

 Speaker 1 - 00:02


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

 Speaker 2 - 00:08


Chair Ryan.

 Speaker 1 - 00:09


Present.

 Speaker 2 - 00:10


Vice Chair Fur.

 Speaker 3 - 00:11

Here.

 Speaker 2 - 00:13

Member Shuham. Member Horland. Member mateo. Member dunn. Member rideau. Member mead.

 Speaker 4 - 00:32

Here.



Speaker 2 - 00:33

Member cagiano. Member a.j. Ryan. Member newton. Member colborne. Member murphy solomone. Member bright cruise.



Speaker 5 - 00:52

Here.



Speaker 2 - 00:53

Member geller.



Speaker 6 - 00:54

Here.



Speaker 1 - 00:56

All right, Ms. Cole, we have a quorum. All right. If you would please stand for the pledge. I pledge allegiance to the flag of the united states of america. All right, we have public comment. Tammy.



Speaker 7 - 01:43

Tammy Lethierry Coconut Creek, Florida Broward county wants to build a dangerous sludge dryer at the North County Wastewater Treatment Plant in Pompano fueled by methane emitted from the dump. Commissioner Furr says this is good use of the methane, but waste management already extracts it and converts it to electricity, which they sell to the grid to power homes. More importantly, the South County Wastewater Treatment Plant in Hollywood uses a more sustainable and cost effective method to process their sludge, known as anaerobic digestion. But that's not in the cards for north county. And I wonder why, since the North County Treatment plant

has newly installed solar panels and may add wind turbines. It begs the questions, do they really need methane to power a sludge dryer? And who benefits from this? Not Deerfield, Coconut Creek or Pompano.



Speaker 7 - 02:37

And what is the county doing to minimize trash and improve recycling rates within their own agencies using biodegradable single use? Eating utensils is not enough and still generates waste. Every county agency and signer to the ILA should be required to recycle all cardboard and office paper and switch to double sided printing for starters. Change is possible Through a series of notices containing graphics and brief instructions. MyHOA made significant gains reducing contamination and in recycling bins in a little over a year. Perhaps it was the reminder that the landfill was closing or the warning that the county was running out of capacity at the existing incinerator and would lock us into a 40 year long deal to transform trash into poisonous air. That really resonated with them. After all, incineration is the most expensive toxic method of municipal solid waste disposal.



Speaker 7 - 03:40

But the message was clear. Less trash means more cash for them.



Speaker 1 - 03:47

Thank you. Stephanie Pearson.



Speaker 8 - 04:01

Hi, I'm Stephanie Pearson here today representing the League of Women Voters of Broward County.




Speaker 9 - 04:07

The League of Women Voters has been involved in this long and carefully crafted process since the beginning. We've studied the issue over many years. We are convinced of the necessity of Broward cities and the county banding Together.




Speaker 8 - 04:24


For the long term benefit of all of us.

 Speaker 9 - 04:27


With more than 5 million tons of waste to dispose of and no place to put it, cooperation is the best way to ensure that in the long term, we will have a system that will be less costly, gives the public more control, and benefits the environment. If we are short sighted and balk at the small initial cost, we will pay later. We are in strong support of the master plan and the facilities amendment, which.

 Speaker 1 - 04:55


Needs to be ratified so that we can go forward.

 Speaker 4 - 04:58


Thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 04:58


Thank you. All right, any further comments? Public comments. All right, I'll close. Public comments. We have a motion on the February 24, 2026 and March 2, 2026 minutes. Motion by member Horlan, seconded by Member Cagiano. Any discussion on those items? All in favor say aye. Any opposed? All right, that passes. Executive Director update. Thank you, Chair Mike.

 Speaker 4 - 05:26

Thank you, Chair, for the update. We've been just diligently working on getting.

 Speaker 6 - 05:31

This master plan together and also speaking with some of the cities scheduling their workshops.

 Speaker 4 - 05:37

We did have a workshop in Davie.



Speaker 6 - 05:41

And in Weston, so that's really it.



Speaker 10 - 05:45

Okay.



Speaker 1 - 05:46

I know we have a lot of business here today, and I appreciate that. We'll provide an additional executive director update in the governing board. All right. Cohen resnick, financial statements, January 2026.



Speaker 6 - 06:04

Hi, my name is Alex Patron.



Speaker 3 - 06:06

I'm a partner with the accounting firm Cone Resnick, here today to go over the financial position of Broward SWA. As of the end of February 2026, the authority had cash and cash equivalents of \$2,852,000. Its accounts of receivable balances were \$834,000. When subtracting the entity's liabilities of approximately \$141,000 from their total assets, the authority's.



Speaker 6 - 06:30

Net equity position stood at \$3,545,000.



Speaker 3 - 06:36

Based on its current financial position, Broward.



Speaker 6 - 06:40

SW has sufficient liquidity to meet its budgetary spending through the fiscal year ending September 2026.



Speaker 1 - 06:46

All right, thank you. Any questions for Colin Resnick on the financial statements? Thank you, sir. All right. We have a number of subcommittee updates intact. What I would propose, assuming it's the will of the body, is to move those to the governing board so that we can provide the governing board members a full update. Is that fair? Anybody in opposition to that? All right, let's move to the master plan and the financial modeling. Before I do that, I want to lay out what. What we're here as the executive committee to do. We are at a generational and Historic moment. The executive committee has been working monthly for years and sometimes bi weekly. We are presented today with the financial modeling. That's the last piece of the master plan, and we'll have a discussion about the facilities amendment.



Speaker 1 - 07:40

We all know the crisis we face, and there are still questions to be answered. But today the executive committee will be called upon to either recommend or not recommend the master plan and facilities amendment to the governing board so that we can move forward to address the issues that are so critical. It is hard, and I'll raise it with the governing board. It's hard to imagine how hard and how long we've had to work on what for some people seems obvious, but the details are important. The impacts on the cities are important, the impact on the county is important, and what we're planning to do for the next 40 years is important. So I thank the executive committee, the subcommittees, and all the work that's gone in. And this is the last piece. And I will turn it to Daniel for this.




Speaker 1 - 08:25

And we will have in the governing board a detailed discussion as well. I know there's a full presentation. For the purposes of the executive committee. We don't need the background information that we've been working on and that we're quite familiar with. We need to move right to the financial modeling. If that's fair, Daniel?




Speaker 11 - 08:42


Fair.

 Speaker 1 - 08:42


Okay, the floor is yours, sir.

 Speaker 4 - 08:43


Okay, thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 08:44


Good morning.

 Speaker 4 - 08:45

Chair, vice chair, executive director, general counsel, members of the executive committee and governing board. Daniel Deitch here, representing the SES team. I want to thank all of you for your engagement. I want to thank my colleagues that have. We've been working collaboratively over the last nearly two years to apply reach this point. I also want to acknowledge the stakeholders that come to meetings. They are tireless in their advocacy and engagement. Not only the citizenry that has been showing up, but the organizations, the business interests that have helped us get to this point. As was indicated, I do want to cut straight to the financial analysis. The detailed financial plan document was included in the backup. And we simply want to walk through the mechanics of the flow of funds. And we will reiterate this at the next meeting with the governing board.

 Speaker 4 - 09:42

Lisa, if we could jump to slide five, please. And I would like to invite my colleague, Vida Quinn, who you're all familiar with, that we've been working with through the performance of this work to arrive at this point.

 Speaker 12 - 10:00

Morning, Vidaquin. Just to provide some additional clarity on the different phases that we're anticipating, because there have been questions about how the funds actually flow, we Tried to make something simple here to sort of break it down a little bit more. And I think it also helps to explain the administrative end of things and how that money will actually move physically. So phase one being the way things are done right now, monies are coming from the ILA communities on a population basis. And while that is an approximation of waste generation, it's not the most fair way to distribute funds or to ask for funds from the member communities.

Speaker 12 - 10:45



So entering into phase two, the anticipation is that there's going to be a disposal surcharge and that's money paid on every ton of waste that passes through disposal and processing facilities, which I think we all can agree is a much more fair way of charging for the waste that's being generated within the county. The way that works in practice is that the haulers come to bring the solid waste or the recyclables to the disposal or processing facilities. At that time, they pay the surcharge in addition to the tipping or processing fee that is going to be retained by those disposal facilities and then remitted to the Solid Waste Authority. The one thing I want everyone to take away from this, that means that the ILA communities do not have any additional administrative burden.



Speaker 12 - 11:32

This is handled between the authority and the disposal or processing facilities. Now entering phase three. Once we have some facilities or some drop off sites and the authority is fully operating, we can move to the implementation of a non ad valorem special assessment. That again is not going to be administrative burden on the ILA communities because the authority can work with the county to make sure that appears on the resident's tax bills. That will be a separate line and again, as those funds are collected, that will be remitted back to the Solid Waste Authority. The way that we're anticipating this will look in terms of finances for the individual communities is that while there will be a surcharge that will be passed on, it's through the collections rates, right?



Speaker 12 - 12:28

So the hauler is paying that at the processing or disposal facilities that will be passed on through the existing collections rates. But with the now improved contracting authority or contracting power of the authority to negotiate tipping fees and processing fees, we're anticipating that would help to offset any increase that would happen in the collections rates due to the surcharges. Again this will be phased in over time. We understand that the communities have existing collections agreements. So within the financials that you've seen, we are anticipating the phased in as each individual community has the ability to begin to have those contracts. The Funding mechanisms here are the same that I just explained, but this puts the numbers to it. We're anticipating that when the surcharge begins, it's \$2 a ton.



Speaker 12 - 13:25

The surcharge will be in place for a couple of years as we're getting the drop off sites constructed, land acquisition, all the things associated with that and begin to operate it. There will be some overlap with the surcharge and the non ad valorem assessment as we're trying to get that implemented. Any city who has tried to implement a non ad valorem special assessment, you know that there's quite a lot of work to get that established initially. So the surcharges will likely continue until the funds begin to be received from that assessment. The dollars per ton is just the best way that we can express this to you.



Speaker 12 - 14:03

The anticipated cost that residents might pay with the understanding that any numbers that you've seen about the anticipated cost per household is that with the waste generation study, the information collected on the average residents within Broward county generate approximately 1.3 tons per year. So that can give you an idea. But again, the apportionment methodology and the way the non envelope special assessment works out, it's not going to be technically dollars per ton.



Speaker 13 - 14:42

Whoops.



Speaker 12 - 14:44

This is just in phase three to give you an idea about what we're talking about. So many cities now have a special assessment on their tax bill. When the authority creates its assessment, it will be a separate one, and that would be just a second line on that tax bill. So the authorities or the city's individual assessments will still go back to the city to pay for the collections. The authority's assessment is a separate line. We will go straight to the authority. The cities will not have to have any involvement in that portion of it. Then I'll let Daniel talk about the processing.



Speaker 1 - 15:21

Okay.




Speaker 4 - 15:22

So one of the important aspects of our work is to make sure that it's in alignment not only with the interlocal agreement, but also with the facilities amendment. So in the facilities amendment that will be presented to you in a moment, Article 24 addresses maximum service charges, and it's really the safeguard for all ILA members. This analysis is based both on market research and also actual costs that have been negotiated through the global agreement that the county holds for recyclable materials. We are anticipating. And again, this is using the economies of scale, the flow control that will be enacted if the authority continues beyond August. We know that there's ample capacity for processing recyclables within Broward County. We have Estimated that maximum cost to be \$110.




Speaker 4 - 16:15


The authority still rests with the governing board in the event that the cost is greater to assess those conditions at that time. When we look at yard trash, we're looking at it both in terms of disposal and for beneficial use. And that's why you see two different rates here. Again, maximum service charges, and the same with class one waste. And again, to avoid the vernacular of the industry, that's really household waste or putrescible waste. And just to remind you, the only capacity, landfill capacity for putrescible waste is the Monarch landfill. And through a negotiated settlement, they will not be accepted. That kind of waste after this year. And then class three waste, which is dry waste, basically bulk construction and demolition debris and the like. This is the rate that is negotiated currently.

 Speaker 4 - 17:09


And I think the important takeaway from that is with the global agreement, you can see in action the benefit of working together, because with tonnage, you can secure better pricing. And that's exactly what the county has done. And we think that we can build on that mod to secure favorable pricing for all communities. It's also important to take away that the surcharge and the assessment that Vita just spoke about, that is really to pay for the operation of the authority and all the services associated with that. The tipping fee, we believe in many cases it will be preferable to what is currently being charged within your respective collection contracts. So we think that there may be an opportunity for an offset of total charges by a reduced processing or disposal fee with the negotiated rates.

 Speaker 4 - 18:04


We'll be going over this again during the governing board meeting and perhaps in greater depth. But we wanted to give you the broad brushstrokes and the contours of where we landed. Right.

 Speaker 1 - 18:14

If you could go to the next slide as well. I think it's important to just go over the process in the phases and what's. At least as the plan in the master plan, what would be performed by the Solid Waste Authority in each of these phases. Okay, and again, I know we'll go over it again with the governing board, but I think it's important for the members of the executive committee.

 Speaker 4 - 18:34

Elisa, if we could advance to Slide 11, please, and the next slide, please. Okay, so these are broad brush strokes. There's far more detail beyond this, but in phase one, that will enable us to go out on the street, issue solicitations to get binding pricing for processing of recyclables and yard trash and disposal. And again, we believe that with the economies of scale, we will have increased bargaining power and we'll be able to secure preferable rates compared to what is being paid now. It also provides long term stability and predictability. Right. So while the master plan had a 40 year planning horizon for financials, we looked out over 20 years and we will continue to assess where we are at every step in the way.

 Speaker 4 - 19:21

And it's really the governing board that has the responsibility and the opportunity to provide further guidance as we go along. As Vida mentioned, we want to move away from the population based revenue generating mechanism

and move to a fairer approach which is based on actual solid waste tonnage. We've already started a really impressive public education and outreach program and we will continue to enhance it. If you remember when we presented on our education outreach white paper, we have budgeted \$10 per household initial years for education and outreach because we know that it has to be a full court press so that we are meeting people where they are and very consistent. And while that funding level does decrease over time, it doesn't mean we're taking our foot off the gas. We have learned from other communities that is an ongoing effort.



Speaker 4 - 20:23

It has to be sustained and it requires the support of all your respective communities so that we are helping people to make better decisions. It's one of the pillars of the master plan. Effectuating behavior change and changing the way that we think about waste so that we can extract the maximum value from the waste drain resources. We are also, as you know, we're planning for eight recycling drop off centers and in part that is to meet people where they are, to make it convenient to recycle, not just curbside, but where people are out in their daily lives to have those facilities available.



Speaker 4 - 21:02

And on a parallel path, we are already moving forward with and we'll continue to develop and implement targeted waste stream programs that address C and D, the heaviest portion and one of the largest portions of our waste stream, commercial recycling and moving towards organic waste processing beyond yard trash. As we move into phase two, we have already done a preliminary siting study, but we will be moving forward with acquiring land for the drop off centers. We'll start developing and operating those centers over that phase two period. We will continue the public education outreach program and we will start to build capital reserves for the future that really provides the economic stability to address unforeseen conditions and plan for capital investments as they are needed. And lastly in phase three, we will require anticipating, completing all of the drop off centers, expanding the diversion programs.



Speaker 4 - 22:02

We are, there's a deep dive on innovative technologies Both in terms of facilities and software and hardware. We are going to continue to monitor the marketplace to identify opportunities that we can leverage that innovation. We continue the education and outreach and we continue building capital reserves.



Speaker 1 - 22:21

All right, thank you, Daniel. I'll open up to questions from the executive committee. Just to clarify, on the surcharge of \$2 a ton, the average household generates 1.3 tons per year. So the estimated per household cost begins at roughly \$2.60 per household per year.



Speaker 4 - 22:43

Correct.



Speaker 1 - 22:43

For the whole year?



Speaker 4 - 22:44

Correct.



Speaker 1 - 22:45

Okay, thank you. I just wanted to clarify. Member Matteo bowen.



Speaker 8 - 22:48

Thank you, Mr.



Speaker 9 - 22:49

Chair.




Speaker 8 - 22:50

Thank you, Daniel, for your presentation. I know when I have the discussion, this discussion with my commission last week during our workshop, the reoccurring question that folks kept asking was in regards to pricing, are we, when we talk about the tipping surcharge and all of the costs, will this be absorbed in our millage rate? How are we estimating that we're increasing this every year? They just wanted a guesstimate of the added cost because we want to make sure that we put funds aside to absorb any and our residents don't carry that burden.




Speaker 12 - 23:36


So it would depend on how your collections rates are paid for right now. So again, when the haulers go to the disposal or processing facilities, they are paying that surcharged. So then they're going to come back to the cities and say we're going to need to raise your collections rates.

 Speaker 1 - 23:55


So but to be clear, what we're talking about per household is again, roughly \$2.60 per household for the whole year. But the issue of increase, especially as it goes to the millage, that's one of the slides where you have it laid out for each year in 2033 is projected to be 286 per ton. Right. Which would roughly be depending where we're at, or \$3.50 or whatever per household for the whole year.

 Speaker 12 - 24:25


Yes. Okay. So in that instance, roughly 30 cents a month. But understanding that some communities, if you're saying that desire to subsidize that would be the number that you are looking at per household per year. But again, it does have to do with how those collections rates are paid right now.

 Speaker 13 - 24:44


Okay, perfect.

 Speaker 8 - 24:45


Thank you for that. And then my follow up question that my colleagues asked me is say this master plan does move forward. How frequently are we updating this? How frequently are we revisiting this? Because we don't want to move forward.

 Speaker 1 - 25:02


And maybe something in the master plan.

 Speaker 8 - 25:04


Doesn't work and we want to revamp it. So are we as the governing body, the one that will request the revamp or.

 Speaker 1 - 25:11


Yeah.

 Speaker 8 - 25:12


Okay, so how frequently are we thinking about.

 Speaker 1 - 25:14


I think that's. If we get by today.

 Speaker 11 - 25:16


Okay.

 Speaker 1 - 25:17


If we get by today. That's the task. Hello, sir, how are you? Nice to see that is the task of the executive committee and the governing board to set that.

 Speaker 8 - 25:26


Okay.

 Speaker 14 - 25:27


And.

 Speaker 1 - 25:27


And in combination with not only the financing, which is important. Right, right. We're going to be examining technology, compliance with contracts, whether the facilities are working. This cannot be a 40 year master plan that in the 40th year we first look at it.

 Speaker 8 - 25:43


Correct.

 Speaker 1 - 25:44


So let me just say this. Unlike the RV structure, each city has a seat at the table. Every city has a seat at the governing board. Every city can say at any time, hey, it's time to reevaluate this. It's a really important question. And there has to be. If we get by today, there has to be a commitment of the governing board to examine this in a perpetually. And we know that in the first, particularly in the first two phases, that examination is going to be very intense. Right. It's going to be essentially monthly as we're dealing with negotiating contracts and looking at compliance and dealing with the city issues. The bigger concern is that there slips in some sort of sense of lack of urgency in year five or year ten, and we can't let that happen.

 Speaker 8 - 26:36


And to your point, Mr. Chair, thank you for that. In regards to the other municipalities that have not given their buy in, are we continuing to engage them and let them know that this is a changing document or a working document? Because from my conversations with my colleagues in those cities is that they want to see what we bring up. And then if something they do not like, they still won't join. But if there's room to make additions and edits, they're more likely to come on board. So I just really want to state that for the record that this is a working document and something that we're working to benefit our entire county. Thank you, Mr.

 Speaker 9 - 27:20


Chair.

 Speaker 1 - 27:21


And it's an excellent point that member material raises in that from the outset of the Solid Waste Working Group through the initiation of the Solid Waste Authority, this has never been an us and them process, at least from the perspective of those of us who've been working on this. And that is that every community should be paying attention to this. Our job was to build a system that would encourage communities that had decided to sit on the sidelines to join. That's our job. It's our job to make sure that all communities that are around the table have a voice. And I think it's an excellent point we can't lose sight of. For the three communities that have not joined for whatever reason, the door is always open. But beyond that, we want their ideas and where this can be improved.

 Speaker 1 - 28:07


And I appreciate speaking, always maintaining that while understanding that we have an obligation to continue to engage those communities. And that's an excellent point. Thank you.

 Speaker 8 - 28:18


Thank you, Mr.

 Speaker 2 - 28:19


Chair.

 Speaker 1 - 28:19


Member Horland.

 Speaker 15 - 28:21


Thank you, Mr. Chair. Daniel, you've heard that the financial modeling is the most critical part for all of us in this room. And having sat through a couple of presentations this week, I want to play devil's advocate and just have absolute clarity before we go forward today and have full confidence in the numbers that are presented to us. We've seen that per ton number come down from six to four to two. What I want to ask you today is two very quick questions. The tonnage report that is online and that's been presented previously and I know that some of the cities, including mine, have expressed some concerns about the numbers on that. The Broward mass balance number, for example, city of Plantation. When we back out bulk and cnd, the numbers on here are three times more than our actual numbers.

 Speaker 15 - 29:09


So my concern about that is I want to make sure that the accuracy is there and how this is affecting our financial modeling.

 Speaker 1 - 29:18


Do you want to speak to that?

 Speaker 4 - 29:20


It's a fair question. So let me walk you back. Where we started almost two years ago was combining population data, waste composition data and projection. So we relied on. We started with census information and then we there was more current information specific to Broward county that formed the baseline to project or to estimate where we are with tonnage today and what is going to what we can reasonably expect in the future. There is some imprecision with projections and we know that. We've also validated the total tonnage assigned to a given community. And we know that there can be differences between what is assigned to residential and to non residential. And for that reason, that's why we focused on a tonnage basis, because one, it's fairer and because there's a nexus with who generates and what the cost is.

 Speaker 4 - 30:24


But we are confident in the numbers that are presented. And as was indicated, you know, how often do we go back and reassess this? I'll ask Vida to talk about best practices from financial analysis, but this will be a failure. If a master plan sits on the shelf. It was stated it's a strategic document. It is the plan. But ultimately activation of the Plan rests with the governing board and the executive committee. Depending on where there is the specific responsibility is. So there will be continuous engagement to make sure that there is alignment with the numbers, the real world conditions and the policy direction from this body.

 Speaker 15 - 31:09


Okay, last very quick question. Anticipating questions that you may be getting as and I just want to say putting on another hat as president Briard Lee cities, I will be present at as many of those presentations as possible because I think it's important that our colleagues see that the league is also supporting this initiative. So I think it's important for all of us to be in support as these workshops take place. When we talk about recycling rates and as we are trying to educate people and get more people recycling, I want to be absolutely clear if those questions come up about a city's overall cost increasing. So it stands to reason if we are say for example paying 5749 on class one waste, if we're diverting more to that of that to recycling, costs are going to go up.

 Speaker 15 - 31:56


Right, because we're paying more for the recycling rights.

 Speaker 4 - 31:58


But it really is marginal when you think about the total amount that is generated per household. A portion is for recycling, a portion is for disposal. So while the numbers look big when you actually apportion it to the stream, it really is a marginal impact.

 Speaker 15 - 32:15


Okay. And I appreciate that because I think those are the questions that we're going to be hearing.

 Speaker 13 - 32:18


Thank you.

 Speaker 4 - 32:18


Thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 32:19


Member fir Vice Chair.

 Speaker 10 - 32:22


Thank you. And I appreciate mater by one's comment on the living. I think we have to look at.

 Speaker 4 - 32:27

This as a living document.

 Speaker 10 - 32:29

And you know, there's a lot of questions out there right now. We all just got the numbers. We're all kind of looking at it. So I, you know, I can understand the question and it does need to get. Need to be looked at constantly. I think that one of the places where I'm seeing where I can't quite figure it out is I look at the total tonnage and I look and I'm maybe I'll look at Fort Lauderdales for an example. It's like 400,000 tons almost. And Sam, you had brought this up that first we are looking at what the cost would be per ton and that kind of stuff. We were looking at their total tonnage, but there's a lack of a lot of that is commercial. So how do we just. When we're.

 Speaker 10 - 33:15

When someone's bringing in the garbage to a place that's a disposal site, how are we going to be able to. And how does it work that we're able to distinguish between residential and commercial? How does that pass through work? Because I think for most of us, we're responsible to our. Our citizens, and we want to make sure that rate is at that, you know, what we're talking about \$2, you know, person, per. Per household. But there's a whole nother side to this. That is the commercial rate. So does. How does that part work? And I mean, I guess every truck coming in is either residential or commercial truck. Is that what it is? And that's how you make the distinction.



Speaker 12 - 33:59

But ultimately it wouldn't matter because it's just going to be passed through in the collections rates.



Speaker 10 - 34:06

But it would matter because if you're asking the city to pay, you know, that other part, they've got to be able to distinguish it.



Speaker 4 - 34:15

If I may so that you've hit on a very important issue months ago when we said, really, the only way to address the concern that you've raised is to have contracts for processing and disposal. In the absence of flow control, we can talk about the 5 million tons that's generated in Broward County. But going out on the street to say, well, maybe in a year we'll have control. Why would anybody want to respond to that? Because they're spending their good money to chase what isn't real yet. And that's why we first sort of move towards what are the ranges that we think are reasonable. And ultimately, we landed at the maximum service charges that were just presented to you. So once we go out on the street with solicitations, secure contracts, that's where really the authority has more influence.




Speaker 4 - 35:16

All of the ILA communities will gain the benefit of those rates. And we believe in many cases they are going to be less than what folks are paying today.




Speaker 10 - 35:23


And I think this is important because I think, Sam, you caught this kind of in terms of how you were looking at how everything looked like it was getting charged, and you kind of caught that distinction between what cities are, what residential. And I thank you for that because I think it made for people that were thinking they were looking at what their tonnage was and they were multiplying. Oh, wait, we're going to be paying way more. That's a very important distinction. The other part, Denise, I think what you were talking about with. That's a good question. When you're asking about with recycle, you know, if we're getting more recycling, are we paying a higher rate? One part is the lighter stuff, but the heavier stuff is actually going to be cheaper because of. Because of the leafage and all that kind of stuff.

 Speaker 10 - 36:12


That part's actually going to be cheaper. So I think that. I think there is where the wash is, you know, I mean, I think that's. Is that a fair assessment on that? Okay. Because I mean, if you're hauling trees and stuff, that's a lot more than a plastic bottle, so.

 Speaker 1 - 36:30


All right, Member ridell.

 Speaker 6 - 36:35


Thank you, Mr. Chair. I want to just. I'm really gonna ask Jamie some questions because I think it's important and it piggyback on what member Matteo Bowen said. I know we're all qualifying this as a living, breathing document. Right. Usually I agree that with the Constitution. Now, what's interesting is the constitution is written, can't really be changed, can be interpreted, can be amended. Right. Jamie, I want you to be very clear right now with this body of how the master plan can be changed. Because in my interpretation, not that easy. Can be activated on. Can be, you know, utilized, can't really be changed that easy. As well as how could the facility as amendment be changed? And I think that's a really important distinction.

 Speaker 6 - 37:20

While I do agree with member Mater Bone, it is a living, breathing document, we need as a body to be crystal clear on how and when that living, breathing document gets changed. Because how I interpret it, not so easy. But I turn to our attorney.

 Speaker 1 - 37:36

Yes, let me preliminarily say that's an excellent point. There are aspects of this that are absolutely clear that it cannot be changed easily. As we'll present to the governing board and the executive committee is aware of the facilities amendment, it's very clear there are only certain solid waste facilities we can do to make any change in that is a governing board process. And it's hard, it's intended to be hard. In terms of what happens on wind down, it's very clear that can't be changed easily. But the issues of what is the right tonnage, what is the right amount, what is going on with which programs, how are we flipping the levers on each of the commodity streams to maximize the value and minimize cost. That's easily adaptable and almost meeting by meeting.

 Speaker 1 - 38:32

In a sense, that's an examination, but I think your point is really well taken because there are some who are extremely happy that there are aspects of this master plan that do not include certain solid waste facilities. And the message has to be very clear. It cannot be changed easily. That's a really good point. Jamie, can you summarize that?



Speaker 3 - 38:54

Certainly for the master plan, there's certain types of quote, significant amendments. Those significant amendments are very difficult. They need a very high threshold vote of municipal population, etc. Those are things like in addition or removal of any category of waste from the jurisdiction, closure of our solid waste disposal facility, anything that affects the county obligations. Those are deemed to be significant amendments and those are very difficult to amend. I mean you say the US Constitution can be amended, but it's difficult. That would be very difficult. Simple changes to the master plan, those can be done by the governing board. And you know, there's requirement voting for requirements as such, but it's not that difficult to do smaller changes. As far as the facilities amendment, there's also a whole long list of things that require a very, a super majority vote.



Speaker 3 - 39:51

There's some things that require everyone to agree, for example, to own or operate a solid waste facility, disposal facility or waste energy plant requires an amendment to facilities amendment. And I think the population, cities represent a population of 80% of the municipal parties. So that's a. Almost everyone would have to agree to something that significant. So I guess it really depends on how significant the amendment is. The small, minor stuff, it's a working document. Those things can be changed. Big significant fundamental things need very high voting requirements.



Speaker 6 - 40:24


So I think that's important to be brought up today because I think the chair is right in terms of the implementation of these issues, right in terms of tonnage and things like that. But I don't want to the sentiment to be coming out of this room to us presenting to other people saying oh it's, you know, we can sit down every year and rehash certain components to it. Simply I don't believe is true. And that's my interpret. You know, that's my legal opinion of it. Not that I'm the lawyer for the authority, but I think that's an important component that we all need to go into to not, I don't want to say, I don't use the term misrepresent but to properly educate our own municipalities on getting this to the finish line, fully support it. But the other.




Speaker 6 - 41:00

I'll put the asterisk on it today because we're ultimately being asked as an executive committee to vote to present it to the. I don't even know if we have quorum. We do. We're ready. I say it because if there is, if any member on this body has a what I'll call a last minute change or a fundamental change or some asterisk, it's easier to implement


before the vote. And I say that as just if there's some interpretive issue, that there's an issue. I don't have one. It's a cautionary note that it's easier to do it now than in a month. That's all I got. Thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 41:30


Okay, thank you, Member Gellert. And then we'll go around the room. We do have a full quorum for the governing board, so the full presentation will be presented from start to finish.

 Speaker 16 - 41:42


Thank you, Mr.

 Speaker 5 - 41:42


Chair.

 Speaker 16 - 41:43

To follow up on what commissioner, member, council member, commissioner President Worland was asking.


 Speaker 6 - 41:49

About.


 Speaker 16 - 41:52

And a little on what commissioner Mater Bowen was talking about, I think we're looking at two separate costs here. And this has always been my concern. You've got the two and a half dollars so tipping fee and then the roughly doubling on recycling from 50 something to about 110. Let me finish and I'll get to that in a moment. So what I think is the issue, and this is why I've had some concerns. Cities that are already doing recycling, I think will end up better off than they are now through our ability to generate more and better pricing power. Cities that are


not currently doing curbside recycling or not recycling at all are going to end up paying a lot more than they are now because they will be recycling when they're not.

 Speaker 16 - 42:49


I think everybody in this room recognizes that we should be recycling. But I'm afraid some cities, if they find that the recycling rates will double, are going to say no. Do we have a list? I'm sure we do. I am not familiar with it as to what cities are currently doing curbside recycling and which are not, because again, if you are doing it, you'll be much better off under this agreement. If you're not doing it, you'll be doing the right thing, but it's going to cost your residence. Do we know that answer?

 Speaker 1 - 43:22


Yes, we have all of that. It's all been outlined and graphically and otherwise. Let me put a finer point on that. It's not that they're recycling rates going up. It's that they're not recycling it at all and they're sending it all to landfill or wte. So they're taking up, and I say this as you're the one of the county representatives who we hear so often about the statutory responsibility for disposal, which is finite. They are taking capacity from the finite resources that the county is responsible to at least direct us towards. And yes, rather than throwing it in the landfill, the ocean or wte, there they will have a choice to make whether to join or not.

 Speaker 1 - 44:04

But I don't think any city who says, look, I'm not so sure I want to join because we just don't want to recycle should assume that they'll always have the opportunity to send it to WTE or the landfill, because for the rest of us, they're taking capacity and the Solid Waste Authority has to construct a system. Does it? That's number one.

 Speaker 16 - 44:25

I agree with everything you just said.

 Speaker 1 - 44:27

I know you do. Number two, and I know you've been very supportive of this. Number two, there are some aspects that will. Will increase and there'll be other aspects of that should be offset. And I, and I think that's a complicated formula for certain cities that just refuse and can't have decided economically, whatever. And that's going to be part of our job to figure out where do we create those levers for incentive. But the alternative for those cities that say, now we're not in, we're going to continue to just throw it in landfill or wt, they shouldn't assume that's always going to be the case. Thank you. Okay, Member Solomon. And then we'll just come around and.



Speaker 12 - 45:09

For the purposes of the governing board presentation. So I, I really think what we're talking about, Member Mateo Bowen started the conversation. I really think it's the governance oversight.



Speaker 17 - 45:21

Right.



Speaker 12 - 45:22

And so part of that is also assessing roi.



Speaker 11 - 45:26

Right.



Speaker 12 - 45:26

Coming from kind of a corporate America person. And so, you know, this is a business for a very important cause. Right. But it's money and it's metrics. So what is our plan? And I think this is important. We don't have to answer it now. But as we present to the governing.



Speaker 17 - 45:43

Board, we need to have, you know,.

Speaker 12 - 45:45



Is it quarterly metrics that guide and inform what we need to change? And that is really, I think, you know, what does that. So we need to spell out that plan. And I don't know, is that the governing board? Who is that? But I'm not sure that we have that fully baked. So that's my comment.



Speaker 11 - 46:05

Thank you.



Speaker 1 - 46:06

I think it's an excellent point. I think that part of the analysis that will go forward will be breaking these commodity streams into subparts that we already know are identified. Because as we again, move the levers on any one of this, from composting the yard waste to, we know that in the private sector, the bean counters are saying this works, right? They're reducing their hauling because they've diverted out of the traditional solid waste and they're using it in the circular economy, those are. It's a little easier in a closed system, but. But that type of analysis that the bean counters are already doing right here in Broward county to implement their own programs is exactly what we need to figure out. How to do.



Speaker 1 - 46:46

How each city analyzes that may be a little bit challenging, but the overall system has to evaluate how we've preserved finite capacity, met the state goals, our own goals, participated in the circular economy, reduced hauling costs in some cases as we get further out. That has to be part of the analysis. There's no question, and I think it's an excellent point for you to raise with the governing board as well. There's a commitment to do that. Member Mead and Member Suham and Member Sorensen.



Speaker 4 - 47:22

Thank you, chair. Quickly. First, I just wanted to thank Mr. Deutsch and Mr. May for coming to Weston and making a presentation to our commission meeting. It's a great presentation. We thank you for that. I appreciate Ms. Horland and Ms. Tai from the Broward League of Cities also being there and helping us participate. Regarding the program may be a little ahead of ourselves, but in the spirit of abundant optimism, have any sites for land, sites for drop off facilities been ID'd? There's like eight that you've mentioned. No, but I will say that we did a sighting analysis, limited sighting analysis as part of preparing the master plan to identify public land, much to the chagrin of the county. Most of them are county owned, but.



Speaker 1 - 48:09

No county said they'll give it to us, don't worry about it. And they'll pay for all this too.



Speaker 4 - 48:13

But no, that is if it's premature at this time to start that siting analysis before we actually have an authority that's going to. Yes, because something that's going to take some time. Yes, that is an activity in phase one, to proceed with that and also to develop and issue the solicitations that we started last fall. We put our pens down many months ago and we will pick that up as well. Okay, thank you. And the second thing is that food waste has not been identified as being kicked into gear until 2031-46. Thinking primarily not of individual homes, but thinking primarily of supermarkets, restaurants, that type of thing. School system that has abundant waste that would seem to me to be a little low hanging fruit.



Speaker 4 - 49:02

And I don't know if that could be kicked forward or not, because that just again, it seems to be something. It'll take some land.



Speaker 1 - 49:08

I get that.



Speaker 4 - 49:09

Yeah. The approach is to crawl before we walk, before we run. And that's why we want to focus on yard trash. Because if you are going, there are lots of ways to beneficially use these materials. But whether it's composting or anaerobic digestion, there are opportunities. But in the short term, the approach is again to meet people where they are. Encourage home composting or food waste segregation at public events. We really need to activate and build the biggest tent to show people how easy it is to take individual action for all of your respective governments to lead in your communities, to share, show how easy it is and lead by example. So it's an incremental approach.




Speaker 4 - 50:00

But if we have curbside collection of food waste, which we have analyzed, that's a big step and we want to make sure that we are ready for it and it's planned for and we're engaging with the governing board appropriately before we activate that kind of program.




Speaker 6 - 50:16


Right.

 Speaker 4 - 50:16


But there would be a big difference between curbside collection and again between what the major supermarkets and those people can do. That's got to look at that as low hanging fruit.

 Speaker 1 - 50:27


Yep.

 Speaker 4 - 50:27


And I don't want to steal May Orion's thunder, but the Florida Panthers at their facility, they are demonstrating they have different sort of control. It's a closed loop. They can dictate what comes in, how it's managed and what goes out. But they are managing food waste within their facilities. So there are lots of examples that will help inform and build momentum for exactly these kinds of initiatives. Thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 50:54


Along that line, I want to thank Plantation Coral Springs. I know Hollywood has and others have been providing information so that the members are already initiating their pilot programs to begin. And what I hear reported is that there's wait lists of folks who want to participate in this. So we know there's energy in the community working through the kinks of that. And to the Panthers, I got the report yesterday that they're just under 7,000 pounds of composting since they started just in the middle of last year.

 Speaker 1 - 51:23


So the momentum's there and I think to member Mead's point, and it's important for not only the executive committee, the governing board, but for the public to realize that we have all been working on trying to establish the foundation for that in our own communities and Rydell's, you know, the schools there have demonstrated and finger wagged at us for us. So, you know, almost every community has some component of it. I heard Davies got something going on as well.

 Speaker 1 - 51:50


I think what we're seeing and what's going to happen from this is I think very early on, assuming we get by today, is that we're going to see yet again another subcommittee stood up that's going to focus on these pilot programs, synthesizing and synchronizing the messaging on composting, how it can be done and getting rid of the myths while addressing the substantial challenges of any ultimate curbside. But starting as was said, to walk before we run to make sure that we have the facilities for drop off and otherwise. So it's an intense program that's already begun in cities.

 Speaker 10 - 52:26


Let me add one part on that. The important part is that the infrastructure is now getting established. What we didn't have because those cities are doing it on a kind of a smaller scale, but on the large scale. The contract that the county did with waste management provides for acres and acres of compost up there. They have to do that. That's part of the contract. The reason that it's not there's no more food waste going into Monarch Hill is because it is now going to be going to Okeechobee on a large scale. That's so that having that ready and that looks to the bigger issues of climate warming and global warming and trying to reduce methane. So those are the bigger issues of how it ties into it.

 Speaker 1 - 53:12


Okay, member Suham and then member Tor and then we'll close.

 Speaker 13 - 53:17


Thank you.

 Speaker 12 - 53:17


Chair.

 Speaker 13 - 53:17


Quickly, just on the composting Filthy Organics was at Warner Matters day and he could not give away the byproduct fast enough. So I think people are really seeing the benefit of it. My question is this and it may be the elephant in the room, I don't know. But my comment was exactly that of Senator Geller with respect to, you know, clearly some cities will initially be winners and some may be playing paying a little more. Has there been analysis of knowing what you know about which cities are recycling and which aren't, as to how long it would take and if at all the cities that aren't recycling will basically be where they are today because the savings in unit prices due to the number of participants or the number of, you know, the amount of tonnage is there has been.

 Speaker 13 - 54:14


Has there been analysis that yes, they're going to maybe pay more today, but in time with the increase in quantity and all of us working collectively together, the unit prices will even out. And also I just want to point out a city that doesn't recycle is not paying zero to your point. They're just paying as a solid waste price. So does that make sense that question?

 Speaker 10 - 54:38


Yeah.

 Speaker 4 - 54:39


And It's a terrific question. And that's so what we've learned, right, as we've gone from the work that we're doing to the one one conversations with the members of the governing board. What we're seeing is a need for a workshop or it's called different things in different Communities, but so that we can have a conversation around that. So we've been working, I'm sure many of you are aware, with the professional staff, with the administrative staff from communities so that we can address those specific questions. Because the data that we have, if you remember, were pulling teeth for many months to get just basic financial information. Every city, most likely every city handles the finances differently. So it really is a conversation to be prepared for those workshops so that we can address those questions specifically.

 Speaker 12 - 55:26


Okay.

 Speaker 13 - 55:26


But yes, I'm just kind of picturing like a fictional city, you know, who this is, what is happening now, this is what's going to happen in 2027, 2013, that kind of thing.

 Speaker 4 - 55:38


But and I've been referring to it as the sausage making. We've got 29 collection agreements and then there are sub agreements within that for processing and disposal. There's a process of aligning that and it's going to take some time.

 Speaker 13 - 55:53


Gotcha. Okay, thank you so much. And I too just want to say thank you to your firm and your sub consultants and Sam, for getting us today.

 Speaker 11 - 56:04


Thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 56:05


Okay, Member Sorensen, then I have member Bright Freeze's hand up online and then I'll come to member right now. All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you for having me here representing city of Fort Lauderdale. So thank you. Thank you. Honored to be here. Thank you.

 Speaker 5 - 56:25


Thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 56:25

Don't, don't set the bar too high for me. Keep it very low. Please perform much better. Thank you. Vice chair for Mr.

 Speaker 3 - 56:34

Chair.

 Speaker 1 - 56:34

I'll call it a encouraging call that he gave me to make sure we're here today as a city.



Speaker 3 - 56:42

So happy to be here.



Speaker 1 - 56:46

Just a couple, maybe one basic question. The executive committee, is it. And just again, not knowing the process and the history and being a complete rookie, is it possible for the city of Fort Lauderdale to have a seat on the executive Committee? It's never been impossible, but the ILA that we all signed set very clear democratic principles.



Speaker 14 - 57:09

Okay.



Speaker 1 - 57:10

For the large cities, which Fort Lauderdale qualifies, obviously there are five elected members and an alternate.



Speaker 6 - 57:17

Okay.



Speaker 1 - 57:19

In that process, and I won't go back over, but in the process, Fort Lauderdale was an alternate and an alternate is as important as members and we'll go to Member Bred Cruise in a moment, who has 7,783 residents. But I don't. I don't know that most people around the table even know that he's an alternate because he's at every meeting, he's, you know, participating in the subcommittees. And his leadership reaches beyond the borders of a city. He's conducted all sorts of additional assistance to the other members. So for whatever reason, and I don't know why, but for whatever reason, when Fort Lauderdale was an alternate, weren't here. And Miramar, who is another large city, want to be part of this process as well. Every large city wants to be part of this.



Speaker 1 - 58:10

What's important is that unlike the rrb, every city has a seat at the table. Every city has a voice. Even as we talk here in the Executive committee, there are members who have spoken, who are not members of the executive committee, who've raised comments. And so what I want to make clear is I am thrilled you're here. I think we all feel that as long as I'm chair, I want Fort Lauderdale to have a seat at the table. And as a voice, and I will tell you whether an alternate or otherwise, the executive committee has never taken a vote that didn't have in consideration the voice of an alternate or the voice of someone who was not even a member but was a member of the governing board. I can say that with confidence because I've sat in this chair.



Speaker 4 - 59:01

We need you.



Speaker 1 - 59:03

We want you. We generate in this county twice the national average of trash. But that's because we're blessed to be a tourist destination. It is not because we're trash generators, because we are place.



Speaker 3 - 59:19

Right.



Speaker 1 - 59:20

We're not sloppier than everybody else.



Speaker 11 - 59:22

Right.



Speaker 1 - 59:23

And we have a crisis. You know it as well as anybody. We're throwing 20,000 pounds of trash away every minute of every day while we've been here. Just think of what the numbers are this morning. And so we need Fort Lauderdale.



Speaker 4 - 59:38

And I am.



Speaker 1 - 59:39

I can't overstate. It would not be possible to overstate how happy I am that you're here. And I think the members are with respect to the executive Committee at the next election. I think Fort Lauderdale should make its voice heard and whatever that is. But understand that when it came time, there were a lot of members here who were at every meeting.



Speaker 3 - 01:00:01

Sure.



Speaker 1 - 01:00:02

Who were at the bi weekly meetings, who were heavily participating. And maybe a value judgment was made in that democratic process.



Speaker 3 - 01:00:11

Sure.




Speaker 1 - 01:00:11

But it was never intended ever to exclude Fort Lauderdale, not hear its voice. We need you at the executive committee meetings. We need you at the governing board meetings, and we need Fort Lauderdale to tap meetings because we. While we can do this without certain cities and we could certainly move forward without Fort Lauderdale, it makes no sense. We're trying to solve this together, from the sea grass to the sawgrass. And so we need you. I appreciate that. Thank you. That sounds great. And so let me just play it back to you just so I'll make sure I'm understanding, which is going forward. Fort Lauderdale representative, whether it's me or whoever it might be, can attend the executive committee meetings. They've always had that invitation, even when they were an alternate and weren't showing up.




Speaker 6 - 01:00:59


Yep.

 Speaker 1 - 01:01:00


They could come to whichever ones they want or call in. Got it. Or do whatever and can participate in those, ask questions and so forth. Okay. And then to become a formal member of the executive committee, that's through an election, which is. Sorry. In November of 2026. Yes. Okay. There's going to be a vacancies so that we'll have to have that vote.

 Speaker 3 - 01:01:24


Okay.

 Speaker 1 - 01:01:25


That's fantastic. That makes.

 Speaker 14 - 01:01:27


Keep coming.

 Speaker 1 - 01:01:27


Well, you might want better representation than me, so. And that's not a judgment call against anyone else who comes, because we. We know you are, as a. As a community, as a city, as a major economic player in the region, not just the county, take these issues seriously. I know that we do, and I'm honored to be part of this conversation. And then just lastly, just because our four lateral city commission last night asked me if I'd be here today, which I'm honored to be here, I have to leave at 11am So I just want to share that. All right. So we'll try to get to the full presentation as soon as possible, but we don't want you to leave. And I'll turn it before I go to member Riedel, to member Colburn, because member Colburn also wanted this seat here.

 Speaker 1 - 01:02:14


And I think it's really important that Miramar has been a powerful voice. Ralph said every. Not only every one of these meetings, but at every meeting that exists that says anything about solid waste. I'm not even sure he's the same person. I think there's two of them.

 Speaker 11 - 01:02:29


Well, I will say member Sorensen, I guess we will be competing because they're only about so many positions to be on the executive board. And I do want to say that it does feel that we don't have a voice when we're not on the executive committee. One of the questions that I do have is how do we change that? I understand that's part of the ila, but how can we change that makeup? What does it take? Can a member, as myself, City of Miramar, 140,000 residents, or City of Fort Lauderdale, submit a proposal to the governing board that we're on to make a change to the ila? Is that something that we can do? City to the attorney.

 Speaker 3 - 01:03:26


Yes. The ILA can be amended. There's a provision. I'm sorry, The ILA can be amended at any time. It takes a.

 Speaker 11 - 01:03:35


But the way it is. The way it is amended, can one board member make that recommendation to the governing board? So I'm speaking specifically of the process, because I don't believe the answer is yes.

 Speaker 3 - 01:03:57

After speaking with you at a governing board meeting, a member of the governing board, which is not just the executive committee, the whole governing board.

 Speaker 11 - 01:04:05

Right.

 Speaker 3 - 01:04:06

Proposed that in order for it to happen, the governing board would. Would vote to direct me to draft it. It would then have to be approved by two thirds by the county and cities representing two thirds of the population. Now, theoretically, it could be added to the facilities amendment that we're about to send out.



Speaker 17 - 01:04:26

Okay.



Speaker 3 - 01:04:27

If the board wants to do that, we could. We could add another seat to the large cities or we could add, you know, whatever. If we're about to go to all the cities and we're going to need. This facilities Amendment needs actually 80%.



Speaker 11 - 01:04:40

So this would be the time to do that.



Speaker 3 - 01:04:42

It could be added if. If a majority wanted to do that, yes.




Speaker 10 - 01:04:46

Okay.




Speaker 3 - 01:04:46


At the governing board, not at the.

 Speaker 11 - 01:04:48


Executive committee, but yes, on the governing board.

 Speaker 2 - 01:04:51


Okay.

 Speaker 1 - 01:04:53

I welcome any changes that make people feel they're at seat, but I take exception with the idea that non members of the executive committee. I take exception that non members of the executive committee feel they don't have a voice. I think this executive committee has been incredibly careful to make sure. I appreciate that you have become so much more engaged. But we never cut out any city and executive committee meetings. Again, there are people who come as alternates who cannot vote because there's nothing to be an alternate to. All the members have shown in that particular area yet they have a full voice. And member Brett Cruz is the best example of that. When he's here as an alternate with all the members already here, it's as if he's just a member of the governing board. He has no voting right.

 Speaker 1 - 01:05:38

He can't make a motion. He's a voice. And so I want to make clear, while I welcome any change, it's Going to make two cities feel. Remember, that means you got to be here. Right. Because we have quorum issues as executive committee at times. And I know you will, but I want to make it clear that it's not because there's a lack of hearing. And I'll leave it to the individual executive committee members to respond to it. But let's be clear, no matter what the outcome of that is, we need all the voices at the table. But we are holding monthly meetings of the executive committee. Governing board is a challenge sometimes to get quorum, but we always get there. Executive committee can be a challenge. So I welcome the recommendation when we get to the governing board.

 Speaker 11 - 01:06:23

Okay, thank you. This is certainly not personal, that when I say, you know, that we're not valued, we don't have the equal vote. We don't have that voice that I currently have for my residents when it comes to their waste issue when I sit on, when the city is part of this board. So if I don't have that voice and I have a seat at the table, I would want to have a vote along with the seat. So I appreciate being invited to the meeting. I just want to be able to have an equal vote for my city. So amendment would be. Amendment that would facilitate. That would be great. And if we had like two minutes in between the meetings that I could speak to the city attorney, I would appreciate that. Solid waste attorney.



Speaker 1 - 01:07:15

But be clear, there's lots of cities that want to be. We cannot have 28 members on the executive committee. We will not get any work done. So I invite. And I. And I. And I welcome that. But be clear that we've always had that. And I'll turn it to member Bright Cruise before member Rydell as an example of that. Member Bright Cruise.



Speaker 5 - 01:07:35

Thank you, Chair. I'm sorry that I couldn't be there in person, but I appreciate this opportunity and appreciate those kind words. You know, just to. This wasn't what I originally was going to speak on, but just since it's the topic that we're talking about at the moment, I just would like to also add to what you said that I've always felt the full part of that committee, the executive committee even serving as an alternate. Yet at times when they take the vote, if. If the other two members from the small members are there, I just keep my mouth shut at the voting time. But you know what? The important thing to me has always been not necessarily being able to vote because we've had very few votes that were close.



Speaker 5 - 01:08:21

It's the opportunity to speak to voice concerns, to voice proposals and have the full members be able to make a judgment call on whether those comments are worthy of being moved forward or whether I was off base. And, and that's the critical thing and being able to have your voice heard. And this executive committee has always been exceptional at hearing any comments and making those judgments. So I appreciate that and I appreciate the kind comments. What I did want to talk a little bit more about was, and I brought this up before and I understand there's a hesitation to believe what I'm saying, but I believe in it. So I'm going to say it yet again and that is I want to talk a little bit about the cost of recycling versus just regular solid waste. We've done that analysis, Waste Management has done.



Speaker 5 - 01:09:15

WM has done that analysis for us separately. And the increased cost or the ability to move from non recycling at all to doing recycling has been less than 5% increase in cost. So I know there's been some, some understanding that this was going to be a massive cost to go from one to the other. I don't believe that's to be true. And what I'll throw out a recommendation that hopefully will make some sense.



Speaker 5 - 01:09:48

I would really like to see our consultants do a, maybe a quick analysis on that because I think that's going to be a major concern that a number of cities is going to have and if we can have them take a look at that and be able to present some sort of a magnitude of cost growth that is going to be associated with those cities that are not doing any recycling now and will be going to recycling, I think that will be very beneficial because I think it will be a surprisingly low number for those municipalities and it may be able to help us get over a significant hurdle with those particular cities.



Speaker 5 - 01:10:35

And then the last thing I'll say and then I'll sign off is, well, I'll still be listening in, but I won't in my comments is that I just want to say that we on our own in Southwest ranches began our own composting program partnering with Filthy Organics. It's been a huge success with minimal cost. And, and so I just say that because I don't think we. The, the master plan is an awesome plan that I fully believe in and engaged with, but I don't think it dictates how quickly we can start things on our own that are in the master plan and kind of get ahead of the curve on those things and So I just would throw that out there. Keep that in mind that we can always move a little faster as municipalities if the master plan goes forward.



Speaker 5 - 01:11:25

But you know that doesn't restrict us in that way. So thank you, Chair. Appreciate being able to make those comments.



Speaker 1 - 01:11:32

Thank you. Member Reitcruz, Member Rydell and then we'll close.



Speaker 6 - 01:11:36

It's really just to answer a couple of the questions that were, you know, referenced in some capacity in terms of cities that don't do curbside recycling. We don't right now. We stopped about five, six years ago in terms of curbside. The city invested due to contamination rates and the cost and things weren't ultimately getting recycled. We made an economic decision ultimately because it wasn't really being recycled at all. We ended up investing a heavy amount of money into drop off locations and it is a wild success in the city. We've done pretty well in that. That being said, to answer your question, we, whether we extend a current contract or whether we go to bid, we're in that window right now to make a determination. I can't speak to that. Obviously there's a cone of silence going on in our city.



Speaker 6 - 01:12:14

But whatever we move forward will bring back curbside recycling with the understanding it will have a greater cost. So there will be a cost to bring it back in with the hope that by bringing it back in we will then as a city reap the benefit. I know you recently went back to curbside and Sunrise and I know that I think there's only two other cities that are member cities that don't right now. I don't. I mean, I know you do. I think it's just Deerfield and Navy. I don't want to throw anyone under the bus, but we all make the decisions we make. But my understanding through some of listening to some of the TAC meetings is everyone's intent on when their renewals are to come up, understanding there's going to be an increase.



Speaker 6 - 01:12:49

So there may not be as much of a benefit as you guys are all going to see. Right. But that's at least our intent in Coconut Creek to bring it back in house with the understanding that we'll meet all the parameters for whatever amendments come out of here in good faith. So to answer that question, Senator walked in at the wrong time, but I was answering the question about curbside recycling but you left and I'm not going to answer it again, but I'll tell you about it after. So. All right, that's all I got.



Speaker 1 - 01:13:15

We're at. We're at the stage, Ms. Cole, please outline what the process is both for the master plan, the facilities amendment. Sure.



Speaker 3 - 01:13:25

For the master plan is approved by the governing board, so the executive committee can, if it wants, make a recommendation to the governing board. So if you choose to, and there's no requirement that there be a recommendation, but normally that's the way we've operated. So you could have a motion to recommend the master plan to the governing board. And then when we get to the governing board meeting, the governing board would need to approve it. And that needs. The master plan needs to be approved by the county. By the county has to vote yes. And cities representing two thirds of the municipal party's population, which is approximately 1.1 million. So.



Speaker 1 - 01:14:06

And to put in context, the recommendation, even by the governing board, is not passing the master plan, because that's only the first stop, if you will, on the next stage. Right. Because what happens, it has to go to the cities to ultimately. No, wait, let me finish. Let me finish. Let me finish. It's going to each of the cities for their review. And while they only have to approve the facilities agreement, we all understand that if the master plan doesn't work, facilities agreement is not going to get voted. So I want to make clear to all the members what we're doing. If somebody say, look, I have some angst, I have some issues, but let's move it along so that at least we can get it to the city for discussion.



Speaker 1 - 01:14:44

It's not the master plan, ultimately that will be passed because that is a living. It's the facilities amendment. But we are all mindful that if the master plan doesn't pass, the facilities amendment isn't going to pass. I mean, that's the reality, correct?



Speaker 3 - 01:14:55

Right? That is correct. And just because a governing board member votes yes today does not mean that the city has to vote yes on the facilities amendment.



Speaker 14 - 01:15:05

Correct.



Speaker 3 - 01:15:06

I mean, this is really, it's being approved by the governing board, but it is just to move it forward.



Speaker 1 - 01:15:12

Okay.



Speaker 3 - 01:15:12

On the facilities amendment, the governing board can. Will vote to recommend it to the cities. That just requires majority vote. But then the cities, the county plus cities representing 80% of the population are going to have to approve it. And anyone who doesn't approve it is out. They're basically opting out of the solid waste authority.



Speaker 1 - 01:15:35

Okay.



Speaker 3 - 01:15:36

So the action for the executive committee is first to recommend the master plan and second to recommend the facilities amendment.



Speaker 1 - 01:15:47

Okay. All right. Do we have a motion on the master plan? Motion by member Cagiano. Is there A second. Second. Second by member Dunn. Any discussion on that motion? Go ahead and call the question by individual role.



Speaker 2 - 01:16:04

To recommend the master plan.



Speaker 1 - 01:16:06

To the governing board. Yes.



Speaker 2 - 01:16:07

Chair Ryan?




Speaker 1 - 01:16:08

Yes.




Speaker 2 - 01:16:10


Vice Chair Furr?

 Speaker 10 - 01:16:11


Yes.

 Speaker 2 - 01:16:13


Member Shuham?

 Speaker 1 - 01:16:14


Yes.

 Speaker 2 - 01:16:15


Member Horland? Member Material Bowen?

 Speaker 8 - 01:16:18

Yes.

 Speaker 2 - 01:16:19

Member Dunn?

 Speaker 1 - 01:16:20

Yes.



Speaker 2 - 01:16:21

Member Riddell?



Speaker 6 - 01:16:22

Yes.



Speaker 2 - 01:16:23

Member Meade?



Speaker 4 - 01:16:24

Yes.



Speaker 2 - 01:16:25

Member Cagiano?




Speaker 1 - 01:16:26

Yes.




Speaker 2 - 01:16:27


Member A.J. Ryan?

 Speaker 10 - 01:16:29


Yes.

 Speaker 2 - 01:16:30


Member Colborne?

 Speaker 3 - 01:16:33


Oh, actually the alternates won't be voting except for Bright Cruise, because Newt is not.

 Speaker 2 - 01:16:39


My apologies. Member of Bright Cruise?

 Speaker 5 - 01:16:42

Yes.

 Speaker 12 - 01:16:44

Thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 01:16:45

Thank you. All right. Facilities amendment. I know we're going to have a proposal. So maybe the first step would be to see if we can move the facilities amendment to the governing board on recommendation and then on. On the

break you could have. I'm mindful that we're going to lose member Sorensen at 11. So we'll take a break in between these. If that works for you.



Speaker 6 - 01:17:03

Member Copernic.



Speaker 1 - 01:17:04

Okay. Do we have a motion on the facilities amendment? So moved. Motion by member Reid?



Speaker 2 - 01:17:11

Second.



Speaker 1 - 01:17:11

Second by member Salaman. Any discussion on that? Go ahead and call the individual roll.



Speaker 2 - 01:17:17

To recommend to the governing board the facilities amendment.



Speaker 1 - 01:17:20

Correct.



Speaker 2 - 01:17:20

Chair Ryan?



Speaker 1 - 01:17:21

Yes.



Speaker 2 - 01:17:23

Vice Chair Furr?



Speaker 18 - 01:17:24

Yes.



Speaker 2 - 01:17:25

Member Shuham?



Speaker 13 - 01:17:26

Yes.




Speaker 2 - 01:17:27

Member Horland?




Speaker 11 - 01:17:28


Yes.

 Speaker 2 - 01:17:28


Member Matteo Bowen?

 Speaker 11 - 01:17:30


Yes.

 Speaker 2 - 01:17:31


Member Dunn? Yes. Member Rideau?

 Speaker 6 - 01:17:34


Yes.

 Speaker 2 - 01:17:35


Member Meade?

 Speaker 4 - 01:17:36


Yes.

 Speaker 2 - 01:17:37


Member Cagiano?

 Speaker 1 - 01:17:38


Yes.

 Speaker 2 - 01:17:39


Member A.J. Ryan?

 Speaker 3 - 01:17:40


Yes.

 Speaker 2 - 01:17:42

Member Bright Cruz?

 Speaker 5 - 01:17:44

Yes.

 Speaker 1 - 01:17:46

Thank you to the executive committee. Thank you for all the hard work. And we know that this is still has effort ahead of it. Why don't we. Ahead and there's no new or old business. Can we have a motion to adjourn? And then I say this, knowing that's going to be hard. We'll take a two minute break and then we'll try to whip everybody back. Do we have a motion to adjourn? Motion by member Suhan. Seconded by member Horland. All in favor say aye. Aye. Thank you. Not yet. No. I was just telling him how to get it done. We have two instruments to look at. He'll tell

you about. He's going to tell you what they are.



Speaker 6 - 01:19:33

I know that, but I'm trying to. I don't want to talk through that. I just wanted to know if you knew off camera. Best tree guy around them. Did he go into that?



Speaker 1 - 01:20:24

It's hundreds. That. All right, let's try to get everybody together seated. Two minutes already.



Speaker 6 - 01:22:24

What's going on, man?



Speaker 3 - 01:22:25

How are you?



Speaker 1 - 01:22:26

So the Reeves family, it was awesome. They got up there to do a cross to do a bunch of stuff. Wow. I was like, wow, you're politically involved now.




Speaker 6 - 01:22:38

Good for you, Dan.




Speaker 1 - 01:22:42


He's got the whole family. Really? He brought his whole family? Oh, his brothers and everything.

 Speaker 3 - 01:22:46


Oh, okay.

 Speaker 1 - 01:22:47


Okay. I just know Dan. I know him. High school.

 Speaker 3 - 01:22:53


Just good to see people might pay attention like that. No, he's not.

 Speaker 1 - 01:23:01


Hey, guys. All right, come on. We gotta get going. Let's go. Daniel. We're gonna lose Ben Sorensen. 11. So we gotta get mo.

 Speaker 14 - 01:23:36

Let's go.

 Speaker 1 - 01:23:37

We gotta get going. Where's Mr. Cole? Let's go. Come on. Member Coburn. We're going to lose Mr. Sorenson. Member Sorenson at 11. So that's more than two minutes. I only took 30 seconds. All right, we got everybody together. We need the vice chair. Where is he at? We have member Geller here. All right, so can you open it? Can you call them out of there? Tell them to prioritize the brakes in a better way?

 Speaker 16 - 01:24:31

Right.



Speaker 1 - 01:24:43

It. Are there any members that are in the audience? If so, please come to the table. All right, I'm going to call to order the March 2026, governing board meeting. If you would please call the roll.



Speaker 2 - 01:25:26

Fort lauderdale. Alternate ben sorensen.



Speaker 10 - 01:25:30

Here.



Speaker 2 - 01:25:32

Hollywood. Member shuham.



Speaker 1 - 01:25:34

Here.




Speaker 2 - 01:25:36

Miramar. Member colborne.




Speaker 11 - 01:25:38


Here.

 Speaker 2 - 01:25:40


Coral springs. Member matteo bowen.

 Speaker 11 - 01:25:42


Here. Davey.

 Speaker 2 - 01:25:47


Member lewis. Thank you. Plantation. Member horland. Chair. Ryan.

 Speaker 1 - 01:25:59

Presentation.

 Speaker 11 - 01:26:01

Vice chair.

 Speaker 2 - 01:26:04

Deerfield beach. Member droski. Lauderhill. Member dunn. Tamarack. Member patterson. Weston. Member meade. Margate. Member cagiano. Coconut creek. Member ryd. Oakland park. Member ernst.

Speaker 6 - 01:26:27



Here.



Speaker 2 - 01:26:28

North lauderdale. Member borjelen. Parkland. Member murphy. Solomon. Here. Cooper city. Member curran. Lauderdale lakes. Member thomas. Dania. Beach. Member a.j. Ryan.



Speaker 3 - 01:26:52

Here.



Speaker 2 - 01:26:53

West park. Member evillard.



Speaker 12 - 01:26:55

Here.




Speaker 2 - 01:26:56

Wilton manors. Member newton. Lighthouse point. Member stafford. Southwest ranches. Member brightcruise.




Speaker 5 - 01:27:07


Here.

 Speaker 2 - 01:27:09


Lauderdale by the sea. Member strauss. Pembroke park. Member morissette. Hillsboro beach. Member rabinese. Sea ranch.

 Speaker 11 - 01:27:22


Lakes.

 Speaker 2 - 01:27:23


Member tomlinson.

 Speaker 11 - 01:27:25


Lazy lake.

 Speaker 2 - 01:27:26


Member nyhues. Do we have any alternates?

 Speaker 1 - 01:27:33


Okay. Mr. Cole, do we have a corps?

 Speaker 3 - 01:27:35


Yes, we do.

 Speaker 1 - 01:27:36


All right. Please stand for the pledge. Allegiance to the United States of America. All right, public comment. We'll open up for public comment. First, Debbie Green.

 Speaker 19 - 01:28:09


Hello. Once again, I just want to thank you all for the tremendous amount of work and hours and the commitment that you've put into this and bringing us to where we are today with this plan and the ILA from where we.

 Speaker 12 - 01:28:22

Were two years ago.

 Speaker 19 - 01:28:25

I think it's quite. It's important that we quiet some of the misrepresentation that this new. This plan and the ILA comes with an increased cost while it comes with an increased Cost, it's actually pretty small. Even if, you know, if it goes to a hundred dollars per household for everything from where you were yesterday, I mean, well, where you are today, if you're not recycling, I don't even think it. Maybe it goes to \$50. But in any case, instead of talking in percentage increases that it's going to be a hundred percent more, 200 more. And if you're starting at 25 and you go to 50, in the scheme of things, it's very little. It's a small cost to pay to do the right thing for the future of Broward county and for our kids and their kids and their kids.

 Speaker 19 - 01:29:16

I also wanted to just thank Broward League of Cities. I didn't realize, you know, they have their support. I urge all of you here to support this master plan in the ila and to all of you know that we are here to support you. And if you need any help in any of your cities, please, please contact me. We will be there. I wanted to. Also, just as far as everyone having a voice at these executive committee meetings I've been attending for the past two years, I think I've missed maybe five in this time. And I can tell you there is not one meeting.



Speaker 19 - 01:29:47

Whether they were meeting every two weeks for almost a year to then monthly and then back to two weeks, there has not been ever a time where a member or a alternate or even someone on the general board was there that wasn't allowed to share their voice. And those voices have been heard. And as you've seen, I can't be more proud of our mayor, Steve Bright Cruise, and the impact that he's had on this board as an alternate. And just to share, in Southwest Ranches, we had our bar dance last week that raises funds for our college and vocational school scholarship. We had over 100 people catered events bar. We did not have not one full trash bag of trash. We composted and we recycled. And I'm telling you, there was not one full trash bag with over 100 people.



Speaker 19 - 01:30:37

So I think people, the education is working, it's getting out there. And I think people, they start to see what's right in the right direction. And there has been a change in people's mindsets.



Speaker 13 - 01:30:50

Thank you.



Speaker 1 - 01:30:51

Thank you. Stephanie Joffe.



Speaker 9 - 01:31:00

Good morning. My name is Stephanie Jolffy and I'm a resident of Dana Beach. I'm here today to speak in favor of the facilities amendment and the master plan. As you know, Broward county is in the midst of a solid waste crisis. We produce £20,000 of waste per minute, which to me is almost incomprehensible. We are rapidly running out of landfill capacity. And as someone who lives near the incinerator, or what is euphemistically called the waste to energy plant on 441 and Oaks Road, I don't want another one. When I first began attending ILA meetings several years ago, based on my few prior experiences with local government, I really wasn't expecting much. But the Solid Waste Authority has proven me wrong, really wrong.



Speaker 9 - 01:31:52

They've listened to the public, sought input from industry and municipalities, and work with extraordinary dedication to develop a master plan aimed at both reducing solid waste generation and diverting as much waste

as possible from landfills and incinerators. This plan is not yet perfect. As it said, we need to walk before we run. But it charts a clear course towards zero waste with meaningful improvements projected over the next 40 years. And it proposes to do this at a very minimal cost increase to residents and businesses by prioritizing public education about waste reduction and proper recycling, and by leveraging the excellent recycling and composting infrastructure that already exists in our county. If this plan is not approved, the long term costs, financial, environmental and public health will far exceed any very small near term increase in fees. Conversely, the cost of inaction is simply too high.



Speaker 9 - 01:33:08

I look forward to the governing board's favorable vote and ultimately to approval by the cities that have been part of this plan's development from the beginning. And I just want to reiterate what mayor Ryan said and Debbie said, that even as a representative of the public, I have felt really heard. So you don't need a vote to feel heard. I am, like, amazed at how everyone has listened to us, how people have answered emails, how the board has requested over and over again information from the public, opinions from the public. SCS has done an amazing job. Mr. Deitch has answered my emails. I mean, I just. I'm so impressed. I just. I mean, how you found a new commission, just everything. It's just been amazing. And I hope you'll approve the master plan. We absolutely need it.



Speaker 11 - 01:34:14

Thank you.



Speaker 1 - 01:34:14

Thank you, Stephanie. All right, we have the meeting minutes. Anyone else from the public who wishes to speak? By the way, we didn't have anyone else signed up. Thank you for your comments. Comments? We have the meeting minutes of February 2026. Can I have a motion?



Speaker 6 - 01:34:28

Motion?



Speaker 1 - 01:34:29

Who made the motion? Sorry? Who made the motion?

Speaker 4 - 01:34:33



Okay.



Speaker 1 - 01:34:33

All right. Motion by member Arndt. Seconded by member Patterson. I'll just give it to you. All in favor say aye. Any opposed? Okay, thank you. Master plan presentation. We have the subcommittees, but given the limited time, I don't want to lose member Sorensen. We should move to the discussion. And any recommendations on the master plan. I want to begin in recognizing that we do face an absolute crisis. We know the numbers, we know the data. But it's not just the diminishing finite capacity of the landfill and of the WT plant. It's that we have utterly failed in this count. On recycling, the state goal is 75%. Palm Beach county achieved 75% or better, and we're at 30.



Speaker 1 - 01:35:27

And in part it was because of market forces in the mid 2010s, but it's also been because it's taken so long to keep the cities at the table and work on a program that can right the ship. To the members of the executive committee and the governing board. I was going to share the comments about the amount of work, but I think you heard it from the public. I don't need to reiterate. Your work has been recognized. Your leadership is recognized. Failure is not an option. Improvement is always our driving force. Aside from the metrics that some will say about environmental We've lost control of our economic destiny. As long as we've been fragmented, we've been forced to cities to deal in five year contracts, some getting teasers, some deciding to cut services.



Speaker 1 - 01:36:20

And along the way, we have never been able to pull together our true economic power. And we know in Broward county when it comes to regional issues, that the cities, when working together with the county absolutely can change the course of history. The RRB fell apart for reasons that aren't important here. But in the shadows of that as we saw it collapse in our ability to manage waste collapse. I want to thank Vice Chair Fur. We sat down over coffee with Mayor Starmer and we said this is simply not sustainable. Not in an environmental way, but in an economic way. And were failing. Our vision was that we could, for instance, build our own recycling facility. Because as government, we don't need to make a profit, we just need to achieve the goals.




Speaker 1 - 01:37:09

But in the years it's taken us to even sit at this table to discuss a master plan. Waste Management's built the state of the art facility and we are grateful for that. It can handle all of the capacity of recycling here in the county and it can handle the commercial recycling here in the county. We're incredibly fortunate that exists. Because if we had to begin this master plan with what does it take to build \$100 million facility? I doubt we get forward. And as a result, I use that as an example of what we have in the county. We have little land left and little capacity to build our own, but we have infrastructure here. Our only hope is to utilize our economic power through economies of scale and bargaining power to get the best possible contracts for long term to eliminate variability.




Speaker 1 - 01:37:55


If we fail, we probably can do cheaper and short term. Only until we can, until the industry figures out we have no other options. And then we'll be held over the barrel. We forced into environmental choices that are unacceptable and we will lose our economic destiny. We have here today the opportunity to review and hopefully pass through a master plan on recommendation to the cities, along with the facilities amendment, all of which is linked together. And we're mindful of that. So I'm going to ask Daniel to go ahead and begin the presentation. I think you can skip over. We must do better. I think everyone recognizes that the funding flow we covered, unless anyone wasn't here for the executive committee. And I think you could go just beyond what the issues are for each of the phases. I don't have the number of pages.

 Speaker 1 - 01:38:49


You're probably really starting with the five myths we can dispel. If you can move forward on that.

 Speaker 4 - 01:38:56


Sure. Elisa. If we could move to slide 12. And again, my name is Daniel Deitch, representing the SES team chair. Vice Chair.

 Speaker 1 - 01:39:03


Let me just be clear. I'm not intending to cut off any of the comments or questions on any of the other slides, but I think everybody was here for that. If you weren't and have questions, we can do that. Sorry, Dan.

 Speaker 11 - 01:39:11

I wasn't here from the beginning with the executive, so I didn't see the full presentation.

 Speaker 1 - 01:39:15

Did you see the financial presentation?

 Speaker 11 - 01:39:17

I did not.



Speaker 1 - 01:39:18

Okay, well, I'll go back. We'll do that.



Speaker 4 - 01:39:20

Okay. So we're going to chair, vice chair, executive director, general counsel, members of the governing board. Daniel Deitch representing the SCS team. I'm joined today by my colleagues Leah Richter and Vita Quinn and Ashley.



Speaker 1 - 01:39:35

You have to go back to the funding flow.



Speaker 4 - 01:39:38

Yeah, if we could go back to the funding flow, which starts on slide five. So I'm going to turn it over to my colleague Vita Quinn, who is going to give an overview of the phased funding approach. It is detailed in appendix R to the master plan. The master plan and the appendices for all of you and for the general public is available on the SWA website. And with that, I'm going to turn it over to my colleague Beta Quinn.



Speaker 12 - 01:40:09


So there's been some questions as to how the phases will look, how the money actually flows. So the purpose of this slide was to kind of break it down by phase and really make it clear the involvement of the cities and the authority and how that money actually moves. So in phase one, it's sort of continuing the way that the ILA communities have. There's a member contribution based on population. That's the best we could do to approximate waste generation before having a full waste generation study. But moving forward, a more fair way to do it is based on actual tonnage. So the surcharge in phase two is something that's charged at the disposal and processing facilities at the time that the haulers cross over the scales.




Speaker 12 - 01:40:54

So in addition to their tipping fee, they're paying a tipping fee surcharge that is remitted to that disposal facility and set aside and then paid to the authority in a pass through manner. The cities will pay that surcharge by virtue of their collections rates, which may likely increase during phase three. Now we have an established authority, it has programs and facilities. We're going to implement a non ad valorem special assessment. At this point, the surcharge will likely be phased out and that assessment will be charged to residents directly on the tax bill, the


same way that the current assessments for many communities are charged on the tax bill that will be collected by the tax collector and sent to the authority directly.

 Speaker 12 - 01:41:47


The way that we're anticipating there will be some savings realized is that with the ILA communities working together to negotiate tipping fees and processing fees, there will be lower tipping and processing fees paid by individual communities, which should offset the cost of that surcharge. We understand that not everybody's agreements come up for renewal at the same time. So this is even in the financial plan, something that is phased in over a few years as everyone begins to really have control over their waste stream. This just shows what we're anticipating. The cost per ton by year through the beginning of phase three.

 Speaker 12 - 01:42:32


So again, next year would still be the ILA member city contributions directly to the authority for the subsequent several years be done by a surcharge paid at the disposal facilities and then once that's phased out, bringing in a non ad valorem assessment to be paid on the tax bill. As far as it relates to an individual household, we're basing that on the assumption through the waste generation study that the average household in Broward county generates about 1.3 tons of waste per year.

 Speaker 1 - 01:43:06

So at that rate first year on the surcharge, that's \$2.60 per house for the entire year. Yes.

 Speaker 12 - 01:43:17

This is in phase three, what it would basically look like for the residents. So to the extent that the communities currently have a solid waste assessment, there would be a line on the tax bill for that assessment that continues to pay for collections. And then there would be the authority assessment would be a separate line item on that tax bill, again paid directly to the authority from the tax collector.

 Speaker 4 - 01:43:46

Again, the nexus between the master plan and the facilities amendment is what is presented on the slide. It's reflected in Article 24 in the Facilities amendment, the maximum service charges. We have broken it out by material type for many of you. You may be aware of what your current tipping fee is for recycling. Some communities are less, some communities are. But based on our market analysis, we know that by enacting flow control and securing all of the tons, we can leverage the economies of scale and secure better pricing for recyclables. What is reflected is simply the tipping fee. I know many of you have raised the issue of the AMV or the

cost offset from the sale of the commodities that is embedded in this. But the tipping fee itself is presented in this chart for yard trash.



Speaker 4 - 01:44:40

And the point was raised at the executive committee meeting. There are lots of options for managing yard trash. We have provided maximum prices both for disposal, which is robbing us of capacity over the long term, or beneficial use. And again, there's lots of pathways to achieve beneficial use of yard trash. We've also broken it out for class one waste, which is household waste, prepressible waste, and class three waste, which is inert waste, construction and demolition debris, yard trash in bulk waste. So all of these are now, if the master plan is adopted and the facilities amendment are adopted, become binding. And any deviations from these numbers in the wrong direction has to be brought before the governing board for future policy direct. I just want to note that these are not static prices. These are, these will increase each year.



Speaker 4 - 01:45:33

As we all know that there are escalations that we face. We have selected one that is specific to the solid waste industry because we think that most closely aligns with the subject that we're discussing. So in the spirit of time, I would ask Elisa to advance to Slide 12. And these are some myths that we think have been dispelled with the financial modeling. But there's really some key takeaways. One is we do better working together. The more tons, the better the pricing. There are concerns what happens with other communities that aren't part of the authority, the SWA members will retain a most favored nation advantage over all other parties. The question is this new fee necessary? Well, we are facing a crisis. One of the key guiding principles that was policy direction from the executive committee was control.



Speaker 4 - 01:46:36

Our solid waste management destiny, the master plan and the financial approach help us to manage that solid waste future for all for the authority. And we see that it is critically important again, where we can institute a fair approach that's based on tonnage and for the benefit of the authority over the long term. We also heard concerns that the funding approach is complicated for the cities. The way that it has been structured, it is essentially a pass through cost that reduces or minimizes and in some cases eliminates the administrative burden as we move from phase one to two and two to three. And lastly, it may be expensive for cities to stay in the authority. We have seen that working together has benefits. Is it the same for every ILA member? Absolutely not.




Speaker 4 - 01:47:33

We've talked about this at length, but on the whole, on the balance, the best way to mitigate against the risks and uncertainties of solid waste management in Broward county is to work together as the authority. I was thinking about it during the discussion earlier. In the two years, nearly two years that we have been engaged in support of this initiative, the recycling rate has decreased two years in a row. We're waiting for new numbers in June and we'll be happy to report those to you. We hope the trend will be turned around, but the clock is ticking. We know that working together is the best path forward for the authority. Next slide, please. So I just want touch, really the four elements that help us justify moving together.




Speaker 4 - 01:48:34


One is affordability, the economies of scale, fairness, moving away from a population based funding mechanism to a tonnage base. There is a direct nexus between tonnage generated and payments stabilization. We have seen it, you have all felt it over the recent and the long past. You are subject to the vagaries of the marketplace. And yes, you have contracts that help mitigate against that. But all of your contracts are going to come due at some point and you have hard decisions to make. We want to lock in long term disposal and processing to provide you with the cost certainty and predictability that's necessary. And lastly, we've touched on it in many different ways. We want to decrease the dependency on combustion and landfilling. And that's within everybody's power. You as elected officials, we've heard it from members of the public.

 Speaker 4 - 01:49:36


Everybody has a role to play. We're not asking any one person to do everything. We are trying to create the conditions that everybody can do something. And working together, we know that we can reduce the amount of waste generated in the first place, maximize the beneficial use of resources and reduce that reliance on combustion and landfill.

 Speaker 1 - 01:50:02


I think everyone's familiar with the project background. Next slides. Okay. Why don't you move that?

 Speaker 4 - 01:50:08


The point has been made. £20,000 Waste generator and the infrastructure.

 Speaker 1 - 01:50:14


Yeah.

 Speaker 4 - 01:50:15


So I just want to boil it down and I'm going To invoke Mayor BrightCruise, who has shared many times, the path to 75% recycling is a journey. Nobody has a magic wand. We don't have a light switch that we can turn on. It is a process. We believe that the master plan provides those pathways with clarity. How we can get there. It was raised earlier about metrics. Metrics are critically important and as I mentioned, we're aiming for 75% right now. We're moving in the wrong direction and doing the same as we've done in the past isn't going to get us there. The four pillars of the master plan. First is behavior change. And we do that by meeting people where they are and a robust education and outreach program.

 Speaker 4 - 01:51:02


And we're not going to take our foot off the gas and we're going to adjust to the conditions as we need to make sure that it is an effective program. The economies of scale, leveraging that for optimal pricing and long term financial security. We've talked about leveraging existing infrastructure. We are blessed to have so much solid waste infrastructure within Broward County. I know that there's been talk, well, what about transfer stations? What about other facilities? We don't need them yet. The financial plan helps us start to build the reserves so that we have the financial strength when it is needed. But in the short to midterm, we know that we can leverage the existing infrastructure for the benefit of the authority. And lastly, harmonizing services. As the chair mentioned, we're a tourist based economy.

 Speaker 4 - 01:51:49


We want to make sure that there is clarity, whether you're a homeowner, a resident, a business owner or a visitor, that the messaging is consistent and clear wherever you are within the county and consistent with mobility, moving from one community to the next. Next slide, please. So in terms of some of the key benefits.

 Speaker 1 - 01:52:15


Right.

 Speaker 4 - 01:52:15


We want to maximize recycling services for all Solid Waste authority members. It's been shared before. Approximately 20% of households do not have access to curbside recycling. We see it as critically important to restore that. We have recommended developing new reduction Reuse and diversion programs. We are laser focused on a heavy portion of the waste stream. Construction and demolition debris, commercial recycling, yard waste, and eventually organic waste streams. We want to meet people where they are not only within your own communities, at your public events, at special events, but have facilities that are available that people can go to in their daily lives to drop off their recyclables and hard to recycle materials. Again, we want to harmonize the processing and disposal services to increase efficiency. And lastly, and this is foundational, the education and outreach program to support the behavior change.

 Speaker 4 - 01:53:13

That's really what success turns on. Everybody doing something.

 Speaker 1 - 01:53:18

All right, before we move on to the facilities amendment, I'm mindful of member Sorenson's time limitation. Do the members want to address the issue of the master plan and any vote to approve or not to recommend? Vice Chair?

 Speaker 10 - 01:53:36

Yeah, I. As much as I want to vote on this right now my staff and our attorneys are saying there are a few things that we have to bring up. We. Natasha had sent a whole lot of stuff to you yesterday, Dan. Is there. What were the things that were left that you couldn't quite get to yet? I know most of them were satisfied. Yeah. And so what is, what were. My understanding is that there were some things that you weren't clear on and.



Speaker 4 - 01:54:10

They weren't clear on. I mean, we're going to get into the weeds if that's okay.



Speaker 10 - 01:54:14

But for example, I say that because for our lawyers, they're saying to make sure that it's, that we do this right and the numbers are right, that you know, this has to be right. So we've got to get there.



Speaker 4 - 01:54:30

Let me give you an example.



Speaker 10 - 01:54:31

Okay.



Speaker 4 - 01:54:33

Concrete, a component of construction and demolition debris, is often used for lake fill material. So is that beneficial use or is that disposal? And how do we capture a revenue from that? Because if it went for disposal, there would be a surcharge applied to it. So it's details like that. And we believe that we can work through how that is handled.




Speaker 10 - 01:54:55

But does it change? And I'm going to probably ask Nathaniel and Matt to come up to explain why this number is not right. Because if that number is not right, is it, does it make everything else fall apart?




Speaker 4 - 01:55:12


We don't believe so.

 Speaker 10 - 01:55:13


Okay, good. But let me ask Nathaniel and Matt to come up with what the. Their issues are real quick because I'm trying to get this. We. I sent it, I sent it to our staff. When I got this on Wednesday. I Said, give this a quick full review. They've come back and they sent all this stuff to Daniel. There's things that they're trying to make sure in general, it's all good. But they also were saying,.

 Speaker 15 - 01:55:42


Sure.

 Speaker 14 - 01:55:42


So I won't opine on what Daniel just referenced. I'd have to rely on Natasha from our solid Waste division to talk about the numbers. What I had found in my very limited review and the small amount of time I had to review the document was I checked it against the requirements that the ILA has for the master plan. In Article 7, there's a list of things that the master plan must contain. You know, again, I'm not sure that everything's in there, but I know for sure that it doesn't include the hazardous materials diversion plans that the ILA requires. This is a very easy fix. I think you can fix it in two weeks.

 Speaker 14 - 01:56:16

Part of my concern is if it isn't included in the initial math master plan and is at no point adopted into it becomes very easy for someone to later argue that the formation conditions were not met, and therefore the ILA is no longer in existence, and therefore the authority was not validly formed. So these are not large things that are insurmountable. But we all want to get this right. And so this was the one thing that I found. Again, I fully believe in two weeks, this could be fixed. I also know that.

 Speaker 1 - 01:56:51

Are you suggesting a delay of two weeks on voting on this? Is that the county's position? Because I know you haven't raised this with Jamie before this meeting.

 Speaker 14 - 01:56:57

I know I haven't seen the full draft of the master plan before last night.

Speaker 1 - 01:57:06



Why can that come up earlier? What is. I'm trying to understand what is fatal here that you're really concerned about, because I want to get to it.



Speaker 14 - 01:57:15

I think there.



Speaker 10 - 01:57:17

That was one. The hazards.



Speaker 14 - 01:57:19

There's two separate issues. Right. I can tell you. From a legal perspective, does this meet all of the requirements in the ila? My concern is that it does not. Separately, our staff has raised a technical question as to whether or not the projected numbers are accurate. And I'm not. I'm not qualified to speak on that point.



Speaker 10 - 01:57:43

The other part was. And Natasha, I may need your help.



Speaker 6 - 01:57:46

On this as well.




Speaker 10 - 01:57:48

All of the. Because I asked her to look through every single one of these. I say make sure these numbers are right. And I got this yesterday. I sent it to Daniel, and they had a chance to go over this. Sam, we got it as well. So I think what I'm trying to do is make sure it's right. I don't want to rush this and get it wrong. So that's. Natasha, go ahead.




Speaker 11 - 01:58:15


So my concern initially is the 4.9 million. The 4.9 million represents Broward and origin waste coming in, but not necessarily how much waste is going out and going.

 Speaker 1 - 01:58:28


Across the scales in Broward.

 Speaker 11 - 01:58:30


And so that would have an impact on how much money we're assuming we're going to receive. If you're using the number 4.9 times 2 to build a reserve and the numbers that we track say differently, we're.

 Speaker 1 - 01:58:45


Going to be making a lot less.

 Speaker 11 - 01:58:47

Revenue, in my opinion, than if were to go with the current numbers that are being used.

 Speaker 1 - 01:58:53

Daniel,.

 Speaker 4 - 01:59:02

First, I want to speak to the household hazardous waste. Let me take a step back. The master plan was substantially completed and presented to the general public and structured workshops last summer. The master plan was delivered to the executive committee and governing board in August. So the numbers have been there. We were asked to address the financial components in a different way. And you have all received multiple memoranda that sort of refine the analysis because we need a policy direction to land where we are today. The master plan and the financial plan was. Was distributed last weekend? I believe so. Not in terms of the tonnage. We know that there is leakage from Broward County. There is material that doesn't cross a scale. There is leakage. That is part of our responsibility is to identify where those gaps are and develop the systems.



Speaker 4 - 02:00:08

Having a plan without appropriate oversight is useless. It's just aspirational without any substance. There is a responsibility of the Authority and of each ILA member to make sure that your contracts are adhered to. And we believe that is the safeguard for the concerns that have been raised.



Speaker 10 - 02:00:36

Let me ask Natasha what else was on there that needed to be looked at? Because I. Because I have all. You sent me a whole list. Matt, go ahead. And explain to me what you were trying to explain to me a few minutes ago.



Speaker 14 - 02:00:52

Sure.



Speaker 10 - 02:00:53

That if our number is wrong, what that would. The potential legal implications.



Speaker 14 - 02:01:01

The number I don't believe has an immediate legal implication other than the fact that you may have to take various operational changes. Right. So you may have to have a surcharge as well as general fund revenue supporting the authority at the same time, if you're not bringing in the revenue you need. But. But that's an operational question. The legal question is more. Have we checked all the boxes that the ILA requires us to check in this document? And if we have not then it means we have not validly formed this authority and therefore it's open to challenge. That's the concern that I would bring to the body.



Speaker 1 - 02:01:39


Okay, so what is the specific. We have limited time. What's the box that's missing that somehow, since August, wasn't identifiable?




Speaker 14 - 02:01:45

Right. So Daniel referenced household hazardous waste. That is one component of the way the ILA defines hazardous materials, which includes things like universal waste and batteries. The drop off centers that are


referenced in the master plan are designed to take those in. The way the ILA is set up, it is impermissible to take those in. So how are you dealing with them? How are you diverting them from final disposal? That's a very easy question to fix, but it has not been fixed in the document.

 Speaker 1 - 02:02:13


Yeah, that would have been great to know since August. Daniel, what's the response to that?

 Speaker 4 - 02:02:23


We've had this discussion many times before. The master plan is the plan, but it's a strategic document. We know that there are details for implementation that will follow. But first we need to have the vision. You know, I'm reflecting back on the Broward workshop where the CEO of the Florida Chamber posed a very challenging question to the audience. What is the unifying vision for Broward Howard County? How are we going to measure success?

 Speaker 1 - 02:02:55


Let me stop you there. They're raising hazardous waste. And that somehow the failure to include this in the document or to do it in the master plan, not the facilities matter, which is what needs to be approved in the master plan, somehow could undermine the legal existence of the Solid Waste Authority. Love to have heard that before today. Can I understand what's. Jamie, have you had any discussions about this?

 Speaker 3 - 02:03:17

No, this is the first time I've heard this.

 Speaker 4 - 02:03:18

But if I may, it is addressed in two of the white papers that are part of the master plan. What are the future needs? The future needs assessment. That's task four, and I'm forgetting the task number, but innovative technology. Part of our team are industry experts on these matters. Batteries, electronic waste. And I encourage you, if you have not read those documents and I think you'll come. Come back with a different sense of whether it's been addressed in the.

 Speaker 1 - 02:03:47

What's your plan? What's the proposal of the county to correct this? And since you've raised it, I have concerns about the legal existence or the ability to challenge its legal existence. What is the proposal? What is the language you think needs to be in there and what needed to be identified?



Speaker 14 - 02:04:07

I would hesitate to draft something off the fly again. I think this is something with very short amount of time we can get fixed and rectified to make this thing stronger, to make sure it's something we can all be confident in. But this is not something that I can just quickly say off the bat. But again, I don't think it would take many meetings or much time to fix.



Speaker 1 - 02:04:26

Yes, since August, it would have been the number of meetings we've had on the facilities amendment maybe once. There could have been something raised on this or in an executive committee earlier today or something that could have been done this. I. I'm trying. You know, I'm not a show for the county. I've been very supportive of the work that's been done together. But this is another example like we've been through on the facilities amendment. That was a tortured process. Member Ridell, then member Colburn.



Speaker 6 - 02:04:55

I mean, I just want to. Maybe we'll just streamline this because we're gonna end up going around the room and lamenting on short time a the lawyer in me. If I hear challenge, I don't care who brings it up. That's a concern. That can't be a concern in a public forum. That's just my position. Agreed.



Speaker 1 - 02:05:08

Now it's been laid out here as opposed to having been presented.



Speaker 6 - 02:05:11

I got you, chair. I got you. I sense the frustration, but let's try to be positive and move forward. Also, in all candor, I came back out of the country to be here today. It's spring break week. I was on spring break with my kids. There was new interpretive. We'll call it new interpretive. Things received this week. Right. Interpretive. Not new foundational. New interpretive. My staff's here all the time. I ask my staff if you. Oh, I think it's more, you know, in application and activation. I don't think it's substantive. The only thing that troubles me in that is think. Would I like a little more time to digest this? Yes, that concerns me as well.



Speaker 6 - 02:05:43

And candidly, I don't know what member Colburn's gonna say, but if there's gonna be some sort of potential motion that to piggyback on some sort of modification on what potentially quorum could be a members could be. I'll just say this to Sam. I think we all would need distributed the attendance, the percentages of quorum, because if we're making quorum by one, it presents an issue if we're adding potentially three people there. However, we're adding. So while. Mike. I understand your chip, Mr.



Speaker 3 - 02:06:13

Chair.



Speaker 6 - 02:06:14

I apologize the frustration on this issue, I just, and I want to ask Sam and Jamie a very succinct question because maybe it streamlines discussions, frustrations. What would we already have a docketed meeting on April 17 governing an executive.



Speaker 1 - 02:06:30

We can't do that. We just scratch that. We don't have the play in the joints because that means then we only have 120 days. That puts us outside of us. We don't have the time. So if we're going to have a meeting, it's going to have to be next week. That's the reality. And it needs to be solved. We built it a little bit of play in the joints, but we do not, we cannot wait essentially four weeks.



Speaker 6 - 02:06:51

So I'm just, I'm asking. So I want it to be clear to me because I understand that. I don't think any city's putting this on their agenda in April. But Jamie, I just want. You're voting on it.




Speaker 1 - 02:07:04

Okay.




Speaker 6 - 02:07:16


So the question is succinct because it may streamline other members issues. Mr. Cole explained to me why we cannot table these two items until April 17th.

 Speaker 3 - 02:07:30


Legally we can. The issue here really is the summer breaks for city council commissions. We, once we send this out, the plan, the timeline is to distribute this on Monday and then there's 120 days for cities.

 Speaker 6 - 02:07:44


I'm with you on that.

 Speaker 3 - 02:07:45


If we delay that for two or three weeks, the end of that ends up being the second after July, early August, where cities are away. So it's just going to make it much harder to get it approved. So the thought was the timing was set that way. Now if we do it next week, you know, we're still within, it's not as much of a problem.

 Speaker 1 - 02:08:05

But went.

 Speaker 3 - 02:08:06

If we delayed this an entire month. Now you're talking about the summer breaks and you're taking 120 days to make. Make, basically.

 Speaker 6 - 02:08:14

I mean I, I respect that and I appreciate your response, but I don't think any city's taking summer break in, you know, May, really in June. I think summer breaks are traditionally in July. That's just my, in my city. I hear you, I hear you. But the only thing I'm hearing county wants two weeks. I know there's concerns, there's hands raised and as opposed to all jumping on the bandwagon when we're at 15 minutes out of time, you know, I get it that there's a significant amount of members of the governing board in this room that's representing, I would say 70% of our members that if it's a priority of saying, hey, we're going to kick the can a month, I don't want to do that. But. And I know Mike saying is looking at me with big eyes because it's.



Speaker 1 - 02:08:53

Not just, it's not just a meeting because if we start trying to do a workshop and then I'm with you.



Speaker 6 - 02:08:58

But if we roll this.



Speaker 1 - 02:08:59

A week, then you, then everybody may.



Speaker 6 - 02:09:01

Not get the answers they want.



Speaker 1 - 02:09:02

I understand. Here's what the point you if the will of the body is to push this a month, you all are going to have to be ready. You're gonna have to be ready.



Speaker 6 - 02:09:11

That's the point I was getting at. If I was able to finish my comments. Chair, I understand you didn't. You cut me out. Let me finish.



Speaker 1 - 02:09:17

That's the, that's what I'm getting to that so we can then to get.



Speaker 6 - 02:09:19

To it is the 70% of people in this room are firmly committed to going and saying we are going to schedule this now. That's what we need to give everybody the time so they're comfortable. That's what I would be prepared to make a motion of and I'm deferring the body and I yield my time.



Speaker 4 - 02:09:36

Mr.



Speaker 6 - 02:09:36

Chair.



Speaker 1 - 02:09:38

Member Shoeham, then Member Coburn.




Speaker 13 - 02:09:41

So my question for the county and for SWA Council is about an hour ago we had a conversation that this is a living document and there are certain types of items that are very difficult and certain that are very simple that can be addressed by the executive committee. So my question is based on what you've just heard, it sounded to me like these are in the executive committee type issues. Is that correct?




Speaker 14 - 02:10:10


Yes.

 Speaker 3 - 02:10:11


This is something that could be through an amendment to the master plan. If we needed to add something, it could be amended.

 Speaker 13 - 02:10:17


Okay. My suggestion. That's all I wanted to know. My suggest we are not doing anything today but making a recommendation. Correct. To our cities to accept this master plan and the facilities amendment.

 Speaker 17 - 02:10:33


Right.

 Speaker 13 - 02:10:34

We're adopting the master plan and then making a recommendation to accept the faculty facilities amendment, but the master plan can be amended by our executive board committee in a majority. Is that correct?


 Speaker 6 - 02:10:45

By the governing board.


 Speaker 13 - 02:10:46

I'm sorry. By the governing board. So my suggestion would be that, and I'm happy to make the motion that we make a motion to approve the master plan subject to a subsequent discussion over these two or three issues that are within the control of the governing board with respect to the master plan, so that cities, just as you said, can


now move forward and schedule their commission meetings because there is technically an approved master plan which all of us in this room will know are going to have minor amendments. Maybe we don't know based on the concerns raised today by the county, but based on your conversation, the conversation earlier, these are things that don't require these are the easy fixes is the point.

 Speaker 11 - 02:11:43

Could we continue the discussion before motion, before any motion?

 Speaker 1 - 02:11:49


Because I think it's fair that others want to weigh in on this and the real issue is not to force fit this and the issue's been raised. We're going to do this in a deliberate way. Leaving aside the facilities amendment core. There's complicated issues. But if this and I'm not telling you to withdraw the motion, I'm just saying if the body says, look, we're going to push this because there have been additional issues raised, I'll leave aside just for a second how we got to this point and why it wasn't raised earlier this morning or why it wasn't raised last week or in September or October or November or December. But that's where we are.

 Speaker 1 - 02:12:25

So the real question, I think, because we want to cut to the chase on this, is and everybody can go into is it the will of the body to A, delay the vote here today and then B, if so, for how long? I think that's fundamentally the question we're facing. Member Colburn, thank you.


 Speaker 11 - 02:12:43

You know, first of all, I just want to say thank you to everybody, especially the executive committee and anyone else has been coming to all these meetings over the last two years for the tremendous job that you have done to get us this far. I do want to make sure, I do say that there are concerns and I still have discussions that need to happen with my staff and my commission before I vote on this master plan. So I would certainly appreciate, and I understand your frustration hearing this today, but I would certainly appreciate us moving this to April 17th. That will give my city enough time to go over the master plan. Yes, the master plan was made public in August and there have been several changes.


 Speaker 11 - 02:13:32

The financial modeling has changed consistently and it's only recently that we have, okay, this is what we're going with. And I think it is only fear, it is only respectful for my staff and for my city commission for them to be able to know what this has. This is a major solid waste. Authority is major and it's a big deal for my city and I don't want to


leave out my colleagues without understanding what is it that we're doing at this level because just like I represent my constituents, so do they. And I want to make sure that we're all on the same page. So with that, I'm at the point where I do agree to the April 17, and if we can bring back a resolution, I guess we'll have to vote.

 Speaker 11 - 02:14:24


But my recommendation for the ILA to include an additional position for the large cities and an additional position at large that could be from any of the other cities. And that's what I discuss with the attorney.

 Speaker 1 - 02:14:43


Member Patterson.

 Speaker 17 - 02:14:47

Thank you. Thank you, Chair. Thank you, everyone. You know, I think that I kind of tend to come to these meetings and I'm quite quiet because I recognize that it's important to kind of listen. I'm not one of the members that have been on this board for any major amount of time. And so this is, you know, no minor charge. I think that we've been charged with, you know. Echoing Member Colburn, I want to thank Member Bright Crews. He came to my city last week or two weeks ago or so and did a workshop for my commission and, you know, took the time to just kind of go through the process and what we've been doing here and gave them an opportunity to ask questions and what have you. Thank you, Member fir, for having the county staff review what's before us today.


 Speaker 17 - 02:15:39

And I appreciate you, Mr. Chair, for. And everyone here, I think the dialogue is very healthy. It's important to see all sides of this thing. All of us are really in a situation as, you know, elected people to this is, you know, it's a tough scale to balance right now. Obviously we have this decision to make, among other things that I think all of us are considering as it pertains to our constituency. And I too, have a number of questions specifically about what was presented in the financial model today. But I'm not even going to ask those questions because given what we just heard, I don't even know that there is any. It's not even necessary at this point. I think that, you know, there is validity to each, you know, to Member Shuham's proposal.


 Speaker 17 - 02:16:32

If it is a living document, perhaps, you know, and I would, you know, to defer to the attorney on how do we deal with this. I understand, you know, the position of Member Rydell and Coburn as well, you know, if cities are able to


maybe even set a special meeting. But I don't think that this is something that we just breeze over. I think it is important that we spend the time ironing out. And I would Ask you member for given that your staff, I mean you made reference several times to a list of things.

 Speaker 17 - 02:17:03


I heard one thing which obviously I understand presents some legal challenges, but I'd be interested to know what are those other things and should we be considering that A and then B, from your position, what given you are the vice chair of this board and you've been here from, I assume, day one, what was going to be your position on this item today? Deferring it. Until when?

 Speaker 1 - 02:17:30


So just before we get there, just to kind of get to the kind of the point here, we have an executive committee on March 30th. Okay, we're already set for that. The question is, will the governing board members agree to a governing board meeting on March 30? I said 30th, 9:00pm of course, 9:00am it's on the agenda. The future meetings are all on the agenda. Presumably members of the executive committee were had that on their calendar. The question is the governing board. It would not or would. All right, we have this room available on April 6th. How does that fit for the executive committee and the governing board. Vice chair fur cannot be here on that date. All right, so the only option. Yeah, no, but you've been here all along, so you've raised this.

 Speaker 11 - 02:18:55


Does it have to be a Monday?

 Speaker 1 - 02:18:58

No, but it's a combination of when this room is available.

 Speaker 5 - 02:19:00

Mr.

 Speaker 16 - 02:19:00

Defer, I have a doctor appointment, but I'd move it if I have to.



Speaker 1 - 02:19:03

April 17th is the next date that is set for the executive committee and the governing board.



Speaker 3 - 02:19:07

Mayor yes. If I can just add one other thought. The 120 day period is for the facilities amendment. The key dates here are the facilities amendment. The master plan is just approved of the governing board. Technically, the governing board just has to approve a master plan by the whole end of the 120 days. The idea was to have the facilities amendment and master, you know, give the cities the master plan with the facilities amendment. But we could give it to them subject, you know, like member Schuran said this the diversion what the ILA says just to get what their issue is it says the master plan must provide a diversion plan for any hazardous materials that have impermissibly entered the system. I guess there's an issue as to whether within the 61600 pages of backup there is a diversion plan.



Speaker 3 - 02:20:01

This will be very easily fixed.



Speaker 1 - 02:20:03

Mr.



Speaker 16 - 02:20:04

Chair, our staff does not have any objection to approving the facilities, only the master plan today. So we're okay with the approving facilities today.



Speaker 3 - 02:20:14

Right. You could approve a facilities amendment today, approve the master plan, and then you can always amend it to add this, you know, sometime in the next 120, 150 days. You had plenty of time to do that. The cities would just need to be advised that, you know, that minor change is going to be made.



Speaker 1 - 02:20:32

Right. It wouldn't be expected.



Speaker 4 - 02:20:34

Right.



Speaker 1 - 02:20:34

And they wouldn't be expected to move on the facilities amendment until there's a mass plan. I mean, that's the reality. Nobody's at the commission level.



Speaker 13 - 02:20:45

But we can move on today.




Speaker 11 - 02:20:47

I mean. Right. I would be most comfortable since there's really not a significant rush to approve the master plan today, to just defer it to our next meeting on the 17th. In terms of just the master plan. It doesn't mean that we can't move forward with it and the master plan as we've been making adjustments so far. It's out there. That's a document that we can continue to, I guess, continue to use that one in terms of staff knowing something is coming, but I wouldn't want to vote on it knowing we have something changes to it. And I know it gives my city, some other cities a few more weeks to look at it before I vote on it.




Speaker 1 - 02:21:41


Yes, Member of terror.

 Speaker 8 - 02:21:43


Thank you, Mr.

 Speaker 2 - 02:21:43


Chair.

 Speaker 8 - 02:21:44


I second the recommendation of member Shoehan. I also would love to circulate with my colleagues the memo my staff just shared with me in alignment with what the county recommended, they are not in. There are some discrepancies with the master plan in alignment to what staff had just presented. So I would like for my colleagues here to see. See what my city is recommending to make sure that we are clear on what we are taking on. Thank you, Mr.

 Speaker 1 - 02:22:15


Chair. I would suggest that both what your staff has raised and what member fer staff has raised get circulated to all the members so that we all know what these issues are and can better understand how many of them were not could have been addressed easily and which ones are necessary for absolute amendment. Remember Rydell and member Dunn?

 Speaker 6 - 02:22:38

Just clarification, Member Shoeham is your member. Mater Bone. You're supporting voting on it today with essentially an asterisk.

 Speaker 8 - 02:22:47

Correct.

 Speaker 6 - 02:22:48

Okay, so I'm not supportive of that. I think, I think we can still circulate a majority of the documents saying it's going to be subject to change. And the. My biggest concern, and I'm just going to be very clear, as soon as I have a lawyer stand up there saying there's a challenge issue that is not put that in the public realm. I can't in good faith recommend passing something today with that asterisk, understanding that if there's activation or policy issues or some of the other things, I would be fine with that. To me, I can't. I can't do that. So I'm a fan of putting this down to April 17th with the understanding that there has to be a stress to all governing board members to prioritize this or set it knowing it's coming down the pike.



Speaker 6 - 02:23:25

So I would be making a competing motion depending on yours. Table the Items till the 17th.



Speaker 8 - 02:23:30

Point of clarification. It is the ILA to move forward with the ILA, bring it to facilities agreement with the caveat of us voting for the master plan on the 17th. That is what was presented, right?



Speaker 13 - 02:23:46

That was not. But I'm fine with that. Okay, So you vote on the facilities.



Speaker 6 - 02:23:57

Can I see clarification on member Shuham's motion, please?



Speaker 13 - 02:24:00

So I think it's going to get changed. And member Mateo Bowen is a different concept, which I can live with. My concept was we vote on the master plan and approve it with an asterisk that these corrections will be made at the next meeting of the general board. I think what you're saying is we vote on the facilities amendment with the asterisks that the master plan will be voted on at a subsequent meeting, which is what you're saying as well.



Speaker 6 - 02:24:28

I'll make. I'm prepared to make a motion to table the master Plan item until April 17th.



Speaker 1 - 02:24:36

Okay, there's a motion. But before we go forward, because there might be competing motion, let's get this sort. We'll finish discussion and then come back to member Dunn. Yeah, I just kind of want to attorney get some clarity on the timeline.



Speaker 8 - 02:24:49

So the facilities amendment, sir, is what.



Speaker 1 - 02:24:53

The cities really need to vote on.



Speaker 12 - 02:24:55

In order to pass.



Speaker 1 - 02:24:56

So if we vote on the facilities.




Speaker 8 - 02:24:57

Amendment today, there's nothing that precludes the timeline that we're working on in my.




Speaker 1 - 02:25:02


City, which is a presentation to the commission on Monday at the workshop, and then the possibility of a vote in.

 Speaker 8 - 02:25:08


April, which potentially would happen before the April 17 meeting.

 Speaker 3 - 02:25:14


Yes, you could do that. The only caveat to that is you would be vote. Once you vote for the facilities amendment at your city, you're committed. And if the master plan is then change in a way you don't like, you know, this is a very minor.

 Speaker 1 - 02:25:31


Let me ask you another clarifying question. So. So if were to then move the vote on my commission to the first meeting In May, we're still on track.

 Speaker 3 - 02:25:41

Yes, you'd stay on track.

 Speaker 1 - 02:25:42

Thank you.

 Speaker 3 - 02:25:43

The problem here with timing is really the end of the period, not the beginning of the period. It's just whether or not it's going to end in end of July or August. This is a extremely minor technical amendment that's going to have to be made to the master plan that Daniel can probably do in five minutes. I mean, this is not, this is a very minor issue, this hazardous material issue, this diversion.

Speaker 1 - 02:26:06



Okay. Member geller?



Speaker 10 - 02:26:09

Thank you, Mr.



Speaker 3 - 02:26:09

Chair.



Speaker 16 - 02:26:09

I think there's some confusion here. I came in here today not having any idea that there was a problem from the county on the master plan. My understanding, and I'd like to ask Mr. Klitzberg to come forward, is that they just received this a day or two ago.



Speaker 1 - 02:26:27

When did you receive this?




Speaker 16 - 02:26:30

The master plan, the final version, the.




Speaker 18 - 02:26:32


Master plan document itself has been circulated for some time. The financial plan is dated. The most recent financial plan is dated March 13. And the financial concerns associated with that staff has raised as questions has just been in the last few days because I believe again, the document was just distributed.

 Speaker 16 - 02:26:51


In addition to that, the other arguments that have been raised, for example, the diversion.

 Speaker 3 - 02:26:58


I thought that what y' all told.

 Speaker 16 - 02:27:01


Me was that it's a 1600 page document, that you received the final version in the last couple of days and that it they've used one example of the diversion, but that there may be other things you simply haven't had the opportunity to go through.

 Speaker 18 - 02:27:18


I don't know whether anybody has had. Again, Senator Gellert, the master plan document is about 30 pages and there's 1293 pages of additional appendices, some of which have changed over time. I know that we've been reviewing it since we got the. We were alerted to the final version and saw that it was on the agenda for today. So we've been looking at that. Solid waste. Staff has also been looking at that for the last couple of days, has raised certain questions.

 Speaker 16 - 02:27:48


And have you finished your analysis yet?

 Speaker 18 - 02:27:51


I certainly would not say that I finished a 1300 page review in the last 48 hours. But again, to what Mr. Cole also said is that the 120 days applies only to the facilities amendment. The master plan being voted on by the governing board doesn't need to travel. One last other comment to Commissioner Shuham's original motion. If the governing board passes the master plan today, asterisk or no asterisk, the changes that would have to be made potentially, and it's not just dealing with the hazardous waste diversion, but staff has raised questions in terms of the numbers. I believe that some of the city staff have also raised questions in terms of the numbers and costs.

 Speaker 18 - 02:28:35


The manner by which the master plan is amended based on those financials, if that happens to be something that needs to be changed, is not just a simple one vote. It is two thirds majority. Some of them require two meetings because it's dealing with costs. Once the master plan is adopted, it's a master plan. And if it has conflicts with the ila, then you have the legal issues. And if there are monetary issues that may exist in the financial plan that just got distributed within the last few days, you have to go through that whole process of amendment which becomes.

 Speaker 13 - 02:29:13


Well, that would question.

 Speaker 1 - 02:29:17


Just to be clear, 1300 pages was not dropped on anybody. Do not put that in.

 Speaker 18 - 02:29:22


Mayor I am absolutely not saying that.

 Speaker 1 - 02:29:24


Thirteen. Let me finish. Those are the task reports that have been discussed, not just since August, over and over, they've been trickled out with recommendations and changes and questions and happen. Absolutely. The financial. I understand your point. The point's various. So where are we at?

 Speaker 13 - 02:29:42


So that was my question.

 Speaker 3 - 02:29:46


Okay.

 Speaker 16 - 02:29:46


So, Mr. Mayor, I believe everybody in this room wants the master plan to be approved.

 Speaker 1 - 02:29:52


I think I have.

 Speaker 16 - 02:29:53


You're a lawyer.

 Speaker 6 - 02:29:54


I'm a lawyer.

 Speaker 16 - 02:29:55


Our lawyers, county lawyers, have told Commissioner Ferrari and myself that they think that they simply haven't had time to review that. The thing that they found some issues that they disagree with and they're recommending. I don't want us to do anything that would prevent us from getting this accomplished. But if postponing it two weeks or a month gets it done correctly, I have to follow our lawyer's recommendations as Vice Mayor Furr does.

 Speaker 1 - 02:30:24


No question. And what I don't want to do is I do not want to set up a vote just to move something forward that has no votes in it.

 Speaker 13 - 02:30:30


Right.

 Speaker 1 - 02:30:30


We were unanimous at the executive committee. And none of that stuff was raised. Not at all. So everybody's already on record recommending this to the governing board and not once was raised that there may be an underlying legal infirmity. So we're here. I think we're scheduled for the 17th and the members can make their motions. But there's obviously an interest in. In addressing membership that's going to be through the facilities and whether it's one or two, because it's not going to be so easy to say one, we're back to an election problem, then we have significant quorum issues and I want to be clear on the governing board. We've always met quorum, executive committee. We have started a large number of meetings without quorum. So folks want beyond. They're going to have to come when it's scheduled or you have to send an alternate.

 Speaker 1 - 02:31:18


We cannot take a chance of tying up the executive committee. And the most important part of this, which is implementation, that's just to lay it out. So there's going to be a proposal on that. The executive committee will meet on March 30th.

 Speaker 6 - 02:31:31

We're meeting.

 Speaker 1 - 02:31:32

We'll get an update from legal. The proposals for facility amendment changes and anything in the master plan that has raised concern will be circulated and we can begin to address that.

 Speaker 3 - 02:31:42

Okay.



Speaker 1 - 02:31:43

Including from Coral Springs. And then at that point, my suggestion to the body is, because I don't think it's healthy to have a no vote on any aspect of this, is that we do this on the 17th. In the meantime, everybody's got. If you guys want workshops, got to get it scheduled. I looked at the chart. There's a lot of cities who haven't responded that they want to have this or when they're scheduling it. We need to do that so that we can get out and have staff. It's a very complicated issue sometimes, you know, two meetings on the same night, trying to get people out. That has to be done. Have to have. By March 30, everybody wants a workshop and wants Daniel or the team there. We need to have it.



Speaker 1 - 02:32:18

If you're going to have a vote and you want Daniel or the team there, need to have it. This. This can no longer be pushed down the road, and too many cities have pushed it down the road. So now we know where we're going to be. What is member material?



Speaker 8 - 02:32:31

Thank you, Mr.



Speaker 2 - 02:32:31

Chair.



Speaker 8 - 02:32:32

I've also volunteered to go to various municipalities to speak on behalf of the master plan and the facilities agreement. My motion was to vote on the facility agreement today.



Speaker 1 - 02:32:49

Okay, so let's have a discussion. The challenge with that is if it's voted on today, the proposal from Miramar to add membership, whether it's one or two, Fort Lauderdale wants to be on as well. That has to be part of the facilities amendment. So I want to be mindful that's what the motion is, and I don't want to no vote on the facilities amendment by somebody who says, hey, I haven't had a voice. So you. Are you persisting in the motion? There's a. There's a bunch. Let's. We've kind of stepped back we're going to. We're going to sort it. We're not going to force anything through. But I want to be mindful that in order. So that everybody understands, the proposal in deference to Miramar has to be part of the facilities amendment.



Speaker 1 - 02:33:30

If we vote on the facilities amendment, amending that later is a problem. So go ahead, because the clock starts. Because then we have to let notify the seas pursuant to the ILA. Once the facilities amendment's approved, it gets notified, the 120 days starts, and it's only going to make us look like we have. We have issues.



Speaker 3 - 02:33:48

So if I can Just add the 120 days from April 17, I think, ends up on a weekend, and you end up not making. We. We have a deadline, complete deadline of August 15th or 16th. I don't know if the city's gonna get there. 420 Days. If you wait till the 17th.



Speaker 1 - 02:34:08

Well, they. They. It's in the. I like.



Speaker 3 - 02:34:10

The ILA requires them to have 120 days. So, I mean, technically, that's a violation if we're on the 17th and at the end of that night, we send it to cities that we might be making it by one day or something. This is cutting it really close.



Speaker 1 - 02:34:27

If I can do this in two.



Speaker 3 - 02:34:28


Weeks, it would be much better than waiting four weeks.




Speaker 1 - 02:34:30

So to the point. So in lay terms, cities are entitled to 120 days. A city could say weren't given 120 days in violation


of the ILA, which is why it would be helpful.

 Speaker 3 - 02:34:42


Two weeks would be much better. Or sometime next week or the following week would be much better than waiting till the end.

 Speaker 8 - 02:34:49


My city is ready to vote on the facilities agreement next week. And so my staff is here, and I need to give them direction after this meeting. So are we holding off on the facilities agreement? Because I need to pull it off of our agenda because we need to give public notice.

 Speaker 1 - 02:35:08


Okay. So the only issue on the facilities amendment that's been raised is this change in membership.

 Speaker 8 - 02:35:12


And that is where I want to hear from member Colburn on the. The clarification. You want to be included in the financial amendment agreement.

 Speaker 1 - 02:35:24

Facilities amendment.

 Speaker 8 - 02:35:25

Facilities amendment. And the issue is they weren't before.

 Speaker 1 - 02:35:29

No, they want to be include. Right now we have five large cities.



Speaker 9 - 02:35:33

Okay.



Speaker 1 - 02:35:34

Membership that were democratically voted in October 23rd and then again.



Speaker 8 - 02:35:38

Yes.



Speaker 1 - 02:35:39

So now they want to expand. There's a suggestion to expand the five to either six or seven of the large cities, which is fine. Everybody can do that. It affects quorum. So everybody has to understand that there may be medium cities that say the same thing and there may be small cities that say the same thing, in which case we're growing the executive committee that have to all be mindful. It makes it a challenge to get quorum so that the facilities amendment, in deference to one of our members, has been asked to be amended. I know you have a motion and there's a second. We're having a discussion.



Speaker 11 - 02:36:12

Member Copernic, in order to make any changes to the ila, it has to go to all of the cities. So this is an opportunity, as presented by. As stated by the attorney, for us to make a change to the ila, since we do have an amendment that's going to all the cities. What I am proposing is to increase the number of large cities by one and also to include. To increase one other that could either be large, medium or small city. So it includes decreases the size of the executive committee by two and that's. That would be added to the amendment that's going forward. An additional outlaw seat.




Speaker 1 - 02:37:09

What happens if Miramar and Fort Lauderdale, who vindicated and through the democratic process don't get on? And I'm not saying it's about you.




Speaker 11 - 02:37:17


That's understood. That's understood. I mean, it's still a. It's. There is still a process. It does not guarantee that either one of us will go on. You're absolutely right. You know, do we want to add all large cities to it? You can make that motion. I was just.

 Speaker 1 - 02:37:44


I don't. As somebody who's had to sit here and try to get. Get quorum and call and find out who's showing up and who's not, and then us only being able to do, hey, let's talk about some presentations. Because we don't have a quorum. No, I don't.

 Speaker 11 - 02:37:55


I personally, I can't speak for other people. Well, clearly, if you have people on the committee and they are not coming, you definitely want to have people on your committee who truly are. Are interested. Those would be the ones that you want to vote to have on your committee. But if you don't have a quorum and you're the individuals who are voting for these people to come, I don't understand that either, but I would suggest, I would certainly let it be known that I would be interested. My city would be interested in being on it. And Fort Lauderdale has indicated the same. You do have a process. The suggestion is to increase it, which will allow that process, that democratic process to take place.

 Speaker 1 - 02:38:50

The Democratic process did take place, but.

 Speaker 11 - 02:38:52

The issue you have additional. You can always go through the process. You can vote for Lauderdale or Miramar if you want, or you don't have to, but that's the process I'm referring to. I realize I can't change that. I'm just asking for increase.

 Speaker 1 - 02:39:12

Microphone Sorry.

Speaker 6 - 02:39:14



Yeah, there was a process in the beginning.



Speaker 1 - 02:39:18

Large cities had an opportunity to vote for large cities to be on the board. Medium cities had an opportunity to vote for medium cities on the board. Small cities had an opportunity to vote for small cities. There was a process. Your city didn't advocate well enough for itself. Maybe your city didn't show up, but there was a process that was democratic. You keep saying democratic process. Well, guess what? The democratic process was there, and the people who were there voted democratically. I don't know if your city was there or not there or if you advocated for yourself or said, well, let somebody else do it, but there was a democratic process.



Speaker 11 - 02:39:56

I'm not challenging the process in any way. My suggestion is to increase the number of the large cities by one. I mean, if that's something that has to be done by a motion, it can be voted up or down, but that can be discussed further if anybody does not want it increase or they do want it increased. But I do understand that even once that number has increased, it has to go through the process just like it went through before in order to vote for that person. And there's no guarantee, as you said, it's going to be Miramar or Fort Lauderdale. It can be whoever you want it to be whether or not they come to your meetings.



Speaker 1 - 02:40:44

Excuse me, I just saw something else.



Speaker 3 - 02:40:47

That I have to point out, actually. To amend the agreement, and as to certain sections, we actually need 100% of the cities. One of those is actually executive Committee membership.



Speaker 1 - 02:40:59

So we're not going to be able to do it. I mean, if it's part of facilities.



Speaker 3 - 02:41:02

Amendment, it's going to need 100% approval. So it probably will have to be a standalone amendment separate from the facilities amendment, and it's going to have 100% approval because we did have that.



Speaker 1 - 02:41:15

It's kind of a separate issue to put that in context, because if a city of any size says, I don't agree with that position, the whole system falls apart. Yes. So that's the nice edge we're walking right now, which is fine. We take that risk. Are you suggesting that there could be a separate proposed amendment to the ILA that would not affect the facility's Amendment that could be voted on by all the cities by whatever date or time which.



Speaker 6 - 02:41:51

Could.



Speaker 1 - 02:41:52

You know, all it needs is one city to say, one participating city to say no, and it remains as it is. Yes. And that could either be done at the same time. It could be done. We could present two amendments at the same time, or it could just be done as a separate amendment at a different time.




Speaker 3 - 02:42:06

But it will require 100 approval because we do have that provision in here.




Speaker 1 - 02:42:10


All right, so let me ask this. Given that, would you be okay with voting on the Facilities Amendment as it is today? Understanding we're going to come back and there's going to be a discussion amongst the governing board. Right. On amending the ila, not the Facilities Amendment. Amending the ILA to address membership on the executive Committee. That would go as a standalone, could go parallel, could be voted on whenever. So that if any small city. I'm not saying small, I'm not saying they would do it, but some city who doesn't really have, you know, doesn't have a direct. But might be concerned for other reasons why that's happening. If they vote no, at least the Facilities amendment and this entire SLBA does collapse.

 Speaker 11 - 02:43:04


Yes, if you include changing from the hundred percent to eighty percent.

 Speaker 1 - 02:43:09


Well, now we're changing the ila. We're changing the whole ila.

 Speaker 11 - 02:43:12


You're not changing the ila. You're doing the same thing. It's one. It's just one small change to what you are currently submitting under Facilities Amendment.

 Speaker 1 - 02:43:24


You still need. You would need 100% to agree to that. It doesn't get you around.

 Speaker 2 - 02:43:29

Got it.

 Speaker 1 - 02:43:30

Right. This is a provision of an existing agreement that we all signed and voted on, and it requires 100%. Are you okay with a freestanding amendment to the I LA under your proposal, which, by the way, may include Fort Laurier LLC. Two suggests maybe an large. Whatever the case may be, we absolutely can address that.

 Speaker 11 - 02:43:50

So if I could just take this back to where were before, where this started, which is, you know, in terms of the large

cities, in terms of. Let me just speak for Miramar, in terms of my city. Currently, we have full control over our waste services. We provide recycling and everything. We don't have a voice on the executive Committee where major decisions are made. And when the question was asked, how do we change that? We got, well, you can do this, you can do that. But then when went around in circles and circles, it turned around. You need 100%, which is clearly not likely. So it's almost Impossible for us to get any changes to the ila. If I as a member of the executive, of the governing board want to recommend any changes that are meaningful, it's really, you really can't. Okay.



Speaker 11 - 02:45:03

In any real way. And that's one of the issues that I have. That's one of the issues that I will be discussing with my city in terms of being on this board now adding it was a small solution even though that wasn't. It doesn't guarantee that we will be on there. But it was something. But even that it's almost impossible to happen.



Speaker 1 - 02:45:31

Listen, this ILA was wrestled over for a year. Every city had input on it. We wrestled with the county who were sharp elbows and there was an intention set to make sure there were certain provisions that were not easy to change because that could have been easily changed to only three large cities. Right. This is what everyone agreed to. This is the process we all agreed to. And so we're now all that we got here is not as important as there's a plan and a proposal that gives you a chance at what you're suggesting. I'm just asking, is that something you want to pursue?



Speaker 11 - 02:46:10

I would like to pursue it. If we cannot pursue it along with this, it's really not a priority for us to have a discussion on it right now. In my opinion, it can be something pursued any other time. I think the focus here would be the ILA and the master plan. So I would not, you know, I would not pursue that at this time. If any changes that we can make as we go through now, if we can put it on the under. Yes, but I'm not, I'm not trying to do it outside of that at this time.




Speaker 1 - 02:46:50

Right. And I'm not suggesting you do it. I mean we can include it in the facilities amendment. The only challenge is somebody, one city could just say no to that provision for whatever reason, I don't know why, and then the whole system falls apart. That's not really. I'm risk averse that way. So I'm leaving it to you as the member as to how you would like to proceed.




Speaker 11 - 02:47:11


If we can submit it as a separate resolution along with the others, there'd be two separate items to be voted on. I would pursue that.

 Speaker 1 - 02:47:21


Okay, here's what I would suggest because we don't want to craft it on the fly here. We have an executive committee meeting on the 30th between now and then your staff can also and legal can look at the ILA validate and verify that. Yes, that is it requires 100%. Figure out what provisions it would be. Think through how you want to present that. And we can certainly take that up on March 30 and present it on April 17 as a standalone potential ILA material, if that's what you want.

 Speaker 11 - 02:47:48


Yes.

 Speaker 1 - 02:47:50


Okay.

 Speaker 6 - 02:47:51

There's another issue. I apologize for interjecting. This is your issue. If we try to do that, there's other cities taking it up in the interim. So I understand that. So if we Jamie, correct me here. If this body agrees to move forward the facilities improve amendment, we agree with member Colburn to put an addendum on. So it's two. Is that not what I'm hearing?

 Speaker 1 - 02:48:17

No, it's not an addendum. It's a standalone item.

 Speaker 6 - 02:48:20

So two items. So the road show is going to include. The roadshow is going to include two items. But hold on, let me get there because my what I've heard on this body today is people intend to vote on that in April. So they're not there. If it's 100%. You may be shooting yourself in the foot if somebody one commission takes it. That's my point. What I'm hearing. If I'm incorrect, please correct me.



Speaker 1 - 02:48:42

Let's assume there's no facilities amendment and we are a year ago and a member comes forward and says I want to amend how the membership of the executive committee. There's nothing else to be voted on. We could have done that. We could have said, okay, we're going to recommend that goes out. We don't need 100% and they go vote on it. Go put it on the agenda. Yes, no, whatever. It's completely independent. It has its own course of time. It's not tied to the facilities amendment one way or another. Now. Well, we. Have to. It can go anytime. Right. But you want to move forward with it. So I think, I mean that's the point. I'm not just answering technically, legally.



Speaker 6 - 02:49:26

Right.



Speaker 1 - 02:49:26

But that has to be drafted and it has to be considered and everyone has to think through the policy issues on it. But it's independent of the facilities amendment as structured right now. That's the proposal. Chair.



Speaker 6 - 02:49:37

I don't know what everyone else came here for. I came here to vote on the master plan and the facilities amendment and this is getting time sensitive right now. I think we ought to go ahead and either up or down or move forward. Going back and forth. Half an hour. We're going back and forth in this ila and I'll tell you what, right now I'm not inclined to amend the ila, so you're going to have to really talk me into that. So if you have one vote that's not going to do it, then you're just. What you're talking here is you're making a mountain out of a molehill. So I'd just like to get forward and get these votes done so we can do something today.



Speaker 1 - 02:50:17

All right, So I think what we're going to probably hear is a motion to table consideration of the MASS plan today to address the issue. The motion right now was the facilities amendment.



Speaker 6 - 02:50:25

Okay.



Speaker 1 - 02:50:26

The motion on table right now is to approve the facilities amendment as it is. Is that what I understood with a second from member Mateo Paul.



Speaker 11 - 02:50:33

Can I be just. Okay, can I be just clear on what we're voting on with the. With the amendment? Is it just to. We're just voting to send it to the cities, Right?



Speaker 1 - 02:50:47

That's it.



Speaker 11 - 02:50:48

That's what Would that motion relight to the attorney? Jamie?



Speaker 3 - 02:50:54

Okay. As to the facilities amendment, the exec. The governing board will be voting to recommend the facilities amendment to the cities. That. That's what you'll be doing. The 120 day time period doesn't start until it's actually delivered to the cities for approval. I don't know if we want to deliver it to the cities to approval until we have the master plan approved. That's something we can discuss because once the master plan is approved by the governing board, you know that's a separate action. I know this is kind of weird the way it was set up because we have the facilities amendment and we have the master plan. The facilities amendment is really the legal operative document. And once it. Each city is going to choose whether to approve it or not. The master plan does not go to the cities.



Speaker 3 - 02:51:46

So technically, once you prove the facilities amendment, you could deliver the facilities amendment to the cities

and the 120 days period starts. The problem is the cities are going to want to see the master plan beforehand. And so if it hasn't been approved by the governing board, that's kind of contrary to what we always introduce intended, which was that the two would go hand in hand. So you can vote to approve the facilities amendment, not send it to the cities until the master plan is approved by the governing board. That would probably be. Make the most sense.



Speaker 1 - 02:52:20

Okay.



Speaker 12 - 02:52:21

Mr. Shearer over here.



Speaker 1 - 02:52:24

Yes, of course.



Speaker 12 - 02:52:26

Yes. I'm Commissioner Evard from the city of West Park. I'm grateful to be here to represent my City. Before we move on, I want to say that there are certain things that I'm not really clear about, you know, because I'm new and I'm learning the process. But I want to say I do believe that every city should have a seat at the table and should be able to have a vote, regardless if they're a large city or bigger cities. Because in terms of the master plan, you know, our dollars has been, you know, also part of it, too. So if we put in our dollars there, then we should also be entitled to have a vote at the table. Next thing I wanted to point out, as far as the facility amendment coming in new, I haven't seen it.




Speaker 1 - 02:53:18

I have.




Speaker 12 - 02:53:19


I haven't gotten any email about the facility amendment to see what it's all about.

 Speaker 1 - 02:53:23


Committee review.

 Speaker 11 - 02:53:24


So.

 Speaker 1 - 02:53:25


So two things. You have a vote. You are at the table. The issue is the executive Committee. The executive Committee is formed to be able to do essentially the interim business that has to be done every month. We cannot have, in my opinion, can't have 28 members of cities and one on the county as an executive committee. We will get no business done. That'll be number one. So you do have a vote. Number two, we will make sure you have everything. The instruction to all staff is all communications go to every governing board member and to every city. So your city should have it. Irrespective of that, we will make sure you have it.

 Speaker 9 - 02:54:01


Okay.

 Speaker 2 - 02:54:01


All right. Thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 02:54:02


Thank you. All right. So, Member Ryan. Thank you.

 Speaker 2 - 02:54:07


Chair.

 Speaker 3 - 02:54:08


Yeah, I'd just like to point out that we're still a year and a half away from next time we vote on the Executive committee anyway, so I'm sure we can get that handled in between that time.

 Speaker 1 - 02:54:18


Yeah.

 Speaker 3 - 02:54:19


And, yeah, everybody does have a seat at the table, and everybody's more than welcome to come to the executive Committee meetings. And you have just as much as a voice as anybody on that Executive committee meeting, except for the votes. And Mayor Brightkus brought up a good point, saying that most of the votes haven't been contentious anyways when it comes to that. And I want to emphasize how we're viewed as. As a governing body from the outside world, and our perception has to be a positive perception, and we have to show that we're moving forward and getting things done. So with that, I'd like to make a motion to approve the facilities agreement as is.

 Speaker 1 - 02:54:56

I think we have a motion on the. On the table right now.

 Speaker 12 - 02:54:58

Good.

 Speaker 1 - 02:55:00

Discussion on this motion.



Speaker 17 - 02:55:01

Thank you, Member. Chair.



Speaker 1 - 02:55:02

But before you do that, I need A motion to extend. 15 Minutes. Motion by member Dunn. Seconded by member Orland. All in favor say aye. Member Patterson?



Speaker 17 - 02:55:12

Yeah, I just wanted to clarify, though. There's a motion on the floor for facilities amendment.



Speaker 1 - 02:55:15

I'm sorry, one more time.



Speaker 17 - 02:55:16

I just wanted to clarify. There's a motion on the floor for the facilities amendment. However, we have not reviewed that item on the agenda.



Speaker 1 - 02:55:24

I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.



Speaker 17 - 02:55:24

Because there's a motion on the floor to amend the facilities amendment. However, we've not gotten to that portion of the agenda yet. I thought were discussing the master plan and potentially doing a motion to extend or

move it to April 17th. I'm not comfortable voting on the facilities limit yet. Yeah, without the. Without that one. The second question is, I personally, I don't know of anyone else, but I have not had my city attorney take a look at either of these items, the master plan or the facilities amendment. My understanding was that the board attorney here was who we would be deferring to as it pertains to what we're. The business that we're doing here. Am I mistaken? I mean, I'm still trying.



Speaker 1 - 02:56:10

I've given it to my city. I've given medicine staff because our attorney, including the drafts, to make sure my staff didn't have any issues.



Speaker 17 - 02:56:17

I mean, I gave it to my staff. However, because it has not been agendized yet, our attorney is to some extent taken the position that the board attorney here would be the appropriate person to give any legal opinion prior to it coming to the commission. So I just wanted to clarify or get some perspective on whether or not anyone else had their attorney weigh in outside of the county attorney.



Speaker 1 - 02:56:44

Yeah, I've had our lawyers look at it. I mean, I look at everything. They're drafts because they're not giving the opinion to the swo. This is the SWA charge. He's not your city attorney. City attorney could say, hey, I have an issue with this. I don't know if you thought of that. So we've gotten comments back. So whatever happens to you today, I would definitely loop your city attorney in, and I would not suggest that they wait until there's an agenda. The idea is to try to get all the legal issues. That's part of my frustration of not hearing some of this. So I would strongly suggest you do that.



Speaker 17 - 02:57:15

But that's interesting to me that if your attorney reviewed it at the city side, that they didn't see or have any opinion that perhaps the county attorney.



Speaker 1 - 02:57:23

Yeah, neither did anybody else until yesterday.



Speaker 17 - 02:57:27

Not suggesting that. Obviously, I don't think they're incompetent. I just, it's interesting that here we are, if folks have already had their folks review this stuff that, you know. And so now I'm kind of feeling inclined to support the April 17th as well, because I feel like, you know, I did not do that, but I didn't do it because I wasn't aware.



Speaker 12 - 02:57:43

Of what was going on.



Speaker 17 - 02:57:44

I just didn't recognize it was appropriate. All right, thank you.



Speaker 1 - 02:57:52

So, Crystal, we share a city attorney and he's.



Speaker 11 - 02:57:56

I've shared the document with him and.




Speaker 1 - 02:57:58

He was also invited to one of the presentations with the team. And so he has also said to me that he doesn't want to issue an opinion until after it comes to the. Even though he has it. And he was a part of some of the meetings, so he's aware.




Speaker 17 - 02:58:16


Yeah.

 Speaker 1 - 02:58:17


Okay. We have members who have your cards up.

 Speaker 6 - 02:58:21


Sorry.

 Speaker 1 - 02:58:22


Member Coburn,.

 Speaker 11 - 02:58:26


About an hour ago, it was said that we couldn't vote on the amendment because weren't voting on the master plan, so weren't going to vote each other. I think we have gone so many different scenarios here. At this point, my vote would be a no vote. At this point, I am fully willing to wait till our next meeting, whether it's the 17th or whatever date that is. And I've had an opportunity to go over every new thing that was presented to us over the last few days with both staff, my attorney, and I'll make sure that I schedule a workshop for my colleagues as well before I. Before I can vote yes on any of these two items.

 Speaker 1 - 02:59:24


So I welcome that. But I want to be clear to all the cities voting, even voting yes, and I'm not suggesting even voting yes does not in any way suggest you did anyone doing anything other than bringing it to their commission for full consideration. It's saying this is where it's at. Go think about it. So I, I. Everybody can choose how they want to move forward on this, but to the extent a member says I'm going to vote not today, I'm not talking about today, I'm going to vote no because my colleagues on the commission have not agreed to the MASS plan, the facilities amendment, I'm not sure that really sends appropriate message of what we task the governing board to do. And that's simply to recommend moving it forward and the approval of it.

 Speaker 1 - 03:00:09


That being said, I know there's a motion on the facilities amendment. I hesitate if we're going to have no votes, I hesitate to start generating no votes. That sends a message to the community that somehow we're divided. We're not even divided on an issue. This is a procedural issue and I won't force it. We'll call the motion. But no votes send the wrong message, I think to where we're headed.

 Speaker 8 - 03:00:33


Chair, point of clarity on my motion, I think there is a lot of confusion. This is for us. If you have not workshopped this with your commission as of yet, this is where you do so we as protocol in my city, before we workshop anything, we put it on the workshop agenda. So my colleagues have the opportunity to review any of the backups that I put on the agenda. I have to give direction to staff today to do that because our workshop is next week, Wednesday. This is an item that will be on the workshop because I attended this meeting today. So if we don't move forward with this, I then now have to explain to my colleagues, which we've workshopped this twice already, that we could not come to an agreement to discuss this. And that makes us.

 Speaker 8 - 03:01:28


They look at us not having our priorities straight. And it puts me in a bad position with my colleagues and staff because we've been talking about this for too much. They've provided me with feedback, we've created a memo, we've done all the steps with our attorney. And now I'm saying with full confidence, this is how we're moving forward on. I'm presenting, I'm reporting out to my colleagues. That is why I'm saying if we can't agree on the master plan, let me at least present the agreement to them.

 Speaker 6 - 03:02:03


I think there's an easy cleanup.

 Speaker 1 - 03:02:05

Matt.

 Speaker 6 - 03:02:05

I think there's a very easy cleanup here. And I'd ask who made whose motion is it Nancy's. Here's my suggestion. I think you separate your motion. I think the first motion hypothetically should be to table the master plan. But it's you did it in two and one. So I think for the purpose of that, I think everyone could get on board with that. And then if we're talking the second step, which is still is predicated on the first, then it will be a second motion to move the island. I'm just trying to separate it out because I think that would facilities amendment. I think that would give everybody it's cleaner and I think it would allow everyone to feel more comfortable chair to your point, and hopefully have them both unanimous as two different motions. That's all.

 Speaker 6 - 03:02:48

So we step one it which then that would be my only suggestion. Member Mater Bowen.



Speaker 1 - 03:02:53

I had interpreted the motion as a motion on the facilities amendment alone. We had not addressed it, never raised the master plan. It wasn't questions. Let's do that first. Well, we have a. We have a current motion. Do you want to withdraw the motion and do a motion to table the master plan?



Speaker 6 - 03:03:08

So I would make a motion to table.



Speaker 1 - 03:03:09

Wait. You have to withdraw the. You have to withdraw the motion the second. We're going to do procedurally correct. You have to withdraw. We'll come back to the facilities amendment.



Speaker 8 - 03:03:20

I withdraw my motion.



Speaker 1 - 03:03:22

Okay. And the second? Withdrawn as well. Yeah.




Speaker 6 - 03:03:26

I make a motion to table the master plan until the April 7th.




Speaker 3 - 03:03:31


You make it continue rather than table. I don't have to take it off the table, etc. Just procedurally. Just continue it until that meeting.

 Speaker 1 - 03:03:43


By member Rydell. Second by member Kajiano. All in favor? Any opposed? Okay. Member Mater Bomb.

 Speaker 8 - 03:03:51


I move that we. My motion. I move to move forward with the facilities agreement.

 Speaker 3 - 03:04:02


It's to recommend it recommended.

 Speaker 8 - 03:04:04


Yes, I'm. I move that we move forward with the recommended facilities amendment.

 Speaker 1 - 03:04:10

Okay. Motion by member Mateo Bowen. Seconded by member Shoeham. Any discussion on that further? All in favor, say aye.

 Speaker 12 - 03:04:17

Aye.

 Speaker 1 - 03:04:18

Any opposed? Let the record reflect both were unanimous votes. All right, well, we're out of time. And so when folks ask, why has it taken us seven years to get here? All right, can I have a motion to adjourn? Motion by member

**Meeting Title: SWABC Executive Committee &
SWABC Governing Board-...**

Meeting created at: 9th Apr, 2026 - 6:29 PM

Dunn. Seconded by member Rydell. All in favor say aye.