

 Speaker 1 - 00:00

All right, I'm going to call to order the executive committee meeting. Folks in the audience, we're calling to order the executive committee meeting of February 2026. If you would please start calling. Can I please have order in here? Thank you. Folks, we're running behind already, so let's get moving. Need to call the roll.

 Speaker 2 - 00:26

Chair Ryan.

 Speaker 1 - 00:27

Present.

 Speaker 2 - 00:28

Vice Chair Furr. Carol. Member Shoeham. Member Horland. Here. Member Mateer. Bowen. Here. Bowen. Member Dunn. Here. Member Riddell. Member Meade.

 Speaker 3 - 00:49

Here.

 Speaker 2 - 00:50

Member Cagiano.

 Speaker 1 - 00:51

Present.

 Speaker 2 - 00:53

Member Ryan. A.J.

 Speaker 3 - 00:54

Ryan.

 Speaker 2 - 00:54

Here. Member Newton. Here. Member Colbarn. Member Murphy. Solomon. Here. Here. Member Bright Cruise.

 Speaker 4 - 01:07

Here.

 Speaker 2 - 01:08

Member Geller.

 Speaker 4 - 01:09

Here.

 Speaker 2 - 01:10

Member Bowman. Thank you. Ms. Call.

 Speaker 1 - 01:15

We have a quorum.

 Speaker 4 - 01:17

Yes, we do.

 Speaker 1 - 01:18

All right. Please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

 Speaker 2 - 01:19

Excuse me.

 Speaker 4 - 01:36

Yes.

 Speaker 2 - 01:39

I'm sitting in for member Rydell. Commissioner Sandra Welch, if you can make note.

 Speaker 1 - 01:45

Thank you so much. Thank you.



Speaker 4 - 01:46

Okay, just for the record, that will work for the governing board meeting for the executive committee, you can't be taking his place. We have different alternates.



Speaker 1 - 01:55

But for the alternate, when a member doesn't show, it's not an alternate from the same day, it's another city. But for the governing board, that works.



Speaker 2 - 02:03

Mr.



Speaker 1 - 02:03

Cold, you may need to explain to Commissioner Welch.



Speaker 4 - 02:06

For the governing board, each city has a representative and an alternate.



Speaker 2 - 02:11

So?



Speaker 4 - 02:11

So if their representative is not here, their alternate comes from that city. For the executive committee, we have 11 members, and then we have an alternate for the large cities, the medium cities, the small cities in the county. But those alternates go for aren't from the same city. So you're here for the governing board, but for the executive committee. You would not be a voting member today.



Speaker 1 - 02:34

Okay, public comment.



Speaker 4 - 02:37

Tammy.



Speaker 2 - 02:46

Tammy Letteri, Coconut Creek. In my opinion, one thing is clear regarding this agency. You don't practice what you preach. You pay lip service to the issue of plastic waste, which the Lancet recently declared the gravest threat to planetary health. Now you bring plastic water bottles here and have a kitchen full of toxic single use plastic. Anyone butter their bagel this morning with a plastic knife? Yet you hold us to a higher standard and deem us incorrigible for our poor recycling record. It's appalling that no one has the courage to tell me how the county plans to transport methane from the dump to their proposed site for a sludge dryer.



Speaker 2 - 03:32

Your refusal to have an informative dialogue with residents concerned about methane flowing through pipelines beneath their roads to a highly combustible facility in a densely populated area close to homes, schools and parks goes Part and parcel with your refusal to fight for a local food and yard waste composting program in the master plan or on day one in 2022, Commissioner Furr told the Sun Sentinel he thinks people want to live with dignity in a place that is safe. Bingo. I agree. And that he enjoys collaborating with people. Let's have some collaboration, especially on the sludge dryer. Lastly, I want to tell Commissioner Furr to stick the sludge dryer in Hollywood at the South Regional Wastewater Plant. They have plenty of room there. You can even make history by fueling it with solar power.



Speaker 2 - 04:33

As for utilizing methane from the dump, Waste Management is already making good use of it fueling homes.



Speaker 1 - 04:42

Either either a fan or an objection, I'm not sure. Go ahead. Your time was reserved.

 Speaker 2 - 04:49

As for utilizing methane from the dump, Waste Management is already making good use of it fueling homes. It's long past time for Broward county to leave North Broward alone, put the sludge drier elsewhere and stop destroying our community with a lousy vision and poor urban planning. Thank you.

 Speaker 4 - 05:10

Thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 05:11

Julie Long,

 Speaker 4 - 05:20

Good morning.

 Speaker 2 - 05:20

Thank you for the opportunity. JULIE long, City of Plantation I attended the educational subcommittee meeting this week and was really excited about the progress they're making. They were highlighting, trying to reach out to some zip codes and they also highlighted their partnership with the public school. And as I thought about this after the meeting, I thought we could do direct mailing to some of those schools and targeted zip codes and reach the children and the families and increase our continue to increase our partnership with the public schools. So I hope you'll consider other innovative ways to reach the target audiences in our school system. Thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 06:03

Thank you, Julie. Richard Ramchart,

 Speaker 4 - 06:15

Good morning, Chair. Vice chair, members of the committee, thank you for letting me speak this morning.

Southwest Ranches I wanted to let you.



Speaker 1 - 06:23

Know that yesterday I attended the.



Speaker 4 - 06:26

Opening ceremony for the Waste Management recycling facility. And having gone to San Francisco and toward the recology facilities there, I was totally blown away by this one. It was, it's tremendous in the scope and what they've built there for the entire county to utilize in the coming years. And I'm encouraged by that because I think it's going to help our Solid Waste Authority have the infrastructure for recycling and it definitely will make a big dent in the amount of diversion that we can achieve.



Speaker 1 - 07:10

So I just wanted to say thank.



Speaker 4 - 07:11

You to Waste Management. And I saw Vice Chair beam for you, asked me about what I thought about it. I went after you and like I said, I was totally blown away. I took probably 100 pictures in there. We were given permission to take pictures right away.



Speaker 1 - 07:28

So I'll be posting that on Broward.



Speaker 4 - 07:29

Clean Air's Facebook page so that every.



Speaker 1 - 07:32

All of our members can see it.



Speaker 4 - 07:34

I also saw member Bright Cruise and member Mead. We had a little chat. And so I just want to say that it's very encouraging to see such a facility, a \$90 million facility that they've made an investment in, as well as the size of this is two football fields in size. So I encourage everyone here, if you have not had the opportunity tour this facility, to book an appointment with. With Waste Management to go there and see it. It's going to be worth your while. Thank you.



Speaker 1 - 08:07

Thank you, Richard. All right, Anyone else signed up or who wishes to speak as part of the executive Committee? All right, I'm going to close. Public comment meeting minutes. I have a Motion for the February 9th and February 13th, 2026 meeting minutes. Motion by member Horland. Seconded by member Cagiano. Any discussion on that item? Any amendments? All in favor say aye. Any opposed?



Speaker 2 - 08:30

All right.



Speaker 1 - 08:31

Passed unanimously. Cohen, resnick. Financial statements, 2026. Hi.



Speaker 4 - 08:48

Alex Petrone from Congressic. I'm here to present the Statement of Financial Position through January of 2026 for Broward SWA. The authority ended the month of January with 2.771.



Speaker 1 - 09:03

\$485, \$2,771,000 in cash and cash equivalents.



Speaker 4 - 09:08

Accounts receivable balance is down to \$972,000. Once you subtract out the existing payables, the net equity position of the entity is \$3,649,647. There's ample liquidity to cover the eight months budgeted activity for the organization.

 Speaker 1 - 09:30

Okay, thank you. Any questions on the financial statements? All right. Thank you, sir.

 Speaker 4 - 09:34

All right.

 Speaker 1 - 09:34

We have a number of committee updates, but what I'd like to do, if it's the will of the body, to move up two items. Number nine.

 Speaker 4 - 09:40

Number ten.

 Speaker 1 - 09:41

The Facilities Amendment recommendation to the governing board. There's some discussion items on there. Is there any interest in that? Yes. Can I have a motion?

 Speaker 2 - 09:47

Yeah.

 Speaker 1 - 09:47

Motion by member Dunn. Seconded by member Cagiano. All in favor say aye. Aye. All right. Facilities Amendment recommendation to the government board. As an update, we asked all cities to provide comments. Additionally, over comments that were provided previously this past week, we did receive some additional comments. Mr. Cole, if you can, I know you've been through the comments and try to categorize them. Some of these items should be presented as Discussion issues, and let's present those to the Executive committee.

 Speaker 4 - 10:17

Thank you, Mr. Chair. We got comments from four cities. These were not comments from elected bodies. These are comments from just either staff members or individual people. But I just wanted to give that caveat at the beginning that these are not from the elected bodies. Among the four, there's probably 100 issues. So we're obviously not going to be able to go over all of them. However, there are some that I thought were really policy issues that needed to be discussed. A lot of the other ones, I. I can work with the various cities and the county attorneys and try to resolve them. But there are seven issues that are more policy issues. So if you want, we could go over them now or I think we.

 Speaker 1 - 10:58

Need to go over them now, particularly before the Governing Board. Let's have a discussion on them. We can certainly have an additional discussion at the governing Board, but let's. It's our responsibility to at least make the initial recommendation to push it up. So if you would, Mr. Cole, go through those categories.

 Speaker 4 - 11:11

Certainly I do want to thank the people that did put in comments. And some people, some cities really obviously spent a lot of time going word for word through the whole agreement, and it's very helpful. The first general issue that was raised by the city of Miramar was that because we don't have sufficient details yet, we should just basically do a one or two year extension and just like move out everything for like a year or two. That is something we could do. It would require approval by everyone, require 100% of the cities to approve.

 Speaker 1 - 11:46

All right, so let's address that issue. I know it comes up and it's a continuing point of discussion. We've discussed this many times at the Executive Committee over and over. It's been discussed at the Governing Board previously as well. It would require 100% of all the ILA members to agree to do that. And the decision previously by the Executive Committee was there. Let's move forward. Is there any interest in altering that current path? Because it's a big lift if we're going to alter the ILA. Okay, thank you, Mr. Cole.

 Speaker 4 - 12:16

Next category, the second general.

 Speaker 1 - 12:19

Let me just say on that comment, I'm not commenting on the merits of it because this is something we press for. We all want it, but it's structurally near impossible. Yes.

 Speaker 2 - 12:36

In terms of extending it, you say it requires 100%. Let me just say the concern of my staff as well as mine is that as we rush this through, you know, it goes back to trying to just get it done instead of really just taking the time to get it done. And if what we really need, it's time, I just feel that then we should ask for what we need. We need additional time. And, you know, if that doesn't pass, then we continue on working on the timeline that we have. But at least to put that out there and let municipalities know that we would need some more time. And we could also be doing that at the same time as trying to meet the current timeline, but at the same time being realistic, knowing we need an extension on it.

 Speaker 1 - 13:40

Thank you, member material.

 Speaker 2 - 13:43

Thank you. Just One clarification for Mr. Cole. When you said governing body, are you speaking to this governing body or each entity that submitted as a governing body? Because Coral Spring submitted. But I was very active in making sure those comments reflected what my colleagues wanted to see as well. So I'm not clear with what you.

 Speaker 4 - 14:04

Okay. I just wanted several of the comments that were submitted. They had caveats in them saying that the elected official, the elected bodies had not voted on the comments. And I just didn't want anyone to think that any elected officials. Bodies had. Various elected officials did include comments. Yes.

 Speaker 2 - 14:22

Okay.

 Speaker 1 - 14:25

I understand the comment. It's something that I literally pushed for probably eight months a year ago. And we made a decision we couldn't do it, that it was going to be. We needed to move forward in this context. So it's an absolutely meritorious point, but it's just not possible at this stage. And it. We'll see whether that's a good decision or a bad decision at some point. Fair enough. But I appreciate the comment, Ms. Cole. Okay.

 Speaker 4 - 14:53

A second comment was more of a generic comment as well, that the county, that there's too many situations where the county has too much power, that various approvals require a percentage of cities plus the county's approval. And throughout the whole agreement, we have lots of those. I know that's something the county's insisted on, so I'm not sure there's much we can do about that comment. But it was a comment, so I just wanted to raise it.

 Speaker 2 - 15:16

All right.

 Speaker 1 - 15:16

I think the executive committee has wrestled on every one of the provisions that has county veto or vote as participant. We've wrestled over this. I think this is the best document we can produce at this point. And the county's been cleared, wasn't willing to alter it. So while we accept the comment, and certainly there's been a collective view of the municipalities on many of Those paragraphs and even on the facilities amendment, trying to make sure the county's interest is focused only on its statutory obligation for disposal, not how we deal with things. So it's a fair comment, but this is the document that we have. Any further comments on that or any request to amend. Okay.

 Speaker 4 - 15:59

Third.

 Speaker 1 - 16:00

Okay.

 Speaker 4 - 16:00

The third comment deals with section 8.18, which is the authority to own a solid waste facility. Currently, the agreement. Currently the ILA says you need a 2/3 vote, 2/3 of the city populations to do that, plus the county. The proposal is to change that to 80% to make it harder for the facility, the SWA, to own a solid waste facility like our waste energy plant. That was done in response to certain members of the public who were concerned that we're going to build waste energy plant. We wanted to make sure that, you know, the ILA says you can't. And to make to do it would require an 80% vote. But changing it from 2/3 to 80% was pointed out by Miramar. That does make it harder for us to have the owner facility. We lose the flexibility.



Speaker 4 - 16:50

And the thought was we should have that flexibility. So the suggestion was to keep it at 2/3.



Speaker 1 - 16:57

Right. Any discussion on that?



Speaker 4 - 16:59

Okay, fourth point. Okay, the fourth point deals with the successor entity or a county takeover at termination. So at the end of the agreement, there's a provision that all the assets get. Get sold or distributed. And there's an exception if a large number of the members want to go to the county or want to go to a successor entity. And the question is what percentage of the population would be necessary in order to do that? Ultimately, what we have in the agreement is you would need 51% of the municipal parties and 55% of all of the waste countywide. There's a proposal by two cities that should be higher. Tamarack thought it should be 2/3 rather than 51 and 55%. Miramar thought it should be 80% to make it harder for a successor entity or the county to take over everything.



Speaker 4 - 18:04

Do recall that if everything is taken over by successor entity, all the assets, all the money, everything goes to the successor entity and it won't be sold and nothing will be distributed. So anyone who doesn't continue to participate will not get anything back.



Speaker 1 - 18:21

Okay. What's the will of the body? We wrestled over this over and over before I turned to governing board member. Let me ask the executive committee if there's any comments on that issue. Okay.



Speaker 2 - 18:31

Remember Colburn?



Speaker 1 - 18:32

Oh, let me start. Member Colburn. Since counties doubly represented here today.

 Speaker 2 - 18:38

What do we need?

 Speaker 1 - 18:39

Both optimism and pessimism.

 Speaker 4 - 18:40

Go ahead. Thank you.

 Speaker 2 - 18:42

What do we need to do in order to amend that?

 Speaker 4 - 18:45

Well, if I get direction today, we'll make the change and we revise it. I will say we did originally propose 80%. The county did not agree with that. And they. They. 5155% is the highest numbers that they would agree to, and that's why we're at 5155. But you know, Tamarack is suggesting 2/3, Miramar suggesting 80%.

 Speaker 1 - 19:10

Okay.

 Speaker 2 - 19:12

I would like to amend it. I would like to make the motion.



Speaker 1 - 19:14

Well, you can't because you're not a member of the executive committee.



Speaker 2 - 19:16

I'm sorry.



Speaker 1 - 19:17

Executive committee. On the governing board.



Speaker 2 - 19:19

I am on the executive committee now.



Speaker 4 - 19:22

You're on the.



Speaker 2 - 19:22

Governor, I'm the governing board.



Speaker 1 - 19:26

Alternate.



Speaker 2 - 19:26

I am.



Speaker 1 - 19:27

I just want to.



Speaker 2 - 19:28

Just procedurally, I am a non voting member. If I. If I recall, on the executive committee,



Speaker 4 - 19:35

You're an alternate for the large cities, but all the large cities.



Speaker 2 - 19:39

Alternate.



Speaker 4 - 19:40

You're an alternate for the large cities.



Speaker 2 - 19:43

All right, so as such.



Speaker 4 - 19:44

But all the large cities are here today. So.



Speaker 1 - 19:47

Okay, but I'm gonna. I would just want to follow this procedurally. So let's. Let's have the discussion and then we'll come back to that. I'm sure deference. Somebody may make the motion so we can have a discussion on it. So I'm not trying to cut you off. I just want to make sure we procedure, because we have a lot of people in the room as to who can do what, at least at the executive committee. Either way, when it goes to the governing board, that's another place where it can also be done.



Speaker 2 - 20:08

Got it.



Speaker 1 - 20:09

So. So it won't be lost.



Speaker 2 - 20:10

Okay. Okay.



Speaker 1 - 20:12

Member gel.



Speaker 4 - 20:13

Thank you, Mr. Chair. And don't feel bad. I'm an alternate also, and I can't make motions either. Quick question, though. When I was looking at our last meeting, at the language which keeps referring to what will happen at the end with all of the many assets we have. What I didn't. This is assuming that we have assets at the end where it is. I could certainly envision circumstances where our debts would exceed our assets, and I didn't see that the document dealt with that at all.

 Speaker 1 - 20:55

So, Miguel, let me just focus first on this issue that was raised and we can come back and have a general discussion on that as a catch all. So put a pin in that, if you would, on the debt issue.

 Speaker 2 - 21:08

Just.

 Speaker 4 - 21:08

Just a quick idea of where this kind of came from. I think initially there was a proposal of 80%. I think the county was thinking 30%. This was kind of halfway in point, in the middle. The idea was, if we've gone to all this work to put together a system, the idea you want, if. If some people want to start to bail, that at least the system stays up, the system is still there for anybody, any city that wants it. And if you've got 50, over half of the county wanting to still use it, keep the system intact. The other point of reference was the global agreement that is available to all cities right now, of which 19 cities I believe take part in. That is 55% of the population right now. That's a. That's our global agreement that we're using currently.

 Speaker 4 - 22:00

That's going to Wheelabrater, going to Okeechobee, all that. So that's the. That's the amount that it's actually. It's working. It's a good working number. We know it's working.

 Speaker 2 - 22:08

That's.

 Speaker 4 - 22:09

That's where that number came from. Okay.

 Speaker 1 - 22:11

All right, to the members. Is there any desire, members of the executive, any desire for a motion to amend to 80% and have a discussion on that item now or reserve that for the government board? All right, see, no motion. Reserve that for the governing board, and we'll have that discussion and all the members will be here. So that'll also make it better. All right, number five.

 Speaker 4 - 22:30

Okay, the next issue deals with any surplus funds or proceeds from sales under section 21.7.12 and various other sections. As of right now, any thing that has to be distributed. If there's money to be distributed from either surplus funds or sale of assets, it is distributed pro rata based on population at the end of the term. There's a proposal by Tamarac that it should be not just based on population, but it should look at capital contributions and historical tonnage. So you'd look at the tonnage for the entire 40 years as opposed to just the amount at the end. Miramar said it should reflect the population over the whole term and not just at the end. That's a policy decision. It would be a little complicated, but I assume there's a way to do it.

 Speaker 4 - 23:20

But the assumption, the question is whether or not it should be based on the population at the end or look at the whole term. I think we've battled this throughout the entire ILA trying to figure out what's the best way for representation. And I think that's why we've Fallen using population. Because for the most part, waste follows population. Maybe some people are there. There is. You can actually look. And the richer communities actually have more tonnage than the poorer communities. That's actually a fact. But for the most part, we've found, I think we've looked at population as being one. That's. We can just be equitable. We've, we've. All of our contributions so far have been based on population. To me, it makes sense to continue that one. Okay.

 Speaker 1 - 24:07

Any discussion on that? Any discussion. Member C,

 Speaker 2 - 24:12

Can you show us a comparison so that we can, you know, the rest of us can really understand the difference. Can that be provided to us or. I'm asking if you can provide that to us at another meeting.

 Speaker 4 - 24:30

We, we can comparison what it would.

Speaker 2 - 24:32



Look like under both circumstances.



Speaker 4 - 24:39

Oh, under both circumstances. I do think the bigger issue wasn't tonnage versus population. It was really historical versus end of term. But for example, let's say there's a city that's very small now and just keeps growing and growing by the end. You just look at their big population, or do you take an average of what it was during the time? Or there could be cities that contract. So I think that was more the issue than the population. Tonnage has historically been very close. I don't think that's really been the main issue. I think what's being raised by Tamarack and Miramar is really, do you look at the end population or do you.



Speaker 1 - 25:16

Have kind of an average running over 30 years? And I think it has to be at the end because that's really, frankly the time that we're making the big decisions. Even if it first 10 years wasn't and it could weigh negatively. Right. If you say, all right, well, the first 10 years they were much smaller. Last five years they blew up for whatever reason, maybe, you know, Miramar takes over Pembroke Pines. Right. Annexes. I'm not suggesting that, but you could have this all of a sudden. You know, we don't know what's going to happen in 40 years, given that there's 31 municipalities here and whether that will be a sustainable model going forward, whether the legislature or other one.



Speaker 2 - 25:53

But definitely don't let it get out to casino.



Speaker 1 - 25:55

The county wants to pay for it all anyway, so that's good.



Speaker 4 - 25:57

Let's be one big city.



Speaker 2 - 25:58

But yeah, don't let Miracle Steer hear about this. But I guess I'm asking, do we think it's a considerable difference? We can't know that municipalities, I mean, are There any predictions for big growth in anywhere? I mean, it's like, have we looked at it?

 Speaker 1 - 26:19

Does Myanmar have a big prediction over 40 years?

 Speaker 2 - 26:23

No, not Miramar. So I'm trying to figure out what do we expect this to be any different and where it will affect any municipality.

 Speaker 1 - 26:32

I think if we look at county, we're built out. We're built out in the county. I don't know there'll be any expense other than consolidation. I don't know that there will be any big changes.

 Speaker 2 - 26:41

All right, thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 26:43

Thank you for that comment. All right, number six.

 Speaker 4 - 26:45

Okay, the next comment deals with the county's right to a technical review. The county, under section 23.4, they wanted this additional right to do kind of audit type of things, and Miramar wants to just delete it.



Speaker 1 - 27:00

Okay. County.



Speaker 4 - 27:01

I think the idea there is that if. If for some reason we start to see that. That the authority is not living up to what it needs to be doing and we're not, and. And our statutory responsibility is not being met, that we need to take a good look. Actually, every city has this option. Every city has this option, and any city can. Should want to hold on to that option. Just to be clear, there's two different things. One, every city has the right. This is a special extra right that only the county has, but it deals with the statutory obligation. It is kind of limited, and there's an arbitration provision that things are disputed.



Speaker 1 - 27:43

Look, and let's be clear, this is not. And this has been a wrestling match that went on for an extended period of time with the county's attorney's office, at least since January, maybe before, but at least. And the issue that has resulted at this point, as we funneled down through all the language, was that it's not just the county saying, we don't. We think you're not running this transfer station correctly. It's got to be that it's having a dilatory impact on their ability to run the landfill or the wte. That is, it's impairing their ability to meet their statutory obligation for disposal. That's a much narrower. And it is within their wheelhouse. Again, I think that's why the county should pay for everything. But it has been a wrestling match.



Speaker 1 - 28:34

And so to your point, the initial and early drafts of this were rejected by Mr. Cole, the negotiating team, and ultimately the executive committee to get it to this point. And I think that to the county, this is a die on the hill kind of situation. And I think we put it at Least in the best guardrails that we can on the potential abuse of that.



Speaker 4 - 28:57

Power, which is what we're all worried about.



Speaker 1 - 28:59

And I. I say that with no disrespect, but.



Speaker 4 - 29:03

All right.

 Speaker 1 - 29:04

Any further comments on that one? Number seven. All right.

 Speaker 4 - 29:06

The last issue was dealing with maximum service charges under Article 24, it limits the amounts that will be paid by either the parties or the residents. And it can't go up without a certain vote requirement. Miramar suggested that the limit should only apply to the amount paid by the cities, not by the residents. So that there could be. If there's an assessment or surcharge, it could go up if the residents are paying it for commercial users as opposed to just the cities directly.

 Speaker 1 - 29:40

All right, I need some explanation on that. Maybe we can reserve that for the governing board discussion. Okay, we'll reserve that for the governing board.

 Speaker 4 - 29:52

And that was the. That was the main substantive issue.

 Speaker 1 - 29:55

Right. And Amber Geller had a pin in the issue of debts.

 Speaker 4 - 30:00

Mr. Cole?

 Speaker 1 - 30:02

I think it's net assets. I don't think there was any.

 Speaker 4 - 30:04

Yeah, it's net assets. I think the question was what happens if the liabilities exceed the assets? Well, hopefully that will not happen, but we do have a provision that says it is not the liabilities of the individual cities or the county. It would be an entity. The entity would have the obligation, the entity would cease operating and there'd be a liquidation. And creditors presumably wouldn't get completely paid if there were liabilities that exceeded. Thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 30:33

Okay, Any further points that the executive committee wishes to raise with respect to facilities amendment? If not, we're in a position where we have to vote on a recommendation at least to move it preliminarily to the governing board for initial consideration. The final vote on the facilities Amendment will be March 20th. But we should be in a position now to move it with a recommendation to the governing board to give sufficient time.

 Speaker 4 - 30:56

Is there a motion?

 Speaker 2 - 30:57

So moved.

 Speaker 1 - 30:58

Second motion by member Horla. Second by member Shoeham. Any discussion on that? Call the roll on that call the question. Mr. Cole, if you can help us, maybe that.

 Speaker 4 - 31:13

Sure. Do we want to do a roll call for it?

 Speaker 1 - 31:15

Sounds like.

Speaker 4 - 31:15



Yeah, but everyone's in agreement.



Speaker 1 - 31:17

Okay.



Speaker 4 - 31:18

I can call the roll. So, Chair Ryan?



Speaker 1 - 31:21

Yes.



Speaker 4 - 31:23

Vice Chair Furr? Yes. Member Shoeham?



Speaker 2 - 31:27

Yes.



Speaker 4 - 31:28

Mayor Horland?



Speaker 2 - 31:31

Yes.



Speaker 4 - 31:32

Yes. Mayor Matteo Bowen?



Speaker 2 - 31:34

Yes.



Speaker 4 - 31:36

Mayor.



Speaker 1 - 31:36

Member Dunn?



Speaker 2 - 31:37

Yes.



Speaker 4 - 31:39

Member Rydell? Is not here. But. I'm sorry. The alternate for the Medium cities is Member Salomon?



Speaker 2 - 31:52

Yes.



Speaker 4 - 31:54

Member Mead?



Speaker 3 - 31:57

Yes.



Speaker 4 - 31:58

Member Cacciano Is not here. Member A.J. Ryan? Yes. Member Newton?



Speaker 3 - 32:08

Yes.



Speaker 2 - 32:09

All right.



Speaker 4 - 32:09

Passes unanimously.



Speaker 2 - 32:10

Thank you.



Speaker 1 - 32:11

Thank you. To the executive committee. All right, the next item I think we should move up is item 10 before we go to committee. Is there a motion to move that up? Motion by member Mead. Any second.



Speaker 2 - 32:21

Second.



Speaker 4 - 32:22

Second.



Speaker 1 - 32:22

By member Dunn. All in favor say aye.



Speaker 4 - 32:24

All right.



Speaker 1 - 32:24

Executive Director, Interim Director Search. I'll turn this over to member horland.



Speaker 2 - 32:29

Thank you, Mr. Chair for moving that up. I'm going to ask you to passes out on your side. So I wanted to give everyone in full transparency of how this process took place to discuss the potential candidates for the interim director. Mr. Cole and I met on Tuesday, February 19, whereby a list was compiled of 10 potential candidates, all with prior city manager experience. Most have worked in multiple municipalities in various roles. Only two names of former elected officials were discussed and some are merely dismissed as the pool of candidates was sufficient. And one of those elected officials of had been named will be out of state for the next 20 days. I proceeded to call all of the candidates on Tuesday and had follow up conversations with seven of them.



Speaker 2 - 33:11

All understood the importance of what we're trying to accomplish, asked detailed questions, some reviewed recent meetings and backup material, then followed up later in the week with additional questions. Most seemed intrigued, if not excited by the challenge and were quite honored that they were under consideration. My final call was at 10:30 last night as a follow up call to answer additional questions. A lot of questions about day to day operations and support staff. I passed out to you a list of candidates. Understanding that several of these individuals were away this week, I asked them to send me whatever bios they had available or resumes. What I'd like to do after we discuss the candidates is be able to provide that to everybody via email. What I would like to do is call for a special meeting with. We know time is of the essence.



Speaker 2 - 33:59

I know we keep adding special meetings, but I do believe we need a special meeting early next week to interview the candidates. And again I'll send the resumes through Alyssa, then have the ability with Jamie and I to negotiate the terms of. And basically terms are going to be the length of the commitment and the financial compensation. But I would love to see us be able to get something done by next Friday and get somebody on board by March 2 if that is possible. And I know that's aggressive, but this is vitally important. So the list you have in front of you, those highlighted are the candidates that would be able to commit to being interviewed next week. The first one on the list is Erdell and they're in no particular order. Erdell Donmez, who is retired from Coral Springs in 2017.



Speaker 2 - 34:46

He would be able to zoom in. He's out of town. He'd be able to zoom in Monday or Tuesday. Andy Burns retired from Southwest ranches in late 2023. Bob Payton retired from Parkland in 2019. Richard Salomone retired from Sunrise in 2020, and Lee Feldman retired from Fort Lauderdale in 2018. I did have a conversation with Frank Babenack from Coral Springs. He was interested, could not devote the time because he has other projects currently. But he actually also endorsed Erdol, not knowing that I had already spoken to him because they had worked together. Wazir Ishmael from Hollywood, who had recently retired in 2023, was very interested, but he has family commitments over the next couple of months. George Keller I sent an email, did not hear back. George Hanbury and I are playing telephone and email tag. Retired from Fort Lauderdale in 1998.



Speaker 2 - 35:38

I will still speak to him today as a courtesy. And I left a message for Kathleen Woods Richardson, who was retired from Miramar, and I did not hear back. So, in full transparency, Those were the 10 candidates. They were very insightful and productive conversations. I think we have an excellent pool, so I think it will be the will of the committee. It's how many of those top five candidates you'd like to interview and if we could get a meeting on Mr. Chair.

 Speaker 1 - 36:00

Okay. First of all, I'd like to thank Member Horlund. This is a thankless job to take on top of all the other work that has to be digested and for the members and the public. You had to take this on alone because of Sunshine. It wouldn't allow us to. Even though there were many members who were willing to help and assist and take that burden because of Sunshine. You had to carry that all by yourself, including making the calls, fielding all of this, working with Mr. Cole, identifying, and so on behalf of the Executive Committee and the Governing Board, even though they're not fully here, I think we need to thank Member Horlund with a round of applause because that's a lot of work.

 Speaker 1 - 36:39

Second, Mr. Cole, if you could outline for us again, for some of the Governing Board members, the authority that the Executive Committee has with respect to the retention or hiring of an interim Executive Director, as well as perhaps the issues that would present by the Executive Committee doing so.

 Speaker 4 - 37:02

Sure. The Executive Committee under the ILA has the authority to appoint an Executive Director, so you can appoint an interim Executive director for a limited time period. The Executive Director under the ILA cannot be, or, I'm sorry, must be. An employee of the SWA does not be a full time employee, but it has to be an employee can be paid hourly. There's nothing limiting to how you pay them. Cannot be a employed by any. So it can't be like a city employee that's just given on loan. You can't have that. It has to be someone independent and it can't be someone who lobbies. Those are the limitations we have in the ila. Beyond that, you have a lot of discretion as to who you would want to hire. It's completely within your purview. Okay.

 Speaker 1 - 37:58

With respect to the. The few that you have not played phone tag with or hadn't had the opportunity to vet, the idea is to continue to do so between now and any special meeting. If that's the will of the body.

 Speaker 2 - 38:11

If that's the will of the body, Chair. But quite frankly, when I look at the timeline that we have set for ourselves, I think that we have five candidates that if we can get a meeting next week and have the conversations with Mr. Hanbury comes highly recommended. Understanding that he has not been a mutual municipal government since 1998, but I still wanted to have the courtesy call with him.

 Speaker 1 - 38:32

Okay. And, and then lastly, before I turn over for comments, each of the applicants that you've highlighted have experience in solid waste and the issues that we are that are within our wheelhouse for the Solid waste authority.



Speaker 2 - 38:46

Yes, Mr. Chair. And I think what the, what I found that the will of the committee was last Friday when we had this discussion is we really felt that we needed somebody with municipality, city manager or county management experience and a different skill set to get this over the line. So while all of those have been executive positions over their cities or counties, they have solid waste experience. Some have a little bit more. For example, Mr. Salomon was on the SWA and RRP, certainly Bob Payton. So. And I think that would be part of the conversation when we speak with them. All right.



Speaker 1 - 39:19

And then lastly, while these are have numbers as opposed to bullet points, these are not. This was not a ranking by you. Correct.



Speaker 2 - 39:26

This is not a ranking by me. The only caveat I would say with Mr. Feldman at number five, his time may be a little bit more limited. He felt he could commit, but he does have some other initiatives that he's working on.



Speaker 1 - 39:38

Okay. Member fir.



Speaker 4 - 39:40

Thank you. First of all, thank you for doing all that work. That's, that's a lot of work. I think it's important that we figure out exactly what kind of person we need on this. This is crunch time. We have to make sure that whoever we hire can unite everybody. You need somebody who can pull people together. You need a cheerleader. Because this is not. I mean, Todd has done a great job getting us to where we're at. That was the nuts and bolts of it. Now it's actually the political landscape of knowing the political landscape here, knowing the people and having. Having those kind of. Those relationships, good relationships. So the baggage has to. We kind of have to make sure there's not baggage there. I think it's important that we. That we think that way.



Speaker 4 - 40:30

Who's going to be in front of your commissions and who do you want to see in front of your commissions, and how will they present themselves? That's, you know, that's all I can. That's mainly what I want to say. It's going to make all the difference in the world, whoever's there. So it's not. It's not just a city manager. I really don't. I mean, I'm not. It could be a city manager. I'm not saying it can't be or shouldn't be. I'm just saying whoever it is has to be able to pull all of this together and be able to know this knowledge very quickly. That's not easy. So just thought.

 Speaker 1 - 41:08

All right, thank you. I think that's a really good outline of the guide or the Lighthouse. We need to look towards that. It's somebody who is going to unite, but also someone who has the technical experience. As we've seen, as we've seen from the questions from some of our electeds, it's really staff. Oftentimes, until they raise their hand, it's really staff that's had a lot of these technical questions on numbers, on budget, on what it's going to mean. And so we've got to be able to talk to and unite the staffs, the city managers, the folks who understand this the best as well. So it has to be. Has to be both. All right, I'll just work my way around. I'll start with Member Mead, and then I'll work around to the right and I'll finish up with Member Yellow.

 Speaker 3 - 41:51

Thank you, Chair. Yes. I want to thank Member Horlan, too. I know that this has been a big job, and I'm ever mindful that any more than five hours of sleep a night is superfluous. With that in mind, is there any kind of a job description that we.

 Speaker 4 - 42:05

Can give to some of these candidates?

 Speaker 3 - 42:07

I'm understanding that the job is. Although they do have solid waste experience, the job is far less technical than it is more administrative and political. So I'm thinking that maybe something to hand out to them so that they know what they're getting in food.

 Speaker 1 - 42:21

Yes, Member Horland.

 Speaker 2 - 42:23

Thank you for that, Member Mead. So, as I spoke to each individual, I had come up with somewhat of a profile from the conversation here and what was. What had already been taking place, what we felt we needed per the discussion to get this across. So while it was not a job description, it was a profile of someone. I thought from the conversations we had that we should be looking for to get this done. And I think to Vice Chair first point, that was one of the things that I felt that had been lacking was that conversation with our staff and that relationship building. And that's why I felt so strongly that it should be a city manager, retired City manager, to be able to take this position.



Speaker 1 - 43:02

It's a good point on the job description. We certainly had one at the outset to remember Fers point Vice Chair's first point. And a number of points have been raised. You know, the next six months is almost a new job description. Right. Getting to yes or addressing the technical questions is a. I'm not saying it's a different job because it does include all of what we expected, Mr. Story, but it's a skill set that, given that we don't have Mr. Storey, who has relationships, who has been talking to staffs, now is somebody who's got to be able to do that. Right. And so it's a new job description, but it's an excellent point. I think, assuming we have a special meeting, we go through this process and the will of body, that's going to be.



Speaker 1 - 43:45

We're going to have to press on that for sure. All right, Member Shuham.



Speaker 2 - 43:50

Thank you, Chair. I too want to thank Member Horland. It was a yeoman's task. And of course, as with everything you do, you did an amazing job. To Vice Chair Furr's point, I think that the trusted voice is really what we need. And I know for someone like me, I would want it to be someone that I've heard of. You know, I think it's going to be difficult for strangers, even if they were the most amazing city manager to. To go into these cities. So that's, I think, a challenge. And I know that you recognize that trying to find kind of a community trusted voice is a challenge, but it's an amazing list.



Speaker 2 - 44:33

And I'm sure that each of these people will be able to convey to us when they come here that they have had experience with people in various cities and that they understand the challenge. I think also it's important what they don't need to be. They don't need to have the ability to build a big staff like a city manager does. It's a short term job. And so I just think when we're interviewing them that we have to bear in mind what's not gonna happen. And then just a simple question for council, and that is, and you may have said it, so forgive me, which body has the authority to hire. Is it this Executive Committee?



Speaker 4 - 45:17

Yes, the executive Committee.



Speaker 2 - 45:18

All right, thank you so much. Thank you.



Speaker 1 - 45:21

Member Rutgers, you had your card up. Okay. Member Mataya Bowen.



Speaker 2 - 45:25

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I also want to extend my gratitude to member Horland. I know this is a thankless job and you have many things on your plate, so thank you. First, I would love for us, I'm not sure if the governing members here understand why we're going through this process. So I don't want to make that assumption. So I see some puzzled faces. So if we can stick, take a step back and explain to them why we're going through this process and why Mr. Todd's storey is no longer here. So I think that's the first step. And second, in regards to job description, to member Mead's point, I do think that we need to outline some expectations. I understand this is a six month rule, but in that six month we need to have some clear deliverables of what we are expecting.



Speaker 2 - 46:12

It's not just relationships, but we need them to usher this ILA and all of the agreements across the finish line and we have no time to spare. So they have to be able to come in and hit the ground running and we may not have time to do that back and provide them that background information. So they have to have some type of knowledge of where we came from and what we're doing and where we need to go. So that is something I would like to, for us to ask during the interview process just to examine their knowledge of the current state of the solid waste. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you.



Speaker 1 - 46:53

Let me, let me just outline briefly. Although all the executive committee members and most of the public here know because we've had multiple discussions on this. In January we had the sudden resignation of Mr. Storey due to a family medical emergency that he simply could not manage both. He needed to go home to take care of. He

was torn about it. He was bothered by it he was upset that he had to do this. And we began by obviously thanking Mr. Storey for all the work that he's done, recognizing that family comes first. And the Executive Committee worked over what's really been the last 30 to 45 days trying to manage the responsibilities while maintaining the integrity of the Executive Director process.



Speaker 1 - 47:46

Again, because the ILA requires that the Executive Director be an employee, we could not simply turn it to a consultant to come in and handle it for us. That was 1, 2. Mr. Storey still has bandwidth and institutional knowledge and we wanted to keep that as much as possible. And third, we knew that SCS could also assist in many of the areas that we wanted Mr. Stewart to continue on. But the members were and SES and Mr. Stewarty were concerned, wanting to make sure that there was a delineation between financial integrity and oversight, that is not having SES approved bills for their own work or improve scope of work issues, while maintaining the ability of SES to be directly engaged with city staff and others.



Speaker 1 - 48:34

So as went through this process, we realized that Mr. Storey's bandwidth, in fairness to him, was simply not going to be enough. Although his spirit was there, it wasn't going to be enough. And were in the final six months. So the decision was made by the Executive Committee at the last meeting to move and I hastily constructed fashion that member Horlund undertook to reach out to potential interim director candidates for a report here today, not with the expectation of hiring today, but just to understand the process and in all likelihood move forward to some sort of special meeting. That's, that's the background of it. All right. Member Solomon,



Speaker 2 - 49:13

I just want to say, Chair Ryan, that was a very articulate and clear, concise description of what's going on. Oh, I just wanted to commend.



Speaker 1 - 49:23

I was no one was asking to do that because you seem to be putting kind thoughts towards me. It was just I appreciate the members doing.



Speaker 2 - 49:30

I, I, I feel like that was a very good, clear, concise explanation and I do think that was needed. And yes, I'll echo all the comments. Commissioner Horland is continues to amaze me. I think everyone the time and still of course at the Broward League of Cities membership meeting last night as the president. So I do have a question. I've been involved in the interview process from a legal standpoint for many years and so wondering and of course very different. But will we have structured questions? What will be the process? Do we anticipate interviewing next year

week and the Executive Board making the decision based on that? Interview. Understanding the tight timeline.



Speaker 4 - 50:18

Right.



Speaker 1 - 50:19

Excellent questions. I think it's going to be up to the members to construct that in the time frames we have and recognize that this is not being shoehorned in a rush. The members have the opportunity after, if were to hold a special meeting, to hold additional special meetings to make that right decision. So that isn't the. No one should feel it's being rushed and that it meets all the standards and principles that have already been enunciated here. So I think that's a subject of discussion. Member Geller and then Member Fur. And we're on a tight time.



Speaker 4 - 50:51

Thank you, Mr. Chair. First Councilmember Horlund, ditto. I agree with a lot of what Commissioner Shoeham had said about this job requiring different skills. I had hoped that Mayor Ross would be able to do that because I think he has those. But I understand that he's unavailable, unable to do that. What I did want to bring up, though, is you had said you had not reached Mr. Hanbury. Someone, I think it was Commissioner Shuham had said that you need somebody with, you know, credibility that people have heard of. The reason that George left Fort Lauderdale was to assume the president longtime presidency of nova. He's a great speaker and most people in the county know him or if not, could be.



Speaker 4 - 51:46

So I would recommend that you continue to try and reach out to him and that whatever motion comes would say that if you are able to reach him and if he is willing that he be one of the people included because he might be the best, because he's probably the highest profile person on this list. Thank you.



Speaker 1 - 52:07

Thank you, Member Furr. And then we need to address a special meeting issue. We're set to end at 10 to begin, the governing board proposed to the body that on the committee updates. It may best to have that during the governing board so that the governing board members get a full sense of what work's been done. So we won't be eliminating anything, but let's move that to the governing board. Vice Chair.



Speaker 4 - 52:29

Thanks. And before we think that this guy's going to do all the work for us, this is our job. This is our job. This guy's going to help whoever it is, or one. Whoever it is. This is our job. And we're the ones who have to pull this over the line. Each one of us, every single person on the governing board, getting together with your city manager, getting

together with your commissions, letting them know. Because a lot of people in this, a lot of the commissioners throughout this county don't know what all is going on. We have somebody from all these cities and not all the messages are getting through. So don't rely on this. That's what I'm saying. Rely on yourself. This is a good group. We know what's going on in this and we're the ones who need to pull this through.



Speaker 2 - 53:17

Okay. All right, thank you, Mr. Chair. Just very quickly, to member Mater Bowen's point, what I'd be happy to do is when I send the bios and the resumes that I have currently for these five candidates to a list of send out. I could also send this interim executive director profile that I use for my own edification as I spoke to these individuals, send it out and if there's feedback or changes, but very quickly, key responsibilities, operational stability. And I elucidated on that. Organizational operations, board, partnership, strategic planning, relationship management, went through the experience, communication, financial acumen. So there was a list. As you said, Mr. Chair, the job description is quite different from what we had from Mr. Stordy because we're in a different phase. So be happy to send that out as well.



Speaker 2 - 54:04

And if we get the special meeting scheduled, I will continue to reach out to Mr. Hanbury. That's motion.



Speaker 1 - 54:12

Just as an additional amendment to that, let's make sure that we provided the facilities amendment, the master plan and the executive summary to all of the candidates, including those that you may continue to have contact with to member Geller's point to the members. Obviously, to the extent you have comments, they need to be directed to Mr. Cole because of Sunshine. So be careful and cautious not to send those to member Horlan, though she would accept them. Let's make sure we run that with respect to a special meeting. Let me just give you a sense of what's available here at Government City West. Monday afternoon 12:30 to 5, Tuesday 8 to 5 all day. Those are two. And I don't know, again, depending on what availability each of these have, obviously to the extent they need to appear by zoom, we'll address that.



Speaker 1 - 55:03

But those are the two basic days. Right now. Were there any other days during the week? At least not.



Speaker 2 - 55:10

Not next week. I can ask for the following.

 Speaker 1 - 55:14

No, no. Let's see if we can first start here. So it was Monday afternoon, 12:30 to 5. This room is available. And Tuesday afternoon 8 to 5. What's the will of?

 Speaker 2 - 55:27

I'm going to shoot for Mr. Chair Tuesday. I'll make myself available all day Tuesday. If we can get a quorum.

 Speaker 1 - 55:33

All right. To allow even at some additional Time. Are the members willing to consider an afternoon meeting? Is that something that's a. Again, just to provide some additional time to member Dunn's point. Member Dunn.

 Speaker 2 - 55:44

Yeah.

 Speaker 1 - 55:45

Microphone.

 Speaker 2 - 55:46

Sorry. Is it necessary for the meeting to be here? Could someone not host the interviews that meeting and that way we'd be able to get it done on the Friday.

 Speaker 4 - 55:54

It's just because of all the technical.

 Speaker 1 - 55:57

Issues that we have for streaming this and making sure public can be okay. So it's not a. It's not a terrific desire to be here. It's just that it works. It's a lot.

 Speaker 2 - 56:06

Got it. Thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 56:08

So again, back to Tuesday. What's the consensus of the executive committee? I guess.

 Speaker 4 - 56:15

All right.

 Speaker 1 - 56:17

Noon 1. Anybody in the afternoon. Let's go through it. Okay. You have to. Microphone. All right.

 Speaker 2 - 56:26

Tuesday, like 1:30 to what time? 1:30 to 4:30.

 Speaker 1 - 56:31

Okay. 1:30 to 4:30 dot 1:30 to 4. 130 to 145. No, 1:30 to 3:30 would be our typical two hour meeting. So that's fair. And if we need. Again, back to the point I raised earlier. If we need additional time, we'll do it.

 Speaker 4 - 56:51

It's.

 Speaker 1 - 56:51

It's ambitious in two hours, but it's going to be incumbent on both the candidates and the committee to be focused on what the issues are that are important. Is 1:30 to 3:30 work. All right.

 Speaker 4 - 57:04

All right.

 Speaker 1 - 57:05

Let's go ahead and notice that as a special meeting for Tuesday, the eighth single item on there, so we're not getting distracted, is this issue of the interim executive director. Everybody in agreement on that? No, I don't think so. Mr. Cole, you'll. You'll take care of all the notice and. Yeah, okay, so we'll take care of that. All right, again, thank you to member Horland. We are at 10 o' clock on the nose. What I would propose if the executive committee is willing again items 6, 7.

 Speaker 4 - 57:33

And 8 to be moved to the.

 Speaker 1 - 57:34

Governing board for a presentation. Is everyone in agreement on that? All right, in which case, can we have a motion to adjourn? Go ahead.

 Speaker 2 - 57:42

Member motion. Second.

 Speaker 1 - 57:44

Oh, okay. Motion.

 Speaker 2 - 57:45

Gotcha.

 Speaker 1 - 57:46

Member material motion. And second by member Shoeham. All in favor say aye. All right, we are adjourned. Let's just take a minute for biological breaks and getting everybody ready.

 Speaker 2 - 57:58

Thank you, sir.

 Speaker 1 - 57:59

Good job.

 Speaker 4 - 58:03

Good job.

 Speaker 2 - 58:04

Thank you. Can be on remotely or you'll be out.

 Speaker 1 - 58:35

I have a meeting at 2 o'. Clock, but I never miss him, so.

 Speaker 2 - 58:37

I can miss this one.

 Speaker 1 - 58:38

This one time I can miss him.

 Speaker 2 - 58:40

That's what I just Did I just texted I won't be there too, Sam.

 Speaker 1 - 01:00:39

All right, let's get everybody together for the governing board to the members. We need to get gathered in the break room. Folks, if you start coming in. Member Shoeham.

 Speaker 4 - 01:00:51

Maybe you can give me a hand.

 Speaker 1 - 01:00:53

Remember Shoeham. Can you just remember breakfast or somebody just.

 Speaker 2 - 01:01:25

Thank you. Mike from the Panthers was part of my. Everybody drop what they were doing and listen to me. Mike said everyone drop what they were doing and listen. That's it.



Speaker 1 - 01:01:38

They dropped that sugar right out of.



Speaker 2 - 01:01:40

Their hands.



Speaker 1 - 01:01:43

Arm for the governing board. They need to be in the room. So let's make sure. Mr. Cole, you let me know when. Okay? All right, I'm going to call to order the governing board meeting of February 2026. If you would please call the roll.



Speaker 2 - 01:02:09

Chair Ryan.



Speaker 1 - 01:02:10

Present.



Speaker 2 - 01:02:12

Vice Chair Furr. Member Glassman. Member Shoeham. Here. Apologies. One moment. Apologies. Member colbone. Member matteo bowen. Here. Member luis.



Speaker 3 - 01:02:50

Here.



Speaker 2 - 01:02:52

Member horland. Here. Member droski. Member dunn. Here. Member patterson. Member meade.



Speaker 3 - 01:03:06

Here. Again.



Speaker 2 - 01:03:09

Member cagiano. Member rydell. That's welch. Member welch.



Speaker 1 - 01:03:19

Sandy welch. Member welch.



Speaker 2 - 01:03:22

Member borjolin. Member ernst.



Speaker 1 - 01:03:26

Here.



Speaker 2 - 01:03:27

Member thomas. Present. Member murphy. Salamone. She's here. Member curran. Member a.j. Ryan. Member brunson. Member newton. Member stafford. Member bright cruise. Member morissette. Member strauss. Member

ravinese. Member tomlinson.



Speaker 4 - 01:04:02

Member smith is here for.



Speaker 1 - 01:04:03

Okay,



Speaker 2 - 01:04:06

Yeah.



Speaker 1 - 01:04:06

Member smith is here for. Member brunson.



Speaker 2 - 01:04:09

Member smith. Are there any other alternates? Okay, thank you.



Speaker 4 - 01:04:15

Thank you.



Speaker 1 - 01:04:16

If you would please stand for the pledge.



Speaker 2 - 01:04:25

Of the United States of America to.



Speaker 4 - 01:04:27

The problem for which it stands, one.



Speaker 1 - 01:04:30

Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. Right, Public comments limited to 2 minutes. Tammy.



Speaker 2 - 01:04:46

Hi. In 20, Tammy Leteri, Coconut Creek, Florida. In 2022, Broward county passed a resolution banning certain single use plastics on government property. You need to post that resolution in every building, starting with this building. And shame on members for bringing plastic to the dais and into this room. When you're regulating our behavior and you're not even paying attention to what the Lancet said, the countdown on plastic and health, it is the single gravest threat to life on earth. So somebody went through the trouble and bought a whole box of single use plastic knives and forks and plastic salad and serving tongs and whatnot. I mean, why do I have to point this out to you? I'm a physical therapist. I'm a clinician. I care about health and I understand what it takes to affect change in behavior to lead a healthier lifestyle.



Speaker 2 - 01:06:00

But you guys don't get it. And if you want to affect our behavior, you need to start with yourselves. So next time I come back here, I want to see that sign up there. I want to see no plastics. Go buy a cheap set of metal knives and forks from Publix and stock them here. Do it. Show us how it can be done. If you don't, it won't happen. Thank you.



Speaker 1 - 01:06:28

Thank you. Richard Ramcharitar.



Speaker 4 - 01:06:34

Good morning. Yes, so as you, I'm here to.

 Speaker 1 - 01:06:41

Speak about the Broward County Solid Waste.

 Speaker 4 - 01:06:43

Authority master plan and its relationship to our county's mandate to protect wetlands. As you evaluate long term waste infrastructure decisions, I urge you to ensure that environmental protection, especially wetland preservation, is not treated as an afterthought or simply a permitting step. Broward County's wetlands are essential to flood protection, water quality, habitat preservation and climate resilience. Once they are impacted, restoration is costly and often incomplete. The master plan outlines a 40 year strategy that timeline demands careful siting decisions that prioritize avoidance of sensitive lands from the start. Compliance with environmental regulations is the minimum standard. Leadership means proactively steering facilities away from wetlands and conservation areas altogether. Solid waste planning and environmental stewardship should work together, not compete. By embedding wetland protection principles directly into site selection criteria and decision making frameworks, this committee can demonstrate that sustainability is more than a goal.

 Speaker 4 - 01:07:56

It's a commitment. Thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 01:07:58

Thank you, Richard. Stephanie Pearson from League of Women Voters.

 Speaker 2 - 01:08:06

Good morning. STEPHANIE Pearson, League of Women Voters. The League of Women Voters of Broward county strongly supports the master plan and will do what we can to help to its final approval. We urge all cities to join. It's critical for our future. We have a few specific points and questions in your message to city elected officials and staff. We suggest you take the time to explain why there is a facilities amendment to the ILA and what it means. There is a misconception out there that somehow this relates to an ultimate goal of expanding waste to energy. We should emphasize that no new waste to energy plant is planned. And I was going to say that the new authority is now allowed to own one. But now, honestly, I'm a little confused because at the conversation this morning, there was some.

 Speaker 2 - 01:09:07

We need some clarity as to whether the authority could ever own one and what the criteria would be. A clear explanation cannot be said or often enough about the facilities amendment because it is causing confusion on the financial side. Larger cities are concerned. They'll be subsidizing the smaller cities. And we suggest that you tailor your presentations to address this impression. We Applaud the plan to put forward a pledge campaign to encourage individuals to contact their local officials in support of the approval of the master plan. And we hope this will be available asap. As in the next few weeks, there are many community events that offer a wonderful opportunity to interact with the public on this issue. If the pledge is not ready, a short message we can show at our events will help keep the public engaged.

 Speaker 2 - 01:10:03

I do want to mention that tomorrow we are hosting, along with the library, Sierra Club and Climate Reality, a short film called Reinventing Recycling. And we appreciate the fact very much that Mayor Mike Ryan is going to be on the panel to discuss the issue afterward, along with Jairo Gonzalez of the Organics Foundation. It's free. We hope you can come. It's going to be right here at the west regional library at 2:00'.

 Speaker 4 - 01:10:33

Clock.

 Speaker 2 - 01:10:34

So thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 01:10:35

Thank you, Stephanie. All right, any other speakers? All right, I'm going to close public comment. All right. Meeting minutes from January 16, 2026. Do I have a motion? Motion by Member Meads, seconded by Member Salomon. Any discussion on those minutes? All in favor say Aye. Any opposed? Okay, we have a number of items to cover. What I like to do with the consent of the body is to carry over the C and D Commercial Subcommittee update and the Education Outreach Subcommittee before we go to the master plan so they can get some sense for the governing board of the work that's been done that everyone agree and consent to that. Member Welch. Mike.

 Speaker 2 - 01:11:16

Fr. Sorry, I was unable to hear clearly what you said. Did you say you're passing over the. The C and D?

 Speaker 1 - 01:11:24

No, no.

 Speaker 4 - 01:11:25

Right.

 Speaker 1 - 01:11:25

We're including it now. We'd like to include a. A presentation on that and from the Education Subcommittee.

 Speaker 2 - 01:11:30

Okay, perfect.

 Speaker 1 - 01:11:31

All right, the C and D Commercial Subcommittee. Member Meade. Sorry. Yeah, we'll come back to that. Member Mead.

 Speaker 3 - 01:11:43

Thank you, Chair. We met last week and we have ordinances. One ordinance for the cd, one ordinance for commercial pickup. We have.

 Speaker 4 - 01:11:53

As I said, the ordinances are in hand. We have some questions and we have.

 Speaker 3 - 01:11:57

Gotten those questions back to the source so that we can get some clarification on them, and we'll be presenting those within the next couple of weeks to the board.

 Speaker 1 - 01:12:07

Okay, thank you. Member Meade, with respect to the ordinances, one request from the TAC members has been to see and to be able to be engaged. As I understand it, that has been provided to the TAC as well. And you've sought comments from the tac, correct?

 Speaker 4 - 01:12:21

That is correct.

 Speaker 3 - 01:12:21

We are seeking comments actively from anyone.

 Speaker 4 - 01:12:25

Who involved in the process.

 Speaker 3 - 01:12:26

Contractors, haulers, and everyone who is involved. We want to get their input so that we can make this a very workable product. There's no sense in making up a bunch of rules and regulations but not having them apply. So we're eager to get comments.

 Speaker 1 - 01:12:40

And I understand the TAC at the last meeting was focused on the facilities amendment. They're going to continue to focus on the C and D at limited time because the executive committee was meeting right afterwards. So to. To SES again, I'd ask that you send out to the TAC members, make sure they are. Mr. Storey's not here, so I want you to be on point of that to make sure they're aware of all of the updates from the C and D subcommittee and again, see comments as rapidly as possible on that. Okay. Member Welch,



Speaker 2 - 01:13:11

Thank you. I wasn't able to attend her, so I just wanted to ask a couple of questions. The thresholds for the compliance and the non compliance. It seems as if the bigger percentage burden is on the smaller user rather than the larger. Can you help me with that?



Speaker 4 - 01:13:34

I'm not sure I understand the question.



Speaker 2 - 01:13:39

Fee table for the covered project valuation thresholds.



Speaker 1 - 01:13:46

Okay.



Speaker 3 - 01:13:46

Maybe Mr. Deutsch can address that if he's okay.



Speaker 2 - 01:13:49

Thank you.



Speaker 3 - 01:13:53

Daniel Deitch, SES Engineers Chair, Vice Chair, Council members, what we have presented is a draft ordinance. I presume you're talking about the CMD ordinance and we're soliciting feedback in writing. So I would ask if you could share that through the chair and it'll come back to us and we can address that at the next meeting. We can talk about it, explain it, and hopefully reach resolution as it works through the subcommittee process.

 Speaker 2 - 01:14:23

Thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 01:14:24

Thank you. And again, as we've emphasized to the TAC members in the community at large, this is a work in progress and no one should be waiting until the final product to give us their comments. Engagement now, criticism, concerns, worries, suspicions, whatever need to come into the C and D subcommittee for them to be able to produce the best product to come back to the executive committee. So welcome the comments from. From your staff as well. Thank you.

 Speaker 4 - 01:14:51

Vice Chair, are we envisioning this as a county ordinance? I assume. I'm assuming we are.

 Speaker 3 - 01:15:00

So we are still working. We're focused on the ordinance, the draft ordinance. Now, implementation is top of mind, but that comes next, we would expect on the C and D. It is adopted both by the county and all the ILA members in terms of an ordinance that specifically prohibits direct disposal of C and D. That may be handled best by the county alone because of just your responsibilities.

 Speaker 2 - 01:15:25

Okay.

 Speaker 3 - 01:15:26

And then same thing with commercial recycling, even. And I apologize for any confusion. When we drafted the proposed ordinances, we simply put it on county.

 Speaker 4 - 01:15:37

So I think it's important just to. To specify that. Where. Who. Whose jurisdiction is in.

 Speaker 3 - 01:15:44

Yes, so we.

 Speaker 4 - 01:15:45

So we can initiate it and get him going.

 Speaker 3 - 01:15:47

Correct.

 Speaker 1 - 01:15:48

Right. And I, again, to. The CD subcommittee has really been flushing these issues out consistently and in depth. So it's important to get the information out for the government board members who maybe are not as familiar with what's happening here. There's two parallel lines here. One is dealing with the heaviest part of our solid waste stream, which is construction and demolition debris. Too much of that has been going to the landfill. Too little of it's been recycled for, repurposed or diverted. And so what's happening here is the C and D subcommittee, through the direction of the executive committee, has been tasked with looking at models that already exist in the state of Florida that have effectively been able to divert significant large quantities from landfilling and repurpose it. And so that has been the backbone.

 Speaker 1 - 01:16:41

But because, you know, an existing ordinance in another county cannot be automatically replicated here, we have to take into account the dynamics here, including the complexities of 31 municipalities, as well as just the sheer

volume of this. The work has been done to start with the model of the ordinance, then take into account all of the unique issues that we face here in the county, including the issues of enforcement and etc. So that process has been ongoing and TAC has been, to their credit, involved in providing comments, and we'll continue to do so. Eventually we should have before the executive committee at least a presentation with a proposal that'll get us close to at least that. We'll talk about commercial recycling in a moment. Member Meade.

 Speaker 3 - 01:17:29

Thank you, Chair. Yes, we've been modeling after a couple of different, very successful programs. One of the major differences that Broward county has is that we are dealing with public private partnerships here. Some of the others are strictly county owned facilities.

 Speaker 4 - 01:17:46

So we do have to integrate that.

 Speaker 3 - 01:17:48

I shouldn't say we have to. It's. We want to. It's there, so we want to do that. The commercial aspect is a separate entity from the C and D. It's going to require a lot more education from people as to source separation and a few other things than the CND is.

 Speaker 4 - 01:18:09

Okay.

 Speaker 1 - 01:18:09

Member Welch, your cards up? Did you want to speak? Okay. With respect to the member Newton, I.

 Speaker 3 - 01:18:17

Don't know if I Missed this before or not.



Speaker 4 - 01:18:18

But do we have any know anything about the contamination rate in C and D?



Speaker 3 - 01:18:23

I'm just remember over hearing about that.



Speaker 1 - 01:18:27

Not everything is recyclable.



Speaker 3 - 01:18:28

So even if C and D goes.



Speaker 4 - 01:18:29

In, there's going to be some.



Speaker 3 - 01:18:32

Yeah, there's.



Speaker 4 - 01:18:32

There is some.



Speaker 3 - 01:18:35

Wood, for instance. A lot of the wood is not recyclable. I'm not sure the percentage on that. I think it's somewhere around 20%, am I right? You may be right. I'm not going to confirm that. But certainly CCA treated wood is problematic. We want to keep that separate. I just know because anything like that,



Speaker 1 - 01:18:54

There's another process that has to be.



Speaker 4 - 01:18:56

Done to get rid of that and.



Speaker 1 - 01:18:57

Has to go somewhere.



Speaker 3 - 01:18:58

It costs more money.



Speaker 1 - 01:18:59

And all I've been hearing from my.



Speaker 3 - 01:19:00

Residents and from my commissioners is what's the cost of all this?



Speaker 4 - 01:19:03

Right.

 Speaker 1 - 01:19:04

That's what we're working through. And there's established. That's not a unique question, the issue of contamination within the industry right now. The existing players know how to deal with this. The question is, how do we address, you know, C and D is again the heaviest part of our waste stream. It has a lot of components that are most divertible, most recyclable, but there are major components that are not. And so there are already models in place for that. The question of cost, which is a paramount issue, of course, is a matter for the modeling on this. And that's where the engagement of both the public and private partnerships that exist have to be addressed.

 Speaker 1 - 01:19:47

And I would also add this, and it's true that while we focus on cost, every ton of C and D that goes to the landfill is taking away capacity from the landfill. And there's an independent value that we have to continue to focus on. As we know, and I know this, the fact that you're a board member, the fact that you've come to these meetings often, the executive committee that's dedicated so much time already gets this. But for the public to understand, as we're looking at these cost issues, there's the real question is cost when? What's the cost next year? What's the cost in 10 years? What's the cost in 20 years? And when we run out of landfill capacity, we run out of waste energy capacity. And we need to start either putting this on rail or other ways of moving it.

 Speaker 1 - 01:20:38

We become subject to the vagaries of the market. We have no choices. And then the landfill costs will go up. Extraordinary. So the cost is absolutely true, needs to be had and the questions are both acute and chronic. What are the acute costs that we're going to be facing this year, next year, the year after? But we can't lose sight of a lot of the reason we're here together is because we recognize that the chronic cost is our biggest risk. And so both models have to take that into account. And as we get to C and D, that's key. Remember, Mead said on commercial recycling, that's a much more challenging aspect. And just to put it in some context, think of an office building with 25 floors and 120 different offices. How do you collect?

 Speaker 1 - 01:21:28

Where is the space that doesn't exist at the office building? What do you do? And we talked about this in a different context, but the mall is seen as an, you know, simply one building large, but it's 300 businesses. And how do you commercially pick up and how do you do. So to the credit of the committee, they're really addressing some very challenging issues yet. While it's important we talk about the plastics that we're talking about at a meeting like this, or what we do at an event or what we do at home, it's the commercial producers that are going to be the game changer in recycling. It's those that we have not been able to get that are right now either going to waste energy or going to the. To the landfill. So credit to the committee for taking that on.

 Speaker 1 - 01:22:14

And as we go over time, each of the members should feel the, not only the opportunity, but the commitment to offer ideas and participate even in the governing board members, even if you're not a member of the C and D

subcommittee, want to make sure you know about the subcommittee meetings. You're welcome to attend and really put in the effort because this, these are. The executive committee has made the commitment irrespective of the facilities amendment, the master plan. This must move forward. This does not, is not contingent except on us managing flow control lately. But we did not want to wait for this process. And to the credit of the members and staff, I thank you for continuing to push that forward. When do you think Daniel will have a presentation on the.



Speaker 1 - 01:22:59

The C and D and where we are in getting the best comments and decision points.



Speaker 3 - 01:23:03

I would like to think within the next 30 to 45 days, we want to continue workshopping it through the subcommittee. We want to have engagement with the industry to make sure that we're meeting, we're finding the common ground to help maximize the implementation. And I just want to offer one of the guiding sort of Philosophies is how do we maximize the value of the waste stream components? And that's where these regulations come in. And as Chair Mead said, we are looking at best practices from around the country, but specifically around the state. I want to call out Hollywood on the commercial recycling side. They are already dealing with this responsibly. But Lee County, Collier County, Gainesville, and Alachua County, Orlando, there are great examples that. That we are relying on for best practices that are being tailored to the Solid Waste authority.



Speaker 1 - 01:23:58

Okay, we look forward to that present day. Any questions to SES on the commercial or C and D? Thank you. Thank you, Member Mead, for taking lead on that Education Outreach Subcommittee Member Dunn.



Speaker 2 - 01:24:13

Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. We had a great meeting this past week. Couple of noted progress. First, we are moving forward with our partnership with Broward County Schools. I'll let my. My colleague kind of give that, because that's an area that we're gonna have to discuss. Secondly, we saw the Put Waste in Its Place campaign. We're gonna be having that for you guys to look at soon. The toolkit is gonna be ready for the March 2026 meeting. We have added tick tock to our communication channel, so we're now on Instagram, Facebook, YouTube, and TikTok.



Speaker 1 - 01:24:51

So if you're not already beginning to move like a dance that she wants to do.

Speaker 2 - 01:24:56



So if you have not followed us, please do. And I'd also encourage you, if you wouldn't mind, sharing on your commission page as well, so that we can have the residents hearing from you directly about your involvement in solid waste. And we do have a request. So a survey went out to the TAC team, asking them to respond to the TAC member for each city, asking them to share any data that they might have around the percentage of your city's recycle rate. And so if you wouldn't mind just nudging your TAC so that they can respond to that survey. We need that data because we are trying to make wise decisions about how to spend the dollars for the direct mail.



Speaker 2 - 01:25:42

And so we would prefer to kind of really focus on those cities with the lowest recycling rate and also focus on making sure that we get the message out in a very targeted way. And if my colleagues have anything to add, then we'll turn it over to. Yep. Good morning, chair and vice chair and all the board members. I am Kesha Eugene, the public information lead for Conceptual Communications, which is the firm that is responsible for the public outreach and communications for the authority. And as member Dunn stated, we did have a very productive meeting where we shared the Put Waste in Its Place campaign. We shared some drafts, and at this point we're fine tuning from the feedback that we received before we present it back to you all. Again, thank you for sharing the information about the tax survey.



Speaker 2 - 01:26:40

We did send that out via email and we're requesting for that information to come back to us next week as member Dunn said to so that we can go ahead and distribute the information and tailor the messaging according to the feedback that we received, which is specifically about the residential and commercial recycling rates in each of the TAC members, respective city or town. Now, we do have the recycling curriculum budget that is before you. You all have approved this already. \$50,000 that is allocated to Broward County Public Schools for the recycling curriculum and 5,000 of that has been used to support the Youth Climate Summit already. We do want to take a moment to thank Chair Ryan and Vice Chair Furr and members Dunn and Bowman for attending and supporting and representing the authority.



Speaker 1 - 01:27:42

There were a bunch of members. Tatiana was there as well.



Speaker 2 - 01:27:45

Oh, you were? Excuse me. Thank you for attending and thank you for representing the authority. Your support is of

course effective when they see your face as representation at the school board. So thank you very much. Now we have \$45,000 that remains and we are happy to share that for the implementation of the recycling curriculum. This is going to go and be integrated into all school grade levels, K through 12. So not only will the recycling curriculum be integrated into the standard curriculum, but also the standardized curriculum. So, for example, if the school has a art program, the students will go ahead and make art out of recyclable materials. If there is a debate program, they're going to research and have a discussion and debate based on recycling waste information.



Speaker 2 - 01:28:46

So there is going to be classroom instruction on each grade level to reinforce the waste reduction and recycling concepts. Now we have Susan Kantrick, who we are working very closely with, that is prepared to launch and roll out the curriculum in April in alignment with Earth Day. So it's going to be rolled out in time for Earth Day programming. And so we are seeking your approval to release the remaining funds of \$45,000.



Speaker 1 - 01:29:21

Okay. Before we get to the budget issues on that, obviously that's a decision for the executive committee to recommend and do that. And we'll come back to that to our school board liaison. First, let me introduce to the members. The school board has had a liaison to the governing board and to the executive committee and has participated for over a year in very intense efforts and we appreciate the engagement directly of the school board. Again, it was not required by the ila. It was an invitation and the school board took it. And they understand the role that the school board plays in so much of the education, but also in the actual outcomes as it relates to solid way. So I'll turn to member Boldman to talk about the role of school board and the efforts in supporting the swa.



Speaker 2 - 01:30:10

Thank you, Chair, and thank you to everyone that came to the Youth Climate Summit. We had over 1200 students attend and it was an amazing event. So the school board and the school district is very grateful to have the opportunity. We've already use the \$5,000 for the youth Climate Summit and then this opportunity to roll out the curriculum. I think we've discussed before, educating the students is going to help our overall cause and so this is going to get the job done. I spoke with Susie Kantrick and she is working very hard to put this all together for a rollout. The curriculum will be ready at the end of March and then they'll be able to roll it out for the three weeks with a culminating events for Earth Day. And there's going to be different incentives for students, teachers and overall participation.



Speaker 2 - 01:31:11

And so we fully support this, obviously. And I just one other thing as a side that came. Vice Chair Fur and I did a breakout session at the summit and something that came out of that was the idea of having our student groups going out to the various commissions while we're trying to get support for the master plan and advocating for that. So I'm actually going to be starting next week. I'm meeting with a group from South Broward High School. I'm going to be meeting with Hollywood Hills High School and also South Plantation just to start. And so we're going to work on mobilizing the students for the rest of the school year.

 Speaker 2 - 01:31:59

So and any input that anybody has for that and how you think that could be the most effective in terms of coming to the commission meetings and advocated on open as we start to put that plan together. Thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 01:32:13

All right, thank you. I know the members will have some questions. I want to thank you for allowing the SWA to participate in the Climate Summit. It was an amazing experience and the student speakers were stunning. And their ability to communicate the importance of what we're doing here, not so much the swa, what we're trying to accomplish and their ability to communicate that to their fellow students in a way that wasn't finger wagging but was inspiring. And so it was really really special. All right, we'll come to the budget, a number of questions that the folks have. But let me start to member Don and to conceptual on the pages that you want us to share. If you could provide us all just again, self contained, I know you've done it before.

 Speaker 1 - 01:32:56

Let's do a self contained new email out saying here's the new links for whatever, TikTok, whatever for us to share and include that to the PIOs and the electeds. If that's.

 Speaker 2 - 01:33:07

Absolutely, absolutely. And we did have a PIO meeting this week as well. So information has been shared with them. Very effective, very productive. So absolutely we will share that with you all.

 Speaker 1 - 01:33:18

And I, and I know that they've been engaged, but it's important to let the electives, they may not know the PIOs are doing this. So let us all know all of the electives across that. This is information we're requesting to be shared. Then folks have their own individual pages. They may do it as well. So thank you for the PIO engagement. For all the PIOs that are involved on the TAC data that you requested the percentage of recycling. I would just offer a friendly thought on that. We should also ask to the extent they know the contamination rates.

 Speaker 4 - 01:33:48

Okay.

 Speaker 1 - 01:33:49

Okay, perfect. Because for folks who are asking about what it costs our residents, you may be shocked. If you go look at your contracts you have, you think you're charging this, but when you get a contamination rate that's 40%, you may be paying it, your residents may not be paying, but it's hitting your general fund and it's a cost. So you're already increasing your recycling costs. You don't even know it. Right. You don't feel it because you don't get a report on it. So that's a huge component. And I know the education subcommittee has been working on that. All right, to the budget question. I'm going to turn to the members to have the comments. I'll just start on my left and work my way around.

 Speaker 2 - 01:34:26

No budget.

 Speaker 1 - 01:34:27

Okay, no budget. Member Bright Cruise.

 Speaker 4 - 01:34:31

Thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 01:34:31

Chair, do you have a separate comment? Member THOMAS okay, do you want to do that now?

 Speaker 2 - 01:34:35

Yes, I do. Thank you so much. Thank you for that report. Thank you for Commissioner Dunn for presenting. I would like to know when the curriculum will be rolled out. Out only because I do a. What is it, an art contest with the students recycle. Art contest in four. What is it, the month of April minus five now, Earth Day. And so I had 89 participants last year and they're in the atrium of our city hall, and anyone who comes in votes on it.

 Speaker 4 - 01:35:12

And.

 Speaker 2 - 01:35:12

And then we give them different prizes. But it was absolutely amazing to see the creativity and the volume of involvement. We didn't want to go up to high school because that would be massive. But nevertheless, the curriculum, even when I do cleanup, we bring in the recyclable component where we have the green bags as well. And to teach them at an elementary age, because it's very important at the foundational age, because they're the ones that run to the parents and tell them they're doing it wrong.

 Speaker 1 - 01:35:47

Right.

 Speaker 2 - 01:35:48

But it would be interesting about the curriculum because we could also engage that in the post the art contest as well.

 Speaker 1 - 01:35:58

So my understanding is that the curriculum will be done the third week in March and it's rolling out in April, right?

 Speaker 2 - 01:36:04

Correct.

 Speaker 1 - 01:36:05

So the curriculum being done, though, if we could get it to the members so that they understand it before it's even rolled out, that would be, I think, incredibly helpful to member Thomas Point that fair. Thank you. All right, Member Welch, then Member Bright Cruiser.



Speaker 2 - 01:36:21

Just quickly, which three schools are being targeted, if I may ask? That's. That's to be determined. We'll be coming back with a criteria at the next meeting. That was one of the conversations that we asked. Conceptual. So they're going to be figuring it out and coming back to us. Well, just put it out there. We'd like to volunteer. We did, however, give them clear instruction to make sure that it's to member to vice chair Matera Bowen's point that it's spread out throughout the county so that we have someone in north, south, and in central. But we instructed them to come back with a clear, transparent way that they're going to be doing that. And to add to that, Member Dunn, we want to make sure that we get representation from elementary school, middle school, and high school. So that's a starting point for us.



Speaker 1 - 01:37:19

All right. And then at the back end of this, we'll need the metrics on what you thought was the success of it.



Speaker 2 - 01:37:23

I'm in them all, so I'm glad to advocate for any and all of them.



Speaker 1 - 01:37:27

Thank you, Member Welch, Member Breakfast.



Speaker 4 - 01:37:29

Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to thank member Bowman for her partnership as we've had these meetings and all that she's done to communicate that and to move this forward with the school board and the administration there. It's been key to our success. So thank you for that. I pushed it forward, actually at a speed faster than. Than I expected.



Speaker 1 - 01:37:51

So that was awesome.



Speaker 4 - 01:37:53

One Other thing, I just. As far as the pio, we had a great PIO meeting at Southwest Ranches. It was great to introduce some folks.

 Speaker 1 - 01:38:00

Out there that had never been out.

 Speaker 4 - 01:38:01

That far west before. We do exist out there for those that don't make it out that far west. But we had a great meeting and appreciate that opportunity. Look for more of those and appreciate everybody's participation. Had a good group.

 Speaker 2 - 01:38:13

Thank you for hosting us.

 Speaker 1 - 01:38:14

Thank you for doing that. Member Bright Cruz. Member Horland.

 Speaker 2 - 01:38:19

Yes, thank you. I'd like to echo that. Thank you to the education subcommittee and to school board member Bullman. Your partnership on this is invaluable. Kesha, I had a couple of questions about implementation. What's the accountability piece on the implementation? Are we simply writing a check for \$45,000? Are we being invoiced? Are we coming back and you know, are there going to be metrics, as the chair said, as to how this was implemented? Do we know if 25,000 students are going to receive the Recycling Patrol badges? So how is that going to be? I don't have a clear outline at the moment, but we can make sure that we send an email out with that information. Okay, I'd like to see that. Yes. Thank you very much.

 Speaker 3 - 01:39:00

Okay.

 Speaker 1 - 01:39:01

Vice Chair, thanks.

 Speaker 4 - 01:39:03

Just to the idea of the art contest you were doing. There is a large county wide one going on March 8 by the Sierra Club. That's at Ann Kolb Park. So anybody wants to know about that, do it. With regard to the recycling, I mean. Yeah, with recycling, what is that? The curriculum. We had applied for \$150,000 to the Bloomberg foundation and we opened it up to all the students in the county. We got a lot of people applying for it. Got some unbelievable stuff. And what they did is they did some immersion curriculum that the students wrote themselves. It was unbelievable. It was fantastic. And I say that because they tested it on themselves. They did pre test, post tests to see how effective it was. Very effective. And I think we want to be.

 Speaker 4 - 01:40:03

I think the idea of using students own curriculum would go a long ways. They did such a great job. We gave each one of them, they could apply for it. They each got \$5,000 to work with and then it was carefully monitored. They had all these metrics that they had to reach. They did it. They had to present to the climate change task force. Unbelievable work. So it's worth using that if we can, to take it to the next step.

 Speaker 2 - 01:40:30

Thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 01:40:30

In the future, not in this current.

 Speaker 4 - 01:40:33

Proposal, I would Try to work with them somehow, because it's already done. They've already got it just in cl. You know, if they know it exists.

Speaker 2 - 01:40:42



Okay. We will connect with the school board.



Speaker 1 - 01:40:45

So. So just to clarify for the members, the. The point here was to develop a lesson plan.



Speaker 4 - 01:40:50

You're.



Speaker 1 - 01:40:51

I think what the vice chair is saying is that the. There's lesson plans that have already been developed. Do we need to spend the money on it? I guess that's the question. Is that to the point the vice chair's saying we have 5,000 for development of lesson plan and curriculum? It sounds like there's been a grant, given there's been harvesting of that information. It's been vetted. Do we need to spend the money to develop that curriculum? I guess I would turn to member Bowman to let us know what you think about what's already existing in collaboration with the vice chair.



Speaker 2 - 01:41:21

Well, I'm not 100% aware of what exists. Besides, you know, I understand that it exists, but I haven't looked at it. So I'd have to, you know, talk to Susie Kantrick and see what she think. I think there's still going to be a component of the teachers having to develop the curriculum, but I think that we could.



Speaker 4 - 01:41:41

How to make it transportable to all of them.



Speaker 2 - 01:41:43

Yeah, I mean, I think we can, you know, collaborate with the students that have already created the curriculum. I don't have that. I don't have to talk to her.

 Speaker 1 - 01:41:54

What I would ask, though, is that the education subcommittee and conceptual come back with that because we have a separate component for professional development. That's a bigger number. That's 21,000. That's obviously focused on what it takes to get the teachers up. But if the curriculums have been developed or there's one or two that seem to be driven. Driven by the students in the student's language, that has been vetted and seems effective. It's immersed. Let's just take, you know, why try to build a better mousetrap and take the money separately for other purposes? Is that fair? Is everybody on the same page? I just want to understand.

 Speaker 2 - 01:42:29

I'll take that information back so we can have a discussion on it.

 Speaker 4 - 01:42:32

Okay, sure.

 Speaker 1 - 01:42:33

So I. Because I asked that, because I know what's being asked is to release is what I think I heard the. The remainder, the 45, but I'm not ready one. To release the 5000 if we already have curriculum there. Again, I defer to the education subcommittee on its. Its work and whether that's the recommendation. But this is New information I think that we're all kind of receiving. So, Member Dunn, what's your thought?

 Speaker 2 - 01:42:58

Yes, I actually did not know that students develop curriculum. My understanding what the process is that we've been working with the department of the school board, who that's kind of what they do. And so I would imagine that they have kind of looked at how they can kind of merge and customize, but we can certainly verify and report back at the next meeting. All right, so then, Mr. Chair, am I hearing that the thought is to table this until the next time or move on with everything except for the \$9,000 for curriculum?

 Speaker 1 - 01:43:32

Yeah. So I don't want to hold up moving forward. We have limited time. Right. We're going to be going into March pretty quickly. So I'm not trying to hold it up. What I'm trying to say is let's try to conserve the 9,000 as much as possible. If a good curriculum exists and simply tweaking it into a final standard that is acceptable to the school board, as opposed to just giving the school board to 9,000 to develop a curriculum. Facility exists. I guess my point.



Speaker 2 - 01:43:57

So perhaps I can make a motion. If we have additional discussion, and then I'd like to make a motion.



Speaker 1 - 01:44:03

Okay, fair enough. Member Bowman, did you want to address that? Just before I come back over with comments.



Speaker 2 - 01:44:08

So my understanding is that the 9,000 was to be used to teachers to develop. For teachers that are going to develop this curriculum over, you know, I think the month of March. So there's still going to be work that has to be done to incorporate whatever existing curriculum is there. And it has to be age appropriate because we want. We are hitting elementary, middle and high school. And the way that they are rolling it out through the, you know, they're trying to incorporate it through, like, pe, specialized civic engagement departments.



Speaker 1 - 01:44:46

So that's fair. Look, we have. We have limited time.



Speaker 2 - 01:44:52

Funding. When there's a lot, there's a work to be done.



Speaker 1 - 01:44:55

I'm not suggesting hold back. I'm saying let's just make sure we're conserving if it's not necessary, as opposed to just having a light item that gets paid and we don't know. That's all. Let me just vote to member Colburn.



Speaker 2 - 01:45:08

Thank you. I do want to thank member Dunn and all those who have been working on the Education Committee. I do think they're doing a great job. I wanted to emphasize the role of the TAC committee when it comes to the Education Committee. I know that they have been meetings with the PIOs. I met with our PIO in our city this week and basically PIO will meet with you. But the PIO is there to support our departments, and in this case it would be our public works departments, who is our TAC person. So whatever discussion you have or instructions or whatever your desires are from our pio, they go back to the TAAC person in our department. I don't know if that works similar in all the cities.



Speaker 2 - 01:46:10

But my point is, I don't know that you're meeting with the TAC committee, but you need to be meeting with the TAC committee. That's my only point on that. I just wanted to emphasize the importance on that in regards to the budget. I don't see why we couldn't just approve it. And if the 9,000, it's not needed, then it shouldn't be used. It will remain in there. Thank you.



Speaker 1 - 01:46:38

Thank you. Member Dunn, you want to respond to that?



Speaker 2 - 01:46:40

Thank you for that comment, Member Claiborne. So the role. And by the way, some members of the utility departments were actually in the meeting that we had with the PIOs. But we're targeting the PIO specifically so that they can drive the communications using the city's channels. So using them really primarily as a way to take, you know, get the E blasts out the Facebook and really kind of advise us on, from a communication perspective what works best to reach your residents. But we do also liaison with the technical experts in the cities as well. So thank you for that suggestion. Yeah, I just really wanted to emphasize, because that became an issue where attackers are. Our PIO is really not moving forward. Yes, they're participating. They're getting all information.



Speaker 2 - 01:47:32

They're learning and everything, but they want to make sure that they are supporting what is it the city have. We have a recycling program as well. We have other stuff. So that's not going to be separate from what the city is doing. So they have to work together. And that's why I say the tac, these things need to be brought before the TAC so that when you meet with PIO and you do the. That informational piece for them and they're ready to move on

that they're educated on, that they can, the TAC committee can work with them to make sure it's in line with what we're doing in the city.

 Speaker 1 - 01:48:13

Let me just offer this because we have limited resources and that means that we now have conceptual meeting at tac, conceptual meeting at pio, conceptual meeting at Education. Here's What I would suggest that there's going to be a meeting with the PIOs. The TAC committee members be invited as a four as opposed to a formal presentation to TAC. There's some members attack who have no interest in education. Each city is different. But since it's a theme based issue, if a city PIO doesn't feel like they will get authority or can approve or can participate fully without the authority of whoever, maybe it may be a TAC member, it may not be a TAC member. I know Ralph said everything, so I don't know.

 Speaker 1 - 01:48:55

I mean maybe he goes to all of them, but I think the better course to conserve their resources so we're not spending extra hours on them is that if there's a PIO meeting or an education meeting that's addressing this and PIOs are invited, invite not just TAC, but PIOs should be instructed. Invite whoever you ought to talk to. Right on whether it's thematic, right. With the language or what's going to go out or can give authority to say oh yeah, that's a good message, we're going to be able to do it or here's our concern or our question or it doesn't work for our community.

 Speaker 4 - 01:49:28

We have.

 Speaker 1 - 01:49:29

The reason why the PIOs are supposed to be on point on this is they understand the city communications better than anybody. Not every city has the same cultural makeup capacity for engagement, whether it be electronic or old school. Right. So PIs are supposed to understand that the best on getting the information out, to the extent there's messaging problems or issues or suggestions, let's let it run through education subcommittee and the PIOs just to conserve resources. Is that fair, member Dunn?

 Speaker 2 - 01:50:02

Yes, Mr. Chair. And the PIO meeting that we did have, there were of course quite a few folks from TAC that was there. But I think we can absolutely make a concerted effort to invite them both. Thank you. Okay, thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 01:50:17

Member Bowman, do you still have your card up? Don't know if you wanted to say anything else. Did you have anything else? All right, so the executive committee, well it's. We're in the governing board, but the executive committee needs to pass on this budget for this education.

 Speaker 2 - 01:50:30

I know.

 Speaker 1 - 01:50:30

Member Dunn, you want to make a motion?

 Speaker 2 - 01:50:32

Yes, I. I actually want to make a motion that we approve the 45,000, understanding that we will double check and if we don't have to use the 9,000 we won't.

 Speaker 1 - 01:50:42

Okay, there's a motion and a second by member Shoeham. Any discussion on that item Member Colburn. Oh, okay.

 Speaker 4 - 01:50:48

Sorry. All right.

 Speaker 1 - 01:50:49

All in favor, say aye. Any opposed? All right, thank you for the presentation. All right, we've got a pretty robust schedule left, and it's coming up on 11. So let's begin with the master plan timeline and where we are, which includes engagement meetings with the governing board members and workshop scheduling with the cities, per their requests. Daniel?

Speaker 2 - 01:51:16



Yeah.



Speaker 3 - 01:51:16

Again, Daniel Deutsch, SES Engineers. And I'm joined by Ashley, who's going to walk through sort of what we've been doing in terms of engagement meetings and. And where we're going from here. We have asked for some additional time before meeting with professional staff, really, so that we can reach consensus on the path forward on the financing plan. We're going to talk about that as a separate agenda item.



Speaker 4 - 01:51:41

Speak. Clues.



Speaker 3 - 01:51:43

My apologies, but we believe that we're still on schedule to have all of the information, at least on the financial side of the master plan, in advance of the March 20th executive committee and governing board meeting so that we can pass that milestone of either adopting the master plan or not and recommending the facilities amendment or not.



Speaker 1 - 01:52:03

All right, if we could just go over the timeline.



Speaker 4 - 01:52:05

First of all, before we get there,



Speaker 1 - 01:52:07

I'm going to ask, at least if you can pull up, I know there's a document, you may have to blow it up that has the

specific what we're expecting. For instance, March 20 is the big date for the governing board. Yeah, that's it there. And if you could just enlarge that a little bit for us, that'd be great.

 Speaker 3 - 01:52:22

And chairman, if I may, there is one meeting that's not on there, which is March 2, that has been recently added. And we will be back before you to address the financial plan.

 Speaker 4 - 01:52:33

All right.

 Speaker 3 - 01:52:33

In advance of that, you'll have the financial plan memo that we've committed to.

 Speaker 1 - 01:52:37

All right. And to update the governing board members. We remain on track in part because of special meetings and additional effort today. The executive committee did review the facilities amendment. You'll have a recommendation from the executive committee on both that and the master plan. That'll be turned to the governing board today for some discussion. But you don't need to approve that until March 20th. That's where we'll have the full recommendation. At that point, if it's recommended and it is the will of the governing board, that's when the deadlines start for us to get the communities, individual ILA members on board. You can see that it would be sent. The projection would be. It would be sent to the cities on March 23rd. And that starts the clock. The deadline at that point to either approve or reject will be July 21st.

 Speaker 1 - 01:53:27

And the ultimate deadline for adoption is August 14th. Any questions? First on the timeline from the board members. All right, Daniel, in terms of the timelines, you're still on course as far as you're concerned, correct?

 Speaker 2 - 01:53:40

Correct.



Speaker 1 - 01:53:41

Okay. Mr. Cole, in terms of the timelines, from the legal perspective, we're still on course?



Speaker 4 - 01:53:47

Yes, we're on course.



Speaker 1 - 01:53:48

Okay. Yes.



Speaker 4 - 01:53:51

To try to kick this thing off. If this passes on the 20th, then what I'd like to try to do is get the counties right after that. Go. Going ahead. That means I need a resolution by 23 March. That's pretty quick, but that's resolution is one we're all going to need. So I'm thinking April and May is when all these meetings are going to be taking place. So the. Soon. So that means that resolution, if it's by the 23rd, I almost needed two weeks prior to that to be able to put it in. Put it in the. I'm just giving you kind of where the timeline is. Okay. And that way we're all ready to go.



Speaker 1 - 01:54:30

I think it's a great idea. Mr. Cole. Yes.



Speaker 4 - 01:54:33

We're going to prepare a form resolution that's going to go out to all the parties to use, and I think it's a good idea. What, what you're suggesting is send it out even in advance of March 20th. Yes. And we can do that.



Speaker 1 - 01:54:45

Okay, great idea. Okay. Engagement with respect to the governing board members and staffs.



Speaker 2 - 01:54:53

Hi, my name is Ashley Walker. I'm a part of partner at Mercury Public Affairs. We have been conducting meetings with all the governing board members, and the purpose of those meetings is to get a better understanding of what each city is going to need to meet this timeline that we just went through. We're also gathering concerns, flags, other issues that need to be sorted through in advance. There are some key themes that we're finding. First, I think the number one. One thing that we're hearing from almost all cities is cost is the primary concern. I think you all know that, but they'd really like to see some cost. I know you're going over financial modeling, but I think that's going to be one of the first things that we have to do to make sure that we can get through these cities.



Speaker 2 - 01:55:44

Second is process and timing preferences. There were some cities that want some formal, some workshops before the formal votes. Some cities have requested Individual one one meetings with the other commission. We have had members that are bringing staff members or asking that we do individual meetings with staff members. So we are going through all of those individual requests for each city and trying to get them scheduled for this timeline in the 120 days and make sure we're meeting their request. There's some trust and governance concerns. We're getting some questions about kind of post implementation governance structure, some concern about flow issues. I think it's important that we have transparency about the governance structure and learn from other county experiences and address these proactively. There's some environmental considerations. These are were secondary and weren't on the forefront, but it's worth mentioning.



Speaker 2 - 01:56:46

And then some technical and operational questions. You know, the impact on existing collections programs, contract timeline clarity when these contracts expire. And then lastly just some political observations that we've made through these meetings. One is we're identifying champions. Different board members are saying, you know, I will champion this or in order to get this through, you need so and so we are identifying champions that will either help in their city and we even have some that want to help in other cities. Some potential challenges is just we have some folks that are singularly focused on cost because that is an important factor. So we need to really kind of work through this financial modeling and really kind of get clarity there. We have upcoming election cycles.



Speaker 2 - 01:57:40

So those are considerations that people are kind of putting into creating political sensitivity, state level uncertainty around what is happening at session. I think we've all been reading the news on the property taxes and then different cities have different mixes of rental properties versus ownership and so that is kind of creates different stakeholder dynamics. We are on track. I appreciate Vice Chair Fur. We are starting to identify people to go first and he has offered for the county to do that first meeting after March 23rd. I know chair Ryan is going to, has offered to also spearhead for Sunrise. We are starting to get those scheduled. We will be reaching out to all the cities again just to now that we know what you need, we need to start getting that on the calendar and we are starting to schedule that.



Speaker 2 - 01:58:35

But we are on, we are on track.



Speaker 1 - 01:58:39

All right, thank you for that. I want to first thank you for the assessment of the issues. It's singularly important. Right. We all are in our own silos at times and maybe can't fully perceive what some of the concerns are. So that's very helpful for all the members to know, second to your point about champions within a particular day. I think the executive committee has also suggested that to the extent that neighboring municipalities have good relationships, who share common mission, who have consistently worked together, and the members of either the executive committee or the governing board who are available to go and also answer questions, since they may have, you know, independent credibility on topics of shared mission, also should be invited.



Speaker 1 - 01:59:31

So to the extent that any of the governing board members feel, and the executive committee is already committed to that concept, that, you know, hey, we're prepared to go talk to our neighboring municipality to answer questions, not necessarily to, you know, be there to push for them to approve or not, but to be able to be an independent voice that can answer questions. So that's next. Third, to the extent the governing board members, and now's really the time to look at this, are going to want either workshops or attendance of executive committee, vice chair, otherwise, at a commission meeting or workshop, now's the time to schedule it. Now's the time to really be thinking about when are you going to put this on the agenda for up or down, whatever it's going to be, when are you doing that?



Speaker 1 - 02:00:19

And start getting us the dates? Because it's a lot to do in a small timeframe. It was different when we had a six months or a year to go around and do a roadshow. It's. We're talking about a very compressed timetable and mindful that not all commissions work the entire summer. You know, the county takes off from what, April to October or something? I'm not sure. It may not even be possible. If you get into June or mid June and still need approval to get that done. Even though we look at the time frame, we say, okay, well, we have until August 14th. That's not realistic for a lot of cities. Not that members wouldn't be willing to do it, but scheduling a special meeting over the summer can be challenging.



Speaker 1 - 02:01:03

So you really want to start right now thinking about what's the meeting after March 23, but before June 1 to. And if you envision it's going to take multiple meetings by workshop, otherwise, now's the time to let us know, and we need to know. It can't be just stored in your head. We need communication at this point to Mr. Stordy or the interim director. I would ask, at least for now, that it go to Mr. Cole and then Mr. Cole can distribute it to SES and the team, if that's fair. Mr. Cole. Okay, so I'm begging right now to start thinking about that. Get with your staff and again, whether it's up or down, let's know. And if it's going to be an early. No, let's know, because we may be able to come back and help clarify some points.

 Speaker 1 - 02:01:54

So we don't want this pushed off to June or July for a discussion. And I thank the county for already thinking that through and getting the resolution Sunrise.

 Speaker 2 - 02:02:02

We'll be doing the same thing.

 Speaker 1 - 02:02:04

All right.

 Speaker 2 - 02:02:04

Remember, Horland, very quickly, Ashley, thank you for the detailed comments. Important for us to hear that. I understand that there had been some difficulty in getting some of those meetings scheduled with the elected board members. Have you now reached out to all 28 representatives? We have reached out to all 28. There are a handful that still need to get on the calendar. Okay, thank you. And I'm sure you're making every effort to make sure that those people are on the calendar. Thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 02:02:28

Okay.

 Speaker 2 - 02:02:28

Member Patterson, thank you. I'm actually one of the cities that reached out to have a workshop scheduled with my colleagues. I believe my staff said that. We were told that you guys weren't prepared to do that. My concern is that naturally we're discussing agenda, an item that we're not prepared to discuss, given obviously the timeframe lends right into budget. It lends right into recess if we're not ready to brief or have conversations with our colleagues. I'm a little bit at a loss.



Speaker 1 - 02:03:00

I think it's just a timing issue, the question of doing a workshop now or before March 20th. All of the efforts right now are focused on getting all of this in order, the financial modeling, everything. The workshops and the meetings are really going to have to start after March 23rd for the most productive, because the executive committee hasn't even passed fully on everything. The governing board hasn't passed on it. It can change. And so one of the concerns, I think, from the communication folks and from SCS is to put forward a workshop where perhaps member comments on March 20, alter some of this discussion or alter the course. And so what I would suggest is that what they're willing to do is to sit down with individual members, Right. Who have questions and staff, and they've been doing that.



Speaker 1 - 02:03:47

But with respect to workshops and meetings, those have to start after March 20, essentially, when it comes back to the government board for it to be the most effective. Again, the number one comment, right. We hear from everybody is the money. Right. And so we're working to make sure that by March 20th that this. And we'll talk a little bit more about this in a moment, that this context is where it needs to be.



Speaker 4 - 02:04:12

In order to move towards.



Speaker 1 - 02:04:14

Yes.



Speaker 3 - 02:04:14

And we still.



Speaker 2 - 02:04:15

I mean, I guess my thought was to minimize, you know, confusion and the need to have five conversations or four conversations that we would sit and just, you know, be given an overview. I think that my colleagues, personally, I don't know what the history has been in terms of their engagement and their involvement, but I don't know that I believe that they're briefed and privy and prepared to make a decision. And so while there is going to be questions relating to numbers and budget, I do think that there is an education component that just needs to simply happen before they even get there.

 Speaker 1 - 02:04:51

That's fair. Maybe the solution to that, to the extent. Let's not call it a workshop, because I think that has a different context.

 Speaker 2 - 02:04:57

Well, I think what we're saying is that a meeting in the sunshine, I mean, obviously to have five conversations at once, we need to have a sunshine meeting.

 Speaker 1 - 02:05:05

So they're not necessarily having five conversations. They're meeting with the governing board members to get an assessment, because that's what the governing board members are responsible for.

 Speaker 4 - 02:05:14

Right.

 Speaker 1 - 02:05:14

Not to vote on it, but to have an understanding of where either, like you're pointing out, the gaps may exist. What do we need to do to address and. And to get with staff? I mean, ultimately, staff needs to understand this historically, to the extent that your suggestion is maybe a preliminary meeting prior to any approval, because, again, remember, we won't be coming forward with an absolute recommendation. Here's what we're projecting. Costs are over, what time? If it's simply, how did we get here? What have we been through? What is the scope of the master plan, which is mainly containing the executive summary, and what the work of the governing board is expected to do with this timeline. Absolutely. If you tell us that would be a good idea in March, even before approval, we'll have somebody come out and do that.

 Speaker 2 - 02:05:58

Yeah, I mean, I. I gave consideration to having you, the consultant, brief the staff and then the staff subsequently having a conversation with my colleagues. However, I'm not confident that the staff would be able to properly convey and communicate, you know, the depth of what's happening here. And so while I also wasn't sure whether or not the consultant would be able to, I guess, not have a position in their delivery as well. I mean, naturally, they are the SWABC's consultant. I mean, I just kind of feel like I'm in a little bit of a tough situation. I want to make sure that my colleagues are prepared to make a decision. Simply put, so what is the best approach is this is essentially

what I'm trying to get at.



Speaker 1 - 02:06:45

Yeah. So listen to each individual governing board. I'll just speak for me, and I know others have done this that are either on the executive committee of the government, they're taking the time to educate, if you will, or bring up to speed their colleagues without an ask, saying, here's how we got here's what's been going on. You know, because for some it might be, hey, this is a. It's been a hole into which I haven't seen or heard anything in five years, let's say, or their new members.



Speaker 4 - 02:07:11

Right.



Speaker 1 - 02:07:11

The individual colleagues around this table first have that obligation. And what Mercury and others have said, to the extent you need help in doing that, in educating your commission, getting them just up to speed, not the weighing, you know, recommended what this, but just need help getting where we are now in an update, that's what they're there to help. So I would first turn to the members and to your point, not every governing board member may feel as comfortable in providing that update. I totally acknowledge that. And so to the extent that the vice chair and myself can assist, you know, we're happy to come out and do a. Here's where we're at and listen to all of the concerns, knowing it's all before we're recommending anything. Is that, does that answer it a little bit?



Speaker 2 - 02:07:59

Yeah. I mean, if, I mean, I believe there was, I, I forget which member was it. Okay, I'm sorry, last meeting had made himself available to be able to do that as well. But I believe that there was some discussion around whether or not that would be appropriate.



Speaker 1 - 02:08:14

So is it he. Go ahead, member.



Speaker 4 - 02:08:20

Thank you, Chair. Yeah, we had a quick conversation after the last meeting. I know I've given a presentation to the League of Wisdom and Voters to a number of organizations and I would be more. We, you know, we have a great relationship between our two municipalities and I would absolutely be thrilled to be able to come up there and just give just a 10 minute overview of where we are, where were, why this is important and you know, what's upcoming.

 Speaker 1 - 02:08:44

Be happy to do that.

 Speaker 2 - 02:08:45

Okay.

 Speaker 1 - 02:08:45

All right. And I think to the point Patterson raises.

 Speaker 4 - 02:08:48

Right.

 Speaker 1 - 02:08:48

It's also setting expectations. Right. There may be those who haven't been following and they hear master plan and what they. In our own cities, oftentimes the master plan is this is what we're building, here's the time frame for the build, and here's what it's going to cost for everything going out and that sort. Or it's very general, an art master plan or a bike and pedestrian. This is kind of the concepts. This is what it's somewhere in between. I'm not sure master plan at the end of the day was the right terminology, but just a nomenclature. And what a facilities amendment is supposed to do and what it doesn't do and what are you approving and how did we get here and how does it compare?

 Speaker 1 - 02:09:19

I think it's incredibly productive before we get to the dates of a workshop even to discuss numbers or the up down vote, as you're pointing out. So I think to member Bright Cruise's invitation, I think all of us would say to any governing board member who, whether you want to communicate it openly here or simply say, hey, can you come to a meeting in March? Communicate that and we'll make that happen to get it up to speed.

 Speaker 2 - 02:09:47

Okay?

 Speaker 4 - 02:09:49

Okay.

 Speaker 1 - 02:09:50

All right. Thank you so much for that. All right, let's move just real quick to the facilities amendment draft and we'll get to the financial modeling this morning. The Executive Committee, many of the governing board members know this. The executive committee was presented with the facilities amendment draft. It's been a product of negotiation. It began back in December with the county and it's gone through a significant number of drafts of which I seen almost all of them painfully. We have worked hard with special meetings to get us in a position to.

 Speaker 4 - 02:10:26

Where the goal was today, to at.

 Speaker 1 - 02:10:28

Least be able to present, pursuant to our timeline, to the governing Board a recommendation on the facilities amendment draft. This is not a request to the governing board for you to pass the facility amendments today or pass a recommendation on it, but rather it's the first step in you fully evaluating. Let me just clarify that, though, throughout this process, the TAC has been involved. We've requested comments from individual cities. We've requested comments from individual city staff. And so many of your staffs have already seen this, have been involved in it, have offered thoughts. That does not mean that there are not additional comments that can be considered. I know member Coburn had a number of points today we can discuss here as well if you still wish to take do so.

 Speaker 1 - 02:11:09

But this is the period of time to do it over this next 30 days to provide any final comments, concerns or issues that you perceive will cause a problem in getting this to Yes, I want to thank the Executive committee for its additional work in moving this forward. I want to thank Mr. Cole and the county attorney's Office and county staff for their continued engagement all the way through the holidays and oftentimes over the weekend to try to get this done. That is the report that I'll provide as the chair. Individual members of the executive committee may wish to provide additional information related to the facilities amendment, but that now is laid before you based on the recommendation of the Executive committee. And what I would ask from here is that to the extent you want to address some comments on that.

Speaker 1 - 02:11:53



Again, not expecting a vote, there's no motion that will be had here today. This is an opportunity for the government board to take the next 30 days to do more intensely. Give it some thought and our first opportunity as a group to really discuss it outside the executive committee. Member Colbert,



Speaker 2 - 02:12:08

I'm not sure if the governing board have had a recent facility amendment overview. Is that going to be done before you go into the actual concerns or comments that was. Yes.



Speaker 1 - 02:12:22

I asked Mr. Cole to provide the outline that we provided previously on that.



Speaker 2 - 02:12:26

Right. Not just the outline in addition to the comments that was received, just so that everybody would understand. Thank you.



Speaker 1 - 02:12:34

Yes. Did you want to say anything before I came down?



Speaker 4 - 02:12:36

Quick overview on that. I think when we first, when were writing the ila, we thought this facilities amendment was going to be something totally different. I think we thought we would be building what was opened yesterday. And I, I said, you guys beat us to it. We thought we would probably be building a waste, I mean a recycling center or a waste energy plant. We thought we'd be doing all these things. It has since evolved into more of a flow control type contract. And so facilities amendment almost is, it's not a misnomer, but it is different from the initial concept.



Speaker 4 - 02:13:12

And I think that when you're explaining that, and I'm saying this primarily to the governing board members, when

you're explaining that to your commissions, I think it's important to talk about that they realize that this is not, we're not talking about bricks and mortar assets at this point. We're really talking more, you know, we're going to be using assets throughout the county, but those assets that are already there's, I mean there's all talk about the wind down stuff, but it is different from what we started off with. And that evolution probably, it would make sense to probably start off with that.



Speaker 1 - 02:13:51

Yeah, let me make a point on that. When we first sat down, before any iteration of SWA was even in existence, it was that we had collapsed in our recycling market. Completely collapsed. And it was unsustainable and the view of, you know, I remember us sitting down over coffee with Mayor Stermer and we sat down and said, we can do this. We should be able to do this as a community. We should be able to build the recycling. And as government can prove over and over, it can't do anything quickly. And in the timeframe from that simple concept to Richard Ramchartar's points today, Waste management built a facility that can handle the capacity.



Speaker 1 - 02:14:35

In addition, we recognize now that we examine our county and the infrastructure that unlike the decisions that were made 50 years ago in Palm beach county, to actually own the infrastructure, and I'll just leave it generally that we won't really have that capacity to do it's already built. We're having to rely on private, public partnerships with existing private providers if we are to utilize the best of, at least in the short term, but always keeping an eye on the fact that we can never be subject to the market vagaries. We have to be prepared as a body that if the market goes sideways or we become subject to monopolistic behavior, we have to be able to reassert ourselves.



Speaker 1 - 02:15:16

So the facilities amendment that I'll have Mr. Cole first outline, then we'll go to comments is going to outline that much of what we're talking about is what we're not doing right, what we're not owning, with a very clear area of where we could own in the future to the extent it needs to backfill the private infrastructure. Ultimately, what this is all about is flow control. Whether you run a utilities or you're simply buying paperclips for your city, pricing is based on volume. You want to buy an ounce of something, it's different than buying 10 tons.



Speaker 1 - 02:15:55

And what we're faced with is the opportunity to utilize the strength of the flow of all of the solid waste streams for both best pricing but also beneficial outcomes, whether that's on the backside of the circular economy, preserving landfill capacity, WTE capacity, and ultimately what you'll see from this master plan discussion that we'll have on the financial modeling as well. The facilities amendment draft definitely began differently as a concept, and now what it's focused on mostly is defining what SWA will be able to do. You'll hear about what facilities, what it won't be doing, and putting guardrails on the concerns that somehow SWA would wander into massive spending regarding huge disposal assets, whether it's land, additional landfills or WTE or anything in that like that is not part of this.



Speaker 1 - 02:16:49

And in order to ever deviate from that, it's going to take significant approval from all of the ILA members.



Speaker 4 - 02:16:56

So before we go to any more.



Speaker 1 - 02:16:57

Comments, Mr. Kalp, can you please outline the facilities draft? I know you had previously done that for the executive committee in a five or six category.



Speaker 4 - 02:17:04

What this presents, certainly there's basically five aspects to the facilities amendment. The first aspect is what the solid waste authority can own and operate and what it can't own and operate. What it can own and operate is a transfer station, a permanent drop off center, a recycling facility. Those are three main types of facilities that it can operate. Obviously it can also do education and those other type of things. But as far as facilities, it's really transfer stations, drop off centers and recycling facilities. What it can't own is any is a solid waste disposal facility like a waste to energy plant. It specifically says in here that we cannot own or operate those. The only way they the SQA can is if this is amended with a super majority vote. And the super majority vote is an 80% of the total population.



Speaker 4 - 02:18:01

So the county and the municipal parties representing 80% of the party's tonnage would have to vote. So it's a very high standard. So basically the idea is esta way is not going to own a solid waste disposal, it's not going to build a waste energy plant, it's going to have those other types of facilities. The second aspect of this is the wind down. And basically this is dealing with the question what happens at the end if we're 40 years from now and the municipal parties at that point and the county decide they don't want to stay together anymore, they want us to go their separate ways. What happens to whatever assets we have, what happens to the operations, what happens to any money that's left, et cetera. And there's basically two different paths that could happen. One is everyone can go their separate ways.



Speaker 4 - 02:18:52

The county will go its way, the cities will all go there each way they can.



Speaker 1 - 02:18:56

Each kind of what we have right now.



Speaker 4 - 02:18:58

So we could go back to that or there'll be some kind of successor entity. Either it'll be another type of governmental entity that could be created by the legislature or some other way, or it could be the county. But the only way we go that path is if the county and a high percentage either, you know, the number that's in here now is 51% of the municipal parties and 50 representing 55% of the total tonnage, including the non ila cities. So a large amount would have to go forward with it. And if they want to, they stick together. If we go one of those paths, the successor entity or the county, then anyone who doesn't participate, all the assets, everything is transferred to the new entity. And if you choose not to be part of the new entity, you're basically out.



Speaker 4 - 02:19:50

The other way is each city goes their own way. The assets are basically either sold or they go. If they're regional assets, the county could take them and operate them for solid waste for up to five years. But once that five years is over, they have to compensate all the municipal parties for their contributions. Or if they're non regional assets, or if the county does not want a regional asset, it can be offered to the various cities where it's located. And if they don't want it can go to any of the other cities want it.



Speaker 1 - 02:20:21

So basically it's going to be does.



Speaker 4 - 02:20:23

Anyone want these facilities? And there's an order of priority and anyone who takes it is subject to they have to use it for solid waste. And if they stop using it for solid waste, they have to pay for it or sell it right then or at the end of the five years they have to either pay for it or sell it. The third aspect are kind of some guardrails on the operations and basically this deals with some inspection rights that all the cities and the county all have inspection rights. If you want to inspect and see what's going on and make sure things are being done right at your expense, the SWA will facilitate it and will assist you with it.



Speaker 4 - 02:21:06

The second type of review is a special type of technical review by the county because the county has a statutory obligation regarding disposal. So they have a special right to do a more detailed type of audit dealing with their statutory obligation. And it this would also be at their expense. But if they find things that they feel that the authority is doing that compromise their statutory obligation, they can raise those to the governing board and executive committee and either the SWA, government board, executive committee have to do it or you choose. If we choose not to do it goes through a dispute resolution process with like a mediation, etc. And, and if we still can't resolve it goes to an arbitrator to try to figure out. But that's only things that interfere materially interfere with the county's statutory obligation.



Speaker 4 - 02:21:58

And then the third aspect of that is when there's, when we're at the end, when there's only a couple years left, there has to be a complete technical review of the whole operation to figure out where we are and whether or not to give information as to whether or not we want to continue it for the next 40 years. And that review has to be done. It has to be completed at least 18 months before the termination, and it has to start three years in advance. The fourth aspect deals with the maximum service charges. As you recall, because we didn't have the RFPs, were not able to be completed, we don't know exactly what things are going to cost.



Speaker 4 - 02:22:38

So there's going to be a provision in the master plan with maximum service charges, and in the ila, it provides that those maximum service charges cannot be exceeded unless there's a very large threshold vote of the municipal parties in the county. And then finally, the last aspect, the fifth aspect is just some cleanup regarding voting, dealing with quorum and voting requirements that needed to be cleaned up. But that's basically what this is about.



Speaker 1 - 02:23:07

All right, so before we go to the comments that were received, I want to put some clarity on the issue of the RFPs. We began that process, which, frankly, I didn't think was going to be productive, and it wasn't. We started to construct RFPs for the solid waste streams, but what we received back was comments from the industry saying, nobody's going to bid on this because we don't know if you're sticking together. We don't know what your flow is. Complete common sense. So to the extent there's some view that what needed to come out of this is a specific contract, a synchronizing of all contracts, a plan that tells you exactly what it was going to cost, it can't happen because if we're not staying together, no one's going to bid on it. So that's number one.



Speaker 1 - 02:23:55

Number two, there was an effort, and to some of the comments I think member Colburn's made at the executive committee and have been made many times within the executive committee of trying to figure out how do we extend the deadline, which we know is August, in an effort to say, all right, well, let's go out on the RFPs, let's go get this information. Let's make sure. The view was that it was not going to be possible. We needed 100%, and if we didn't, we'd be starting over again. And so we are in this area, this arena, that ultimately what's being approved is not the master plan, but the facilities amendment, the way the ILA is structured. But we are acknowledging and must acknowledge that to the extent there's opposition to the master plan. The facilities amendment will be approved.



Speaker 1 - 02:24:38

There are still some technical terms that have been raised. And I'll turn to member Colburn before. Oh, you have to leave, Right. All right, so I'll turn to member Shoeham, and then I'll come back to you on the comments on the. On the facilities amendment that you wanted to raise earlier. Is that fair? Okay. Member Shoeham, I apologize.



Speaker 2 - 02:24:52

Thank you, chair. First, I want to apologize for having to step out. But. But before I do, I just want to share with the board how I think about this facility as amendment. So if we just view the ILA as a contract amongst ourselves, it's an existing agreement with the. That anticipated as time moved on and the solid waste authority worked together, would have to be modified in a way. And at the time of the ILA, it was like commissioner Fur said, the expectation was that this future amendment would have to deal with a lot of capital improvements and huge expenditures. So when I'm talking to my commission at a meeting about this, what I try to say is the facilities amendment is much simpler in one way than was expected and more complicated in another.



Speaker 2 - 02:25:51

The simpler way is that we're not building anything that thanks to the work of Todd Stordi and our excellent consultants, we did an inventory of assets in the county, and we're going to use them together the more complicated way. And so much of the discussion has been about the way wind down and really, as I understand it, just wasn't there. It was a part of the agreement that had to be discussed over this amount of time. And so if you think about it in those two ways, I think it just makes it easier to explain to your commission members. There's a simplification on the one hand, and the complexities are really truly like legal things that weren't there.



Speaker 2 - 02:26:42

And so I just wanted to share that because in my brain, it just makes it much easier for people that haven't been so immersed in this all the time to kind of break down what it is that we're talking about. That's it. Excellent.



Speaker 3 - 02:26:55

Thank you.



Speaker 1 - 02:26:56

Thank you. Member Colberg, I know there were some points you wanted to raise about the facilities amendment.



Speaker 2 - 02:27:03

You can have the attorney raise the points that he has. If he's going through those, that's fine.



Speaker 1 - 02:27:08

I think every. Was everybody here for the executive committee when went through all the points, I just don't want. We have limited time because of the financial. What I'd like to do is focus on the ones that you. That the executive committee said, okay, we're just going to move on from. So that way we know we can focus our time.



Speaker 2 - 02:27:22

Right. If you can go through the one with the 80%, that's the one.



Speaker 4 - 02:27:26

There were two that. Two items that I guess we moved on to this. The first is the successor entity or county takeover termination. So if we're at the end of the 40 years and we're at the end and we decide not to all stick together, the question is if there's a successor entity, successor governmental entity, or the county wants to take over and there's a large. Some large group of the cities still want to stick together and go to that entity, how large should that group be? Because if the people that go into that large group will continue to get the benefit of these assets that have been paid for by everyone and the ones who don't join will no longer get the benefit and won't get compensated.



Speaker 4 - 02:28:13

So the thought was initially it should be a very large number because if people don't join in, they're going to lose out. They're not going to get compensated for what they put in. But the future feeling at the county level is it does want to be so big that it makes it basically impossible. Like if we required 100% of everyone to go in, obviously this would never happen. So the question is, how do you balance that? The number we had originally started with an 80% number went down to 51% plus 55% of the tonnage for the whole county, including non Iowa cities. There was a proposal by Tamarack to go to 66 2/3%. 2/3. There's a Miramar was proposing saying at the 80. I do want to remind everyone that the county has to approve the facilities amendment.



Speaker 4 - 02:29:05

So effectively, if the county's insisting on the 5155, this is kind of a moot conversation. But, you know, we certainly can have a discussion about it and see if county's willing to do a different number or if the, you know, everyone wants to discuss it.



Speaker 1 - 02:29:20

And I'm not known for being a skill for the county. I think that's clear and I don't think I'll ever be. But I can understand a concern that the county has, which is if it's set so high that we don't get the approval, then the entire system blows up and everything's getting sold. And I. That's the. I don't think the number they began with was

appropriate. I think there's some logical explanation for the numbers of 51 and 55 based on the current contract. So I have softened on the 80 because my fear is that we would blow up. It's hard to get 80% of us to agree to anything. I don't know where we'll be in 40 years.

 Speaker 1 - 02:30:08

But if all of that work blows up because we're at 75% and everything gets sold, then we will have wasted a whole lot of effort at that point. So that was a concern. I don't know if you want to honestly.

 Speaker 4 - 02:30:20

There's kind of a real world example of this, and that was Palm Beach. Palm beach started with all the cities doing this, and then they felt like it was just. They couldn't. It was too cumbersome for them. And they said, let's. And they said, county do it. Yeah. And that ended up working for them. The fact is, if we spend all this time building all this infrastructure and all this stuff and a few cities say, hey, I can. I'm gonna go my own way. Don't. Don't leave everybody else in the lurch. That's. That's really what it comes down to. You've built a good system. Let it, Let it get chance. And the real world number here has to do with the global.

 Speaker 4 - 02:31:02

The one we're using is the global agreement that 19 cities are currently using wheel abrader, and that is the 55% of tonnage and 51%. You know, that's why we've picked those numbers. So they're real world numbers. And I think it makes sense for all of us. You know, if we're building this, don't. Don't leave everybody in the lurch.

 Speaker 1 - 02:31:26

Member Coleman.

 Speaker 2 - 02:31:28

Thank you. I realize we're. My staff said 80%. That is, that is high. I understand what member fir is explaining. Tamraca also looks for something, but not quite High as 80%. I do know that we need the county to approve this. I am proposing 65%. Does that sound like it would be acceptable to the county?

 Speaker 4 - 02:32:09

I'm going to say no, because I. For the sake of the system, for the sake of the majority of the people in the county, I think it needs to be. I think 51% is where the county is.



Speaker 2 - 02:32:20

Anything above 51%, they just will not approve that. At the county level.



Speaker 4 - 02:32:25

We started 30. Actually went up to 50.



Speaker 2 - 02:32:28

You started at 30?



Speaker 4 - 02:32:29

Yeah.



Speaker 2 - 02:32:30

Okay.



Speaker 4 - 02:32:31

Yeah, it was 80 and 30, and we actually went to there.



Speaker 2 - 02:32:34

Okay.



Speaker 4 - 02:32:35

I, I do think this is a, you know, this is important. And it's for the sake of the counties, not, you know, for. For all the cities that need to use this.



Speaker 2 - 02:32:46

Understood.



Speaker 1 - 02:32:48

All right, Mr. Cole, the second point that was raised, right, the second issue.



Speaker 4 - 02:32:52

Deals with the limitation on increases over the maximum service charge. And basically what it provides now is in the master plan, there's going to be a maximum amount that each city can be and the unincorporated area can be charged and also how much the residents can be charged by the swa. And it's unclear whether the cities are going to be paying directly or whether residents are going to be paying, you know, whether the SWA is going to do an assessment to residents or cities are just going to be paying a surcharge and including it in their special assessment. So it's unclear how this is going to play out, and that's why we included both. But Miramar has suggested just limiting it to the amounts paid by the parties as opposed to directly by the residents.



Speaker 1 - 02:33:41

So it's a very interesting, valid point to raise to help understand cities don't treat trash as an enterprise fund. We have water, we have other enterprise funds. We don't treat trash that way. So trying to understand what your residents pay is really hard. There are some cities that have a very large assessment that goes on a tax bill. The residents look like they're only paying a little, but they don't realize they're paying a lot more in something else. Some cities use the general fund to offset because they don't want to bill the residents. So they have other ways of doing it. So it was. It's been very challenging for SCS to even compare and get us to apples and apples because each city's handled it differently.



Speaker 1 - 02:34:29

I think going forward, we're going to have some recommendations on creating enterprise funds and being able to be, you know, I'm not saying more transparent. I'm just easier to understand. So the concern is making this decision now just to parties does over complicate and I think the unintended consequences could create a problem where you could get incentivize not us, but a different SWA to say, okay, we're not going to increase it on the parties, but we'll increase it on the residents. And because that's not in there anymore, were able to exceed the maximum charge, which wasn't the intent. But if it's not there, you know, you got to kind of think what might

happen in the future. That's a concern.



Speaker 4 - 02:35:11

Member ARS Yeah, I disagree with you about the enterprises. Ours is an enterprise fund. Right. Because we own our own sanitation department. Right.



Speaker 1 - 02:35:19

You're in a different everything that we.



Speaker 4 - 02:35:21

Do is it's a user pay as you go. So we don't have to worry about including ours. Is what we do is we have a garbage like a fire fee. So you have a garbage fee. It goes on your tax bill. And the other thing about the whether you want to collect it from the cities or the residents, there's not even a question you collect from the cities because Q Imagine trying to collect it from the residents, the ones that don't pay, and trying to get it from them. The cities are it's going to be a lot easier to get the money from the cities than from the individual residents.



Speaker 1 - 02:35:59

I agree 100% with that. What I don't know is what the structure will be legislatively or otherwise down the road. And so I think this was meant as a protection. So the maximum surcharges and exceeded. And I thank you for having an enterprise fund because I know we're all going to be looking at that. All right. Remember Coburn?



Speaker 2 - 02:36:18

Yeah, I we have some time before we have to approve it. I definitely will be getting back with staff and getting some comments on that. And you know, I ideally, I like to see models, some sort of comparison to know what I'm, you know, what type of, you know, impact it has. The decisions that we're making, if that's something that can be provided, certainly helps me and it help it will help my other colleagues as well in understanding this when it comes before us. But we'll have further conversation on it. Thank you for the discussion today.



Speaker 4 - 02:36:57

Thank you.



Speaker 1 - 02:36:57

Member Coleman Remember, Gall, unless it's really important, we only have 20 minutes left, we're going to be extending. We got to deal with the financial modeling which seems paramount to everybody. Is that fair? Thank you, sir. All right, financial model, let's talk about that SES presentation and policy guidance view. I'm going to likely be asking the members to extend beyond the noon time. So let's get ourselves started.



Speaker 3 - 02:37:22

Daniel Deutsch, SES engineer, is joined by my colleague Vita Quinn, who's also been before you on many occasions. In individual conversations with many of you, we keep hearing we're sharing the same terminology, chicken and egg. It came up earlier today, not in those words, but some of the challenges that we have is until we go on the street, we don't know what the requirements will be, what the savings we anticipate being able to secure through the economies of scale. We only get that with the passage of the master plan and acceptance of the facilities amendment. Then we have the Authority, policy, direction, to go out and get that pricing. So we've been listening to you. We've been deliberating amongst ourselves.



Speaker 3 - 02:38:11

We think that we have an elegant solution and it really incorporates what we've been sharing over the past several months, but it breaks it out into phases, so each one with a decision point. So you're not locking yourselves into a position beyond the phase that you're authorizing. And we're going to walk you through what that means. So I guess buckle up, we'll have the conversation and then we'll deal with any questions that you have.



Speaker 2 - 02:38:50

I feel like you might do a better job of this, but I'll take a stab at it. So. Sorry. Why does it keep doing that?



Speaker 4 - 02:39:03

I'm not sure. You're controlling. You're not controlling. Oh, they're controlling.



Speaker 1 - 02:39:06

It's only the illusion.



Speaker 2 - 02:39:08

It's magic.



Speaker 1 - 02:39:10

None of us are really in control.



Speaker 2 - 02:39:12

Okay.



Speaker 4 - 02:39:13

Get that in the bathroom.



Speaker 1 - 02:39:14

I know. Absolutely.



Speaker 2 - 02:39:19

Okay.



Speaker 1 - 02:39:19

All right, can we get started?



Speaker 3 - 02:39:21

Here we go.



Speaker 4 - 02:39:22

Are we on the right? Are we on the right?



Speaker 2 - 02:39:24

We wanted. Yes, we are. Now, we wanted to talk about a realistic plan for implementation. That's kind of what we've been asked. Because there are never going to be clean breaks in either operations or funding that will happen to end at the end of a fiscal year and start a new phase at the beginning of the next. So we do realize there will be some overlap for a while. Things will continue the way they are. We're really calling that phase one. Right. The member communities will continue to contribute to the Authority the way they have been while we work on getting this master plan accepted, while we begin to issue RFPs, to begin to have control over some disposal facilities or have contracts with them, which will allow for the tipping fee surcharge, which would be the start of phase two.



Speaker 2 - 02:40:17

At that point, we can begin to really look at some of the things that we're planning on implementing. The drop off sites, starting with land acquisition and then eight drop off sites. We are assuming that gets phased in over a handful of years because again, not necessarily easy to acquire eight different parcels of land and construct those all at once. So we're phasing that in over a five year period. And as these programs and these facilities get up and running, now we have the opening to begin to implement a special assessment, which would be phase three. Again, that is something that also really requires a lot of preparation. We've done the waste generation study, but there's a considerable lift actually getting an authority special assessment implemented. This is Kind of redundant, I guess. This is exactly what I was talking about.



Speaker 2 - 02:41:13

Sort of the things that are included in those phases at all points. The basis for the funding is also just the administrative contractual capacity of the authority. What is happening in my world?



Speaker 1 - 02:41:30

Is there any way we can give her. It's really controlling.



Speaker 2 - 02:41:33

So the last slide is just kind of a Gantt chart, if you will, showing how this implementation might look.



Speaker 1 - 02:41:47

Go back one slide, please.



Speaker 2 - 02:41:49

This is. This is the right slide.



Speaker 1 - 02:41:50

No, but I want to make sure we covered whatever you were trying to outline here. Go back one slide for us if it's possible. If not, forget it. Move on.



Speaker 2 - 02:41:58

Oh, it's fine. This is all I wanted to show you. This is sort of showing the timing right. We're always having just the basic operational costs. In every year we begin the education and outreach, we begin to acquire land for the drop off centers, then to construct them. The RFPs are assumed to sort of have one at a time progressively over a few fiscal years. So that's what's really included in the plan. Now, again, what we think is a realistic implementation, what that timeline might look like, understanding that we do want these things, but it takes a minute. It takes a minute to issue an rfp, to get responses to choose facilities or vendors. So we think that this is how it might really play out over the next 10 years. I'm open for questions.



Speaker 4 - 02:42:52

Let's just keep moving through and then that's it.



Speaker 1 - 02:42:55

That's it, the whole thing. All right, well then I do have a lot of questions. All right, so at the outset,



Speaker 4 - 02:43:04

One.



Speaker 1 - 02:43:04

Of the challenges you had, if I understand correctly, is that, for instance, let's just take recycling. Unless you know what the flow is, the volume, you can't give us a projection on what the pricing will be. Correct. Dan, you want to stand up as well and help us because it's not. I don't think that one's a complicated answer.



Speaker 3 - 02:43:24

Right, Correct.



Speaker 1 - 02:43:27

Okay.



Speaker 3 - 02:43:27

For certainty on the three waste streams that we need to go on the street and secure contracts that would be held by the authority.



Speaker 2 - 02:43:34

Okay.



Speaker 1 - 02:43:35

You do have experience in certain volumes based upon what you see around the state and what you see in this community as to, for instance, what it might cost per ton, if all the volume of recycling under certain assumptions are committed, is that fair to say?



Speaker 2 - 02:43:52

That's fair.



Speaker 1 - 02:43:53

All right. Is it your assessment that if the flow is guaranteed at a particular volume, that overall the recycling costs should be reduced? And I'll just say, when I say across the county, that is amalgamating all contracts that it would be a reduced cost per ton.



Speaker 3 - 02:44:18

Correct.



Speaker 1 - 02:44:19

Okay. Why is that?



Speaker 3 - 02:44:21

There are two factors that influence it. It's the term of the agreement and it's the volume. And it provides security.



Speaker 1 - 02:44:30

Right.

 Speaker 3 - 02:44:30

There's a benefit on the authority side, but it de risks it for the service provider.

 Speaker 2 - 02:44:37

Okay.

 Speaker 1 - 02:44:38

So that's the second part of my point is that critical to this effort is not just flow, but long term relationship by contract. Correct. All right. That reduces risk for the provider and for the ILA member. Correct?

 Speaker 3 - 02:44:55

Correct. I'm going to phrase it as long term stability on the side of the authority.

 Speaker 1 - 02:45:00

Yet there are municipalities that may say we're paying less or we have a short term contract that allows us to get to pay less per ton. Explain that to me how that fits.

 Speaker 3 - 02:45:14

It's the competitive landscape. There are lots of decisions that private businesses can make to secure business and one of them is offering lower prices. And you shared it. We've talked about it over many meetings. When the Resource Recovery board dissolved 15 plus years ago, there were commitments that were made that looked like they were less expensive. And as I think we've come to realize, they were less expensive in the short term, not in the long term.

Speaker 1 - 02:45:43



Okay. The term of contracts that you would be. And let's just take recycling for right now because then I'll move on to the next category. But for recycling, the term of contract that you would be looking at or expect given the flow guarantee would be over what period of time?



Speaker 3 - 02:46:00

On the outside range, somewhere in the order of 20 years. It's a little bit different here in Broward county, as was Sheridan. I know many of you were at the facility yesterday. There is a new facility that's already built. The capital has already been in. So there's an operational component, typically because equipment needs to be. Refurbishment needs to occur. The equipment is on a different depreciation schedule than the building itself. So this is an inside baseball conversation. But generally what we like to aim for is a 20 year term. It can be structured as a 10 year base term with extensions, but 20 years is an appropriate time.



Speaker 1 - 02:46:39

So rather than every five years, procurement at every city having to go out on a staggered basis and trying to figure out whether a provider needs that flow for that next period of time or doesn't and can charge higher rates. This is locked in for the. That would be the goal, to lock it in for the ILA members.



Speaker 3 - 02:46:55

Correct. And he didn't. You haven't asked a question yet, but I'm going to share with you. We also have the. I'm going to call it a challenge. We have 29 different collection agreements and we have notwithstanding the agreements on the disposal and processing side through the county, we've got to work collectively to align all of that. And David's point, these things take time.



Speaker 4 - 02:47:19

Right.



Speaker 1 - 02:47:19

And I was gonna go to disposal next because of these existing contracts until they can be synchronized. Let me back up. I think most cities have been asked already to build into their newer contracts. Those that have been implemented since we began this discussion. Some direction to the haulers to say. And you'll take it to wherever we say it needs to go.

 Speaker 3 - 02:47:40

Correct.

 Speaker 1 - 02:47:41

Okay. That will in once the contracts are synced, presumably people. Again, we're not touching hauling contracts, but people have IL members will have language to say this is where we need you to take it to this transfer station to this place over that period of time.

 Speaker 3 - 02:47:59

We would suggest simply using the term designated facility for the different waste streams.

 Speaker 1 - 02:48:03

Okay. When you look at yard trash, for instance, right now, for the most part your trash is mixed in with msw,

 Speaker 3 - 02:48:12

Typically with bulk waste. I'm sure in some cases with MSW.

 Speaker 1 - 02:48:16

It's not being separated, it's going to.

 Speaker 3 - 02:48:17

The landfill or in most cases, yes.

 Speaker 1 - 02:48:20

Okay. So right now we're not doing anything really as a county wide on yard trash. Correct?

 Speaker 3 - 02:48:27

Not in a meaningful way.

 Speaker 2 - 02:48:28

Correct.

 Speaker 1 - 02:48:28

Okay. The ability to project what it would take to stand up yard trash processing. Because we're not processing, we're dumping. You can give us some parameters of that general cost, but you can't tell any one city what that would cost yet. That is correct. Okay. And again, is that a factor of flow, timeline and commitment either of the private market or county large property owner.

 Speaker 3 - 02:48:59

And changing the set out requirements so.

 Speaker 1 - 02:49:04

As and it and then in disposal that goes further out and that's even also has to be synced with the limited landfill capacity wte and working across those contracts as well.

 Speaker 3 - 02:49:15

That's correct. So right now you have contracted, I'm going to call it Class 1, the kind of garbage that we all set out. You have capacity at the resource recovery facility and through the end of this year you have capacity through the agreement with waste management. My understanding, correct me if I'm wrong, Class one waste will no longer be accepted at Monarch after this calendar year.

 Speaker 1 - 02:49:40

Okay. So in terms of what you're projecting, if you will, if I understood the presentation for the fiscal year 2026, 2027, it's status quo.

 Speaker 3 - 02:49:53

And what we mean by status quo,

 Speaker 1 - 02:49:55

That's the current assessment levels that We've had to fund, assuming everybody signed on to fund the limited staff that we have for the education outreach that is preparatory for these contracts that would be implemented and then the RFP process, et cetera, in order to go out. Which we have not funded yet.

 Speaker 3 - 02:50:20

That's correct. So I would suggest if there's an affirmative vote to move forward with the authority, we pick up the pens that were asked to put down earlier or late last year and we continue working on those solicitations. They can be all issued at the same time, but we are recommending that they be phased. It just provides a little bit more.

 Speaker 1 - 02:50:43

And in that first phase, if I understand is because maybe the simplest, because we're not standing as much infrastructure up that we would have to is the recycling process.

 Speaker 4 - 02:50:53

Right.

 Speaker 1 - 02:50:53

So in the next phase of that the focus would be on getting the best recycling contract for all ILA members, synchronizing what they already have and working with the providers for a long term contract. That's second phase, correct?

 Speaker 3 - 02:51:10

Correct. So I should say it's going to be funded in phase one.

 Speaker 2 - 02:51:16

So.

 Speaker 4 - 02:51:16

Right.

 Speaker 3 - 02:51:17

For next fiscal year 27, we are that. That is what we're recommending moving forward with that solicitation to lock in that cost.

 Speaker 2 - 02:51:26

Okay.

 Speaker 1 - 02:51:27

And it's your projection again, if everybody leaving out maybe a teaser contract that somebody's gotten or they've

got a legacy contract that's a lot lower. The idea would be that the total cost for recycling per ton would be less because of the sheer volume and our ability to go to a single provider.

 Speaker 3 - 02:51:47

And a long term contract. Yes, a long term contract.

 Speaker 1 - 02:51:49

And then the third phase of this is looking at the implementation of infrastructure that may include yard waste composting, drop off centers and the like as we move forward.

 Speaker 3 - 02:52:04

Correct. And on the yard trash, it really is, we'll be recommending policy making recommendations related to policy whether you want to own that asset or. Or you simply want a contract for those services.

 Speaker 1 - 02:52:17

All right, so let me just end with this then. This concept and I think this is one that we're going to have to struggle with. There are those that are only don't want to know all this stuff about what you're going to get in this circular economy and what's going to be beneficial in landfill compact. Just tell me how much it's going to cost. We can't do that because. Because we don't have a commitment to even participate. Is that fair to say?

 Speaker 4 - 02:52:45

Fair?

 Speaker 3 - 02:52:47

We have calculated what the cost is simply to start the education and outreach and continue the administration of the authority. That cost we have.



Speaker 1 - 02:52:58

And you have a projection, do you not, Because I think you've given it to us of what it would take for recycling per ton under the assumption that everybody joins.



Speaker 3 - 02:53:06

Yeah. And we've been sort of vacillating changes in the model, turning it on and turning it off simply because we have to marry it up with each of the collection contracts in terms of the timing. And we realized that were creating confusion. If we assume broad brushstroke, \$110 per ton processing fee, separate from the AMV, separate from any transportation. If shoes. We're all over the map. The good news is that say we're.



Speaker 1 - 02:53:38

All over the map.



Speaker 3 - 02:53:39

What do you mean in terms of what the price is in the collection contracts today?



Speaker 2 - 02:53:43

Right.



Speaker 3 - 02:53:43

They range from.



Speaker 1 - 02:53:44

You're not all over the map. Our contracts are all over the map.

 Speaker 3 - 02:53:47

Yes.

 Speaker 1 - 02:53:47

Okay.

 Speaker 3 - 02:53:48

We take on.

 Speaker 1 - 02:53:49

Don't take on too much. No, I think it's important because somebody may say, well what are we paying per ton for recycling? And it's.

 Speaker 3 - 02:54:00

Based on the information that has been provided to us. Again, not considering the value of the commodities because that goes up and down every month anywhere from 100, excuse me, \$96 to \$178 per tonk processing.

 Speaker 1 - 02:54:14

Sure, 96 to 178 per tonk based.

 Speaker 3 - 02:54:17

On the information that we have.



Speaker 2 - 02:54:19

Right.



Speaker 1 - 02:54:19

And at 110, that assumes everybody's in. And that's what you project for a long term contract. Maybe better, maybe it's a little worse, I don't know. But that's roughly what you would expect given the generation, the volume of generation and the capacity that exists here in the county.



Speaker 3 - 02:54:35

Correct.



Speaker 2 - 02:54:36

Okay.



Speaker 1 - 02:54:37

So when we're asked how much is it going to cost? Again, back to a point I raised earlier, some of it's when.



Speaker 3 - 02:54:44

Correct. So let me answer it a couple different ways. Deerfield beach asked that question.



Speaker 2 - 02:54:49

Right.

 Speaker 3 - 02:54:49

They're not recycling. Coconut Creek has drop off, but not curbside recycling for them. That will be an additional cost to bring recycling back. But for the communities that are paying more for recycling, they will see that as a savings. And if I may, I'm just going to digress to who holds the paper for these contracts?

 Speaker 1 - 02:55:10

So what do you do for like a Coconut Creek? It says why would we pay more? We have drop off now. Why would we even participate?

 Speaker 3 - 02:55:17

Curbside recycling. So one.

 Speaker 1 - 02:55:18

Right.

 Speaker 3 - 02:55:18

We've been talking about restoring curbside collection uniformly across the authority members. Right now we don't have. We're not providing that collectively.

 Speaker 1 - 02:55:30

All right, Member Dunn.

 Speaker 2 - 02:55:35

So I guess I'm. I just want to summarize what I think I'm hearing you say. So I think I'm hearing you say that for next fiscal year, the fee that our city is currently paying will remain the same.

 Speaker 3 - 02:55:47

That's what we're recommending.

 Speaker 2 - 02:55:48

Okay. And then step two, you're going to go out to rfp, leverage economies of scale to give us some exact numbers. And then the first part of the pricing. You are suggesting a tipping fee, Correct? That's the pricing model that you're recommending that we go into phase. Yeah, a tipping fee search on the tipping fee surcharge. And then for cities who are not currently recycling as a member, that's going to cost us.

 Speaker 1 - 02:56:23

Yes.

 Speaker 3 - 02:56:24

So to achieve curbside recycling across all members, that is going to cost that community. You're not bearing the cost in that second phase because they are being charged for. The authority is going to hold the paper, they're going to hold the contract which will require that each ILA member go back into their collection agreement and make sure that the material is going to flow to the selected facility at the designated facility.

 Speaker 2 - 02:56:53

Right. But if we now are working together. Right. Then where the item goes is going to be based on the new contract term that we're going to collect for.

 Speaker 3 - 02:57:06

Either processing or disposal.

 Speaker 2 - 02:57:08

Correct. Okay. And then where then does the \$6 per ton tipping fee come in? Is that still valid or are we now releasing.

 Speaker 3 - 02:57:17

I'm going to ask something of the governing board. Let go of the numbers that we've shared previously because the assumptions have been changing as we've been engaging with the governing board.

 Speaker 2 - 02:57:29

Okay.

 Speaker 3 - 02:57:29

So I can tell you today that number is lower because we realized that were creating confusion. Embedded in that number was an assumed processing cost for yard trash and recyclable materials. We have now removed that in this for the next recommended, next fiscal year. Status quo. Let's go out and get. Issue the solicitations and get contracts for that material so that we can then have the conversation with each member to say the processing cost is now X. You need to open up your contract and make sure that you're not paying for that through your current service provider. It's going to be paid to the authority because it's the authority that holds the disposal and processing contract.

 Speaker 2 - 02:58:17

So basically what I'm telling my city is we're going to pay the same next year as we're paying this year. You're going to go out to rfp leveraging economies of scale. And then based on that, we're going to know exactly what we're paying. But for now, you want us to enter into a 40 year agreement with some sort of uncertainty of what the future cost looks like.

 Speaker 3 - 02:58:40

Yes, and yes.

 Speaker 4 - 02:58:42

And.

 Speaker 3 - 02:58:45

There's really a conversation that want to involve our general counsel in the way that the facilities amendment is structured. Now there's another decision point, right. So if there is a change in the financial picture, it has to be ratified by the governing board under the conditions in the facilities amendment. So in a sense it addresses the concerns, I believe, that were expressed by Miramar. What are we buying into? Take our time and try to get not perfect information, but better information. That's why we've broken it into phases so that there's a decision point or essentially an off ramp. If it is completely misaligned with the authorities needs and expectations.

 Speaker 1 - 02:59:31

If you assume there's no limit on capacity of landfill or wte, that all of it can go there, the people are going to reject this. If you assume that you can just continue to dump, we know we can.

 Speaker 3 - 02:59:45

We cannot.

 Speaker 1 - 02:59:47

If you're not recycling, then you're taking your recycling material right now and consuming precious landfill space for the rest of us or precious WTE capacity for the rest of us. Is that true?

 Speaker 3 - 03:00:03

True.

 Speaker 1 - 03:00:04

That can no longer be sustainable. And if the SWA stays together, yes, for a community doesn't recycle, is going to have to come to grips with that. But they've made that decision not to recycle because we fell apart at the RV and just said, hey, let's save some bucks, but that's not sustainable. And then we look at yard waste again, consuming precious capacity. None of us are doing. We have to do it. And the same for glass and organics. So I think you said this at the outset. This process of making corrections for mistakes made 50 years ago is not going to cost you less.

 Speaker 1 - 03:00:38

It is going to save the higher costs that will be absolutely will fall down and rain down on all of us when we have no capacity left and we've taken no steps towards diversion from the landfill and WTA, is that fair to say?

 Speaker 4 - 03:00:54

Yes.

 Speaker 1 - 03:00:55

All right. Member Bright Cruise. Member Welch. Member Gill.

 Speaker 2 - 03:00:59

Thank you, Chair.

 Speaker 4 - 03:01:01

I've mentioned this before, but I don't think I've mentioned it in front of the entire governing board. So I wanted to bring it up again. In the ranches, we don't. We don't subsidize our waste disposal with the general fund. It's a separate fund. That's the expenses are totally segregated from everything else. So we have a clear view of.

 Speaker 3 - 03:01:19

What our costs are.

 Speaker 4 - 03:01:21

Fortunately, we do recycling. And a couple months ago, I had, I did two things. I asked our vendor, WM, to do analysis, and I asked for our internal finance team to do analysis. And I said, tell me this, since we recycle, tell me what it would have cost us if we did not recycle.

 Speaker 1 - 03:01:42

What would have been our cost, our.

 Speaker 4 - 03:01:43

Tipping fees, and what it would cost us through the whole cycle. What it would have cost us if we had just said, listen, we're not doing recycling in the last two years, rather than recycling it, we would have not done it. And then compare that to what we actually physically paid. And so both groups went back. Both groups came back to me with the numbers, and fortunately both groups came up with basically the same number. Extremely close. So that was all awesome. So I felt confident that the numbers that I got back were legit. And here was the results. In 2024, if we had not done recycling, we would have saved 3%. So when you hear figures that are.

 Speaker 3 - 03:02:28

Much higher than that, and I've heard.

 Speaker 4 - 03:02:29

Them, this is the reality. In 2025, it was a little bit higher. It was closer to 4%. But that's the type of, type of increase that you're looking at by doing that. Is there a much higher tipping fee for the recycling? Absolutely there is. But the tonnage that's going there, most of your tonnage is not going there. And so those two things, the weighted average

of those things, when you take them together, makes for a much smaller difference. So is our, you know, am I saying to you that our experience is going to exactly reflect yours? Obviously not every municipality is different. But what I am telling you is that this is not a terrible story to tell to accomplish what we're talking about in the long run, to accomplish what we're talking about for the next generation that's coming along.



Speaker 4 - 03:03:25

This is a minimal fee.



Speaker 1 - 03:03:26

Nobody wants to pay more.



Speaker 4 - 03:03:28

I get that. But I think this is very reasonable. Reasonable and something that, if we can, you know, express this in the proper.



Speaker 3 - 03:03:35

Way, it makes sense. It makes sense.



Speaker 1 - 03:03:38

And the corollary to that is you may be paying less if you're already recycling because you're locking in a long term contract. And you may be mitigating increases in the future in your landfill and other disposal costs because you're reducing that flow and preserving the capacity. How to quantify that is a challenge. But that's corollary to it member Welch, member Gel and member Cagiano.



Speaker 2 - 03:04:06

Okay, thank you. So it's a lot to take in. And I want first of all, can you clarify member Duns when she brought up the tipping fee, the previously given numbers. That was from the last presentation that I was at. And did I hear you correctly? Just say that. Just forget those numbers.



Speaker 3 - 03:04:37

Ask to let go of those numbers. We're wrapping up our analysis. We're asked for policy direction today so that we can do that and put in black and white a memo that explains why what we have done through the financial modeling, what it means in terms of the status quo and the surcharge, basically the approaches, the implementation approaches so that you will be informed to make a recommendation on the master plan. We have, as I mentioned, we have eliminated from the financial analysis an assumed tipping fee for yard trash and recyclable material that was previously in the analysis which led to an estimated \$6 per ton surcharge. Because that was part of the administrative cost, we have now broken it into phases. So the administrative or excuse me, the status quo essentially carries us forward. In part it relies on fund balance.



Speaker 3 - 03:05:35

So the fiscal responsibility of peer executive director, he received funds that have not been completely spent. So we're able to offset because starting to ramp up the education and outreach program which we believe we hear is fundamentally important, that needs to begin immediately. That's really building on the foundation of what's already been done. So long story short, the figure will be less than \$6 in terms of what your car contribution is. As a matter of fact, somebody in your city knows exactly what you've been contributing this year in the past years and then the surcharge should be significantly less.



Speaker 2 - 03:06:17

Okay. And I definitely agree education sooner rather than later. And I mean I just really have to get my arms wrapped around and I'll ask for a one off if I can after the meeting because we are up for renewal and I don't want to double pay.



Speaker 3 - 03:06:38

No, we're not going to recommend that anybody double pay. I think it's going to be helpful when we provide the memorandum that explains it.



Speaker 2 - 03:06:45

Am I allowed to have a one off with him separate from the name then I would do that. I won't take up any more of the time. Thank you very much.

 Speaker 4 - 03:06:51

Member Ernst, real quickly, is that number locked in for the recycling? Because I know our recycling depends, depending on what the market value is for recyclables, goes from \$178 a ton to down to 90 ton depending on what the market is. Sometimes the market tanks, sometimes it's good. Glass is worth just about nothing. And is that mark, that rate you're giving us locked in, or are we going to have a surcharge or credit when we have a good mark?

 Speaker 3 - 03:07:23

We're going to come back to you with those details. Those are all the right questions to be asking. We're trying to keep it simple. What you're referring to is average market value was also mentioned earlier about contamination and the impact that has. This is what. This is the world that we live in. We understand it, and that is really what we'll be focused on if the authority survives when we issue the solicitations.

 Speaker 1 - 03:07:46

Member Gallagher.

 Speaker 4 - 03:07:47

Thank you, Mr. Chair. And I think this is the most important thing. And when you have accused me of being pessimistic, it's because of this.

 Speaker 1 - 03:07:57

No accusation, just an observation.

 Speaker 4 - 03:08:01

All right. It is because of this precise issue. And so let me ask you a couple questions. First, my understanding and everything I've been told by county staff is that recycling, even if we have to end up shipping things up to Okeechobee, that recycling is still going to be, even with a unified agreement with a large, greater amount, is going to be a lot more expensive than landfill. Do you agree with that?

 Speaker 3 - 03:08:35

Yeah. Broad brushstrokes, it is more expensive than landfilling. But I can say that today the future is very different. And we do, globally, we do see as disposal options decrease and become more expensive because we're not handling it locally,



Speaker 4 - 03:08:56

It can, I'm assuming, even with the cost of transportation to Okeechobee, what I've been told is that it will be substantially more expensive than landfill, recycling will be more expensive.



Speaker 3 - 03:09:10

It's a true statement today.



Speaker 4 - 03:09:12

Okay, thank you. Here is my concern. I think everybody at this table and everybody in this room understands why we need to do much more recycling than we're doing. As close to. I don't think we'll ever reach zero. But if we reach 80% or 85%, that most groups can consider that to be zero waste. And if we can do that, I think we all agree we need to. However, I do. Town meetings, I've spoken with city commissioners, I've explained this issue. And the feedback that I'm getting is that in a lot of the cities, and I represent five prosperous municipalities. I almost said cities. Five prosperous municipalities, including Southwest Ranches, the feedback that I'm getting in these prosperous cities is that a lot of the commissioners are going to vote for whatever is least expensive to their constituents.



Speaker 4 - 03:10:15

Even though they may understand why they should be recycling if it's cheaper to landfill, I think a lot of them are going to do that. And that's in the more prosperous cities. I think in the poorer cities, you're going to see even more impetus for that. And this is what my concern has been all along. And that's why you said I've been pessimistic and I have been getting the cities to do something that I think is going to. They're going to have to explain that we need to for the good of the planet, that we need to for the long term. 40 years from now, although as the phrase goes, eventually we'll get this done. Well, eventually we'll all be dead. Eventually, all of the elected officials voting now will be out office. Before a lot of these things happen.



Speaker 4 - 03:11:12

I've got one or two more questions. My understanding is that the ILA requires before we're voting that it requires exact numbers, which I don't think we have. Am I correct at the ioa? That's what my county staff has told me. I don't think it uses the term exact numbers. It has a financial plan requirement.

 Speaker 1 - 03:11:37

And.

 Speaker 4 - 03:11:39

The phrase my staff used was precise numbers. But we are planning. I think we are planning on having a maximum price which will be an exact number. Okay.

 Speaker 3 - 03:11:48

So respectfully, that's what we're trying to navigate through, not around, but through that. And that's why we broke it into phases, each one having another decision point for this body. Because we recognize nobody wants to sign up for a long term commitment without, again, not perfect information, but better information. And there are activities that we are recommending to pursue to get better information. But we're not usurping authority. We want to bring you that information when it's available, but requires policy.

 Speaker 4 - 03:12:26

And this I think also shows why the Education Committee in many respects is the most important. And our new executive director. This is going to be a big, heavy sales lift and we're going to need. I have a couple of more precise, simple questions.

 Speaker 2 - 03:12:42

Right.

 Speaker 1 - 03:12:42

We're already beyond noon, so obviously. But we've lost a lot of members. We don't have a quorum, so just keep that in mind.

 Speaker 4 - 03:12:48

If cities are paying for the collection of recycling, will the authority be paying the cost of recycling? Facility contract.

 Speaker 3 - 03:12:57

Yeah, we anticipate by going out on the street, it'll be the authority. Authority that holds the contract for processing. Collection remains the responsibility of each ILA member.

 Speaker 4 - 03:13:07

When trucks drop recyclable materials at a facility for a member city Will they be charged a tipping fee? Yes.

 Speaker 3 - 03:13:16

So that's the balancing act right? Now that cost the collection and the processing is embedded in each collection contract. We're recommending moving the processing cost to the authority, yard trash recyclables and disposal and removing it from the collection contracts. So you're going to pay for the collection portion, not the processing portion.

 Speaker 4 - 03:13:39

They would not be charged a tipping fee if they were an authority member.

 Speaker 3 - 03:13:43

They will be. Not through the current billing method. It'll come from the authority.

 Speaker 4 - 03:13:49

Okay, two more. Will the authority, the member government or the residents be responsible for paying for any contamination related costs?

Speaker 3 - 03:13:58



That would be part of the processing agreement. So yes, there will still be. Typically, the way contracts are structured now is there is a threshold.



Speaker 1 - 03:14:09

So that is. And when you exceed the threshold, you pay.



Speaker 4 - 03:14:12

Okay.



Speaker 1 - 03:14:12

The city pays or passes.



Speaker 4 - 03:14:14

Right.



Speaker 1 - 03:14:14

Okay.



Speaker 4 - 03:14:15

And last question on yard waste. Will cities also be required to have a yard waste curbside collection facility in service? That is a yard waste curbside collection service in addition to MSW and recycling.



Speaker 3 - 03:14:30

Correct.



Speaker 4 - 03:14:30

So there would be. Cities would be required to have three curbside collections.



Speaker 2 - 03:14:34

Correct.



Speaker 1 - 03:14:35

There's no other way to divert yard waste that's going to continue to fill the landfill otherwise. And I think the other story that has to be told, the reason we're sitting here and we're even having this discussion about costs is because of mistakes made 50 years ago before you and I were here. Bad, bad decisions. And so we haven't paid the piper, but we're about to if we don't get this together. Remember, Cajuno, that was basically what my.



Speaker 4 - 03:15:00

View about this is.



Speaker 1 - 03:15:02

It's a bad situation, we've got to do something about it. But it comes down to the simple old commercial. It's either pay me now or pay me a whole hell of a lot later. And, and we've got to make sure that, look, I'm going to sit down.



Speaker 3 - 03:15:14

With my people and tell them, look,



Speaker 1 - 03:15:15

It's going to cost more, but it could cost a lot more if we do nothing. So if you're worried about telling people the truth, well, but I'm.

 Speaker 3 - 03:15:24

Going to tell them that it's going.

 Speaker 4 - 03:15:25

To cost you a lot or it's a lot later.

 Speaker 1 - 03:15:27

And what kind of world do we want to leave our kids and grandkids because it's going to cost them triple, quadruple the amount to fix anything we don't fix. Now you talk about 50 years of errors.

 Speaker 3 - 03:15:38

Do we want to make it 90 years of errors?

 Speaker 1 - 03:15:43

All right, anything further.

 Speaker 3 - 03:15:44

I realize you may not have quorum anymore.

 Speaker 1 - 03:15:46

We don't. So we won't be able to give you guidance. But I think the. From the comments that have been provided, I think this modeling is the only choice. I think we're in agreement. The heads are shaking. Yes. Continue down the road to finish this modeling as you've done it, with the predictive capacity that you have across those timelines and with the appropriate explanations as to why in your ultimate memorandum on this, the story has to be told. We

cannot get you an RFP until you tell us how many tons. Until you all agree to work. If you're not going to work together. It's simple. Good luck. All right.



Speaker 3 - 03:16:23

Thank you. Thank you.



Speaker 1 - 03:16:24

Anything further? All right. Can we get a motion to adjourn?



Speaker 2 - 03:16:28

So moved.



Speaker 1 - 03:16:28

Motion by member Horland. Second by member Welch and member Colburn. It's all right.



Speaker 4 - 03:16:35

That's all right.



Speaker 1 - 03:16:36

You have to stay here. Stay here. Definitely.