



Speaker 1 - 00:00

All right, I'm going to call to order the September 8, 2025 SWA executive committee meeting. If you would please call the role. All right. Chair Ryan. Vice Chair Furr. Here. Member Shoeham. She's here. You saw her. Member Horlund. Here. Member Matteo Bowen. Member Ryan. I already said that. I'm sorry. No, no. I got AJ down here on Zoom. Okay. Member Dunn. Member Rydell. Member Mead. Here. Member Cagiano. Member AJ Ryan. Online. Member Newton. Member Bright Cruz. Okay. If you would please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance. I pledge allegiance to the flag in the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. Right. We have a very aggressive agenda today and a lot to discuss. We'll start with public comment.



Speaker 1 - 01:16

Before I do, I need some guidance from the executive committee. We have some folks who are online who've indicated they wish to speak. Some of them are the regular folks that we've heard from in the past. Presently, we don't have a procedure. We have historically only accepted from the podium. I hesitate to open this up to anyone who can show up online at any time. It could stall or lengthen out public comment. The options for those online is to submit written comments and provide those to the executive committee, which will be circulated and become part of the record. In this way, we are prioritizing those that are here and ready to speak. What is the will of. I'll turn to my vice chair. I would actually agree with those comments. Okay, Executive committee, any guidance? Any.



Speaker 1 - 02:00

I. I would actually go the other way, but just limit the time. Give them one minute. You know, just give them one minute. That's what I'm saying. All right, what's the guidance? I just think it. Historically, the problem that we create is that we're not. We don't have the forms, we don't know where they're from. It could be from all over the country. We could have invite welcoming comments. And I suggest what they do is if they are unable to attend, written, provide written comments, emails, make it part of the record and be able to prioritize those that are here. Member. Right now, you don't allow Zoom comments anymore. We don't allow. The county does have to be a person. I think the purpose of today is aim to speak. I think you'll have to speak today.



Speaker 1 - 02:40

But yet we should have a policy about that in regarding public comments. So people did come today to speak and we should allow them moving forward. It's either we're allowing it or we're not. I don't, I don't want to stifle, you know, transparency, but we don't allow you guys. And we encourage the written comments 100%. What, what's the will Executive Committee? I concur with the chair. Okay. All right, so we're, is it, are we in consensus that we're going to pass on those who are appearing remotely? They're welcome to submit written comments and we'll focus on those that are here. Is that the consensus? Yes. I welcome the comments of member Brightus and member Idell. Thank you. Right, so let's add to. Well, we have some additional folks who want to go ahead and call. Okay. So public comments.



Speaker 1 - 03:35

Stephanie Joffe, thank you for all the hard work. Make sure you're. Make sure you. Mic's on right in front of you.

The head. There you go. Okay. Thank you. No, it's wonderful. Thank you for all the hard work and thought that's gone into developing the master plan thus far. I really appreciate the long term vision behind it and the clear effort to guide us toward a more sustained, sustainable, zero waste future. I also want to say how much I value the openness Todd and the executive board have shown. Being willing to listen, clear up misunderstandings and talk with us informally after meetings. That kind of accessibility really matters and I'm grateful for it. I do have some serious concerns though, about prioritizing incineration over landfill, which seems to run counter to the plan sustainability goals.



Speaker 1 - 04:32

I really hope I'm wrong, but I'm starting to get the sense that there's an assumption that a fourth incinerator will be added on Oaks Road, possibly even before food waste composting is fully implemented. I believe that would be a mistake for several reasons. One, it locks us in. Building new incineration infrastructure means committing long term to generating enough waste to justify the cost. That could mean that could make it a lot harder to scale up composting or take advantage of new, more sustainable technologies down the road. Two, the emissions data is problematic. Even though incinerated emissions are technically monitored by the state, the data comes from the incinerated companies themselves, which is clear conflict of interest.



Speaker 1 - 05:16

And while we test for known toxins, history has taught us, like with pfas, that we can miss emerging threats for decades or worst case scenario, as with 3M and Dupont, they can be covered up. In addition, if the endangerment finding is overruled by the current administration, no one knows if future EPA and state guidelines will be robust enough to protect us. The Master Plan's focus on organic waste management is encouraging, but it also highlights the need to stay flexible. As imperfect as landfill is, it allows us more room to adapt as cleaner, better solutions become available. Therefore, I'm asking the board to please one reconsider the current push toward incineration in the final version of the plan and to make sure the community has a real voice in this decision, both now and as the plan moves forward.



Speaker 1 - 06:05

Thank you again for your time, leadership and dedication to a sustainable future. Thank you. Stephanie, Nice to see you again. Tammy Lettieri Did I say that right? I never pronounced your last name. You got it right. Thank you. Even if you didn't, don't worry about it. Tammy Lethierry, Coconut Creek so I'd like to point out that no one is talking about the debt the Solid Waste Authority plans to saddle us with by refurbishing the existing incinerated, which you all voted for about a month or so ago. Your plan locks us into a costly four to six decade long financial commitment with the requirement to generate toxic waste to maintain and even expand incineration. How much will it cost to keep these three burners going? Who is going to pay for this? What will it cost to build a fourth burner?



Speaker 1 - 06:53

Who will pay for that? Where will the biochar plant be located? What's the likelihood of throwing a new incinerator into the mix? We know Beam Fir is very fond of them. You're planning a thermal conversion facility on undeveloped land at the Alpha 250 site in West Pompano on the border of Coconut Creek and Trade Winds Park. Seems like the county loves to pollute our county parks. What's next? Incineration of the sludge? For the record, sewage sludge dryers, AKA pelletization, have led to fires and explosions on a number of occasions, as in Palm Beach County, Baltimore, Toronto and New York City, all recent events. It's a difficult waste stream that cannot be easily reduced, nor can we eliminate its toxic pharmaceutical, radioactive and biological contaminants.



Speaker 1 - 07:52

Anaerobic digestion followed by landfilling is the least bad option, but should not be done in such a heavily populated area as ours due to inevitable odor concerns which we are struggling with at the moment. The master plan is all about waste to energy, with zero waste and food recycling and composting a vague, remote possibility. Even with your recent suggestions in reply to my email, it's an affront to our constitutional right to clean air, water and land, all essential to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. This is your legacy. Make it a good one. Vote no on the master plan in its current form. Thank you. Thank you, Tammy. Debbie Green, good morning. Good morning. Debbie Green, Southwest Ranches. Hi. Thank you all again for all your hard work and all that you've done.



Speaker 1 - 08:56

I just wanted touch on a couple minutes is my thing. So now that we actually have minutes from the July 18 meeting, there's the motion that was made by member Newton, seconded by member Mead to instruct SCS to not move ahead with task 14 and 15 of the original contract. No other discussion. It passed unanimously. I think it's important that whole discussion was around that there's no new waste energy. There's no waste of energy contemplated in the plan now. So that is why that was removed. So I just think it's important that it's in the public record. That was the reason 14 and 15 were removed. And it's just as far as, you know, AI is an awesome tool and when it's used in the right ways.



Speaker 1 - 09:44

So where we have medical researchers using AI that, you know, hopefully one day they come up with the cure for cancer and all other diseases. I don't think it's the place for the minutes, any minutes. But this authority, as we saw in the last summary, the minutes were, they were 100% wrong as far as the motion that was made that they're correct in the minutes. But in that summary that was out, published publicly on the website, there's been no correction made to where it said there was a preference to keep any new incineration in the future at an existing site. And what the motion was as it's reflected properly here is that it's only to be placed at an existing site. As far as the, you know, the RFP when you're looking later at biosolids on the agenda.



Speaker 1 - 10:44

I'm not sure how all of that is, you know, how you're looking at that and what methods, how you're planning to use biochar or is it digestive, anaerobic digestion, which seems to be possibly the healthier or the better option to do it. I'm just not sure how the like biochar is being, is thought to being used throughout the plan. And just really quickly, I'm just going to share, you know, when the solid waste working group was sunseting and this group came from that group. I know and I appreciate all the work this group has done because no, this group has never suggested an incinerator elsewhere. But I just want you to know it was prior Commissioner, Broward, county commissioners, and state representatives, plural, that had made those comments, and that's where those concerns came from.



Speaker 1 - 11:41

But I appreciate all the work y' all have done. Thank you. Thank you, Deb. Okay, that ends. Public comment meeting minutes. July 18, 2025, Executive Committee Meeting minutes. Do I have a motion? Motion. And a second. And a second. Any discussion on. On that? Are we going to address the issues that Debbie just brought up? I think both

from changes to the minutes and the summary. Do you have a specific adjustment you're suggesting? Go ahead. Yeah, we talked after last meeting. We will not be putting up the AI minutes anymore, only the minutes that are created by elisa. So we will take. We'll take that out of the equation. And are those going. The ones that are up there that are incorrect currently, they're gonna be fixed. Thank you. Okay. Any further discussion? All right, all in favor say aye. Any opposed?



Speaker 1 - 12:30

All right, Carries unanimously. Executive director report, financial update. Okay, real quick. We'll have cone resident go through the financial update. And then with regards. I think everybody got the update with regards to the solid Waste authority, the mailing address and the phone number. So if there's. I'll get out another on that, but that's been updated on the website also. Good morning. My name is Alex Petrone. I'm a partner with the accounting firm Cone Resnick. I'm here to report on the statement of financial position. Through July 31, cash and cash equivalents amounted to \$1,607,513. Net assets as of July 31 were \$2,077,419. If you have any questions on the financial position. I'll take those now. No. Okay, great. Thank you. Thank you. Any discussion or questions for the accounts? Okay, we have one question. Member Meade, your. Your mic. Thank you. Chair under professional services.



Speaker 1 - 13:39

That's a \$999,000 bill in there. Can we get that broken down a little bit better? And we can. We can provide the general ledger detail to you. Generally, it's the SCS contractor that's in the professional services, but there are a few other vendors as well. Yeah, I'd rather have that broken down. That's a good sized chunk of change. Okay, thank you. Member Meade, any further questions? All right, thank you. Anything else from the executive director for the executive director report? That's you. Anything else? Okay. All right. SWA 2025, 2026 budget. Let me offer this as a suggestion. Before we do that, it's important. We need to do that, obviously, before the governing board but there's a lot to discuss about the master plan, the timeline moving forward, it may influence how we look at this budget as well.



Speaker 1 - 14:29

Is there any objection to Moving up item 10, which is the master plan discussion that includes the timeline moving forward in the rfp? Is there a consensus? All in favor say aye. All right, let's move up the master plan. Item 10, SES master plan that was received on August 3rd. The acceptance of the master plan by Executive committee, the financial framework. Let me offer just some comments before we go into this so we can talk about where we are and help to get some consensus and then we have an opportunity to talk to SES in a more maybe focused way. We're at a crossroads right now. This executive committee has been working tirelessly. In some cases we had two meetings a month, sometimes it was once a month, but very rare occasion where were unable to get a meeting.



Speaker 1 - 15:27

And then when we couldn't get a meeting, we scheduled one in between like we have for this meeting. So the Executive committee has been working to move forward. There are two fundamental options moving forward. We have an August 2026 deadline. We need to walk ourselves back from that deadline, acknowledging some realities that we face in terms of what needs to be done technically at that August 2026 deadline. All that needs to be voted on is the facilities amendment. That seems pretty simple, not building anything. But pragmatically, if the cities or the county are not in support of where we are on the master plan and where we're headed on the financing of this, what it looks like, then it really, they can vote down the facilities amendment and we're done.



Speaker 1 - 16:20

That option, in light of the 50 years of mistakes that were made, doesn't seem palatable. So one option is, we've discussed this in a general sense, is to say, all right, let's begin building a process because we know we have to go out on RFPs, we have to then build a financial model. We have to understand what those options are across SWA assessments or city assessments. And let's take the time to do that. Let's get approval now and build in an additional opt out. That's one option that would give us time to make sure we go through this. The second option, if that's not palatable, requires a commitment of scs, all the consultants, the executive director, our staff, most importantly the executive committee, to move forward in an aggressive, dedicated timeline that I think looks something like this first.



Speaker 1 - 17:21

And these are legs that are not legs of a chair, they're three legs of a stool. If you will, that are necessary to keep us upright. One would be to immediately initiate a change order for SCS to begin the process of getting the RFPs out for what this would look like consistent with where the master plan is. Right. Remember, we're not going to be building anything. We're trying to figure out if we have maximum flow control across all the commodity streams, what players are there and will offer us the best pricing based on that flow control. So that first task would be to get the RFP out. Let's understand what that would mean. That would need to go out essentially immediately. It would need to come back with responses and recommendations by the end of January.



Speaker 1 - 18:27

It'll make sense as I explain it as to why I think that's the case. That would give the executive committee the month of February to analyze the RFP responses. The other components, the other legs on the stool will be parallel that but be able to evaluate those RFP responses, meet on that, require any additional follow up or workshops so that by early March the executive committee is in a position to begin making recommendations on that. The governing board is the one that must approve this. We only make a recommendation. So that would give the governing board we would like, I would think a response by early April. I say that because we need to be cognizant that an August deadline, considering that many cities and certainly the county aren't as active over the summer in meeting.



Speaker 1 - 19:20

It doesn't mean the staffs aren't or the commissioners aren't, the mayors aren't. It's just as a matter of meetings. It's more difficult. The Cities all have 100 and the county have 120 days to approve the master plan once it's approved by the governing board. Having that done in early April would hopefully get most of the approvals by the end of June before most people go out on recess. Parallel to that, we would need a change order for SCS to provide us the analysis that is more refined than task 17 which was a general discussion about how you build a system around solid waste financially to be able to allow us as an executive committee to start making recommendations on what that looks like. I don't want to go too much into the options. SES can do it. Task 17 touches on it.



Speaker 1 - 20:18

But the issue of even the balance between what cities will pay for disposal versus what SWA's surcharge will be for our education and operations and things like that. The balance of that needs to be specific and how we get there

needs to be intentional and has to be transparent. That takes time, and that needs to begin now. Third and parallel to that, we need to make sure that the change order for SES has them in the position to provide the financial report, what that looks like in light of number one and two, which is the RFP results and the analysis from the executive committee as to what that balance looks like, what those options are. And that has to be all done probably by mid February.



Speaker 1 - 21:13

If we have the RFP is coming back at the end of January, if the executive committee throughout the fall is providing the guidance of generally what we think the balance is or how it should be handled by assessments or surcharges or whatever, understanding that the central component of that is making sure we've protected flow control, then it's a matter of pulling together one and two to create three. That has to be in hand.



Speaker 1 - 21:40

If we're going to go to the governing board in early April, it would separate from that would mean that there needs to be a very intense effort throughout the fall of educating individual commissions and the county Commission on the current state of the master plan, the plan moving forward on the rfp, the plan moving forward on the financial options, the plan moving forward on what the financial plan will look like on approval, and the specific timeline. Because I think there will be some cities that may wish to have a workshop or have other discussions, notwithstanding the fact that members are on the executive committee or the governing board, they need to start planning those now because we will not have the time in the summer, in that 120 days to be able to meet that.



Speaker 1 - 22:32

And so what we want to do is be able to say, look, we're working really hard. It's an existential crisis. We know that. That's why we've been working this hard. That's why so much attention and time has been spent by individual commissioners and mayors on this board, and why so much staff time has been dedicated. We need to begin that now, that intense educational effort, and lay out the timeline, because this is where the hard work starts. In reality, we're under a serious time crunch. We're under a serious environmental crunch, a financial crunch, all sorts of things. And we have the capacity to do it, but we have to lay out a timeline, not in a paternalistic way saying, this is what we want you to do, but what we're willing to do. And we need you to come along with us.



Speaker 1 - 23:21

Because if we get, frankly, to March or even February and the RFP has slid and we don't have the financial analysis and we haven't been able to come up with the generalized options and we're not going to meet it. There's only one option left and that is to go back out to every one of the cities and ask for an extension of another six months, which is incredibly labor intensive and has political risk. It is the last I from my position, others may feel differently. That would be the last option that we would want to invite after all this work. So I lay that out as a general some general comments having given this some thought, I know all of my colleagues have as well.



Speaker 1 - 24:05

But I wanted to lay that out so that when we're talking about what the master plan is now and what we're expecting of scs, that we take this incredibly important moment in our history and make some very important decisions and

recommendations today because we're going to have to report this on the 19th to our governing board. And really honestly, this is the first time we're really talking about it. We've talked about a lot of the component parts obviously in meeting after meeting and comments and everything else. But now we are at that juncture where if we fail this next step then the entire system collapses. So I'm happy to open up to comments first but I would like to hear from SCS if this is at least what I've laid out is even doable.



Speaker 1 - 24:49

Because if it's not, then it takes us back to option one. It's ambitious, it's aggressive, but it is doable. Just share for the benefit of those in the room and those watching. That's part of the advantage of having the SES team. So it's not just the resources of SES engineers, it's also the resources of Arcadis and RRS who have been serving you over the past year. Plus but as you stated, we need to be clear eyed. It isn't just the work that we do, it's the work that we do together. Just as we wrote into our current authorization, there's a timeliness to your feedback and we're going to be calling on that because we don't work in a vacuum. We work at your pleasure. But we need that feedback so that we can keep it moving forward.



Speaker 1 - 25:44

But you know, managing, developing, procurements, analyzing the results, we do that every day. The financial work, we do that every day. Supporting the executive director and going out to the communities, the public engagement, we do that every day. So to answer your question, yes, the timeline is aggressive and ambitious. But we are here to support you and we're confident that we can get it. Let me be more Precise. And I'll open up for comments first. I want to, because as I outlined the three legs, one is getting the procurement out the door, back and ready for decision by the end of January. I take it you say that's incredibly aggressive.



Speaker 1 - 26:26

My question to you directly is, if that was the will of the Executive Committee and were willing to do the work we need to in that process, and that may mean additional meetings, et cetera, is that something SES and the consultants can deliver on? Yes, but we need to start immediately. As everybody knows, we have holidays that run through the fall into the end of December. What holidays? The optional holidays of Thanksgiving and Christmas and Hanukkah. But, yes, we need to start immediately developing the solicitations. All right. Second part of that leg was, I don't know if this is the right way to describe, but refining tax 17 to.



Speaker 1 - 27:11

Not that it needed to be refined, but to delve deeper into what the options are, how this would work, the various formulaic approaches, all aimed at the ultimate flow control issues, but also financial stability and being able to this fall be able to fully educate and be able to get some guidance so that when you get to the formulaic process in the first quarter, that at least we're further down the road not initiating that discussion. Is that possible? That is possible. As a matter of fact, we'll be submitting the draft financial framework white paper for everybody to review and provide feedback, and that addresses in broad brush strokes the approaches to finance the Solid Waste Authority.



Speaker 1 - 27:58



All right, the third part of that leg then was the ultimate formulaic output of both the RFPs, as well as how we have structured the variables in what it looks like. And to be able to have that back to the Executive Committee in early March, is that doable? Yeah. Again, it's aggressive, but it isn't just what the SES team can produce. It's also what the support that we need from the Executive Committee. All right, along with that, there are some dollars remaining in the SCS contract that have not been spent. Obviously, a change order for these tasks would need to be approved before we could move forward. What aspects of those three legs would you be able to begin?



Speaker 1 - 28:47

Let's say it was the will of the Executive Committee to start that process, begin with the existing dollars that have already been budgeted and set aside. And how long would it take to evaluate and provide any change orders for the additional tasks outlined in legs 1, 2 and 3? We could start drafting the solicitations following this meeting. I've got. I do not have a clear financial snapshot. We just closed our last month. I can provide that snapshot to the Executive Director, but we would need to prepare a change order and get that submitted to the Executive Director. I know that we have a meeting with the governing board on the 19th.



Speaker 1 - 29:26

I believe the question is, do you want to wait until the 19th, or do you want to provide the Executive Director with some authority to execute a change order based on our discussions today? Okay, I'll open it up for discussion. I know there was a presentation to be had here and acceptance of the master plan, but it really almost is irrelevant if we're not making a decision on what the next steps are. So I think this is. I'd rather consume a lot more time amongst my colleagues discussing this juncture, this crossroad we face. I know we have important updates from other committees and things like that, but this is the most important. This is the reason we exist. So I want to make sure we take the time. So, any further comments before I open it up to my colleagues?



Speaker 1 - 30:08

No, I look forward to the discussion. Okay. Member Mead. Thank you, Chair. I would agree that we need to be aggressive going forward. The easiest thing is to do nothing, and it's also the most destructive thing. So we do need to get ourselves going out here on this. I think Mr. Deitch had answered the question that I had originally asked. My concern was that does the end of January give you enough time to collect the RFPs, analyze them, and get out information? Yeah. I mean, we can provide an outline of what a schedule will look like, but we will be developing three solicitations in parallel. Recyclable material, organic, starting with yard trash, and long term disposal. Okay. All right. Thank you. I would also say that definitely we need to work some time into this schedule for the cities to workshop it.



Speaker 1 - 30:58

I know my city is going to want to do that, and I don't know how many other cities are, but I'm sure many of them are, too. So that has to be built into the schedule. Third thing is, I would appeal to my fellow members, please attend the meetings. I know it's difficult sometimes. We're all busy. We got jobs, we've got other things going on, but this is also important. And the summer was a little bit disruptive. And I think we need to make every effort to attend and be here at the meetings and get the work done. Thank you. Member Mead, to your comment about building in time for the workshop. It's an incredibly salient point.

Speaker 1 - 31:35





It's imperative, which is why I think if we're going to move forward, we need to begin the intense education now with what's coming and give the commissions time. Often what we've done in, you know, task forces and committees and all these things is we show up with the final result and in fairness, everybody who's not involved is busy with other things. And they have their own committees and they have their own task force. It's going to be incumbent on us and on the governing board on the 19 to be able to communicate. We need you to communicate this to your commissions now. We're prepared to provide that support, go out and educate where we're going, what the timeline looks like so that when this starts to come back in January, February, March, these aren't surprises.



Speaker 1 - 32:17

There may be debates about it, there may be reasons, but that's what's going to take the time really, so that come March, when we're talking about as executive committee parallel, I would hope that those that are interested in workshoping have already set their workshops ahead of time. In March, we're giving them six months. If you think you're going to be interested, begin setting that now. And it allows us to also be able to allocate the necessary resources from staff to be at the workshops where possible, either virtually or in person, and plan that ahead. This, this is going to require interlocking pieces to come together in order for us to meet the time frame. So remember, Mead, your point's really well taken and I think that has to be a reinforced message. Thank you for that. Member Rydell and member Bright Cruise.



Speaker 1 - 33:06

You have your light on where you. Okay. Actually you had your light on first, if you want to go. Member Shoham. Sorry, no, let's go ahead. Thank you. So I have three questions. First, I wanted to understand when you talk about the procurement, what is the scope of the procurement? It's basically a services agreement to process material from each of the ILA communities. So what is the cost to provide recycling services, yard trash processing, essentially producing mulch or compost and then long term disposal. Okay, but the transportation of waste from the cities stays with the cities. Correct. Okay.



Speaker 1 - 33:50

So I just think if we're asking our cities to get a workshop on a calendar, which I think is a good idea, we really need to be able to provide them like almost like a small executive summary of what exactly it is that's going to be procured. My second question I think is for Jamie, and that is the Plan B, or I think you described it as the least favorable plan. If we just wanted to have the facilities amendment approved by our cities. Right. Is that's what I'm understanding. That would allow us to take some of the pressure off of this timeline that you're describing. But there's a risk and I want to understand the risk. The way this is set up, the governing board approves the master plan. The city elect, the city commissions do not.



Speaker 1 - 34:49

The facilities amendment has to be approved by all the city commissions. And both of those things have to happen before August, mid August, I think it's August 16, August 17, the elected the city bodies. The way it was set up with the ILA is there's the ability if a city is not happy with the master plan and the facilities amendment, they can opt out. But the way they opt out is by not approving the facilities amendment. So if you were to just present the facilities amendment and you haven't adopted the master plan, you'd be asking the cities to basically commit

for the next 40 to 50 years without seeing an adopted master plan.



Speaker 1 - 35:34

So really the only way for the cities to have a meaningful opt out is for you to have the governing board first approve the master plan and recommend the ILA facilities amendment. And then that goes to each of the city elected officials. So yes, we could take the pressure off time wise by just approving the facilities amendment and putting off the master plan. But then the city is going to be asked to commit for 40 or 50 years without having in their hand an adopted master plan. And I think it's going to be hard to get the cities representing 80% of the population without them knowing what they're buying into. Okay, thank you.



Speaker 1 - 36:13

And then as I recall, during the first phase of this board, one of the reasons that we had to approve giving SES additional time earlier on was because of delays in the municipalities providing you feedback. In part. I mean we're herding cats here. And so my concern is, with such a tight deadline, despite your best efforts, all of our best efforts, what happens if you don't get that feedback and we blow the August date? The way the ILA is drafted, if we don't complete the. They're called the formation conditions, which is the approval of the master plan by the governing board, the adoption and the facilities amendment. If those two things don't happen by mid August, the estuary goes away. Now that's not to say you could not amend the ILA separately and extend the August deadline.



Speaker 1 - 37:22

So I think the, I call it plan B, the break in the in case of an emergency is if we get to March April, May, and we have not progressed as far as we need to. We can go to all the cities and ask them to amend the ILA and the county to amend it and extend that August date to some other date. Now, that requires 100% approval. If one city says no, the SWA goes away. Now, that's not to say we could not create a new ILA with all the other. All the ones that did vote yes, they could just approve a new one saying what we want. So I don't want you to think that one city could just hold us hostage. But it would be hard. It'd be a new. I mean, we'd have to reenact everything that we've enacted.



Speaker 1 - 38:16

Just one question and then we can. I'll just say on. I would like to see a timeline with very conservative deadlines for when you would need feedback. I mean, actual dates. I think that was kind of the problem last time is, you know, a really black and white timeline with maybe give yourself a lot of buffer when you need things. But just one thought. Is it possible for us now to take back to 100% of the cities a contingent extension, in other words, to proceed as the chair is suggesting, with a very aggressive timeline, but to have a what if in there now so that we don't have anyone holding us hostage later, so that we get the cities now to approve something that says we are aiming for August 26th, we're going to give the change orders.



Speaker 1 - 39:06

We're proceeding on all these three parallel fronts. However, in the event that this can't be done by August 26th, we give ourselves a six month extension. Get something a conditional extension agreed to very early, before there's any real pressure. That's a question. From a legal standpoint, yes, legally we could draft something, present it to

every single city, get them to approve it, if that's the will. I mean, it does take the pressure off, but it also takes the pressure off if you want to get it done. The question is that a good thing to do now or is it something you'd want to do in January, February? That's a decision that the board drafting. I also wanted to clarify. The feedback that SES needed before was when they were looking at how much waste each city made, et cetera.



Speaker 1 - 39:56

I'm not sure they need that much feedback on this procurement, but you can ask Mr. D. Yeah, I think the feedback you need is from us. Right. What does it look like? What is the scope of the procurement before it goes out? Which is why, if anything, it's going to be, to Member Mead's point, it's going to be more aggressive on us in the next 60 days in terms of maybe additional meetings, maybe being able. One of the other things I think SES would say diplomatically is that they initially expected from all of us that we provide comments within 5 days of every task report. And we know that didn't happen. Right. So part of what we're having to commit here to is that we may have to have more meetings and people are going to have to be here.



Speaker 1 - 40:42

So we have the quorums and we have to hold them to the timelines, but we have to hold ourselves. And I think he was trying to say that diplomatically, he even at the podium here today, but that would be it. The Plan C, if you would, that you suggest, also has some political risk in that what it will identify is a city that says we're preparing to not participate, and then it's going to really begin to undermine the energy and passion perhaps that we have here because we know if we don't get 100%, we're done. I think the. Well, I said it is legal and probably practical. I want us to see if we could first meet this time frame and then at least we've done our work.



Speaker 1 - 41:32

And as we report back to our individual commissions and we report to our colleagues and neighboring commissions, were able to say we really put the effort in, we just can't meet it. And here's why. And this is all that's left now, can you give us, as opposed to kind of this soft, you know, we're trying. We might get there, we might not. But I offer that it would have ferret out any cities early on that don't have an intention of getting on board. And so if you needed to redo the ila, you would be able to do it earlier. Just to be clear, I think to Jenny's point, it's a really complicated process. If the SWA collapses, all the money has to be refunded, then we have to start all over again.



Speaker 1 - 42:13

Everybody can remember the kind of constitutional conventions we've had to get back on board. So I hope is that through our educational effort, the work of the advocates in the communities that are demanding their commissions continue with this, where the alternative is simply not palatable. It's got to be the key. All right, Member Rydell. Thank you, Chair. A couple quick points, Carol. I think doing that early would. Would be sound. Here's the other issue with it. I can tell you right now there's two people in this room that if we extend from August 26th six months out, you're not here. You're not here. Three other members on the executive board, I think, are termed out. I can't even speak to the governing board. So you have a huge change that comes with an education. So for that purpose, different seat, you're here. No, no.



Speaker 1 - 43:07

My point being, if we extend it six months out, we lose people politically and then you have people that may have different intentions or different motivations sitting on here. So that's what makes me not go that route. We need to expedite the fiscal impacts on the cities immediately. That's my position. Immediately. Because that is the number one question. We were up in Orlando when you start talking to other elected officials from other places about the work we're doing and trying to get buy in, because I think everyone here has bought into the process. There's some things here I don't love, but right now is not the moment to address that. Everyone wants to know what's it going to cost? And if we can't put that out a lot earlier than, you know, beginning of summer, it's a problem. It's a problem.



Speaker 1 - 43:52

We will not have buy in of the cities if there's not a significant education post fiscal impact of the cities, even more so that I think you're going to have to juggle. So, chair, I fully support getting that. Whether it's a change order, however we have to logistically do it, I support expediting that. All right. Now, the other interesting thing, which is why I wanted to go after Carol, is when you're doing that RFP or whatever we're going to call it to get vendor buy in for solicitations to understand the cost. I mean, listen, City of Hollywood is about to award a contract to a new vendor that is groundbreaking, candidly. I mean, I don't know if you've looked at Coastal's agreement. You know, I don't know if it's been awarded or you're awarding it, but it changes a lot of fiscal components.



Speaker 1 - 44:38

Then the other side of that is, and again, I don't want to. This isn't the get into the master plan component of it, but there's things that are going to be required in the master plan that I'm going to have additional costs in my city. Right. So for example, let's take yard waste. If we're separating out yard waste, which is required under the current master plan, under my hauling agreement, I'm going to need a different hauler or an additional cost. So I'm going to. It's like a double lick. So residents of Coconut Creek are going to be paying more because I got to add a hauler or another sub vendor to be in compliance with a waste stream issue that we don't even know the fiscal impact. So I say it as cautionary, prioritize the fiscal aspect.



Speaker 1 - 45:16

But I think you or whoever's drafting really the solicitations has to be super cognizant of points that are, we'll call it required under the master plan and the secondary fiscal impacts to cities because that's what my commissioners want to know. My colleagues on my dad want to know how much is it going to cost. My guys that's here want to know how are we going to have to change. You know, our contract in the city's done any year. Am I going to have to anticipate additional haulers for yard waste? Because we're separating it out under their recycling agreement. Hollywood's having a recycling program that Waste Management has never offered. How are we going to engage that capacity on the recycling and not on the hauling side, but on the waste stream side?



Speaker 1 - 45:57

So I think there's huge, significant fiscal impacts that we need to understand much sooner. Because then regrettably to everyone's time, there's the nuclear option that some city is going to hear that and say, hell no, we're not doing that. And it's going to end up being somebody that's not here, that probably hasn't come to meetings to remember Meade's point that doesn't understand that they can burn the whole thing down. So that's my input. But for the priority of chair, what you were asking for, we need to prioritize the solicitations to understand the fiscal impact on the cities as soon as possible. Thank you, Mr. Chair. And to member Reindell's point, it's incumbent on the individual executive committee members to give thought as matters Rydell has to the individual issues that may face a particular city and be able to provide that.



Speaker 1 - 46:45

And so we can have a dialogue there through a workshop or otherwise work with our staff. So it's an excellent point. Congratulations on solving your legal problem with Waste Management, I guess and Monarch Hill member breakthroughs. See, look at them smiling. The host fees will make people smile. Thank you, Chair. Thank you, Chair. A lot of my questions were answered. Great questions. I appreciate them out there. It helps a lot. Couple of comments though, really quickly. Number one is there's an element of this that I'm actually very encouraged by that based on what the county has brought forth that I think we're really taking the important next step and it really brought it to the light. So I actually think this is a very positive thing. It's obviously going to be a huge challenge given the number of municipalities and all that are involved.



Speaker 1 - 47:46

But I actually think this is kind of taking what we want to do and converting into how are we going to get this done, which I think is critical and I'm actually encouraged to see us get there. The only thing and chair you mentioned it, I just was going to recommend this. I think that we need to put meetings at least between now and say mid November. I think we need meetings twice a month. Again, I think we need to, we should schedule those. If we don't need it, let's cancel it. But let's get it on the calendar so it's on everybody's calendar so that we can get folks here. Let's just, let's just do that. Let's just do that. And, and I think that'd be helpful. All right, thank you.



Speaker 1 - 48:25

Member Bright Cruz A lot before one of the things member Riddell raises is the contracts with individual haulers. I know were trying to synchronize when everybody was coming due. We need to come back to that chart because that'll be part of the discussion. If there's going to be adjustments or no adjustments are possible, we need to begin again bringing that back. Member Dunn thank you. Just four quick points. I concur with my colleagues. Number one, I do believe that we should make sure that we calendar those extra meetings. And to the executive director, if we could just make sure that your staff sends out the calendar invite so that there's no more mix up with meetings and I'll know where I need to be when I need to be there.



Speaker 1 - 49:13

I want to also suggest that it might be helpful for us to re engage staff around this RFP process. I'm a policymaker. I am not necessarily a person that knows the ins and outs of what my city needs in terms of procurement. And so I think it's important to have some city expert tac type person that's at the table as we're going through this. There are I'm sure consideration that it's not occurring to me that may well occur to our folks in the city that they do this all the time. Particularly those like in my city, we are currently, I think have an extension on our contract with our current carrier because our contract already Expired. Right. So this is going to be an urgent consideration. So I would suggest that we engage TAC around the procurement process and then also this timeline. Mr.



Speaker 1 - 50:14

Chair, I'd like to submit that as we are aggressively working on the procurement and getting task 17 completed, that we run also an aggressive community outreach type of schedule at the same time so that we're hitting five things with one stone, if you will. Thank you. So, excellent point. I think, in fact, one of the dangers of an extension is that we slow the educational process. If anything, we're now going to be more vested in having to get out to the

individual cities, provide the executive summary, get the guidance from staff as to what they're concerned about. We need to do that now up front, otherwise. Member fer. Thanks, Josh. I agree with you on this. I don't think we can go back to the cities till we know exactly what we're ready to tell.



Speaker 1 - 51:10

Greg and I went to every city and when went there, we had answers and we didn't for the most part. Now they're going to be asking us, like you said, what's it going to cost? And it will cost more. It will cost more. And we have to have those answers of why it's going to cost more and why it's worth it. And we have to be able to articulate that and why it's. Why it's worth it for the long run and where, why the short term costs, you know, what do those, you know, by just being cheap on the front end. What is the long term cost? And we're going to have to convince every city commission of that. And that is not going to be easy in an election year. Right. All of the above.



Speaker 1 - 51:58

But, you know, I, I think there's, you know, there is a lot, there are a lot of people that want this to happen and they want us to do it the right way, you know, so that's kind of what we're, you know, I don't, I like it. I don't want to go back out until we've got the answers. I do want to pass out a couple things real quick. This is from, this is just to help on the RFP stuff. Some of the things that, because we're asking you to go to do RFPs. The one thing I think that we have not been in this executive committee as good as we could have been is as clear with you all what is needed and what's wanted to make sure that you know exactly what to do.



Speaker 1 - 52:45

I know you guys, I Actually have confidence that you guys can do this quickly. I know that because you have templates of every rfp. You've done Miami Dade, you've done Palm beach, you've done. You know, all you have to do is kind of pull up a template and you're changing things a little bit. So he's trying to get the cost down. I'm trying. I'm doing my best. Yeah. Cut and paste, I think is what you should say. Cut and paste. Exactly. Cut and paste. And you're off and running. But. But what we have to realize is there are things you can't cut and paste. This is part of it, and this is what I'm wanting to show you is that there are numerous options, whether it's on residential curb, whether it's on yard waste.



Speaker 1 - 53:26

And we have to be, you know, I don't know if we would be asking you to do RFPs on each one of these different options or do we need to nail it down? And that's what I think our job is coming up. What are, what is our vision on this? And we're going to have to be clear on it. We can't just say we need an RFP on yard waste a lot more complicated than that. And there's various iterations of that, and we can't get a good answer unless we're asking a good question. So that's important. That's. That's. I think that's my main thing. But I have confidence we can do this. You know, I hope we can do it very quickly because, you know, I want to see. I would love to be able to see us 1. Have this to me.



Speaker 1 - 54:17

I would like to be reverse engineering this from when things would be voted on by the public. I think we, not only do we have this own timeline, but we have. I want us to be looking at when would. That. When would we be voting on



this? If you're doing an assessment. If you're doing an assessment, we're doing it. You know, not everything has to be voted on. It's tipping fees. I don't think that has to. So there's. But if we are going to do an assessment, then we do need to think of when are you. When are we going to do that and work backwards from that. And that puts a little extra pressure on that. I am asking Joe Scott to give us a timeline on that if need be. So we're ready on that today.



Speaker 1 - 55:05

We are simply accepting the master plan. And let me pass this out as well. I think the Wording of this needs to be very clear because it's an acceptance of the master plan, but it is also recognizing that there's a lot of work still to be done before the adoption of the master plan. And that has almost specifically to do with having these financial frameworks in place. Because everybody I've talked to, every commissioner that's not on this executive meeting, they're like you said, Josh, what do they ask? What's it going to cost? And what do I get from that? And what's going to happen? Where's it going? There's a lot of questions. So, I mean, I'm looking forward to getting this, the first part accepted and then putting our sneakers on and going as fast as we can.



Speaker 1 - 56:08

But I do have confidence you guys can do that. To that, to that point, you will need, you don't have to do it here on the fly, but you'll need to give us the date at which the RFP has to go out in order to accomplish the rest the of that time, because that's then incumbent on us, whether it's two meetings, three meetings, meeting weekly, whatever it is to get you that we're going to have to try to do. Does that make sense? Okay. And would you be able to give us that by the 19th? Yes. Okay. Member Horland and Member Bruce very quickly. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I concur with everything that my colleagues have said. And to member Rydell's point, that is the number one thing that we're hearing from our sister cities is about the cost.



Speaker 1 - 56:59

But I don't want to underestimate Commissioner Dunn, Member Dunn's point about tac. I think I had asked a couple months ago about engaging tac. It's one thing for us to come back with the comments from our staff, but I think that's a very important group of people who here with to have been involved in this process. And especially as we're going out for procurement, we really need to hear from the TAC members and what obstacles we may face in going after the procurement process. So thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you. Member Brightus. Yeah, Just a question. So when we are talking about doing this flow rfp every I know that we've submitted for each of the municipalities kind of where our contracts are when they run out and things like that, is that going to be.



Speaker 1 - 57:48

So flow is going to grow over time as these contracts run out and then they hook into the new process, whatever that turns out to be. I assume that is going to have an impact on when we put out this RFP on what kind of price they put out there because they're going to be judging based on the amount of flow they get over this, probably maybe even a five year period as these contracts run out. Are you comfortable that you have the information that you need now on that? Does that need to be refreshed at this point? Where are we on that? Great question. And that's one of the challenges. Right. It isn't just a matter of looking at what's been done elsewhere. There's a lot of moving parts in the procurement process.

Speaker 1 - 58:42



So since we requested copies of the contract collection contracts, anything that has changed, I would ask that information be provided to us because we do need to line up and review each agreement to understand whether there is flexibility in terms of where materials may be delivered to. Sometimes it is as vague as it must be delivered to a designated facility that is within the municipal authority to say where that material goes. But for example, for disposal, it may need to go out of county. And that's sort of a different circumstance that needs to be accounted for. All right. Just as a friendly. Just todd, this point reinforces the need to have a communication as rapidly as possible. But it can't be just, hey, give us an update.



Speaker 1 - 59:37

We're going to need the specific questions that maybe have you had changes not evaluating everybody's contract, but as a general sense, have you made any changes to these elements since you provided us the information last year? Sorry to interrupt, but that needs. That's a priority one. If that's a sticking point for us. Yeah, yeah, absolutely.



Speaker 1 - 59:58

And what I'm wondering, I'm asking the question, I'm not saying this is what needs to be done, but asking the question, is it, do you have that summarized in a way that you can send it back to each of the municipalities so we can kind of check the box rather than, you know, trying to figure out a calendar, what we sent last time, what we should be sending this time, if we have that summary of that, I think we can go down it relatively quickly, maybe speed up the process a little. Yeah, not to over promise, but we can get that to you today. Great. Camera. Write down the number four. Really? Just briefly, really, Jamie. And for both of you, what would be the time? And I don't know this.



Speaker 1 - 01:00:36

If we're required to do this to what's the timeline for an RFP of this magnitude? Is it an A? Jamie, are we bound by anything in our docs that require a time frame? I don't think we are. No, we're not. We don't have a procurement code, so we can. Whatever executive committee decides is going to be the time frame. So I think the critical element is the response period. It should not be any less than 30 days, which is already extraordinarily tight, which is, you know, increasing the importance of having clarity when these solicitations are issued. So, to the mayor's point, we need to know exactly what. We need to be very specific in what we're asking for. If we throw out a jump ball, it doesn't serve anybody.



Speaker 1 - 01:01:25

And we're also mindful of the reputational risk as this authority continues to stand up and walk and hopefully run. We want this to be a successful process because you're sending a signal to the service community and you want them to receive it with the seriousness and interest of the authority. The only reason I ask is I think this is moving towards some sort of consensus to direct to do this. What is your recommendation for time frames? So I'm not going to be the one to say let's do it in 30 or 60. I don't think that's appropriate. In your experience, obviously, there's industry people in the room. What would your recommendation before there's some motion made, which I'm maybe by the end of this meeting to, on a timeline for the responsiveness. I think we can, if we're clear and specific.



Speaker 1 - 01:02:18

I think if the solicitation is on the street for 30 days, that should be sufficient. You may very well get a request from a potential proposer that says we would like an extra two weeks or an extra 30 days. We need to be mindful of that. So we've already had outreach with industry. I would suggest that we have another event so that we are maintaining the connection with the community that we're hoping will respond to these processing solicitations. Thank you. Great point. Member Fir Two things, I think the response time can be. Can be 30 days. If it's very clear as to what's being asked for, then it's like, doable. Second is, I think for all of our contracts, I think all of us can always ask our, you know, people that are haulers, would you be amenable to a, an amendment?



Speaker 1 - 01:03:17

There's always, there's always that possibility. And, and if they want to keep the business, they're probably going to say, yeah, let's, you know, if it's in, you know, and in exchange for maybe another extra year, or two. So, you know, there's always. There's lots of ways to do it to pull everybody back in, pull everybody in a little quicker. I think we should always be thinking about that. Member Mead. Thank you, Chair, and thank the table for putting this together. We provide some options. Back to Mr. Deitch's comments about needing to drill down a little bit more on the RFPs. I would like to suggest that this be put on the agenda for our next meeting. I think it's the 18th or 19th, I'm not sure which it is for discussion. And hopefully we can take this back to.



Speaker 1 - 01:04:04

Again, Member Dunn's point about getting it back to the people in our cities that are knowledgeable on these things, getting their feedback and bringing it to the next meeting so that we are prepared to put up a discussion on these, so that we can give Mr. Deutsch some more guidance on these and drill down a little bit better on what we're going to do in those RFPs so that we can get back some solid, good information to act on. Thank you, Member Meade. Member dunn. Thank you, Mr. Chair.



Speaker 1 - 01:04:33

I actually, to my colleague's point, was going to suggest that perhaps, and I don't know if it's appropriate to bring this up now or during the outreach part of the agenda, but I think it would be helpful to have some talking points summarizing where we are in the process, the master plan, and then whatever timeline we agree to so that we are all giving out a unified message when we go back and speak with staff and our constituents. So I'd like to suggest that also as an action that comes out of this discussion and again, making sure that whatever that is, that we're keeping the governing board up to date. Agree. Thank you. Agreed.



Speaker 1 - 01:05:17

We need to emphasize to the governing board that when they meet the 19th, the next communication to them and their next engagement is not February, it's not March, not April. It's all along the timeline because there are critical components to that. Remember, Rydell, is yours still up? Back to Member Fir. Thanks. To answer your point, because I think the governing board is kind of right now not engaged. And I do think you don't mean that judgmentally. It's just. No, no. Yeah, yeah. Not. Not on their fault. I think we need to find a way to engage them. And I think to that point, and I need to ask Jamie this, we have numerous committees and maybe we should be asking them to be on various committees to pull them into also keeps us. We can't overburden ourselves with Our

committees.



Speaker 1 - 01:06:08

But I think bringing them in and asking them to be part of things right at this stage would be a good idea. Let me just say that the challenge we've had with that's not the governing board with any large group is quorum. Right. So be great to meet monthly with them. We know that's just not realistic, number one. Number two, to the members of the executive committee that are participating in subcommittees, who volunteered for the additional burden and effort, that's going to be on top of maybe what is going to be for some periods, maybe a meeting every two weeks, maybe every week. So we have to be mindful that there's limited resource capacity, not just for ourselves, but for staff and being prepared for each of those meetings. So I'm not suggesting the subcommittees should slow down.



Speaker 1 - 01:06:58

I think they prepare and do whatever they feel necessary to report back. But the priority one has to be keeping us on this timeline, getting the RFPs out. And to the extent that there's going to be conflicts or difficulty in being able to make sure we have a quorum here in this executive committee that is foundational. Everything else at this juncture is helpful. It's instructive, it's beneficial. But it's also a bonus beyond this member breakus. Just real quick, in the past when we've required this information, I've never felt super comfortable that. I mean, I know I talk to my administration and I feel like, okay, they're taking action, and I think they have. But I've never felt super comfortable that it's been acknowledged from the, you know, from. From the SWA side that, okay, we got your information.



Speaker 1 - 01:07:53

You don't have to worry about it anymore. And I wonder if we can, like, put out, like, a. We don't need to publish it to everybody, but, like, for Southwest ranchers, I want to know that you got everything that you need so that I don't have to. I don't have to hassle them anymore. And I think if we can do that, you know, both to the, you know, the technical side as well as the governing board side, so that they can follow up if they need to, I think that will help them engage and maybe help us a little bit. All right, that's an excellent point, referring to your signs to fu. Okay.



Speaker 1 - 01:08:23

I think we're at a point to find out whether there's consensus on the plan and the individual pieces, and I do want to break down the individual pieces because they're important and we're committing to that effort. The first that we would need consensus on is to direct with the current available funding that has not been already spent to initiate the process of the procurement, however that's better described. So there would first need some direction from the executive committee directing SES and executive director to initiate that process. Second. Okay, we have a motion. Second, do we need to. Just so it's clear that there are contingency funds. Right. So we're going to use the contingency. Contingency funds for that. I just want to make that right. But this is not a. This is not a change order that's being proposed at this stage.



Speaker 1 - 01:09:15

There's a secondary one that I would suggest. We need to provide guidance to the extent that we don't want them to get to the end of that and then not be able to continue the effort. Go ahead. First, before. I'm just saying that. I'm just saying that we need to get this moving. I didn't realize there was the echo. It's a voice, the voice of God. I think I

would suggest that we accept the master plan first before we go on to this next parts, because this is accepting what you've got so far. The next parts, where you're going is the parts that are not finished yet, but we're going to meet on the 19th. I'm not sure we need to accept it. Is that a technical legal issue?



Speaker 1 - 01:09:59

I mean, you're welcome to make a motion, but I think there's some refinement to it. I don't think it's necessary for the procurement of it. The governing board isn't even going to be asked to accept the master plan at this point because they don't have the facilities amendment. They don't have. We're going to present it to them. But unless there's some reason. First of all, that's a separate motion. But I understand your comment is that this motion shouldn't proceed on the procurement without accepting. Is that the point? I think so, because we have a. This just says if knowledge received. Right. Is there a legal requirement. Is there a legal requirement in the ILA that we have an executive committee vote accepting the master plan before this next stage? No, there's. There's no legal requirement.



Speaker 1 - 01:10:40

It has no legal impact to, quote, accept or acknowledge that we've received it. Okay. I guess when. When we asked you or agreed that you would have it done by now. Yeah. I felt like you needed. Yeah. Our commitment to the authority was what was to submit it by August 3rd, which we have done. In a sense, it's ceremonial to Accept it because it's distinct and separate from adoption. But. Okay, well, I think we have a current motion on the floor right now. Before we do that. Okay, let me make a substitute motion. And you all have it.



Speaker 1 - 01:11:21

As the current draft of the master plan submitted by your consultant team does not, in its current form, include all the required elements of a master plan as described in the interloper agreement establishing the Solid Waste Authority, I move that the Executive committee acknowledge receipt of the current draft of the master plan submitted by the consultant team and that we direct the consultant team to continue its work toward completion of the remaining items from the scope of services. If I may, and not to pick a fight. Before you have a discussion, there's a. First of all, to the maker of the motion. Are you willing to withhold the motion until this is heard? Correct? Yes, I will. Okay. There's a motion. Is there a second? Thanks, sir. All right. Met second by member of discussion just for discussion purposes.



Speaker 1 - 01:12:08

We believe that we met both the intent and the letter of our contract to prepare the master plan in the performance of that work. It was brought to our attention that there were elements in the interlocal agreement that were not included in the master plan scope of work, which we are addressing. We are addressing through using the contingency funds because we recognize the importance of that work. But for the record, I would like it to reflect that we have met our obligations in our agreement. Yeah, I object to this. Just as part of this discussion. It seems like. I mean, it's obviously well written and it's legalistic, but I don't understand why we're passing on this to say the consultant team has not included all the elements of the master plan. I don't know where that advancement is.



Speaker 1 - 01:12:57

I'm happy to accept the plan and a motion that's amended on this, but it's first, legally not required. Second, it starts to look like some sort of setup. And third, there's already consensus to move forward to complete the financial aspect of. That's necessary for the ila, not the master plan itself. Member Radak. Yeah, we're going to have to be on the opposite side of this one, Mr. Chair, just because I think the ceremonial nature of it, I think is pretty significant. I mean, they met their contractual obligations. They need to be acknowledged by meeting the contractual obligations. And I think this is worded in a way that I don't think. I think it's saying that it's not done yet. I think it's a really legal way of saying it's not done yet, but we're acknowledging receipt of it.



Speaker 1 - 01:13:35

So I actually am very happy with this language as opposed to the hesitancy I have in the document itself on a number of different fronts. But that's still work in progress. They're still working on that. This is just more ceremonial, so I do support it. I understand the language, I don't know why it's necessary and that when I don't understand something it raises the hairs on the back of my neck. So I'll just, I'll add to it. From the county's point of view, we still feel like there's work to be done. There's a financial framework that's necessary and we're in agreement that's laid it out from the beginning.



Speaker 1 - 01:14:08

So other than, you know, I would accept, you know, a friendly amendment that simply has I move the executive committee acknowledge receive the current draft master plan submitted by the consultant team and we direct the consultant to continue work towards the completion of the remaining items from the scope of services and as required under the ila. I don't think it covers it. That's my point. That's why I'm trying to understand why that first clause is so important to county legal and county as a whole. We're acknowledging receipt of what has been presented. We are also acknowledging that there are parts of this that are not done yet. And I for us, we know where we've decided together to do the contingency.



Speaker 1 - 01:14:55

But until that part is done, we don't feel like it has lived up to what the was asked of the agreement with the and what the ILA expected. But nobody's suggesting that. That's why we have till August 26 to finish the financial. I think there's a consensus that's evolved to have the county now put this forward as some sort of statement. I'm not sure how it would be used and that's what causes me concern. I don't see it's functionality if it's the will of the executive committee. I don't want to belabor the point, but quite frankly I don't see it as legally necessary. I am concerned about its language and how it's going to be used particularly to be a bludgeon somehow that after all this work the executive Committee has not delivered on the ila.



Speaker 1 - 01:15:36

We haven't finished the MAS plan which we know we have work to do to get the approval by August 26, but I don't understand its significance and importance and why a motion like this is even necessary and for that reason, I'll end my comments. I'll vote no against it. Okay, let me just add one more part. Part of it was because were thinking about doing an adoption of the plan, and there's no way were ready to do an adoption. This is a kind of a, you know, a step that acknowledges where you're at. But we're not quite to the adoption level yet until that part's done. That's really what it is, because we. We were looking at possibly trying to do adoption at the governing board or, you know, getting there, but we're not there. Right. And I think there's a consensus.





Speaker 1 - 01:16:20

I understand that county legal and the county itself was concerned about and maybe even objecting or trying to prevent an adoption, and that's what this language is intended to do. But we're. I think there's consensus that's not what we're doing. We're trying to finish up the ILA requirements. I'm concerned about the language that seems to reflect. The consultant didn't complain, and I don't think it's accurate. I don't. I don't think it's necessary, and I don't think it advances the mission of the executive committee. Member Meade. Thank you, Chair. I would go along with Vice Chair Fur. I think there's a difference between acceptance and adoption. I think it's a major exception. So that's why I think the amendment is important. Okay. For the discussion, briefly, do you need this? No. Okay. I mean. I mean, if he doesn't need it.



Speaker 1 - 01:17:17

I like how it sounds because I think it's still a work in progress. But if there's something that I'm missing here, which I'm getting the feeling there may be, I'm a no. I'm worried about, as always, about weaponization. So if we don't necessarily need the language, then I would rather not do it then. All right, there's a motion. And second, let's go ahead and call the question. Individual Chair Ryan? No. Vice Chair Fur? Yes. Member Sue Ann? Member Horland? Member Ryan. I'm sorry. I did that again. Member Dunn? Member Ridell? No. Member Meade? Yes. Member Cagiano? No. Member Bright Cruise? No. All right, the motion fails. Back to the pending motion. Member Cagiano, on moving forward on the procurement utilizing both contingency and unspent funds. We'll get to the issue separately of guidance for. But on procurement. There is that motion. A second.



Speaker 1 - 01:18:28

Any discussion on that item? All in favor say aye. Aye. Any opposed okay. Second, to provide guidance purely because we don't have the ability yet to decide it, but we need to provide guidance to ask SCS to generate a change order with respect to developing a more refined task 17 financial plan outline platform for the executive committee. Is there a motion? Okay, I'll get to discussion in a second. A motion by member Dunn. Is there a second? Second by member Cagiano membership. Okay, so I just want to understand for the sake of the change order, both change orders that we're going to be talking about what was in the original scope of your contract because you had a task 17. I'm sorry, go ahead. Task 17 was established as a contingency task.



Speaker 1 - 01:19:23

There was a task three that was a financial component and it was essentially laying out different options for financing and cursory survey of what the market conditions are that was delivered back in February or March 1st. Delivered. So that's exactly my question. Just maybe as part of the change order language as to what was in the original scope versus the scope of the additional work so that we have a clear understanding of what we've already paid for versus now what you're planning to do for both of these change orders. Thank you. Good point. Any further discussion on that? All in favor say Aye. Any opposed? All right. Do you have that you need any further guidance on that consensus? For now, this is obviously coming back to us on the 19th. Right. Okay.



Speaker 1 - 01:20:14

Third was a change order to proposal from SCS to develop the actual financial model in light of both the procurement and the guidance that the executive committee will ultimately give as to the elements of that financial. Is there a motion? Yes, this is a requesting a change order from SCS to essentially build a financial model

of what it's going to cost cities predicated upon the results of the procurement and the guidance provided by the executive committee as to the formulated elements and balances. Okay. Motion by member Cagiano, second by member Ridella. Just the same comment with, you know, being able to clearly see what, if anything was in the original scope that's been completed versus the future work. Thank you. Okay. All in favor? Okay. Member Rydell.



Speaker 1 - 01:21:11

I think it's also important on all these things that we have the ability of encapsulating and presenting this to our own commissions that this is coming down the pipe because this financial aspect is very important. And I just envision whoever it's the PR team, not you or it's in house with the executive director a formulated way that we have something to tangible. I don't care if it's a PowerPoint or whatever it is. Hey, guys, this is where we're at. We're going to have these answers pretty soon. I think that's very important for early education. That's all I have agreed.



Speaker 1 - 01:21:41

When we come through the 19th, assuming it remains the will of the executive committee to proceed forward on these two elements, the one that just passed and the one that's pending, that'll be at the point in time when we need to have a very, as was mentioned, talking points or a summary as to what's coming in the timeline to be in preparing commissions along with the idea of these. If they're going to workshop, they should start planning that in March and what we intend to do. Okay. Any further discussion on that, all in favor say aye. Okay. There'll be elements of the procurement that we're going to want to all, you know, have input on. So you need to begin getting that back.



Speaker 1 - 01:22:17

There was, and I think it's worthy of some discussion that was by multiple members request that we begin scheduling more frequent meetings. How does the executive committee wish to begin that process? We have the 19th that is already set. Obviously moving into October. We should schedule. We have problems. We have one meeting already scheduled. I believe we should schedule a second meeting and we should plan the same thing for November at least and determine whether there's one in December. So we can either try to do that here with everybody's calendars or what is it stretching that your cards up number right up or even though I hesitate, the survey monkeys or whatever they're called that go out, they tend to not be as effective in getting responses back quick enough. What do you suggest, Mr. Story? I think we should get out.



Speaker 1 - 01:23:12

I can get out of Survey Monkey today. All right, so there's that. We can be able to talk about this no later than 19. So here's the point then to everybody. It'll go out. Begin looking at Fridays that don't work for you in October, November and frankly December. Be prepared on the 19th to basically finish that and finalize that. If you need to start putting holes on your calendars for Fridays and then we end up picking doesn't mean that it ultimately won't change from a Friday based on everybody's coverage or League of Cities or, you know, other commitments. But let's. I think that's the best way to probably start. Remember, right after Curious if there's a palette on the people that are always here. Right. Because I think we're always here.



Speaker 1 - 01:23:53

Is there any pal for Friday afternoon like a Noon start time or a one start time as opposed to a nine? No, that was unequivocal. That was a very brief response to that. I think she's giving you a small percentage chance on that one. Anybody else? Some people shaking heads, unfortunately. I just wanted to make a suggestion, and that is that we put. In fact, I was going to say 8:00am versus 9, but. Okay. What I would suggest is even before the survey monkey, is to put this calendar invite out every other Friday from now, I would say, until August 26, if we don't need it, cancel the meeting. But there has been many instances of confusion. We've had instances of no quorum. So I would just say put it on the calendar.



Speaker 1 - 01:24:52

The 8:00am Executive meeting every other Friday and the 9:00-call general board meeting when you need it. All right, so let's do this. Executive Director, pull that together to see if that's doable. There's a number of different elements. Right. We need to make sure this room is available. We need to do some other things. So between now and the 19th, let's pull that together and just assume that we're going to find our way in October, November, and then we can work through the optional holidays, as was noted, all the way through August if we have to. Is that everybody in agreement on that? As a matter of consensus? Okay. Yes. Member Dunn. So that was one of the action item for the Executive Director. I just want to put the second one in the record again, the talking points.



Speaker 1 - 01:25:40

And then the third one is making sure that TAC is engaged. Thank you. Thank you. All right, so there were a number of elements on the agenda under TASC. Under number 10, we've covered various parts of that in different ways. Do you want to go over the financial framework development, the tip fee surcharge, assessments for long term? That document will be provided to the executive committee, preservative, the governing board, and made available for any public comment as well. Okay, so the final one's being presented is what you're saying is that essentially task 17. Task 17 is a contingency task. There have been a lot of activities that have been performed under that with your authorization. But that is the current activity that we're working on. So if you would like us to present the final assessment. Right.



Speaker 1 - 01:26:38

Let me put this, because I know there's some other things we want to try to cover today. We could have a presentation on that. I know you're prepared to give us some information, but it seems like what has to happen is the executive committee should digest task 17. Any revisions that are being done to that, we can talk about that on the 19. Would that be more productive? Yes. Okay. Everybody in agreement? Okay. Anything else that you wanted to cover on the master plan? Well, just in terms of change orders. So we had assumed initially a project period, 180 days plus some additional time, bring us to 240. We have now extended our agreement until the end of this month. There's a lot of activities that we do in support of the authority, working in conjunction with the Executive Director.



Speaker 1 - 01:27:25

I just want to set the expectation that going to the various commissions and a lot of the transactional work that keeps things moving is supported by the SES team. And I would just respectfully ask that be included as an element in the change order so we can continue to support the authority. All right, so while we won't develop a consensus on that right here, be prepared on the 19th to have that as a freestanding item as to what you're proposing and working with the Executive Director so that we can give you consensus and authority. Perfect. Thank you. Anything further on the MAS plan you want to cover? Okay, thank you. All right, so SWA 2025, 2026 budget. That's the other major issue we should try to address before we depart. We have roughly 29 minutes. Presentation by executive Director on this.



Speaker 1 - 01:28:21

The Solid Waste Authority budget really is unchanged except for the items that we put in for the various RFPs that we've mentioned talked about in detail today. I tried to assume with regards to what those would be and an estimated cost with that, but we can refine this even more going forward without really needed direction with regards to an additional assessment for this coming year. Right. To be able to cover these items, especially this change, these number of change orders and the procurement process and all the additional materials that were discussed today. The authority does have the money to be able to operate and till next August, but would not have the funds available for these additional change orders and additional tasks that have been requested today.



Speaker 1 - 01:29:04

So we're really looking on guidance to see if that is something that we'd like to be able to move forward with the additional assessment so that we can take care of all these additional items. All right, a couple questions on that. And first of all, there are significant accounts receivables outstanding from certain cities. Second, as I see, we have 1.6 as of July 31st in the bank accounts assets. So help me to understand how we won't have funds for the surcharge. I mean, sorry for the change Orders between now and the spring of 26 with regards to the 1.6 to 1.57 that money has been in essence would be carried over. Obviously it's used in the alignment for the 26th proposed budget. But the amount of items that are in the 2026 budget do exceed that \$1.57 million.



Speaker 1 - 01:30:06

So we would be able to work again. I'd be able to work through a number of the items you'll see on the second page that I put and distributed today that we would have enough funds to be able to carry through where we are currently with the Solid Waste Authority budget. But the additional funds needed to be able to cover the additional items would not be available. I need to make sure we understand that help us understand. I see some questions from the members on this. How it is that we won't have sufficient the receivables that are still in process. They are assumed that we would get those. You can see that in the \$2 million within the revenue we do have the charge back to the county at the top with regards to the various 50% portions.



Speaker 1 - 01:30:59

That brings us to where we are with the total assets now going forward for the remainder. We take out what is due for that SES contracts current year along with the anticipated expenses for the remainder year. That gives us what's left over at the \$1.5 million. That money is carried over with the \$2 million and it adds in the additional we're estimating. Here's the issue. 1.4 for the for what is going to be the change orders. Just where did that number come from? I guess where did \$1.4 million come from? Those are estimates with regards to what we thought estimated would be for the cost of the various RFPs.



Speaker 1 - 01:31:48

Not that we would be able to process all of these RFPs in 2026, but that was an estimate with regards to all the recommendations that came out of the master plan and being able to address those going forward. Forward, you'll see the stars with regards to the sheet that's in front of you, the stars. Those add up to a million dollars. Those are in essence the main items that were part of the recommendations and the RFPs going forward and additional

costs to be able to deal work with SCS with regards to professional services. Now in addition to that we have increased our costs for community outreach. We've seen that's doubled, almost in essence doubled with regards to that community outreach and education and being able to move those things forward.



Speaker 1 - 01:32:35

Also with regards to being able to work with and get out to each of the member cities for the outreach needed to be able to talk about the education for each of the city commissions. You'll see that in the top portion under section Member Master Cities Outreach, those additions and in addition to that, all the work that's now being requested with regards to the public relations, the communications, the website, there's been a number of different items that also increased for this next time period to be able to accomplish all of the education and outreach that's being requested of the authority. So then expenses have somewhat increased. Now, the second page that you have in front of you.



Speaker 1 - 01:33:21

If we did not do the assessment, you can see what can be accomplished in year three, even with the carryover funds of the 1.5 million because we've been very prudent with regards to spending the money and what would be left at the end of next fiscal year without the assessment. I generally support keeping the assessment where it is, but I need more detail on each line item here for us to approve on the 19th before the governing board. I don't, you know, want to put us in a position we can't move forward aggressively. We've set a very aggressive time frame. I'm just not comfortable in the assumptions for some of these numbers. All right, I'll start from my right member Horland and member dunn. Thank you, Mr. Chair. And I, I agree. I think I need certainly more details on some of these items.



Speaker 1 - 01:34:11

To the chair's point. I was surprised and concerned when I saw the accounts receivable that were still outstanding with the member cities. What are we doing to attempt to collect those funds? They've been contacted numerous times. They've been contacted numerous times individually with regards to that outstanding balance. Okay. And legally, Jamie, where are we with if they don't fulfill their agreement, I can't imagine we're going to start suing cities. But we can certainly send. I should send a letter stronger to follow up after Todd's right. But I'm not sure what we're really going to do to cities that haven't. No, I'm not suggesting legal action, but perhaps a stronger letter because I was actually quite surprised at the number of cities that have not paid. We have received probably half of those.



Speaker 1 - 01:35:04

Those have been put the toss in the bank and shown in the July statement. Those will be are being addressed right now by Cone Rosnick. We also might want to do rather than a legal letter, maybe a letter from the chair might be more sure. And I'm not saying a legal letter But I think a stronger letter, whatever that takes to get those funds in. And again, when we're talking about more details, I was questioning here as we have moved away to our own administrative support, why do we have \$5,000 for League of City administrative support there? That was just a placeholder to make sure that we could stay a member. All right. Going forward. Okay.



Speaker 1 - 01:35:44

And with the no assessment with the administrative manager on page two, that 75,000 going up for 45,000, is that just reflecting a four full year salary as opposed to. Okay, again, I concur with the chair though I'd like more details before we approve this. Thank you. With respect to any communications to the individual cities, I would respectfully request that we hold that communication until after we at least on the 19th have consensus on the aggressive time frame so that we can emphasize that there is work done and that we need their help. I'm fine with that. Okay, thank you, member Dunn and member Mead. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I too would like to have more details. I just want to make sure that I am. Well, first of all, Todd, I know that we've been in communication with my city.



Speaker 1 - 01:36:40

My city manager acknowledged receipt. Did Lauderhill pay? Yes. Okay, perfect. Yes. I withdraw my text that I just sent to city manager. Okay. And then I just want to make sure that, you know, finance is not my thing. So under professional services. Am I hearing this? Am I reading this correctly? That for communications it's \$150,000 plus \$90,000 for master's member city outreach. So that's like 200 something two different firms. One is with regards to the outreach that's needed from conceptual for the website development etc. The other one with regards to member cities outreach plan is specific to the city commissions and this city managers to be able to communicate for \$90,000. That's an estimate with regards that is billed with on a monthly basis. I'd like to look at that.



Speaker 1 - 01:37:40

That was actually going to be done by Mercury communication because that's a lot we might need to go out to. That was a time immaterial. So provide more detail on that before. Okay. Member Mead. Thank you, Chair. Just as a point of order, there seems to have been a lost check. In the case of Weston. Has that been rectified? The check was not lost. It was at a different location. We have got that check. Okay. But you have access to it, so. Okay, thank you. Okay. Member ridell on the 19th. Can we just put up a list of all the cities that haven't paid like is that not common sense. Because every elected official should be here and they could send a quick message on a cell phone to their finance director. Is that a motion?



Speaker 1 - 01:38:22

I don't know how on earth we're not highlighting. All right. It's in the backup, so we'll let you sort out. Well, I understand where it is. I'm not suggesting that. I'm suggesting we. We discuss it openly. Because you're having elected officials that are going to be sitting here, robust, engaged in the discussion that if it's a just a connection issue, I don't know, I think we should highlight. Is on that. It is on that in the financial. In the financial statement. Okay. We'll make sure to identify where we are on receivables on the 19th. I think that's what your motion was. Yeah. All right. Any further discussion about. I think before final approval, you'll provide this backup that we have that for the 19th.



Speaker 1 - 01:39:02

There may be additional questions from the members that will direct us beforehand so we can answer any questions by email. Okay. Make sure that's addressed. All right. Education Outreach subcommittee. Good morning, Mr. Chair. Members of the Executive Committee. Go ahead. Member Dunn. Member Dunn, I'm sorry. Could I make a recommendation to the executive director? Can we pull all the contracts and look at how we're being billed for certain things? Are we being billed by the hour? Is there a flat fee? Maybe there's an opportunity for us to make adjustments. They're all billed by the hour. We should probably. Member Dunn's requesting the contracts, so we'll provide those contracts. Thank you. Thank you. All right. Education Outreach Subcommittee. In the spirit of the budget, we have our next Education and Outreach Subcommittee committee meeting on Thursday.





Speaker 1 - 01:39:54

So they'll be reviewing the 500,000 that's been divvied up into seven different buckets per the Executive committee's requests. So more on that. You'll have that detail. We completed the municipal survey, so we're ready to go. We know how all cities, except for five want to be communicated with, what their deadlines are. They've even offered what events would be great for the authority to have a presence at. So it's very detailed communication. We're good on that front. Yes. I think you provided some of this information already. Can you provide the ultimate result on that? And if there's cities that have not responded, but more importantly, it allows us to see best practices, be able to look and say, wow, look what Lauder Hill does, or Coconut Creek does. Why can't we do that? That shaming of our staff is sometimes beneficial.



Speaker 1 - 01:40:50

So if you can provide that to us, that'd be great. I don't want to shame anybody, but we are waiting on the five. We're going to give them a few days and then we're going to discuss those preliminary results with the subcommittee. Thank you. You're welcome. We did our second round of videos with the students. Nova Southeastern University reached out. We're working with them now, too. So the students, they got 40,000 views. We just keep creating creeping up. They're doing such a good job. Yeah. South Plantation. We did have a great call with the Panthers, Mike Prairie on the sustainability side. They want to do when we're ready the trust campaign, which is in this part of this budget, having Victor and Stanley go to the recycling facility, educate people to show them what happens when your stuff leaves.



Speaker 1 - 01:41:38

So they're all ready for that. And to be a model business example for other businesses of how to handle recycling within their own facilities. Maybe they could bring the Stanley cup there, but point out it's not recyclable. That's right. That's a good idea. Chair. It's renewable. Okay. It's repeatable. If the legal in the mayor career doesn't work out, you can come to the public outreach and marketing side. And then lastly, we had a very good call with Susan Kantrick, the director of applied learning for Broward County Public Schools, about the curriculum. So her feedback was they've already started an assessment to understand how they can get this back into the curriculum. And the summary is it's not required, as we know by the state. It would be voluntary for the teachers.



Speaker 1 - 01:42:34

A good first step her and I discussed on that call was surveying the teachers who teach let me find it, the environmental impact standards and to see how many would be willing to incorporate it as they're starting to develop this curriculum and what pieces would be included. She was very excited about the partnership and that there's potentially help available through the authority. She talked about educating kitchen staff and their janitorial staff further. And then she said that they are looking to host the climate Summit, which they do every year. And we all know this. It brings about 1000 students and faculty to the table and they'd love for recycling to be a very big part of that. So very good.



Speaker 1 - 01:43:21

Our next call is set for later this month on September 22, but I will have a monthly call with them so that we can

keep supporting them and moving forward with them to hopefully get that back into their curriculum soon. A part of that building on the experience from schools in Coconut Creek and elsewhere is making sure that they're building in organics. Yes. And the organic processing that needs to be a central component of this educational outreach as we try to reinforce available resources in the community already and what they can do. Yeah, Susan's great. She'll be great to work with. And to your point, I think whenever we're going to have every school doing composting, that's going to be absolutely essential. My question though is.



Speaker 1 - 01:44:11

Yes, I know you're doing the education like on a survey, but we do need to figure out what our message is with all the city commissions too. And I do wonder if it's. Would be under your umbrella. Yes. To help in kind of putting together what the message would be that we would be bringing to city commissions, talking about short term costs, long term costs, all that, because I think that message is transferable on a larger scale as well. But our first audience is the city commissions. Yes. We've got to get that one down right. Otherwise all the other ones just float away. So I don't know if that's part of your. It is. Okay, good.



Speaker 1 - 01:45:01

I wrote down for the Education and Outreach subcommittee meeting for Thursday to talk about just putting together a short video that just explains your timeline that you're going to be, you know, coming to agreement on very soon so that everyone can bring that back to there. You play the video for a minute and then the person who represents on the governing board or here could then have additional comments. And I think some of the. And I think we need to figure this out of what, what does this, what is the advantage of having swa. How does this kind of give us a little bit of control long term?



Speaker 1 - 01:45:37

All those kind of things that I think the city commissions need to hear, that this allows us to kind of, you know, secure our destiny to quite a bit and all of those parts of that. So that needs to be part of the message and we kind of need to kind of message that a little bit. Have it right now. It's just a thought really. I have a very engaged commission on these issues always. I know some of you may not or you may. I think this needs to be an option to be presenter led, meaning whether it's a slideshow or something that I could be given that I can go and present on the item. I think doing a couple minute video is not. Is going to miss the mark. If we're going to pitch cities, I really do.



Speaker 1 - 01:46:23

And if another city wanted somebody else to come, I think it has to be presenter led. And for. From my perspective, I would love for you to send me. Here's the PowerPoint, Josh. You know, and then I. I give my. I give my colleagues updates every single meeting we have on what goes on here and what goes on behind the scenes. So I would. I would prefer, at least on my preference, let me present it to my colleagues. Yes, but let's have the messaging consistent amongst all cities. We could do both. Sorry? We could do both. Some prefer the other, some prefer the longer form. Absolutely. And the timetable for that really is in October. We need to be able, once we come out of our budget because most commissions are consumed with that right now.



Speaker 1 - 01:47:03

But starting in October, we need to be providing the very detailed going forward outline and then being able to provide meaningful updates. Procurement's done, it's out, returned. We're on our timeline so that each of the members can simply put that up on the screen and it's a consistent message. I mean, it could almost be updated monthly and be held somewhere for all of you to always have access to. You pull down the most updated one for your meeting and you have it there. It's a great idea. Thank you, member. Right now. Great idea. All right. Thank you. Any other aspects on education? Nope. All right, are you up, member? So I actually was going to suggest, in addition to the video, we should have a deck. So I agree with you, Member Rydell fact sheet with timeline and then talking points.



Speaker 1 - 01:47:54

So almost like a toolkit. And then that way, however, which way works best for our political landscape, for us to bring it up and then we have all the tools we need. Can do. Yep, absolutely. Thank you. All right, CND subcommittee update. I'm going to take that one. We haven't had that meeting. That meeting will be next Tuesday here at the 16th. Now, the only things in that bring that up is it's really with the development of a C and D ordinance for the community and the cities within the community. But I also like to be able to consider as part of that subcommittee a commercial recycling ordinance, which is one of the items that is a recommendation in the master plan. I think we can utilize that subcommittee for both the C and D recycling ordinance and the commercial recycling ordinance.



Speaker 1 - 01:48:44

The provided information in the CND white paper listed Lee County. I know that a number have read that, but read that in more detail. It does include a commercial recycling ordinance and the C and D ordinance as part of that example. So I'm just looking for guidance here to be able to add the C and D to The C and D subcommittee, also a commercial recycling portion. Okay. Before we get to that guidance, let me just say that in terms of the time frames that we've laid out here today, while I welcome the CND subcommittee's work on this, and they're welcome to keep meeting to provide, I think we need to put those items really on the executive committee at this point because they're central to the flow control issues that have to be discussed.



Speaker 1 - 01:49:33

In addition, it does touch on, and it's a curious issue. I know the county has been looking at. Let me say it this way. The county has said, look, we would have been willing to invest in glass recycling and other things, but we needed the flow control. That implicates the RFP process in a sense. Right. If the county had its flow control and was willing to invest, that may be something going forward. There may be short term, long term, midterm and long term. But the county facility funded by the SWA process to handle those issues on existing public property may offer the best hedge ultimately to market vagaries, issues surrounding charges and the county's right in saying, look, we would be willing to do this, but we've never had the flow control. We've never had the commitment from the cities to do this.



Speaker 1 - 01:50:29

We can't bring an operator in to do insert whatever proper C and D recycling we know that hasn't been done there, or glass recycling or composting or yard waste. And so this does raise the point of how do we integrate what is the single biggest public asset and what, quite frankly, was the genesis long before we even sat down as a group? Right. We're saying, what could we do within the gaps of the commodity streams from a public perspective, to meet the paramount social and environmental goals while creating a fiscally transparent process? It doesn't

necessarily have to have a profit in it, but can break even. I'm just curious what your thoughts might be on that, because I know you've given this some thought. Sure.



Speaker 1 - 01:51:17

And I think for sure, with regard to yard waste and for sure with glass, C and D is a little more complicated. I think Lee county has the idea that before you either demolish or before you build, you have to be talking about where you're. Where that stuff's going, because there's already an industry in the county where there's places I don't think we want to. I'm not sure, but I think. I don't know if we want to be saying everything. All C and D has to be going here or here. When you already have such a big network of places where it can go with mulch. I mean, yard waste. Yeah. Glass. Yeah. And those places and those kind of things where it makes sense. Organics. Organic. Well, mulch. What's being set up is now that we can use Okeechobee, all composite source separated.



Speaker 1 - 01:52:10

Can now go there. Well, not now, but very soon. So, yeah, those kind of things. But that's an arrangement with Waste Management on that one. But I think our idea of having yard waste go to BIC is a good idea. Glass. You know, I think we're set up. You know, we could be set up for that. Okay. That may implicate RFPs. I'm not really sure because obviously the investment's not there. We need to turn around quick. It may be something that is in the future or is an eye towards the county being able to identify operators to either supplement or provide. But we shouldn't lose sight of that opportunity to guard against the market figures. Member right now moving to extend the meeting. Mr. Chair. I got a Neva at 11, so I will end up having to hand it over.



Speaker 1 - 01:52:56

But I have no objection to. I mean, there's a couple things. It's the will of the board. If we choose to get through what we're getting through, we're almost done. Well, I don't know. You got something on here about wt. I don't know how quickly that's going to get done. So anyway, to the C and D, the request from the executive director was to add the commercial recycling ordinance. Is there any objection to adding that to the burden of the C and D committee? Okay. And then second, I think we ought to bring those presentations at least forward so that we have an understanding of the opportunities for flow control. It is part both economic and regulatory. Right. So we need to have that in October for sure.



Speaker 1 - 01:53:35

We need to be fully versed in that and be making those recommendations because it may have impacts on the RFP process as well. Is that fair? Okay. Any further guidance on that? All right. Master plan wt Long term disposal may or fer. I think, I think this is necessary to have a subcommittee on this. It is a, you know, it's a big part of our waste stream where it goes, but there's a lot of. And when we're looking at costs and things like that, we need to be looking at what the options are, whether it's another burner, whether or not your plant we're planning ahead for if that one goes down. What do we do? What happens if we, you know what are the thresholds where you need it or don't need it. Another one.



Speaker 1 - 01:54:18

All those kind of things need to be brought in and what those possible costs would because they think when we go

to the city commissions, they're going to be asking them and we need to be given those kind of range things. And what happens if there's, you know, other things that might come in, whether they're unsolicited bids, all those kind of things, what kind of tipping feeds. This is a range of stuff. I do think there needs to be a group that is discussing this, that can. That can kind of bring this to this group. That's all. I have no objection if folks want to create one. I just don't think right now that's going to be part of what we're going to be bringing back to the cities for approval in August. We have finite resources.



Speaker 1 - 01:54:59

I mean, obviously, maybe it would have been helpful to have that subcommittee when the south plant was out for purchase and could have evaluated whether the county should buy it or not. But even if that is the case, it's. This is so detailed, so involved, it's going to take us off task, quite frankly. I'm not saying in the future it's not going to be potentially relevant. We know that in the MAS plan there's some discussion of 10 Pless, and there's been discussions about site restrictions and not beyond the current existing site and what a fourth might look like.



Speaker 1 - 01:55:33

But right now I think we have to develop a master plan, a financial model to deal with the flow that we have with the facilities we have without getting caught in the quagmire, the very complicated financing, particularly since we already paid for this plant once. Go ahead, member. Right now I think we need to show other cities that there's a. We're addressing it. That what? That we're addressing this concept of wt. I mean, listen, if this is worded wrong and presented wrong, maybe his commission doesn't vote for it, right? Maybe Miramar doesn't vote for it. So I say it because I think it needs to be. We need to show we're addressing it. Mike. That's what I. That's what I think. Addressing what, though? Because we're not going to come to a conclusion. What are we.



Speaker 1 - 01:56:16

We're going to vote on a fourth boiler or we're not. We're not. We know that's not part of this plan right now. We know it's not part of the financing. We know we're not suggesting it that to Go and make this the tail that wags the dog on something that quite frankly, we have to deal with our recyclable, our yard waste, our C and D, our cart, household waste before we could even begin. We have to make sure this SWA is going to even stand up and exist past August. And that is priority one. Thereafter, there could be debates about whether it's ever going to expand and if. And if somebody votes out of this because they're fearful that someday there could be an expansion of the boiler. And it wasn't a commitment.



Speaker 1 - 01:56:50

Any commitment this board makes, any commitment the government board makes only exists as long as the memory is of that commitment. And then thereafter, it's going to be about needs. So even if we voted, we're never going to do WTE ever again. We're not going to ever expand. Two years from now, they could do it anyway. So to me, this is form over substance. And I worry that the complexity of even getting into this, everything from medical to environmental, to what, a fourth, to financing to bonding, to paying yet again for the plant that we already purchased, all of that just takes us off the first priority, which is, I think, me, just me, whatever the will of the executive committee is.



Speaker 1 - 01:57:32

But to take away the resources where we're meeting every other week, if not every week between now and the end of August, and start dedicating significant time to waste energy, which if we do not, it cannot be a learned result, it can't be an educated result. It will only be a perfunctory nod to whatever the wins are out there, to me is a distraction and frankly is not part of this master plan. I'm going to resist you a little bit on that we need to address it in our outreach to the cities in some capacity. It needs to be addressed. What does the request here is to establish a subcommittee to start evaluating potential financing options for a fourth boiler. And what WT is in here. We know 750,000 tons go to WT now.



Speaker 1 - 01:58:21

And we know that there are some cities who proclaim that they're opposed to WT that are sending tens of thousands of tons of wt. What more is it is part of the solution right now. And we have not, as an executive committee or a government board said we're going to do anything further than what is an existing site. That part I agree with. But to establish a subcommittee that makes it look like now what we're going to do is start weighing and evaluating and let's start arguing over environmental and medical and scientific and EPA and what are more advanced and less advanced and then the financing and what does that look like? What does it do to the tipping fee and is going to be a surcharge that would be necessary to have that discussion. I think that's a distraction.



Speaker 1 - 01:59:03

I. I'm happy to have any discussion with any city that says we don't understand your wte it. It's right there, 750,000 tons. If you don't want to send your stuff there, don't send your stuff there. And if you have a solution to reduce so we don't have to send any residual there, all the better. But right now we're not anywhere near poised to be able to even conceive of what that looks like, in my opinion. And given the extraordinary time we're going to have to take just to try to make April, it seems to me that it is a distraction. Sure. Well, you can't even debate the guy. You just need pontificates. I love him, but I support Mayor First's request candidly and I think in the governance of long term planning, the discussion needs to be had. So thank you, Mike.



Speaker 1 - 01:59:50

I didn't mean any offense, but you were a better lawyer than me today. Yeah, I actually agree with what you're saying. I think that this is a distraction at this point. I think we may get there where we need to talk about this, but at this point it is a distraction from our primary goal of getting this all in place and getting a vote done and getting everything. I think it is addressed actually in the master plan, not in the detail you're requesting. I get that, but it is addressed. But even more than that, by creating this subcommittee and I brought this up in one of our public meetings, that this will become a dividing point. And if you want to retain everybody and have a shot at everybody voting for this, then we will.



Speaker 1 - 02:00:35

We've addressed it in the master plan and we won't, you know, we won't create this distraction that will get blown away. I can just tell you it's going to get blown way out of proportion. I understand where you're going. I don't disagree that information is important, but I think the timing right now at the critical point of moving towards the most our priority and also looking at the political ramifications of what's going to happen if you bring this up, I think is going to be very negative. Any further discussion from the members. I just think that we should keep this to the old axiom of keeping simple, stupid. Let's let's laser focus on what we need to do to get everybody on board.





Speaker 1 - 02:01:18

And then once everybody's on board, then if we want to expand what we want to do and what we want to look at, that's easy. But the key is getting everybody on board. And to do that, we need to keep it simple, do the education and not expand the parameters. Just keep it simple. I mean, we can use what SES has provided so far and we can do that. Is it as transparent? Is it, I mean, what I think we've tried to do here is be very upfront on everything so that everybody knows exactly what we're doing. Here's, here's, all, here's all the possibilities, here's all the possible costs. Because what I don't want to do is bait and switch any city, nor do I want to bait and switch any citizens in this county.



Speaker 1 - 02:02:06

I want to let them know here are the possibilities. And the possibility is if that waste energy plant right now is there, if it goes down, we probably need another one. That's the reality of it. You're seeing what Miami Dade is going through. They're going through hell. They lost, there's one down, they're having to build another one and they're trying to figure out where and they're trying to figure out the cost. I don't think we're doing a good service by ignoring it. And I understand it is not easy to deal with. I don't want to deal with it either.



Speaker 1 - 02:02:43

No, I, but, but I also feel like if you're going to be a solid waste authority and you don't deal with it and 20% of your garbage is going there and 20% of your garbage is at risk, then you're not really doing your job. That's what it comes down to. You want to avoid the job, that's fine. You want to do the job, that's what I think you got to do. Member Rickers yeah, maybe you misunderstood what I said. I'm certainly looking to avoid the job. I think we addressed it. It's in the master plan. It is the master plan, frankly. Frankly, if were to go through what you're talking about, this is a long term issue. If were to go through what you were talking about, by the time we get there, these numbers would be totally have to be redone anyway.



Speaker 1 - 02:03:27

We're not going to build one of these according to the master plan. If we stick to the master plan, we're not going to Build one of these for a very long time. Correct. And so when we get ready to. If we ever get to the point. I'm not talking about a bait and switch because my hope is that we still never even need to do this. But if we ever get to the point where we need to do it, that's the time to go through the exercise. The exercise is absolutely correct. The timing is what's not correct from my view, and I hope you're right on that. But I actually think that this has to be done parallel to everything we're doing because permitting and all those things take a very long time. And I actually think you have to. To.



Speaker 1 - 02:04:10

I think we should be going 100 right to where we never have to build another one or have to. But you know what? You better be ready. You better be ready in case. In case you don't, because you're going to have to figure out where 4 million tons of garbage goes right now. And if we can't recycle 4 million tons, then where are you going to put it? And we have to have that answer. And we need to provide that now. So are you, because that's. We're not even close to that and trying to figure out where. And we already know a million tons or more than a million tons right now can't be recycled. We're already over what one waste energy plant does. So you have to be. You have to

be thinking responsibly. That's what it comes down to.



Speaker 1 - 02:05:06

It comes down to thinking responsibly. Very briefly. Very briefly, I agree with you. You have to be thinking responsibly. But it sounds to me almost like you're proposing that we start this whole process of actually proposing a site and doing it. And that's not what's in the master plan. I would say that I find it rich that the one site that was permitted for this was allowed to be rezoned. If there was such concern from the county that we need to be planning for that was exactly the point of the executive committee. Don't do it. And you did it. Not you. The county did. Second, the county, if it was so concerned about the existing plant, had the opportunity to buy it. Maybe it did put a bid, maybe it didn't. Maybe it was in earnest, maybe it wasn't.



Speaker 1 - 02:05:59

We already paid for this once. Third, we have not said anything in this master plan that should cause anyone to think we're even considering expanding wte that is the dividing line right now. We have to do this work and we've emphasized this, that if you're opposed to WTE even in its existing capacity, you better double and triple your efforts to make sure your buying decisions at the counter, your decisions on purchasing, your decisions with your commercial, your decisions at home and schools and county operations and hospitals and cruises and big entertainment centers and what we do in our cities has more effort to it. That's the focus of it. And then lastly, I would say it will then become a part of the natural presentation that this SWA has stood up committee to examine this and begin considering it.



Speaker 1 - 02:06:49

I think that's the wrong message. I think that's. Then will become again the tail that wags the dog. Whatever the will of the executive committee is, I know the members will rise to the occasion. I just don't think to the point of member Bright Cruise, that the timing's right. And to suggest that it's not responsible to proceed as we're doing or that it's irresponsible not to proceed with a WT subcommittee, it just, at least for me, falls on deaf ears. Remember Cagiano? Look, I don't have a problem with having a Plan B, C, D, F. But the thing is that we don't have to advertise it. Even if we're thinking about it. We can keep it to ourselves for a Plan B, a Plan C. We don't have to advertise because to me, it just confuses people.



Speaker 1 - 02:07:33

We deal with enough people who get confused over parking regulations. We're talking about something as serious as. They're garbage. We should be leading this and not giving us so many options to confuse them because once they're confused, they vote no. Well, you can just. I mean, we. Our option is to just use the scenarios that have been presented. We can always do that. But I will tell you, there is a ton of work that needs to be happening now. And. And, well, it could be done in the backdrop. But. But I guess what I'm. What I'm. I don't think that. I don't think that's palatable. That's the wrong message, that somehow we have a secret committee, considering that's. I know, I know your point is that you can always keep it in your mind.



Speaker 1 - 02:08:13

But, you know, it's not as if the county over the last, you know, 10 years has said, let's plan for another boiler, let's

buy the property, or let's not. Let's protect the dismantling of the north site because we may have capacity issues, or let's not allow the Property to be rezoned. We're in a bit of a bind here, and I don't think at this stage that it's the job of the SWA to pull us out of that bind. With respect to WTA. It exists. It has its capacity. The master plan says we're not doing anything with any additional capacity. We need to move forward. There are risks if that plant burns down. It doesn't matter what this committee talks about because it won't get done in the next 10 years. It's just not going to get built. Miami Dade has the same problem.



Speaker 1 - 02:08:53

So the point is to create, in my opinion, a distraction until we are stood up. We have a commitment of flow control and then if it takes a year or two for folks to debate it and have input and talk about the medical and scientific and environmental and financial issues, all well and good, but we're not even building a transfer station. The county's not even building glass recycling. The county's not building yard waste until this is done. That is where we need to focus, in my opinion. Member right up. Mayor Fur. Would you be okay bringing this back up in three months? Yes, after we have some financial discussions. Yeah, there's not a rule. Yeah, we could wait. We can wait on this, but. But I will say I just settled that one. Yeah, we can wait.



Speaker 1 - 02:09:38

But I will say that the work to ignore it is at our peril. It absolutely is. We can kick it down the road a little bit there. I mean, there's some other stuff that needs to be and we have to make sure that whoever the people that bought that are going to be servicing us after 2032. There's all those things that have to be brought into consideration. Right. And making sure that Miami Dade is not using that plan. All the more reason why perhaps the county, in its infinite wisdom, should have put a bid on to buy it so we could protect ourselves. They did put a bid in. Yeah, I can't wait to take a look at it. But that was not something that was discussed here.



Speaker 1 - 02:10:18

And I've heard you say that and I believe you, but it wasn't something brought here that, by the way, the county is going to put a bid in to try to get this so that we can protect against the very concerns of market vagaries or the fact that they will utilize the resources for somewhere else or that we will lose control of our destiny. And maybe there would have been input from the SWA to say, look, let's start building that into the financial model eventually.



Speaker 1 - 02:10:40

Or what will the county charge us for tipping fees how are you going to do this on operator but irrespective of that's water under the bridge the point going forward now is as I understand this will be put off until some later date I don't think it's three months I think it's longer than that we have to get through the adoption of this master plan the commitment to the finances and the work that is going to be extraordinarily difficult between now and April of next year that's just my opinion but welcome to put it on the calendar and we can delay this a little bit but we will have we will be asked what in all in every presentation to every city what is what are you going to do and we better have a good answer yeah we're not as far as I can see the mass plan does not have us building or even if it's not in it's still going to be okay all right Motion to adjourn.



Speaker 1 - 02:11:33

Second all in favor say II.