

**INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD**  
**Meeting**  
**June 4, 2020**

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

**MEMBERS**  
**ABSENT:**

**Also Present:** Angela Wallace, County Attorney's Office  
Gretchen Cassini, Assistant County Administrator  
Audrey Thompson, staff  
Ernesto Carreras, Senior Mobility GIS Analyst (Surtax), Broward County  
Nicholas Sofoul, Planning Section Supervisor, Mobility Planning Section, (Surtax)  
Tony Hui, Deputy Director, Broward County Public Works  
\*Cindy Malin, Broward County Public Information Officer  
Andrew Riddle, Broward County Metropolitan Planning Organization  
Alexander Mayorga, Program Performance Analyst, Mobility Advancement Program

- \*Mike Bailey, Director of Utilities/City Engineer, City of Cooper City
- \*Tim Fleming, Operations Supervisor, City of Cooper City
- Mark Collins, Public Works Director, City of Margate
- \*Salvador Zuniga, Assistant City Engineer, City of Margate
- \*Lea DeRiel, Senior Project Manager, City of Margate
- \*Tammy Reed-Holguin, Community Development Director, City of North Lauderdale
- \*Sam May, Public Works Director, City of North Lauderdale
- \*Andrew Disbury, Planner, City of North Lauderdale
- Horacio Danovich, CIP and Innovation District Director, City of Pompano Beach
- \*Phillip Holste, Assistant Town Administrator/CRA Director, Town of Davie
- \*Jonathan Vogt, Town Engineer, Town of Davie
- \*Howard P. Clark, Vice Mayor, Town of Pembroke Park
- \*JC Jimenez, Town Manager, Town of Pembroke Park
- \*Dincer Ozaydin, Town Engineer, Town of Pembroke Park
- \*Myriam Jacques, Public Services Assistant Director, Town of Pembroke Park
- \*Christopher Ryan, Town Attorney, Town of Pembroke Park
- \*Priscilla Cygielnik, Assistant Director, Engineering and Operations, City of Deerfield Beach
- \*Casey Graham, Director of Engineering, City of Oakland Park
- \*Carl Kennedy, City Engineer, City of Pembroke Pines
- \*Kathleen Dunn, Assistant Manager, City of Tamarac
- \*Mark Labowski, Assistant City Manager, City of Sunrise
- \*Todd DeJesus, Capital Projects and Grants Manager, City of Wilton Manors
- \*Jason McClair, City Engineer, City of Wilton Manors
- \*Paul Carpenter, Transportation Planner, City of Coral Springs
- \*Karen Warfel, Program Manager, Transportation Planning Division, City of Fort Lauderdale
- Nancy Cavender, The Laws Group
- \*indicates telephonic registrants/attendees/participants

A meeting of the Independent Transportation Surtax Oversight Board, Broward County, Florida, was held at Room 422, Commission Chambers, 115 South Andrews Avenue, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, at 10:00 a.m., Thursday, June 4, 2020.

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

**ALL TO ORDER - CHAIR HOOPER**

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Good morning, everybody. We're going to call the meeting to order of the Independent Transportation Surtax Oversight Board June 4<sup>th</sup>, 2020. It's 10:00 a.m.

**ROLL CALL - AUDRY THOMPSON**

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Can we do -- can we do a roll call first, and then I can set some ground rules for today's meeting? Is that all right? Could we to a roll call --

MS. THOMPSON: Sure, Chair.

MR. HOOPER: -- Audrey?

MS. THOMPSON: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: How are you?

MS. THOMPSON: Hi. Mr. Hooper.

MR. HOOPER: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Ms. Love? Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Present.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros? George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Ron Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Chair, we have a quorum.

MR. HOOPER: Great. Thank you. Okay. I'm just going to go through a few quick guidelines and ground rules for the meeting. We went over this last time, but I'm just going to do it quickly.

Please, if you're not speaking, keep your phones on mute. On these -- these items, the city items and even the maintenance and repair items that we're going to be talking about, we're going to go through them. You can pull them, but we're not going to discuss or answer questions on them until this afternoon when we go back to those items for discussion. Okay? So you can call -- you can ask for them to be pulled, but, please, we don't want to get into long discussions this morning.

### **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

MR. HOOPER: Let me see. The public can make comments during Agenda Items Number 1 for two minutes, Number 3, Number 4, Number 5. You must have pre-registered to speak by 9:30 today, if you plan to speak. Municipal -- municipalities and their legal counsel are pre-registered to answer questions and offer supplemental information for line items 6, 7, 8, and 9, which is scheduled after lunch. Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So we have no public participation today, so we're

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

going to go to the action items. And –

MR. FRAZIER: Mr. Chairman, before we go to the action items, I'd like to ask a question.

MR. HOOPER: Sure. Go ahead.

MR. FRAZIER: May I ask a question?

MR. HOOPER: Yes, sir.

MR. FRAZIER: Yeah, this is Ron Frazier. I had spoken to Ms. Cassini this morning regarding this issue. It is my understanding that this transportation program is also to benefit poverty areas, low and moderate income areas, minority areas, and Black communities. I cannot -- I cannot tell which projects are positively affecting these areas, so I would like to have the project -- the project and the areas identified as well as the total expenditures proposed for these areas.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So I spoke with staff today, and at the end -- in this -- this afternoon, we are going to put up a map -- correct? -- that shows where all the projects are located and where the money is being spent. Okay?

MS. PENNANT: If I -- if I may just –

MR. FRAZIER: Thank you, sir.

MS. PENNANT: -- add, I had some of the same concerns, and I requested ZIP Codes, because I know that in some cities, the projects are happening, but we want to make sure that they're happening equitably across cities.

MR. HOOPER: I think they are also broken down in ZIP Codes. So we will be pulling -- we will be discussing that this afternoon.

MS. WALLACE: Okay. Chair, I guess I'd like just take a moment to clarify. So we can request information as a board. The board can request certain information, and the staff is happy to provide that information. But when it comes to eligibility, the role of the board is to determine eligibility based upon the statutory criteria.

So any supplemental information that is requested, we will provide and we can have discussions regarding, and provide supplemental information so

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

that we can see the distribution of the funds and where the projects are scheduled to be, but our -- the focus of the eligibility determination is statutory, and we'll go over those eligibility criteria that are the factors that will be considered by the board for the projects, when we get to that section.

MS. PENNANT: And if --

MS. WALLACE: Thank you.

MS. PENNANT: -- if -- if I may just add, as you're -- as you're mentioning this, because I'm still bothered by that measure that has equitability on a low scale in that MPO chart that they use --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MS. PENNANT: -- in terms of deciding which projects get done. It seemed like equitability is so low on the totem pole, that's -- I still don't understand how that can be.

MS. WALLACE: So the criteria under the ordinance and in the interlocal agreement among the County, the municipalities, and the MPO provides for that. So this is a transportation tax and -- surtax, and it's -- the funds are to be used for transit and transportation improvements.

And so the MPO was charged with prioritizing or ranking projects based upon their ability to promote connectivity and relieve traffic congestion. That's the primary criteria. And so there is an equity analysis in terms of, you know, the distribution, and that's being -- there's equity in terms of distribution countywide and where the funds are distributed by the County for purposes of both capital and municipal projects. But equity is not what the -- was not the primary task that the MPO was assigned when it came to ranking the projects.

MS. PENNANT: Okay. Well --

MS. WALLACE: It's one of the criteria, but for transit and transportation, we - - the objective is to promote connectivity and relieve congestion.

MS. PENNANT: -- well, I'm hoping that in the next iteration of the contract that we look at that a little bit more closely, because I -- I'm bothered by that. I'm still bothered by it.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. WALLACE: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. And we can discuss this more when we do this -- when we have this discussion in the afternoon.

### **ACTION ITEMS**

#### **2 - DISCUSSION OF DRAFT MAY 22, 2020 OVERSIGHT BOARD MINUTES**

MR. HOOPER: So the next one is the discussion on the draft minutes? Is that correct? From the May 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting. I know there were some changes that we had to make. Mr. Riddle wanted -- wanted to make some changes to the minutes, or clarification.

MR. RIDDLE: Good morning, Mr. Chair, members of the board. Andrew Riddle, Surtax Services Manager at the Broward MPO. There are three corrections. Page 20, Project Number 1, the correct amount should be \$247,711. And the revised cost estimate should be \$287,532.

And for Project 9, which is on page 24 of the minutes, I need to correct the record. The total project cost is \$5,662,921. However, the Town of Davie is requesting \$3,751,358 in surtax funding. This is below the surtax plan estimate of \$5,000,000 and also which was originally recommended for their phase funding.

MS. CASSINI: Andrew, I'm sorry to interrupt you. Mr. Chair, may I ask?

MR. HOOPER: Sure.

MS. CASSINI: Thank you. Could you identify the city and the project ID number for those who may not have copies of the draft minutes available? And I think this is important also because one of these projects was one that Ms. Pennant had pulled. So I want to make sure that people who are following along on the project matrix can also identify the changes that you are requesting.

MR. RIDDLE: So on your screen, you have Project Number 1. The correct --

MR. HOOPER: That's in Wilton Manors?

MR. RIDDLE: Yes, sir. Wilton Manors, 006. The correct amount should be

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

\$247,711. The minutes show it is for \$747,711, which is not correct. And the revised cost estimate should be 287,532. That was submitted after these amounts were submitted to us from the city.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. RIDDLE: The -- and for the 287,532, the minutes show it's 207,000.

MR. COOLMAN: Alan, this is Doug Coolman. I don't -- I only have the agenda on my screen. Are you guys looking at something else?

MR. HOOPER: He only has the agenda on his screen?

MS. CASSINI: Are you watching -- Mr. Coolman, are you watching live on the webcast?

MR. COOLMAN: No. I was watching the materials, as advised.

MS. CASSINI: Okay. So we are -- we are -- if you would like, we are following along on the matrix. This is the project matrix without comments. And we're going to move through that matrix. It has both the Public Works capital projects on it, as well as all of the municipal capital projects that were ranked by the MPO, and an area for you all to make comments. I highly recommend that each Oversight Board member have a copy of that open or printed out, because we'll be moving from the agenda to the matrix to presentations.

MR. COOLMAN: Well, should I stay on materials or should I switch over to live?

MR. HOOPER: I don't know.

MS. CASSINI: I personally recommend that you switch over to live. If you are having an issue seeing something, you can always move back and look at the materials off of the website. That way, you can see --

MR. COOLMAN: Thank you.

MS. CASSINI: -- the presentation as it's happening.

MR. COOLMAN: Thank you.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. HOOPER: Go ahead.

MR. RIDDLE: Page 24 of the minutes, Project Number 9, this is for Davie, 003. I need to correct the record. The total project cost is \$5,662,921. However, the Town of Davie is requesting \$3,751,358 in surtax funding. And as you can see on the screen here, that is below the recommended phase funding that we provided to you earlier. And, also, this is below the \$5,000,000 estimated projects cost of the project in the surtax plan.

MS. CASSINI: Well, how will those fund -- how will that project be fully funded?

MR. RIDDLE: This -- the town will be using other funding sources to complete the project. And this project, of course, as Gretchen mentioned, this project was pulled at the May 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting, due to the incorrect information I provided at that meeting.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. RIDDLE: Bear with me. The next item is page 29 of the minutes, Project Number 23. This is for Pompano Beach, 006. The cost estimate should be \$3,741,868. The minutes reflect \$3,741,806, which is incorrect. That concludes my edits, Mr. Chair.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

Ms. Pennant, you pulled these items. Do you still wish to pull them?

MR. RIDDLE: It was only the one item.

MS. CASSINI: Yeah, just to clarify, Ms. Pennant pulled the Davie item because it was placed on the record as coming in 800,000 over the cost estimate.

MS. PENNANT: And now you're saying it's less.

MR. RIDDLE: Yes, ma'am. That's correct. It's less -- less.

MS. PENNANT: Okay. No.

MR. HOOPER: Is your microphone on?

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. PENNANT: No longer want to pull the item.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you, Ms. Pennant. Okay. All right. So do we need to have -- do a --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: -- we're just changing (inaudible).

MS. CASSINI: Correct.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. The next item is the review and approval of the supplemental 2020 budget requests for the Broward County Public Works construction-ready projects pulled for discussion on --

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman?

MR. HOOPER: Yes, sir.

MR. ALLEN: It's Phil.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MR. ALLEN: Should there be a motion to approve the minutes as corrected?

MR. HOOPER: That's -- that was the draft of the minutes, and in order to get those appropriately drafted for the next meeting when we approve the minutes, we wanted to go through that exercise.

So that was just clarification, because during that workshop there was some line items that were showing the wrong numbers, and those minutes will be approved at our next meeting. Does that work?

MR. ALLEN: That's good for me.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Allen. Are we on Number 3?

MS. CASSINI: Yes.

**3 - REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF SUPPLEMENTAL FY 2020 BUDGET REQUESTS BY BROWARD COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS CONSTRUCTION-READY PROJECTS PULLED FOR DISCUSSION ON MAY 22, 2020**

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. HOOPER: Okay. All right. So is Tony going to step up again for this item?

MS. CASSINI: You can go straight to him. (Inaudible) discussion.

**A - DISCUSSION OF NEW PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS PULLED BY CHAIR HOOPER ON MAY 22, 2020**

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So discussion of the new Public Works projects pulled by Chair Hooper on May 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2020. Okay. Are those with the –

MS. CASSINI: Those are the three that you wanted (inaudible).

MR. HUI: Good morning, Mr. Chair. Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: Good morning.

MR. HUI: I'm -- I'm sorry, I was having a little trouble hearing. Was there any additional information that you requested? I couldn't hear it.

MR. HOOPER: So the line items that I pulled were new projects –

MR. HUI: Right.

MR. HOOPER: -- and I just want to understand if those projects are affecting other projects that could have been put on -- on -- that -- that were waiting in line. Because here we've got new projects that weren't part of the plan –

MR. HUI: Right.

MR. HOOPER: -- that have been added, so I wanted to go through those projects, and you just explain to us how they fit in the -- in the concept of a five-year plan and how they got put into this year's budget.

MR. HUI: Right.

MR. HOOPER: Okay?

MR. HUI: Uh-huh. Yeah, thank you. It's -- just as a step back, when we put the program together with regards to all of the surtax projects, it's a 30-year program over -- obviously, over an extended period of time. When we do our

capital projects, we typically allocate budgets one year at a time. We do a five-year look ahead so that we can do an idea of what we're coming up.

So the -- so the gist of it is that as the program go on, and especially with a program that is a 30-year program, there's going to be a number of changes and adjustments to the program as we proceed. Now, with regards to these three new projects, what we want -- what -- the reasons for the driving force for these projects are in many -- in quite a few of them, drainage issues that have propped up, side -- broken sidewalk issues that have come up with regards to safety for pedestrians, and then also in these cases, two new bridge repair projects that were just identified by the FDOT's biannual inspection program that this is something that we have to deal with.

So these are all major repairs/replacements that have come up. And in a normal course of a capital program, these issues do come up. So what we wanted to -- what we want to do and what we do do is is that we want to keep track of these projects in context of what our original plan is. So we do keep track of the total costs of the projects as compared to what it was.

And our program, the way that it's projected now, even with the new projects, and because there are adjustments on existing projects -- and we're working, actually, in a number of different areas, working with DOT to coordinate and combine some of our projects, so the costs are going to change. But the gist of it is is that where we are now versus where we're -- where we project to be, we're within percent -- a couple percentage points of each other. So it's a very close match.

These projects didn't push any projects back. We had used our in-house staff to design many of these so that we can proceed ahead. And this gives - - these projects actually gives us an opportunity to proceed ahead with the projects rather than delay any of the other ones.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So, to clarify, these are construction-ready projects --

MR. HUI: Yeah. Uh-huh. Except for that one that I mentioned as part of the presentation, which is the Sheridan Street. We want to do a -- proceed quickly with the design/build package. That's the only one of the one that we're requesting that is not construction-ready.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. And we have the funds from our surtax revenue to --

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. HUI: Yeah. Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: -- to do this and to do the projects that we had already put in the plan?

MR. HUI: Yeah. We do. And there's --

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. HUI: -- there's going to be adjustments going forth, but, yes, we do.

MR. HOOPER: And then I did notice, and I did not pull, those two items that, when you talk about drainage in coordination with other projects, there was new work that went on with those two. And, again, I recognize that there were drainage improvements that you were kind of putting on top of a project that needed that.

MR. HUI: Right.

MR. HOOPER: And so I was fine with that. So --

MR. HUI: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: -- I just -- just for clarification, transparency so that the public knows that when we see something new that comes on, we should ask questions, and we should make sure that they fit within the plan.

MR. HUI: Of course.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Thank you, Tony. I appreciate that. And since I -- can I take them off the pulled list? Because we haven't voted on the consent yet. So we can put those three items, I think it's B104 -- I think that's O102 and O103, back on the consent list. Okay?

MS. CASSINI: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

**B - MOTION TO RECOMMEND AS ELIGIBLE NEW COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS NOT CONTAINED IN THE ORIGINAL SURTAX PLAN**

MS. CASSINI: All are ready for a motion.

MR. HOOPER: We are? We're ready for a motion on the -- on those items? Okay. So we're looking for --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, could you do that, please?

MS. CASSINI: Absolutely, Mr. Chair. So we are prepared to take action on the Public Works capital projects. These are project IDs S04, D101, S39, B21, B31, D102, the ones that have been pulled, which are B104, O102, O103, and D7, which had not been pulled, R17, and R18, for a total of 12 projects, 24.5 million dollars. These are County Public Works projects.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman?

MR. HOOPER: Yes, sir.

MR. ALLEN: Could we have counsel to give her advice as to the eligibility?

MR. HOOPER: Sure.

MS. WALLACE: Thank you. Yes, so these are road improvement projects, and Chapter 212.055 Florida Statutes Subsection 1(d) provides that the proceeds from the surtax can be used for planning, development, construction, operations, and maintenance of roads, bridges, buses, fixed guideway systems. And so these are road improvement projects and they are therefore eligible under 212.055 Florida Statutes.

MR. HOOPER: Great.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman, I would **move** approval.

MINUTES SECRETARY: Is that Mr. Allen?

MR. HOOPER: Yes, it is.

MS. LOVE: This is -- this is Allyson, and I second.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. I just have one question.

MR. CAVROS: Mr. --

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. HOOPER: Go ahead. Who is this?

MR. CAVROS: -- yeah, Mr. Chairman -- Mr. Chairman, this is George Cavros. I have a question. And this is maybe for our attorney. There is -- in the ordinance, there's a provision that allows us to provide recommendations to the County and the municipalities on their projects. And is this the appropriate time to --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. CAVROS: -- to invoke that provision, or would it be after a vote?

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: So we're going to have a Q and A and any comments --

MS. WALLACE: This afternoon.

MR. HOOPER: -- this afternoon to pass on recommendations to the County Commission. So I think that would be a better time to do that, if you're willing to wait.

MS. WALLACE: Correct. I guess to answer your question, Mr. Cavros -- this is Angela Wallace -- yes, the ordinance does provide for the Oversight Board to provide recommendations to the County Commission, and we can -- we have a time to address that this afternoon for purposes of the projects that the Oversight Board is considering today.

MR. CAVROS: Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: And then did we mention -- or did we pull D -- D07? Did you -- did you add that to the list?

MS. CASSINI: That was already on the list. That had not previously been pulled. So all 12 --

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: -- projects that were brought forward, including the three that you had pulled on May 22<sup>nd</sup>, are now being recommended as eligible. I think that's the motion on the table.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So we've got a motion and a second. Let's do a roll call, since we're virtual here. Ms. Thompson, if you don't mind doing that.

MS. THOMPSON: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Sorry. Can you hear me? Chair Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Ms. Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Ron Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: And Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Okay. We have a quorum.

MS. CASSINI: No, the vote passes unanimously.

MS. THOMPSON: Oh. Vote passes unanimous -- unanimously.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you, Ms. Thompson. Thank you, everybody.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

**4 - CONTINUED FROM MAY 22, 2020 OVERSIGHT BOARD MEETING:  
REVIEW OF CYCLE 1, FY 2020 MUNICIPAL CAPITAL PROJECT  
RECOMMENDATIONS FROM BROWARD'S METROPOLITAN PLANNING  
ORGANIZATION BEGINNING WITH PROJECT RANKED 48**

**A - OVERSIGHT BOARD MEMBERS' OR SURTAX GENERAL  
COUNSEL'S PROJECT PULLS FOR FURTHER REVIEW**

MR. HOOPER: We'll go to the next item, which is Number 4, and it was continued from our May 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting. We were reviewing the Cycle 1 year 2020 municipal capital project recommendations from the MPO. And so we're going to restart that, beginning with Project Number 48, and we're going to have Andrew Riddle come up to the podium and start going through those projects.

And, again, I just want to remind you, if you want to pull an item, after Mr. Riddle has gone through the item, you may pull it. We won't go into any questions or discussions, and we'll discuss them this afternoon. Thank you.

MR. RIDDLE: Mr. Chair, members of the Board, I will continue my May 22<sup>nd</sup> presentation on the Cycle 1 municipal capital projects. Starting with Project 48 in Lauderdale Lakes entails installing citywide traffic calming. The planning estimate is 25,500. The project location are depicted on the map.

Project 49 in Wilton Manors entails installing citywide bus shelters and bus benches. The planning estimate is 180,000. The project locations are depicted on the map, and also Dixie Highway north of Northeast 26<sup>th</sup> Street.

Project 50 in Sunrise entails bike lanes along Pine Island Road. The planning estimate is \$540,000. The project location is from Commercial Boulevard to the city limits.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

Project 51 in Pembroke Park entails installing missing sidewalks and bike paths. The design estimate is \$30,000. The project location are depicted on the map.

Project 52 in Lauderdale by the Sea entails pedestrian walkways, bike lanes, lighting, and drainage on El Mar Drive. The design estimate is \$240,000. The project location is for the entire length of El Mar Drive corridor.

Project 53 in Weston entails adding bike lanes, ADA improvements, pavement markings, and resurfacing of Weston Road. The design estimate is 588,000. The project location is from Griffin Road to South New River Circle.

Project 54 in Deerfield Beach entails adding -- adding lanes from a two- to a four-lane facility, landscaping, bike lanes, a linear trail, lighting, drainage of FAU Research Park Boulevard. The design estimate is \$480,000. The project location is from Southwest 10<sup>th</sup> Street to Northeast 48<sup>th</sup> Street.

Project 55 in Cooper City entails neighborhood signage throughout the city. The design estimate is \$21,000. The project locations are depicted on the map.

MS. WALLACE: I'd like to pull Item 55, Cooper City Project Number COOP035.

MR. HOOPER: If anybody's got their phone on -- un-muted, please mute it. Thank you.

MR. RIDDLE: Project 56 in Tamarac entails expanding the bikeway network throughout the city. The planning estimate is 135,000. The project location is Pine -- Pine Island Road from Northwest 79<sup>th</sup> Street to McNab Road --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Pay your utility and tax bills online.

MR. RIDDLE: -- and west --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Order bus passes --

MR. RIDDLE: -- of McNab and Westwood Boulevard West.

Project 57 in Lighthouse Point entails expanding sidewalks and bike lanes. The planning estimate is \$15,000. The project location is Sample Road from

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

Northeast 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue to US-1.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.) Avoid touching hard –

MR. RIDDLE: Project 58 in North Lauderdale entails neighborhood traffic calming devices. The design estimate is \$360,000. 218 -- I'm sorry -- \$360,218. The project improvements are on Southwest 81<sup>st</sup> Avenue and also on Tam O'Shanter Boulevard.

Project 59 in Parkland entails widening Parkland Drive to include bike lanes and extension of a right and left turn lanes in -- into rivers -- River Glades Elementary School. The design estimate is \$180,000. The project location is Parkside Drive from Holmberg Road to Loxahatchee Road.

Project 60 in Dania Beach entails construction of a road -- of a bridge over the C-10 Canal on West Dania Beach Boulevard. The design estimate is \$480,000. The project location is depicted on the map.

Project 61 in Margate entails sidewalks, crosswalks, and landscaping for Winfield Boulevard. The design estimate is \$20,880. The project location is the entire length of Winfield Boulevard from State Road 7 to the west.

Project 62 in Southwest Ranches entails drainage improvements along Southwest 6 -- 61<sup>st</sup> Court and Southwest 61<sup>st</sup> Avenue to reduce roadway flooding. The design estimate is \$12,000. The project location for the two roadways is depicted on the map.

MS. PENNANT: Excuse me. You're no longer saying whether the projects -- you -- you're no longer saying whether or not the projects are over budget or under budget. Is there a reason?

MR. RIDDLE: Yes, ma'am. So as we discussed on May 22<sup>nd</sup>, the planning estimate is three percent of the total project cost.

MS. PENNANT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. RIDDLE: The design estimate is 12 percent of -- of the total project cost, and the construction estimate is 85 percent of the total project cost.

MS. PENNANT: Okay. Okay.

MR. RIDDLE: So we used the total project cost as -- in the surtax plan to

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

derive -- derive those numbers.

MS. PENNANT: Okay.

MR. RIDDLE: So the -- none of these --

MS. PENNANT: All right.

MR. RIDDLE: -- projects would be exceeding that amount.

MS. PENNANT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. RIDDLE: Project 63 in Fort Lauderdale entails new sidewalks in various locations across the city where sidewalks are currently missing. The design estimate is \$360,000. The projects location are depicted on the map.

Project 64 in Oakland Park entails a study to provide recommendations for safety improvements to the CSX and FEC rail crossings. The planning estimate is \$150,000. The project locations are depicted on the map.

Project 65 in Coral Springs entails a new sidewalk in various locations across the city where sidewalks are currently missing or not ADA compliant. The planning estimate is \$600,000. The project locations are depicted on the map.

Project 66 in Hollywood entails a new sidewalk and pedestrian lighting on Johnson Street. The planning estimate \$150,000. The project location is on Johnson Street from Dixie Highway to west of I-95.

Project 67 in Miramar entails new bus shelters throughout the city. The design estimate is \$144,000. The project locations are depicted on the map.

Project 68 in Lauderdale Lakes entails traffic calming, bike lanes, landscaping, and drainage improvements on Northwest 50<sup>th</sup> -- 50<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The planning estimate is \$500,000. The project location is on Northwest 50<sup>th</sup> Avenue from Oakland Park Boulevard to the end of the street by the C-13 Canal.

MR. HOOPER: I'm sorry. (Inaudible.)

MR. RIDDLE: Correct. Yes, sir.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. HOOPER: You said it's 500,000?

MR. RIDDLE: Yes, the planning estimate -- I'm sorry. Well, actually --

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, I've got 15,000 on my sheet. I have 15,000 on my sheet. You have 500,000.

MS. WALLACE: All right. The planning percentage of the project cost estimate, right, is -- it should be 15?

MR. RIDDLE: Right. But I believe that this is a planning only study.

MS. WALLACE: Right. That's why we're saying it should be 15 and not 500,000 for the planning study.

MR. RIDDLE: Right. There were two projects that the total amount was only for a planning study. And I believe this is -- this is one of those.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. I'll pull this.

MS. PENNANT: Yeah.

MS. WALLACE: Right.

MR. RIDDLE: Okay.

MS. PENNANT: (Inaudible.)

MS. WALLACE: Number 68.

MS. PENNANT: I keep (Inaudible) on the one for --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh.

MR. HOOPER: I'm sorry, Ms. Pennant, which one?

MS. PENNANT: Well, in -- in the situation with the Hollywood, I -- I noticed that but kind of after the fact.

MR. HOOPER: So --

MS. PENNANT: It was 150,000 but I don't know if it's all for planning.

MR. HOOPER: Which number was that?

MS. PENNANT: Number 66.

MS. WALLACE: The Complete Streets on Johnson, Johnson Street.

MS. PENNANT: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: Could you go back to that and let's see if the numbers jive on that.

MR. RIDDLE: Which project is that?

MR. HOOPER: Number 66.

MS. WALLACE: HO -- the Project Number is HOLL038. And so it's for planning of a Complete Street project on Johnson Street.

MS. CASSINI: It's one above. No, that's a different (Inaudible.)

MR. RIDDLE: Right. The planning estimate is 150,000. That's --

MS. PENNANT: Go up to --

MR. RIDDLE: -- three percent.

MS. PENNANT: -- 160 -- to 64 then.

MS. CASSINI: It's that one.

MS. PENNANT: There, that's the one.

MR. RIDDLE: Right. This is in the -- Oakland Park. That's correct. So the -- the intent of this project that was submitted in the surtax plan was only for a planning study.

MS. PENNANT: Okay.

MR. RIDDLE: So they are asking for planning only for a single phase of planning.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. PENNANT: Okay.

MR. RIDDLE: So the 150,000 matches the 150,000.

MS. PENNANT: Okay. All right. Thank you, I guess. I -- I don't know. So planning and then what?

MS. WALLACE: Planning for rail- --

MR. HOOPER: Do you want to pull it?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. WALLACE: Yeah.

MR. HOOPER: Pull that item, please.

MS. WALLACE: I put that on the list, 64, because it's planning for a railroad crossing. That seems high. So the next one would be 69?

MR. RIDDLE: I'm trying to get there here.

All right. Project 69 in Sunrise entails a multi-use path along the south side of Oakland Park Boulevard. The design estimate is \$390,000. The project location is from Flamingo Road to east of University Drive.

Project 70 in Pompano Beach entails a multi-use path along the south side of Oakland Park Boulevard. The design estimate is \$328,183.

MS. WALLACE: I'd like to pull Project Number -- Ranked Number 70, Project Number POMP011.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Chair, can we pull Number 69 as well? This is Shea Smith.

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MR. SMITH: Thank you.

MR. RIDDLE: Project 71 in Davie entails road widening, bike lanes, new sidewalks, and drainage improvements on Southwest 30<sup>th</sup> Street. The design estimate is \$240,000. The project location is from University Drive to College Avenue.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

Project 72 in Coconut Creek has been requested by the city to be removed from Cycle 1 funding consideration. A letter was received from the city manager in the backup indicating this request.

MS. WALLACE: And so for purposes of our process, we will pull Project Number 70, POMP -- I mean 72, COCO20. Thanks.

MR. RIDDLE: Project 73 in Wilton Manors entails widening and ADA improvements of sidewalks on Northeast 26<sup>th</sup> Street. The design estimate is \$240,000. The project location is from Dixie Highway to Federal Highway.

Project 74 in West Park entails bike lanes, sidewalks, drainage improvements, landscaping, resurfacing of Southwest 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The design estimate is \$420,000. The project location is from Pembroke Road to County Line Road.

Project 75 in Weston entails sidewalks, ADA improvements, bike lanes, and signage on Indian Trace Road.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: To reopen in a safe way. (inaudible).

MINUTES SECRETARY: Who's speaking?

MS. CASSINI: It was the --

MR. HOOPER: It was a mistake. The computer spoke.

MR. RIDDLE: The design estimate is \$33,600. The project location is a portion of Indian Trace Road from Southwest 160<sup>th</sup> Avenue to Saddle Club, and is tied to Project 98, West 193, and will be delivered as a single project.

Project 76 in Pembroke Park entails bike lanes, sidewalks, drainage -- drainage, street lighting, landscaping on Southwest 52<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. Please note that the MPO transmittal correctly identifies this project as a Pembroke Park project, but was incorrectly submitted with a Pembroke Park -- West Park ID number. The design estimate is \$144,000. And the location is from Southwest 41<sup>st</sup> Street to Hallandale Beach.

Project 77 in Deerfield Beach entails the new -- entails new sidewalks, ADA improvements, pedestrian lighting on Southeast 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. The design estimate is \$240,000. The project location is from Northeast Eller Street to

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

Southeast 10<sup>th</sup> Street.

Project -- Project 78 in Lighthouse Point entails sidewalk and median improvements and traffic calming on Sample Road. The planning estimate is \$30,000. The project location is from US-1 to Northeast 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue.

Project 79 in Pembroke Pines entails sound walls on Sheridan Street. The design estimate is \$162,000. The project location is from Flamingo Road to Palm Avenue.

MR. HOOPER: I would like --

MS. WALLACE: I'd like --

MR. HOOPER: -- to pull it.

MR. CAVROS: Mr. Chairman.

MR. HOOPER: You know, I didn't even know it was on your list and I was like, I've got to pull that one.

MS. WALLACE: Okay. Yeah, so 79 -- ranked project 79 is pulled, and the Project Number is PPIN021. Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: George, did you want to say something or were you pulling that?

MR. CAVROS: Well, thank you. I was actually going to ask to pull that, and also I had a question about Project Number 77 and would like to pull that.

MS. WALLACE: 77.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Pull 77, please.

MR. RIDDLE: Project 80 in North Lauderdale entails sound walls, sidewalks, raised intersections, lighting, and safety improvements on Boulevard of Champions. The design estimate is \$360,000. The project location is depicted on the lap -- map here.

MS. WALLACE: Is that 80? We're pulling -- also pulling Project Number 80, Project NLAU008. Thank you.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. RIDDLE: Project 81 in Cooper City entails drainage improvements on Stirling Road. The design estimate is 288 -- \$288,000. The project location is from Hiatus Road to Southwest 100<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Project 82 in Parkland entails sidewalks, bike lanes, and medians on -- within medians on Lox Road. The design estimate is \$312,000. The project location is approximately 2,300 feet west of Parkside Drive to State Road 7.

Project 83 in Margate entails multiple -- multi-use path on easements from Firefighters Park to Sample Road. The design estimate is \$120,000. The project location is depicted on this map.

MS. PENNANT: Is that project 83?

MS. WALLACE: Yes. You want to pull 83?

MS. PENNANT: Yeah. I'm uncomfortable with some of the pieces here. I'd like to pull that.

MR. RIDDLE: Project 84 in Southwest Ranches entails drainage improvements to reduce flooding on Southwest 162<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Court, and Southwest 160<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The design estimate is \$5,160. The project location is depicted on the map.

Project 85 in Tamarac entails development of a multi-modal transportation master plan. The planning estimate is \$120,000. This is the same as the surtax plan estimate. The location is not provided at this time.

MR. HOOPER: I'd like to pull that.

MS. PENNANT: Yeah. That's --

MS. CASSINI: This is in Tamarac?

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

CHAIR HOOPER: Tamarac 001.

MR. RIDDLE: Project 86 in Lauderdale by the Sea was requested by the city manager to remove from Cycle 1 funding consideration. A letter from the city manager is included in the backup.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. WALLACE: Okay. So for purposes of, I guess, our process, we'll pull Ranked Project Number 86, which is LSEA035. Thank you.

MR. RIDDLE: Project 87 in Dania Beach entails stormwater improvements to address street flooding. The design estimate is \$865,440. The project area is shaded in blue. It is located south of Dania Beach Boulevard, west of Southeast 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue, north of Sheridan Street, and east of Federal Highway.

Project 88 in Fort Lauderdale entails reconfiguration of Southeast 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue for a potential one-way pair in order to improve traffic flow, potential transit-only lanes, and provide for additional pedestrian and bicycle space.

This project is tied to Project Number 38 and will be delivered as a single project. The planning estimate is \$45,000. The project location is from Sunrise Boulevard to Southeast 17<sup>th</sup> Street.

Project 89 in Coral Springs entails bus shelters throughout the city. The design estimate is \$45,000. The project locations are depicted on this map.

Project 90 in Miramar entails buffered bike lanes on Pembroke Road. The design estimate is \$252,000. The project location is from Palm Avenue to Douglas Road.

Project 91 in Sunrise entails new bike lanes on Oakland Park Boulevard. The design estimate is 700 -- \$720,000.

MS. PENNANT: Can you pull 90 and 91? I -- I want to look at that closely. There's some big dollars there. I want to see what is entailed for bike lanes.

MR. RIDDLE: Okay.

MS. PENNANT: Quarter million dollars.

MR. RIDDLE: This is for Project 91. This is the project location for the -- from Flamingo Road to the Sunrise city limits. So this is the extent of the project.

MS. PENNANT: I still want to look at it closer.

MR. RIDDLE: Understood.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

Project 92 in Oakland Park entails multi-modal traffic congestion improvements on Oakland Park Boulevard. This project is tied to Project Number 100 in Wilton Manors as a joint planning effort and will be delivered as a single project. The planning estimate is \$396,000.

MS. WALLACE: I'm pull -- I'd like to pull Project Number 92 -- or Ranked 92, Project Number OAK025.

MR. RIDDLE: The project location is shown on the map from Northwest 31<sup>st</sup> Avenue to Federal Highway.

Project 93 in Lauderdale Lakes entails streetscape, landscape, wayfinding, lighting, traffic calming, and drainage improvements on Northwest 36<sup>th</sup> Street. The design estimate is \$120,000. The project location is from State Road 7 to Northwest 43<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and Northwest 34 -- 43<sup>rd</sup> -- I'm sorry. The project location is from Southwest 7<sup>th</sup> -- I'm sorry.

The -- the project location is from State Road 7 to Northwest 43<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and Northwest 43<sup>rd</sup> Avenue from Northwest 36<sup>th</sup> Street to Oakland Park Boulevard.

MS. PENNANT: That's a big one.

MR. RIDDLE: Project 94 in Hallandale Beach entails on-street parking, buffered bike lanes, sidewalks, and ADA improvements on 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The design estimate is \$180,000. The project location is from Southwest 11<sup>th</sup> Street to Pembroke Road.

Project 95 in Davie entails construction of a three-lane roadway with raised medians, left turn lanes, bike lanes, ADA compliant sidewalks, drainage, lighting on Nova -- and on -- lighting on Nova Drive. The design estimate is \$336,000. The project location is from Pine Island Road to University Drive.

Project 96 in Coconut Creek entails construction and widening of sidewalks and transit shelters and amenities on Sample Road. The design estimate is \$330,600. The project location is from Lyons Road to the Florida's time -- Turnpike.

Project 97 in West Park entails traffic calming, bike lanes, sidewalks, drainage improvements on Southwest 21<sup>st</sup> Street. The design estimate is \$240,000. The project location is from State Road 7 to Southwest 40<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

Project 98 in Weston entails construction of ADA accessible ramps, sidewalks, bike lanes, pavement markings, and signage on Indian Trace Road. The design estimate is \$336,000.

MR. HOOPER: Hey, can you pull 97, please?

MS. WALLACE: Okay.

MR. RIDDLE: For Project 98, the design estimate is \$336,000. The project location is a portion of Indian Trace Road from Southwest 160<sup>th</sup> Avenue to Saddle Creek -- Saddle Club Road. And it's tied to Project Number 75, which is West 192, and will be delivered as a single project.

Project 99 in Pompano Beach entails construction of traffic calming, sidewalks, lighting, landscaping, and road realignment on Riverside Drive. The design estimate is \$711,452. The project location is from Atlantic Boulevard to Northeast 14<sup>th</sup> Street.

Project 100 in Wilton Manors entails multi-modal improvements on Oakland Park Boulevard. The project is tied to Oakland Park -- Oakland Park Project 92 as a joint planning effort and will be delivered as a single project. The planning cost estimate is 396,000. The project location is on Oakland Park Boulevard within the two cities.

MS. WALLACE: I'd like to pull that project. So it's ranked -- Project Ranked one -- number -- I mean 100, Project Number WILT015.

MR. RIDDLE: Project 101 in Deerfield Beach entails bike lanes, sidewalks, landscaping. The design estimate is \$60,000. The project location is at Southeast 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue from Northeast Eller Street to Southeast 10<sup>th</sup> Street, and to include Southeast 4<sup>th</sup> Street and Dixie -- Dixie Highway to Southeast 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and Eller Street from the railroad to Northeast 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Project 102 in Pembroke Park entails stormwater improvements to address roadway flooding. The design estimate is \$90,000. The project location is on Countyline Road, which is also Southwest 41<sup>st</sup> Street.

MS. WALLACE: (Inaudible.)

MR. RIDDLE: Project 103 --

MS. WALLACE: Oh, sorry. Before you move --

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. RIDDLE: I'm –

MS. WALLACE: -- on, I'm pulling Project 102, Project Number PPRK008. Thank you.

MR. RIDDLE: Project 103 in Cooper City entails stormwater improvements on Stirling Road. The design estimate is \$192,000. The project location is from Flamingo Road to Hiota -- Hiatus Road.

Project 104 in Pembroke Pines has been requested by the city to be removed from Cycle 1 funding consideration.

MS. WALLACE: Okay. So that's -- so we're pulling, for purposes of our agenda and how we handle the Consent Agendas, 104, which is Project Number PPIN038. But I would also like to pull Project Number ranked 101, which is DEER006. Sorry about that.

MS. PENNANT: So 101, 104, we're taking it out? 104?

MS. WALLACE: That was removed by the municipality, yes.

MR. RIDDLE: Project 105 in Lighthouse Point entails new sidewalks on Sample Road. The planning estimate is \$22,500. The project location is from Northeast 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue to Northeast 31<sup>st</sup> Avenue.

Project 106 in Parkland entails new side -- new signal -- signalized intersections. The design estimate is \$72,000. The project location is at the intersection of Hillsborough Boulevard and University Drive. Project –

MS. PENNANT: I'd like to pull that. The design estimates are really high.

MS. WALLACE: 106?

MS. PENNANT: 106.

MR. RIDDLE: -- Project 107 in Margate entails new pedestrian bridge over a canal. The design estimate is \$24,000. The project location is at -- is at Winfield Boulevard to the east side of Firefighters Park.

MS. WALLACE: I'd like to pull Project Number 107, which is MARG00033.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. RIDDLE: Project 108 in Southwest Ranches entails drainage improvements to reduce road -- roadway flooding. The design estimate is \$36,000. The project location is at Southwest 51<sup>st</sup> Manor and Dykes Road.

Project 109 in Hollywood entails traffic calming, signage, and safety improvements. The design estimate is \$100,000. The project locations are within District 5 boundary, which includes Buchanan Street from North 67<sup>th</sup> Avenue to North 72<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, Allen Drive from McArthur Parkway to North 74<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and Allen Drive from McArthur Parkway to North 74<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue between Taft and Johnson Street.

MR. HOOPER: I would like to pull that.

MR. RIDDLE: And, finally, Project 110 in Tamarac entails new crosswalks throughout the city. The planning estimate is \$90,000. The location of the study area is citywide, but specific locations of improvements will be identified using -- using the city's major arterial corridor study with additional locations identified based on the proximity of -- proximity and connectivity to transit.

MR. HOOPER: I'd like to pull that.

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MR. RIDDLE: Mr. Chair, that concludes my presentation for the Cycle 1 municipal capital surtax projects. Thank you very much.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you. All right. Let me -- give me a second. Let me get to my agenda here. Okay. So we just did that. Okay. So we're going to -- do we need to do a motion on the ones that we -- on the Consent?

MS. CASSINI: I think what Angela and I had recommended was that we go ahead and read, for the purposes of transparency and for the record, the ones that have been removed from consideration by the cities, the ones that have been pulled either by Angela or an Oversight Board member so it's clear and we can cross-check each other and make sure that we've got it right.

MR. HOOPER: And then --

MS. CASSINI: Would you like to do that?

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. HOOPER: -- make the motion --

MS. CASSINI: Yes. And then do a motion --

MR. HOOPER: -- (inaudible) Consent.

MS. CASSINI: -- yes.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. And maybe, Andrew, if you can also cross check, help us cross check which ones we pulled.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

**B - READING OF MUNICIPAL CAPITAL PROJECTS BEING CONSIDERED FOR ELIGIBILITY AND THOSE BEING PULLED FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION**

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Very good. So do you want to kind of set that table, one of you guys?

MS. CASSINI: Sure. I'm happy -- I'm happy to. And then you all jump in if I've got one wrong; okay? I have Sunrise 025.1, which was ranked Number 2, pulled for eligibility reasons. I have Lauderdale Lakes 003, Ranked Number 10, removed for consideration by the city.

I have Tamarac 018, Ranked Number 11, pulled for eligibility concerns. Cooper City 036, Ranked Number 12, pulled for eligibility concerns. Oakland Park 099, Ranked Number 16, pulled for eligibility concerns. Pembroke Park 002, Ranked Number 18, pulled. I'm not sure if it was -- is it an eligibility or a Q and A issue? It's important for us to know that. Does anyone know?

MR. HOOPER: Which one was that?

MS. CASSINI: I'm sorry, this is Pembroke Park 002. Eligibility or Q and A?

MS. WALLACE: Eligibility issues regarding the project.

MS. CASSINI: Thank you. Wilton Manors 012, ranked -- oh, actually, I'm sorry. That one was not pulled. Next pull was Wilton Manors 007.1 --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. CASSINI: -- pulled for eligibility concerns.

MR. RIDDLE: Ranked 29.

MS. CASSINI: I'm sorry?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MR. RIDDLE: 29.

MS. WALLACE: Yes.

MS. CASSINI: Yes, ranked 29<sup>th</sup>.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: Those were the only construction projects that I have. Were there any that I missed?

MS. WALLACE: (Inaudible.)

MS. CASSINI: Okay. So, Mr. Chair, we're going to move into design and planning projects now.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: Just for the record, projects ranked 34, 35, 36, 37 from Miramar are all being combined into a single project at the city's request. Cooper City 035, ranked 55<sup>th</sup>, pulled for eligibility concerns.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

MS. CASSINI: Oakland Park 007, ranked 64<sup>th</sup>, pulled for Q and A. Lauderdale Lakes 016, ranked 66<sup>th</sup>, pulled for Q and A. Sunrise 075, ranked 69<sup>th</sup>, pulled for Q and A. Pompano 011, ranked 70<sup>th</sup>, pulled, I believe for Q and A or for eligibility?

MS. WALLACE: Eligibility.

MS. CASSINI: Thank you. Eligibility.

MS. PENNANT: Did you do Number 38?

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. CASSINI: Hold on. Rank 38?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. CASSINI: I –

MS. PENNANT: (Inaudible.)

MS. CASSINI: -- this was Fort Lauderdale 108, ranked 38<sup>th</sup>?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. CASSINI: I'm sorry, I didn't have that one.

MS. PENNANT: I'd like to pull that.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-uh.

MS. CASSINI: Okay. So at this time, Anthea Pennant is pulling Fort Lauderdale 108, ranked 38<sup>th</sup> for Q and A.

MS. WALLACE: Right. I didn't have that.

MS. CASSINI: Okay. The next one I have is Coconut Creek 020, ranked 72<sup>nd</sup>. It has been removed by the city from consideration for Cycle 1.

MS. WALLACE: Correct.

MS. CASSINI: Next would be Deerfield Beach 005, ranked 77<sup>th</sup>, pulled for eligibility concerns or Q and A?

MS. WALLACE: Q and A.

MS. CASSINI: Q and A. Pembroke Pines 021, ranked 79<sup>th</sup>, pulled for eligibility concerns.

MS. WALLACE: Correct.

MS. CASSINI: North Lauderdale 008, ranked 80<sup>th</sup>, pulled for eligibility concerns.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. WALLACE: Yes.

MS. CASSINI: Margate 047, ranked 83<sup>rd</sup>, is this a pull for eligibility or Q and A?

MS. WALLACE: Q and A.

MS. CASSINI: Q and A. Tamarac 001, ranked 85<sup>th</sup>, pulled by an Oversight Board member, I believe for Q and A.

MS. WALLACE: Yes, Mr. Coolman.

MS. CASSINI: Lauderdale by the Sea 035, ranked 86<sup>th</sup>, removed from consideration by the city.

MS. WALLACE: Correct.

MS. CASSINI: Miramar 025, ranked 90<sup>th</sup>, pulled for Q and A.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: Sunrise 061, ranked 91<sup>st</sup>, pulled for Q and A.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: Oakland Park 025, tied to Wilton Manors Project Ranked 100. This one's ranked 92<sup>nd</sup>. Pulled for –

MS. WALLACE: Eligibility.

MS. CASSINI: -- eligibility.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: West Park 008, ranked 97<sup>th</sup>, pulled by an Oversight Board Member for Q and A.

MS. WALLACE: Correct.

MS. CASSINI: Wilton Manors 015, also combined with Oakland Park 025, pulled for eligibility concerns.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. WALLACE: Yes.

MS. CASSINI: Deerfield Beach 006, ranked 101<sup>st</sup>, pulled for Q and A.

MS. WALLACE: Eligibility –

MS. CASSINI: Eligibility.

MS. WALLACE: -- concerns.

MS. CASSINI: I'm sorry.

MS. WALLACE: Yeah.

MS. CASSINI: Eligibility concerns.

MS. WALLACE: That's mine. Uh-huh.

MS. PENNANT: And if you could add Number 39 to it as well –

MS. CASSINI: Okay.

MS. PENNANT: -- in Oakland Park.

MS. CASSINI: So Oakland Park 023, ranked 39. This is a mast arm conversion being pulled by Anthea Pennant for Q and A.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: I believe the next one on the list was Pembroke Park 008, ranked 102<sup>nd</sup>, pulled for eligibility concerns.

MS. WALLACE: Yes.

MS. CASSINI: Pembroke Pines 038, ranked 104<sup>th</sup>, city is requesting this project be removed from Cycle 1 consideration.

MS. WALLACE: Correct.

MS. CASSINI: Pembroke Park -- I'm sorry -- Parkland -- Parkland 007, ranked 106<sup>th</sup>, is being pulled for Q and A.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. CASSINI: Margate 033, ranked 107<sup>th</sup>, being pulled for Q and A.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: Hollywood 056, 109, being pulled for Q and A. And, finally, Tamarac 021, ranked 110, is being pulled for Q and A. Did -- please let me know if I've missed anything.

Do any other Oversight Board members have any items that they wish to pull for further discussion this afternoon? Please let us know at this time. Okay. With that, Mr. Chair, I think --

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MS. CASSINI: -- you can entertain a motion.

MR. HOOPER: Do we have a motion?

MS. CASSINI: Actually, could we ask --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman --

MS. CASSINI: -- could we ask for the eligibility slides to please be queued up so we can go through the eligibility presentation very quickly before we take a motion, please.

MR. HOOPER: It doesn't show up on my screen here.

MS. CASSINI: Oh, you have to do it there.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. RIDDLE: We're trying to pull up the eligibility slides, so I don't think there's anything (inaudible).

MR. HOOPER: Oh, okay.

MR. RIDDLE: All right.

MS. CASSINI: Can you read it?

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. WALLACE: Sure.

MS. CASSINI: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: So -- thank you.

MS. CASSINI: Everyone, we have both -- we have this eligibility presentation posted to the website for those of you that are following along on the website and for Oversight Board members -- oh, here it goes. There it is. Thank you.

MR. RIDDLE: I was trying to figure it out. Sorry. I don't -- I'm not used to your --

MS. CASSINI: Thank you, Andrew. No, we're so grateful. We appreciate it.

MS. WALLACE: No one gave me the clicker, so. Okay. But --

MS. CASSINI: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: -- eligibility --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MS. WALLACE: -- so the Oversight Board's goal as outlined in Section 31½-75 of the Broward County Code -- Code of Ordinances, which are -- is the Transportation Surtax Ordinance provides that the Oversight Board will make determinations of the project eligibility and the associated expenditures for those projects, eligibility under 212.055 (1)B of Florida Statutes, and what this involves is the projects under the current version of the ordinance are presented to the MPO for capital projects, staff -- County staff for the municipal rehab -- rehabilitation and maintenance projects.

We present them to the Oversight Board, and the Oversight board considers them for eligibility, and the Statute provides that projects that are for planning, development, construction, operations and maintenance of roads and bridges in the County and for planning, development, expansion, operations and maintenance of buses and fixed guideway systems, and for planning, development, construction, operations and maintenance of on-demand transportation services.

So the projects that have been presented so far, the municipal projects are

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

capital projects that would be for road improvements that would be eligible under the Statute. Another criteria that applies to these particular projects is Section 3, that outlines eligibility under the interlocal agreement. And I guess at this point -- and that slide is on the -- on the projector, on the screen.

So what will happen is some of the projects that are listed may include elements that are ineligible, so while the whole project will -- would be eligible, there are elements that, if they don't comply with this eligibility criteria outlined in the interlocal agreement, would be removed from the projects during the negotiation process.

So we just wanted to make sure that we put that on the record. So, you know, there's drainage, and there are criteria that apply to drainage improvements, for instance, as outlined in the -- in the in the interlocal agreement.

MS. CASSINI: Okay.

MS. PENNANT: So I'm just curious, have all the cities signed the interlocal agreement?

MS. WALLACE: So the interlocal agreement will come after the County Commission allocates funding. So once the Oversight Board makes recommendations regarding eligibility and provides comments to the County Commission regarding the projects, whichever they would like to submit, there -- the next County Commission meeting will be on June 16<sup>th</sup>, and we plan to present the Oversight Board's recommendations regarding those projects on June 16<sup>th</sup>. The Board allocates funding, and then we negotiate the agreements.

MS. CASSINI: I think, Ms. Pennant, are you referring to the interlocal agreement that was just mentioned? So we have an active interlocal agreement with 29 of our 31 cities, the MPO, and the County that has that -- that eligibility criteria that Angela was just reading, that Section 3 that's actually up on the projector. And 29 of the cities are participants in that. And only those cities that signed that agreement can apply for surtax funds.

MS. PENNANT: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: But then they have to enter into a project-level agreement to receive those funds.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. PENNANT: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: So the -- right. The umbrella agreement that this slide is a part of is -- outlines the County's funding commitment to municipal projects and the eligibility criteria for certain aspects of projects, like how lighting or sound walls or certain elements, the criteria that they would have to comply with in order to meet the eligibility criteria.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Uh-huh.

MS. PENNANT: And this --

MS. WALLACE: Okay?

MS. PENNANT: -- agreement does not include any requirements for them to meet the 30 percent?

MS. WALLACE: That is in the funding agreement.

MS. PENNANT: It's in the funding agreement.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh. That will be negotiated after the Board allocates funding.

MS. PENNANT: Okay. Thank you.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: I think that, you know, for the board members, I think that the fact that our staff put this up on the screen and if you'll look in your folder under -- there's a tab that has eligibility determination in your book.

And I think that even as we start going through the discussion this afternoon, having that handy and looking at it might help speed up the process, might clarify a few questions.

I can tell you just -- just that part with the peach-colored eligibility line items has already clarified a couple things that might help me get through a couple of my items that I pulled. So please, when we get into the discussion, if you have that handy, it might help get us through this. Okay?

**C - MOTION TO RECOMMEND AS ELIGIBLE MUNICIPAL CAPITAL**

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

**PROJECTS CONTAINED IN THE ORIGINAL SURTAX PLAN SUBJECT TO RATING, RANKING, AND RECOMMENDATION BY THE MUNICIPAL PRIORITIZATION AGREEMENT BETWEEN BROWARD COUNTY AND THE BMPO**

MR. HOOPER: So we're looking for a motion on the Consent items.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman, this is Phil.

MR. HOOPER: Yes, sir.

MR. ALLEN: Could we have Angela on the record just point out, before we make the motion, that all of the projects not pulled for further discussion do, in fact, meet the eligibility requirements?

MS. WALLACE: Okay. Yes. Yes, I can do that. So, yes, the projects that are listed as part of the Consent items that have not been pulled meet the statutory eligibility criteria. And while some of them may have components that are ineligible under that criteria in the -- the interlocal agreement, those will be extracted during the negotiation. So, yes, the projects and the associated expenditures for the projects are eligible. I recommend them as eligible under the Statute.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman, I would **move** approval of the Consent Agenda.

MS. PENNANT: I'll second.

MS. LOVE: This is Allyson. I'll (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Who seconded?

MS. PENNANT: Anthea.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. All right. We've got a motion and a second. If we could please do a roll call, Ms. Thompson.

MS. THOMPSON: Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Sorry. Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Ronald Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: And Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Vote passes unanimously.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

**5 - REVIEW OF CYCLE 1 FY 2020 MUNICIPAL REHABILITATION AND MAINTENANCE PROJECT ELIGIBILITY**

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

**A - OVERSIGHT BOARD MEMBERS' OR SURTAX GENERAL COUNSEL'S PROJECT PULLS FOR FURTHER REVIEW**

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So the next line item on the agenda is the review of Cycle 1 2020 municipal rehab and maintenance projects. We've got 67 projects to go through. I think we're going to go through them the same way we just went -- correct? -- the same way we just did the city projects, the capital projects; correct?

MS. CASSINI: Exactly. So for those of you that might be following along on the website or are looking for your -- for Oversight Board members that are looking through your materials, you'll have a matrix for the rehabilitation and maintenance projects.

You'll want to go ahead and bring that matrix up. And Mr. Mayorga is going to go through a presentation that's going to follow along that matrix, and just give you a very high-level overview, very much like what Mr. Riddle did. And after each of those, you can also have an opportunity to pull an item if you have any questions.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Thank you.

MR. MAYORGA: Good morning, Mr. Chair, Vice Chair, members of the Oversight Board. My name is Alexander --

MS. PENNANT: Good morning.

MR. MAYORGA: -- Mayorga, Program Performance Analyst with the Mobility Advancement Program. And I will be presenting the municipal rehabilitation and maintenance programs for Cycle 1 fiscal year 2020. And for those joining us virtually, if you cannot see the information on the screen clearly, you can find a link to this presentation on the home page of our website, pennyfortransportation.com.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, Ms. Cassini?

MS. CASSINI: I'm sorry. Before you start, Alex, there are five projects that, for the record, we need to make sure have been removed from consideration. They are eligible projects, but under our interlocal agreement, they were not allowed to be submitted for Cycle 1 because they were not contained in the original surtax plan that went to the voters. Angela, would

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

you like me to read those?

MS. WALLACE: Sure.

MS. CASSINI: Okay. Plantation -- Plantation 01 for bridge repairs is not going to be considered at this time by the Oversight Board. And there were four projects submitted by the City of West Park, 01, 02, 03, and 04, which will not be considered right now for Cycle 1, but can move forward for future consideration. So with that, I'll let Alex go ahead and get started.

MR. MAYORGA: Correct. Thank you. I would like briefly to describe the process that has brought us to this moment. And it all started with the amendment to the interlocal agreement with the Broward County, the Metropolitan Planning Organization, and Broward County's municipalities in which the responsibility for prioritization of rehab and maintenance programs was removed from the MPO and was -- and it became the Broward County responsibility to create a process and procedures for prioritizing rehab and maintenance projects.

This process was developed, and it was introduced to municipalities through a first municipal workshop in January 9<sup>th</sup>, 2020, after which a period of feedback and Q and A's allowed municipal participation into the fine tuning of the criteria and the procedures. The final criteria, procedures, and process was, again, shared with municipalities on the second municipal workshop in February 27<sup>th</sup>.

And the five categories for rehab and maintenance projects were defined as milling, paving, and resurfacing of public roads, sidewalk/greenway repairs, including repairs to meet ADA standards, bridge repairs, roadway drainage system repairs, and street lighting repairs. Immediately after the second workshop, Mobility Advancement Program staff engaged with developers to create this online rehab and maintenance application portal. And it took about three weeks to a month.

So the portal was open finally on April the 2<sup>nd</sup> and it was set to be open for 30 days, but it was extended until May 16<sup>th</sup> due to the COVID pandemic. During this process, our office engaged in the -- with the municipalities, first in one online training, which included every municipality, and additional on-demand training one-on-one, several communications through email, phone calls, and to the portal itself.

And all that allowed for the 62 applications that are there today for your consideration. Now, all these applications, they haven't been ranked yet

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

because part of the ranking criteria considered equitable distribution that depends on the amount that is going to be awarded to municipalities for capital projects. So there's no ranking order to these projects. I will be reading by municipality order, on alphabetical order and a consecutive number.

There were some limitations established for Cycle 1. First, the projects must be included in the original surtax plan. Projects could not exceed \$3,000,000. And they should be constructed within 12 months. There was no limit in the number of applications that municipalities can submit. So with that, I will go ahead with our first project.

MR. HOOPER: Hold on.

MR. MAYORGA: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: I just -- okay. So there's a time limitation of 12 months.

MR. MAYORGA: For -- to -- for the project to be constructed, yes. So municipalities that submit a project, they have to indicate that the schedule cannot exceed a 12-month period.

MR. HOOPER: (Laughs.) Okay. I'm a little bit dubious about that. I'm in the construction industry, so schedules are meant to be broken. Okay.

MR. MAYORGA: Thank you. So as I said, I will be calling the municipalities in their consecutive number. Coconut Creek 1. The project includes milling and resurfacing, striping, sidewalk, and ADA improvements in multiple locations citywide. The amount requested is \$3,000,000.

MR. HOOPER: Yes. So there -- there's no specific location? Just citywide?

MR. MAYORGA: As you can see, there is multiple locations in -- around the city.

MR. HOOPER: Oh.

MR. MAYORGA: And in the presentation, you can see the drawings.

MR. HOOPER: So they've identified the locations.

MR. MAYORGA: They -- they have identified the locations in the map, and --

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. MAYORGA: -- I -- I'm pretty sure additionally on the portal itself they are defined.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

MR. MAYORGA: Cooper City 1. This project includes milling and resurfacing of Stirling Road from Flamingo Road to Palm Avenue. And the amount requested is \$1,036,960.

Cooper City 2. Bridge replacement -- sorry -- bridge repairs at five bridge locations based on recommendations from DOT bridge reports. Amount requested, \$138,275.

Coral Springs 1. Milling, repairing, and resurfacing the highest priority alleyways in multiple locations. Amount requested, \$399,406.

Coral Springs 2. Milling and resurface neighborhood streets, including five local neighborhood streets and two collector arterial. Amount requested, \$1,881,531.

MR. HOOPER: I've got -- I've got to go back. I'm going to pull Coral Springs BC Coral Springs 2020 Number 1.

MR. MAYORGA: Okay. Next project is Dania Beach 1. Resurface and rebuild base for various streets, Southwest 27<sup>th</sup> Terrace, Southwest 27<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and Southwest 2<sup>nd</sup> Terrace. Amount requested, \$297,905.

Deerfield Beach 1. Bridge repairs to bridge located at Southeast 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue over the Tern Waterway to address deficiencies identified in FDOT bridge inspection reports. Amount requested, \$791,219.

Deerfield Beach 2. Bridge repairs to bridge located at Southeast 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue over the Tern Waterway to address deficiencies identified in FDOT bridge inspection reports. Amount requested, \$661,888.

Fort Lauderdale 1. Citywide sidewalk repairs, including repairs to meet ADA standards. They submitted a citywide map indicating the condition of their facilities, but the municipality indicated that the contractor would repair from five to ten percent of the identified locations.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

So this map doesn't represent the precise boundaries of the project.

MS. PENNANT: Oh, I don't know. I'd like to look at this project some more.

MR. MAYORGA: Fort Lauderdale 2. Bridge repairs. Replacement of bridge on South Ocean Drive over Marion River. Amount requested, \$2,553,217.

MS. PENNANT: I'd like -- I'd like to look at that one as well.

MR. MAYORGA: Fort Lauderdale 3. Asphalt repairs on the Finger Isles on East Las Olas Boulevard. Sorry. Amount requested, \$522,757. Fort Lauderdale --

MS. PENNANT: Excuse me. Can you go back --

MR. MAYORGA: Yes.

MS. PENNANT: -- go back on that one?

MR. MAYORGA: This one?

MS. PENNANT: Yes. Public roads. It just seemed like it's -- can I look at that, too, please?

MS. WALLACE: Of course.

MR. MAYORGA: Fort Lauderdale 4. Bridge repairs on bridge located on West Lake Drive over the Estelle River. Amount requested, \$1,617,300.

Fort Lauderdale 5. Roadway drainage system repairs, replacement of seawall on Las Olas Boulevard and Southeast 10<sup>th</sup> Street. Amount requested, \$3,395,860.

MS. CASSINI: And I need for -- to put on the record that that exceeds the \$3,000,000 cap. The city has been notified, and the city has indicated in writing that they know that they would have to pay any amount over the \$3,000,000 cap for Cycle 1.

MS. PENNANT: Just, for me, it looks, from the maps that I'm seeing, they're all like waterways, almost -- I -- I guess I want a closer look at the areas, because I don't know that it's serving the general public --

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. MAYORGA: Okay.

MS. PENNANT: -- in a -- in a bigger way.

MS. CASSINI: Are you asking to see this, Fort Lauderdale 5?

MS. PENNANT: Yeah. Where are -- yes.

MS. CASSINI: Okay.

MS. LOVE: This is Allyson. I have a question.

MR. MAYORGA: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: Yes, Ms. Love.

MS. LOVE: You indicated that it exceeds the \$3,000,000 cap, so I just wanted to understand then, the number that's reflected says three million three ninety-five. So when this goes to the Board for approval, does it then just show the \$3,000,000 for approval and appropriation purposes?

MS. CASSINI: Yes, ma'am.

MS. LOVE: So just -- so in terms of showing the board, us, the three million three ninety-five, I was just trying to understand the purpose of showing the total project cost when that's not impactful to the project from the County perspective.

MS. CASSINI: Ms. Love, similar to a couple of the projects that you saw from the MPO's prioritization process where Mr. Riddle showed you the total project cost and it exceeded what was being asked for from the surtax, for full transparency, we wanted to show you what the total project was going to cost, but the amount of contribution from the surtax cannot exceed \$3,000,000.

MR. HOOPER: Go ahead.

MR. MAYORGA: Thank you.

MS. LOVE: So when it goes to the Board, what will it show?

MS. CASSINI: When it goes to the Board of County Commissioners, it will show the total project cost and then the amount that the city is contributing,

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

which will be the \$395,860 and the recommended amount of \$3,000,000 in surtax funds.

MS. LOVE: Okay. All right. Thank you.

MR. MAYORGA: Okay. Hallandale Beach 1. Citywide sidewalk repairs including meeting ADA standards. The amount requested is \$2,971,710.

Hallandale Beach 2. Sidewalk -- sidewalk repairs -- oh, I'm sorry. I have a mistake. Rehabilitating and providing new textured patterned crosswalks along US-1, A-1-A, Pembroke Road, and Hallandale Beach Boulevard.

Amount requested –

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman, pull that one.

MINUTES SECRETARY: Who was that, please?

MS. CASSINI: Mr. Allen.

MR. HOOPER: Phil Allen. Can you pull that, please?

MR. MAYORGA: Amount requested, \$1,710,485.

MR. HOOPER: There's somebody with their phone on, or they're talking. Please mute your line. Thank you.

MR. MAYORGA: Hollywood 1. This project is for milling, paving, resurfacing, and sidewalk repairs on District 3 and 4 in different locations around the city. Amount requested, \$2,967,457.

Hollywood 2. This is a resurfacing project on North 58<sup>th</sup> Avenue between Johnson and Sheridan Street, including sidewalk repairs and drainage improvements. The amount requested is \$1,666,863.

Hollywood 3. Sidewalk replacement, ADA upgrades, drainage repairs, and pavement resurfacing on Liberty Street. Amount requested, \$1,038,006.

Lauderdale Lakes 1. Citywide replacement and repair of sidewalks, including repairs to meet ADA standards. Amount requested is \$400,000.

Lauderdale Lakes 2. Citywide drainage improvements, including culvert repairs, drainage pipe installations, swale improvements, and drainage structures. Amount requested, \$2,000,000.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

Lauderhill 1. This project is for citywide sidewalk repairs. And the amount requested is five -- \$15,500.

Lighthouse Point 1. Bridge repairs, bridge replacement of bridge located on Northeast 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue over Alameda Waterway. Amount requested, \$913,588.

Lighthouse Point 2. Replacement of bridge on Sample Road over Cap Knight Bayou Canal. Amount requested, \$1,051,247.

Margate 1. Repair the bridge located on Margate Boulevard west of State Road 441 that FDOT has identified as functionally obsolete. Amount requested, \$176,064.

Margate 2. Sidewalk repairs. Replace valley curb -- curbing adjacent to the road in several areas of Paradise Garden subdivision. Amount requested, \$293,350.

Margate 3. Citywide milling and paving of public roads. Amount requested, \$1,053,184.

MR. HOOPER: Can you pull that?

MR. MAYORGA: Margate 4. Repairs to bridge listed as functionally obsolete by FDOT bridge inspection report, located on Northwest 76<sup>th</sup> Avenue over the Ripple Canal. Amount requested, \$123,599.

Miramar 1. Milling and resurfacing, drainage apron installation, and sidewalk ADA upgrades in multiple locations. Amount requested, \$1,995,001.

Miramar 2. Milling and resurfacing, drainage apron installation, and root barrier installation in multiple locations. Amount requested, \$1,854,177.

Miramar 3 -- 3. Sorry. Milling and resurfacing, drainage installation, and root barrier installation in multiple locations. Amount requested, \$2,234,426.

North Lauderdale 1. Milling and paving of all local public roads in multiple locations in Area 2. Amount requested, \$2,362,500.

North Lauderdale 2. Milling and repaving of Rock Island road from south -- from Southgate Boulevard to McNab Road. Amount requested, \$1,646,365.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

North Lauderdale 3. Milling and paving of all local public roads in multiple locations in Area 1. The amount requested is \$2,700,000.

North Lauderdale 4. Milling and paving of all public roads in multiple locations in Area 3. Amount requested, \$2,025,000.

North Lauderdale 5. Milling and paving of all local public roads in multiple locations in Area 4. Amount requested, \$2,193,750.

North Lauderdale 6. Citywide sidewalk and curb ramps repair and replacement to meet ADA standards. The amount requested, \$2,914,575

North Lauderdale 7. Drainage improvements of the city-owned stormwater system near the western city boundary. The amount requested, \$1,251,556.

North Lauderdale 8. Drainage improvements for Silver Lakes in multiple locations. The amount requested, \$1,440,093.

Oakland Park 1. Paving citywide residential roads and local collectors. The project description indicates 87.7 miles, but this project includes 14 (inaudible) miles. That's what the \$2,981,440 is going to cover.

Oakland Park 2. Drainage repairs in the northwest area of the North Andrews Garden Neighborhood. The amount requested is \$2,072,800.

Oakland Park 3. Citywide drainage repair projects to address street flooding.

MR. HOOPER: Pull.

MR. MAYORGA: Amount requested, \$510,510.

MR. HOOPER: Please pull.

MR. MAYORGA: Pembroke Pines 1. Resurfacing and ADA improvements for multiple locations on Johnson Street. The amount requested 400 -- \$483,380.

Plantation 2. Citywide resurfacing of municipal roads. The amount requested, \$2,749,823.

Southwest Ranches 2. Milling, paving, and resurfacing of public roads in

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

multiple locations. Cost estimate \$737,005.

Southwest Ranches 3. Milling, paving, and resurfacing of public roads in multiple locations. The amount requested, \$1,223,165.

Sunrise 2. Sidewalk replacement in Zone A, Sunrise Golf Village. Amount requested, \$401,406.

Sunrise 3. Milling and resurfacing in Zone 1 along Shotgun road and Dykes Road. Amount requested, \$852,796.

Sunrise 4. Milling and resurfacing in Zone 4 along Northwest 29<sup>th</sup> Manor -- Manor. Amount requested, \$577,693.

Sunrise 5. Milling and resurfacing in Zone 8 along North Hiatus Road. Amount requested, \$1,522,622.

Sunrise 6. Milling and resurfacing in Zone 11 in multiple locations within the Gold Key Village -- Villas and Sunrise Golf Village neighborhood. Amount requested, \$1,853,260.

Sunrise 7. Milling and resurfacing in Zone 13 in multiple locations. The amount requested, \$819,527.

Sunrise 8. Sidewalk replacement in multiple locations in Zone B within Sunrise Golf Village. The amount requested, \$450,795.

Sunrise 9. Sidewalk replacement in multiple locations in Zone C within the Twin Lakes Community. Amount requested, \$395,212.

Sunrise 10. Sidewalk replacement in multiple locations in Zone C within the New River Community. The amount requested, \$198,947.

Tamarac 1. Pavement, resurfacing project in multiple locations around the city. Amount requested, \$2,817,339.

Weston 1. Roadway drainage projects in the entire neighborhood along Sailboat Circle. The amount requested, \$596,268.

Weston 2. Citywide refurbishment of bike lanes pavement markings. The amount requested, \$191,834.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

Weston 3. Street lighting repairs on Bonaventure Boulevard between Royal Palm Boulevard and South Post Road. The amount requested, \$884,763.

Weston 4. Sidewalk repairs and replacement on Meridian Parkway, Corporate Avenue, and Universal Boulevard. The amount requested, \$72,765.

Wilton Manors 1. Milling, paving, and resurfacing of public roads in multiple locations in Wilton Manors Zone 1. The amount requested, \$1,334,667.

MR. HOOPER: Please pull.

MR. MAYORGA: Wilton Manors 2. Milling, paving, and resurfacing of public roads in multiple locations in Wilton Manors Zone 2. Amount requested, \$1,651,467.

MR. HOOPER: Pull.

MR. MAYORGA: Wilton Manors 3. Milling, paving, and resurfacing of public roads in multiple locations in Wilton Manors Zone 4. Amount requested, \$1,425,600.

MR. HOOPER: Please pull.

MR. MAYORGA: Mr. Chair, that concludes my presentation.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

**B - READING OF MUNICIPAL REHABILITATION AND MAINTENANCE PROJECTS BEING CONSIDERED FOR ELIGIBILITY AND THOSE BEING PULLED FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION**

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Hold on. Let me get organized.

MS. WALLACE: Do you want me to start reading the pulls?

MR. HOOPER: What's that?

MS. WALLACE: You want me to start reading the pulls?

MR. HOOPER: Yes, please. We'll do it the same way we did the last one. We'll read the pulls, and then we'll hopefully get a motion.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. COOLMAN: Mr. Chair?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MR. COOLMAN: This is Doug Coolman. I have a comment that may (inaudible.) When I looked at this list of projects, I had a question about how this paving and resurfacing was going to reduce congestion or improve connectivity. And, therefore, I thought a lot of these projects should be pulled or not even eligible.

But I was informed, because of the amendments that the MPO accepted, that these projects are not subject to that consideration. And if that's the case, then maybe some of the projects that have been pulled by other board members with the understanding that they don't have to improve –

MR. HOOPER: No?

MR. COOLMAN: -- congestion or connectivity, we might not want to pull them. In fact, I'm even wondering -- I think it's great we're seeing them, but I'm not so sure that we need to even review them if -- if we were charged with reviewing them based on their ability to reduce congestion or improve connectivity, but it doesn't apply to these projects. I just wanted to make that –

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. COOLMAN: -- statement.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. COOLMAN: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: I'll -- I'll ask counsel to answer that.

MS. WALLACE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So the MPO's role in reviewing municipal projects is to prioritize or rank them based upon the ability to promote connectivity or relieve traffic congestion. And that's for capital projects. And they have a criteria by which they evaluate them. The amendment that Mr. Coolman is referring to was an amendment to the global

interlocal agreement among the County, the municipalities, and the MPO.

Originally all of the municipal -- municipal projects were included in the MPO's ranking process, but because the MPO applies that criteria, the rehab and maintenance projects would never rank high because they don't reach that objective, they don't fit within that criteria. Therefore, those projects were separated from the MPO process, and they're instead reviewed and ranked internally by the County.

And for purposes of funding, the capital projects, because of the way the interlocal agreement is written, the capital projects ranked by the MPO get funded first, and then the County agreed to consider rehab and maintenance projects, funding for those, in years where there's funds available that the County is willing to fund those.

So, yes, this board can consider them for eligibility, because eligibility, for purposes of this review, is based upon the statutory criteria. And so as long as they're road projects, they're -- they're eligible, and you can look at the expenses. So I imagine that some of the pulls were related to the projects and how they're described, and possibly the dollar amounts associated with the.

But this body can review them for eligibility and as road projects or road improvement projects. And the way we distinguish the two is capital projects are for something new to -- for a new road or widening sidewalks, whatever. Rehabilitation/maintenance is resur- -- milling and resurfacing, repairs to existing facilities. And that's kind of how we divided the projects, the -- separated the capital from the rehab and maintenance. Okay?

MR. HOOPER: Yeah. I would imagine that the MPO can rank and position things any way they like, but this board, when we're approving capital expenditures, whether it's for maintenance or new projects, we have to look at eligibility; right? We have to follow the Statute.

MS. WALLACE: Correct.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Does that answer your question, Doug?

MR. COOLMAN: Not really, because, as I understand it, those projects are no longer subject to their ability to reduce congestion or improve connectivity, which were the two main things we were to look at. So I'm -- I'm a little wondering if -- if that doesn't apply to them, why we -- we can't review them

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

based on that.

MS. WALLACE: That's what the MPO reviews for purposes of the MPO ranking, not this body. The Oversight Board reviews the projects for eligibility under the statutory criteria, not the -- this board does not review connectivity and traffic -- relief of traffic congestion.

MS. CASSINI: And if I may, just for the purposes of anyone who might be watching or for the rest of the Oversight Board, the reason to separate rehabilitation and maintenance projects from new capital projects is that they were subject to an entirely different evaluation process, because the projects are so different.

And so the criteria that we used was to look at the condition of the existing facilities and try to determine need based on how long it had been since those facilities, those existing facilities, had been repaired. And that is -- so the ranking that the MPO used looked at connectivity and congestion relief. That's how you got the 110 projects ranked.

Our ranking, when it gets done, will be looking at completely different factors, including, as Alex mentioned in his presentation, how much money a particular municipality received through the MPO's capital process, going to the conversation that Anthea Pennant and Mr. Frazier have brought up, which is the whole purpose of geographic equity.

So by scoring rehabilitation and maintenance projects, a portion of that score relates back to how much money a municipality has received through the other process. And just -- again, I just want to make sure it's clear, rehabilitation and maintenance projects have to be funded, under our agreement, after the capital projects have been funded. Whatever's left over can then go to rehabilitation and maintenance projects in any given year.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Thank you.

MS. PENNANT: Yeah, you know, I think some -- some of my concerns were related to, you know, if you put some of these rehabilitative projects side-by-side to some of the new -- the capital improvement projects, I want to make sure that there isn't an overlap in terms of -- you know, because when you're reading some of the capital improvement projects, it almost sounds like it's rehabilitative in nature.

And so I want to make sure that -- and I don't know that we have the ability to

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

do that, to look at the projects side-by-side to see where there's some overlap. So that's a concern for me.

MR. HOOPER: You know, that's an interesting point. I almost feel like we're rehabilitating the entire County's transit and, you know, connectivity just by nature of what we're doing. So it's a good point. There is. It feels like there could be overlap –

MS. PENNANT: And redundancy.

MR. HOOPER: Yes. Yes.

MS. PENNANT: So we just have to be careful that some of the municipalities aren't just taking advantage of this opportunity to get some things repaired, and it's just a matter of how you word it; right?

MR. HOOPER: Correct. Okay. So we're looking -- did –

MS. CASSINI: Are you ready for the pulls?

MR. HOOPER: Yes, please.

MS. CASSINI: Okay. So at this time, I will start calling off the pulled rehabilitation and maintenance projects -- excuse me. The first I -- one I have is Coral Springs 1. This is a project for milling and paving that was pulled for Q and A.

The next one I have is Fort Lauderdale 1, sidewalk and greenway repairs, pulled for Q and A. Fort Lauderdale 2. This is a bridge repair, pulled for Q and A. Fort Lauderdale 3, milling and paving, pulled for Q and A. Next one I had was Fort Lauderdale 5, roadway drainage system repair, pulled for Q and A.

Hallandale Beach 2, pulled for Q and A. Next would be Margate 3, pulled for Q and A. Oakland Park 3, pulled for Q and A. Wilton Manors 1, 2, and 3, all pulled for Q and A. Did I miss anything?

MS. WALLACE: No. Uh-uh.

**C - MOTION TO RECOMMEND AS ELIGIBLE MUNICIPAL REHABILITATION AND MAINTENANCE PROJECTS CONTAINED IN THE ORIGINAL SURTAX PLAN SUBJECT TO RATING, RANKING, AND**

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

## **RECOMMENDATION BY BROWARD COUNTY STAFF**

MS. CASSINI: Okay. Mr. Chair, I think you are ready to entertain a motion for the other projects.

MR. HOOPER: Do we have a motion for the Consent projects?

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman? This is Phil.

MR. HOOPER: Yes, sir.

MR. ALLEN: Can we have the County Attorney give us her advice relative to the eligibility under the Statute for those items not pulled for further discussion?

MS. WALLACE: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Allen. Okay. Yes. So for purposes of Section 212.055 Florida Statutes, projects -- surtax funds can be utilized for planning, development, construction, operation, and maintenance of roads and bridges, buses, and fixed guideway systems.

So all of the projects -- the rehab and maintenance projects that have been listed that have -- that were not pulled involve roadway improvements, and I recommend them as eligible under the Statute.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman, I would **move** approval.

MR. HOOPER: Great. Do we have a second?

MS. LOVE: Allyson, and I will second.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you. Okay. Could we do a roll call?

MS. THOMPSON: Sure. Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: Yes.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Ron Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: And Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Okay. Vote passes unanimously.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Thank you, everybody.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

MR. HOOPER: So we are going to take a lunch break. I'd like to do it as quickly as possible, so let's limit it to 30 minutes, please, because we still have quite a bit of work to get done in the afternoon. And that'll give us time to set up for that. So we'll reconvene -- what time is it now?

MS. WALLACE: It's 12:06.

MS. CASSINI: 12:06.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. HOOPER: So let's say 12:36 we'll start up again; okay?

MS. PENNANT: All right.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

**(THE MEETING RECESSED AT 12:06 P.M. AND RECONVENED AT 12:50 P.M.)**

MS. CASSINI: Ready?

MR. HOOPER: I'm ready. Go ahead.

MS. CASSINI: Okay. We're going to do a roll call. We'll start with the Chair.

MR. HOOPER: Here.

MS. CASSINI: Okay. And Ms. Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Here.

MS. CASSINI: Vice Chair Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Here.

MS. CASSINI: Mr. Ronald Frazier? Mr. Ronald Frazier? I'll come back to him. Dr. Consuelo Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Here.

MS. CASSINI: Mr. Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Here.

MS. CASSINI: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: Present.

MS. CASSINI: Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: Here.

MS. CASSINI: Excellent. I'm going to come back. Mr. Ronald Frazier, are you on the line? Okay. It appears that we have a –

MR. FRAZIER: Here.

MS. CASSINI: Ah. Mr. Frazier, is that you?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

MS. CASSINI: Okay. So, Mr. Chair, we have all nine members on the line at this time.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Great. So –

MR. CAVROS: For the record, George Cavros, Mr. Chair.

MS. CASSINI: Oh, I'm so sorry Mr. Cavros. I apologize. I'm going off of memory. I apologize. Mr. Cavros is here as well.

**6 - MUNICIPAL CAPITAL PROJECTS PULLED BECAUSE OF ELIGIBILITY CONCERNS WILL BE TAKEN UP IN RANK ORDER**

**A - DISCUSSION, Q AND A, PRESENTATIONS BY MUNICIPAL COUNSEL AND/OR STAFF**

**B - MEMBERS, IN CONSULTATION WITH SURTAX GENERAL COUNSEL, WILL MAKE INDIVIDUAL MOTIONS REGARDING ELIGIBILITY ON A PROJECT-BY-PROJECT BASIS**

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So what we're going to do is we're going to start with the municipal capital projects. We're going to go through all the projects that were pulled, one at a time. And I believe we're going to ask the city -- whoever the project is for, the city will be un-muted. That's -- I guess you have to kind of electronically raise your hand; right?

MS. CASSINI: So we are going to be asking, Mr. Chair, at -- we're going to actually say on the record that we are handling a City of Sunrise eligibility issue and we're going to ask the City of Sunrise representatives that are on the line, or any City of Sunrise representatives that may be in the audience, to identify themselves so that they can be un-muted by the AT and T operator. Anyone from the City of Sunrise that is going to be speaking to

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

Sunrise 025.1, please identify yourself, raise your hand on the line, so that you can be un-muted.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: To identify yourself to the line, please press pound 2 to raise your hand. Once again, pressing pound 2 will identify your line.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible) for the record?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

MS. CASSINI: Please press pound 2 to raise your hand on the lines. Pound 2 to raise your hand on the line.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So we're going to start with –

MR. LABOWSKI: Good afternoon. This is Mark Labowski, (inaudible) –

MS. WALLACE: We've got City of Sunrise.

MR. HOOPER: Great. So are we going to -- we're going to allow the city to speak after –

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: -- right? Because we pulled it, right? So we're going to -- all right. Okay. So let's start with Sunrise 025.1. And who pulled that one?

MS. WALLACE: I did.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yeah, Sunrise Project 025.1 requests surtax funding to replace a pump in a canal. And the eligibility criteria for drainage reflects that improvements to a public road stormwater system that addresses drainage deficiencies, provided the drainage improvements only address stormwater runoff from a public roadway.

Improvements that address runoff from private roads and developments are not eligible. And the City of Sunrise provided an aerial map that kind of depicts -- will you go to the additional material that has the red attachment,

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

Mr. Riddle? The supplemental items they -- they produced -- they provided. This one (indicating). So some of the other -- the documentation that the city provided reflects that the project was actually included as part of the -- as an infrastructure project, as part of the city's capital improvement program.

And the County's review of the project reflects that it's really an infrastructure project, and the flow from the project for -- the -- into the canal that would be serviced by the pump is from private development in that area and not flow from the roadway. So the County is recommending that the project is ineligible because it does not meet the criteria.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Do any other members want to speak on this? City of Sunrise, does anybody want to speak to this line item?

MR. LABOWSKI: Yes. Good afternoon. This is Mark Labowski, Assistant City Manager for the City of Sunrise. I appreciate the ability and time to be able to speak with you today. We did provide some additional information that Ms. Wallace has just referenced.

I do want to make some clarifications is that -- one is that this pump -- stormwater pump station does serve a drainage basin that does provide direct drainage benefits and runoff for several roadway -- public roadways. Sunrise Lakes Boulevard, Northwest 94<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Northwest 26<sup>th</sup> Place, Northwest 26<sup>th</sup> Street, 91<sup>st</sup> Lane, and then portions of Pine Island Road, 87<sup>th</sup> Lane, and Nob Hill Road.

We understand that there -- there are some ancillary drainage benefits to this project to adjacent private property. However, given how south Florida is a regional connection, it's virtually impossible to have a drainage system that is 100 percent public and does not receive any runoff from -- from private developments or private properties.

Even a single-family neighborhood with residential -- with a roadway system, the runoff from single-family homes are graded as to drain onto private -- onto public roadways. So I just wanted to clarify this project does provide the direct drainage relief for public roadways within the drainage system and does provide some private benefits, but equal to almost any other drainage system within Broward County. And I'm here to answer any questions you may have. Thank you very much.

MR. HOOPER: Does anybody else have anything to say, any of the members? I would take the position that -- that --

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. CAVROS: I have a question.

MR. HOOPER: Sure.

MR. CAVROS: George Cavros.

MR. HOOPER: Go ahead.

MR. CAVROS: I was wondering if the representative from Sunrise could provide some information on -- on how much of -- you know, I understand the interrelationship and, you know, it may be hard to distinguish between what is runoff from a road, and what is runoff from a private property. But what is your estimate in terms of percentage of runoff from -- from each source?

MR. LABOWSKI: Thank you. That's a -- that's an excellent question. So you have -- this is a regional stormwater system for a larger drainage basin that is comprised of lakes and canals. And the -- you have roadways that drain directly into those lakes and canals, and then you do have some adjacent properties that -- that have connections to those canals. But those connections to those canals are not direct connections. They'll go through an internal drainage system and probably a weir before it is discharged.

So during a -- a standard storm event, probably, you know, a majority of the rainfall in -- that hits into that canal would occur from the public roadway system. When you start getting into a larger storm event of, you know, a hundred-year storm, that's when you'll probably receive a lot more benefit from a -- from the private drainage system. So it's hard to give an exact percentage, but it's probably, on a normal -- normal rainfall system, it's probably 80 percent roadway and then as you get a larger system, maybe it's, you know, 60/40 roadway to private.

MS. WALLACE: Mr. Chair --

MS. LOVE: This is Allyson. So -- this is Allyson. Can I be recognized?

MR. HOOPER: Yes. Yes, go ahead, Ms. Love.

MS. LOVE: So in terms of the City of Sunrise point in relationship to eligibility, I was curious on what the representative from the County -- or the MPO, I guess they determine -- I know (inaudible) determine eligibility as well, but what is the position based on the city's point that there is some parts

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

of it that is a public right of way and the private and that correlation. So just curious on what the response to that.

MS. WALLACE: We would like to have Mr. Tony Hui, the Deputy Director of the public -- County's Public Works Department, address that question.

MR. HUI: Good afternoon, Chair, members of the board. Again, Tony Hui, Deputy Director, Public Works Department. It -- number one is I think that it is important to mention that this pump station is a very important part of the City of Sunrise drainage system.

And if you take a look at that map right in front of you, the entire drainage basin goes through that little red dot, which is that pump station in there. I don't know exactly how the system is designed, but there are a number of lakes and so forth internal to the development themselves. When the area drains, whether it's to the lakes, the roads, or whatever, you know, it is, it all collects through that one single point and then, from there, it drains the entire -- drains that entire drainage basin.

Now, in terms of contribution, I think that was the point that was just made, if you take a look at it -- and there's -- there's actually another map that was provided by the City of Sunrise that identified all of the public roads within that drainage development -- if you were able to see that, or even if we can't see that, the main -- the main roads are then public roads.

The -- it's in the -- the drainage is important to the entire area, but in the context of the surtax project where we're -- where we're defining the drainage of -- you can't see (inaudible) it was provided to us, is that the orange is -- is the public roads in this map here. And so the entire drainage goes to that point.

But in the context of the surtax project, where we're only eligible to fund contributions that are runoff from the road themselves, it is only the -- it's only the rainfall and the runoff from the roads that are eligible. The -- all of the other areas are not eligible in terms of that they drain private development. Now, it may be the case that some of the pipes is used, and some of the roads is used as a conveyance to the system, but the roads themselves do not contribute the flow for the entire drainage basin.

A very quick way to take a look at this is is that if you take a look at the percentage-wise, the percentage of the contribution of the roads is essentially what's in red or -- or in orange. That's the percent contributions

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

from the road themselves as compared to the entire drainage area.

MR. HOOPER: Is this a new development or is it an -- it's been existing for a while?

MS. WALLACE: It's been existing for a while.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. And what about those parts of the city that were built 70 years ago that didn't bother to put any lakes in or any canals and that they are flooding and the water's probably hitting the roof, going down the driveway, and into the road?

What about those -- those parts of the cities and the counties? See, I have a philosophical issue with going in and fixing up some neighborhoods and not fixing storm flooding from other neighborhoods because it appears that it's a developed neighborhood. But they were all once developed neighborhoods. And if they're having an issue with storm drainage and it's going into the roads, and these are citizens of our County, then it's -- you -- you're really kind --

MS. WALLACE: No.

MR. HOOPER: -- in my opinion, you're kind of weighing one thing against another that --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-uh.

MR. HOOPER: -- seems to be conflicting, in my eye.

MS. WALLACE: No. So the -- the significance is roadway. So if it's an -- an infrastructure project, and while an infrastructure project can utilize other funds, an infrastructure project can't utilize transportation surtax funds unless it's related to the road.

So the -- a flow analysis would have to be conducted to determine the level of flow that's contributed from the roadway and not from the -- and so these are all private communities. That's not public space within this area. Those are all private developments and the roads are not flooding if the -- from the documentation that we've received now, the road isn't flooding now.

MR. HOOPER: Oh, so the roads are not flooding. They're just fixing the --

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. WALLACE: Their –

MR. HOOPER: -- canal.

MS. WALLACE: -- infrastructure. Correct.

MR. HOOPER: But the -- but is this neighborhood getting flooded during rain events?

MS. WALLACE: No. That would be the documentation we've received.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Well, that's a different program for me. Yeah, I understand now. I thought they were having issues –

MR. LABOWSKI: Good afternoon. Sorry.

MR. HOOPER: Yes?

MR. LABOWSKI: This is Mark Labowski with the City of Sunrise, again. I just want to add another clarification. As part of the attachment we provided, Attachment Number 1, which was provided by an engineer who is performing our stormwater master plan, they provided a statement here that -- it says, in our opinion, the failure of Pump Station 8 during a ten, 25, or a hundred year storm event would increase the depth and extent of flooding within Basin Number 5. This increase in flooding would at a minimum impact Sunrise Lakes Boulevard, Northwest 94<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Northwest 94<sup>th</sup> Way, 26<sup>th</sup> Place, and Northwest 26<sup>th</sup> Street. Increased flooding on Pine Island Road may also occur if Pump Station 5 were to fail. So without this pump station, there would be significant flooding in this community.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Does anybody else have anything to say or any comments from a member?

MS. WALLACE: That's it.

MS. PENNANT: What exactly is the ZIP Code for this area? Does anybody know?

MS. CASSINI: Sunrise representatives?

MR. HOOPER: I don't know. Does anybody know what the ZIP Code is in this neighborhood?

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. LABOWSKI: This is Mark Labowski, again, with the City of Sunrise. It's 33322.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Okay. If there's no other comments, I'd like to take a roll call on eligibility, please. Right? We're doing them one at a time; right?

MS. WALLACE: So we don't have, I guess, a motion yet.

MR. HOOPER: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I'm sorry.

MS. WALLACE: And so -- and I guess --

MR. HOOPER: Yes, can we get a motion, please. If -- if --

MS. WALLACE: So the --

MR. COOLMAN: Alan, before we do that -- this is Doug Coolman -- could I just say something? It appears that there is going to be water going onto these roads -- coming from these roads into this system, and flooding of these roads if the pump doesn't work. Now, I mean, I know we're splitting hairs here, but I don't -- you know, whether it's one percent or 90 percent, I don't know that we have a rule that says it has to be more than X percent. So, based on what the City of Sunrise is saying, this pump probably will allow the roads to drain better. So I'm having a problem saying no to it because of that fact.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Would you like to make a motion?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman?

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Yes.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman, it's Phil.

MR. HOOPER: Yes. Yes.

MR. ALLEN: Am I --

MR. HOOPER: Go ahead, Phil.

MR. ALLEN: -- on? It's -- okay. There's a difference between the roadway flooding because of rainfall within the basin versus that water that is accumulated or attributing -- contributing to the flooding because of the road. I -- you know, it's an --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

MR. ALLEN: -- concern there is that it's not the road that is causing the flooding but the overall drainage within the basin.

MS. PENNANT: And that is my challenge with it, too, because I don't want us to end up funding projects that is really projects that the city should be funding out of their own budget --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MS. PENNANT: -- and not out of the penny tax. You know, that's -- that's the question here, you know, because I know there -- there are other neighborhoods where there's flooding because the road was built bad in the first place. And I feel like when we -- we pay for these projects that -- you know, in a city like Sunrise, that they should be paying for this pump so we can use the monies elsewhere in other communities where it's really -- the flooding is caused by a road issue. You know?

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

MS. PENNANT: So I'm having a problem with this one.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. And my opinion, again, is I kind of -- I kind of sway over with Doug. There's a lot of drainage projects that are being brought forward, and because they have -- if they didn't have those lakes and those canals, then you might see some serious flooding in the streets. So I'm kind of like one percent or 90 percent, I'm kind of on the same -- on the same level as Doug Coolman, but that's just my opinion.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: Is there any other -- yes, Mr. Hui.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. HUI: Just -- just a point of clarification is that the drainage system is tied together. So the fact that there's a pump station there with roads and so forth that helps the -- help to -- help the system to work efficiently, that's how it's entirely designed to do.

Just the point I want to make and just to make sure that the board understands or recognizes this point is that in our eligibility requirements, we said that the surtax would provide drainage improvements that only addresses stormwater runoff from a public road.

So it does -- so what that means is that if you take a look at that map in the back of you is is that the -- the surtax should only address the runoff from those parts in orange. So as a comparison of those parts in orange versus the entire basin area, I think there's a point that -- that the percentage of the surface area of the area in orange may be an eligible amount, but the others may not fit within the context of --

MS. PENNANT: Right.

MR. HUI: -- the surtax eligibility rules.

MS. PENNANT: Exactly. I think the -- it's okay for the city to have skin in the game.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MS. PENNANT: The County's taking on a big portion of it. I think they can take on some of it. I mean, to agree to the full amount is going outside of the scope of our requirements for approving the eligibility of a project.

MR. HOOPER: I hear you.

MS. PENNANT: So where it infringes on our jurisdiction, we should not be agreeing to it. Because you set a bad precedent for making that exception now, and then what later on? And I don't want it to come back and bite us later on because some other city's saying, well, you did it for the City of Sunrise. There needs to be equity, and we need to stick to the scope of what is our jurisdiction. And we're not allowed to do that. So that's my position on it.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. LABOWSKI: Good -- good afternoon again. This is Mark Labowski, again, with Sunrise. I apologize for -- for chiming in, but I -- I'm listening to the Oversight Board and they're bringing up very good points.

And, you know, upon reflection and the discussion that's being made, we understand that there are some private property benefits, and we understand the intent of the surtax dollars is for the public roadway system. We would absolutely be supportive to a percentage covered by the city and a percentage covered by the surtax.

MR. HOOPER: Can we negotiate?

MR. LABOWSKI: I would suggest as a compromise to do a 50/50 on this project --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. LABOWSKI: -- and the City would support that.

MS. WALLACE: So what would have to happen is an analysis of the flow. So there's a mechanism by which the flow that -- into that area can be analyzed to determine the percentage that is from the roadway runoff. And we would submit that an analysis should be done to determine the level of flow and the -- it should be proportionate. The contribution should be -- from the County surtax should be proportionate to the actual runoff, the flow from the roadway.

And the city would bear the remainder, because the -- it's actually a pump, and it's a city infrastructure project. It's the pump in the canal. It's not drainage within the -- the swale or along the roadway to impact the -- the drainage and the road. This is a pump in a canal. So how much flow is actually from the public roadway into the area that's serviced by that -- by that pump.

MR. HOOPER: So if -- so if they --

MS. PENNANT: Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: -- if we were to -- if the board were willing and it could be a percentage, could the staff and the city go discuss this and bring it back to the board and maybe earmark the project, you know, like allow it to come back to the board and --

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. CASSINI: It doesn't even have to come back to the board. We can treat this project like we've treated so many of the other projects that were discussed in the morning that were partially eligible, that were eligible that had ineligible elements.

And so in the motion statement, we could, if you all are comfortable -- and I'll -- I'll read you a proposed motion -- you could recommend as eligible this particular project and it would be eligible under Section 212.055(1)(d), but it would -- during the negotiations, it would exclude any ineligible elements or components per Section 3 -- and this is drainage -- 3(b) of the interlocal agreement. And then the County staff and the counsel for the County and the City of Sunrise could work together to identify what portion was actually fundable with transportation surtax proceeds.

MS. PENNANT: I'm good with that. I'd like to endorse that **motion**.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So you made a motion?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Do we have a second?

MS. LOVE: I second. Allyson Love.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you. Can we do a roll?

MS. THOMPSON: Sure. Chair Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Ronald Frazier? Ronald Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: No.

MS. THOMPSON: Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Vote passes.

MS. CASSINI: 8 to 1.

MS. THOMPSON: 8 to 1.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Thank you.

**VOTE PASSES 8 TO 1 WITH RONALD FRAZIER VOTING NO.**

MR. HOOPER: Let's go to our next pulled item.

MS. WALLACE: The next pulled item is Ranked Project Number 11, and it's -- the project number is TAMA018. And they are electric vehicle charging stations requested by the City of Tamarac.

MS. CASSINI: If we could please ask the City of Tamarac to identify themselves by pressing star 2 so that the ATT and T operator can un-mute your lines.

MS. DUNN: Hi. This is Kathleen Dunn, Assistant City Manager with the City of Tamarac. May I be heard?

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. DUNN: Okay. Thank you. Good afternoon, members of the Oversight Board and members of Broward County and MPO staff. My name is Kathleen Dunn, Assistant City Manager for the City of Tamarac.

Thank you for the opportunity to address you today regarding the City of Tamarac's projects TAMA-019 titled electric vehicle charging stations, to install 12 electrical vehicle charging stations at various locations in the city. We're grateful that the Broward County MPO has ranked it among the top 11 projects within the County, and we believe that it should remain recommended.

When the County approached the municipalities back in 2018 about putting a transportation surtax on the ballot, the city was excited about the possibilities promised by a dedicated funding source to develop an integrated transportation system throughout the County. We were particularly inspired by the whys behind the surtax. The opportunity to reduce the effects of greenhouse gas emissions on the community, in addition to the promise of easing congestion while leveraging technology, new sources of energy, and alternative modes of transportation.

As such, our funding requests reflect the City of Tamarac's bold thinking when it comes to the future of an integrated transportation system in the City and in Broward County. We took this important opportunity to envision a future in which our residents will be able to travel with multiple options for transport and with ease.

We all know that the transition from car-dependence to transit does not happen overnight. Electrical vehicle charging stations, although single occupancy, answer the County's question of why a penny for mobility. They're better for the environment and reduce emissions. Electric vehicles offer a solid compromise, a realistic middle point between fossil fuel car dependence and transit.

Most of the stations proposed are either along or within walking distance of Broward County Transit bus lines. Two of them will be located at city facilities that serve as stops for our own community bus shuttle service. The city is committed to resiliency, sustainability, and smart city principles. As such, we look at the surtax holistically as a system. We know everything works together, and investing in technology that is future-leaning is paramount.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

Our projects also seek to connect pedestrians and bikes to bigger, more long-term ideas related to alternative transportation options and mass transit. This approach takes into account issues beyond congestion and roadway improvements, and envisions an integrated, environmentally friendly transportation system which will, in large part, dictate the overall economic development of Broward County.

And I'd just like to read one piece from the first amendment to the surtax interlocal agreement that says, the parties agree that prioritization will be informed by each project's ability to alleviate traffic congestion and improve connectivity, but also acknowledge that transportation surtax-funded MPO staff may properly consider shovel-readiness, construction work planned in the vicinity of a proposed project, corridor delivery and timing, and other existing conditions that allow surtax revenues to be utilized responsibly, efficiently, and with the least interrupt to residents and businesses. Therefore, the City of Tamarac requests that you please forward Project TAMA-019, titled electrical vehicle charging stations, to the Broward County Commission for their consideration and funding support. Thank you.

MS. CASSINI: For the purposes of correcting the record, I would just like to make sure that the record correctly reflects that this is actually Tamarac 018. Tamarac 018.

MS. PENNANT: Right.

MS. WALLACE: Not 1 -- 019. So -- for purposes of eligibility, though. So while there are benefits to electric vehicles that deal with carbon emissions and so forth, the Statute does not address that.

MS. PENNANT: No, it doesn't.

MS. WALLACE: The Statute, 212.055 Florida Statutes, specifically provides that the surtax -- the proceeds from the transportation surtax can be utilized for planning, development, construction, operation, and maintenance of roads, bridges, buses, fixed guideway systems, on-demand transportation. So if it's transit or if it's roads or -- and things ancillary to transit and roads, it can be funded.

These are vehicle charging stations for private vehicles unrelated to transit. If it were charging stations for transit buses that are operated by a municipality's community shuttle program, then they would be eligible.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

But there -- the charging stations for individual vehicles, regardless of the value of the emissions benefits, are not eligible under 212.055 Florida Statutes.

MR. CAVROS: Chairman, I'd like to be heard on this. This is George --

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MR. CAVROS: -- Cavros.

MR. HOOPER: Go ahead, George.

MR. CAVROS: Right. Look, I think there is a -- a nexus here in terms of improving connectivity and relieving congestion. That was the -- you know, the high level criteria that was provided to -- to the cities. First of all, I want to applaud the City of Tamarac for being proactive in proposing this new EV infrastructure project.

As we look at transportation going forward, it's important to note that -- that Florida has the -- the third most electric vehicles in the U.S. We have over 60,000 vehicles. Many of those are -- are in south Florida. And it's important to note that many cities are moving their -- their fleets to electric vehicles.

Yet there is a lack of charging stations in south Florida. In fact, Florida has one of the lowest ratios of electric vehicles to electric vehicle charging stations in the nation. I mean, ask any EV owner or any fleet manager. A lack of charging infrastructure is a continuing concern. You know, and I -- look, we can put all the maintenance cost savings and the fuel savings and the clean air benefits to the side for now, you know, and the economic development benefits of charging stations, because I think what's important for our purposes here is that this project is addressing the dearth of EV charging stations in Broward County right now by providing more charging stations.

These stations will be available throughout the city, as was mentioned, and they'll be available to all residents of Broward County. You know, the city is taking a first step in creating an infrastructure network for EVs where, you know, very little infrastructure currently exists. And this type of infrastructure helps create a network of charging infrastructure that increases mobility and connectivity for EV users.

And I would also add a lot of those EV users are -- are more and more

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

becoming on-demand transportation type vehicles. So it's important to remember that this mode of transportation is nascent, but it's going to explode. There are projections by economists that by around the year 2035 to 2040, there'll be as many EVs sold as there will be internal combustion engines. And I believe it's almost negligent not to prepare for that future. And this project is simply a first step in having that infrastructure ready for a steadily increasing EV adoption here in Florida.

We need to prepare for this future, and to improve the mobility and connectivity for this ever-increasing new mode of transportation. So this project has my full support. And, you know, I hope fellow board members will vote to approve the project, as well.

MR. HOOPER: Ms. Pennant.

MS. PENNANT: Yes, my –

DR. KELLEY: Mr. Chair, I'd like to speak.

MS. PENNANT: -- I -- I cannot support this project, because, again, it goes outside the scope of what we're supposed to be voting on. That's one. But I'm also concerned that if there are only a few charging stations and we build one in the City of Tamarac, how do you relieve congestion? Now you're going to have all of those vehicles trying to come to Tamarac to get charged up.

How does it relieve charging -- the congestion? It seems now we'll have people from other cities. I think this is a matter that needs to be dealt with probably through the League of Cities, and then the cities can decide among themselves how they want to create this network of charging stations. But it should not be used from the penny tax dollars.

MR. HOOPER: Ms. Kelley, did you want to speak?

DR. KELLEY: Yes. I wanted to second what board member Cavros was saying, because not all -- I mean, the characterization of electric vehicles as private is not true. More and more public transit vehicles are moving to electric. And it's just simply a matter of building that structure and that network. So I do believe that it speaks to connectivity and it's -- it's going to have to happen throughout the County.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. COOLMAN: Mr. Chair –

MR. HOOPER: Yes, who's this? Doug?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: Go ahead.

MR. COOLMAN: I initially brought this up. One of the things -- I kind of agree with both -- all three speakers in a way. There are 12 locations, and I noticed that two of -- they said two of them were next to bus stops, et cetera. Would it be possible to put up the map with the locations of the 12? Maybe there's some type of compromise.

Because I believe we need to move forward with -- with supporting this system. Whether it should be a hundred percent, I don't know, but I'd like to see where the locations were for these 12.

MR. HOOPER: They're -- it's on the screen. Where does he have to go to –

MS. CASSINI: He just needs to watch live.

MR. HOOPER: You've got to watch live. It's on the screen.

MS. WALLACE: So I'd like to –

MR. COOLMAN: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: You –

MS. WALLACE: -- clarify, if I might, Mr. Chair.

MS. DUNN: You can't –

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. DUNN: -- really see the screen from -- I'm watching live, too. This is Kathleen Dunn. You can't see the screen, but if you'd like, I could give the general locations of them. Twelve -- ten of the –

MR. COOLMAN: Now I -- now I see them.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. WALLACE: It's okay. So –

MS. DUNN: Okay. Great.

MS. WALLACE: -- if I might –

MR. HOOPER: Yes, go ahead.

MS. WALLACE: -- Mr. Chair?

MS. DUNN: So as proposed, we put them in city –

MR. HOOPER: Hold on. Hold on. Kathleen --

MS. DUNN: -- facilities that we have control over –

MR. HOOPER: -- Kathleen –

MS. DUNN: -- but we are more than willing to –

MR. HOOPER: Can you mute?

MS. DUNN: -- oh, sorry.

MR. HOOPER: Hold -- hold on. Let -- let me -- let me run the people that want to speak, and then I'll open it up for you again in a second. Ms. Wallace.

MS. WALLACE: Okay. I'd like to clarify that, you know, eligibility under the Statute does not include connectivity and traffic congestion. So statutory eligibility is just the criteria that's outlined in the Statute. So it has to be related to roads or transit.

This charging infrastructure cannot be used for transit buses. The County operates the transit system and is acquiring electric buses and is installing -- installing electric bus infrastructure for the Transit vehicles. And it does -- it's not compatible with the -- with the automobile charging stations.

And personal automobiles are not considered transit. If it's not part of the transit system, the public transit system, it is not eligible under the Statute. It does not qualify. And so while it does provide benefits in terms of the environment, and the connectivity and congestion relief are a criteria for

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

prioritizing the project and what the project might -- project benefits might be in terms of, you know, what the County would like to see the projects accomplish, but eligibility on the Statute is very defined. And this is not transit, and it's not roads.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman, this is Phil.

MR. HOOPER: Hi, Phil. Go ahead.

MR. ALLEN: The -- it seems we have two elements that we, as the board, approve for eligibility. First, the over -- overall issue is the statute requirements. Secondly, there is congestion and the other factors that we consider. If we can't meet the first statutory requirement, you don't get to the second choice.

MS. PENNANT: That's right. And -- Mr. Chair --

MR. HOOPER: Yes, Ms. Pennant.

MS. PENNANT: -- I also have issues with the fact that these charging stations are predominantly to the west side of Tamarac, and completely excludes people living on the east side. Again, the lack of equity in certain neighborhoods.

MR. HOOPER: So I'm going to say that I think that the idea of this project and -- and the thought to increase the amount of electrical vehicles, whether they're transit or they're personal, the more we've had, the better.

However, I'm -- and, unfortunately, unfortunately, I'm reading through the Statute and it just -- there's nowhere I can find where it meets the Statute. And we were put on this board to -- like Phil said, the first thing is the Statute, and then anything else is after. So as much as I like this project and I wish there was a bucket of money somewhere to pay for this, my hands, I feel, are tied by the Statute. So I'm -- I can't support it, only for that reason.

MR. COOLMAN: Mr. Chair, Doug Coolman. I call the question.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. We've got a motion --

MS. WALLACE: He said a follow up question.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. HOOPER: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. COOLMAN: No. I called the question to vote on it, and I -- that's what I'm -- I'm suggesting. I think we've heard enough --

MR. HOOPER: So, yeah, he wants to make a motion.

MR. COOLMAN: -- so I would like to call the question, take a vote.

MINUTES SECRETARY: Is that Phil Allen or --

MR. HOOPER: Who is that speaking?

MS. WALLACE: Doug Coolman.

MINUTES SECRETARY: Mr. Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Doug Coolman.

DR. KELLEY: I would like to --

MS. WALLACE: Mr. Coolman.

DR. KELLEY: This is Dr. Kelley. Can we just say something?

MR. HOOPER: No. Let me -- let me get through the motion and the second, and then I'll open it up for discussion. So does anybody have a second for the motion?

MS. PENNANT: I will. Anthea. I'll second.

MR. COOLMAN: The motion is to call it.

MS. PENNANT: To -- to --

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. PENNANT: -- to not support it. Or is it to support it?

MR. HOOPER: He's just calling the question. He just wants to pull it up for vote, to see if it meets eligibility. And if we have a second -- I think you just

seconded it; right?

MS. PENNANT: If -- if it's a matter of just assessing whether or not it's eligible, I'm -- no, I'm not supporting --

MS. WALLACE: So, no --

MS. PENNANT: -- it as eligible.

MS. WALLACE: -- is the question -- is there a motion to --

MS. PENNANT: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: We -- so the -- the -- here's the -- here's the point of this process. We've got to bring these -- these projects up for discussion, because we pulled them, and then we have to vote on them for eligibility, whether you vote yes or no. So I believe that Doug called the question, which is making the motion to vote on this thing, whether you like it or not. Correct?

MS. PENNANT: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: So if we can get a second --

MR. COOLMAN: Right.

MR. HOOPER: -- to that, then we can have a discussion, again, if Ms. Kelley wants to say anything, and then we can call the vote.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

MS. LOVE: This -- this is Allyson, and I second it for discussion.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Ms. Love seconds it. Ms. Kelley, do you have anything --

MR. ALLEN: If you're calling the --

MR. HOOPER: Sorry?

MR. ALLEN: -- if you're calling the question, there is no further discussion.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. CASSINI: That -- yeah, that kind of tables it, generally.

MR. HOOPER: Oh, that's true. That's true. Okay. All right. So let's take a -- let's take a roll call, please.

MS. THOMPSON: Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: No.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: No.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: No.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: I'll vote no, but I would like to say something after.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: No.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: I'm sorry, could someone repeat the motion?

MR. HOOPER: Do --

MS. WALLACE: So it's basically a motion to determine that this project is not eligible under the Statute.

MR. HOOPER: If you vote no, it's not eligible. If you vote yes, you believe it is eligible.

MR. CAVROS: Thank you. I have a clarifying question at the end, as well. Yes.

MINUTES SECRETARY: Did he say yes or no?

MS. WALLACE: He said yes.

MR. HOOPER: He said yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: No.

MS. THOMPSON: Ron Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: No.

MS. THOMPSON: Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: No.

MS. THOMPSON: Okay. The motion did not pass –

MS. CASSINI: The motion passed –

MS. THOMPSON: -- it passed –

MS. CASSINI: -- 8 to 1.

MS. THOMPSON: -- 8 to 1.

MS. WALLACE: Right. So the motion –

MS. THOMPSON: With one -- with one (inaudible).

MS. WALLACE: -- the motion determining that –

MR. HOOPER: Because we pulled it –

MS. WALLACE: -- the project is not eligible.

MR. HOOPER: -- because we pulled it for eligibility. That's right.

MS. WALLACE: Correct.

MR. HOOPER: That's right.

MS. WALLACE: So the motion that the project is not eligible passes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: Okay. We've got -- I'm going crazy here. Okay. Ms. Kelley, if you'd like to speak and then I think somebody else asked to say something after. Mr. Cavros.

DR. KELLEY: Yes. I would like to speak. I -- you know, as we started to discuss this, which is why it is not worth calling so quickly about eligibility, we started to discuss this, and Ms. Pennant had a very good suggestion about maybe the -- because we (inaudible) this won't work throughout the County, that we make the recommendation or something that this goes through the League of Cities, and all the cities submit, you know, a couple charging stations, at least, and we build a network. I think that is a great --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

DR. KELLEY: -- possible solution here, which, now that we have decided the Statute doesn't make it eligible, which I understand, you know, the legal type wording that it is, I would like to say that -- that we -- that we make a recommendation to -- along with our other submitted approved for eligibility and funding projects, that -- you know, that this -- that this issue has come up and we feel strongly about wanting to advocate for that strength in the County.

MS. WALLACE: It would have to be recommended as an infrastructure project, not a transportation surtax project.

MS. CASSINI: May I speak on that?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

DR. KELLEY: I understand.

MR. HOOPER: I want to move on to the other projects.

MS. CASSINI: (Inaudible.) I just very quickly, and this is just a one -- one minute. The Invest Act was released yesterday, the summary. It's a federal

infrastructure funding act. It has very little likelihood of passing, at the moment, but I think it is worth looking at.

I think anyone who's interested in it, I'm happy to share the summary of that, because it includes a significant amount of funding for electric vehicle infrastructure through competitive grants to local and state governments.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Mr. Cavros, do you have anything you wanted to say real quick?

MR. CAVROS: Just -- just a quick question. There was a reference to the Statute, earlier, and I guess this is a question for Angela. I'm looking through it, and I'm trying to figure out how some of the projects that are before us, you know, include sidewalks. How is that -- something like that compliant with the -- with the Statute, State Statute.

MS. WALLACE: Because the sidewalks are considered ancillary to the roadway, and they're all part of the roadway system. So when you do the sidewalks and the swale and the drainage, sidewalk and ADA improvements, just like the shelters and the ADA improvements for the intersections. So that's part of the roadway infrastructure. You don't have a sidewalk generally if you don't have a road.

**VOTE PASSES 8 TO 1 WITH MR. CAVROS VOTING IN THE AFFIRMATIVE FOR ELIGIBILITY.**

MR. HOOPER: Okay. We're going to move on to the next item.

MS. WALLACE: Okay. The next project is Project Ranked Number 12, and the Project Number is COOP036. And this project involves -- I guess requests funding for wayfinding signs and hardscaping, signage, lighting, landscaping. And so we had an issue that the -- the project title or name was wayfinding signs, but the description included landscaping and hardscaping, signage, and lighting.

So we had questions regarding the request and what the request consists of, and want to make sure that it's -- you know, that the request is for standard wayfinding signs for the roadway. And, generally, they should be associated with -- so the -- if there's landscaping, for instance, which seems to be part of the description, it should be part of the roadway -- of a roadway project, because, under the interlocal agreement, it's only improvements within the public road right of way that meet the applicable design criteria may be

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

considered for funding.

So we can't just install stand alone landscaping, that's not part of a roadway project, part of the design. And so I'd like to have some -- the board to receive some input from the municipality regarding what the request consists of.

And to the extent that there are wayfinding signs for the roadway that provide direction to drivers or cyclist or pedestrians, then, you know, we're -- the County's position is that's eligible, but there are some other items that are just generally described, and we're not sure --

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: -- what the city's position was on those.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. And then I'm going to ask that -- I guess Cooper City is here to speak, but let's -- if I could ask the speakers from the city to just keep it to two minutes, please, because we're -- we've got to get through a bunch of these. Okay? So if we have somebody from Cooper City?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: Great.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And if there's anybody from Cooper City, press pound 2 to identify your line.

MR. BAILEY: Thank you. My name is Mike Bailey. I'm the city engineer for Cooper City. And I -- I understand your point exactly. And this project is essentially the replacement of wayfinding signs that -- that helps motorists find different city facilities. And essentially, it's the sign and lighting for the sign, so that folks can see it. It -- we don't need to include any landscaping as part --

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. BAILEY: -- of this project.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. WALLACE: So with regard to lighting, has the city conducted the -- a lighting justification -- done that lighting justification report that's provided for in the ILA? Because we didn't have that.

MR. BAILEY: No, we didn't. We assumed that would be part of the -- the design of this project. I'm sorry. No, we didn't.

MS. WALLACE: Okay. So --

MR. HOOPER: Okay. From an eligibility standpoint, from my perspective, I think it -- signage and lighting meet the eligibility requirements. It's -- it helps with -- I mean, just to have road signage helps --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: -- even if it's -- if you're trying to find a -- a point of interest or you're trying to find the fire department or the City Hall. I think it matters to have wayfinding signage --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: -- keep the traffic flow, and I think it's eligible. Do other members have anything they'd like to say?

MS. PENNANT: I guess my question is what's up with the decorative context? Why -- why is it being referred to as a decorative sign, and does that increase the cost because it's decorative?

MS. WALLACE: So under the ILA, we could deal with that and the lighting justification. So I guess it -- generally, it's eligible under the Statute. When we deal with the municipality and we're in negotiations, we'll deal with the eligibility criteria under the ILA, because the ILA prohibits decorative --

MR. HOOPER: It's --

MS. WALLACE: -- signs.

MR. HOOPER: -- it has standard.

MS. WALLACE: So it's standard wayfinding signs and lighting -- a lighting justification report consistent with Broward County and FDOT policies is required --

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. WALLACE: -- in order to fund the lighting improvement. So we'll go through that --

MR. HOOPER: But if they want to upgrade it, they can do it with their own dollars.

MS. WALLACE: Correct.

MS. PENNANT: Right. But -- but -- so -- so that's what's bothersome, because it's saying decorative, and it's almost seeming that we're approving a decorative sign.

MS. WALLACE: No. The --

MS. PENNANT: So just for the record --

MS. WALLACE: -- you can qualify the motion to reflect that you're not.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Any other members want to speak? Okay. Do you want to kind of --

MS. CASSINI: Sure.

MR. HOOPER: -- make a motion?

MS. CASSINI: So like the other project, this will be a motion that indicates your approval under the Statute, 212.055(1)(d), excluding ineligible components of the project under Section 3 of the interlocal agreement.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman, this is Phil. I would approve -- or make a **motion** to approve as stated.

MS. PENNANT: I second.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you. Can we do a roll call?

MS. THOMPSON: Alan Hooper?

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Ron Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: And Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: So it passes unanimously.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

MR. HOOPER: Can we go to the next item?

MS. WALLACE: Okay. The next one is Ranked Number 18, and the Project

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

Number is PPRK002, and is another stormwater improvement project. And it -- stormwater improvements. And if you would go to the next slide, Mr. --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. RIDDLE: I think we skipped one.

MS. WALLACE: Did we? Uh-oh.

MS. CASSINI: Oakland Park (inaudible).

MR. RIDDLE: 16?

MS. WALLACE: Oh, that one was removed; correct?

MS. PENNANT: (Inaudible.)

MS. WALLACE: By --

MS. CASSINI: Was it?

MR. RIDDLE: No, it was not.

MS. PENNANT: It wasn't?

MS. WALLACE: I thought that 16 --

MS. PENNANT: It says likely ineligible.

MS. CASSINI: There were some municipalities that, because of eligibility concerns, indicated that they would like their projects removed, but I do not have notations on that, unless Angela received that communication directly.

MS. WALLACE: I thought that was the one we had received from Mr. Calloway. I'll check.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Uh-uh.

MS. WALLACE: Well, Oakland Park, I guess Number 16 is OAKL099, and it's for landscaping not ancillary to a roadway project.

MS. CASSINI: If we -- we didn't --

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. WALLACE: This one is the one that we received the additional information from the City of Oakland Park –

MR. RIDDLE: This is –

MS. WALLACE: -- that this was Phase 2 of the -- of a roadway project that was designed and constructed by FDOT.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible) the Center for Disease Control.

MS. WALLACE: So this one should be gone.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We appreciate your patience. Someone will be with you shortly.

MS. CASSINI: Please mute your line.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: On May 14<sup>th</sup>, the County (inaudible).

MR. HOOPER: Please mute your line, and don't put us on hold. Thank you.

MS. CASSINI: Okay. So I guess what I'm -- I'm hearing is that we now –

MS. WALLACE: We are recommending this one as eligible.

MS. CASSINI: -- we are now recommending that this is eligible.

MS. WALLACE: Correct. So we received –

MS. CASSINI: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: -- additional information from the City of Oakland Park that reflected that there were road improvements that were constructed by the Florida Department of Transportation, and Oakland Park Boulevard is a state road, and part of the design included landscaping.

The municipality had received funding for Phase 1 of the landscape -- landscaping for Phase 1 of the project and is requesting funding from the surtax for the landscaping associated with Phase 2 of the road improvement. So it's included in the design from the FDOT roadwork, and FDOT did not fund it, and they're requesting funding from the surtax for that purpose. And I

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

would recommend this as eligible, because it was part of the roadway project. I'm sorry.

MR. HOOPER: Are there any -- any comments from the members, or would anybody like to make a motion?

MR. FRAZIER: So **moved**.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: Do we have a second?

MS. LOVE: I second. Allyson.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you. Okay. Let's have a roll call.

MS. THOMPSON: Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Ron Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: And Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Okay. It passes as eligible.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

MR. HOOPER: Can we go to the next item?

MS. WALLACE: Okay. I'm sorry. Now this one is Project Ranked Number 18, and the Project Number is PPRK002. And it's for stormwater improvements. And the information we received from the municipality reflects that there was a FEMA hazard mitigation grant that was submitted for the project and we'd like to know the status of that. And it appears to be more of an infrastructure project and the area that is -- from the aerial map, if you would move to that slide, Mr. Riddle -- seems to reflect that it's a commercial area.

So we have questions regarding the project and the -- I guess the flow and whether the flow is from the roadway or if this is commercial. And we'd like to have the city provide some more information regarding the project.

MR. HOOPER: Is there somebody from the city here to speak?

MS. CASSINI: Anyone from Pembroke Park on the line, please press star 2 to identify yourself so that you can speak to the item. Pembroke Park.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If I may, with a slight correction. You may press pound 2 to raise your hand. Once again, pressing pound 2 will raise your hand.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. This is to address the area in question that you mentioned.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. CASSINI: Can you identify yourself?

MR. JIMENEZ: Hi. Can you guys hear me?

MS. CASSINI: Please identify yourself before you speak.

MR. JIMENEZ: This is JC Jimenez. Sure. Can you hear me?

MS. CASSINI: We can hear you, but please identify yourself, give your name.

MR. JIMENEZ: Sure. It's JC Jimenez. I'm the Town Manager for the Town of Pembroke Park.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Could you speak to the question that Ms. Wallace had about the drainage and where it's coming from, if it's a -- she had mentioned that it might be coming from a commercial property.

MR. JIMENEZ: No. The -- the -- unfortunately, the aerial photograph is not very accurate. It's -- it's really just 25<sup>th</sup> Street, and it's not -- it doesn't -- it's from the roadway. It's just roadway drainage, and it's not from that commercial property that's there.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. JIMENEZ: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: Do we want -- does -- do any members --

MR. JIMENEZ: So that's -- that's -- that's the -- the -- all the drainage that -- that we're looking at is just on 25<sup>th</sup> Street --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. JIMENEZ: -- basically from -- yeah, from what is that, Park -- Park Lane all the way to the end of the 25<sup>th</sup> Street, basically. And it'll turn into an outfall in -- in (Inaudible) Lake, or in (Inaudible) Park in the lake there.

MS. PENNANT: Alan, I would -- I would want to table --

MR. JIMENEZ: None of this -- none of this is from the public.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. PENNANT: -- I want to table making a vote on this until we have the proper documentation. Because I think we need to be making the decision with the right documentation.

MS. WALLACE: So –

MR. JIMENEZ: Okay. That -- that's fine. If you want to table it, then we'll -- we'll make sure we update it, because there's also some confusion as far as the phasing, and it's going to be one master project now and no phases.

MS. WALLACE: -- so is the city requesting to defer the project for a late -- for consideration at a later date?

MR. JIMENEZ: Yes. Yes.

MS. CASSINI: Okay. So this would move to a Cycle 2 consideration, which will just be in a couple months when you all get the five-year plan. It won't be a long time.

MR. HOOPER: I would agree with Ms. Pennant –

MR. JIMENEZ: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: -- on that.

MS. WALLACE: Okay. So motion to do defer? Do we -- Ms. Pennant?

MR. HOOPER: Go ahead and make –

MS. PENNANT: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: -- the motion.

MS. PENNANT: I'd like to make a **motion** that we defer this project until the appropriate documentation has been submitted.

MS. LOVE: I second. Allyson.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you. Can we get a roll call, please?

MS. THOMPSON: Roll call for motion to defer. Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros? George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Ron Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: And Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Approved for motion to defer.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Let's go to the next item.

MS. WALLACE: Okay. The next one is Project Ranked Number 29, and the Project Number is WILT007.1. And it is request for funding for a parking lot in Colohatchee Park. The parking lot inside the park, the County has reviewed

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

the submittal, and in order to be eligible, a parking lot has to -- parking improvements have to be used for purposes of a park and ride or other transit-oriented development that serves the public and the public's transit needs.

And a parking lot in -- inside of a park is an infrastructure project that would not be eligible under the Transportation Surtax Statute.

MS. CASSINI: Anyone from Wilton Manors on the line? Please hit pound 2 to identify yourself, raise your hand, and be un-muted.

MR. HOOPER: And please keep it under two minutes.

MR. DEJESUS: Todd DeJesus here, Capital Projects and Grants Manager for Wilton Manors. Can you hear me?

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MINUTES SECRETARY: Repeat the first name?

MS. CASSINI: Todd.

MR. DEJUSUS: Okay. I also have Jason -- Jason McClair, our City Engineer, will also be on the line.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. DEJUSUS: So just wanted to say -- well, first of all, it's a little misnomer. It's not a parking lot in a park. It's actually a separate facility. So the proposed what we're calling Trailhead Trail Parking Facility is located adjacent to one of the area's major roadways, Northeast 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue. There's an existing dedicated bike lane on Northeast 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and two bus stops just steps from the location of the proposed facility.

It is an existing trail that leads from the existing parking area through a mangrove to the upland, usable portion of the park. The park is a loop trail, in addition to a regionally used dog park. The proposed project, though, will provide some parking and a new trail connection to the existing park trail. A trailhead will be constructed on the site with informational signage. This will provide a new access point to the trail and allow users to exit the park more

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

easily and more readily connect to the Northeast 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue bike lane and nearby bus stops.

The project will turn and in/out trail into a loop system. Due to the increased demand of the park, the existing parking on Northeast 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue is often at capacity and results in increased congestion on the road as users look -- users look to alternate parking locations. The proposed facility will be on a side street in Northeast -- Northeast 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue and remove traffic off of the main roadway.

The trailhead will also provide connectivity to our state-designated Blueway system. There will be a Middle River canoe/kayak access point adjacent to the proposed facility. An important function of this proposed facility is the use of it as a connection to transit. There are no public parking facilities in the vicinity, and this will allow users to park, walk the trails, bike on the dedicated bike lane system, and/or take the bus.

This will also provide a connection to transit-oriented development along the FEC corridor to the north of the project area where a train station is currently proposed. Lastly, the additional parking area may benefit those utilizing the adjacent Colohatchee boat -- boat ramp across the street. Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Thank you. Would any members like to comment? Okay. I'm having a --

MS. PENNANT: I --

MR. HOOPER: -- I'm struggling. I don't think it meets the eligibility.

MS. PENNANT: -- me, too. I'm sorry.

MR. HOOPER: I'm sorry, but it --

MS. PENNANT: I -- I don't mean to be so (inaudible).

MR. HOOPER: -- it's just too hard to connect the dots to where this is going to be a transit-oriented parking facility. And, clearly, I love the idea of having - - it's a beautiful park. It's great to have parking for the park. But, at the end of the day, it's not a transit-oriented parking lot. So --

MS. PENNANT: Right. And even with respect to -- if you don't mind, Mr. Chair -- to the railroad track, I mean, it's -- it's -- looks like miles away to me.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. HOOPER: It's not.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. PENNANT: It looks -- I just --

MR. HOOPER: No, it's okay. Yeah. So can we -- if anyone wants to make a motion.

MS. WALLACE: So the motion would be that Project Ranked Number 29, WILT007.1 is ineligible. Do we have a motion?

MR. HOOPER: So do we say yes for it's ineligible?

MS. WALLACE: Right. So --

MR. HOOPER: Would yes --

MS. WALLACE: -- if you say it's not --

MR. HOOPER: -- mean --

MS. WALLACE: -- eligible --

MS. CASSINI: Yes means ineligible.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Do we have a motion?

MS. PENNANT: I'd like to make a **motion** that this project is ineligible for funding through --

MS. LOVE: I second.

MS. PENNANT: -- the surtax dollars.

MR. HOOPER: Do we have a second? I thought it was --

MS. WALLACE: That sounded like Dr. Kelley.

MR. HOOPER: Ms. Kelley, yes. That's what I thought. Okay. Can we --

MS. LOVE: Allyson, but okay.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

100

MS. CASSINI: Is that Ms. Love?

MS. WALLACE: I think it was Allyson.

MR. HOOPER: Oh, it was Ms. Love.

MS. LOVE: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Thanks. Thank you.

MS. THOMPSON: Okay. Motion for ineligibility. Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Ron Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: It passes as ineligible.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

MS. WALLACE: Okay. The next ranked project that was pulled was Project Number -- Ranked Number 38, Project Number FORT108. And it was pulled by Ms. Pennant. No?

MS. CASSINI: No. So we're only dealing with eligibility right now.

MS. WALLACE: Oh, not the ones that were for discussion.

MS. CASSINI: No. We're only dealing with eligibility right now --

MS. WALLACE: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: -- because we're pulling up in the dashboard those that have Q and A.

MS. WALLACE: All right.

MS. CASSINI: We're going to deal with that separately. Sorry, Angela.

MS. WALLACE: So the next one that's recommended for ineligibility is Ranked Number 55 --

MS. PENNANT: What about Number 30, though? Because that's the same decorative sign concept thing going on there, as well.

MR. HOOPER: Did you pull it?

MS. PENNANT: I didn't, but I'm noticing it as well.

MS. WALLACE: No. So for the citywide wayfinding signs, we made it clear that the cost of the standard wayfinding signs would be eligible, and as long as it's wayfinding, and the standard wayfinding --

MS. PENNANT: (Inaudible.)

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. WALLACE: -- would be funded. It did not include any of those other elements, decorative elements or lighting that needed to meet the lighting criteria or gateway features. So if it's just a standard --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MS. WALLACE: -- wayfinding, we can deal with that directly through the negotiations.

MS. CASSINI: And to clarify for anyone's benefit from the Oversight Board, when you took your -- when you made your motions on eligibility for the Consent Agenda items --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: -- it included that exclusion of any ineligible items --

MS. PENNANT: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: -- that Angela will be dealing with during the contracting.

MS. WALLACE: Right. So --

MS. PENNANT: Thank you.

MS. WALLACE: -- betterments or enhancements that we would pay for standard, what you approved was the standard elements, not the enhancements. Okay. So the next project that's being recommended as ineligible is Ranked Number 55, and the Project Number is COOP035, and it's for gateway signs for the City of Cooper City.

And this project requested to replace its city and neighborhood entry signs that are -- it says the existing signs are outdated, deteriorated, and not consistent with each other, and they would provide updated decorative signs. And such decorative signs are not wayfinding, and we're -- therefore, we're recommending them as ineligible for surtax funding.

MR. HOOPER: Are there any photos of the -- the signs?

MR. RIDDLE: No, sir.

MR. HOOPER: Because I think they're replacing some -- I mean, it would make it more clear to us.

MS. CASSINI: Well, we have -- Cooper City's here.

MR. HOOPER: Right. The picture's worth a thousand words. Okay. So we have someone from Cooper City that would like to speak, so why don't we go ahead and have them speak.

MR. BAILEY: Yes. Mike Bailey again, Cooper City. Thank you. Yeah, this project is to replace 21 existing entry -- city entry and subdivision entry signs. I apologize that we didn't include pictures, but the pictures wouldn't indicate what we want to replace them with, because they're all different. They're all kind of old and deteriorating. So this project is proposed to replace those with more consistent sign and new signing that people will see.

MS. LOVE: I'm not able to hear.

MR. HOOPER: Oh.

MS. WALLACE: Oh, if that microphone --

MR. BAILEY: I apologize.

MS. WALLACE: -- is that microphone on?

MS. CASSINI: It's on. He's just too far away.

MR. BAILEY: I -- I'm sorry. So, yes, these would replace existing deteriorated and signs -- signs that aren't consistent with each other. And I understand that they may be considered decorative, especially with the landscaping that we'd like to include, but I think previous with the similar project, if we could be approved to move forward to the Commission, to the County Commission with the caveat that the surtax would only be paying for the basic sign, and if the city wanted to provide some upgrades to that, we could do that on our own.

MS. WALLACE: What do you mean by a neighborhood sign? So that was of concern, besides the, I guess, decorative nature of it. And so wayfinding signage for a neighborhood, what is -- what is -- what are you referring to?

MR. BAILEY: It identifies the entry to a neighborhood or a subdivision.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. BAILEY: So we have, for example, the Forest Lake Subdivision. The sign would identify the entrance to that subdivision so people knew, oh, I'm supposed to turn here to go to –

MS. WALLACE: But how –

MR. BAILEY: -- my destination.

MS. WALLACE: -- so when -- I guess when -- if you're dealing with a municipal complex or a park or something of that nature that is a public facility, that it could lend itself through -- I mean, could be supported by a wayfinding sign. But a neighborhood sign seems to be distinguished from that, from the -- from a public facility.

MR. BAILEY: Certainly –

MR. HOOPER: So these are -- these are entrances to neighborhoods, no different than Coral Ridge or from what, you know, Fort Lauderdale –

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: -- Melrose Park or some other -- right?

MR. BAILEY: Correct.

MR. HOOPER: That's basically what you're –

MR. BAILEY: Correct.

MR. HOOPER: -- you're talking about doing.

MR. BAILEY: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: So, you know, the wayfinding, on one hand, tells you where to go if you're going somewhere in your car.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: The other one is -- to me, is an improvement of the

neighborhood.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: It's a neighborhood improvement sign.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: So -- and I'm struggling with the fact that road improvements -- it's under the heading of road improvements, signage is --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: -- and I do believe that the wayfinding signs help with the flow of traffic, and it is a road improvement. I'm just not sure a neighborhood sign that tells you you're in this neighborhood at the entrance of the neighborhood is just a little -- I'm having -- I'm struggling with that. Not that that's a bad project, it's just I struggle a little bit with that.

MS. PENNANT: I'm in that struggle with you.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So that's -- that's --

MR. BAILEY: Understood.

MR. HOOPER: Are there other members that would like to make any comments?

MR. COOLMAN: Doug Coolman. I'll call the question.

MR. HOOPER: What did he say?

MS. WALLACE: He said he'd call the question.

MR. COOLMAN: Doug Coolman called the question.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. I get confused when he calls the question. Does that mean he's calling it for eligibility --

MS. WALLACE: It's a motion --

MS. CASSINI: No more conversation.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. HOOPER: I understand that. But one time we voted yes and one time we voted no. So what are we voting on.

MS. WALLACE: So we're -- go ahead, Ms. Pennant.

MS. PENNANT: Well --

MR. HOOPER: We need a second on his call the question.

MS. PENNANT: -- well, I -- I just think that --

MS. LOVE: I second. Allyson.

MS. PENNANT: -- we want to support the way --

MS. CASSINI: Turn your mic on.

MR. COOLMAN: I just called the question, to let (inaudible).

MR. HOOPER: I know. I'm sorry, but -- but --

MR. COOLMAN: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: -- before it was seconded, Ms. -- Ms. Pennant was in the middle of a comment, and I didn't realize, and her microphone was off. So just let's give her a little leeway.

MS. PENNANT: Right. No, I'm just saying I am all in support of the wayfinding signs, but the other signs directing people into neighborhoods, that I think is something the city needs to pay for. You know, we all have to have skin in the game. And so we can do part and they can do the other part.

MS. CASSINI: So could -- could we get some clarification before we actually read a motion for you all to consider?

Are there any signs that are not neighborhood entrance signs that would be considered wayfinding signs in this project? Are we doing a partial eligibility or a ineligibility motion here?

MR. HOOPER: I think it's to Mr. Bailey; right?

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

107

MR. BAILEY: Correct. These are all -- the 21 signs, the majority are neighborhood entry signs. The other ones are city entry signs, you are entering Cooper City.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. CASSINI: So how many of those 21 -- so I guess I'm -- I'm looking --

MR. HOOPER: They're all --

MS. CASSINI: -- to you all --

MR. HOOPER: -- they're all entry signs.

MS. CASSINI: Okay. So are we doing partial eligibility for the city but not the neighborhood, or are we just going straight ineligible?

MR. HOOPER: I think he called the question as to the eligibility of the project.

MS. WALLACE: And the recommendation was ineligible, so we --

MR. HOOPER: And we have --

MS. WALLACE: -- have the question.

MR. HOOPER: -- two -- we have a second.

MS. PENNANT: Yeah, a second.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So can we do a roll call?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: Yes. So if you -- if you don't think it's eligible, say yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Okay. We're voting for ineligibility.

MR. HOOPER: If you think it's eligible (inaudible) --

MS. WALLACE: If you –

MS. THOMPSON: Alan Hooper?

MS. WALLACE: -- if you think it's eligible, say yes.

MR. HOOPER: Say no. All right.

MS. WALLACE: If you think it's eligible, say no.

MR. HOOPER: Right.

MS. WALLACE: Right. Okay.

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. WALLACE: So we're voting -- the motion is to support the recommendation that the project is not eligible.

MS. THOMPSON: Okay. Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: No.

MS. THOMPSON: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: It's confusing.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: I'm voting yes, it's not eligible.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

MR. HOOPER: That -- that clarifies.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: No.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Totally confused.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: I -- I'm going to vote yes, but could -- could you repeat the motion for the benefit of -- of the whole --

MS. CASSINI: Okay.

MR. CAVROS: -- (inaudible).

MS. CASSINI: And we can start again. So the motion is to find Cooper City 035 ineligible under Section 212.055(1)(d). So voting yes means that the project is ineligible under the Statute.

MS. THOMPSON: (Inaudible.)

MS. CASSINI: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: We're starting over with the vote for ineligibility. Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: No.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley? Dr. --

DR. KELLEY: Yes. Change my vote.

MS. CASSINI: She's yes.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Ron Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Vote passes 8 to 1.

**VOTE PASSES 8 TO 1 WITH ALLYSON LOVE VOTING NO.**

MS. WALLACE: Okay. So the next ranked would be Number 70. Is that what you have, Gretchen? For the ones that are recommended as ineligible? POMP011.

MS. CASSINI: If there is anyone on the line –

MS. WALLACE: (Inaudible) ranking 70.

MS. CASSINI: Okay. So we have Pompano personally appearing. This is Rank 70.

MS. WALLACE: Correct.

MS. CASSINI: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: So this project requests funding for what it titled the Powerline Road Improvement Project, and it's for landscaping improvements,

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

paving, benches, decorative pedestrian lighting on Powerline Road between McNab Road and Atlantic Boulevard. This project is being recommended as ineligible because the landscaping improvements and decorative lighting are not associated with a road improvement project.

We do not have a lighting justification report consistent with the requirements, and benches are not eligible. So we'd like to have someone from the municipality respond.

MR. DANOVIK: Sure. Good afternoon, everybody. Horatio Danovich, Capital Improvements and Innovation District Director with the City of Pompano Beach. Thank you for the opportunity to address -- to address the board.

At this time, the City of Pompano Beach would like to defer this project until the next eligible opportunity so that we have a -- we have a chance to talk to the Department of Transportation, who is the actual owner of the roadway, and work with them on a project that is eligible.

MR. HOOPER: Great. So we're going to defer this project to another date, or just -- or just table it.

MS. WALLACE: You can do a motion defer. And --

MR. DANOVIK: Next cycle.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Motion to defer to Cycle 2.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Do we have a motion to defer?

MR. ALLEN: This is Phil. I would so **move**.

MR. HOOPER: Do we have a --

MS. LOVE: Second. Allyson.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

MS. THOMPSON: We're voting to defer to Cycle 2. Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Ron Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Vote passes unanimously.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

MS. WALLACE: Okay. The next project, the ranking is Number 79, and the Project Number is PPIN021, and it's requesting surtax funding for sound and safety wall on Sheridan Road. The –

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. CASSINI: I'm sorry. I was just going to let -- if anybody from Pembroke Pines in on the line, now's the time to hit pound 2 to be recognized.

MS. WALLACE: Okay? So the eligibility criteria for sound walls provide that improvements that are consistent with the Florida Department of Transportation noise decibel level criteria will be considered, and that noise -- that FDOT criteria requires road improvement. So if there's a road expansion that increases capacity, increases the sound over a certain decibel level, then sound walls will be eligible.

That's been adopted by the County as part of the County's process and is included in the eligibility criteria under the interlocal agreement. And we did not provide -- receive any documentation that reflects that the project meets that criteria.

MR. HOOPER: So you're saying that -- because all I see is it -- it has to meet a certain decibel level, but you're -- you're saying that it has to do that plus it has to be part of a roadway improvement?

MS. WALLACE: The criteria that's described there includes all of those requirements. So the Florida Department of Transportation noise decibel level criteria --

MR. HOOPER: Uh-huh.

MS. WALLACE: -- includes -- what that criteria is, it's a road -- it's expanding the road, increasing the capacity, and -- and therefore --

MR. HOOPER: Oh, so they're --

MS. WALLACE: -- increasing the noise.

MR. HOOPER: -- so FDOT's criteria is a higher level --

MS. WALLACE: No.

MR. HOOPER: -- than what's --

MS. WALLACE: This is referring to FDOT's criteria --

MR. HOOPER: (Inaudible.)

MS. WALLACE: -- as the criteria that's applicable for surtax projects.

MR. HOOPER: So in the future, can we get what FDOT's criteria is?

MS. WALLACE: Yeah. Is Mr. Hui here? We can give you a copy of it, but Mr. Hui can probably give us a kind of synopsis.

MR. HOOPER: Can you give us a quick 101 right now, and just tell us what the basic criteria of FDOT is for -- to install a sound buffer wall?

MR. HUI: Yeah. Uh-huh. Certainly. Tony Hui again. There's three main conditions --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HUI: -- of the FDOT criteria.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: Hold on. Hold on. Who -- who is that speaking? Please put your phone on mute if you're not trying to address the board. Go ahead.

MR. HUI: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: Sorry about that.

MR. HUI: Yeah. There's three main criteria that's -- that FD -- FDOT holds to that we also -- we also utilize. The first one is that it's associated with a road expansion or there's significant changes to the road alignment that brings traffic more into residential areas. That's the first condition.

The second condition is that it either increases the decibel levels of the road to 67 decibels or it -- or it adds an additional 15 decibels to the road, either one of those things.

And the third condition is is that the corrective solution, like a sound wall and so forth much at least reduce the decibel levels between five to ten decibels. So those are the three conditions that FDOT utilizes and that we also utilize.

MR. HOOPER: And do the three conditions have to walk hand-in-hand?

MR. HUI: Yes. Uh-huh.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

115

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. HUI: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: All right. Thank you. Okay. So –

MS. CASSINI: There's somebody from Pompano on the phone.

MR. HOOPER: There is somebody from -- this is Pembroke Pines; correct?

MS. CASSINI: I'm sorry. Pembroke Pines.

MR. HOOPER: Is there someone from –

MR. KENNEDY: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: -- Pembroke Pines that would like to speak to this and give us some clarification on your scope of work and how it meets FDOT's criteria?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes. This is Carl Kennedy, City Engineer for the City of Pembroke Pines.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. KENNEDY: Yes. I was calling to discuss this project. And the city is moving forward with a noise study. We have selected a -- a firm to do this noise analysis, which is consistent with the FDOT noise decibel level criteria, which is the only criteria which is listed in the eligibility requirements in the surtax documents. The surtax documents say improvements that are consistent with the FDOT transportation noise decibel criteria, and that is the only criteria that is listed in the documents.

MS. WALLACE: And do you understand what that criteria entails?

MR. KENNEDY: I understand that the criteria in the ILA only lists the noise decibel level criteria. It does not speak to the road expansion, or it does not actually have decibel criteria listed in the ILA. There's only one criteria for eligibility.

MS. WALLACE: Okay. So Section 3 Eligibility Subsection C says it has to

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

be consistent with the Florida Department of Transportation's noise decibel level criteria. And if you Google Florida Department of Transportation noise decibel criteria, you will receive lots of guidance documents issued by the Florida Department of Transportation that will tell you what that criteria consists of.

And we did not list it all in the document. What we did was refer to the documentation that is produced and issued by the Florida Department of Transportation so that you can refer to those documents for the criteria.

MR. KENNEDY: And that would mean that the sound walls would not be eligible anywhere except where there is a road expansion, and I do not think that that was the intent of the eligibility criteria that was listed in the ILA.

MS. WALLACE: Right. That was the intent, and the County included that criteria because that is the criteria that the County follows. So all of the eligibility criteria that's listed under Section 3 of the ILA was provided by Broward County and is consistent with County policies that are adopted and implemented by the County for County projects and are -- and it was intended to apply to the municipal projects. That's why it's in the ILA that commits the ten percent of -- minimum ten percent surtax revenues to the municipalities.

MR. KENNEDY: Okay. Well, the city has hired a noise consultant, and we will have a study complete by the end of June. I'm not sure if that would be in time for consideration of this project or if it would make it eligible for the next cycle of funding.

MS. WALLACE: If the city would like to defer the project for a future cycle, I'm sure the board will be willing to entertain that.

MR. HOOPER: So I would -- I would prefer that. I'm still a little bit grey, too. I would like to get some information and be able to read up on FDOT's criteria for installing sound walls.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: I -- it's just -- it's hard for me to -- to conceptualize that we are -- that they are not putting in any sound walls without doing expansions of roads. If a neighborhood is experiencing a lot of noise, are they not putting in any walls, just walls, anywhere? That's -- that's where I'm having a struggle with. And so if I could -- if they would be willing to defer it to the next

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

cycle, then I could learn a little bit more and -- and know whether or not I do support this.

MR. COOLMAN: Mr. Chairman --

MR. HOOPER: Yes, sir.

MR. COOLMAN: -- this is Doug Coolman. I have a --

MR. HOOPER: Go ahead.

MR. COOLMAN: Alan?

MR. HOOPER: Yes, sir.

MR. COOLMAN: Yeah, this is really one for Gretchen or legal counsel. Can people put up new sound walls only relying on decibel changes or -- because if you don't have a record, I don't know how you keep track of change -- without the road improvements?

That's over -- over simplified. If you're not going to build or -- or widen the road, then sound walls apparently can't be funded. Is that correct or incorrect?

MS. WALLACE: Right. So a municipality I guess could, or a private development could. Just in order to be eligible for surtax funding, it would have to meet this criteria.

In order for the Florida Department of Transportation to install a sound wall, it would have to meet that criteria. So if the municipality wants to treat it as a municipal infrastructure project and fund it out of municipal funds, then they're -- they're able to do that.

MR. COOLMAN: So if they're not going to do any road improvements, the only reason for them to do the sound wall testing is have a record for them as to what it is today, and if it increases for whatever reason, they still can't get -- right now, couldn't get surtax dollars.

MS. WALLACE: Correct. So they couldn't get surtax dollars if it's not associated with a road expansion project and meets the -- increases the sound -- the decibels such that it's eligible for -- under the FDOT criteria.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. PENNANT: You know, if –

MR. COOLMAN: I guess that answers the question –

MS. PENNANT: -- if I -- if I can just –

MR. COOLMAN: -- the question.

MS. PENNANT: Mr. Chair, sorry.

MR. HOOPER: Who -- who's –

MR. COOLMAN: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Ms. Pennant.

MS. PENNANT: It -- it reads different to me. It doesn't really say that it has to be as a result of construction. It just says it needs to be for improvements that are consistent with the transportation -- Florida Department of Transportation noise decibel level criteria. So it sounds like if there are roads that exist right now where there is extraordinary noise levels and you can prove it, that it would be eligible. So it doesn't have to be –

MR. HOOPER: That's my thought.

MS. PENNANT: -- as a result of a new construction or any –

MR. HOOPER: (Inaudible.)

MS. PENNANT: -- (inaudible) -- I mean renovations to roads that would increase the capacity of traffic. It's right now, if the road is producing way too much noise that meets the criteria of Florida Department of Correction [sic], it would be eligible.

MS. WALLACE: But the criteria requires a road expansion. The criteria's too long –

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. WALLACE: -- to put in this document, so –

MS. PENNANT: Oh.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. WALLACE: -- we'll provide the criteria.

MR. HOOPER: Why don't we --

MS. PENNANT: So I think moving forward, then, in that regard, because I -- I've -- we've heard some interjections of the criteria --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MS. PENNANT: -- alongside the eligibility language, and I think in the future we should probably have a spreadsheet, if you will, that lists the eligibility and then the conditions, and if there are any other variables that would impact how we make our decision, then it should be on one page so we can make a more informed decision.

MS. WALLACE: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: So would you make a motion to defer this to the next cycle so we can figure that out?

MS. PENNANT: Okay. I'd like to make a **motion** that we defer voting on this item until the next cycle.

MS. LOVE: This is Allyson --

MR. FRAZIER: Second. Frazier.

MR. HOOPER: Yes. Yes. Mr. Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: I'm just seconding the item.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Thank you.

MR. FRAZIER: I was seconding the item.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you. So could we have a roll?

MS. THOMPSON: We're voting to defer to Cycle 2. Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes, but I'd like to comment after the vote's taken.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Yes, but also a comment afterwards.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Ron Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Okay. Vote passes to defer.

MS. WALLACE: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. I think Doug and George wanted to make comment. Doug, why don't you go first?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes, if in fact the criteria are that these new sound walls need to go in conjunction with roadway expansion, et cetera, maybe -- I don't know how this group feels, but the surtax dollars are certainly to improve transportation, make everybody happy.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

If we've got a neighborhood that has terrible noise and maybe it should have had a sound wall before but didn't, for whatever reason, maybe this group should recommend to the County Commission that they might change some criteria to help specific neighborhoods with sound walls that are -- that should have been there. Just a comment.

MR. HOOPER: Good comment. Mr. Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Yeah, my comment was just that, in my opinion, this does not meet the statutory requirements, but, you know, should -- it -- you know, it's certainly within its prerogative to reoffer this project. But I haven't heard anything here today that would change my vote a second time around.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Thank you.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

MR. HOOPER: Next item?

MS. WALLACE: Okay. So the -- we apparently missed Ranked Number 77. So I will go back to, which is DEER005. It's a Deerfield Beach project that's titled Pedestrian Lighting and Burying of FPL Lines.

MS. CASSINI: If Deerfield Beach -- any representatives of Deerfield Beach are on the line, please hit pound 2 to be recognized. And we've lost one of our Oversight Board members just temporarily. I don't know if you'd like to take just a quick break or just --

MR. HOOPER: Yes?

MS. CASSINI: -- if we could just -- I think we're going to take about a two-minute break, just a biology break, perhaps, and we'll come back with the Deerfield Beach item.

MR. HOOPER: Sorry about that. Five-minutes. Thank you.

**(THE MEETING RECESSED AT 2:29 AND RECONVENED AT 2:38 P.M.)**

MR. HOOPER: Okay. We're going to reconvene. I don't -- is everyone on the line?

MS. CASSINI: So we're just making sure. Is Deerfield Beach on the line?  
Deerfield Beach?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. CASSINI: They probably are and they're just muted.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. What was it, pound 2 or something like that? Okay.  
Are we ready?

MS. CASSINI: Yes.

MS. WALLACE: I believe so.

MS. CASSINI: They're getting them on the line.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you hear me on the line?

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Let's go to the next item.

MS. WALLACE: Okay. So the project rank was –

MR. CAVROS: I'm not sure they can hear us.

MS. WALLACE: We hear you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. COOLMAN: Everybody that's on the phone hears you, but we don't  
have connection to the -- to the Chair and the office.

MR. HOOPER: To the Chair and the office.

MS. CASSINI: I don't know.

MR. HOOPER: Can you hear me?

MR. COOLMAN: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: Doug, can you hear me?

MR. COOLMAN: I can hear you, but I don't think you can hear us.

MR. HOOPER: I hear you perfectly.

MS. WALLACE: Yeah.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay. Now maybe it's back on. All right. Go ahead.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. WALLACE: So Project Rank 77, Project Number DEER005. It's pedestrian lighting and burying FPL cables. So there was a general description of the streetscapes project to build accessible sidewalks, improved pedestrian lighting, innovating intersection design -- which I'm not sure what that meant -- high visibility crosswalks, and markings to improve safety.

The main issue I flagged -- reason I flagged this one is the burying of FPL lines, and I'd like to get, I guess, some more information to -- presented to the board by the city regarding the other elements of the project. But the surtax cannot pay for the cost of burying utility lines. And we'd like to get some more input from the municipality regarding the rest of the project so that the board can make an informed decision.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Do we want to run through it? Is there someone from Deerfield Beach --

MS. CYGIELNIK: Hi, good afternoon. My name (inaudible).

MS. CASSINI: Please restate your name.

MS. CYGIELNIK: Priscila Cygielnik, Assistant Director for Engineering and Operations.

MS. WALLACE: Melissa -- Melissa something from Deerfield.

MS. CASSINI: Could you speak up?

MS. CYGIELNIK: Can you hear me?

MS. CASSINI: Can you -- yeah, we can hear you a little bit better now.

Could you please repeat your name?

MS. CYGIELNIK: Yes. Priscilla Cygielnik, Assistant Director of Engineering. Are you hearing me okay?

MS. CASSINI: We hear you fine. Please go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. CASSINI: Melissa.

MS. CYGIELNIK: Thank you. Well, thank you for the opportunity to address the board today with regards to the city's pedestrian lighting improvements. This is a Local Activity Center that we've recently rezoned. It's an area we commonly term as Pioneer Grove.

I'd like to note that two projects before you today, Deerfield 005, which is the lighting improvement, and Deerfield 006, which is a streetscape improvement, represent the same project limits on Southeast 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue from Eller Street to Southeast 10<sup>th</sup> Street, Southeast 4<sup>th</sup> Street from Dixie to Southeast 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, and Eller Street from the FEC railroad to Northeast 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue. And the intent of these projects is both to design and construct these projects concurrently.

So Deerfield 005 and Deerfield 006 will be designed as one streetscapes project. The project is part of the city's redevelopment effort in this region's Activity Center, and it is intended to culturally and economically revive our downtown Deerfield Beach and go back to our original pioneer roots.

The goal is to transition Pioneer Grove into a mixed use connected and -- and walkable downtown. The streetscape components consist of sidewalks, (inaudible) for traffic calming, improved pedestrian crossings, roadway pedestrian lighting, landscaping, and the establishment of essential stormwater (inaudible).

We -- we understand that the undergrounding and the aerial services, while a city initiative, is not imperative to the project, and we understand that this would be locally funded. Similarly, we are proposing water and sewer services (inaudible) out of our municipal enterprise funds and are not intended to be reimbursed through the surtax. However, all the work is going to be planned concurrently, and the purpose of that is to reduce the (inaudible).

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

125

MR. HOOPER: Okay. You're breaking up quite a bit, but I think you said maybe that the FP and L line part wouldn't be included in the project cost for the surtax?

MS. CYGIELNIK: Yes, that is correct.

MS. CASSINI: And water and sewer services also, correct?

MS. CYGIELNIK: That would be funded out of our municipal enterprise.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. ALLEN: The -- Mr. Chair --

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MR. ALLEN: -- the project lists a project cost of \$2,000,000, and since this is the design, it's a formula that says 240,000 for design in this phase. The question I have is is the \$2,000,000 total project cost or only that that you have defined as eligible?

MR. RIDDLE: The \$2,000,000 was --

MS. CYGIELNIK: That -- that is what we intend for the eligible items as they, you know, represent the roadway component, the -- the skeleton, so to speak, of this project.

MR. HOOPER: Is that what you did? Is that the way we look at it? Ms. Wallace?

MS. WALLACE: So we don't have a cost estimate that breaks down the different elements, so it's hard to determine. What we'd have to do is have a reasonable basis for the cost for the eligible components. So we'd need a better cost estimate to determine what the actual cost of design should be, what a reasonable cost for design for those elements would be.

Because if it's just sidewalk and ADA improvements, and it would have to be pedestrian lighting that is consistent with the criteria, and it would be standard lighting, nothing decorative or enhanced. So we'd just have to have -- have to get a better estimate of the cost, because that does seem high for design for the few elements that seem to fall within the eligible criteria.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. HOOPER: Was -- was the design for the site plan that --

MS. CYGIELNIK: That --

MR. HOOPER: -- you just showed?

MS. CYGIELNIK: -- that is the estimate.

MR. HOOPER: I hate these kind of meetings. Was the design --

MS. CYGIELNIK: That is the estimate for the Complete Streets total project.

MR. HOOPER: That -- the 2,000,000. And then the 240,000 is for the -- the project that I saw --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: -- on that site plan?

MR. RIDDLE: Is the 12 percent of the 2,000,000.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So not --

MS. CYGIELNIK: That -- that is for the --

MR. HOOPER: -- to exceed.

MS. CYGIELNIK: -- design.

MS. CASSINI: Correct. Not to exceed.

MR. RIDDLE: For the design.

MR. HOOPER: So it's a not to exceed.

MR. RIDDLE: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Can we go to --

MR. ALLEN: I'm -- I'm sorry. Just to follow up on my question, Mr. Chairman. This is Phil. I'm still confused as to is the \$2,000,000 the total

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

project cost including the undergrounding of the -- of the power lines as well as those other ineligible costs? Or is it just the total cost?

MS. CYGIELNIK: No, sir. The undergrounding of overhead lines is estimated at about \$1,000,000 per mile, so that is not inclusive in this cost.

MR. HOOPER: So the -- so Deerfield Beach said that the 2,000,000 is for the projects surtax-specific parts of this project.

MS. CYGIELNIK: Correct.

MR. HOOPER: Do we have any comments from members?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: Ms. Pennant.

MS. PENNANT: I really think -- I -- I'm only comfortable voting affirmatively on this if the numbers can be separated, because I don't know where the lines are drawn.

I don't know what aspect of this 240,000 in design includes what -- what's being done with the burying of the FPL lines and the water and the sewage. And I don't know what percentage of the \$2,000,000 is for that portion and that portion. So I think there needs to be clear language --

MS. CYGIELNIK: (Inaudible) the water and sewer and --

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. PENNANT: But it's not here where (inaudible) --

MS. CYGIELNIK: -- the water and sewer --

MR. HOOPER: I'm sorry, Miss, but Ms. Pennant has not finished speaking, so please just wait and -- and let --

MS. PENNANT: Right.

MR. HOOPER: -- let her finish talking.

MS. PENNANT: (Inaudible.) Thank you, Mr. Chair. It -- it's just not clear, and

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

-- and we're -- we're supposed to vote on this, and I want to vote on something that I can read.

And right now, what I'm reading does not segregate the -- the cost of the burying of the FPL lines and so on. That language is in there. So once that is extricated, then I know exactly what the pure numbers are.

MR. HOOPER: So I don't -- I don't -- I think it's difficult to draw some plans that don't include the entire project. If you're -- if part of the scope of the work is going to be burying lines, it's going to be in the project -- it's going to be in the plans.

FP and L will have their own shop drawings and their own plans that they'll add, that they will provide for their own work. But you're going to show stuff in the -- you're going to show everything in the plan, as much as a -- a good landscape architect or -- or a civil engineer can do. So, you know, that part of it, I'm not as concerned with.

When it gets to the project itself, you know, I wish that -- and the reason these are getting pulled is because it's either vague or you're putting stuff in the application that doesn't -- that doesn't meet the eligibility.

Like you're putting FP -- burying FP and L lines. So then Ms. Pennant thinks you're going to be -- or Ms. Wallace thinks you're going to be burying FP and L lines with the money.

So what we need to make sure happens is the application is accurate, and, you know, maybe if there's a question as to whether it's eligible or not, call our staff, work with them to get something put together. Yes.

MS. PENNANT: Or include a caveat that says these dollars does not include the burying of lines and sewage and so on and so forth, so we know --

MR. HOOPER: Right.

MS. PENNANT: -- exactly what we're voting on.

MS. CASSINI: Detailed cost estimates would be very helpful --

MS. WALLACE: Yes.

MS. CASSINI: -- for future cycles. Detailed break -- broken out cost

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

estimates for all of the elements.

MR. HOOPER: Well, they're -- but they're in a planning stage right now, so coming up with detailed costs would be difficult. But, you know -- so I'm okay letting it go, but I would -- I would like them to be more specific on to which parts of the project are in the scope and which are not when they make application. Mr. Riddle, did you have something to say?

MR. RIDDLE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The project description was the actual description that was transferred over to the Broward MPO from the County. We did not want to make any changes on what was submitted to us. We had an online submittal tool. There was a two-week period where the cities could go in and refine the project scope and the project objective. And those two are following -- are below where you see the project description.

MR. HOOPER: I got you.

MR. RIDDLE: So those descriptions in the -- the description that you see in the project description section is straight from what was transferred over for that specific project from the surtax plan that was adopted in September of 2018.

MR. HOOPER: So that makes sense. So basically, they're telling you what the overall project is on the project description, and then the scope goes into accessible sidewalk, improving pedestrian lighting, innovative intersection design, crosswalks, improve safety and multi-modal -- encourage multi-modal traffic.

MR. RIDDLE: Yes, sir.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. PENNANT: But -- but for voting purposes, I don't know. And I wouldn't want any -- to be accused of voting for this as written, you know. It definitely needs to be clarified.

MR. HOOPER: Well, I'm -- I'm okay.

MS. CASSINI: So then the motion state -- statement can be just as the others. So it's eligible under 212.055(1)(d) subject to removal of any ineligible components under --

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. HOOPER: That's fine.

MS. CASSINI: -- Section 3 of the interlocal agreement.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: I think that's good.

MS. PENNANT: I'd like to make that **motion**.

MR. HOOPER: Do we have a second?

MS. LOVE: I second. Allyson.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Can we get a vote?

MS. THOMPSON: So we're voting to pass the project as eligible while removing the ineligible components?

MS. WALLACE: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Okay. Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. CAVROS: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Ron Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: And Shea Smith? Shea Smith?

MR. HOOPER: We have enough to pass that.

MS. THOMPSON: Okay. We're passing -- the vote has passed 8 to 1?

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY WITH SHEA SMITH NOT PRESENT FOR THE VOTE.**

MR. HOOPER: Okay. And let me make just one --

MS. CASSINI: 8-nothing.

MR. HOOPER: -- quick point. You know, I apologize to everybody who is feeling like they're at the dentist's office, but we're working hard, and it's our very first time at going through this process. I promise you we'll get better at it.

And I'm sure that also the applications will come in better. I mean, it's just it is what it is. So we had to pull items that we didn't quite -- either didn't understand or didn't -- or needed more questions answered. But we're trying very hard to keep this thing going and progressing forward, so.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: All right. Next go to the next item.

MS. WALLACE: Okay. The next one was another sound wall. It's ranked 80. And the Project Number is NLAU008. It's a North Lauderdale project. And this project also does not have the requisite documentation that reflects the -- that the Florida Department of Transportation noise decibel criteria has

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

been complied with for purposes of this project. Do we have anyone –

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: -- from North Lauderdale on the line?

MR. HOOPER: Is anyone from North Lauderdale on the phone? Do they –

MS. REED-HOLGUIN: Good afternoon. This is Tammy Reed-Holguin, the Community Development Director in North Lauderdale.

MR. HOOPER: Hi. Thank you for joining.

MS. REED-HOLGUIN: Thank you. Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today. Based on the discussions that we've had with the County Attorney regarding eligibility, we do understand that the sound wall does not have enough documentation at this time to be deemed as eligible, and -- however, this was a Complete Street project that was -- originated from the neighborhood with some concerns that they had to install devices for traffic calming and make some road improvements.

This road is in one of our eastern neighborhoods called the Boulevard of Champions, which is a circle -- circular roadway, and had become somewhat of a speedway for the -- the neighbors. So the project is for design only at this stage, to include Complete Street components including the expansion of the sidewalks, the removal of some oak trees that were damaging the sidewalk, and replacement of landscaping to make it more pedestrian friendly, and the reduction of -- from a two-lane to a one-lane road with possible roundabouts and other traffic calming devices.

And we also are removing the request for lighting along the roadway. That will be done (inaudible) FP and L project. So it's -- our understanding the is walls and the lighting were the two things that the -- had eligibility concerns. And we are agreeing to remove those from the scope, and we'd like consideration to move forward with the other Complete Streets components of the project.

MR. HOOPER: I've got a question for Ms. Wallace. Do –

MS. WALLACE: Yes?

MR. HOOPER: -- do the other components meet the eligibility requirement?

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. WALLACE: So the lighting, we don't have any information regarding the lighting criteria. The lighting -- we don't have a lighting justification report.

MS. CASSINI: They're removing the lighting, though.

MR. HOOPER: They removed it.

MS. WALLACE: (Inaudible.)

MS. CASSINI: They removed the lighting. They're removing --

MS. WALLACE: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: -- the walls.

MS. WALLACE: And so I guess a -- I don't know what would be required for a raised intersection. We looked at this because it was called a sound -- sound walls as the project. What would be the purpose of the raised intersection?

MR. HOOPER: It's a traffic calming --

MR. RIDDLE: Traffic calming.

MR. HOOPER: -- device.

MS. WALLACE: Oh, okay. All right. I guess the traffic calming would be eligible if it's -- if that fits. And then it says crosswalk pedestrian signal -- and pedestrian (inaudible) --

MR. HOOPER: Signal.

MS. WALLACE: -- signal. Sorry. Those appear to be eligible. I don't have an issue with those. But it was the sound wall and the lighting components --

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MS. WALLACE: -- that were problematic.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So do -- do we -- someone want to make a motion or make a recommendation --

MS. CASSINI: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: -- for a motion?

MS. CASSINI: Certainly. So it'll be the same motion as before. The Oversight Board would be approving as eligible under Section 212.055(1)(d) the municipal project for North Lauderdale 008, excluding ineligible components per Section 3 of the interlocal agreement or any other ineligible components under the Statute.

MR. FRAZIER: So **moved**. Frazier.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you. Do we have a second?

MS. LOVE: Second. Allyson.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you. Do you want to take a vote?

MS. THOMPSON: Sure. Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Ron Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: I'm sorry, Mr. Smith, can you repeat?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Okay. It's passed as eligible with -- without [sic] the exclusion of the ineligible components.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Next item.

MS. WALLACE: Okay. The next one on my list was addressed -- was part -- when the representative from Deerfield Beach spoke, she mentioned it's ranked 101 and the Project Number was DEER --

MR. RIDDLE: I'm sorry --

MS. WALLACE: -- 006.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MS. WALLACE: So --

MR. RIDDLE: 83.

MS. WALLACE: 83 as I have pulled as -- pulled by Ms. Pennant.

MS. PENNANT: Which one is this one?

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. WALLACE: But that's a Margate one for discussion, if I'm not mistaken. Right?

MS. PENNANT: Number (inaudible) –

MS. WALLACE: So mine was infrastructure project for -- well, (inaudible) Pioneer Grove infrastructure improvements is what it reflects. And this one addressed the wastewater component of what the representative from Deerfield had discussed. On 101.

MS. PENNANT: 101.

MS. CASSINI: Let me just make sure. Mr. Chair? I'm sorry.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MS. CASSINI: Okay. Angela, I had identified Wilton Manors 015, ranked 100 as the next one that you had pulled. It was combined with Oakland Park 025, which you did take care of. I don't -- I don't know if the consideration of those two went together, but I just wanted to make sure on the record.

MS. WALLACE: Because they had combined them –

MS. CASSINI: Right.

MS. WALLACE: -- right, as one –

MS. CASSINI: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: -- project. And this was the one with the signs; correct?

MS. CASSINI: Just wanted to make sure for -- on the record, because we did identify on the record that we had pulled that as an -- as -- for eligibility concerns.

MS. WALLACE: Yes.

MS. CASSINI: Okay. Did -- so we need to take a motion on it since they're still separate projects.

MS. WALLACE: Okay.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. HOOPER: And this is for 101?

MS. CASSINI: This is for 100. This is for Wilton Manor 015 –

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: -- ranked 100. It had been pulled by Angela as likely ineligible. So we'll need a vote by the Oversight Board.

MS. WALLACE: Right. And this is the Oakland Park Boulevard and Andrews intersection gateway improvements is what this was listed as. And it was -- it was also coupled with an Oakland Park -- a project that was submitted by Oakland Park. Right?

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So what are -- so I'm not clear on what the scope is here.

MS. WALLACE: So for -- and the other one was Number 55 -- was that it? No.

MR. RIDDLE: 92.

MS. WALLACE: 92. (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: Is -- is Wilton Manors here?

MS. CASSINI: They're on the phone.

MR. HOOPER: Are they on the phone?

MS. CASSINI: If Todd from Wilton Manors, or anyone else from Wilton Manors is still on the line, if you could please identify yourself as being present and hit pound 2 to be un-muted.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: Do we want to (inaudible)?

MS. WALLACE: So –

MR. HOOPER: (Inaudible) information (inaudible) see what it is.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. WALLACE: Right. That's what my notes say, that for Number 92, which is Project Number OAK025, the intent was unclear. And then for ranked 100, which is Project Number WILT015, it says gateway improvements, and gateway improvement signs and so forth that are not wayfinding signs.

So usually that's decorative signage. And lighting and features that are decorative, not wayfinding, are not eligible.

MR. HOOPER: Is Wilton Manors on the phone? Okay. Wilton Manors –

MR. GRAHAM: Hello. This is Casey Graham, City of Oakland Park. I -- I -- I don't want there to be some confusion, so if you want me to respond for Oakland Park, I am available.

MS. WALLACE: Okay. So that would be fine. Oakland Park –

MR. RIDDLE: It is a joint project between –

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: Oh.

MR. RIDDLE: -- Oakland Park and Wilton Manors.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MS. WALLACE: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: Which number was that? That's number 93 –

MS. WALLACE: So Ranked –

MR. HOOPER: 92.

MS. WALLACE: -- Number 92, and the Project Number is OAK025. And we have a representative from Oakland Park on the line.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Let's pull it up.

MR. GRAHAM: All right. I think you -- you're probably waiting for me to talk, and I'll help it move along. So we did submit some supplemental answers, because I think there was some confusion in terms of what work was entailed

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

in what we were proposing.

And it was called a gateway project, but the intention was to fund planning for the entirety of the corridor to look for improvements for vehicular, ADA compliance, landscaping, pedestrians, buses, and other multi-modal components along the corridor. It's our heaviest traveled corridor. It has a lot of non-vehicular travel. And this would be a planning study to improve those modes of non-vehicular travel, for the most part.

MR. HOOPER: How much is it?

MS. WALLACE: It says \$396,000.

MR. HOOPER: So it's a -- it's a design -- it's planning?

MS. WALLACE: Planning?

MR. RIDDLE: Planning money.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. And it's for multi-modal and --

MR. GRAHAM: And for -- yeah. And to be clear on the limits, the limits as we submitted it are from I-95 to Federal Highway. That is -- that does span Wilton Manors. That does span a part of Fort Lauderdale's municipal -- municipal boundaries. We have coordinated with them. And it's a significant length and a significant study area, and there are a lot of components to look at.

MR. HOOPER: Yes, go ahead, Ms. Cassini.

MS. CASSINI: I -- for the record, both cities submitted for the same project at the exact same amount. Just for clarity, what is the actual request? Is it only amount of \$396,000, or is it for two amounts of \$396,000?

MR. HOOPER: Good catch.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. GRAHAM: I believe the -- I believe that the \$396,000 covers the planning for both cities. I don't know if Todd is available to give his opinion, but it's my understanding that it's for the -- for both of us.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. WALLACE: So what we would need to know is whether the –

MR. DEJESUS: I'm here on the line. Okay.

MS. WALLACE: -- whether the projects are being combined and whether one municipality is taking the lead such that –

MS. PENNANT: Yeah.

MS. CASSINI: So Todd's on the line.

MS. WALLACE: -- for purposes of coordination. So if we have someone from Wilton Manors on the line, would you speak to that?

MR. DEJESUS: Yes. This is Todd with Wilton Manors.

MR. HOOPER: Is the 396,000 one project? Because there's two applications in, both for \$396,000, and they seem like they're the same project. Could you clarify?

MR. DEJESUS: We've combined them to be sort of the same project, but the limits of Oakland Park is obviously much greater than Wilton Manors.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. But is it one project –

MR. DEJESUS: Because we can only go from 95 to Andrews.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So are we approving -- have you guys -- 396,000, is that going to do the entire scope of from wherever we're talking about, 31<sup>st</sup> Avenue to Federal Highway?

MS. WALLACE: For planning. It's not design.

MR. HOOPER: For planning.

MR. GRAHAM: For planning, yes. It -- Casey Graham, Oakland Park. Our intention was 396 would cover the entire planning effort for the corridor –

MS. PENNANT: Okay. So –

MR. GRAHAM: -- both within Oakland Park's limits and our extended limits.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

141

MS. PENNANT: Okay. Mr. Chair?

MR. HOOPER: Yes, Ms. Pennant.

MS. PENNANT: Why -- why are they putting them together? I don't understand. Why can't they have separate -- separate funding? Is there a -- an allowance for us to jointly fund cities? Are we going to write the checks to both of them? How does this work?

MS. WALLACE: Right. That's why we're seeking --

MS. PENNANT: I mean, it's --

MS. WALLACE: -- clarification, because what's been submitted is the same amount, the same funding request for the same length of the corridor for two projects. At one point, we were informed that they may be combining them and it would be a joint effort.

So what we need for purposes of this board making a decision is some clarification regarding what this is and how they want to proceed do that you can make an informed decision.

MR. HOOPER: And --

MS. PENNANT: The project can be collaborative, but they should be funded separately.

MS. CASSINI: Or --

MS. PENNANT: They can --

MS. CASSINI: -- alternatively --

MS. PENNANT: -- (inaudible).

MS. CASSINI: -- I will say, Ms. Pennant, so we have a Pembroke Pines -- we have the exact same situation that happened with Projects 34 through 37, where both Pembroke Pines and Miramar submitted, for the exact same project, varying amounts.

Miramar took the lead on those projects, and now those projects are going to be combined into a single project that Miramar is going to take the lead on to

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

work collaboratively with Pembroke Pines. There's no reason why that can't be done.

We just need on the record which city is going to take the lead, and what is the total amount being requested.

MR. HOOPER: That's right.

MR. RIDDLE: Mr. Chair?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MR. RIDDLE: I did have discussions with the city manager for Oakland Park alongside with the city engineer with Oakland Park, and it was my understanding that, with Wilton Manors' assistance as a combined project, the City of Oakland Park would probably take the lead, and that both planning phase funding would be needed to do this long of a corridor. So that would result in a \$792,000 request.

MR. HOOPER: So they just broke it in half.

MR. RIDDLE: They split it up because they submitted their projects independently to the surtax plan in 2018. But it's for the same corridor, but, of course, you can only submit based on your jurisdiction. You couldn't submit one project, from my understanding, for -- that crosses other jurisdictions.

MR. HOOPER: So the cycle --

MR. RIDDLE: So that's why they wanted to combine and deliver the project --

MR. HOOPER: I got it.

MR. RIDDLE: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: Cycle 2 is in two weeks? Is that what we said?

MS. CASSINI: Two months.

MR. HOOPER: Two months?

MS. WALLACE: Two months.

MR. HOOPER: I -- we need -- we need this to be cleaned up a little bit and done -- done -- if you guys -- if Wilton Manors and Oakland Park, and if Fort Lauderdale's involved in it, too, if one of -- if one party can take the lead on this and bring us a project, tell us what the total cost is, what the total scope is, then we can make a decision. Okay?

And I don't think anyone is -- I think we're just unclear, and we want to vote on one \$396,000 project today, but it's not real clear.

MS. PENNANT: Yes. You know, I think clearly we're all about being collaborative. But I think about even the auditing implications. If we allow these cities to just converge all of these projects in one statement, how -- how do we audit it on the back end.

MS. WALLACE: That makes it easier, because one municipality gets the funding agreement and that one municipality will deliver the project.

MS. PENNANT: And --

MS. WALLACE: And the funding -- and the project would expand. They just need authorization from the other jurisdictions to implement the project within that jurisdiction.

MS. PENNANT: -- what about accountability? Do we only hold one city accountable? Should we --

MS. CASSINI: The one that's delivering.

MS. WALLACE: Yes, normally, you --

MS. PENNANT: -- (inaudible) --

MS. WALLACE: -- you hold the city that's delivering the project and receiving the money accountable for the deliverables.

MR. HOOPER: And then -- and then between the three of them, they'll have their own interlocal agreement.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: So -- so in my opinion --

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. PENNANT: And I think we need to be privy to that interlocal agreement, because the thing of -- again, there's a 30 percent goal.

MS. WALLACE: Right.

MS. PENNANT: I want to make sure that each of these cities hold up their end of the bargain.

MR. HOOPER: Well, there's only going to be one person managing it, so your 30 percent goal has got one target on it.

MS. WALLACE: Correct.

MR. HOOPER: I think it's better that it's one, from your -- from your -- from what you're talking about, and then, for me, from a planning perspective. And I -- for someone that drives Oakland Park Boulevard from University all the way to Federal Highway, on a pretty regular basis, having one thematic project makes a lot of sense to me. Especially, from 31<sup>st</sup> all the way to Federal, they have very similar -- the characteristics of that -- that street are very similar. And I think you'll find that it comes out to be a better project if they do it that way.

MS. PENNANT: Well, this is my last comment. I'm not saying they can't be collaborative, but I think from an accounting perspective, each of the cities should be getting their own monies. It should be tracked separately. That's how I see it.

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

MS. CASSINI: I think we're looking for a motion to entertain deferral to Cycle 2. And that would be for both the projects. I just want to make sure we've got this in the record. It would be for Wilton Manors 015 --

MS. WALLACE: Which is ranked 100<sup>th</sup>.

MS. CASSINI: -- thank you -- and Oakland Park 025.

MS. WALLACE: Which is ranked 92.

MS. CASSINI: Okay.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. FRAZIER: So **moved**. Ron Frazier.

MR. COOLMAN: Coolman seconds.

MR. HOOPER: Thanks. Can we take a –

MS. THOMPSON: We're voting to -- for a motion to defer to Cycle 2.

MS. CASSINI: Uh-huh.

MS. THOMPSON: Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MR. ALLEN: Wait.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: Yes.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman?

MR. HOOPER: Yes. Yes.

MR. ALLEN: Yes, this is Phil. I would -- I would concur that it would be best to have one project and one city responsible for the entire project and do that as an encouragement to support that.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Thank you. All right. Keep going with the roll call.

MS. THOMPSON: Okay. Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Ron Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

MS. THOMPSON: Vote –

MR. HOOPER: Oh. I'm sorry. Go ahead.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

MS. WALLACE: Okay. All right. So now the next one, Ranked Project -- the ranking is 101. The Project Number is DEER006. And the project name is Pioneer Grove Infrastructure Improvements slash Complete Streets. And we had a representative on the line earlier who spoke about this project and Deerfield Project 005, which involved the FPL lines.

Now, this one is the one that involves the wastewater improvements. And we just need to ensure that -- you know, that the Complete Streets elements are -- are eligible and the -- just like the FPL lines being buried, these wastewater improvements are not eligible, and to understand what this project consists of and -- and address it so that the board can make an informed decision.

MR. HOOPER: Ms. Cassini.

MS. CASSINI: So this would be the same motion that we took up on the Deerfield Beach 005. We would be -- the Oversight Board would be recommending as eligible Deerfield Beach 006 -- hold on one second -- oh, right -- as eligible under Section 212.055 of the Florida Statutes, excluding

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

ineligible components per Section 3 of the interlocal agreement.

MR. HOOPER: Does anyone want to make a motion to that?

MR. FRAZIER: This is –

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So **moved**.

MR. FRAZIER: -- Ron Frazier.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you, Mr. Frazier.

MR. COOLMAN: Doug Coolman. I will second it.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. We got Doug Coolman seconding it and Mr. Frazier making the motion. Can we get a roll call, please?

MS. THOMPSON: Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Ron Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Vote passes eligible without the ineligible components.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

MR. HOOPER: Next item?

MS. WALLACE: The next item is ranked 102 and the Project Number is PPRK008. It's Pembroke -- I mean, Pembroke Park, County -- Countyline Road stormwater improvements. And the description for the project reflects that it's for stormwater improvements for -- through commercial and industrial developments.

And the photographs, the aerial photo that's provided looks like it's through an -- like an industrial part? What is that? Or where is this? Here, it says commercial and industrial developments. And so we just wanted to understand what the project entails and ensure that it's -- we address the flow issue that we've addressed with other drainage projects.

MR. HOOPER: So Pembroke Park?

MS. CASSINI: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: Is there --

MS. CASSINI: Is there anyone on the line from Pembroke Park? And, if so, could you please hit pound 2 --

MS. WALLACE: Countyline Road.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. CASSINI: -- to be un-muted.

MR. HOOPER: (Inaudible.) No, I'm good. Thank you. Is there anyone here from Pembroke Park?

MR. RYAN: Yes. Hi, good afternoon. My name is Christopher Ryan. I'm the attorney for the Town of Pembroke Park. And I believe there are some staff members there, and one of the Commissioners should be in attendance at the meeting.

MR. HOOPER: Is there anybody in the audience?

MR. RYAN: If they're not, I can (inaudible).

MR. HOOPER: They are not.

MINUTES SECRETARY: Can he repeat his name, please?

MR. HOOPER: Could you repeat your name, please?

MR. RYAN: Yes. Christopher Ryan, R-y-a-n.

MINUTES SECRETARY: Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So I think there's a question as to the location of the storm drainage system. It looks like it's going through an industrial park. Can you give us a little bit of clarity as to the scope and the location of the work? Maybe even a description?

MR. RYAN: It -- it is a -- yes. The project is to construct a stormwater (inaudible) to connect 52<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and 56<sup>th</sup> Avenue. And it -- it's not industrial at all. It's residential in that area. There's flooding caused by the -- the -- the runoff of the street, and it creates a traffic hazard.

And, also, the -- the pathway is used -- or the -- you know, the -- the right-of-way is used for children walking back and forth to school, because there's a school on 52<sup>nd</sup> Avenue.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. RYAN: So when it gets -- when it gets accumulation of water, it's unsafe for both the vehicles and for the kids. This would alleviate that by allowing the

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

150

stormwater to be drained into the County's drainage system on 56 -- 56<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. I think -- I think that's pretty clear.

MS. WALLACE: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: And it meets eligibility; correct?

MS. WALLACE: Correct. As long as --

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: -- I -- we just wanted clarification for purposes of --

MR. HOOPER: Yeah. Uh-huh.

MS. WALLACE: Right. Okay.

MR. HOOPER: Sure.

MS. WALLACE: The board's actions.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Do we have a motion to approve?

MR. COOLMAN: So **moved**. Doug Coolman.

MR. HOOPER: Thanks, Doug. Do we have a second?

MS. PENNANT: I'll second.

MS. LOVE: Allyson. Second.

MR. FRAZIER: Second. Frazier.

MR. HOOPER: I think that was --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: -- Ron Frazier just seconded it. Okay. Can we get a vote?

MS. THOMPSON: Okay. We're voting to approve.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MS. THOMPSON: Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Ron Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Vote passes unanimously for approval.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

MS. CASSINI: Okay.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Next item.

MS. WALLACE: All right. The last one that I pulled for eligibility and seeking -- this one is seeking information is Ranked Number 107, and it's Margate MARG033, a pedestrian -- pedestrian bridge to Firefighters Park. So I wasn't sure regarding, I guess, the property and the -- that it was traversing and the ownership of property and whether this is public right-of-way.

I was hoping that the municipalities representatives could provide some information regarding, I guess -- you know, I guess supporting that this is a public project or public property that would meet the criteria. If we have someone present from the city?

MR. HOOPER: Looks like it. Yes, sir.

MR. COLLINS: Thank you. My name is Mark Collins. I'm the Public Works Director for the City of Margate. So if I can get some clarification on the question. Was it on the bridge or the ownership of the property for the greenway trail?

MS. WALLACE: So I guess both. So is this, you know, on public property and a public right of way and, if so --

MR. COLLINS: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: -- that it's not benefiting private property.

MR. COLLINS: Okay. The bridge is the key -- key component to all three of the projects that Margate is requesting, one being Winfield Boulevard, which comes up to the canal, which is owned by the City of Margate. Then it goes over that to an easement that FPL runs, which is our other park, which is the greenway trail.

According to Broward County property appraisers, that property underneath the transmission lines belongs to the City of Margate. I also have found a quit claim deed deeding all of that property over to the city. And I do have an

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

email from FPL saying that they would have no problem whatsoever with us putting a -- a pathway past the park underneath there as long -- and we'd have to enter into an ILA with them.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. COLLINS: If that answers your question.

MS. WALLACE: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: Does it meet --

MS. WALLACE: Yeah --

MR. HOOPER: -- eligibility?

MS. WALLACE: -- yeah, that addresses -- yeah, that addresses my concerns, yes.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Thank you, sir.

MR. COLLINS: Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Can we get a motion? It meets eligibility.

MS. CASSINI: So -- and there are --

MR. COOLMAN: So **moved**.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

(Laughter.)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: That was Doug Coolman. Do we have a second?

MS. LOVE: I second. Allyson.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

MS. THOMPSON: We've voting to -- for eligibility. Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

MR. HOOPER: (Inaudible.)

MR. CAVROS: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Ron Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Vote passes as eligible.

MR. HOOPER: Fantastic.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. WALLACE: Okay. That was all of the pulls that I had with regard to eligibility concerns. And the other pulls were from board members with projects that they would like to discuss.

**7 - MUNICIPAL REHABILITATION AND MAINTENANCE PROJECTS  
PULLED BECAUSE OF ELIGIBILITY CONCERNS WILL BE TAKEN UP BY  
MUNICIPALITY**

**A - DISCUSSION, Q AND A, PRESENTATIONS BY MUNICIPAL COUNSEL  
AND/OR STAFF.**

**B - MEMBERS, IN CONSULTATION WITH SURTAX GENERAL COUNSEL,  
WILL MAKE INDIVIDUAL MOTIONS REGARDING ELIGIBILITY ON A  
PROJECT-BY-PROJECT BASIS**

MS. CASSINI: And, just for the record, because I know we have it on the agenda, there are no issues with eligibility for rehabilitation and maintenance projects, so we're going to move straight into Oversight Board questions on municipal capital projects. We'll be moving through those in rank order.

MS. WALLACE: Right.

MR. HOOPER: So we don't have any more under this -- this list? We have no more pulls?

MS. CASSINI: No, we --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: -- so we don't have any eligibility pulls. Now there -- we're just into question and answer. And so we're in the very last stretch.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: And so the projects that were pulled that were municipal capital will be dealt with first, and then we'll move into the projects that were pulled --

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: -- that were rehabilitation and maintenance for Oversight Board member questions.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

**8 - INDIVIDUAL MUNICIPAL CAPITAL PROJECT DISCUSSION - Q AND A. PROJECTS PULLED FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION WILL BE TAKEN UP BY MUNICIPALITY.**

**A - DISCUSSION, Q AND A, PRESENTATIONS BY MUNICIPAL COUNSEL AND/OR STAFF.**

**B - MEMBERS, IN CONSULTATION WITH SURTAX GENERAL COUNSEL, WILL MAKE INDIVIDUAL MOTIONS REGARDING ELIGILITY AND MAY OFFER RECOMMENDATIONS ABOUT PROJECTS THAT WILL BE INCLUDED IN THE TRANSMISSION FOR ACTION ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE COUNTY COMMISSION**

MS. WALLACE: And the first one that I have as pulled was Number 38, Project Number FORT108. That was pulled by Ms. Pennant.

MS. PENNANT: Number 38.

MS. CASSINI: And at this time, I would –

MS. PENNANT: (Inaudible.)

MS. CASSINI: -- also -- I would also like just a moment for our GIS team to go ahead and bring up the municipal dashboard, because this is also an opportunity for us to address the general question that was -- and I don't -- is this okay? Okay.

MR. HOOPER: Go ahead.

MS. CASSINI: That Mr. Frazier brought up, where he would very much like to see the location of every project that is in an underserved ZIP Code. So while Mr. Riddle is talking about the project, specifically, and attempting to address Ms. Pennant's questions, we'll also have the dashboard available behind that if you'd like to drill down and get a little bit more granular. Okay?

MR. HOOPER: But I think -- did -- Mr. Frazier wants to see if -- how all of them fit in; right?

MS. CASSINI: Correct. But I just wanted for -- for all Oversight Board members' benefit, and those members of the public, we do have this

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

dashboard available.

MR. HOOPER: Right.

MS. CASSINI: Every single –

MR. HOOPER: Right.

MS. CASSINI: -- project that has been considered today is mapped in this GIS dashboard –

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MS. CASSINI: -- with information. And so if any Oversight Board member wishes to see kind of a street-level view or a little bit more information than what's available on the two-dimensional map that you -- that you received, this is the time that we can do that. That's just an opportunity.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. And on the -- on the items that we pulled that you guys didn't pull for eligibility, they're still being discussed and were not a part of the Consent Agenda; correct?

MS. WALLACE: Correct. So they have to be voted on.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. All right.

MS. PENNANT: So –

MR. HOOPER: So what's the first one?

MS. PENNANT: -- so I think you have me as 38, but I also had an issue with 39. I thought that was the one in particular.

MS. WALLACE: Right. We were just going to take them in order, 38 –

MS. PENNANT: Right.

MS. WALLACE: -- and then 39 and -- okay.

MS. PENNANT: Well, for both, I just thought the cost was just too high. I thought the cost on planning for a project, that project in particular, seemed unusually high. And -- and the same thing for 39.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. CASSINI: Mr. Chair, those comments can be transmitted to the County Commission for their consideration when they take up these projects. I can make sure that that's noted for both of these projects if you all still -- you'd still find them eligible, but you would just be giving --

MR. HOOPER: I got you.

MS. CASSINI: -- commentary --

MR. HOOPER: I got you.

MS. CASSINI: -- to the County Commission about your concerns as to the costs.

MR. HOOPER: I got you. Okay. So -- and then my -- just for -- for clarification --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: -- on the Andrews Avenue one-way pairs, that project goes, I think, from 17<sup>th</sup> Street to Sunrise Boulevard. And so from a planning perspective, they're -- they're looking at one-way pairs, they're looking at multi-modal, dedicated transit lanes. There's a lot of scope of work.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: As a matter of fact, I think that's just -- that's just part of the total planning costs.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh. Right.

MR. HOOPER: I think --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: -- this is just to -- this is just to see if the -- it's a feasibility study or something like that. I --

MS. WALLACE: Correct.

MR. HOOPER: -- I know what -- I've heard about this project, so I know

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

something about it. So –

MS. WALLACE: And it would have to be coordinated in conjunction with various County departments. Transit –

MR. HOOPER: It's a beach project.

MS. WALLACE: -- Transit and Public Works, because, you know, Andrews is a County road, so –

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Uh-huh.

MS. WALLACE: -- it would require significant coordination with the County. And so I guess it's planning, and we would have to work out the details with the -- with the city. So while this -- this type of planning project is eligible, the details will have to be worked out with negotiations, and it would have to be -- there would be significant coordination.

MS. PENNANT: And that's really my concern, because it says feasibility study. And I'm thinking what -- what would cause the cost to be so high. And on the other one, a detailed map of locations without mast arms. And I just would like to get a better sense of the spread of it. If we're spending this much money, I wanted to know exactly where these –

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. PENNANT: -- mast arms were being located.

MR. HOOPER: So let's do -- let's go through them one at a time, because I think we have to vote on these, okay? So on Number 38, the feasibility study, I believe goes into modeling and a lot of other things. It -- I –

MS. CASSINI: And also, for the record, that one is connected with Number 88.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: Those two are going to be delivered together, based on the testimony that was given to you all earlier.

MR. HOOPER: Right.

MS. CASSINI: So the cost of 30 -- of 38 and 88 would be combined.

MR. HOOPER: (Inaudible.) I find it to be fairly reasonable, but --

MS. PENNANT: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: Is there other comments from the members on Number 38? Okay. We need to --

MS. CASSINI: We need a motion.

MR. HOOPER: -- we need a motion for eligibility.

MR. ALLEN: Can we go back -- this is Phil.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MR. ALLEN: What are we -- are we talking about project ranking 38, Coral Springs?

MR. HOOPER: No. We're on 30 -- we're on 38 Fort Lauderdale; correct?

MS. CASSINI: You're on the rehabilitation and maintenance list, Phil. We're back on the capital.

MR. ALLEN: Oh.

MS. CASSINI: It's okay. There's a lot. There's a lot of projects. So we're on the MPO's prioritization list, so this is municipal capital ranked 38th. This is going to be the Andrews Avenue widening and one-way pairs feasibility study.

MR. ALLEN: Oh, okay.

MR. HOOPER: Fort Lauderdale 108.

So did we get a motion?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: Can we get -- will someone make a motion as to its eligibility, please?

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

161

MS. WALLACE: It's Project Ranked Number 38, Project Number FORT108. It would be a motion to approve as eligible.

MS. LOVE: This is Allyson. I make the **motion** to approve as eligible.

MR. HOOPER: Do we have a second?

MR. FRAZIER: Second. Frazier.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Can we vote?

MR. FRAZIER: Second. Frazier.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

MS. THOMPSON: We're voting for eligibility. Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love? Allyson Love? Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman? Doug Coolman?

MR. HOOPER: This is so hard.

MS. CASSINI: Come back to him.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Ronald Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Back to Allyson Love. Back to Doug Coolman.

MR. HOOPER: She might have taken a biology break.

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Ms. Pennant.

MS. PENNANT: I -- I want to say no. I -- I'm just having a problem with spending this much money for a feasibility study and it's -- it's throwing me off.

MS. CASSINI: So I just want to remind you all, because I see that Angela is looking at something. So you are approving the project as eligible under the Statute, and you are transmitting your concerns with the costs to the Commission for their consideration on June 16<sup>th</sup>. But right now, we're just voting on eligibility.

MS. PENNANT: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MS. LOVE: This is Allyson. I got kicked out and had to come back on. But my vote was to have it as eligible.

MS. THOMPSON: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

MS. THOMPSON: So voted passes unanimously for eligibility.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

MR. HOOPER: Okay So now we can go to the -- Number 39.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh. Which is OAK023. Oakland Park project that was pulled by Ms. Pennant.

MS. PENNANT: Yeah, same concern. I -- the map didn't show equitable distribution, in my -- in my opinion. I just didn't see where we're distributing all of these new mast arms. And it seemed like a lot of money to spend, where it seemed like the concentration was just in one area.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. PENNANT: That's my concern.

MS. CASSINI: So I know it's difficult to see on the screen in front of you --

MS. PENNANT: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: -- but if -- if I could ask Ernesto to just kind of drill down and show the various locations of those mast arms as quickly as you can, just to see if that helps Ms. Pennant with the distribution. And also, obviously, if anyone from the City of Oakland Park is on the line and you're like to press pound 2 and assist in describing the geographic distribution of the mast arms that are being requested, please feel free, and you will be un-muted.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Are there any other comments from members? Okay. Let's -- let's --

MR. GRAHAM: Hello?

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MR. GRAHAM: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: Yes?

MR. GRAHAM: Sorry. This is Casey Graham, Director of Engineering in the City of Oakland Park. I would just like to address the distribution question. The intention of this projects is actually to replace all signalized intersections that have existing span wire as opposed to mast arms. And so we've highlighted all of those particular intersections. So in the area of the city that

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

doesn't show any proposed work, that's not that we are excluding those from the work effort. It's just that they are -- they either don't have a signal or they're already a mast arm.

MS. PENNANT: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

MS. PENNANT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Could we get a -- could someone make a motion to eligibility, please?

MS. WALLACE: So it would be rank -- Ranked Project 64, Project Number OAK00 --

MS. CASSINI: No.

MS. WALLACE: No? Oh.

MR. HOOPER: This is for OA --

MS. CASSINI: This is for 39.

MS. WALLACE: 39? I went to the next one. Sorry. Project Rank 39, OAK023. It would be a motion to approve the project as eligible.

MR. HOOPER: Is there a motion?

MR. ALLEN: So **moved**. This is Phil.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you. Second? Anyone?

MS. LOVE: Second. Allyson.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

MS. THOMPSON: Vote passing for eligibility. We will have Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

165

MS. LOVE: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Ron Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Vote passes unanimously for eligibility.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

MS. WALLACE: Okay. The next ranked project that was pulled is Ranked 64, and that's another Oakland Park project, OAK007. And the project description or name says CSX and FEC crossing safety studies. And it was pulled by Ms. Pennant.

MS. PENNANT: I was in a pulling mood.

(Laughter.)

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. PENNANT: Oh, my God.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. PENNANT: Again, I think I wanted to see the distribution. It wasn't clear to me where these sidewalks were distributed.

MS. WALLACE: No. It's –

MR. HOOPER: No.

MS. WALLACE: -- railroad crossing improvements for -- it's a study –

MS. PENNANT: But –

MS. WALLACE: -- to install safety improvements at railroad crossings.

MS. PENNANT: -- but it also talks about construction of new sidewalks.

MR. HOOPER: No, that's below.

MS. PENNANT: Are you looking at 65?

MR. HOOPER: No, just 64.

MS. CASSINI: 64.

MS. WALLACE: Just 64 was the one that was pulled.

MS. PENNANT: Okay. No. So –

MS. WALLACE: So you're good?

MS. PENNANT: -- my question was on 65.

MS. WALLACE: Okay.

MS. PENNANT: So –

MS. WALLACE: So can we get a motion to approve as eligible the project that's ranked 64? And the project name is OAK –

MS. PENNANT: No, no, no.

MS. WALLACE: No?

MS. PENNANT: Sorry. Again, it's the studies again. The cost –

MS. WALLACE: Oh, it's the study?

MS. PENNANT: -- of the studies –

MS. WALLACE: Okay.

MS. PENNANT: -- just seem exorbitant to me. Exorbitant. The studies was an issue to me –

MS. WALLACE: Okay.

MS. PENNANT: -- yeah.

MR. HOOPER: So I guess we can forward that comment.

MS. WALLACE: Correct. We can forward the comment regarding the -- the cost –

MS. PENNANT: Cost.

MS. WALLACE: -- to the County Commission.

MR. HOOPER: (Inaudible.) Okay.

MS. WALLACE: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: Can someone make a motion to -- to vote on this for its eligibility, please?

MS. WALLACE: So it would be Number 64 in rank. OAKL007 would be the project. And it would be a motion to approve it as eligible.

MR. HOOPER: Do we have a motion?

MR. FRAZIER: So **moved** by Frazier.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

MS. PENNANT: Second.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

MS. THOMPSON: We're voting to approve motion for eligibility. Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Ronald Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Vote passes unanimously for eligibility.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

MS. WALLACE: Okay. The next project pulled was Rank 66, and it's Hollywood project HOLL038. And –

MR. HOOPER: Which number?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. WALLACE: Do you have -- you don't have that one pulled?

MS. PENNANT: Well, I had a question on it, too. I want –

MS. WALLACE: I think it ws Ms. Pennant.

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. WALLACE: I thought –

MS. PENNANT: I did.

MS. WALLACE: Okay.

MS. PENNANT: (Inaudible.) It -- it's, again, about the distribution of the sidewalks. The map wasn't clear. It seemed like it's just (inaudible).

MR. HOOPER: So now is -- is this 66?

MS. PENNANT: 65.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Because –

MS. CASSINI: (Inaudible) 65. We already voted on 65 (inaudible).

MS. WALLACE: Right. This was 66.

MS. CASSINI: And 66 was already voted on as eligible. We didn't pull it.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. WALLACE: Oh. Oh, I had it written as pulled. Okay.

MS. CASSINI: The next one is 68.

MR. HOOPER: So –

MS. WALLACE: Right. I have 68 –

MR. HOOPER: -- Ms. –

MS. WALLACE: -- pulled.

MR. HOOPER: -- Pennant, do you –

MS. PENNANT: So -- so six -- 65 is -- was -- was voted on?

MS. WALLACE: Yes.

MS. CASSINI: Yes, but you can transmit –

MS. PENNANT: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: -- any questions or concerns that you have.

MS. PENNANT: Yeah, can I see the map again? I'm more concerned about distribution of some of these projects, that they're not always in the same neighborhood.

MS. CASSINI: If there's anyone from the City of Coral Springs that would like to speak to this question of distribution, even though I know that this project has already been voted on as eligible, if you could please un-mute your line by pressing pound 2 and addressing Ms. Pennant's question.

MS. PENNANT: Okay. It just seems sometimes that some of these projects are just always on the west side, and I'm not seeing enough on the east side. And that's, I guess, my quandary. They're building up sidewalks in an area that I believe is -- I haven't seen them. And so that's -- that's the thing that I'm always concerned about, that there is equitability.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

171

MS. WALLACE: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: Hey, can someone mute their phone, please?

MS. PENNANT: That was my -- my concern. I wanted to see the map. I -- I don't see it as being equitable, but I guess they know where their sidewalks are not doing so well. You see nothing on the east side.

MS. WALLACE: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: So we're looking for a motion for eligibility on Coral Springs -- sorry. We already have --

MS. WALLACE: We have (inaudible).

MS. CASSINI: -- never mind. Right. You're good.

MS. WALLACE: And you said we voted on 66, which was Hollywood, so the next one I have as one that was pulled for discussion by Ms. Pennant was ranked Number 68, and it's LLAK016.

MS. PENNANT: I -- no, I didn't pull every one (inaudible).

MS. WALLACE: 68? This one is Northwest 50<sup>th</sup> Avenue improvements, planning, beautification, traffic calming, drainage improvements.

MR. HOOPER: So let's make a -- if you didn't pull it, let's go -- it might have just --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: -- a mistake.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: Let's go ahead and make a motion.

MS. PENNANT: I don't recall.

MR. HOOPER: Do you want to make a motion to approve for eligibility?  
Does anybody?

MS. PENNANT: I'd like to make a motion that we approve this project for eligibility.

MR. HOOPER: Do we have a second?

MS. LOVE: Second. Allyson.

MS. THOMPSON: Okay. We're voting for eligibility approval. Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Ronald Frazier? Ronald Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: The vote passes unanimously –

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

MS. THOMPSON: -- for eligibility.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

MR. HOOPER: Next item?

MS. WALLACE: Okay. The next ranked project was 69, and it's a Sunrise project, Project Number SUNR075. It was pulled by Mr. Smith. And the project name says Oakland Park Boulevard multi-use path from Sawgrass Expressway to east city limits.

MR. SMITH: So, if I can -- if I can comment. This is -- this is Mr. Smith. I -- I pulled this project for discussion purposes. It actually has an excellent description of how the multi-use path and other facilities are going to connect to other paths and features, and how it's going to be used. So I just bring it up as an example.

I mean, there was lots of discussion today about, you know, bike lanes and -- and so forth. And something that I've noticed, you know, in my use of bike lanes and just in general, they're really not that useful if they're not overall connected to, you know, systematically throughout the cities and then the County.

So I just wanted to bring up this concept of, you know, how are these bike paths and -- and multi-modal facilities going to be ultimately connected to one another, both in the cities and then countywide.

I think it's just really important that we have that view as we go through this -- this process, because we're -- we're involved in this over the longer term. I think it's one of the more exciting things we're able to do.

And I just want to make sure that we have a viewpoint of getting things more connected than what they are now, because there's a lot of bike and multi-modal facilities that don't go anywhere right now. So I just kind of wanted to bring it up and -- and say it was a great description, and it seemed like the way the County was analyzing that, I think that's the way we should look at all these project when we're analysis them from a multi-modal perspective.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

So I just kind of wanted to bring it up for commentary from that perspective.

MR. HOOPER: And now would you like to make a motion to approve it?

MR. SMITH: I will make such a **motion**.

MR. COOLMAN: Doug Coolman will second.

MS. THOMPSON: Voting for eligibility for approval. Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Ronald Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Shea Smith?

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Passes unanimously for approval.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

MR. HOOPER: Shea, I agree with you, too, by the way. Next item?

MS. CASSINI: So the next items that I have that was pulled for Q and A was Margate 047. This is ranked Number 83.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: I'm sorry, but I don't have a notation on who pulled that item –

MS. WALLACE: Ms. Pennant.

MS. CASSINI: -- Angela. Ah, Ms. Pennant.

MS. PENNANT: I –

MS. WALLACE: Bicycle and pedestrian –

MS. PENNANT: -- read the -- read the record. I don't know if I pulled it.

MS. WALLACE: -- bicycle and pedestrian greenway infrastructure, pulled by Ms. Pennant. Number 83.

MS. PENNANT: I think there -- I had a question with the solar operated call stations and benches and exercises stations. Somehow, that didn't seem to jive with our requirements. It sounds good, but it doesn't sound like it is in line with eligibility requirements.

MS. WALLACE: Right. And so -- and we have a notation from the staff review that reflects that the parameters of the project have to be clarified prior to contracting.

And so while the bicycle and pedestrian and greenway infrastructure would, there could -- you know, depending on what's being proposed, some of the elements may not be eligible, and we could work that out during the contract negotiations for the funding agreement.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. HOOPER: You want to make a motion that way?

MS. CASSINI: So that's the -- that's the motion.

MR. HOOPER: That would be a good motion.

MS. CASSINI: So --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: -- the Oversight Board would be approving as eligible Margate 047, ranked Number 83, eligible under Section 212.055 of Florida Statutes, excluding any ineligible elements or components per Section 3 of the interlocal agreement.

MR. ALLEN: So **moved**.

MR. CAVROS: Ms. Wallace?

MS. WALLACE: Yes?

MS. PENNANT: Second.

MR. CAVROS: This is George Cavros.

MINUTES SECRETARY: Who made the motion? Who made the motion?

MR. CAVROS: If you could --

MR. HOOPER: (Inaudible.)

MR. CAVROS: -- do me the favor, just explain how the greenway project is consistent with the state statute.

MS. WALLACE: So the greenways project is -- because it -- it's bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, we've determined that that would be eligible because it is a -- a mode -- it provides for the modes of transportation.

MR. CAVROS: Well, thank you for the explanation. My understanding was that it had to be related to the -- to a road, but apparently that is not the case.

MS. WALLACE: The greenway paths are -- while they don't accommodate

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

vehicles like cars and trucks, they do accommodate bicycle and pedestrian, similar to sidewalks. And we determined that the greenways projects would be eligible under the Statute.

MS. PENNANT: And for the –

MR. CAVROS: And –

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: Go ahead, Ms. Pennant.

MS. PENNANT: Well, I'm just –

MR. CAVROS: Yes. I just -- yeah.

MS. PENNANT: -- for the record, it's not that I'm against any projects that is good for the environment or increases the health and well-being of residents. I just want to make sure that how we spend these tax dollars is consistent with the eligibility requirements.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MS. PENNANT: That's all.

MS. WALLACE: Got you.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So we had like –

MR. SMITH: Can I make a comment also. Mr. -- Mr. Chair, when -- when there's a break in action, can I comment also? This is -- this is Shea.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Can we -- let -- let's get through this vote, and I'll -- I'll let you talk right after that. We just had a second, but I don't know who -- who made the second.

MS. PENNANT: I did.

MR. HOOPER: You did? Who made the –

MINUTES SECRETARY: You seconded?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MINUTES SECRETARY: Who made the motion?

MR. ALLEN: I made the motion.

MS. CASSINI: Mr. Allen.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Mr. Allen made the motion. Ms. Pennant made the second.

MS. PENNANT: Yeah.

MR. HOOPER: Motion for approval.

MS. THOMPSON: We've voting for motion for approval. Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes, but I want to comment after the vote.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: No.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. THOMPSON: Ronald Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: The vote passes 8 to 1.

**VOTE PASSES 8 TO 1 WITH GEORGE CAVROS VOTING NO.**

MR. HOOPER: Okay. I think Shea wanted to say something, and Doug Coolman, I'm going to say. So, Shea.

MR. SMITH: Well, it's just a couple -- a couple quick things. One thing is that I think as we're -- we're forward looking, and what is the -- what is the County going to look like in the longer term, we need to build out and preserve alternative means and paths. And we do talk about these things in terms of bicycles and pedestrians, but I would argue that multi-modal is going to include all sorts of other --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. SMITH: -- vehicles and ways to get around, personal transport that hasn't even been contemplated yet. But we're not going to have the facilities unless we start thinking about those things now.

And I think as we get congest -- more congested over the years, even electric vehicles and even, you know, no matter what we do, even -- even if they're self-driving, we're always going to have more of a population. People are going to be looking for alternative means to get around. And so I see the greenways in that vein, connecting the dots of -- of other ways to get around the County.

MS. WALLACE: It's a road without cars.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Mr. Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yeah, if you'll pull the drawing back up, my question had to do with the -- the limits of the project goes all the way down and then doesn't

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

connect back into the community at that cul-de-sac. I don't understand how that -- why they wouldn't do that.

MS. WALLACE: Why we wouldn't extend it longer? Well, the -- one of the project notes from the County reflects that the parameters of the project have to be defined prior to contracting, so that's something we're going to have to work out. What -- are you suggesting that you make the recommendation -- are you -- did you want to make a recommendation regarding that, Mr. Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yeah, I think that the green sausage or whatever you want to call that --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. COOLMAN: -- should connect into the --

MR. HOOPER: (Inaudible.)

MR. COOLMAN: -- cul-de-sac.

MR. HOOPER: You already won. You already got the vote.

MS. WALLACE: I think he wanted to offer an explanation?

MR. COLLINS: I just wanted to --

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. COLLINS: -- offer an explanation. It'll be real quick.

MR. HOOPER: Sure.

MR. COLLINS: It -- it goes down to the end, and, as I said before, the connectivity is the bridge. That's what connects so that the children get to -- from the Winfield housing area, over the bridge, to the schools. This is all for a safe route for children to be able to get to schools as opposed to going out on State Road 7.

MR. HOOPER: Makes good sense.

MR. COLLINS: So it kind of all connects together. It doesn't really dead-end

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

there. It goes over the bridge, should the bridge get approved.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

MS. WALLACE: All right. So the –

MR. HOOPER: Next -- next item.

MS. WALLACE: -- next project was ranked 85, and the Project Number is TAMA001, and it was pulled by Mr. Coolman. It's a multi-modal planning study slash master plan for the City of Tamarac.

MR. HOOPER: Doug?

MR. COOLMAN: Yeah, what was that number again? TMA18?

MR. HOOPER: Number –

MS. WALLACE: TAMA001. It's ranked 85. If you go in order of the rankings of the projects, it's Number 85.

MR. COOLMAN: You sent me an explanation -- give me that number again, please?

MR. HOOPER: It's ranked Number 85. It's Tamarac.

MR. COOLMAN: Oh, (inaudible).

MR. HOOPER: It's a –

MR. COOLMAN: I don't -- I don't have a record of pulling that. What's the number? TAM what?

MS. WALLACE: TAMA001. It's Number 85 if you go in ranked order down the list. Did you have that, too, Gretchen?

MR. COOLMAN: Well, I pulled -- TAMA14 is the one I pulled.

MS. WALLACE: Okay. So do we have a motion to approve as eligible Ranked Project 85, which is TAMA001?

MR. HOOPER: Do we have –

MR. COOLMAN: I would –

MR. HOOPER: You want to make a motion?

MR. COOLMAN: -- I would so **move**. I didn't pull it.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Thanks. Is there a second?

MS. LOVE: Allyson. I second.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you. Do you want to do the -- take a shot at it?

MS. CASSINI: So the Oversight Board would be approving as eligible TAMA001, ranked 85<sup>th</sup>, as eligible under Section 212.055(1)(d).

MR. HOOPER: Just need to take a vote.

MS. CASSINI: Oh, I'm so sorry. I apologize. Chair Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. CASSINI: It's been a long day.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MS. CASSINI: Vice Mayor [sic] Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MS. CASSINI: George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Yes.

MS. CASSINI: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MS. CASSINI: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. CASSINI: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: Yes.

MS. CASSINI: Ronald Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

MS. CASSINI: And Shea Smith?

MR. HOOPER: Dr. Kelley?

MS. CASSINI: Oh.

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MS. CASSINI: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. CASSINI: Okay. We have a unanimous vote.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

MS. WALLACE: Okay. The –

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Thank you.

MS. WALLACE: -- next ranked project was Number 90, Project Number MIRA025, pulled by Ms. Pennant. And that is for Pembroke Road bike lanes design.

MS. PENNANT: I -- again, I was curious about distribution on that one. I also thought -- thought the cost was a lot.

MR. HOOPER: It looks –

MS. PENNANT: I wanted to see how long the bike lane was. Okay. All right. Okay. It seemed pretty expansive. Okay. All right. I'm good.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. WALLACE: Okay. So do we have a motion to approve Project Ranked Number 90, Project Number MIRA025, as eligible?

MS. PENNANT: I'd like to make a **motion** that Project 90 on the ranking scale is eligible, meets the eligibility requirements.

MR. FRAZIER: Second. Frazier.

MS. THOMPSON: Voting for eligibility. Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Yes, but with a comment afterwards.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Ronald Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Vote passes 8 to 1.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Thank you, Chair. I -- just a quick comment as we go through these projects. I'm a big fan of bike lanes and greenways, and I think they're critically important in connectivity, and also relieving congestion. You know, the statute speaks to -- to roads and bridges.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. CAVROS: And, you know, to suggest -- you know, the -- the -- (inaudible) just a greenway is -- is, you know, can be interpreted as a road or a bridge is a bit attenuated to me. So I -- you know, I just want to, for the record, say that if -- if we can make somewhat attenuated determinations like that, then I think infrastructure like electric vehicles and, you know, maybe being a little less stringent with other forward-thinking and -- and infrastructure that improves connectivity. I think it's within the power of this board to do that. That's all. Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

MR. HOOPER: Next item?

MS. WALLACE: Okay. The next one was 90 -- 91, Sunrise SUNR061, pulled by Ms. Pennant. Complete Streets master plan element bike lanes for design.

MS. PENNANT: Yes. It's again bicycle lanes. You know, I guess I'm having a little challenge with we're spending so much money on the bike lanes, and I really want to see which segment of the population is benefitting from this. I know not everybody has vehicles.

And so I guess my concern all the time is when I see these bike lanes on the west side, I feel like it's more for exercise than it is for transportation. And to

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

the point that was made earlier, you know, the bicycles really aren't the mode of transportation, but in some communities, it really is.

MS. WALLACE: It is. Uh-huh.

MS. PENNANT: And so when I'm seeing that these bike lanes are on the side of a city where I know there are a lot more cars and bikes aren't used with such prevalence, that's bothersome to me. You know, we're spending a lot of money on the west side to provide bike lanes, and on the east side, where people ride a lot of bikes, we have no bike lanes, you know. And so that's really my challenge. That's my challenge.

MS. WALLACE: Okay. So –

MS. PENNANT: That's my challenge. It doesn't strictly meet eligibility, but yet people are using bikes for transportation, but more on the west -- on the east side, not on the west side.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MS. PENNANT: And so we're -- we're chunking off, you know, large portions of these dollars to provide exercise bikes for people and not so much transportation. That's that it feels like.

MS. WALLACE: Right. So these are for bike lanes –

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have a –

MS. WALLACE: -- that are in the -- actually on the roadway. And so the bike lanes are eligible, but we -- we'll make the point to the municipalities and to the Board that you're recommending that there be more bike lanes implemented east rather -- you know, in addition to the ones that are being recommended on the west side of the County. Is that correct?

MS. PENNANT: Yes, that's –

MS. WALLACE: Okay.

MS. PENNANT: -- my sentiment –

MS. WALLACE: Okay.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. PENNANT: -- for sure.

MS. WALLACE: So do we have a motion to approve as –

MR. COOLMAN: I'd (Inaudible.)

MS. WALLACE: Sorry. Mr. Allen?

MR. COOLMAN: I'd like to make a comment.

MS. WALLACE: Yes.

MR. COOLMAN: I'd like to make a comment. This is Doug Coolman. I think the planners made a lot of effort for more bike lanes on the east. And the reason we had to do it is we didn't have them. And we're making a lot of headway in getting more bike lanes on the east and going to the extremes in that effect.

So even though we're now putting them out west, I think that's a good thing. And we're having to retrofit the east. And we've done a lot of work in that area. So I'm not that much of a biker, but I do know that there's a lot of effort, certainly in the City of Fort Lauderdale, for improving our image as a bike city, making it more safe. So I think we're at least getting ahead of the game out west. We're so far behind in the east, we're trying -- trying to play catch up. That's my only comment.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Thank you.

MINUTES SECRETARY: Was that Mr. Coolman?

MS. WALLACE: That was Mr. Coolman.

MR. HOOPER: That -- do we -- have we -- you need to make a motion on this one?

MS. WALLACE: A motion on the project that's ranked Number 91, Project Number –

MR. HOOPER: Can we get a motion?

MS. WALLACE: -- SUNR0 –

MR. HOOPER: -- for eligibility?

MS. WALLACE: -- 61 as eligible.

MR. COOLMAN: Doug Coolman. I'll **move**.

MS. LOVE: Allyson. Second.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Allyson Love second.

MS. THOMPSON: Voting for eligibility of Item Number 91. Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love? Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: It's a no for me. It's -- I don't -- I don't see -- no. I don't like it.

MS. THOMPSON: Okay. Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Ronald Frazier?

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Vote passes 8 to 1, Chair.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

**VOTE PASSES 8 TO 1 WITH ANTHEA PENNANT VOTING NO.**

MS. WALLACE: The next ranked project is Number 97, and the Project Number is WPRK008 for West Park. And it was pulled by Chairman Hooper.

MR. HOOPER: Let me see why I pulled it here.

MS. WALLACE: It says Southwest 21<sup>st</sup> Street improvements from US-441 to 40<sup>th</sup> Avenue. This is design, \$24,000. But that seems kind of low.

MS. CASSINI: It's actually 240. That's an error.

MS. WALLACE: Oh.

MS. CASSINI: It's 240 on the -- on the sheet, it's 240 here, and it's 240 on one matrix but not the other. It was just a --

MR. HOOPER: That may have been why --

MS. CASSINI: -- typographical error.

MR. HOOPER: -- I pulled it, because I --

MS. WALLACE: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: -- I can't think of any other reason --

MS. WALLACE: The 24?

MR. HOOPER: -- why I would have pulled it. So --

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. WALLACE: Okay. So want to –

MR. HOOPER: -- just for clarification, we're approving 240,000?

MS. CASSINI: Correct.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. PENNANT: So 92?

MS. WALLACE: 97. So it's ranked Number 97, Project Number WPRK008, and it would be a motion for -- to approve as eligible this project.

MR. HOOPER: Can we get a motion to approve?

MR. COOLMAN: Doug Coolman. Move --

MR. FRAZIER: Moved.

MR. COOLMAN: One of us **move**, one of us seconds.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Thanks.

MR. FRAZIER: All right. I'll second.

MS. THOMPSON: Voting to approve Item Number -- Ranking Number 97. Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen? Phil Allen? Ronald Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: And back to Phil Allen. Vote passes, Chair.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY WITH PHIL ALLEN NOT PRESENT FOR THE VOTE.**

MR. HOOPER: Next item?

MS. WALLACE: The next item that was pulled in Ranked Project 106. And it's Pembroke Park PPRK007 –

MS. CASSINI: Parkland.

MS. WALLACE: Oh. Oh, is that Parkland? Oh, PARK. I can't understand my own writing. I'm sorry. PARK007. It was pulled by Ms. Pennant, and it's for traffic signals at Hillsborough and University.

MS. PENNANT: Which -- is that Ranking Number 102?

MS. WALLACE: 106.

MS. PENNANT: 106.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. WALLACE: I think we went over 102 already.

MS. PENNANT: I don't have any notes on this.

MS. WALLACE: You don't have any notes on 106 for Parkland?

MS. PENNANT: No.

MS. WALLACE: So can we get a motion to approve 106, which is Parkland 007?

MR. HOOPER: Can we get a motion to approve?

MR. COOLMAN: Coolman. So **move**.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Thanks, Doug.

MS. PENNANT: I'm going to second it.

MR. ALLEN: Second. Philip.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

MS. CASSINI: She has a question.

MS. PENNANT: Wait a minute. There's a charter school issue here.

MR. HOOPER: Oh.

MS. PENNANT: Hang on (inaudible).

MS. WALLACE: It's a traffic light signal at the intersection of Hillsborough Boulevard and University.

MS. PENNANT: It's fine.

MS. WALLACE: Okay. All right.

MS. THOMPSON: We're voting for approval of Ranking 106. Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Ronald Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Vote approved unanimously.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

MS. WALLACE: Okay. The next project that was pulled is Number 109, and it's a Hollywood project, HOLL056. And it was pulled by Chair Hooper. And the project description is District 5 traffic safety improvements.

MR. HOOPER: Wait a second. Can I get -- can we see what --

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. CASSINI: Would you like to see what was presented to you?

MR. HOOPER: Yeah. I think that's probably why I'm –

MS. CASSINI: Andrew, could we ask you to please bring up the summary sheet? It's ranked 109, Hollywood.

MR. HOOPER: Oh, okay. I know why -- I know why, because –

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: -- well, there was no map there, and so I didn't understand what I was looking at. So I just wanted clarification as to the scope and where it was.

MR. RIDDLE: Sure. Mr. Chair, Andrew Riddle. So it is depicted on this map here, and generally, this is District 5 within the City of Hollywood, and including -- it includes Buchanan Street from North 67<sup>th</sup> Avenue to North 72<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, and Allen Drive from McArthur Parkway to North 74<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and Allen Drive and -- from McArthur Parkway to North 74<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue between Taft and Johnson Street.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. RIDDLE: It's a design estimate in this District 5.

MR. HOOPER: I -- so seeing no map and then -- I assume that they -- that we didn't have all the information.

MR. RIDDLE: Right.

MR. HOOPER: So if we're going to do a design, if we're going to get a bid on a design and we don't have all the information, that's why I pulled it.

MR. RIDDLE: I understand. It was just backup information –

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. RIDDLE: -- that we had.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So we had all that to make our decision; correct?

MR. RIDDLE: Correct. The –

MR. HOOPER: Staff had it. Yeah.

MR. RIDDLE: -- it was part of the --

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. RIDDLE: -- backup –

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. RIDDLE: -- information.

MR. HOOPER: All right. Can we get a motion to approve it?

MR. COOLMAN: So **moved**. Coolman.

MS. PENNANT: Second. Anthea.

MS. THOMPSON: Voting for approval of ranking 109. Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. CAVROS: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Ronald Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Vote passes unanimously.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

MS. WALLACE: Okay. The last one that was a pull –

MR. HOOPER: Oh, there was another pull?

MS. WALLACE: Sorry.

MS. CASSINI: Yeah, (inaudible).

MS. WALLACE: 110 was pulled by Mr. Hooper.

MR. HOOPER: And it's the same thing. It didn't have a map; correct?

MS. WALLACE: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: It didn't show maps, so –

MS. WALLACE: It's TAMA021, citywide crosswalk installations was pulled.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, it didn't show the -- I believe that's what it was.

MR. RIDDLE: Yes, sir. So the City of Tamarac will be looking at -- this is a planning study, so they will be looking citywide, but they are focusing on the city's major arterial corridor study, and they're going to identify locations identified based on the proximity and connectivity to transit. So this is just a --

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

they haven't started it, and they want surtax funding to start a planning study  
–

MR. HOOPER: I understand. I just –

MR. RIDDLE: -- for this project.

MR. HOOPER: -- so these kind of things, to me, are a little bit foggy, because unless you've identified, for instance, a street or an area or a park or whatever, you know what you're looking at and what you're going for. And I just -- citywide, trying to find -- trying to put all these pieces together and then we throw a number at \$90,000, that's why I pulled it, because I just think it's hard to identify what it is we're trying to do here. And I'm -- you know, and to -- and unless it's very detailed or unless you really know what you're trying to do, then we're just giving money to cities to just talk about something that they might want to do but that they might not do.

And that's a hundred thousand -- that's \$90,000, you know. So that's why I pulled it, because I just think that if we're -- I almost think that the cities should come up with at least a conceptual plan and then come to us for design money.

Because it's -- it's almost like we don't really know what we're getting or what we're doing. We're just talking about doing the right things, but we're not really -- we don't really have an idea. So that's why I pulled it.

MS. PENNANT: And that's how -- why I feel -- how I feel about some of the feasibility studies. We're spending a lot of money and, at the end, we don't know what we're going to get. And so I think some onus needs to be on the cities. I mean, if you feel you want to make some changes, you should at least do the groundwork and then come back to us with something solid. We've done our homework, and this is what needs to be done and this is how we are proposing it be funded.

MR. HOOPER: No, I agree.

MS. PENNANT: I don't think we should be spending a lot of these –

MR. HOOPER: I agree.

MS. PENNANT: -- dollars on –

MR. HOOPER: When –

MS. PENNANT: -- feasibility studies.

MR. HOOPER: -- when you come back and say I'm looking at something to implement citywide, it's hard. It's hard to figure out what you're going to actually draw on a -- on a plan until you -- anyway. Okay. So –

MS. WALLACE: Right. So that can be included in the recommendations going forward for future, you know, project cycles, that -- you know, to make - - to ensure that, you know, the project description and documentation are fully developed so that the Oversight Board is informed when making its decisions. Because a lot of these -- some of the projects that were higher ranked had a little more documentation, but the -- some of the others that are included in this list that are for planning and design, you know, are lacking. So we can -- we can –

MR. HOOPER: So –

MS. WALLACE: -- provide that direction regarding what you'd like to see, and that can be conveyed to, you know, County staff for purposes of the rehab and maintenance projects, and to the MPO for purposes of the capital projects.

MR. HOOPER: And I would ask, like for instance -- I'm just using Tamarac as an example. If you're going to want to do crosswalks and a bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure plan, pick the streets you're going to do it on.

MS. PENNANT: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: Okay? All right, we're doing it citywide and we know we want the bikes to be on Commercial, on -- I don't know what streets go through the city, but 441, you know, 31 –

MS. WALLACE: Right.

MR. HOOPER: -- 31<sup>st</sup>.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. HOOPER: And so you -- you've at least come up with a concept in your mind as to where your scope is going to go, and then it might grow a little bit after that. But this is -- this seems kind of a -- citywide just seems a little bit --

MS. PENNANT: And -- and it needs -- there needs to be greater equity. Because a lot of these projects are just on one side of the cities, and on the other side, it continues to be -- when you drive on the east side of most of these cities, the roads are bad, the sidewalks are bad, yet most of these developments are flushed on the west side. That is a problem. That is a problem.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: Who's -- who's -- who was that?

MS. CASSINI: Mr. Allen.

MR. ALLEN: (Inaudible.) It's Phil.

MR. HOOPER: Yes, Phil.

MR. ALLEN: Just when -- when the money -- when the planning money is free, from a city's perspective, or even from the County's perspective, politically sometimes it's easier to hire a consultant to give you a planning study relative to a constituent's complaint. So down the road, we may want to consider some recommendation that says you go out and spend your planning money and then come to us for design money.

MR. COOLMAN: Mr. Chair?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MR. COOLMAN: Doug Coolman. I want to echo Phil. In fact, I think, because we're setting some precedents here, I'd like to make a **motion** that this be rejected and sent back for more information. I don't think we want to take projects like this.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Well, we've got a motion. Do we have a second?

MS. PENNANT: What was the motion?

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. HOOPER: The motion is to reject the request.

MS. WALLACE: And any project that's conceptual.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. WALLACE: So conceptual projects that just say we want –

MR. HOOPER: It's too conceptual.

MS. WALLACE: -- to plan something. You know, anything that's too conceptual, send it back and make sure that the city has a more defined project that's presented for consideration.

MR. HOOPER: Do we have a second?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: Who was that?

MS. LOVE: I second.

MR. HOOPER: Oh, Ms. Love.

MINUTES SECRETARY: Who -- who made it first?

MS. WALLACE: Mr. Coolman.

MR. HOOPER: Coolman did.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. PENNANT: And –

MR. HOOPER: It's to reject. Ineligible.

MS. PENNANT: -- and what about feasibility studies? I mean, is that part of a requirement for us? I mean -- I mean, they should at least be going halfway on that.

MR. HOOPER: So let's talk -- let's vote, and then let's go right to that.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

201

Okay?

MR. ALLEN: Hold one second.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MS. THOMPSON: Okay. Voting for –

MS. CASSINI: Wait, wait, wait.

DR. KELLEY: Can I say something? Because I think it's –

MR. HOOPER: We've got –

DR. KELLEY: -- (inaudible) –

MR. HOOPER: -- we've got a motion –

DR. KELLEY: -- (inaudible).

MR. HOOPER: Yes, yes. But let me -- we've got a motion and second. Unless it affects your -- well –

MS. WALLACE: Yeah. So let's –

MR. HOOPER: Go ahead. Go ahead.

MS. WALLACE: -- you want to do the vote first and then we'll take your comment, Dr. Kelley?

MR. HOOPER: That's what I'd like to do.

MS. WALLACE: Yeah. Okay.

DR. KELLEY: You know, it's -- it's what the vote is (inaudible). I think the vote is not that it's ineligible. The vote is that it's not specific enough and, therefore, rejected, which is different from statutory –

MR. HOOPER: That's -- that's true.

DR. KELLEY: -- eligibility.

MS. WALLACE: So it's –

MR. HOOPER: That's true.

MS. WALLACE: -- rejected –

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. WALLACE: -- as insufficient information.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

DR. KELLEY: Correct.

MS. CASSINI: Rejected for insufficient (inaudible).

MS. LOVE: This is -- this is Allyson. This is Allyson. If it's rejected for insufficient information, does it then move just to -- if they choose to, to go to the next cycle –

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

MS. LOVE: -- and get the additional information?

MR. HOOPER: (Inaudible.)

MS. WALLACE: Right. It enables them to resubmit it with -- with more information. It -- so it doesn't determine that it's ineligible. What we're saying is that the Oversight Board doesn't have -- have sufficient information to make a decision at this point, and more information would have to be presented for the board to consider it again.

MS. LOVE: Okay. That's what I would recommend.

MS. THOMPSON: Okay. Motion for rejecting Item 110 for further information to be submitted. Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. LOVE: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Ron Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

MR. HOOPER: Ms. Pennant, you wanted to say something?

MS. PENNANT: No –

MR. HOOPER: About eligibility? I mean –

MS. PENNANT: Feasibility.

MR. HOOPER: -- feasibility.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. PENNANT: Yeah. I feel that way about feasibility studies. I think that we need to establish some standard by which we consider these feasibility studies. The cities either need to show that they have invested in it or they're willing to co-invest in a feasibility study so we're not just, you know, squandering these dollars.

MR. HOOPER: I think -- I think co-investing, putting money in with, is a good idea.

MS. PENNANT: And justification for why one is needed.

MR. HOOPER: Right.

MS. PENNANT: So that would be my **motion**.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you. Okay. What's next?

MS. CASSINI: Do you want to take a quick break, or just continue?

MR. HOOPER: I --

MS. PENNANT: I prefer.

MR. HOOPER: -- let's go.

MS. PENNANT: -- to keep moving.

**9 - INDIVIDUAL MUNICIPAL REHABILITATION AND MAINTENANCE PROJECT DISCUSSION - Q AND A. PROJECTS THAT HAVE BEEN PULLED FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION WILL BE TAKEN UP IN RANK ORDER.**

**A - DISCUSSION, Q AND A, PRESENTATIONS BY MUNICIPAL COUNSEL AND/OR STAFF.**

**B - MEMBERS, IN CONSULTATION WITH SURTAX GENERAL COUNSEL, WILL MAKE INDIVIDUAL MOTIONS REGARDING ELIGIBILITY AND MAY OFFER RECOMMENDATIONS ABOUT PROJECTS THAT WILL BE INCLUDED IN THE TRANSMISSION FOR ACTION ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE COUNTY COMMISSION**

MS. CASSINI: So the next item are Q and A pulls from Oversight Board

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

members related to the rehab and -- rehabilitation and maintenance projects. And the very first item that I have on the list -- we're going to be -- we're not moving in a ranked order. This is just a reminder that there are no rankings for the rehabilitation and maintenance projects. We are just asking for Oversight Board eligibility approval and determination. So we are at Coral Springs 1. This is a milling, repairing, and resurfacing of highest priority alleyways in the city. If there is anyone from the City of Coral Springs on the line, now would be the time for you to hit pound 2 to be un-muted.

MR. HOOPER: Which number was it?

MS. CASSINI: This is Coral Springs 01. This is on different -- here.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MS. CASSINI: We're on the rehabilitation and maintenance matrix. And this is the --

MR. CARPENTER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: Who's that?

MR. CARPENTER: (Inaudible.) Can you hear me?

MS. CASSINI: Yes, that's Coral Springs.

MR. CARPENTER: Paul Carpenter from Coral Springs. Can you hear me?

MR. HOOPER: Yes. Okay. The -- I pulled that. Okay. The reason I pulled that is so the part about alleys, alleyways.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: Is that -- is that us? I mean, are we managing alleyways?

MS. WALLACE: So alleys are not primary roads. They're secondary roads.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

206

But they are -- they are considered roads. How they get ranked or prioritized will depend on, you know, when they get funded.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So my take on that is alleyways are back of house.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: They're trash, they're -- they're delivery in some cases, back ways to get to your house or apartment, town house. I just -- to me -- I don't know. That --

MS. WALLACE: So you consider that more like a long driveway rather than a roadway.

MR. HOOPER: I'm just wondering if -- that's -- that was my question.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: That's what drove my thought was now we're getting into alleyways, and I just don't see them as being like a thoroughfare or anything, or trying to -- I don't see how you -- are you running traffic through it? Are you -- are you motivating bicycles to go down them? Are pedestrians cutting through alleyways? I just don't see how that plays out into the -- into the overall program of the surtax.

MS. WALLACE: I understand.

MR. HOOPER: So that's --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. CARPENTER: (Inaudible.)

MS. CASSINI: Go ahead.

MR. HOOPER: So whoever's from Coral Springs --

MR. CARPENTER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: Go ahead.

MR. CARPENTER: Hello? Yeah. I'm hoping you can hear me. I can't tell.

But these -- these alleys are -- are all behind commercial areas, and so they are -- they are all -- they are not connected to homes at all. They are -- they're connected to the -- to behind businesses.

MS. WALLACE: Are they public --

MR. CARPENTER: (Inaudible.)

MS. WALLACE: -- right of way?

MR. CARPENTER: Yes. Absolutely. They're city -- they're city-owned and they're public right of way, and they are eligible based on the surtax. They don't receive the number of points that regular arterials or collector roadways receive in -- in the evaluation, but they are eligible. And these higher end projects are -- are primarily based on need, but there are some (inaudible) - grades to the types of roads that you're actually improving. But the alleyways are all city-owned. They're city roadways. We maintain them.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

MR. CARPENTER: And -- and these are have been demonstrated the need by the study that we provided in the -- on the supplemental material. So, anyway, I -- they are eligible. They don't rank as well as some of the -- the higher level streets, but they are eligible projects from the --

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. CARPENTER: -- way we understand it.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So --

MINUTES SECRETARY: I did not get his name.

MS. WALLACE: She didn't get his name.

MS. CASSINI: His name is Paul Carpenter. Paul Carpenter. And I just want to -- for the purposes of transmittal to the County Commission with respect to this project, it was -- it was already deemed eligible, but I just want to make sure that your comments are that you would prefer not to see surtax funds used for these types of projects, that, you know, roadways that are more publicly accessible and utilized at a higher rate --

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

208

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. CASSINI: -- would -- would be your preference. I just want to make sure I capture what --

MR. HOOPER: I didn't know --

MR. CARPENTER: No.

MR. HOOPER: -- they were eligible.

MR. CARPENTER: No, no, no, no. I did not -- I did not say that. I did not say that.

MR. HOOPER: No, no, no, no, no, no. We're not saying (inaudible) --

MR. CARPENTER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: -- I'm sorry. Paul, she's saying -- she's asking me.

MR. CARPENTER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Right, you were asking me?

MS. CASSINI: Yeah.

MS. WALLACE: Correct.

MS. CASSINI: It's already been determined eligible. You already voted (inaudible).

MR. HOOPER: We did?

MS. CASSINI: So all of the projects on the R and M were taken up as eligible, I believe. Angela, please --

MS. WALLACE: Right. When we did the motion earlier.

MS. CASSINI: Right.

MS. WALLACE: Right. And so these were pulled for discussion.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. CASSINI: Question and answer, yes.

MS. WALLACE: Yeah.

MS. CASSINI: So this -- this already went through on Consent, so the issue is now what types of comments --

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: -- the Chair would like to have sent to the Board of County Commissioners.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Well, honestly, I -- I'm -- I can see developers or owners of commercial properties, or malls, taking alleys and converting them to private property, but I do not see how an alleyway benefits a transit or transportation program that's receiving a penny of the sales tax from the -- from the citizens of Broward County. So I do not believe that that's that it meets --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: -- that requirement. But that's just my -- my opinion, and you can let the County Commission know that.

MR. CARPENTER: Can I comment?

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. CARPENTER: (Inaudible) --

MR. HOOPER: Do any other members have any --

MS. CASSINI: That was Paul.

MR. COOLMAN: Yes. Alan, I agree a hundred percent. Coolman.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you, Doug.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Do we want to go to the next item? We're not voting on these, are we?

MS. WALLACE: We're just -- they're -- these are for discussion.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. CASSINI: Just discussion.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Let's go to the next item. So then do we –

MR. COOLMAN: (Inaudible) you're going to send those comments to the Commission, right?

MR. HOOPER: That's right.

MS. WALLACE: Correct.

MR. HOOPER: That's right, Doug.

MS. WALLACE: Correct. The purpose of this exercise is to understand the recommendations that the Oversight Board members want to relay to the County Commission and to County staff and the MPO for purposes of future projects.

MR. HOOPER: Okay

MS. CASSINI: So the next projects that I had pulled were –

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. CASSINI: -- City of Fort Lauderdale 1, 2, 3, and 5. I believe those were all pulled by Chair Hooper.

MR. HOOPER: No, they weren't. I think Ms. Pennant pulled them.

MS. PENNANT: Don't blame it all –

MR. HOOPER: Ms. Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: -- on me.

MS. WALLACE: So Fort Lauderdale 1, 2, 3 –

MR. HOOPER: I wouldn't have pulled them.

MS. WALLACE: -- and 5 were pulled. I don't know -- but I don't know –

MS. PENNANT: Oh, yes. I -- I had -- let me see. There -- which --

MR. HOOPER: It's okay.

MS. PENNANT: -- page are you on? There was --

MS. WALLACE: So --

MS. PENNANT: -- there were some projects that I had an issue with. The --

MS. CASSINI: You -- you can --

MS. PENNANT: -- there's one in Fort Lauderdale, the BC Fort Lauderdale -- I don't know the number.

MS. CASSINI: There you go. So those are up on your screen. If you'd like to look on the screen, too, in front of you, on your television screen.

MS. PENNANT: Yeah. I -- that -- that wasn't one of them. They were -- I don't know how you ID the projects. Yes. That was one of them. It seemed like these were all like private roads. They weren't off any main thoroughfare. And I'm getting the sense that they're in private communities.

I don't know how these are helping the flow of traffic, because they -- they basically look like peninsula, for lack of a better word, to just -- and then what? How -- how is that helping connectivity and flow of traffic? I just -- I don't see it.

MS. CASSINI: So if there's anyone from the City of Fort Lauderdale that's on the line, if you could please hit pound 2. To repeat the question, we're looking for some clarification of how Projects 1, 2, 3, and 5 are creating a public benefit and improving flows of traffic.

MS. WARFEL: Hello, everyone. Good afternoon. This is Karen Warfel with the City of Fort Lauderdale. I can address the first concern. These are all public right of way. There are no private roads or private communities proposed here.

MS. PENNANT: Wait, but I -- I just don't see where it is helping traffic flow. Can you explain how these dead-end streets are helping --

MS. WARFEL: Sure.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. PENNANT: -- traffic flow?

MS. WARFEL: I'll defer to Gretchen, however, I -- I think the -- it's a repair and maintenance thing, and in terms of the Las Olas ones that you were just looking at previously, those roads need to be improved, according to the standards and the inspections.

If you can put back up the seawall project. The seawall project, that impacts travel, it impacts a emergency evacuation route because of the number of times that it's overtopped currently by high tides. So that one very much so impacts the general public. It impacts emergency response. It impacts people driving, biking, and walking down Las Olas particularly.

MS. PENNANT: Okay.

MR. FRAZIER: Mr. Chair and Anthea, this is what I brought up earlier. Apparently, these projects do not have to reduce congestion or improve connectivity because they're maintenance, et cetera. So I -- I hear what you're saying, but --

MR. HOOPER: Oh.

MR. FRAZIER: -- we don't -- we can't -- they -- they don't have to meet that criteria --

MR. HOOPER: Oh (inaudible).

MS. PENNANT: Right.

MR. FRAZIER: -- as I understand it.

MS. PENNANT: Well, it -- it seemed to -- it needs to meet that 3,000,000 criteria, and right now, it's \$395,860 over the 3,000,000 minimum.

MR. HOOPER: So Karen --

MS. WARFEL: Yes, and we're aware of that, and we will contribute the remaining funds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So do we want to address all of those?

MS. WARFEL: If I can also add, you know, specifically with the bridge and the seawall, these were part of an overall master plan and identified as priorities. So they weren't just chosen randomly.

MS. PENNANT: Right. And I guess for me, when I'm looking at the map -- and maybe I'm looking in the wrong area, and these projects are not numbered, but the addresses seem very similar. And it almost seems like there's this project and there are layers of projects that -- that is adding up to way more than 3,000,000, because there's one project that is for --

MR. HOOPER: (Inaudible.)

MS. PENNANT: -- \$522,000, and then on the next page what looks like almost in the same area, another 1,000,000 and another 3,000,000. That's all in this concentrated area. There's over -- I don't know -- almost close to \$10,000,000 being spent. That -- that -- I have a problem with that.

MS. WALLACE: And none -- and none of it is east of the railroad tracks.

MS. WARFEL: (Inaudible.)

MS. PENNANT: Pardon me?

MS. WALLACE: (Inaudible) west.

MS. WARFEL: However, this is a (inaudible) -- they -- they are separate projects. One is a seawall, one's asphalt. They're not associated with each other. However, in terms of critical infrastructure for evacuations and roadways that are impacted by sea level rise, Las Olas is our number one priority. So that's why there is quite a bit happening in that area.

MS. WALLACE: West of the railroad track. Ask her.

MS. PENNANT: Well, you know, again, it's -- it's -- it just seems -- let me be clear. My -- my -- my issues with some of these projects, it just seemed like in wealthy communities, in wealthy neighborhoods, that's where the money's being spent. And in the poorer communities, I just don't see enough projects and enough spending going on. And many of those roads are in dilapidated conditions. So we keep fixing the areas that are already doing pretty good, and the fact is it's not just their tax dollars that is -- is being collected through

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

the penny tax.

So I want to see more money being spent in some of those communities that the roads are really, really in desperate conditions, not in communities where there are yachts parked out behind some of these homes.

It doesn't seem equitable to me. And I'm telling you we need to revisit that equity question, because when you start with a bad narrative from day one, and if the measure is bad, then everything you measure after that becomes bad. We need to revisit this equity question. Something is wrong with it.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. CASSINI: All of those comments will be part of the transmittal.

MS. PENNANT: Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: All right. Any other members –

MR. CAVROS: Mr. Chair, may I speak?

MR. HOOPER: -- any other members? Go ahead.

MR. CAVROS: George Cavros. Yeah, clearly, the city here is trying to be more resilient as it relates to sea level rise. And those areas are -- are definitely impacted. So I understand that. And since we're providing comments to the Commission now on -- on all these projects, I would like to address generally the -- the ranking process that MPO used.

With -- with the exception of the projects here that are related to drainage or this project here, that appears to be addressing sea level rise, I was -- was not impressed with where sea level rise and resiliency ranked on their prioritization chart of many of these projects.

It ranked below signage, it ranked below landscaping. And, you know, that could be a problem later on down the road if municipalities have to revisit these projects because they did not consider sea level rise. I'm also part of the Climate Change Task Force that also received a presentation on this by the MPO and the Florida DOT, and, again, I was not impressed with -- with the standards that the Florida DOT uses, because they're based on historical sea level rise, and they're -- they're not forward-looking in a way that projects sea level rise in a realistic manner.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

215

So moving forward, I would like to see all the projects prioritized -- and not only considered, but prioritized on sea level rise and in the design of the projects.

And I understand that, you know, that prioritization was a result of some sort of query of the municipalities and they actually ranked it themselves, but I think it was the way that it was framed to the municipalities, and environmental stewardship or some language similar to that, rather than sea level rise -- you know, just -- just call it what it is.

If it's a level of service issue, it's not about, you know, planting wildflowers and native plants in medians. I mean, it's addressing an immediate issue. So all these add up to the MPO to figure out how to frame it to -- to the cities and how it's ranked in the future.

But I think it -- it needs more attention, more focus, more prioritization, and I would ask that the municipalities from here on out rely on the projections in the 2019 Southeast Florida Compact Unified Sea Level Rise Map. Thank you.

MS. PENNANT: So --

MR. COOLMAN: Comment.

MS. PENNANT: -- the thing is --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. PENNANT: -- in these areas, we're not talking about building walls or barriers to prevent sea level rise. We're talking about connectivity and creating easy flow of traffic. And it seemed to me in these communities, they're just making the roads prettier for the people who live in that neighborhood.

And I know a lot of neighborhoods where the roads are -- don't even exist. They're practically dirt roads. And so why aren't the cities focusing on some of those areas? And many of those people have to walk to work or ride a bicycle to work or take the bus to work. They don't have the luxury of working from home.

And I know that we're going to see a time where this County will probably

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

move to a larger percentage of its population working from home. If nothing else, COVID has taught us that.

So we're going to see more people working from home. And I promise you, it's not going to be the poor people working from home, right? And so I want to keep them at the forefront. Greater equity is required.

MR. COOLMAN: Additional comment, Mr. Chair. A lot of this money does relate to sea level rise, and it's extremely important. And I think you pointed it out. Even though it may not have gotten as many points as it should have because they don't consider that, it's an extremely important thing.

This is the main -- one of the main evacuation roads, and it needs to be taken care of. And I would guess that of the \$10,000,000 -- I didn't total it up, but I'll bet a majority of that has to do with fixing -- making the road above water. So I think it's money well spent by the City of Fort Lauderdale, and they had good insight.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. All right. Do we want to move -- you've got all those items?

MS. CASSINI: I've captured all of those. What I will be doing, because I will obviously not be able to wait for the wonderful verbatim minutes from Nancy in order to do this transmittal by next Tuesday, which is when we're hoping to be able to do that, what I will do is I'm going to try to capture all of the information that I've heard, and I will distribute it to the Oversight Board members to make sure that I have accurately captured your comments before it's transmitted to the Chair for signature.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you. All right. What's the next item?

MS. CASSINI: The next item that was pulled was a Margate item. It was Margate 3 for milling, paving, and resurfacing of the public road (inaudible) --

MR. MAYORGA: Excuse me. Hallandale 2 was pulled also, I believe.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. CASSINI: Oh, I'm sorry.

MS. WALLACE: Hallandale Number 2.

MR. ALLEN: I pulled -- this is Phil. I pulled that one.

MS. CASSINI: You're absolutely right. I apologize.

MR. ALLEN: It was -- my concern or issue, just for discussion, is in one of the comment sections, it says 90 percent of the funds requested are for new paver crosswalks. Are these pavers that qualify under eligibility?

MS. WALLACE: No, they are not. And so the -- these motions were approved with the caveat that they have -- that the project have -- while, you know, these types of projects are eligible, they are -- they exclude the items that are delineated in the interlocal agreement that indicates that they're not - - they -- they're not eligible. So brick pavers and headers and things of that nature are listed as ineligible in the interlocal agreement, and we will address those elements when we negotiate the contracts with the municipality.

MR. ALLEN: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. What's the next one?

MS. CASSINI: That was -- the next one is the Margate 3. And I don't -- I'm sorry, I don't have notes on who pulled that one.

MR. HOOPER: (Inaudible.)

MS. CASSINI: Angela, do you know? It's Margate 3. This is for milling, paving, and resurfacing of public --

MR. HOOPER: That's me.

MS. CASSINI: -- roads. Okay.

MR. HOOPER: Again, I -- there's no map provided, but I guess these repair and maintenance things are different than the others, so I don't know.

MS. CASSINI: I believe we do have --

MR. HOOPER: (Inaudible.) So we're --

MS. CASSINI: -- some locations.

MR. HOOPER: -- going to give them a million fifty-three, but I don't know

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

where that million fifty-three's going and –

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: -- unless there's an attachment that -- that I didn't see. And so any -- so I'll tell you right now, I've got like five of those in this, maybe six. And it's just because I didn't have the information of a map, and I didn't know where the location of the work was being done. And then we have a number and we're approving something, and I don't even know where it is. No, no, no. I just want to see the map. I want to see where this is located.

MR. COLLINS: Well, if I may –

MR. HOOPER: Go ahead.

MS. CASSINI: You've got to come to the podium.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: I mean, you know –

MR. COLLINS: No, I'm Mark Collins. City of Margate.

MR. HOOPER: -- real quick question. Are we getting these locations and then sometimes not putting them on our -- because if we're going to approve stuff, I would really like to get the full information. And if it's on some -- some attachment of a PDF somewhere, while we're going through it, show it to us on the screen, because I'm really -- I don't really want to approve something. Now we're holding ourselves up for another hour screwing around with at least six of these I've pulled. At least six. And this gentleman's going to have to come up and tell me where it's located.

MS. CASSINI: I –

MR. COLLINS: Well –

MS. CASSINI: -- I would like -- before you say, I -- I would just like for the Oversight Board and the municipalities and anyone that's watching, that's -- that's our responsibility, and it's on me, and I take that responsibility. We obviously had to rush because of all of the issues that we had with COVID-19

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

219

and then the delay on our last board meeting.

So in order to meet the deadline to have all of these municipal projects acted on by the Oversight Board and our Commission before they go on break, which will happen after June 16<sup>th</sup>, we just closed the application portal on May 16<sup>th</sup> and had the -- and were able to try to pull together as much of this information as we possibly could out of that portal.

Any time that we didn't have sufficient information or we had multiple maps, it made it very difficult for us to be able to put it on a single slide, which is why we had this time in the afternoon to try to give you more information. So, again, that's on me. It was -- it was just a matter of trying to do everything on one slide.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. All right. So on this Margate one --

MR. COLLINS: Well, on the Margate one, you're a hundred percent right. I did not submit a map because we don't have one right now. We've contracted with a company called Trans Map. They're due to come in in the next two weeks, do an evaluation of all of our roads. The City of Margate has not had that done in numerous years.

It will then list out over -- it'll give me a five-year CIP that I can start pulling and actually get back on a program. They will provide me with the map with the condition of the -- the pavement, the thickness, the cracks, and everything. Then I'll present that.

MR. HOOPER: So then how did we come up with a million fifty-three one eighty-four? I mean, that's like a -- that's like a -- that's like -- that's a pretty specific number.

MR. COLLINS: And, unfortunately, I cannot answer that, because predecessors before me came up with numbers, and --

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. COLLIN: -- I'm sorry, but I -- I can't answer that question.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So, I mean, honestly, I wouldn't even have approved - - I would have voted against it.

MS. CASSINI: So what I can assure all of you, and especially you, Mr. Chair, since I know you pulled all of these, is while they are eligible under the

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

Statute, and they're eligible under our interlocal agreement, prior to the Board of County Commissioners acting on them or any of us contracting with the municipalities, all of that information will be provided, and the scopes will be provided. And when you get updates on all of these projects that you get approved, when you have the broad oversight –

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: -- of these projects on the back end, we will ensure that you have everything that you need.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: Okay? I apologize. It –

MR. HOOPER: No, I know it's –

MS. CASSINI: -- it's just on an eligibility review.

MR. HOOPER: -- I knew that we were scrambling, but I'm just -- I'm just saying that's -- the reason I'm pulling all of these is because I don't have the total information.

MR. MAYORGA: Mr. Chair, if I may? All the projects that were submitted that have maps defined in the (inaudible) boundaries, they are in this presentation. As you correctly pointed out, a number of them did not provide maps, so.

MR. HOOPER: So the applicant didn't provide the map.

MR. MAYORGA: They didn't provide maps, correct.

MR. HOOPER: Right.

MR. MAYORGA: And I know there's a few number of them who provided maps, but not of the project but of cities –

MR. HOOPER: Right.

MR. MAYORGA: -- and that was not informative to the application –

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, it's not informative.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

221

MR. MAYORGA: -- so were not included as well. So that's the reason why --

MR. HOOPER: So my question would be --

MR. MAYORGA: -- some (inaudible).

MR. HOOPER: -- if it wasn't something that had to do with us scrambling to put something together, okay, where the staff knew what they were dealing with, knew what the scope was, but we just didn't get it in the package. But if it's the applicant not providing us with all the information, why are we even looking at it? Why don't we put them in the next cycle? So that's just -- if you --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: A comment --

MR. HOOPER: -- I'll tell you what. If I want money from somebody, I better have a lot of information for them. And then I've got to like sign my personal name on it; right? So, anyway.

MS. CASSINI: I can include that in the transmittal information to the Board of County Commissioners that, while they may be eligible, that the fact that they did not provide all of the required information, you would recommend that they move to a later cycle.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. PENNANT: And quality pictures. Sorry.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman?

MR. HOOPER: We can move to the next one -- yes, sir.

MR. ALLEN: So and at the same time, these projects are supposed to be completed within 12 months, and -- and we don't even have the maps today.

MR. HOOPER: That's right. That's right, Phil. Thank you. All right. Let's go to the next.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And practice social distancing in public. Avoid close contact with anyone showing respiratory (inaudible) --

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. CASSINI: Please put your phone on mute. Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: So, honestly, for the purposes of time, if all of the projects that were pulled were simply because they did not have maps, I would suggest to the Chair that, if there is any project that was pulled, Alex, that does have some backup information, to go ahead and go to that project.

MR. MAYORGA: Yes. This is –

MS. WALLACE: So the last ones that we have are Oakland Park Number 3 and then Wilton Manors 1, 2, and 3 are the only –

MR. MAYORGA: Wilton Manors, they didn't provide maps.

MS. WALLACE: Okay. Did –

MR. MAYORGA: And –

MS. WALLACE: -- Oakland Park?

MR. HOOPER: No.

MR. MAYORGA: -- Oakland Park 3 provided some maps.

MS. WALLACE: Okay. So the -- that was all of them.

MS. CASSINI: Can you show the Oakland Park maps just so that the Chair has an opportunity to see those?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MR. MAYORGA: Oh, here they are. These are the locations that they submitted. There are multiple locations, and there is other information as well.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Okay. Well, I mean, if you had something to analyze it to determine the scope, I'm okay. But –

MR. MAYORGA: Yeah. The only reason, like I said, that I did not include it

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

is because I couldn't see clear boundaries and I -- I didn't want to do (inaudible).

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Okay. Is that where we are at this point?

MS. CASSINI: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Mr. Frazier, would you like us to pull up the map and show -- and I think that's interesting to you, too, Ms. Pennant -- to show the -- the location of where the projects are in their ZIP Codes and throughout the County, so that we can see what neighborhoods are getting some of the work -- or the work?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes, I would. I'm having problems with my phone.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So that's what we're going to do now; right?

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: Can I -- I need to make a phone call.

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

MS. CASSINI: So at this time, we're going to move into the dashboard --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: -- and we're going to -- we'll focus in on the ZIP Codes that have been identified as having the most under-served population and the highest needs so that the Oversight Board members are able to see the types of projects and the amount of financial investment in those areas. I'm going to ask Ernesto Carreras to bring those up. And when you do, if you could please speak into the microphone and identify which ZIP Code we're looking at when you do so.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.).

MS. CASSINI: At this time, I think all of the cities -- there are no further

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

questions of the municipalities. If there are any Oversight Board members on the phone that do have any additional questions to a municipality, please let me know, because otherwise, we're going to go ahead and disconnect their lines. Okay. We are going to disconnect the lines for all of our municipal participants, and we are so grateful for your time, and thank you for your participation.

MR. COOLMAN: Can I say one thing, though, to the municipalities? We're all in a learning process, so hopefully as we go through this, it gets better. And now the municipalities will also have a better idea of what we're looking for. And thanks for their effort.

MR. HOOPER: That's exactly right, Doug. That's a good comment.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I do not hear anything.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.).

MS. CASSINI: We're still setting up the dashboard. We apologize. So we're --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh.

MS. CASSINI: -- just about to get started.

MR. SOFOUL: Good afternoon.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

MR. FRAZIER: Would we -- would we be -- would we be better switching from the live over to the exhibits to look at these?

MS. CASSINI: No. Actually, the only way you'll be able to see this is through the live, because we aren't able -- the dashboard is so enormous, it's a GIS database, so we aren't actually able to send it to you. So this is the only way you're going to be able to see this part of the presentation. Make sure you stay online.

MR. FRAZIER: Thank you.

MR. SOFOUL: Good afternoon. My name is Nicholas Sofoul. I'm the Planning Section Supervisor for the Mobility Planning Section funded through surtax. And we do have some information prepared by ZIP Code to share with you.

We conducted an analysis of the poverty by ZIP Code by the Census Bureau American Community Survey. And so we have a list that we provided of the top ZIP Codes by poverty status. And if you like, we can go ahead and kind of go through those ZIP Codes one by one. You can kind of take a look at the projects that are in them. We also have a separate document that has a list of all the projects in the surtax capital for municipalities by ZIP Code and - and by city.

MS. CASSINI: That was distributed to the Oversight Board. And, at the Chair's request, we can also post that to the website for the meeting materials today.

MR. SOFOUL: Okay. Wonderful. So the highest ZIP Code for poverty in Broward County is 33311, with 28.6 percent of households falling below the poverty level. So we can go ahead and zoom into that project -- or that ZIP Code so we can identify the projects. Let me go to that ZIP Code.

There are a significant number of projects in here. Fort Lauderdale has projects that intersect this, including safety improvements for Andrews, safety improvements Northwest 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, mobility improvements, there's sidewalks, there's street lighting on Northwest 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Lauderdale Lakes has a traffic calming program.

Lauderdale Lakes has 36<sup>th</sup> Avenue -- 36<sup>th</sup> Terrace -- Terrace improvements. Oakland Park has several projects, as does Wilton Manors. So this is actually a -- ZIP Code where there is quite a bit of investment, you know, from the surtax projects submitted that you've approved today.

MS. CASSINI: Nick, are you looking --

MR. FRAZIER: Excuse me. Can you tell us what the colors mean on the legend? Give us the legend, because we can't see that detail. What do the different colors mean? What type of projects are they?

MR. SOFOUL: I'm going to ask our GIS Analyst to take that.

MS. CASSINI: Well, actually, Nick, you -- you were -- you were actually

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

sharing with the Oversight Board what those types of projects were. So the various colors mean drainage, lighting, sidewalks –

MR. SOFOUL: Correct.

MS. CASSINI: -- traffic calming. It's very -- I know it's very, very difficult for you all to see that.

MR. SOFOUL: Yeah.

MS. CASSINI: But, Nick, could you also identify the total amount, the number, the value of investment in that area, please?

MR. SOFOUL: I would have to –

MS. PENNANT: You read my mind.

(Laughter.)

MR. SOFOUL: -- I would have to add it all. I have it segmented by project, so we -- we can provide that. I have it, but I just don't have it ready to be able to be added on the fly. But we have all the amounts.

One of the issues, too, is that these project were submitted by municipality, and many of them -- the -- many cities have multiple ZIP Codes that go through them. So these projects transect through ZIP Codes.

So it's difficult to get an accurate depiction of how much funding is going to each ZIP Code, because you would have to allocate what percentage of this project is in this ZIP Code and how would you split that up. That's not something I think we would do. What we can provide is for all the projects that intersect a ZIP Code, we can give you what the total amount of funding is for the projects intersect that ZIP Code.

MS. PENNANT: I see the value here, but (inaudible).

MR. SOFOUL: We could certainly provide that.

MR. HOOPER: (Inaudible.)

MR. SOFOUL: Do you want to go through those other ZIP Codes? I mean, we have a -- the second highest is 33313, with 23 percent poverty by

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

household.

MS. PENNANT: Is this pre- or post-COVID? Is this pre- or post-COVID?

MS. CASSINI: It's definitely pre.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. SOFOUL: No. This is from the 2014 through 2018 American Community Survey for the Census Bureau by household. 33313 has projects all within the City of Lauderdale Lakes. They have a citywide community greenway system, comprehensive traffic calming program, Northwest 36<sup>th</sup> Street improvements, and Northwest 50<sup>th</sup> Avenue improvements. If I had to look at the numbers and try to add them quickly off the top of my head, it looks like it's somewhere close to 2,000,000.

MS. PENNANT: Well (inaudible).

MR. SOFOUL: Do you have any particular ZIP Code you're interested in? We can certainly go to it and bring it up.

MS. PENNANT: 33309.

MR. SOFOUL: 33309. Yes.

MS. PENNANT: 33319. I know all those property ZIP Codes.

MR. SOFOUL: Okay. Can you go to 33309? 33309 is Number 5 on the rank for poverty in Broward County by ZIP Code. It's 20.6 percent.

MS. PENNANT: Twenty?

MR. SOFOUL: 20.6 percent poverty by household.

MS. PENNANT: So that's ranked fifth. We did one, two. Which one is three?

MR. SOFOUL: Three is 33 -- 33060.

MS. PENNANT: Uh-huh.

MR. SOFOUL: And Number 4 is 33004.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MS. PENNANT: Okay. Just so I can start monitoring them.

MR. SOFOUL: Yeah.

MS. PENNANT: Okay. And what's --

MR. SOFOUL: It's --

MS. PENNANT: -- what's the percentage ZIP Code -- I mean, poverty in 33360?

MR. SOFOUL: It's 21.2 percent.

MS. PENNANT: And 04?

MR. SOFOUL: 20.9 percent.

MS. PENNANT: Okay. All right.

MR. SOFOUL: If this isn't in your attachment, we can certainly provide it to you. We have the list by ZIP Code.

MS. PENNANT: Yeah, I just want to make sure there's some equity in the spending, more or less.

MR. SOFOUL: When we come back for the next round, it could be a recommendation that we add more metrics in the dashboard related to this, and we could look at -- specifically at ZIP Code level and we can kind of orient this dashboard to be able to bring in some more of the equity-type metrics for you to examine the next go around. I'd be happy to do that.

MS. PENNANT: Yeah.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Frazier, is there any location or ZIP Code or city that you'd like to take a better look at?

MS. CASSINI: (Inaudible.)

MR. HOOPER: Oh, he is?

MS. PENNANT: Oh, okay. All right. I'm good. I'll be looking at this chart.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

This is helpful.

MR. SOFOUL: Okay. Wonderful. Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. What's next? Is that it?

MS. CASSINI: If Mr. Frazier doesn't have a specific one that he wants to look at, we're done.

MR. HOOPER: You know, and we can -- you know, next meeting, we'll have a little more time. I'm sorry this took so long and it was pretty arduous for all of us. So I think we should spend a little time looking at where the money's being spent and where the projects are being located in the County. But thank you all for -- for working so hard today and getting this done. All of you guys did a great job. So --

MS. CASSINI: Could I take a point of personal privilege?

MR. HOOPER: Please do.

MS. CASSINI: May -- may I just say that without the unbelievable dedication of so many people, both on the MPO staff, the municipal staff, and I would just be remiss without saying thank you so much to our GIS planning staff, my own Mobility Advancement Program Administration, Ms. Wallace.

Obviously, Tony Hui and Richard Tornese have just done an amazing job in the Public Works Department. And we would very much like to invite any of the Oversight Board members that would like to attend the June 16<sup>th</sup> County Commission meeting. I will be sending you out some more specifics about the time certain when all of these projects will be considered by the County Commission.

Obviously, all of our municipal partners are invited to attend, as well, if -- if we're back open and we're actually doing this physically. Otherwise, I'll be sending you virtual participation information.

And thank you to all of the Oversight Board members for your great questions and for helping us kind of shape what you wanted through our briefings. So thank you very much.

### **MEMBER REPORTS/OTHER BUSINESS**

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

230

MS. WALLACE: The July –

MS. PENNANT: Thank you.

MS. WALLACE: -- the next meeting is July 30<sup>th</sup>?

MS. CASSINI: So we have a two-day meeting. It will be July 30<sup>th</sup> and 31<sup>st</sup>.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. CASSINI: And that will be to do the five-year plan. Or maybe not, based -- based on the sadness.

MR. HOOPER: Is that on my calendar?

MS. CASSINI: Yes. That was decided -- we actually took a vote back in January when we met to set our calendar for the 2020 calendar.

MR. HOOPER: Can I call in? You guys all did it today. Can I call in?

MS. CASSINI: We'll probably still be doing virtual participation by then, so we'll talk about it.

MR. HOOPER: Maybe Doug can Chair, and I'll call in. How about that? That'd be nice for me.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can I call in?

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Well, we'll talk about that a little bit more.

### **ADJOURN**

MR. HOOPER: Thank you all again, and we'll see each other in July.

MS. PENNANT: Okay. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MS. WALLACE: Thank you, everyone.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you, everybody.

MS. WALLACE: Take care. Be safe. Thank you so much.

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

JUNE 4, 2020

dh/NC

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Be safe. Bye-bye.

(The meeting concluded at 5:09 p.m.)