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Executive Summary

The Strategic Planning Technical Report (Technical Report) is a synopsis of the strategic planning process conducted by the Broward County Resource Recovery Board (RRB) with the assistance of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) from September 2008 through June 2009. The Technical Report highlights the strategic planning process as a vehicle to debate options for the future of the Broward County Solid Waste Disposal District (District) and the New Interlocal Agreement (New ILA). The current Interlocal Agreement (ILA) will expire in 2013. This Technical Report is intended to document some of the debate and the recommended changes to the ILA by the TAC. It is intended to provide background as provisions of the New ILA are presented to the Board of County Commissioners and the communities throughout Broward County for consideration and, if appropriate, ratification.

The strategic planning process documented in this Technical Report did not begin with a blank sheet of paper in September 2008. Four critical activities during the preceding five years laid the foundation for this most recent effort.

Recommendations from the 2003 Strategic Plan were fleshed out further during the 2006 Broward Trash Summit. In 2007, the District issued a Request for Expressions of Interest (RFEI) to identify interest of emerging and commercially viable technologies in the Broward Solid Waste Program. Finally, the 2008 Needs Assessment Survey provided Contract Communities (and one non-Contract Community) the opportunity to voice their opinions and concerns over the existing ILA and discuss features of the organization they would like to see going forward.

A core group of TAC members and particularly members of the TAC Administration Subcommittee became the working vehicle to debate and develop key terms and provisions of the New ILA. Through five formal workshops the TAC prepared the New ILA Term Sheet representing a framework of the key provisions of the New ILA.

The most fundamental change resulting from the strategic planning workshops is a proposed new structure for the administration and management of the District and the Resource Recovery System (RRS). The District, while remaining a dependent district, would become more autonomous depending on the Board of County Commissioners only for final Budget approval and as the guarantor of long term debt or bonds. All other governance and management functions of the District would become the responsibility of the RRB. These functions include but may not be limited to:

- The establishment of administrative policy related to all aspects of the RRS,
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- Preparation of an annual revenue and expense budget for the District and submission of the budget to the BCC for approval,
- Approval or veto rights of any new debt financing related to the District,
- Responsible for all plans and planning related to the RRS,
- Responsible for all legal matters related to the District, and
- In general, responsible for all activities related to the operations, administration, management and obligations of the RRS, except final budget approval and the issuance of long term debt.

The New ILA provides for the RRB to employ sufficient staff to be able to meet the obligations and conduct the business of the District and the RRS in accordance with State Law in an efficient and effective manner. The provision of staff may include direct hire, contract employees, contract services, contracted County staff or any combination of alternatives selected by the RRB. However, under the New ILA, all District staff would ultimately be accountable to the RRB.

The composition of the RRB and the TAC would remain essentially as it is in the current ILA as amended. The RRB will consist of nine (9) members: one member appointed by the BCC; three (3) members, one each by the three Contract Communities with the largest populations; three (3) three members, one each by the three Contract Communities nearest to the median population; and two (2) members appointed by the Broward League of Cities. The TAC would consist of one representative from each Contract Community, one (1) from the County, one (1) from the Broward League of Cities, one (1) from the Broward School Board, and three (3) industry stakeholders.

The purpose of the TAC is to provide technical advice and counsel to the RRB on any matters related to the Resource Recovery System.

The New ILA may need to be amended from time to time based on internal or external factors. The New ILA may be amended using a two tier process. Any amendment must be approved by a majority of the Contract Communities and by sufficient Contract Communities representing a majority of the population served by the RRS.

Under the New ILA, the RRB will have as much financial control over the RRS as is allowed by Law for a dependent special district. The RRB will be specifically responsible for:

- Establishing rates and user charges to sufficiently fund the District
- To approve all short and long term debt required by the District
- To cause to be prepared an annual revenue and expense budget for final approval by the BCC
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- To provide operating budget management and control, and conduct such audits as required by law or as directed by the RRB
- Provide other financial services necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the District.

Going forward, the District’s legal counsel has been charged with the responsibility to develop the New ILA. The RRB Executive Director will take the New ILA, along with a memorandum of understanding for an extension of the solid waste disposal services, to the communities throughout Broward County. The Executive Director will gauge the interest in the New ILA as well as discuss modifications that might make the New ILA more desirable to the communities. Any proposed major changes to the New ILA will be presented to the RRB for determination if they will be incorporated into the final agreement.

As the New ILA moves toward its final form and community participation becomes better defined, a plan will be required to guide the transition from the current, County based RRS to a District that is administered and managed by the Resource Recovery Board. The plan will need to address the schedule and process for framing and presenting the myriad of policy decisions and activities required to affect the implementation of the New ILA. These may include, but are not limited to, decisions and issues related to:

- Administration,
- Operations,
- Staffing,
- Finance and accounting,
- Office facilities, and
- Virtually every aspect of daily activities required to keep a $100 million per year organization operating efficiently.
1. Introduction

1.1. Broward County and the Creation of the ILA

Broward County’s population of 1,765,707\(^1\) currently ranks it as the second most populous county in Florida. As the population grows, the solid waste disposal needs of the County continue to change in response to an increasing awareness of the environmental needs of the community.

In the 1970s, the majority of solid waste generated in Broward County was disposed of in the County-owned Davie Landfill and the privately owned Central Disposal Sanitary Landfill (CDSL). In the 1980s, as the State of Florida and the federal government were discouraging the use of landfills as the sole method of solid waste management, Broward County began to look for long-term solid waste management solution in the recovery of waste resources and the development of alternative energy resources.

In the mid 1980s, Broward County competitively procured the design, construction, operation and financing of two waste-to-energy (WTE) facilities. In order to best manage both the solid waste generated in the County and the new WTE facilities about to go online, a Solid Waste Disposal District (District) was created via an Interlocal Agreement (ILA) in 1987. This dependent District allowed the County to guarantee waste limits to obtain tax exempt financing on behalf of those cities that are members of the ILA (ILA Communities), identified in Figure 1-1. The District consists of 26 ILA Communities and five non-ILA Communities which are Pembroke Pines, Parkland, Pompano Beach, Dania Beach and Hallandale.

---

1.2. ILA Management

Solid waste generated in Broward County is controlled either by the District for the ILA Communities, or one of the five non-ILA Communities. The 26 ILA Communities are managed by the District under the Resource Recovery Board (RRB). The RRB in turn accords responsibility to Broward County for the disposal of all solid waste delivered by haulers from the participating municipalities and the unincorporated areas of the County. The facilities and services managed by the RRB make up the Resource Recovery System (RRS). Each of the non-ILA Communities make their own arrangements for the collection, disposal, and administration of their solid waste.

1.3. Broward County Solid Waste Management

Municipal solid waste (MSW) is disposed of at several facilities. Table 1-1 summarizes the various solid waste disposal facilities in Broward County, their ownership, capacity and general status. The Wheelabrator South Broward Facility (WSB) is sited on leased property owned by the District and has an adjacent Ash Monofill owned by the District and operated by the Wheelabrator North Broward Facility (WNB). The Broward Interim Contingency (BIC) Landfill receives mainly non-putrescible waste including construction and demolition (C&D) debris and yard waste from the District. The CDSL, which is privately owned, accepts waste from Palm Beach and Miami-Dade Counties as well as waste generated in Broward County whose disposal is not contractually bound by the existing ILA.

Table 1-1: Key Solid Waste Facilities in Broward County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Waste Stream</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Contract Expires</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wheelabrator North and South</td>
<td>Mass Burn WTE</td>
<td>District Solid Waste</td>
<td>4,500 tpd (2,250 tpd at each facility)</td>
<td>North: 2012</td>
<td>Wheelabrator 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South: 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward Interim Contingency (BIC)</td>
<td>Landfill</td>
<td>District Solid Waste</td>
<td>25 million CY</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>District 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill (CDSL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waste Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Disposal Sanitary Landfill</td>
<td>Landfill</td>
<td>Non-District Solid</td>
<td>Permitted Capacity Estimated to be Consumed by 2013</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash Monofill</td>
<td>Ash Monofill</td>
<td>District Ash</td>
<td>2 million CY</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>District 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Recycling Facility (MRF)</td>
<td>Dual Stream</td>
<td>District Recyclable</td>
<td>300 – 450 tpd</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Waste Management-Recycle America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Hazardous Waste Facilities</td>
<td>Drop-Off</td>
<td>Household Hazardous</td>
<td>600 tons/year</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>District 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The Wheelabrator South site is owned by the District.
2. Assets indicated as owned by the District may, in some cases, be owned by the County. Actual ownership to be determined by RRB
Data retrieved from 2005 (the year for which the most recent information is available) show that the total amount of County solid waste disposed and recovered in 2005 was approximately 3.5 million tons, of which approximately 1.4 million tons of solid waste is controlled by the District. A breakdown of the solid waste stream is presented in Table 1-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>County Solid Waste Disposed/Recovered (Tons)</th>
<th>District Solid Waste Managed (Tons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Wheelabrator</td>
<td>District 654,127</td>
<td>654,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spot Market 0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Wheelabrator</td>
<td>District 598,203</td>
<td>598,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spot Market 0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIC Landfill</td>
<td>Solid Waste 61,456</td>
<td>61,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tires 926</td>
<td>926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDSL</td>
<td>C&amp;D Debris 812,184</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solid Waste 507,545</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solid Waste Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,634,441</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,314,712</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRS MRF (i.e., Residential Recyclables)</td>
<td>61,665</td>
<td>61,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-ILA/Other Residential</td>
<td>31,874</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Wastes (e.g., Electronics and HHW)</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;D Debris</td>
<td>197,638</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard Waste</td>
<td>203,184</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Commercial/Institutional Recovered Materials</td>
<td>357,073</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTE Metals Recovery</td>
<td>10,029</td>
<td>10,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recovered Materials Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>862,141</strong></td>
<td><strong>73,372</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solid Waste and Recovered Materials Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,496,582</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,387,084</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Calendar Year 2005 data

Of the nearly 1.4 million tons managed by the District, approximately 1.2 million is disposed of at the North and South Wheelabrator WTE facilities. Figure 1-2 presents how the approximate 1.4 million tons of District solid waste is managed. Based on the most recent estimates, ash from the WNB facility is disposed of at the CDSL Landfill and the Ash Monofill from the adjacent WSB Facility. Remaining materials are recycled under
contract with a Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) that is owned and operated by Waste Management.

**Figure 1-1: Composition of District Solid Waste Managed (Calendar Year 2005)**
2. Background Strategic Planning Activities

2.1. Overview

Waste generation is expected to increase by up to seven million tons per year over the next 20 years. Some contract agreements for solid waste services are also approaching their expiration dates including solid waste disposal agreements for the WSB and WNB facilities in 2011 and 2012 respectively. Also, the Interlocal Agreement (ILA) between the County and the Contract Communities is set to expire in 2013.

Given these impending changes, in 2002 the RRB on behalf of the Broward Solid Waste Disposal District (District) initiated a series of activities to transition to a comprehensive solid waste program for Communities that want to continue the benefits afforded by a regional Resource Recovery System (RRS). These activities have become the building block that allow for development of a New ILA upon expiration of the current Agreement. Some of the key activities or events that constitute the foundation for the New ILA framework are as follows:

- 2003 Strategic Plan;
- Broward County Trash Summit to expand on the 2003 Plan;
- Request for Expressions of Interest in providing solid waste management facilities or services;
- Broward County Site Evaluations to evaluate potential solid waste management facility sites on land controlled by the District;
- Needs Assessment Survey of the incorporated communities in Broward County; and,
- Strategic Planning Process to develop a New ILA Framework.

2.2. 2003 Strategic Plan

In 2003, the County completed an update of its existing Strategic Plan to further the TAC’s vision to “...develop and maintain recommendations on the short and long term system wide goals and objectives of the Resource Recovery System.” The Strategic Plan focused on the administrative, programmatic and infrastructure aspects of the RRS.

The 2003 Strategic Plan recommended changes to the administration of the RRB including increasing awareness of RRS issues; empowering one agency to handle the budget, revenue and expenses of the RRS; and policy development regarding expansion of programs by the ILA Community.
Program issues centered around education for the integrated solid waste management system and resource recovery issues including flow control, recycling, waste tires, a waste composition study (conducted by Malcolm Pirnie in 2002), and a plan for storage and disposal of emergency induced debris.

The 2003 Strategic Plan identified other goals and recommendations for the District including:

- The need for an expanded, cost effective recycling program,
- Expanded collection programs for residents and small businesses,
- A regional yard waste program,
- A plan to maximize landfill diversions
- A metals recovery program for each WTE facility.

### 2.3. Broward County Trash Summit

The Broward County Trash Summit (Trash Summit) was one of the first formalized and collective efforts in the creation of a new solid waste management infrastructure. The Trash Summit was held June 16 - 17, 2006 to develop a policy framework that would guide future decisions about the County’s RRS. The Trash Summit was attended by a diverse group of stakeholders who were involved in or affected by solid waste collection, disposal, and recycling in the County, including governments, businesses, civic associations and environmental groups.

The stakeholders participating in the Trash Summit favored maintaining a regional solid waste disposal system. While there was less support for regionalizing collection, several participants suggested multiple collection zones with collection contracts procured collectively for each multi-community, geographic zone.

Participants suggested and discussed options for governance of the District going forward:

- The RRS could continue to be governed by a dependent district as it is now, or by an independent district.
Alternatives for representation on the RRB were debated. Trash Summit participants thought that municipalities should represent a majority of the RRB membership.

Participants also believed that an RRB with representation for each Contract Community would be unworkable and ineffective.

The results of the Trash Summit are summarized in Appendix A. The key recommendations included the following:

- The RRS should be improved and expanded to provide for continued safe and responsible solid waste disposal for the next 20 years and beyond,
- Communications with elected officials in each Contract Community should seek to achieve a consensus on the future governance structure for the RRS, and
- Changes are needed to increase the amount of recycling and waste reduction through improved public education in the Contract Communities and in the County’s school system; enhanced recycling programs for commercial high rise developments and multifamily communities; increased convenience for household hazardous waste and electronics recycling programs; and development of consistent minimum standards for recycling services throughout the District.

Trash Summit participants expressed the need for regional solid waste disposal facilities and acknowledged the need to explore alternative solid waste disposal technologies that may be appropriate for the District in the future. It was decided that technological research findings and interest from emerging technologies should be widely distributed and discussed. In the future, all Contract Communities should be provided the opportunity to express their preferences regarding solid waste services and governance issues.

2.4. Request for Expressions of Interest

The District initiated a Request for Expressions of Interest (RFEI) in July 2007 to solicit information from firms that could meet all, or a portion of, the District’s future solid waste processing and disposal requirements. While not a procurement effort, the intent was to use information obtained during the process to support future procurement, if required. The objectives of the RFEI process were to:

1. Inform interested parties of the District’s solid waste management needs.
2. Engage qualified firms in preliminary discussions regarding possible approaches to addressing those needs.
3. Determine the viability of emerging solid waste management options and technologies, in addition to established technical approaches. Viable options were defined as those solid waste processing and disposal options that would:
   - Provide the District with long-term disposal capacity;
Be cost effective for the District;
- Provide high levels of service to the community;
- Increase recycling levels to meet or exceed State of Florida goals; and
- Provide flexibility to adapt to future changes.

4. Identify relevant procurement, technical, business and management issues.

5. Identify vendors and developers with the experience, financial capability and proven technology to potentially manage the District’s future solid waste stream.

In response to the RFEI, 27 Expressions of Interest (EOIs) were received. Following a comprehensive review of all of the EOIs, 11 respondents, which are listed in Table 2-1, were invited to participate in discussion sessions in November 2007 with the District and other interested parties. The 11 Respondents were chosen based on the District’s desire to learn more about their proposed solid waste disposal method or technology. Of the 11 invited Respondents, more than six offered an innovative technology, defined as a technology that involves waste conversion with the promise of significant environmental benefits, overall volume reduction benefits and/or cost reduction.

Table 2-1: Respondents Participating in Discussion Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Name</th>
<th>Proposed Service Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Disposal Services South Florida, LLC</td>
<td>Full Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casella</td>
<td>Innovate Technology/Full Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Energy Solutions</td>
<td>Innovative Technology/Full Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Waste Technologies, Inc.</td>
<td>Innovative Technology/Full Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill Environmental Systems of N.C. Inc.</td>
<td>Niche Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratt Industries, USA</td>
<td>Niche Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ReCycled Refuse International AG</td>
<td>Innovative Technology/Full Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Environmental Initiatives</td>
<td>Innovative Technology/Full Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbaser and Valorga</td>
<td>Innovative Technology/Full Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Recovery Seattle International LLC and</td>
<td>Full Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributed Energy Systems Corporation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Services, Inc. and Sun Recycling LLC</td>
<td>Full Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the proposed technologies offered both out-of-county and in-county disposal options as well as innovative technologies. The advantages and disadvantages of both options are offered in Tables 2-2, 2-3, and 2-4.
## Table 2-2: Disadvantages and Advantages of Out-of-County Disposal Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally short-term contracts. Changes in transportation and maintenance costs likely to increase overall disposal costs.</td>
<td>Flexibility to re-procure haul and disposal options. This option could be scalable to adapt, should local, “merchant” processing facilities emerge in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An out-of-County option requires at least two very large MSW transfer stations sited within Broward County.</td>
<td>Short-term haul and disposal costs may be lower than the current tipping fee, however the current Wheelabrator Tipping Fee ($63/ton) may be reduced through negotiation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer stations, like any MSW facility, can be difficult to site and a site large enough to accommodate the transfer station(s) may not be available.</td>
<td>Some ILA Community collection fees may be reduced, depending on proximity to the new transfer stations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Table 2-3: Disadvantages and Advantages of In-County Disposal Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A waste processing facility can be very difficult to site. This applies whether the facility is a transfer station, MRF, composting facility, or any other type of waste processing facility.</td>
<td>The BIC Landfill site can be used for a variety of solid waste processing facilities, which could eliminate one of the most significant barriers to constructing any new facility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Table 2-4: Disadvantages and Advantages of Innovative Technologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovative technologies generally have a limited track record and have not been tested for use on a commercial scale. In some cases, there is no track record of on-going operations and the technology has been tested on a limited basis.</td>
<td>Many innovative technologies involve waste conversion and promise significant environmental benefits, volume reduction benefits and/or cost reduction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developers of innovative technologies may not have the financial resources to satisfy contractual obligations (such as clearing and restoring a site if it’s unsuccessful).</td>
<td>Developers generally contract to assume most risks, recognizing the need to develop a successful track record, and to offset the sponsor’s risk in order to secure the waste disposal opportunity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depending on contracting, there may be lost opportunities if the technology fails.</td>
<td>The County would have the opportunity to be at the forefront of waste disposal technology and would receive national and international attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developers may not be willing to assume certain important risks, regardless of financial resources.</td>
<td>The County could negotiate additional financial benefits such as decreased tipping fees and increased recycling payment from the developer if the developer does not assume all risks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The RFEI process allowed the District to gain an understanding of the innovative technologies currently on the market. These technologies could be capable of meeting all or some of their future solid waste disposal needs. The detailed results of the RFEI process are summarized in Appendix B. Although no further action was taken in relation to the Respondents, the technologies they offered as well as the proposed pricing and services would be beneficial for future efforts related to strategic planning including site evaluations and workshops.
2.5. Broward County Site Evaluations

The results of the RFEI process provided the backdrop for evaluations of four County-owned properties from May through June 2008. The evaluations were conducted in order to determine which of the solid waste processing and disposal technologies proposed in the EOIs would be appropriate based on a particular site’s dimensions and characteristics. The following four sites were evaluated:

1. 2780 North Powerline Road (North Powerline Road Site), or the Old Pompano Incinerator Site
2. North Alpha 250 (North Alpha 250 Site), North of NW 24th Street, West of Blount Road
3. 441 Temporary Debris Management Site (441 TDMS), just north of the Ash Monofill at the Wheelabrator South Broward WTE Facility on Route 441
4. Broward Interim Contingency Landfill (BIC Landfill)

The Site Evaluations included the following tasks for the first three sites:

- Preliminary Zoning/Land Use Review;
- Wetlands and Wildlife Desktop Evaluation;
- Determination of Available Area for Future Development; and
- Summary Evaluation & Site Development Base Map.

The Site evaluation for the fourth site, the BIC Landfill, included the following:

- Preliminary Zoning/Land Use Review;
- Conceptual Site Analysis;
- Determination of Available Area for Future Development; and
- Preliminary Conceptual Layouts.

It was determined that the County sites would be able to accommodate the technologies proposed in the EOIs. The site evaluations offered an important first step in helping to determine the future solid waste management options available for the County. The detailed results of this evaluation are summarized in Appendix C.

2.6. Needs Assessment Survey

The Needs Assessment Survey (Survey) was one of the key drivers behind the proposed New ILA Framework. In February 2008, Malcolm Pirnie, on behalf of the RRB, issued an electronic version of a four-part Survey which was structured around District needs, governance, infrastructure, and finance. The survey was designed to solicit input from
each municipality in Broward County, regardless of their District status, and to gauge opinions and preferences on the issues of the District’s services, responsibilities, governance structure, finances and other issues.

A summary of the key findings of the Survey were presented to both the RRB and TAC in May 2008. The information gathered through the Survey acted as the basis for identifying areas of consensus and difference among ILA Communities and non-ILA Communities. Some of the key statistics from the survey are:

- Of the 31 City Managers to whom the Survey was issued, responses were received from 25.
- Of 25 responses, 24 were from ILA Community members equaling a 92% response rate among ILA Communities surveyed. One response from a non-ILA Community equaled a 20% response rate among non-ILA Communities surveyed.
- It was noted that several ILA Communities answered “Neutral” to greater than 25% of the questions posed in the Survey. Some of the cities were Sunrise, Lauderhill, Hollywood, Miramar, Fort Lauderdale and Coconut Creek.

While some of the cities indicated interest in continuing with the ILA, they also indicated that several modifications to the District structure were necessary. Other key findings of the Survey were as follows:

- Cities expressed dissatisfaction with the current ILA structure.
- Cities want to see a continued formal structure similar to the current ILA structure after the expiration of the ILA in 2013.
- Solid waste disposal services are as essential to a city as police, fire, or port services which all residents should support.
- Regional disposal facilities are important.
- Cities that provided neutral responses should be visited in order to provide them with the information they need to make a formal decision.

The final results of the Survey indicated that while some of the cities were interested in continuing with the ILA, several modifications to the District structure would be necessary. These results would be used to determine the future needs of the District structure and potential future solid waste disposal options. The detailed results of the Survey are included in Appendix D.

### 2.7. Initial Strategic Planning Process

A series of facilitated workshops were conducted from February through March 2008 to help identify the solid waste disposal options available to the District. Using the collective feedback from the Trash Summit, the RFEI process and the Needs Assessment Survey, informational dialogues and interactive exercises were facilitated that resulted in
a Strategic Policy Action Plan. The Strategic Policy Action Plan defined the District; the governance structure needed to achieve the District’s goals; and development of a waste management system that reflects the District’s values and the available technology options. The workshops were attended by a Task Force comprising of TAC members, Broward County Waste and Recycling Services (WRS) staff, the RRB Executive Director and Legal Counsel. The policy guidelines would be used to do the following:

- Negotiate with solid waste vendors;
- Determine the best fit between available technologies and ILA Community’s needs;
- Develop new solid waste disposal facilities; and
- Provide a platform for the development of a future District governance structure.

Beginning with an introductory workshop that detailed the actual planning process, the workshop sequence progressed from the identification and validation of the District’s core values, to topics that examined the effectiveness of the District’s existing governance structure. The workshops, in successive order were the following:

- Strategic Planning Overview;
- Core Values Definition and Validation; and
- Charter and Governance.

2.7.1. Strategic Planning Overview Workshop

The Strategic Planning Overview Workshop presented what the typical planning process should be, along with an introduction to scenario planning for the development of a solid waste management infrastructure. The goals of the process were identified as follows:

- Identify Core Values of the District;
- Identify the guiding principles for future decisions and actions; and
- Create a policy and action.

2.7.2. Core Values Definition and Validation Workshop

The Core Values Definition and Validation workshop identified the key elements that would be used in the identification of the District’s core values. These elements would involve characterizing the components that were integral to the District’s solid waste management infrastructure, such as system flexibility, reliability and the use of a proven technology that encouraged environmental stewardship. These values were expressed in Vision and Mission statements:

- **Vision:** The vision of the District is to ensure the public health and welfare of all citizens of Broward County through responsive and efficient management of
economically feasible proven technologies while sustaining environmental stewardship.

- **Mission:** The mission of the District is to serve the citizens of Broward County within a flexible system that meets or exceeds environmental regulations by encouraging cost-effective proven green technologies.

### 2.7.3. Charter and Governance Workshop

The Charter and Governance workshop allowed participants to assess how the District’s structure may best accommodate the needs of stakeholders and shareholders. The workshop engaged discussion on the following:

- Identifying viable platforms for a future ILA District Governance structure for managing solid waste and making decisions.
- Considering whether the ILA should be inclusive of all communities in Broward County.
- Outlining the roles/power of the RRB, District, TAC, ILA Communities and other stakeholders.
- Considering whether the proposed changes satisfy stakeholder concerns as delineated in the Survey and other feedback.
3. Strategic Planning Activities and the Development of New ILA Framework

In September, 2008, the RRB through the TAC began the process of developing a New ILA Framework to become the basis for a new Interlocal Agreement with Broward County and Incorporated Broward Communities wishing to continue regional solid waste management services through a Special District. The development of the New ILA Framework used the previous activities, studies and surveys as the basis for considering the key terms of a new charter for the District.

3.1. Strategic Planning Process

Through a series of five facilitated workshops, TAC meetings, TAC subcommittee meetings, and a combined RRB/TAC presentation and workshop, the strategic planning process provided a platform for debating and resolving the previous activities and issues outlined in Section 2. The planning process is depicted graphically in Figure 3-1. The workshops were attended by a core group comprised of TAC members, Contract Community representatives, the RRB Executive Director, the RRB Legal Counsel, and Waste and Recycling Services (WRS) staff.

Figure 3-1: Broward County Strategic Planning Process Diagram
3.2. Governance and Management Workshop

The Governance and Management Workshop focused on alternative governance structures and possible processes for the administration and management of the delivery of solid waste services under a future organization. Figure 3-2 shows the current District governance structure. Suggestions for proposed changes to the governance and management system included:

- Modifying the organizational structure of RRS to provide more efficient, cost effective oversight and delivery of solid waste services;
- Providing more cost effective services to Contract Communities;
- Reducing the “management fee” for the procurement, management, monitoring and oversight of the service delivery systems for the District; and
- Establishing a fee for solid waste disposal that eliminates the annual distribution of “excess” reserve funds.

The Survey results indicated a desire by ILA Communities for greater independence and less County oversight of the operations and management of the RRB. The Core Committee discussed the powers and obligations of dependent districts versus independent districts. It was noted that the legal implications of these forms of governance were not at the heart of the matter to the Survey respondents. Instead, it was believed that the responses reflected the wish to reduce the County oversight of the RRS while increasing the role and responsibilities of the ILA Communities through the RRB.
3.2.1. **Management, Administration and Operations of the Dependent Special District**

The goal of management and operation is to create “improved effectiveness and efficiency associated with governance and management of the RRS.” While the Core Group expressed their appreciation for the work of the WRS staff in support of the RRB, it was collectively agreed that the RRB would be able to operate more effectively if the organization had its own dedicated professional staff that reported directly to the RRB through the Executive Director. The balance of the staff required to conduct the business of the District could be direct hire, contract employees, seconded employees from the WRS with cost reimbursement by the District, or any combination based on the preference of the RRB.

The autonomy achieved with staff dedicated to the District would be further enhanced through the creation of an efficient, effective administration system created specifically to achieve the objectives of the District in accordance with the requirements of law. This independent structure would provide management flexibility resulting in lower costs and increased efficiency over the current structure administered by the County. Figure 3-3 represents the proposed structure for solid waste service delivery under the New ILA.

The role and composition of the TAC should stay essentially the same as it is now. The TAC would continue to be an advisory board representative of the Contract Communities, the County, the Broward League of Cities and stakeholders within the Broward County area. They would provide technical advice and guidance to the RRB on any issue related to the RRS and would continue to administer special programs in accordance with delegated responsibility from the RRB. Any request for technical advice
and counsel by the County would be directed through the RRB rather than directly to the TAC.

The Core Group expressed concern about attendance by individual TAC members. Since most TAC members represent Contract Communities, it is recommended that the TAC Chair would report excessive absence of individual members to the appointing authority.

The Core Group took up the concept of a Citizens Advisory Committee to achieve additional transparency and represent the position of Contract Communities to the RRB. After consideration, it was determined that this additional level of advisory committee is not necessary since the TAC is representative of the Contract Communities and conducts its business in the sunshine in accordance with law.

With the increased responsibility related to a more autonomous organization, the Core Group discussed the adequacy of composition of the RRB and their ability effectively lead the RRS under the New ILA. After much discussion, it was felt that the RRB would probably need to meet more frequently to effectively govern the RRS without delaying critical contract and administrative deliberations. It was determined that the RRB would be responsible for setting their own schedule of meetings to effectively carry out their responsibilities.

In keeping with the results of the Survey, several community representatives expressed concerns about representation on the RRB. The Core Group debated several alternatives for RRB representation by the Contract Communities including number of members, selection of the RRB members, terms of office, and other parameters. In the end, the Core Group could not come to a consensus on alternative structures and left the decision to the TAC Administration Subcommittee and the TAC. It was determined that the RRB composition, member appointment and term of service would remain as it now and that such compositions may be reconsidered as an amendment to the ILA in the future if or when conditions so warrant.

### 3.2.2. Resolutions

The outcome of the Governance and Management Workshop provided resolution on key issues:

- The District would remain a Dependent Special District authorized by Broward County.
- Broward County would delegate all administrative and management responsibilities to the RRB for the District except as provided by law for a Dependent District.
- The management and operations of the RRS would be provided by staff with direct reporting responsibility to the RRB through the Executive Director.
- The TAC would remain a technical advisory group to the RRB representative of each Contract Community and other stakeholders.
- There is no need for a Citizens Advisory Committee based on the composition and responsibility of the TAC.
- The RRB composition and selection will remain as it is with expanded responsibility for the operation and management of the District.

### 3.3. Core Services Workshop

The Core Services Workshop used the results from the Survey to analyze and review those core and optional services desired by the ILA Communities. In particular, Survey results indicated a significant preference for the RRS to continue to manage core services, such as the processing and marketing of recyclables and in the management of solid waste disposal. The RRS would also include regional programs for low volume waste materials and yard waste. ILA Communities expressed a preference for continuing to provide local management of Community solid waste collection services.

Solid Waste Services currently offered to ILA Communities include:

- Solid Waste Disposal,
- Recycled Material Processing,
- Limited Innovative Technology Development,
- Public Education Programs,
- Household Hazardous Waste Program,
- Electronic Waste Processing, and
- Emergency Debris Storage and Disposal.

The Core Group discussed the existing programs including ideas to expand the effectiveness of each. The Core Group, supported by results of the Survey, felt strongly that each of the current services should continue to be provided and expanded where appropriate under the New ILA. Additionally, the Core Group, supported by previous plans and the Needs Survey, added Yard Waste Processing to the list of Core Services of the new RRS.

Previous workshops, studies and activities identified alternative proven and emerging technologies that might be considered for potions of the District’s solid waste stream. The proven technologies clearly fit into one or more of the selected Core Services to be provided by the District. Decisions regarding the specific technologies used to meet the Core Services may be reevaluated from time to time based on the advancement of the industry, economic factors and other considerations determined appropriate by the RRB.
3.3.1. Resolutions

The outcome of the Core Services Workshop provided resolution on the following key issues:

- Optional solid waste disposal services will not be offered to ILA Communities by the District.
- Collection services will continue to remain under local management of each ILA Community with disposal services provided by the District.
- The Core Services to be provided by the District are:
  1. Solid Waste Disposal and Reduction
  2. Educational and Public Information
  3. Electronic Waste Recycling Program
  4. Regional Yard Waste Processing
  5. Household Hazardous Waste Processing
  6. Materials Recycling Program
  7. Research and Development Program
  8. Emergency Debris Storage and Disposal

3.4. Implementation Process Workshop

The Implementation Process Workshop was the third workshop, which focused on scenarios for creating and delivering the proposed New ILA Terms to potential Contract Communities. During this workshop two alternatives were presented and discussed.

In the first alternative represented an interactive one-on-one dialogue between representatives for the District and representatives for each potential Contract Community. The purpose of the dialogue is to present the New ILA package, including the New ILA terms, estimated cost and the process for ratification of the New ILA. As details of the New ILA are discussed with potential Contract Communities, provisions of the terms could be fine tuned by the representatives of the District or carried back to the RRB if the Contract Community request warranted such action. Basically, the Implementation Process would consist of six, or more, distinct stages:

- Creation of the ILA Terms document at the completion of the workshop process.
- Determination of the estimated cost of Services and Administration of the District under the New ILA.
- Presentation of the New ILA package to ILA and non-ILA Communities, one-on-one.
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- Resolution by the RRB of any proposed changes emanating from the dialog with potential Contract Communities and crafting the final version of the Interlocal Agreement.
- Presentation of final ILA to potential Contract Communities for ratification.
- Finalize the procurement of Solid Waste Services and develop a Transition Plan for the Administration and Management of the new District.

In the second alternative, instead of meeting with individual Contract Communities on a one-on-one basis, the proposed New ILA package would be presented to all potential Contract Communities in one or more, collective group meetings. All other aspects of the six-stage process would remain essentially the same.

The Core Group, following a presentation by the Executive Director, decided to utilize the first alternative. The one-on-one dialog with potential Contract Communities would begin with the Executive Director and a member of the TAC supported, where necessary, by the RRB Chair.

3.4.1. Resolutions

The outcome of the Implementation Process Workshop provided resolution on the following key issues:

- A one-on-one dialogue would be most effective in refining the ILA Terms to reflect the needs of potential Contract Communities.
- The New ILA package would be presented by the RRB Executive Director and a TAC member (preferably for the potential Contract Community being visited) on a one-on-one basis with support, as required by the RRB Chair.
- The RRB will resolve any issues that the RRB Executive Director is unable to resolve.

3.5. New ILA Terms Workshops

In the fourth and fifth strategic planning workshops, the proposed New ILA Terms were presented, debated and revised with the participation of the TAC and the Core Group. Proposed New ILA Terms incorporated results from previous strategic planning efforts including the Survey and the workshops conducted with the Core Group to date.

The issue of the composition and selection of the RRB was debated again considering five alternative structures proposed to allow more equitable representation by all Contract Communities. Final resolution of this matter did not occur until after the workshops were completed and prior to presentation to the Combined RRB/TAC in June, 2009, in the form of a recommendation by the Administration Subcommittee.
The final two workshops created the platform for the Core Group, the TAC and other interested stakeholders to review all preceding activities and workshops resulting in the recommended New ILA Terms that were later presented to the Combined RRB/TAC on June 30. Some of the issues and recommendations that were re-visited, discussed and further debated included:

- A preference for the RRB to have more autonomy in the Administration and Management of the District but remain a Dependent Special District created by the Board of County Commissioners (BCC);
- One of the key decision makers for potential Contract Communities will be the solid waste disposal tipping fee, which includes revenue that covers some of the cost of additional programs offered by the District and the administrative, management and operating cost of the District. A reduction in tipping fee is seen as a critical factor under consideration by potential Contract Communities;
- The fate of surplus reserve fund distribution to Contract Communities;
- The transition of staff accountability from the County to the District represented by the RRB through the Executive Director; and
- The role of the TAC in the New ILA.

The following proposed New ILA Terms were discussed, fine tuned and recommended for inclusion in the presentation to the Combined RRB/TAC and later incorporated in the New ILA Package to be presented to potential Contract Communities.

### 3.5.1. Resource Recovery Board Composition

Five options for the selection and composition of the Resource Recovery Board were considered, including:

#### 3.5.1.1. Option 1: Existing RRB Structure

- The RRB is currently comprised of nine (9) members composed as follows:
- One (1) member is appointed by the County Commission.
- Three (3) members. One (1) member each selected by the three ILA Communities with the largest populations.
- Three (3) members. One (1) member each selected by the three ILA Communities nearest to the median in size based upon population.
- Two (2) members. Each member is to be chosen by the highest ranking office of the Broward League of Cities or its successor organization, held by an elected official from a municipal ILA Community. If no office of the Broward League of Cities is held by an elected official from an ILA Community, the appointments shall be made by the past President of the Broward League of Cities from an ILA Community, which most recently served as President of the Broward League of Cities. If no past President of the Broward League of Cities is available to make
the appointments, same shall be made by the Director of the Broward League of Cities from an ILA Community which has the longest service as a Director with the Broward League of Cities.

3.5.1.2. Option 2: ILA Community Council with Existing RRB Structure

Under this option, a Community Council would be created and would be responsible for the following:

- Nominating and electing members of the RRB from within its constituency.
- Recommending consideration of proposed ILA amendments to the Contract Communities for approval in accordance with procedures adopted to amend the ILA.

The Community Council would consist of one member appointed by each Contract Community and one member by the Broward BCC. The Community Council would meet a minimum of once per year and more frequently, as needed. In order to conduct official business, each meeting must have a quorum of 50% of the members. Action by the ILA Community Council must be approved by simple majority vote of the members present at the meeting. This RRB selection process would be applicable to other options regarding the membership composition of the RRB.

ILA Community Council is a unique concept proposed as a means of addressing issues of representation for smaller Contract Communities. Critics of the Community Council offered the following observations:

- The Community Council would add another, unwieldy layer of governance to the District, which would complicate a process that is already complex.
- The Community Council would complicate and possibly delay consideration of an amendment to the ILA having no effect on consideration by the Contract Communities.

3.5.1.3. Option 3: Seven Member Resource Recovery Board with Tiered Representation

Under this option, the RRB would be comprised of seven (7) members. One (1) member would be a representative of the Broward BCC and six (6) members would be appointed by the Contract Communities as follows:

1. Two (2) members selected by tier one Contract Communities.
2. Two (2) members selected by tier two Contract Communities.
3. Two (2) members selected by tier three Contract Communities.

Contract Communities would be grouped into tiers that each represent approximately one-third (1/3) of the total population of the Contract Communities based on the latest population estimate published by the University of Florida Bureau of Economic and
Business Research. The tiers would be reassessed every two (2) years in order to reflect the changing populations of ILA Communities.

The RRB would elect one (1) of its members as chair and one of its members as vice chair of the RRB. However, the chair and vice chair may not represent the same ILA Community.

3.5.1.4. Option 4: Nine Member Resource Recovery Board with Tiered Representation

The RRB would be comprised of nine (9) members. One (1) member would be a representative of the Broward BCC and eight (8) members would be appointed by the Contract Communities as follows:
1. Two (2) members selected by tier one Contract Communities.
2. Two (2) members selected by tier two Contract Communities.
3. Four (4) members selected by tier three Contract Communities.

Contract Communities would be grouped into tiers that each represent approximately one-third (1/3) of the total population of the Contract Communities based on the latest population estimate published by the University of Florida Bureau of Economic and Business Research. The tiers would be reassessed every two (2) years in order to reflect the changing populations of ILA Communities.

The RRB would elect one (1) of its members as chair and one of its members as vice chair of the RRB. However, the chair and vice chair may not represent the same ILA Community.

3.5.1.5. Option 5: Nine Member Resource Recovery Board with Tiered and Leagues of Cities Representation

The RRB would be comprised of nine (9) members. One (1) member would be appointed by the Broward BCC; six (6) members would be appointed by the Contract Communities and two (2) members appointed by the Broward League of Cities. The six (6) members from the Contract Communities would be selected as follows:
1. Two (2) members selected by tier one Contract Communities.
2. Two (2) members selected by tier two Contract Communities.
3. Two (2) members selected by tier three Contract Communities.

Contract Communities would be grouped into tiers that each represent approximately one-third (1/3) of the total population of the Contract Communities based on the latest population estimate published by the University of Florida Bureau of Economic and Business Research. The tiers would be reassessed every two (2) years in order to reflect the changing populations of ILA Communities.
Two (2) members appointed by the Broward League of Cities would be selected by the highest ranking office of the Broward League of Cities or its successor organization, held by an elected official from a municipal ILA Community. If no office of the Broward League of Cities is held by an elected official from a ILA Community, the appointments would be made by the past President of the Broward League of Cities from a ILA Community, who most recently served as President of the Broward League of Cities. If no past President of the Broward League of Cities is available to make the appointments, the same would be made by the Director of the Broward League of Cities from an ILA Community which has the longest service as a Director with the Broward League of Cities.

The RRB would elect one (1) of its members as chair and one of its members as vice chair of the RRB. However, the chair and vice chair may not represent the same ILA Community.

### 3.5.2. Resource Recovery Board Responsibilities

The Core Group built on the concept of transferring the Administrative, Management and Operations of the District from the County to the RRB with the following examples of responsibilities that would inure to the RRB. This list represents illustrative examples of the governance responsibilities of the RRB and is not intended to limit that authority. RRB responsibilities may include but are not limited to:

- Serve as the executive governing board of the Solid Waste District in accordance with the provisions of the ILA and the laws of the State of Florida.
- Establishing operations and management policy related to the administration and management of all aspects of the RRS.
- Developing and recommending County approval of an annual revenue and expense budget.
- Approval or Rejection authority over the issuance of any bonds or other instruments related to short or long term borrowing, and letters of credit or debt.
- Preparation of all plans and planning related to the Resource Recovery System.
- Responsible for all legal matters related to the Solid Waste District.
- Responsible for financial management of the District, including but not limited to:
  1. Establishing rates and user charges to sufficiently fund the District.
  2. Management and administration of the annual expense and revenue budget.
  3. Conduct such audits as required by law or as directed by the RRB.
  4. Provide other financial services related to the proper and efficient operation of the District.
In general, the final responsibility and authority for all activities related to the operations, administration, management and obligations of the RRS, except for the final budget approval and the issuance of debt would become the primary responsibility of the RRB and its delegated staff.

### 3.5.3. ILA Term and Extensions

The terms of a new ILA will be 10 years with up to two (2) 10-year renewals. This term would allow flexibility for Contract Communities and service contracts with vendors providing core services. ILA renewal would be an individual decision of each Contract Community. The ILA term and subsequent extensions would be coterminous with the solid waste disposal agreement and other major service contracts.

### 3.5.4. Provision for ILA Amendments

In the event an amendment to the ILA becomes necessary, the method for approval will require a majority of the Contract Communities and sufficient Contract Communities representing a majority of the total population of all Contract Communities.

### 3.5.5. RRB Member Term

The RRB will have an expanded role in the governance of the District. The issue of term limits was discussed by the Core Group. Some felt that a two consecutive term limit for RRB members would provide a fresh perspective on administrative policy related to the administration and management of the RRS. This concept was discarded in favor of continuing the current no term limit of the RRB members.

### 3.5.6. RRB Meetings

Based on the expanded responsibilities of the RRB, it was felt by the Core Group that more frequent meetings would be required to avoid unnecessary delays in the administration of the District. The final decision regarding the frequency of RRB meetings should be left to the RRB.

To aid in streamlining the administration of the District, the Core Group suggested the Executive Director be given more direct authority to act on behalf of the RRB through an approved schedule of delegations. This would enable the Executive Director to conduct the business of the District in accordance with pre-approved authority and constraints granted by the RRB.

### 3.5.7. Technical Advisory Committee Role and Responsibilities

The following was determined regarding the responsibilities and makeup of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC):
The TAC will function as an advisory committee to the RRB representing each Contract Community and other stakeholders.

The TAC will provide technical advice to the RRB on matters related to the solid waste management and the RRS.

TAC members will be appointed as they are in the current ILA.

In an effort to improve participation by TAC members, any member having four or more unexcused absences from the TAC meetings within a fiscal year will be reported to the Contract Community by the TAC Chair.

The TAC members shall elect a chair and vice chair from the TAC membership and shall appoint standing or special Subcommittees as required.

Key discussion points regarding this proposal were:

- The TAC Chair should not have the authority to remove a member for unexcused absence from any number of meetings because each TAC member is a representative of a Contract Community or other stakeholder groups.
- Only the appointing agency should have authority to remove or replace a TAC member. The TAC Chair should have the responsibility to report excessive absence of TAC members to the Contract Community or appointing agency.

3.6. Presentation of Revised ILA Terms to the TAC and RRB

The proposed New ILA Terms were presented to the combined TAC and RRB on June 30, 2009. While the overall composition of the RRB would remain the same as the current ILA, the proposed New ILA Terms included the following changes:

1. New, expanded RRB responsibilities in a dependent District
2. The Governance provisions of the New ILA and the management of the District.
3. The Core Services to be provided by the District.
4. The TAC Role and Responsibilities
5. How amendments to the ILA will be adopted
6. Control of revenue, budgets, debt, and cost of services and other financial matters.

Expanded Roles and Responsibilities of the RRB

The expanded role of the RRB is a result of shifting responsibility for the administration, management and operation of the RRS to the Contract Communities while maintaining the status as a Dependent Special District created by the Board of County Commissioners. Under the New ILA, the RRB will function as a semi-autonomous governing board with direct control of the RRS inuring to the Member Communities. These changes include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. The establishment of administrative policy related to all aspects of the RRS.
2. Preparation of an annual Revenue and Expense Budget for the Special District and submission of the Budget to the BCC for approval.
3. Through the New ILA, any new debt financing would require the approval of the RRB before issuance by the BCC.

4. The RRB would be responsible for all Plans and Planning related to the RRS.

5. The RRB would be responsible for all legal matters related to the Solid Waste District.

6. The final responsibility and authority for all activities related to the operations, administration, management and obligations of the RRS, except for the final, annual budget approval and the issuance of debt would become the primary responsibility of the RRB and its staff.

Management of the Solid Waste District

Management and operation of the RRS will be the responsibility of the RRB who will provide the staff required to conduct the business of the District. This might include the direct hire of staff, contract employees, contracted County staff or any combination of these alternatives selected by the RRB.

Core Services

The New ILA will include specific core services to be provided by the District to the Contract Communities. The New ILA Core Services are:

- Solid Waste Disposal and Reduction
- Educational and Public Information
- Electronic Waste Recycling Program
- Regional Yard Waste Processing
- Household Hazardous Waste Processing
- Materials Recycling Program
- Research and Development Program
- Emergency Debris Collection and Disposal

TAC Role and Responsibilities

The TAC will function as an advisory committee to the RRB for any matters related to solid waste management and the RRS. The TAC will be represented by a member appointed by each Contract Community, one member appointed by the County, one member appointed by the Broward League of Cities, one member appointed by the Broward School Board and three industry stakeholders.

Amendment to the ILA Terms

A two-tier approval process for amendments to the ILA is recommended to make desired changes to the ILA necessitated by internal and external factors. Amendments would be approved by a majority of the Contract Communities and by sufficient number of Contract Communities representing a majority of the population served by RRS.
Financial Control

The TAC recommended that the RRB have as much financial control over the RRS as allowed by law for a Dependent Special District. It is proposed that the RRB be responsible to:

1. Establish rates and user charges to sufficiently fund the District
2. Approve all short and long term debt required by the District
3. Prepare an annual revenue and expense budget for final approval by the BCC
4. Provide operating budget management and control, and conduct such audits as required by law or as directed by the RRB.
5. Providing other financial services related to the proper and efficient operation of the District.
4. Implementation Process and Next Steps

A combined workshop with the RRB and the TAC was conducted on June 30, 2009. The strategic planning process to develop the New ILA Framework was presented followed by discussion of the TAC recommendations. During this workshop and the RRB meeting preceding the workshop, the RRB authorized the District Attorney to begin crafting the New ILA based on the results of the workshops culminating in the Combined RRB/TAC workshop.

In addition to moving forward with development of the New ILA, the RRB approved a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Wheelabrator Environmental Services. The MOU is the result of negotiated terms between the RRB and Wheelabrator for the provision of solid waste disposal services under the new ILA. The MOU must be developed into a Contract for Services and is, in part, dependent on ratification of the New ILA by the Contract Communities.

The RRB has authorized the preparation of an asset inventory of solid waste facilities owned, developed or controlled by the District. It is anticipated that the ownership rights or control of these assets will be determined as a result of the inventory. This inventory report is expected to be provided in draft form within the next month or two. The results of the solid waste asset inventory and determination of ownership rights and control of assets will play a role in the evaluation of the New ILA by potential Contract Communities.

The next major step for implementation of the New ILA is to complete the preparation of a package of documentation to present to potential Contract Communities, including but not limited to:

- A draft new Interlocal Agreement,
- An estimate of the solid waste disposal tipping fee for the Contract Communities including fees for other Core Services and administration of the District,
- A summary of incentives provided as a result of the MOU, and
- A summary of the ownership rights and disposition of the District’s solid waste assets.

After ratification of the New ILA by the Contract Communities, a transition plan will be required to guide the process of developing the governance and management structure of the RRS. Development of the transition plan will require a coordinated effort by the RRB, the Executive Director, the TAC including the Administration Subcommittee, and
the County WRS. The transition plan is intended to guide the process of successfully implementing the terms of the New ILA.
5. Conclusion

The Strategic Planning Technical Report summarizes the process by which the New ILA Framework was developed on the basis of previous studies, plans and activities, and a series of facilitated workshops with the TAC. The New ILA represents modifications and improvements to the original Interlocal Agreement adopted by the County and the Contract Communities in 1986. With the ILA set to expire in 2013, the RRB is considering the various options for its future. The Strategic Planning Process allowed the RRB to engage representatives of the Contract Communities and other stakeholders to help define the preferred outcome of the District following expiration of the ILA in 2013. Previous efforts including the 2003 Strategic Plan, Trash Summit, RFEI, and the Needs Assessment Survey, became the foundation for the New ILA Framework as described herein.

The Solid Waste Disposal District was created to provide an efficient, cost effective way to meet the waste disposal needs of Broward County. The proposed New ILA Framework has been developed to preserve and enhance the original goal of the District while incorporating the needs expressed by the Contract Communities in the Needs Assessment Survey. A significant number of survey respondents highlighted the need for revisions to the ILA.

One of the fundamental issues debated by the TAC was whether or not the District should become an Independent District, completely independent of the County. The TAC was not prepared to make a complete break from the County at this time and recommended that the District remain Dependent to the County. Based on discussions at the final combined RRB/TAC workshop, this issue is not completely resolved and may be re-evaluated after the issuance of the District inventory assessment and determination of ownership rights and disposition of the identified District assets and liabilities.

There are several key factors that will influence the decision of potential Contract Communities to enter into this New ILA. The transition of administrative responsibility and the operation and management of the RRS from the County to the RRB is only one of those factors. Cost of services and control of the District assets will also play an important role in the potential Contract Communities decision for their future solid waste management program.