

MINUTES

**INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX
OVERSIGHT BOARD**

JANUARY 30, 2020

MEMBERS PRESENT: Shea Smith, Accounting, Director of Audit and Attest Services, Berkowitz Pollack Brant Advisors and Accountants
Phil Allen, Retired, Finance
Douglas Coolman, Retired, Land Use and Urban Planning
Alan Hooper, Engineering/Construction Management, General Contractor and Real Estate Re-developer, Hooper Construction, Inc., and a founding member of Urban Street Development.
George Cavros, Esq. P.A., Environmental Sciences, Florida Energy Policy Attorney, Southern Alliance for Clean Energy
Allyson C. Love, Former City or County Manager, Assistant City Manager, City of Homestead, via telephone
Dr. Consuelo Kelley, Resident Consumer of Public Transportation
Anthea Pennant, District Director of the Broward College Office of Supplier Relations and Diversity
Ronald Frazier, Architecture

**MEMBERS
ABSENT:**

Also Present: Angela Wallace, County Attorney's Office
Gretchen Cassini, Assistant County Administrator
Audrey Thompson, staff
Cindy Malin, Public Information Officer
Laura Rogers, County Auditor's Office
Drew Meyers, Broward County Attorney
John Robertson, CFO, Broward County Metropolitan Planning Organization
Brett Friedman, RSM
Andrew Riddle, Manager of Municipal Surtax Services, Broward County Metropolitan Planning Organization
Kerrie MacNeil, Surtax Project Manager, Broward County Metropolitan Planning Organization
Maribel Feliciano, Assistant Director, Office of Economic Development and Small Business
Lenny Vialpando, Chief Innovation Officer; Broward County EPGMD
Min-Tang Li, Mobility Planning Section, Innovation Team Unit
Josette Severyn, Innovation Team Unit
Ernesto Carreras, Innovation Team Unit

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION
SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD
JANUARY 30, 2020
dh/NC

Nichole Francis, Office of Economic and Small Business Development
Savika Junor, Office of Economic and Small Business Development
Nancy Cavender, The Laws Group

A meeting of the Independent Transportation Surtax Oversight Board, Broward County, Florida, was held at the Broward County Traffic Management Center, 2300 West Commercial Boulevard, Fort Lauderdale, Florida at 9:30 a.m., Thursday, January 30, 2020.

(The following is a near-verbatim transcript of the meeting.)

CALL TO ORDER - CHAIR HOOPER:

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Let's call the meeting to order of the Independent Transportation Surtax Oversight Board, January 30th, 2020.

ROLL CALL - AUDREY THOMPSON:

MR. HOOPER: Can we do a roll call, please.

MS. THOMPSON: Good morning, Oversight Board members. I will begin the roll call with Ms. Allyson Love.

MS. LOVE: Present.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant.

MS. PENNANT: Here. Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen.

MR. ALLEN: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman.

MR. COOLMAN: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Alan Hooper.

MR. HOOPER: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley.

DR. KELLEY: Here.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION
SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JANUARY 30, 2020

dh/NC

MS. THOMPSON: Ronald Frazier.

MR. FRAZIER: Here.

MR. SMITH: Shea Smith. George Cavros.

MR. CAVROS: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Chair, we have a quorum.

MR. HOOPER: Very good. Thank you. Before we start our meeting, I do want to welcome a new member, Mr. Ron Frazier. If you'd like to maybe say a little bit about yourself or introduce yourself to the group, we would -- it'd be great.

MR. FRAZIER: Well, I'll just use the minimum amount of words. I'm a retired architect/urban planner. I was in business for about 45 years here in south Florida. I've been involved in a lot of different community activities as well. Been on several oversight boards with Jackson Hospital, School Board -- Miami-Dade County School Board Oversight Board. So I do a lot of community service. And I've been retired for about seven years.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Lucky you.

MR. HOOPER: Well, we welcome you and thank you for participating.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

MR. HOOPER: So let's go to the action items. First item is approval of the minutes. Oh, I'm sorry. Do I have the -- oh, public participation. I'm sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: Oh, Shea Smith has just entered the room. Welcome --

MR. SMITH: Good morning, everyone.

MR. HOOPER: -- Shea. So at this time, we -- we typically allow anybody from the public to stand up and speak to the board. Is there anybody in the public that would like to say something? Okay. All right. We'll move on to the next item, which are the action items.

ACTION ITEMS:

1 - APPROVAL OF MINUTES, MEETING OF OCTOBER 24, 2019 AND DECEMBER 19, 2019

MR. HOOPER: Approval of the minutes from the meeting of October 24th, and also of the meeting of December 19, 2019.

MR. COOLMAN: I **move** both minutes.

MR. HOOPER: You've got to -- you've got to push the button. Does it work?

MR. COOLMAN: I **move** both minutes.

MS. PENNANT: Second.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. All those in favor, say aye. Those opposed? Okay. Minutes are approved.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

DISCUSSION ITEM:

1 - TRANSPORTATION SURTAX ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS

MR. HOOPER: Let's move next to the discussion items. Our first item is the one that we had discussed in a special meeting. It's the transportation surtax ordinance amendments. It's your Exhibit 1. Who should we -- you want to take it?

MS. WALLACE: Yes --

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

MS. WALLACE: -- thank you. Good morning. Okay. In your -- the Exhibit 1 to your materials is the memo -- excuse me -- to the Oversight Board dated January 17th that outlines the communications between the County Administrator and the County Attorney when they met with the Chair in addressing the -- to address the concerns raised by the Oversight Board, or the request by the Oversight Board in the correspondence that came from the Chair.

And the memo outlines the changes or the -- the provisions that remain the same, and how the ordinance was revised to accommodate the request of the Oversight Board. And I don't know if you wanted me to go through each of them. We can do that. Or if there are any questions, you can let me know.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, so -- excuse me -- so I did meet with the County Administrator and the County Attorney to discuss where we were upon our meeting in December, and then also a few grammatical changes that they wanted to make to our proposed changes.

So I think maybe let's focus on those first. If you can just go to the ordinance changes as they are proposed for the Oversight Board --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: -- and then we can let them decide --

MS. WALLACE: Certainly.

MR. HOOPER: -- let the rest of the members decide.

MS. WALLACE: So the first request from the Oversight Board is covered on page 5 of the document, paragraph G. And the Oversight Board requested that there be no changes from the existing ordinance in that provision. And so the document does not reflect that there are any changes. So there's no strikethroughs. There are no underlines, and that provision, G, Staffing, will remain as currently written in the existing ordinance.

Okay. And then on page 13, paragraph I-1, it's the paragraph that addresses the Oversight Board's review of eligibility and the -- rather than saying based upon the advice of counsel, the Oversight Board requested that the ordinance reflect that the Oversight Board would give consideration to advice of the counsel regarding determinations of interpreting the statute. And that request was incorporated in the ordinance.

Then on page 14, the other Oversight Board request reflects that the Oversight Board will be able to make recommendations regarding best practices and other methods that may be employed to improve proposed projects and proposed expenditures when they're making their recommendations regarding eligibility.

And the last request from the Oversight Board is in paragraph K, which starts on page 15, the bottom of page 15, and ends on the top of page 16, with regard to audits. And the Oversight Board will be able to select accountants and other qualified individuals to conduct financial and programmatic audits. The process would -- the -- the County would engage or contract with the -- with the selected vendor, and the selection process would follow the required state and County procurement processes, with the County Auditor acting as the Contract Administrator, assisting with the developing -- development of the scope of the engagement, and administering the contract in terms of deliverables and processing invoices and the like to the performance and financial audits that are requested by the Oversight Board.

Those are the four requests made by the Oversight Board, and they've been incorporated into the draft ordinance which will -- which will be scheduled to be considered by the County Commission on February 11th.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Allen.

MR. ALLEN: First off, I'd just like to say that the Chair, I think, has communicated well on behalf of the board to arrive at these changes that we had discussed over a period, not just the January special meeting, but --

CHAIR HOOPER: Right.

MR. ALLEN: -- two months in advance of that, in fact. So thank you, Mr. Chair, for representing our interest in front of the County Administrator and the County Attorney. And I would also note that, overall, I think those changes met our concerns that we had expressed.

I have a mechanical issue, though. How will -- if this board says yea to these proposed changes, how would that be presented to the Board? Because there's a -- you know, I was looking at the County Commission's agenda, and there's a trail of amendments, you know, a mile long to the original submission. How would that be handled on the agenda for next Tuesday's Public Hearing.

MR. MEYERS: Mr. -- Mr. Chair?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: Yes, sir.

MS. WALLACE: That's -- Andrew Meyers, the County Attorney, is present.

MR. MEYERS: I can perhaps speak loudly enough that --

MS. WALLACE: Yeah.

(Laughter.)

MS. WALLACE: They -- they record it.

MR. MEYERS: Oh, record it? Okay.

MS. WALLACE: Yes.

MR. MEYERS: And I, too, want to thank the Chair for taking time to sit down with us and work these items out. These amendments are expected to be sponsored by

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION
SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JANUARY 30, 2020

dh/NC

Commissioner Furr, and it is the hope that certainly the County Attorney has one -- I have one proposed amendment that's incorporated into this document. Mayor Holness has one proposed amendment that's incorporated into the document. Commissioner Sharief has one that we're going to be discussing with her. But this is going to be presented as a freestanding document that would substitute for what is currently Exhibit 1 on the agenda. So this is what we hope would be considered by the Board, none of the other amendments.

MR. ALLEN: Okay. And the other technical issue, and I think this is probably more for Angela --

MR. MEYERS: Thank you.

MR. ALLEN: -- the one section talking about annual report and differentiation between the annual report -- annual financial report, perhaps, and an annual report of accomplishments.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. ALLEN: And perhaps we can hold that discussion until we get about -- talk to the auditors relative to the status of the annual financial audit.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. ALLEN: But the mechanical process of you note that the proposed amendment provides that the Oversight Board shall select --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. ALLEN: -- but the -- but it's also made subject to the Procurement Code.

MS. WALLACE: Yes.

MR. ALLEN: And when and if we reached that point of needing to select an auditor or a performance auditor or whatever, there has to be some interface between what the Procurement Code provides for and how we, the board, selects. Because, as I understand the current Procurement Code, there is the capability of appointing a selection committee, which could incorporate members of this board onto that selection committee, but that doesn't really deal with the board itself --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. ALLEN: -- unless we all sit on that selection committee --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. ALLEN: -- and I don't know if that's feasible or not --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. ALLEN: -- to make that decision, or if it's just a ranking that will be done by the members of the selection committee.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh. So the selection committee, in the normal County procurement process, is made up of County staff, but can also, in instances where it involves another, say, local government entities like a municipality, then the representatives from that other entity can sit on that -- can be selected to sit on the selection committee. This body can delegate authority to one or two members to sit on the selection committee on its behalf to represent the body on the selection committee, because those meetings are sunshined, as well, for purposes of, for instance, retaining an accountant.

If the two financial members of the selection -- of the Oversight Board, would like to participate in that selection process, or there are three, this body can delegate authority to those members to sit on the selection committee and participate in that selection process, reviewing the proposals and doing the reviewing and ranking of the proposers through that -- the County's procurement process.

MR. ALLEN: And that doesn't require any change in the Procurement Code, or that just would be handled at the time that the committee is appointed by the County Administrator?

MS. WALLACE: Correct.

MR. ALLEN: That's all I have.

MR. HOOPER: Ms. Pennant.

MS. PENNANT: Thanks, Chair. I just wanted some clarification, and just for public record's sake, if you could just speak to the Office of the County Auditor shall -- shall assist in the over- -- in the selection of the independent public accountant. Can you kind of speak to exactly how the County Auditor will function in that aspect of selection? Because we would have selected the -- or at least participate through the procurement process. How is the County Auditor assisting?

MS. WALLACE: Contract Administrator or Project Manager, it's another term that's used, helps prepare the scope of services, makes sure that the documents that are needed by the County's purchasing division are completed, requisition forms, reviews the County's solicitation document and ensures that it complies with all of the requirements, includes all of the requirements that the -- this body would like in terms of a scope of services, would -- would draft and present a scope of services to the Oversight Board for its input regarding the task to be performed, the particular project to

be audited, the scope of the audit, and those parameters for the scope of services that would go along with the solicitation when the solicitation gets advertised. They participate in the selection committee meetings. They assist with evaluating the proposals.

The Contract Administrator or Project Manager prepares a matrix of the proposals that are submitted that summarizes what the proposals consist of. They sit through the selection committee meeting and prepare whatever documents that need to be prepared or transmittals between, say, the Oversight Board and Procurement.

And then they administer the -- once the vendor is selected and the contract is approved by either the Purchasing Director or the Board of County Commissioners, depending on whose authority that contract would be within, that person would be the communicate -- would communicate with the selected vendor for purposes of its performance under that contract.

MS. PENNANT: Okay. For the record, I want to make sure that part of the consideration is that 30 percent that -- you know, we have small businesses that are professional -- provide professional services, as well. So oftentimes, that is excluded.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MS. PENNANT: And so I'm open to be -- sitting on the board that -- or committee, but I also want to make sure, even if I'm not on the board, that that is included in the record that that should be a part of it.

MS. WALLACE: That's part of the solicitation process, and, yes, that would be --

MS. PENNANT: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: -- included.

MS. PENNANT: Thank you.

MS. WALLACE: You're welcome.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Chair?

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: I had a similar question a little bit further down the timeline. So when we -- when we speak about the County Administrator, so now we're talking about the County Auditor or internal -- internal audit department or County Auditor shall work to ensure the audit and review objectives established by the Oversight Board are achieved while ensuring accountability of the contractor.

So after someone were retained, can you talk a little bit more about that role? And my concern is just that we would be in a position of kind of driving that and having them report to us, and we're kind of driving what's going on there.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MS. CASSINI: So one -- of the things that you all are currently doing is you're having me be a Contract Administrator for the contract that you approved for prioritization services from the MPO. And then I bring reports or bring the surtax-funded MPO staff here on a regular basis to give you all updates, just like what's happening today. Same with Lenny Vialpando being the contract administrator for the M.I.T. contract that you approved, and providing you with regular updates about how that engagement is going. The County Auditor, or, in this case, probably Ms. Rogers, would be coming here on a regular basis and bringing you updates about the engagement, and also bringing the auditor or consultant that you have selected before you to give regular updates so that you can offer direction and hear from them.

MR. SMITH: Okay. I just wanted to make sure that that's kind of not in lieu of a direct line of communication between the auditor and the board. That's my concern there of how that would really work and kind of what that filtering process -- and maybe it's not filtering, just bringing the information directly, but just to -- you know, that's kind of my concern there.

MS. WALLACE: Right. No, it would not be in lieu of the -- the contracted auditor's communication with this body, but there are administrative tasks that have to be completed with the contract -- within the contract.

So it's monitoring the deliverables and reviewing and paying -- making sure that invoices are paid. And then they would -- and reporting to this body and bringing, similar to the way that we brought RSM, the independent auditor that conducts the single audit for the County has come to discuss the audit process for the single audit with this body, if -- the selected vendor to conduct either a programmatic or financial audit of a surtax-funded project would come and report to this body, as well. So the County Auditor's Office would not substitute for the contracted auditor for purposes of fulfilling requests of this body in terms of reports.

MS. CASSINI: And we can include, obviously, in the actual contract itself, in the scope of services and the deliverables, that there is an expectation that whomever is selected is coming before this body on a regular basis so that you all can have --

MR. SMITH: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: -- a direct line of communication.

MR. SMITH: Okay. And then more -- one more question, if I may.

MR. ALLEN: Could I just follow up on that?

MR. SMITH: Go ahead, please.

MR. ALLEN: Shea, under your generally accepted principles and applying those, does the -- who is the contracting entity, you know, that the -- that is relying upon the performance of the auditor that -- and the reporting relationship between the auditor -- the external auditor or consultant that we have selected? How does that interface with - - since the Board of County Commissioners is the retention --

MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

MR. ALLEN: -- they are the contract -- contractor, how does that fit within the rules of accounting, relative to your ethics and performance --

MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

MR. ALLEN: -- requirements?

MR. SMITH: Yeah, it's somewhat -- it's somewhat interesting. I mean, it's really -- it's more the audit standards than the accounting standards. And it really does bring up a question in terms of the arrangement that we have. I mean, even getting outside of auditing standards, I think that typically what would happen is that's somewhat of a closed relationship. I mean, they use a term those charged with governance, and we need to enter the conversation, and we are a group charged with governance, and we just need to make sure that we're up front about that and that we want a direct line of communication.

What I don't want to have happen is that certain issues maybe get worked out and discussed and we don't get just the raw data of something that's going on, and there's just a direct line of communication to us. And that's my concern, and that's why I think all of these relationships, we need to have a stake in them right from the beginning, direct lines of communication, know when we're going to hear back from anybody that's engaged at regular intervals.

So I would be comfortable with that approach, just having a timeline --

MR. ALLEN: That would need to be --

MR. SMITH: -- so that --

MR. ALLEN: -- incorporated in the contract between the County and the selected vendor.

MR. SMITH: Yeah, or at least some sort of understanding that's out in the open as to what would trigger communication also.

So even if you have a timeline and something comes up that's critical, you hear from your auditor; right? They don't wait. If something ratchets up and it's important, you're going to hear from them.

So I think in certain instances we would want to hear.

MR. HOOPER: Can I make a point? Just looking at the way it's drafted, the Oversight Board shall select.

So our board shall select --

MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: -- correct? Okay. And it talks about it gets retained by the County to perform all these necessary reviews, but it also says that the review reports shall be submitted to the Oversight Board by the Broward County Administrator by no later than 180 days after the end of each fiscal year. So we should be getting these audits for us to review. I think it speaks to that, and it speaks to the fact that we're the ones that are supposed to select the consultant.

MR. SMITH: Yeah, correct.

MS. PENNANT: Mr. Chair?

MR. SMITH: And I'm trying not to be in the weeds with this stuff this time.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MR. SMITH: I was really focusing on the last sentence. It says the Contract Administrator, which has now been defined as the County Auditor, shall work to ensure the audit review objectives established by the Oversight Board are achieved while ensuring accountability of the contractor, which, I'm sure, is a valuable role that we want, because we're not going to be --

MR. HOOPER: That's right.

MR. SMITH: -- in the details every day. I just wanted to make sure that whatever is going on in those communications are all brought back to us, especially if any contentious issues come up or whatever the case may be, because we have a stake in

our, let's say, fund that's, you know, outside of the normal County audit, and we want to know anything that may come up. We don't really want that to get resolved and not be brought to us. That -- so I was kind of focusing on that.

MR. HOOPER: So how do we --

MS. PENNANT: Mr. Chair -- oh, I'm sorry.

MR. HOOPER: -- oh, I'm sorry.

MS. PENNANT: Go ahead. You (inaudible).

MR. HOOPER: How do we clearly achieve that?

MS. CASSINI: In the contracts.

MS. WALLACE: Yeah, it -- it becomes an element of the contract. So it gets defined in the scope. The reporting requirements and the like all get included, incorporated in the scope of services for the contract when the auditor is engaged.

MS. PENNANT: And that's what I wanted to speak to, that I think that we need to be involved in the early stages of even the drafting of the RFP --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MS. PENNANT: -- so we can have a say as to what the expectations are.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh. And it provides for that.

MR. HOOPER: As determined -- as determined necessary by the Oversight Board.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: So we're going to set the course of what they're going to do.

MR. COOLMAN: Alan --

MR. SMITH: Mr. Chair, I had -- oh, go ahead.

MR. COOLMAN: No, go ahead. Finish.

MR. SMITH: Well, I was going to -- I was going to ask something a little bit separate on page 15, on Item 3J. Is this -- the project oversight paragraph. Is this really driving what we were discussing before and when we're using the term performance auditing? Is this kind of the language that puts that in play?

MS. WALLACE: The performance audits are covered under paragraph K, Audits, which is line -- starts at line 18 on 15. Project oversight is the reports that the surtax team will bring to you and the respective County agencies or city departments once the city -- the municipal contracts are completed.

So it's oversight of the projects, whether they're meeting their schedule, whether they're on time, what those consist of, you know, whether there are any issues.

So we brought, for instance, the Transportation Department to talk about the additional vehicles that they've purchased and the additional service that has been deployed, the additional operators that have been hired with surtax funds, based on your previous approvals and how service has increase.

So that's what we mean by project oversight.

MR. SMITH: No, I understand. But -- so did we not at some point have the word -- or the words performance audit in here somewhere?

MS. WALLACE: Right. So --

MS. CASSINI: It's in the next section. Go ahead.

MS. WALLACE: -- that was -- that was a proposed change to the original -- the existing ordinance. And rather than separate out performance and financial audit into separate paragraphs, the previous iteration included a separate section related to the single audit, that external single audit. And so rather than separate the single audit, the provision is going -- the existing --

MR. SMITH: Yeah, but --

MS. WALLACE: -- ordinance --

MR. SMITH: -- single audit is not a performance audit. Single audit is --

MS. WALLACE: Right.

MR. SMITH: -- the -- what gets done when you have a certain amount of federal funds because there's a federal requirement to come and do specific prescribed procedures. So I think that's a different thing.

MR. MEYERS: Yes, sir. This board has discretion, and I think that would extend to the performance auditing. I think J and K are interrelated. And I think the key language here is very important language. It says the Oversight Board shall select, as had been mentioned, basically the professional, who shall be retained by the County, because the County legally has to retain the entity --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. MEYERS: -- or person, to perform and complete audits and reviews, as determined necessary by the Oversight Board, of projects funded and proceeds. So I think there's very broad discretion --

MR. SMITH: Okay.

MR. MEYERS: -- and I think this board, the majority of the board, will make a decision as to what it believes is necessary --

MR. SMITH: Okay.

MR. MEYERS: -- and that will drive the contract scope and the audits.

MS. PENNANT: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: Ms. Pennant.

MS. PENNANT: I think I understand where Shea may be going with this, because the overtone in this language speaks to an accountant. And we're looking for performance in terms of the other variables that we need to be measuring.

MR. MEYERS: And, Ms. Pennant, it says independent certified accountant or other qualified individuals --

MS. PENNANT: Okay.

MR. MEYERS: -- who will adhere to all applicable standards. So --

MS. PENNANT: You got me.

MR. MEYERS: -- it's intended to --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

(Laughter.)

MR. MEYERS: -- intended to be very, very broad, to --

MS. PENNANT: Okay.

MR. MEYERS: -- give this board discretion. And can I tell you something? As you all have learned very clearly by this exercise, none of this is carved in stone, and if there are problems with it, we'll get them resolved. So this board has a very --

MS. PENNANT: Yeah.

MR. MEYERS: -- important role to play, and it's reflected in here. If there are any scrivener's issues or anything that six months or one year down the road doesn't seem to be workable for whatever reason, we're very easy to reach. We'll work with you in good faith and we'll get --

MR. SMITH: Okay.

MR. MEYERS: -- everything resolved.

MR. SMITH: And I think what took me down the path was it's titled annual audits. So then just being a CPA in the audit field, when I see annual audits and then I see the terms audits and reviews, you're typically just thinking of, you know, financial audits. And those are two different levels of attestation, so that's kind of where my head went.

And I just wanted to make sure, because some of the things that we've been talking about is really how innovative can be -- can we be with this, what are the benchmarks globally that we can be looking at, you know, what are we really trying to achieve. I mean, even aside from are we doing what the ordinance says, which is the basic level of the performance audit, is -- are the funds being used efficiently, but I think we can be very innovative with how we look at this. And I just want to make sure that we have some discretion.

MR. MEYERS: Yes, sir.

MS. PENNANT: And if I might, to your point, Shea, the reality is the -- the guidance that we're getting professionally in this section is from the County Auditor. So who will be --

MS. WALLACE: No.

MS. PENNANT: -- not necessarily? No?

MS. WALLACE: (Indicates negative response.)

MS. PENNANT: So we want to make sure that the -- there is some guidance on the performance component, because if he is strictly financial, and even though you say, other qualified, we need to make sure that there is -- even on the RFP that we have the right guidance in terms of the performance piece.

MS. CASSINI: Let me respond to that. Actually, the performance piece is handled primarily by us, your professional staff. And the County Auditor does mostly performance audits. We have financial audits done by RSM right now. That's who's going to be coming and talking to you, because they're working on the single audit, which is the financial piece.

But there is the opportunity for you to utilize the County Auditor's Office, and, of course, Ms. Rogers is here at the table with you. She's, you know, funded by the surtax and focused on surtax projects. And she's focused on their performance. And if you felt that you needed an additional look at a particular project's performance or overall program performance, Subsection K gives you the ability to seek that out and -- through a competitive solicitation process.

MS. PENNANT: Thank you. Thanks.

MS. LOVE: As this was being discussed right now, the title, as Shea mentioned, talks annual. Maybe that could just say, audits, and then it takes out that annual connotation. But then the other part, if I can get clarity, is if we go to page 16, line 1 through 3, it talks about shall be submitted to the board, to the County Administrator by no later than 180 days after the end of fiscal -- of the fiscal year.

That timeline, I think, is talking about the financial audit. It should be that it's broad enough that whenever an audit is done, it's being brought forward. And this does not provide that open timeframe. So I think this is kind of putting the financial piece verbiage opposed to the flexibility of both financial and performance -- and our performance --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MS. LOVE: -- audits, and it's at the discretion, recognizing the role of the entities, the County and the County Auditor's office, but it should be that we have the latitude. It's about what happens with this board and our interaction. And I think this provides some limitations.

MS. CASSINI: So also in Subsection J, on project oversight, it also reflects the word annual. So perhaps the -- what -- if what I'm hearing is there's some consensus around removing the word, annual, in Subsection J so it just says that the Oversight Board shall issue reports on the performance of ongoing projects and shall provide recommendations. Would that address your concerns? Because then, in the project oversight, which is the performance component of this -- again, it's Subjection J, page 15, starting on line 12 -- if you look at line 15, it talks about the Oversight Board shall issue annual reports on the performance. So if the issue is that you'd like to be able to submit reports at any time, then we would just strike the word, annual.

MR. MEYERS: Ms. Love, I believe these are, in some measures, reports you'll be receiving. I think, consistent with what Mr. Smith said and you've said, I agree the word, annual, should be stricken from the title. And perhaps what we should do is sort of bifurcate the timing so that annual reports are to be received within 180 days, but other reports should basically be --

MR. HOOPER: That's great.

MR. MEYERS: -- promptly -- promptly received.

MR. HOOPER: That's great.

MR. MEYERS: Okay? And I can conform that language.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

MR. MEYERS: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Yes, Mr. Coolman.

MR. COOLMAN: I wanted to echo Phil's thank you to you, but I also want to thank our staff for working with you, because you're not an easy guy to work with.

(Laughter.)

MR. COOLMAN: I also feel with Shea Smith here, as this comes up, we're going to be able to get through it, even if we need these audits. I mean, the truth is this is just a safeguard if we decide we need to do it.

So I'd like to thank everyone for the effort put forward. I'd like to thank staff for putting it off for the County Commission to look at it, what is it, next -- the 28th is it?

MS. CASSINI: The 11th.

MR. COOLMAN: The 11th.

MS. CASSINI: The 11th of February.

MR. COOLMAN: And I think -- I think the -- I hope the cities that were here and expressing concerns are happy. I didn't -- don't see them here today, but I think they probably are. So thank you all.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MR. FRAZIER: Mr. Chairman, I have a --

MR. HOOPER: Yes, sir.

MR. FRAZIER: -- general question. This is my first meeting. You may have already discussed this. It deals with regarding procurement of services and projects that would be required for this bond. Does the Oversight Board responsibility is only to recommend and advise, or do we have any authority to approve any of these selections?

MS. CASSINI: You actually on the pre- -- before a project is -- do you want to come back over? Before a project is taken to the Board of County Commissioners for funding, this board entertains each proposed project and proposed expenditure and determines whether or not it's eligible under Florida Statutes which authorize the Charter County transportation surtax.

MR. FRAZIER: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: But you also approve the project and approve the expenditure in a letter that goes to the Board of County Commissioners. You don't select projects, but you do approve them as eligible under the statute --

MR. FRAZIER: It's --

MS. CASSINI: -- to move them forward.

MR. FRAZIER: -- it's a two-part question. Those entities that will be performing the services for these projects, because you say you have a 30 percent CSB goal, it relates to the Broward County procurement process.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. FRAZIER: So my question is do we have a role in the selection of those providers or --

MS. WALLACE: No.

MS. CASSINI: No.

MR. FRAZIER: -- do we have a recommended role?

MS. CASSINI: No.

MR. FRAZIER: Do we sit on any of the selection committees for that?

MS. WALLACE: Not for any of the projects. Only -- only for selecting --

MR. FRAZIER: The auditor?

MS. WALLACE: -- auditors or reviewers, professionals to -- for purposes of a programmatic review for services directly to the Oversight Board. So the projects funded by surtax proceeds for municipalities or for the County, itself, no, this body does not sit on selection committees for contractors -- to select contractors to perform the other surtax services that are just general, say, construction projects for roads or -- no.

MR. FRAZIER: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: However, if the project were to come to you for approval and you all had recommendations for how to improve the project, or perhaps a project comes to you that doesn't contain a goal that you feel it should have a goal, you do have the ability, when we transmit your action to the Board of County Commissioners, to include those recommendations for project improvement or performance improvement with that transmission.

MR. FRAZIER: Okay. The second question is usually when I have big projects like this --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. FRAZIER: -- usually there -- there are two ways that municipalities handle it. They either hire an outside consultant and manage the whole process --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. FRAZIER: -- or the look within their internal staff and sort of pull people from different places and put a team together. Which way is this going to be done?

MS. WALLACE: So that will be determined on a project by project basis. So the --

MR. FRAZIER: I'm talking about the whole -- the whole program.

MS. CASSINI: The way that we are currently functioning is that we're using a collaborative process. We're using internal teams, kind of --

MR. FRAZIER: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: -- cross-functional teams. And then when we get into delivery, large scale project delivery, we intend to go out and utilize a -- you know, a competitive solicitation process --

MR. FRAZIER: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: -- to bundle projects together so that we'll be delivering, you know, hundreds of projects at once using an outside firm and many subs.

MR. FRAZIER: Okay. The bottom -- and this is the last part. I'm looking at accountability.

MS. CASSINI: Uh-huh.

MR. FRAZIER: When you have one prime source, you have one source of responsibility. When you have an association of staff people, the issue becomes who is liable, who's responsible in terms of liability. That was the purpose of that question. Okay. Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you, Mr. Frazier. So within this item on the agenda, I want to echo what Mr. Coolman said. I'm very difficult to deal with.

(Laughter.)

MR. HOOPER: However, I do want to thank our staff. And the County Administrator and the County Attorney met with me and they were -- it was a very amicable meeting. We worked together to figure out what was the best way to get this Oversight Board's objectives to move forward in a way that could be managed by both parties. And I think that, with the help of the County Attorney and the County Administrator, as well as the County Auditor, we were able to get there. And I thank them for the hard work they did, as well as staff. And I'm -- I think we're all pretty happy with the results.

So, with that, I will call -- if somebody could make the motion --

MR. ALLEN: I have a **motion** to accept the recommendations subject to the revisions that the County Attorney has mentioned to be incorporated, and authorize the Chair to send a letter to the County Commissioners encouraging them to adopt the amendments as proposed today.

MR. HOOPER: Do we have a second?

MS. PENNANT: Second.

MR. SMITH: Second. It's a tie. You can -- you can have it.

MR. HOOPER: Ms. Pennant is our second. So I'll just -- all those in favor? Those opposed? Okay. The motion passes. And, again, thank you to everybody that participated, including the board.

MR. MEYERS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MS. PENNANT: Thank you.

MR. MEYERS: Thank you, everyone.

MS. PENNANT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

2 - INAUGURAL ANNUAL REPORT CONTENT

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So the next item is the inaugural annual report content.

MS. CASSINI: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Okay, members, we're going to just spend some time going through our proposed content for the first transportation surtax report and make sure that you all don't see anything that's missing, and also just give the public an opportunity to see what it is that we are planning to include.

So the plan is to release the report in March after receipt of the financial audit, the single audit. And the proposed content includes information about the County Commissioners, information tying the surtax back to the Commission's strategic plan values and goals that relate to the transportation initiative, give a brief summary about the penny for transportation.

We want to make sure that there is some historical background that lays the foundation for how we got here, since this will be our first report. Then there will also be information about the Appointing Authority. When it comes to the section related to the Oversight Board, each meeting that you all have had, there is a summary, a detailed summary, especially if you were entertaining any proposed projects or expenditures. There's detailed information about how much was brought before you, how much was approved in each category.

The financial overview will include information about the 30-year plan, the financial plan, that it was audited by the state, the amounts that are set aside for municipal projects, the number of total projects, a little bit about processes. It will also break down the overall 30-year program into various categories so that you all can see how much is going for operations, how much is going for capital, and things like that.

Then we'll go to the surtax goals and objectives. We'll include the amended and revised Transportation Surtax Ordinance that you all just acted on. We're also going to include - while it's not listed here, we're going to include the language straight from Florida Statute 212.055 so it's clear what our authorization legislation is.

And then we're going to get into the accomplishments thus far. So in the Public Works, Transit, Economic and Small Business Development -- that's where we have that 30 percent CBE goal. There'll be information about what has been accomplished to date.

We'll have all of the information about our innovations team, the municipal community shuttle, surtax-funded MPO staff accomplishments, all of our transparency and accountability efforts -- that's what we've been doing out in the community, the hundreds of different presentations, workshops, and events throughout the implementation timeframe.

And then we'll go into some of the 2020 approvals that you all have made in each of the

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION
SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JANUARY 30, 2020

dh/NC

various categories. Again, talking about some -- giving some teasers, what can you expect in the upcoming year, what will you be seeing in next year's annual plan in each of the various categories. And we're going to make sure that it's very visually rich.

So the first -- the very first version will be print. And while it will be -- I still think it'll be visually stimulating, because we're going to use a lot of pictures, not a lot of words, eventually, it will become an electronic. It will be an e-report. It will be animated. It will have links so that folks who are reading the report can easily go back to the budget book. They can actually link back to a particular Oversight Board meeting if they want to take a look at it.

And I'm just hoping that it's something that you all can be very proud of, because this is your annual report. This is the report, you know, that we are creating on your behalf to present to the public in furtherance of your transparency and accountability responsibilities. So if there's any information that you would like to include, please let me know.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. PENNANT: Oh.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. PENNANT: Go ahead. Well --

MR. HOOPER: Ms. Pennant.

MS. PENNANT: -- you know, I just want to say that I would like to see included in this content something that speaks to the economic impact that the penny tax is having. And I don't think we can dismiss that at all.

CHAIR HOOPER: That's a good point.

MS. PENNANT: And so, again, it's about making sure that we're guarding that 30 percent goal. And I also would like to see something that speaks to the kinds of trades that we're looking at for some of these projects. I'd like to see where -- even among the cities, where we've carved opportunities for that 30 percent. Because I can tell you, a city putting forth a request for funds, I'm going to be looking very closely at that 30 percent to see whether or not they're participating in meeting that goal.

I also think it is important to look at the job opportunities that will come from this kind of expenditure so we can be forward-thinking in how we prepare the community for those jobs. You know, yes, unemployment is very low in Broward County, 2.8 percent, but there are communities in Broward County where the unemployment is still extremely high. And so we need to get people trained so they can tap into those opportunities.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION
SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JANUARY 30, 2020

dh/NC

We're creating all these jobs, and I want to make sure that we are targeting those communities to be able to access those job opportunities. And I want to make sure that the small businesses in our community have a place at the table, across sectors, across the -- all the municipalities.

So, just for the record, I will not be -- you know, any city that's not playing in that realm won't get my vote on projects.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Allen.

MR. ALLEN: Potential issue that comes up in defining an annual report on the performance of the overall program versus the annual financial report, which is a set of fund statements, I think you have a problem under attestation issues as to the incorporation of a fund-based financial statement which incorporates the financial information, the management letter and -- and all of that, as well as performance data or program performance issues that are incorporated in this annual report.

I think the auditors -- if you are going to attach and incorporate that financial report into this annual report, I think you have a problem, because the auditors will not -- will have to have some level of review to ascertain that the information that you represent in here is within the realm of the financial report that is -- so you may want -- we may need to separate those two issues, or those two reports, and maybe refer back to the audited financial statements here, and maybe list some of the numbers into this. But this would not be audited, but the financial statements, of course, have to be audited and opined upon.

MR. SMITH: Yeah, no, I concur with that. One quick question or comment. So you had mentioned that this will potentially be used and consumed by the public, and I'd like to use it in that way.

My concern is, you know, if you think about when we still shopped for books, and you grab a thick book and you flip to the back and say, hey, what is this thing really about, so, you know, what -- can we put something together that will grab someone's attention with the things that we've done or have planned that are innovative?

And how does this tie into kind of the public awareness piece of what is going on here? Because I find there's a lot of people that kind of were a little bit aware of this, that this is even happening. And, I mean, aside from the small group that come here, or maybe they're involved with cities, a lot of people aren't really aware of what is kind of going on. And I think that that public awareness and support is something that's going to be critical --

MS. CASSINI: Uh-huh.

MR. SMITH: -- as we move forward and how this is positioned in the communities to let

people know we're trying to make Broward truly better and that we want their participation in all of this. And us, as volunteers, I think we're uniquely positioned to kind of communicate that message.

So if this is a mechanism that we can use for that, you know, is this -- can we use this for that? And is anybody going to read through the whole thing? I mean, it sounds like it's going to be this thick (indicating).

MS. CASSINI: So that's a great question, and we couldn't agree with you more. We are waiting with bated breath to have a marketing, branding, you know, outreach, communication, social media contract, because we completely agree. We are under-resourced to be able to do the type of public outreach and community outreach that's really necessary to tell this story. And while I did not spend any time on it here, I think I have mentioned to you all in the past that this is the annual report, but it will also act as the basis for smaller executive summaries, white papers, briefing sheets.

As you all know, we've been doing, with Chair Hooper, your staff, support staff have been meeting with congressional delegation members, and we intend to continue doing that. We've been meeting with our municipal partners, telling the story about what's going to happen within their jurisdictions.

You know, we have the dashboard that you all, you know, look at periodically that's broken down by Commission districts, state legislators' districts, congressional districts. And we want to use this annual report content to kind of distill it down to its barest bones and then be able to use that as outreach material, too. Because we agree, not everybody's going to read a 30-page report, but if we can do an executive summary of that and give it to you all and use it as part of our outreach efforts and educational efforts, I think that's at least a great step forward.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Cavros.

MR. CAVROS: Mr. Chair, just to add on to Mr. Smith's comment, and I'm sure you've already considered this, but as a Broward County resident looking at this report for the first time, I think you'll want to explain how the projects are ranked, why we're doing this, how we're prioritizing projects in terms of relieving congestion and improving connectivity.

You probably want to include, you know, how we weigh equity in that equation, how we're handling resilience concerns. I think these are the kind of things that are going to matter to sort of everyday people. And, again, I'm sure you've probably contemplated this, sort of -- you know, but I think that needs to be at the front end and, you know, very visible.

MS. CASSINI: Duly noted.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Allen.

MR. ALLEN: This is a very ambitious outline of contents, and it's only the beginning of this board's actions during this first year. What is the status of the marketing consultant?

MS. CASSINI: I'm going to have to turn that over to either Legal or the Auditor's Office, because I'm on the SC, and I don't really want to speak to that.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Is that you Ms. Rogers -- Rogers?

MS. ROGERS: Hello. I do know that our office has issued an advisory memorandum to the County Administrator expressing some concerns about the solicitation and some of the responses, but I am not sure of the status of action on the solicitation of selection of a vendor at this time.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. ALLEN: Okay. Angela, can you provide any background?

MS. WALLACE: Well, I'm aware of the advisory opinion, and I know that the County Auditor's Office intends to work with the Purchasing Division regarding some issues raised about the solicitation and the responses.

So the solicitation was closed and there were proposers. I think there were ten proposers. And there was a selection committee meeting, and there was a short-listing and ranking. But then there was some issues that were raised by the Auditor with regard to the proposals, the contents of the proposals, and disparity in the pricing, and some of the scoring by some of the selection committee members. And so they're -- the County Auditor's Office is in the process of working with Procurement regarding that.

So it's not finalized as yet. And we're waiting to hear, I guess, the next steps regarding that process. That hasn't been determined yet.

MR. ALLEN: Then, I guess to staff, do we have the capability on staff to get this kind of work done before the deadline of March? Without the marketing consultant.

MS. CASSINI: Oh. Absolutely. So at the staff level, we have the capacity to do the annual report, and our Office of Public Communications is supporting this, as well.

So it's not just your surtax-funded staff. There are actual general funded staff that are helping make sure that this gets done. I think what I was speaking to was more to Mr. Smith's point that we have to get out into the community and start telling the story in a very proactive way. And that is a little bit more difficult without having the resources that would come with a contracted vendor.

MR. CAVROS: Chair -- Mr. Chair, just one more comment is you're explaining what we do. And as part of the content, you may want to emphasize what the County and municipalities are doing to anticipate the electrification of transportation, what investments they're making in infrastructure, what capital investments they're making in terms of -- well, at least the County in terms of electric buses, electric vehicles.

I think that'll be of interest to some folks, because there is going to be an explosion of electric vehicles in the near term, and I think folks are going to want to know how we're using funds to anticipate that and be ready for that. Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: You know, I also -- I think it's on us a little bit, too, when we're out in the community. I sit on other boards, or I'm at panels, or I'm at business meetings, and often the surtax program comes up. And whatever I've learned through sitting on this board, I try to relay and communicate with those folks.

And I have sat on a panel with Gretchen and staff, in the past. Most of the stuff that I interact with are folks that are in downtown. It's a lot of business groups. But I can tell you that whenever we have these kinds of communications with these folks, it -- they don't know, and it gives them a lot of awareness that they didn't have prior to even one spoken sentence about the surtax.

So whenever you're out there, I mean, tell people. Relay the information. I can tell you that some of the stuff that's very exciting to folks is the idea of a coordinated light system and -- and the smart intersections that we've talked about. They're -- all the technology is really what gets people pretty charged that's going to move vehicles and - - of all different types in and around the County.

So we have to get out there and speak. But I think that our staff now understands that idea that you had, both Mr. Cavros and Smith, about making this report very attractive to folks to want to open it. Because I do agree that as we get out there, we've got to communicate the advancements and the benefits that we -- that the County is working on.

Any other -- any other questions on the -- on the item?

MR. ALLEN: I have -- just to follow up, I would encourage each of you who are involved in those types of outside organizations to work with staff. I mean, I railroaded Gretchen into coming to a group called the Port Everglades Association, which is like an alternate Chamber of port-related businesses. And I will tell you that the comments I received back from that, much like you did with the downtown council, were, wow, we're really doing that.

And so if you've got the opportunity to be before a group, a large group -- I think we had like 120 the day that Gretchen presented -- to do that, because staff does an excellent job of explaining it and really dealing with the promise that this program has.

MS. CASSINI: And I would just like to let all of you know that I'm happy to do that. We have at least 70 different specialized presentations. We will tailor the presentation to your exact needs and make it as short or as long or as complex or focus on particular issues like resiliency or innovation.

So that's one of the reasons I'm here. That's my role for you. So I'm happy to do it. And we would encourage you.

MR. SMITH: And if I could just make one more quick link. You know, I just want to make the point that when we talk about awareness, it's not just awareness for awareness' sake. It's more -- so let me give you a practical example. We're electrifying buses and increasing the routes; right? Well, that's really no good if people -- if the ridership does not increase.

So if people are not aware that that's happening -- so I just would never want the public or just people to get the wrong impression. It -- a marketing contract doesn't really do any good if it doesn't tie into everything that we're doing. And that's my hope with it, is that the awareness creates involvement, and we actually change the way people are getting around the County.

You know, even just buses, like staying on that example, there's a stigma here. You go to San Francisco, everybody takes the bus. Here, it's like you see someone at the bus stop, and they -- they look a little sad, half the time. You know, it's like -- it's like they don't want to be there. And that should not be the case. We need to rebrand the way we're looking at transportation, or we need to go in a different direction. And we need -- it actually ties into the performance auditing, too, is the ridership increasing. So all these things are very much integrated and tied together, so I just wanted to kind of make that point.

DR. KELLEY: And I would like to add something, too.

MR. HOOPER: Ms. Kelley.

DR. KELLEY: I just wanted to add that it would be, I think, in part -- as part of this branding/marketing vision that we're putting together here, so that the public sees how hard basically we're trying to make moving people around in Broward, you know, cutting edge, and as efficient and logical to them as possible.

And in that vein, I think the proposed content, it would be helpful to identify up front, as well, the -- an assessment, which we've discussed before, about the populations in Broward County. Because, as we've talked about, there is this ongoing and growing Silver Tsunami thing happening in terms of population, and the elderly and disabled, moving them around.

And there are advancements that we are making in terms of paratransit, in terms of outreach, in terms of accessibility for people in communities that are maybe further from easy access to where they need to go. All of that. It would be helpful, I think, up front, to say there are unique things happening in Broward that we are very focused on helping, one of which is these populations.

CHAIR HOOPER: Uh-huh.

DR. KELLEY: So.

MR. HOOPER: Absolutely. And I think that the content that we're going to be providing in this inaugural report is going to cover just about everything that we're doing. But let's remember that we are in our first year, and, as -- as the years go on, our reports will cover -- I think we should be looking at are the buses full; right? And in a marketing process, we should be asking that not only -- don't only just tell us what the surtax is about, but help us get the job done by promoting the offerings that we have.

So I think that these are all great points, and I'm -- I have a lot of confidence in our staff that they'll take a lot of our comments to heart and to insert it into the annual report. So we have anything else to talk about on this?

REQUESTED UPDATES:

MR. HOOPER: Okay. The next item is the Oversight Board requested updates, and we have RSM transportation surtax financial audit to discuss.

MS. CASSINI: Is RSM here?

MS. ROGERS: I think they were told to come at 11:00.

MS. CASSINI: Okay. So what we'll do is -- we're ahead of schedule, which is great. So --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. CASSINI: -- we will actually have the MPO CFO come up and do their presentation as we wait for RSM.

2 - BROWARD METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO) AUDIT PROCESS FOR STRANSPORTATION SURTAX FUNDS - JOHN ROBERTSON, CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

MR. ROBERTSON: Well, good morning, everyone. My name's John Robertson. I'm the CFO at the Broward MPO. And first of all, I'd like to say that I'm glad I'm not the guy standing between you guys and lunch. So I'm happy to have the schedule flip.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION
SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JANUARY 30, 2020

dh/NC

So I'm happy to come to you all today. I was really fascinated by the governance discussion you all had about the audits earlier. So as a former auditor, that -- that's kind of exciting. The accounting geek in me really enjoyed that conversation. I thought it would be useful just to -- to maybe give you a little bit of context about our accounting for the -- the surtax proceeds on our end to -- to maybe assist you in considering, you know, scoping out a -- an audit. I'd also like to describe a little bit about our audit process and what content it -- it might provide to you all as you further flesh this out.

So first of all, how we account for the funds. As you know, we -- we receive the funds in advance from -- from the surtax proceeds. We deposit them in a separate bank account. Upon receipt, they are considered a liability. They're a liability back to the County until we have qualifying expenditures under the -- under the surtax activities. As we reconcile the expenses on a monthly basis, then we would reduce that liability on our books.

Now, the underlying nature of the expenditures are primarily salaries of the staff. You know, we have two dedicated staff and -- and perhaps a few other MPO employees, myself included, who work on -- on the surtax. We have one consulting contract and a few other expenses. And on the whole, I would anticipate that for an annual basis, there's probably less than a hundred transactions for the year, so a fairly low volume of transactions that would be examined in a -- in an audit scenario.

Thinking about our -- our internal controls or those policies and procedures that -- that keep the -- the transactions being recorded accurately and prevent fraud and the like, they're -- they're the same procedures that we employ across the -- all of our activities within the MPO, so the review of expenditures before disbursement, review of time sheets before we do payroll and the like, bank reconciliations, things like that. So it's a very common environment. There's nothing unique that we do separately for the -- for the surtax activities that we don't do for -- for others, and vice versa. So in a nutshell, that's a very quick overview of our accounting for it.

I'll just tell you a little bit about our audit. Our fiscal year is June 30. And because we receive federal funding, we are subject to -- to a single audit like the County is, also known as a Uniform Guidance Audit. Our external auditors are a firm of Keefe McCullough. They're a local firm here in Fort Lauderdale. They've performed our audit for a few years, and they're under contract until our year end June 30, 2021. Generally, they come to our offices, perform some procedures in June, prior to our -- our closing the books, and then they'll return in September to do their final procedures and wrap things up. Our audit report is generally issued right before Thanksgiving time, and we present it to the MPO board in December.

Now, the financial statement audit contains three reports, and this is all consistent with the single audit. The first is an opinion on the financial statement. So that's kind of that broad perspective, okay, looking at all of the activities of the MPO, and these are the financial statements.

The second report is an opinion they issue on the internal controls and compliance, based, again, on that broad financial statement audit. Now, this could be interesting to this -- this body because it -- it really does consider our entire control environment and whether they have any recognized deficiencies or recommendations for our internal controls.

And then the third report is really dealing with those federal awards, and they'll select a major program, one or more major programs, and they'll do specific procedures on controls and compliance related to that.

Our audit results have historically been clean, meaning we receive they call it a modified opinion on the financial statements and with no findings on internal controls or instances of non-compliance. So I'm very pleased with that.

And generally, when the auditors come in, they do, you know, look at our internal control environment, look at those policies and procedures. Then they look at them to say do they make sense for the nature of our activities.

And then next step is to say -- test some transactions and say, well, did they -- did they really do what they say they're going to do within those procedures. And then they'll look at the underlying substance of a sample of transactions and -- and evaluate them, both for their accounting propriety as well as compliance. Again, some of the reports that are issued out of this could be useful to you all, because it -- it could give you some context of our internal control environment and how they're -- the controls are performing. So I want to be helpful and transparent to you all, and do what you need if you need any information from me.

One of the, you know, thoughts I have is -- is one of timing, because we are a June 30th and I believe the County is a September 30th entity. We're going to have a little bit of a timing difference in the way that we close our books in June and then prepare for audit in September. I don't think that's an -- certainly an insurmountable issue, but something for -- for me to consider, you know, and -- and the timing of having a -- a firm that you would select to -- to either visit us or have us submit information to to -- for them to perform their procedures.

Certainly, you know, our audit firm could be part of your scope of the RFP and could do procedures while they're with us. But clearly that is your -- in your purview and your choice of selection, and -- and I know you have financial experts on board to kind of help design that scope. So with that, I'll stop and entertain any questions you might have regarding the -- the accounting and the audit.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Coolman.

MR. COOLMAN: Yeah, my question is kind of a global one. The MPO's existed for a number of years and had a budget. And I want to know what increase in that budget,

either percentage-wise or dollars-wise, is associated with the surtax dollars, to make -- in other words -- and you mentioned three audits, but I didn't see a specific one that talked about the money that's being spent by the MPO specifically related to the surtax. Could you talk about that?

MR. ROBERTSON: Sure. Well, let me -- let me take your last question first. So the short answer, there isn't a specific audit that audits only the surtax funds. That's -- that's not in the scope of a single audit. Now, having said that -- and this is, again, part of the importance of, I think, a scope discussion of what examination or audit procedures you want to have an audit firm perform on us.

The auditors do sampling. So if you look at kind of the -- all of the activities of the MPO, they're going to sample across the board. That doesn't mean they necessarily are going to guarantee they're going to pick a surtax transaction, one or more of them, or, you know, select all of them. So that's -- that's an important consideration in scope. That's just the nature of audit procedures. I have no influence on how they pick their sample, what they pick. But their -- their first remit is to issue an opinion on the financial statements taken as a whole, like all of the activities of the surtax.

Now, with respect to the budget, you know, on an annualized basis, we receive a little less than a half million dollars a year. And I believe our overall is -- is maybe a \$10,000,000 budget. So it's not a substantial increase to our -- our financial budget, you know, regardless of the importance of the activity, of course. But -- so it's not going to attract, you know, material attention to the -- to the auditors necessarily in their sampling. So, again, that's something where you want to consider if you send a firm in to do an examination to focus solely on the surtax transactions.

MR. COOLMAN: Well, would it -- maybe not do an audit, but would it be a reasonable request to have a summary of the dollars that the MPO is spending to -- related to the surtax requirements?

MR. ROBERTSON: Sure. Sure. Absolutely. And we can provide that. In fact, this is my surtax notebook. On a monthly basis, I do a -- just a summary statement of here's our beginning balance of our cash. Here's what we spent money on this month. Here's the ending balance of the cash. Does it tie to our financial records, yes or no, and it does. And it's just broken in -- in just categories of here's our payroll. Here's the -- the overhead rate we agreed to. Here's maybe consulting expenses, and the like.

MR. COOLMAN: So right now, in round numbers, your half a million of \$10,000,000 budget. So it's -- what's that -- five -- where's my math?

MR. HOOPER: Five percent.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Five percent.

MR. COOLMAN: Five percent.

MR. ROBERTSON: Yeah.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay.

MR. ROBERTSON: Uh-huh.

MR. COOLMAN: Thank you.

MR. ROBERTSON: Of course.

MS. PENNANT: So --

MR. HOOPER: Ms. Pennant.

MS. PENNANT: -- yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. Again, you know, the 30 percent is something that I feel very strongly about --

MR. ROBERTSON: Uh-huh.

MS. PENNANT: -- and I don't see any reference to that. And I'm really curious to know how are you tracking that. Is there any tracking of that?

MR. ROBERTSON: So with respect to the activities, we only have the one contract with a consultant who -- who was engaged to help stand up some of the selection procedures. The consultants do report to us their participation with the disadvantaged business enterprise list that the State of Florida maintains.

MS. PENNANT: Uh-huh.

MR. ROBERTSON: To my knowledge, I don't believe that they have reported any activity at this point on that one contract.

MS. PENNANT: Are you --

MR. ROBERTSON: Everything else is staffing.

MS. PENNANT: -- are you working with the Office of Economic Development at the County? Because, you know, they have that long list of CBEs. We need to make sure that there is that participation.

MR. ROBERTSON: So noted. So noted, and I'll make sure that we do.

MS. PENNANT: That needs to be part of the ranking process moving forward and -- if

it's not being done right now. But if it's being done, I would like to hear --

MR. ROBERTSON: Okay.

MS. PENNANT: -- what's been done so far. And if not, how, moving forward can we make sure that we are playing catch up, essentially.

MR. ROBERTSON: Okay. I'll work with the program staff to make sure that there's some level of reconciliation of how that's happening.

MS. PENNANT: I'm always, just for the record, going to talk about that. And, you know, again, it's the employment piece as well, across cities. We need to be mindful of that. We're spending the potential of 16,000,000,000 over the next 30 years. We need to make sure that people in our community are benefitting from that expenditure, because they're all paying into the penny tax. And I don't want --

MR. ROBERTSON: Uh-huh.

MS. PENNANT: -- to see a situation where it's only the big companies and the very wealthy cities that are benefitting from our activities.

MR. ROBERTSON: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: I think Ms. Wallace has something to speak to that.

MS. WALLACE: Yes, thank you, Chair. Okay. The contract that the MPO currently has with the County is to evaluate, rank, and prioritize the projects that have been submitted by the municipalities. There is an application process that the MPO has used to -- that -- they've used Kimley Horn, their contractor, to help them with an application process to process the information that they receive from municipalities for that ranking.

So the MPO is a government body, and so our contract is with the MPO, and they only have that one contract.

MR. ROBERTSON: That's correct.

MS. WALLACE: And they've indicated that, with the one contract that they have with Kimley Horn to help them with the municipal application process for capital projects, they will -- they will use their state -- follow the guidelines for their state DBE program. But it's not the -- when the municipal projects are ranked and prioritized by the MPO and those recommendations come to the County, then the County will enter into agreements with the municipalities to fund those projects. And those projects that relay the funding to the MPO -- to the municipalities will include the CBE requirements.

So we're -- the MPO is not dealing with the municipalities --

MR. ROBERTSON: Uh-huh.

MS. WALLACE: -- related to their contract -- municipalities' contractors or the CBE goals for those municipal contracts. Does that make sense? The -- we're not at that stage yet.

MS. PENNANT: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: I also, if -- Mr. Chair, if I could.

MR. HOOPER: Go ahead.

MS. CASSINI: I just want to clarify for the record that the contract that the County entered into with the MPO for prioritization services did not include the 30 percent CBE goal, because it was expected that they would be hiring staff to complete the prioritization, ranking, evaluation, and recommendation.

So that's the first thing. And it's also -- bless you -- it's also not -- the role of the surtax-funded MPO staff that are doing that evaluation, ranking, prioritization, and recommendation of the projects that were actually in that original 2018 plan, those municipal capital projects that were there when we went to the voters, was not to take into consideration the 30 percent goal.

They're supposed to be looking at connectivity, congestion relief, improving transit, multimodal components. And then when they come to you --

MS. PENNANT: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: -- and then they come to the County to be funded, that's when that consideration of the 30 percent goal would be appropriate.

MS. WALLACE: Right.

MS. PENNANT: So how does that -- the fact that they are not held to that 30 percent in that original agreement, how does that play with the interlocal agreement that we've established? Because I know that part of our requirement was to include the 30 percent. So can you just clarify how --

MS. CASSINI: So I think --

MS. PENNANT: -- that plays?

MS. CASSINI: -- what Angela was trying to say is that when we enter into agreements with each municipality at the project level --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: -- which is coming --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: -- it's -- it's the very -- you know, the very next step, we'll be entering into individual municipal agreements for funding at -- for a particular project --

MS. WALLACE: Right.

MS. CASSINI: -- that's been recommended.

MS. PENNANT: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: That's where that 30 percent CBE goal is going to be contained.

MS. WALLACE: Right.

MS. PENNANT: Okay. So I just want to make sure that that is in place. And, certainly, moving forward, I don't know how if -- if there's an establishment of a new agreement between the County and the MPO, that we can make sure the language of the 30 percent is inserted in the next agreement, because it's this -- the agreement before the penny tax was not forever agreement; right? It was not a --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. PENNANT: -- 30-year agreement.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. PENNANT: So whenever that agreement is to be renewed, I want to -- I would hope that that would be included. But at least now we have some way of holding cities accountable to the 30 percent. And if the ILA doesn't work, I'll work.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Allen.

MR. ALLEN: What I heard in -- or between the lines here is that we hired the MPO. We gave them money to the MPO to do the ranking. We thought at that point in time that that would be staffed by employees of the MPO to do that ranking process that they are contracted to do.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. ALLEN: The MPO contracted with Kimley Horn to provide staffing. So the question is that I have, who does the ranking? Is it a Kimley Horn ranking or is that an MPO ranking.

MS. WALLACE: It's MPO. So there are two MPO staff -- surtax-funded staff members, and they've been here before and they're here today.

MR. ALLEN: Uh-huh.

MS. WALLACE: Andrew Riddle and Kerrie. So -- and there's an MPO presentation that is part of your agenda today.

So there were -- our -- what we had anticipated was the MPO hiring additional staff, not just Andrew and Kerrie, to develop the prioritization process, similar to their current CSLIP project, using that as a model, since they prioritize projects for purposes of federal funding. And we were going to model after that CSLIP process for prioritizing the municipal capital projects. And when the MPO -- they had difficulty in hiring, in filling --

MR. ROBERTSON: That's right.

MS. WALLACE: -- two of the positions that they were seeking to fill, and there was a timeframe within which the prioritization process needed to be done. And they had an agreement with Kimley Horn, and they used that engagement to assist them in developing the application process and a portal for receiving information, the additional information that they needed to evaluate the municipal projects.

But it is being done. The ranking and the prioritization and the evaluation is being done internally by the MPO staff. And they are here, and during the MPO presentation, you can inquire of Andrew Riddle regarding --

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MS. WALLACE: -- what that consists of.

MR. HOOPER: Ms. Pennant.

MS. PENNANT: So I don't mean to keep hitting this point but can someone clarify for me. Money's being spent, surtax dollars being spent. Isn't all the surtax dollars being spent held to the 30 percent goal?

MS. WALLACE: The County Commission voted to have CBE goals applied to surtax-funded projects to the extent that it's permissible.

So there are some circumstances under which it wouldn't be, but that's not what this particular contract is. This one is not -- it's not prohibited under this contract. At the time that we entered the contract, we did not anticipate that there would -- it was not expected that there would be a contractual relationship that the MPO would use to -- for this prioritization process.

MS. CASSINI: I think it's --

MR. FRAZIER: A question. Is any of this retroactive? Because Kimley Horn is a subcontractor. They're receiving these funds.

MS. WALLACE: It's not retroactive. It would have to be an amendment to the contract in order to incorporate the -- a CBE goal in the MPO contract.

MR. FRAZIER: I'm just -- just reading the language. It says 30 percent County business enterprise commitment to the extent funded with transportation surtax proceeds. Kimley Horn is receiving those proceeds.

MS. WALLACE: Through the MPO. And our contract is with the MPO.

MR. FRAZIER: So MPO has the responsibility to ensure that the funds that they got has that 30 percent goal?

MS. WALLACE: Correct. It would need to be in the MPO's agreement with the County. And at the time that we entered that agreement, we did not anticipate the MPO needing to contract for a portion of the work under the contract.

MS. PENNANT: I --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can --

MS. PENNANT: -- I don't know. I'm having a hard time wrapping my brain around that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well --

MS. PENNANT: It just seemed to me that it is understood that if you're spending surtax dollars that you are held to that 30 percent, contract or no contract. I mean, I just -- I don't understand. I don't understand it.

MS. CASSINI: Mr. Chair?

MR. HOOPER: Yes, go ahead.

MS. CASSINI: Thank you. So some of the contracts that we have for services --

MS. PENNANT: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: -- including, for instance, the M.I.T. contract and some of these other contracts for services for research and things of that nature wouldn't necessarily have the 30 percent CBE goal, because it was kind of -- it was one of those -- when the directive came down, it was related to projects.

But we are now going to look at every single contract that we enter into and make sure. I mean, we've had the conversation with the MPO. We've certainly had the conversation internally to make sure that we evaluate every single contract, whether it's a services contract or a construction contract or a design or planning, to evaluate whether or not we have CBEs that can do that work. Absolutely.

MS. PENNANT: Whatever we're buying. If it's a pencil, 30 percent needs to be included every single opportunity, unless you can't find somebody. Then that's the excuse. But we have professionals that can provide it, we have people can provide goods and services related to this expenditure, and I just feel like we're being a little wobbly on that. Just my thought.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Chair?

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, Shea.

MR. SMITH: A couple of things. So I wanted to -- well, thank you for the presentation about -- about the MPO. And I wanted to, you know, echo your thoughts on this and stand behind that just in general. I do think it's very important that -- you know, obviously, I think the basis for some of this is it is a bit of a regressive tax. I mean, if you look at sales tax affects everybody, so the less you make, the more it's going to impact you.

So I stand behind this in general. Now, I do think on something like this we should kind of put -- I'll put on my auditor hat and think a little bit about materiality.

So I think our concern, to really capture this, you know, it's a \$500,000 contract; is that correct?

MS. CASSINI: It's actually quite a bit more than that.

MR. ROBERTSON: But on an annual -- on an annual basis.

MS. CASSINI: It -- it was --

MR. SMITH: On an annual basis.

MS. CASSINI: -- I think it was about eight -- 800 --

MR. SMITH: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: -- the first year.

MR. ROBERTSON: Yeah.

MR. SMITH: Okay.

MR. ROBERTSON: That's -- that correct.

Web 1:34:12

MR. SMITH: Well, I -- so it's not that it's small, by any means, but I think what I heard is that when the projects come forth, really, this board's role in that regard and this issue is to really be involved in how those are getting evaluated, I think, at the County level, to make sure that that 30 percent is going to get hit.

And I think one concern I have in that arena is if they are prioritized by the MPO and then make it here, what is that process -- we don't have to get into this now, but what does that process really look like, how long does it take, what happens if they just get kicked back?

So that's something that we should --

MR. ROBERTSON: Uh-huh.

MR. SMITH: -- we should think about, because is it going to stall things, you know, and what's going to happen when somebody says, oh, well, we just couldn't get this.

So there's a lot to think about here, and I think that there's so much opportunity at the project level, we should probably be proactive and think about what was said before by Gretchen.

The other thing to mention is that I think in terms of the MPO and what they're doing, I think the financial impact of their contract -- like you mentioned financial auditing and maybe what we would want to look at. I think the performance audit piece is something to think about here in terms of this prioritization and us looking at how that is kind of happening. And I think that that really is hitting directly on what this is supposed to be doing.

So they're coming up with this process to say, yes, this is going to improve congestion, and that's what the voters wanted.

So in terms of is it -- is it working, a lot of it is going to be the prioritization and how they looked at that.

So I do think that that's something we need to get on the weeds on, not so much in terms of their financial statements, like their gap financials. I think that's going to be -- end up being less interesting of a proposition, just in terms of what we look at that they're doing.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you. Is there anything -- oh --

MR. CAVROS: Mr. Chair?

MR. HOOPER: -- Mr. Cavros.

MR. CAVROS: Yeah, no, just to take us back to the financial aspect of it, I think all the members here would appreciate maybe an annual report of some kind that focuses on the funds that have been allocated to the MPO specifically --

MR. ROBERTSON: Uh-huh.

MR. CAVROS: -- for these -- in the prioritization process. So to the extent you can do that --

MR. ROBERTSON: That's doable.

MR. CAVROS: -- I think that'd be helpful.

MR. ROBERTSON: That's completely doable.

MR. FRAZIER: I have one additional question.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Frazier.

MR. FRAZIER: MPO is going forward with their scope of services and contract; correct? And you're saying that it can't be retroactive. Are they going to get future funding? And at some point, when would you apply the CSB goal to it?

MS. WALLACE: So in the event that we amend the contract with the MPO, we can -- the amendment could incorporate the -- a CBE goal. And so -- but the current contract is a five-year contract --

MR. ROBERTSON: That's right.

MS. WALLACE: -- and we're close to the end of the first year of that contract.

MR. FRAZIER: So --

MS. WALLACE: But it can be amended.

MR. FRAZIER: -- so the anticipation is that it can't be amended for another five years -- another four years, or?

MS. WALLACE: Well, I guess we will --

MR. FRAZIER: I mean --

MS. WALLACE: -- evaluate --

MR. FRAZIER: -- I guess the big question is how do you initiate a change in their contract?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

MR. FRAZIER: Because they are receiving these funds --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. FRAZIER: -- and this document that we just read says, all funds. It didn't discriminate. It said all funds.

MS. PENNANT: All funds.

MR. ALLEN: We've only approved --

MR. FRAZIER: It said all funds.

MR. ALLEN: -- the first year funding for that program, right?

MS. CASSINI: Correct.

MS. WALLACE: Correct.

MR. ALLEN: So when it comes time to authorize the second year part of that contract --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Uh-huh.

MR. ALLEN: -- I think it may be a role for the board to ask the MPO to look at their opportunities.

MS. PENNANT: Right. Because it's renewable every year?

MS. WALLACE: It's --

MS. PENNANT: It's five years with --

MS. WALLACE: -- so it's funding. What Mr. Allen is referring to is all of our contracts are subject to --

MR. ALLEN: Subject to funding.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION
SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JANUARY 30, 2020

dh/NC

MS. WALLACE: -- appropriation annually.

MR. HOOPER: Can I -- can I ask?

MS. PENNANT: I --

MS. LOVE: I think it's just a --

MS. PENNANT: -- I support that.

MS. LOVE: -- matter of asking the MPO would they, at the next point that it can, which would be at the end of the year, to incorporate that, and let's see what they say, opposed to --

MS. CASSINI: We have done so.

MS. LOVE: Okay.

MS. PENNANT: And their response?

MS. CASSINI: Their response is that it's not included in the contract.

MS. PENNANT: Ah.

MR. ALLEN: But the second year funding is not provided by this board, either, so I think, you know, the -- what is the saying? He who holds the gold controls?

MR. HOOPER: Can I ask a question? What -- the 500,000 bucks, what is it exactly being used for?

MR. ROBERTSON: So primarily to fund the staff that are working on the agreement. So, again, I think as Ms. Wallace indicated, you know, at the time we entered into the agreement, it wasn't contemplated that we would have a -- any consulting services associated with it. But as we went to market and recruited staff, we were very fortunate to have Mr. Riddle and Ms. MacNeil. Recruiting is -- the market is very tight for labor. And really to accelerate the development of the ranking procedures and stand up the system. And I know Mr. Riddle can speak more to this this afternoon.

That was when the decision was taken to engage a consultant to bring that kind of assist and lift so that we could meet some -- some of the -- I think there were timing goals. I think the -- a timeline to be established.

MR. HOOPER: So it's for personnel resources.

MR. ROBERTSON: Primarily, yeah.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION
SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JANUARY 30, 2020

dh/NC

MR. HOOPER: And then how would we promote small businesses when we're spending money on personnel? And maybe the small business is a Kimley Horn type group, and I guess you would -- you would bid it out and rank them that way.

But if all you were doing -- if you had the market out there with the qualified individuals, does it really speak -- does this particular amount of money really speak to small businesses, or should we be focusing in on the cities and the projects and making sure that the small businesses get opportunities within the small -- I'm asking the question, okay? Because I'm trying to figure out what it is we're -- what we're targeting here. I would target the projects and -- because I think that if the personnel were out there, you would just be hiring qualified people.

And so that's where I think we need to focus is on the whole contracting of companies that are going to execute.

MS. CASSINI: So, Mr. Chair --

MR. HOOPER: And I -- I could be wrong. So I'm just bringing up the point.

MS. PENNANT: No --

MS. CASSINI: -- so, Mr. Chair --

MR. FRAZIER: Mr. Chairman --

MS. CASSINI: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. FRAZIER: -- I'd like to respond to your question. One of the big problems when you have all kinds of public programs like this is that community small businesses, minority businesses, underutilized businesses are always a second thought.

MS. PENNANT: Uh-huh.

MR. FRAZIER: They're never put into the equation when you start the overall planning. You have to make that a priority when you start your plan. You can't add them as an adjunct somewhere down the road, because it doesn't work. People rebel against me adding somebody to me after I'm out of the -- out of the gate. But if people have the understanding, contracts, everybody has the understanding, you use this money, you got to -- you got to deal with this goal, so we need to see what you have.

People think of just professionals. There are all kinds of services, you know. MPO has to buy supplies. So what's wrong with that? They have to utilize -- they have to buy supplies. There's a whole array of things in which they can make this goal again. So it just can't look at a professional business, a contract or an architect, that type of situation.

MR. HOOPER: I'm not doing that. What I'm trying to do is to understand how the money's being utilized.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

MR. HOOPER: And if the money was being utilized for exactly ten employees -- let's just make an example -- for exactly ten employees, there's no opportunity for a small business to provide ten employees. If we're -- but on the other hand, if they're ranking projects and the rankings are based on small business participation, or the contracts themselves require a percentage of small business participation, then I think that's an easier thing to manage.

Managing the -- I just don't understand how we're -- if you're trying to hire ten people for them to help us on selection of projects that it's a small business issue. That's the question.

MR. FRAZIER: Temporary hiring services. I have to hire temporary staff. I'm only going to have them for a year and a --

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. FRAZIER: -- half, two years. I don't want them full time. I can go to an employment agency. Well, there are some minority employment agencies that supply staff.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Well, that answers my question.

MR. FRAZIER: Okay.

MS. PENNANT: Yeah, and, you know, with -- with all respect, I mean, there's lack of qualified people. I mean, I -- there are so many communities in Broward County where the unemployment rate is as high as 15 percent. Are we looking in those communities for staffing?

You know, I -- and what training is required for the staff that you use, so we can get people trained. And this has been my concern, that we're not being proactive enough in identifying the kinds of skills that we need, whether we're talking trades, businesses, or the employment opportunities that will come out of this. You know, when we have so many communities that the unemployment rate is so high, we need to be targeting those communities for prospects.

MR. SMITH: I think -- I think the way to do this, to wrap this all together in the future or whenever we can is we have a great Office of Economic Development who they're versed in this. So if we go to them and say, listen, these are the skill jobs we need, whatever they are, so contract evaluation, engineering, whatever the skill is, can we find that? Is it available?

You may find instances where you cannot make that match, because that is something that happens. But they may be able to. But until you go through that process, I mean, that's who -- that's where the expertise lies, if I understand it correctly. That's what they -- they do.

MR. ALLEN: But in this case, I -- it's a matter of timing. This is one of the first contracts that was issued. And from the County's perspective, I'm hearing there was no intent to do a subcontract to Kimley Horn or anybody else, and therefore, it was not held to be subject to the 30 percent small business requirement.

MS. PENNANT: My question, are they even satisfying the ten percent that they were being held to?

MS. CASSINI: I'm waiting for an answer on that as the Contract Administrator.

So, to be clear, we were unaware that a contract was entered into with Kimley Horn until it was on the agenda for the Broward MPO to take action on it. It is a rather large dollar amount, and we would have preferred that there had been a goal placed on it. And so we are trying to treat ourselves and all of our contracts the same.

So when the County is looking for professional services, we have to do an evaluation of whether or not a CBE goal can be placed on the contract. And we are going to -- again, we're going to make sure that it's very clear. It's very true what Mr. Allen said. We did not anticipate that there would be a contract let for that amount of money on -- when we entered into the contract. Had that been a consideration, I think perhaps Angela and I would have had the 30 percent goal included. But we can amend the contract to make sure that the goal is included.

And we are looking at, for every single contract that we bring in front of you, for every -- when we bring you a request for funds to enter into a contract, we are working with our Office of Economic and Small Business Development to make sure that we've evaluated every possible way to include our small businesses.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Is there any more discussion on the item? All right. Let's move on to the next item.

MS. CASSINI: Can I have RSM please come to the table.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

MS. PENNANT: One quick question. Do we have any idea how much the contract is?

MS. CASSINI: I -- it was -- I believe it was a little over \$400,000. But --

MR. ALLEN: For one year.

MS. CASSINI: -- for -- yeah.

MS. PENNANT: And -- and --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Five years is --

MS. PENNANT: -- but it's a five year --

MR. SMITH: Well, that's with the MPO.

MS. CASSINI: So it's an interesting -- the way that the actual contract was structured was there was an upfront payment of around \$495,000 that could be used over the course of the five years for a variety of services. And there's a -- you know, a whole scope that they could -- a whole list that they could utilize that fund -- those funds for. That was in addition to the \$129,000 quarterly payment.

So, you know, you'll have to ask the MPO. I'm not going to speak for them. But it's my understanding that the Kimley Horn contract was actually procured out of the upfront \$495,000 payment. But when Mr. Riddle comes to the table after the RSM presentation, you're more than -- I think it would be more appropriate that you present that to him.

MS. PENNANT: I will. Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you. Go ahead.

1 - RSM TRANSPORTATION SURTAX FINANCIAL AUDIT

MR. FRIEDMAN: Good morning. My name's Brett Friedman, partner with RSM. Pleasure to be here this morning. I know we were just asked for a brief update on the audit of the Broward County surtax fund.

So just to let the board know, and we started the audit field work for the County, which also includes the standalone fund financials for the surtax fund this month. We obtained a trial balance from the County. We've already done, you know, part of the testing. Particularly all of the revenue testing's been completed. Currently working on expenditure testing.

Also we just recently received the draft of the financial statements from the County's finance team, and we're currently starting the process of tying that information out to the trial balance they provided, and also going ahead and going through the various levels of review of those fund financials, as well as the accompanying footnotes. And, with that, I guess any questions?

MR. HOOPER: Yes, Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: So something interesting came up earlier. And when you're documenting your audit, are we a group that you would deem as charged with governance?

MR. FRIEDMAN: One of the things I --

MR. SMITH: Of the fund?

MR. FRIEDMAN: -- well, I know that we, you know, specifically made arrangements to, you know, incorporate this group as well as far as a second party. You know, our contract is with Broward County, but --

MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

MR. FRIEDMAN: -- yes, as far as communicating, that was a commitment done, because I know the County is very clear, and they wanted to be very transparent with this board as well.

So just as we did with the audit plan at the beginning, we would be bringing the results here as well.

MR. SMITH: Okay. So just to be clear on that point, if something were to come up -- and, you know, I'm an auditor as well, and if something comes up that rises to the occasion of, hey, I've got to call my client now -- and I realize we're not the contracting, you know, agency, how -- would you get in touch with us through the County immediately, or what would happen in that case?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Well, that one, again, depending on the nature of what the issue is, yes, we'd most likely coordinate through Gretchen and reach out if there was something of concern. Yes.

MR. SMITH: Okay. Fair enough. And then my general question is is there anything that has come up that is worth discussing, noteworthy? Have there been significant adjustments to the County records?

And I'm assuming that a separate materiality and everything is applied, you know, at the fund level. There's a whole separate, you know, calculation and those sorts of things, and documentation related specifically to the fund.

And the only other follow up would be, you know, if there's any specific documentation of internal controls and so forth around the funds that normally maybe would be shared with the client or the contracting agency, I would be interested in seeing that, because I know part of an audit is documenting how the controls interact with the fund and how things are maintained specifically with the fund that we're responsible for. So I'd be interested in having like a further understanding at some point relative to that.

MR. HOOPER: Oh, Mr. Coolman, then Mr. Allen.

MR. COOLMAN: Yeah, we learned early on that the surtax dollars are not just going to be spent for projects. We have overhead, administration, rent, and we have the County auditors, which are you, which are going to be doing additional auditing -- auditing because of the surtax.

Are you able to quantify those costs so we know how much we're spending of our surtax dollars for your audit services?

MR. ALLEN: They provide -- I think in the original work plan, they showed that proposed amendment to the contract of additional services, and I thought it was like 15,000 or 20,000 or something like that.

MS. WALLACE: But it's my understanding that the single audit engagement is being paid by General Funds. So they're going to do the --

MR. ALLEN: But there was additional scope --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. ALLEN: -- that was required to do the --

MS. WALLACE: For surtax.

MR. ALLEN: -- standalone financials.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Right.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. ALLEN: And they provided a quote to the County's Finance Department --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. ALLEN: -- to do that additional work. So I would say --

MS. WALLACE: Correct.

MR. ALLEN: -- that that is the work that we have asked for as part of surtax.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. COOLMAN: So I guess this is a question really for staff. When we see what's spent for the year, we'll have projects, we'll rent, we'll have all these things, audit. So everyone will know where every dollar is going; is that correct?

MS. CASSINI: To my knowledge, it may not be as detailed as that. I mean, I'm not sure that we were going -- I think we were going to look at it from kind of administrative, planning, support services, construction, personnel, and then capital, capital projects -- well, construction would be the capital projects, but it could also be the purchase of buses, vehicles, fleets, things like that.

So we were going to break it out, but not down to where you could -- because I -- to my knowledge, I don't think anyone is utilizing --

MR. COOLMAN: I just --

MS. CASSINI: -- surtax funds for rent.

MR. COOLMAN: -- I just don't want to make -- I want to make sure we're not spending too much on overhead and the dollars are going in the ground. That's all.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chair?

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Allen.

MR. ALLEN: RSM is under a multi-year contract with the County.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Correct.

MR. ALLEN: What year are you in now?

MR. FRIEDMAN: We are in year three of the contract.

MR. ALLEN: Year -- so there are -- you have two more years including this one or --

MR. FRIEDMAN: Well, to more --

MR. ALLEN: -- you're in the --

MR. FRIEDMAN: -- after --

MR. ALLEN: -- third year --

MR. FRIEDMAN: -- this is year --

MR. ALLEN: -- now --

MR. FRIEDMAN: -- three now.

MR. ALLEN: -- so you've got four and five.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Right.

MR. ALLEN: Four would be 2020 and '21.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Correct.

MR. ALLEN: And this board, by action of the board, approved them to do the standalone financials for the surtax fund for this year. Your County contract also has a small business commitment as part of that. I think it was, what, 20 or 25 percent or something like that?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Yeah, that's the -- and we exceed that, actually, there. We have three firms we work with --

MR. ALLEN: Okay.

MR. FRIEDMAN: -- for the audit.

MR. ALLEN: I would suggest that before we approve the engagement for next year, that the percentage of participation -- we'll ask for a contract amendment to incorporate the 30 percent requirement under the small business requirement, as well as I would like to know the possibility that one of your subcontractors could actually issue an opinion on the surtax fund as part of that overall work program.

So you would have to look at your proposed scope of the audit, how much of that work would be performed by that subcontractor for that particular sub -- surtax fund, and allow them to provide either a standalone or a joint opinion with you for those financial statements for the surtax fund. I think you do that for the elections' office now, I believe.

MR. FRIEDMAN: We -- yeah, we do for Supervisor of Elections, Property Appraiser, Housing Finance Authority, those are all issued by the -- the CBEs --

MR. ALLEN: Do you --

MR. FRIEDMAN: -- on their library.

MR. ALLEN: -- foresee that that would -- is possible this year for the surtax fund, or would that be something that would be -- have to be incorporated in your proposed work program for next year?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Well, it can't be at this time, because, obviously, we're already --

MR. ALLEN: Right.

MR. FRIEDMAN: -- in the process of doing the work, but we can definitely talk with the County about it. That's --

MR. ALLEN: Okay.

MR. FRIEDMAN: -- you know, we use them interchangeably throughout the entire team.

MR. HOOPER: You know, I was going to mention the same thing about the small business and -- and how to analyze it. And maybe that is a separate -- is that what you're saying? A separate audit?

MR. ALLEN: No.

MR. HOOPER: You're saying as part of the annual --

MR. ALLEN: I'm saying as --

MR. HOOPER: -- audit.

MR. ALLEN: -- as part of their overall audit of the County. Financially, it makes sense from a cost standpoint to try to do your standalone financials as part of your overall audit so you don't --

MR. HOOPER: Uh-huh.

MR. ALLEN: -- have auditors tripping over each other at the same time in the same fashion.

So -- but we also recognize the board's prerogative to make that decision on a year-by-year basis, and I'm just saying before we make that decision for next year to allow the County's auditor -- the County's external auditor to provide that service, that we look to trying to increase the minority particip- -- not the minority, the community small business participation into that work program for next year.

And, further, that they provide a joint opinion on those financial statements which require them, the auditors, to arrange their work program so that their involvement for the community small business firm would be sufficient to allow them to provide a joint opinion.

MR. HOOPER: Thanks. Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: One more quick follow up. So when will we hear from you again, and at what stage do we anticipate the audit will be in at that point? And then this next part may be just a question for the County, but it sounds like if they're working kind of full steam on the work paper section of the audit, then clearly there's a County draft of the financials or the balances, at least. And I haven't seen any of that.

I mean, if they're working on the areas, typically what happens in an audit is, okay, here's the trial balance, go audit it. I'd like to see what the unadjusted just balances are that they're auditing. I mean, I haven't seen any kind of financial information in that regard for financial reporting purposes. So -- and that may be to the County. But I just wanted to kind of tee up when you would expect that we would hear -- hear from you again relative to the audit, as well.

MR. FRIEDMAN: I mean, I would expect, given the nature of the work timing, that the next phase would be coming back with the results of the audit because of where we are. And that, you know, should be probably towards the end of next month or early March. That's the target.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Are there any questions? Any other questions? Ms. Pennant, do you have any questions?

MS. PENNANT: No. I'm just kind of hoping that somehow, in whatever you report to us, that we will kind of see if there was any expenditure with small businesses in the dollars that have been spent so far, so we can kind of -- I know you're not being held to it, but that would be my wish. I don't know.

MR. HOOPER: I think that is -- that is going to be a great way to measure ourselves going forward. And I --

MS. PENNANT: Provide the baseline.

MR. HOOPER: -- think that Mr. Allen's advice was good and --

MS. PENNANT: Yeah.

MR. HOOPER: -- and that's what we should be pushing for in the future, as well. Okay. All right. Any other questions? Thank you for your report.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. We're ahead of time. Do we want to take --

MS. CASSINI: So I just wanted to let -- just remind all of the Oversight Board members that during lunch, we are going to have IT staff here to help with your new Broward County email addresses, the setup, the configuration with your devices. And we're also

going to take some photos. So we're going to break for at least 45 minutes so the public has time to go out and get something. And if you all need any assistance, just let me know.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Let's take our lunch break now.

MR. COOLMAN: You want to take it now?

MR. HOOPER: Why, what do you -- you got something to say?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. COOLMAN: No. Let's keep working. I don't even think lunch is here.

MR. HOOPER: It's not here?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MS. CASSINI: So Mark Valmonte (phonetic) is here. He's our IT guru.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: Let's take our break.

(THE MEETING RECESSED AT 11:22 A.M. AND RECONVENED AT 12:32 P.M.)

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Let's restart the meeting. Let me see where we are.

3 - SURTAX-FUNDED BROWARD MPO MUNICIPAL PRIORITIZATION PROCESS - ANDREW RIDDLE, MANAGER OF MUNICIPAL SURTAX SERVICES

MR. HOOPER: The surtax-funded Broward MPO municipal prioritization process. Andrew Riddle should be here --

MR. RIDDLE: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: -- manager of the municipal surtax services.

MR. RIDDLE: Good afternoon. I'm Andrew --

MR. HOOPER: All right, Andrew.

MR. RIDDLE: -- Riddle, Surtax Services Manager, along with Kerrie MacNeil, Surtax Project Manager. And we are here to provide you the MPO surtax update. As a reminder, the MPO has been tasked to review, rank, and program municipal projects

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION
SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JANUARY 30, 2020

dh/NC

that are eligible for local surtax funding. And these are only the capital projects.

We completed the reviews and the mapping of all projects. Now we're in the process of ranking all the projects. We must deliver the Cycle 1 recommended municipal projects to the County staff by March 1st.

Since our last update in September, we had -- we were just staffing the MPO surtax team. Since then, we held three workshops with the cities; provided monthly MPO board and advisory committee updates; completed one-on-one meetings with the cities to discuss their projects; completed maps for each project; established the ranking criteria, scoring methodology, and project readiness approach with the cities.

We developed the objective data-driven ranking tool with the assistance with Kimley Horn. And also we completed the engineering reviews and assessment for shovel readiness, also with the assistance with Kimley Horn. And if you would like, I can follow up with the question that was previously asked about the contract, if you would like at this time.

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MR. RIDDLE: Okay?

MS. PENNANT: Uh-huh.

MR. RIDDLE: So the existing Kimley Horn contract is the -- the question was what was the total amount. The total amount is 469,000. However, at -- there is a portion in the contract that is for as needed services, which totals \$128,000. 341,000 is underway.

We have reached out to Kimley Horn, and they are talking internally with their senior management at Kimley Horn to potentially add a CBE onto the contract as an amended -- amendment to the existing contract to help meet that CBE goal. We are -- hopefully, next week we will have a sit-down meeting with them to go over the contract amendments and also the percentage that they could potentially include in their contract, because we're substantially complete, so we have this 128,000 still left.

So I think if we can, you know, make a good faith effort to actually include some CBE participation in the existing contract, I think that would be a positive thing in meeting the CBE goal over the 30 years. Does that help you with your question?

MS. PENNANT: It -- it does. It does.

MR. RIDDLE: Thank you.

MS. PENNANT: Okay.

MR. FRAZIER: I have an additional question.

MR. RIDDLE: Yes, sir.

MR. FRAZIER: Do you have a detailed scope of services for Kimley Horn?

MR. RIDDLE: Yes, sir, I do.

MR. FRAZIER: Could you provide that to the Oversight Committee?

MR. RIDDLE: Absolutely. And --

MR. FRAZIER: Okay.

MR. RIDDLE: -- Gretchen also has a copy of that. And I will definitely forward it to Gretchen and she can send it on to --

MR. FRAZIER: The second --

MR. RIDDLE: -- board members.

MR. FRAZIER: -- question is the criteria for scoring, ranking, and what have you, is that also public information where we can see the detail?

MR. RIDDLE: Yes, and I'm just about to --

MR. FRAZIER: Oh, okay.

MR. RIDDLE: -- talk to -- talk about that.

MR. FRAZIER: All right.

MR. RIDDLE: All right. The ranking and programming process has three factors of emphasis. All projects will be evaluated based on their ability to alleviate congestion and enhance connectivity. This is straight from the ordinance, surtax ordinance. The -- all projects will be ranked -- will be actually programmed based on program readiness or shovel readiness. This is part of the interlocal agreement.

So this is the important slide that you were just referencing. And through the workshop that we had in October and December, this is the point -- this is the ranking criteria and points distribution that we established with the cities. The first three, employment and population density, access and support to transit, and incident delay support both factors of alleviating congestion and enhancing connectivity. These three get the highest points. Roadway level of service and connection to existing facilities relate to only one of the ordinance factors, and that's why they get the midrange points.

Resiliency and equity do not relate directly to the surtax ordinance. There's -- the ordinance is silent on resiliency and equity. But we know that it's very important to our communities and our cities, so that -- so we went ahead and included that into our criteria, but they will definitely get the lower points because they don't directly relate to the ordinance factors of alleviating congestion and enhancing connectivity.

Project performance. Is the project delivered on time, on budget, and also meeting the CBE goals will be evaluated in the future, once the projects are being implemented. Yes, ma'am.

MS. PENNANT: Well, what about the ten percent? There was a ten percent. Isn't that part of the original agreement?

So you may not be tracking for the 30 percent, but what about the ten?

MS. CASSINI: So I just -- for -- Mr. Chair?

MR. HOOPER: Yes, go ahead.

MS. PENNANT: Sorry.

MS. CASSINI: There's --

MR. HOOPER: Absolutely.

MS. CASSINI: -- there's a ten percent --

MS. PENNANT: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: -- minimum annual guarantee for municipal projects --

MS. PENNANT: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: -- in an umbrella interlocal agreement that was actually entered into by 29 municipalities, the County, and the MPO prior to the actual ballot initiative.

MS. PENNANT: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: And it was kind of the glue that held --

MS. PENNANT: Right.

MS. CASSINI: -- us all together.

MS. PENNANT: Right.

MS. CASSINI: And what it did is it said in exchange for your support of this initiative, we will guarantee you a minimum of ten percent of the annual revenues for your municipal projects. It didn't have anything --

MS. PENNANT: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: -- to do with an actual CBE goal.

MS. PENNANT: Okay. So what are you using in terms of your measure for the CBE goals that you're talking about in the performance --

MR. RIDDLE: For the --

MS. PENNANT: -- currently?

MR. RIDDLE: -- project performance, that's why I had this to be determined, because that is something that we will have to work closely with the County --

MS. PENNANT: Right.

MR. RIDDLE: -- on establishing that evaluation process for project performance.

MS. PENNANT: Right. But prior to that, there was no -- no requirement. That was not a part of your --

MR. RIDDLE: No, ma'am.

MS. PENNANT: -- consciousness.

MR. RIDDLE: Our -- our purview did not include that we had to come up with a --

MS. PENNANT: Right.

MR. RIDDLE: -- criteria for project performance.

MS. PENNANT: Okay.

MR. RIDDLE: That's correct.

MS. PENNANT: Thank you.

MR. RIDDLE: But I just wanted to put that on there so that you're aware that that will be, going forward, as part of the -- the points system in criteria.

MS. PENNANT: Thank you.

MR. FRAZIER: One other question. When you're dealing with large municipalities versus small municipalities, wealthy municipalities, not so wealthy municipalities, and all of them have projects --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. FRAZIER: -- that are important to their individual municipality, how do you rank that in terms of the overall how -- how you measure, what kind of weight you put on that?

MR. RIDDLE: Well, this tool is data-driven, so --

MR. FRAZIER: Okay.

MR. RIDDLE: -- it's based on these criteria only. But there's a next step that's coming up --

MR. FRAZIER: Uh-huh.

MR. RIDDLE: -- that we'll talk about programming. And that's whenever we talk about geo -- geographic distribution of projects.

MR. FRAZIER: Uh-huh.

MR. RIDDLE: So --

MR. FRAZIER: I'm ahead of --

MR. RIDDLE: -- it's coming.

MR. FRAZIER: -- myself, I see.

MR. RIDDLE: In addition to the criteria, each project will be assigned points based on its work mix. Higher points were -- will be assigned to capacity increases, sidewalks, bike lanes, and transit.

Midrange points are assigned to intersection improvements and signal enhancements.

Lower points are assigned to landscaping, resiliency, and fiber projects.

Now Kerrie will go over the four steps to the ranking and programming process.

MS. MACNEIL: Hi. Good afternoon. Kerrie MacNeil. So step one of the ranking and programming process is establishing the project location.

So the original locations that we received from the County project locations started out as points. And so in order to create more accurate representations of the projects, we asked city staff to provide to and from descriptions of each of their projects. And that was inputted in an online submittal tool that the MPO developed.

So it was opened to the city staff following a workshop explaining what we were looking for. And then the information that we received was then digitized into a GIS map. And then, depending on the criteria, there is a buffer created around each project location that ranges from 200 feet to a quarter mile. Okay.

So after we received this information from the cities, they submitted information on the project location, as well as other information like a point of contact for the project, need for the project, et cetera. So we reviewed these project details internally that were submitted in the online tool, and then we discussed the project details at the one-on-one meetings this fall with staff members from each of the municipalities. So these --

MR. HOOPER: I'm sorry. I dropped something.

MS. MACNEIL: Okay. So at these meetings, we identified project attributes such as work mix, status, phase, and design phase. So this gave us an opportunity and a chance -- an opportunity to talk about the work mix of the project, which Andrew mentioned earlier. Is it a road widening project, are you adding bike lanes, sidewalk improvements, things like that.

And then the cities had an opportunity to tell us if they wanted to hold off on a project for any reason, if they weren't ready to move forward in fiscal year 2020, if they were to be -- if they were to rank high. Also if they were planning on swapping out the projects in -- starting in February of 2021, or if they actually didn't want this project at all anymore because it had already been implemented and they're looking to, again, in the future apply for a new project. We discussed the phase. Is it in need of a planning phase, design, is a right-of-way phase needed, or is it right before it goes to construction. And then if it was in the design stage, was there no design, did they have 30/60/90 percent design completed.

And after these meetings, the city staff were given the opportunity to submit more supporting documentation. If they wanted to submit additional design plans or construction documents, we had an opportunity for them to do so. So all of this, of course, goes into developing the geo database.

So step three, the ranking tool. So the GIS ranking tool incorporated both the project attributes and then the ranking criteria, which Andrew went over in a few slides before, which was level of service, incident delay, et cetera. And then we discussed several project -- point scale scenarios. So when we determined a point scale that we were to move forward with, we put this into the ranking tool, and, of course, the output of the tool is a ranked list.

The last step, step four, programming. In order to get from the ranked list to the program of recommended municipal projects for fiscal year 2020, that has us looking at both is the project shovel ready and is it program ready. And we'll go into that in just a second.

MR. RIDDLE: So once the projects are ranked, they will be evaluated for program readiness.

For cycle one which is current --

MR. ALLEN: Sorry. Where -- where would the consideration be given to municipal projects that would be compatible or dependent upon the County's corridor program? I mean, how do -- it would seem to me if you're going to do a corridor and you're going to bring a consultant on board to do the corridor study, that any municipal projects that -- abutting that corridor should have a higher priority than a standalone project that is tucked in the back of a neighborhood.

MR. RIDDLE: Yes. So we've been working with the County, and we have actually done buffer maps around the corridors that have been identified, and we have created a spreadsheet of all those projects that are -- that are with that -- within that quarter mile of that corridor. And some of the projects are kind of outliers and could have -- could be standalone projects that really wouldn't be of benefit to be in a corridor delivery.

But that's something that we are definitely working with the County on, and making sure that the projects that we're forwarding to you in March 26 are projects that could be incorporated into a corridor delivery plan.

MR. ALLEN: I guess I'm -- where I'm coming from, though, is are there any point given to the municipal projects --

MR. RIDDLE: No, sir.

MR. ALLEN: -- within the corridor?

MR. RIDDLE: No, sir. I'm sorry. I misunderstood your question. No.

MR. HOOPER: So where does the enhanced connectivity points fall under?

MR. RIDDLE: So enhanced connectivity, if a -- if there's a sidewalk gap, then you're filling in a sidewalk gap, that's improving connectivity. If you're within a half mile of a school, then you're, you know, building a sidewalk that's also helping connect to a school. It's really filling in at a local level. You know, we're at a finer grain network here with these projects, and they're trying to connect the like facilities to fill in those type of gaps. So for Cycle 1, which is current fiscal year, programming priorities are for shovel ready, new roads to complete the regional network, and also geographic distribution of projects. Here's an example of an assessment of shovel readiness.

During the review with city staff, we'll be identifying the project manager for the project. We'll also be looking at the design plans in relation to existing conditions and any permitting obstacles or issues that we might find with the plans. And also is the project biddable. And this is a complete dialog that we have with the cities whenever we talk about the projects that we're feeling like they're shovel ready so that we definitely take all these into consideration to make that determination.

Cycle 1 schedule. As you can see, we are substantially complete with all of the major tasks in the project schedule. We just have the last two, which is develop the list of program projects, and then deliver the Cycle 1 projects to the County. Our next steps include finalize the ranked list, prepare Cycle 1 program of recommended municipal projects.

On February 19th, we will hold a meeting with the cities to discuss the ranked list and also the Cycle 1 recommendations. And we'll deliver the Cycle 1 list to the County by the March 1st deadline. On March 26th, this board is expected to take action on the Cycle 1 projects. In April, the County Commission is expected to approve Cycle 1 projects. Immediately following the County's action, the cities can then start their projects, as long as they have that ILA in place. So that concludes our update, our quarterly update. But if you have any questions, feel free to ask us. We're both here to answer any questions.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Chair?

MR. HOOPER: Yes, sir.

MR. SMITH: Quick -- can I ask a quick question?

MR. HOOPER: Uh-huh.

MR. SMITH: I'm kind of curious as to the details of kind of what's happening in the box. And that may not be the exact right term, but -- so we went over a bunch of factors, and there are words. And we're saying that points are being assigned to words; right? But being kind of a numbers person, like what is happening actually inside of the software, or how is this kind of happening? Like what's the range of points, how are they really being assigned?

And then there's priorities that are being kind of kicked out, but, you know, like -- I'll give you a specific example. If you look at the ranking criteria and you say, okay, incident delay. So that's going to give high points. So that's -- I know that now, that incidence delay is going to give high points.

And now you look at a project, how do you assign the number of points? I mean, for a specific project, you just say, hey, it gets a high rating in that area? Is that how that would work in a practical sense? Or is there a number of points that it gets for that or?

MR. RIDDLE: There is a number of points.

MR. SMITH: And what's the scale of points it could get for having --

MR. RIDDLE: Okay. So --

MR. SMITH: -- incident delay?

MR. RIDDLE: -- for incident delay, over 60 incidences within 200 feet of that specific project would get a hundred points. Between 40 to 59 incidences within that 200-foot buffer gets 80 points. Between 30 to -- 20 to 39 incidences within that 200-foot gets 60 points. Between 11 and 19 incidences within that 20-foot [sic] gets 40 points. Less than ten incidents get 200 points. So everyone is going to get points for incident delay, but the higher incidents, the higher points you get.

MR. SMITH: Okay.

MR. RIDDLE: Does that help with --

MR. SMITH: It does. So -- so each one of these general points is backed up by further definitions of --

MR. RIDDLE: Absolutely.

MR. SMITH: -- points that are behind it, and then that's kind of what's happening in the system --

MR. RIDDLE: Yes, sir.

MR. SMITH: -- right, where it's -- so the data is loaded in and then the software's looking at all those data points and then --

MR. RIDDLE: Absolutely.

MR. SMITH: -- putting this all together.

MR. RIDDLE: Correct.

MR. SMITH: And then in terms of ranking these projects and working with the cities and them seeing, hey, I've loaded in this data and this is getting kicked back, what is going on with that whole --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I hear you.

MR. SMITH: -- interface in terms of loading it in and getting the results? Are the cities

coming back and saying, hey, this looks great or this doesn't make any sense or -- I mean, I have no idea.

MR. RIDDLE: So the cities have been fine with the approach.

MR. SMITH: Okay.

MR. RIDDLE: The criteria and the point scale and the work mix, the cities are comfortable with. What they haven't seen is the finalized ranked list, which we're still in the process of doing. So we're still, you know, using the -- this point scale scenario inputting into the ranked tool and running all 509 projects through it. And that'll be published on February 14th, prior to our February 19th meeting.

So the cities will have from the 14th to the 19th to look over the finalized ranked list, and if they have questions on why, you know, a certain project ranked 200, we can actually open up the tool, and we can go into that specific location for that project, and we can say here are the reasons why.

The level of service is great. There's no level of service concerns, so you weren't able to get points there. There were no crashes, the crashes were lower, that's why you got lower points there. Or vice versa. They could be getting, you know, really high points for these. But we will be able to open up the tool so they can better understand why their points -- why their, you know, ranking actually resulted, you know, based on the -- the criteria and the point scale.

MR. SMITH: So there's going to be time for kind of an open discussion and dialog back and forth with the --

MR. RIDDLE: Yes, sir. And we also have one-on-one meetings scheduled for three days --

MR. SMITH: Okay.

MR. RIDDLE: -- with the cities to go over their specific project.

MR. SMITH: Okay. And the connectivity that someone mentioned before, I mean, does that include multimodal, as well, and kind of future plans for things other than cars, or connecting even to other systems in terms of, you know, you come off the Brightline in Fort Lauderdale, and you're kind of in no man's land, for example.

And I know there's some stuff going in right there, but just connecting in with the other improvements that are happening as opposed to, okay, you can cut through here and get to another road. And we don't have to get into all that now, but I'm --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

MR. SMITH: -- interested to see what the connectivity kind of drivers are and how that -
-

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

MR. SMITH: -- like what the details of that are.

MR. RIDDLE: So we use existing data sets. Mostly they came from the Broward and also our studies that we have here within the Broward MPO on these things. And for existing facilities, we really were looking at is the sidewalk connecting to an existing sidewalk? Is this bike lane connecting to an existing bike lane? Is it within a half mile of an existing public school?

That was the connection to existing facilities points. And the maximum points for that would be 50 points.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. COOLMAN: Mr. Chair?

MR. HOOPER: I'm going to go with ladies first. MS. PENNANT: Oh, thank you. So I --

MR. HOOPER: Are you -- Ms. Love, did you --

MS. LOVE: I'm -- I'm fine.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. PENNANT: -- so I'm curious about why employment and that the population density were paired together. That's the first question that I have.

And then I'm also curious to know in the employment piece, how -- the details on that. because, you know, when I think of employment, I'm thinking about those communities where unemployment is really high and -- but -- but most of those communities have high levels of poverty. And so many of them are the folks that are going to be taking the buses. And so I'm curious to know how you're measuring employment as it relates to the ranking.

MR. RIDDLE: Okay.

MS. PENNANT: And then with respect to the population density, I'm also interested in seeing demographic breakout, because age matters. And I'm also curious to see just -- just the whole -- the whole gamut of demographics. Because I think that we have to be mindful of the Silver Tsunami, and I also want to make sure that there is definitely some -- some fairness in terms of how we distribute the -- the funding, and that certain

communities, based on population demographics, are not being disenfranchised --

MR. RIDDLE: Absolutely.

MS. PENNANT: -- by virtue of how the ranking is being done.

So really, it almost seemed to me that the employment piece should be factored separate from the population density component.

MR. RIDDLE: And you're absolutely correct.

MS. PENNANT: Okay.

MR. RIDDLE: Because we did split them up. So for employment density, the top five employment density gets 50 points, whereas the less -- less than 20 percent employment density gets ten points. So there's a range for just the employment density, and then we have population density.

The top five population density gets five -- 50 points, and the less than 20 percent population density gets ten points. But if you are in an area where there's high on both sides, high employment, high population, you would get a total of hundred points.

MS. PENNANT: Uh-huh. Okay.

MR. RIDDLE: Now, on your equity side, we do have equity factored in, and that includes population with a disability, racial minority, population below poverty line, ethnic minority, limited English proficiency, youth, older -- older adults 65-plus. And that is part of our analysis that we not only use here in surtax, but for all of our federal -- federal and state programs that we use this tool for. So --

MS. PENNANT: Thank you. Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Doug, and then --

MR. COOLMAN: This --

MR. HOOPER: -- Phil.

MR. COOLMAN: -- this ranking system is right now just for the city projects; is that correct?

MR. RIDDLE: Yes, sir.

MR. COOLMAN: And the --

MR. RIDDLE: That's correct.

MR. COOLMAN: -- city projects are --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible) want to ask (inaudible).

MR. COOLMAN: -- what, 25 percent of all the transportation --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. COOLMAN: -- dollars we're going to be spending, roughly?

MR. RIDDLE: From what I understand, we're at -- at this time, we're at 25 percent --

MS. MACNEIL: Twenty-three.

MR. RIDDLE: -- 23. I'm sorry.

MR. COOLMAN: Are you going to be applying this same criteria to the County's projects that are in the cities? In other words, the County has projects independent.

MS. WALLACE: No.

MR. COOLMAN: Are these criteria going to apply or not?

MS. WALLACE: No. The MPO is only, under the ordinance and under their contract, prioritizing --

MR. COOLMAN: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: -- municipal capital projects.

MR. COOLMAN: That's fine. Well, then, getting back to Phil's comment is if we've got 75 percent of our dollars spent elsewhere, then we've got to make sure that these city projects folding into that so we don't do things twice.

MR. RIDDLE: Absolutely.

MR. COOLMAN: And although we may or may not be part of this ranking, I think it would be helpful if you could take us and show us a project, a specific project, I don't care if you name it, but say, okay, we looked at this. Got this points.

In other words, this is all fine, but if you could take us through a project, don't tell us where it is, but how -- you know, how does it -- how do these things turn into scores, I guess --

MR. RIDDLE: Absolutely.

MR. COOLMAN: -- is the question.

MR. RIDDLE: And that's exactly what we're doing on the February 19th meeting.

MR. COOLMAN: Oh.

MR. RIDDLE: We're going to create a fake project in a municipal that isn't part of the ILA, just so that we didn't offend any of the cities, and we would actually go and show them, okay, here is this fake project and how it's scored. And -- so that you can see the back end on how this tool actually operates --

MR. COOLMAN: Okay.

MR. RIDDLE: -- so that people are familiar. And we can definitely bring that to you in March, if you would like.

MR. COOLMAN: Well, I -- I'd like to see it, but I'm also going to ask staff, this may not be in our purview. We are basically -- once these projects are brought to us, we're supposed to go thumbs up or thumbs down.

So this would be nice information to have, but I'm not so sure we have an influence on it.

MS. WALLACE: Correct. So your role, this -- the Oversight Board role with regard to the prioritized list is determining eligibility.

MS. CASSINI: We need to have people turn off their mics.

MR. HOOPER: If anyone's mics are on, please turn them off.

MS. CASSINI: There you go.

MS. WALLACE: Again, the Oversight Board -- Board's role with regard to the prioritized list is to review for eligibility under the statute, eligibility of the project and the proposed expenditures, not how it got prioritized.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Allen and then Ms. Kelley.

MS. PENNANT: Oh, are we not allowed to go to that February 19th meeting?

MS. CASSINI: Of course you are.

MS. PENNANT: No? Okay.

MR. RIDDLE: It is open to the public, yes, ma'am.

MS. PENNANT: Okay.

MR. RIDDLE: And it's posted on our website.

MS. PENNANT: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: And so if multiple members of the Oversight Board would like to be there, please let us know, because we will need to send out a sunshine notice that --

MS. CASSINI: You've already sunshined it.

MR. RIDDLE: Yes, ma'am. We sunshine.

MS. WALLACE: But you sunshined it for purposed of the MPO board, or did you list the Oversight Board?

MR. RIDDLE: We -- it was part of our -- just our regular meetings that we hold -- host at the MPO.

MS. WALLACE: Right. So we would need to send out a sunshine notice that multiple members of the Oversight Board may be present.

MS. PENNANT: And can we get the information on where it's being held and so on? I'm interested in going.

MR. RIDDLE: Yes, ma'am. It's on our -- on our website. I believe -- do we have our --

MS. PENNANT: Okay.

MR. RIDDLE: -- web link?

MS. MACNEIL: (Inaudible) send it to Gretchen.

MR. RIDDLE: I can send it to Gretchen and she can forward it along to you, if you'd like.

MS. PENNANT: Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Allen.

MR. ALLEN: The MPO is under contract with the County to do this ranking process. Is there a role for the MPO, itself, to approve these projects or to approve these rankings? You're just --

MR. RIDDLE: No.

MR. ALLEN: -- basically staffing the County's decision process.

MR. RIDDLE: Right. This is a staff-level endeavor. We just brief our technical advisory committee members, because they're municipal -- they make up of municipal staff. And we also brief our MPO board on our progress monthly.

MR. ALLEN: But nothing that you will be producing as part of this ranking process goes back to the MPO for formal action --

MR. RIDDLE: No --

MR. ALLEN: -- by the MPO.

MR. RIDDLE: -- action. No, sir. That's correct. There is no action by our MPO board or our advisory committees. The action will be with the -- with the Oversight Board here and also with the County Commission.

MR. HOOPER: Ms. Kelley.

DR. KELLEY: If you could go back to the rank -- the high, medium, and low chart with the points on the right. I don't know what page it is here.

MS. CASSINI: One more -- there you go.

DR. KELLEY: Okay. And forgive me if I missed this somewhere. In terms of big picture point allocation over on the right where things are essentially grouped as high, medium, and low, you know, what I'm hearing here and I -- my -- I -- when you talked about equity, which is right now down under low in terms of point -- total points or point allocation, I'm assuming, I want to speak to essentially what Ms. Pennant is also speaking to, which is if you look at the -- in the high area, we've got employment and population density.

We've got equity way down in the low area. And the equity, in terms of serving the shifting demographics and population in Broward, including the disabled, which I -- you know, I noticed when you talked about equity and the disabled or elderly in Broward, let's say, for example. I mean, I always knew that I was headed to be elderly. I wasn't expecting to be disabled. And in the last 14 years, I've traveled all around Broward through paratransit, and I've seen a huge shift.

But in equity, it seems to me, why is it down there and not up somehow with a major -- in terms of what the public perceives, you know. It seems important to me, and maybe you could speak to the equity.

MR. RIDDLE: I total agree with your comments. Because it didn't relate directly to the surtax ordinance on alleviating congestion and enhancing connectivity, we were -- we were wanting to include it somehow so that we could potentially give some points for equity and also resiliency that were very important to our communities.

DR. KELLEY: I know specifically that it doesn't, at first glance, necessarily relate to congestion and connectivity, but it does relate to quality of life, which is a huge driving force for this entire process. We would not have this great concern and this one percent -- the -- sorry -- the penny surtax funds if people weren't concerned about quality of life in Broward. And I understand that it doesn't immediately look like one of those two, but in terms of what the public sees in terms of what we are trying to help with, I don't know if there wouldn't be some way that we could make the concept of equity appear more important.

MS. CASSINI: I'm here to take all of your considerations and your direction as we move forward. And I -- to speak to what the constraints were for the prioritization process for the MPO, we have an interlocal agreement that details exactly what the MPO's prioritization process is supposed to look like for Cycle 1, because we knew that we were going to be working within some very tight time constraints --

DR. KELLEY: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: -- to try to get these projects delivered. We want very much for the public to see things happening and for projects to be underway.

So the interlocal agreement for prioritization services limited the MPO in this first round only. And that's what I really want to make sure everyone understands. The process that's being used to prioritize the 509 projects that were in the original plan that went to the voters was required to use what was called a modified Complete Streets and Localized Initiatives program, because it was something that the MPO already had and that the municipalities were comfortable with using.

So as part of our overall negotiation with the MPO and all of the cities, it was determined that that process was something that people were comfortable with and we would just modify the evaluation criteria to include congestion relief and connectivity.

When we start evaluating new projects and when we start accepting new projects and creating the application for that, we can take into consideration a lot of other factors, and we intend to do so. And the Board of County Commissioners will have to actually approve that application process and what is in it, and what the evaluation criteria are.

So I just wanted for this body to know that this was just to try to get the 500 projects that were in the original plan in some semblance of ranked order so that we could identify what was shovel ready and could go now. And we will be looking at equity much more as we move through this program into the future.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Frazier.

MR. FRAZIER: My question deals with the economic side. Once these projects have been identified and you have in this ordinance this 30 percent participation, whose responsibility is it to ensure or put a plan of action or something to indicate that these goals can be met on these various projects?

MS. CASSINI: Great question. So our Office of Economic and Small Business Development, which you've heard mentioned previously, they're going to be working with every municipality to ensure that they have the resources and tools and technical assistance. Actually, we're going to be introducing you to a brand new surtax-funded staff member who has joined OESBD's team to do this type of community outreach. I, as -- so with -- the MAP Administration Office will be the Contract Administrator for all of the municipal contracts. It's our job to be working with the Office of Economic and Small Business Development to monitor the contracts for compliance, to be going on-site, to be providing whatever technical assistance and capacity-building as needed, to be working hand in hand with our OESBD team.

And that is really on us to come back. And that's one of the reasons why the contracts are going to be administrated -- administered in our office, so that we can be reporting to you all and accountable to you all to make sure that those goals are being met.

MR. FRAZIER: Well, one of the things that are usually absent, and it comes in after the fact, is that participation. No one puts together a schedule, just like this schedule for these projects they have on here, showing a timeline and what's involved. Well, to get this inclusion of these community small business, you need the same kind of schedule. You can't introduce these community businesses at the 11th hour and say, hey, here's a 30 percent opportunity, but on Monday I need your documents in.

So somewhere along the line, either that agency you just spoke of, someone has to put together an implementation plan where these things intersect along the way.

So I don't know whether that's the County's responsibility or you're hiring an outside consultant to do that, or just what.

MR. HOOPER: I think it -- us being on this board for the last year, we've learned quite a bit. And the County's efforts with a separate department to help small businesses apply for these type of projects is in -- is in the works. So maybe we can ask (inaudible).

MR. FRAZIER: So that would be their responsibility. Okay.

MS. FELICIANO: Good afternoon. Maribel Feliciano. I'm the Assistant Director for the Office of Economic and Small Business Development. And that is correct. We have a process in place currently for our CBE program where we will work with the municipalities before they start the procurement process for these projects. Our staff,

our small business specialist, is going to be meeting with each municipality one-on-one with our director to explain to them what the process is for compliance, to ensure that they monitor the projects.

So our office will be monitoring these projects on a monthly basis. The primes are required to submit progress reports to us. And those reports are going to include the amount that have been paid to the prime and the amounts that have been paid to the subs, our small businesses. And we will be monitoring compliance.

MR. FRASIER: I understand.

MR. HOOPER: Excellent. Mr. Cavros.

MR. CAVROS: Can we put the slide back up with the ranking? That's Slide 5 on mine.

So I have a couple questions regarding the prioritization. You have level of service there as a -- almost a medium to high criteria. Could you explain for the folks watching at home what level of service means?

MR. RIDDLE: The level of service, every roadway has a level -- level of service grade. Basically, are there enough -- is there enough capacity for the volume that -- of traffic per day.

MR. CAVROS: Uh-huh.

MR. RIDDLE: And the way the level of service is broken out, it's from Level of Service A, which is basically free-flowing, gets a minimum of ten points. For forced or breakdown flow, those would get the highest, which is 50 points.

MR. CAVROS: Okay. And you don't have to give me all -- all the point breakdown. I just --

MR. RIDDLE: Okay.

MR. CAVROS: -- wanted kind of a general definition of level of service so folks could understand --

MR. RIDDLE: Right.

MR. CAVROS: -- what that is.
And I think at the state level, they rank them from A to F, depending on how traffic --

MR. RIDDLE: Yes.

MR. CAVROS: -- flows on them; is that accurate?

MR. RIDDLE: Yes, sir, that's correct. So it's --

MR. CAVROS: Okay.

MR. RIDDLE: -- Level of Service A through F, and it's, you know, based on, you know, the capacity that's available for that type of roadway.

MR. CAVROS: Would you agree during rain events in Florida that -- in Broward County, that certain communities in Broward County, the roadways flood in those communities?

MR. RIDDLE: Absolutely.

MR. CAVROS: Okay. I'm thinking of Hollywood, Hallandale, Fort Lauderdale, some others. Would you also agree that during high tide events, especially in October and November, those roadways flood, there are certain roadways that flood as well in Broward County?

MR. RIDDLE: Absolutely. And we do have projects to remedy those issues in the surtax plan.

MR. CAVROS: Would you agree that those -- those drainage issues affect level of service on those roads?

MR. RIDDLE: That or divert traffic to other areas, which would create level of service issues for the diverted roadways.

MR. CAVROS: Right. Okay.

So -- and then if we could go to the next slide where it shows resiliency improvements actually scoring less than signage and landscaping. Given that we just agreed that flooding due to rain, flooding due to King Tide events -- and generally these events are going to become more frequent, as I understand it, according to the science, climate change impacts to Florida. You may have heard the old adage that south Florida is ground zero for climate change impacts.

So I'm kind of scratching my head when I see that resiliency improvements scored below landscaping. Could you explain that to me?

MR. RIDDLE: The resiliency projects that we were getting for Cycle 1, they were more about the existing drainage deficiencies. And they will still get 20 points out of the 50 points. So it's not a huge, you know, differential between the highest points, which would be 50.

MR. CAVROS: Would you explain to me how you analyze resiliency?

MR. RIDDLE: Well, some of the resiliency projects would be for -- yeah, Kerrie's bringing it up here. Example -- example of resiliency projects can include, but not limited to, addressing sea level rise, flooding issues, and the conversion of existing infrastructure to be windstorm resistant.

MR. CAVROS: Did you use -- are you familiar with the unified sea level rise projection?

MR. RIDDLE: We use the Broward MPO extreme weather and climate change risk to the transportation report to base our analysis on.

MR. CAVROS: Okay. Do you know if that report is based on or considered the unified sea level rise projection map that has been -- come -- developed by the Southeast Florida Regional Climate Compact?

MR. RIDDLE: I can't speak on -- for sure on that, but I think it was coordinated, if I understood.

MR. CAVROS: And do you know if your model is consistent with the sea level rise projections called for in that map?

MR. RIDDLE: I do not have that answer --

MR. CAVROS: Uh-huh.

MR. RIDDLE: -- right in front of me now.

MR. CAVROS: Is there a transparent way for us to see how you model resiliency?

MR. RIDDLE: Well, this report is actually on our MPO website, that's correct. We use -- we were trying to use existing studies and data and not having to recreate in a three-month timeframe to develop new data and analysis.

MS. CASSINI: Mr. Chair?

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. CAVROS: I'm not done --

MR. HOOPER: You still going?

MR. CAVROS: -- Mr. Chair.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. CAVROS: Are you familiar with the -- are you familiar with the 2045 metropolitan

rather the regional transportation plan that was -- we had a presentation --

MR. RIDDLE: Uh-huh.

MR. CAVROS: -- in January on that. How does this figure into the -- projects that are coming forward now figure into the regional transportation plan?

MR. RIDDLE: Well, we have done an analysis of what was submitted in the 2045 plan, and also what is in our existing TIP. And we are making sure that the projects that are funded in the TIP, in the Transportation Improvement Program, are a good fit to stay either in the TIP or be funded with the surtax plan.

MR. CAVROS: Okay. So we talked about how you analyzed sea level rise and resiliency of projects. Apparently -- and, again, I'm just going to summarize -- this was sort of a composite report that you developed based on a number of indices; is that -- is that --

MR. RIDDLE: That's correct.

MR. CAVROS: -- accurate? Okay. And let's talk about prioritization. I understand the logic, or at least the argument that you're making, that this -- you know, resiliency was not specifically stated in the statute. But from a common sense perspective -- look, I view our role here -- you know, our role here is to make sure that the taxpayer dollars are spent wisely.

So I'm a little reticent to approve a project that involves millions of dollars when resiliency hasn't been factored in at a significant level. I don't want those taxpayers to have to come back in five or seven or nine years and redo that project because we didn't consider resiliency -- actually, not that we didn't consider it, that we didn't prioritize it in these projects.

So that's where I have a problem with this -- with this prioritization. And given our independent oversight role here, you know, it's -- and I know at some level, our approval of these projects is limited to the statutory language, so that presents a little bit of a challenge, because if these projects are not prioritizing resiliency, you know, does that or does that not meet the statutory language? You know, at least that -- that's a challenge for me. It may not be for other board members. But I'm going to have a problem approving projects in the future that don't prioritize resiliency, just as a guidance to the Broward MPO and to the municipalities that are putting these projects forward, and -- and to the County.

MS. WALLACE: Okay. So the prioritization process factors in resiliency, but the statute is a Charter County regional transportation surtax. And there are provisions under the statute that allow for an infrastructure tax where the infrastructure itself could be funded separately. But if it's strictly infrastructure and it's not infrastructure that's ancillary to a road improvement, then we can't just pay for infrastructure.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION
SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JANUARY 30, 2020

dh/NC

So if the road doesn't need to be raised or resurfaced or expanded, and it's just the road floods, we can't just pay for to -- the infrastructure needed to alleviate the flooding. So the resiliency component is a factor in the provision of the transportation improvements. It's not the primary factor.

MR. ALLEN: Could you clarify that? If you've got a project that -- let's say the roadway, the intersection is failing because of capacity constraints, or, you know, clearly qualified under the statute. If as part of that project you elect to raise that road to deal with a potential flooding issue, is that not -- not allowed?

MS. WALLACE: That would be permissible, because it's ancillary to the road improvement. It can't be the -- alleviating the flooding can't be the only aspect of the project.

MR. ALLEN: So basically what you're saying, resiliency or the -- you know, I need to raise the infrastructure to meet a potential flooding event is not allowable ranking criteria, or not a recommended ranking criteria.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. WALLACE: It can't be a straight drainage --

MR. ALLEN: Absent any other need for a project.

MS. WALLACE: For a transportation improvement, right. So if the road needs improvement, if the road is -- and so the criteria applied by FDOT in the grading from A to F is about the usage of the road and whether there's too much congestion on the road. Can the road accommodate the capacity of traffic that is attempting to use the road on a daily basis, not whether the road floods. That's not part of the A to F criteria. But if the road is an F and the road needs to be expanded, then we can deal with the drainage ancillary to expanding the road. But we can't just pay --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. WALLACE: -- we cannot just pay for a straight drainage project because drainage is infrastructure, not transportation.

MR. SMITH: Can I make a quick comment?

MR. HOOPER: Provided that we're still on what Mr. Cavros --

MR. SMITH: Yes, we are.

MR. HOOPER: -- was (inaudible).

MR. SMITH: We are.

So that's not what I -- I mean, I appreciate the clarification, but that's not what I really heard from Mr. Cavros. I think what I heard -- what I took from it is if we're looking at these, anyway, and we're going to put in a big project, and let's say years from now, all this infrastructure goes in and it's at risk for resiliency, right, because the climate is changing, whatever is happening, and we don't build that in, we're kind of just foolish; right?

So I think that's -- that's what I took from what he was asking. I don't think he's saying, hey, let's go look around Broward County and fix all the issues that are there that just are related -- are related to resiliency, but just to factor it in so we don't have to go backwards later.

MR. HOOPER: I think what would be interesting, maybe in our next meeting, is to have one of the County engineers or someone come speak to us on the code that they follow when they install roads and they -- today, and when they install different infrastructure. Because I'll tell you that with buildings today, I have to be a foot higher than I had to be a year and a half ago. Why is that? Because of climate change and water -- sea level rise.

So I am quite sure that as we start building -- if we took Bayview Drive and redid it, or Commercial Boulevard, there's going to be certain elevations that these streets are going to have to be brought to. That's my thought. I'll wait to hear from Engineering. But I think we're going to get a little of it on every project we do. There's going to have to be consideration to resiliency and climate change. And I think that is per code, so.

MS. PENNANT: Mr. Chair, I want --

MR. HOOPER: Is it the same --

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: -- because he's (inaudible).

MS. PENNANT: I just really want to support what Mr. Cavros is saying. I think -- I mean, when you -- when you look at it, and I didn't even realize it until he said it, is the idea that landscaping and signage is even -- the optics of it, it's above resiliency is -- is a little disturbing, you know.

Even if it's both in the low section, it seemed to me that resiliency should at least be above landscaping, because that's not even, you know, something that is part of the measure, but yet it's still higher. And so it's the thought process, the philosophy that we're going into that measure with -- or ranking.

MS. PENNANT: Are you done, Mr. Cavros? Okay. Mr. Coolman.

MR. COOLMAN: I find all of these comments extremely important, although, based on my previous comment, I'm going to ask a question, answer it, and then I'm going to propose something for discussion. Is this part of what the Oversight Board is charged with evaluating, rating these projects? Answer's no.

Then I'm going to myself, wait a minute. A great conversation. Maybe this is something the Oversight Board should be involved with. And I would think we're in the first of 30 years, we've already amended what was done, an excellent job to get this thing going, but I have always wondered what our role is. I don't know what you guys think your role is because I can't talk to you outside these rooms, which I think is absolutely ludicrous, but that's the way the rules are.

So if -- I'm glad that the MPO is ranking these projects, but before they go to the Broward County Commission for a vote, they need to come here, and we need to give the scrutiny that we're -- should have. If this means another amendment, I think we need an amendment. That's my two cents.

MR. HOOPER: Ms. Cassini.

MS. CASSINI: Mr. Chair? So your role on the pre-award side is to evaluate projects for eligibility under the statute. But when you submit your letter to the Board of County Commissioners with your recommendations and your determinations, you can include in that letter, based on the ordinance, any recommendations that you think would make the project better.

So this is a perfect opportunity where you could say, we think that this project should have a resiliency component, and then the Board of County Commissioners would have that information and take that under advisement.

The other thing that I just want to let you all know is we haven't talked about performance metrics. We haven't brought you forward how performance is going to be measured or what we're proposing to measure, and how we're going to define connectivity. Because, you know, connectivity, the way that we are proposing to define it, has an element of resiliency. It talks about roadway flooding, because if you can't get through a road, if it's not passable, then you have a connectivity issue.

We believe, at least at the County level and as your staff support people, that resiliency is kind of a foundational element of this program, and we see it that way, and we'll be looking at ways to measure that and to benchmark that, you know, improvements not just in, you know, flooding, but also in air quality and lots of other things that we plan to bring back to you at a later meeting for you to react to and see if we're -- if we're getting it right.

I just -- for the purpose of the MPO's ranking, the responsibility is -- was on the County. The County told the MPO, through a contract, what things they wanted it to consider, how they wanted to -- how we expected them to prioritize the -- this initial set of projects quickly.

And so I'm taking all of this under advisement. I know the importance of resiliency at the County. And we will certainly make the adjustments moving forward. But they were constrained by what we told them they had to do in their interlocal agreement.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Coolman.

MR. COOLMAN: That sounds all well and good, but that's not what I'm talking about.

(Laughter.)

MR. COOLMAN: I'm talking about the fact that we have a MPO ranking 509 city projects that are going to be recommended to the County, and I think we should have the ability to make sure that that ranking is -- now, I don't want to review everything, but even -- yes, resiliency should be part of it, but there may be some projects that some cities don't like the way they were ranked and don't know why. And I don't know, but I just don't understand why this board wouldn't see these rankings, which is fine, understand how they all happen, bless them, and send them onto the County rather -- I mean --

MS. CASSINI: That is what you're --

MR. COOLMAN: -- why wouldn't that be --

MS. CASSINI: -- doing --

MR. COOLMAN: -- our responsibility?

MS. CASSINI: That is what you're doing on March 26th.

MR. COOLMAN: When?

MS. CASSINI: It is your responsibility.

MR. COOLMAN: Yeah, but when -- yeah, but wait a minute. When -- you had us -- they were going directly from there to the County.

MS. CASSINI: No.

MS. WALLACE: No. They come to County --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Absolutely not.

MS. WALLACE: -- the list will --

MS. CASSINI: Next slide, please.

MS. PENNANT: Municipalities are not.

MR. COOLMAN: I must have missed something.

MS. CASSINI: Go to that slide. Thank you. There you go.

MR. COOLMAN: So that -- March 26th is when they're coming here?

MR. HOOPER: Right.

MS. CASSINI: Correct. And that's going to be a long --

MR. COOLMAN: Your --

MS. CASSINI: -- meeting.

MR. COOLMAN: -- set of recommendations. Sorry, I missed that.

MS. CASSINI: And all the municipalities that are being recommended for funding will also be here --

MR. COOLMAN: So --

MS. CASSINI: -- to take any questions that you all have.

MR. COOLMAN: -- the answer to my question was -- is yes. I said, is this part of what the Oversight Board is charged with evaluating. You said no. I said, no, wait a minute. It is.

MS. WALLACE: So the criteria being applied by the MPO for purposes of ranking the projects is the subject of the ordinance in terms of the relieving congestion and promoting connectivity. It's included in the existing ordinance. It's included in the global ILA, umbrella ILA among the County, the municipalities, and the MPO, and in the scope of the MPO's agreement with the County for them to prioritize municipal projects. And those agreements provide that the ranking that is created by the MPO will come to the Oversight Board for a determination of eligibility of the projects and the proposed funding, not an evaluation of the criteria that the MPO is applying. And we have to, by contract, because the municipalities included in the contract that the prioritized list of municipal capital projects will be funded by County in the order prioritized by the MPO.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION
SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JANUARY 30, 2020

dh/NC

So we have to be careful that we don't run afoul of what the existing agreements are, because then there will be issues raised by the municipalities who are -- whose projects are being evaluated. And it's being done based upon the agreements among all of those parties.

MR. COOLMAN: So we can comment, but we can't comment on their ranking.

MS. WALLACE: Correct. And you can make recommendations. So with regard to the prioritized list, it's a determination of eligibility. And if there are recommendations regarding the criteria that the Oversight Board wants relayed to the County Commission, then we can do that.

MR. COOLMAN: If we have an issue with a ranking, can we say it?

MS. WALLACE: Yes, you can say it.

MR. HOOPER: Ms. Love and then Mr. Allen.

MS. LOVE: Just in line with what Mr. Coolman is saying, maybe, so is -- what -- is there an appeal process of the ranking that a municipality can use if they disagree? And if it is, how does that take place and when.

MS. WALLACE: There is no appeal process related to the prioritized ranked list created by the MPO. And the inter- -- yeah, that umbrella interlocal agreement defines what happens in terms of how -- when they get funded and how they get funded. That's a product of an interlocal agreement among the municipalities, the County, and the MPO.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Allen, did you have something?

MR. ALLEN: I think we're fooling ourselves if we think we're going to do that in one day.

MS. WALLACE: Oh, no. No --

MR. ALLEN: I mean --

MS. WALLACE: -- we anticipate two days in March.

MR. ALLEN: -- the 26th.

MS. WALLACE: Right?

MS. CASSINI: No, one day in March. There are -- there are not that many projects, and the way that we're planning to structure it -- it will be a full day.

MR. ALLEN: You say you --

MS. CASSINI: It's not going to be --

MR. ALLEN: -- have 500 projects?

MS. CASSINI: Oh, no, no. There's about 40. So --

MR. ALLEN: Oh.

MS. CASSINI: -- so the first cycle --

MR. ALLEN: What'd I miss?

MS. CASSINI: -- so the -- so the first cycle is just what the MPO surtax-funded staff believes can be started --

MR. ALLEN: Oh, shovel ready.

MS. CASSINI: -- in fiscal year '20. They're shovel ready --

MR. ALLEN: Oh, okay.

MS. CASSINI: -- and they can start in fiscal year '20. The next big one that I think I mentioned to most of you in your briefings is when we get the five-year plan ready. And the five-year plan is still not going to have 500 municipal projects in it, because those 500 projects were supposed to be over 30 years. But it's going to have a lot of municipal projects. It's going to have a lot of County projects. And so we are suggesting that in July --

MR. ALLEN: Oh, okay.

MS. CASSINI: -- your July meeting, we would probably need two days to go through the five-year plan.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Are we talking maintenance?

MS. CASSINI: Oh, and, of course, the rehab and maintenance will come to you in May. So the municipal rehab and maintenance projects get funded -- they get recommended and funded after all of the action on the capital projects has occurred.

MS. WALLACE: For this cycle.

MS. CASSINI: For this cycle, yes.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. I just want to say a couple things. I think that when it comes to ranking the cities' priorities, I think the MPO is -- and we can talk about what they use to

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION
SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JANUARY 30, 2020

dh/NC

rank them, but these are all projects, if I'm -- if I understand this correctly, these are all projects that were already part of the original plan. Okay?

So the cities themselves posted those projects in. And then they're going to rank them, the ones that are teed up closest to being ready to go, they're going to rank them based on those things. Then it comes to us and we can ask questions about all the things that matter to us.

But I don't think we want to get hung up on the idea that we're involved in the ranking process. I don't.

MR. COOLMAN: I didn't want to get involved in the ranking process. I wanted to be able to question the ranking process, if we could. And you're saying all we can do is comment about it.

MR. HOOPER: I know, but if --

MR. COOLMAN: That's okay.

MR. HOOPER: -- you look at what --

MR. COOLMAN: I -- I don't want to rank them.

MR. HOOPER: -- who -- who -- but if you look at who makes up the MPO, it's the cities that makes up the MPO; correct?

MS. WALLACE: There's a municipal representative on the MPO.

MR. COOLMAN: That's fine.

MR. RIDDLE: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. All right. So I just --

MR. COOLMAN: I said I want to --

MR. HOOPER: -- I just --

MR. COOLMAN: -- bring it up for discussion so I could clarify.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Sounds good. Do you have -- you want to keep going?

MR. RIDDLE: We're --

MR. HOOPER: Or are you done?

MR. RIDDLE: -- we -- we concluded, but I just wanted to make a point that we -- every year, we will be looking at how well this performed, and we will make adjustments with the tool.

So if there's criteria that, you know, we can adjust, going forward, we're going to do kind of an analysis of how the past performance was, and, moving forward, we can take any kind -- you know, from the public, we can take it from the cities, and move forward with, you know, improvements to the tool and the criteria.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Thank you very much. Is there anybody else that has any comments or questions? Okay. Thank you --

MR. RIDDLE: Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: -- for your --

MR. RIDDLE: It was a pleasure. Thank you so much.

MR. HOOPER: -- thank you.

4 - TRANSPORTATION SURTAX INNOVATION TEAM **A - INTRODUCTION OF NEW SURTAX-FUNDED TEAM MEMBERS**

MR. HOOPER: The next item is the Transportation Surtax Innovation Team. Exciting stuff.

MS. CASSINI: And the very first thing I'd like to do is ask both Maribel and Lenny to come up and introduce their brand new, since you last met in October, the five new surtax-funded staff members. These are all positions that you all approved either in fiscal year '19 or '20, and we are excited to bring them to you.

MR. VIALPANDO: Thank you for having me. So, if you recall, we did create a County Innovation Unit, and three of the positions in the Innovation Unit are surtax funded. And, as of now, I'm happy to report that those three positions have been filled, and they're here. Let's see. Yeah. Okay.

And so I want to introduce right now, just go ahead and come up, Ernesto and Josette, and Min-Tang.

So Ernesto is -- works in GIS and will be doing a lot of the support for the dashboards and a lot the stuff that we created using General Fund personnel, initially.

So, you know, any tweaks that you need, any other additional information, any kind of project data that you'd like us to be tracking, or visualizations that you need and that sort of thing, Ernesto will be working on that.

And Josette is -- she came -- comes to us from Fort Lauderdale. She was their Vision Zero coordinator. And she is -- she's going to be working initially on the greenways master plan and putting out the RFP for the greenways master plan.

And Min-Tang Li is a modeler that comes to us from FDOT. And he will be expanding out our ability to run the super (phonetic) model, which is something that the County has not been able to do, and right now, really only FDOT and the MPO and maybe some consultants can do that. And the advantage there is as we build out our capability to run that model, we'll be able to put our new emerging transportation technologies and data into that model and see what kind of impacts we're getting, as well as be able to evaluate the actual return on investment that projects are producing based on that data, and be able to run like small models.

So I -- I guess -- anybody want to say anything now?

(Laughter.)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MR. VIALPANDO: All right. Well, thanks and --

(Applause.)

MR. VIALPANDO: Thanks.

MS. FELICIANO: Good afternoon again. Maribel Feliciano, Office of Economic and Small Business Development. Our office, as we discussed earlier, is going to be responsible for ensuring the compliance with the 30 percent small business participation. And we have hired two small business specialists. I would like to call Nichole Francis and Savika Junor to come to the front.

Nichole Francis is going to be the person responsible for ensuring compliance on that 30 percent small business participation. She's going to be scheduling meetings with each municipality to describe what the procurement process is going to be like and our coordination with them. We're going to be providing technical assistance to each one of the municipalities to ensure that they understand the process, the compliance process, the reporting process. I mentioned that there's going to be MURs, monthly utilization reports, that they're going to have to provide to us, the primes, indicating every month how the percentage of the small business participation that they are reporting. So Nichole is going to be responsible for that function.

Savika Junor is going to be working on the communications and outreach aspects. We have been already having many information sessions with small business. As you know, we're going to be building capacity, developing outreach, marketing, and information sessions with many local organizations. We're going to have a regional outreach effort

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION
SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JANUARY 30, 2020

dh/NC

and later on we're going to go out of state to try to bring, as part of that economic development initiative, bring outside companies to -- to locate here in Broward, as well. So Savika is going to be part of that responsibilities, working together with the MAP team.

So I would like to welcome them.

(Applause.)

B - WAZE ENGAGEMENT PRESENTATION

C - M.I.T. CONTRACT ENGAGEMENT

MR. VIALPANDO: All right. So I just want to give you a couple of quick updates. And I - again, I think you so much for having me. It's really very awesome to be in here and to hear all of the interactions and the questions that everyone's asking. And I really appreciate all of your engagement and how, you know, on top of this you guys really are.

And, you know, to that end, I'll kind of tailor some of my comments to things that I've heard you guys bring up. And, you know, as Maribel was just saying, you know, there have been a lot of outreach sessions. And to your question earlier about, well, how do people know, you know, so that we don't tell them on Friday that we want the report. And I feel like they've done a really good job of going out. And I've actually attended two of those sessions where we focused in on how small businesses can ramp up over, you know, the next five or ten years to be able to meet the demands as the surtax grows and be able to be on top of those innovations and be able to help us out.

And from those two engagement sessions that I've had, we've met with a number of firms who would like to become CBEs. We've actually met with 48 separate technology and -- and university firms since we began this engagement. And six of them have been CBEs. And we're very interested in bringing them on and helping them understand what is happening and how we're going to be doing it.

And, you know, I just want to point out about the resiliency components that you were asking about. You know, we have been engaging with Dr. Jurado and looking at, you know, as new projects come on board, how we can look at the resiliency aspects. And, you know, to what Gretchen was saying earlier about sensors and things, you know, I want to -- you know, remember that the other half of the Innovation Unit, there's four other positions that are being recruited right now that are General funded. Those will be data scientists and GIS personnel.

And we're going to be testing in the Innovation District a whole host of technologies related to sea level rise and flooding, as well as mobility in transportation and, you know, air pollution, and looking at the overall mix and how we can give people

information about, oh, you know, there's a King Tide and the road is flooding. And then, if we have more information about that, we can actually go and, you know, show FDOT that there's an issue.

And, you know, I want you to know we were able to use some of the technologies we're testing. We're using the virtual reality headsets and we actually were able to go out and use 3D cameras recently to take images at a location where we experienced sea level rise that many in the transportation industry thought really wasn't an issue. And so we went out and we videoed it while it was happening. And, you know, you're standing in, you know, water up to your knees.

And then we were able to, on a nice beautiful sunny day, bring the Secretary of FDOT out there and put the VR headset on him and let him see what it looked like just a few weeks before when the high tide was there on a sunny day. And he was like, you know what? You're right. There's a problem. We -- and then they programmed it, and they're actually going to -- they're actually going to fix that area.

So I want you to know we've been able to leverage some of those technologies. We're - - we're, you know, just in the -- in the forefront of being able to implement that. We do have -- our M.I.T. scope is with what's called their Office of Sponsored Research, as we speak, and it goes through how we're going to sort of engage with them over the next five years and in the first year.

You know, one of the things we want to be really cognizant of is not only what -- what we could do, right, what's possible, but also what we should do, based on public perception and public tolerance for risk. And not just stated preference surveys, which is what the typical kind of, hey, do you like Coke or Pepsi better, you know, but also fall -- you know, figuring out, well, are they buying Cokes and Pepsis, even though they tell us they like the other; right?

So they're called behavioral studies. So one of the things M.I.T.'s going to be helping us do is, A, figure out how the Innovation District looks and the types of sensors and vendors and data that could be collected, but also dealing with residents and doing behavioral research and studies and really engaging them throughout the process to say, you know, we could do this, but, you know, do you think we should, and how do we make sure that we're addressing people's concerns as part of this.

And, you know, we may look at a technology and say, well, it's possible, but, you know, maybe we're not going to do it right now, based on the -- you know, the input that we're getting. And we'll be sharing that information with you, both everything that's possible as well as the feedback that we're getting about how people feel about those things. And, you know, the last thing I just kind of want to share with you is that, you know, we are going to be going out and doing a number of RFPs over the next few months, and going out and getting, you know, an RFP for the greenways master plan. And we'll be putting, you know, goals in there, if we can, with -- with the help of OESBD. And we're also

doing a procurement for big data, and many of these CBEs and other firms that we've met with have been interested in how they can participate in getting big data.

We are already partnered with Waze, which is the great presentation that you're about to get from Min-Tang, and how we're able to get data from them. And as part of the surtax, we are implementing Waze with the cities and trying to get the road closure data, you know, marathons, any types of other -- you know, pipe breaks or reasons why they've, you know, had to close down the road so we can put that out to Waze electronically, so that people can get a countywide picture of that. And we're going to show you how the data we get from Waze can be used. And this is just going to be kind of like a little sample of that.

And then we are very close to the traffic signal sharing. We've actually worked out a protocol for how we're going to transmit the traffic signal timing data out onto servers so that the vehicle manufacturers can get that data and provide it to people in real time so that they'll know how much longer the light is going to be red, and maybe how long it will be green, and whether or not if they went a certain number of miles per hour that they could catch the next three green lights instead of having to wait at a red light.

And then, once that's up and running, we're going to look at trying to create some sort of service so that people can go, you know, either on the web or through an app and just get that themselves from us, and not have to own a certain type of vehicle or something like that. And then we're also looking at partnering with University of Florida. I believe you met Dr. Ranka a while back. We are in the process of putting that together and looking at five intersections in the County where we can use A.I. to basically try to make sure that we're not having a lot of near collisions between pedestrians and vehicles and if we are, whether or not any improvements we make actually are rectifying the problem. And then we've met with FIU recently, and we're in the process of engaging FAU, as well, so that we can bring all the local universities on board, as well, and help us do research.

So with that, think I'll ask Min-Tang if he'll come up and just give you kind of a quick overview. He made these in Power BI, which is a business intelligence software that can aggregate data from a lot of different places and create dashboards. And these dashboards are the kinds of things that we'll be building in the future, and that you'll have access to, as well, as well as the kind of information we want to put out to the public, so.

MR. LI: Thank you. Thank you, Lenny. Good afternoon, Mr. Chair and members of the board. Again, my name is Min-Tang Li, and I'm with the Mobility Planning Section. As Lenny mentioned or introduced, crowdsourcing data are now popularly used to assess traffic conditions and identify mobility concerns.

Today I'm going to present the preliminary, yet interesting, result obtained from the analysis of crowdsourcing data retrieved from Waze and RITIS. How to move forward?

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION
SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JANUARY 30, 2020

dh/NC

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Green arrow.

MR. LI: Okay. Thank you. Sorry. First time. So Waze is a GPS and navigation app for portable devices such as smartphones and tablet computers. Waze --

(Laughter.)

MR. LI: Thank you. Waze collect traffic alerts from -- such as crashes and jams from Waze users, aka Wazers, and share the data with Broward County. In November 2019, alone, there are more than 100,000 traffic alerts reported by Wazers for roadways located within Broward County. The slide shows the composition of those records classified by alert type, including jams, hazards, accidents, and subtypes.

The next slide shows traffic jams daily changes and fluctuations patterns. As you can see that the number of traffic jams peak on Wednesday and Thursday, and the general weekly pattern may make traffic condition we experience a typical work week.

Waze accident records, however, did not reveal a similar pattern as traffic jams. RITIS stands for Regional Integrated Transportation Information System. Is data archiving and analytics platform sponsored by many public agencies, including FDOT, Florida Department of Transportations.

Currently, observed travel speed and calculated free-flow speeds provided by a company called Here Technologies have been purchased and make available by FDOT on RITIS for public use. With RITIS data, same as Waze -- Here -- I'm sorry -- Here collect GPS data and calculate free-flow speed based on 85 percentile of observed speed from given roadways.

With RITIS data, travel speed index, which is a ratio of observed speed over free-flow speed, can be calculated and used as a traffic congestion indicator. For demonstration purpose, we created a video clip based on Waze and RITIS data to depict and visualize traffic conditions that we maybe observe during 6:00 to 9:00 a.m. on December 12, 2019. How to play the video. Okay.

So as you can see -- maybe I pause here -- in the early morning, 6:00 o'clock, 6:15, most of the roadway within Broward County operated at a free-flow speed -- around free-flow speed level. There are some location reported with -- those will be hazards. The green means hazards, and red -- if there's any red -- okay. Blue -- blue -- dark blue -- the blue dots represent Waze jams locations. And the darker the segment is, the darker the red for the segment, that means it's more congestion.

So when we start moving into maybe close to 7:00 o'clock, you start seeing the segment with more and more congestion and with more and more reported Waze records.

So now we move about getting closer to close to 9:00 o'clock, you can see the roadway start to clean out with more and more green, which reflect the traffic condition coming back to the usual normal levels.

So the clip that I just played provides a quick glance at countywide overall traffic conditions based on crowdsourcing data that are available for County's use. We plan to continue exploring the application and utilization of similar data for mobility planning, and we'll update the board periodically on the relevant progress and findings.

With that, I will be happy to answer questions, if any. Thank you.

MR. VIALPANDO: If I could, just I kind of want to add, if I could, at the end here just a little bit of -- so this is an example of two layers of data, right? This is Waze and RITIS. And then remember, we're about to add a third, which will be the -- the data from the vehicles that are getting the traffic signal timing information. And then we're looking at using like streetlight data and other types of data sources to get more -- more and more crowdsource data. And then when we talk about sensors and install them on roadways to get first party data.

So we're going to be able to add all these layers together and just be able to create visualizations like this and give you a better sense of what's happening, and then also be able to use that information to say, okay, this is what it looked like before we did X surtax project, and this is what it looks like after we did it. Did we -- did we help? And if we did, why? And if we didn't, well, why not. And we'll be able to start really looking at projects and hopefully being able to quantify the impact that we're making.

And then we also want to get data in the hands of people so that they can look at things like this and you can see parts of the County and get a gauge of, well, that part of the County is really bad between 7:00 and 8:00 on Mondays, but it's not so bad between 8:00 and 9:00 on Tuesdays.

And one of the, you know, really interesting things that we saw here is, you know, if you had asked me before I saw this what day was the worst for traffic, I would have said Monday; right? Just from my own perception. But, you know, it was kind of interesting to see, well, you know, at this -- for this month, anyway, the worst days were Wednesday and Thursday. And, you know, we want to sort of like verify that and get a lot more data and just see, you know, how prevalent that is over the, you know, temporal variations of the year and the seasonal, you know, variations from snowbirds and others.

But the bottom line is once we've established some of these -- you know, some of this data, we hopefully can get that -- get it out to people. Maybe if they had a choice to decide, you know, which day that they're going to flex and work from home, or, you know, which day they're just not going to go out or whatever, you know, you can -- you can look at that and say, you know, that's -- that's a bad day.

So we want to kind of help people understand what's going on out there, you know, when they may not otherwise always be traveling the roads or going to that area. I know sometimes I'm very surprised. I get called to a meeting in another part of the County and I don't drive there often, and I have no idea what to expect. Should I allow an hour? Is it 20 minutes? And, you know, we're hoping to give those kinds of insights to people through this. So, and then -- so now if you have any questions, we'd be happy to answer them.

MR. HOOPER: I do. One is why Waze over Google --

MR. VIALPANDO: So --

MR. HOOPER: -- Map?

MR. VIALPANDO: -- so we have met with Google, and I believe Waze is owned by Google.

MR. HOOPER: Oh, it is?

MR. VIALPANDO: Yeah. And --

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So then you're using --

MR. VIALPANDO: Yeah.

MR. HOOPER: -- the same analytics.

MR. VIALPANDO: It's -- it's the same kind of stuff.

MR. HOOPER: It's probably even more.

MR. VIALPANDO: Yeah. A lot of the data, you know, that you get -- that you see in Google is also based off of the Google phones, you know, like the -- you -- people using --

MR. HOOPER: Right.

MR. VIALPANDO: -- Google Maps. So we do want to get that data, as well, and we have met with Google, and we have talked to them. But Waze is a program where the County has -- the Board of County Commissioners has approved an agreement between the County and Waze to exchange data, and we're, like I said, in the process of collecting that data through the ILAs where we would give that data directly to Waze, and then, through that, Google slash Waze gives us data directly.

And so this is directly from Waze in their portal, and we're able to go in and look at this

for any given time period. Like we could go in and look at, you know, last week or what have you. And so -- but we are going to be adding to that things like Google, things like AT and T, you know, Verizon, the other types of provider data, as well. So that's kind of where the layers come in.

So, yes, to your point, we will be adding that.

MR. HOOPER: So then my next thought is I watched the map changing and the red areas and all that stuff. And I -- you know, the calculation is somewhere between 20 and 30,000 people are coming to Broward County on an annual basis; right? And we're planning something -- you guys were talking about resiliency. Something on the more immediate future is that folks are going to be landing somewhere; right? And I know that the planning department and Transit are kind of trying to work together and figure it out. I hear County Commissioners say that they would like to put affordable housing for the workforce on the right streets, and to give -- what is it called? Carrot cake? -- give carrots out?

(Laughter.)

MR. HOOPER: So -- but all those things start to play together; okay? And this thing indicates -- this thing is only going to be useful to us as we move along and to determine that we're either doing something wrong or right. But if you're continually adding 30,000 people every year, you may not be able to get your arms around it.

And I just think that we should be focusing in on -- and we are, and we are -- focusing on these corridors, these east/west and these north/south corridors, and try to determine -- try to set policy and then keep your eye on those the most. Because, honestly, some of those other streets like Andrews or Powerline, they're going to get -- they're going to get jammed up just because, okay, every day between 7:00 and 9:00 o'clock and between -- but I think there's some use to planning.

And I think -- and I could be speaking to the choir, so I'm just from a -- from a layman's perspective, I see that as being the thing is we've got to keep our eye on all the people that are coming in, where do we place them and all that other stuff.

MR. VIALPANDO: You're absolutely right. And just -- you know, just to add to that, this model that we showed you here, you know, is countywide and does show all the roads. But it's just a representative example, and we are going to be looking at each corridor and doing corridor-specific modeling as well as we're hoping to do like some 3D rendering and things of the corridor and be able to show kind of like what the project -- what the road was like before the improvement, what it was like after the improvement. And then we can also account for, you know, we just held the line, but this is what it -- our model says, which he'll be working on, would have happened without the project because of the increases in -- in traffic or --

MR. HOOPER: And --

MR. VIALPANDO: -- or people.

MR. HOOPER: -- see, to me, it's like looking at a body, and they call them arteries anyway, so -- but looking at arteries, right, and then you're like this one is the one I've got to work on right now; right?

And in the next ten years, there's going to be 300,000 more people, so if I can work on these five and keep them in check, and these are the ones that move the most people, Broward Boulevard, all the ones that we know, University, and we can keep our eye on those, it'll help the overall body by doing that.

And so that's why -- you know, we get hung up on so many things, but this whole -- if you look at the way that thing fills up, I call it with blood, because they all turn red -- if you look at the way it fills up with blood, it's the whole County, it's not any -- I mean, geez, the whole thing looks like it's in a traffic jam by a certain time. And I just think we're going to need to be really looking at it forensically. And it's a very difficult task that we have ahead of us, you know.

So you want to talk and then --

MR. COOLMAN: I think you already answered, and that is you're going to be able to project this growth, so even if you didn't do anything, it's going to get bad.

So we'll be able to see all the improvements we're making, recognizing with the growth and without the growth.

MR. VIALPANDO: That's right. We're going to be able to run the circle (Phonetic) model and be able to say, okay, if X happens, this is what would happen, and then if we did this, this is what we project the improvement would be. Then we'll be able to do the project, see if the projection lived out, and then also look at what would have happened in the increases in traffic if we had done nothing.

MR. COOLMAN: Does this mean we don't need auditors?

MR. VIALPANDO: Oh, well, we'll be able to help you --

(Laughter.)

MR. VIALPANDO: -- understand.

MR. SMITH: Well, it's a good --

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: -- it's a good performance metric for us to use.

So first let me just say any time Lenny and his team come, I'm always impressed, and I'm happy to have you guys. And I think every time you speak and do a presentation I just think of more ways that this can -- can really help.

So one thing I heard that was really interesting, and it ties into all this, is, you know, you give people the option and the data, maybe they make different decisions.

So even though more people are coming here, why do they opt to be in their cars?

So the other thing you talked about is the greenway project, right, connecting other ways to get around. We don't all have to drive all the time. People are moving closer. There's infill. I mean, you've done some of those buildings that are -- that are there in Flagler and so forth. People don't want to drive as much.

So we've got to get this a little bit out of our heads that transportation is always what we saw there is ca- -- I mean, that's an issue, right? But there's a lot of ways to cut into that. I mean, just because people are moving here doesn't mean we have to have so many more cars; right? So there's just so many ways to think about this, and it's so smart --

MR. HOOPER: That's true.

MR. SMITH: -- and it's so smart to have this data. And I love what you guys are doing. And so part of the hope is these other things that we can work on, like light rail and the buses and, like I said, getting more people taking other modes of transport around -- I mean, those are all solutions here, too.

So I just want to keep coming back to that and I think --

MS. PENNANT: Mr. Chair?

MR. SMITH: -- this will help show that over --

MR. HOOPER: And -- and that's --

MR. SMITH: -- the long term as well.

MR. HOOPER: -- to my point. The light rail potentially could be a University Drive thing. It could be a Broward -- from Sawgrass to downtown. I'm going to leave that to the smarter folks; right? And to your point, one other point. So from 7:00 to 9:00 and from 4:00 to 6:00 is like the blood is completely all over the place; right? We also should talk about the connectivity and how you feel the quality of life, the quality of life that you get

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION
SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JANUARY 30, 2020

dh/NC

from an improved system on Saturday or on -- or after hours. That's some of the greenways stuff, and the -- and how you're -- and when you're not in your car, you know. Because the jam's going to always be, right? They call it peak hour because of that; right? But how does it feel -- because if we did nothing for 30 years, 11:00 o'clock in the morning's going to feel like -- terrible.

MR. SMITH: Absolutely.

MR. HOOPER: Right? So then you've got to also figure out how this whole thing affects your quality of life, as well, so.

MS. PENNANT: Mr. Chair?

MR. HOOPER: It's interesting stuff, man. You're -- it always gets -- this is the section I like the most. You can tell I'm like falling asleep during the audits, but --

(Laughter.)

MR. HOOPER: -- this is the stuff that charges me. Ms. Pennant.

MS. PENNANT: Yes, I -- like I echo everything that everybody else has been saying. Always excited to hear from you. But I was also impressed with the fact that you're making some connections with the universities. And I think -- I think higher learning institutions for sure we need to create partnerships with them, because they are -- I think that's the next generation of travelers; right?

So to get them to start taking buses. So many of these higher learning institution folks struggle to pay their college tuitions because they're having to use a car and so on. So when we can start marketing these opportunities to take rail or transit in a way that makes it attractive, we will be able to build a culture that is more prone to taking public transportation.

In New York and so on, nobody thinks anything of it. But here in south Florida, we don't have that culture. So the partnerships with the -- the universities and colleges are important. So we look forward to seeing you at Broward College, at some point.

MR. VIALPANDO: That would be awesome.

MS. PENNANT: Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: Any other -- any other questions? Thank you very much. Really appreciate it. Okay. The next one is Chair's Report -- M.I. -- that was all together, wasn't it?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: M.I.T. was --

MS. CASSINI: It's all done.

OTHER BUSINESS:

CHAIR'S REPORT:

MR. HOOPER: Chair's Report. Thank you all for all the stuff we did today. We -- lot of input, lot of important stuff. That's my report.

(Laughter.)

MEMBERS' REPORTS:

MR. HOOPER: Members' Report. Does anybody have anything to say? Yes, sir, Mr. Coolman.

MR. COOLMAN: Kind of housekeeping. I assume all of you got a couple letters, one from Mr. Kolinsky (phonetic) and one regarding Lauderdale by the Sea. And now that we're on the email system, we'll still be getting them, I suppose, and maybe more. I simply forwarded it back to Gretchen, said, what do I do with it, or just FYI. I guess I did the right thing, because I guess we're not supposed to, one, copy the rest of you, and we're not supposed to really respond to the person. So I'm just bringing it up for information. And is that correct?

MS. CASSINI: Obviously, whatever you all are comfortable with, I'm comfortable with. But as we talked about before, once you have email addresses that are actually published on the website, there's a high likelihood that you all are going to start getting even more communication from the public, and you are more than welcome to forward those communications to me to handle. And I will always copy all of the -- blind copy all of the Oversight Board members on any of the communications or responses to the correspondence you receive. And I'm happy to continue doing so. I'm -- obviously, if it's a legal issue, then Angela will respond to it and copy all of you.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yeah, just a quick kind of administrative point. What is the best way for us to interact with everyone else in your office? You know, what's the best way to handle -- and specifically what drove my question is like now I'm kind of a little more interested in this greenway master plan. Of course, I'm interested in some of the things they were talking about. I don't need to sit here and blabber on about it, you know, in this meeting.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION
SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JANUARY 30, 2020

dh/NC

But, you know, where is everybody housed and can we just make appointments with them and interact? I mean, is there any rules --

MS. CASSINI: Absolutely.

MR. SMITH: -- around that? That's okay to do?

MS. CASSINI: No. They're -- we're your staff. I mean, we're here to help you be successful and do your jobs and receive the information that you need. And anyone -- I know when Mr. Cavros wanted more information about an electric bus, you know, Chris made sure that he was able to take a ride. And anything that you all are interested in, people that you want to talk to, things that you want to see, you just let me know and I'll get you in touch with those folks and they will accommodate that. Absolutely.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Oh, I'm sorry, did -- Mr. Allen and then Ms. Pennant.

MS. PENNANT: No, I'm done. Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Allen.

MR. ALLEN: Is there a method where we can periodically, say monthly, get a report of where our various contract are, what stage of procurement, is there issues coming up relative to a contract that's stalled because of a complaint or a grievance or whatever, or -- and I would like to start seeing, as projects come forward, some kind of timeline on when we expect various things to happen.

You know, some kind of a PERT chart or something, just so that we can start to see -- you know, I didn't know that the -- for instance, that the marketing assistance was being held up, or other issues may come up, you know, relative, that, you know, why aren't we into our new facility out at the Government Center West. We're approving these things, but nothing is happening, or they're getting delayed.

MS. CASSINI: Happily. Yes, we've been trying to give you periodic progress reports, but I'm happy to do them monthly. If you all don't meet, then I'll just distribute them electronically to you. That's fine.

MR. HOOPER: And then one other thing, you know, last year we had the workshop; correct? You know, the discussion about the performance consultants or audits, depending on whether it's a specific project or annually, I think we should try to get our head around -- our heads around how we're going to maneuver those and are we going to do them annually. We could do them annually, you know, or is it going to be something that happens on a per -- you know, one -- a one-off basis.

It started to make me think about it because if we start all of a sudden just throwing out, hey, we need to do a performance measure on this one this month, and then next

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION
SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JANUARY 30, 2020

dh/NC

month someone else comes up, and before you know it, we've got all these audits or studies going on, I think we should be like look -- kind of methodically looking at how we're going to measure things.

Maybe I'm wrong, but at least in a -- some sort of a -- in a workshop or something we can talk about how we're going to try to at least put it in an organized method, and then knowing that there'll always be one somewhere down the road where you might have to do it, treat it on a one-off basis. But measuring things, I think, should be done in a very methodical and organized fashion. That's just -- I'm sure the accountant feels the same way.

MR. SMITH: Yeah, I agree with the general sentiment. I think part of it will be -- and this is part of just probably a longer discussion about this whole topic, but part of it will be the performance measures that the County, you know, collectively will come back with between the -- you know, our staff, the auditor's office, and say, hey, this is how we're just kind of looking at these, and these are the performance metrics.

So it was mentioned earlier that we haven't even seen that component yet, so I think that's a big piece of it. And then we can say, okay, do we think this is a comprehensive list of performance metrics that are the most relevant to the public, because essentially that's who we're representing. And if not, what else do we think needs to be included there, and how's this being viewed so far. So I think it'll be interesting to see when we think we'll have some of that data, and then I think that will be our starting point to the discussion.

MR. HOOPER: And maybe if we have a list of things that are important to us. We may find already that they're included in the measures that are being done, but at least we could find a couple that maybe aren't included, you know. So I just would like to open up that dialog as we continue moving forward so that we don't one day say, hey, we missed this for a whole year, we didn't measure this, when we maybe could have just put it --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: -- put it in front of ourselves even before the measurements are required.

MR. SMITH: I agree. And I think what else is important to consider -- so Lenny made a comment that part of the data they want to get with -- you know, out there is what is the public really thinking about this, and what is important to them. And I think that we just have to keep that in the back of --

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MR. SMITH: -- our minds. It's not so much what we personally feel about it, but what -- are they aware of it, of what we're even doing? Are they seeing the -- like what do they

care about in regards to this? So I think that's something -- that's the -- kind of the lens we need to put on it.

MR. HOOPER: Absolutely. Ms. Kelly.

DR. KELLEY: I was just trying to understand. In March, we're essentially looking at 50 or 40, something like that, out of 509 submitted projects; correct? And those 50 were selected based on the prioritization ranking that we've been over this afternoon. And I just think that it's likely that in March we're also going to maybe, as we -- as we approve and send something on to the Commission, want to make a -- you know, a collective statement about how we view the high, medium, low kind of big picture things such as resiliency and equity, in terms of populations that may have been marginalized before but are going -- are growing in Broward.

So, you know, just all of that. I think it's likely that we might want to come up with something together.

MR. HOOPER: That's part of the metrics.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

DR. KELLEY: Right. Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So let's keep our eye on that ball. And is there any other members that want to report on anything? Okay. Well, welcome again, Mr. Frazier. We're happy to have you. All right. Everybody, we'll go ahead and adjourn. Thank you.

COORDINATOR'S REPORT:

MS. CASSINI: Wait, wait, wait, wait.

MR. HOOPER: Oh, wait.

MS. CASSINI: Calendar.

MR. HOOPER: Calendar.

MS. CASSINI: Calendar. Please.

MR. HOOPER: You closed my agenda.

MS. CASSINI: Please?

(Laughter.)

MS. CASSINI: So I'll be quick, but we do get a lot of questions from the public and --

MR. HOOPER: Okay, yeah.

MS. CASSINI: -- from, you know, even internal staff about what the calendar is going to look like for 2020. And I'd obviously like to hear from you, and I have some recommendations for you to consider.

We know that we're going to have to meet on March 26th to entertain the municipal capital projects. And that will be a very long meeting, so I will try to just have that one item on the agenda. We are recommending in advance of that meeting that everyone attend their annual required ethics training.

So your next normally scheduled meeting on a fourth Thursday would be the February 27th. February 27th would be morning only. It would be maybe an hour to an hour and a half. Angela has coordinated with one of her colleagues who does the ethics trainings, and it would be occurring in the Governmental Center East building.

MR. SMITH: Is this -- is this a -- what level requirement ethics training is this? Like as a Florida CPA, I have to get a certain amount a year. Would that count or this is something different than that?

MS. CASSINI: This is related to your membership on this board.

DR. KELLEY: And how long will this take on --

MS. CASSINI: It's maybe --

DR. KELLEY: -- that day?

MS. CASSINI: -- just one hour, an hour and a half at the most. So it'd be from 9:30 to 11:00, and it would be in the County Attorney's suite. And we'll send out more information if you all are amendable to that. I'm just trying to get consensus around your availability on that day.

MR. SMITH: That's on the 27th of February?

DR. KELLEY: Where is the County Attorney's suite, just roughly?

MS. CASSINI: It's in downtown -- it's in the Government --

MR. SMITH: On Andrews?

MS. CASSINI: -- so it's in the Governmental Center East.

DR. KELLEY: Same time?

MS. CASSINI: Uh-huh.

DR. KELLEY: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: Right -- right across from --

MR. SMITH: I'm supposed to be at a Bayview (Phonetic) recruiting, but it's a whole, I don't know.

DR. KELLEY: Yeah.

MS. CASSINI: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. CASSINI: Right. Exactly. Exactly. So it looks like I have some general consensus on availability for the 27th for ethics training.

MR. HOOPER: I'm okay with that.

MR. ALLEN: What day of the week is that?

MS. CASSINI: It's a Thursday.

MR. ALLEN: Thursday.

MS. CASSINI: It's the fourth Thursday. It's when you would normally meet.

MR. HOOPER: I -- I can do that.

MS. CASSINI: Okay. So --

MR. SMITH: What if we can't do that date? Then what do we do? Because I'm -- I mean, I have a whole (inaudible) for FAU campus, on campus interviews. I don't know if I can (inaudible) or not.

MS. WALLACE: I guess we would have to arrange for a separate training session for you if you're not available that day.

MR. ALLEN: Do you have an online version?

MR. SMITH: I mean, why is it --

MS. WALLACE: No.

MR. SMITH: -- that day? I have the whole day before that open.

MS. WALLACE: Well, the normal date that -- of -- that everyone had agreed -- on this board had agreed upon was the fourth Thursday of the month for your regular meetings. If there's another day that everyone else is available, that's more convenient for the ethics training, we can try and accommodate that. But we just selected that day because that's the fourth Thursday of the month.

MR. SMITH: Any other day that week leading up would work other than that day, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday.

MS. CASSINI: Can you check with Rocio to see if she can -- what we can do is we can try to schedule -- so let me ask this first. Does the 27th work for everyone else? In the morning from 9:30 to, say, 10:30 or 11:00?

MR. HOOPER: I'm good on the 27th.

MS. CASSINI: Okay. So we'll go ahead and schedule it for the 27th, and then we'll work on a day that is better for your schedule to do it separately.

MR. SMITH: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: And so, again, we'll be meeting on the 26th. It'll be a full day. What I'll do is after this meeting I will send out holds for all of you on your calendar so that this is showing up.

MR. HOOPER: The 26th of March?

MS. CASSINI: Of March.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. I've got -- sorry, I -- I have something.

MS. CASSINI: Okay.

MR. ALLEN: Is that also a Thursday?

MR. HOOPER: I'm going to be out of town.

MS. CASSINI: Well, then, shall we try to --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: I don't know.

MS. CASSINI: The fourth Thursday of March is March 26th.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: Is this to approve all the projects?

MS. CASSINI: This would be to approve the municipal projects.

MS. WALLACE: Municipal capital.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MR. SMITH: Do you -- Alan, are you out that whole week?

MR. HOOPER: I am. But, I mean, I --

DR. KELLEY: Well, we could do Monday and Tuesday of the last week of March, which is the 30th or 31st.

MR. SMITH: Well, that does become -- that's like my biggest reporting deadline day for --

MS. CASSINI: Yeah, it's -- it's very problematic.

MR. SMITH: -- banks in the audit world. The 31st, that's --

MS. CASSINI: Yeah, we have a Commission meeting on the 31st, so that would not work for Angela and I.

MR. HOOPER: I mean --

MR. SMITH: Could we do it before, the week before that?

MS. CASSINI: It's -- so we will -- what we can do and why we're having this discussion is we can see what's possible.

But, again, we have to package -- once we receive all of those recommended projects, then the MPO surtax-funded staff and myself and Angela and several other people will have to be working to try to package this in a way that you all can -- you know, the public can understand it, create a presentation around it, make sure you have all the backup documentation. Then we have to have briefings, individual briefings with each of you. Those briefings are going to be long.

So trying to back it up is probably going to be more problematic than pushing it into --

DR. KELLEY: Okay, pushing it --

MS. CASSINI: So --

DR. KELLEY: -- when does the County have to have it? When do they send it to the Commission?

MS. CASSINI: -- here -- here are some things for you all to consider. And there's no absolute drop-dead date, but what we have been communicating to the municipalities is that the County Commission is going to entertain this in April.

So the County Commission's agenda deadlines will force us to go two weeks from whatever time you all take action. And so the later you take action, the more difficult it will be for us to actually meet that April goal.

MR. SMITH: What about April 2nd?

MS. WALLACE: That's a Thursday.

MR. SMITH: It's a Thursday. I mean, it doesn't back it up all that much, and then gets me past March 31st.

MR. HOOPER: I mean, I could do it if you guys are willing.

MS. CASSINI: The MPO has an executive committee meeting, so I'm going to be turning -- are they still here? No, they're not even here. Okay. I don't -- I don't think there's any problem. I mean --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MS. CASSINI: -- certainly Angela and I can --

MR. HOOPER: The 2nd of April.

MS. CASSINI: -- skip that, if that would be your preference.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MS. CASSINI: Oh, the 2nd -- is everyone okay with the 2nd?

MR. SMITH: Yeah, 2nd is fine.

MR. HOOPER: April 2nd.

MS. CASSINI: Okay.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION
SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JANUARY 30, 2020

dh/NC

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MS. CASSINI: That's a Thursday, first Thursday.

MS. WALLACE: First Thursday in April.

MR. HOOPER: That works for me.

MS. CASSINI: Does that work for you?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

MR. HOOPER: I appreciate everybody (inaudible).

MS. CASSINI: Absolutely. Gives us more time.

MR. SMITH: It's going to happen. I mean --

MS. CASSINI: Okay. We'll communicate that with the municipalities and to the MPO so that they know it's actually going to be April 2nd now.

MR. COOLMAN: Question. Then we should always set aside the fourth Thursday?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: I can't believe I didn't do that.

MS. CASSINI: I would hold it for the whole -- for the whole calendar year, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: I'm sorry, guys.

MS. CASSINI: No problem. So then if we meet on April 2nd, then we won't meet again, obviously, that month. We'll meet in May -- is that acceptable to everyone -- to go through the municipal capital projects?

MR. HOOPER: Uh-huh.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. CASSINI: That would be May 28th.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: So May 28th is the --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: -- capital projects.

MS. WALLACE: Rehab and maintenance.

MS. CASSINI: May 28th will be rehab and maintenance projects.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: And then what I would like to recommend based on what I just heard is that perhaps we schedule our workshop where we do performance management, program management, and have the opportunity for you all to just talk with one another and dialog, get consensus around the approach to auditing in June. Would that be something that you all are amenable to? That would be the 25th.

MR. SMITH: Of June?

MS. CASSINI: June 25th.

MR. SMITH: That one I'd have to look at, because of the --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MR. SMITH: I'd have to get back to you on that one.

MS. CASSINI: Okay. We may -- if you --

MR. SMITH: Because we're -- when we get into June and July, there just could be some travel stuff that's like not even planned yet that --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. SMITH: -- (inaudible) like slow down and think about this.

MS. CASSINI: Right. So that's -- that's one of the reasons why I wanted to have this conversation now, in January, because we know that that was an issue last year. It's always going to be an issue.

We need -- because of our own budget cycle, we have to have action on the five-year plan, because the first year of that five-year plan is actually going to be our FY '20-21

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION
SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JANUARY 30, 2020

dh/NC

budget, and because our budget has to be packaged, our recommended budget book has to be published, and we generally have all of that done by August. You all chose to take August off last year. That would mean that if you all do want to have a workshop and June doesn't work, we can try to add that into the May 28th meeting and just make that meeting a little bit longer again.

So we would do the rehab and maintenance projects and maybe a workshop on performance management and program management on May 28th. I'm looking for nods, consensus. Does that sound good?

MR. HOOPER: Can you say that again?

MS. CASSINI: So try to do two things on May 28th, municipal capital -- sorry -- municipal rehab and maintenance and also maybe a couple hour worth of conversation, like a workshop on performance management, around --

MR. HOOPER: So take the whole day.

MS. CASSINI: Just take the whole day --

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: -- and get rid of the June 25th. Does that --

MR. SMITH: Yeah.

MR. ALLEN: Well --

MS. CASSINI: -- is that better for people? Okay.

MR. ALLEN: -- I'm sorry.

MS. CASSINI: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. ALLEN: You said that was a five-year plan, though.

MS. CASSINI: No, no. Sorry. Let me be clear. May -- May 28th would be the rehab and maintenance projects for fiscal year '20 Cycle 1, and then it would be several hours where we would be able to talk about program management, performance management, outreach, so public outreach to try to determine what the public wants to know, what they're interested in. And then allow you all to have a conversation about your approach to audits. That's what I have -- I wrote down from your --

MS. WALLACE: Discussion today.

MS. CASSINI: -- discussion just now. Does that sound good?

MR. HOOPER: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: Okay. And then July is when we would have to deal with the five-year plan. And, as I mentioned to most of you in your briefings, that would probably require two days, at a minimum, to get through that -- that number of projects.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Wow.

MR. ALLEN: So that would be like a Thursday/Friday?

MS. CASSINI: That's up to you. That's why we're having this conversation. I'm open. Our Board is on break, so we have a lot more flexibility in July. I'm looking at either -- it looks like the 30th and 31st, 29th and 30th. Anybody have any suggestions or conflicts? We can either do a Wednesday/Thursday or a Thursday/Friday. Is there any preference?

MR. HOOPER: Friday -- usually Fridays are more open. Right now, I don't have anything on here. I just don't know what my kids --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

MR. HOOPER: -- they were -- they were going camping, and I've got to figure that out.

MS. CASSINI: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: So --

MR. CASSINI: So what -- the 23rd and 24th. What I can do is go ahead and --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. CASSINI: -- and send it out --

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MS. CASSINI: -- and ask -- and ask you all to accept it. We'll put a hold on the calendar for the 23rd and 24th, okay, of July.

MR. SMITH: That's fine with me.

MR. ALLEN: Of July?

MS. CASSINI: Of July.

MR. COOLMAN: Instead of the 30th, 31st.

MS. CASSINI: Yes.

MR. SMITH: Either one would be fine with me, Angela.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MR. FRAZIER: 23rd is (inaudible).

MR. HOOPER: They look okay with me, too.

MS. CASSINI: Wednesday/Thursday looks like it would be better for Dr. Kelley?

MR. FRAZIER: 23rd I'm not available.

DR. KELLEY: (Inaudible.)

MS. CASSINI: Oh, 23rd you're not available. Okay. All right. He's not available. The 23rd you're not available? Okay. So it looks like how about the 30th and 31st?

MR. HOOPER: That looks okay to me.

MS. CASSINI: Is that better?

MR. FRAZIER: Yeah.

MS. CASSINI: 30th and 31st. Okay. Shea, 30th and 31st is okay?

MR. SMITH: That's fine.

MS. CASSINI: All right. I'm going to go ahead and send those out, and we'll figure out the rest of the year when we have the next meeting, hopefully. But at least this will get us through the big -- the major --

MR. COOLMAN: But we should try to set the fourth Thursday always.

MS. CASSINI: -- that -- that's my recommendation, if you --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: All right.

MR. ALLEN: I'm sorry. On --

MS. CASSINI: No.

MR. ALLEN: -- February 27th, you're putting that aside for --

MS. CASSINI: Ethics training.

MR. ALLEN: -- ethics training, which reminds me. When are our disclosure reports due?

MS. WALLACE: They're due in July each year.

MR. ALLEN: Okay. So we've got --

MS. WALLACE: So last year, you had 30 days from the date that you were appointed.

MR. ALLEN: Appointed, right.

MS. WALLACE: And the training will be done within the 30 days of Mr. Frazier's appointment, yeah, because it'll be the 27th. So -- and he was appointed the 28th. So it's within 30 days of your appointment, and then it's annually in July.

MR. ALLEN: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: By July.

MR. ALLEN: In July. On the -- so on the 27th, we're just doing the -- I'm sorry -- ethics training?

MS. WALLACE: The training. So --

MR. ALLEN: Because I thought the auditor said that there might be trial balances or something available at that point in time.

MS. CASSINI: I will be able to get the trial balances from the County Auditor's Office, and I will distribute it to all of you electronically.

MR. ALLEN: Because I thought I even heard him say that he thought the audit would be done by --

MS. CASSINI: The audit should be done in early March. It's due in early March. So the audit itself should be able to be distributed to you all or provided to you for your March

meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MS. WALLACE: So and the training, if you recall, the sunshine law, public records, ethics, the state Ethics Code, the County Ethics Code, the Form 1 --

MR. ALLEN: We're going to go through all that again.

MS. WALLACE: -- those -- required filing -- yeah, Rocio Blanco Garcia, the ethics lawyer from our office who did the training last year, will do it again this year. It'll cover all of those areas within that hour, hour and a half. And it will be -- we plan to have it in the library within the County Attorney's Office on the fourth floor in Government Center East.

MS. CASSINI: Okay. So I will send you all of those appointments tomorrow, so they'll get onto your calendar, and you -- like I said, at our next meeting on April 2nd, that's --

MR. SMITH: That is the next meeting after ethics.

MS. CASSINI: So the next meeting is April 2nd.

MR. SMITH: The next meeting is April 2nd, other than ethics.

MS. WALLACE: Other than ethics, right.

MS. CASSINI: Other than ethics, yes. Okay? So we can talk about the rest of the year at that point. Thank you.

ADJOURN:

MR. HOOPER: Okay. I'm going to adjourn this meeting. Thank you, everybody.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Have a great two months or whatever.

(The meeting concluded at 2:33 p.m.)