

 Speaker 1 - 02:37

All right, we're going to call to order the executive committee meeting. Can I get.

 Speaker 2 - 02:41

Hello?

 Speaker 3 - 02:42

Hello?

 Speaker 2 - 02:43

Hello?

 Speaker 1 - 02:54

All right, I'm going to call to order the executive committee of February 9, 2026. If you would please call the roll.
Yeah, go ahead.

 Speaker 2 - 03:07

Chair Ryan. Vice Chair Furr. Member Shuham.

 Speaker 1 - 03:15

Member Horland.



Speaker 2 - 03:16

Here. Member Matteo Bohm. Here. Member Dunn. Here. Member Rydell.



Speaker 1 - 03:22

Here. Member Meade. Here.



Speaker 2 - 03:25

Member Cagiano. Member A.J. Bryant.



Speaker 1 - 03:29

Member Newton. And Member Breakfruse.



Speaker 3 - 03:34

Yes.



Speaker 1 - 03:35

All right, we have a quorum. Please stand for the pledge of allegiance.



Speaker 3 - 03:43

To the flag of the United States of America.

 Speaker 1 - 03:55

All right, we'll begin with public comment. Tammy, Hold on. Let's make sure your mic's on for the millions at home.

 Speaker 2 - 04:14

Okay? Tammy Lethierry, Coconut Creek on July 18, Chairman Ryan admitted there's a lot of interest in food waste composting, but said we're not yet dedicated to it and too stretched to address it. While ignoring the fact that 22% of landfill waste is derived from methane producing food waste supported by fir and shoe ham, you continue to shun the methane reducing alternatives of food and yard waste composting and remain fixated on yard waste paralysis and using methane from the landfill for a sludge dryer. It's disturbing to hear this board portray incinerators as clean energy. They emit dioxins and neurotoxic heavy metals. And when you burn trash, you burn plastics and thus you burn fossil carbons. Remaining steadfast in pursuit of your folly, replacing landfills with incinerators, you're considering locking us into a costly 40 year long deal.

 Speaker 2 - 05:15

Disposal and recycling rates are already on the rise and so are solid waste industry profits. Imagine that if we don't generate less household waste, we won't be able to afford it and we won't be able to breathe. Considering that the largest category of landfill waste is single use packaging at 28%, an aggressive consumer education campaign and countywide food and yard waste composting remain our best bet. You need to get off the incineration bandwagon and focus on these methane reducing alternatives. Lastly, how do you plan to transport highly flammable methane from the monocil dump to the proposed sludge dryer in West Pompano? Your refusal to answer me for the last eight months speaks volumes.

 Speaker 1 - 06:11

Thank you. Richard Ramshard, Testing. Good afternoon and greetings to the chair, the vice chair and members of the committee. No prepared speech here. Just talk. And I just want to say that something good happened this morning. I was invited by a Montessori school to speak to about 40 students and faculty members about the solid waste initiatives undertaken by this authority. So it was very enlightening to them. In fact, I invited them to come here and speak to you so this way they can share their expectations of the adults and their future. So you know, Miami Dade county is working on a zero waste master plan as you all know. And there are 32 strategies that have been used around the country that have been presented to them and they're under review. Some of them are actually being implemented.

 Speaker 1 - 07:20

And I would employ you to start working on the low hanging fruit that former Todd Stordy spoke about. There's lots of it and we can start doing this before the actual master plan is completed. So why wait? Let's get going and start setting the example for the different cities so that they can get on board. And also, you know, we have a long way to go. This is not a short term plan. Right. So there's short term, medium term and long term objectives with this

plan. And I don't understand why we can't start a large scale composting pilot program utilizing filthy organics at the South Broward landfill. There's lots of space that India met multiple times and I see that the land area is available for us to implement such a program. So I would encourage you to consider getting some pilot programs going.



Speaker 1 - 08:21

Don't wait. And also I'm here to help you with structuring a three city pilot program, preferably the ones out west. But if they're not interested, any other city, small, medium and large. So if you'd like I can send you an email. So this way I can give you some ideas of what we can do. Thank you. Thank you, Richard. Stephanie Joffe.



Speaker 2 - 08:51

Richard said I think is important the composting trials. Anyway, good afternoon. Thank you again for your hard work and the thoughtful effort put into getting this plan right and accepted by the ILA Today I have a question that I hope one of you can address. What is the status of adopting a county ordinance similar to the one passed by Miami Dade county that would prohibit single use plastics at the airport and seaport Combined these hubs serve as a gateway for nearly 4, 40 million travelers annually. I ask this question for two reasons. First, such an audience would such an ordinance would significantly reduce the volume of single use plastics that Broward county must process. Second, and perhaps more importantly, it would serve as a powerful educational tool.



Speaker 2 - 09:44

It would introduce both tourists and residents to the master's plan, the master plan strategy of improving recycling awareness and behavior. The ordinance could be enhanced with educational posters and videos that travelers would see upon arrival and departure. In addition, I would like to propose the inclusion of compost collection containers which could be serviced by our existing composting companies. All collection bins, recycling, compost and landfill could be clearly labeled with simple visual stickers indicating what belongs in each bin. Thank you for your time and consideration. I mean, to me this is low hanging fruit and like a no brainer and we can, we, Miami Dade, we can see how they've done it. I mean, let's do it. Thank you.



Speaker 1 - 10:33

Stephanie, do you want to answer the.



Speaker 3 - 10:34

Portland or I'll answer a few of these if that's okay.

 Speaker 1 - 10:38

Yeah, yeah, I have a few I'd.

 Speaker 3 - 10:39

Like to as well. Tammy, I couldn't agree with you more on with regard to the organic waste being low hanging fruit. The fact of the matter is that we had passed in our landfill not to take any organic waste after 2027. That's one of the few. We're one of the few landfills in the United States that have taken that step to reduce the methane. And Bill's here. I think you can. I'm not going to ask you to comment on it, but waste management has agreed to have all of our source separated food waste and organic, go to the Okeechobee landfill and be composted. So all of it's how to get there and all that logistics. Not there yet, but the contracts and things that are the precursor to that are ready.

 Speaker 3 - 11:28

As for transporting gas, we don't have a place yet to know where thermal conversion of biosolids is going, where it's in the design stage. So hold on.

 Speaker 1 - 11:41

Yeah, we're not doing it. Yeah, you're not. We're not going to do that.

 Speaker 3 - 11:44

No.

 Speaker 1 - 11:45

These. Well, hang on a second. Hang on a second. Is the chair. I'm going to tell you right now, we're not going to do that. No, no, Tammy, we're not going to do that. We've been doing this a long time. You've been at all the meetings. We do this with decorum and respect. You're welcome to come back the next meeting and raise the issues. Okay.

 Speaker 3 - 12:03

And I'm happy to talk with you afterwards.

 Speaker 1 - 12:05

Okay.

 Speaker 3 - 12:06

Third, when you put Miami Dade up as a, as exemplar, I want you to know they are putting most of their trash on trains and sending it out of here and at some point going to be sending it out of state. Probably that's because they're in a desperate situation trying to put them as like this Zero waste. Perfect. No, they're putting it all on trains, going to landfills, and they have a 10 year contract to do that. So let's, you know, let's be clear on what's going on over there. They're trying, they're trying a few things, but that's what they're doing right now because they're in a desperate situation because their incinerator went down and they don't have any other options right now. I will have answer for you next meeting. On the single use plastics.

 Speaker 3 - 12:56

I know we have put places, many places in the county where you can't have it. I will check on both the airport and the Seaward. Okay. And if it's not, I will put forth an ordinance that will do that. Okay. As for using, wanting to use a landfill for yard waste, that is absolutely the plan. That's for the Broward landfill for using it for yard waste. And once we get all of these, hopefully all of these facilities amendments passed through all the cities, then you have, then you know that there's a flow control, that all of that yard waste would be going there. Until you, until we have that, it's it doesn't make sense to stand it up yet because you would, you don't know how much machinery you're doing, how much mulching you're doing.

 Speaker 3 - 13:44

All of the infrastructure has to be based on what the expected amount of capacity is. So hopefully that's our plan. We've already done the study for it. We know the cost. What we don't know is a capacity. So we're, let's get these things passed. Help us get these things passed in every city and then we'll be able to stand those up.

 Speaker 1 - 14:06

Thank you, Vice Chair, Let me offer a few comments. Let's, let's be really clear where we're at. We're either six months from being able to take on everything that's possible in this county, or we don't exist. That's the reality. So this issue of you're not standing up quick enough, you're not doing, you're not as a solid waste authority. We don't even have the authority to do it right now. And I have never said we're too stretched to address composting. You're welcome to anything that you want to say, but we've not said that we cannot, as a county begin doing it. I've worked with Filthy Organics, we've worked with others. We've been able to say this is something that should happen.

 Speaker 1 - 14:48

In fact, there is an opportunity that I know on an unsolicited proposal may be going in front of the County Commission to deal with a composting facility in North County. South county is not the only solution. We need to be looking at facilities that are available around the county and there are multiple providers for that. That can happen now, irrespective, and that should happen. So we first have to make sure we're standing up this Solid Waste Authority, that we have the flow control to justify the investment in these properties and facilities and that can continue on forward. I do believe that the county has the capacity to approve sites for it to begin and it should begin now. Has nothing to do with the Solid Waste Authority. But it is fair for the county to say, do we have the capacity?

 Speaker 1 - 15:36

Do we have the flow? And it. Where are we going to put it? But I hope the county is looking sincerely at moving well ahead of even the approvals that we hope will happen in August either to north county or to South County. And I do think the single use plastics is important. I know we've looked at it in our own individual operations and I look forward to the answer on that. All right, meeting minutes. I have a motion. Motion by member Mead, seconded by member Horland. And changes. All in favor say aye. Any opposed? Passes. All right, Master plan workshop, staff meetings. Why don't. Why don't we move things around just a little bit? Just so we can deal with some things. I think we should. We have the executive interim administration and management SES support. Do we know if Todd's on today?

 Speaker 1 - 16:27

Okay. It's okay. Where are we? I know we can have a motion to move up. Item eight. Motion. And second. Second. All in favor say aye. All right, Executive Director, I know you were in charge that. So I'll let you.

 Speaker 3 - 16:41

So I've had conversations with both Todd and with SCS about how to. How to deal with this. Todd is able to work on an hourly rate. What we kind of looked at is him doing one third of what he thinks he can do. A lot of the stuff that, you know, the agendas, me, some meetings. So we kind of looked at it, dividing it one third. Todd 2/3.scs for doing a lot of the administrative stuff. There's some things that require an executive director to facilitate contracts. All this kind of things.

 Speaker 1 - 17:17

Approve their invoices, all.

 Speaker 3 - 17:20

All the financial parts so that there's no mixing of that. So both and Dana, remind me if this is right, but I know Todd is okay with doing hourly up to 100,000. You guys were okay with doing hourly, Was that correct? Up to 200,000. That's 300,000. That's the what? That's what Todd's salary was. So. So there's no additional money being going in. It's just divided. And I think we can just, you know, we have to get through August. That's what we have to do. All right, So I think both agreed to that. The question was, and I don't know if.

 Speaker 3 - 17:59

Daniel, but the one concern was whether or not if there was enough time within this for you to go to every city commission and be all of our backup, or up front, either one, to be able to handle that from here to August. Because what I think is important, more so than any other part here, is you being able to go to those city commissions and explain the master plan, the details, the backup, the logistics of it, all those kinds of things. Because I think for all of us, we have a pretty good hand line. You have a entire panel on it. So the question. The question that. The only unanswered question is whether or not that 200,000, if there was. If we could cap it. And you still do your hourly rate.

 Speaker 1 - 18:59

Yeah. And that's the way that we've set up all of our work over the past almost two years. Now there's an upset, and we keep the executive director apprised through our invoices and through our communications, so there are no surprises. So as were instructed, we prepared a proposal that has a not to exceed amount and basically hourly rates. So. And those rates are consistent with what's been approved with the last change order and the work that we're doing on the construction and demolition debris and mandatory commercial cycle. Yeah, absolutely. Sorry. So, without a doubt, we're committed to going to every ILA member commission meeting. What we have learned is that there's oftentimes other meetings to prepare staff and others to make sure that we are in lockstep to get to those commission meetings. We believe that there's ample capacity to do that.

 Speaker 1 - 19:52

And again, we'll be working with Todd, who will be communicating with you exactly where we stand on a monthly basis. So there are no surprises.

 Speaker 3 - 19:59

Okay. All right.

 Speaker 1 - 20:01

So I guess the question is what. What I think we need to do, because the resignation was effective today, as I remember it. Is there a delineation of responsibilities for Todd in a proposed contract or an amendment to it where we're maintaining the executive director, which is required under the ila, and a delineation of their responsibilities go Ahead, Jimmy? Yes.

 Speaker 4 - 20:27

Todd and Daniel have prepared that. I have a proposed amendment to. To Todd's agreement that will do the things we're talking about. And then we also have a proposed. This is called. It was a change order, I guess is what it was correct. For scs. So we do have those documents. So we are ready to move forward with those. So you might want to.

 Speaker 1 - 20:51

But. But it occurs to me that's for us to approve. Do we have any. How would you propose we proceed, considering the resignation was effective today? We can't. We can't approve it in a vacuum.

 Speaker 4 - 21:02

No, no, I think. I think you could approve now a. An agreement with both based on the terms that we're discussing and delegate to the chair to execute it and approve it.

 Speaker 1 - 21:14

I think we need. I think we need to see the specifics of it, what's delineated in order to fully enforce. That's what I was hoping we'd have today. I apologize. Okay.

 Speaker 4 - 21:25

Daniel. I mean, I have what. I know that I don't have with me, but I know that we do have one. I mean, Daniel, do you have that with you?

 Speaker 1 - 21:39

I don't have it with me. All right, what's the proposal then? In light of. I'll turn to member Horland and remember. Donna. Second, what's the proposal then? Since we're here, we don't really have a document to approve. Or is it in a posture where it could be where there's a full agreement?

 Speaker 4 - 21:59

Well, the agreement is really simple. It's really the scope of the work that is really what we need to talk about. And I know we do have that on an email somewhere.

 Speaker 1 - 22:07

All right, what we'll do is I'll member comment and then what we'll do is we'll just table this for a moment and allow staff to print it out. We try to resolve it before we leave here today because we need the specific enumerations and the protections. Right. We talked about this before and I know, Daniel, you're aware of this and have made sure to create the protections. We got to leave the financial with not. I know you want no part of that. Right, I got you. But the members are entitled to see that in writing and specific enumerated. So we're not approving something that later is not. So I'll turn it to members and then you guys can decide how to best to proceed to try to resolve this today. Member horan.

 Speaker 2 - 22:44

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That's gonna be my question. I'm not comfortable proving anything without saying in Writing. But my question was gonna be, you know, I think were all taken by surprise. Many of us were. I know that the chair and legal knew that Mr. Storty was going to be resigning at the past last meeting. My question is when we talk about the delineation of duties and obviously we'll get to this, and we talk about administrative, what administrative duties will SES be handling that Alyssa could not be handling?

 Speaker 1 - 23:16

Okay.

Speaker 2 - 23:17



And I think that's a fair question where we're talking about these amounts. And my other question is when we talk about Daniel coming out, which we I think had already booked you to come out to the city of Plantation, is that part of this new agreement? Because my understanding that was already part of the consultants agreement.



Speaker 1 - 23:32

Right.



Speaker 4 - 23:32

There's certain parts that are under the old agreement and certain. Maybe the best thing to do is, you know, we. It's the 9th and we have another meeting on the 20th. It's only 11 days from now. We could, we could, you know, rather than looking at things at a meeting where that you haven't had a chance to look at, we could finalize that, get it off the 20th. We just need to, you know, for this next 11 days, we'll just keep operating as we are. I don't, you know, we can extend Todd's date until the. To the 20th.



Speaker 1 - 23:57

All right, let the members continue. Maybe the only option.



Speaker 2 - 24:00

My final comment is I think there should have been a little foresight that we should have had that document, but also a public meeting. It should have been provided in the backup to the public.



Speaker 1 - 24:07

So agree.



Speaker 2 - 24:08

All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

 Speaker 1 - 24:09

Member. Done. And member Rydell and member.

 Speaker 2 - 24:14

Yeah, I concur with my colleague and I. For me, I want to see not only the scope of work, but to be clear about which budget item that scope of work is going to be paid out of. Because my understanding is the going to the cities and the meeting with staff and commission that was under the existing contract that we currently have. And so I would like to see those details as well.

 Speaker 1 - 24:45

Member Rydell, Member material.

 Speaker 5 - 24:55

The fingers. I think you got a philosophical issue, right? So number one, if you want to split the baby, right, you're going to say 100 grand, 200 grand. That actually doesn't work out when you're billing somebody hourly. There's a difference between a salaried position, an hourly billing, which you could burn through, you know, x amount of dollars on an hourly billing different than a salary employee. So the numbers don't add up to me as I'm sitting here Unless that's clearly delineated, I think of a lawyer. Right. If a lawyer's on retainer and he's paying up being a painted associate attorney for \$100,000 a year, I'm sure you're from. Jamie. You got guys working 80 hours a week for that \$100,000 a year. So there's a difference in philosophically how you want to split that money. Secondly.

 Speaker 5 - 25:35

Well, at the last meeting, we gave slight direction to say, hey, we're in a predicament.

 Speaker 2 - 25:40

There's.

 Speaker 5 - 25:40

I mean, we got to talk about the future as well. And I'm with you, chair. You know, the six month. There's a. There's a hammer coming down. But who's the best person to go to the cities? Is there. Is there a contract individual that we may want to suggest using is Daniel's.

 Speaker 3 - 25:55

Great.

 Speaker 5 - 25:55

But I mean, there's a little more to it than a factual industrial presentation. There's things. We're all elected officials. There's. There's matters, of course, that come with that and how to express that as well. He's not navigating, you know, elections and things of that nature. So the only thing that I feel a little lacking, aside from the monetary split and not seeing it, like member Horlund said, is how are we moving forward? The stopgap was our last meeting of saying, hey, we got to just make do with what this news was. But now I'm hearing that this is now the permit.

 Speaker 1 - 26:26

I don't think that's the case.

 Speaker 5 - 26:27

I think it feels like that if we're giving these. If we're. That's what it feels like.

 Speaker 1 - 26:32

I think it's a fair clarification from the vice chairs what he intended. Obviously, it took us how many months to go

through.



Speaker 5 - 26:40

I'm with you recruiting and who's going.



Speaker 1 - 26:43

To answer the recruitment, not knowing if after August we exist. So. So I agree with you 100%. We have to talk about that. We have kind of urgent. I wouldn't call it emergency, but an urgent situation. I think that's what the chair was saying and trying to pro rata the contract till August. I want to put words in your mouth because we haven't talked about it, but I think that's what you meant, that It's a full 300,000 through now in August. If that doesn't work. Right, because that's. It was annualized. So to your point, it still needs to be broken down as to what that means. What are the predicted number of hours? Will it be a Sufficient budget.



Speaker 4 - 27:13

I agree with all that.



Speaker 1 - 27:14

I'm happy to have the future discussion. I just, I think we might best to first deal with this. We could certainly deal with the next meeting. What does that look like? But I think what we'll hear from the recruiters is we're not going to have any future discussion because nobody's going to respond to it. So that's my only concern because we don't come August 100%.



Speaker 5 - 27:34

I'm with you completely. I just say I think it's remiss if there's at least not an open discussion about that, which still has kind of yet to happen. But that's the point I'm trying to make for the purposes of transparency.



Speaker 1 - 27:45

Agreed. Member Terror ball.

 Speaker 2 - 27:47

Thank you, Mr. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I echo a few of the thoughts that my colleagues have shared too, in the scope of work. I would love to know what Elise would be tasked with. So we are not duplicating efforts and we're not double billing and second, want to ensure that our consultant still are able to follow through with what their contract says they're going to do. I also don't want for them to be stretched in and really dealing with administrative things that we already have capacity for. I would love to see other options, a consulting option. There's plenty of people in our community that can probably tap in for six months to continue doing this role.

 Speaker 2 - 28:36

I would prefer to see someone from the outside coming in to be the executive director simply because there may have a fresh perspective or a different way of moving this work that we may not have seen prior. So I really want us to keep these different entities separate so we are not again, duplicating efforts.

 Speaker 3 - 28:59

Okay.

 Speaker 1 - 29:00

All right. So subject to the members approval. Why don't we table this while somebody at least prints out and at least distributes what the purpose was. I don't know how far we're going to get with it because I do think there are significant questions and I don't think anything's going to get approved. But I want to at least have the discussion here today as to what the proposed scope of work was so that we can begin looking at it. Vice Chair and then member table.

 Speaker 3 - 29:24

Danny, can you send the email that you said that had the last change order, that included your work with the city commissions, that. Oh, is that the last one you all worked on?

 Speaker 1 - 29:34

Yes, that has changed. But is that the scope that's expected to fill the gap? What that primarily focused one of the tasks that I think is what has been referred to is the getting to yes task. And that engagement was largely with members of the executive committee and governing board. But as we have tried on every activity where we have additional capacity and we're directed by the executive director to provide additional services, we are ready, willing and able to provide those. Those additional services. All right, a member of Chair bowen. Let's just.

 Speaker 2 - 30:10

Mr. Chair, I also think it's important that the governing body is aware of this because they have often said previously that they are. They would like to be in the know. So if we can make sure that they get these documents and follow up with next steps regarding what we are doing with the executive.

 Speaker 1 - 30:28

Excellent point. Excellent point. All right, let's just table this table list for now. But I. I don't know that we're going to get that far. We need the scope of work that was expected for Mr. Storty, what that looks like in terms of expected projected hours and hourly and what that means in a budget. That's what we really needed today. And what the scope of work is for SCS and the evaluation of where Elise is filling in the administrative. So there's no duplication of that in who she's coordinating with. I think there also has to be, as we've talked about many times already across these two meetings, clear delineation of the financial oversight issues to maintain that integrity. I know you. You agree with that, and I know Todd does as well, but we need it in writing. We need to see that.

 Speaker 1 - 31:11

And if we're not going to be able to do that today, then by the end of the meeting, we're going to have an alternative for this because we really needed to have this on the agenda today to be approved. And Chair, if I may. Yes. It extends beyond just financial oversight. It's also work product. I don't want to approve our own work. Yeah, no, I agree with that. Agreed. All right, we'll come back to. To this issue. All right. If we could go to the legal to the draft Facilities Amendment, Item 6. Can we have a motion to move that up? Motion by member Rydell. Seconded by Member Break. Who's all in favor? Say aye. All right, this has been a process. Mr. Cole, where are we at?

 Speaker 4 - 31:54

Well, I'm happy to report we've made a lot of progress and there's been lots of meetings. Mr. Chair, you were at some of the meetings. Mr. Kelleher, all the attorneys, Mr. Storty. So we've had lots of meetings to get through this. And you've gotten the latest version of the facilities amendment. You all got it late last week. I hope everyone had a chance to look at it. I can go over the substance of it today just to give you a kind of a overview of what it is. We are under the original timetable, I think at the next meeting on February 20, when the governing board will also be here. That was the plan to have it when it would be approved. And then after that it goes to cities, there's a four month period, etc.

Speaker 4 - 32:39



So the facilities amendment really has five parts to it. The first part deals with what the authority can basically own and what operate and what basically we can do and the type of facilities we can own. And basically what the, what it says is that we can own and operate transfer stations, permanent drop off centers, recycling facilities. Those are like the three main types of things that we can do. What we can't do is own a solid waste disposal facility. So we can't own or operate a waste to energy plant. So we can't go and build a waste energy plant under the ila. And that under the current ILA would require an amendment that would need the county and 2/3 cities representing 2/3 of the population. The amendment changes that to 80%.



Speaker 4 - 33:32

So it makes it even harder for us to ever own a waste energy plant or other solid waste facility. So that is the first part of this. It really says that we can own and operate transportations, drop off stations, recycling facilities.



Speaker 1 - 33:46

But hang on. So we got a little bit of feedback I think. Is everybody on mute online? Okay, thank you, go ahead. I apologize.



Speaker 4 - 33:55

Okay, so that's the first part. We can, we can not own a solid waste disposal facility or waste energy plant unless we got an 80% approved amendment. But we can own transportations, drop off centers and recycling facilities. The second portion of this deals with wind down. What happens at the end when the Solid Waste Authority no longer exists? And how could we no longer exist? It's a 40 year deal. There's a 40 year renewal. If that 40 year renewal is not exercised, the wind down would happen in 40 years. If it is exercised, it would be much later. Theoretically something else could happen where the whole Solid Waste Authority goes away. It's hard to imagine what that could be. It could be a change in law. There could be something. So theoretically it could be.



Speaker 4 - 34:41

But it's really what we're talking about is what happens at the end of the 40 years if it's not renewed or much later, if it is renewed and there's two different avenues that we could pass go through. One avenue is someone, some entity takes over the Solid Waste Authority's role and responsibilities and they take over everything. So everything the Solid Waste Authority is doing gets taken over by a different entity. It could be a successor entity. It could be some kind of special district created by the legislature. It could be some other type of entity, or it could be the county. The county could take over everything that the Solid Waste Authority is doing. If that were to happen,

basically all the assets of the Solid Waste Authority and reserves cash, everything just goes to the new entity.

 Speaker 4 - 35:29

And the parties no longer have any rights to that. That all goes to the new entity. And each city at that point would have the option of joining in or not joining in. And the question that is open in the solid way in the facilities amendment, which is the only thing we did not really come to a final decision on, is what percentage should that require. The concept initially was that everyone should.

 Speaker 1 - 35:53

Have given an outline before we come back. Okay. Before we come back, I think it's hard to figure out what the structure is. Sure. And what the options be sure. Put a pin on that. That that's a decision point.

 Speaker 4 - 36:04

Okay. So that's the one decision point we're going to have to deal with is what is how many have to join in on that. If we're not doing one of those either success or entity or the county, there's something we call the default is basically the standard procedure, which is what is going to happen to all the assets then and who's going to provide solid waste services. So the concept for providing services, each city is now on its own. We're back to how we are today. And each city will decide what you want, what the city wants to do. As to the assets, if they're regional assets and it defines what the regional assets are, the county would have the first right to have those to have it transferred to them.

 Speaker 4 - 36:49

If the county chooses not to take one, whatever city it's located on would then have the option to try to take it. And if it's a non regional, it goes the other way. So it's a non regional facility. First it goes. The option first goes to the city where it's located. And if they don't want it, then it goes to the county under either of those.

 Speaker 1 - 37:09

But not.

 Speaker 4 - 37:11

Not the successor county concept under the standard procedure, the facilities transferred. So ownership is transferred to either the county or to the city. But it's subject to another provision that says for up to. For five years transition Period has to be used for solid waste purposes. And if it's not used for solid waste purposes, it's the same as getting to the end of the five year period. And at the end of the five year period or once it's no longer used for solid waste purposes, it has to either be sold and the money.

 Speaker 1 - 37:49

That.

 Speaker 4 - 37:51

Sales proceeds gets distributed pro rata based on population to all the cities. With the county getting its share for the unincorporated only or whoever is transferred to can choose to pay for it and now own it and be able to do whatever they want. They don't have to use it for solid waste purposes. There's an appraiser that's like an Mai appraiser does an appraisal. And that appraisal is the amount of money that recipient has to pay. So under that whole standard procedure, all the parties who've been part of this will get compensated for the fair market value prorated based on population. The third concept in here is deals with inspection and technical review. And basically this, there's different aspects to it.

 Speaker 4 - 38:45

The first deals with inspection rights and there's a provision that basically says that each party has the right to, at their own cost to inspect and see what's going on. And the SWA has to cooperate with that. The second is a systems facility report, which this is something that happens 18 months before the end of the term where there's just analysis done 18 months before the end term to see how everything's going to see what's happening that will help inform the decision whether to keep going or not. And it'll also help inform any decision as to what happens with assets if it doesn't keep going. The third aspect of this is a special right that just the county gets because of their statutory obligations for solid waste disposal.

 Speaker 4 - 39:34

And they have a right to do a technical review at their cost to have people come in and do even more investigations and to come up with a report as to anything that they think is not being done well. And that would then be presented to the executive committee. And if the executive committee doesn't agree with what the county's inspectors decided and if it relates to the county's obligation statutory obligations, so it has to relate to the statutory obligations. If that's the case and the executive committee doesn't want to do what the inspector said, then it goes through a informal dispute resolution process and then ultimately even an arbitration to try to figure out what to be done with that issue. The fourth aspect deals with maximum service charges. And this is necessary

because if you remember, we, rather than doing the.

 Speaker 4 - 40:33

Since we don't have exact numbers on the cost, we're going to have a maximum range. We need to figure out how that maximum would be implemented. So that's what this section does. And basically what it says is the master plan is going to say what the cost is, the maximum cost, and that is the maximum cost. And you can't, you all will not be able to go above that. And then it does provide the only time you can go above that if you get a certain vote. And it takes 2/3 population plus the county basically to go above that amount. The final thing that's in here is kind of cleanup on voting and quorum, the way it's provided now for the governing board, the quorum required.

 Speaker 4 - 41:19

In addition to the county, you had to have a majority of all the parties and you had to have a majority of the tonnage that stays the same. Once you had a meeting, however, let's say you had a meeting and you only had 52% of the tonnage or population at the meeting. Every decision had to also have that same 52%. So it would have to be unanimous. That decision, that didn't really make sense. So the change makes it so that the voting is a majority of the tonnage of the people that are at the meeting that are present at the meeting, rather than the total amount because it was not workable. And that is in. Actually, we put that in the bylaws, but now we're putting it into the ila. And that is really all that this does.

 Speaker 4 - 42:05

And for it to be effective, you need 80% approval.

 Speaker 1 - 42:09

All right, going back to the question that we have appended. Go ahead and explain that. That was in 2A, regarding when the county takes over everything. Right.

 Speaker 4 - 42:19

And it may not be the county. It could be a different successor entity. Yes. So we're getting to wind down and we decide, you know, so we have to decide. Either you're going to. The cities are each going to go out on their own, or we're going to continue something, but not the swa, a different entity. And under this concept, wherever it goes, whether it's a county or successor entity, the cities that choose not to participate do not get compensated for the value of what they've done over time. So the original concept was that all the cities should have to agree, but then

there's, you know, you got the heckler's veto. One city could stop the whole thing, and that didn't seem right. So then it was based on 80% so if 80% approved, but when you just do.



Speaker 4 - 43:02

Just to keep in mind the math of all this, when we first started this, to do this, Ila, we needed 75%. We ended up with 83% of the municipal population countywide on this facility Amendment, we need 80%. So we could lose another 20%. So from the 83%, let's say we lose 20%, now we're down to like 64%. Then when you're at 64%, if we say 80% at the end now you're at about 51 or 52% of all the county waste. So that's why we had originally proposed 80%. The county has been proposing that be a lower number. And that's a pure policy decision. That number, they were saying majority.



Speaker 4 - 43:49

So you would need, if you go through the math, you would need, if you started 83% and then you got down to 65%, now you're going to need a majority that'd be like 35%, 32, 34, 35% of all the county waste, of all the municipals waste. And you know, but that's the issue. I don't want to make it sound like I'm advocating for anything. That's just the issue that were talking about. And we need to decide because there's a blank in here other than that the attorneys for the county and we've kind of agreed on everything else, but that we just couldn't come to anything, so we just left it blank.



Speaker 1 - 44:26

Vice Chair and then.



Speaker 3 - 44:29

So for that number to try, what number to decide on, I think went every, everywhere from between 30 and 80. But then I wanted to know how much, what was the percentage that is used in the global agreement right now when we, for all the cities and what is that percentage of the use that we all use? Wheel radar. That's 55%. So I think that's actually a good number right there. I, I mean, 50 is probably the better number. But. And the thinking in terms from the county's point of view is whatever we're doing here, all of this stuff and all these things that we build, all the infrastructure, the idea is, you want it to say to be able to keep serving all of our citizens, so try to keep everything in place as much as possible. That's, that's the reality.



Speaker 3 - 45:17

I was just trying to, you know, if it falls apart, you want to, you've. We've built a lot, all those things. Let it keep going. That's the thinking. So from the county's perspective, 50% plus one or majority is ideal. You know, we know the 55% is what's being achieved right now with the global agreement. So you've got kind of some benchmarks.

 Speaker 1 - 45:41

Yeah, I'm not sure the global agreement should be a lighthouse on this one, guiding us in the direction. But, Mr. Cole, just as a. Just get. Let's get practical. If it's 50% or 55 or whatever, effectively, if it's half of that, I mean, is it requiring 55% of all of the tonnage? And then what happens to the 45% who aren't participating? They basically don't get anything back. Right.

 Speaker 4 - 46:11

Well, anyone who chooses not to, assuming there is a successor entity or the county, anyone that's not going to be part of that is out of it, and they're forfeiting the chance to get any compensation for whatever they've put in over the years. The. I think we do need to be clear, though, if we're talking 51% or 55% of all of the municipal waste for Broward county or 55% of the municipal waste of the ILA members. Right.

 Speaker 1 - 46:42

Because we have nine members.

 Speaker 4 - 46:43

Yes.

 Speaker 1 - 46:44

Right.

 Speaker 4 - 46:44

So when we said eight, when were proposing 80%, were saying 80% of the municipal members, which is 80% of the 83% we have now, minus whatever percentage doesn't join into the facilities amendment. So it could be that number is the 55% of the total amount is actually a higher amount than the 80%.

 Speaker 1 - 47:07

So we just got to make sure.

 Speaker 4 - 47:09

We know what the denominator is.

 Speaker 5 - 47:10

He talked. I don't mean to.

 Speaker 1 - 47:12

I'm just curious.

 Speaker 5 - 47:12

Beam you gave a position piece. I'm curious, on that delineation. What's that position piece on that delineation?

 Speaker 3 - 47:18

I would think it's of the ILA members. That's what I would think, because that's who's been part of the whole thing.

 Speaker 1 - 47:25

Remember Breakers? Thank you, Chair. I mean, I think a lot of that comes down to flow control.

 Speaker 5 - 47:31

Again.

 Speaker 1 - 47:31

Right. If that number gets to be too small and we're not able to negotiate a reasonable contract, then that's just going to spur more members to do their own thing and go their own way. So we may be in one hand doing ourselves a little bit of a favor by getting the number lower, but in the long run, we may be shooting ourselves in the foot. So I would tend to actually go a little higher than that.

 Speaker 3 - 47:56

Right. And, and to that point, the reason the global agreement does kind of come into it is if we don't achieve a certain tonnage, that agreement goes away. That's in the, that's in the contract right now. So we don't have a certain amount. We can't send it. You know, they're going to go start spot, spot marketing.

 Speaker 1 - 48:17

Yeah, but it's a, a singular part of the system, so it's a different thing than others. It's not, it's not a true global.

 Speaker 5 - 48:23

Right.

 Speaker 1 - 48:23

It's a global to waste energy. It's not a true global that we're talking about. But I understand your point.

 Speaker 3 - 48:28

Okay.

 Speaker 1 - 48:28

It's a benchmark.

 Speaker 3 - 48:29

Yeah.

 Speaker 1 - 48:30

Mr. Cole, how do you propose we move through this? Because I think for the members, and I know myself, I think I need to see it a little more graphically on scenarios to understand the implications. Implications and particularly the unintended consequences. To your point, it may be that we end up frustrating the ultimate purpose, which is to try to keep the system together even if it's falling apart. Right.

 Speaker 4 - 48:57

Well, it's hard to do it graphically because we don't know what percentage of our current membership is going to stay in after the facilities amendment.

 Speaker 1 - 49:06

We can make some.

 Speaker 4 - 49:07

You assume, if you assume we're going to lose 20%, we're currently at 83%. If you lose 20%, you're at 64. You're at 64%. So if we're at 64%, then the question is, of that 64%, what makes sense? I mean, if it's 50%, that's 30% of the total county waste. If it's 80%, it's 51% of all the county waste. So if you want to just make sure we have at least 51% of the total county waste.

 Speaker 1 - 49:35

And we could, by the way, we.

 Speaker 4 - 49:36

Could word it that way. We could just say you need to have at least 50%, 1% of the total county waste. But then the question is, if some other city that was an ILA member wants to join, do you count that or do you not count that?

 Speaker 1 - 49:49

But if you go to, if it's written as. I'm not saying you're suggesting this, but if it's written as 51%, let's just say of the county total municipal waste, whether they're in or out, and they join later, it's still being counted, right?

 Speaker 4 - 50:02

Yes, but the, under that scenario, theoretically, you know, 40% of the municipal parties might not join and they are forfeiting their right to get paid for the value of the SWA assets.

 Speaker 1 - 50:18

So it's a. Instead of a heckler's veto, it's a preventing against a whole row of hecklers. Okay, I got you. All right.

 Speaker 5 - 50:27

Remember, right now, I'm just gonna. I'm shocked that I'm gonna have to say this, but I agree with the vice chair and his number.

 Speaker 1 - 50:34

It's okay.

 Speaker 5 - 50:35

I know it pain me, but I.

 Speaker 1 - 50:40

Think, well, part of the member assistance program will be some therapy afterwards for you on this intervention. County's paying for it. Yes.

 Speaker 5 - 50:49

The reason, and let me couch it, because when you phrase it that way and you look at the percentages of losing potentially 20%, the number becomes even a mandate, which is hard. And I think the benchmark being, well, apples and oranges slightly, is a fair assessment for the purposes of consistency with more global amendments. I'll support. I will support the 55 because theoretically, that's what you raised. You're saying, I'll support that.

 Speaker 1 - 51:12

All right. Member breakfast. Yeah.

 Speaker 3 - 51:14

Quick question.

 Speaker 1 - 51:15

Can we clarify what would happen if a non ILA member were after seeing the master plan, they were to decide, you know what, we do want to join because we have at least one municipality that specifically said that they were interested, but they were not interested in joining until they saw the master plan. And so how would that. How would that impact these numbers or has that. First of all, we do have a.

 Speaker 4 - 51:41

Provision in the ILA that lets people join later so other people can join. We have not yet figured out what the cost would be, whether there's some additional costs that they have to pay or some higher rate for some period of time to compensate, some kind of buy in. But assuming someone else joined, that would increase the total amount of the municipal party waste. So then theoretically, you could have a lower percent, like the 55%. If would make 55% would make a lot of sense if all these other cities joined. So after the facilities amendment, theoretically we could have 100% of the municipal parties. And then if you said 55%, then you would know you have at least 55% of. So that would be very positive.



Speaker 1 - 52:24

Right. To get us on this time frame. It is at the next meeting, we have to endorse this and approve it, to move it up or not approve it, whatever it looks like, up to the governing board. Is that correct?



Speaker 4 - 52:38

Yes, but I think the governing board meeting is that day as well.



Speaker 1 - 52:42

Correct. My point is that we have very little time. We put this on an aggressive time frame. I won't comment on how we got to this point of only looking at the couple of issues. But what is the proposal, Mr. Cole, for how to proceed through and what guidance do you need?



Speaker 4 - 53:01

Well, I was hoping to get policy guidance today as to what number to put in and then any other comments or things. Now's the time to discuss any other changes we want to make because at the next meeting the executive committee will meet. Hopefully at that meeting you'll be approving it and then the governing board can approve it then. And then we'll be set to go to the cities.



Speaker 1 - 53:20

All right. So just before we get to that point, I just want to express to the members I, I have been involved in this process and I'm not going to cast dispersions but this is not where I want it to be that you all were looking at this in this version on this day and having to comment on some complex policy issues. I, I credit counties Attorney's office for continuing the discussions but I could not have been clear that this needed to be done three weeks ago. But we're here so we're going to do like we often do when there's something new on an agenda. We'll have to adjust and we'll have to deal with it. We do have a couple of options. One, we can certainly flush out as much as

we can here today.

 Speaker 1 - 54:07

We can conduct a special meeting between now and the 20th to go over just this issue so that we have more time to talk to Mr. Cole, which I'm prepared to do and prepared to recommend. Or third, we can try to between now and the 20th digest and get comments back. But the problem is that we won't be able to hear what everybody else is saying. I don't think it's ideal. I, I do agree that this is in its best form compared to what versions were going along the conveyor belt. And I'm comfortable with where everything is now and I thank the county attorney's office for working with Mr. Cole on some of the policy issues I think would have been non starters and trying to resolve it and find a gap.

 Speaker 1 - 54:53

But as we go through these comments I want the members to think about is it not best to get as much the questions out that you can today about the five sections, if you will of this address the percentage as was said and then try to schedule a special meeting to go over this to provide guidance so that we're not quite frankly redlining this before the governing board meeting and trying to get that approved. Vice Chair and Then member mater bond.

 Speaker 3 - 55:29

Well, I was, what I was thinking about doing was making a motion to put a number in here. Would that be appropriate now?

 Speaker 1 - 55:36

Well, I think let's have some comments from some folks.

 Speaker 3 - 55:39

Okay.

 Speaker 1 - 55:39

I was thinking but it doesn't solve the either issue because well there's only.

 Speaker 3 - 55:42

One part and I know we have to do we have three or four issues that we have to get clarification on. So it's trying to get one at a time and just kind of move our way through it because.

 Speaker 1 - 55:54

It'S what other pins or questions or decision points. Yeah, hang on a second. Just hang on. What, what other decision points were there other than the percentage?

 Speaker 3 - 56:04

The, the percentage is one on the wind down. Just clarity as to what a regional asset was. Just being real clear on that and I think we're pretty close on that.

 Speaker 1 - 56:19

Well, I, I, I want to say I didn't see in this version some sort of Chinese menu or something of options or some red line. So I'm trying to understand. My understanding is that all the other terms have been worked out with the county attorney's office. If there's new terms that let's put.

 Speaker 3 - 56:31

It's not, it's a, they're already in the document. But the clarity. And you made you were pretty clear on this today regarding the regional assets are landfills. The transfer stations just need to make sure that there isn't a dispute at wind down process. That's all. That's. That's all.

 Speaker 1 - 56:52

I didn't, I thought all the language was gone.

 Speaker 3 - 56:53

Okay. Okay.

 Speaker 4 - 56:54

All right.

 Speaker 1 - 56:55

So member Matteo Bowen. And then remember right now my question.

 Speaker 2 - 56:59

Is for our attorney, Mr. Cole. Has my city responded with feedback in.

 Speaker 1 - 57:04

Regards to the draft the C's haven't seated.

 Speaker 4 - 57:07

No, that's the problem.

 Speaker 1 - 57:10

It's been, it's been given to you all. Unless you've given it to your city.

 Speaker 2 - 57:13

I've given it to my city.

 Speaker 4 - 57:14

No, they have not.

 Speaker 2 - 57:15

Okay, thank you.

 Speaker 5 - 57:17

Remember right now we'll call it non pinpoint and just food for thought. I'm not trying to make it more complex is the definition of solid waste purposes. And the reason I a lot to what we're defining as solid waste purposes is it brings back like Ojida of the RRB in terms of the money that was distributed post rrb. I get the purpose of it. I'm just wondering was that language agreed on? Was that work language I just so I could understand from Jamie your side in the county attorney's office that definition, because that definition became real ripe when cities were getting pretty big checks and what the broad spectrum that was utilized for these funds.

 Speaker 1 - 57:53

Well, Mr.

 Speaker 5 - 57:55

Call that right, but that's the question.

 Speaker 1 - 57:58

That was a different, that's a different.

 Speaker 4 - 57:59

Issue that back then the issue for salvation purposes was whether or not the money that you got had to be used for certain solid waste purposes. That was the issue.

 Speaker 5 - 58:08

By the way, that definition that is.

 Speaker 4 - 58:10

Not in this agreement. In this agreement there's nothing that specifies what you can and cannot do with the money that you get.

 Speaker 5 - 58:15

Okay.

 Speaker 4 - 58:16

Now your city attorney may give an opinion that it has to be used for certain purposes. We did not want to put that in.

 Speaker 5 - 58:22

That was my question.



Speaker 4 - 58:23

So we did not put that in here.



Speaker 5 - 58:25

That was intentional.



Speaker 1 - 58:26

Yes. Okay.



Speaker 5 - 58:27

That was the clarification I needed on a non pinpoint. Thank you.



Speaker 1 - 58:31

All right. You said there was others that you thought. Well, just the, I just want to be clear first because I thought from the county attorney's office and J.D. There was no, there were no other points. If, if we're, if there's others that's fine.



Speaker 3 - 58:42

But I'll just say it real quick, real clear from the city's point. What, what we're thinking is the city's point.



Speaker 1 - 58:51

Okay.

 Speaker 3 - 58:51

Yeah. That the, that the majority of facility types go to this, that they go to the city where located. That includes drop off centers, recovered materials processing facilities, puerto centers, compost facilities, yard waste processing and hauler vehicles.

 Speaker 5 - 59:09

Ms.

 Speaker 1 - 59:09

Call.

 Speaker 4 - 59:10

Yeah. Well those all would are not defined to be regional assets. So yes, the cities, when you say it goes to the cities would have the first ability to have it transferred to them subject to within five years they're going to have to either pay for it or sell it. But yes, those would, those are not including the definition of regional asset.

 Speaker 1 - 59:32

Okay. All right.

 Speaker 3 - 59:34

There's one last part and I'm going to need Matt to help on this one with regard to the transition period with that the five year. Matt or Nathaniel, either one of you guys want to address this? Yeah, bring them both up. How that five year extension works because I think that's important for everybody to be clear on. Hello.

Speaker 1 - 01:00:05



Hi. Matt Habert, County Attorney's office. I'll just sort of set the stage and let Nathaniel do some of the specifics. The concept that Mr. Cole has talked about is under the standard procedure where everybody's going their own way, both the municipalities and the county would be taking different assets, but they take them subject to certain requirements and the biggest requirement is that they can't hold onto it for more than five years absent paying for it or selling it. And so the issue that Commissioner Fur is bringing up is really one of flexibility. So anything that you want your successors to have the ability to do ought to be in this document. Right now, the way it's written, there's no flexibility. Five years done. That's it.



Speaker 1 - 01:00:56

If for some reason the parties want to continue with this transition period longer, it's going to be very difficult to make that happen because a lot of these things are required to be in bond, sorry, in deed covenants. So if you want to have the ability to extend or either for those parties who inherit this from all of us to extend that five year period, the mechanism ought to be included in this document. So let me just ask this. So what we're saying is the county's not in agreement with this document and you're asking. That's not at all what we're saying. This is just a policy discussion. I'm having that policy discussion. I'm trying to ask has the county attorney's office and Jamie come to an agreement on this language?



Speaker 4 - 01:01:36

There was discussion about that exact language and it was taken out and we thought we had an agreement without having that language.



Speaker 1 - 01:01:42

Okay. Okay. Now we can have the policy.



Speaker 4 - 01:01:44

This is different.



Speaker 3 - 01:01:45

Okay, so the idea is here. Go ahead. Well, I'll let Nathaniel.



Speaker 1 - 01:01:48

Sure. And just to Nathaniel Klutzberg from the county attorney's office, in addition to what Matt said, based on some of the comments at the last meeting, in terms of the main goal here is to keep public assets in public hands. What had been discussed, and again to Mayor Ryan's point, the lawyers talked about whether to include this language and then it was not included because it is ultimately a policy decision. And Commissioner Fur is bringing it up for the discussion today is at the time that the transition period ends at five years, there is no authority it would wind if there is a desire to keep those assets. Let's say, for example, a city of Coconut Creek takes a drop off center. The city of Plantation takes a yard waste facility. The county takes transfer stations to operate them.



Speaker 1 - 01:02:40

And everything is working at that point. At five years right now, it all disappears. It has to be sold or it has to be purchased. It doesn't disappear. I don't know where you get that. Well, they want to continue operating. They simply have to pay for it.



Speaker 3 - 01:02:54

Well, again.



Speaker 1 - 01:02:57

You're absolutely right, Mayor, that the question at that point is they'd have to pay for it and then they can continue to operate, it can charge their residents whatever it is that they're choosing to charge. The question becomes, is a city going to want to take on an asset or would the county want to take on an asset knowing that at some point, no matter what, even if all of the requisite parties wanted to continue doing, has to be sold or purchased? And that's a pure policy.



Speaker 5 - 01:03:26

Just a simple question.



Speaker 1 - 01:03:28

Sure.



Speaker 5 - 01:03:28

Because I read it, I see it, I know what you're talking about. I understand the policy issue. The question is, you guys clearly had additional policy language in there for what happened the other. The alternate, we'll call it the alternate. What's in there? There's language, right?



Speaker 3 - 01:03:40

Yes.



Speaker 1 - 01:03:41

There had been language that as we sit here right now, I don't need.



Speaker 5 - 01:03:46

To see it this minute, but.



Speaker 1 - 01:03:47

Well, I would think if you're bringing forward a policy decision that you all have talked about, that you want alternative language. We're here today. We know we have to deal with it. And I only say this because no disrespect, but this has been a really tortured process to get to this point. There's been language flying everywhere. If you have an idea, let's get the language. And I thought that this was. I thought the only PIN in place was the percentage that we've just talked about. But if there's others, that's fine. That's what we're here for. Let's get them all out. But let's have the language and we need it basically today. So I certainly can go print out earlier versions of the language, but just in terms of conceptually, so that you understand, it's the opposite.



Speaker 1 - 01:04:25

It's sort of the mirror image of the Alpha 250 concept where we have to go and get everybody's agreement to delay selling it rather than doing that. What had originally been proposed and discussed and again between the attorneys, because it was ultimately a policy issue, it was taken out, is that unless a certain number of the parties who would be getting benefit from the sale notify then current owner of the property, we want the transition period to end, it renews for another period. So that you're not constantly chasing after yeses, you're just waiting to see if enough of the parties that say no that get the money want to say no. And it's ultimately a policy decision. It's not a legal issue.

 Speaker 3 - 01:05:10

We've had to approve the Alpha 250. How many times? Yeah, over and over. Because it wasn't.

 Speaker 1 - 01:05:17

Because we didn't have solid waste authority. That's why. Because we didn't have any agreement. And so we. You're going to have. You're knowing 18 months out that you're going to be winding this down. I just want to put it some context. I'm happy to consider any language members will as well.

 Speaker 4 - 01:05:31

This should have been.

 Speaker 1 - 01:05:32

We should have had this language here today. I am frustrated beyond belief because I've had to take it on the chin as the chair that I told the members they were going to have this to review.

 Speaker 3 - 01:05:43

There is.

 Speaker 1 - 01:05:43

This is no surprise to the county attorney's office my level of frustration. I'm happy to have this and it may very well be great language, but it should be in this document. And Mr. Cole should have been notified ahead of time that there's yet another policy decision so that were talking about it. So here's what I would suggest. I want to put in context. We're talking about something that's going to happen 45 years from now. I will tell you, this wind down process has been the tail wagging the dog through this facility's amendment. The amount of time that's been spent on trying to deal with this in part because of perhaps PTSD from the RV breakup, but that's what's been wagging this dog. From the county perspective, how do we get this language?

 Speaker 1 - 01:06:22

And I think what we're going to need is a special meeting. We cannot go to the next executive committee meeting with new policy proposals, new language being handled up, trying to redline and then trying to hand it to the governing board. It's not going to happen.

 Speaker 4 - 01:06:38

Not.

 Speaker 1 - 01:06:38

It's not a responsible way of doing this on a document that was supposed to be so simple when we practically don't own anything. So I open it up for how we proceed. But I think the first step is we have got to reach an agreement on a special meeting members.

 Speaker 5 - 01:07:00

You know, listen, I think some of these things could be worked out in a talking capacity. I understand specific languages in here and I see you're wide eyeing me, right?

 Speaker 1 - 01:07:07

Yeah. Because we've been working on this language, the things that aren't in here.

 Speaker 5 - 01:07:12

Policy level. I read this at length. I redlined it myself. I know issues that I have, whether they're policy issues or other issues or legal issues. Right. I have my own set of eyes. I'm telling this board I'm prepared to make some of these policy decisions today to let the language work itself out. So I'm. I'm sitting here ready. I don't need a special meeting. I'm ready to go. If other members do, so be it.

 Speaker 1 - 01:07:36

I think it's unfair to the members, be honestly, because I do think the point is that some of them will want to talk to staff, make sure. I'm happy to have that discussion with the time we have. Right. But I. But I think we. Frankly, my sense is we're going to need a special meeting. In fairness, I need some discussion, though, from the members. If that's not the case, well, we can extend this meeting and work our way through it today. There's no hesitation on that member. Bright Cruz. Thank you, Chair. I would say that we should schedule a special meeting. However, I also think that it's too easy to schedule a special meeting and be very close to where we are today in that meeting. And I don't want to do that. I agree. So I think we need to do both.

 Speaker 1 - 01:08:16

I think we need to get all. All the different ideas, the policy items out here. We need to discuss them and give very distinct direction to. To those. The attorneys that are pulling this all together so the wording matches what we think it's going to look like. And then that special meeting is basically to tweak it, you know, the minor changes, and approve it. I agree. I don't want. I don't want there to be some confusion. I was saying let's move on to the next agenda item. There's still work to be done. I want to hear from all the members on what's been discussed. The second part of that is we have an obligation to the governing board that we're not handing it to them on the day of the meeting.

 Speaker 1 - 01:08:53

So we cannot just have this discussion today, put out, get some general guidance and not see the language, as was evident here today. Mr. Cole came in thinking all the language was essentially done. I get it. New policy. Members may introduce new policy, that's fine, but we cannot go to the meeting on the 20th, and we can't wait till the 19th. So I say it because I really want the members, if they can, to. First, I need to turn to staff to see when this room is available over the next 10 days and frankly over the next week to give the governing board the most opportunity between now and next Monday, which is hard. You're denied the opportunity to speak because of that respect.

 Speaker 5 - 01:09:36

I think there's going to be frustration on behalf of some of the governing board, no matter what.

 Speaker 1 - 01:09:40

I get that. I get that. I'm not. I'm not trying to. I'm not trying to cure. But what I'm trying to do is mitigate it from getting it at the meeting in a red line version. So there's still going to be frustration. We're going to have another problem. I get that. Let's solve what we have in front of us. One, let's schedule a special meeting subject to when this is available. And then two, let's start moving through whether it's member Rydell's comments or anybody else's on the policy issues that should be discussed and placed out there. Questions to Mr. Cole, the county attorney's office, to understand how this is working as best as possible, given the fact that the members just got this essentially.

Speaker 3 - 01:10:15



Can I do a point of order?



Speaker 1 - 01:10:17

Sure.



Speaker 3 - 01:10:18

Because I think there's only two. I mean, for the. For the attorneys, they camera everything out. These are two policy decisions. These are the ones we have to figure out. Because they can't put a number in there. You know, that's. They can't decide. Should it be 30, should it be 80? That's up to us. We can make that decision. We pick a number. That's all we have to do.



Speaker 1 - 01:10:41

That's not all we have to do, though.



Speaker 3 - 01:10:42

That is all we have to do.



Speaker 1 - 01:10:42

We have a transitional period. We have additional period.



Speaker 3 - 01:10:45

Let me finish. The second part of it is, do we want some flexibility at the end or not? If we don't. Okay, if we do, it primek sense to me, because you put together an entire system, you want those assets to be able to continue to

work for the citizens of this county on. On a continued basis. If you don't want that to work to happen, then. Then you just have a five year vote. We make that decision when. And those are the two decisions. There aren't more than that, Mike.



Speaker 1 - 01:11:17

But that's not fair to the members who may have their own. This is my point. No, no, this is my point. And why this should have been given.



Speaker 3 - 01:11:22

But we all came here with this document.



Speaker 1 - 01:11:25

No, we did. That's not fair.



Speaker 3 - 01:11:26

Everybody has this document.



Speaker 1 - 01:11:27

They got it last week. Friday.



Speaker 3 - 01:11:29

Friday.



Speaker 1 - 01:11:29

It's Monday.

 Speaker 3 - 01:11:30

Right? Exactly.

 Speaker 1 - 01:11:31

And they haven't had time. I don't want to argue this because here's the point. I'm not arguing the merits. I'm arguing the process. Okay? It may very well be, yes, it gets treated like alpha. That may be the right way to do it. My point is we have to get through it. And the members are entitled to introduce their own. So my frustration is that. And I look forward to hearing from member Riddell. Who has been through it, has his red line. But we're going to need another meeting. That's how I feel about it. If the members disagree, then we're going to certainly draw the ire of the governing board even worse than what's going to be drawn now to member Rydell's point.

 Speaker 3 - 01:12:04

And I totally agree that we should have this thing done and ready for the governing board.

 Speaker 1 - 01:12:09

And if it does, I mean not for the governing board. It has to be done and ready and sent to them so they have time. Which means not next Thursday or like what was done here the business day before.

 Speaker 3 - 01:12:20

Right.

 Speaker 1 - 01:12:20

That's my point.

 Speaker 3 - 01:12:22

I mean, I'd go the hammer route today, but if we need a special meeting, I'm fine to do that. Yeah, but okay. I mean, I'd love to hammer it out.

 Speaker 1 - 01:12:29

Remember Mateo Bone and then.

 Speaker 2 - 01:12:31

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Is it possible that we can have this special meeting ahead of an executive meeting, like a 30 minute placeholder?

 Speaker 1 - 01:12:40

The next one's the 20th. That's the problem. Then the government. That's the problem. I apologize right now. And then let's start going through the.

 Speaker 5 - 01:12:47

So, I mean, I'll be clear. I think that I, I support the number I supported earlier. I support the additional flexibility for wind down. I support highlighting the subsections in what we distribute to the governing board as a whole. Right. Making a direct point, as opposed. It's a voluminous document. A direct point to the highlighted areas. So they're. Everyone on the governing board has their attention directed to the policy issues. And we're not giving it in the 11th hour. Right. We're giving it to them in a timely manner. We're highlighting the policy issues. And if we can come to a hypothetical policy decision today, hypothetically, it at least gives them a starting point to highlight the general policy overview. So for the purposes of today, those are my two positions on the two issues. I'm in the solid waste point.

 Speaker 5 - 01:13:36

Maybe I could have a private conversation with Jamie to understand the language that was removed, how they did it with Alpha. That's maybe not what I'm hearing is the issue today. It's a personal issue, but we'll get there. But those are my feelings on the two policy issues. And I think if we want to make sure that we should be distributing this after today, regardless of there's a special meeting or not, to the governing board members with a highlighted section saying these are the issues we're hammering up. That's my thought.

 Speaker 1 - 01:13:59

Thank you. Certainly agree. It should go out in no other way. It certainly is a draft, but I'm not prepared to walk into the meeting on the 20th without us all seeing the language being proposed for this transition period, what that looks like. I am telling you, this has been a period comma type discussion at times. And so we need to have that. We need to be in a position so you all can digest it, approve it, if that's going to be the case. Send it out as these. This is the recommendation. That's what we're supposed to be doing, sending it out as a recommendation. Not that we're just talking about it where we have a draft, but that we're sending a recommendation up from the executive committee with sufficient time for the governing board to look at it.

 Speaker 1 - 01:14:42

And I just will say again, this is what I've been telling the county since December, Mr. Cole, Because Monday's a holiday. Well, Friday, would there be time? Okay, so which day? Right, there's. I think member Shoeham also has their hand, but we'll come to you in a second. Glad your. The question is about the date, right? We're gonna do this. I mean, what. What's the issue for the county? Friday is what? A retreat.

 Speaker 3 - 01:15:17

Tuesday.

 Speaker 1 - 01:15:18

All right, how about Friday? No, this week. I'm talking about. I'm talking about next week. So you have time to put the paperwork together and we can get it by. Maybe get it by Thursday so we have actual time to look at it. But, but let's put. We got. We got 10 days. We got 10 days. We have to have enough time for us to get the language back, which is sufficient. This is a Monday. We had it Thursday. We had a meeting this Friday. If we approve, then it goes out to the governing board with a full week advancement. To me, that's a. That's more respectful to the governing board while still continuing to gather costs. Doesn't mean that at the governing board there won't be additional policy questions or even policy introductions that are going to have to be hammered out.

 Speaker 1 - 01:15:58

But we have to have a document that's being pushed up from the executive committee with a recommendation, not just a direct. That's just my. I'm available Friday.

 Speaker 2 - 01:16:05

Okay.

 Speaker 1 - 01:16:08

Yes. Is this room available on Friday? Let's begin with some of the infrastructure that we can find out. Plantation off.

 Speaker 5 - 01:16:16

Is it.

 Speaker 1 - 01:16:17

Sorry. Okay. So tac. Can we.

 Speaker 4 - 01:16:23

Can.

 Speaker 1 - 01:16:24

We can either do eight and have tac go at 10 or 10:30 or 11 or immediately after, if it's up to the members. Whatever you all want to do.

 Speaker 2 - 01:16:34

I think.

 Speaker 1 - 01:16:34

I think it would better. Let me just say, hey, time out. Time out. Time out. That's right. It would better for the executive committee to work through this and then make sure the TAC is also introduced its comments. Right. Rather than in reverse. So what was, what were you gonna say?

 Speaker 3 - 01:16:48

I was just asking the date.

 Speaker 1 - 01:16:49

All right, so this Friday. Talking about this Friday. Okay. Remember matay bond? Nine. Nine as Friday night.

 Speaker 4 - 01:17:12

All right.

 Speaker 1 - 01:17:12

Can you do 10? 10, 10, is it 10?

 Speaker 4 - 01:17:17

All right.

 Speaker 1 - 01:17:18

Do we have a motion for a special meeting at 10 o' clock next Friday with the sole purpose of addressing this Friday? Sole purpose of addressing the facilities member motion by member Cagiano, seconded by member Bright Cruz. Any. Any discussion on that? Member Horland?

 Speaker 2 - 01:17:36

My question is, will this be provided to TAC at 9 o' clock so that they could provide.

 Speaker 1 - 01:17:41

Well, they should have this already. That needs to go to them right.

 Speaker 2 - 01:17:44

Now so that we can discuss their comments at 10 o'. Clock.

 Speaker 1 - 01:17:47

Correct.

 Speaker 2 - 01:17:48

Thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 01:17:49

Yep. Okay, so now let's.

 Speaker 4 - 01:17:53

Let's do this.

 Speaker 1 - 01:17:53

All in favor say aye for the special meeting.

 Speaker 4 - 01:17:55

Any opposed?

 Speaker 1 - 01:17:56

All right, so we're gonna get that set notice. Yes. Is the room available? No, no, let's leave the tack at nine. All right.

 Speaker 4 - 01:18:03

And we'll.

 Speaker 1 - 01:18:04

We're at 10. Okay, so everybody can. Everybody. Sorry. Now. Now it's nine to 10. Okay, I know, but they are working on C and D and some others, so maybe they'll prioritize. Okay. Whatever the members want.

 Speaker 5 - 01:18:22

I just say to make sure.

 Speaker 1 - 01:18:24

Whatever.

 Speaker 3 - 01:18:25

Could it be 8:30 to 10?

 Speaker 1 - 01:18:28

I don't know. Tax at night, folks, 10:30 is now the next. What is the member Tyobond. Right. All right. 10:30 it is. Okay. All right, so now let's move to any of the questions on the five categories. Working our way through before you've even had the chance to look at the specific language. Because the language is important and I think that'll be part of the work between now and Thursday. If you have other comments outside of what will be discussed today. But the general concept, again from the first category, was the authority to own and operate specific facilities, limited to transfer stations, drop off centers, and recycling. With the general concept that we can't operate as solid waste disposal facility, defined as waste energy or landfill for that amount.

 Speaker 3 - 01:19:25

Right.

 Speaker 1 - 01:19:25

Okay. Right. Any changes to that in terms of beyond transfer stations, drop off centers and recycling, which is broadly including yard waste. And we talk about recycling, to be clear, for the members, it's talking about yard waste and composting and all the others. Right. That we can Own that to change the ownership beyond the enumerated facilities would take the county plus 80%. Okay, everybody, any concerns without looking at the language and you can go home and send more comments. Any concerns at that level yet?

 Speaker 2 - 01:20:00

Okay.

 Speaker 1 - 01:20:02

All right, Member Shoeham, you can go ahead and release her.

 Speaker 2 - 01:20:11

Sorry, Chair, thank you so much for allowing me to speak and my apologies for not being able to be there and I

can't stay on too much longer, but I will definitely be there on the 13th at 10:30. Before you get into the details of those five points, my recommendation would be that when you get through with this meeting, that council basically immediately prepare an executive summary of these major points and highlight in there any open issues. And that goes to everybody on the governing board, the executive board and staff, so that you can have comments from everyone by next Monday so that you have five days to basically get it together before the 13th.



Speaker 2 - 01:21:06

So my suggestion is that the most final version we can get be distributed to the governing board this week with a deadline for comments, verbal comments to go back to council by, like next Monday. So by the. The 13th, when we have this special meeting, we are close to done.



Speaker 1 - 01:21:33

Member Sham, I think there's some confusion. The 13th is this Friday.



Speaker 2 - 01:21:40

I'm sorry, I'm sorry. I'm a week off.



Speaker 1 - 01:21:43

Yes, but still, I wish we had your week.



Speaker 2 - 01:21:47

Yeah. The executive summary needs to go out to the governing board, like after this meeting, so everybody can get comments to us. Not Monday, but before Friday. So that when we're in this special meeting, we are not just addressing our own executive committee's concerns, but we are getting at least initial concerns from everybody on the governing board in time to finalize something before the 20th. That's my point.



Speaker 1 - 01:22:21

Yeah, agreed. As indicated, this needs to go out immediately. The executive summary. Mr. Cole, I think you all have worked on something in the past.

 Speaker 4 - 01:22:30

We can certainly do an executive summary. The reason I hesitate to do it is whenever we've had any of these documents, the county attorneys. And we end up having disagreements over language. I mean, the language is in the agreement. If we do an executive summary, then we have different language and we have more disputes.

 Speaker 1 - 01:22:48

Let me ask.

 Speaker 4 - 01:22:49

Sometimes the summary creates more disputes than.

 Speaker 1 - 01:22:51

No, I don't think member Shoeham's asking for it to be a. Instead of a 30 page document, a 10 page document. But I think how you outline the five categories to help direct the members how to look at this, I can certainly do that. Which includes that recycling facility would include composting.

 Speaker 1 - 01:23:10

Just make that kind Just to summarize that and then to the extent there are any open policy decisions like the percentage, if that's still a debate at the end of the day today, any others regarding the 5 year kind of Alpha 250 scenario and any others that the members identify here today as potential, just put a pin on it, say that the exec committee is still working through some of these policy decisions, but we're letting you know that these are some issues that still and examine it to find any other policy issues that you may wish to raise.

 Speaker 2 - 01:23:46

Member Shuham Yes, Chair. I mean you said it exactly. I don't mean a detailed legal executive summary. I mean what you guys are talking about today like here. A lot of the cities are not expecting all these issues. This is not what the document was originally kind of to be. And so I think it's just helpful for them to have this high level list of issues and then they can direct it to the appropriate people on their staff to go through this asap. I would just hate

for anyone on that governing board to say on the 20th that they didn't know or they didn't have adequate time.

 Speaker 2 - 01:24:25

So I understand we're in a crunch and so that means this week a lot has to get done and I think it has to get done before the 13th as far as sharing information and trying to get back any input from the governing board members before the 13th so we can hash it out at that meeting and that's it.

 Speaker 1 - 01:24:46

Okay, thank you, member Suham. Mr. Cole will go ahead and direct that and I hesitate, but I know that this will have to get reviewed by the county to make sure you're in agreement on what the summary is. I'm just asking for it not to be laden with anything other than the most basics to provide based a little bit more than a table of contents and a little less than policy debates. So other than that, if that's going to be an issue for the county then you know, certainly we could have Mr. Cole send one, we have the county send another one. But I really just want this to be a summary in general like was outlined. I don't think anybody had any exception to these five categories and the general concepts and just allow the members then to direct.

 Speaker 1 - 01:25:32

Is that okay with you? Right. Are you okay if I will just.

 Speaker 4 - 01:25:36

Prepare it and we'll send it out and if the county has comments, I guess I'll give comments afterwards. I mean.

 Speaker 1 - 01:25:42

Well, I don't know about quick, but I appreciate that ambitious or optimistic view of it.

 Speaker 4 - 01:25:48

Sure.

 Speaker 1 - 01:25:49

Okay. Member Reichst quick point. I'm wondering since we have all the attorneys here, can we get a commitment on when that can go out? Remember Cole, I mean attorney Cole?

 Speaker 4 - 01:25:59

Well, I. We can have one drafted before. By tomorrow. Okay, by tomorrow.

 Speaker 1 - 01:26:08

Can we see if that's something that can be forwarded on that same day after the county has approved it? I just don't want it. I mean so many times we've seen these things. It should only take a day and then it. Here's how my perspective. Mr. Cole's the solid waste authorities council. We should direct him to send out what's the proposed okay. If, if he can send it to the county attorney's office and they can say okay, yeah, no problem. That's a fair summary of what's in the document without putting fingers on. On scales, then that they're certainly welcome. But this can't be held up if you're committing till noon. And we would expect it goes out to the governing board no later than noon tomorrow. Or if they're not comfortable, they can just send out a known their own version of it.

 Speaker 1 - 01:26:52

I'm fine with that, but I just don't want to delay it while everybody is talking to another. Okay, we're in agreement. All right, let's start work. Continue to work through. We're on the first point. Any issues on the authority to own? I would just ask the members to look to the facilities as defined to make sure we didn't miss anything. Everyone was careful to try to make that as broad as possible. The wind down procedures were generally explained and it's. We saw the Alpha250 issue separate from that.

 Speaker 4 - 01:27:20

But the.

 Speaker 1 - 01:27:23

Demarcation of regional versus non regional is a component just to make sure everybody's in agreement on that definition. As member Riddell was raising. There was an issue on that in a different context, but that is something to be looked at to make sure everybody's in agreement on regional because it's handled differently as to whether the county has first right or a city has first right. Okay. As it was described by Mr. Cole. Does anybody have any exception right now? Understanding you'll still get your comments in. Okay. Anything else in there that's other than

the percentage, Mr. Cole, that is a bit squirrely or you think you need some policy direction on.



Speaker 4 - 01:28:01

No, I think the only issue would be this transition thing if I can give you some context of that. So you got to remember we're at the end of 40 years. The SWA has decided you do not want to continue. You're going to disband. Every city is going their own way. That's basically where we are. So you're all going your own way. Now the question is, what do we do with the assets? And the first concept was we would just sell all the assets. But then the thought was, well, some of these assets would better to stay in public hands. So if they're regional assets, the county may want them. So the county should be able to buy them and pay everyone. Or if a things located in the city should be able to buy it and pay everyone.



Speaker 4 - 01:28:46

But then the concept was, well, they shouldn't have to pay right away. There should be some period of time. So we'll give them a year or two years or five years. So ultimately we agreed that they'd have five years. So long as they're using it for solid waste purposes, they'd have five years to pay for it. And if they don't pay for it in the five years, they have to sell it. And that's how it's drafted right now. So the concept now is should we have another provision that says at the end of the five years, if the person who took it, either the city or the county took the property and doesn't want to sell it, they want to keep using it, but they don't want to pay for it, should they be able to get an extension of that time period?



Speaker 4 - 01:29:27

Now if that should be extended, it's a little bit tricky logistically because there's no SWA anymore. So now the question is, how do we extend it? So there's two ways of doing it. One is, and it has to be by agreement of everyone. So you could either require everyone to agree, which is how we did it in the alpha 250. So with alpha 250 at the end, the county kept title. But when they were supposed to sell it within one year and when they sold it, everyone would get their share. To extend it, we had to have an agreement. So we've had eight agreements, eight one year agreements basically to extend it. That's one way of doing it.



Speaker 4 - 01:30:10

Now the other way of doing it is it automatically gets extended unless everyone gets together and says we don't want to extend it, which is what the county had proposed, or some percentage had said we don't want to do it. So just you got to think logistically, how is this going to work and how are you going to.

Speaker 1 - 01:30:28



Well, the first question is do you.



Speaker 4 - 01:30:29

Want to allow it to be extended or should the five year period be the end? And at the End of the five years you got to either sell it or pay for it. That's one option. The other is you're going to extend it. And if you're going to extend it, then it gets a little complicated. So when you're saying you wanted to see the language, were discussing the language because there's different ways of doing it. We just decided not to do it.



Speaker 1 - 01:30:53

At all and just took it out.



Speaker 4 - 01:30:55

And that's how we ended up. So the question, you know, that's really the first question you have to ask is 10 to the five years. Should, should whoever took the property either pay for it or self sell it?



Speaker 1 - 01:31:05

All right, remember Kaja, maybe it's just me, but I just feel as though this is like expecting failure. If this is, if this, if the swa, if it's working great, why do we automatically now going to say we're going to have a wind down period after 40 years? If it's working great, why not have it for 60 years? Why not? So what I'm saying is, but you're.



Speaker 4 - 01:31:27

Having it where it's going to end.



Speaker 1 - 01:31:29

Whether people are going to buy it.

 Speaker 4 - 01:31:31

Or this or that.

 Speaker 1 - 01:31:32

But if it's working great, oh then why not just keep it going?

 Speaker 4 - 01:31:35

If it's working great, it gets extended another 40 years. We don't.

 Speaker 1 - 01:31:39

Oh, okay.

 Speaker 4 - 01:31:39

The only time we get to this issue is if it's not working great, okay. And we're ending it at the end of 40 years. So okay, now the question is what do we do with the okay, because I'm like this sounds like a fetus attitude.

 Speaker 1 - 01:31:50

All right, number right now.

 Speaker 4 - 01:31:54

Work the.



Speaker 5 - 01:31:54

First time I support the position, not what's in the agreement. To add to the agreement on the reverse, alpha 250 that there should be an extension period that it doesn't extend if someone voices a concern. Right. So I support the ability of being able to extend it. It shouldn't be five years put up or shut up, depending on what at the time the regional asset or city asset is being used for. Right. So I don't think it should be a put up or shut up. And I think it should administratively extend unless there's that event. So on your theory, it's one don't want one under two A or B. I'm taking B. That makes sense. That's the language I'd like to see.



Speaker 1 - 01:32:30

Thank you. All right, Let me offer one consideration. Alpha 250 is vacant. Nobody's making money on it right now. Okay. Nobody's operating it, getting a host fee not making coin on it. Under B, if it's the county, they're not paying for it. They're continuing to get whatever money they've presumably decided it's operating. Great. Or if it's city, I'm making money off, why would I give it up? I don't have to ever pay for it. It just gets perpetually extended and extended. And if maybe you're a neighbor and you're taking advantage of it, or maybe you're a neighbor and you're like, I got nowhere else to go. They're making all this money off it and they haven't paid for it even though we paid for it. So I.



Speaker 1 - 01:33:14

What I say to you is this is incredibly complex and where you need to put yourselves in the position. Not about the 250, because that is not analogous situation. This is a fully functioning asset that's presumably making money. Right. Or there's a reason to keep it. Right. And maybe it fits within a broader system. If it's a county, it might fit because it's one of the transfer stations that's necessary for other reasons or it's a good recycling center or it's whatever the case is. But what you're doing is you're giving an entity perpetual ownership with not paying for the asset. This was the point of the five years. It could be a great regional asset and we're okay with that.



Speaker 1 - 01:33:59

Keep using it, but you shouldn't keep it operating to the detriment of your neighbors or to the detriment of anybody else without paying for it. The other component, like if they're not going to use it for solid waste, it's easy. The agreement says you got to sell it or pay for it. But we're talking about a fully functioning revenue producing, presumably necessary is either individually on its own, stood up to make money, or part of a system that without it makes other assets less valuable. Remember Bright Cruz? Yeah, I agree with you. I think that we just, we can't look that far in the future and understand what the scenarios are going to be and how it's going to be operated. What's going to be running successfully, what's not going to be running successfully.



Speaker 1 - 01:34:47

Frankly, this gives you five years to figure out whether you want to take ownership or you want to dispose of it. And I think that's plenty of time. Frankly, a couple of years is probably long enough, but five years is definitely long enough. You make the decision at this point. We've gone through the RRB. It failed. Now we're saying went through

a 40 year plan. It failed. I mean, I think it's over at that point. To try and dispose of these things or figure out the plan from these minimal assets to move forward, I think is probably not realistic. I think there's frankly, there's just too much uncertainty of where we will be at that point. This gives five years to determine what's best to do with those assets and do it, I think, to throw anything else in there.



Speaker 1 - 01:35:31

I certainly am not comfortable with taking public assets and letting somebody just run with it for an undefined amount of time with no guidance on that.



Speaker 3 - 01:35:48

I was going to talk. Well, on that one, I'll say real quick. It's really just a matter of wanting flexibility at the end. I know, Nathaniel, you looked like you wanted to say something on that.



Speaker 1 - 01:36:00

I mean, this is a reminder. Let's kind of get to that point because we still have the update on the financial modeling and the workshop timeline. We're at 235. So commissioner and Commissioner Riddell, Mayor Ryan and everybody else, the only issue in terms of whether it's. And to your point as well, sir, it's the question of whether or not you want to have the flexibility or don't want to have the flexibility. Again, there is no right or wrong answer to this question. It is a pure policy call.



Speaker 1 - 01:36:28

The question is if you do want to have the flexibility, do you want to have the flexibility to chase all of the cities to get their agreement, or do you want to have a scenario where if two cities object or one city objects or 20% of the population, cities representing 20% of the populations object, then it stops. And again, there's a million ways to slice that. The only question, the gating question is whether or not you want to have the flexibility or not, which is the ultimate policy question. And again, there is no right or wrong answer on that. I agree with that. It's not about flexibility.



Speaker 4 - 01:37:02

It's about what are we doing with.



Speaker 1 - 01:37:04

Public assets that have been paid for perhaps by a very distant city. It could be located in Margate and Southwest Ranch has helped pay for it. And they're saying, wait a second, they're operating that asset up there. They've been operating it for five years. Now they want to operate for 10, now they want to. We're entitled to some of that. The land's valuable, let them pay for it or don't pay for it. And if it fits within the county system and we're at that point, then the county will hopefully entertain a motion to pay for everything. Remember, for.

 Speaker 3 - 01:37:34

And then let's see that, like, so that this is, you know, we can decide yes or no on this. Flexibility, to me, makes a lot of sense because you're trying to keep the system intact as much as possible for the. The greater good. That's. That's my thinking. I did want to make one clarification on the. When we're looking at that percentage of needing for, you know, on the wind down, I had mentioned 55% of cities. I think it should be 55% of the cities and 55% of the waste. Because you could have a bunch of cities, small cities, you know, you'd end to it. So it needs to be a clarification of both.

 Speaker 1 - 01:38:17

Mr. Cole, I thought it was a ton that you were gonna go. Right.

 Speaker 4 - 01:38:21

So 55% of the cities and 55% of the ton who are municipal parties or 55% of the tonnage for the whole county. That's the one thing that's still not still. It's just of the ILA. So it's 55% of the 65%. So it's like 30%.

 Speaker 1 - 01:38:39

30%. Back to the point.

 Speaker 4 - 01:38:40

Just to make it clear.

 Speaker 3 - 01:38:42

You've got me confused.

 Speaker 1 - 01:38:44

All right. Well, the calculation is correct. That's exactly what it is.

 Speaker 4 - 01:38:47

Right now, if after the facilities amendment, we only have 65% of the waste, and then it's only 55% of that, these county would continue as the successor entity or the successor entity. It might not be the county would continue, but it would only have like 35% of the waste. Was like, now the county has 55%, I believe, of the total waste. This would only be 30 or 35% of the total waste. And all the other municipal parties do not get their money back.

 Speaker 1 - 01:39:14

And since you wanted to align it with the global. The global agreements of county tonnage. Yes. Yeah. So if were going to keep it in line, and I raised the point is whether that's a good threshold or benchmark, it should stay with that total county tonnage.

 Speaker 3 - 01:39:32

You're saying it's a majority of the.

 Speaker 1 - 01:39:33

Waste in the county?

 Speaker 5 - 01:39:34

Correct.

 Speaker 1 - 01:39:35

Okay.

 Speaker 4 - 01:39:36

All right.

 Speaker 1 - 01:39:37

The third area. And we've got to really move because we've got some issues. The technical inspection reviews. I really invite the members to look at this. This has been one that has gone round and round, and there are some real issues about what an arbitration looks like and what, you know, those who work in the legal field. What this really results in. What is an arbitrator ordering the executive committee to do regarding something that might impact the county's disposal. It has nothing to do about whether it's operating efficiently or you could have gotten a better deal from a contract or a certain recycling center drop off center is not working as best that can do that. But it's only when it is impacting. And all us lawyers know how to argue everything impacts something else.

 Speaker 1 - 01:40:27

But I just invite everybody to take a look, close look at whether we're inviting quite frankly a legal dispute that I'm not sure how it gets resolved. I don't know what an arbitrator tells the executive committee to do. So please take a look at that. I know there was a lot of interest on the members parts regarding the maximum service charges not being able to exceed unless two thirds of the population and the county agree to go above. That's a major protective provision. You should understand it, be able to talk about that because I know that was a great concern and the cleanup issues are not that controversial. Just so I've.

 Speaker 4 - 01:41:03

Before you move on to the next issue, just so we have clear guidance as to the. I think I have the percentage to be 55% of all county waste. Maybe you should get everyone see if everyone's okay with that.

 Speaker 1 - 01:41:14

You can always change your minds. But is that generally the guidance we're giving?

Speaker 3 - 01:41:16



Mr.



Speaker 1 - 01:41:17

Call for that.



Speaker 4 - 01:41:18

So we'll draft it that way.



Speaker 3 - 01:41:19

Let me ask Kevin and Nathaniel real quick.



Speaker 1 - 01:41:26

The only. And there's again, this is pure policy, so there's no right or wrong answer. And I forgot who it was that raised the issue of other cities who are not part of the authority. Whether or not their waste is going to count towards that 55% or whatever the percent is. I mean there really are two components to that which is there enough waste in it for the system to be viable? And there is. Is there enough percentage of buy in from the authority member cities to want to have that. So there again you could have it be the waste. Then you need to also know whether or not it's only authority members waste or is it total county waste? What the proposal just now was. Well, county waste, all county waste from authority members or all county waste period, including non county tonnage.



Speaker 1 - 01:42:13

Okay, but I just want to. Global is right now, right? Absolutely. But the question is are you counting non authority members waste the 55 as long as they stay in the county and they're not. Okay, well just to make, sorry just one point. Just you got it.



Speaker 4 - 01:42:27

To make that, to make that clear. You certainly don't want to be in a position where you have 55% of the county waste, but you have only 5% of the municipal party waste. So you probably want to have 55% or make it a majority of the municipal party waste and 55% of the county. You want to have both to make it to make sure that municipal parties are protected.

 Speaker 1 - 01:42:49

That's fine. Also, just to be clear, we. I don't have that information. Maybe county administration does. But the global Amendment only represents 55% of the county population. I don't know if that is also the tonnage.

 Speaker 4 - 01:43:02

I would assume it is not.

 Speaker 1 - 01:43:03

Okay, thank you. Okay, I.

 Speaker 4 - 01:43:05

Then now for the other issue. I still not sure how we're. What you want the document to have. No, no.

 Speaker 1 - 01:43:14

The transition, yes. That's up to the counties. They're going to have to propose the language right now because I. Unless there's direction from everyone here to go draft it after getting to this stage, I'm opposed to a transition beyond five years. I think it's make or break. And I think that the concept of allowing a city to continue to operate it in perpetuity or the county and not pay for it after some other cities pay for it, I'm opposed to it.

 Speaker 4 - 01:43:38

But that.

 Speaker 1 - 01:43:38

That. You do need that guidance from the members. That's what I need.

 Speaker 2 - 01:43:40

Right.

 Speaker 1 - 01:43:42

So members, you just need to. I think member Rydell has weighed in, member breakers, member Dunn, to which we'll.

 Speaker 5 - 01:43:52

Call it the flexibility issue. So it's just the flexibility or no to flexibility.

 Speaker 1 - 01:43:56

That's not.

 Speaker 3 - 01:43:57

That's not.

 Speaker 1 - 01:43:57

That's a yes to the county operating now, paying for it.



Speaker 5 - 01:44:01

Mike, you're not calling it flexibility. I understand your resistance to do it, but 40 years from now, we don't know the asset, the circumstance to think it's as black and white as that.



Speaker 1 - 01:44:13

I agree.



Speaker 5 - 01:44:14

Of a clear line in a document. I agree with you very clearly. I just don't think it's a black and white legal issue.



Speaker 1 - 01:44:19

But this is not trying to keep the system together. Let's be really clear. I understand flexibility keeps. It's already blown up. And the question is this regional asset, somebody wants to operate it. I'm just thinking, because I know I have at least one colleague on my days who is not going to be in support of allowing a county or city to run a regional asset that we paid for and not make a decision on it. The system's blown up already. It's blown up. It's done.



Speaker 3 - 01:44:47

Okay.



Speaker 1 - 01:44:47

So this is not about flexibility to keep the system together. It's blown up and Somebody wants to operate one of the facilities that's a drop off center, recycling center, composting yard waste or transfer station. And they're doing it because they either believe it's important from a social. Social policy or economically it's great. And if you don't want to pay for it, that's great. You just get. Keep getting extended. Because I know that's what we would do in Sunrise and that's a decision. I'm just saying it's not just pure flexibility because the system's blown up. It's about who gets to run the asset and not pay for it. Correct. And they should pay for it.

 Speaker 3 - 01:45:29

What if you have to suddenly come up with \$50 million?

 Speaker 1 - 01:45:31

Then they'll sell it. That's right.

 Speaker 3 - 01:45:33

And then it's taken out of the whole system.

 Speaker 1 - 01:45:35

But its system's blown up. So if I'm operating transfer stations. Let me just break it down. If Sunrise is operating a transfer station and it's so important, the neighbors are going to pay because I'm not going to operate it at a loss, I might have some advantage that it's in our city. So I might take a little bit of a haircut, but I'm going to run it as long as I can. Making money when it's sucking wind or nobody's using it or I can't keep upping it because the system's blown up again. Remember, everybody's off on their own. I'm negotiating contracts individually. It's gone.

 Speaker 3 - 01:46:07

You're going to require your city to pay a crazy amount of money or sell it.

 Speaker 1 - 01:46:12

That's right. And maybe the industry steps in and says it's that valuable. At the point at which this is a pure economic issue, if it doesn't have value as a regional asset, why are we allowing somebody to operate it for free?

 Speaker 3 - 01:46:24

They wouldn't be operating it for free. They may not be able to make it at the amount of money that they'd have to pay at an exorbitant rate.

 Speaker 5 - 01:46:32

I think Mike won the room. I don't agree. But let's call because there's consensus. You're presenting a picture to. To. To. You're advocating your position, Chair. But I. I support flexibility. It doesn't seem anyone else's chime in.

 Speaker 1 - 01:46:46

I welcome the county to propose the language so we can talk about it at the meeting on the 13th. All I'm saying is if there's no consensus, then it's really up to the county.

 Speaker 4 - 01:46:54

I don't.

 Speaker 1 - 01:46:54

I certainly don't want to direct Our attorney to start drafting language on something that may not have a consensus, but welcome to consider the language.

 Speaker 4 - 01:47:02

The only reason I hesitate on that is, I mean, first of all, if there's no agreement to have the extended transition, then it just stays how it is. If ultimately we are going to do something and the county just proposes language, there is other language. I think that would make a lot more sense. You know, having the people object when they don't even know what's necessary. Those cities may not have, you know, a mechanism to do that. So it is going to be very awkward. I think the county system was very awkward. And one of the reasons it's not in here is because were trying to figure out how to make it work and we really couldn't come up with any, so we took it out.

 Speaker 4 - 01:47:38

So I think it would make the most sense to decide today if you want to have an extension. And if so, then we can work together and try to come up with language for it, or you don't want to have the extension and then we can just go with it.

 Speaker 3 - 01:47:50

I'll be real quick. This is not going to be a veto. This is up to this group. I'm telling you right now.

 Speaker 2 - 01:47:57

That's correct.

 Speaker 4 - 01:47:57

That's right.

 Speaker 3 - 01:47:58

Okay. This is not one of those that's gonna die on, but we think it's probably a good idea. If you don't think it's a good idea, this is 45 years from now. Let them figure it, you know. Yeah, sure.

 Speaker 4 - 01:48:10

Would it be. Would it be appropriate for you to.

 Speaker 1 - 01:48:12

Make a motion to. To not have this flexibility? Leave the wording the way it is? Yes, there's a motion on the table. Is there a second? Okay, there's a second. Any discussion on that or. There's not much more dialogue? Because I don't want to. I, you know, I think I've beaten the horse pretty badly. No offense to the communities that actually have horses. That are on either side of the room. All right, while we do that, we got. Yeah, okay, sorry. Member

Matay Bone. There's a motion and a second to leave the language as it relates to the five year period in the document as it is now.



Speaker 1 - 01:49:04

And we're opening up for discussion, trying to get consensus because Mr. Cole has indicated if the consensus is the other way, there's a lot of work to be done and he has to adjust some language and work with the county.



Speaker 3 - 01:49:16

So it's.



Speaker 1 - 01:49:16

Whatever the position is of anybody, I'm prepared to vote on it. So whatever everybody wants. All right, go ahead. And call the question on. On that item. Can you just run through the rule? Thank you.



Speaker 4 - 01:49:31

Just so it's clear. Yeah. The motion is to leave language how it is and not have an extension of the transition period.



Speaker 1 - 01:49:38

Correct.



Speaker 4 - 01:49:39

So a yes to keep it out is.



Speaker 1 - 01:49:41

Okay.

 Speaker 2 - 01:49:46

Schumann on line.

 Speaker 1 - 01:49:47

Still no.

 Speaker 3 - 01:49:49

I think she had to go.

 Speaker 2 - 01:49:51

Member Horland? Yes. Member Matea Bong? Yes. Member Dunn? Yes. Member Rydell?

 Speaker 1 - 01:50:00

No. Member Mead?

 Speaker 4 - 01:50:02

Yes.

 Speaker 2 - 01:50:03

Member Cagiana?

 Speaker 1 - 01:50:04

Yes.

 Speaker 2 - 01:50:07

Member AJ Bryan?

 Speaker 3 - 01:50:09

No.

 Speaker 2 - 01:50:10

Member Bright Cruz?

 Speaker 5 - 01:50:11

Yes.

 Speaker 2 - 01:50:13

Mayor Bryan?

 Speaker 1 - 01:50:14

Yes. Vice Chair Fir.

 Speaker 3 - 01:50:17

No.

 Speaker 1 - 01:50:18

Okay, we're done with that. What can we accomplish in the time we have left? Let's go do anything else on this document right now.

 Speaker 4 - 01:50:24

Absolutely.

 Speaker 1 - 01:50:24

Okay. Thank goodness. Absolutely. All right. So we have the master plan workshop meeting starting beginning in March. You want to talk quickly on that issue? Yeah. Whoever's going to talk from SES on it. Timeline and the status of EC and governing board member engagement meetings. Yeah. And if we may, Daniel Deutsch, SES engineers. I would like my colleague Peter Quinn to give a presentation on what has changed in the financial. All right. So you're moving to the financial modeling. Okay, that's nice. All right. That's fine. Thank you. We're at 250 right now, so we may need an extension on this. We have a Motion to extend 15 minutes. Motion by second, by. All right, well, we have. We now have a form at that point, which is fine. I'm not. We'll just have the. Go ahead.

 Speaker 2 - 01:51:16

You've seen these slides before, so I'm just going to hit you with the highlights. And that's what's changed since we talked last. Do I have control? Okay, so you've done enough arguing about why we're here. You know that part and where we are in the process. Couple of things to focus on today being that we need to start developing a revenue stream. That's kind of the key issue to pay for the programs that we're saying that the authority will run. We understand that there's affordability concerns, so that's why I'm trying to be as transparent as possible in the analysis. The only thing that's changed since we talked last is the assumption that the authority will also do yard waste processing. And that cost. Cost to be \$45 a ton. It does still assume that we're establishing flow control within the ILA member communities.

 Speaker 2 - 01:52:06

The difference being, after talking to the attorneys and I was a little brazen about my tonnage assumptions, we think that we really can only probably surcharge or have ultimate control over the ILA communities and not non ILA member communities. So that tonnage will change slightly, which does change the outcomes of the analysis. Why it's important to think about the revenue streams is that they have varying levels of revenue stability and responsiveness as tonnage changes over time. There is some from a political perspective, perception of equity concerns that you may want to factor in there. But as far as the revenue stream, it's really more that volatility. That's something worth keeping in mind.

 Speaker 2 - 01:52:57

So comparing the two potential revenue streams that you're considering right now, tipping fee surcharges versus a non ad valorem assessment, I do have some updates on the thoughts behind both of those. Again, this is a slide you've seen before, but understanding that surcharges are done on a per ton basis, they're really responsive. Right? Any tonnage that comes through is automatically given that surcharge. It is a pass through cost and it is again volatile because it does depend in any given year on the tonnage that flows through those disposal facilities. However, as we're talking now strictly about ILA communities, a per ton charge could be done in other ways. So part of what I'm asking for today is to get some direction on this so that we can begin to consider implementation and how that might look.

 Speaker 2 - 01:53:52

With that being said, what I'm saying is if we're assuming that the tons are charged at a disposal facility versus a tonnage estimate in a given year of what each community would produce and then some sort of true up situation, the way that the revenue is collected could look very different. Even though you're collecting the same amount of revenue, we need to begin thinking about that, the realistic implementation of this with the updated assumptions. So again, yard waste processing, as well as removing some of the tonnage from non ILA communities, that now brings us to \$6 per ton is the estimate the non ad valorem assessment. Now that we are saying that the authority will be providing specific services, it's easy to see where there's a special benefit which is required in a non ad valorem assessment.

 Speaker 2 - 01:54:44

If you're paying for recycling processing and yard waste processing, it's very easy to have that nexus there. Assessments are a heavier lift though. This is not something that you can just easily implement tomorrow. They're usually done on a fiscal year timeline. The revenue stream is somewhat fixed. We did the waste generation study, but you would need the full assessment study to get that implemented. So my recommendation right now is that a surcharge of some kind is much easier to get implemented and then you could consider doing, collecting all or part of your revenue in an assessment somewhere down the road. Once you have those programs actually

established.



Speaker 1 - 01:55:23

Right, right. That actually have metrics, thresholds and benchmarks that have been achieved or not achieved, something that's provable before you can. Yeah, before you're doing assessments.



Speaker 2 - 01:55:33

And it's going to take you a little while to get those drop off sites constructed. So at that point it would make a lot of sense to consider what you want to recover an assessment. But for now, my recommendation is that we look at different ways that we could implement some kind of per ton surcharge. All right.



Speaker 1 - 01:55:48

Is that the guidance you're seeking today so that you can move forward? All right. To the members, any disagreement on at least focusing for now on the surcharge understanding, once it's a stable system and the members of the ILA that are participating realize the benefits from it and everything else then, and the connectivity from north, south, east and west, then assessments may work better. Remember right now is the goal to.



Speaker 5 - 01:56:10

Further investigate surcharge methods in terms of passing through the vendor, the hauler versus cities. I'm seeing nods. I support that. Yes.



Speaker 2 - 01:56:19

Member Harley, can I ask the recycling processing cost of 110 a ton? City Plantation has the least contaminated recycling, I think in the county. We are now with the changes in the markets, we're like at about 130, 140 a time. So where did that number come from?



Speaker 1 - 01:56:39

Great question. And I would imagine each of you have negotiated your own deal. We've done benchmarking across the state for what both cities and counties are currently paying for recyclable material processing. Not to talk too

much inside baseball, but there are different approaches to also factor in the value of the recyclable materials that may offset the tipping charge. We believe that it's a reasonable assumption to use \$110 tipping fee, not considering the value of the recyclables. And we also believe, as we spoke about at our last meeting, that with all of the ILA tons together, we're in a much stronger negotiating position. And that would be the expectation that moving forward we'd go out on the street with a solicitation, which we have started, but not only for recyclable materials, also yard trash processing and for disposal.



Speaker 2 - 01:57:29

Okay, thank you, Dan.



Speaker 1 - 01:57:30

Member Cagiano, your lights?



Speaker 4 - 01:57:31

No.



Speaker 1 - 01:57:32

Okay, thank you.



Speaker 4 - 01:57:33

Any.



Speaker 1 - 01:57:34

All right, so they're looking for guidance on this to pursue the surcharge analysis. Any objection to moving that forward?

Speaker 4 - 01:57:40



No.



Speaker 1 - 01:57:41

All right. I think you have Consensus. Thank you for accomplishing that in the time you did. All right, so just real brief on the workshop meetings and staff meetings coming up. I know that there were some questions. Where are we on the timeline, status? So we've. Collectively. And when I say collectively, it does not include you. So let me share with you. We're still going through the financial analysis. We know that's top of mind for each of the ILA communities. So we've decided to pause the direct engagement with a lot of staff. We continue our engagement with. I think we've met now with all of you on the executive committee. We're pretty deep into the governing board as well. But in terms of sitting down with staff that really want to know what is the financial impact, we want to sort of wind down.



Speaker 1 - 01:58:28

My apologies. Considering the wind down from the last conversation with the triggering work. Yeah, I apologize. We want to just be a little bit more advanced with the financial analysis and we believe that we will have that after our next executive committee and governing board meetings and then we will restart the engagement with municipal staff member Duck.



Speaker 2 - 01:58:51

So basically then it makes no sense to meet with my team on Thursday then, is what you're saying, because I absolutely cannot move forward with anything for Lauderdale until we had that follow up meeting with our team and the last meeting. I mean, my guys are all finance guys, so I'm confused. And, and I need them to fully understand the financial piece and their question. Like, based on what you're presenting, I don't feel like I could even begin to answer the questions that they're going to ask. So what I'm hearing you say is that it's better to wait until you have a more concrete answer.



Speaker 1 - 01:59:31

Yeah, what we're suggesting is early March. So, yes, postponing the meeting, is there any value in having preliminary meetings, at least with staff, to say we're still working through it?



Speaker 2 - 01:59:42

Well, we've had the meeting. So now my guys want to know what's the bottom line with the numbers. And so if then that meeting happens after March, when are we, when do we want to get this thing to a vote?

 Speaker 1 - 02:00:03

So.

 Speaker 2 - 02:00:07

Oh, yeah, that timeline is problematic for me.

 Speaker 1 - 02:00:10

Yeah, we're going to have to accelerate that. Even if it's broad guidelines, understanding it's. I don't know how we get done. We're aiming for the governing board to adopt on the 20th. They're going to need to know the numbers with enough time to go back to their daisies and otherwise. So I don't know that we can afford a pause. Understood. Okay. Commissioner, let me speak with you offline. We'll switch that up. Okay. We still have to address Mr. Storty's. Go ahead. I'm sorry, Member Ryan question.

 Speaker 5 - 02:00:38

When it comes.

 Speaker 4 - 02:00:43

The IMA can bring.

 Speaker 1 - 02:00:44

You before our commission. I thought you were just calling me Greg. Thank you.

 Speaker 4 - 02:00:50

Nice to.

 Speaker 1 - 02:00:50

Nice to hear from you, Greg. So, yeah, my city, we had a workshop scheduled before our commission meeting yesterday and given the, you know, abrupt resignation of our director story, that meeting has now been canceled and we're gonna have to reschedule it sometime. But obviously we're at a time crunch here and you know, with my city, when they see that executive director resigns. Right. Doesn't. It doesn't really make us look very good.

 Speaker 4 - 02:01:19

Okay.

 Speaker 1 - 02:01:19

For whatever reason that it's for. I totally understand. But you know, I'm assuring them that we're still taking the reins with leadership.

 Speaker 4 - 02:01:26

And I appreciate the executive committee's.

 Speaker 3 - 02:01:30

Effort and how we're going to carry.

 Speaker 4 - 02:01:32

This forward, but my question is, when we go before our commission, is it just the governing board members responsibility or the executive director or the executive board members responsibility to present it to our commission?

 Speaker 1 - 02:01:43

Because I know it's hard for SCS to come out to each one of those meetings when it comes time to make a decision. So I want to know if we have some type of plan together.

 Speaker 4 - 02:01:53

I'm not sure how Sunshine Law works.

 Speaker 1 - 02:01:55

But, you know, some other commissions would like to hear from possibly, you know.

 Speaker 4 - 02:02:00

Vice mayor, former mayor Fur, or even Josh Rydell coming into my city and.

 Speaker 1 - 02:02:04

Explaining it, you know, exactly. To my other commissioners that would understand it.

 Speaker 4 - 02:02:10

So there should almost be some sort.

 Speaker 1 - 02:02:13

Of like presentation team, you know, backed by elected officials that have been working.

 Speaker 4 - 02:02:18

On this for as long as we have.

 Speaker 1 - 02:02:20

So we could bring some teeth back to this and show that we've all been working on this for this long. I know, like Sunshine Law, we don't want to get involved in that, but just being there as a show of support and especially we should focus on that number that we have to get, you know, so especially the big, the large cities that are part of this. So I just wanted to bring that up and see if we have any type of plan for that. Because that's what it's going to come down to is getting them to say yes.

 Speaker 4 - 02:02:47

And you know, maybe people on the.

 Speaker 1 - 02:02:50

Governing board, they can't communicate it as well to their commission as somebody else could from another city or as SES obviously can.

 Speaker 4 - 02:02:59

So that's what I really wanted to.

 Speaker 1 - 02:03:01

Present that to the executive committee today to see if we have any type of plan or if we could create something like that. I think it's critical. Right. You can't put a pause on meeting with staff. You're going to have to. Even if the number is not final yet and we have to have a plan for getting to the commissions. Do we have. I know it's tough without Todd here. But my understanding is going to be basically a chart of when the meetings were coming up

and who was going to be able to go. So. So that is being worked on. So. But obviously the critical date will be March 20th. Right. Because you're going to be recommending. Right. So the governing board.



Speaker 4 - 02:03:33

Governing board.



Speaker 1 - 02:03:34

Some governing board members will not vote if they haven't had a chance to talk to their commissions and understand it. That's. That's the reality. So we need to work on that. That's why the meetings with the governing board members are so important. Needs to continue with haste so that we can assess whether governing board member may say, I'm completely comfortable. I don't need anybody to come. I know where my commission. Somebody else would say, you're gonna need to come. You need a lot of work. Let's get on.



Speaker 5 - 02:03:59

This list exists.



Speaker 4 - 02:04:00

Yes.



Speaker 1 - 02:04:02

So we've been compiling that list. They have been.



Speaker 3 - 02:04:06

And.

 Speaker 1 - 02:04:07

And they will continue to. And we've been asking those questions during the one one meetings. Are you comfortable attending other workshops? The sunshine is an easy matter. That is administratively. Every municipal clerk can. Let me just pause you. We're running out of time here. So here's what I. What I need as chair. I need that list.

 Speaker 3 - 02:04:26

Okay.

 Speaker 1 - 02:04:27

And I need to be able to decide whether there's panic that we need to address. And we'll address it on the 13th.

 Speaker 5 - 02:04:32

The resources.

 Speaker 1 - 02:04:34

Exactly.

 Speaker 5 - 02:04:34

Certain places.

 Speaker 1 - 02:04:35

Right. And just AJ's point. Yes, exactly. And I don't want to spend too much time. We still have to address Todd Storty's issue. Member Meaden and Vice Chair. Thank you. Chair. Just very quickly. Yes. I completely agree with member Ryan. We need something that is a coherent plan that's focused. That is contemporary with the. With the plan that we have going forward so that we could put present this to the different commissions so that.

 Speaker 4 - 02:05:01

We can do our best job of getting them on board. As it is right now.

 Speaker 1 - 02:05:04

I don't think we're there. We really need to focus on this so that we can have something to present as a coherent focus plan.

 Speaker 3 - 02:05:16

I think it'd probably be a good idea on the 20th of asking all the governing board who's prepared, who needs help, who wants. Who wants a team.

 Speaker 1 - 02:05:26

I don't think the plan should wait. I think this is what. This is what they're supposed to be doing now. It's being stood up as we go along. So on the 13th, we need an outline of what meetings are upcoming and a plan to get out to each of those commissions. We can't wait till 20 to ask them.

 Speaker 3 - 02:05:42

Okay.

 Speaker 1 - 02:05:42

That was the plan all along to make sure that there were individual meetings. So we don't get to.

 Speaker 3 - 02:05:46

So I guess part of it is knowing being able to coordinate all those meetings across all the cities, make sure there's no duplication on. Yeah. Okay. All right.



Speaker 1 - 02:05:57

County will go to all of them. Sorry, Mayor, just one more thing is like I said, we have to have part of the game plan to know which cities that if they say yes, we're good.



Speaker 4 - 02:06:10

Right? Yeah.



Speaker 1 - 02:06:11

Okay. And you can almost practice on the smaller cities.



Speaker 4 - 02:06:14

Right.



Speaker 1 - 02:06:15

Before you lead us to the bigger cities.



Speaker 4 - 02:06:16

Right.



Speaker 1 - 02:06:18

Don't be telling inside basics.

 Speaker 3 - 02:06:21

Just last thought.

 Speaker 1 - 02:06:21

So I think. Do think that it would be important to have that. That finalized or as final as we can plan of where we need to focus our efforts and distribute it to the governor board so they can confirm or kind of, you know, say, hey, we missed the mark in someplace. Right. And just to be aware, there's advocates in the community that want to participate in that. So they will. We don't have to add more comments, but that's why we need to start getting this out. Okay, perfect. All right. We still have a couple minutes. Based on that motion for extension, we have to deal with Mr. Stor situation and SCS. Again, the issue is technically he's resigned as of today. I don't believe. I don't know if he's on Daniel's. He on. No. So I hope we'd have the amendment here today.

 Speaker 1 - 02:07:08

How do you want. We don't have the amendment. So how do you want to proceed?

 Speaker 4 - 02:07:14

Yeah, we still have a quorum. Barely, but yes.

 Speaker 1 - 02:07:18

Okay, so how do you want to proceed? Let's. We have to get to it. Mr. Cole, what do you recommend?

 Speaker 4 - 02:07:23

This was given out. So you do have in front of you the. All right, so you know, now that we're meeting on Friday the 13th, which is only a couple days, we could just agree now that will keep, you know, Mr. Storty on for four more days and just let him keep working and.

 Speaker 1 - 02:07:45

Is that it? Is that a motion that would be a motion. Motion by member Rydell. Seconded by member Bright, who's.

 Speaker 2 - 02:07:50

I'd just like to amend that. And we did. We received this. But again, we'd like. Also, there was a request for Elise's duties on there as well. So we have Lisa's duty so that we really have a full understanding what the team is doing.

 Speaker 1 - 02:08:03

Right. Okay.

 Speaker 4 - 02:08:04

We can ask Elisa to prepare that.

 Speaker 1 - 02:08:06

We don't have with her and Todd. They can work that together so they know who's okay. All right. All the favor, say aye.

 Speaker 4 - 02:08:12

All right.

 Speaker 1 - 02:08:12

Any opposed? All right, we know the direction for the 13th. I have to amend the agenda to include that item on the special meeting, as well as an update from SCS on the commission plan and the governing board plan.



Speaker 2 - 02:08:27

Okay.



Speaker 1 - 02:08:28

Any further business?



Speaker 2 - 02:08:30

Mr. Chair, when Mr. Cole provides the executive summary, can we get that on the website for the public to see?



Speaker 4 - 02:08:38

Y.



Speaker 1 - 02:08:39

That's fine. Again, it's a draft document. I hesitate to.



Speaker 2 - 02:08:41

Okay. Thank you.



Speaker 1 - 02:08:43

All right. Any further business? Motion to adjourn. Motion by member Rydell. Seconded by member. Break. Who's all in favor, say aye. At least an hour.



Speaker 5 - 02:08:57

Trouble it may be.



Speaker 3 - 02:08:58

I know, I know.



Speaker 1 - 02:10:16

I understand.



Speaker 3 - 02:10:24

No, that's why we're still.



Speaker 1 - 02:10:25

Well.



Speaker 4 - 02:10:29

We've been working on.