

Solid Waste Disposal and Recyclable Materials Processing Authority of Broward County, Florida

SWA Executive Committee Meeting

March 20, 2026, 9:00 AM – 9:30 AM

Broward County Government Center West

1st Floor Board Room – Surtax Plaza

1 North University Drive

Plantation, FL 33324

MINUTES

The meeting was called to order, roll call was taken and a quorum was established.

Present: Chair Ryan, Vice Chair Furr, Member Shuham, Member Horland, Member Metayer Bowen, Member Dunn, Member Rydell, Member Mead, Member Caggiano, Member AJ Ryan, Alternate Member Colbourne, Alternate Member Murphy Salomone, and Alternate Member Geller.

Present Online: Alternate Member Breitzkreuz.

Not Present: Member Newton and School Board Member Bulman.

The meeting continued with public comment.

Meeting Minutes – February 24, 2026, and March 2, 2026 - *Motion:* A motion was made by Member Horland and seconded by Member Caggiano to approve the Executive Committee meeting minutes for February 24, 2026, and March 2, 2026. There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

Executive Director Update - The Executive Director reported that the Authority has been diligently working on finalizing the Master Plan financial modeling and continuing outreach to member cities, including scheduling and conducting workshops. It was noted that recent workshops had been held in Davie and Weston.

CohnReznick - Financial Statements – January 2026 - CohnReznick presented the January 2026 financial statements, reporting that as of the end of February 2026 the Authority held \$2,852,000 in cash and cash equivalents and \$834,000 in accounts receivable. After accounting for approximately \$141,000 in liabilities, the Authority's net equity position was \$3,545,000. It was confirmed that the Authority has sufficient liquidity to meet its budgetary needs through the fiscal year ending September 2026.

With the consent of the body, Chair Ryan moved the subcommittee updates to the Governing Board meeting to provide a more comprehensive report at that level. The meeting proceeded to the Master Plan and financial modeling discussion.

Master Plan, Financial Modeling and Facilities Amendment – Chair Ryan opened the Master Plan and financial modeling discussion by emphasizing that the Executive Committee had reached a historic decision point after years of work and was being asked to determine whether to recommend the Master Plan and Facilities Amendment to the Governing Board. He thanked the Executive Committee, subcommittees, and stakeholders for their work and directed the presentation to move straight to the financial modeling.

SCS Engineering presented the funding structure in three phases and explained that the current population-based approach in phase one would transition in phase two to a \$2.00 per ton disposal surcharge, which was

described as a fairer mechanism because it ties revenue to actual waste generation. It was explained that the surcharge would be paid by haulers at disposal and processing facilities and remitted to the Authority, creating no additional administrative burden for member cities. In phase three, a non ad valorem special assessment would be added as a separate line on tax bills and similarly remitted to the Authority without requiring city administration. Based on an average household generation rate of 1.3 tons per year, the initial estimated household impact of the surcharge was about \$2.60 annually, with later projected increases still described as modest on a household basis. SCS stated that improved contracting power and negotiated tipping and processing fees were expected to help offset added surcharge costs over time.

SCS further explained that the financial analysis was aligned with the Interlocal Agreement and the proposed Facilities Amendment, including maximum service charge protections. The presentation outlined projected maximum rates for recyclables, yard trash, Class 1 waste, and Class 3 waste, and noted that the county's existing global agreement already demonstrated the pricing benefits of regional coordination and larger tonnage. SCS emphasized that the surcharge and assessment would fund Authority operations while negotiated processing and disposal rates could in many cases be more favorable than current municipal contract rates. The phased implementation plan also included issuance of solicitations, long-term contracting, continued public education and outreach, development of recycling drop-off centers, targeted programs for C&D, commercial recycling, and organics, acquisition of land for facilities, expansion of diversion programs, and the building of capital reserves.

Executive Committee discussion focused heavily on the financial assumptions, fairness of tonnage-based funding, the effect on municipal millage and collection rates, and the need to treat the Master Plan as an active strategic document rather than something left unreviewed for decades. Members emphasized the importance of continued reevaluation by the Executive Committee and Governing Board, particularly during the early implementation phases. Questions were raised about projected tonnage figures, the drop in the surcharge estimate from earlier figures to \$2.00 per ton, the relationship between recycling rates and overall city costs, and whether increased diversion might raise some categories of cost while still producing systemwide benefits. SCS acknowledged some imprecision in projections but stated it was confident in the underlying numbers and reiterated that the Governing Board would need to continue reviewing performance, contracts, compliance, and technology over time.

There was substantial discussion about how flexible the Master Plan and Facilities Amendment would be once adopted. SWA Legal Counsel clarified that minor operational changes could be made by the Governing Board, but significant amendments, such as major changes to waste categories, closure of disposal facilities, or changes affecting county obligations, would require very high voting thresholds. Similarly, major changes to the Facilities Amendment, including any future Authority ownership or operation of a disposal facility or waste to energy plant, would require an amendment approved by municipalities representing 80 percent of the population. Members stressed the importance of clearly communicating to municipalities that while implementation details may evolve, the core structural provisions were not easily changed. Members also discussed the effect on cities that do not currently offer curbside recycling, with several noting that those cities may face higher near-term costs but are already paying disposal costs in other ways. Pilot efforts already underway in some cities, including composting and drop-off programs, were cited as examples of progress already beginning ahead of full implementation.

Questions were raised regarding participation by cities not formally seated on the Executive Committee. Chair Ryan emphasized that all cities continue to have a voice through attendance and participation even if they do not hold a voting seat, while SWA Legal Counsel explained that any change to Executive Committee composition would require an ILA amendment.

SWA Legal Counsel outlined the procedural next steps and explained that the Executive Committee could make recommendations to the Governing Board on both the Master Plan and the Facilities Amendment. Mr. Cole clarified that Governing Board approval of the Master Plan would move it forward in the process, but city approval would still be required on the Facilities Amendment, and that if the Master Plan did not work for cities, the Facilities Amendment would not succeed.

Motion: A motion was made by Member Caggiano and seconded by Member Dunn to recommend to the Master Plan to the Governing Board. There was no further discussion. A roll call vote was taken: Yes – Chair Ryan, Vice Chair Fur, Member Shuham, Member Horland, Member Metayer Bowen, Member Dunn, Member Rydell, Member Mead, Member Caggiano, Member AJ Ryan, Alternate Member Breitkreuz. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion: A motion was made by Member Rydell and seconded by Member Murphy Salomone to recommend the Facilities Amendment to the Governing Board. There was no further discussion. A roll call vote was taken: Yes – Chair Ryan, Vice Chair Fur, Member Shuham, Member Horland, Member Metayer Bowen, Member Dunn, Member Rydell, Member Mead, Member Caggiano, Member AJ Ryan, Alternate Member Breitkreuz. The motion passed unanimously.

C&D / Commercial Subcommittee Update - By consensus, moved to the Governing Board meeting.

Education and Outreach Subcommittee Update - By consensus, moved to the Governing Board meeting.

TAC Meeting Update – By consensus, moved to the Governing Board meeting.

New/Old Business – Not discussed during the meeting.

Adjournment - *Motion:* A motion was made by Member Shuham and seconded by Member Horland to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned.