion was seconded by Mr. Corr and the motion passed unanimously on roll call vote. (5-0)

Chair Trumbull asked whether contracts can be terminated during their term. Ms. Skelton confirmed that contracts may be terminated by either party with 90 days' notice.

Ms. Skelton then introduced Ms. April Branscombe, who was present at the meeting. Ms. Skelton stated that Ms. Branscombe has been a valuable addition to the team and has been working alongside staff, including Dr. Frank Fuller, Juliet Milam, and Cori Henderson, to meet with various stakeholders throughout the community. She noted that Ms. Branscombe has been well received and brings significant expertise, having retired from the Okaloosa County School District as Director of Career and Technical Education (CTE). Ms. Skelton expressed that staff is pleased to have her as part of the team.

Program Administrator's Report

Mrs. Cori Henderson, Program Administrator, shared some quick notes about what staff has been working on behind the scenes, in addition to preparing for compliance technology upgrades. She noted that, for the past few years, during the spring and into early summer, staff has made site visits to workforce grantees, and that those in-person and virtual visits are underway again. She added that, in addition to Dr. Fuller's expertise, this year she and Juliet Milam have been able to introduce April Branscombe as part of Triumph's team. Mrs. Henderson stated that, because Ms. Branscombe was previously both the CTE leader for Okaloosa Schools and a Triumph grantee, she has been a wonderful resource, and grantees have been very appreciative of the time she is able to spend working with them.

She further stated that she and Dr. Harper continue to meet with community and education leaders regarding future Triumph applications that are being developed, including rural projects that are waiting on the outcome of the current legislative session's budget before applications are submitted.

Mrs. Henderson noted that staff is also in discussions with existing grantees who have indicated interest in shifting uses of funds and possibly project goals, and that the Board will be kept informed if and when those ideas move forward.

She added that, as a team, staff is continuing to systematize and streamline Triumph documents, processes, and construction reviews, and is making behind-the-scenes tweaks to Smartsheet.

Mrs. Henderson stated that one of her biggest takeaways related to developing the AI-assisted automation is the need for structured data, noting that if the organization wants to use automation and AI assistance for additional future tasks, it needs to be mindful of collecting information in structured ways.

Mrs. Henderson reported that, as of Tuesday, March 17, Triumph Gulf Coast has received 369 pre-applications totaling approximately \$3.2 billion. She noted that pre-applications 371 and 372 have been recommended as not eligible. She further reported that, as of the same date, the organization has received over \$1.5 billion in full applications. Mrs. Henderson stated that the March project snapshot reflects no significant changes from the previous Board meeting, with grantee projects continuing to progress as expected.

She also directed the Board to the first-quarter construction reports, noting that construction activities are ramping up and continuing to move forward across several larger projects. Mrs. Henderson added that Randy Lewis and Harold Branch have remained actively engaged, particularly with projects at Pensacola Airport and in Okaloosa County.

Mrs. Henderson noted that much of the work currently underway has been occurring behind the scenes. She reported that there is a project not listed on the current agenda (Project Maeve), and that she and Dr. Harper have scheduled discussions later in the week with Sallie Neese and Megan Fry to continue moving that project forward.

Chair Trumbull asked what the most common reason is for project disqualification. Mrs. Henderson responded that, generally, applications are disqualified because they request funding for private company use. She noted that one of the recent projects fell into this category, while another involved a tourism-related application that did not meet statutory requirements. She explained that the governing statute is very specific regarding the allowable use of tourism funds, and that the project in question fell outside those parameters.

Mr. Rigdon made a motion to approve the Program Administrator's report. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Weiss. The motion passed without objection.

Economic Advisor's Report

There was no Economic Advisor's Report for today's meeting.

Legal Report

Directors and Officers Insurance Policy Renewal Update

Mrs. Neese, Legal Counsel, reported that the Board currently maintains \$15 million in insurance coverage, consisting of a \$5 million underlying policy and two \$5 million excess policies, at a total cost of approximately \$75,000.

She outlined options to increase coverage through additional excess (“stacked”) policies:

- Increasing to \$20 million in coverage would require an additional premium of approximately \$11,250.
- Increasing to \$25 million would require an additional \$10,100 (stacked on top of the \$20 million).
- Increasing to \$30 million would require a further \$10,100, for a total premium of approximately \$106,000.

Ms. Skelton stated that there were two questions raised by a Board member that would be helpful for the Board to hear, and asked Mrs. Neese to address them. Mrs. Neese explained that Mr. Humphreys had asked whether the policies cover litigation arising from current and past projects. She stated that if there is a grant from a prior year, such as 2020, and an event gives rise to litigation today, the policy would cover it, provided the claim is made during the policy period. She clarified that coverage is based on when the claim is made, not when the underlying activity occurred. She also addressed a second question regarding whether Board members remain covered after leaving service. She stated that there is coverage under the regular policy for retired members, as well as a special endorsement specifically for retired Board members. Mr. Rigdon asked whether the coverage would apply retroactively to the beginning of the calendar year. Mrs. Neese clarified that coverage begins when the policy is bound, not retroactively to January 1. She explained that if a claim arose after the policy is bound, even if it relates to an earlier project, it would be covered, but claims made prior to binding would not be. Mrs. Weiss asked how far back project coverage extends. Mrs. Neese reiterated that it does not depend on how far back the project goes, but rather when the claim is made. She noted that if a claim had already been made prior to the new coverage, it would only fall under the previously existing policy limits.

Mr. Scott Remington, Legal Counsel, stated that the biggest potential exposure for the Board is litigation costs, particularly if Board members are named individually in lawsuits. He explained that defense cost indemnity is the primary benefit of the policy. He added that the policy covers wrongful acts and failures to follow procedures but does not cover fraud, failure to disclose conflicts of interest, or improper personal gain. He further noted that many potential claims would likely be nuisance or process-based challenges, and that those types of claims would be covered. He emphasized that Board members benefit from qualified immunity as members of a public body and that the grant process is not competitive in a way that creates direct winners and losers. He also noted that the organization includes indemnification and fraud provisions in grant agreements to further protect the Board.

Mr. Rigdon asked whether future renewal pricing might be lower if higher coverage levels are requested initially rather than added incrementally. Mrs. Neese responded that the initial increase from \$5 million to \$30 million may have contributed to pricing, but that was speculative. She stated she could follow up with agents to explore how pricing might differ if higher coverage is requested from the outset.

Mr. Remington added that it can be difficult to obtain coverage in the first year, particularly given the unique nature of the Board. He noted that while premiums may decrease over time with a

strong claims history, exposure increases as additional grants are awarded, which insurers consider in pricing.

Mr. Rigdon stated that, as volunteers, Board members should ensure they are adequately protected, particularly those rotating off the Board.

Mr. Rigdon made a motion to direct staff to bind insurance coverage at \$30 million and Mr. Humphreys seconded the motion. Following brief discussion, including confirmation that the total premium of approximately \$106,000 is already accounted for in the approved budget, the motion was put to a vote. The motion passed unanimously on roll call vote. (5-0)

Cybersecurity Insurance Discussion

Mrs. Neese stated that there are two questions: the first being whether the Board wants cyber coverage at all, and the second being what limit would be appropriate. She noted that the Board had previously expressed interest in an exposure analysis and that she had spoken with representatives from Tech Rug, the Lloyd's cover holder for the proposed policy. She explained that Triumph is a bit of an odd animal in terms of cyber exposure, noting that business interruption is typically a top concern but is not really an issue for Triumph's operations. She outlined the other primary concerns as cyber extortion or ransomware, where someone takes over a system and demands payment, and social engineering, which involves psychological manipulation to induce someone to transfer funds or take action. She distinguished this from funds transfer fraud, which involves unauthorized access and direct transfer of funds.

Mrs. Neese stated that she had discussed these risks with Mrs. Davidson, particularly as they relate to Florida Prime holding Triumph funds and noted that there may be some exposure depending on how systems and transfers are handled, although it appears there are strong authentication controls in place. Mrs. Davidson clarified that Florida Prime operates differently from a typical bank, noting that it can only send funds to two pre-established locations and that transfers require dual authentication. She stated that no routing information is exchanged and that transfers are limited to predefined destinations.

Mrs. Neese said that, while that reduces exposure, risks may still exist through third-party vendors such as Microsoft or Smartsheet. She noted that defense expenses and system recovery are key considerations and stated that, in her opinion, having some level of coverage would be helpful, as when cyber incidents occur, they tend to escalate quickly. She recommended considering at least a \$2 million coverage level. Ms. Skelton disclosed that staff had attempted to price cyber insurance through the open market but found it difficult due to the a la carte nature of coverage options and noted that the proposed policy is through the same insurer used by Digital Boardwalk, with both advantages and disadvantages.

Mrs. Weiss stated that she has personally experienced a ransomware incident and understands how debilitating it can be, expressing concern about the potential loss of data within Smartsheet and the difficulty of recreating that information. Ms. Skelton agreed that Smartsheet appears to be a primary point of concern and noted that this is an area insurance providers tend to focus on. Mrs. Weiss added that while Triumph may not hold extensive proprietary information, grantee data could still be sensitive and important. Ms. Skelton stated that staff tries to avoid holding sensitive proprietary information but acknowledged that there is still some exposure. Mrs. Weiss noted that even if the information is not critical to Triumph, it may be critical to grantees if

compromised. Mrs. Neese agreed, noting that the policy would cover restoration expenses, including the cost of recovering documents and rebuilding systems.

Mr. Humphreys shared his experience with ransomware and stated that while insurance can be helpful, having a strong backup system is even more critical. He emphasized the importance of backups that are segregated or air-gapped from the primary system and asked about current backup practices. Ms. Skelton responded that Digital Boardwalk provides regular backups, as does the organization's website provider, but noted that additional information would be needed regarding Smartsheet backups. Mrs. Weiss stated that Smartsheet backups are her primary concern. Mrs. Henderson explained that most documents in Smartsheet originate from grantees, who are public entities with document retention requirements, meaning that source documents are preserved elsewhere, although recreating systems would still be burdensome.

Mr. Rigdon asked about the deductible for a \$2 million policy. Mrs. Neese explained that the policy includes a \$10,000 retention with a \$10,000 premium, and that the full \$2 million limit remains available beyond that retention. Mr. Humphreys noted that, in his experience, insurance typically provides access to experts but does not guarantee recovery of data, particularly in more sophisticated cyber incidents, and reiterated the importance of verifying how backups are maintained and whether they are protected from compromise. Mr. Remington stated that, based on his experience, Digital Boardwalk maintains frequent backups, potentially multiple times per day, and that systems can be restored with minimal data loss, with backups maintained on separate, segregated servers. Ms. Skelton noted that backup systems are geographically and cloud-based, providing additional redundancy. Chair Trumbull stated that additional information is needed regarding Smartsheet and how it is incorporated into backup systems, and Mr. Humphreys added that integration with the planned AI system should also be evaluated.

Mr. Rigdon asked whether a broader technical risk assessment could be conducted to determine appropriate coverage needs. Mrs. Neese stated that she would explore that option, noting that it had been difficult to obtain a tailored analysis previously due to the unique nature of Triumph's operations, but that she would revisit the request.

Following discussion, the Board agreed to table the cybersecurity insurance decision pending additional information. Mrs. Neese agreed to obtain further details from Digital Boardwalk and insurance representatives, including a potential technical risk assessment, for consideration at a future meeting.

Consent Agenda

Chair Trumbull asked whether any Board member wished to remove an item from the consent agenda for separate consideration. He also invited public comment on the consent agenda and acknowledged the presence of Mr. Parker McClellan, Executive Director of the Northwest Florida Beaches International Airport (ECP), and Ms. Becca Hardin, President/CEO of Bay Economic Development Alliance. Hearing no requests from Board members and no public comment, discussion proceeded.

Proposed Amendment to Proposal #259 – Pensacola Escambia Promotion and Development Commission, Inc. – Project Pioneer / Pegasus – NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS – Extends metrics deadline due to construction/renovation requiring more work than anticipated. (Project has created almost all required jobs)

Proposed Amendment to Proposal #296 – Project Maple - Panama City/Bay County Airport and Industrial District – NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS – Extends project deadline by six months to allow project financing to be completed, requires additional amendment prior to committing to use of any Triumph funds.

Proposed Amendment to Proposal #345 – Wakulla County BOCC – Project Safety – NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS – Extends construction deadline and metrics deadline to account for actual anticipated construction start date.

Proposed Amendment to Proposal #355 – Florida’s Great Northwest – FGNW United Forward – NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS – Creates new budget category to allow grant from Florida Department of Commerce to be counted as match.

Ms. Skelton noted for clarification that the consent agenda includes an amendment related to Project Maple (#296), which was requested by staff due to timing issues. She explained that delays arose after the project moved away from Space Florida as a financing partner.

With respect to Project Maple, Mr. Parker McClellan provided additional context, stating that the project initially encountered funding challenges related to working with Space Florida, including complications associated with an international (Canadian) company. He reported that the project team has since engaged with banks, international lenders, and developers, and that a developer has now expressed interest in funding the project. He explained that the requested amendment will allow time to modify the agreement, remove Space Florida from the arrangement, and address the developer’s concerns. He added that initial discussions with staff and legal counsel indicate that these modifications will not present issues.

Mr. Rigdon made a motion to approve items on the Consent Agenda and Mr. Humphreys seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously on roll call vote. (5-0)

Regular Agenda

Chair Trumbull noted that discussions on Project Maeve had been postponed and that the Board had reached the end of the agenda.

Public Comment

Chair Trumbull asked if anyone from the public would like to speak about any items related to Triumph process, policies, and practices. Seeing none, the Chair then invited closing remarks from Board members.

Closing Remarks

Mrs. Weiss expressed appreciation for the progress made on the AI contract, noting that it will be a significant benefit to staff. She thanked staff for their patience and acknowledged the approved raises and contract extensions, stating she looks forward to the coming year.

Mr. Humphreys also thanked staff for their efforts in researching and advancing the AI initiative, recognizing the complexity and learning curve involved.

Chair Trumbull welcomed Ms. Branscombe and thanked staff for their substantial work on the AI project.

Ms. Skelton announced that the next meeting will be held on May 13 at the Aviation Center of Excellence in Crestview (airport location).

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:34 AM CT.