

 Speaker 1 - 00:27

Our foster daughter, and she is five from a second.

 Speaker 2 - 13:12

Yeah.

 Speaker 1 - 13:24

All right, we're gonna get started. Sa. All right, we're going to call to order the executive committee of the Solid Waste authorities meeting for June 15, 2026. If you would please call the roll for the executive committee.

 Speaker 3 - 14:10

Chair Ryan.

 Speaker 1 - 14:11

Present.

 Speaker 3 - 14:11

Vice Chair Furr.

 Speaker 4 - 14:13

Here.

 Speaker 3 - 14:14

Member Shuham. Here. Member Horland.

 Speaker 5 - 14:17

Here.

 Speaker 3 - 14:18

Member Dunn. Here. Member Riedel.

 Speaker 1 - 14:21

Here.

 Speaker 3 - 14:22

Member Meade.

 Speaker 6 - 14:23

Here.

 Speaker 3 - 14:23

Member casiano.

 Speaker 7 - 14:25

Present.



Speaker 3 - 14:26

Member A.J. Ryan. Member Newton. Alternate Colborne. Alternate Murphy. Salamone.



Speaker 8 - 14:39

Alternate Bright Cruz. Thank you very much.



Speaker 1 - 14:44

All right, if you would please stand for the pledge. All right, we'll begin with public comment. I don't have anyone signed up for the executive committee. Is there anyone who wishes to speak on any matters before the executive committee? We'll have the governing board meeting after the executive committee. All right, I'm going to close public comment at this time. Okay, great. All right, do I have a motion to approve the meeting minutes for May 18, 2026? Motion by Member Rydell, second by member Cagiano. Any discussion on that item? All in favor say aye. Any opposed? Okay, that passes. All right, item five. As you know, executive committee members, I circulated a memo a few weeks ago with respect to some potential changes to the second amendment of the ila.



Speaker 1 - 15:53

Since then, based on the comments that we've heard from various commissions about the importance of having an additional potential opt out untied or untethered to the results of the market rate, results from the RFP, in combination with what appears to be spirited support for what we're trying to do here, suggested that perhaps we should reconsider this. I got with Mr. Cole, and we have drafted a revised second amendment to address the issue of an opt out. As you remember, we had five options last time, and the item that passed was an opt out at 25 years and an opt out essentially at the end of 2027, in the event that the governing board recommended an award of a contract outside of the market rate guidelines that we had set.



Speaker 1 - 16:57

Given the meetings that I've seen and what appears to be, again, spirited support for what we're trying to accomplish rather than undermining it and instead wanting to make sure that everyone can participate and that we stay on track to achieve the greatest good for the greatest all, I have put forward an additional amendment for consideration by the executive committee. And if it passes, the executive committee by the governing board. Now, on the last vote, were 10, eight. And I want to again give credit to member Riddell for what I thought was an innovative And I intend to use it in my own life going forward to explain why did folks vote no? And it was quite revealing. Some were on the principle of we should all be in without exception.



Speaker 1 - 17:52

Some voted no because they wanted the additional opt out untethered to the market rate RFP results. But what we didn't hear was a no vote against what were trying to achieve. And as a result, the mechanism for this, as I understand talked to Mr. Cole, is being on the victor side that I could bring, you know, surrender the gavel, if you will, to vice chair fur and seek a motion for reconsideration. Or any member on the side of the winning 10, 8 vote could seek a motion for reconsideration. That would be voted on. And then we can address the merits of the additional proposed opt out.



Speaker 1 - 18:33

I. I don't want to get too formal, so I want to hear what everyone feels about this as we move forward and whether there would be anybody willing to make the motion for reconsideration who is on the victor side. So I'll open up to the members.



Speaker 9 - 18:52

Okay.



Speaker 1 - 18:52

Member fir.



Speaker 6 - 18:56

I would be willing to make motion for reconsideration just for discussion at first. The one thing that, and I know there are a couple of cities that were wanting to have that opt out without any conditions on it. I just want to kind of say what that means and I want us all to consider what that. What we're voting on there. And I may be supporting it, but I think we all need to know what it means. The main thing that I'm concerned with a little bit is that this.



Speaker 1 - 19:32

Why don't we do this for efficiency? If you're going to make and we're.



Speaker 6 - 19:35

Going to have the discussion, that's fine. I'll make a motion to reconsider.



Speaker 1 - 19:38

All right. Is there a second on that motion? Second by member Rydell. All right, so now we're talking about the motion for reconsideration. Does anyone wish to have a discussion on the motion for reconsideration? The merits of that motion? All right, Mr. Cole, do we need a voice vote or a roll call? You can do voice.



Speaker 2 - 19:56

Okay.



Speaker 1 - 19:56

All in favor of the motion for reconsideration, say yes.



Speaker 6 - 19:59

Yes.



Speaker 1 - 20:00

Any opposed? All right, the motion for reconsideration passes. And now we can move forward with a motion to consider the second Amendment that's been proposed as this week. Do we have a motion on that for discussion purposes? We make the motion. All right, we have a motion. Is there a second? Second by member Shoeham. All right, now we're Open discussion member for you had the floor.



Speaker 10 - 20:22

Thank you.



Speaker 6 - 20:23

So the first thing were discussing the. Well, let me just go back to the motion that we're talking about. This is the motion to allow for opting out if we didn't meet the prices that we thought we would meet. So this would be wide open, people would be able to reconsider it. Mike, my worry on this is this it kicks the can down the road for another year.



Speaker 1 - 20:54

Correct?



Speaker 6 - 20:55

Am I correct on that?



Speaker 1 - 20:56

I don't know, but I don't know that I would characterize as kick the can. But it does allow for just continued discussion over the next year. Yes.



Speaker 6 - 21:05

Okay.



Speaker 1 - 21:05

All right.



Speaker 6 - 21:05

So right now we've been doing everything we can to educate every commission and every city commissioner in

this entire county. Come November, there's going to be a whole lot of new commissioners, new commission setups, and you just don't know what's going to happen there. You don't know if this, if the commissions that have already voted for this are going to vote still be in favor of it. To me, it's just we have done a tremendous amount of work to have to go redo that work. Maybe we don't have to. It, it's a risk. Let's just put it that way. It's a risk. On the other hand, if it brings in all the cities that are saying that they're not ready to do this without that, and I'm looking for Lauderdale. I think Law Hollywood is mentioned that a little bit.



Speaker 6 - 22:07

I think Miramar's said that I want to know from those cities, if we do this, are they going to be support making a full, robust support to go forward? Because if they're not, I don't want to do it. And I would take the chance. I mean, I'm just being blunt because we have put in years worth of work of trying to educate people in this, not only county Commission, but people in this county to and to have to and to go one more year on this, which is what this does. Well, you know, it does give us a chance to continue education and that's very important. That's, that's the upside. There's silver linings to it as well.



Speaker 6 - 23:00

The 25 year opt out, which is part of this as well, I think, is I don't have to, I don't have a big problem on that because that's something that if, you know, if we decided we wanted to build something at some point, then everybody can take a vote. So I don't think that's going to give anybody heartburn. But I do. I do want to hear from those cities that this is essentially being written for. And you know that we are taking those cities into consideration. We've heard them that they need this to be able to go forward. I do want to hear from them directly that this is what they need to hear and this is what they can go forward with and convince their fellow commissioners. This is what will get them over the finish line.



Speaker 1 - 23:55

I think that's a fair request. Before I open up for comments, I want to point out two additional risks that caused me angst. And one was the result of attending the Hollywood meeting where its disposal vendor got up and attacked the swa. And it wasn't based on, in my opinion, on merits. It was based on concerns over their own parochial interests that we as a Solid waste authority could generate a system that maximizes our leverage on pricing and term that would cut out some members of the market. I say that not because I was concerned about the comments that were made, because I think they fell flat. But what I would say is in the interim, where commissions are given the opportunity to potentially opt out, there will be members of industry chirping in the years of elected officials.



Speaker 1 - 24:57

And some of us have strong relationships with our providers, some of us don't. But it does create a worry. I think the other minor issue is how does industry respond to the RFPs, if there's a potential for one or more to simply opt out for any reason, that may not even be meritorious as we see it, but it's their own parochial decision. I am less worried about that because I think, assuming we get by August 14th, the goal of the consultants and the RFP is to show that we have maximum tonnage, that we have the ability for maximum pricing, that we have everyone on board. And it is then the job of both the consultant industry to either respond to that without creating all sorts of

caveats and exceptions, or to create chaos.



Speaker 1 - 25:53

And I think this body has worked so hard to achieve what we know needs to be done over the next 20, 30, 40 years that I may be optimistic, but I'm not, you know, blind to the risks. But I think what we're doing here is that important, and that's our job over the next year to keep everyone on board like we've been doing. For those that have been part of this since the Solid Waste Working Group, there were plenty of moments of existential threat as to whether or not we would even exist. And A lot of sharp elbows in negotiating llas and working together to achieve the greater good. And all we're going to have to do is keep doing that, keep working hard and make sure we're having honest dialogue that's transparent and achieves the best for our residents and our businesses.



Speaker 1 - 26:44

So I accept what you say. There are those risks. But if we don't get by August 14th and we go back to the fragmented system of failure, the results will be catastrophic. And they will be that way long term. Even if some can declare a minor victory in the short term, the result will be devastating long term for this county, for our residents and for our businesses. Member Rydell.



Speaker 9 - 27:12

Thank you, Chair. Vice Chair I hear your concerns. I don't know if they're necessarily well placed and I'll tell you why. I've spent. I've talked to probably over a dozen elected officials that are not represented on this board, but their cities are represented on this board. Skeptical elected officials that maybe have not been appropriately either educated by their respective colleague on the board or have not had the bandwidth to engage in the process of this that we have. Right. Huge education curve, huge hyper technical. You know, talking 40 years here and I understand to go back to the last meeting, why certain members were, I don't want to say upset, but didn't want any of this.



Speaker 9 - 28:00

I also believe that while certain cities may have, we'll say one commissioner or council member that is skeptical, I don't think any of us could say that may not be the trend in 10 years. We don't know the shift of communities. This is something that has come up that has picked up a little steam. It may not be the majority steam. I support it. I support it today. The amendment. I believe in the work we're doing and I believe it will be for naught. I don't think it's going to make a difference. I really, truly don't. I think your comments in terms of the industry are extraordinarily salient and true. We again, can't change or re educate people to that component as well.



Speaker 9 - 28:40

So that being said, well, I think it's fair to ask, you know, member Shoehammer, Member Sorensen, their positions globally, they can't say that. And they have people on their body that for one reason or another may not be supportive of this. But if this is the carrot, hate to use that term, but if this is the carrot that brings everyone to the table, we'd be foolish to not support it. We'd be Foolish to debate it. We are hearing from the large industry people this is what needs to be done. Totally understanding you, Vice Mayor. And in my perspective, I believe in the work. I believe what we've done, I believe it's going to not matter. I truly believe that with how we've set this up. So if this is we need this to get forward, total no brainer.



Speaker 9 - 29:28

I'm totally supportive of it and I am happy to talk to any member of any commission or council about this because I think I've, you know, to some of you that may or may not know. I've talked to members that, you know, some of you thought were going to be a resounding no and it became yeses right on certain commissions. So I maintain that I will continue to do that and I think that this is a slight, call it that a slight deviation but I think it allows certain actors to stay very committed to the work as a whole. And I, and I fully support it with and I think it's a little unfair beam. Not unfair. That's the wrong word.



Speaker 9 - 30:06

To ask certain members in this commission that have been a little more contested to take a global position I think is very difficult, I think to hear that member's position is totally fair. But I think to ask certain elected officials that may be looking at that tagline or they may be looking at the comments they made and that's we all got to realize that too certain elected officials have made public comments whether through social media outlets, whether on their dais, whether in public meetings and that matters because an elected official, whatever capacity is not going to roll back on something they said or that they want. And if we can deliver on what they said or they want, it makes this a lot easier to succeed. Thank you Chair.



Speaker 2 - 30:43

Thank you.



Speaker 1 - 30:43

Member Rydell. Member Shoeham. I'm going to go to Hollywood and for Lauderdale and I'll come to Member Harlan.



Speaker 8 - 30:52

Well, first and foremost I want to thank you and Vice Chair fur Jamie and Sam. I mean this has just been such a process and it's been really stressful. I know that everyone in this room wants us to succeed, but we are not the determiners. We are part of a democratic process and a commission vote is really important. I just want to share a couple things. First, I can say that the Hollywood certainly meet and Hollywood staff will be 100% behind this going forward. They feel like this will get them over that hump. I don't know, can't speak for the rest of the commission but I think this is Something that will help our commission support this. To me, it's like a Hail Mary, really. If you don't do this, I may never see all of you. Right. It's not worth that.



Speaker 8 - 31:53

Although it extends, it's a one year extension. That's how I view it. There's just been so many interesting things that have come out of it. But one thing I've shared with a few people that I've talked to this about was very early in the process, people said to me, you guys are going to work like dogs. And then at the end, industry is going to come in and throw a wrench into the mix. I was like, no way. I was naive because I feel like that's what's happened. We got very far along and then somebody threw a monkey wrench into the mix. And the burden is on us who know the most about this to find our way past that monkey wrench. There's also a lot of discussions about large cities versus small. And it is true, large cities have a lot of quantities.



Speaker 8 - 32:47

We get good pricing, but it doesn't undo fundamental economics, which is the more quantity, the cheaper the price. And that has been my point all along, and I will say several months ago at my commission, when I conveyed to them in a way that I think is very accurate, that the idea of the facility amendment has gotten much simpler. There's not going to be a facility at this stage. Everybody was like, this makes it so much easier. This makes it so much easier. So this shifting, I will say, is somewhat unexpected. That said, I totally support this amendment and I would ask, just. Just want to talk about a few other things that are related. The first is when we go out for pricing, there's two components, at least to any contract. Pricing and terms and conditions.



Speaker 8 - 33:48

The pricing was the only thing mentioned, but terms and conditions obviously are important. My public works director has talked about annual increases and things like that. Those are really material terms. But I feel like that RFP is not going out until all of us have the opportunity to share our best practices. And maybe big cities have done this more and longer and the small cities are going to not only benefit from the pricing, they're going to benefit from the terms and conditions that we've had also. So terms and conditions. And Sam, this is going to be on you to really look at the best every city has brought to their contracts and make sure that it gets into this rfp. I think if this passes today, it gives us a little bit of a gift.



Speaker 8 - 34:39

And that is the gift to revisit some of the things in the ILA that were there and sounded great but when we got close to the end were raised by various members. So, okay, we have ways under the terms of the ILA to modify it. And so we will be giving ourselves a year to dig in and see where are these things. Not wait until a year from now. So to the extent that any of us here feel that there are terms and conditions in the ILA that sounded great when we first approved it a couple years ago, but may need tweaking, please bring them to this board as soon as possible so that we have plenty of time and all of that stuff gets resolved.



Speaker 8 - 35:29

And then I think the last thing I want to say, and we've all heard this expression and I think you said it in your interview with wlrn, this is a once in a generation opportunity and that's why I support this. I don't want to lose this opportunity. There's been so much time, effort, heart and money put into this that if it takes another year. Better another year than another generation. And so with that I support it. I want to just thank you for bringing it forward. Like I said, it's a Hail Mary and it's going to save the game. So thank you.



Speaker 1 - 36:06

Thank you, member Shuham. And to put in some context to be clear, if this passes, we're not extending anything. The work isn't going another year. We were always on track on August 15th to have, assuming we exist, to have that first step of where the RFPs are and to remember Shoeham's point, if it passes and we're together, the hard work starts because of how to craft these. And I think your point about terms and conditions is hugely important. But not just that, your call to action to every city who says, hey, we've wanted to be part of this process, we have ideas, we can no longer hold those up. That has to start immediately because the RFP is going to be the most challenging part of this process as industry will pick and we'll try to divide.



Speaker 1 - 36:55

And for some, not all, we've seen industry come together and be part of this process. But there are some individual players out there who feel that they're under threat if this passes because of our ability to work together. So there's going to be that hard work and I appreciate that. Call to action. Member Sorensen and then member Orlando.



Speaker 2 - 37:14

Thank you Mr. Chair, and thank you very much for this amendment. I really appreciate means a lot to me. Thank you Vice Chair, for moving It I have several process questions I wanted to ask if that's all right. Just for my own understanding. Again, one of the. A rookie here just to kind of. So that I can best understand and then hopefully best communicate this to the rest of the Fort Lauderdale City Commission, if that's all right. So starting with the ila again, just these are very basic questions, but so I'm tracking. So this is a second amendment to the ila. Can you just recap for me again any other amendments and the history of those amendments to the ILA, just so I can understand that, Mr. Culver, sir, thanks.



Speaker 1 - 38:11

Yes, there haven't been any amendments yet. The first amendment is the facilities amendment and that is what is been approved, I think by about 15 of the members. And that has to be approved by August 14th. 15. This second amendment will have to be approved by all the cities and the county who approved the facilities amendment. The facilities amendment itself had to be approved by population with 80%. So this will be presented, assuming it passes the recommendation of the executive committee and then the recommendation of the governing board will be presented to all the cities and they'll be asked to consider it as well, along with facilities amendment before August 15th, although that's not technically the deadline.



Speaker 2 - 38:59

Got it. So let me just play that back to you to see if I'm. I'm tracking. So the first amendment is the facilities amendment that is to be approved by all the cities in the county or the 85% threshold.



Speaker 1 - 39:16

80%.



Speaker 2 - 39:17

80%.



Speaker 1 - 39:17

80%. And if that is not approved, the SWA goes away. I mean, that is a existential type of provision. This would not be. But that one is existential. If it doesn't get approved, the SWA ends in mid August and we'll have wind down, but it'll be over.



Speaker 2 - 39:36

Got it. So then sequentially the First Amendment has to be approved by August 15th. That's so far so good. The Second Amendment has to be approved by. When is there a deadline?



Speaker 1 - 39:50

There's no deadline. It'll be. But we're going to try to do it along the same timeline so that everyone will know that it's done. But there's no specific time. Yeah. To as the chair. Let me just take a point of order on this. Assuming it gets recommended by the governing board to be pressed out, it would go out today to all the cities, including those have not yet voted on the facilities amendment and the cities who have. That's why the timing is important. Everyone still has at least one meeting before summer break. And so the timing of this was critical to get it back out. I see no reason at all that any staff would ever oppose any of this in the 15 that have already approved this or the county for that matter.



Speaker 1 - 40:33

So the goal would still be to have everything wrapped up by the 15th and then we can address other ILA issues that I think have to be addressed moving forward. But the goal is to get this all done.



Speaker 2 - 40:45

Great. Makes sense. The so process wise, if the first amendment is passed and the second amendment is passed, then the RFP process in terms of crafting the RFP begins. Am I saying that right?



Speaker 1 - 41:06

You are.



Speaker 2 - 41:06

Okay. The deadline for the RFP process to conclude or remind me of that if you don't mind.



Speaker 1 - 41:15

There's no specific deadline right now under these proposed second amendment. There is a provision that says that the governing board will make the recommendation between October 1 and November 15 and then there would be a 45 day period where cities or the county incorporated area could opt out. So that's the timing that we plan. Now we did put in a little flexibility just in case we're not done, you know, the governing board could extend that date if necessary. And to put some context, we have had some prior discussions early on the RFP process and the challenges. We're all familiar with the RFP process in our own cities. It is possible. And let's put this in some context.



Speaker 1 - 42:06

When the RFP goes out, as member Shoeham pointed out, it will be the product of every participating member and their staff crafting it, wrestling over it, what are the terms we want, what are the reasonable expectations? And when that goes out, so there won't be any shock as to what we're asking to achieve. Second, when the RFP responses come back and they get opened up, so to speak, there won't be any shock what's going on. Right. We'll all know where we are.



Speaker 1 - 42:37

So you would expect, if the process works and the executive committee works hard from August 15th on, that you know, the RFP should be out probably within 90 days and then you probably have 60 to 75 days for response, which puts us into the spring of 27 with results long before a decision has to be made about are we part of this or not part of this. There will be no secrets at that point. Everyone will know what the result has been. But we have to be mindful that it is possible that there might be, in whole or in part, a second RFP process. If we identify either market risks we didn't calculate or reasons why we can achieve Better pricing. So there's enough play in the joints to allow that process to continue as well.



Speaker 1 - 43:34

But the idea in this was to ensure that one, all the cities were participating in the RFP process aggressively and meaningfully. Two, that when the process was opened up, the tough discussions that happen have sufficient time to come to consensus and three, that it isn't so rushed that any city feels like okay well this is going to be a cram down and it's going to be anything but that. So I say that because I think when you, not you, but when one looks at this you say okay, well it doesn't look like they're going to do anything till October 1st. That's actually the case. We should know in the middle of spring of next year are we close to achieving what we set out to achieve and do we have to make any adjustments for it?



Speaker 1 - 44:19

So I just want to put that in some context.



Speaker 2 - 44:21

Yeah, that's great. This is all really helpful for me. So again going back to the timeline progression, so August 15, 2026, the hope is, you know, positive vote then is it Sam begins crafting the rfp is,.



Speaker 1 - 44:43

Is that what, and that's in fairness to you because I know like you said, you're rookie to this part of it. To go back in

history, there were two things that were proposed. One was to go out on the RFP before we got to the facilities amendment and get a result.



Speaker 11 - 45:01

Okay.



Speaker 1 - 45:02

Second, I proposed an opt out early. What we found from the RFP process though, once it was started, before it went out, is that the consultants came back and said industry is not going to respond because we can't tell you what amount of tonnage. There's been no commitment.



Speaker 2 - 45:24

Got it.



Speaker 1 - 45:24

This is this body's inchoate, if you will, in terms of whether it's going to exist. And when the consultant reported back, we as the executive committee governing board had to make a major adjustment. Are we going to retreat from going on the RFP so we could tell cities exactly the pricing? And what we chose instead is to say look, let's set the maximum price goal. We're never going to go beyond this pricing, you know, with very few exceptions. And in the meantime make sure we get the facilities amendment approved so that we can go out with maximum tonnage and maximum time.



Speaker 1 - 46:00

So the RFP process, to answer your question, a long way did begin and it's with the consultants, but it'll be the product of the consultants, the executive committee staff from, even from the governing board folks, staff being engaged as we circulate the RFP to make sure we've hit all of that. So from process standpoint, it'll be the hard work of the executive committee and the governing board ultimately to approve the RFP as it goes out and be part of that crafting process.



Speaker 2 - 46:32

Got it. So the DARFP process has begun.



Speaker 4 - 46:38

The.



Speaker 2 - 46:38

If the facilities amendment passes, and if the second amendment passes, that existing RFP would be adjusted based on that. Am I saying that right?



Speaker 1 - 46:50

I think it probably hasn't been drafted that deeply because we got response pretty quick. But the question of whatever is just whatever's been saved, you know, is going to be reintroduced to the executive committee and the governing board for its consideration.



Speaker 2 - 47:05

Got it. And when would that happen?



Speaker 1 - 47:08

So we'll have to work with the consultant, but the expectation would be that Immediately after the 15th, the RFP discussion would begin with the executive committee and the governing board and a product produced by the consultant with the goal of having the RFP completely finalized and out on the street within 90 days of August 15th.



Speaker 2 - 47:30

Great. Okay. So we're looking at. Okay, so October. Ish. So October 2026, RFP being out on the street. November. November. Now, in that I think I heard you say this, but just so I'm clear in that between August and November of 2026, the exec committee will work.



Speaker 1 - 47:58

On that RFP and the governing board.



Speaker 2 - 48:00

And the governing board. And then did I hear you right in saying cities will give their input.



Speaker 1 - 48:07

Or through the executive committee and the governing board.



Speaker 2 - 48:09

Great. Okay.



Speaker 1 - 48:11

We're not. This is not something that goes back out to each individual commission.



Speaker 2 - 48:14

Right.



Speaker 1 - 48:15

I mean, we know from an RFP process, while there'll be certainly some. And welcome the input of individual electeds, whether on this board or otherwise. The real work's going to be at the staff level and tact.



Speaker 2 - 48:28

Great. That all makes sense. Excellent. So then the RFP goes out November 2026, and then what's the next marker? What happens next?



Speaker 1 - 48:40

I don't want to get too down the road. The next marker would be whenever we set as when the RFP response is due. Okay, great. And then it's opened. And then it's either then the executive committee, government board are gonna have to review it and make a termination. Are we accepting the responses like we normally do or do we have to do something else? And I say, because we're talking about essentially five different commodity streams, if you will. Do we have to do something else?



Speaker 2 - 49:06

Great. So at Some point in 2027, the RFP responses come back from the market. Am I saying that right?



Speaker 1 - 49:14

So far, yes.



Speaker 2 - 49:15

Comes back, then the executive committee and the governing board evaluates those responses and then determines next steps.



Speaker 1 - 49:23

Correct.



Speaker 2 - 49:24

And at that point, do I have it right? Based on the Second amendment, when those RFP responses come back, then at some point, once they've returned, then cities have the option to opt out.



Speaker 8 - 49:37

Correct?



Speaker 2 - 49:38

Is that right?



Speaker 1 - 49:39

Okay.



Speaker 2 - 49:39

Date to be determined. Because that's gonna determine based on when the responses come back. Correct.



Speaker 1 - 49:45

But one of the concerns that I think had been raised is to make sure the executive committee and governing board is giving sufficient time to evaluate the RFP responses, including whether or not significant or major adjustments need to be made. And so the way the current proposed amendment that's on the table is written is that the governing board will not recommend any earlier than October 1, 2027, the contract award, no later than November 15 from the date it gets recommended. The cities have 45 days.



Speaker 1 - 50:26

So to be, again, to be transparent about this, there will have been lots of discussion and lots of input and lots of public acknowledgement of what the results are long before the governing board approves it, giving staff and individual commissions sufficient time, even with the adjustment of new, potentially new commissioners, new mayors, and whatever else on the different days is around the participating members.



Speaker 2 - 50:53

Great, thank you. That helps. Then I'm looking at.



Speaker 1 - 50:57

Let me just see.



Speaker 2 - 50:58

I'm looking at the executive committee agenda. So is item five that we're talking about right now?



Speaker 1 - 51:05

Yes, sir.



Speaker 2 - 51:06

Okay. And so I see in parentheses it says providing for a second opt out in 2048.



Speaker 1 - 51:13

Correct. That was the previous one we passed. It's simply carrying that forward. The current one is the as has been outlined and has been sent to all the members.



Speaker 2 - 51:21

Got it. Okay, perfect. So that's describing the prior correct amendment. Okay. I just want to make sure I'm clear on

that.



Speaker 1 - 51:28

So.



Speaker 2 - 51:30

Just want to reiterate. I personally believe in the work of the Solid Waste Authority. I'm excited to be part of it. I think what we're doing is excellent. I greatly appreciate this amendment. And what I will pledge to do is that if this amendment passes oath bodies, we have a Fort Lauderdale City Commission meeting tomorrow and I will advocate share this update number one and advocate for the strength of this amendment and the importance in my view of the city of Fort Lauderdale continuing to participate and move forward in passing the facilities amendment and also passing the second amendment as amended here Is that perfect?



Speaker 7 - 52:30

Fair.



Speaker 1 - 52:30

And thank you, Member Sorensen, for your commitment. Again, thank you for stepping in.



Speaker 2 - 52:34

Yeah.



Speaker 1 - 52:34

And you've been A welcome presence. So we thank you.



Speaker 2 - 52:37

So thank you. Appreciate it.



Speaker 1 - 52:38

Thank you, Member horland.



Speaker 5 - 52:43

Thank you, Mr. Chair. And before I begin, I would just like to echo what you said, Member Sorensen. We wish Fort Lauderdale had been at the table all along, because your voice is needed. I did not vote for the amendment at the last meeting.



Speaker 12 - 53:01

And.



Speaker 5 - 53:04

The reason I did so is exactly why we're here today. And I share many of the concerns that the chair and the vice chair have. Have stated. I will say I'm going to vote.



Speaker 8 - 53:13

For this today because as has been.



Speaker 5 - 53:18

Said, we put in far too many hours, hundreds of hours around this table to get to this point. We've also said many times we cannot let perfect be the enemy of good. And this is a generational vote, and I think it is vitally important. And that's why so many of us have not given up on this and we have stayed the course. What I'm not going to allow, and the reason I'm going to vote for the amendment today, is for rogue individuals that are not telling our story to compromise our success. I have advocated plenty of times for TAC to be involved in this process. Our staff is vital to this process. We rely on their knowledge. I do not think it's appropriate for public work director in a city to be calling electeds another city.



Speaker 5 - 54:02

I think that's above their pay grade to work out other deals and to compromise what we're doing. And I want to say that.



Speaker 3 - 54:11

We.



Speaker 5 - 54:11

Want all 28 cities. I'd love to have all 31 cities on board. So, again, we have a mission. This is not about politics. This is not about power. I do agree with Member Rydell as somebody who has been attending the majority of these meetings, as we've done workshops and votes. Education was lacking all along. And, you know, we can wonder why we can have our opinions alive.



Speaker 8 - 54:38

But.



Speaker 5 - 54:38

But that was definitely a thing. But I think that we have something else going on here. And I think my only question is if we pass this today, what is our guarantee that the process is not held hostage any further going down the line?

Speaker 1 - 54:54



Thank you, Member Horn. Remember, Katiana.



Speaker 7 - 55:00

I want to thank Fort Lauderdale and Miramar and Hollywood for engaging in this, because this really is important. And as members said before, industry is scared and they're throwing wrenches into it. There's a good reason why they're doing it, because they're still dealing with the old politics of divide and conquer so that they can take us to the bank. What we're doing here is something that's Unbelievable. We're creating unity. And where there's unity, there's strength. Where there's strength, there's an opportunity to choose our future. And that's why they're scared. And that's why this board is so important, because we are forward looking and we are taking an opportunity to make sure that our residents have an affordable future where affordability is such a problem right now. So thank you, Ben, for the work that you've done.



Speaker 7 - 55:53

Thank you, Member Colburn and everybody else who's participated in this because it has been years, but it still comes down to this. We have to unify. Because where there's unity to strength, we cannot be divided anymore. So thank you.



Speaker 1 - 56:08

Thank you, Member Bryan. Thank you, Chair. Yeah, Just a few questions to clarify a couple things. These amendments that we're passing are basically from the feedback that we got from the three large cities.



Speaker 11 - 56:24

Right.



Speaker 1 - 56:25

From workshops, I would say, beyond that and the coconut telegram and everything. No, I, I would say it was a product of both the feedback, you're right, that we've heard, but it also was the product of how the vote happened last time and what Member Rydell uncovered from this, that there were even small cities who said, we're passing this, but we still want what is a part of the Second Amendment that opt out. So it was a product of reflection on some of the holdup as well as what the vote was last time.



Speaker 13 - 56:57

And.



Speaker 1 - 56:57

Okay, thank you for clarifying that. And for the opt out, could this be used almost as a negotiation tactic with, you know, specifically the large cities when they opt out? Since you could opt out and opt back in, could you opt out and look for more favorable options? You don't find it and then you opt backed in two years later and you're kind of keeping the executive committee on a string by just holding off. And then it could be a trend and it follows and then one more major city comes in and boom, all this work and then this agreement just falls apart. Because of that, whatever politics or whatever happens in the future, who knows, I can't predict what happens in the next 25 years.



Speaker 1 - 57:40

But I just, you know that's what cautions me about this because like I said, for whatever reason, you know, rumor, negotiation, we could be held like at our mercy for this, especially by the larger city. So I just wanted to have an open discussion regarding that.



Speaker 2 - 58:00

Thank you.



Speaker 1 - 58:01

Fair point, Member Ryan. I think there's a lot to unpack there. First, let me start with a latter point that was made about opting out and opting back in. We've not yet addressed what it takes for a city to come back in or to join for the first time. We're going to have to face that, because if we achieve what we think we will through the RFP process, if we generate a system that is performing the highest mission of reducing and recycling and diverting from landfills, it would be natural for those that were not in this program to consider coming in. And we have to be prepared for that when it happens. But we've not yet proven it yet. Right. So we will need to consider that the slight variation of that issue is what you point out.



Speaker 1 - 59:03

Could individual big cities or a collective try to say, you know, what we'll do parallel to this is try to negotiate separately with industry and we'll try to see if we can build our own separate coalition. There's certainly been

rumors out there that's going on already. Cities that have not proved this are having their staff call around or having that discussion. But as we've been through this process, we've encountered plenty of rumors along the way. We've encountered a lot of potholes that we've had to scale or fill. And what we have to do is probably work harder to make sure that, as member Shuham said, and I know you've committed to, which is.



Speaker 1 - 59:44

And your city's committed to, is the idea that the best pricing that's possible is through this process, that no individual city can go out on its own and get a better process. Even if it's a short term better price, it will not achieve the paramount goals that we have with dwindling landfill capacity, dwindling WT capacity, and a recycling rate that's abysmal, that we will achieve that. So you're right. That is a potential. But I think that's the work of the executive committee, the governing board, the individual members here, to work in a transparent and hopefully open way to make sure that doesn't happen.



Speaker 2 - 01:00:23

Thank you. Thank you, Chair.



Speaker 1 - 01:00:24

Also, is it possible we could change the number? I mean, the percentage of the opt out. I know we need 80% to approve it, but to, you know, dismantle it within that 25 years, could we make it a larger percentage that would have to opt out, or is there a reason that we have the 20%? Yeah. That's been carried over from the ILA that we negotiated four years ago.



Speaker 2 - 01:00:48

Okay.



Speaker 1 - 01:00:49

And to member Shum's point to what we've all considered.



Speaker 2 - 01:00:53

Right.



Speaker 1 - 01:00:53

Is everything can go back on the table. We can certainly have that Discussion. But we have to also balance, right, Going forward, what is the distraction value versus achieving the mission and how much time will be consumed in the distraction of that. But it was, you know, you were part of that process too. We had a lot of discussions, right? How do we find that right balance? There's no mystical correct answer. Certainly the body and the member cities can consider that going forward as well. Thanks, Chair member Shoemaker.



Speaker 8 - 01:01:29

Two points that I forgot to make. One was to also thank all the members of the board that have gone to these other cities, particularly member Horland. I know she has worked tirelessly and really deserves our gratitude. The other thing I'm thinking is this is really stream of consciousness, but over the next year or a few months, I'm wondering if we should come up with an opt in scheme for the remaining cities to get in before the RFP that's a little bit more definitive than we have now. And if they get in by a certain date, you know, here are the rules and I think that might really be helpful. And then we can get ourselves maybe above 28 cities. So that's just something I want to put out there.



Speaker 8 - 01:02:22

Sam and Jamie, maybe we can think about opt in that's more detailed than what we have right now for these.



Speaker 5 - 01:02:30

Few cities that aren't with us.



Speaker 1 - 01:02:32

I think that's spot on. We have to address it. There are probably other, like you point out, there are other issues we look at in the ILA between now and August 15th. None of those really matter if we don't exist. So I think the bandwidth here has been really focused on answering the questions, hearing what's being said, but not just hearing, listening, but going forward. I think that's a great idea that we have to work with the consultant to figure out what that looks like. If additional tonnage was to come in through the RFP process, is there even greater economies of scale that can be achieved with that delta, that incremental difference? But that should run parallel to the RFP process starting hopefully August 16th.



Speaker 2 - 01:03:17

Okay.



Speaker 1 - 01:03:17

Any further comments or questions on the proposed amendment? That's on the floor. All right, Call the question individual voice. Do you have something?



Speaker 6 - 01:03:26

I do have. I do have something I want to bring up. The what is what. What I've seen when I've gone to all these different commissions is a lot of the cities have wanted, been wanting, been concerned that they're not at this table right now. So the one thing that I think that I want to remind everybody, and particularly the larger cities, is that each of the large cities, they are not. You're not voting for just your city. You're representing the large cities. And I don't know how we do this, but at some point, I think we should be having almost a chance for the conversation for larger cities middle season before we vote, so that anybody on the governing board can weigh in. In other words, right now you've got a couple large cities, but you have a couple that aren't here.



Speaker 6 - 01:04:17

Where do they get a chance to say, you're looking at me weird?



Speaker 4 - 01:04:21

Well, I know, because I think we're here today.



Speaker 6 - 01:04:23

I know, I know that. I know. But, but let's say one of the other large cities wanted to weigh in and tell either any of the large cities what they're thinking is what.



Speaker 1 - 01:04:37

Would be the proposal? What are you suggesting?



Speaker 6 - 01:04:39

My suggestion is if there's. If we need to figure out how to do this so that everybody feels like they're represented. Yeah, I know. But, but they could speak. If they were here to speak, they could.



Speaker 1 - 01:04:53

We have no further delay if this.



Speaker 6 - 01:04:55

No, I'm not trying to delay. I'm not. I'm not trying to delay. I'm trying to. I'm trying to say we. And you know that there's larger cities that want to be permanent. I'm trying to make sure that everybody gets their. Their 2 cents. And that's all I'm trying to say.



Speaker 1 - 01:05:10

That's been the problem.



Speaker 6 - 01:05:11

And if there's any. And I guess I'm asking if there's anybody on the governing board that wanted to weigh in at this point. I know, I'm just saying it right now.



Speaker 2 - 01:05:19

Calm down.



Speaker 1 - 01:05:20

I know we have to get to the governing board.



Speaker 6 - 01:05:22

I know that. I know. But this is the vote that does that. And I'm trying to make sure. Because Miramar, Hollywood, you know, there's a couple cities that aren't. Aren't on. Aren't taking this vote. So all I'm saying is if there's anybody in the governing board that wants to weigh in now's a good time to. So that they can. So that they're represented. That's all I'm saying.



Speaker 1 - 01:05:42

As has been done in all the executive committee meetings and what we've made clear to all government board members is come to the executive committee meeting, even if you're not a voting member, if you're not an alter your voices be heard. So, yeah, having heard.



Speaker 4 - 01:05:53

Having heard this, okay, so before we.



Speaker 6 - 01:05:55

Bunch of commissions, I'm just saying this is a good time.



Speaker 1 - 01:05:58

Last chance to say it, but it's not the last chance because it's got to go to the governing board next. So executive committee will open it up to any governing board members who want to be heard on this item right now.

 Speaker 2 - 01:06:08

All right.

 Speaker 1 - 01:06:09

Okay. Call, call the vote.

 Speaker 3 - 01:06:13

Chair Ryan?

 Speaker 1 - 01:06:14

Yes.

 Speaker 3 - 01:06:16

Vice Chair Fern?

 Speaker 6 - 01:06:17

Yes.

 Speaker 3 - 01:06:18

Member Shuham?

 Speaker 10 - 01:06:19

Yes.



Speaker 3 - 01:06:20

Member Horland?



Speaker 5 - 01:06:21

Yes.



Speaker 3 - 01:06:22

Member Dunn? Yes. Member Ridell?



Speaker 11 - 01:06:27

Yes.



Speaker 3 - 01:06:28

Member Meade?



Speaker 7 - 01:06:29

Yes.



Speaker 3 - 01:06:30

Member Cagiano?



Speaker 11 - 01:06:31

Yes.



Speaker 3 - 01:06:32

Member A.J. Ryan?



Speaker 2 - 01:06:34

Yes.



Speaker 3 - 01:06:35

Member Newton?



Speaker 4 - 01:06:36

Yes.



Speaker 8 - 01:06:37

Thank you.



Speaker 4 - 01:06:38

All right, unanimously passes.



Speaker 1 - 01:06:41

Move on to the rest of the agenda. I think most of the governing board members are here, but let's go ahead and go to the CMD and Commercial Recycling Subcommittee. UPDATE MEMBER Meat.



Speaker 4 - 01:06:52

Thank you, Chair.



Speaker 1 - 01:06:52

Let me defer over to Executive Director May Sam.



Speaker 11 - 01:07:01

Yes. So we've been we had a workshop at the last TAC meeting and discuss these options that came up from that workshop. We've had a few meetings with some county staff to discuss just discuss those options that came up. Also, we're going to continue that workshop with TAC on bringing back kind of our findings and bring it back to a workshop that we're going to have tomorrow with the TAC group and the CND subcommittee and hopefully get some more input and then wrap it up with one final meeting with what we have the county staff involved with it. So we're getting closer and closer, but there's a lot of moving parts to it that we've got to make sure that we address.



Speaker 11 - 01:07:55

We're kind of going in one direction, and we found out from the county staff that we really got to kind of bring it back more focused where we have more enforcement power. So we'll bring that back to you probably in two meetings from now.



Speaker 2 - 01:08:13

All right.



Speaker 11 - 01:08:13

In this update.



Speaker 1 - 01:08:14

So first of all, I want to thank the CND subcommittee and the TAC for moving forward in each of these meetings and handling each meeting like a workshop that is to take in as much information as possible. There was a suggestion from someone in the industry that the C and D subcommittee wasn't taking information or they didn't have their voice, which is just not the case. There's been plenty that's been produced and continues to be produced and the commitment to hold them all as workshops to get a work product that gets through all the staff, all the members, and comes to the executive committee.



Speaker 1 - 01:08:47

I would strongly encourage at the next meeting that we have a real update on where we are on the ordinance again, to those in the industry that are looking at this, you know, we would love to pass something before August 15th. But if we don't exist, there's nothing to really pass and we're going back out to the city. So the goal here is to have something at the next meeting and then a final product that can be recommended to the governing board for that second meeting. And so that if we exist on August 16, that we're pushing it out right away. And to be clear, you know, there was a commitment by the executive committee and the governing board to work parallel to achieve goals that we felt were necessary in the interim and not to wait until it was all finished.



Speaker 1 - 01:09:38

And to member Meade's credit and those that have been working on this, that has been achieved and we should be in a position to make recommendations on the day that we know we exist. Remember Meade.



Speaker 4 - 01:09:49

Thank you, Chair.



Speaker 1 - 01:09:49

Thank you for recognizing that we have reached out to the community. We've had roundtables, we've had input from them other than roundtables. And thank you to our executive director for all the work he's done with communication. Member of Orland has been a big help in that committee as well. And we are making progress. It's a bit of a challenge as it is for the executive committee for their job too. So I want to appreciate the work that has been done by other people. Thank you, Chair. It's as a reminder, this has been categorized and characterized as the low hanging fruit. And yet it's been quite a challenge. So we have the work to do. And to attck, I thank them individual staff members who are either on TAC or participate on tac. I'll say it again as I've said it six months ago.



Speaker 1 - 01:10:36

This is the time. All of your comments, all of your concerns, every issue you think that exists has to be given to the C and D subcommittee so that we get a work product. It will not be helpful to get a work product at the end of this and then hear from individual staff said, well, what about this or what about that? I'm not saying that we can't always improve and we want to do that, but to hold back comments is this is not the time to do it. And I thank you for all the hard work that you all have been doing. All right. Education outreach Subcommittee Expenditure reallocation request.



Speaker 2 - 01:11:06

Laurie.



Speaker 1 - 01:11:07

And I'll turn it to member Dunn as well.



Speaker 12 - 01:11:14

Good morning, Chair Ryan, Vice Chair Burr, Members of the executive committee. Member Dunn, would you like to start or would you like me to brief on what this item is?



Speaker 5 - 01:11:24

Yeah, you'll do that item and then I'll give an overall update.



Speaker 12 - 01:11:27

Terrific.



Speaker 5 - 01:11:28

Thank you.



Speaker 12 - 01:11:28

Just a heads up. That was channel 10. That was here. We filmed the Trash to Treasure segment. So they were grabbing some B roll. Not to be alarmed. And thank you everyone.



Speaker 1 - 01:11:38

It's all I'm ever good for is B roll.



Speaker 12 - 01:11:41

Yeah. So this item is not a request, just to be clear, for more funding. We have a budget for this year. Simply just asking. We charge for our services, flat hourly rate whether we're doing a media or an advertisement, whatever have you. But we had some things outlined when we did the best we could at the beginning of the year to determine what work would go on here. But now we need those monies for some other activities. So the Education Outreach subcommittee has brought to you this item today just to be able to have freedom with those dollars to use them as needed until the end of the year. So just to be clear what we're asking for, we have about 400 hours left on our contract for this year to not use them specifically for schools which we know the curriculum is coming.



Speaker 12 - 01:12:32

We're kind of paused with that right now as they're in summer business outreach as C and D ordinance is getting worked out. But we want to be able to use that time effectively now to keep building that awareness and that care that will help us lead to behavior change. In addition to that, we have about \$100,000 in hard cost things that we're not going to do right now. Some focus groups, some recycling posters, things of that nature. They want to be able to use those funds to support the efforts that we're doing now. Okay, questions.



Speaker 1 - 01:13:02

So what's the specific request then, Member Dunham?



Speaker 5 - 01:13:06

So it's simply allowing us to reallocate the budget so the amount stays the same. But we're just shifting from different pockets. Do you have the backup for that?



Speaker 12 - 01:13:16

I do. So what we're asking for is \$106,000 that was broken up into hard cost focus group direct mail for businesses, LinkedIn campaigns, paid media with trades and those Recycle Across America posters to be able to use those funds for ad work we're doing now. And then for our services. We have about 400 hours that was broken up between schools and businesses and we want to be able to use that, continue the recycle. Right efforts, reduce contamination and then supporting the authority on the PIO efforts that we do.



Speaker 1 - 01:13:50

Okay. Member John, do you want to make a motion on the allocation? We can have a discussion.



Speaker 3 - 01:13:54

So moved.



Speaker 1 - 01:13:55

Is there a second? Second by member Shuham. Alright. Any discussion on the Request for reallocation. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Okay, thank you so much. Appreciate it. Any new and old business before we transition the government?



Speaker 5 - 01:14:11

Just to give a quick update on what else the communication efforts been up to. So we thank you, Chair, for doing a great interview with Jackie Nespral, Vice chair with wrn. We've had articles come out in the Sun Sentinel, a lot of great media placements. And our pledge, we are close to 1000. We're well over 1000 pledges now of folks agreeing to pledge to recycle.



Speaker 3 - 01:14:38

Right.



Speaker 5 - 01:14:39

And we'll continue to make sure that the communications effort is supporting fully the.



Speaker 1 - 01:14:45

Get to yes effort.



Speaker 5 - 01:14:46

Thank you.



Speaker 4 - 01:14:47

Thank you. Thank you, member.



Speaker 1 - 01:14:48

To the credit of the executive committee and the governing board, from the outset, education was seen as key. There was a clear commitment to invest, to make up the ground we had not been able to achieve as individual cities. And it started to pay off. And so we truly appreciate that. Again, it was one of those parallel efforts along with C and D, that had to begin immediately. And the education subcommittee under your leadership, member Dunn, has done a tremendous amount of work. And so thank you very much. And thank you to Lori and her team member sorensen.



Speaker 2 - 01:15:19

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Separate topic, New business. Again, a process question. The I'm seeing a. On the executive committee, a member unassigned large city position is what's the process or timing of that election or naming.



Speaker 1 - 01:15:38

Of that person Right now, Member Cockburn is the alternate, has been serving. It's up to the will of the body when they want to do a vote. I query whether that needs to be done before August 15th, as if we don't exist. The work of whatever has been happening or the friction that's caused by it. Everybody wants the seat, which is a good thing. But I leave it to the members to decide how they want to go forward with it. Member horland.



Speaker 5 - 01:16:12

Thank you, Mr.



Speaker 3 - 01:16:13

Chair.



Speaker 5 - 01:16:14

To member Sorensen's point, I thought were going to hold a vote. I think it's. It's a moot point at this point because we don't have any meetings left. But I was hoping that we would have gathered before this meeting and had the large cities either via Zoom or in this room to go ahead and have that election. So I did support you on that.



Speaker 1 - 01:16:32

Yeah, we have to hold it through one of these meetings, as we noticed. And then it has to be sunshine and everything else. So happy to do it. If you want to do the next meeting, whatever the will, we can.



Speaker 5 - 01:16:41

I don't Think it needs to be the full body. I think it should be the way that we did it in the incorporation of the swa where the large cities, the medium cities and the small cities gather together. I think if we can, if you, if the will of the body is to do before the next meeting, I'd like to hear from everyone, but I did think that we should have an election with the large cities involved.



Speaker 1 - 01:17:02

Sure. And so we need to make sure we notice it in fairness to all the large cities. And I think it has to be conducted under the same rules where we have to have a quorum, we have to have everybody here. So the. While the mid sized cities and the other cities don't have a direct vote, they're part of the process. So whatever you like, whatever everyone like to do, we can certainly notice it for the next meeting to give all members an opportunity of the particularly the large cities so that they know to be here for the executive committee vote, which is whatever you all want to do. Your light's still on. I don't know if you wanted to comment.



Speaker 2 - 01:17:41

That sounds great to me, but I defer to you all as an executive committee. Thank you.



Speaker 1 - 01:17:45

So is there a motion to do that? Because I want to make sure we're clear on the agenda.



Speaker 6 - 01:17:48

Member for this is exactly the point I was bringing before is reminding everybody that when you're at the table here, you're representing a group. You're not just representing your city. And I know some cities that want to have a seat at the table are thinking, I'm not. Our city's not there. Your city is there no matter what because you're being represented. If Fort Lauderdale is not there, or Wilma or whoever's not there, you're being represented. That's the important part on this. That's, that's why I was bringing that up.



Speaker 1 - 01:18:23

All right, so is there a desire of the executive committee. This is where this goes. The executive committee to have on the next meeting an election by large cities for the seat that is vacant and being managed by the ultimate.



Speaker 7 - 01:18:38

I'll say yes to that.



Speaker 1 - 01:18:39

Okay.



Speaker 5 - 01:18:40

Okay. Yep. I'll make a motion. If one is needed.



Speaker 7 - 01:18:42

I'll make. I'll second it.



Speaker 1 - 01:18:43

All in favor say Aye. Any opposed?



Speaker 7 - 01:18:46

All right, perfect.



Speaker 1 - 01:18:46

We'll have it on the next meeting and make sure there's appropriate noticed. All right. Any further new or old business for the.



Speaker 2 - 01:18:52

Just one comment on that. So the next meeting is July 17th. Is that correcting that? Right. So I'm in the United States Navy. I'm going to be on Navy duty that day and unable to participate. So I just share that.



Speaker 1 - 01:19:09

Thank you as a. For your service.



Speaker 2 - 01:19:11

I don't know what to do about that.



Speaker 1 - 01:19:12

Well, we could certainly try to. You can. It's kind of a challenge, right, to. To reschedule. We could reschedule the meeting from July 17. When do you go on duty?



Speaker 2 - 01:19:22

So I'm on duty about July 3rd through July 31st. Again, I don't want to hold up the process. I just don't know how. Okay, so I have an alternate be.



Speaker 1 - 01:19:42

Here, just so it's clear the executive committee elections are individual people.



Speaker 7 - 01:19:48

So it.



Speaker 1 - 01:19:50

You don't have to be here to run, but your alternate could be here to represent your interests. But. Okay, vote fort Lauderdale. But that. That person could not be on the executive committee. It would have to be you as the person from Fort Lauderdale. But there's no meetings until September, so I'm not. You know, you can decide, by the way, there's going to be another opening in November, maybe multiple openings in November. So there's a meeting July.

Meeting Title: Executive Committee and Governing Board Meetings.m...

Meeting created at: 18th Jun, 2026 - 9:50 AM

What are you saying? No, after the July meetings don't mean until July. Right. So I think that makes meeting in September or in November. There's gonna be more elections. There's an August 21st executive committee. There's an August 21 executive committee. Okay, well, this is a. This is a governing board issue, not an executive. No, because all the large cities.



Speaker 1 - 01:20:32

Not just the large cities on the executive committee. We've always done it at governing board. I know, but. But all the cities have to be here.



Speaker 4 - 01:20:38

I understand, but it's for the appointment.



Speaker 1 - 01:20:40

To the executive committee.



Speaker 9 - 01:20:41

That's correct.



Speaker 2 - 01:20:42

Right.



Speaker 1 - 01:20:42

So from the. From the large cities on the governing. Correct? Correct. That's correct. But there is executive committee work that's going to start if we still exist after the 15th. So it's up to you how. Whatever suggestion you have. First of all, if you're gone from the 3rd to the 31st, when is Fort Lauderdale going to address the facilities?

Speaker 2 - 01:21:00



July 2nd. July 2nd.



Speaker 1 - 01:21:04

I'll bring a care package.



Speaker 2 - 01:21:07

Thank you. Appreciate it. I think it pleases the body. I can Talk with the 4 lateral city commission tomorrow at our commission meeting, ask if the alternate could be there, and we can plan to have the alternate here on July 17th, possibly myself, be considered and go in that direction.



Speaker 8 - 01:21:31

Mr.



Speaker 5 - 01:21:31

Chair, may I ask a question of attorney Cole? This is precisely why I would hope that we had this election before summer began, because so many people were Traveling Attorney Cole, is there a reason why we cannot publicly notice a zoom call and hold a meeting of the large cities to get selection done? Is there anything precluding us from doing so?



Speaker 1 - 01:21:53

You know, there's an interesting disagreement between the attorney general and myself as to whether or not you can do that. I personally think you can. The attorney general thinks you need quorums in person. So I think that is a problem. I mean, order to do. In order to take action at that meeting, you probably would need to have a quorum in person. And it is. And this is like the large cities who are members of the governing board is. Who would be technically meeting because they're the ones that make the decision. So you need a quorum of that group physically in person. But you could have a separate meeting just for that if you wanted to.



Speaker 5 - 01:22:28

How about. How about if we tried to have a separate meeting of the large cities late next week, if anyone was available? I know it's.



Speaker 3 - 01:22:36

Pardon me.



Speaker 1 - 01:22:37

Has to be the governor. Well, technically, just the large cities on the governing board make the decision.



Speaker 4 - 01:22:44

The governing board have quorum.



Speaker 1 - 01:22:46

If it's just the large cities, we've always done it as part of a governing board meeting. That.



Speaker 9 - 01:22:51

That.



Speaker 1 - 01:22:51

But we've broken the governing board into three sections. When we do that, there's no rule about it. There's nothing in here in our agreement that talks about quorums for the. Like, the large city subcommittee. So I would say it would just be a governing board meeting, and you would still need a quorum. Yeah, I mean, we can have an individual meeting just on that issue at any time in between, but certainly before member sorts and leaves, Just be mindful that obviously, you know, Miramar and Coral Springs have very strong positions on this as well. And so I,

you know, I wonder how far we get with it, but we need to be together, not divided. I'm hoping that a vote like that doesn't then be reflected as somebody wasn't wanted again or they weren't part of it.



Speaker 1 - 01:23:38

And then there are individual members that feel raw, that causes, you know, cities to look at this differently. But it's whatever the will of the body. You want to schedule a separate meeting, we can do that. Nothing's holding us up. Want to wait till the 17th. We want to see if we even exist. Whatever the will of the body is.



Speaker 2 - 01:24:04

Chair, if it's the will of the body. If something could happen more quickly, I think that'd be fantastic. But just my view that's fair.



Speaker 1 - 01:24:16

And we certainly can just. I think we Just need to be aware. That cities who didn't get a position carried forward a pretty negative attitude about the executive committee work. And that was problematic. And we continue to live with that. We're within 60 days of knowing whether we exist. And I. Whatever the will is, we can try to see from claim from at least what rooms available we can hold it. But somebody's going home not being part of this and just need to be clear that there's a single position open as an alternate. And I, you know, I kind of. To vice chair's point.



Speaker 2 - 01:25:07

Yes.



Speaker 1 - 01:25:07

I would hope that individual cities that don't become executive committee member don't continue to have an issue with the work that's being done just because they're either not chosen or because of votes. And it's a very uncomfortable situation for the rest of the large cities at a point which, to member Cagiano's point, this is where we should be declaring unity. So if you'd like, we can circulate potential dates for a meeting before July 2nd that would be available. I think we have to be mindful that all of the large cities need to show up because someone who doesn't show up and can't be on may feel the rub and at a time when we need to be working together shoulder to shoulder, whoever is on the committee or not. So how would you like to proceed? Right now it's on the 17th.



Speaker 1 - 01:26:00

There's an interest in trying to move it up quicker as has been suggested by member Sorenson. Member Horland. Yes. Member Morissette.



Speaker 4 - 01:26:07

Yeah, I would like to see it moved up. I mean a lot of people have travel arrangements for the summer.



Speaker 1 - 01:26:13

Ever heard real quickly. Doesn't have to be 100% boat. No, it doesn't. Of the large cities.



Speaker 7 - 01:26:21

Right.



Speaker 1 - 01:26:21

What I'm saying. So you have two large cities that want it bad. The one person. Hold it up. Sorry, does the vote have to be 100? No, no, it's a popularity vote or it's just a vote so it can be divided and by one, which is what's happened in the past, by certain numbers. So it's just the member cities and all their votes are public. The large cities all write down who they want, which creates, you know, in of itself. It hasn't created a lot of banks to this point. But there have been moments in time where that friction alone caused some to withdraw from the process entirely and some in part. So sometimes we get the governance we deserve.



Speaker 7 - 01:27:06

Right.



Speaker 1 - 01:27:07

So however you all want to handle it, we need to move by this we can get to the government board. So please, I just, I invite.



Speaker 8 - 01:27:19

I just think there's so much going on with commission meetings in the next few weeks that if you could have your alternate physically present on the 17th and you virtually. Is there a downside to that?



Speaker 2 - 01:27:35

I can't, unfortunately, I can't be virtually because I'm on Navy duty and I can't.



Speaker 1 - 01:27:42

He doesn't have to be here present. You don't have to be here to run. I mean, you could express today your desire and your alternate could be there to speak on your behalf.



Speaker 8 - 01:27:50

My concern is simply to make a shift like this in the middle of all of these commission meetings that are coming up. I don't know if you're comfortable with the vote on the 17th with your alternate here. I mean, we want to make sure you're okay.



Speaker 2 - 01:28:09

Yeah. So I guess my feedback would be if it's July, if the will of the body is July 17 as the earliest it can be, then my suggestion would be could we wait till August 21st? I think would be my suggestion if the 17th is earliest. That way I'll just double check I'm.



Speaker 1 - 01:28:34

Not on Navy duty and I. August,.

Speaker 5 - 01:28:35



I don't think I. I will not be here on August 21st. So I just wanted to add that. So if you're willing to wait until August. I'm not sure why we don't just wait until September at that point, you know, because we're. We're running out of. Running out of time. So it's up to you. Member Sorensen,.



Speaker 2 - 01:28:55

Does the alternate need to be here for me to be considered as a candidate?



Speaker 13 - 01:29:03

Yes.



Speaker 1 - 01:29:04

The alternate has to be a vote.



Speaker 2 - 01:29:07

No, no.



Speaker 1 - 01:29:08

If you're not here, you could still be elected.



Speaker 6 - 01:29:11

Right.



Speaker 1 - 01:29:12

But you're having vote. You always want your alternate here so we can have warm.



Speaker 2 - 01:29:17

I just. Great. I just don't know if the alternate will be able to be here at 70. That's the reason I, I just mentioned that because I don't know their schedule.



Speaker 1 - 01:29:25

And in fairness, we don't know.



Speaker 2 - 01:29:29

If.



Speaker 1 - 01:29:30

Coral Springs and Miramar can be right.



Speaker 2 - 01:29:32

Then my adjusted suggestion would because it sounds like we can't go before July 17th. Then I'd say September would be my suggestion number four.



Speaker 6 - 01:29:47

I think that probably for the best. Plus I want to see make sure that each one of those seasons member at that point has voted to be a part of this. That's what I want to see.



Speaker 2 - 01:29:59

Okay. All right.



Speaker 1 - 01:30:01

So we had a motion one more second. I can see. I can see exactly what he means because if he's not here and something comes up, he's not able to sit there and defend himself or to provide more information. I understand 100 where you're at, because if you're not here, you. You have notes, you don't have a. A spot at the table that day.



Speaker 5 - 01:30:22

So I'll amend my motion for the September meeting to hold the election.



Speaker 1 - 01:30:28

Motions withdrawn from July 17, where we had a motion. I think. I think what she meant was, is Fort Lauderdale going to sign the facilities amendment so that you're here in September?



Speaker 11 - 01:30:43

Yes.



Speaker 1 - 01:30:43

Okay, perfect.



Speaker 4 - 01:30:44

I'll be here.



Speaker 1 - 01:30:46

And just for the will of the.



Speaker 2 - 01:30:47

Body, just one of the possible challenges I may have to overcome with my fellow commissioners in the city of Fort Lauderdale is that we may be considered for membership election on the Executive Committee. But that won't happen until September. So I just want to share that's going to be a challenge I'll have to address and I don't know how that will impact people's thinking, but just want to share that. Thank you.



Speaker 1 - 01:31:21

So there are broader issues to membership's point earlier that certainly can be addressed. Remember, we created this ILA four years ago and the fact that we're coming to the finish line and there's all this excitement of large cities to want to be part of this process on an ongoing basis, even though everybody's invited, but want to be. Want to be pushing this forward, want to be seen as pushing this forward, want to be a member. To push this forward is. Is terrific and we should embrace it. And I think there are solutions for our governance as we get by, if we get by this. And I have some proposals for adjusting that and make sure that happens.



Speaker 8 - 01:31:59

I'm sorry, Member Sorensen, when is the last meeting of your commission prior to summer break?



Speaker 2 - 01:32:05

We are voting on the First Amendment, the facilities agreement and possibly the Second Amendment. July 2nd, July 2nd.



Speaker 8 - 01:32:14

So in reality, whether it's July 17th or September 19th or 18th, it's the same.



Speaker 2 - 01:32:22

Correct.



Speaker 8 - 01:32:23

It wouldn't be happening before your last.



Speaker 2 - 01:32:25

Meeting, it would be happening after. Yeah. My ability to persuade or encourage my fellow commissioners is going to. Would best suited if I could say I was considered for the Executive committee prior to July 2nd and they. And a vote was taken. That ability obviously diminishes rapidly after July 2, because we will.



Speaker 1 - 01:32:56

Here's the reality. Right. If the Second Amendment's passed, Fort Lauderdale can vote out and leave for any reason. They don't let the governance structure stopped out. We've given ourselves that year's timeframe to make all the adjustments. And there are other adjustments that probably have to be made to the ILA that needs to be part of it. And if for some reason either the executive committee or the governing board doesn't pay the necessary respect that is perceived as necessary to any city, whether it's Lazy Lake or Fort Lauderdale, and they have the option to leave, and that's our work. So I would hope the retort to it is simply, yeah, we're going to be part of this, and we have. If we don't like it, we'll leave. Agreed.



Speaker 2 - 01:33:44

Chair and also my feedback to Fort Lauderdale City Commission is I am currently not a member of the executive Committee. I have never been a member of the executive Committee. And I feel I have been fully involved, engaged, supported, communicated with, fully allowed to participate as though I'm a member of the executive Committee. That's been my experience, which I appreciate from everyone, because it is a grace you provide for me and everyone else who's not part of the executive Committee. So I appreciate it.



Speaker 1 - 01:34:19

Thank you, member Sorensen, for saying that. From the outset, all the members recognize that we're just neighbors. We had the opportunity to do something that was denied us 40 years ago, and we had the chance to do it together for the first time. Everybody around the table. And I give credit to the executive committee and the governing board members who come, even though they may not be, and again, the kind of poster child for that. And I know that probably doesn't like being on posters much, but is Mayor Bright Cruz, right, who is an alternate, and there is nobody in the public who could even perceive whether he's an alternate based on his engagement in every meeting. Sometimes he doesn't even vote.



Speaker 1 - 01:34:57

But that's been the commitment of this body, and it needs to be the commitment going forward, no matter what, no matter who's on the executive Committee, that every governing board member has the right to show up and. And be heard. So thank you for saying that, Mr. Member Sortson. All right. Any further business or can I adjourn this Executive Committee? Motion to adjourn by member Shoham. Seconded by member Newton. All in favor say aye. All right, we're going to adjust. We have a quorum. All right.



Speaker 4 - 01:35:26

No, we do right now.



Speaker 1 - 01:35:28

All right, don't anybody leave just yet. I'm going to call to order the Solid Waste authority meeting of June 15, 2026. Governing board, if you would please call the roll. Sorry. Yeah, yeah, go ahead and call the roll. Call anybody on the governing board who is sitting in the audience and needs to come to the table. All right.



Speaker 3 - 01:35:56

Chair Ryan. Vice chair for.



Speaker 4 - 01:36:00

Here.

Speaker 3 - 01:36:01



Member Sorensen.



Speaker 2 - 01:36:04

Here.



Speaker 3 - 01:36:05

Member Shoeham.



Speaker 2 - 01:36:06

Here.



Speaker 3 - 01:36:07

Member Colborne. Member Sarah. Online.



Speaker 6 - 01:36:13

Present.



Speaker 4 - 01:36:13

Virtually.



Speaker 8 - 01:36:15

Thank you.



Speaker 3 - 01:36:16

Member Lewis. Member Horland. Here. Member Clout.



Speaker 10 - 01:36:22

Online.



Speaker 7 - 01:36:24

Here.



Speaker 3 - 01:36:27

Member Patterson.



Speaker 2 - 01:36:28

Here.



Speaker 3 - 01:36:31

Patterson. Member Meadow.



Speaker 13 - 01:36:37

Here.



Speaker 3 - 01:36:38

Member Cagiano.



Speaker 7 - 01:36:39

Present.



Speaker 3 - 01:36:41

Member Rydell.



Speaker 1 - 01:36:43

Here.



Speaker 3 - 01:36:44

Member Bordjelin. Member Murphy. Salamone.



Speaker 5 - 01:36:50

Present.



Speaker 3 - 01:36:51

Member Thomas. Present. Member Curran.



Speaker 4 - 01:36:56

Here.



Speaker 3 - 01:36:58

Member AJ Ryan.



Speaker 1 - 01:36:59

Here.



Speaker 3 - 01:37:01

Member Eveyard. Online.



Speaker 8 - 01:37:07

I see her on there.



Speaker 3 - 01:37:10

Member newton.



Speaker 1 - 01:37:11

Here.

Speaker 3 - 01:37:13



Member stafford. Here. Member bright cruise.



Speaker 6 - 01:37:18

Here.



Speaker 3 - 01:37:20

Member strauss. Member morissette.



Speaker 13 - 01:37:26

Here.



Speaker 3 - 01:37:27

Member ravanaci. Member tomlinson. For the yard is here. Thank you. For alternates online, if you could let me know you're here for the record.



Speaker 2 - 01:37:50

All right.



Speaker 1 - 01:37:51

Do we have a quorum? Remember Dunn's here.



Speaker 4 - 01:37:57

You forgot Oakland Park.

 Speaker 1 - 01:37:59

I'm sorry.

 Speaker 8 - 01:38:00

Remember Dunn.

 Speaker 1 - 01:38:01

Also Oakland Park. Forget Barnes. Present.

 Speaker 9 - 01:38:07

Here.

 Speaker 1 - 01:38:09

Still here. Yeah, still. All right. Anyone else we missed? Anybody in attendance who didn't get called?

 Speaker 13 - 01:38:18

Okay.

 Speaker 1 - 01:38:19

If you would, please stand for the pledge.



Speaker 4 - 01:38:27

Pledge allegiance.



Speaker 1 - 01:38:31

To the republic which is pen. One nation under God, indivisible liberty and justice for all. All right, Public comment. Richard Rum. Charit. There you go.



Speaker 13 - 01:38:57

Testing. Good morning, Chair, vice chair and governing board members. The global zero waste movement continues to gain momentum. Earlier this month, the zero waste leaders, policymakers, researchers and advocates from around the world gathered at the International Zero Waste Forum in Turkey. They shared strategies focused on waste prevention, resource conservation, circular economy principles and climate action. Here in South Florida, we have an opportunity to put many of those same principles into practice through the Broward County Solid Waste and Recycling Master Plan. Implementation will require more than infrastructure and programs. It will require regional collaboration, innovation and broad participation among Broward County's municipalities. Across the region, communities are already advancing zero waste initiatives. Miami Dade County's Department of Solid Waste Management continues to support pilot programs that are evaluating innovative diversion strategies, including biochar production from clean yard debris and commercial scale composting of organics.



Speaker 13 - 01:40:21

These projects are generating valuable real world data that can help inform future waste reduction and resource recovery efforts. Likewise, the town of Selfish Ranches has initiated development of zero waste initiatives tailored to its unique rural, equestrian and agricultural character, while supporting the broader goals and framework of Broward County's master plan. That is why Broward Clean Air supports the Second Amendment to the Interlocal Agreement. A strong regional system works best when all communities have a seat at the table and a voice in the decision making process. We also encourage continued engagement with municipalities that have not yet joined the ila, including the City of Pembroke Pines. The long term success of the master plan will depend on bringing together all of the Broward's municipalities to help shape solutions, share best practices and work toward common goals.



Speaker 13 - 01:41:21

By working together, Broward county can build a more resilient, sustainable and cost effective materials management system that benefits residents, businesses and future generations. Thank you for your leadership and your commitment to this important countywide initiative.



Speaker 1 - 01:41:36

Thank you, Richard. Stephanie Pearson,.



Speaker 10 - 01:41:43

Good morning. Stephanie Pearson with the League of Women Voters. First of all, I just want to say that we are in support of the second Amendment that the executive committee just passed. And we certainly hope that the governing board does go ahead and approve just so that we can get this process going and move forward. We all need to be on board. We greatly appreciate the support of Fort Lauderdale's representative, Commissioner Sorensen this morning and hope that he's able to speak with his fellow commissioners. And we also have to be concerned, of course, about the fellow commissioners of some of the other larger cities which have not yet voted to accept this.



Speaker 10 - 01:42:30

Some of the arguments that we've been talking about and you've been talking about, especially related to the larger cities, include, of course, a better bargaining power that we'll have if we all work together harmonizing the recycling procedures and messages so that recycling goes up and contamination goes down. We have residents that move within the county and also that of course, travel to different events throughout the county. And it's important to remember that if everything's the same, we're all much better off.



Speaker 12 - 01:43:06

One of the other things that we.



Speaker 10 - 01:43:08

Really should be reminding some of, all of us should be thinking about is the fact that we have a port, we have an airport, we have libraries, we have parks, we have hospitals. And if we are not all on the same page, it's going to be more confusion, more contamination. So if everyone is on the same page and we have the same messaging and

so forth, the same bins, we're all going to be much better off with a cohesive system. So thank you very much for all your hard work.



Speaker 1 - 01:43:40

Thank you, Stephanie. All right, anyone else who signed up for the governing board? Public comment. All right, I'll close public comment. Do I have a motion to approve the meeting minutes of May 18, 2026? Motion by Member Horlan. Seconded by member Salon. Any discussion on that? All in favor say Aye. Aye. Opposed? Aye. All right. It passes. All right, Item five, potential addition to proposed second amendment to the interlocal agreement. Is there anybody on the governing board who did not sit through the Discussion of the executive committee on this item. All right, so I won't go back through the issues of announcing it, but we would need a motion on what was recommended unanimously from the executive committee to be considered by the governing board and then a discussion on that item. You need a motion to reconsider first.



Speaker 1 - 01:44:29

Motion reconsider brought by member Sorensen. What? Let me just make clear. Was member Sorensen on the Victoria side of that vote? 10, 8 Vote or whatever it was?



Speaker 2 - 01:44:39

No.



Speaker 1 - 01:44:40

Okay, I need a member who was withdrawal.



Speaker 6 - 01:44:42

Make a motion to reconsider.



Speaker 1 - 01:44:46

Member Bright Cruise. Seconded by members. Right now. Cagiano team. All right, all in favor of the motion reconsider, say aye.



Speaker 2 - 01:44:57

Aye.



Speaker 1 - 01:44:58

Any opposed? Aye. All right, now that. Do we have a motion on the item? Mr. Sorensen, you want to make a motion Moved. Motion by member Sorensen. Do I have a second by member Hsu Ham. All right. Discussion on this item. Even though everyone was here, if there's any further discussion on this item as proposed, now's the time to do it.



Speaker 2 - 01:45:18

Thank you again for this consideration and this amendment. I greatly appreciate it. Chair. Thank you.



Speaker 1 - 01:45:25

Any further discussion, call a question by rolled.



Speaker 3 - 01:45:30

Chair Ryan?



Speaker 13 - 01:45:31

Yes.



Speaker 3 - 01:45:33

Vice Chair Furr?



Speaker 4 - 01:45:34

Yes.



Speaker 3 - 01:45:36

Member Sorenson?



Speaker 2 - 01:45:38

Yes.



Speaker 3 - 01:45:39

Member Shuham?



Speaker 8 - 01:45:40

Yes.



Speaker 3 - 01:45:43

Member Sarah. Online?



Speaker 1 - 01:45:45

Yes.



Speaker 3 - 01:45:47

Member Lewis?

 Speaker 6 - 01:45:48

Yes.

 Speaker 3 - 01:45:50

Member Horland?

 Speaker 5 - 01:45:51

Yes.

 Speaker 3 - 01:45:53

Alternate Plout? Online?

 Speaker 2 - 01:45:55

Yes.

 Speaker 3 - 01:45:57

Member Dunn. Member Meade?

 Speaker 2 - 01:46:03

Yes.



Speaker 3 - 01:46:04

Member Cagiano?



Speaker 7 - 01:46:06

Yes.



Speaker 3 - 01:46:07

Member Ridell?



Speaker 9 - 01:46:09

Yes.



Speaker 3 - 01:46:10

Member Ernst?



Speaker 2 - 01:46:11

Yes.



Speaker 3 - 01:46:14

Member Murphy? Salamone? Member Thomas?



Speaker 8 - 01:46:19

Yes.



Speaker 3 - 01:46:21

Member Curran?



Speaker 7 - 01:46:24

Yes.



Speaker 3 - 01:46:25

Member A.J. Ryan?



Speaker 6 - 01:46:27

Yes.



Speaker 3 - 01:46:28

Member Eveyard? Online? Yes. Thank you. Member newton?



Speaker 4 - 01:46:38

Yes.



Speaker 3 - 01:46:40

Member stafford?



Speaker 8 - 01:46:43

Yes.



Speaker 3 - 01:46:44

Member bright cruise?



Speaker 13 - 01:46:45

Yes.



Speaker 3 - 01:46:47

Member morissette?



Speaker 7 - 01:46:49

Yes.



Speaker 3 - 01:46:51

Alternate andriano.



Speaker 8 - 01:47:01

I think that's it.



Speaker 9 - 01:47:02

All right.



Speaker 1 - 01:47:03

Thank you to the government board members for that unanimous approval. All right, Mr. Cole, from here, you'll transmit this to all of the cities today to the city attorneys in request that those that have already passed the facilities amendment to put it on their agendas and to be considered by those who have yet to vote on the facilities amendment to be considered in tandem with the facilities amendment. Is that correct?



Speaker 7 - 01:47:24

Yes.



Speaker 1 - 01:47:24

Mr. Mr. May, we'll do that. I will prepare a form resolution to go along with it. I guess two form resolutions, one for those who've already passed the facilities amendment and one you haven't, because I guess they'll be different.



Speaker 6 - 01:47:35

And there's. And there's three votes being taken on Wednesday. So we have to do this kind.



Speaker 1 - 01:47:41

Of quick, whatever the number of votes will get out today, and so hope.



Speaker 13 - 01:47:47

All right.



Speaker 1 - 01:47:48

Well, along with that, we have item 6. Executive Director's update on the upcoming Votes and workshops.



Speaker 11 - 01:47:55

Yes.



Speaker 1 - 01:47:56

So microphone.



Speaker 11 - 01:47:59

So we have upcoming votes coming up on June 17, Coral Springs. June 23, Wilton Manors. June 29, Lauder Hill. June 30. 30Th. North Lauderdale. July 2, Fort Lauderdale. July 7, Hollywood. July 7. Yes. July 15, Oakland Park. July 27, Davey. And July 30 is Deerfield. It says workshop. Hopefully it's workshop. Slash vote. Slash vote. So far, there's no meeting scheduled for Lauderdale by the Sea, Lighthouse Point, Miramar or Parkland. So please, if you can get those on your agendas. Also, as the chair said, all the cities who've approved the facilities amendment will need to have the Second Amendment on their agendas for approval by August 14th. So that's the ones who've already approved, they don't have.



Speaker 1 - 01:48:49

But we're going to get it out to.



Speaker 11 - 01:48:51

We'll hope that they get it out there then. Yes, that's.



Speaker 9 - 01:48:53

That's the.



Speaker 11 - 01:48:54

That's the goal.



Speaker 1 - 01:48:55

Okay, thank you. Perfect. Any questions to executive director on these upcoming votes?



Speaker 2 - 01:48:59

Sure. Yes.



Speaker 13 - 01:49:01

Just real quick.



Speaker 1 - 01:49:02

Can we publish those out somewhere? Are they somewhere where we can get.



Speaker 7 - 01:49:04

A hold of them?



Speaker 1 - 01:49:05

Because I just like to. You ran them off really great. I'm glad they're out there, but I.



Speaker 2 - 01:49:09

Want to compare those against my calendar.



Speaker 11 - 01:49:10

Those are on the swa, Broward SWA website.



Speaker 2 - 01:49:15

They are out there, yeah. Okay.



Speaker 11 - 01:49:16

Upcoming votes.



Speaker 2 - 01:49:17

All right. Thank you.



Speaker 1 - 01:49:19

Remember.



Speaker 6 - 01:49:20

Yeah, I think we need to. I think that's important because I think it has made it. It has made a difference when a number of us have showed up at commission meetings. And I think this is actually a good time to figure out who can go where. I mean, it's. It's important. It makes a big difference when there's a lot of us there having a chance to talk and we're face to face with our counterparts. So I guess the next meeting is. Is which one is this Wednesday, right.



Speaker 11 - 01:49:53

Wednesday, July 17, with Coral Springs. There were two other ones that were scheduled, but those got pushed out. So those are. July 17th is the only meeting we have on Wednesday.



Speaker 6 - 01:50:02

Okay.



Speaker 11 - 01:50:03

I'm sorry. Coral Springs, July 17, Coral Springs invite.



Speaker 1 - 01:50:08

All the members to go to the website also at least has been sending around, I believe that list to look at that. Look at your schedules and to the extent you can appear again, member Horlins has a record right now for attendance at these and probably will maintain that record all the way through. And of course, Mary Lou, who's not a member of the swa, has been to all of them as well. So thank you to the Broadleague of Cities member Wright Cruz. Anything from.



Speaker 2 - 01:50:34

Okay.



Speaker 1 - 01:50:34

Any further discussion on that? Okay. Colin. Colin Resnick. Yes. Colin Resnick.



Speaker 6 - 01:50:51

Hi.



Speaker 1 - 01:50:52

Alex Patrone with the accounting firm Cone Resnick here today to go over the financial position of the Broadsw. As of the end of May 2026, the authority had cash and cash equivalents of \$2,574,000. Its accounts receivable balances were \$668,000. When subtracting the entity's liabilities from their total assets, the authority's net equity position stood at \$3,115,000. Based on its current financial position, the broad SWA does have sufficient liquidity to meet its budgetary spending needs through the end of the fiscal year, which ends September 2026. All right, any questions on the finance?



Speaker 2 - 01:51:31

Thank you.



Speaker 1 - 01:51:32

Appreciate it. New or old business? Anybody want to introduce any additional items? We have a motion to adjourn. Motion by member Newton. Seconded by member Lewis. All in favor say aye. We're adjourned. Well done. All.



Speaker 6 - 01:52:01

Right.



Speaker 1 - 01:52:02

There's.



Speaker 4 - 01:55:01

Richard. Appreciate it. Thanks for the kind words there. It was great. Yeah. It was okay, right? Yeah, fantastic. Okay. Yeah. Just to let them know that, you know, we're behind it. We're moving. We're moving, you know, fast and furious ahead. I think this is such a. I think this is such a unique situation. Yeah. To have so many varied organization on board. Yes, correct. I mean, that's not easy to do. No, no. It's a monumental situation that we're dealing with. But I think I'm encouraged because I think that we're. We're 75 there.



Speaker 13 - 01:55:42

Right.



Speaker 4 - 01:55:42

We just need a few more over the line. Well, join us. You know, I think I told you how to conversation with that, but. Yeah, the big P is if they don't join, we don't get to the 80%. They. They only get sink. So. So they're. They're the biggest. We get them going even if we lose.



Speaker 6 - 01:56:09

Yeah.



Speaker 4 - 01:56:09

Or I think even a mar. If everybody else joined, we'd still be okay.



Speaker 1 - 01:56:15

But that's okay.



Speaker 4 - 01:56:18

Yeah. Had a pickup this morning.



Speaker 1 - 01:56:22

I hope so.



Speaker 4 - 01:56:27

So what seems to be their concerns? You know, it sounds to me like, number one, that they did not have a seat at the table. So they feel. So it's a little. Slight sour grapes.



Speaker 1 - 01:56:45

Yeah.



Speaker 4 - 01:56:45

And it feels slightly.



Speaker 6 - 01:56:47

Yeah.



Speaker 4 - 01:56:47

And then the second thing is because of that, they don't really understand all the pieces of it. They just want to just, you know, if we don't, like at the end of the day, if we don't like.



Speaker 1 - 01:56:56

It, we should be able to pack.



Speaker 4 - 01:56:58

Up our tents and go home. So. So this gives them an opportunity to get on there. So I think. I think that resolves the major issues that they had.



Speaker 6 - 01:57:13

Right?



Speaker 4 - 01:57:13

And so I'm hopeful that they get on. They get on and I think, feel.



Speaker 1 - 01:57:18

Really good that we'll be in good place.



Speaker 6 - 01:57:21

And I think.



Speaker 4 - 01:57:21

I think Angelo expressed the same thing, too. Basically, Angelo, his. His thing is number. He really spreads two

things that I don't know if we're going to be able to overcome. Number one is that he's afraid that if we.

 Speaker 1 - 01:57:39

If he signs on that five years,.

 Speaker 4 - 01:57:44

10 Years down the line, this group is going to sign up to put an incinerator in our backyard and he'll be stuck paying for an incinerator.

 Speaker 6 - 01:57:56

Right.

 Speaker 1 - 01:57:58

That.

 Speaker 4 - 01:57:58

That's a. That's a possibility. I'm not really concerned about it because the cost of that incinerator, who's going to vote for \$1.5 billion? It's exceeding that.

 Speaker 6 - 01:58:11

No.

 Speaker 13 - 01:58:12

Yeah.



Speaker 4 - 01:58:13

2.3. That's. That's what's estimated. It's a.