

 Speaker 1 - 00:52


Ultron. All right. All right. We've got. We've got quorum for executive committee. So let's get ourselves together. I don't know if there's anybody online. Anybody online that for executive committee? We can count. And Elisa, let me know when you're ready.

 Speaker 2 - 10:01


Ready.

 Speaker 1 - 10:02


Okay. Perfect. All right, I'm going to call to order the solid waste authority's executive committee meeting of may 18, 2026. If you would please call the roll.

 Speaker 2 - 10:11


Chair ryan.

 Speaker 1 - 10:11


President.

 Speaker 2 - 10:13


Vice chair for.

 Speaker 3 - 10:14


Here.

 Speaker 2 - 10:15


Member shuham. Here. Member horland.

 Speaker 4 - 10:20


Here.

 Speaker 1 - 10:24


Member orland. Me.

 Speaker 5 - 10:26


I'm here anyway.

 Speaker 1 - 10:27


It's okay.

 Speaker 2 - 10:28


Member dunn.

 Speaker 5 - 10:31


Yes.

 Speaker 2 - 10:33


Member riddell.

 Speaker 6 - 10:34


Here.

 Speaker 2 - 10:35


Member meade.

 Speaker 1 - 10:36


Here.

 Speaker 2 - 10:37

Member cagiano. Member a.j. Ryan. Member newton.

 Speaker 1 - 10:51

Remember, Horland is here. Show is present. Please.

 Speaker 2 - 10:54

Alternates. Member Colborne. Small cities. Member Bright Cruz. Thank you.

Speaker 1 - 11:05



All right, Mr. Cole, we have a quorum. All right. If you would please join us in the pledge of allegiance. All right. We have opportunity for public comment. Do we have anyone signed up for public comment? Anybody wish to have public comment? If you haven't signed up Right. Seeing none, I'll go ahead and close public comment. Meeting minutes. I have a motion to approve the meeting minutes for March 30, 2026. Motion by member Cagiano. Second. Second. Second by member me. Any discussion on that item? All in favor say aye. Any opposed? Passes unanimously. All right. Item 5, Second Amendment to the interlocal agreement providing for additional opt out. Let me provide some context to this issue and then I'll turn it to Mr. Cole to introduce the options.



Speaker 1 - 12:07

As you know, throughout the course of the executive committee's work and the governing board's work, at various times there's been suggestions of potential opt outs, opportunities for cities who wish to leave this Solid Waste Authority for one reason or another that needed to be balanced against the overwhelming need for predictability in terms of tonnage so that we can ensure the best pricing for economies of scale with predictability for both the market and ourselves. And to do that over the long term, short term contracts have been why we're here. That fragmented approach is why we all came back together. So at the outset of any of.



Speaker 7 - 12:50

Those discussions, it was obvious that.




Speaker 1 - 12:53

Opting out at any time would undermine the ability of the Salt Waste Authority to deliver on its paramount mission of the best pricing possible for all of the participating members over the long term, to eliminate the market vagaries and to maximize our opportunity to achieve the goals of the multiple goals of recycling and positive waste disposal. We also saw in the early process of trying to go out on The RFP that the market responded quite dramatically that it would be unable to provide us prior to this point in time, good pricing without knowing who was in. And that makes some sense, right? How does the market, any of the participating players in the commodity streams provide long term pricing if there's uncertainty as to the tonnage and who's participating? So we moved on beyond that.




Speaker 1 - 13:54


One of the protective mechanisms though that we instituted within the facilities amendment and the expectation of the master plan was to set a maximum price for the commodity streams. This was intended to protect the cities that were concerned and all was concerned that we would get into the process and all of a sudden the pricing would be wildly different than our expectations and that a city would be dragged along and have no alternative. By setting that maximum pricing, we did provide a safety valve for 2/3 of the population of the governing board to approve if it was necessary to go over the maximum pricing. Over the last 45 days, the discussions amongst various cities raised the possibility of two issues. One, this is a 40 year plan.

 Speaker 1 - 14:50


It was intended to be long term, to provide the best pricing possible, but also to allow the industry to be able to finance bond or in the alternative solid waste authority, if I ever did it, to bond over the long term. You can't have short term bond for any infrastructure. The question that raised by some of the cities was would there be an opportunity at some interim short of 40 years to have an opt out? One of the proposals that you'll, that Mr. Cole outlined for us has an opt out period. It's roughly 25 years out and probably in the big scheme of things is not something to be dramatically concerned about in terms of long term predictability.

 Speaker 1 - 15:36


We can expect over the next 20 years, particularly that technology and the economics of trash are going to change dramatically as the market catches up and we need to be responsive to that. Our job is the governing board and executive committee is, and for those who will come after us, is to convince all the participating members that we're doing the best job to achieve these goals in the most economical way while taking advantage of the latest technology. And so it is at least from my perspective that additional concern of 40 years probably is marginally dealt with by some shorter period of time, 25 years for us all to reconsider. That's our job to make sure this continues on. The second issue that came up was a proposal to allow for an earlier opt out around the RFP process. This has significant complications.

 Speaker 1 - 16:36

It's very complicated. Again, and I'll say it as an early proponent. And you remember this because I know the county took a different position at the time. We wanted to try to have an early opt out with erp. And what we found though is that the market really would not allow that. Market needed the predictability first rather than our concerns. The issue that is presented is the timing of this. We, you know, have until August to get the facilities amendment approved. At that point, if it's approved and we're still together, then the consultants will go out for the request for proposal on the commodity streams. And there are multiple commodity streams. That's going to take time to draft. You can expect 60 to 90 days.

 Speaker 1 - 17:26

Just in the nature of how, you know, we've proceeded through this to make sure everybody's reviewed, everybody's had their input, everybody in his agreement on the RFPs. And then from there'll be a response time from the market. Now the market will either come in below or at what we have said as the maximum price or they will come in over that. If they come in over that, then the executive committee and governing board will have the opportunity to make some decisions like we do in our own cities, which is go back out on the rfp, renegotiate, figure out some other structure. We have our own. You know, we are not fully defined by what you all may be used to in terms of your procurement. We can set those standards, but we have to be mindful that will take time.

 Speaker 1 - 18:13

And when that process is completed,.



Speaker 8 - 18:19

The,.



Speaker 1 - 18:20

The timing of that has to allow for both a recognition that prices change over time. If this goes out too long, if we're debating this too long on debating contracts on it, we may lose pricing. But at the same time we also are mindful that the county in April 28 has the global disposal agreement that will have to be addressed. So the proposal that you'll hear from Mr. Cole addresses both. And these are opportunities you can, you have really from the executive committee's perspective and then ultimately the government board, there's three options. Option one is simply a, an agreement that we will amend the ILA to allow an earlier opt out short of the 40 years. It's roughly the timings between 20, 25 years. Option B is to allow only an opt out tied to the RFP process.



Speaker 1 - 19:16

And I'll give a little tweak to that in a moment. And option three would be to include both opt outs with respect to the RFP tied to the opt out tied to the rfp. I think we have to be clear about the disease we're trying to cure here. The concern that's been raised by the cities, it is the genesis of it is that no city wants to be dragged along even if there's a 2/3 vote. Is the view that we're hearing 2/3 vote to exceed the maximum price, saying our voice wasn't heard all the things that we've heard. Therefore it's not just a timetable opt out. It's got to be tied to does the executive committee, in my opinion the executive committee and the government board recommend a pricing structure that exceeds the maximum price that we all agreed.



Speaker 1 - 20:11

And even if 2/3 of the governing board agreed to that, say it's 10 cents more, somebody would could say that makes no sense to opt out of this product. But you could find a city for political reasons that says otherwise. So then it cannot just be timetable. It's got to be tied to whether the executive and government board through the RFP process in my opinion, has exceeded the maximum price and has recommended that. And then a short time period for the cities who decide, look we don't want to go along even if it's one penny more to say we're out knowing and understanding that if it achieves a certain threshold of that, you know, the Solid Waste Authority could evaporate after all this work.



Speaker 1 - 20:57

This introduces more than and we have to be honest about this, it introduces more than just a substantive analysis that introduce a political analysis that is dangerous for the Solid Waste Authority. But that's our job is to be able to achieve the RFP goals, to do it as rapidly as possible. It's going to put a lot of pressure on our consultants to be able to complete the RFP on the executive committee and the governing board to have input on that at a pace at, you know, it's going to continue where even if the facilities amendments approved under the proposal of an additional opt out in a shorter period of time, it's going to create a lot of extra work for the executive committee and the government board.

Speaker 1 - 21:40



We have to be committed to that process because of, you know, our focus on a higher goal. And then it's going to put some pressure on the market to make sure that we're able to have enough play in the joints that if the RFP responses come back and we're unhappy with them, that we have the ability to either go back out to renegotiate, to Split up the RFPs to do the things we're all used to doing when we're faced with a response. So what I'd like Mr. Cole to do is to outline essentially the timetable issue, starting with option one, which was something shorter than 40 years, then go into option two, which is tied to the RFP and then option three, how that would work for both. Mr. Cole?



Speaker 8 - 22:23

Sure.



Speaker 7 - 22:24

The way these have been prepared is a little different than the way the facilities amendment is working. With the facilities amendment, each city has to consider at the elected body and then if the elected body approves it, they have to deliver to the city. So it's kind of a continued opt in is really what we have with facilities amendment. These are done the opposite way. These are opt outs. So basically the way these are drafted is at honor before that certain date, if a city's elected body opts out, if they vote to opt out, then it takes effect. But they don't have, if they don't do anything, they stay in. So the default is staying instead of getting out.




Speaker 7 - 23:03

So for the first one, for the 2048 opt out the basically what it says is that any of the municipal parties or the county, but the county is only as to the unincorporated areas. Obviously this the SWA can't continue. The county has so many different powers, various different things under the swa it doesn't make sense for them to be out completely, but they could opt out as to the unincorporated areas. So any municipal party and the county is the unincorporated areas may withdraw from the agreement by honor before August 16, 2048, which is the 25th year. And that date was chosen because we're already in three years in and then it's going to take some time to get the agreements going. So we wanted to have a 20 year period for all of the solid waste agreements that we're going to enter into.




Speaker 7 - 24:03


So this will give us a 20 year period, which was felt to be the minimum. That's why Even though it's 25 years from the effective date of the SWA, it enables a 20 year agreement. And then the condition is that they have to adopt a resolution approving the withdrawal.

 Speaker 1 - 24:22


And that has to be the elected.

 Speaker 7 - 24:24


Body has to approve the resolution. They have to deliver it to the authority by August 6, 2047, which is one year in advance. So we want there's a one year period of time that the SWA will know who is opting out. That way they'll be able to do agreements and RFPs into the future after that. And then beyond that there's a whole bunch of just technical language with the important other provisions. If municipal parties representing more than 20% of the total population of the municipalities withdraw.

 Speaker 1 - 25:01


The question is what happens then?

 Speaker 7 - 25:03


And the way it was drafted with Ursili's amendment is unless we had 80%, the SWA goes away. This kind of does it the opposite. This says if more than 20% opt out, then the governing board will determine by majority vote whether or not the SWA should continue. And if they decide it should continue, then the agreement, then it should not continue, then it terminates and we go to the wind down provisions. But if they decide, even though, you know a certain 25% has withdrawn, we they still think they want to keep going, they can keep going. Whereas with the facilities amendment, if we.

 Speaker 1 - 25:39

Have more than 20% opt out, we're finished.

 Speaker 7 - 25:42

So that's basically what the option one is, which is the 2048 opt out.

 Speaker 1 - 25:49

The 2027 opt out is that's before.



Speaker 7 - 25:55

You is basically the same except the dates are different. The date is you cities can opt out by December 31, 2027 and everything else is the same. Now the length, what the chair had talked about was possibly modifying that, which would be a different way to do it, which would basically say that is a conditional opt out, that cities cannot opt out unless the prices that we get are above the maximum prices. So if the prices come in within the maximum prices that are set forth in the master plan, then there's no opt out. That way people bidding will know that if they bid under that maximum amount, things will continue. But if the prices for any of these RPs end up above the maximum price, then this would trigger the opt outs.



Speaker 7 - 26:52

So the language that we would add that would basically say that provided that the withdrawal option shall not be available if prior to November 15, 2027, the governing board awards contracts for the five different things, which is recyclable materials, yard trash for disposal, yard trash for beneficial use, solid waste disposal class one and solid waste disposal class three at prices that are less than or equal to the applicable maximum service charge. And the master plan is adjusted. So that means there will be an opt out if the prices exceed the maximum prices. But if the maximum prices are not exceeded, everyone is committed. So that would be a tweak that we could make to the 2027 opt out if you decide you want a 2027 opt out.



Speaker 7 - 27:40

Now the third option is a combination of both where you would have an opt out opportunity in 2027 or 2028 and then that could also be tweaked so that the 2027 opt out is also conditional if you want to do it.




Speaker 6 - 27:55

That way.




Speaker 7 - 27:55


So those are basically the three things that are before you.

 Speaker 1 - 27:59


Mr. Cole, just as a clarification, the process assuming the body will of body, was to recommend this and then ultimately the government board, this is an amendment to the ila. What is the process for that approval?

 Speaker 7 - 28:10


Okay, this is an Amendment to the ILA, but it's a called a significant amendment to the ILA. There's certain types of MCI LA that require 100% of the elected bodies to approve. This is one of them. So what would happen is the this the executive committee would first recommend it by majority vote to the governing board. The governing board has to approve it just by majority vote and majority of population. It's not a super majority, but then every single city commission would have to approve it. So over these next couple of months, all of the city commissions, when they're considering the facilities amendment, can also consider this. If they've already voted on the facilities amendment, they can still consider this. But this will also not take effect until the day after the facilities amendment takes effect.

 Speaker 7 - 28:59

So all of the parties that will need to approve this will just be the ones that remain on August 17th. So if a city decides they don't want to stay in and they don't pass the facilities amendment, they don't have to pass this and it won't matter. But all the ones that do pass the facilities amendment would have to pass this in order for it to be effective.

 Speaker 1 - 29:17

And are they on the same deadline as August 17th or is that something that can be improved in September? Since it's not a facilities amendment? That's all the ILA credit card.

 Speaker 7 - 29:26

There's no specific deadline for them to approve it, but it can't take effect until all the cities that are still in after August 16th approve it.

Speaker 1 - 29:35



Okay. Member H. I think.



Speaker 9 - 29:38

Member right down.



Speaker 1 - 29:39

I'm sorry. Member right down.



Speaker 8 - 29:43

Thank you, Denise.



Speaker 6 - 29:44

Thank you. So just to clarify, procedurally. Right. I think it'll be good, Jamie, if you could do that. Assuming the amendment doesn't get handled until, let's say, September. Right. Whatever the. The discussion of this executive board and as I think it's a salient point to make, assuming that doesn't happen until September and then 80% of the cities approve the facilities amendment, it is as is moving forward, correct?



Speaker 1 - 30:10

That's correct.



Speaker 6 - 30:10

Okay. So I want to say that first, I also want to address some comments, what I think will be relevant to the discussion of what I've heard from other elected officials not in this room, what I've listened to in some of your Workshops and what I've heard deist discussions on this. I've heard elected officials say why on earth would I lock my city into 40 years? I've heard that from like five different elected officials. Right. You do it every day on the dais.

You do it every day on the dais with your underground contracts, with your capital improvement contracts, with your wireless telecommunications. We all do it every day entering our cities into long term agreement. So I don't buy that necessarily. I think it's an important point to make because that's become the soup du jour of what you're saying.



Speaker 6 - 30:49

Why are we going to do this for 40 years?



Speaker 10 - 30:51

Oh, private.



Speaker 6 - 30:54

I think that's a big one. The second one is we're creating another bureaucracy. Why are we going to create another bureaucracy? Which we are, but we're creating a collective agreement to ensure better rates and processes in the county. So I start with those two things because I've heard that from a lot of people and I've heard that in these workshops and I've heard it from staff talking about some of these points. I do agree that there should be amendment based. I kind of like all of it today and I'm not as supportive of a 25 year opt out.



Speaker 6 - 31:25


And I think everyone in the industry that's listening to this as well as all of us up here, you're not going to get a major player coming investing infrastructure and really saving us money if we're going to shorten the term of this and if you want to opt out for yourself. I can't, I can't talk. I'd love you to have a conversation with you. But shortening it for four years I don't think does anything. I think that actually hurts what we're doing today. The second prong of making it a rate based opt out once things are on the street. I support, I do support that. If everyone needs that or if somebody here is saying, hey, my elected, my colleagues are not going to support something like that. I think that passes it, but I don't want to be misinterpreted.




Speaker 6 - 32:01

While that doesn't have to be in now if you pass, we've passed the facilities amendment in Coconut Creek, I'm in when that and Jamie again, correct me if I'm wrong. Once we hit 80%, that's it, I'm in. I'm locked in. I've committed


to that. I've kept my colleagues in Coconut Creek very advised on that and I've stayed coarse with that even it was some hiccups about is there an opt.

 Speaker 1 - 32:21


Out, is there not?

 Speaker 6 - 32:22


The consensus is we intend to move forward. Even though a lot of people are wrapping their head around how do we get out. So I think if you're going into it thinking how are you going to get out? I think we're kind of doomed because there's, we've spent, I mean we spent three hours, one meeting, Chair, all of us up here talking about the wind down and the opt out that we as a board can implement. If it's all going south, the people in this room or the future people in this room will be able to, to advocate and end it if the group, if the group wants to do that. So I think those points are important to make at the start of the discussion. And it's really, you know, Mike is much more eloquent with his existential crisis of trash.

 Speaker 6 - 33:04


But I, I think what we're doing here collectively, if we're trimming down time is damaging and understanding that a city could still be a bad actor. There's potential ways that if somebody on the amendment, if you get, you know, all cities but one, it doesn't pass. That's a tall order in and of itself. So I think the discussion, while we have to have a discussion to give some direction, if any direction to a potential opt out parameter, in some degree, I think we got to look at really the commitment to and understanding the discussion piece of why we're here in the first place. And I understand a lot of, and I'm open to hear some of those conversations that happen in other cities so we could address them better. Because I'm getting the number one thing that people are calling me, Josh.

 Speaker 6 - 33:43


Why the hell am I going to do this for 40 years? Because you're going to save a bunch of money and we're going to collectively be in a better place. But that's what I think we all do on the day. So thank you, Chair. I hope that provides some clarity and some concept to the future discussion.

 Speaker 1 - 33:55


Thank you, member. Right now, Member horland.

 Speaker 9 - 33:58


Thank you, Mr.

 Speaker 1 - 33:59


Chair.

 Speaker 9 - 34:02


As somebody who has attended most of these votes and workshops and, or watch them online as my colleague, Member Riddell has. Yes, there have been concerns about the 40 year commitment, but I think that they, once they're addressed, we've been able to get the votes. To the Chair's point, I'm very concerned.

 Speaker 11 - 34:25


About the politics surrounding this.

 Speaker 9 - 34:28


It takes one elected official who may not even be a member of this body to write a Facebook post. And all of a sudden we're here today. I think we need to stay the course. If there is an opt out, I wholeheartedly agree. It's got to be tied to the pricing. What I don't want to see is us undo all the work we've done over the last couple of years. Couple years. It's been many years and.

 Speaker 11 - 34:53


I. I.

 Speaker 9 - 34:55


Have a lot to say, but I think I'm going to hold my tongue on some of it. But I'm very disappointed. What I don't want to see is us capitulating to a few, whether they're bad actors or they just don't understand. It has been a heavy lift this road to. Yes, the presentation has evolved as questions have come up. I think that the members in this room have been done a very good job with their colleagues and explaining it. I think it's just gotten better and better. There are still a couple of questions out there, but we know why we're doing this and we know why there's a 40 year commitment. We need to continue to articulate that. Mr. Cole, I just have a question on two of these and I want to understand if it's a typo.

 Speaker 9 - 35:36


On the two proposals for the 25 year opt out and the 2027, 24, 2048 opt out, it reads that with. But not with regard to the other rights and obligations.

 Speaker 4 - 35:57


Let's see.

 Speaker 9 - 35:58


May withdraw from this agreement on the date that is 25 years after the effective date of August 16, 2048. Do you see that online? It's on both of them.

 Speaker 11 - 36:10


I think that's a typo.

 Speaker 9 - 36:15


The effective date.

 Speaker 1 - 36:17


Right.

 Speaker 7 - 36:17


The effective date of the ILA is August 16, 2023. So 25 years after the effective date is August 16, 2048. And that's the date in parentheses. So that is accurate.

 Speaker 9 - 36:31


Just the way that reads. To me, it seems like that's the effective date. So I just want to make sure. Okay, again, Mr. Chair, I agree if that we do anything today, it has to be tied to pricing.

 Speaker 1 - 36:44


All right, thank you. We'll open up to the other members as well. But I'm going to open up to the governing board members who are here, even though this is executive committee because I think it's important to get input on this from all the members I want to. But remember right now, remember, Horland have touched, I think on the issues that caused me the angst as well. They got looked very eloquently outlined Better than I could have what the angst is. But this is not market driven. This is not the market saying to us, hey, we only need 25 and we'll be able to give you the best pricing. This is being somewhat arbitrary. And to remember Rydell's point, we're. We're asking the market to take all of our tonnage and invest in. Because we're not.

 Speaker 1 - 37:29

We're either not politically willing or there's no appetite to do so, to actually own the assets, to be able to go out and bond. We're not going to spend a billion.


 Speaker 12 - 37:37

There's no.


 Speaker 1 - 37:37

We're not doing this again. We did this for the R and B and we didn't own anything at the end. We should have, but we didn't. We're not going to go back out and do it. And I think that there is a significant danger that we're going to hear this in the RFP process, that they need 30 years or they need more time or they need more predictability, and


it's going to be too late at that point and we're going to put ourselves in a bind. I think that there was an enormous concession made to the fears of which I don't think were well taken.

 Speaker 1 - 38:09


But I understand the cynicism that this body these folks have all worked so hard for now, going on six or seven years in some iterations, would somehow just approve some gigantic contract that is out of line with what market pricing is and then force everybody to go along just because we have some social policy view on this, that we don't have the same commitment to fiduciary responsibility to each other and to our community. And in concession of that, we said we're going to set maximum market pricing. It's aggressive, and if it comes out 10 cents more, we're gonna have to go through a whole process to get two thirds of the population to agree to that. And it'll be a sharp elbows and a wrestling match. And I think that's the protection there.

 Speaker 1 - 39:01


I am deeply concerned that it'll shift from the substance to politics over minimal dollars and that we'll find ourselves back here again. I am open to it, but I think that there are tremendous risks in both of these. And I think to some extent it's inconsistent with what we've done. But I understand the voices because I've heard them. Like my colleagues, Member Arnson and Member Sorensen.

 Speaker 8 - 39:28


Yeah, thank you, Board Chair. Has anyone thought about doing a percentage of price? Because one penny over is not. That's crazy. I mean, if you do a rolling percentage where it's a certain percentage at.

 Speaker 1 - 39:46


The early opt out and then a.

 Speaker 8 - 39:49


Different percentage later opt out, which would make it a little difficult, more difficult for some to opt out. It wouldn't be so easy to say, well, Your price is \$0.02 over on opt now.

 Speaker 1 - 39:59


Now lay a percentage out there and.

 Speaker 8 - 40:02


Then it rolls with how much your rates are. So it's a percentage of the rate. If it's over that percentage, they can have the option to opt out. It just makes a little more sense, it makes it a little harder, but it does give them the option if it is significantly more than we're expecting.

 Speaker 1 - 40:21


Yeah, it's a great point. I think the complexities of figuring across the five different waste streams makes that hard as to what that percentage would be. I also think we put it in the context of what some of us are dealing with in school zone cameras. You know, the speed limit's 15, right. The new de facto speed limit is 26. Because we put play in the joints to say we're not going to tick it till after I hear the discussion out there. So I think that there is some merit to just holding to it and then having the significant wrestling match of one penny over. Is that really why you're going to opt out?

 Speaker 1 - 41:00


And I think that we have to, we have to commit to keep the market within the rates we have, understanding if we've missed something in the rp, we want to give ourselves time to go back out and say, I think we, I think the percentages could generally, I think we could probably take another month or 60 days trying to figure out what that percentage is and then that, then we're going to go out to the cities and then it'll be, no, I want 5%, not 10%. You know what I mean?

 Speaker 8 - 41:26

I just, I just want to make it a little tougher to opt out so you're not in some two or three or four or five cities. Can't just say, oh, it's a penny over, I'm done. I want to move on because they've got a better deal or supposedly better deal with something, a consortium with other cities.


 Speaker 1 - 41:43

You know what, you raise a good point. I want the members to consider as well. When we offer an rfp, the lowest responsive, responsible bidder comes in, there are two and three behind. They could be chirping in people's ears saying, hey, by the way, insert whatever their position is because they want this market. We're talking about a significant Long term contract. That is all the tonnage in Broward County. It's never been done like this since the rb. Right. And we're controlling it as cities and they are going to be able to talk to every elected official number two, number three down the line and say, oh, by the way, they messed this up. This should have been in the rp. I can get you a better contract.


 Speaker 1 - 42:25

So if it's not tied to price at the very least, and we just have it as it's proposed right now, there is significant political risk that we will not be able to control. Not based on the substance, even with price. This is a responsible body. I think as member Rydell pointed out, we've been working hard on this and if it's going to exceed, we have a mechanism that we wrestled over for two or three months as to what that would be and everybody was in agreement. Now I get it, we go back to some of the bodies and some folks who weren't, they're busy on other


important issues and we're responsible for this. Somebody's on another body and so they maybe weren't fully as aware and have the angst and you know, walking down the aisle can be, you know, daunting for some.

 Speaker 1 - 43:11


It's a big commitment. But I think the bigger fear is that we introduce both a political and a market driven effort to undo this for reasons that are not tied to our mission, that are based on markets, market forces. So I think we need to your point, I don't know how we come up with the percentages. It's a great idea. It's meant to make it harder, but I think we could, we probably spend another 60 days trying to figure that out.

 Speaker 8 - 43:41


If somehow or another the hauler goes.

 Speaker 1 - 43:46


Bankrupt, what's the option then?

 Speaker 8 - 43:51


Is there an opt out option then?

 Speaker 1 - 43:54

So hauling remains a city based issue.

 Speaker 8 - 43:58

Disposal. I mean, that's what I'm talking about, disposal. If the person we're using for disposal all of a sudden bugs out, has, has had enough of it or goes bankrupt, what's the option to opt out then?

 Speaker 1 - 44:11

Yeah, that's the struggle for every large community. What do you do if it burns down? What do you do if they bankrupt? We'll have to work our way through that. But we can't have the system automatically collapse because a single market player. Right. So I think that'll be part of the RF and ultimately part of the agreement process as to what the protections are. But I don't think we want to introduce an Automatic opt out. On just my view, the body may feel different.



Speaker 8 - 44:36

Not an automatic, but a process. That's all.



Speaker 1 - 44:39

Yeah, it's a fair point. Other members from the governing board, Member Sorensen,.



Speaker 12 - 44:46

Thank you, Mr. Chair, appreciate it.



Speaker 1 - 44:50

Couple thoughts.



Speaker 12 - 44:51

One is as I'm just starting to get up to speed and talk with our city staff and just neighbors about this. So they're definitely, at least in Fort Lauderdale there's concern about not having an opt out.




Speaker 1 - 45:05

They especially the.




Speaker 12 - 45:09


What I'm hearing from our city staff.

 Speaker 1 - 45:10


Is especially.

 Speaker 12 - 45:13


After the RFPs hit the street and dollars come back in terms of estimates, only then at least can we really analyze with efficacy where we are now, where were this, where this would be. And so there's the option for the 2028 opt out is very appealing to us as a city and interesting and I completely understand the challenges that the market may have in making a commitment, knowing that there is the potentiality for the opt out.

 Speaker 1 - 45:50


But I think at least for folks.

 Speaker 12 - 45:53


In my area, that's going to be an important component to have. And I think the conditional piece around the max pricing right now, just not getting a lot of comfort around that from Fort Lauderdale folks. So I wanted to just share that. But I really appreciate the being able to consider these opt out provisions. So want to share that if I could. I have a separate question for the ila, but not related to the opt out, but I can share that later or whatever.

 Speaker 1 - 46:23

We'll come up back to that if it's not.

 Speaker 12 - 46:25

Thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 46:26

So, other comments or concerns? Sorry, over here. Member Shoeham.



Speaker 11 - 46:32

Just a couple questions. One, I'm missing 28. Can you walk me to 28? Because the three attachments are 27 and 48 and I didn't follow you.



Speaker 1 - 46:44

I didn't say 28. 27.



Speaker 7 - 46:45

It's 12-31-27.



Speaker 11 - 46:48

Okay, so Ben just said 28.



Speaker 7 - 46:50

Well, I think it's 12-31-20 after the RFPs come back. Right, it's 12-31-27, but 27.



Speaker 11 - 46:57

Okay, 20, 27 and 48. There's no 28. Okay. And then the other question is the 25 years. Can you. How did you know? I understand the idea offering some options and opt out opportunities, but what was magic about 25, Mr. Cole?



Speaker 1 - 47:17

I wasn't involved in that process.



Speaker 7 - 47:19

Well, we're already three years in, so the 25 years is really 22 years. And the thought was that we're going to have the RFP process over the next year. And by the time the contracts start, we want to make sure, we wanted to make sure there was 20 years for the contract itself. So by making it at the end of year 25, that gives us a 20 year contract.



Speaker 11 - 47:43

Okay, so this is my thought process and this is kind of what I had shared with our commission over the years was when this all began, much of it was about the ability to work collaboratively to absorb a huge expense of future capital investments. And over these past couple of years, it's really, that's. I won't say it's off the table forever, but it's off the table for now. And in my mind that 40 years tied very closely to that need to make these huge capital improvements. Like you were saying, we all do it at our cities and were prepared to do it as a collective group, but without those long term, large scale investments. You know, that I think is the question I'm hearing from other cities is why is this still here?



Speaker 11 - 48:44

That being said, I appreciate what council is saying about these long term contracts. So I think for me, adding the one year opt out provides a breather for certain cities who need a breather to go forward. This has been a lot over these past couple of years without necessarily jeopardizing the long term need that Mr. Cole just described for these long term contracts. And also recognizing that at least at this point in time, these long term capital investments aren't on the table. So I guess I appreciate what member Horlan is saying about like stick to the plan, but I also think that giving people a little wiggle room right now is not necessarily a terrible thing. That's it.



Speaker 8 - 49:42

Okay.



Speaker 1 - 49:43

With respect to the long term investment, it's an excellent point that we're not going to be going out bonded, but we should not expect the market isn't. We put ourselves in the position that we need to rely on the market to do that. And we saw that in the time it took us to even put together an ILA Waste Management built its own \$90 million facility, we had to dream we would do it, look at what it's taken to get us to this point. And they did it. But that's, let's be clear, they have the capacity of 245,000 tons. Right. And they're ready to get it from everywhere around the state. We need to be able to commit to that long term because we need to lock that in. That we're not subject to.



Speaker 1 - 50:21

And so while it's an excellent point that we're not going to be bonding we should not assume the market doesn't look at it that way. So I'll say it a little bit differently. If we said, okay, and this is not the proposal, but if we said let's do it in 10 years, we know when we get the RFP back, we're likely not going to get the best pricing if it requires additional investment. Right. Because what corporation would do it knowing that in 10 years this whole thing could blow up? So I, I, it's a subtle differences.



Speaker 1 - 50:47

An excellent point, but I think the recognition of the 40 was particularly after we realized from the infrastructure analysis done by the consultants that weren't going to build, that were going to have to take advantage of the private market and that there were gaps within the private market that would require investment, that the 40 year didn't change.



Speaker 10 - 51:04

Right.



Speaker 1 - 51:04

We didn't have a debate and say, okay, well, no longer going to bond. We still need that long term to tell the market we're in. Most favored nations don't, you know, undo this contract. I mean that's going to be part of the battle. Right. To make sure we are locked in. So I don't know that subtly changes it much. With respect to the Breather and I appreciate Member Sorensen Veracity in explaining these are the issues in my mind. If it's not tied to pricing, then we've wasted the last three years because it may not happen in full art, but it can happen in another city where it's just a pure political response that somebody, as was said by member Horlund says, I just don't, I don't believe anymore in the paramount goal of recycling. And it's not a penny more.



Speaker 1 - 51:50

We're out and then the cascade begins because we think we can get a better pricing. I think, I don't support frankly either of these, but I'm willing to go along with the body that ultimately, I believe, ultimately we're going to have to prove this year in, year out anyway. And when we get to 20, likely the technology has changed, there's been upgrades, there's been alternatives, there's probably going to be amendments to contracts they're going to take into account. I just saw two robots boxing.




Speaker 11 - 52:17

Right, right.




Speaker 1 - 52:17


You know, which, you know. And so, you know, it's something that's.

 Speaker 7 - 52:22


Almost Jetsons to me.

 Speaker 1 - 52:23


So my point being is we're going to have to do this here in Europe.

 Speaker 11 - 52:25


Is there a suggested amendment to the first option?

 Speaker 1 - 52:31


So the, with respect to the 2027. All right. The second, the, I think the language that Mr. Cole has looked at ties it to the. And Mr. Cole can, can outline this but it essentially understanding the timeline we have August RFPs probably go out, let's say December, November, 45 to 60 days. From there, the governing board and executive committee will analyze those. We have to replay in the joints that if the governing board awards, recommends to award contracts in the five that exceed the maximum price, then the cities have a timeline. To your point, have a timeline to consider. Is one penny too much to opt out. So that would be by November 15th roughly of 2027. Governing board executive has to have all its work done. Have to do the work leading up to this.

 Speaker 1 - 53:30


And by the way, when we open the RFPs, there's going to be a lot of public debate about this. We know that we're going to see the pricing. Somebody's going to tell us. We're going to have other industry folks chirping in our ear saying you could do better, you should have done this. But giving them November 15th for all of us to complete our work, make that recommendation and give them until December 31, which is 45 days to say are you in or out? Recognizing that's still introducing to the market some question of whether this goes. Is the, is the alternative proposal to just an automatic as had been suggested.

 Speaker 11 - 54:07


Thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 54:08


Thank you, Mayor Colburn.

 Speaker 9 - 54:10


Thank.

 Speaker 11 - 54:15


You. Thank you. Good morning. At the risk of having to go back a little bit, maybe repeat yourself, why was this proposed? What came up?

 Speaker 1 - 54:30


What's the genesis?

 Speaker 9 - 54:30


What happened?

 Speaker 11 - 54:31


I heard something about a Facebook post. I don't know if that has anything to do with it.

 Speaker 1 - 54:39


I want to validate the feeling. Right. Because we've all lived. Those of us who were there at the RV rightfully have cynicism about structures of all this. But let's remember this is the first time that unlike the rv, we didn't all have a seat at the table. But there's still that lingering cynicism and worry. That's one. There's also a legitimate question that we do with on our own days, as has been stressed all the time. Right. About a long term contract for capital improvements. Will they be there? Can they deliver on the project? How long is it going to take? We're going to go out on bond and you're going to do the parks. How do we know we're going to get there? I don't believe we're going to get there. Right.

 Speaker 1 - 55:16


The usual fear of where do we find ourselves in five years if we vote on something now. Okay, here it's. Some have said, and we've already achieved, you know, a fair number of approvals, but there have been some electeds out there who have said, I'm worried about committing to 40 years. Whether it's. It's a valid. I don't want to cheapen it by making some sort of analogy to walking down the aisle. It's a fear, right? What am I buying into for my residents? And then, as we know, right early on, there was this fear that we. That was legitimate as well.

 Speaker 1 - 55:50


If we sign on and you as the executive committee and governing board members decide to double the price just because you feel like you want to achieve some paramount social goal, we're stuck in this for 40 years and we can't get out. Right. So what we built in was we put the consultants on a leash and we said, establish the maximum predicted price. We will not exceed that. If something happens, it's going to take two thirds of the population of the governing board to recommend to go one penny over. And that's the rest of it. So what happened is as this went out, people were still raising the questions and saying it. And so as a.

 Speaker 1 - 56:30


In fairness, right, because it had been said so many times, the idea was to bring it back to this body to at least have the discussion so that we're not allowing it to grow in the dark, but rather to put some sunshine on this and talk about what are these policy issues, right or wrong, we can have different views on, but let's at least talk about it. So that's where it came from.

 Speaker 11 - 56:52


So for those municipalities that have already approved it, they have to approve this amendment.

 Speaker 1 - 56:58


To it, they would go back and approve.

 Speaker 11 - 57:01


Is it required 80% or 90% of approval as well for this amendment?

 Speaker 1 - 57:07


100%. Because it's an ILA amendment, it's not the facilities amendment.

 Speaker 13 - 57:10


So.

 Speaker 1 - 57:11


But to your point, let's. It requires 80% of all of those in the ILA to pass the facilities amendment to pass these proposals. It's 100% of the members who passed the facilities amendment. Right. So if city A rejects the facilities amendment, it doesn't matter whether they agree. Right. On the other hand, someone else on the other side would say, but that.

 Speaker 7 - 57:38


CDA is waiting to see, are you.

 Speaker 1 - 57:40


Going to do that so that we can pass a facilities. But procedurally, to your point, it would be 100% of those who approve the facilities amendment.

 Speaker 11 - 57:48


Okay, got it. Thank you.

 Speaker 7 - 57:51


Is that correct?

 Speaker 1 - 57:52


Okay.

 Speaker 11 - 57:52


Number two, I have one more question, and forgive me if this was already explained, but instead of Having this hard date of 27, could it tie to the final negotiation of the RFP?

 Speaker 1 - 58:07


That's an excellent point. The date is seemingly arbitrary, but in April of 28th, at least according to the county, the global disposal agreement comes up. They need time. If it's going to fall apart, they're going to need time. So as we've done throughout this process, we've identified timelines that sometimes seem arbitrary, but they're tied to something. So it was really the global.

 Speaker 11 - 58:30


Okay. So I think that's important to explain to the cities that have yet to vote because on the one hand we're discussing an opt out at 27, but that doesn't necessarily mean that it's helpful because we're not giving ourselves adequate time to look at these RFPs, but we have to look at them by a certain date because the county has a deadline anyway. So I don't know. My sense is, I like what you're suggesting, Chair, tying the one year to a financial, to the contract language that we have already. So we're not reinventing the wheel, but we're giving some comfort to cities that are uncertain and who cares where they heard about this or what generated it. It's out there. It's out there.

 Speaker 1 - 59:23


I want to say I was not suggesting this Amendment 2 at all. I was suggesting an amendment to Amendment 2 to blunt the worst possible scenarios, the parade of horrors that would come from this it which I and with respect to Fort Lauderdale, that my concern is not the analysis that you all will continue to do based on the substance, it's that it could be just politically driven by someone else. So that was, that was my..

 Speaker 11 - 59:50

My, I like it.

 Speaker 1 - 59:52

Member Rydell.

 Speaker 6 - 59:55

I think it's also important to note that when we don't presume 40 years is a mandate like I think it's really important, Jamie, for the cities that may be on the fence like this, like I hear from Ben, right there's ways this body can terminate this body as well. But the vice versa to that and to your point and you got to be impeccable with your word on this. The if you pass the facilities amendment, one city can prevent an opt out after that. That's a real fact. And I don't, I want to say it for the room because I don't want anyone to be clouded here, but I think the shift of that is understanding how this body winds down as well. Because I think if you can educate people on your commission of how the body winds Down.



Speaker 6 - 01:00:40

I think it probably meets the need as opposed to, I want an earlier opt out a little bit. That's just food for thought because, for discussion because there's all these, I hate to use the term, there's all these poison pills on every reiteration. You do this for somebody acting in bad faith.



Speaker 1 - 01:00:57

That's, that's an excellent point. Right. So there's also all sorts and this, maybe we haven't spent enough time talking about it. We wrestled over it for a long time, which was the transparency and oversight features of this that allowed each member to have the authority to delve into the numbers and the books and not like the rrb, but to literally get their own auditor. I mean this is driven in part by the county, but we extended it to every member. So this issue of hey, is this body really achieving its financial imperatives? Comes with a significant fulcrum that if identifying to your point, if it identifies these features that have undermined the financial integrity or the stated goals. Right. The players aren't meeting the contract. We're not, we're not getting to those points.




Speaker 1 - 01:01:51

There's likely, first of all, there's going to be one of the members that are going to identify it and then secondly, it's going to be a topic of how does this get wound down either through litigation or straight up. This is not working. And that's a really good point. We really haven't featured, you know, even though the facilities amendment seems to have a disparate feature of the wind down. Turns out to your point that it's important to understand that there is protection on the backside.




Speaker 6 - 01:02:19


And we're not highlighting that in a lot of these workshops. Like who had a workshop on this recently? If I could just ask, did anything get discussed in terms of how the entity would wind down in that? So I say it because I'm also hearing a need when I'm listening to these meetings. We're missing a mark too because we're highlighting that in a presentation. Then I think that gives comfort to elected officials as well, saying, wow, there's actually a room of people that could wind this down.

 Speaker 1 - 01:02:44


That's the truth. But even before wind down as a friendly amendment to that, it's. You have unique authorities on transparency that you didn't have in the RV that did not exist at that time. The ability to not just be an advisory board, but as a member to demand access to every one of the books and metrics and achievements.

 Speaker 6 - 01:03:03


And that, and that goes. We're kind of working in Tandem right now. That's not just for the governing. That's not just for the executive board. Right. For any member.

 Speaker 1 - 01:03:10


Right.

 Speaker 6 - 01:03:11


At any time, at any meeting. So it's important to point out.

 Speaker 1 - 01:03:14

Thank you, Chair. Excellent point. That we should be added to the workshops. Member Ker. Sorry, you were going to say something about it.

 Speaker 3 - 01:03:23

We just recently passed it, but I'm going to say it now and those that were there, thank you all for being there and answering our question. Commissioner, we feel that the opt out will only help you guys going forward to capture the rest of the cities. And we've heard the same thing and we talked about it at our meeting. I think the reluctance of the cities jumping on board right now is the fact that it's a 40 year commitment. And as far as this being driven by market and you know, them jumping in board and wanting to go for 20 years or 40 years, I think it would be to go with an opt out on this now would actually give comfort to the cities.

 Speaker 3 - 01:04:02

And yet at the same time it will also put your contracts on notice that it's not a 40 year dream job and that you don't have 40 years to capture it all, that you got to get up every day like we all do and you got to go to work for your residents and they're going to have to go to work for their cities. I think the reluctance that I'm hearing from our neighboring cities right now is the fact that there's no opt outs. We made it clear that night that we wanted them as well. I'm just a strong proponent of opt outs for that purpose and I believe that the market will carry that as well. If they put out a great product, then they're not gonna have to worry about it.



Speaker 1 - 01:04:36

It's a fair point member sorts and I'd like Daniel to come up because I think you raised a point, Member Kerr, in that we're doing this without the market telling us this is a good idea. The day we find out it's a bad idea is when the RFPs come back.



Speaker 5 - 01:04:51

That's right.



Speaker 1 - 01:04:52

Right when the market says, wait a minute, you went and built this in, you guys decided because you were scared, whatever, you had these legitimate valid concerns, whatever the. That's not helpful and we're going to be stuck. But I think this is where we have to rely on the consultants. Is this, you know, a trap, a bear trap that we could potentially step into that we find ourselves. Say it a different way. Getting to yes is not the priority here priority is building a system that can justify yes. And if we just do anything to get to yes, we may be undermining ourselves long term. So it's a balance, right? I don't, I don't have the wisdom on it, but I want to emphasize that getting the yes is not my priority. And I know it's none of your priorities.




Speaker 1 - 01:05:42

It's about building a system that's going to support yes. So. Right. Member Sorensen and then Daniel, if you could, on the 20 year.




Speaker 12 - 01:05:51


Sure. Thanks Chair. One other just kind of differing perspective is you could make the argument by having an opt out in 2027 not conditional on price drives price down. Stay with me for a second on that. In other words, if you say hey, if there's let's go for an opt out with a percent of max price. So you say let's just say \$5. So hey companies, you have to come in at \$5.10 or less. Otherwise cities can opt out. What that private business might do is come in at \$5.09 knowing they're good. If you alternatively say, hey, cities can opt out in 2027 for any reason, including price, and not put a conditional max on it's possible those providers would come in with a compelling price product to ensure that their case is the strongest as possible, thus possibly the lower price.

 Speaker 12 - 01:07:03


Just a thought.

 Speaker 1 - 01:07:04


There's no, there's no doubt there's a market dynamic. We know, right. Anytime we have a piece of property in our cities that is distressed and we want to buy is horrible, that we have to discuss it. Right. We all pretend like I don't really want the property. It's not that important. We're not going to do anything with it. Right. But we know they're listening and we know what they're going to do to us. I got that. What we have to hope is that there's enough competition in the market that the one who says, well, they're not going to break up at 5:10, I'm going in at 5:10 and if it comes in at 508, then we've achieved our goal.

 Speaker 1 - 01:07:35


May not be as big a goal, but we've kept our commitment, which was to make sure we had a maximum price and we achieved it long term. There's a different issue than just the pricing. It's also the predictability and stability of those at pricing over a long term. Because we all know we could get a short term contract. It's better, right? A teaser contract. And I think this is part of the concern the consultant has. So if you could just address and I think there's. It's a valid point that's raised by member Sorensen, but address the two issues about the 20 year contract.

 Speaker 1 - 01:08:07


Are we going to find ourselves if it was the will of the body to have a 25, are we going to find ourselves regretting or living to regret that day that we approved it because the market says we need it longer?

 Speaker 13 - 01:08:18


Potentially So I think of it in terms of if it is simply a services contract where the infrastructure already exists, 20 year term is entirely appropriate. But as has been stated, if somebody wants that's in the marketplace but doesn't have the infrastructure they're going to be, I would think they would want a longer term specifically to bond or to.

 Speaker 1 - 01:08:41


Finance that facility player in the market who right now may not have a majority opportunity because of its infrastructure, but could go back to its board and say look, we could price this and we're going to have X number of years in order to do that and achieve our own roi, which we're unable to do because we're not going to go out, we need to have X years. Are you saying that there's a potential for those other players don't have a fully robust or fully built out infrastructure will sit on the sidelines if it's only 20 versus 30 potentially.

 Speaker 13 - 01:09:13


And I can't say for certain because these are business decisions and there's lots of factors that any going concern will keep in mind when responding to a solicitation. But my larger concern is the signals that we're sending to the marketplace.

 Speaker 2 - 01:09:31


And.

 Speaker 13 - 01:09:31


There is reputational harm if we're not sincere in our desire to move forward. So we got a taste of that when we had the market engagement several months ago where I mean it was clear there was a very clear reason why we got the feedback that we did. They were being asked to respond to a solicitation where there was no commitment of waste.

 Speaker 1 - 01:09:54

Right. For the members who don't remember this, the first step of this was to try to find out the RFP pricing before we even got the facilities amendment. You started drafting it, as you were doing that, you began hearing from the market, we're not going to bid on it, we're not going to give you pricing because and however they want to describe the board doesn't even look like it wants to stay together. So why are we going to price ourselves against it? In addition, we don't even know what we're talking about in tonnage. You can't give US assurances on what the tonnage is for any single stream. As long as the entire body says we're going to opt out after the RFPs are done. Is that accurate?

 Speaker 13 - 01:10:29

Correct. And that's why the mid August date is so important, because we're going to know who's in and who's out. What is the basis of the solicitation in terms of tonnage? And I don't think it needs reminding, but I will say it anyway. There are two levers that this organization has. One is tonnage and the other is term. Those are the two most significant factors to secure the optimal pricing. And that's the assumption going into setting the maximum service charges that we're dealing with 4 million tons. And we're all part of the conversation of how went from 5 million tons total generated to 4 million. And that is a reasonable basis to go out on the street with.

 Speaker 1 - 01:11:15

For one thing, that occurs to me as we go through this, whatever the recommendation, executive committee of the governing board is on this. For those on a day somewhere who say no, this is what I really needed. Right. We've

now changed the conversation to a point that many of us understand may not be as significant if we do the right thing, but we're changing it. And so this is a very. This is a very significant decision. Whether we vote yes or no. It's a very significant decision about the message we're sending and the challenge that each of us have in communicating the depth of the discussion here. This is not a bumper sticker analysis. It has a lot of complexities to it. Remember, for.



Speaker 13 - 01:12:03

Thank you.



Speaker 10 - 01:12:05

Yeah. I kind of, along with you, Mike, saw these amendments. As you know, this is not where I wanted to go because I thought were already there. But having gone to most of these meetings, you know, I also have been hearing it. I saw the Facebook post. I responded with about five pages. You know, thank you very much.



Speaker 1 - 01:12:31

Thank you.



Speaker 10 - 01:12:33

And you know, I've heard various responses here and there. And when I heard these amendments, the 25 year one didn't bother me so much. Not too bad, I understand. But because I do think as it goes along the way, if something presents itself, a board can say, you know what, we need to do this. I'm really. I came in hearing about the other amendment where they could opt out if. If there wasn't, you know, if they didn't like the price, thank goodness. I don't know if you put that in or jam, whoever, but the idea of tying it to the guardrails, much better. And and the reason is the last thing I want to be doing and I won't be here but the last and you know you've got a couple of ambassadors here that have been going out that won't be here.



Speaker 10 - 01:13:29

This executive committee, one third of it won't be here and trying to re educate everybody and particularly you know you being on the as president of League of Cities going out there, it means something. And who knows if the next president is up to date on you are but not everyone is and not having that kind of, you know people invested in it as well as the knowledge base, it's not it's going to be different. It's always going to change. So it's going to change a little bit. But that worried me the fact that it is tied to this that it's that you know, if we stay within that pricing that feels good. And here's a couple things to think about.



Speaker 10 - 01:14:12

I actually think when word you're this mentions five the five streams of garbage, the yard waste, I actually I, I really do see the county being able to do something on this with the Broward landfill. And as we've said a million times there shouldn't be a profit motive there. This should be you know stand it up and like you like the same way we do utilities, it's whatever it costs, you know, it's an enterprise fund. Exactly. And you add a little bit to just be able to continue to you know maintain it. The just for those who don't know the waste energy plant has the lease is over in 2038. Am I right on that, Kevin? 2038 That gives us leverage. Just so everybody knows that should give us leverage because they FCC is going to be wanting to renew that lease.



Speaker 10 - 01:15:13

They just bought it now they're also going to be asking probably at some point can we put another burner on there that's going to now that's one of those things where I don't know how that is gets affected on cost. That's something that we're all going to have to be thinking about do we want another burner? I don't know. We actually probably want to try to compost as much as we can before we do that. The good the other good part about it is we already have a law of a contract with waste Management to do all of the compost up in Okeechobee. That part, you know hasn't been part of the conversation yet and that doesn't go into effect until next year until 2027.



Speaker 10 - 01:15:58

The hard part on that is we don't know what the logistics or the capital expenditures are of trucks, things like that, picking up from every school, haulers saying, you know, what we, those are things we don't really know about. And those are the kind of considerations we don't, you know, I'm just kind of throwing out there what we need to think of the landscape. Cnd, I think there's, that's going to be a, I think when, if you, when you hear people trying to. I don't think we have to worry about that hitting those guardrails on top because they're going to be battling it out. There's a lot of C and D possibilities there.



Speaker 10 - 01:16:38

So, you know, I actually think it looks pretty good of being able to stay within the guardrails or the cost containment as long as it's staying within that and that you can't opt out. And this is. To your point, Ben, I think saying you can opt out if it stays within that. Because I really don't think this, we want to be going back out to every city commission. It's too hard and it's, it's, it's not easy to do. You know, I mean, every night, I think every night this week is somewhere you're going to be there, I'm going to be one of us. And I don't think everybody recognizes how hard it is to do that. So, you know, with that, I'm not too worried about the 25.



Speaker 10 - 01:17:22

And as long as this other one goes within, stays within, if, you know, we're within the cost containment, I think we could probably do it. But I, but to your point that there is risk, but it also shows that we're also listening. And I think that's the one part that I think, you know, it's not that we're chained, but we're listening. And I think that's, there's a lot to be said for that. I think if a lot of cities are saying that they want to know that this board that they're about to join, that their voice is being heard. There's something good about that. We did.



Speaker 1 - 01:18:04

Right. I mean, in a sense that he built in, we built in the guardrail, right. We listened. We took a huge risk even in that. Right. To say. But I, but I understand it. All right. So we've been going for a while. We're going to obviously turn it to the governing board in a Minute. But to the executive committee. We, we've got to make a recommendation to the governing board where we're at. And again, the options are just one, which is the 2048, just two, and that has two subcomponents, A and B, which is straight up December 31, 2027, unrelated to any price issues, or B, if it exceeds the maximum price. And then the third option is a combination of those two combined, whether it's 1 and 2A or 1 and 2B. What. What's Will?



Speaker 11 - 01:19:01

So I was compelled by what Member Sorensen was saying about maybe hurting ourselves committedly, but it's still going to be a competitive process. Process. So I think, and I understand Chair Farrow, your point about the 25 years, but once this thing gets going after this, let's assume for a moment there's this first year opt out. Once things get going, it's likely that those contracts will exceed 2048, or we should have the flexibility for them to be able to exceed it. So I think that does add some uncertainty to the future. And I also think that just as we pulled this group together today, and I just really want to thank everybody for just clearing the decks and being here. This is super important. We can do that again in the future.




Speaker 11 - 01:19:56

You know, if we are in 2045 and somebody's having some real heartburn, we'll do what we did today and listen. Right. So, and I don't want to jump to make the motion, but what makes the most sense to me is the one year subject to the financial constraints that Chair Ryan brought on. And part of me is saying, of course were fine until this was brought up, but not only it was brought up, we reacted to it. And so I think that there's something that needs to come out of this meeting that's not only conciliatory to members that might be hesitant, but also encouraging to cities to welcome them. And maybe we can get some additional cities to buy on with something like this.




Speaker 11 - 01:20:46


I also think that a year from now, or a year and a half from now, although it will be a huge difficult task for you, Sam, I think that it will give cities time to dig in a little deeper. And they should have, and they could have already, but some haven't. And so my sense is the one year, with the additional language that the chair raised, tying it to the financial conditions that we already have in the contract.

 Speaker 1 - 01:21:21


Okay. Member write down.

 Speaker 6 - 01:21:25


So just let's make it simple. Option one, 25 years. Option two, opt out after RFP Option three, a little bit of both. Could we all be on the same page with that?

 Speaker 1 - 01:21:38


I, I, I actually think, I don't.

 Speaker 6 - 01:21:40


Mean to dumb it down. I'm just trying to like, let's,.

 Speaker 1 - 01:21:42

Let's, let's do that though, because it's very precise to your point. Right, so 25 is option one. Option two is opt out 1231 for whatever reason, not title. Option three is opt out tied to market price. Hang one second, hang on 1/2. Option 4 is 25 opt out for any reason, 1231. Option 5 is 25/ opt out tied only to market.

 Speaker 6 - 01:22:15

Yeah, I think that's fair. So I know that was a lot.

 Speaker 3 - 01:22:18

And I'm sure he's gonna.



Speaker 6 - 01:22:19

Ben, I think your point is extraordinarily, and I just want to say this, we're all making each other think of things that don't exist, but I think for the purposes of this, with price, that's the purpose of this. I mean, if we're not getting good prices, we're doing something wrong. I'm three. You're three. Did I hear you say three? Three. I'm a three.



Speaker 1 - 01:22:39

So here's the options for us on a motion. Yeah, yeah, exactly. Well, it's always been there. We just haven't defined it. So the first One is a 25 year, 2048 option only for opt out. Option two for a motion would be opt out 1231, 27 for any reason whatsoever. Option three is opt out with notice provision 11, 15, 27. Opt out 1231, 27 only if the government board awards a contract in excess of the market protections that we've built in motion four is the 25 year 2048 and opt out 1231, 2027 for any reason. And option five for motion is 25 plus opt out tied only to the market. 1231, 27. Those, those are, does everybody agree with those are the motion options. Okay, somebody wish to make a motion?



Speaker 11 - 01:23:42

Motion.



Speaker 1 - 01:23:43

All right. We have a motion for the opt out tied to market only without any respect to the 25. Is there a second from the executive. Second from the executive committee. Tied to the market pricing. 2020, 20, 1231, 27. The market progress. Yeah. If it exceeds the market. Right. All right, Mr. Chair, before. Yes, Lord.



Speaker 7 - 01:24:08

I just want to read the exact language.




Speaker 1 - 01:24:10

So. Yes, let's do it, please. All right.




Speaker 7 - 01:24:11


So the language that was handed out to everyone. This will be added to, will be added. Provided, however, this withdrawal option shall not be available if. Prior to November 15, 2027, the Governing Board awards contracts for recyclable materials, yard trash for disposal, yard trash for beneficial use, solid waste disposal, class 1 waste, and solid waste disposal, class 3 waste at prices that are less than or equal to the applicable maximum service charges set forth in Table 14 of the Master plan, initially adopted without amendments, as adjusted by the applicable index.

 Speaker 1 - 01:24:52


All right, remember, Cagiano, you understand that as your motion. Member Bright Cruise, you understand that as your second. All right. Is there a discussion on that? All right, call. Call the executive committee.

 Speaker 2 - 01:25:07


Chair Ryan.

 Speaker 1 - 01:25:09


Yes.

 Speaker 2 - 01:25:11

Vice chair Furr. Member Shuham.

 Speaker 9 - 01:25:15

Yes.

 Speaker 2 - 01:25:17

Member Horland. Member dunn. Yes. Member rydell.



Speaker 6 - 01:25:28

Yes.



Speaker 2 - 01:25:30

Member meade.



Speaker 10 - 01:25:31

No.



Speaker 2 - 01:25:33

Member cagiano.



Speaker 1 - 01:25:34

Yes.




Speaker 2 - 01:25:37

Member colborne.




Speaker 7 - 01:25:43


Yes.

 Speaker 1 - 01:25:44


She.

 Speaker 7 - 01:25:44


She's the large alternative.

 Speaker 1 - 01:25:45


You do get to vote today.

 Speaker 11 - 01:25:50

Yes.

 Speaker 2 - 01:25:52

Member Bright Cruz?

 Speaker 1 - 01:25:53

Yes. All right, so it passes with two nos. This is a recommendation that we're making to the governing board. We'll have to open up the governing board for that discussion because of the time. I don't know that we need an update too much on the city workshops and the commission meetings. Everybody's received the update on those dates. You have those? Any new or old business anyone wishes to raise from the executive committee? Can I have a motion to adjourn the executive committee? Motion by member Dunn. Seconded by member Mead. All in favor, say aye. All right, let's go ahead and open up the executive committee. I mean, the governing board. Meeting of the Solid Waste Authority for May 18, 2026. If you would please call the roll for the governing board.



Speaker 2 - 01:26:38

I'll save the city and then the member. Chair Ryan.



Speaker 1 - 01:26:47

Present.



Speaker 2 - 01:26:49

Vice chair for Here. Fort Lauderdale. Alternate Sorenson.



Speaker 12 - 01:26:58

Here.



Speaker 2 - 01:27:00

Hollywood. Member Shoeham.



Speaker 4 - 01:27:04

Here.



Speaker 2 - 01:27:05

Miramar. Member Colborne.



Speaker 10 - 01:27:09

Here.



Speaker 2 - 01:27:11

Coral Springs. Member Sarah.



Speaker 3 - 01:27:14

Present.



Speaker 1 - 01:27:16

Davey.



Speaker 2 - 01:27:17

Member Lewis.



Speaker 1 - 01:27:18

Here.



Speaker 2 - 01:27:20

Plantation. Member Horland.



Speaker 5 - 01:27:22

Here.



Speaker 2 - 01:27:23

Deerfield Beach. Online. Alternate Plow.



Speaker 10 - 01:27:27

Yes.



Speaker 1 - 01:27:28

Here.



Speaker 2 - 01:27:31

Lauderhill. Member Dunn. Tamarack. Member Patterson. Weston. Member Me.




Speaker 1 - 01:27:42

Here.




Speaker 2 - 01:27:44


Margate. Member Cagiano. Coconut Creek. Member Rydell. North. Lauderdale. Member borgilin. Parkland. Member murphy. Salamone.

 Speaker 4 - 01:28:06


Here.

 Speaker 2 - 01:28:08


Lauderdale lakes. Member thomas cooper. City. Member curran. Dania. Beach. Member A.J. Ryan. West Park. Member Evillard. Here. Wilson Manors. Member Newton. Lighthouse Point. Member Stafford.

 Speaker 4 - 01:28:35


Here.

 Speaker 2 - 01:28:37

Southwest Ranches. Member Brightcruits. Lauderdale. By the Sea. Member Strauss. Pembroke Park. Member Morissette. Hillsboro.

 Speaker 9 - 01:28:51

Beach.

 Speaker 2 - 01:28:52

Member Ravinesi. Sea Ranch Lakes. Member Tomlinson. I believe I skipped Oakland Park.



Speaker 10 - 01:29:02

Here.



Speaker 2 - 01:29:04

My apologies.



Speaker 11 - 01:29:08

Online.



Speaker 2 - 01:29:08

I know we have a few alternates. We also have member Alternate Welch. Are there any other alternates or members online that I have not called?



Speaker 11 - 01:29:19

Thank you and Lisa. Thank you.



Speaker 1 - 01:29:24

Okay, Mr. Cole, we have a quorum. All right. If you would please join me for the Pledge of Allegiance. Right. We're open up for public comment. Stephanie Joffe.



Speaker 8 - 01:29:59

There you go.

Speaker 4 - 01:30:00



I'm listening to this conversation.



Speaker 9 - 01:30:01

I feel like I want to scream.



Speaker 1 - 01:30:04

I also have been to almost every city meeting and I have not heard.



Speaker 9 - 01:30:10

That much in the way of objection.



Speaker 11 - 01:30:12

That couldn't be satisfied just saying. I mean, okay. Also, I don't understand how one city would get a better rate than all of us together. I don't see how in an individual.



Speaker 1 - 01:30:32

City thinks they can do that.



Speaker 4 - 01:30:35

That's another issue.



Speaker 11 - 01:30:36

I also want to say I'm really disappointed that I haven't heard anybody speak.



Speaker 1 - 01:30:39

About opportunity cost at all.



Speaker 11 - 01:30:42

How much is it costing the city of Fort Lauderdale to deal with sea level rise or the city of Dana.



Speaker 4 - 01:30:50

Beach to deal with sea level rise?



Speaker 11 - 01:30:52

I know on my street they spent, and I live on a really.



Speaker 1 - 01:30:57

Little street, they spent over \$1 million for storm drainage. And I'm on septic systems.



Speaker 11 - 01:31:04

If that goes over, that's going to.



Speaker 4 - 01:31:07

Be a public health emergency.



Speaker 11 - 01:31:09

If people can't get an ambulance to take them to the hospital after they have a heart attack because there's flooding, that all of this costs money. Seawalls aren't cheap and they're ugly. I mean, we need to think, do you want the burning in the air? And if we're going to make deals.



Speaker 4 - 01:31:32

With companies that can take advantage of.



Speaker 1 - 01:31:34

New technology, they are going to want.



Speaker 9 - 01:31:37

A long term commitment from us.



Speaker 1 - 01:31:39

And I'm hoping that over 40 years,.




Speaker 4 - 01:31:41

There's going to be a lot of.




Speaker 1 - 01:31:42


New technology that we can take advantage of. So that's what I want to say.

 Speaker 11 - 01:31:48


I actually am kind of disappointed because.

 Speaker 4 - 01:31:51

I feel like we work really hard.

 Speaker 11 - 01:31:55


To get to yes. And I don't want to see it fall apart because one city says after.

 Speaker 4 - 01:32:01


The RFPs are in, oh, no, that's.

 Speaker 11 - 01:32:03

Too expensive for me. And that's what will happen, especially if we need 100%.

 Speaker 1 - 01:32:09

So that's all right. Anybody else who signed up for public comment? Anybody else who wishes public comment? All right, I'll close public comment. We have meeting minutes from April 17, 2026. Can I have a motion to approve? Motion by member Rydell. Seconded by Second. Any discussion on the meeting minutes? All in favor say I I any post? All right. Second Amendment to the local agreement. I want to begin by thanking all the governing board members who came early for the executive committee. So you've all had the opportunity to Participate.

 Speaker 7 - 01:32:41

One thing we didn't do is just.



Speaker 1 - 01:32:43

To outline for everybody where we are on approval. The following cities have approved, I believe this. All of these have been unanimous in the county. Sea Ranch Lakes, Coconut Creek, Southwest Ranches, Hillsborough Beach, Broward County, Lauderdale Lakes, Cooper City, Dania Beach, Tamarack and Plantation. All unanimous. So notwithstanding the conversations we've had and the concerns as was raised both publicly and amongst our members, the work has been done to try to make sure we achieve and address each of those questions. You each have a calendar of upcoming voting and upcoming city workshops that you can attend or speak to the members.



Speaker 9 - 01:33:27

Remember, Horland, I'm sorry, you mentioned calendar and I was going to bring something up, but I'll wait. I'd like to bring something up for the next meeting.



Speaker 1 - 01:33:34

Okay, perfect. All right, so the Second Amendment. First, I'll turn to the members of the government board as to whether or not they feel they've had sufficient information from the executive committee. And I'm saying there aren't more questions, but it's significant information such that we can move to questions as opposed to reintroducing and replying that ground. Any. Any objections that. Okay. Member AR yeah.



Speaker 8 - 01:33:57

Let me ask a question. What happens if 10% or 15% of the tonnage of the cities that. That decide to opt out on 27? Does that give the. The disposal a. And opt out to rebid this thing? That's. That's the big question because.



Speaker 1 - 01:34:19


Daniel, maybe to you, but I mean this has got to be. The question is broken down that we're going to go out and the RP will state the following cities have approved the SWA participation. There is their tonnage across these streams. Please provide us the best pricing for prospect leaving guard waste aside for senior processing and disposal. Will the fear that 10% or 15%. He says tonnage, and it's based on population, but the point is tonnage. Will that impair the ability to get the best pricing or will it create too many caveats in the RFP response?




Speaker 13 - 01:34:59

It's a great question. I mean, one approach is that we simply advertise for the total tonnage that we believe is available, probably a little bit less, just to provide some flexibility. The other is to provide tier pricing. I wouldn't necessarily recommend that approach. Again. You know, here we are on the cusp of advancing, working together again. If we're sending a signal that we're. While we're together, we're still teetering on the edge. It's going to have


an impact on how folks how respondents view the solicitation. They may see it as an opportunity. Let's get in, let's give the best price that is preferable to the maximum service charges. Or they may want to hedge. And we're building in uncertainty.

 Speaker 8 - 01:35:54


But the biggest thing I'm concerned about is that if they're not getting the tonnage that we've advertised for, does that give them the ability to come back and say, hey, we're going to reprice this thing because we're not getting the tonnage we expected to get. And that's that really? That's where your economy of scale comes in.

 Speaker 14 - 01:36:10


Yeah.

 Speaker 13 - 01:36:11


And we're going to have to deal with that contractually because there are some uncertainties that we need to build into the solicitation.

 Speaker 1 - 01:36:19


You said contractually. But it has to be built into the. To your point, it has to be.

 Speaker 7 - 01:36:22

Built into the solicitation, the RFP process.

 Speaker 1 - 01:36:25

Correct.

 Speaker 8 - 01:36:26

That was the reason I'm saying I just don't want to be a penny or two. You know, I don't know what the number is.

But if a penny or two allows cities to opt out. Say some cities start, you know, getting close to the date and they say they start getting together with each other and start making deals with these other haulers. I mean, I mean the disposers and they decide to opt out and worse is stuck holding the.



Speaker 3 - 01:36:53

Yeah.



Speaker 13 - 01:36:53

I like your suggestion of having a percentage of flexibility for the benefit of.



Speaker 8 - 01:36:59

The authority of a high percentage, you know, maybe 1%, 2%, something that. That just doesn't allow. So it's.



Speaker 1 - 01:37:09

Doesn't make.



Speaker 8 - 01:37:09

It makes a little more difficult to get out.



Speaker 1 - 01:37:11

That's all right. So this comes down to the work we have to do. We committed before this happened that were going to achieve the market guardrails, the market pricing guardrails. If we didn't, we needed to get two thirds of the governing board population to agree. We knew that would be a wrestling match. Right. Depending on whether it's a penny or a lot more. I don't, I don't. I worry about the wording on a percentage over which line, which amount it. You know, we're inviting litigation and lawyers and I want, I don't want 2%. Now you're telling me you were going to achieve the market price and if you exceeded that, you were going to go to the governing board and get approval, but now you're saying you'll. If it's plus or minus 5% or 2%, then you don't have to do that.



Speaker 1 - 01:38:04

Or you're still doing that. But I'm stuck now and I can't do it. We're saying oh well, it might be just a few pennies more. I think that the, what we have to do is unfortunately because again this is a recommendation from the

executive committee. If, if that's what the governing board decides to do, it's going to put an enormous amount of pressure on the consultants to get the RFP moving. It's going to require us to move rapidly as a governing board and executive committee to analyze to achieve those markets. And if we achieve the market guardrails, nobody can opt out. If, if we don't, then we've got work to do.



Speaker 1 - 01:38:38

It's either going to be what we do in our cities all the time where we say we're throwing out the rfp, we're going to do it again, we're going to get, we're going to tweet, we're going to divide a particular. Some of you presented this right, you throw out the RP and you split it because you've got different competitors or you have different pricing. I think we committed to meeting. We didn't, we didn't build the 2/3 governing board approval to have an exception that we really wanted to deployment. We were giving ourselves a protection. These are uncertain times and I think we just have to drive forward and commit to what we said were going to do and meet it within the market rates and then this becomes a non issue member Ivoria and then I'll go back around Taylor. Yes.



Speaker 5 - 01:39:31

But thank you for the opportunity to speak. Mr. Scheer, Commissioner from the city of Westport. My concern is at what point does each city gets locked into the contract agreement. That's one. And number two, I feel like giving the city an option to opt out within a year time. I feel like that shouldn't even be an option because the time limit is very short and we're not giving the authority enough time to release, to analyze, to see how you know, how is it going to work out?



Speaker 1 - 01:40:14

Mr. Cole, to point number one, can you restate your point? Number one, you wanted to know.



Speaker 5 - 01:40:21

Yeah. At what point does the city get locked into the contract agreement and for how long?




Speaker 1 - 01:40:27

So the facilities amendment which is what's being approved has to be approved by August 16th. Okay. That's in. With respect to. If this body recommends an amendment to the ila, the best course is to try to get it done by August 16, even for those who've already. But it's not Actually required. I mean, I know it's something that we should do, but it's just an ILA amendment like anything else that we could do along the way as a governing board. The course of the best practice would to have cities who've already approved go back and if the will of the governing board is to recommend this, the ILA amendment, go back and vote on that soon.




Speaker 1 - 01:41:07


And for the cities that are yet, who are, have yet to vote on the facilities amendment, they should do it in parallel with the proposed amendment if that's the will of the body and to get it all done by August 16th.

 Speaker 5 - 01:41:21


Okay, so when all that is done, then,.

 Speaker 1 - 01:41:25


Then what happens is the consultants have to finish the RFPs, those have to go out, then this body has got a lot of work, probably starting January by the time the RFPs come back to unpack what we're hearing, what the pricing is, where does it meet, are there, do we have to tweak the RFPs? Is there something we missed? Did we give the market the full opportunity? And we've got to get that done with a recommendation by November 15 based on the executive committee's recommendation to the governing board to be able to tell the cities, this is what we're doing. If it's within the market guardrails, market pricing guardrails, there's no opt out. Everybody's in it. If any one of the lines of commodity streams exceeds, then the governing board is going to have to, and it'll happen long before Nov. 15.

 Speaker 1 - 01:42:15


The government board's either going to have to send it back out, the executive committee send it back out to have a tweet to get it below the market rate guardrails, or the governing board would have the option of approving the excess at one penny more or two pennies more, whatever it is, of two thirds, and then telling the cities that, and then the Cities have essentially 45 days to December 31, 2027 topped out. Is that a fair analysis?

 Speaker 5 - 01:42:42


Okay, so that means at that point, that's when they decide that they don't want to be part of the.

 Speaker 1 - 01:42:49


Correct. If the pricing exceeds what we've committed to already in the master plan. If it doesn't, everybody's in. There's no opt out, there's no vote based on the. That mean that can change from amongst this body, but based on the executive committee's recommendation to the government board. But the government board has full authority to reject that or consider alternatives or amend it or anything else. But the current proposal is whatever the market Pricing is if it doesn't exceed from the rp, there's no opt out.

 Speaker 5 - 01:43:22


Oh, okay. Yeah. Because my concern was how would if a certain amount of city up out in 2027, you know, how would the pricing affect the other cities and especially the small cities.

 Speaker 1 - 01:43:35


That's member Arns point.

 Speaker 8 - 01:43:37


Right.

 Speaker 1 - 01:43:37


Okay, I agree, that's a concern.

 Speaker 5 - 01:43:41


Thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 01:43:42

Thank you member Shuham and I'll work my way around.

 Speaker 11 - 01:43:48

So I mean the time constraint exists because of the county situation. We're making it worse but it's already a very serious time constraint. Right. So I just want to make sure I understood that. I mean typically to the point of volume, I mean I understood that almost all disposal contracts pricing is tied to volume anyway. So even a single city, when they go out to the market prices. And Daniel, is that correct? Prices fluctuate based on the volume that the cities are committing. Typically.

 Speaker 2 - 01:44:28

Right.

Speaker 11 - 01:44:29



So that's not really different here either.



Speaker 4 - 01:44:32

And.



Speaker 11 - 01:44:34

Timing wise, Jamie, this one year opt out, as I understood in our earlier discussion, would come prior to execution of any contract. Obviously because we wouldn't know. So I'm not suggesting it's not complicated, but certainly the RFP would simply say, you know abc, this is how you have to bid it.



Speaker 7 - 01:44:58

Right, Right. The RFP will say that if you're. If the ultimate price exceeds X,



Speaker 1 - 01:45:07

Then cities will have the ability to opt.



Speaker 7 - 01:45:09

Out and the price could be different.



Speaker 1 - 01:45:11

But if it's above, if it's below.

Speaker 7 - 01:45:14



That amount, then there's not. Okay, timing is, you're correct, it's about, you know, in.



Speaker 1 - 01:45:22

By November 15th, the governing board will.



Speaker 7 - 01:45:26

Have to award the contracts. So on November 15th we'll know whether.



Speaker 1 - 01:45:29

Or not it's above the amount.



Speaker 7 - 01:45:31

If it's above the amount, cities will.



Speaker 11 - 01:45:33

Not award the contract.




Speaker 1 - 01:45:35

We'll know when we open the rfp.




Speaker 5 - 01:45:37


Right.

 Speaker 1 - 01:45:38


At the first level. Yes, acknowledging.

 Speaker 11 - 01:45:42


But execute a contract until the body of members is solidified.

 Speaker 7 - 01:45:47


Well, if they award the contract and.

 Speaker 1 - 01:45:49


It's below the guaranteed price, there's no opt out.

 Speaker 7 - 01:45:53


So then we can just go forward with the contracts.

 Speaker 1 - 01:45:55


Right, but if the RFP gets opened up and it exceeds, then the body is going to be working to say why did it exceed what it, what can we tweak? How do we get it below? Because that's what we committed to. We would have been doing this irrespective of this discussion. And then that's a question of they go back out, you send out a new rfp, give them a shorter time frame and but unfortunately that's November 15th. That's okay. We needed a deadline anyway.

 Speaker 11 - 01:46:18


Okay. That's all I had.

 Speaker 1 - 01:46:19


Member for and member breakers.

 Speaker 10 - 01:46:22


I just wanted to ask, Daniel, you seem to have some hesitation on the tiered pricing. Is there a reason for that? Because. Because I know we've been kind of highlighting what you had accomplished in Orlando and showing how it got better and better with more volume.

 Speaker 13 - 01:46:40


Yes.

 Speaker 10 - 01:46:41


Right. So principle, when you were just up there a minute ago, you had a hesitation.

 Speaker 13 - 01:46:46


There's a period of alignment. We've got 29 partners. Not everybody segregates yard trash from bulk waste. There's a lot I described as sausage making. There's going to be a period of sausage making under the best of circumstances. I just. We want to make this as clear and uncomplicated as possible. We want to speak with one voice and provide that path so that when we issue the solicitation, we are serious, the intention is to execute. But we also recognize that there's going to be a period of alignment that follows that not every municipal collection contract identifies designated facilities. For example, there's going to.

 Speaker 1 - 01:47:30


Right.

 Speaker 13 - 01:47:31


We're going to have to align that.

 Speaker 10 - 01:47:32


Okay.

 Speaker 13 - 01:47:33


In all of the collection agreements.

 Speaker 10 - 01:47:35


I just wasn't sure if there was something I didn't know.

 Speaker 13 - 01:47:37


Yeah.

 Speaker 1 - 01:47:38


Wasn't sure about the collection.

 Speaker 13 - 01:47:38


And maybe it's stating the obvious. The largest portion of your solid waste charge to your residents is for collection. So I just want you to keep in mind while we're talking about dollar value tipping fee, it's relative to the amount that actually goes in that path, whether it's for recyclable material processing or yard trash processing or solid waste. So it deserves to be stated that it the cost differential is marginal relative to the total cost of solid way services.

 Speaker 10 - 01:48:13


Thank you, Chair.

 Speaker 14 - 01:48:14


Yeah, I just wanted to make comment really based from our responders standpoint, the vendors that might be fulfilling these contracts, I think it's important to look at it from their angle just for a moment. And so if were to proceed with the recommendation from the executive board here in the governing board, and they're aware, which they certainly would be aware of this element, that if they.

 Speaker 1 - 01:48:40


Go over a certain price..

 Speaker 14 - 01:48:44


Then the volume, the tonnage could vary. I really don't see them going over by a penny or two or a very small amount because from their standpoint, they're guaranteed tonnage, they take a penny or two off, they're guaranteed all this tonnage, they add a penny or two on and all of a sudden they don't know what the tonnage is going to be. So I think, I just don't want that to be overemphasized because I think from, if we look at it from their standpoint, they're going to do everything they can to get a price under that amount. And I also think that we just need to remember that these numbers, a lot of thought went into these numbers. They were not random numbers or just.

 Speaker 1 - 01:49:32


A lot of thought.

 Speaker 14 - 01:49:33


Our consultants put a lot of time and effort into these numbers. So I feel the numbers are good. I feel that when the vendors look at it, they're going to see that it's to their advantage to below that. And of course, the competitive spirit, of course it's not just slightly underneath of it. They're all going to be competing against one another and the lowest price is going to be the most beneficial. So I'm hoping that through this, it was one of the reasons why I voted for it was because I really feel like those numbers are good. The vendors are going to look at it, they're going to be well below that, and we'll be in good shape with everyone being on board.

 Speaker 12 - 01:50:07


Thank you, Chair.

 Speaker 13 - 01:50:08


Okay.

 Speaker 11 - 01:50:12


Thank you, Chair. Member Safra, I appreciate the executive committee's willingness to just discuss this, to bring this back to the governing board today, listening to the workshops and the meetings going on in the various cities. And I just appreciate the ability to discuss this morning. I also appreciate coming back with the options. I tend to agree with Member Sorensen as far as the fixed price. Are we, are we locking ourselves in.

 Speaker 9 - 01:50:38


With the haulers and their rfp?

 Speaker 11 - 01:50:41

Could, could they come back with a lower amount if we hadn't locked in that fixed pricing? And I know it seems that the governing board still has the ability this morning to possibly reject that and maybe just go with the plain option. Because saying that as a small city, 40 years is a long time to be in a contract, I can guarantee you that right now the city of Lighthouse Point doesn't have any contracts that.

 Speaker 4 - 01:51:08

Are anywhere near that long.

 Speaker 11 - 01:51:10

And I appreciate we need market stability. I appreciate that, you know, this has to be built in for this to succeed, but

it's a tall order for my commission. And so saying that, I think for my city standpoint, having that option, that opt out option, not tied to the pricing, I just think I would be in more in favor of that this morning. And then I have one question that hasn't been discussed here. And currently there are several Broward county cities that are not, you know, part of this swa? And so what does the opt in process look like for those cities that either are currently not in or choose to opt out and maybe want to opt in after everything stood up? What does that process look like?



Speaker 4 - 01:51:58

Thank you.



Speaker 1 - 01:51:59

Thank you. Let me address both points. The second one I'm going to ask you to hold, put a pin in it till we finish this discussion on this item because I think it's a valuable discussion to have because there is no current opt in now. And we set it up that way from the start because we didn't know where we would be. We didn't know what the costs are going to be. We don't. But it's a worthy discussion in the event some city wants to with respect to the pricing and what happens. Unlike our, you know what we typically do in an rfp, we never go out to say we'd like you to build a building and we don't want you to exceed a million dollars. We know what we get. You get a million dollars without this discussion today.



Speaker 1 - 01:52:42

Table 14 tells them what the maximum price is. That's already built in. That was already their fear. That was already part of that discussion when we said we're going to build in this commitment to everyone we're not going to exceed. And the discussion at the time was aren't we just telling them what to price it at? We're already there. Okay. This is more about the safety valve that was built in that if we did not accurately understand the market forces and what they would respond and came in higher. Right. Which is what the cities, many cities were saying, we don't want to buy pig and poke. It's going to cost us so much more. There was a safety valve which would be okay. Now the government board's got to go back and look at this.



Speaker 1 - 01:53:26

If two thirds of the population agree this is worthy, we didn't assess it right. It is going to be more. There's something unique about Broward County. There's some other infrastructure problem then at least under the executive and I'm not promoting it but under the executive committee's proposal, it would offer an opportunity for city to say I don't want in on it because it's one penny over. But we're already committing. Unfortunately, the way this process worked to tell them, hey, this is what we're willing to pay what we're hoping. Right. And I think this was to member breakers. Point is that as Daniel said, our ability to get the best pricing is based on tonnage and term. The only way any other market player will say I'm going to invest, I want all the tonnage is they've got to give us a better price.



Speaker 1 - 01:54:17

They got to give us the term and that will justify their capital investment if it doesn't already exist here. Right. So.

And it may get broken up amongst. But. But we don't have any more leverage and this opt out doesn't provide any leverage. And we've already committed to the price that we're maximum. We're hoping that the competition, like member Breaker said, will say I want to come in lower because I want the tonnage, I want to beat this other competitor. That's the hope. We're already there. The second point though, if you just remind me if I forget, we'll come back to that second point about opt in. Yeah, we can do that today. Other discussions on this particular item. All right. As a reminder to the governing board, I'll say it just because this is how it was presented to the executive committee.



Speaker 1 - 01:55:03

There were five options for motions. One was a 25 year opt out of 2048 all by itself. The second was an opt out at 1231, 2027 for any reason. The third was an opt out for the cities based upon November 15, 2027 governing board approving, awarding a contract that exceeds the market value, giving cities the market guardrails, giving cities until 1231, 2027 to opt out. The fourth option for a motion was 25 years opt out with an opt out at 1231, 2027 for any reason. And the fifth was 25 years plus an opt out tied to the market guardrails. That was part of option three. So it's to the members as to whether or not member Colbert.



Speaker 11 - 01:55:57

Can you repeat number five?



Speaker 1 - 01:55:59

Sure. It would be 25 years, 2048 opt out and the opt out tied to the market guardrails. That is a November 15, 2027 awarding by the governing board something that exceeds the market guardrails from Table 14 giving cities until 1231, 2027 to opt out.



Speaker 11 - 01:56:21

Got it on. On the tonnage, the tiers in terms of the rfp. I just wanted some clarification. What member fir mentioned, I seem to.




Speaker 1 - 01:56:37

Be able.




Speaker 11 - 01:56:40


To envision that we have an RFP that says, you know, bid certain this price for certain tonnage, this price for different tonnage range. Is that something that we could do?

 Speaker 13 - 01:56:56


Yeah, and most likely we will. In part I was reminded because there's going to be a period of alignment.

 Speaker 11 - 01:57:02


Because this is how we're set up. Okay. So we can do that. That can be done.

 Speaker 1 - 01:57:08


Correct.

 Speaker 11 - 01:57:09


Okay. I just wanted to clarification on that chair. I know you want to discuss the opt in afterwards, but I do like that question and I really would like to hear that during this discussion as well. I thought there was an opt in option and I'm hearing that there isn't an option.

 Speaker 12 - 01:57:31


There is not.

 Speaker 1 - 01:57:32


We have. The members were established and the issue of opt in was reserved for us to talk about at some future time. That's it. And to put in. And to put in some context, most of the members have paid.

 Speaker 11 - 01:57:48


I think the attorney wants to say something.

 Speaker 1 - 01:57:50


I know.

 Speaker 11 - 01:57:50


I just want to see if maybe it's different from what you're saying.

 Speaker 1 - 01:57:53


No, no, I want him to clarify.

 Speaker 11 - 01:57:55


I want him to clarify that too.

 Speaker 1 - 01:57:57


But I want to be.

 Speaker 7 - 01:57:58


There is a provision that allows the other three cities that are not currently members to opt in at the term. But there's a provision that says the terms under which they are going to opt in will be set by the governing board of the executive committee. I have to check which. But one of the executive or the government would have to set the terms. For example, they have not been paying.

 Speaker 1 - 01:58:18


For any of the operating costs for.

 Speaker 6 - 01:58:20


The last three years.

 Speaker 7 - 01:58:21


So the question is how much are they going to have to pay to join in?

 Speaker 1 - 01:58:26


And that has not been determined.

 Speaker 7 - 01:58:28


So as of right now, there's no process or way they can join in because we haven't set that and that the plan is to do that, but it has not yet been done.

 Speaker 11 - 01:58:36

So if a city who is currently part of. If the authority does not sign in now, will there be an opt in option based on how it's currently written and I realize that can be changed?

 Speaker 7 - 01:58:50

Yes, there is an opt in, but the cost is unclear.

 Speaker 1 - 01:58:54

Yeah, let me be clear. There's always an opt in. We've always been trying to say we want them to come. The terms of that may not be available. Right. So there's cost. And those that opt out may not get most favored nations from the vendors. See, part of what we've talked about in the master plan is to achieve most favored nation. To make sure what that means coming back in could be a product of and hopefully it's not punitive. Right. We want to make sure we want more. Right. But that's a discussion for the governing board. Ultimately, even if the executive committee recommends, we want every member to come forward and say but the process and what that is it one year, is it two years, is it three years of what they haven't paid. Is it more than that?

Speaker 1 - 01:59:39



That's something that's left to the body.



Speaker 11 - 01:59:42

Mayor, I. Just to make sure I'm clear on it. Chair if a city does not approve at this point, maybe all their commission members can't agree at this point and they wish to join another time. Maybe they have a different commission. What, what options do they have then? Are they completely out and will never be able to join again?



Speaker 1 - 02:00:11

It's up to the government. It may be that the government example. Wait, I have to give you the example.



Speaker 11 - 02:00:16

Please, please, please. I just want to know the way it's written now, not in the future.



Speaker 1 - 02:00:22

Yes, we gave the.



Speaker 11 - 02:00:24

So they have that possibility now.



Speaker 1 - 02:00:26

Possibility, but that doesn't mean it's going to happen. And I'll give you the best example and I'll use just arbitrary numbers. If a vendor has 100,000 tons of capacity and somebody was out and we've used all that capacity, we won't, we may not want their additional capacity doesn't provide us any better pricing and we don't want them to participate. Right. We, if we invest in some infrastructure,.



Speaker 12 - 02:00:51

Whatever it is, it's a drop off.



Speaker 1 - 02:00:53

Or whatever it may be that there incoming is not just what the financial commitment has been. It also may be a percentage of the capital and operate. So yes, we've always contemplated and I think one of the things starting with the solid waste working group into the ILA was always that those who were sitting on the outside, it was okay. We want all of them to be listening. We want to ultimately convince everybody. But there's no guarantee that somebody who doesn't join is going to have the opportunity to come in. That's, that's the reality. That's how this is written. Remember right now I think I'm going.



Speaker 6 - 02:01:29

To answer your question a little more directly if I can.



Speaker 11 - 02:01:32

Would be nice.



Speaker 6 - 02:01:33

If a city that's sitting at this table doesn't sign the facilities amendment, is de facto out, you can come back. We just don't know how much you're going to pay or when you're going.




Speaker 1 - 02:01:43

To pay or because there's no procedure, it's not actually true. There's an opportunity. Doesn't mean you can come back. It's not just a price issue. The governing board could say no, I'm.




Speaker 6 - 02:01:53


Agreeing with you but the parameters of that are to be determined. So I think that's. Is that what you're asking?

 Speaker 11 - 02:01:59


That. That's what I was asking because I, I've heard big signals there. So I was just wanting to. That's how I understood it. So I just wanted to confirm that.

 Speaker 6 - 02:02:08


I think there's also a different perspective, Mike, of the three cities that aren't have never been a part of it. To somebody that is a vote that comes from a commission, not because maybe a member sitting in this room, but a commission that is going to do what they're going to do. That's, that's a salient discussion for commissions change.

 Speaker 1 - 02:02:27


That's true. But I don't, I want to be.

 Speaker 7 - 02:02:28

Clear the issue because we all live through it.

 Speaker 1 - 02:02:31


The drafting of this, the ila, we said yes, we want to be able to give the solid waste authority the opportunity and option to invite others in. That is not a guarantee. It's not just a, hey, we just have to struggle over the price or what it's going to cost. It's not a guarantee. It may very well be that we say okay because we want all the capacity. But it may very well be we say no. Right. So that I guess that's one way of answering. I know you may have some additional questions for that.

 Speaker 10 - 02:03:01


And a good example of that event is like with the Global Counties Global Agreement, when everybody did, when somebody didn't sign up in time, they were, they, if they didn't waste management had already given certain parameters of what kind of transportation costs they were willing to pay. People that tried to sign in late, they wouldn't have gotten that part. So they, so the price went up considerably if they were trying to come in at a later date. Because there's two. There's more than just a governing board. There's. There's other parties involved. So that's where it gets a little.

 Speaker 11 - 02:03:39


Okay. So even as we do the rfp, not just, you know, in terms of tiers, not just currently what we have, but it could also be a higher because somebody may want to happen. So, you know, there are different tiers not just for the number that's there, but also higher because there are different possibilities.

 Speaker 1 - 02:03:59


Yeah, but we can't do an RFP that we can award by the governing board predicated on the potential that a city, Pembroke Pines, for example, may in the future join. We just can't award a contract like that.

 Speaker 11 - 02:04:09


Just, just options in terms of the rfp. Not the award, no, but even the rfp.

 Speaker 1 - 02:04:15


I mean we can certainly say that, but I think that's a challenge.

 Speaker 11 - 02:04:18


Member SRIAN I think that's a great idea. In the rfp, you would have levels of volume and the vendor doesn't necessarily care how many cities that volume is being generated by. So after the RFP is awarded, and I know we're getting way ahead of ourselves here, you could show those additional levels of volume to future cities as an encouragement. They could help bring all of our unit prices down. So I think it's a great idea to put that in the RFP, though.

 Speaker 1 - 02:04:53


Yeah, I agree with you. And I think it depends on whether there's capacity. That's the key component. Right? Yeah.

 Speaker 2 - 02:05:00


Chair.

 Speaker 14 - 02:05:00


I just want to make sure we're not missing the big picture here. I understand the details that we're talking about and they're very important, but the reality is if there aren't enough people, enough municipalities in this group right here, that sign in the first place, there is no swa. There is nothing to come back and join. It's over, it's done. So I don't think we should be looking at it. Well, I'll bail out now and look to maybe opt in later because there may not be anything to opt in later. The whole point here is we're trying to band together. We're trying to get the best price we can. And especially I'll say just this, speaking as a small municipality, that, you know,.

 Speaker 1 - 02:05:43


This, this is really good for us.

 Speaker 14 - 02:05:44


Because there's no way we can get the same pricing. There's nobody in this room that can get the same pricing that we can get when we're all together.

 Speaker 1 - 02:05:52


Okay.

 Speaker 14 - 02:05:52


But especially as a smaller municipality, there's even more room for benefits and savings. But the whole point is this is a long term agreement for a very real and important reason, and that is that this transcends any particular short term issue. We're going to run out of space in our landfills. We're going to have issues with incineration. This is our opportunity to do what's best not only for our municipalities right now, but to do what's best for Broward county and the next generation. That our kids in high school are so excited about this because they understand sometimes, you know, their front lines, they understand how important this is for their future. And this is a great opportunity. So I think I understand. I understand the cost issues. I understand what's going on in Tallahassee. I understand all the other pressures.

 Speaker 14 - 02:06:53


Listen, I've got it just like you've got it. But at the end of the day, this is something that is bigger than a short term, minor cost differential here. We have an opportunity to band Together as a. As a county, a group of municipalities to do what's best to solve a problem that we've been trying to solve for a very long time. And I think we have to understand that this is going to do two things. One, it's very. It's highly likely that every one of us around this table will get a better tonnage price than what we're getting today because the volume and the market system works that way. And the second thing is by working.

 Speaker 1 - 02:07:39


Together, it's very possible that we.

 Speaker 14 - 02:07:43


Are solving a problem for the next generation that we will not have another opportunity to solve.

 Speaker 8 - 02:07:50


Thanks.

 Speaker 1 - 02:07:51

But I think to member Coburn's point, Member Stafford I think we should have on the next agenda a discussion about what does opt in look like and what are those options. And without sending our consultants to spend extra time, I don't want to take valuable resources that we're right now focused on to divert, but to get us a sense of what the tonnage of these other cities are across the waste streams, if that information is available. So we have. And then we can certainly have that discussion if we get by August. Again, this is a. I think the member Right. Cruises point. We don't get by August. Opt in is not really the issue anymore, but it's a. It's a valuable discussion, particularly when we get to the RFPs. Member Cagiano. Yeah. Extended time by member Rydell. Do I'm second? Yes.

 Speaker 1 - 02:08:42

Second by member Kaziano. All in favor, say aye. Thank you. Member? I don't know.

 Speaker 8 - 02:08:47

Maybe I just have to try and.



Speaker 7 - 02:08:49

Reduce this to ridiculous again.



Speaker 1 - 02:08:52

I've had this conversation earlier about going to lease a car. Who's going to get a better rate?



Speaker 8 - 02:09:00

Me walking in and going to release.



Speaker 1 - 02:09:02

A car or me going in and say I need to lease 20 cars or 40 cars. Of course the person who's going in and getting the 20 cars is going to get a better rate. I just don't understand this. Oh, I'm not sure if I'm gonna opt in. I'm getting a better price. You're never going to get a better price if you're alone. This is insanity. We are always stronger when we work together. Do you get a think about it in your own heads. Do you get a better price if you go into lease a car by yourself or do you get a better deal if you're going to go in there and say, I want 25 cars? This isn't rocket science. This isn't brain surgery. I mean, this is simple math.



Speaker 1 - 02:09:44

I Just don't understand when I sit in these meetings sometimes and I'm listening to this insanity. One car or 25 cars, what are you going to get a better price on? Come on, tell someone. Tell me something different. Thank you. Member for.



Speaker 10 - 02:10:03

I'm not sure. Is Lighthouse Point in the global agreement? Yeah. Okay, so just so you know, you're right. Now the county has those prices established up to 2033. Okay. There is a, there is a renewal of 20 at 2028. But that we have to have over half a million tons of garbage. As long as long as we get that, it's automatic. Doesn't I just want letting you know so that way you know, you're assured of certain prices even with this, you know, as long as this stays together.



Speaker 1 - 02:10:41

All right, we're at the.



Speaker 8 - 02:10:44

Member, I've got one more thing. I'm gonna warn the board to be a little careful on the tier pricing. It's a slippery slope because what goes one way goes the other way. Now, if you're recycling comes up to where you want to be, your tonnage comes down, they're going to want to change the pricing. And so we, you know, we may just want to stick to it. Just give us the price and that's what it is. Because if they come back and say, well, you know, you guaranteed us X amount of tons and now you're recycling so good that we're not getting the X amount of times get a Y amount of tons and we're not being able to. It's costing us money to keep this contract going.



Speaker 8 - 02:11:28

So I just don't know if you want, you know, it's a slippery slope because, you know, they're not going to want one way, not the other way.



Speaker 1 - 02:11:35

Right. It's a good point. And obviously when we get to, if we get to August, that's got to be part of the discussion. The rfp, what that looks like. Member Sorensen.




Speaker 12 - 02:11:43

Thanks. Just one last thought is working together is how we have. I think the greatest win working together in my military career is a joint environment where everyone works together. Where there's trust, there's alignment, there's collaboration. You all have been at this much longer than I have, and I thank you for all you've done on it. If we believe that working together and trusting each other and finding alignment is the path for our future success, which I think we all do, then implicit in that is trusting each other and giving each other the opportunity to fully invest and have the opportunity to step out if it doesn't fit. And so in a, I feel like a trusting, aligned environment, it's important to give people the chance to say, hey, if you don't like this, don't be part of this.




Speaker 12 - 02:12:46


But let's make the compelling argument together with the dollars, with the environmental factor, all those pieces and the option join if you like, not join if you like, through opt in provision that allows that. Once we have that information, I think it's, we're, we're believing and trusting each other and so forth.

 Speaker 1 - 02:13:08


And I just think that's a way.

 Speaker 12 - 02:13:09


To, an additional way to show it. So that's it. Thank you. Thank you.

 Speaker 1 - 02:13:14


The governing board and the executive committee wrestled over the issue of how to put the market pricing guardrails on this to show trust that were going to be working hard enough to do it. That's the level of trust. That's what it comes down to. We can't take a chance, quite Frankly, to just tell the industry we really don't know how many people will join. Could be a bunch that opt out because it's not related to pricing. It just can't work. We know it can't work because they told us it wouldn't work when we.

 Speaker 7 - 02:13:41


Tried to do the RFP first.

 Speaker 1 - 02:13:44

So it's not a matter of trust. It's a matter of the market will not, from an economic standpoint, commit to us. And so the only protection we have is we committed to every city that we will not exceed this pricing.

 Speaker 7 - 02:13:59

If we did, there was a safety.

 Speaker 1 - 02:14:00

Valve that would require a lot of work if the executive committee's proposal was to be the proposal here. We're

also saying we're doubling down on it, saying we really meant it when we said we're not going to exceed. If you don't like it and you don't you want to wait for the governing board, Even if the 2/3 you can get out go, this is how committed we are achieving. That's there has to be a trust the other way that we're going to achieve that. So I, I respect your opinion on that. I, I just think that it's not a matter of trust, a matter of pure market economics. They're not going to believe in us. So, all right, we're at a point where either we got to get a motion because we still have additional business.



Speaker 1 - 02:14:39

I outlined the five options, plenty of other options if anyone else wants to make. But is there a motion on the floor? Member Kaziano3 which is the opt out tied to the market guardrails from Table 14, where the governing board awards the contracts on or before November 15, 2027, giving the cities until 1231, 2027 to opt out if it exceeds the market guardrails. That's the motion. Is there a second? Second by Member Bright Crews. Any discussion on that? Call a question.



Speaker 2 - 02:15:19

Chair Ryan? Vice Chair. Alternate Sorenson?



Speaker 12 - 02:15:27

No.



Speaker 2 - 02:15:29

Member Shuham?




Speaker 11 - 02:15:32

Yes.




Speaker 2 - 02:15:33


Member Colborne?

 Speaker 11 - 02:15:36


Yes.

 Speaker 2 - 02:15:37


Member Sarah?

 Speaker 1 - 02:15:39


Yes.

 Speaker 2 - 02:15:41


Member Lewis? Member Horland?

 Speaker 9 - 02:15:44

No.

 Speaker 2 - 02:15:48

Alternate Clout online?

 Speaker 12 - 02:15:50

Yes.



Speaker 2 - 02:15:53

Member Dunn? One more time, please. Remember Dunn. She's online.



Speaker 1 - 02:16:04

Haven't seen anybody coming in out there.



Speaker 8 - 02:16:07

I'm doing good.



Speaker 1 - 02:16:08

I'm on a meeting right now, believe.



Speaker 6 - 02:16:09

It or not, on my phone.



Speaker 9 - 02:16:11

One moment.



Speaker 1 - 02:16:12

We don't believe it.



Speaker 8 - 02:16:13

I believe.



Speaker 1 - 02:16:15

Excuse me.



Speaker 2 - 02:16:22

I did not hear member dunn's response, so we'll come back to that. Member mead?



Speaker 1 - 02:16:28

No.



Speaker 2 - 02:16:30

Member cagiano?



Speaker 1 - 02:16:32

Yes.



Speaker 2 - 02:16:33

Member rydell?



Speaker 6 - 02:16:34

Yes.



Speaker 2 - 02:16:35

Member ernst?



Speaker 1 - 02:16:36

Oh.



Speaker 2 - 02:16:40

Member murphy? Solomon?



Speaker 4 - 02:16:43

No.



Speaker 2 - 02:16:45

Member thomas? Member curran?



Speaker 3 - 02:16:51

No.



Speaker 2 - 02:16:54

Member eveyard?



Speaker 5 - 02:16:55

No.



Speaker 2 - 02:16:58

Member stafford?



Speaker 11 - 02:17:00

No.



Speaker 2 - 02:17:02

Member brightcruise. And one more time. Member Dunn.



Speaker 7 - 02:17:23

Looks to be 10 to 8.



Speaker 1 - 02:17:25

Yes. And we need a majority of the population, but I believe we have that too.



Speaker 7 - 02:17:31

But I want to do some math real quick.



Speaker 1 - 02:17:34

Look at that.



Speaker 7 - 02:18:12

We have a majority of population as well.



Speaker 1 - 02:18:14

Okay. The item passes as is. All right. Any further discussion on that? We have Cohen, Resnick. Financial update. Yeah,.



Speaker 6 - 02:18:32

We get a little clarity and I. I say this because I'm. I'm very curious. For some of the members that have voted no today, I'm just. I'd like to understand the no vote. I know that's not here. I think it's really important for moving forward. So I don't know if anyone who voted no is. Is willing to discuss that their thought process behind it, or what would get them to yes. That's just a request, Mr. Chairman.




Speaker 1 - 02:18:54

And to the extent that any of those who voted no can convince those that voted yes, there's always an opportunity for a motion for reconsideration. So if you voted no and you want to restate the case, Member Rydell is certainly inviting that and I think it's healthy for us to understand it. Member Hor.




Speaker 9 - 02:19:14


I think I've stated my reasons at the beginning. I feel we did reputational harm to the authority today with this discussion. I think that we could be. We could be receptive to some of the concerns out there, but I think that we capitulated to some of the concerns out there rather than doing a better job of explaining the wind down. And so I cannot support this today.

 Speaker 1 - 02:19:42


And to be clear on that, I actually don't fundamentally support this, but I realize I have to because so many are against and I need the guard with my fear was the 1231 opt out without any guardrails. To me that was the greater ill. That's the only reason I voted yes. So I, I value and I value in saying I do agree that there was a reputational issue here today, but.

 Speaker 3 - 02:20:07


Yes, Member Cooper City voted no. I spoke with the staff. We were highly fixed on our meeting. We wanted both options to opt out on both. We feel that if the product is great and the competition is there, the price will control itself through the option of being able to come in and go out. That's the only reason I'm bringing what the work staff and they all told me basically before I left. So that's why I voted no.

 Speaker 1 - 02:20:34


Thank you Member Kerr. Anyone else for me? Thank you Chair.

 Speaker 10 - 02:20:42


The.

 Speaker 1 - 02:20:44


It's been stated many times that there's economies of scale involved and that we're not going to get as individual cities a better buy than we would as a entity as a totality number one. So the only way that I can see that an individual city is going to get a better total price in a worldview of total prices is to not recycle, just to throw everything in the same container. And that's getting us right back to where we are now. And that's not the stated goal of this body. Our goal is to encourage recycling and I don't think we're going to do it by allowing people to opt out. I think we've been down too many rabbit holes and I think we need to realize that we have an option, one option, and that's to recycle.

 Speaker 1 - 02:21:40


That's where we're supposed to be going with this. Thank you Member Meade. Anyone else wish to offer any additional ideas?

 Speaker 9 - 02:21:48


The reason why the city of West.

 Speaker 5 - 02:21:50


Park I voted on no is because we should be encouraging more cities to join us because the more cities are involved then we have a better chance of getting a better pricing for. For all of us overall. And I think when you give people a leeway, then they tend to more gear towards more of not wanted to drain the crusade of, you know, recycling. So that's the reason why I voted no.

 Speaker 1 - 02:22:20


Thank you for offering that Member Arnst.

 Speaker 8 - 02:22:22

The only option I would like to see is 20 years or 25 years just for the fact that if something changes in that time and we're locked in, I just don't want to get locked in like we got locked in the last time. Last time were locked in for 35, 40 years in the original ILA. I just want to make sure that there's a period if some. Who knows what happens, they find a way that, you know, they find a new bacteria that eats garbage up and we don't. And when I have to just do something like this, that we're able to get out of this thing. That's all.

 Speaker 1 - 02:22:59

Yeah. And I think to. To. So the point that member. Some of the members have pointed out is that the wind down. We haven't really explained the opportunities for us and transparency to drive the contracts. And the contracts are probably going to be 20 years, so we're going to hit a natural inflection point in all likelihood. That's what they're, you know, telling us. So I think we probably get there anyway. But, Member Solomon,.

 Speaker 9 - 02:23:27

Without being lengthy, I would just say overall, I. I feel like we're taking a step backwards. I'm probably one of the

newer people.



Speaker 5 - 02:23:35

To all of this, but it just.



Speaker 9 - 02:23:39

Seems that we are. And I do think it does weaken the authority. I think it's. I agree with member Horland. It's reputational harm. And, you know, were presented with five options, so. And, you know, those evolved and that's fine from what we read.



Speaker 1 - 02:23:56

But, you know, brought forward option three, several support it.



Speaker 9 - 02:24:03

I do agree with Member Rydell is, you know, we're so close in vote.



Speaker 5 - 02:24:08

I think it is important to consider,.



Speaker 9 - 02:24:11

You know, what is being said. And so my.



Speaker 5 - 02:24:14

My points really are, I think maybe.



Speaker 1 - 02:24:18

Option five, but I feel like the.



Speaker 9 - 02:24:21

Other options, for the most part, again,.



Speaker 1 - 02:24:26

Are not the most beneficial to all.



Speaker 9 - 02:24:31

And including the swa. So, again, I want it to be brief.



Speaker 1 - 02:24:37

Thank you. Any further? Okay. Member right now. Anything else? Okay.



Speaker 6 - 02:24:42

It's important to hear.



Speaker 1 - 02:24:43

Yep, I agree. Yep. All right, Conraznik, because we're. We're well beyond time, so.



Speaker 3 - 02:24:49

Yeah, I'll try to be brief. Alex.



Speaker 1 - 02:24:51

Patron from Conrad here to go to the financial position of the broad SWA. As of the end of April 2026, the authority had cash and cash equivalents of \$2,776,000. Its accounts receivable balance stood at \$668,000, which represents seven members that have yet to pay their assessments. Subtracting the entity's liabilities from their assets, the Authority's net position stood at \$3,000,256. Based on its current financial position, the Broward SWA does have sufficient liquidity to meet its budgetary spending needs through its fiscal year ending September 2026. Okay, any questions on the finance? Thank you, sir. Education Outreach Subcommittee member Dunn had to leave any update. All right, we can reserve that for the next meeting. Ashley, you want to give.



Speaker 11 - 02:25:46

I understand it's up to you all if you. We could do the update.



Speaker 1 - 02:25:51

Yeah, to the extent you. You have some updates, you can let us know. It'll be helpful for our tool kits as otherwise.



Speaker 11 - 02:25:56

Great.



Speaker 4 - 02:25:56

Sounds good. Hi, everybody. I'm Haley Nicoletta with Conceptual Communications.



Speaker 1 - 02:26:00

Maybe speak a little bit closer into the microphone. Thanks. Perfect.

Speaker 4 - 02:26:03



All right, we'll briefly go through our Education Outreach updates. Next slide, please.



Speaker 11 - 02:26:10

Alisa. Okay, so this was our ad budget.



Speaker 4 - 02:26:17

That we had that we're working from right now. We have \$90,000 that reserved for a direct mail campaign that we are holding on at this time. Our other audiences are the general population, of course, across Broward, our Spanish and Creole seniors, young adults, multifamily renters, and our economically challenged.



Speaker 1 - 02:26:38

Just, just before you move on, we're losing some of the members. So I just want to make this point just before we go. I think member Rydell's inquiry was deeply insightful because what came out of this was even the no votes were a commitment to the swa. The narrative on this going out, there's going to be. Some are going to say, hey, there was a 10 to 8 vote about some opt out. But then the real narrative is that many of the no votes were a really strong commitment to the swa. And those that even voted no because of their own concerns about their city are not saying they're not committed to the swa. And I think this is a really good point that was made.



Speaker 1 - 02:27:20

I want to thank the members for offering their insight on that because it does help us and more importantly, it helps the community not to be able to misreport what happened here, which was you guys all came together on very short timeline to look at something that was very complicated. We went through discussions. Everybody was here early for the government board to listen to all of it. There was a full on discussion with respect for everybody's position. And ultimately it's still a commitment to the swa. You just have to work a lot harder. All right? That doesn't mean more money, by the way, just harder. So I want to, I just want to thank the members. I didn't mean to interrupt you, Ashley, but I didn't want to lose some of the members without making that point.



Speaker 11 - 02:27:58

No, it's okay.



Speaker 4 - 02:27:59

We can do an abbreviated version the campaign is fully deployed. We're also working very hard on earned media. We are speaking with every major news outlet. Thank you to several of you for participating in those efforts. We also are working with our influencers. I'd like to thank Member Sorensen for working with the Browardist and penning that article for us. And let's see, what else do you have, really?



Speaker 1 - 02:28:21

Can you circulate that? We haven't seen it yet.



Speaker 4 - 02:28:23

Yes, we can. So we also have. Coming up, wlrn. Thank you, Member Horland and Vice Chair Furr, for participating in that opportunity. We have an upcoming Trash to Treasure segment that will be filmed at Mods. And we also have a WIOD radio segment that aired. So thank you, Chair Ryan, for your participation in that. We also are continuing our grassroots efforts with each of our. With several community groups. We've got environmental groups, business groups, multicultural groups. We are out there. We are working with them to really work on that grassroots. So we have some paid. We have our earned, we have our community partners.



Speaker 9 - 02:29:03

The pledge.




Speaker 4 - 02:29:04

As of this morning, we are at over 800 pledges. I encourage everybody. If you haven't, please do take the pledge. Of those, we have about half who have also given us their email addresses. So they're definitely interested in participating.




Speaker 11 - 02:29:18


And then, Elisa, if we could just.

 Speaker 4 - 02:29:20


Go towards the very end, We can keep going.

 Speaker 11 - 02:29:40


Okay.

 Speaker 4 - 02:29:40


One slide or two slides back?

 Speaker 11 - 02:29:45


Yes, here.

 Speaker 4 - 02:29:46

So this is the one piece that we need your feedback on. At last week's Education and Outreach subcommittee meeting, the members voted to reallocate some of the funding that have been originally earmarked for efforts that have been placed on hold in the spirit of getting to yes. So this request is not to increase any of our time or budget, but just to reallocate our remaining hours as your public outreach team to the efforts of getting to yes. We'd also like to align some hard cost items with additional media opportunities and outreach efforts.

 Speaker 1 - 02:30:17

I don't. I'm not sure we have a quorum to even vote on that. So we appreciate the guidance and we'll put that on the agenda for the next.

 Speaker 2 - 02:30:24

All right.



Speaker 1 - 02:30:24

In the June meeting. Okay. Thank you, Member Sorensen.



Speaker 12 - 02:30:31

Thank you, Chair. I had a new business question. Is now good time? Okay, thank you.



Speaker 1 - 02:30:37

Just. Just knowing we can't vote on it. Right.



Speaker 12 - 02:30:39

Absolutely. Question on. And I don't know if this is an executive committee question or governing on the executive committee. Is there a permanent seat? Like, I think the county's a perm. There's no permanent seats, not from the city. Right. But who at the county's a permanent seat? So just suggestion for consideration or feedback. What about the idea of having like the two most populous cities or three most populous cities having a permanent seat on the executive committee?



Speaker 1 - 02:31:11

Member horror.



Speaker 9 - 02:31:15

Thank you. Because that dovetails and I should have brought it up during the executive committee but I was actually going to ask because I've heard concerns from both Fort Lauderdale and Miramar. I do not believe that it should be a permanent seat. I'll just say that. But I was going to propose that before our next meeting that we do have an open seat and that rather than wait till November because we don't know if we will exist in November that before the next meeting the large cities get together and vote to fill that seat. Now understanding that what

Lauderdale and Myanmar and Coral sp will be all vying.



Speaker 11 - 02:31:47

For it as the other cities.



Speaker 9 - 02:31:48

Davey, you may not win it but at least there would be an election before November and that was going to be my proposal. So I'm sorry we got sidetracked today.



Speaker 10 - 02:31:58

Member for I I think there is some precedent for that. You actually have on Career Source Broward and on TDC you have the largest cities as permanent members and I don't know what way what's better or not but there is some precedent for that for some obvious reasons.



Speaker 1 - 02:32:16

I'd be willing to entertain a motion to have the county removed as a permanent seat and have it replaced. I appreciate that member furs offering that opportunity and we can. I'll also accept the friendly amendment that the county will pay for everything thing. So it's certainly a discussion to be had. I think we can add it to the agenda for the next governing board. I would just hesitate a little bit. Just think through we're at an inflection point of trying to make sure we're looking to stay together and that will be a natural issue of tension that we're introducing and maybe it's a good time, maybe it's not. I'll leave it to the body for that. But at any rate that certainly could be on the agenda for the next meeting.



Speaker 9 - 02:33:00

Mr. Chair, may I ask Commissioner Sorensen, would you be amenable if that doesn't happen to having an election in June rather than waiting till November?



Speaker 11 - 02:33:08

Would that be satisfactory to you?



Speaker 12 - 02:33:12

Thank you. Open to any of the above? I definitely would. I think an election would be great just to fill a seat and also I'd love to have a discussion about a permanency for two or three and.



Speaker 1 - 02:33:25

If the will of the body is.



Speaker 12 - 02:33:26

No that's perfectly great, but. Yes, thank you. Thank you, Member Orland.



Speaker 1 - 02:33:30

Right. So we'll add that to the agenda for the be great next meeting. Thank you. Thank you. All right, Any additional business? Can I get a motion to adjourn? Second motion by member. Me. Seconded by member Sorenson. All in favor, say I. If the tables offset.