

 Speaker 1 - 00:00


All right, I'm going to call to order the meeting of March 2, 2026. If you would please call the roll.

 Speaker 2 - 00:11


Chair.

 Speaker 3 - 00:11


Ryan.

 Speaker 1 - 00:12


Present.

 Speaker 2 - 00:14


Vice chair.

 Speaker 4 - 00:14


Fur.

 Speaker 1 - 00:15


Here.

 Speaker 2 - 00:16


Member. Shoeham.

 Speaker 1 - 00:17


Here.

 Speaker 2 - 00:18


Member of. Orland.

 Speaker 4 - 00:19


Here. Member bowen. Matteo. Bowen.

 Speaker 2 - 00:23

Bowen.

 Speaker 4 - 00:24

Bowen. I did it again.

 Speaker 2 - 00:26

Member dunn. Here.



Speaker 4 - 00:29

Member rideau.



Speaker 2 - 00:33

Member meade.



Speaker 5 - 00:34

Here.



Speaker 4 - 00:36

Member cagiano.



Speaker 1 - 00:37

Present.




Speaker 2 - 00:38

Member. A.j. Ryan.




Speaker 1 - 00:43


Member newton.

 Speaker 2 - 00:46


Member colborne.

 Speaker 1 - 00:50


She may be appearing. Yeah, remotely.

 Speaker 2 - 00:52


Thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 00:54


Member murphy.

 Speaker 2 - 00:55


Salamone. Member bright cruz.

 Speaker 1 - 00:59


Here.

 Speaker 2 - 01:00


Member.

 Speaker 4 - 01:00


Senator gellert.

 Speaker 2 - 01:03


Member bowman. Thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 01:07

All right, if you would please stand for the pledge. All right, public comment. We have Tammy. Come on up. Anyone else who is here for public comment, please come on up to the front row. Time is yours. Good morning. I hope you talked about them. You're becoming a professional at that.

 Speaker 2 - 01:42

All right, Tammy Lethierry, Coconut Creek. In November of 2025, Chairman Ryan wrote an op ed about successful corporate recycling programs, citing the Florida Panthers and city furniture. Personally, I would like to see the Panthers or a Broward celebrity resident participate in a PSA video showcased at the airport promoting reduce, reuse and recycle, and more importantly, the proper way to recycle. But Ryan didn't say what the county is doing. Since paper and cardboard account for 23.1% of trash in landfills, I ask, are county offices recycling paper and cardboard and are they committed to double sided printing? What about recycling ink cartridges and computer parts? Are they supplying kitchens? Employee kitchens with non plastic eating utensils and canned beverages and vending machines? If you ever get your kitchen here up to speed, why not showcase it as a model for other entities?

 Speaker 2 - 02:43

You say contamination of the waste stream is a problem, so why not hire your own in house sorters to get it right? A mandatory class for Broward employees on proper recycling and the dangers of plastics would help. Video is key. Signers to the ILA should do the same. What's missing from the master plan are the dangers of plastic, which are made from ethane, a byproduct of fracked gas and 16,000 different chemicals, including carcinogenic PFAS. Plastics are forever trash. They never decompose to their original chemical components, just microplastics which end up in the ecosystem, food chain and our bodies. They are lipophilic and migrate to internal organs and arterial plaque, contributing to heart disease and a public health crisis. They should never be used for food storage. And

people need to know that less trash means more cash for them. Thank you.



Speaker 1 - 03:42

Thank you.



Speaker 6 - 03:42

Can I say one thing real quick?



Speaker 1 - 03:44

Sure.



Speaker 6 - 03:44

I want to compliment Elise on bringing in all the did you bring in all the bamboo cooling area today?



Speaker 4 - 03:51

Yes.




Speaker 6 - 03:52

So diet habits die hard, but they do die.




Speaker 1 - 03:56


And I think Tammy's point is, now let's start with the rest of the county. Yeah, exactly.

 Speaker 4 - 04:00


Okay.

 Speaker 1 - 04:01


Anybody else for public comment? All right, I'll close public comment. Do I have a motion on the meeting minutes for February 2026? Motion by Member Horlan, second by member Cagiano. Any discussion on that item? All in favor say Aye. Any opposed? Okay. All right, let's move to the interim executive director contract. I'll turn it over to member horlan.

 Speaker 2 - 04:22


Thank you, Mr. Chair. So, first, I want to thank attorney Cole and attorney Smith Lala. We were able to work on this contract Wednesday, negotiated that afternoon, and Mr.

 Speaker 3 - 04:31

May signed it on Thursday.


 Speaker 2 - 04:32

So I want to thank you for the support in which we got this done. And I don't know about everyone else, but I have a renewed sense of enthusiasm and I'm excited to get this across the line. So thank you very much.


 Speaker 1 - 04:43

Thank you, Member Orland. Sam, maybe you can come on up. First, I want to thank you on behalf of all the members of the Solid Waste Authority, both the executive committee and the governing board, for your obvious passion and your willingness to jump in on this. I know in many respects this was not part of your plan. And for you to look at this opportunity with the passion you have, I think, struck all of us. It's incredibly important. Second, I want to thank you for working so quickly with member Horland and the attorneys on this. You understand the pace


that we're on right now, so I appreciate that there was simply no delay. I mean, it was obvious that it started immediately. Third, is there anything that you have in terms of concerns about the contract or anything you want to raise before we.

 Speaker 1 - 05:33


We move to it?

 Speaker 7 - 05:34


I don't believe so. I think everything is, you know, we had discussion with. With the attorney, and everything's ironed out that I had. I just look forward to it. I've already, actually already started making some phone calls and some of the. The cities that were on the fence, let's just say, and started that process already. So officially, my first day will be next Monday. But. So I look forward to it and look forward to the, I guess, challenge, but I just see it as just a good thing, you know?

 Speaker 1 - 06:07


Well, I appreciate that. I know that working with Mr. Storty, it'll be a smooth transition, particularly over the next 30 days after you start. There's a lot of work to do, a lot of engagement with the consultants to get to. Yes. But I appreciate the energy and passion that you have for it. Any questions from the members?

 Speaker 6 - 06:26


I do. Just a delineation of responsibilities. First of all, I'm really glad you're on board. The fact that you've been here through for the last 10 years kind of working or seeing what's going on made a huge difference to me. You appeared very invested and that went a long way with me. So I appreciate that and look forward.

 Speaker 7 - 06:50


To working with you.

 Speaker 6 - 06:51


With regard to Sam's responsibilities and what Todd's responsibilities are, I don't know. I don't know where we've decided that because I think I'd like to see Sam stay focused on doing what needs to be done with the cities and the executive stuff with the financing. Is that how it's working?

 Speaker 2 - 07:11


Member Harley, if I may. So in our discussions last Wednesday, we are hiring Mr. May to take over the inter director period. So he will have access to Mr. Stordy.

 Speaker 3 - 07:24


Mr. Stordy be working on an hourly.

 Speaker 2 - 07:26


Basis for the next month should he need it. He will approve those timesheets. He will make those phone calls. I trust that anybody else has any questions, they will call Mr. May and they will call Daniel, our consultant. So that's what. He will be the interim director and he will have the latitude to make the decisions that he needs to do.

 Speaker 3 - 07:47


He will.

 Speaker 2 - 07:48


He will be able to ask Mr. Stordy questions. But beyond that, all responsibilities will be with Mr. May.

 Speaker 8 - 07:54


Okay.

 Speaker 6 - 07:55


I. I mean, I actually think I. I would have liked to have seen Todd take care of just that administrative part throughout. We're not doing that. Everybody's. Everybody's okay with that.

 Speaker 1 - 08:06


Yeah. I think what we have to do is conserve the resources as much as possible. Mr. May is going to step in. He is going to be the interim executive director. There's obviously a transition period probably over the next 30 days. And if necessary beyond that, I'm sure Mr. May will come to the members in that Mr. Storey continues to have great knowledge both in terms of the institutional issues within the Solid Waste Authority as well as outside. And I know Mr. May will work closely, but I don't think what we ought to be doing is planning that Mr. Storey stays engaged as a necessary consultant or required, let me say required consultant through, you know, September. I think we need to start moving forward and have some timeline.

 Speaker 1 - 08:47


I think the members should look at this in the beginning of April to see where we are in working with Mr. May and if he feels there's additional support services necessary. I'm sure. He'll come to the members in that regard.

 Speaker 6 - 08:59


Okay. Again, my thinking is I want you laser focus on the commissions. And I mean, that's where I would rather you not have to worry about all that administrative part at all. I mean, I think to dilute that, especially these next two or three months. Especially these next two or three months. You know, I don't want you to have to even look at financial stuff. Just. Well, I mean, that's, I mean, other than. I mean, that's just me. But I'm thinking strategically, that's what I'm trying to.

 Speaker 1 - 09:34


We all are. I understand that, but I think we also have to be mindful that we didn't plan for this additional expense. Right. So we have to stay within our parameters, what we budgeted for this. It's okay that we're going to have, you know, Mr. Sorties necessary. It'll be helpful. What I would suggest is that we revisit this maybe in the April meeting to see if that's necessary. If there's an administrative gap, then I think that makes the most sense at that point. But let's, let's give the process a chance. Let Mr. May evaluate the capacity for the administrative on top of the additional work, and then the members can reevaluate that. And I'm sure Mr. Storey, you know, subject to his demands, you know, will be happy to have that discussion with us as well.

 Speaker 7 - 10:15


Okay.

 Speaker 6 - 10:15


And my last thing, we've all run campaigns. You don't want to, you don't want to be wishing you had. You hadn't because we have enough money to do whatever we need to do here. You don't want to be at the last minute saying, you know, trying to short circuit whatever you're doing in a campaign and leaving money on the field. That's, that's what I don't want to do. Because to me, it's way more important to have you out there with public works guys, commissions, somebody else doing the other stuff.

 Speaker 2 - 10:43


That's just, you know, and I don't disagree with you. I'm sorry, Mr. Chair, if I just may, I think I have full confidence that Mr. May will be able to do that, and he may. It may be, you know, taking a look at the administrative position and seeing what else can be expanded with Alyssa. And so I think to the chair's point, we can reevaluate in May, but I have full confidence that Mr. May is going to be able to accomplish that.

 Speaker 1 - 11:05


So I'll accept that as a motion for the county to pay for it, if that's what you were intending, Sam.

 Speaker 6 - 11:11


So to the point, if we're going to look at this again in April, what we need to hear from you over the next month or two is an honest assessment is if you are able to put 100 into, with, you know, with commissions and the public works and do this other stuff, if this other stuff is going to be taking too much time, tell us. Okay, so that we, so we, you know, that's the last thing we want to do, sir.

 Speaker 7 - 11:36


Yeah, I can't imagine it's an overwhelming amount of administrative things compared to what I'm used to dealing with on a day to day basis, you know.

 Speaker 1 - 11:46


All right, so that was a very diplomatic way of saying the number of electeds you've had to deal with on a day to day basis.

 Speaker 7 - 11:55


Yeah. So, I mean, I think I could probably handle it, you know, so it's just. There's some. One other thing I'd like to see is that, you know, it's not really kind of part of what was brought to me, but from reviewing, I know that you're looking for champions for every city and it looks like there's only probably six or eight cities that have champions on board. Like as I'm reaching out to all the cities, bring that up to them and trying to, you know, have them get champions. At least one champion for each city. And I think you're just looking for one champion for each city, is that correct?

 Speaker 1 - 12:27


Well, we'd love to have 10, but yeah.

 Speaker 5 - 12:28

Okay.

 Speaker 7 - 12:29

Yeah. So maybe, you know, maybe each commissioner could have a champion, you know, or each district or something like that. So I'd like to, you know, kind of bring that into whatever when I'm going and making presentations to the cities, you know, to talk about that.

 Speaker 1 - 12:42

Great idea. Remember Shoeham?



Speaker 2 - 12:45

Thank you, Chair. Well, Sam, I just want to say thank you so much for making yourself available. Regards to you from Joseph Crow from the city of Hollywood. And we can't wait to sit down with you and get started. I just want to respond to the vice chair. I had that concern. But what was different with Sam was when we were looking for someone to come in and be the persuader to the cities, they did not necessarily come with technical knowledge about public works, recycling and garbage and solid waste. Sam, he has all of that right. So he is a full package. Whereas before we were getting kind of half a package with someone that was going to come in and talk to all the commissions and we would have needed. I think Todd more for that technical aspect.



Speaker 2 - 13:35

But from Sam's background, it sounded to me like he had everything all in one. And it, you know, gives me a sense of assurance to hear you say, which I think also that this is not going to be an overwhelming amount of time to handle the administrative side, because we really want you to focus on getting out there, meeting with every city, and also identifying those champions where we haven't been able to identify them yet. So that's the priority. But it just sounds like based on your work experience to date, that the rest of it will. And you have a, you know, a staff member to help you as well. And just once again, thank you so much. I agree with your comment. It's a renewed sense of excitement and possibility, and so excited for you to be here. So thank you.



Speaker 7 - 14:24

All right, I did have one more question, and I talked to attorney Cole regarding a laptop I don't have. Currently, he don't have a laptop. He said I could just make a purchase of a laptop if I want to. Also to have to brand myself. I'm wearing a North Lauderdale shirt right now. So I like to, you know, to purchase shirts. And he said that this would just be, like, minor purchases or whatever like that. So just to have. So I can represent.



Speaker 2 - 14:48

So I would first like to make a motion to approve your contract.



Speaker 8 - 14:52

Second.



Speaker 7 - 14:53

Okay.



Speaker 1 - 14:53

Motion by member Shuham. Seconded by member Cagiano. Any discussion on that? All in favor say aye. Any opposed? We've got everybody unanimous. Thank you.



Speaker 7 - 15:01

Thank you.



Speaker 5 - 15:02

Thank you.



Speaker 2 - 15:02

And then I would like to make a motion to allocate some cash amount or authority amount for Sam to go ahead and purchase for himself a laptop, you know, SWA attire and other things that he needs. I would say \$5,000 would be a fair amount, but does he already have.



Speaker 1 - 15:25

Some authority, the executive director? He will have all the powers of the executive director under the ila. And yes, he does have that power. So you don't need that power up to 20, \$25,000 to do basically whatever he needs. So, yes, he can buy, control your.



Speaker 7 - 15:39

Computer and his shirt and get a few shirts.



Speaker 1 - 15:45

All right. Thank you, Mr. May we look forward to your first day. Thank you so much. Give him a round of applause for. Sorry, just before I go anywhere. Sorry, I. I was just going to.



Speaker 8 - 15:55

Add from experience that as a city.



Speaker 1 - 15:57

Manager in his department head, Sam does know how to delegate, and he does know how to persuade. And knowing Sam, he does it as a really nice guy. So, Sam, I'm thrilled to be working with you.



Speaker 7 - 16:10

Again, I'm thrilled to be here.




Speaker 4 - 16:11

Also.




Speaker 1 - 16:12


This is really important. We want to move this forward. And I know you have the ability to do that, and I'm thrilled to.

 Speaker 6 - 16:18


Be working with you.

 Speaker 7 - 16:18


I'm really honored to be part of it. I'm happy to see it happen no matter what, whether I'm part of it or not. But I'm just honored to be part of it. So thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 16:26


All right. Perfect. Member Dunn.

 Speaker 3 - 16:28


Okay, thank you. Good morning, sir. I didn't get a chance.

 Speaker 1 - 16:32


Oh, Mr. May. Sorry. One more comment.

 Speaker 3 - 16:34


Sorry I didn't get a chance to meet you, Member Dunn from the city of Lauderhill. We have our workshop scheduled for March, which is gonna be maybe in about another week or two. So perhaps before we leave today, if I could connect with you and the consultant in order to have a conversation about that. Thank you.

 Speaker 7 - 16:54


Yes. And we're actually having our Public Works Association, South Florida Branch Public Works association meeting in Lauder Hill on the 26th of March. So it'll be a lunch meeting. You may want to pop your head in there and say hi to folks.

 Speaker 3 - 17:10


Yeah, that'd be great. And the workshop my city clerk just texted me is now rescheduled for March 16th. Okay, thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 17:17


Thank you. Member for. Hang one second, Sam.

 Speaker 6 - 17:20


Thank you. We had previously offered space todd on the third floor here. We'd like to be able to do the same thing here for you. So you have an office space here? Yes, third floor.

 Speaker 7 - 17:30


Okay.

 Speaker 6 - 17:31


All whatever you need there.

 Speaker 7 - 17:32


Okay, thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 17:34


Thank you. Okay. All right, next item. C and D recycle program guidance, draft ordinance. Daniel.

 Speaker 8 - 17:47


Good morning. Daniel Deitch, SES Engineers Chair, Vice Chair, General Counsel, soon to be Executive Director. My colleague, Travis Barnes is on the phone or on the call. As you've been briefed previously. We're working through the process of updating a draft C and D management ordinance. We had thought about having a processing facility. It's a certifier come and present today. But given the items that were on the agenda, we decided to hold off the actual presentation. The presentation was included in your agenda package. And really where we're at now in terms of soliciting feedback is sort of balancing the penalties and withholding the final CO in terms of a mechanism for compliance. Travis, if you can hear me and are available.

 Speaker 5 - 18:45


Yes, I'm here.

 Speaker 6 - 18:47

Yes.

 Speaker 5 - 18:49

Hey, good morning, Executive Committee. So, just as a quick update, we had distributed the draft ordinance for review back, I believe, late January 26th, and we're expecting comments to be provided back to us, hopefully by the 13th, so that we can review them ahead of the upcoming TAC meeting. Within that ordinance, there are yellow highlights, and those denote key policy decisions that everyone needs to be kind of focused on. So as you review the draft, I'd encourage everyone to kind of pay attention to those yellow highlights. And those are decision points that we're going to be looking for specific feedback on.

 Speaker 5 - 19:21

In particular, two that have come up frequently in public comments that we received as well as at the subcommittee meetings are whether we should have that third party certification be something that is done by the cities or the county, meaning municipal staff conduct those facility inspections and have some type of certification process versus outsourcing that to a third party certifier. The Recycling Certification Institute is the predominant certification body within the US that's doing that. And they're the ones that's recognized by the LEED version 5 as well that's coming out. And so we have included that presentation for you to look at and we can have them come back to speak at a later date. However, the current ordinance is recommending that we take that approach and have it be an outsourced third party verification to have a level playing field.



Speaker 5 - 20:13

So that's one decision point that we're looking to kind of feedback on today. The other is we've heard that there should be no exemptions for the size of the project. So if you're generating construction waste or demolition waste, we have currently within the ordinance different sizing thresholds that trigger a non compliance fee if you don't meet the recycling requirements. And some of the feedback that we've received from stakeholders is that there should be no exemptions and that there should be no compliance fee. You either meet the ordinance or you don't meet the ordinance and you don't get your certificate of occupancy. And so that's something where we're looking for feedback from obviously you all here as well as the subcommittee and the tac. Those are two policy decision points that we're kind of looking for more immediate feedback on today.



Speaker 1 - 21:01

All right, Travis, let me begin with the third party issue. Just to clarify. I know we moved through it quick. The idea of a municipality doing the certification you're talking about is the municipality in which the recycler or processor is located, correct?



Speaker 5 - 21:18

Correct. Yes.




Speaker 1 - 21:19

So, okay, so that's good enough. I just need to clarify because I think that puts an extra burden on a municipality that fortuitously or for whatever reason has that processor there without the benefit of carrying that burden amongst the other ILA members. So that's one in the models you've seen for these. Is it generally handled by a county, a large body, and then referred out to a third party for certification?




Speaker 5 - 21:50


Some municipalities do it in house, others rely on a third party. It really is across the board, depending on each jurisdiction you look at. So it's pretty evenly split from what we see. I will say the more progressive communities, those that have been doing it longer and those in California that are becoming more stringent are relying on the third party certification. And again, the LEED version 5.0 is now going to require C and D facilities to be certified if they're going to be processing commingled C and D in order to achieve credits under that green building certification.

 Speaker 1 - 22:23


All right, and then the last question, just procedurally, if the idea, at least as a policy recommendation, is to use a third party, is that third party being contracted by the SWA or by the county? Who's handling the ordinance itself? What's your right?

 Speaker 5 - 22:39

So actually, so the authority or the county, whoever's enacting the ordinance would actually assign and designate the certification body, but there's no financial commitment between the certification body and that local government. What would be triggered is the C and D facilities would have to register with that third of the third party and they would have to go through the certification process. And it's about \$7,500 annually for them to be certified. There's a monthly compliance fee. They have to submit all of their data, and they're assigned someone that evaluates their data on a monthly basis, ongoing throughout the perpetuity of the program. And within that, they actually look at the recovery rates and the end markets that are used by that facility to determine their recovery rate. And that's all published online for everyone to see. Transparency.

 Speaker 1 - 23:29

Right. And just to be clear, while there may not be any direct financial budgeting aspect, since it seems that all the costs are passed through, there still will be a responsibility for staff to evaluate so that there will be some burden upon whoever does. Seems to me that it makes the most sense if it's going to be a countywide ordinance and the county has ultimate responsibility for the disposal, which they're, you know, is a key component of the statutory obligation. And it's necessary to ensure that there is maximum diversion to preserve the landfill, that it would make the most sense to weave this in with the county ordinance and then county oversight on the third party. I'll turn to member Fur first on that.

 Speaker 6 - 24:16

Well, I think you're right on that. I think the enforcement is going to.

Speaker 1 - 24:19



Fall on cities because it's going to.



Speaker 6 - 24:22

Be in the cities.



Speaker 1 - 24:23

Let's just break down the enforcement for. And there's two levels of this, right. There's a processor, right, who is either meeting the standards or not or doing the right thing. And then there's the more traditional municipal enforcement, which is the what's work, what's happening at the projects where C and D is being generated. Right. Okay. That's always going to be at the municipal level. That I think is fair. The oversight though, it would be unfair to an individual member and that could move over years. You know, where that's going to be processed or who's processing seems to make sense to both for the certification and which is a corollary that the enforcement of meeting those standards for the processor should be at the county level.



Speaker 1 - 25:07

And then the individual municipalities will have enforcement for projects that generate C and D. The does that make sense?



Speaker 6 - 25:14

I would have to refer to Matt on this one because I don't really. Is Matt or you're in need to step out there you are good. He'd have a better idea on this than I do.



Speaker 1 - 25:25

Matt Haberd County Attorney's Office My understanding is that would be a policy decision, which means legally we would have some flexibility.



Speaker 7 - 25:33

Okay.



Speaker 1 - 25:34

All right. So that's a point for us to ultimately decide and for discussion. We don't have to do it necessarily here today, but we could certainly begin that process if the members want. The second point was no exemptions for the size. And I just want to be clear. We're not talking about the processor. We're talking about exemptions for those that produce C and D in the municipal level. Can you give us, Travis, very quickly what the points were on either side of that policy discussion? Exemptions versus non exemptions.



Speaker 5 - 26:03

Right. So there's always going to be some exemptions in there for, you know, under states of emergency and things like that, special circumstances. What we've got in the current draft is that projects under a certain size would not have to meet the ordinance requirements. And there's a table in the back of the ordinance that basically lays those out. Each of those are a policy decision as well as to whether you want to have any exemptions or at what level they should be appropriately set. And we've got what we've recommended in there. But as an example, new construction under \$150,000 would not be held to the ordinance as currently written in there. That would be one exemption.



Speaker 1 - 26:42

Tell us if you go through that, each of these, what the thinking is on establishing that threshold and whether it reflects the common practice for other counties or municipalities that have structured such C and D, mandatory C and D recycling.




Speaker 5 - 26:59

Right. Yeah, our thought on that one is to make sure that we're not unduly impacting workforce housing, affordable housing. Right. So if there's going to be smaller new construction projects, we don't want to do anything that's going to increase the burden on them if there's any financial implication of that, to make sure there's affordable housing. So that's why that one was set at that \$150,000. And we've looked at other communities and we've got some benchmark research that we can provide, kind of looking through how each community deals with this. But ultimately, it does need to be a policy decision that's specific to, you know, Broward county, what's appropriate for your area and your local economy. But you can look through those tables that we've got and we feel that they're appropriate. Again, some of the stakeholders had said there should be no exemptions.




Speaker 5 - 27:39


Every project should be held to the same standard, regardless of how small they are. That's kind of what we're looking for, you know, feedback on. Again, not directly today. I do see member Mead has his hand raised.

 Speaker 1 - 27:48


Okay, I'll come to that in a second. With respect to section 3, the valuation thresholds table, I see diversion rate required. You have. No, no. And then a second. Is that to suggest that these are alternatives?

 Speaker 5 - 28:03


Those are. Any project that has a no would not be held to the ordinance as written. Those would be exemptions. So projects larger than those would be the ones that are. Yes. Would be held to the ordinance requirements as written right now.

 Speaker 1 - 28:16


All right, then finally, with respect to the stakeholders, you said you used the term stakeholders who were opposed to any exemptions. Can you highlight just the character or nature of those stakeholders? I don't need the individual. But what are we talking about when you say stakeholders right now?

 Speaker 5 - 28:30

We've only received written comments from, I believe, eight entities. Six of those, I think, are some of the local governments or staff from those local governments, I should say. Mr. Davita was one of the stakeholders that we had at individual meeting with. He's got. Mr. Louis DeVita, I should say. He's got a lot of experience, obviously, in the waste field. He's been an active stakeholder throughout much of the master plan development process. He was one of the ones that was potentially recommending that we look at these Two policy decisions with respect to the thresholds.

 Speaker 1 - 28:59

I just want to stay focused with respect to the thresholds. The stakeholders we have are the municipal folks who've given you comments, an industry representative, anybody else, just as a general. All right, and where did industry fall on this? Where did Mr. DeVita.

 Speaker 5 - 29:16

Mr. DeVita had said that he preferred no exemptions, that, you know, every project be held to meet the standard of the ordinance and that if they don't meet that, then their certificate of occupancy withheld. There'd be non compliance fee. That would give them sort of a, you know, pay the fee to get out of jail free card. We feel that the fee is appropriate because some projects, for whatever reason, might not be able to meet the ordinance. We don't want it to become just the cost of doing business, that the contractors pass that on to their customers because, you know, we want to see recycling take place, but we feel that it's appropriate to have that non compliance fee versus something that withholds their certificate of occupancy and doesn't allow them to get their business up and running.



Speaker 1 - 29:55

Okay, Member Meade.



Speaker 5 - 30:00

Thank you, Chair.



Speaker 1 - 30:01

Thank you, Chair.



Speaker 5 - 30:01

And I want to thank Travis for helping me out a lot with. We've been going through with the ordinance and we've gone back and forth in a couple items.




Speaker 1 - 30:12

Hang on, Memphis. I just need everybody to make sure you're on mute. We're getting some feedback. Go ahead. Thank you.




Speaker 5 - 30:18


Yeah, I was going to say that I'm having a horrible echo here. So it's very difficult for me to understand some of the conversations. Are we. Are we better? Oh, that sounds good.

 Speaker 7 - 30:35


Okay.

 Speaker 5 - 30:38


I heard you mention that the annual cost for the RCI is about 7,500. Did you mention what the onboarding cost is? It's about 17,000. I think in the first year, it's about 7, 500, if I'm not mistaken. Gas reaction for. To get. To get into compliance with rci. I don't think that's correct. I did the addition. So anyway, that's for six months.

 Speaker 4 - 31:14


And.

 Speaker 5 - 31:17


Hold on here. Do you have any idea of the compliance costs? So a C and D material recovery facility has to go through the registration process initially and then an ongoing 629 per month. \$629 per month. And they have to have a physical inspection at least once every other year. So again, looking at the initial registration cost, it's about 7,500. And then ongoing cost is 629 per month. That's. That's their cost. To comply. Okay, the echoes back. So, again, having a hard time with understanding your standards. I'm going to yield. And we'll talk a bit later on this because I. I can't understand what's going on. Maybe Elise can try to give me some help.

 Speaker 1 - 32:16


We turn the mics off in here. Try again.

 Speaker 5 - 32:20


Okay.

 Speaker 1 - 32:23


Okay, I think we can hear the end.

 Speaker 5 - 32:28


Okay, the.

 Speaker 1 - 32:30


Travis, maybe you can put yours on mute until you have to answer a question.

 Speaker 5 - 32:36

I've been muted when I'm not speaking. Sorry, Chair. I injured my picture.

 Speaker 1 - 32:43

All right, well, we're having trouble with the communication today. We'll try to have that patched up by the next meeting. I want to thank Member Mead and the C and D Committee. Let's make sure we put this back on the agenda for the next meeting. In the meantime, we need to get comments to the C and D Committee, from tacc, from the municipalities, and from industry. Any further discussion on this item?

 Speaker 2 - 33:08

One question for Travis.



Speaker 3 - 33:11

Denise Horland here.



Speaker 2 - 33:13

My question, as we're talking about the certification, the MRFs are already permitted by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection and are regularly inspected for compliance. So what is our thinking with why we would need to go with a company such as rci? What is that going to add to the process?



Speaker 5 - 33:34

So, basically, they're the predominant certification body in the US that certified C and D facilities. So the current facilities that are operating in the county do have to comply with this state permitting and all their annual requirements to report for that. But there is a more rigorous process that the RCI team utilizes to go into these sites, do the inspections. They do a mass balance on the amount of material coming in versus what's stockpiled and what's actually sent to end markets. They check on end markets that are being used and being claimed by the facilities. And then there's a process that they use to, you know, publish all of that transparently.



Speaker 5 - 34:13

They also look at your recovery rate with the use of alternative daily cover counting and without that, which is another key point that we want to have in the ordinance to make sure we're maximizing recycling, but not all of it going to alternative daily cover. And so the other thing I would say is that the industry is kind of moving in this direction with the LEED version 5 requirements as part of that new certification. Any facility that would want to seek LEED certification within Broward county that's going to commingle C and D material would need to take that material to one of these certified facilities in order to get their lead points for those particular material categories. So that's something where we're seeing the industry kind of move in that direction is why we're recommending it for.



Speaker 5 - 34:57

For you all to be a good fit.



Speaker 2 - 34:59

Thank you. Travis, go ahead.



Speaker 5 - 35:02

I was gonna say, I did look up the cost right here. I've got it from the RCI folks. It is right at 7,500 to register initially for the first year, and then 629 per month. So that is an additional cost to the facilities. But we got to keep in mind, with the ordinance, there will be getting a lot more tons, theoretically as well, because all projects should have to carry their material to a certified facility. And so even though there's a cost of that certification, you know, there should be a lot more material flowing to those facilities that will hopefully offset that.



Speaker 2 - 35:29

Thank you, Mr. Chair, final comment. One of the things that we've been concerned about in the subcommittee, and obviously this is going back to tac, and it's going to be incredibly important that staff weighs in on this again, is we want this to be cost neutral and we're concerned about the additional impact on staff time and cost of the city. So I'll be awaiting those comments, as I'm sure everyone else will.



Speaker 3 - 35:48

Thank you.




Speaker 1 - 35:49

Right. I think that's a fair point. And to the cities that are concerned.




Speaker 2 - 35:55


About that,

 Speaker 1 - 35:57


There's no staff time if we just put everything in a landfill and we don't actually do anything. So there's going to have to be staff time if we're going to achieve the necessary societal and paramount goals. And there's also going to be a need to be able to preserve our landfill. So it's a fair point. The question has to come down to how much staff time is necessary and how does that get folded in. But the option can't be nothing.

 Speaker 3 - 36:24


It can't.

 Speaker 1 - 36:25


And it can't be. No. If we have to spend any money, we're not doing it. That's. That's where the county, and this is why the county exists at times has to say, we're going to mandate this because it's important. We have to preserve our landfill disposal capacity, and we're all going to have to, you know, suck it up and make it the most efficient possible member Gel.

 Speaker 9 - 36:44


Just on a different, very quick topic.

 Speaker 1 - 36:47

Mr. May, are you on this topic?

 Speaker 9 - 36:50

No.

 Speaker 1 - 36:51

Okay.



Speaker 9 - 36:51

I thought you were done with this topic. As soon as you're done with this topic.



Speaker 1 - 36:54

Well, I know we have to get to the financial modeling, so I'm just.



Speaker 9 - 36:57

This will take 10 seconds.



Speaker 1 - 36:58

I just want to offer.



Speaker 9 - 36:59

Mr. May I have an office in here?



Speaker 1 - 37:02

This is in my district.



Speaker 9 - 37:04

If you need help moving in terms of dealing with staff, or if you need occasional when you get overwhelmed feel

I'm volunteering my staff in this building to assist you.



Speaker 1 - 37:17

We'll interpret that as a county wants.



Speaker 5 - 37:18

To pay for everything.



Speaker 1 - 37:19

Thank you. Thank you, Member Geller. All right. Anything further on the C and D? All right. Financial modeling update and memorandum.



Speaker 3 - 37:27

Daniel.



Speaker 1 - 37:27

Thank you, Travis.




Speaker 5 - 37:29

Yes, sir.




Speaker 8 - 37:30


Thank you, Travis. So were before you just a few weeks ago, the last executive committee and governing board meeting, presenting a framework of a phased approach to moving forward financially for the authority. We have now drafted a complete memo that sort of details what the modeling process was and how it would unfold over the next several years until we get to steady state. My colleague Vita Quinn is here who can walk through with broad brush strokes what is in that memo and like feedback from you in terms of what additional information, if any, is as needed.

 Speaker 1 - 38:10


Right. And for clarity, the memo you're talking about is the February 25, 2026 memo. Yeah. Okay.

 Speaker 6 - 38:17


And.

 Speaker 1 - 38:17


And to be clear, we included as part of the backup the February 9th PowerPoint slide, some of which is not entirely applicable at this point. So just for moving forward in terms of backup, it seems like that's been set aside. We're now focused on the memorandum.

 Speaker 8 - 38:32

Yeah. So set that aside. Even though there was not a quite quorum at the last meeting, we received general direction to move forward with the phased approach. And it's really there just as a marker.

 Speaker 1 - 38:41

Okay, thank you.

 Speaker 4 - 38:44

Floor is yours, Bowman. So I'm just going to basically summarize what you've been reading, give you sort of the things to look at while you're reviewing the memo. While the numbers are slightly different, the general idea of the PowerPoint remains the same. It's just that as we refine the timelines and the numbers, it is actually helping. It's

sort of as we spread these things out over several phases, it's actually a little bit more cost effective and it's also more realistic regarding implementation. We love the idea that we could have drop off centers tomorrow. The reality is we haven't designed them yet. So there's a little bit of a time frame there.



Speaker 4 - 39:29

So phase one is really that time where there's still member contributions from the Ila communities, where we begin to issue RFPs to design and build those drop off centers, where we begin negotiations with disposal facilities so that we can implement a surcharge, where we begin to have some Control over the tonnage that goes to those disposal facilities. As you know, the different communities contracts are up, the ones that maybe don't have as much control over where the waste goes. Now as we enter into phase two, we really begin to look at the land acquisition, beginning to build those drop off facilities. And that really provides the basis for that sort of phase three where you can begin to implement an assessment. An assessment being something that is based on a special benefit.



Speaker 4 - 40:25

Once you have facilities and programs that are running, there's an obvious special benefit to the residents of Broward County. And at that point, that assessment really begins to have a basis at that point. And that's not in here, but you can begin to discuss whether there are facilities that you really want to build in the future. Infrastructure. We've talked about transfer stations, other things. Those are not in the current plan right now because as it is, there seems to be enough capacity within the county to handle the tonnage. But in the future, should you want to, again, you'll have an assessment that could be the basis of paying for some of those facilities.



Speaker 4 - 41:06

But the financial plan does build in the a capital reserve, which is annual contributions into a special reserve to say we know that we're going to do things in the future. We just don't exactly know what they're going to be. But let's make sure that we're not putting too much of a future burden on our residents with a large increase in the rates. Let's go ahead and build those reserves over time so that when we're ready to add that additional infrastructure, we have the money to be able to do so.



Speaker 1 - 41:39

All right, It's a good summary. Could you give us a summary of the February 25th memorandum, essentially how it's structured, where the members should look to and if you have a new PowerPoint you're going to put together, we should have it. This was a special meeting, so I understand that. But for the next meeting we definitely need basically the February 25th memo in, you know, visually in a PowerPoint for the members. And will you be prepared to do that?



Speaker 2 - 42:07

Sure.



Speaker 4 - 42:07

That that was my summary of the memo. The only difference.



Speaker 1 - 42:11

Well, let's go through because I think it's. That's a great overview. But there's sections in here that we want to direct the members to, right?



Speaker 4 - 42:17

Yes.



Speaker 1 - 42:18

About phase one, phase two contributions, how this is structured to give us a sense of what's going on. And then again for the next meeting, the March 20, we absolutely need for all the members. Right. Because we Have a government board meeting that this is a big meeting. We need to be able to have this drill down with, you know, specifics. And in the meantime, the commentary both from whether it's tacit municipal staff and the members. You need to have that back as soon as possible based on this February 25th memo. Is that a fair outline?




Speaker 4 - 42:54

I can put it in the PowerPoint, yes.




Speaker 1 - 42:55


Okay. All right. So in terms of. There's a lot of background. It begins the memo to provide a lot of information, population growth and what the various funding mechanisms are that are available. And then it begins with the phasing approach in chapter six or section six is where we begin to talk about phase one. If I understand correctly, this is where there's the RFPs for disposal, essentially. Right. We've all committed to the flow. We now know what the volume is. We can go out to the market which said it couldn't respond previously. That's 1, 2. Beginning the process of understanding where we would need additional drop off or transfer stations in that flow first phase to begin that planning. Is that fair?

 Speaker 4 - 43:40


The drop off sites were beginning to get to do the land acquisition.

 Speaker 1 - 43:45


Do you have a PowerPoint for this right now or. No, the February 9th. No, it's the February 9th, which we're not looking at. So I apologize one more time. So let's explain phase one. I just want to make sure and have a discussion on phase one.

 Speaker 4 - 43:59


Sure. Phase one is like you said, the RF to sort of design and build those drop off sites and beginning to look at land acquisition. And then as we go into phase two, land acquisition and beginning for a.

 Speaker 1 - 44:14

Second, just so we can understand Phase one. But what the member assessments are being used for is the development of the rp which we began. So it wasn't a complete loss. That's one. And then that's going to have to go out in that phase one process to be able to get the best pricing possible based on our flow control across commodity streams. Correct.

 Speaker 4 - 44:32

Correct. And negotiation with disposal facilities which will become the basis for that surcharge for phase two.

 Speaker 1 - 44:39

Correct. The primary focus in that phase one is going to be on recycling. We're not focused. While there might be opportunities to continue on yard waste and other things, we're not yet there because of the collection issues and some other issues. C and D is running parallel. That's fine. But the real focus is going to be on getting the RFP out to get the best rate possible based on the tonnage for recycling. Is that accurate? Daniel,



Speaker 8 - 45:08

If I may, Phase one is Essentially status quo. So it's relying on population as the basis for a contribution. So we anticipate certainly no more than the current assessment. And we realize that this.



Speaker 1 - 45:22

I'm not asking about the assessment, I'm asking about what work's done in phase one.



Speaker 8 - 45:26

So it stands up. The education and outreach program that we've been talking about over the past many months, it continues to fund the administration, the operation of the authority and it allows us to prepare and issue the solicitations for yard trash management, recyclable material processing and long term disposal.



Speaker 1 - 45:48

Yeah, in the order of importance. Obviously that last category is the most important for us. I mean education is important. But what we want to be able to tell the municipalities is that in this phase one, we're taking all the tonnage, we're starting right away, the RFPs are going out across the commodity streams so that we can tell you what the best pricing is as well as, which has to be necessarily considered whether or not there's additional drop off centers or transfer stations necessary to deliver on what we project out of the rfp.



Speaker 8 - 46:17

Yeah, transfer stations. Let's set that aside. As Vida indicated and we've shared, there is ample transfer station capacity within the county. So in terms of building capital reserves for the future, it starts to put money into the bank should there be a need for those sorts of capital investments in the future.

Speaker 1 - 46:36



Not drop off centers.



Speaker 8 - 46:37

Drop off centers are in the near term. Drop off centers are an initiative in the near term.



Speaker 1 - 46:44

But phase one, no consideration. Just break me down because we have to explain this in a simple way. Are we looking at where drop off centers are necessary and beginning that process? I'm not saying we're buying them yet.



Speaker 4 - 46:56

No, that's the RFP part.



Speaker 1 - 46:59

Right.



Speaker 4 - 46:59

So we are looking at the design build. We're asking people to give us the quotes for that. As we enter into phase two, we begin the land acquisition and early construction and we're phasing that in over a five year period.



Speaker 1 - 47:13

Okay. And the phase two is where. Because. Because of the general benefit to all of the residents is where we begin to be talking about surcharges.



Speaker 4 - 47:27

So phase two is where we assume that we've done some of those negotiations with the disposal facility so we have the basis to be able to collect a surcharge. We're going to begin to build, acquire the land and build those drop off sites. Having now the education and outreach programs and actual facilities up and running is what phases into phase three.



Speaker 5 - 47:52

All right.



Speaker 1 - 47:53

The other component of this, I think all cities have moved to this, which is we'll direct the haulers where to send. So there's no necessary alignment necessary. That's double necessary. There's no necessary alignment with the contracts in phase one for the RFPs, or if the RFPs are actually entered into that is the contract through the RFP process. There's no need to change or align the individual municipal contracts, correct? Daniel, second sentence.



Speaker 9 - 48:27

Yes.



Speaker 1 - 48:27


All right. Daniel saying yes. Okay, I say this because these are the type of questions we need to really get a little bit granular on to be able to explain this. And this is a great memo. We need to digest it, obviously, one, but we need to be able to say this in very discreet bullet points as to what these exist because it is even as we're having this discussion, Daniel saying yes, you're looking at the finance. We need to get that broken down into really digestible points as to what each phase is and why it's not representative of the next phase. For instance, we can only do so much in phase one, right? We got to have tonnage, we've got to have the commitment, the flow control. Then we have to go out to the street.




Speaker 1 - 49:10

Then we got to get the answers to what it's going to cost. Some may get initiated quicker than others in terms of the commodity streams, whether we're working already parallel on C and D or Dart or whatever. But we need to be able to explain this so that we're coming out of the box actually doing something. Status quo is a worrying term to


me.

 Speaker 4 - 49:31


It's not status quo financially. It's.

 Speaker 1 - 49:34


I understand, but that is the only part, right? It's no additional financial obligation in this first phase. I agree with that, but I. The concept of status quo is not a financial term, right? It's an action term that we're not doing anything. And I really. There's a lot of work that's going to be done the moment the last city signs on and the county begins right away, getting the RFPs out, getting everything going, looking at all the issues. So I need this. I need, from my perspective, I need this to look like an action plan as opposed to just not another study about what we might do in the future. Does that make sense? And I'm not trying to be disrespectful or anything.

 Speaker 4 - 50:12


If you review the memo, it is. It is an action plan. But I'll give it to you. I don't like to read either.

 Speaker 1 - 50:18


No, no, I read it. I read it. It's Not I don't like to read, but we don't, we can't tell the public with our action plan.

 Speaker 4 - 50:22


That's what I mean. You don't want to have to give them 25 pages to review. So what we can do next time is to distill that into a PowerPoint. For your perspective, I think there are a couple tables in there that are key. There's some that are anticipated impact to individual communities and there are some that are anticipated cost per ton. Those are the most summarized version. Also as you mentioned in that section six where we sort of phase one, phase two, phase three, that is the most important part, that is the key information. But again it's a lot to read through. So I will aim to make sure that you have a PowerPoint that will give you something that's a takeaway and maybe something that you can even print more like a one pager. Right.

 Speaker 4 - 51:11


Here's phase one, here's phase two, here's phase three. What we're going to do, the anticipated impacts to the community is a little bit more easy to translate in public meeting or when talking to residents.

 Speaker 1 - 51:26


However you do it's just not digestible in 26 pages.

 Speaker 4 - 51:30


Agreed.

 Speaker 1 - 51:30


Right. So, and I want there to be very clear from my perspective, we want to set out clear expectations of what we're intending to do. Sign on, get the last one on and this is what we do the very next day. That. And that's what we've been fighting for. So I, I'm going to turn over to some member comments now. Member Dunn and then member breakers.

 Speaker 3 - 51:55

Yes, thank you. I too am trying to just have it in my bringing really clear, distinct terms. So here's what I think I'm understanding. I'm understanding that in phase one and I'm looking on page 12 here. In phase one, the cost is going to be the same. Whatever we're paying now is going to be the same next year. During that time you're going to get the RFP going for the drop off sites. During that time you're going to start the research to see how much purchasing the land will cost. During that time the RFP is really focusing on recycling, right.


 Speaker 1 - 52:40

Daniel?


 Speaker 8 - 52:46

That's correct. So and I appreciate you calling attention to Figure 2, which is a graphical representation which is


closer to what you're looking for. And we agree so. Correct. Right now we don't have flow control. We won't until the authority past August. That is the critical linchpin to securing, to gaining the benefits of economies of scale and allows us to really advance the pillars of the solid waste plan.

 Speaker 3 - 53:18


Okay, so just let me continue and please, if my understanding is erroneous in any way, correct me. So I have it in my head because we're going to be talking about this in about another week or two. The fourth thing that's going to happen in phase one is the implementation of the outreach education plan.

 Speaker 4 - 53:33


Okay.

 Speaker 3 - 53:34


Then going to phase two. At that point, we know how much the it's going to cost. So at that point, you're going to put the surcharge, you're going to set the surcharge and start collecting it, and then you're going to purchase the land. Okay?

 Speaker 1 - 53:49

Correct.

 Speaker 3 - 53:50

Okay, so here's the part that I want to be clear about. So Looking at page 14, figure 6.1.1, the estimated member contribution for table 2. So looking at Lauderhill right now, based on our population, this is our estimated contribution, right? Which is pretty much what we're doing now. So 26 and 27 projected, that's what we might be paying. Okay. And then now Looking at page 18, table 6.2.4, table 3, the estimated surcharge based on tonnage, that kind of jumps up to \$432,000 in 2028 and then \$459,000 in 28. Could you help me to understand that, please?

 Speaker 8 - 54:45

Yes. So in phase one, it is relying on the same methodology that has been used over the past several years. The total revenue requirement is divided by population, by municipal, by ILA member. So that is the basis of what the payment from each ILA member will be. Until we secure flow control, we get binding prices, then we can implement the surcharge. So think of it as in the near term, it is a mechanism that needs to be paid by each ILA member directly. In phase two, it is a surcharge on the tipping fee for the management, the beneficial use of material and disposal. So it is not borne by the municipality directly. It is a surcharge on top of that cost, which is already being paid in your solid waste collection agreement, that is then paid by your residents and businesses.



Speaker 2 - 55:50

To be clear about the change in cost.



Speaker 3 - 55:52

Yes, please.



Speaker 4 - 55:53

That is a combination of both cost escalation, which will change from one year to the next and change in tonnage.



Speaker 2 - 56:00

Okay?



Speaker 4 - 56:01

So that's what accounts for that. In addition, the additional revenue that's needed.



Speaker 3 - 56:07

Okay. I think it'd be important for. Because if were to send this. If I were to forward this memo as a backup for the conversation Which I'm now realizing is not wise. I'm not going to give any backup until after the workshop.



Speaker 4 - 56:22

Right.



Speaker 3 - 56:23

But somebody who is not going through this, looking at it, they're going to say, oh, went from \$90,000 to \$452,000 and that's an automatic no vote. I'm just being real. So I think what would be helpful to me as you pull together this PowerPoint is help me understand and help my colleagues understand the breakdown of that 432 where it's going to go. Is that something we're passing on to the residents, which is also equal to as concerning.



Speaker 4 - 56:55

Well, it's a surcharge. So it is indirectly passed on always. Anything that funds this authority is going to be paid for ultimately by the residents of the county. What's happening is you're going from an authority that exists right now only administratively to an authority that has programs and facilities. So what you're seeing in that change is that you're beginning to acquire land, you're beginning to operate facilities, you are having contracts with these disposal facilities. The authority is now operating.




Speaker 3 - 57:36

And I get all of that. But what I'm saying is for an under resourced city like mine, right. This is a challenge, understand? And so I think perhaps if, like, if I were to get something that kind of breaks it down, then maybe in our next education and communications committee we can figure out a way to address that pain point in the communication.




Speaker 4 - 58:01


I think it's very possible to give you a visual on that to really show you where your dollar is going.

 Speaker 2 - 58:11


Right.

 Speaker 4 - 58:11


For every dollar that's to going being spent, here's where it's being invested back into the county to show you where that \$450,000 is going. I, we can do that in the power.

 Speaker 1 - 58:23

So there's also a separate issue here that it's hard to take a baseline and say what is the actual incremental increase for any one community? This is a projection of the surcharge. But some aspects should be more predictable, cheaper, maybe offset if it's unrecycled. If I'm wrong about that, then let's make sure we're analyzing this accurately because we're going out to say, and we know from economies of scale, right, we should, for some communities there will be a savings on recycling products that are not doing it at all. They're already incurring some additional charges and then they're doing the surcharge. So we need to understand how what the total costs are and where this fits in that, is that making any modicum sense?

 Speaker 8 - 59:14

Correct. We can explain that visually to hopefully clarify it. And we'll bounce the concepts off of the executive director and leadership so that we're getting feedback before March 20th.

 Speaker 1 - 59:30

You're going to need to get with members like member Dunn and spend some time because the 20th is the 20th we're going out on this. There's not a lot room left. All right. So we need to really be able to answer these questions. All right, so member Bright Crews and then member Geller.

Speaker 7 - 59:48



Thank you, Chair. Yeah, so as far as education.



Speaker 6 - 59:53

Absolutely.



Speaker 7 - 59:53

I think this should be our focus. It's a great point. Yeah, yeah. We need to really focus on the financial at our next subcommittee meeting. So to me, there's a few things. It's important to understand how we focused a lot on the elements where that money's going and what it's going to produce for us in each one of the phases. 100% justified. That's the way we should be. But the other side of it is understanding the financial side. We've already heard in our last meeting or one of the previous meetings that there's a general feeling out there that maybe the current allocation is not fair because the larger cities are paying more than the smaller cities. And so I personally do think it's fair.



Speaker 7 - 01:00:37

I'm not going there, but I think there needs to be an element in that presentation that discusses that this is not just because you're a larger, but you have more population, ergo, more waste to deal with. And that's how it is. It's not the perfect way of allocating it, but that's the justification for it that I think makes sense. And I think that needs to be a bullet point in there. The other half of that is as we move into the further phases, we're going to be going more towards tonnage, which obviously is even more fair because then that's basically, you know, the more you use, the more you pay.




Speaker 1 - 01:01:12

So.




Speaker 7 - 01:01:12


But I think that's definitely something that needs to be in one of those bullet points to drive that home, that we're attempting to do this as fairly as we can. The other point is, and Chair, you spoke to it, and I have to direct this to you, Sam, back there, is that this PowerPoint is going to be a good over view of the phases and how it's going to be implemented. But the application of that is going to be much different, municipality to municipality, depending on what your current services are, how you know, what you're doing with recycling, whether you're doing curbside, whether you're doing drop off, whether you're not doing it at all. And so like for just as an example, so we do curbside right now. So those drop off facilities, they're probably not going to do squat for southwest ranches.

 Speaker 7 - 01:02:13


We're probably not going to use them because we put it out there and it's picked up right at a curbside. On the other hand, if there's a municipality that's not doing anything at all and they now have drop off points,

 Speaker 1 - 01:02:25


That's a plus for them. Right.

 Speaker 7 - 01:02:27

So that presentation, when we talk to those different municipalities, we need to understand that and how each phase will affect them. And so I guess what I'm saying is I appreciate that we need, and we do need that overall PowerPoint, but I think it's going to take a step beyond that to really make sense and to drive home the points. Let's face it, at the initial point right here, going into an election year, going into a year of uncertainty about ad valorem taxes, dollars and costs are going to be the overriding issue. There's no two ways around it and we all want to do the right thing, but if the dollars get in the way, that's going to be a hard lift.

 Speaker 7 - 01:03:12

So I think that's really, we need to focus on justification for how we're allocating those costs and specifically what is going to benefit to your municipality. Thank you, Chair.

 Speaker 1 - 01:03:27

Okay, I'll come to. Let me start with member Suham then.

Speaker 2 - 01:03:33



Thank you, Chair. Just really quickly, at the beginning, you had said something like as time moves on, this becomes more cost effective for the members. I think that's what you had said at the very beginning of today. And without oversimplifying, although I think we have to oversimplify in these PowerPoints and educational materials, all of us are paying X in our cities. Whatever that X is for your city, when we get together collectively, that X is still, it's just being shifted now to the authority. To a certain degree. Your city was paying it, your city's still going to be paying it. You're just paying it instead of directly. You're paying it through the authority. It's. Is that like.



Speaker 4 - 01:04:19

Close? When I spoke to the cost effectiveness, I was really talking about phasing these facilities in because initially we can tell you know, we could give you a dollars per ton for all of these operations, but that's assuming that we wake up tomorrow and everything is effective. Phasing it in over Time allows us to start at a certain, you know, dollars per ton and then slowly phase that in, you know, gaining our capital reserves, getting our facilities going. That's the part that is cost effective. Instead of, you know, whatever dollars per ton all up front, it comes in slowly over time.



Speaker 5 - 01:04:58

Okay.



Speaker 4 - 01:04:59

That's the part that is cost effective. You're correct in assuming that if you need to pay for disposal and for processing those costs aren't going to go away. There can be some cost effectiveness of the economies of scale, but ultimately those costs aren't going to diminish. They will continue to increase over time. We're just looking at the authority as an entity that can have that collective buying power and the ability to reduce that inflation over time to have more control over your outcomes than you would otherwise if you were strictly in contractual agreements on a municipality by municipality basis.



Speaker 2 - 01:05:40

So I just, I think for me just the simplest individual or however you're going to do it, making sure that the electives and their constituents understand this is a cost that you're incurring already. And it, it's going to be, yeah. This is not a brand new cost. That's really the revelation that you brought to us a few weeks ago. The new cost is not a big

cost. The existing cost will be handled differently. And like I'm, this is at the simplest point. But we had mentioned last time this idea of a template of what each city has to do to deal with solid waste so that we all can now take a look. What are we doing today? Every city does something completely different and it's going to be really hard to have apples to apples comparison.



Speaker 2 - 01:06:34

But for me, I just think that it's important that the public and the commissions understand you're not going from zero to this number, you're going from your number to a new number. And it's really about how that number is being handled and paid. Then a whole new thing. Does that make sense? Member? John?



Speaker 1 - 01:06:54

Yeah.



Speaker 2 - 01:06:55

Yeah.



Speaker 7 - 01:06:55

Okay.




Speaker 2 - 01:06:55

That's it. Thanks.




Speaker 6 - 01:06:56


Member Yeah, I think when we do this presentation, it needs to be done first.

 Speaker 1 - 01:07:02


Sure.

 Speaker 6 - 01:07:03


By the, on a macro. But then it needs to go to the micro and it needs to be, there needs to be an accompanying presentation that is specific to that city. Specific to that city. And I know and Sam, I'm looking at you now began and I'm looking at the public works directors over there that needs to follow the macro so that they first they see the big picture. Here's what we're all doing now. Here's what's happening in your city. Here's where your costs are. Here's where it's going to go. We can't rely one macro presentation that is not going to work. It's got to. They have to drill down. For many of the commissioners. They're going to have to learn very quickly how their own revenues and things are spent on garbage, because they probably don't know it.

 Speaker 6 - 01:07:58

That's just, that's just a fact. They don't know how much it costs per ton right now. They don't know where it's going. They don't know any of that stuff. They are clueless. You know, they know they've paid for, they've approved a garbage contract. They know it gets picked up at the end of the road, at the end of the driveway. That's it. So that second presentation, they need to see the big picture, like I said, because they got. They have to. We have to bring them into a vision. We've got to sell that vision. And then we've got to get down to the actual. Here's what's going to happen in your city when it's. This is why it's going to be a good thing for your city.

 Speaker 9 - 01:08:41

Here's.

 Speaker 6 - 01:08:42

If you're not doing recycling right now, here's how that diversion is going to help you. Here's how it's going to take some of your cost away here. It'll cost more here, but it's, you know, they're going to have to see all of that. Sam, that's where I think you come in. Because you understand this, to the public works directors here, you need to work with Sam to help put every single TAC member needs to work with you to help figure out how to do, how to present for that city. That's what needs to happen. And, and we have about a month. You know, that's it.



Speaker 5 - 01:09:23

But you know what?



Speaker 6 - 01:09:24

It's doable. It's doable. That's, you know, that's the public work people. They know exactly what, where, how much it is and what the conduct. So that's just my. When I'm thinking of it while you're saying this, I'm just thinking to myself, this cannot just be one presentation of help. Phase one, phase two, phase three. That is not going to do it. I'm. That's me thinking, Daniel, I hate to say that.



Speaker 1 - 01:09:48

I mean, I, I see some hesitation. I just want to. It's a really good point.



Speaker 3 - 01:09:51

Right.



Speaker 1 - 01:09:51

And there's also a, again a corollary to that to the city that says like we're was raised by member of Rike crews. Why do I need a drop off center? I'm doing everything. Max. You have to be able to say explain what the purpose of the drop off centers are in the system and how any individual city, you know the same reason, you know, some cities don't have any schools but they pay school board tax because they have kids. Right. So you don't have a dropout center but you got folks that are going and working in other cities creating garbage.



Speaker 2 - 01:10:22

Right.

Speaker 1 - 01:10:22



So you've got to be able to show how this holistically fits and we at least push back on this. I don't need it because I don't. I already do it perfectly or what. And I wasn't suggesting that. But there's somebody out there that's going to say that. What is your sense as to what the vice chair said?



Speaker 4 - 01:10:38

I think I just need some clarity. I don't want to ever say no to anything. I just need to know what specifically are you looking for at the next meeting and then what specifically are you looking for the cities and is that at the same time frame?



Speaker 6 - 01:10:53

That's a good point. That's a good point. So the fir, I think for the next meeting you're showing the big picture. That's, that's what I'm thinking. And that they're going to be hearing when we come to their commission we will break it down to every city. I think that would make sense because we're not going to be able to go into every city.



Speaker 1 - 01:11:13

I get that. But here's what's happening. The 20th we're approving the facilities amendment and there's some folks that aren't going to say yes because they don't know this answer.



Speaker 4 - 01:11:23

So. So how much do you need from us?




Speaker 1 - 01:11:28

Well, I don't know how much you have because I know this has been a perpetual. Yeah, it's perennial issue of trying to get the cost back.




Speaker 4 - 01:11:35


It's been a living work for sure.

 Speaker 1 - 01:11:38


Some of it may be more detailed as we go out to cities but there's got to be some general principles of when you see this 409 or whatever the number is. Let's be clear, you're already paying X dollars, right? I don't, I'm not saying that you, each city already has some level of what it's paying for its disposal.

 Speaker 8 - 01:11:59


Let me give you a real world example. We, we Have, I think from eight municipalities, eight ILA members, we. They're currently paying for recycling, processing. It ranges from \$180 down to \$96. We believe that once there is flow control, we can go out on the street. We're going to be on the lower end by working together.

 Speaker 1 - 01:12:21


Okay, so in terms of stating the surcharge that you're predicting for 2028, say that again. Where does that fit? Where's the cost savings? If, if a city's paying 180, is there any. Presumably there's gonna be a cost saving.

 Speaker 8 - 01:12:34


Not until the next fiscal year. So that's why we're phasing whenever it happens.

 Speaker 1 - 01:12:38


Right. But there's going to be this surcharge.

 Speaker 8 - 01:12:40


So to Commissioner Sriham's point, that processing cost that's currently in each ILA member's collection agreement, we identify. We've asked early on, it's actually during the working group in your collection agreements, instead of naming a facility for processing, simply label it designated facility. So that can change.

 Speaker 1 - 01:13:04


That's the mechanical. We're talking about the dollars. The mechanical doesn't worry me at all.

 Speaker 8 - 01:13:10


So we can't answer that until we go, until we have flow control. We go on the street, we get a binding cost, then we can compare what the current cost is to what the new cost will be.

 Speaker 1 - 01:13:21


But I get that. But you have some basis to say if we had maximum flow control for recycling, the maximum flow control for recycling, this is what we expect in the market now, it could be plus or minus. Okay, maybe it's 110. So 125, whatever the numbers, and you don't want to burden that estimate because then in the RFP process, they'll say, yeah, it's 125. It's not, it's not 118. So I understand there's a little bit of cat and mouse that we have to deal with in the. All municipalities deal with in this process. Right. When you want to buy a piece of land, having a public discussion about it, you have to pretend like you don't really want it. Right. I get it.

 Speaker 1 - 01:14:03

But there has to be something we're presenting here that says for some cities, if you're paying 185 a ton for recycling, this process of flow control should drive that down. Significant. Just economies of scale.

 Speaker 7 - 01:14:17

Correct.

 Speaker 1 - 01:14:18

And then someone's going to say, okay, well, what does that mean to my surcharge? Right. There's got to be. And maybe this isn't the place to hash it Out. Well, there needs to be a pretty quick meeting amongst the thinkers here on this presentation because these are the points that we're going to get presented.

Speaker 8 - 01:14:35



Understood.



Speaker 1 - 01:14:36

Member Bright Cruise and member Galler.



Speaker 8 - 01:14:39

Thank you.



Speaker 1 - 01:14:40

Chair. Yeah, you have a member here already. I mean, I can't have all the county commissioners show up. I got to let the members show. So I'm. Well, I understand, but we have two here. So we don't only have two from the city that we open up like that as well. Go ahead, Member breakers.



Speaker 7 - 01:14:52

I'll be quick. So, couple of elements. I agree 100% with what Vice chair was saying about breaking that down. So there's, there's an element here and you were touching on it. But when we do this presentation, I think we have to focus on the long term aspect of this. If we look at, you know, immediately like what's going to happen next year. I'm a big city and I'm paying more, you know, I think we're going to lose the argument. I think I remember a few meetings ago you brought forth a document that showed a, the tonnage over Orlando over time as their flow control grew. I think it was their. And I think that is what we need to be able to show. Like a five year view needs to be arranged. So I get it. We can't give specific number.



Speaker 7 - 01:15:53

There's no way we could put specific numbers on there. But we need to show the value of flow control, of discounts with volume. It needs to be in there. The other thing that I would say is while each municipality is unique, maybe we can break it down into three or four different elements. One is municipalities that currently have curbside, municipalities that are doing some sort of a drop off today and municipalities that are not doing anything with recycling. And maybe we can build a, you know, some sort of a presentation. Keeping in mind that this is a five

year look at.



Speaker 7 - 01:16:34

It's not, you know, we don't, we're not looking for everything to happen in year one when we're just doing phase one, but we need to be able to put some things there so people can see the long term and still apply it generally to what their current services are offering. Thank you.



Speaker 1 - 01:16:53

Okay. Member Geller, thank you.



Speaker 9 - 01:16:56

A series of questions. I agree with what Commissioner Dunn was saying and Chair Ryan, you've accused me of being Debbie Downer, but I have said before I think cities are going to decide on the base of cost. So I have a couple questions. First one is My understanding is that all of the cities are going to be required to provide curbside recycling and yard waste pickup at some point. Is that correct? Which phase is that?



Speaker 8 - 01:17:30

That will start in phase two, once we have binding prices for all of the ILA members.




Speaker 9 - 01:17:36

Okay. Do you know how many of the cities are currently providing the yard waste, the recycling pickup and are actually. I know some cities are picking up recycling and then mingling it in with their normal trash, but how many are actually picking up and actually recycling?




Speaker 8 - 01:18:01


So I will answer it. Generally, most communities are commingling yard trash and bulk waste, and one of the goals is to segregate those so that each can beneficially used in the most efficient and effective way possible.

 Speaker 9 - 01:18:14

And I appreciate that, but that doesn't answer my question. Do you know how many cities are currently doing everything that they will be doing after we're done here?

 Speaker 8 - 01:18:25


I will get you that answer.

 Speaker 9 - 01:18:28

The reason that I'm asking this is Commissioner Shoeham said that the cities would be paying for what they're already doing, which is not accurate. And the reason that's not accurate is it depends on what level of service they're currently providing. If a city is currently picking up recycling, is in fact recycling it, then their costs should go down based on the increased tonnage. But if you have a city that is not doing any of these things, their costs will go up. And that's why each city needs a city by city analysis as to how it will affect them.


 Speaker 9 - 01:19:15

Because I discussed this with many of the cities that I represent and most of them like Mayor Bright Cruz, who is one of the cities I represent half of Southwest Ranches I DAVY Cooper City I've discussed this with these elected and they're saying we don't want to do anything that's going to increase our costs, which is what Commissioner Dunn was saying. So it's important that they know how it's going to affect them. A concern that I've always had and Mayor Ryan, you addressed this is we don't. We're asking cities to commit before they know how much the recycling rates are. And I know the reason we're doing that is the recycling companies aren't willing to give us a firm price and that's why we need to go for the rfp.


 Speaker 9 - 01:20:11

But I'm not sure that the cities are going to agree to sign on to this without at least a fairly decent idea of what the recycling rates are because I'll use Commissioner Don and lauderhill adding the 450,000. I think you said some


number very close to that. Not paid by the city, but paid by the residents of the city is something that she's going to have a problem supporting. So is there any way or. It's just. There's no way we can get a better estimate as to how much the new recycling will be and adding in how much the curbside pickup and all of that will be.

 Speaker 8 - 01:20:58


So you've hit on some of the, I want to call them unique challenges, but the specific challenges. Collection is outside of our purview. That's by design.

 Speaker 9 - 01:21:09


Okay.

 Speaker 8 - 01:21:09

Is that the way we want it to be? No. Absolutely, unequivocally, no. So for a community that doesn't currently offer curbside recycling, it isn't just the processing cost that needs to be considered. It's the collection cost as well. So we can approximate. But we're in a classic. We've described it as we're building this ship as we're launching it out to sea, or you can call it a chicken in an egg scenario. We have 29 members. We have 29 different collection agreements, each one with different levels of service that we have to align over time. We also have the. I forget the terminology that's used, but the agreement with the county for disposal and the global agreement. Thank you. That we're also trying to weave in through this phased approach so that we can get to certain. We don't have certainty at this point.


 Speaker 8 - 01:22:08

No matter how hard we try and no matter how much work we do, we can't provide the certainty for a community that is focused only on cost.


 Speaker 9 - 01:22:21

I know you can't provide the certainty, but somebody. It may have been Mayor Ryan, but I heard recently maybe it was Mayor Bright Cruz that said that the cities that we need the detailed report because in the city of Blackacre, all of us lawyers know about that city. In the city of Blackacre, the city commission is going to want maybe not \$83.76, but they're going to want a fairly decent idea of how much it's going to affect their city. You've previously


told us recycling is more expensive than grab than landfill. We know that it's the right thing to do. I'm ready to vote for it, but I don't know that every commissioner is going to vote for that. A lot of them have said it's dollars and cents. And that's why I think we need to. If you can't get a formal response from.

 Speaker 9 - 01:23:25


From until you do an rfp, can you get maybe a ballpark from the recycling companies based on what they think?

 Speaker 8 - 01:23:34


Yes.

 Speaker 5 - 01:23:34


The total tonnage?

 Speaker 8 - 01:23:35


Yes. We've already benchmarked in the state of Florida. We have a good sense of what current market rates are, and that is informed. So you shared \$110. That is a number that we're comfortable and we modeled it.

 Speaker 9 - 01:23:50


Okay, so I will close in the interest of letting other people speak, just by saying I don't think that cities that aren't providing these services now are going to be supporting this unless we can let them know approximately how much the total cost increase will be. It's been said before, but I don't know if we have time to do it. But I think it's necessary because I don't think that cities will support something without having at least a pretty good idea how much it's going to cost their cities.

 Speaker 1 - 01:24:29


I think it's an absolutely fair point. We've been talking about it all along. There's other factors that play in here that we can't quantify. One is if a city says, we don't care, we're just going to continue to try to landfill everything, they're actually negatively impacting the county's statutory obligation to preserve disposal. One, Two, they're negatively impacting all the rest of us because they're taking precious landfill resources to put things in there that should not be there. I don't know what that means in terms of what the response from the other members should be. If this stays together. One response may be, then you're going to have to dispose of this on your own. We have ultimate responsibility. But you've refused to participate in this. And the county says we'll have to truck it out. We'll have to rail it.

 Speaker 1 - 01:25:22


We'll have to do something else. But you're not taking these resources. I don't know that can happen, but it's a point to be made that we're in this together. And when somebody says, I'm just not going to do it, particularly a big city, you're negatively impacting the rest of us. That's number one. Number two, the other factor that we've never been able to get our arms around is what we know will happen come August or September. If this doesn't exist, the market is going to take over and there may be some in a boardroom or bean counters out there praying this doesn't go forward. Because you know what? Get ready.

 Speaker 1 - 01:26:00


You're all going to get banged on your individual contracts and it's going to get harder and you're going to run out of disposal space and you're not going to have the capacity to do yard waste and the other things. I don't know what that cost is, but I know in 10 years it's going to be bad. You know why I know that? Because look at the RB and look where we are now. The market took over. There's some other factors, obviously the Chinese market on recycling and other things that came in. But the market took over. And when we have no other option in town and we have nowhere else to go, whatever this number is from almost everybody, it's going to be worse. That is a certainty and I don't know how to quantify. And I, and I know everything you just said.

 Speaker 1 - 01:26:41


I know you do and I know you're working towards getting us there because your comments are productive. I'm not saying you're being pessimistic. All these are the points we have to deal with. You're absolutely right. We have to figure out how to present not only what the costs are, but the negative consequences of what happened. Particularly for big cities who may be saying, you know, I don't want to participate in this. Well, you may have to find somewhere else to go. I don't know what we do on most favored nation. I don't know what we do on our contracting. I don't know what we do in 10 years from now. But not participating is negatively impacting all our neighbors. It's no different than having a neighbor next door that says I'm not putting my trash out, I'm keeping it in the backyard.

 Speaker 1 - 01:27:21


That might be okay for a while. Until it's not. Remember Dunn?

 Speaker 3 - 01:27:28


So I just putting on the outreach and education committee hat I want to kind of say what I think I hear us saying that we need in terms of city specific information. Right. So I'm envisioning just information, background information, getting folks up to speed. And then slides with specific information for each city, including what the city is currently doing, how much each city is currently paying. And I heard talk about collection and processing.

 Speaker 8 - 01:28:02


Yes. What would be most helpful is what is the current processing cost by waste stream and the current disposal cost.

 Speaker 3 - 01:28:09


Okay. So the thing and disposal would be what you want to.

 Speaker 4 - 01:28:13

Okay.

 Speaker 8 - 01:28:14

Processing at a minimum, recycling and disposal.

 Speaker 3 - 01:28:18

Okay. So processing and disposal and then what's being proposed, how it's going to help each city. That is purpose and benefits and then projected cost. And I heard talk about cost per ton and then the surcharge. Okay. And then the direct ask, what are we asking the Commission to do and why this is important. And I made a note here of the negative consequence of a no vote. Is that colleagues, is that an accurate reflection of what we're asking for? Absolutely, Mr. Chairs, is that accurate?



Speaker 4 - 01:28:59

Just to clarify, cost per ton would be the same as the surcharge. That's just a way of approximating what that would look like.



Speaker 1 - 01:29:08

Okay, but the point is you've got 409,000 or 450,000 per ton. Right. You have a surcharge chart that says for Water Hill, whatever that number was,



Speaker 4 - 01:29:18

This much per ton times this many tons.



Speaker 1 - 01:29:21

But that's different.



Speaker 9 - 01:29:22

Right.




Speaker 1 - 01:29:22

The surcharge is per house, let's say.




Speaker 5 - 01:29:25


Right.

 Speaker 2 - 01:29:26


Per.

 Speaker 4 - 01:29:26


Per ton.

 Speaker 1 - 01:29:28


Right, but what does that mean for the residents? Right, that's what the point. We've got to, we've got to get that gap.

 Speaker 4 - 01:29:34

Yeah. That goes back to. On the average in Broward county, households dispose approximately 1.3 tons per year. So if we say it's a dollar per ton, it's A\$30 is the estimated. That's it cost per household. I just feel the need to clarify the two aspects. This goes back to what member Shoehan was saying earlier, that the surcharge may in many ways be very different from some of these realized cost savings for the programs that the cities are already implementing. The surcharge is additive in this way. You are adding education and outreach. You are supporting this authority, you are supporting these drop off sites to the extent that you get that economy of scale that goes back to the disposal and processing costs that the cities are already realizing. So there's two different cost streams we're talking about.

 Speaker 4 - 01:30:32

Some may go down while others go up. And the anticipation is to what you were saying, Chair Ryan, that over the long term there will be more cost effectiveness because the cities can work together. We have not done a full cost benefit analysis to say worst case scenario, here's what it might look like. But it is understood that with that buying power that it will better than without.

 Speaker 1 - 01:31:01

Yeah. And if were a company and were board of directors, we can look at that analysis and we. There's a little bit of

a leap of faith, right, that we're going to conserve money, we'll project some of it. Not a lot of faith in government sometimes. So that lead has got to be worked on a lot more than just we know from basic economics and the benefits of price stabilization. We know that's Economics 101, first year of college. That's not going to be enough. It's going to have to be something else that says to your point, it's going up a dollar a ton, \$2 a ton, and that's what you're going to be paying. If you create 1.3 tons in your household, you're going up \$1.30, you're going up \$3, whatever.



Speaker 1 - 01:31:48

We've got to try to get to some numbers because that's what to member Dunn's point, you present to any commission and say, okay, your surcharge is going up 500,000. They're not going to take the time to understand. We need to upfront explain those numbers in where it is along with the beneficial pros and cons that have to be explained up front before we even get to the model. Right. What we know we're not doing right. Running out of landfill, running out of wt, don't have the capacity. You're exposing yourself to the market. If we don't do anything, this is what we can project happens because we see this all over the country. Markets will take over. This is where you were in RRB and recycling, you completely failed that. Right? You're no longer there. That means you're consuming the landfill, you're consuming WTE.



Speaker 1 - 01:32:34

If you're not doing anything in recycling, you're at zero. Right? When we say 40% across county, that's with those who are participating. There are some that are just sending it to the landfill or to WT. So some things are at zero recycling despite a 75% goal. And we're all trying to make that up because we know we have limited resources. We've got to figure out how to explain that up front.



Speaker 3 - 01:32:55

Mr. Chair, if I could just.




Speaker 1 - 01:32:57

The education committee is going to have the big component of that.




Speaker 3 - 01:32:59


So just to close the loop, I just want to be clear about who is going to be doing this. PowerPoint, is this going to come from your team or are you going to be working with contextual pr? Because we kind of need to have this ready soon because we're going to be going in front of my city and I can tell you this is the information that we need. We only get one bite of the apple.

 Speaker 8 - 01:33:20


So I'm envisioning it's a two headed monster. One is to have a presentation that explains it clearly through phases to the executive board and executive committee and governing board. The other presentation is city by city. So working with each municipality, each ILA member's staff so that we're picking up those details that are most important to each ILA member so that we can take those concepts and drill down to what it means through those three phases for each ILA member.

 Speaker 1 - 01:33:59


Okay, Member Geller Reitcreeet, very quickly this,

 Speaker 9 - 01:34:03


Very quickly, this doesn't apply to any of the people in this room. But other elected officials are more concerned as to what's going to happen the next time they're on the ballot as opposed to what's going to happen 10 years from now. And that's why it's so important that they have the analysis now as opposed to say, well if you don't do this 10 years from now, you're going to be paying more because they're not going to be in office 10 years from now except for the forward thinking people in this room right now and on tv.

 Speaker 1 - 01:34:37

Okay, Member Bright Cruz,


 Speaker 7 - 01:34:41

Chair, Two questions. The first totally different but related first one is do we have an update on where we are with the different municipalities and their likelihood to vote yes? No undecided. We've been talking about that for a couple meetings and I know that's going to be our battle plan for Sam and everybody going forward. Are we close on that yet?


 Speaker 8 - 01:35:10

When we meet with when we've been conducting the one one meetings, it's with a single elected representative


typically from the governing board.

 Speaker 9 - 01:35:21


Right.

 Speaker 1 - 01:35:22


So I don't know that it's fair to have an assessment from staff of where that is. We should assume everybody's a potential now. I mean you can have an interest, you want to have an individual, if you want to have an individual meeting with that to say hey, where are you on these cities? I think that's fair. I just don't want to put Daniel in the position now saying, well we think there's 10 cities that are yet.

 Speaker 7 - 01:35:42


No, I'm not asking that question. I just want to know is that coming in the near future or is that still a ways out? That's all I'm asking.

 Speaker 8 - 01:35:49

So the one ones we've tried to create a safe space to have very candid conversations.

 Speaker 7 - 01:35:55

Yes.

 Speaker 8 - 01:35:56

So the reporting out. So Mercury represented at the last meeting. Broad brush strokes. These are the pressure points. It's not fair to speak on behalf of anybody and we're not in a position to because what we have learned is just because somebody is passionate and volunteered to be on the governing board, they may not be able to carry

the day if you will. So we continuing to have the conversations to understand where are the pressure points where what do we need to address to help carry it over the line and we're going to be talking about it in a moment. Which members of the executive committee. And you've already volunteered. Others have volunteered to be a representative of the authority at other communities.



Speaker 7 - 01:36:50

All right, I won't pursue that any further. I'll just say that I think that's a really critical piece. I know you all are working on it.



Speaker 2 - 01:36:55

So.



Speaker 7 - 01:36:55

Okay, the other question, more related to what were just talking about, is the budget for next year, the \$2 million and the assessment that we've done. What is that specifically going for? And I don't know. You know, we're all big boys and girls, so you all have done a tremendous amount of work over the last two years. I don't know that same level of work is going to be in place over the next year. I mean, we're going to definitely there's work for sure, the RFPs and things that need to go out. What I'm wondering is if that assessment, I mean, it's the same number as last year. Why is it the same number? Have we looked at it from the standpoint of what is really going to be required?



Speaker 7 - 01:37:39


And do we have an opportunity to kind of grease the wheels here a little bit by reducing that a little bit and make it almost driving home the point that we're moving out of one phase, moving into the next phase. Phase. And this phase here, where phase one, the phase one is not the same as what we've been doing, and it may actually be less than what we've done in the past.




Speaker 4 - 01:38:04

It's actually quite the opposite. The phase one involves using some of the reserves that have been built because the authority to date has been able to have some cost savings because these programs haven't started. Started


yet. So that money that has been put into reserves is anticipated to beginning to be spent as we're starting to do the education outreach, to issue these RFPs, to do these other things that, again, the authority is ramping up, but it is anticipated that we would not need more from the member communities than is currently being paid.

 Speaker 7 - 01:38:36


All right. Well, I think a budget on that for even pulling out of reserves and what it's going to. I think that's critical. I think we need to.

 Speaker 5 - 01:38:44


That's.

 Speaker 7 - 01:38:45

That's a piece that will help drive home the point that we're using the dollars as best we can and this is where they're going to. We're not just collecting. Because, I mean, frankly, as a finance guy, when I just see the same number over and over again, I wonder whether that was really thought through or not. Or if that's just where we're on a roll and we think we can get it and therefore it's coming in.

 Speaker 1 - 01:39:05

So it's a fair point. Just we could circle back and you can deal with it. But I think that's the point that has to be made. What phase one is consumed of. Right. There's been so much that's been spent on analyzing and reports and white papers and everything else there might be. Somebody says, okay, well that works done. Now why is it still too. And I think this is an excellent point. What is it projected to be? What is it going to be for RFPs and the work that's going to be necessary there, the education outreach, what does that look like? And that's something for us, that the question of a teaser, if you will, year always comes with a potential of a whipsaw. The following that becomes shock and says, oh, this is exactly what I was worried about. Right.

 Speaker 1 - 01:39:47

We were budgeting and you know, it's. It's like somebody says, look, if you're going to tell me you're not going to raise a certain rate and you're not going to raise it for 10 years and then in the 11th year you're going to whack me, why didn't you just give me the incremental? I think can deal with that over the now I'm really in trouble. So there's a balance here. But I think to the point ultimately is we've got to prove what that budget looks. Why is it the same? And that's why what is going to be consumed? And that phase one analysis, again to come back to the word status quo, I just don't want to see that ever again because it's not status quo. Right.



Speaker 1 - 01:40:20

That money is now being used productively for a whole new set of obligations and focuses, thresholds and benchmarks, satisfaction, status quo. We don't need to come any further to the other point though about where we are on this outreach. Whether we know any individual committee, what community is doing, what Ashley did at the last meeting and outlining where we have some friction or there's some chink in the armor is incredibly helpful. That's the most productive information we can get. Right. I heard one recently saying, what have you guys been doing for a year?



Speaker 3 - 01:40:55

Years.



Speaker 1 - 01:40:55

Yeah, I wish were a company. I'll tell you what, we're trying to keep everybody at the table.



Speaker 2 - 01:40:59

Right.




Speaker 1 - 01:41:00

That's been the hardest part. But there's a fair. It's again it's another point that we all have to be prepared for, even if it's not coming out of an individual community. Because just because you hadn't heard it from community A, all of these friction points could come out in that meeting. They just haven't announced it or pronounced it or bid on it yet. They may say so again to what Ashley and the team are just generating on friction points that needs to be continued to be reported out, because we have to be transparent and forthright about what our challenges are. So that's as productive as anything. So I wasn't trying to cut off that issue. All right. Did you want more clarity just a.




Speaker 6 - 01:41:39


Little bit on that? I do think there needs to be a breakdown of what those extra charges are going to be. I think people are going to be asking that. They're going to be asking, how much is it going to cost to stand up the sdlwa, how much is going to cost to do this and that. So there we're going to need answer for that. I know we've been asking from the county side. We haven't quite got that yet.

 Speaker 8 - 01:42:01


So before.

 Speaker 6 - 01:42:03


I think we're going to need that for the 20th because we're going to be. We're going to need to be able to itemize.

 Speaker 1 - 01:42:11


Okay, we have only a few minutes left. I have a hard deck and, you know, I've really got to go.

 Speaker 2 - 01:42:14

Remember very quickly, Daniel, for efficiency sake, on that meeting on the 20th, I don't think we can expect all the members to sit through, you know, a multitude of slides. Can you do an overview? And then perhaps maybe a one pager that's distributed to each individual member for what their city looks like.

 Speaker 8 - 01:42:33

Those details, it's going to be very difficult to get to that level of detail prior to the 20th. However, we can commit to before going to each ILA Member Commission meeting to work with staff to tailor the financial message. So, and we're going to need feedback from each ILA member, each governing board member in terms of what the expectation is at a commission meeting. Because we're talking about master plan. There's a lot of information. We're talking about facilities amendment, because ultimately that's what's being adopted by each ILA member, not the master plan itself that happens here.

 Speaker 1 - 01:43:20

So I. Yeah, I mean, the master plan, it's a bit of a. If somebody is against the master plan, they're not going to vote for the facilities amendment. It's not getting separate. They're tethered inextricably at this point. Right. So to that point one of the. And the another part of this is to the extent you're announcing a surcharge, let's say what you

expect for a community. Aren't we in the facilities amendment saying we're not going to be above that?



Speaker 4 - 01:43:43

Right.



Speaker 1 - 01:43:43

That's a really good or necessary, I don't know if it's good, but it's a necessary point that has to be raised in these estimates. This is our, if you will, conservative approach. Right. There's still work to be done, maybe there's additional cost savings, whatever. But the facilities matter approved says you're not going up more than that. Is that, is that accurate? So if it is, let's make sure that's part of this discussion. Correct. Okay. All right. Got a lot of work. I know. Appreciate it. All right. Facilities amendment discussion. Outstanding issues. We've got about 15 minutes, Mr. Cole. Thank you, Mr.



Speaker 8 - 01:44:18

Chair.



Speaker 1 - 01:44:19

Several cities provided comments which we've gone through and responded to all the comments. Several cities also gave us proposed revisions as to the revisions. We've gone through those as well. Several were discussed at the last executive committee meeting and that has all been incorporated. So the last version that you got out is the current state of the facilities amendment. I don't want to say the final because I guess theoretically there could, you know, we're still listening to comments if there are any, but you know, we are have gotten to the point we're only 18 days away from this board approving facilities amendment to send out. So what are the outstanding. So there's no outstanding issues. I mean what I sent out has revisions. I want to thank the cities that provided comments. Miramar gave a lot of very specific comments.



Speaker 1 - 01:45:12

I want to thank them. These have already gone through the county attorney's office as well. And this everything in front of you there's really no issues. Okay. Unless anyone has any issues with the changes. You know, the changes are black lined. I sent you a black lined version. They're not major changes, they're more language changes, et cetera. Like we changed the word from a complex public facility to state of the art public facilities, which I think was a much better way of wording it. There's references to the benefits to residents, we added residents and businesses, things like that. Those are the change. Nothing major. So that's where we are on it. Unless there's specific comments, you know, we're ready to have that be the final version. That will go to the executive committee and then to the cities. Okay.



Speaker 1 - 01:46:02

And to this point, obviously, if there's any additional revisions, there's still time for that. But when we get to the March 20, you know, editing on the fly, we'll need to make sure we're ready to go if we need to do that. But what we're ultimately asking, I think, the governing board to do, assuming the facility amendment is recommended to be pushed to the governing board for consideration, is not that they are signing on to the solid waste plan or the authority. They're approving the facilities amendment in its current form so that each commission can then consider it. I think it's really important because I think there's this concern that some members will be like, oh, I'm voting yes for this whole solid waste plan. And that. No, that's not what's happening. It's not even close. All you're doing is recommending that.



Speaker 1 - 01:46:49

Now the cities, the municipalities, I should say, should be considering this plan. This is as far as we've gotten. Now it's time for each city to look at it. So we need to set that expectation, and it may be helpful on behalf of the interim executive director in the next agenda as it goes out to the governing board needs to go out a lot sooner, and it needs to be clear, maybe a short memo as to what the facilities amendment is and what the expectation of the governing board is. That is simply to move this now to municipal consideration so that we're not. Neither the public should take it as, oh, we've approved this. The press shouldn't take it as we've approved it, and the municipalities or the industry shouldn't take it as an approval.



Speaker 1 - 01:47:35

If it is this moving to the next step and the final process for approval, is that fair? Is everybody in agreement on that? Okay, I'll work with the interim director on that. All right, getting to. Yes, we still have 10 minutes. Mr. Cole, letter of support from Broward Workshop. What can you tell us about that? As a member of the Broward Workshop, I've been working with the Business Advocacy committee, and they're presenting it to the executive committee, and we've drafted a draft letter and. And hopefully they will approve it. And it will be sent out approximately the end of the month, around the same time that it goes out to the cities. Okay.



Speaker 1 - 01:48:09


Along that line, there was a discussion at the last meeting about having a resolution, draft resolution for commissions to consider whether they were ready to do that at the end of March or whenever. Where are you in that process and how complicated will that be. It won't be complicated. We're in the draft process. We'll probably have a done within a week. And the plan will be to put that the latest version of the master plan, the latest version of the facilities amendment and that resolution in the backup for the next meeting on March 20th and hopefully to get that out substantially before March 20th. Right. So to that point, again, I want to reemphasize. We can't send this out on the Thursday before March 20th. We just can't.




Speaker 1 - 01:48:51

The agenda, the backup has to go out, I would say at least seven to 10 days before. So let's. We'll work together on what that looks like. Understanding you can supplement whether a presentation doesn't have to be everything's final. Right. But we need to have the agenda, we need to have the major items and the expectation set for what we're going to be considering at that 20th meeting. For the members of the executive committee who are chairs or


dedicated to the subcommittees, it would be my expectation that prior to presenting the facilities amendment that the committees present where they are and what they've been doing. There's a good story to tell here. There's been a lot of work done parallel while we've been debating whether this will even move forward.

 Speaker 1 - 01:49:35


And for instance, on the education being able to explain what's been done, why it's important, what has been accomplished, successes, if you will, in the packages that have already existed in preparation for synthesizing the educational message across all cities. The work that's been done, C and D, same thing. To the extent there'll be a discussion on commercial recycling, still premature, but it's still important to talk about. So I just asked the members who are parts of those committees to be prepared to make those presentations in detail, to be able to bring all the governing board members up to speed on the work that's been done so that we can at least address some of this concern. All we've been doing is arguing about a facilities amendment. That's not the case. Right.

 Speaker 1 - 01:50:21


With respect to Daniel, the presentation at that meeting, we'll talk more about it, but you need to begin working with the interim director after Monday. He doesn't start till Monday after Monday to make sure that we have this as a tight and that we've hit all of Ashley's points that have been raised, all of. Of the executive committee members points that have been raised. And. And let's just be forthright about what we've heard and these are our responses to it.

 Speaker 3 - 01:50:45


Okay.

 Speaker 1 - 01:50:46


Is that fair? All right, Meeting with elected and staff update. Do you want to provide an update? We only have about seven minutes, so tell us where you are and what cities and house you need.

 Speaker 6 - 01:50:57


So.

 Speaker 8 - 01:51:00


We've had approximately 32 meetings with elected officials over the past several months.

 Speaker 5 - 01:51:04


Months.

 Speaker 8 - 01:51:04


We've met with nine, excuse me, 19 for one ones. We have another one this afternoon. We've had approximately 15 meetings with city staff and another five, six meetings with other stakeholders. So it has been a full court press. It's going to continue to be a full court press as we move past the meeting on the 20th and heading.

 Speaker 1 - 01:51:24


Towards the vote in the presentation of where we all are. It's important for you at the Governing Board meeting to explain that as well. Give the updates on the details of who you're meeting with and we'll again reemphasize to the extent that there's workshops or additional meetings requested by any of the government board members. Now is the time where you've been ready, you've been asking and if there's any concerns. Member Dunn.

 Speaker 3 - 01:51:50


I was just going to ask in the. Do you have a sense of how people are feeling based on those meetings?

 Speaker 1 - 01:51:58


I think it's the same question member Bright Cruise asked in a different form. Yes, I'm sure.

 Speaker 8 - 01:52:03


Same answer. So it's. We're not in a position to speak to level of confidence moving forward. We've been digesting the feedback that's given. We've been responding to it, trying to be as proactive as possible.

 Speaker 3 - 01:52:21


But.

 Speaker 8 - 01:52:21


But we need help and this is not new. We've been asking the executive committee, to some extent the Governing Board, to let us know how it's going to be most effective. Presenting at each commission meeting there's a document. I don't know if it's been circulated in terms of seeking volunteers from the Executive committee. But to the extent that you can complete that, if not today, here, if you could complete it, fill it out, scan it, send it back to Alisa. And don't feel limited by the number of squares that are there.

 Speaker 1 - 01:53:17


Okay, thank you for that. Just before you do that, it occurs to me that there's a TAC meeting coming up. It's critically important that we get out to the tac, the C and D Ordinance, for comments. I know it's probably been requested already. We need to get an email out today, tomorrow to all the TAC, to the chair of the TACIT, requesting that they be prepared on the 13th to provide policy input on this. They've been asked multiple times I know they continue to consider it. They now have a version that's highlighted with decision points and concerns. There could be others. But we need the TAC to really come back so that we have some report for the March 20th. Sorry.

 Speaker 6 - 01:53:58

That's okay. This isn't making sure that we hit every city. We need one that has all the cities on it and make sure that every city is covered. Otherwise, we're just going to our favorite cities.

 Speaker 1 - 01:54:11

Well, I know my favorite city. Are you coming to mine?

 Speaker 2 - 01:54:15

Are you.



Speaker 6 - 01:54:16

Glad to hear that. I'm just saying we need to make sure we have.



Speaker 7 - 01:54:20

That's all.



Speaker 1 - 01:54:20

So we'll circulate that.



Speaker 5 - 01:54:21

Yep.



Speaker 1 - 01:54:22

Member breakfast.



Speaker 2 - 01:54:22

And.



Speaker 7 - 01:54:23

And along those same lines, there's certain municipalities that we can. I think we can eliminate. Nobody needs to come out to south Loranches. Southwest ranches were, you know, so we need to eliminate those.



Speaker 1 - 01:54:32

And that's.



Speaker 7 - 01:54:32

That's kind of where I was, you know, saying, huh. But you're always welcome out in southwestern ranches.



Speaker 1 - 01:54:38

No, it's an excellent point. Member of bright crews raises. We'll have to leave it to staff to say which ones are in need of greater assistance. Perhaps based on the individual meetings and.



Speaker 6 - 01:54:48

Some we can tag team. We may take a couple of us. Okay.



Speaker 1 - 01:54:52

Thank you, Daniel. All right. Anything else we wish to cover today? We've got three minutes. We have a motion to adjourn. Motion by member Shoeham. Seconded by member breakers. All in favor say aye. Aye. All right.