



Speaker 1 - 06:11

Good morning, everybody.



Speaker 2 - 06:12

We're going to be starting in about two minutes. All right. Good morning, everybody. Welcome to the tac. Alisa, can you do the roll?



Speaker 3 - 09:22

Good morning. If you would kindly, I'll say your city.



Speaker 4 - 09:28

And then if you could say your.



Speaker 3 - 09:29

Name for the record, please. Broward county.



Speaker 5 - 09:33

Here.



Speaker 3 - 09:35

That's Andres. Coconut Creek, here.



Speaker 2 - 09:39

My time back.



Speaker 3 - 09:40

Thank you. Cooper City. Coral Springs. Thank you. Dania Beach. Davie Deerfield Beach.



Speaker 6 - 09:58

Elegant Aloranzo.



Speaker 3 - 09:59

Thank you. Fort Lauderdale. Hillsborough Beach. Hollywood. Lauderdale. Lakes. Lauderdale by the Sea, Lauder Hill, Lazy Lake, Lighthouse Point Margate.



Speaker 7 - 10:25

Carrie Ann Yap.



Speaker 3 - 10:27

Thank you. North Lauderdale. Miramar. Oakland Park. Julie Leonard, Parkland.

Speaker 4 - 10:42



Jackie Waymire, Pembroke Park, Plantation.



Speaker 3 - 10:50

Sea Ranch Lakes. Southwest Ranches.



Speaker 2 - 10:56

Russell Moniz, Tamarack.



Speaker 3 - 11:00

Thank you. West Park, Weston Wilton. Manners. Thank you.



Speaker 2 - 11:14

Sure.



Speaker 1 - 11:15

Well, good morning everybody.



Speaker 2 - 11:16

Before we get to the Pledge of Allegiance, I just would like to say a few things. So there was a number of documents that were sent out to the group this week and I realize it was quite a bit and it can be a bit overwhelming. We're not expecting all those documents to be reviewed and commented on today. We'll go through those as we go through the agenda. Second is there is an executive board meeting that has been scheduled for 10:30 today, a special meeting. And because of that we're probably going to have to wrap up here around 10:15. But there is a number of items that we do need to get through today. And then we'll talk a little bit more about the next agenda and what we'll expect to review more in depth.



Speaker 2 - 12:00

So don't feel like pressured to provide comments on everything that was sent out this week. We realized it was a lot. So with that, if we could stand up for the Pledge of Allegiance. All right, item three, public comment. We do not have any seat speakers or sign ups or public comment. Item four, meeting minutes. Because we do not have a quorum will not proceed with approval of the minutes at this time. We'll push that to the next meeting. Item 5 on the Master plan update, there's item A which is the adoption of the master plan and B, the draft facilities amendment. Before I turn it over to Daniel, just a real brief. So the master plan itself does not is approved by the executive board and the governing board and not individually by the cities.



Speaker 2 - 13:11

But it is important as each of us as partners in this that we are participating in the review. Providing support for the master plan as that master plan once it gets approved is scheduled right now is for the governing board to adopt a master plan in March that is the trigger at that time for the facilities amendments to be sent out and to start that process for review and approval by each of the cities. So it's important that we monitor that. It's important that we are knowledgeable and provide as much support as we can to facilitate that through the process, as that is the trigger for the facilities amendment. And like I had said before, the facilities amendment will be reviewed at the governing board at the next meeting, which is today at 10:30.



Speaker 2 - 14:01

So it is important that we actually provide some background on that. So I'm going to hand over the master plan update to Daniel and then afterwards I'll hand it over to Jamie to give a summary of the facilities amendment. Go ahead, David.



Speaker 6 - 14:13

Thank you, Chair General Council members of the tac. You really summarized it very well. I'm not sure how much more there is to say other than, you know, the master plan was submitted to the Executive Committee back in August. What we've been focused now over the past many months is really the financial component. And as was, we've had a number of presentations to the Executive Committee. It will occur again on February 20th where we'll be dealing with the Master plan in total, including the financial plan and the facilities amendment. The hope is that

it will be recommended for approval at the governing board on March 20.

 Speaker 2 - 14:53

Any questions on the Master plan from the group? Okay, moving on to the facilities amendment. So as the documents. There were two documents that were provided this week to the TAC members. One was the actual amendment was. The second was a very good executive summary of the facilities amendment. So I'm going to hand it over to Jamie to give a summary of that.

 Speaker 1 - 15:22

Thanks. So just so you understand what the facilities amendment is a, an amendment to the interlocal agreement. When the ILA was first done, we didn't know what types of facilities were going to be owned by the swa. So there was various issues that weren't ready to address, such as what happens at the end, you know, at the end of the 40 years, what happens to the assets. We didn't know what type of assets we'd have, so we didn't really deal with those types of issues. So the concept was that we passed the ila, which we did, and then there'd be a master plan and a facilities amendment, and they kind of go hand in hand. The master plan, which is only approved by the governing Board, will be provided to all the cities along with the master.

 Speaker 1 - 16:11

The facilities amendment, which is recommended by the governing board, Each city commission will then decide whether to approve the facilities amendment and they'll by approving the facilities amendment, they stay in the system. If they decide not to approve the facilities amendment, then they're out. They're not part of the system anymore. When they consider the facilities amendment, they'll have the master plan which was approved by the governing board. So they will be able to look at the master plan and that will be go into the analysis of whether to approve the facilities amendment. Once they approve the facilities amendment, the cities are in for 40 years. So that's, this is the one key decision time we're going the governing board is going to or I'm sorry, the executive committee will be discussing the facilities amendment this morning at 10:30 and wanted any comments from TACC.

 Speaker 1 - 17:05

And that's one of the reasons why we're presenting this to you now. So if you have any comments, those can be presented to the meeting at 10:30 next week. On Friday, there's a meeting of the governing board and they're going to consider the facilities amendment. They may approve the facilities amendment then or they may approve the facilities amendment at the March 20 meeting where we don't, you know, we're going to see how it goes next week it may be approved right? Then once the facilities amendment is approved and once the master is, I'm sorry, is recommended by the governing board and once the master plan is actually approved by the governing board, then it goes to the cities and the cities are going to have 120 days to decide whether to approve the facilities amendment. So that's basically the timeline.

 Speaker 1 - 17:53

The plan is, I think on March 20th to have the master plan approved. And on or before March 20, possibly on February 20, the facilities amendment will be recommended by the executive committee. It will then be actually formally provided to the cities on March 23rd and they'll have 120 days, which gets us to the middle of July. That's the plan. So what does the facilities amendment do? And now I will tell you, the facilities amendment is a little bit different than was initially envisioned. When it was initially envisioned, the thought was the SWA was going to own, you know, major solid waste, you know, all kinds of facilities. Now it's much more limited. So the facilities amendment is much more limited than what was initially inefficient.

 Speaker 1 - 18:37

So the first thing that it does is it discusses what types of facilities can be owned by the SWA or operated by swa. And it says right up front that the SWA cannot own or operate a solid Waste facility like a waste to energy plant. That cannot be done. The only way that could be done is if the ILA is further amended. And there's an amendment in this, in the facilities amendment that says that would require approval by the county, but it also requires approval by the municipal members representing 80% of the population. So that's obviously a very difficult thing to do. And that's, you know, to that I know there was concern about the SWA owning a waste building a waste energy plant. So that can't be done. The ILA will specifically say that the SRA cannot have a solid waste facility.

 Speaker 1 - 19:37

What can the SWA own? Well, they can own transfer stations, they can own drop off permanent drop off centers, they can own recycling facilities. And recycling facilities is very broadly defined in the amendment. And that's basically the first thing that this facilities amendment does is it talks about what types of assets can be owned. And that's the first part, second part deals with what happens at the end. So this is a 40 year agreement. It can be renewed for another 40 years. But for the first, you know what happens if at the end of the 40 years it's decided the SWA is not going to continue anymore and all the cities are going to go off on their separate ways. So what it provides is really three different, was really two different paths that can happen.

 Speaker 1 - 20:28

So if the swa, if the cities want to go break up the swa, one possibility is that even though the SWA is not going to continue, there'll be a successor entity. Either maybe the legislature could create a different entity. There could be some kind of district, create a different district other than the swa, or the county could end up taking over, and this is talking about taking over everything that the SWA does. In order for that to happen, there's a very high threshold. Basically the county has to approve it. And in addition to the county approving it, you need municipalities to approve it. And the municipalities have to represent a majority of the tonnage of the population of the municipal parties.

 Speaker 1 - 21:18

So it's a majority of the municipal parties population plus it has to also represent 55% of the total waste and that includes waste of non municipal parties. So if there's cities that are not part of the system, but they want to become part of this new county system or the new successor entity system, their tonnage would count as well. So it's a pretty high threshold. But if that happens, then all of the assets and operations of the SWA go to either the successor entity or to the county and without limitation. So the municipal parties that choose not to stay in will never get compensated for what they have put in over the years. The other possible thing is all the cities go out on their own. There's no successor entity, the county isn't taking over.



Speaker 1 - 22:13

And in that situation the cities, well, for the assets, what will happen to the assets? Anything that's a regional asset will first be offered to the county. And everything that is not a regional asset is first offered to the city in which it is located. If they, if the county doesn't want the a regional asset, it is then offered to the cities where it's located. And if the cities where it's located for the other assets, it doesn't want it, the county then has the ability to take it. Under this scenario, any assets that go to either the county or to a city have to for five years be used for the solid waste purposes.



Speaker 1 - 22:56

And if they're not right at that point, the county or the city that took it either is going to have to pay the fair market value to all the other municipal parties or sell it and then the sales price is distributed the same way. Or at the end of the five years the same thing happens. They have to either pay for it or sell it. So the concept is there's a five year transition period during the five years for longitudes for solid waste. Whoever got that asset can continue using it for solid waste.



Speaker 1 - 23:28

But if they stop using for solid waste or you get to the end of the five year period, they gotta either pay for it and if they pay for it, then they can use it for whatever they want or they can sell it and then it can be used for whatever, but the money goes. So the idea is unless there's a successor entity or county taking over everything, these assets, five years later, all of will either be sold or compensated to all the other parties. The, the third part of this agreement deals with soy inspection and reporting ideas. And this was really kind of pushed by the county. And the county wanted to make sure that certain things were done to make sure that everyone has transparency and make sure things are done properly.



Speaker 1 - 24:22

So the first concept is inspections and any of the parties, the county or any of the missed parties can do this. So basically at their own expense, they, if they say they want to do inspections, they can do inspections and the SWA will cooperate and let them do that. The second aspect deals with the systems facility report. And this is a, I think it was 18 months before the end of the term. There has to be analysis, a systems facility report that's going to look over everything that's being done to see how well it's going, that the thought is that 18 months in advance, so everyone will know whether or not they want to continue it, or if not, you know, they can choose not to, but there's this comprehensive report that has to be done.



Speaker 1 - 25:13

The third aspect is something that the county can do, which is a county technical review. And the idea here is because the county has a statutory obligation for disposal, that they have the ability, at their own expense, at any time that they want, they can do a technical review, which is audits, inspections, and just look at what's going on, dealing with authority, operations, planning and capacity to meet future needs, vendor performance, contract administration, and anything else that materially affects their duty to provide access. Now, if their inspectors or their, you know, as a result of technical review, they find things that they think are not being done, well, they can then present them to the governing board. And if the governing board wants, they can take that advice and do the

things that they suggest if they choose not to.

 Speaker 1 - 26:08

If the government board says, no, we're not going to do what your people say we should do, they don't have to. I mean, if they say they don't want to do it, they don't have to. But if it does relate to the statutory obligation of the county, and the county feels that the thing they found is going to make it so they're not able to fulfill their statutory obligation, it goes to a dispute resolution process. You know, it's kind of a mediation type of process, et cetera. And then ultimately, if there's still, if the county thinks that the SWA is doing things that interfere with their statutory obligation, it goes to an arbitrator, and there's a process for that. The next section deals with maximum service charges.

 Speaker 1 - 26:52

The executive committee, because we have not done the RFPs or RFQs yet, we don't know what things are really going to cost. So the master plan is going to set forth a maximum price. So it's a maximum service charge. And that can only be exceeded through, well, it goes up each year based on an index. But if they want to provide more services, for example, and that price is going to go up even higher, there was a feeling that the cities and the county all wanted protection against that happening. So it makes it very difficult. You need to have two hearings. You need to have them 45 days apart. There's certain protections. And you also need 2/3 of the municipal population or representatives from Cities representing two thirds of the municipal population to approve it, plus the county.

 Speaker 1 - 27:45

So the idea is that the master plan is going to have a maximum price, a maximum cost, and that, you know, really, it's not written in stone, but it's written in, you know, soft stone. It can be lifted through a two thirds vote with two hearings, etc. Then there was some provisions dealing with voting that we just wanted to clarify. So it's just some quorum and voting issues and that's basically what the facilities amendment does.

 Speaker 2 - 28:18

Any questions or comments for Jamie Russell? I'd just like to say thank you to Jamie and anybody who was connected with the facilities amendment. I was. As I was reading through it, I was, you know, questions were popping up in my head and as long as you read through it, you'll find all the answers very contemplative. You've thought of what appears to be every potential eventuality. So I appreciate the time and the input. Thank you, Margaret.

 Speaker 7 - 28:51

I do have one question regarding ownership of a facility. If Broward county doesn't want it, and it only is then allowed for the municipality where that facility is owned, Margate will likely never be one of those. And at that point, it feels like we then don't have any say with what happens at that point.

 Speaker 1 - 29:21

Well, yes and no. Yes, you won't have the opportunity to own the facility, but I'm not sure why you'd want to own a facility that's outside of your city. But you will get compensated for it, though. You'll get, you'll get your monetary. When it's either sold or when the entity that got it decides to, after five years, they're going to have to pay for it. And when it's paid for, Margate will get your proportion pro rata share. So you'll get compensated for it, but you won't, you'll never own it. You won't have the opportunity to own it. But like I said, I'm not sure why you'd want to own it. It would be a facility that's outside of your city that's not really doing anything with Margate.

 Speaker 7 - 30:04

No, of course, understandable. But then in that aspect, then we would necessarily, we would potentially get into an agreement with the municipal where the facility is located. Our municipal, our recycling waste would be able to go there. We could then, you know, be able to have other islands with any of the other municipalities within Broward that want to use that facility. That might be, you know, depending on where it is, it may be a facility that is better suited for one municipality based on proximity versus another one that is owned by Broward county or you know, a private entity.

 Speaker 1 - 30:54

Ralph, wait. If I just had one. We do have. There is.

 Speaker 2 - 30:59

If.

 Speaker 1 - 31:00

If there is an asset and everyone declined a non regional asset. No one, no one wants it. I'm sorry, the county doesn't want it and the city where it's located. That's why there actually is a provision that says we offered to all the other municipal parties. So Margate will have the opportunity to acquire that asset. Even though I can't imagine why you'd want it. But you would have the opportunity. You will have an opportunity to get it. You'll have to, you know, if you get it, you will have to within 5 years pay for it. But you will have the opportunity. That is in. Right. It's in 21.7.1.5 at the end it does say if all parties to which NASA is offered decline to accept the asset.

 Speaker 1 - 31:40

The asset will then be offered subject to Article 22 to county and then to the other municipal parties. So there's a. We did. We did cover that. Just in case.

 Speaker 7 - 31:48

Just making sure.

 Speaker 8 - 31:49

You don't think it's going to happen in the brief.

 Speaker 7 - 31:51

You never know. Better to have the option than not at all.

 Speaker 1 - 31:54

We do have that.

 Speaker 2 - 31:58

So.

 Speaker 9 - 31:59

Good morning everyone.

 Speaker 5 - 31:59

I promise I will be just a curious question on 8.18 why the in order for the Solid Waste Authority to own a solid waste disposal facility of not a waste, you know, waste to energy facility, why was the number from 2/3 to 80% changed?

 Speaker 1 - 32:23

That was a policy decision that the feeling was that there's such a strong feeling by some people that there shouldn't be a waste energy plant built that they wanted. They thought 2/3 wasn't enough. That they thought it should be 80%. That if we're going to undergo building a solid waste facility such as Waste Engine, which is a huge expense and a huge undertaking, very kind of controversial. It's got to be. Pretty much everyone's agreeing. So they thought with 80% of population that's pretty. It's not everyone, but it's pretty much everyone. They just thought it should be a higher threshold.

 Speaker 5 - 32:58

And the county. So James.

 Speaker 1 - 32:59

And the county.

 Speaker 5 - 33:00

And the county. So the county can say no at any time even if we have 80% or 100%. We went through this way before.

 Speaker 1 - 33:07

Well, there's actually a statutory provision that says that the county has. Cities can't build a waste energy plant or waste facility unless the county consents anyway. So that yes, the county has to agree, but they would have to agree anyway under the statute. Right.

 Speaker 5 - 33:23

So I don't know why we would as an authority say we want to make it harder. I mean, I understand the concept. You want to make it harder because this is a series. But what if, you know, we're going to do a 40 year agreement or at the end create some other kind of, you know, other kind of facility or whatever it might be. I just think that, you know, making it harder for us is something we might want to discuss, you know, and listen, we're not the elected officials.

 Speaker 2 - 33:56

We don't vote.



Speaker 5 - 33:57

I'm just speaking out loud.



Speaker 2 - 33:58

Right?



Speaker 5 - 33:58

That's why we're here. The other thing, can you please go over the second scenario during the wind down on the sale of the assets where it's a. Where about the county and 50% of the population has to. So is it the county and 51% of the municipalities or the tonnage or is it the county, but 50% of the population in tonnage has to agree.



Speaker 1 - 34:22

To sell it to them for. Well, this is not a sale. This, this success. Right. This is just a transfer. And this is when they're taking over all the operations. So first of all, yes, the county has to want to do it. If the county says no, we're not, we don't want to be in, we don't want to do it other than our statute obligation. The county does not want to be involved. They don't have to. So you need the county. And then, so the county's gonna offer it to the cities. And then unless you have at least 51% of the population of the cities that want to do that and 55% of the tonnage countywide, including non SWA cities. So it's kind of a higher threshold.



Speaker 1 - 35:06

But if they don't have at least 51% of the population of municipal parties and 55% of the county wide tonnage, the thought is that it shouldn't go back to the county and we should just. The city should be. Continue to be on their own.



Speaker 5 - 35:22

And what. Sorry, and one more part, just following up where, just for clarity so everyone is aware. The part where you talk about if there be no this, the municipality members would not be due any return money. That, that part again, can you just.

 Speaker 1 - 35:42

Right, the, under the scenario where you have the 51% the county and 51% of municipal parties and 55% of the county tonnage and the county's going to take over the entire system Then the cities will not get compensated. So each city is going to say, all right, well I'm going to be part of the county system and get the benefit of it, or I'm not going to be part of the kind of system, I'm going to stay out on my own. In that case, you're basically forfeiting any ability to get the money back. So. But that's also, you know, under that scenario. Under that scenario, I also remember that right now we only have 83% of the city tonnage of the county wide tonnage. And theoretically when the facilities amendment passes, it could be go down another 20% and then for this.

 Speaker 1 - 36:31

So the percentage of the municipal waste that will be part of the estuary will be possibly 65%. So to get to 51% of the county wide tonnage is a pretty high.

 Speaker 5 - 36:40

Threshold and would under the same scenario, and I appreciate your very clear explanations, would that under the county and the municipalities that decide to be. Is that a new entity then or is that going under the south, the Broward, the current Broward county ila.

 Speaker 2 - 37:01

What's the thought there?

 Speaker 1 - 37:03

Well, I don't know if the current Broward ILA will be around that's, you know, talking about a long time from now. It would be the county. The county could have it as a dependent district or it could be just the county itself. But if it's a successor entity, we have a provision for that also. So it could either be the county or a successor entity. So the county, it could be.

 Speaker 2 - 37:24

Any.



Speaker 1 - 37:24

Type of entity that's created at that point. You know, this is 40 years from now. We don't know what the law is going to be.



Speaker 2 - 37:27

We don't know what's going to be.



Speaker 1 - 37:28

Allowed at that point. But whatever that successor is, be at the county, a department of the county or a different district or some other successor entity, the same 51 and 55% still apply.



Speaker 5 - 37:42

Right. I'm just trying to make sure that we all are aware and understand one part of it says the county and then it's the county and a certain percentage of the other municipalities which may or may not creates this new entity, which then we have another provision for because it's new entity. So it's kind of like. And then you hit on my next thing and I hope this is my last thing about change in laws in the future. There could be a change in law where. And I'm again just thinking out loud that recycling processing is considered a solid waste disposal. Are we then in violation of our own well, you know, you see what I'm saying. I mean, I know there's change in law provisions, but please, let's make sure.



Speaker 1 - 38:26

Well, unfortunately, with the legislature we have now, seems like every session there's things that limit what we can do. But unfortunately, you know, that's the way the constitution reads. So, yes, we are always subject to a change in law, and we will have to do it, you know, follow whatever statute is passed at that point. So that. That would. Could theoretically change how some of this works.



Speaker 5 - 38:50

But we would be protected under something like that. Like where the county could not do an injunction against the authority. If, for example, whether it's a MRF or C and D processing facility or something that technically right now we are allowed to own it changes, and then under this agreement, we're not allowed to own it, but the county will still have an ability to do some kind of injunction because we may or may not be stepping on their toes.

Speaker 1 - 39:16



You know, it's hard for me to answer that because I don't know what the future law could be. I mean, if the law changes. Well, what if it happened tomorrow, right? If the law. Tomorrow the state led. Well, not tomorrow, but by July 1, the state legislature could pass a law saying, you can't have this type event us, we can't exist. In that case, we go into the termination provision as if were the end of the 40 years and then we'll go through that whole process. I don't see that happening. But there's no bill pending to eliminate us. But you never know. So I can't really opine as to the future changes in law.



Speaker 5 - 39:53

So perhaps could we, again, just thinking out loud, have something in there that we are. I understand we're probably protected by change of laws and stuff like that, but we don't want the county turned around and say, why now you guys are, you know, you're. You're interfering with our state obligation and we have something where we could go and you know, says, you guys understand it was there, that we can do an injunction against you. Now I need to stop operating or whatever it might be, right?



Speaker 1 - 40:18

Well, there's nothing in here that says that they can do an injunction against us. There's no provision like that. But if the law changed and it said the county is the only one who can provide these services, you know, we have to follow state law. So I, I don't know what we can do contractually to prevent. To protect us against that. I mean, this legislature does. Can do whatever they're going to do and we're going to have to follow it. So there's nothing contractually I can do to prevent, protect us against that.



Speaker 2 - 40:56

Anyone else? I have, I just have a comment. So, as we move forward with the facilities amendment, it is really important that we educate our commission as you heard earlier, once the master plan is approved by the governing board, that is the 120 day ticker to get the facilities amendment approved by each of our city's commissions or councils. So I would encourage each of you to go back and start the education process. I'll tell you that I personally am planning on having that discussion with our commission at least as an update, hopefully at the next city commission meeting. So I encourage you to at least start the conversation on the facilities amendment. Maybe the executive summary, the master plan is a good document to start that conversation.



Speaker 2 - 41:59

I think maybe it's a little too early to go into details of the C and D and the recycling ordinances because I think we still have to flush out some issues there. But the real item before us is that we have to get done is that facilities amendment. So it's real critical that we start that process. So I just want to just share that with you and kind of share what at least my intention is going back to my sunrise commission. So.

 Speaker 6 - 42:27

Yeah, sorry.

 Speaker 1 - 42:29

So at 10:30, the executive committee's meeting. So they did want to know if TAC had any comments or suggestions. So I know you don't have a quorum, you have 13, you're one shy of your quorum. But, you know, it did sound like there was One suggestion that Mr. Trappier Pani made about switching the 80% back to the two thirds. I don't know if TAC wants to make that as a comment at the executive committee meeting or, you know, you might want to at least talk about whether you have that or any other comments you want to make. That was, I will tell you, that was a very long discussed issue and there was a feeling that to go to 80% was necessary, but, you know, if TAC feels it shouldn't be that, you know, is something you might want to raise.

 Speaker 5 - 43:19

Just real quick, and I know this is, you know, we're on a short time frame here as it is, but honestly, meeting an hour before the next meeting to submit comments and everything like that is. It's not fair to anybody, man. I'm just saying it out loud. You could be mad at me, I really don't care. But it's not how we should be operating.

 Speaker 7 - 43:54

That we already sent comments and I want to make sure that those are going to be incorporated into the discussion today. That's why I'm not going to bringing anything up. So our members. Okay. So just want to make sure that they're going to.

 Speaker 1 - 44:13

I'm not sure we have those, Lisa.

 Speaker 7 - 44:16

And one, we now have a form.

 Speaker 1 - 44:19

By the way.

 Speaker 7 - 44:21

If you can please clarify what system waste is, because we do have wastes that are exempted right now from our franchise agreement. And we just want to make sure that they're not part of the definition. So right now we examined landscape and.

 Speaker 1 - 44:41

Right. Nothing is changing. The definition of system waste is not changing.

 Speaker 7 - 44:44

So system waste is always.

 Speaker 1 - 44:46

Yes, thank you.

 Speaker 2 - 44:56

Mayor.

 Speaker 1 - 44:57

I just want to take a moment to address the timing. As you know, we are on a deadline with the ila. It's not a deadline I like it was established years ago. The executive committee has been meeting monthly and is even doing, you know, special meeting today. The process of the facilities amendment began in December and it was tortured. It took a long time to get here. The second it was done, it was provided to the executive committee and then thereafter submitted out to you all, to the governing board. This issue of it's not fair. It's not the way to operate. We're all working hard because of mistakes.

 Speaker 2 - 45:41

Made 50 years ago.

 Speaker 1 - 45:44

We tried to come up with an idea of how do we extend the ila, how do we give ourselves more time.

 Speaker 2 - 45:50

But for God's sakes, we've been working.

 Speaker 1 - 45:52

At this for five years and nothing.

 Speaker 2 - 45:53

Has come of it yet.

 Speaker 1 - 45:56

We're at a point of either staying together or falling apart. So I apologize as the chair that this is not ideal. I've apologized to my colleagues, but it's not for a lack of work on behalf of Mr. Cole and the county attorney's office, multiple meetings that I was involved, multiple drafts and quite frankly, rolled up sleeves and fisticuffs to get to this point. Fortunately, you're being given this. We don't have to approve it on February 20th.

 Speaker 2 - 46:24

Technically does not to be approved until March 20th.

 Speaker 1 - 46:27

You have the time.



Speaker 2 - 46:29

Take it.



Speaker 1 - 46:30

We're presenting it to you because I don't want any further delay. It's being presented to the governing board.



Speaker 6 - 46:35

Because I don't want any further delay.



Speaker 1 - 46:37

And so I hope that you'll look at this as something that is not because, and I know, Ralph, you know this, you're at every darn meeting. There's a significant amount of work that's been done and we're moving as fast as we can. So I thank you and I apologize, but we need your input.



Speaker 2 - 46:52

Thank you.



Speaker 5 - 46:58

And definitely recognize the amount of time that has gone into this. It's also appreciate everybody. I mean, I will. We will submit some comments once we have the final kind of version because we don't want to, you know, say this on this version and this on another version. However, being that we are against this timetable, in a few months, perhaps there is. And again, I am just throwing this out there's some kind of appetite for consideration of maybe an extension and or conditional approval with specific measurements that must be reached and accomplished in order to continue moving forward. Again, just a thought. We're all here together. You could say stupid idea. We could say great idea.

 Speaker 1 - 47:57

Mayor, first of all, do not hold back comments on any version that you have in front of you ever. Just like the C and D that was pushed out. Waiting for a final version extracts you from the process. You're part and parcel of this process. The same comments we're getting from the executive committee and the governing board members. You all are specialists. Do not wait for a final version.

 Speaker 2 - 48:19

Tell us what the problems are now.

 Speaker 1 - 48:21

That's the point of presenting it to.

 Speaker 5 - 48:22

You, that it's exactly the wrong way.

 Speaker 1 - 48:23

To handle it and it's going to create more delay. That's number one. Number two, I would love an extension. It was not possible. It would require every city to agree to simply wasn't going to happen. And this has been a discussion going on for over eight or nine months. This is not a new request or let's talk about. We are driving as fast as we can because of the urgency of the crisis we face and the mistakes that were made previously. It's not ideal, but the fact that there wasn't the amount of thought that's gone into this 50 years ago is why we're here. So please do not wait for a final draft. Please accept the challenge and please give us everything you have, whether suggestions, comments, edits, criticisms on the document and we will take it into spirit.

 Speaker 2 - 49:12

Thank you. Any other comments? Oh, Carol, I'm sorry.

 Speaker 4 - 49:24

One comment that is really more, I guess, perspective and less technical comment on the facilities amendment. Having been through this process since we started with the Solid Waste Working Group, in fact, having represented a different city as a part of that. The whole point of the facilities amendment, at least from the perspective that I understood the from the elected officials sitting on that board, was they wanted to understand the costs of these things. And the facilities amendment speaks to a lot of process. It speaks to wind down, which is a very valid question. But somehow or another, as we go back to elected officials, the question we're all going to get asked is cost. And other than a process for an above normal increase, cost really isn't addressed in here.



Speaker 4 - 50:23

So I guess my question is how are we going to weave that in and draw that association so that our elected officials are comfortable that they know what the cost of what they're signing.



Speaker 2 - 50:34

On to are right.



Speaker 1 - 50:37

Cost is not addressed in the facilities amendment or the ila. That's addressed in the master plan. There's going to be a section in the master plan about that and this limits any increases above that. That's what's in here. So now the issue will be, you know, how detailed the cost will be in the master plan beyond the amount. And you know, Daniel, is so we.



Speaker 4 - 51:01

Will have to present to our elected officials with the facilities amendment, the amended or updated master plan reflecting that cost because again, that's where the rubber hits the road. I'm going to bet most of us that's the first question we're going to be asked and maybe the only question we're going to be asked. So it's really critical that be front and center. And what exactly is included in that fee is front and center and well defined. Again, the master plan is not approved by the cities. So it's kind of a interesting relationship.



Speaker 1 - 51:43

That's correct. But the master plan will be approved by the governing board before the facilities amendment is

delivered to the city. So you will have that and it will have the cost in the master plan.



Speaker 2 - 51:58

Daniel.



Speaker 6 - 51:59

So chair, if I may. We've been working through the assumptions, the methodology related to cost. It has been presented at the last two executive committee meetings. It will also be presented as it gets refined on February 20th and again on March 20th. So we've been having one one briefings with members of the executive committee and the executive board talking about cost. We've been meeting with staff from various ILA member communities talking about cost, soliciting feedback. So I'd be glad to speak with you offline. I would invite everybody to tune in or attend the next executive committee meeting or executive committee and governing board meetings where it will be further refined.



Speaker 4 - 52:47

I mean, I think we've been pretty active. Plantation's been at almost all of these meetings. Again, I think this is a very sort of loosey goosey relationship between the facilities amendment and the master plan and cost. And again, I think we're going to have to be very clear with our elected officials. The other thing I would point out is, you know, in a month between presentations, the cost went from \$3.45 a ton to \$6 a ton. So again, I think we've got to be very clear what we think those costs are going to be and what exactly is included in them. Because honestly, in the era that we're in, with the fiscal constraints that are going on and that are potentially coming down from Tallahassee, money is king.



Speaker 2 - 53:45

Thank you for your feedback, Jackie.



Speaker 1 - 53:49

Sure.



Speaker 8 - 53:50

I just had one comment. When it comes to communication, so the first I heard that there's an executive committee meeting at 10:30 is right now at this meeting. And as attack, I'm sure that we all assist in trying to get our elected officials here to the meetings. And we know that there's a fire lit under us to get this moving. If we knew there was an additional fire lit under us for today, then we probably would have moved even quicker as much as we can.



Speaker 8 - 54:17

So if there's some way that we could have some extra communication on when the other meetings are scheduled, when they're last minute, that kind of thing, that would be helpful to us to ensure that there's a quorum here for all the meetings, that we get as much information back to you all as we can in a timely manner. So maybe just including us on those emails might be good.



Speaker 2 - 54:41

Excellent point. Thank you, Ralph.



Speaker 5 - 54:48

So at the executive committee meeting later.



Speaker 2 - 54:50

On today, you'll be speaking more in.



Speaker 5 - 54:51

Detail for the financial model.



Speaker 2 - 54:53

Correct.

 Speaker 6 - 54:55

Now, the part the primary focus of the executive committee meeting will be to talk about the facilities amendment and the executive director position.

 Speaker 5 - 55:03

Oh, executive director, right. I'm sorry about that. So since Ms. Carol had brought up the increase from 375 to \$6 per ton, can you give us a \$0.02 on that?

 Speaker 6 - 55:18

Yes. There are really two reasons why that amount went up and it's a per ton surcharge. One was the inclusion of yard trash processing. So that was not included in the original model. And the other contributing factor was based on conversations with our general counsel, we can apply that surcharge only to ILA community tums generated, not to all tons generated in Broward County. So that knocked about \$800,000, 800,000 tons out of the equation. So it simply changed the denominator, which changed that.

 Speaker 2 - 55:52

Okay.

 Speaker 5 - 55:53

And that would be across the board on all waste streams.

 Speaker 6 - 55:55

Correct.

 Speaker 5 - 55:56

And then how many tons does the current members of the ILA produce?

 Speaker 6 - 56:01

A little bit more for the base year. A little more than 4 million.

 Speaker 5 - 56:04

4 million. So \$24 million a year annually. And then in your financial model plan it will be. And if I'm wrong, just say no, that's not how it is. You have a chart that shows, you know, X amount towards education, X amount towards facilities or reserves will be following that model. Okay, so the amount for education is how much? 50, 60%.

 Speaker 6 - 56:33

We're starting at \$10 per household per year.

 Speaker 2 - 56:40

Okay, \$10.

 Speaker 5 - 56:42

See it's different.

 Speaker 2 - 56:43

Right.

 Speaker 5 - 56:43

Because it's \$6 a ton across 44 million tons. \$24 million. No.

 Speaker 6 - 56:50

Correct.

 Speaker 5 - 56:51

Okay, so of that \$24 million, 50%. I'm just using a number would be used for education.

 Speaker 6 - 56:59

I would want to verify the numbers before I share them with. It includes the tipping fee for an assumed tipping fee for recyclable processing, yard trash processing, education and outreach, the administration of the authority and the future build out of convenience, recycle centers, building reserves. So we are in the process of summarizing. So we've talked in broad brushstrokes trying to refine the analysis. But all of that will be presented at a future executive committee and governing board meeting.

 Speaker 5 - 57:31

Okay, so just theoretically, if it was 50% and it was 24 million. So we're spent 12 million on education, 5 million on reserves, whatever it might be. Yes.

 Speaker 6 - 57:44

Again, it's a fair question. I don't have the numbers or percentages at the top of my head, so I'd rather not misstate any information.

 Speaker 5 - 57:55

Just some other thoughts. Would that I know the \$6 can change in the future. Say we want to build another facility, it costs more, blah, blah. But would that \$6 be subject to. And we subject to annual CPI is correct?

 Speaker 2 - 58:13

Correct.

 Speaker 5 - 58:13

Okay, why not do a flat assessment then I keep it.

 Speaker 2 - 58:20

Delete it.

 Speaker 6 - 58:21

We've had a lot of conversations about the funding approach. Whether a surcharge is appropriate at this point versus an assessment. We may very well get to an assessment as facilities are being constructed. But given that the time sensitivity of this. So it's all. You may be aware this is all based on calculating a revenue requirement. And what is the most practical way to get to securing that revenue to allow the authority to survive past August.

 Speaker 2 - 59:04

Any other comments? I want to thank everybody for their feedback on this item.

 Speaker 1 - 59:14

So is TAC going now? You do have a quorum. Is TAC going to have any recommendations or comments at today's meeting or. I mean you probably should decide who's going to be the speaker if you are going to do that. And what you're going to do.



Speaker 2 - 59:30

Is there any formal comments that we, that was, I know there's a lot of discussion points. I think the, the primary in terms of the facilities Amendment was the 2/3 versus 80%. There was other comments on the financial side, but that's not directly tied to the facilities amendment. Was there any other Items other than 2/3 to the 80%? Russell, should we take a formal vote of the TAC just to make a recommendation to endorse the facilities amendment? We could, as I'm trying to see if there is any comments to transmit. I think that was the only item that was raised and I didn't see any support for it. I know I certainly don't support going back to 2/3. Listen, I agree with you, Russell. I appreciate Ralph's comment on that.



Speaker 2 - 01:00:20

But as we've gone through this process, we've seen the concerns raised regarding the WT facility. And if that's the change that is needed to give assurance to the municipalities to gain support the facilities amendment, I'm supportive of it. Oh, I'm sorry, Tamara.



Speaker 7 - 01:00:49

Hi, everyone. I have a quick question regarding Carol, because if we don't have numbers and.



Speaker 2 - 01:00:55

We are in the budget season right now, that we are doing it for.



Speaker 3 - 01:00:59

2027, I know you're working on the.



Speaker 2 - 01:01:01

Facilities amendment and everything, but if we.

 Speaker 1 - 01:01:03

Have, we don't have a number, how.

 Speaker 2 - 01:01:05

Can we budget, how can we agree to this if we don't have a.

 Speaker 3 - 01:01:09

Budget for the 2027?

 Speaker 2 - 01:01:11

I think what Daniel's trying to say is they're working through those numbers and that they will be presenting it in an upcoming meeting at the executive board. But there's no, the, the \$6, I think is the current number, but I think they're still refining that at this point and we're all going to have to be patient and it could require us to amend as we move forward as a budgetary process.

 Speaker 4 - 01:01:37

Just a quick question to her point, and that is right now we are all funding annual contribution. And I guess one of the things that we probably all need clarity on as we go forward because we are in budget season, is whether that goes away in favor of the \$6 surcharge for the upcoming fiscal year, whether it's a hybrid for the upcoming. But I mean, just so you're aware, Daniel, for many of us, that's going to be a number that we're going to need in the next couple of months, not something that we can push.

 Speaker 6 - 01:02:16

It's understood. And appreciated.

 Speaker 7 - 01:02:26

The facilities amendment or the master plan, but I think the authority should commit to a time of the year where they're going to send us the amount that it's going to be needed for every year because we start our budget like now. So maybe just have them committed to provide the figure because I know it's going to change every year by the first quarter of the fiscal year.

 Speaker 2 - 01:02:56

Ralph?

 Speaker 5 - 01:02:58

Yes, that's actually going to be one of our comments as well that we need that number prior to this last time. We got it at the end of September. I do have another question though for the financial model and I just want to understand that part of the \$6 per ton you talked about education facility and recycling facilities processing costs, is that correct? So part of the \$6 will go to recycling processing costs. So we already pay for recycling processing, but this is just an addition supplement. Explain.

 Speaker 6 - 01:03:32

So we're it essentially would be a transfer, right. So if you're currently paying it in your collection agreement, what the actual processing cost is, we are assuming what the cost will be once the ILA and flow control is effectuated. So your recyclable materials would now be part of the economies of scale of going out on the street with a solicitation to get the best possible price, which may be preferable to what your current contract states. So it may be an offset to what is currently part of here. And what if that's risk assessment?

 Speaker 5 - 01:04:07

What if it's not? What if it ends up costing us more?

 Speaker 6 - 01:04:12

It's a possibility. We think that it's a remote possibility. And I think I'm just not so.



Speaker 5 - 01:04:18

Much in favor of us supplementing our. I mean, I know you're saying economies of scale, but listen, honestly, there's already most favorite nations in all of our contracts, so economies of scale are really not going to matter. And it's not so much the tonnage, more of the years of the term of the contract that gets us a more favorable number. However, I just want to go back. I'm not in favor of supporting supplementing recycling processing costs, you know, through this. It, it just doesn't just sit well with me, to be honest with you. I just want to thank you for the clarity though.



Speaker 2 - 01:04:59

All right, we're around 10 o' clock here. Is there any comments that someone would make a motion for the board to vote on? I would move to approve the or move to approve the facilities amendment for the governing board to adopt any second. I'll second it. Second by Coconut Creek. Any other comments before we Call any roll. There was a motion to accept the facilities amendment. Any comments? Before we could we.



Speaker 4 - 01:05:42

Friendly amendment. Could we amend it to accept the facilities agreement subject to addition of a provision about notification of costs for upcoming fiscal years.



Speaker 1 - 01:05:54

That's probably not something that would actually go in the facilities amendment. I mean if those amendments like your constitution, that's more of an operational thing that would go in the bylaws or something like that. It's not really appropriate for.



Speaker 4 - 01:06:05

It needs to be recorded somewhere because that's a critical hit road process for cities.



Speaker 1 - 01:06:12

Understood. We'll make sure it addressed.



Speaker 2 - 01:06:16

So I think that the comments. One second. The comments have been loud and clear on the financial side and we have several members of the executive board that are here listening and many of us are responsible for our budgets here in cities. So I'm pretty sure that message is being delivered. Ralph.



Speaker 5 - 01:06:39

So the motion is to approve the facility then added. But the facilities meant is not complete. It's not been. It's not the final version. And I'm not trying to get Mike mad. I'm not trying to get you mad. What I'm saying how are we going to accept something that's not the final version?



Speaker 1 - 01:06:51

When you say it's not the final version. This. This is the current final version. It's to recommend this version to the executive committee. I think that's what the motion is.



Speaker 5 - 01:07:01

Is that what the motion is? Okay.



Speaker 1 - 01:07:05

I mean if you want to change something, now would be the time to make a motion.



Speaker 5 - 01:07:09

Well, I'm not gonna. I'm not in support of that. So I'm gonna vote now because.



Speaker 2 - 01:07:19

Any other comments? Let's do a roll call, please.

 Speaker 3 - 01:07:25

Okay. Vote on the motion. Broward county.

 Speaker 2 - 01:07:31

Yes.

 Speaker 3 - 01:07:32

Coconut creek. Cooper city, coral springs. Dania beach. Davie deerfield beach.

 Speaker 5 - 01:07:49

No.

 Speaker 3 - 01:07:50

Fort lauderdale. Hillsborough beach. Hollywood. Lauderdale lakes.

 Speaker 2 - 01:08:02

Yes.



Speaker 3 - 01:08:03

Lauderdale by the sea. Lauder hill. Lazy lake. Lighthouse point. Margate.



Speaker 7 - 01:08:14

No.



Speaker 3 - 01:08:15

Miramar.



Speaker 5 - 01:08:18

No.



Speaker 3 - 01:08:19

North lauderdale. Oakland park? No. Parkland?



Speaker 4 - 01:08:27

No.



Speaker 3 - 01:08:28

Pembroke park. Sea ranch lakes? Southwest ranches.

 Speaker 1 - 01:08:38

Yes.

 Speaker 3 - 01:08:39

Tamarack west park. Weston. Wilton manors. Weston.

 Speaker 2 - 01:08:58

Yes.

 Speaker 3 - 01:08:59

Thank you.

 Speaker 2 - 01:09:00

Sunrise also hasn't voted yet either.

 Speaker 3 - 01:09:03

Oh, and Sunrise at the very top.

 Speaker 1 - 01:09:13

At least.

 Speaker 2 - 01:09:13

What was the vote.

 Speaker 1 - 01:09:23

Since there's the vote is not to recommend it. I think it would be valuable for the executive committee to know why. You know, so that they can fix or discuss the issues.

 Speaker 2 - 01:09:35

Yeah.

 Speaker 9 - 01:09:38

Before.

 Speaker 2 - 01:09:39

Sorry.

 Speaker 9 - 01:09:40

Apologies for running late, but was it clear that were. This is. We're meeting to review and approve documents here today.

 Speaker 1 - 01:10:01

Yes. At 10:30 today, the executive committee is going to be discussing the facilities Amendment. So they wanted the TAC to give any advice that to the executive committee to assist them in deciding whether any additional changes have to be made next week on February 20, the executive committee is going to potentially vote on this although it may go until March 20 because the governing board has to approve it as well. Those are the two meetings. So they're really looking for advice. So based on all the comments it sounded like everyone was supportive of this. But then there was a vote. A lot of people voted no without really explaining why. And I think the executive would want to know but I'll let the chair talk to that.

 Speaker 5 - 01:10:44

Yeah, I'm not. But.

 Speaker 9 - 01:10:45

But my question goes back to where it was attack clear that we would be. Yes, we got the documents Monday, Tuesday and but I don't know if it was clear like for instance your. The executive committee may have in their agenda where they're going to move and approve something.

 Speaker 2 - 01:11:06

So. So Carl, I'll jump in on that. So the. The agenda was prepared. We sent out the several documents including the facilities amendment. There was not a clear vote that was to receive comments. However, there was a motion made and a second. So therefore there was a quarrel call.

 Speaker 9 - 01:11:25

No, I know but it's.

 Speaker 5 - 01:11:27

It's.

 Speaker 1 - 01:11:27

It's.

 Speaker 9 - 01:11:28

I mean, I mean I voted yes, but it's. It's. I think some of the nos is because the motion came up and you have to vote. Comments are one thing. You hear the comments and then you can tell by the comments. Various comments but put on the spot to make a vote. Yes or no. That is what I believe is hesitant for some. Right. Because you're asking for an explanation. Maybe you'll get that explanation that weren't fair to put. You know we're prepared to talk about general comments but not to put the cities yes or no on the line. I don't know that's what I'm thinking.

 Speaker 2 - 01:12:07

Thank you, Mayor.

 Speaker 1 - 01:12:08

I don't actually know why the attack was voting. I actually don't know what the executive committee asked of attack on short was to please review and get us comments. We're not voting at the executive committee today to pass it. We're going to be moving it forward and we probably will move it forward.

 Speaker 2 - 01:12:32

In its current version so that at.

 Speaker 1 - 01:12:35

Least the governing board has it by February 20 and the comments will continue. The worst thing that could happen is that somehow this is interpreted as the facilities amendment has been voted down by a body who's had the time to look at it. I have no idea why there was even a motion in a vote. And I don't want to interfere with the work of this tact, but from the Executive Committee, it's perspective.

 Speaker 2 - 01:12:58

We just need your comments, we need.

 Speaker 1 - 01:13:00

Your insight, we need the issues that raised. Right. We know finance is an issue and we hope that you can get those.

 Speaker 2 - 01:13:06

Back to us as quickly as possible.

 Speaker 1 - 01:13:08

And then today what the Executive Committee will likely do is go over and see if there's any additional comments to those members who said I didn't know they were meeting. All the members of the Executive Committee know that there was a meeting today. Whether they got with you or not.

 Speaker 2 - 01:13:20

I can't explain that.

 Speaker 1 - 01:13:23

But in terms of what I think the Executive Committee would expect is for you to take this back and think about any other terms that need to be included, whether they're appropriately here or elsewhere. And then on February 20th, we're expecting that the Executive Committee likely will be recommending it to the Governing Board after we've had the additional time and then the Governing Board will be presented with it. So I leave it to you all to decide your own governance. But I don't know what the assistance is by a vote against the facilities amendment where most of you have complained you haven't had time to look at it.

 Speaker 2 - 01:13:56

Thank you.

 Speaker 8 - 01:14:04

Yes, I just wanted to amplify that. I think a voting no for me is that it's a little bit of a pressure when again, were not aware that our Executive Committee may know that there was a meeting at 10:30 today, but we did not know that the information we got on Tuesday was going to be voted on today. So I think that's the pressure. We don't have a final version. Sure, we can give you comments on what the current version is, but it's a lot of pressure for us to actually as a body say that we support something that we didn't know we needed to make a vote on.

 Speaker 2 - 01:14:42

Is that the general thought of the folks that voted no.

 Speaker 1 - 01:14:53

So it sounds like the no votes weren't so much against it, but more you weren't prepared to do it. So maybe you should do a motion to reconsider it and then withdraw the motion and just talk about what comments you want to make, if any. But maybe the motion is that you have no consensus comments to make at this time, something along those lines. So somebody voted to reconsider. Only someone who could voted no can do a motion to reconsider. So someone who voted no wants to move to reconsider. It can do that and then we can proceed.

 Speaker 4 - 01:15:25

I'll be the person I'll make the motion to reconsider.

 Speaker 2 - 01:15:31

Second.

 Speaker 7 - 01:15:32

Second.



Speaker 2 - 01:15:33

Second by Marty. Any comments, Ralph?



Speaker 5 - 01:15:43

This is more from the financial model.



Speaker 2 - 01:15:45

Microphone.



Speaker 5 - 01:15:47

All right, this is some more from the financial model. Okay. And just using what's been presented in. In the financial model, it's \$110 a ton for recycling processing. Correct. You earlier said it's about \$10 per home annually. As for the \$6. Right.



Speaker 2 - 01:16:07

Okay.



Speaker 1 - 01:16:09

If you.



Speaker 5 - 01:16:09

And if you take \$110 per ton and you multiply it by the waste generation factor, what waste generation factor would you be using for residential recycling? Okay, so waste generation factor is the amount of tons each home gets rid of every year. For garbage, it's 1.3.



Speaker 1 - 01:16:30

We used that before for recycling.



Speaker 5 - 01:16:34

Each city may know their number, they may not say In Myanmar it's 0.17 tons per year. So if you multiply \$110 times 0.17, anybody can do it. How much is that a year? It's \$17.



Speaker 1 - 01:16:50

But we just heard it's going to be \$10.



Speaker 2 - 01:16:54

I don't think I need to say anything about that.



Speaker 5 - 01:16:57

I know that's not the finance. The facility is amendment, but.



Speaker 2 - 01:17:03

No. Any other comments on the motion to reconsider Roll call, please.



Speaker 1 - 01:17:14

You only have to announce the people who are actually here in the roll call.



Speaker 3 - 01:17:19

Sorry, first time with this one.



Speaker 2 - 01:17:21

It's okay.



Speaker 1 - 01:17:22

Sunrise, yes.



Speaker 3 - 01:17:26

Broward county, yes. Coral Springs. Coconut Creek, yes. Deerfield beach.



Speaker 5 - 01:17:41

No.



Speaker 3 - 01:17:45

Lauderdale Lakes.



Speaker 6 - 01:17:48

Yes.



Speaker 3 - 01:17:51

Margate, yes. Miramar.



Speaker 5 - 01:17:57

No.



Speaker 3 - 01:18:00

Oakland Park, Yes. Parkland, yes. Plantation. Southwest Ranches.



Speaker 1 - 01:18:14

Yes.



Speaker 3 - 01:18:15

Tamarack, yes. Weston.



Speaker 9 - 01:18:21

Yes.



Speaker 3 - 01:18:22

Thank you. Motion passes.

Speaker 1 - 01:18:27



Since I passed, at this point, it sounds like people don't want to take an official position. Recommending or not recommendation. You may want to withdraw the motion.



Speaker 2 - 01:18:40

Yeah, I just. I just want to say, like, with all due respect to my colleagues, the reason why we're here, we're under a very tight timeline. And so. And I understand that we're all busy and we all are tasked and we got this with very little time. We. I received it the same day as everybody else. I had a council meeting last night. Still. I took the time last night. I was up till past 12 o' clock making sure that I reviewed the stuff. Stuff because I know how important it is and I wanted to have be prepared for the discussion. What we're talking about here is the facilities amendment. We're not. With all due respect to Ralph and to the people that raise the issues about the financial questions, I understand that, but that's not in the. That's not in the facilities amendment.



Speaker 2 - 01:19:18

That's not what we're talking about. Those are issues for another document for another day. I think that we are prepared to endorse this facilities amendment and I would have liked to have seen it. Just I understand that we didn't need to necessarily give a vote behind it. That was a, that was an attempt to show support from the TAC to the governing board that the tech recommends. It seemed like that was the case in the comments. Obviously there's questions and so that's why people were hesitant to vote on it. Maybe they weren't fully prepared to.



Speaker 1 - 01:19:52

You.



Speaker 2 - 01:19:52

Know, to vote on it because they hadn't had an opportunity. And I understand that. But some of the issues raised as to potential drawbacks I think are reaction to other aspects, other concerns that we might have. And I'm not saying that those aren't unfounded. But from what I read in the facilities amendment, and I read it cover to cover, I don't see any of those questions really as being necessary within the facilities amendment. That's just my comment. Thank you. So, Russell, I understand your position. However, the message that this is going to send is the wrong message from the TAC at this point. So I don't disagree with your points, but I think if the motion stands as it is, it's the wrong message that were trying to send to the executive committee and the group.

Speaker 1 - 01:20:40



So there's a motion withdrawn.



Speaker 2 - 01:20:43

Draw the motion so that people have an opportunity to, you know, discuss it further and give their comments later on.



Speaker 1 - 01:20:50

So I guess the only question now is there going to be any official position or comments to the executive Committee today or is there just no comments and that's. We'll just leave it at that.



Speaker 2 - 01:21:01

What I'm hearing is that there's no official comments from this group, however, that many of you still need some additional time to review and provide additional comments. Thank you. Coral Springs provided formal comments. If you would like to get any official comments in, please send them to me as soon as possible. We heard a few comments here tonight or this morning that will executive members have heard, but there's no official comments this time from the tac.



Speaker 9 - 01:21:34

Mark, I'm on. I don't know why you said why there's no official comments. It's a meeting, it's recording, people made comments.



Speaker 2 - 01:21:42

There's no official vote of a consensus of a specific comment is what I meant.

Speaker 5 - 01:21:47



All so, for example, we're going back.



Speaker 9 - 01:21:50

To the need for a vote. We're just providing the comments back to the governing board, whether official.



Speaker 2 - 01:21:59

I mean.



Speaker 9 - 01:22:00

Yes, for comments by email and there were some verbal.



Speaker 2 - 01:22:02

So I'll, you, I'll use example. Carl, if there was a specific.



Speaker 9 - 01:22:05

No, no, I, I, I, I completely understand what you say. I'm just, I'm just asking about the word. There's no official comments from the.



Speaker 2 - 01:22:15

TAC as a group. There are comments from individual members that have been sent in that are going to be provided to the Executive board. Okay. Margaret.

 Speaker 7 - 01:22:29

I understand that the executive board is meeting this morning right after this meeting and then again next Friday to essentially vote and finalize the facilities amendment. Could I then suggest a timeline? It's going to be super short, obviously, with the holiday weekend of getting all comments to, sorry to any comments you have in by say, Wednesday to at least give opportunity for that to be compiled to be presented to the executive board. So we're not wasting time. So we also recognize their concerns with regards to the timeline and we don't, you know, in excess delay it a month or so. Again, I understand the timeline is really short.

 Speaker 7 - 01:23:17

Essentially we only have Tuesday and Wednesday to be able to take it back to our team if they're around, just, you know, at that point, possibly having that time to get the comments by a set date so that they can vote on it on Friday of next week.

 Speaker 2 - 01:23:32

I would say get your comments in as soon as possible. I don't know if I would even set a date. It would get, if you get me the comments, we'll get them to the board. So.

 Speaker 5 - 01:23:50

Maybe I just not understanding correctly, you want. We'll submit comm. Comments and you're going to give them.

 Speaker 1 - 01:23:56

To the board, correct?

 Speaker 5 - 01:23:59

That is correct. Committee? The Executive Committee, yes. Are we going to vote on those comments that are being submitted to the executive Committee like we just had to.

Speaker 1 - 01:24:07



Do, or we're just going to submit.



Speaker 5 - 01:24:09

And let it go where it goes?



Speaker 2 - 01:24:12

We will not be having another meeting before the 20th exact.



Speaker 1 - 01:24:20

Mayor Ryan, if the TAC feels the need to do that, I would encourage you to have another special meeting just like we did this week. We set a quick special meeting so that we could have this discussion. So I would encourage you, if that's the concern, I'd move to have a motion to have another special meeting so.



Speaker 2 - 01:24:35

We can get the comments.



Speaker 1 - 01:24:36

That's a simple solution. The board want to meet.



Speaker 2 - 01:24:43

Later this week or next week, Jackie.

Speaker 8 - 01:24:54



So maybe I just need to be clear about this. So I understand there's official TAC comments if we all agree on them here. But we've also submitted our own comments from our own cities. So wouldn't those kind of be equal in the sense that if our individual cities have comments and we've submitted them in and they're being presented to the executive committee, they would be looking at them just like they would be considering something that we decided as a whole.



Speaker 1 - 01:25:26

Correct.



Speaker 2 - 01:25:27

So listen, we are an advisory board. We each can submit comments individually. As a municipality, if there is an issue that is raises to the level that this board should act on as a group on a specific comment or an issue related to the facilities amendment, then we should meet and vote on that. But subject to each individual municipalities or county's comments, they should get them in as soon as possible to the executive committee. And when I get them to me, I'm happy to transmit them. Is there a consensus for us another meeting for next week? Russell? I would suggest that we have another meeting next. Next Friday.



Speaker 1 - 01:26:13

Next Friday will be too late because the next Friday is the meeting for the executive green government. There's a C and D meeting. Oh no, I'm sure there's an outreach and education meeting from 9 to 10:30 here. You could do it right at 10:30, right after because we know we have the room. If you can do it at 10:30 on Wednesday, on the 18th, we do know that we have the room. We can just switch from one meeting to the other.



Speaker 5 - 01:26:46

So have a meeting on Wednesday.



Speaker 1 - 01:26:49

Right.

Speaker 5 - 01:26:49



Solidify our comments for a meeting on Friday for the executive committee. Why not just submit our comments?



Speaker 1 - 01:26:56

The other option is you just do that comments.



Speaker 5 - 01:26:59

Just have the comments in by sometime next.



Speaker 2 - 01:27:08

I would suggest you all get your comments in by next Wednesday at the latest, if not sooner. I would suggest have all your comments submitted by next Wednesday at the latest. But sooner the better. All right, so with that I think our time is winding down. We have a scheduled meeting already for apologize.



Speaker 6 - 01:27:35

Where's my agenda?



Speaker 2 - 01:27:38

March 16th. Thank you.



Speaker 1 - 01:27:42

Russell.

Speaker 2 - 01:27:42



Since we have a quorum, can we move to approve the minutes from the last meeting?



Speaker 1 - 01:27:46

Yes, yes we can.



Speaker 2 - 01:27:48

There's a motion. Motion by seconds.



Speaker 1 - 01:27:55

By Parkland.



Speaker 2 - 01:27:57

All in favor say aye. Anybody say no? No.



Speaker 1 - 01:28:01

All right, minutes are approved.



Speaker 5 - 01:28:05

All right.



Speaker 2 - 01:28:06

We conclude today's TAC meeting. We'll see you in March 16th. One quick comment. Can we get that on the agenda? The idea of the MRF recycling processing being subsidized and the pros and cons and take a look at that. So I have some concerns about that and see what the details, the areas on the mrf and you know, when we think we're going to go out for an rfp. Okay. All right, thank you all.