

MINUTES

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX

OVERSIGHT BOARD

August 14, 2020

MEMBERS

PRESENT:

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

MEMBERS

ABSENT:

Also

Present:

Angela Wallace, Surtax General Counsel
Gretchen Cassini, Board Coordinator
Audrey Thompson, Administrative Support Specialist
Cindy Malin, Public Information Officer, Mobility Enhancement Program
Laura Rogers, County Auditor's Office, via telephone
Chris Walton, Director, Broward County Transit, via telephone
Tony Hui, Deputy Director, Broward County Public Works, via telephone

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION

SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

AUGUST 14, 2020

dh/JC

Nicholas Sofoul, Planning Section Supervisor, Mobility
Planning Section
Ernesto Carreras, Senior Mobility GIS Analyst
Jeffrey Napier, Procurement Strategist
Lina Silva, Program Project Coordinator
Nichole Kalil, Public Information Officer
Johnny Caldera, The Laws Group

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 9:30 a.m., Friday, August 14, 2020.

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

CALL TO ORDER - CHAIR HOOPER

MR. HOOPER: We're going to call the -- is it -- we're starting with a workshop --

MS. CASSINI: Wait.

MR. HOOPER: -- a second day --

MS. CASSINI: Wait.

MR. FERGUSON: Okay. You're live.

MS. CASSINI: Go right ahead.

MR. COOLMAN: The webcast is not on.

MS. MALIN: Yes, it is. I'm watching it.

MS. CASSINI: You need to --

MR. HOOPER: Okay. I'm going to -- I'm --

MS. MALIN: There's a time delay.

MR. HOOPER: Tell me when.

MS. PENNANT: You know what? The webcast is not on.

MR. ALLEN: It is on now.

MR. HOOPER: Are we ready?

MS. CASSINI: Please, for those of you that may not have the webcast running, please refresh your computer. Give it just a moment. It is running.

And, Mr. Chair, you're -- you're good to go.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So, we'll go ahead and call the meeting to

order of the Independent Oversight Board for the second day of our workshop, August 14th, 2020.

ROLL CALL - AUDRY THOMPSON

MR. HOOPER: Can we take a roll call, please?

MS. THOMPSON: Sure, Chair.

Alan Hooper.

MR. HOOPER: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman.

MR. COOLMAN: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen.

MR. ALLEN: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros.

MR. CAVROS: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Ronald Frazier.

MR. FRAZIER: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley.

DR. KELLEY: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love.

MS. LOVE: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant.

MS. PENNANT: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: And Shea Smith. Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: I'm here.

MS. THOMPSON: Thank you.

Chair, we have a quorum.

MR. HOOPER: Excellent. Thank you.

NON-ACTION ITEMS

I Years 2-5 (FY 2022-2025) of the Five-Year Plan Presentation

MR. HOOPER: Let's go ahead. We'll start with the first item on the agenda, and it's going to be a presentation of years two through five of the five-year plan.

I'll let Gretchen go ahead and lead it. Thank you.

MS. CASSINI: Thank you very much.

Mr. Chair, Vice Chair, and board members, welcome to the workshop for the five-year plan and your regular meeting and action items, which will occur this afternoon.

As you can see on the agenda, we'll follow a very similar approach as yesterday, starting off with Public Works.

A Public Works

MS. CASSINI: This is, again, the five-year plan funding levels for Public Works.

I want to remind those of you that may -- just been joining us for today, we did discuss yesterday in detail the fiscal year 2021 requests.

And similar to those requests for Public Works, you will not see any

operating expenses being requested in these levels. These are all capital construction and design and some pre-planning projects.

This is just another way of looking at that total budgetary request for Public Works in various project categories.

The total over the five years is just a little under \$320,000,000.

You can see that the large majority of the investments are going into road capacity expansion, adaptive signal control, and the fiber optic network, which is really the backbone of those adaptive signal control projects, really focusing in on congestion relief, traffic system management, and connectivity in these projects.

B Broward County Transit

MS. CASSINI: We do have Mr. Hui and Mr. Walton on the line available to take any questions that you might have, so feel free to stop me if there's something that you'd like to talk about in more detail.

We did speak about this yesterday, but just to reiterate, the -- the reason that you're seeing a decrease in Broward County Transit requests for fiscal year 2021 is primarily because many of the expected investments and projects are being pushed out into later years of the five-year plan.

As you'll see here, there are some light rail and bus rapid transit expenditures and investments expected during fiscal years 2022 through 2025, the second through the fifth year of our five-year plan.

They're detailed here. On the left, the light rail corridor for -- corridor

expenses for approximately four miles, and then on the right, the initial second and third and fourth BRT corridors -- well, the third and fourth BRT corridors actually will go into engineering and design at the very final year of the five-year plan.

In Transit for the fixed route, paratransit, and planning and studies, we have a total of just under \$63,000,000 and I've detailed what some of those planning and studies would entail off to the right.

Customer facilities, that is actually the West Broward Intermodal Center that's expected in fiscal year 2022, and the request is \$39,000,000.

A park and ride facility, location to be determined, in the amount of \$15,000,000, and that would be in fiscal year 2023.

Within that 111.7 million dollar requested investment for operational facilities, you'll see 36.7 million for the Copans bus facility rehabilitation. Just want to make -- this is the second and third year of requested funding, the first being in fiscal year 2020, and then there is also a request in fiscal year 2021.

This is the project that actually leveraged the 17.3 million dollar grant that we highlighted for you yesterday.

There's 75,000,000 for a third bus facility, including the design.

Within the bus shelter and bus stop improvements, we're looking at 43.5 million dollars, broken out into 36.8 million for 300 bus shelters, 75 annually.

And we'll be getting you some details about where you can expect those and their -- their locations in each year that we bring you back the updated five-year plan.

\$5,000,000 for route expansions and some bus infrastructure between '22 and '25.

Then within the new transit infrastructure, there is 9.2 million being requested for security projects, and well as 7.7 million for IT projects for a total of just over \$226,000,000 over those four years.

Then right below that you see the fixed route bus request for 34.5 million dollars. The paratransit program.

Again, while Mr. Walton was explaining that it is certainly down right now amid the pandemic, we do expect demand and ridership to come back, especially because of the continuing aging of our population and the Silver Tsunami.

And then a little under \$11,000,000 for planning studies, which, again, I detailed them on the slide just previous, and they're here again, for a total under Transit of 62.9 million dollars.

MR. HOOPER: Gretchen, can I ask a question, please?

MS. CASSINI: Oh, yes, Mr. Chair. Please.

MR. HOOPER: Before we get too far ahead. So, the 34.5 million is going -- because -- because on Slide Number 152, you have 34.4 million in 2022 to purchase five new rail cars.

And I'm not -- I don't know if I understand what -- five new rail cars, or is that a typo? Will we be buying rail cars?

MS. CASSINI: I'm going to ask the operator to please make sure that Mr. Walton's line is open and let Chris talk you through the difference between on 152 we're talking about our premium transit services, and here on 154, I believe we're talking about our fixed route --

MR. HOOPER: Oh, yeah.

MS. CASSINI: -- bus.

So, Chris, did you want to talk -- Chris, are you there, first of all? Mr. Walton, are you on the line?

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So, I just -- we can make that a thumbnail for a question.

But the 34.5, I -- I now see it, it's for fixed route buses on page 153.

But on 152, I do have a question on the 34.4 million expenditure for light rail transit and why -- I just want to understand. Maybe we buy them so that we can touch them and feel them.

I just want to understand why we would buy five new rail cars in 2022. Or do we have to purchase them in anticipation of them being built for a year, year and a half?

So I just have a question on that whenever he is available.

MS. WALLACE: Mr. Hooper, this is Angela Wallace.

Your last statement was correct. So, the -- the vehicles can be

ordered, but it does take a substantial amount of time, a number of years, for the vehicles to be built and delivered.

So, they would be ordered, and, over a period of years, built and delivered and tested and so forth.

So that's a multi-year process, but the funding has to be available in order to make -- make the order.

MR. HOOPER: Got you. Thank you.

MR. CAVROS: And -- and, Chair, this is George Cavros.

And -- and maybe for the -- my benefit and the benefit of those watching, what is the difference between a -- a light rail and a bus rapid transit?

MS. CASSINI: So, I'm going to ask once more to see if there's anyone representing Transit that's on the line that would like to take that question.

MR. WALTON: Yes, this is Chris Walton.

MS. CASSINI: So, I need to ask everyone that's on the line to please mute the audio on their computer to limit the feedback.

And then I think I heard Mr. Walton is on the line?

MR. WALTON: Yes, this is Chris Walton.

MS. CASSINI: Please go ahead, Chris.

MR. WALTON: Okay. I'm sorry, I -- I did not get the question. Could you have -- could you repeat the question, please --

MS. CASSINI: Sure.

MR. WALTON: -- the question, please?

MS. CASSINI: The question was could you please describe for the benefit of anyone watching the difference between LRT and BRT.

MR. WALTON: Oh, okay. BRT is bus rapid transit. That is typically where you -- you build a bus network that is -- has a number of different features than the standard bus system.

Typically, you -- you try to get it in a separated roadway. It has different features like off-board payment and -- and traffic synchronization and traffic signal coordination.

LRT is actually a train. It's light rail.

MS. CASSINI: Mr. Cavros, does --

MR. CAVROS: Okay. This is --

MS. CASSINI: -- that answer -- oh. Thank you.

MR. CAVROS: It -- it -- it does.

MR. WALTON: There was also a question earlier about the timing of the purchase of the light rail vehicles.

MS. CASSINI: I think --

MS. WALLACE: Yes.

MS. CASSINI: -- Angela --

MR. WALTON: Was that --

MS. CASSINI: -- answered that one, but -- but --

MS. WALLACE: You can go ahead.

MS. CASSINI: -- please feel free. Go ahead, Chris.

MR. WALTON: Yes. It's very different than buying a bus. We -- light rail vehicles, you have to order two, sometimes three years in advance because of the length of time it takes to build them.

And from a payment standpoint, you have to make progress payments.

Now, when we buy a bus, we pay for the bus after we receive it and inspect.

And light rail vehicles, you actually have to have the money in your budget when you order them, because you make progress payments.

Because of the cost of the vehicle, no manufacturer wants to carry that cost of 5,000,000 -- five or \$6,000,000 for the entire two or three year time frame, so the expectation is that you make progress payments as the vehicle's being built.

And it takes about two, two and a half years to build the vehicle and to test it and commission it and to approve for service.

MR. CAVROS: Chair, this is George Cavros. I have another question related to that.

MR. HOOPER: Go ahead.

MR. CAVROS: Thank you.

So, I see further down in the slide we -- you're asking for 26½ million

to begin engineering and design. And at the top of the slide, we're asking for five new rail cars and start at least the process of -- of purchasing them in 2022.

And I -- I -- I thought that the engineering and design study would help inform what is the appropriate corridor and the appropriate technology. And it -- it seems like we're putting the rail car, you know, in -- in, -- you know, the cart before the horse, or the rail car before the rails.

Could you help me understand that better?

MR. WALTON: Sure. And -- and typically, in the planning process, specifically for rail, we budget -- you budget for light rail.

We -- we really don't know at this point, and we won't know until the study's completed, but for budgeting purposes and for planning purposes, we just tagged as light rail.

It could be a different technology, but for budgeting and planning purposes, typically in -- in public transit as these studies are done and it's budgeting because of the length of time it takes to build -- to design and build these projects, you actually have budget five, seven years in advance.

So, in the process, typically you use light rail as a base.

But the study will actually determine --

MR. ALLEN: I think --

MR. WALTON: -- the appropriate technology.

MR. ALLEN: -- Mr. -- Mr. Chair -- Mr. Chair?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MR. ALLEN: This is Phil.

The -- I think the confusion maybe here is that the difference between the initial light rail and the second corridor.

MR. WALTON: Yeah, the -- I'm sorry, Phil. The 26 would be for the second -- design for the second phase or the second corridor. You are correct.

MR. HOOPER: And -- and also, for clarification, I think yesterday we discussed the 2021 budget has engineering and design for the first corridor, if I'm not mistaken.

MR. WALTON: That is correct.

MS. CASSINI: Mr. Chair, this is Gretchen.

I just wanted to let you know I've placed yesterday's slide from 2021's request up so that we could see that the amount being requested in FY 2021 for engineering and design of the first corridor is 31.5 million.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, I -- I think that helps clear -- clear it a little bit, make it more clear.

Any more questions?

Okay. Let's -- let's keep going.

MS. CASSINI: Our next slide is a summary, overall, that breaks down the fiscal years 2022 through 2025 requests in the areas of Transit operating, capital.

It gives you a total.

And for the first time, we are showing you, at your request, some of our leverage presumptions there in the orange row.

I did want to point out that those leverage presumptions are also assuming rail.

And so, we will be tracking and reporting to you about our progress towards those presumptions, and, of course, if there are changes or shifts in the schedules, we'll be making those modifications as we're reporting to you on an at least quarterly basis.

Our totals -- total for the four last years of the five-year plan in Transit is just a bit over a billion dollars.

MR. COOLMAN: Mr. Chair, I have a question.

MR. HOOPER: Yes, sir.

MR. COOLMAN: Gretchen, these numbers for '22, '23, '24, and '25, excluding the leverage, which I think is congratulations. In fact, yesterday, in 2021, we leveraged over 17,000,000 if I -- if I'm correct.

Are these numbers in line with the original numbers or -- or are these the first time the first four -- three or four columns are being seen?

In other words, do these compare to what your original projections were or are these the first time we've ever -- ever been put down?

MS. CASSINI: So, we do have an analysis later on where we -- where we do look back at where we thought we were going to be when we were

building the original plan throughout 2016, 2017, 20- -- a little bit of 2018.

But since this is our first five-year plan, we really intend to start to look forward, not continue to bring you back to that original 2018 surtax financial plan and its projections.

But I can show you -- if you'd like, I can advance forward and I can show you how it compares to what we thought we were going to be asking in the transit area.

MR. COOLMAN: Yeah, I'd like to -- I'd like to see that.

MS. CASSINI: Okay. So right here, on Slide 156, you can see the assumptions that were in the original surtax financial plan for the full five years, '21 through '25.

We originally assumed a Transit capital investment of just a little under \$730,000,000.

We're now assuming \$535,000,000. So, we're down about 194.4 million.

The Transit operational projections are generally in line with the original assumptions, trending up this year.

And, of course, we'll be letting you know if that continues as a result of COVID or if we start to get back into our -- you know, where we thought we would be.

And then on the Public Works side, as you know, we had -- in the original financial plan, we had actually assumed that the surtax would be

supporting some Public Works operating right around the 10,000,000 mark.

We are now requesting no operating from the surtax. We -- we're using gas tax revenues to support the operating in Public Works.

But we do have increased capital requests in Public Works, and that's primarily related to what we talked about yesterday, where we're really trying to bring every potential shovel-ready project that's on the Public Works side to you and get them into the community and under construction as an economic stimulus.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay. Thank you, very much.

To over simplified the -- was it three and -- how many billion dollars was projected for the 30 years?

MS. CASSINI: 16.5 billion in surtax revenues, with a 2.5 billion of leverage.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay. So, we haven't -- we're -- we're -- that number will change according to technically how much we collect, and -- but we're still on track with what the original projection was for the 30 years.

MS. CASSINI: Yes.

MR. COOLMAN: Thank you.

MS. CASSINI: Of course.

Mr. Chair, would you -- would like me to continue, or are there any other questions?

MR. HOOPER: Yes. Yeah, I think go ahead. Thank you.

C Municipal Projects

MS. CASSINI: So, we did want to show you the funding recommendation versus original surtax plan for 2021, since we did break that one out and spent an awful lot of time on that yesterday.

You can see that on the municipal side, the original plan was anticipating about \$35,000,000 of investment in municipal projects for '21, and we're actually recommending an increase of 26 percent. And that's for both the community shuttles and the municipal capital projects.

But then overall -- and then you see the County capital and operating. We were expecting to spend about \$352,000,000 from surtax revenues in fiscal year 2021, and we're -- we're -- we are requesting 52 percent less.

Now you're looking at the total five-year plan. This is no longer FY 2021 specific.

You have the original plan anticipating expenses for municipal projects and community shuttles of almost \$440,000,000, and we are now at a recommended funding level that is 45 percent down from that.

On the County capital and operating recommendation, we had originally expected to be requesting 1.4 billion dollars in the original plan over fiscal years '20, '21 through 2025, and we have reduced our request by 24 percent in this five-year plan recommendation.

MR. HOOPER: Can I ask a question, Gretchen?

MS. CASSINI: Of course.

MR. HOOPER: So, on the recommended expenditures over five years, is that due to a lack of -- of sales tax revenue or is it a lack of projects being teed up?

MS. CASSINI: Well, I mean, I think in -- it depends. I mean, in -- in -- in the municipal category, I mean, we do have some projects that are teed up, and we're going to talk about that a little bit later in the presentation, that we are not recommending for funding in the five-year plan, and I think part of that is because of uncertainty in surtax revenue projects. And there are also the opportunities for many of those projects' cost estimates to -- to change significantly.

We are funding municipal projects in planning and design phases in fiscal year '20, and we have an expectation and we believe that many of the cost estimates are going to substantially reduce, and thus opening up the opportunity for funding those projects through either surtax revenues or through other avenues that may be available, because there are lots of other transportation funding options that the cities could avail themselves of.

Now, on the County side, I do think that the reduction that you see in our requests over the five years does have a lot to do with what Chris talked about yesterday and today, which is we're pushing a lot of the projects that we expected to be delivering in five -- in the five-year plan out past that fiscal year 2025 horizon, very much as a result of COVID-19.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So -- so, potentially, the municipal projects

could grow over five years and, potentially, the County projects could grow. It really depends on the sources and the uses that are available, right --

MS. CASSINI: Absolutely.

MR. HOOPER: -- at the end of the day. The sources of revenue and then just finding projects that are actually fundable, right?

MS. CASSINI: Absolutely. And, of course, the -- the unknown there is are we going to see an infrastructure package at the federal level that would allow us to take these surtax funds and use them to leverage some federal and state money.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: Which is what we --

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

MS. CASSINI: -- really want to do.

MR. HOOPER: Any other -- any questions? Any questions from other board members?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes, I have one, Alan --

MR. HOOPER: Go ahead.

MR. COOLMAN: -- Mr. Chair.

This reduction to the cities' monies, are we going to see a -- a -- I guess we're going to see a detailed breakdown of that later in the presentation, which would give us a better understanding of the \$200,000,000 less that's going to be spent on the city projects; is that

correct?

MS. CASSINI: Yes, sir.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Go ahead, Gretchen.

MS. CASSINI: So, we -- during the briefings, we also got many questions from the Oversight Board members that asked what the County's investment within municipalities was expected to be.

So, I hope you see here on your Slide 159 that just with -- just over the course of our implementation phase from 2019 to 2020, and then our requested 2021 proposed projects and expenditures that we showed you yesterday, we have about a hundred million in Public Works projects that are within cities.

We also have 37,000,000 of city-specific Transit bus shelters.

Then we have 63,000,000 that kind of overlap multiple municipal boundaries. As you saw yesterday in Mr. Hui's presentation, quite a few of our Public Works projects cross multiple city boundaries.

But we just wanted to give you an idea of the level of investment that the County is making within these jurisdictions.

MR. COOLMAN: I have a question, Mr. Chair.

MR. HOOPER: Go ahead.

MR. COOLMAN: Why -- why does Hillsboro have nothing? There's just nothing going on there? Is that kind of an anomaly?

MS. CASSINI: Oh, it's a --

MR. HOOPER: Hillsboro?

MS. CASSINI: -- it's a really good question. They do have a community shuttle program, but Hillsboro is -- and I asked this myself -- and Hillsboro doesn't have a lot of municipal roadways, and their major thoroughfare is a state road.

And so, they are not excluded from -- from having the County make investments there, but, for the most part, you're going to see FDOT investments being made in -- in roadway projects.

MR. COOLMAN: And I guess later on we're going to see how much Hillsboro is spending on municipal -- of municipal funds, correct?

MS. CASSINI: Yes. And, as I mentioned, they do have a community shuttle program that was eligible for full funding as of October 1st of 2019.

MR. COOLMAN: Thank you.

MS. CASSINI: You're welcome.

This is the comparison I think, Vice Chair, you were referencing that we went over during the briefing.

You can see the recommended funding level for municipal capital projects on the first line in each of the five years of the plan.

Then you will see the amounts being recommended for the municipal shuttle program. That's both existing and expansion.

And you have your totals on the third line.

Then we did an analysis of what the municipalities would be receiving if we were to fund at the minimum annual guarantee of surtax revenues that are being projected.

And, as you can see, the amounts over that ten percent MAG are at least 12,000,000 more in each year.

And the total for the five-year plan is actually \$65,000,000 more than then ten percent minimum annual guarantee.

And as you correctly pointed out, this is at the recommended funding level. We're going to be monitoring surtax revenues and the economic impacts of COVID-19 and be bringing you back updates on a regular basis.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay. Thank you for that.

I -- I would say that the -- the cities, they're seeing this for the first time also today; is that correct?

MS. CASSINI: No, we did a municipal workshop with all of the cities --

MR. COOLMAN: Thank you.

MS. CASSINI: -- including cities that don't have any projects in the five-year plan. And I believe every city was represented on that call.

So, they -- they had a chance to see this in advance of us publishing it.

MS. PENNANT: I do. Mr. Chair?

MR. HOOPER: Yes, Ms. Love.

MS. PENNANT: This is Anthea. Can I just --

MR. HOOPER: Oh, I'm sorry.

MS. PENNANT: -- ask a question?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. PENNANT: If we can --

MR. HOOPER: Sure.

MS. PENNANT: -- just go -- go back to that slide with the city investment. I'm curious about the City of Lauderhill I think. They don't have any investment and -- and I found that very strange.

MS. CASSINI: Well, I -- I'm going to have to defer to Public Works to discuss whether there are some planned -- again, I want to -- want to stress that this is just investments from 2019 and 2020 and the proposed 2021 budgets.

There are investments in Lauderhill that are expected in the five-year plan, and we are going to be able to show you, when we do the dashboard analysis of -- later, and you can see the projects that are planned that will have any impacts on Lauderhill.

I happen to know that there were several that we looked at yesterday in the Public Works presentation that do impact Lauderhill, but they go across multiple jurisdictional boundaries, so we weren't able to allocate the exact amounts of those projects, adaptive signal control, fiber optic networks, and some others, that would go to Lauderhill.

But I think perhaps looking at it on the dashboard visually will help you

see the investments that are planned inside that community.

And I think Angela would like to speak to that as well.

MS. WALLACE: Yes, please.

And I don't know if Mr. Walton is still on the line, but the Lauderhill Transit Center is being constructed right now, and I believe that that's being constructed with federal funds. And it's the bus facility that's going to be located on 441 at the Lauderhill Mall.

Mr. Walton, are you still on the line? If so, will you speak to that?

MS. CASSINI: No, but it's County investment.

MS. WALLACE: So, it's a County investment that is -- it's not specific to surtax, but there are County investments in various cities, including Lauderhill. That's just one example, since the -- the question was with regard to the City of Tamarac of Lauderhill.

So, there are County investments within the municipalities that may not be funded with surtax, but they are Transit and transportation related.

And that's a significant facility that's going in in Lauderhill for transportation.

MS. PENNANT: All right. Thank you. I look forward to hearing more on how much we're spending in that city.

MR. HOOPER: Any other questions?

Okay. Gretchen, you can keep going. Thank you.

MS. CASSINI: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

This is just another --

MR. WALTON: Gretchen --

MS. CASSINI: Oh, hey, Chris.

MR. WALTON: -- I am here. I'm have --

MS. CASSINI: Great.

MR. WALTON: -- I'm having issues, but I -- I'm here now, so.

MS. CASSINI: Chris, the question was what type of County investments are occurring in the County of Lauderhill over the -- either in the past couple of years since the surtax passed or planned during the five-year plan that you can speak to.

MR. WALTON: Okay. I -- I caught a little bit of what Ms. Wallace said, but we're building about an \$11,000,000 Transit Center at the Lauderhill Mall, which is fully funded by federal funds and some County funds.

In addition to that, we have had growth in the community shuttle program. They're one of our most successful community shuttle programs.

And over the years, we have added more service to the Lauderhill program than any other program in the County.

We also have a number of bus stops and bus shelters that we added to the -- to Lauderhill, in the City of Lauderhill.

So, the investment has been -- been very substantial in Lauderhill.

MS. CASSINI: Mr. Chair, would you like me to move on?

MR. HOOPER: Yes, please.

MS. CASSINI: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

MS. CASSINI: So, as you can see, this is just another way of depicting the municipal five-year plan utilization of the surtax funds.

In the blue would be the project amounts.

In the orange is the amount allocated for the shuttle programs.

And then the grey that you see in fiscal year 2021, and 2022 in particular, these -- this is what we're recommending as carry forward, allocating to 2023 where you see that \$56,000,000 needed for capital construction projects.

Just wanted to remind the Oversight Board members that all of the municipal projects that are contained in the five-year plan and being recommended to move forward are -- were just evaluated for their eligibility by the Oversight Board on June 4th, so you will not be -- be -- you will not be requested to act on their eligibility today.

The MPO recommendations that were received by MAP administration in July formed the basis of these five-year plan recommendations.

All projects were also evaluated against our planned corridors by our Public Works staff to determine whether or not they would be in conflict with planned corridor delivery.

And there were other factors considered with respect to financial

forecasting.

When you -- when you look at the slides that highlight the five-year plan for the municipalities, you're going to see cells highlighted in yellow, and then you'll see two projects that are highlighted in green.

And that is intended to visually depict those projects which will -- the funding for which will extend beyond the fiscal year 2025, and then those that are highlighted in yellow will indicate the year in which we expect to fully fund the project.

Design phases were calculated generally at 12 percent of the total construction cost estimate that was provided by the cities to the MPO, and most planning projects constituted three percent of the total construction cost estimate.

We believe that as design advances, those construction cost estimates will be adjusted, in many instances downward.

So, this slide shows you the projects. The rank is the far-left column. That was the rank that was done by the Metropolitan Planning Organization under their prioritization agreement with the County.

Then you see the municipality.

I do want to point out that for the projects ranked 34 through 37, that's a joint project between the cities of Miramar and Pembroke Pines. Miramar is just taking the lead on that.

The cost estimate is highlighted in green for you because it indicates

that this is a project that's going to be funded beyond the end of the five-year plan.

Then for the City of --

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman?

MR. HOOPER: Yes, sir.

MR. ALLEN: Yes. Gretchen, the Board, I understand, will be considering the contracts for -- the interlocal agreements for these projects coming up next month, I believe, or this month?

Are those interlocal agreements only for the 2021 portion of the costs, or does it include the overall projection?

MS. WALLACE: Mr. Allen, this is Angela Wallace.

The form agreement will be presented to the Board for approval on August 25th, and we're requesting that the Board authorize the County Administrator to execute that document.

And the first -- the first projects that will be included will be the ones that were approved in June for the -- through the FY '20 budget.

And if the Board approves the FY 2021 budget, we will proceed with those.

But the -- what's being approved or recommended for FY 2021 will be the next phase of those projects.

So, while some of those -- the FY '20 projects that were listed, 1 through 33, were projects that were ready for construction, so it -- the only

phase that will be done for those projects is the construction phase.

The others are design -- planning and design. And once the planning and design studies are completed that were approved in the FY '20 budget, the FY 2021 funds will be utilized to -- to fund the next phase. So, from planning to design or from design to construction.

And those documents will be amended to add the funding that's approved in FY 2021 for the next phase.

MR. ALLEN: So, if I understand correctly, the interlocal agreement between the County and the individual cities will be one -- or will be one agreement for the -- all of the city projects and then funded by specific projects?

MS. WALLACE: So, there will be a -- a -- an agreement, an interlocal funding agreement for each project.

So, the -- the planning phase projects, for instance, if you have a -- a - - a project that was approved for the planning phase in the FY '20 supplemental budget, the first level of funding within that agreement will be the planning -- the -- the funding that was approved for planning in FY '20.

And once the planning study is completed, when the project is advanced for design, if the -- if it's feasible to proceed with the design, and that's going to be based on the cities' wants and so forth, a lot of different factors, that same document will be amended.

So, the project-specific agreement would be amended to add the

funding for the next phase.

So, it'd be the same document for that project through the different phases of the contract, adding funding for the subsequent phases when appropriate.

MR. ALLEN: Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Any other --

MR. COOLMAN: Mr. Chair --

MR. HOOPER: -- questions?

MR. COOLMAN: -- I have a question.

MR. HOOPER: Yes, go ahead.

MR. COOLMAN: I have -- I'm looking at page 157, but I think it might be 158 or 159, municipal five-year plan recommended funding level where it says ten percent minimum annual gross guarantee.

The municipal capital projects so, 159-863 on that chart. Then on the chart 163, which is probably 164, 165, they total 158-9.

It's a minor difference, but I -- I'm just curious why there's a difference that they're not the same number.

Is that clear or no?

MS. CASSINI: No, your question is very clear, but I -- I don't know why. It could just an error on our part. Can you give me a couple of minutes to look into it and I'll -- and I'll report back?

MR. COOLMAN: Yeah, that -- that's fine. I -- I think it makes it even

more difficult because the one that we received by FedEx is slightly changed, correct?

MS. CASSINI: The -- while -- while the -- the presentation itself changed, the numbers should not change, because they're --

MR. COOLMAN: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: -- straight out of the -- the budget that was published on July 15th, the recommended budget book that was published by the County.

So, I will get you the exact number I just a couple minutes.

MR. COOLMAN: And this number is substantially -- this one -- let's call it 160 for discussion is substantially less than previously projected, which can change over time.

MS. CASSINI: It is substantially less than what was in the original surtax financial plan.

MS. WALLACE: And it's based upon projections that were calculated based upon currently available information.

So, what was in the -- the FY '18 transportation plan were projections that were developed prior to the approval of that plan.

But these are based upon current -- the current circumstances and projections going forward.

MR. COOLMAN: Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Any other questions?

Okay. Gretchen, please proceed.

MS. CASSINI: Sure.

And I won't spend a lot of time on these slides unless you all have questions. We just wanted to be able to show you visually what you approved -- what phase you approved -- that's delineated as either a D for design or a P for planning -- in fiscal year 2020.

Those are the project funding agreements that Angela was referring to a moment ago and that we are currently in the process of negotiating.

And then the -- when you see the amount highlighted in yellow, that's when we expect to fully fund the project. That's the year.

And I'll just show you how many of those projects are moving forward in the five-year plan.

And if -- if I may, Mr. Chair, could I ask the Vice Chair if this number is the one that he's referring to that's different than the other?

Vice Chair Coolman, is this 158908328 the one that you are asking about and why it is different from the -- the number that is here, 159863960?

MR. COOLMAN: That's correct. I'm just curious.

MS. CASSINI: Okay. That I can answer. I think I -- because I was not sure -- do you see how on this slide, Slide Number 161 -- I'm getting a lot of feedback. Can I ask everybody to mute their audio for just a second?

So, Vice Chair, as you can see here, we are actually projecting a carry forward balance of a little under \$1,000,000, which is why you see the

difference between what's in the recommended budget and what's being programmed in the five-year plan.

Because at the end of fiscal year 2025, we expect that there'll be about a million unspent in the municipal projects that'll carry forward to the following year. And you can see that here, too.

MR. COOLMAN: Thank you.

MS. CASSINI: You're very welcome.

You also asked in briefings for more details about the projects that are actually not cost feasible in the five-year plan, so we did want to provide you with that detail.

All of the projects ranked 73 through 109 that you all determined as eligible and that were appropriated funds in our fiscal year 2020 that Angela just discussed with you, the vast majority of those were design projects.

And we've been in communications with those municipalities to talk through what their various options are with respect to still receiving the funding for that design and then whether or not they want to move forward with the construction using alternate funding sources.

Now, there were some deferred projects. As you will recall, there were about 11 projects that either the municipalities determined they weren't ready to bring in front of the Oversight Board for an eligibility determination in May and June, and then there were several projects that the Oversight Board or our Surtax General Counsel recommended not be brought forward for

eligibility review just yet. There was insufficient information, actually, to determine eligibility in some cases.

So, we've been working with those cities and letting them know that as soon as they have the requested documentation, that they are eligible to come in front of the Oversight Board for a determination and that we will do our best to find ways to incorporate them into the five-year plan should funds become available.

And these are just --

MS. LOVE: This is Allyson. Chair?

MR. HOOPER: Go ahead, Ms. Love.

MS. LOVE: Hi. So, what's the mechanism that they use if they want to come back before with the information that's needed for reconsideration?

MS. CASSINI: It depends -- it's -- it's on a case-by-case basis. In some instances, there were projects that, on their face, appeared ineligible, or there were significant components of a project that would clearly not be eligible under the statute.

And so, for those projects, the cities are trying to kind of bifurcate the project into eligible and ineligible components so that they can show you the whole project and how they would fund the ineligible component, and how they would use the surtax as leverage to complete the whole -- the whole project.

So, it's just a matter of going back and doing some planning and

design work on their end.

And then in other instances, it's -- I don't know, Angela, if you have a specific one in mind, but they -- they were all a little bit different.

And all we've told them is once you have the package in manner that you feel comfortable and we can evaluate it very clearly for eligibility, we're happy to bring it in front of the Oversight Board.

I think there was one instance where there were a significant -- significant number of betterments in the project and they needed to cost out what the delta was between what the surtax would pay for and what the city would -- would be paying for for those -- for those betterments.

Does that ask -- answer --

MS. LOVE: Thank you.

MS. CASSINI: -- your question? Okay.

MS. LOVE: Well, maybe further clarity. I understand that they need to come back. I just didn't know was -- what was the formal mechanism, if one exists, or they would -- they'd just send you an email. How does it get back in front of you, the -- Gretchen, and then ultimately us?

MS. WALLACE: Okay. So, we are in constant communication with the -- with representatives from the municipalities. And we've provided checklists associated with the different phases of the projects, planning, design, or construction. And it has the list of the requirements of the documentation that the municipalities are required to submit along with those

projects, along with the eligibility criteria.

So, a lot of the municipalities are currently in the process of compiling the required documentation and will submit it through either my office -- my -- myself or my paralegal, or to Ms. Cassini for evaluation by the County, because the MPO already ranked some of those -- those projects and sent them over. They were included in the rankings.

And once the documentation is compiled and submitted to the County, we can arrange to include the -- the documentation in a subsequent Oversight Board agenda for the Oversight Board's consideration.

MS. LOVE: Thank you.

MS. CASSINI: It's a -- it's a relatively informal process. It's just a matter of notice -- notifying Angela and I and then us getting it onto an agenda and having you all consider it.

MS. LOVE: Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Go ahead, Ms. Cassini.

MS. CASSINI: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

So, previously, the Oversight Board has asked that we provide more graphics and visuals to describe the way that the funding is being distributed and recommended.

So, this is just an opportunity for you to see the way that the funding for municipal projects being recommended in fiscal year 2021, it's -- 19.7 million is in construction. These are all construction projects for the most

part, and some right of way acquisition.

And then overall from fiscal year 2021 through 2025, you see that the vast majority is in construction. Three percent of it is in design, and then we have that carryover balance that I was just describing to the Vice Chair.

Again, just another opportunity to see the way that the total for the municipal projects -- again, we've got shuttles in the green, just a little under \$85,000,000 over the next five years. Construction in the grey, about 63 percent of the funds being allocated. Two percent in design, and that carry forward.

And we just wanted to remind everyone that we don't have any additional planning phases in the five-year plan.

I think we've talked through this, but I did want to just once again reiterate that these are recommended funding levels. They allow the five-year plan to operate the way that it was intended; at the request of municipalities, to provide them with some level of certainty about the projects being programmed in the plan.

If additional revenues are realized, we certainly have the ability to bring back additional projects to the Oversight Board and to the County Commission.

And we believe that these cost estimates will adjust. And -- and this is a plan. And we do anticipate, like all plans, that it will adjust.

And we will be bringing you back in detail each year of this five-year

plan, so you can see how that's adjusted.

MR. HOOPER: And, Gretchen, on the -- you say there's no planning phases in five-year plan yet. Are we leaving that open? Because I would imagine it -- it's like a cycle that continually rotates, and if you want to keep teeing up projects, you would have a -- a -- one year of planning, one year of design and engineering -- you know, you'd have -- it would constantly be cycling through. So --

MS. CASSINI: It's --

MR. HOOPER: -- could you clarify that?

MS. CASSINI: Of course, and happily.

There are two -- there are two things that are going on when -- in -- in that statement.

So, one is until a new process has been implemented to accept projects -- we funded every planning and design project that has been recommended by the MPO.

And so, you know, because of our -- the prioritization agreement that we have with the MPO, we are limited to bringing forth to you and to the County Commission projects in the phases of planning and design that have been identified and ranked by the MPO.

And so, until a -- another set of recommendations for planning and design are provided by the MPO, there won't be any additional planning projects in the five-year plan.

Does that make sense?

MR. HOOPER: It makes sense on the way you described it, but maybe in another meeting or there would be an opportunity for the MPO to tell us how they're managing their cycles of projects.

MS. CASSINI: We can certainly invite them to come and have a conversation with you about what the approach is going to be for both accepting new projects sometime in 2021 as well as making additional recommendations.

Our -- our agreement does contemplate that this would be happening on an annual basis.

MS. WALLACE: And there were additional projects that were included in the five-year plan -- I mean in the -- in the 2018 transportation plan, there were capital projects.

So, of the 500-plus municipal capital projects, the MPO recommended 110. And those were the only ones that were included in the recommendations that were received so far.

And the -- the subsequent phases of those particular projects are being programmed and projected over the next five years for inclusion in the five-year plan.

In the event that there -- if there are additional planning projects that the municipalities requested in the remaining 400 projects that the MPO received, we're not sure.

And if so, then we can have the discussion with the MPO regarding those projects.

And municipalities have the opportunity to submit new applications, once this new process is developed, beginning in February of 2021 for subsequent years.

And we anticipate that the five-year plan will be a rolling five-year plan, similar to the MPO work program. So, we're in -- we're -- we're budgeting FY '21, which is the first year of the five-year plan, and then we'll roll over and --

MR. HOOPER: Got it.

MS. WALLACE: -- there'll be a -- a year added to the back of the five-year plan next year.

And so, it is possible that in out years, as the five-year plan rolls, that more planning projects will be included. We just do not have them at this point.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Thank you. That -- that clarifies it. Thank you.

MR. COOLMAN: Mr. Chair? I have a --

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MR. COOLMAN: -- question.

So, in essence, starting in February of 2021, cities can approach the MPO, assuming we get that issue worked out, for new planning dollars, new projects, et cetera.

That's -- that's what I'm hearing; is that correct?

MS. WALLACE: That's what's reflected in the interlocal agreements among the parties that, yes, beginning in February 2021, applications for new projects can be submitted for consideration.

MR. COOLMAN: And I would assume if they have issues with the proposed projects right now, they have to wait until 2021 -- or can they bring those back before that?

MS. CASSINI: If it was a project that was in the original surtax plan that went to the voters -- so as -- as Angela just mentioned, there were over 500 municipal capital projects that were evaluated by the MPO, and so there are substantially more projects than those that you've entertained that could be in a planning or design phase recommendation as well. They don't have to be new projects.

MS. WALLACE: Mr. Coolman, if I understand you correctly, were you asking the -- a follow up to Ms. Love's question with regard to those that we need additional information?

MR. COOLMAN: No, I was just trying to understand how the cities, if they have an issue with the -- the -- the new budgets or proposals for any old projects, what they do, and you've answered that.

And new projects obviously have to go in front of the MPO after February 21st -- February '21. I'm sorry.

I'm -- I'm -- that's fine. That's -- you confirmed my -- what my thoughts were. I was asking the question for the benefit of the cities, and maybe they

have even more questions. I don't know.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Any other questions?

Okay. Let's proceed. Thank you.

D Planning and Support Services

MS. CASSINI: So, this is the over -- overall five-year plan for support services, planning and support services.

And based on Vice Chair Coolman's questions to -- to me yesterday, and it sounds as if he -- you all are seeking a higher level of detail, this is what's in the budget book and what was presented with respect to surtax planning and support services.

But I want to walk through what these numbers actually mean, and -- and how they are allocated.

So, for the seven administrative support -- the team that supports the Oversight Board, the salary and benefits for three Innovation staff and then the seven individuals that are in MAP Administration is 1.27 million dollars.

There's also the funding for the ongoing five-year MPO contract. That is -- it escalates, but it is around \$550,000 a year.

And then you see the number for -- that says transfer to the General Fund. The transfer to the General Fund are for the positions that reside in the County Attorney and the County Auditor's Office.

There's also one-time costs and other contracts like the MIT contract that you all approved actually back in fiscal year '19 that you see inside of

these numbers.

But I did want you to understand what you're looking at at a little higher level of detail than what we provide in the budget, the recommended budget that's published.

And then there are also some other items that are part of the recommended published budget that we intend to be bringing back to you throughout the course of the next year, we hope.

So, we've talked about the Pat Salerno Interchange previously at some earlier Oversight Board meetings, and we are in the final stages of the -- negotiating the details of that project, and expect to be able to bring that back to you hopefully in September for your September 22nd meeting.

As I had mentioned to you all in your briefings, Tri-Rail has approached Miami-Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach requesting additional subsidies.

There is a subsidy that has been included in the five-year plan and in the recommended budget, but, again, that is a subject of discussion with our County Commission.

And once we have more details, we will be bringing that back before you for an eligibility determination.

The funding for the port, airport, Convention Center connector. Whether it be a rail connector or a people mover still remains to be determined, but there is funding that has been set aside in the five-year plan

for that project.

There's also a \$20,000,000 annual set aside for, quote, unquote, regional transportation projects which could include something like commuter rail on the FEC line or other regional transportation projects that are being evaluated.

And so, we just wanted to make sure, for -- from a transparency perspective, that you are aware that those were happening.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman?

MR. HOOPER: Yes, sir.

MR. ALLEN: Yes. Gretchen, where is the 17th Street bypass?

MS. CASSINI: I don't believe that's funded with the surtax. I believe that's funded through other sources.

MS. WALLACE: Right. I believe that gas tax are being -- taxes are being utilized to fund that project.

So far, we haven't received any indication that that would be funded by surtax.

MR. ALLEN: Okay. Thank you.

MS. CASSINI: And I --

MR. HOOPER: And -- and so these will be presented to us in the near future, or as they start to get -- they start making them, correct?

MS. CASSINI: I tried to put them in the order that I expect to be presenting them to you.

I think the Pat Salerno Interchange will probably be in front of you within the next two Oversight Board meetings, as will the Tri-Rail subsidies.

And then it's less clear when we're going to have enough information to actually be able to bring you the port, airport, Convention Center for an eligibility determination, and similarly with the -- with some of these regional transportation projects that we are working on, and as soon as we have enough detail, we will bring them to you, definitely.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

MS. CASSINI: And, Mr. Chair, I couldn't be more pleased to tell you that we are way ahead of schedule, so we might be able to finish this whole meeting before lunch.

It is time for our dashboard review, so I am going to ask Mr. Carreras and Mr. Sofoul if they would please -- if you -- would you like to take a break Mr. Chair, for just a couple minutes while we set that up? Or would you like to stay?

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, I would ask my board members if they would like to take a few minute break.

MS. LOVE: Well, if it's -- this is Allyson. I'm okay with taking a break, but certainly ready to move forward as quickly as possible, so five minutes, if it's okay. That's -- that's fine.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, so they're going to be setting it up, so, you know, keep moving, and we'll take a quick break and come back to the -- to

the desk at -- in five minutes.

MS. CASSINI: Thank you.

MS. LOVE: Great. Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

(THE MEETING RECESSED AT 10:40 A.M. AND RECONVENED AT 10:50 A.M.)

MS. CASSINI: I think you probably should call a roll.

And would you like us to call a roll to make sure that we have a -- a quorum back participating?

MR. HOOPER: Yes, please. Go ahead. That would be great.

MS. THOMPSON: Thank you, Chair.

Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Ron Frazier? Ronald Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

MR. FFRAZIER: Here.

DR. KELLEY: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant? Anthea Pennant?

Shea Smith? Shea Smith?

Chair, we have a quorum.

MR. HOOPER: Great. Let's go ahead and proceed. Thank you.

DASHBOARD REVIEW

MS. CASSINI: At this time, I'd like to present Mr. Ernesto Carreras, who is one of your Mobility Advancement Program Innovation Team members, and Mr. Nichols Sofoul, who is the Planning Section Supervisor, and they're going to run through the absolutely beautiful dashboard for you.

And they'll start off with a project level and they'll go into some of the equity analysis that the Oversight Board members had asked us to make.

MR. SOFOUL: Good morning. Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the Oversight Board.

Nicholas Sofoul, the Mobility Planning Innovation Section Supervisor.

So, I have the pleasure of wrapping up your workshop session, and I think it's a really good opportunity to use the dashboard so that we can kind of get a holistic view of all the surtax projects in the five-year plan.

Over the last day and the morning, you've really seen a lot of

specifics, and you looked at individual maps for -- for programs and projects, but you haven't really had a chance to see how all those pieces fit together.

And so, the dashboard allows us to do that.

Through this time, I know this is the third time you've seen the dashboard -- third or fourth time -- every time we go back and we kind of make revisions based upon your recommendations of what to see.

So, I wanted to show you first off, before we get into kind of distribution of projects, I really wanted to show you some of the improvements we've made since the last time we spoke.

So -- so first off, the dashboard includes all the Public Works projects over the duration of the five-year plan. And so those are on the map right now, and that's what you're seeing. You're seeing every County Public Works project that has -- that's in the five-year program.

Now, one of the things we added that we -- we are -- we got from you in terms of clarity was to be able to look and, when you click on a project, to actually see the whole five-year budget.

So now you can click on a project like this one.

Go to the top, Ernesto. What is this one? This is a -- this is a data detection maintenance project.

Scroll down and you can kind of see you have the description of the project, you have the design year, the specifics for the construction year, and you have the total five-year cost broken out by the five-year plan.

So, you can specifically look at that project and see that in 2021, \$585,000 is allocated to this project, and that in 2022, \$780,000 is allocated to this project, for the total five-year plan of 1.36 million.

So, we added those details to the plan so that you can kind of see the phasing of these projects over time.

I'm going to switch to a different tab so that you can see kind of a five-year view of the Public Works projects.

So, what this is is this is the total five-year plan proposed for Public Works investments.

So, you can see at the top you have the total amount of investments in the five-year plan, roughly \$319,000,000. There might be a couple rounding errors, so it might be off by -- by a buck or two, but it should be basically on the money.

And what this dashboard gives us the capability of doing is you can click on an actual type of project -- like let's do roadway expansion, roadway capacity expansion. And then you'll see on the very top chart you can kind of see instantaneously the -- the dashboard will pivot and tell you what is the total amount of funding in roadway capacity expansion.

So, you can see the number at the top went down from about 315,000,000 to 100,700,000. And so that's the amount of money allocated to roadway capacity expansion and Public Works in the five-year plan.

And then you can see the phasing of those costs over the duration of

the five-year plan.

So, go ahead and click on another one just for -- how about greenways? There we go.

So, greenways, as you're aware, you've seen that we're doing a lot of greenway planning early in the -- early in the process, and that's being done through -- through my team in Planning and Innovation.

But as the greenway plan completes, then these greenway projects are going to start moving into design, and, later, construction, which is why for greenways you can see that kind of builds over time, because in the beginning, we're doing planning.

Then once you get to -- to year '22 and year '23, there's some design going on.

Then you really see the cost ramp up in '24 and '25 where construction will commence.

Then you can see the total funding for greenways at 7.61 million over the five year duration.

We also have the ability, if -- if someone wanted to, we can combine projects together. Like let's say we -- let's do -- combine greenway and bike lanes and sidewalks. Can we do all three of those?

MR. CARRERAS: Where?

MR. SOFOUL: From the left hand sorter, Ernesto?

MR. CARRERAS: Which ones?

MR. SOFOUL: Let's do bike lanes and let's do greenways.

MR. CARRERAS: It doesn't allow us.

MR. SOFOUL: Oh, it doesn't allow multiple? Okay.

Well, we have planned to configure this so that we can do multiple selections. So that way, let's say you have projects that you know are all related, kind of in the same genre of projects.

And when I think about the same genre, I'm thinking about kind of our Complete Streets initiative.

So, we're going to have it so that you can click on, let's say, bike lanes, greenways, sidewalks, lighting, school zones, you know, and then you can kind of see the cumulative impact of all those types of projects, because they're kind of related to each other in terms of being really geared towards safety.

So -- oh, so we do have the ability to do it. Here we go. So, we -- I guess we could do it, but we've got to do it a different way. We do it via the pie chart.

So, in instance, you know, for the ones that were just selected.

So, for instance, in this case, fiber optic network, intersections, and lighting were selected, and then you can see the phasing of those projects over time.

So, it kind of gives you the ability to kind of see, you know, based upon a custom selection, you know, how much money is being invested in

those particular projects through the phasing of the five-year plan.

Thank you, Ernesto. Can we go back out to the -- to the map?

MR. CARRERAS: Uh-huh.

MR. SOFOUL: So, while he's doing this, I want to just take a look back at the -- at the main map here so you can kind of see the distribution because, as I mentioned earlier, we spent a lot of time, you know, diving down into the individual projects.

You got a lot of information yesterday on the fiscal year '21 detail projects, and you have maps for every single one of those projects.

And so, this is kind of the way for us to look at everything holistically together on the same map.

You know, as I mentioned before, you know, this map represents about over -- over \$315,000,000 in investments over the five-year plan.

And this is not -- this map does not include the direct municipal projects which are part of the municipal program separate.

But I want to make the point about these Public Works projects is that we did an analysis by municipality over the five year duration, and basically every single city in Broward County has some sort of projects.

The only exceptions to that are very small cities that don't have a lot of transportation infrastructure or transportation needs.

For instance, the Village of Lazy Lake, Sea Ranch Lakes, and there's -- and Hillsboro Beach, but Hillsboro Beach, as was mentioned earlier, you

know, has a shuttle program and they also -- I know they have a project with FDOT right now on doing some -- some work on their primary corridor, A1A or -- so, yes.

So, I wanted to zoom in to just one of these cities that we know has no direct project, but I want to be able to show the other -- the other projects around it, because I kind of want to make the point that even though the projects aren't necessarily in a particular city doesn't mean that we're not -- all the surrounding residents aren't going to feel the impacts of the improvements around that particular project.

You know, so in the case of the -- the City of Lazy Lake, we know that there are projects scheduled in Wilton Manors, in Fort Lauderdale, in Oakland Park to the north. And I'm trying to see if we can get some of those projects up just so I can -- there we go. There they are.

So, to the north, you can kind of see that's the corridor study that is slated for -- for Oakland Park Boulevard.

And you can see that there's a school project to the southwest.

You know, and so -- and then when you add the municipal projects on top of this, there's even more projects, you know.

So, I just want to try to make the point that our projects, County projects, are regional in nature, and just because it doesn't occur in a particular city doesn't mean it's not having a -- a broad impact on the County as a whole.

And the projects are really geared to making a -- a more connected, more resilient transportation system on the regional scale.

Something else that you've -- I'm sure you've seen from some of the descriptions that you've received from Public Works on some of the projects is the County is trying to be very synergistic -- sorry, is there a question?

The County's trying to be very synergistic in how they -- in how they program projects.

For instance, whenever there's a drainage improvement, they always try to go back and try to see, well, can we improve bicycle lanes or -- and bike connectivity or sidewalk connectivity or -- or ADA at the same time.

And so, there's a lot of those projects that are currently being prioritized through the five-year plan.

And I just want -- just going back and just focusing, you know, one of the things I realized -- can you scroll out a little bit, Ernesto, and bring back the legend on the right-hand panel? Okay.

So, I don't know if you can see on the map clearly, but the -- you have these kind of light pink triangles, you know. Those are school zone investments. And so those are one thing I'd like to just point out that even though these projects are not the high ticket items in the surtax, you know, these projects like this are going to have significant impacts, you know, for your local communities in these municipalities, you know.

So, we have 56 school zones in the five-year plan, which is really

significant. You know, if you ask anyone who has kids and going to a school, that safety improvement is going to be extremely impactful to those communities.

So, I just want to be mindful that, you know, those projects are included in the plan, and we want to highlight those in the dashboard so you can kind of see those investments.

Okay. All right. I'm going to focus a little bit on some demographic analysis and by ZIP Code. This was something that the Oversight Board requested at our last meeting.

So, we went ahead and crunched some numbers and provided some demographic indicators that you can see.

First, I want to start off by saying that we did the analysis and there is either a Public Works or a municipal project in the five-year plan in every ZIP Code in Broward County. There is not a single ZIP Code that's excluded from a project, which is just to show the -- the distribution of the projects throughout the County.

So, I'm going to start off by poverty level was one of the main indicators we wanted to look at. So, what we have here on this dashboard, you can kind of see we have all these different indicators. We have poverty level. We have population 65 older. We have unemployment data, minority population, household income, renter occupied housing units as some of the initial indicators we looked at.

And then what we did was we went ahead and we ranked the ZIP Codes based upon their data and, you know, how they stacked up in each one of those categories.

So, what I'm going to have Ernesto do now is we're going to look at income or poverty level by household, and we're going to pull up the top five ZIP Codes in the County for that particular demographic indicator, and we're going to show those on the map.

Can you hide the projects, Ernesto? So, what I wanted to do was first show -- right.

So, what you see on this map, this is the -- the map of poverty by household at the levels. And so, the -- those -- those ZIP Codes you're seeing kind of in that darker red, you know, are areas that have 18 percent or more of the households in that particular ZIP Code are below the poverty level.

And so, the -- and so you can kind of see that they -- they do match up. You know, our data's looking good. The top five are the ones shaded in that dark red, you know.

And we have the ability for you to click on any ZIP Code and then, based on the ZIP Code, you can pull up this separate panel that shows those -- the rest of those demographic indicators we were talking about.

So, right now, we've pulled up 33311. So, you can look on this panel and instantaneously tell that, okay, it's the number one out of 53 ZIP Codes

in terms of household income below the poverty level.

You know, it -- you can tell that it's ranked 32 out of 53 ZIP Codes in terms of population 65-plus, so it's not necessarily a -- an over population.

Okay. You can look at the minority population. It's -- it ranks 1 out of 53.

The renter occupied units, as well, it ranks third for the most amount of renters out of the -- out of the input.

So, you can get a very nice snapshot just by clicking on the ZIP Code and kind of seeing where that ZIP Code falls on all these different demographic factors.

But then we can take that data and we can overlay our projects in our five-year plan.

And when you do this, you can kind of clearly see, more or less, that the projects that we have proposed, you know, are intersecting and providing benefits to the ZIP Codes that have high household poverty.

And this really does -- this really makes perfect sense to me, because our plan is really a needs-based plan, and the needs generally align very well with our historically disadvantaged communities.

So, this is exactly what I would have expected in kind of how our -- how our projects align.

And so, I just think that that's a -- it's a -- it should give a level of comfort, you know, that these -- that our plan is very need -- is needs-based,

and they are aligning with where these communities are.

And so, I'm going to show another one, just for the -- for the sake of going through a couple of them. And if during questions you want to see some more, we can -- we can do it.

But let's use -- let's use minority population, for instance. We can go ahead and do the same thing where we can click on the top five ZIP Codes and you can see those top fives are 33311, 33313, 33025, 33023, and 33068.

Then we can bring those over into the dashboard, highlight them -- one second. Bring that in --

MS. CASSINI: Ernesto, are you also able to then include the municipal projects so the Oversight Board members can really see the full investment?

MR. SOFOUL: Not on the same map.

MS. CASSINI: Okay.

MR. SOFOUL: But that is something that we're going to be doing moving forward when I talk about the -- the next steps.

You might need to reload it, Ernesto. There we are. Okay. So, there you go.

Those are the top five ZIP Codes for the -- for minority-based population.

I'm trying to wait for the -- the background map to load.

One of the things we've learned is that we've made this dashboard very -- very complex and very heavy, so sometimes it takes a little while to -- to generate or regenerate.

All right. Well, we went ahead and just overlaid the projects on it, Ernesto, we -- we can -- they're highlighted. You can still see it.

When we -- when we overlay the projects, you'll see that the projects, again, very similar to the poverty level, they align with the projects based upon minority population.

And this kind of goes for all of those demographic factors that we looked at. There's really good alignment with the five-year plan and these particular programs and projects.

There we go.

MR. CARRERAS: There we go.

MR. SOFOUL: There we go. Okay.

So, the darker -- the darker blue ZIP Codes are the ZIP Codes that have 71.8 percent minority population or higher. And you can see that there's a lot of surtax investment going on in these -- there we go. Now they're highlighted in white.

And you can see that there's significant surtax investments aligned and occurring in these particular ZIP Codes.

And I think I want to also bring up that we do have some challenges in doing some of this analysis. I -- I prefer, when we look at the -- when we look

at doing analysis by ZIP Code that we kind of look at distributions and the number of projects more so than the -- than the dollar amount, because one of our challenges is that our projects go and splice through multiple ZIP Codes.

And so, it becomes very difficult for us to allocate cost or investment based on ZIP Code because we have projects that intersect four, five, six ZIP Codes.

So, we have some projects that go into a ZIP Code, maybe by, you know, 1,000 feet, you know, so how do we quantify that impact to that particular ZIP Code?

And so just wanted to bring your attention that we -- it's a little bit difficult to be able to quantify cost by ZIP Code, but I think we can -- I think the value is focusing in the distribution and looking at the network and how everything connects and looking at the number of projects in a proximity to a particular ZIP Code.

Are there any questions from the Oversight Board before I move on to talking a little bit about our future projects -- products moving forward with the dashboard?

All right. Hearing none, so moving forward, I just want to give you kind of an outline for where we're going with future dashboard projects.

We all know, we've seen this dashboard many times, and we're going to continue to use this for the sake of Oversight Board meetings, but this

dashboard is really very heavy, has a lot of functionality, and -- and, frankly, it's -- it's not very user friendly as I would like for public distribution.

So, moving forward for the five-year plan, once the County Commission approves the projects that we're going to see for fiscal year '21 and moving forward into the five-year plan, our intention is to make a clean project dashboard for public distribution.

And, you know, we're really going to orient this, you know, so that anyone -- you know, I kind of look at if my mom can figure it out, I think we've done the right thing. So, I'm going to try to do -- you know, use that as my test for whether or not the dashboard is successful or not.

One of the things we know from going to many project and community involvement meetings, the first thing the public usually does when they go to a project meeting involving transportation is you'll see these big giant rolls of -- of maps with aerial images on it.

And the first thing someone does is they walk up to it and they find their house. You know, it's the first thing everyone does.

And then, based upon where their house is, then they'll step back and they'll try to get a view of what's around it, because then they have their bearings.

And so, our intention is to create this new dashboard exactly that way, in exactly the way, you know, someone would -- someone would naturally go to try to get their bearings.

So, we're going to have a dashboard that's going to combine the municipal projects and our County Public Works projects together in the same dashboard so you can kind of see the holistic picture of all the projects in the five-year plan. You'll be able to type in your address -- and this could be your home address or it could even be your work address -- and then you're instantly going to get a map that shows all the projects within let's say one mile buffer of your particular household address.

Okay. So, it's automatically going to do that analysis on the fly. You're going to see the project list of all the projects within a mile of your house. You're going to see them on the map.

And then next to it, there's going to be a report that you can print out, either in PDF that will tell you the details of each project that's within that certain distance of your home.

And so that's really the direction we want to go into. We want to make this extremely simple for folks to be able to access the information of the projects that are going to impact them the most.

This product is also going to be mobile phone compliant, because we know a lot of folks are -- are using -- are using these dashboards on their phones, not just on personal computers, so we want to make sure that whatever we create has good functionality on the -- on the mobile side.

And we're also going to be looking at how we can incorporate ADA compatibility. There are some challenges in ADA compatibility for GIS and

for some of these map products, but we're going to do our best to try to make whatever product we have ADA.

And if we can't make the map product through the -- you know, through the application fully ADA compliant, we're going to have separate map series and other documentation where that information can be accessed that's ADA compliant that kind of -- it's a companion and a rider to those particular -- to those particular products.

Additionally, you know, the -- the project dashboard I think is -- is going to be really great for just looking at, you know, where are the projects around me, but that really doesn't tell the stories that we want to tell, you know, as a County, in terms of the investments that are being made.

You know, when you look at this map -- scroll up a little bit, Ernesto, so you can kind of see the north.

One of the things that pops out to me whenever you see these maps is you can see all the investments, those red lines. And those red lines are fiber optic network.

And, you know, I've seen the question come up multiple times, well, why are all the fiber optic network investments in the surtax on the north side of the County, you know. And it looks like you're not giving any -- any investment to the south side of the County.

Well, the answer to that really -- which you can't see in this dashboard -- is that fiber optics started implementation in the southern part of the

County. And so, what's needed, moving forward, is to connect the northern side of the County.

But these dashboards don't tell you that full connected story. So, we're going to be creating applications called storyboards, which kind of work a lot like a -- reading a article in a newspaper.

I don't know if you've seen some of these -- Washington Post has some good ones, New York Times -- where you can kind of -- where you scroll down like an article, but as you're scrolling down, there's narrative, and then you'll have interactive features and maps come up as you're scrolling down.

And so, our intention with these storyboards is to tell that story so we can show, you know, the phasing of the projects. Yes, this is where the current fiber optic is in the south. We're fulfilling this need.

Then overlaying what's currently there with the connectivity we're providing through the surtax investment, and then moving on to explain, well, fiber optics, so what? What does fiber optic do? And then kind of giving the story of how fiber optic is going to form the backbone for all these future intelligent transportation solutions.

And so, I think the -- there's going to be a great value in providing those types of storyboards to the public.

The same thing can be done for greenways, bicycle, and pedestrian networks. On the map, it just looks like we have these disparate pieces, you

know, that we're filling in, but, really, these pieces are all completing a part of the network.

And so, we're going to use those storyboards to be able to show the existing infrastructure and then overlay our investments, so the public can see that all these projects are really about creating an interconnected and regional system.

We also want to look at a -- we also want to look at corridor implementation. So when the Public Works starts moving forward on these corridor projects, these corridor studies, and we figure out synergies and how to bundle projects together, we're going to want to have dashboards and storyboards as well to tell the story of how we're bundling projects together and kind of the story of each corridor and how these projects work together to make that particular corridor more connected, and the value coming to the community from those corridor implementations.

So, we expect most of these products, certainly the -- the primary dashboard and I'm hoping to get out at least two or three of these storyboards by your proposed meeting that you set yesterday in October, on -- on October 22nd.

So, you know, hopefully there'll be some time there to maybe do another presentation on dashboards.

And with that, I'd like to thank Ernesto Carreras, our GIS expert in the Innovation Team, who's been helping in creating these dashboards all along.

And I'm available for any questions.

Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, I have a question.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chair, put me on the list, too.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So now -- now we're delayed here, so I don't know how you're going to show it to me and then I'm going to listen, so I'm going to have to switch to computer.

But, for instance, you know, the small businesses that we're trying to get information to, show me how a small business could go and start looking through projects or clicking on projects, finding out what size of a project it is, and -- or is that not the type of tool this is, or can it be used for that?

MR. SOFOUL: I think it can be used for that, but this -- this particular dashboard, as I mentioned, is -- is probably too heavy for -- for public consumption. There's -- there's -- there's too many features and functionality, and it tends to work kind of sluggish.

And so, I think that's something when we create that new, clean dashboard that has all the projects and you have all the information on it, and it's -- and it's a lot lighter, it can provide that information.

That's -- I can certainly see it being used by those small businesses to be able to identify the projects that they might want to bid on.

MR. HOOPER: Okay, you cut off. Is that me or is that him?

MR. SOFOUL: Can you hear me?

MR. HOOPER: I'm sorry. No, we -- I couldn't hear you.

MR. SOFOUL: Oh.

MR. HOOPER: How about the rest of the board members?

MR. SOFOUL: I'm sorry.

MR. ALLEN: He cut out for a minute.

MR. SOFOUL: Okay. I'm sorry about that.

I was -- I was essentially explaining that I think that there -- the new dashboard we're creating that's going to go public will provide all that information that the small businesses and firms need to be able to look at projects and then identify the projects that will be suitable for them to bid on based upon the -- the value of the project and the type of the project.

MR. HOOPER: That would be great.

MS. CASSINI: Mr. Chair, if I may, we are at this time trying to provide that type of information on our website, the pennyfortransportation.com website.

We provide details on all of the projects once they are approved. And we've been trying to send our small businesses and any interested parties to that website in advance of the publicly facing dashboard.

MR. HOOPER: Great idea.

Mr. Allen, did you have a question?

MR. ALLEN: Yes, thank you.

This is certainly impressive work that's being put together by the team.

And this really goes beyond, perhaps, the surtax.

I mean, our focus here has always been on what is the surtax doing, how is that impacting the community. But often people are more interested not in who's funding it, but what is the impact on transportation.

And, down the road, is there a possibility that there would be additional layers placed in this that other funding sources such as the state projects, such as city projects not funded by the surtax could, in fact, display as part of an overall GIS look at what are the overall transportation improvements affecting my community?

MR. SOFOUL: I -- absolutely. Absolutely. We -- we could gather that information from -- from FDOT, from the MPO, and from our local municipalities to provide that information.

And -- and, you know, there's kind of a common format for this data. We can bring it into a dashboard and show that holistic picture.

MS. CASSINI: And if I may, Mr. Chair, I would just like to also mention that when Nick was talking about the corridor delivery model, that is the whole purpose of that. Once we start doing GIS dashboard modeling of the corridor projects, there is -- it's expected that FDOT, MPO, perhaps even, let's say, a private sector -- a homeowners association, all of the projects that are incorporated into that corridor delivery will show up on the GIS dashboard that we are presenting to the public.

But I think it's a great idea, and I -- and I'm sure we can do it, not just

for the corridors, we can do it for the County as a whole.

MR. ALLEN: Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Are there any other questions?

Okay. That's really great work. I know how hard you guys have worked, and you've done a great job. Thank you very much for the presentation.

MR. SOFOUL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MR. HOOPER: Do we want to keep moving?

MS. CASSINI: We can happily move on to the action items and call to order the regular meeting if you all would like to do so and try to get through this before two of our Oversight Board members need to -- to take -- take leave.

Is that the will of the Chair and the board?

MR. HOOPER: I -- I would be okay with it if my board members are okay.

MS. LOVE: I'm okay with it. Allyson.

MR. COOLMAN: I'm okay with it.

DR. KELLEY: Dr. Kelley, I'm okay. I'm okay with it.

MR. ALLEN: So am I.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: All right. Let's rock and roll.

MS. CASSINI: All right. So, Mr. Chair, if you'd like to call the meeting

-- the regular meeting of the Oversight Board to order and get -- we'll start with our motions to approve.

CALL TO ORDER

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So, we'll call the regular meeting of the Oversight Board on August -- is it the 14th -- yes, August 14th to -- to order.

ROLL CALL

MR. HOOPER: And can we have a roll call, please, just for formality.

MS. THOMPSON: Thank you, Chair.

Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Ron Frazier? Ronald Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. --

MR. FRAZIER: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: -- Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: Here. Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Thank you.

Anthea Pennant?

And Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Thank you.

Chair, we have a quorum.

MR. HOOPER: Great. Thank you.

Let's go forward with the meeting.

MS. PENNANT: Hello? Hello?

MS. THOMPSON: Ms. Pennant?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. PENNANT: I -- I have been blocked out of this meeting for the last section, since we took a break. I have not been able to ask any questions, and I have questions for the gentleman who did the presentation, because I wanted to know how current his data was. I wasn't able to -- to ask any questions, and I'm not sure why that is.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Let's step back, and Ms. -- Gretchen, if we could call him back up and just allow Ms. Pennant to ask some questions, and then we'll restart the regular meeting.

But let's -- let's back up a few, and -- and if they're willing to come

back in, maybe Ms. Pennant can ask those questions.

MS. CASSINI: Absolutely, Mr. Chair. They're here. Mr. Sofoul and Mr. Carreras are here, and they're happy to answer any of the questions.

Ms. Pennant, we're very, very sorry you got kicked out of the meeting. You can go ahead with your questions, Anthea.

MS. PENNANT: Yes. I wanted to know how current the data that was being reflected in the work that you had done.

MR. SOFOUL: Sure. Are you referring to the actual demographic layers?

MS. PENNANT: The -- yes, the demographic data, employment and so on.

MR. SOFOUL: They're -- they're from the latest version of the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey.

One thing that's not going to be shown in this are the -- the variable that I think is the most problematic, due to COVID-19, is the -- the unemployment numbers, because this data was generated before COVID, and so we don't have the data --

MS. PENNANT: Right.

MR. SOFOUL: -- by ZIP Code for -- for that in the dashboard.

But that's something that, as that data becomes available, we can incorporate.

So that's the only variable where I've seen where I have a concern

about the data source, because clearly we know that the average unemployment in Broward County is not four percent in these current days.

So --

MS. PENNANT: Right.

MR. SOFOUL: -- that's the only --

MS. PENNANT: I see it.

MR. SOFOUL: -- one. But everything else is -- is current as to --

MS. PENNANT: And -- and what's the timeline? How -- how old is the data that was used before?

MR. SOFOUL: It -- it's from -- it's from 2018.

MS. PENNANT: 2018.

MR. SOFOUL: 2018. But as the U.S. Census Bureau releases updates, we can integrate that new -- those new datasets into the dashboard.

MS. PENNANT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. SOFOUL: My pleasure.

MR. HOOPER: Do you have any other questions, Ms. Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: No, not at this time. Thank you.

CALL TO ORDER

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So, then we'll -- let's restart here. I'm going to call the meeting to order, the regular meeting of the Oversight Board for August 14th.

ROLL CALL

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION
SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD
AUGUST 14, 2020
dh/JC

MR. HOOPER: I guess let's do a roll call again. I'm sorry, but I just think it should be in order and formal.

MS. THOMPSON: Sure, Chair.

Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: George Cavros?

MR. CAVROS: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Ronald Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley?

DR. KELLEY: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love?

MS. LOVE: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: And Shea Smith?

MR. SMITH: I'm here.

MS. THOMPSON: Thank you.

We have a quorum, Chair.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

ACTION ITEMS

1 Approval of the minutes from the May 22, 2020 and June 4, 2020

Oversight Board meetings

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So, if you want to lead us, because I don't have like an agenda here, on page -- we have minutes from May 22nd and June 4th of the Oversight Board.

We're going to need a motion to approve that.

Am I in the right order there Gretchen?

MS. WALLACE: Public participation?

MS. CASSINI: We have no -- no one from the public that is registered to speak, and so, yes, it is -- you can entertain a motion to approve the minutes at this time.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. -- Mr. Chairman, Phil Allen would **move** approval of the minutes of the May 22nd and June 4th meetings.

MR. COOLMAN: Doug Coolman will second.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Very good.

All right. Are there any -- any discussion on those -- on that motion?

Okay. Hearing none, all those in favor say aye.

(WHEREUPON, the committee members all responded with "aye.")

MR. HOOPER: Those opposed?

Okay. The minutes are approved.

MR. COOLMAN: Chair?

MR. HOOPER: Yes, sir.

MR. COOLMAN: Just a comment. We got a revision to the last set of minutes, and they were very minor changes, but in the future, if we're going to have a revision, we need to color key them or something so they're easy to see.

Just a comment. They're excellent minutes, but late minute adjustments need to be highlighted.

MS. CASSINI: Noted.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: Thank you, Vice Chair.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. The next thing is we're going to review the eligibility determination.

I guess this will go over to Angela, correct?

MS. WALLACE: Okay. For eligibility determination. Okay.

Article V Section 31½-75 of the Broward County Code of Ordinances outlines the process by which projects that are proposed for surtax funding need to be presented and approved.

So, the oversight for the first step is County staff presenting the

proposed projects and associated expenditures to the Oversight Board for the Oversight Board's consideration with regard to the projects' eligibility under Section 212.055(1)(b) of the Florida Statutes.

And so, the projects that were presented today or -- or over the last two days for the board's consideration for both the FY '20 supplemental, the FY '21 proposed expenditures, are being submitted for an eligibility determination during today's meeting.

And then the next step in the process after the Oversight Board considers eligibility of the projects and associated expenditures, recommendations from the Oversight Board with regard to eligibility are transmitted to the County Administrator in writing.

And the County Administrator, through the County's budget process, will submit those eligible projects and expenditures to the County Commission for review and approval through an appropriation in the County's budgeting process, which culminates in September of each year for the fiscal year beginning October 1 of that year.

So, for purposes of eligibility as outlined in Section 212.055 Florida Statutes, the surtax funds can be used for planning, development, construction, operation, maintenance of roads and bridges in the County; for planning, development, expansion, operation, and maintenance of buses and fixed guideway systems; or for planning, development, construction, operation, and maintenance of on-demand transportation services.

The proceeds can be used for support services, and can be distributed to municipalities through interlocal agreements, which is what we are planning to do the -- for the municipal projects by way of interlocal agreements.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Okay. So, the next part is the Public Works capital projects for year ending 2021 -- fiscal year 2021. And what -- what -- so we -- is this the 53,000,000 is what we just finished reviewing?

MS. CASSINI: Actually, Mr. Chair, this is exactly what you reviewed yesterday, and what I've done here is I've just -- just to refresh everyone's recollection, I'm showing all of the fiscal year 2021 requests by major category, Public Works, then Transit, then the municipal projects that are being recommended to move forward in 2021.

Their total -- and then all of the requests for planning and support services broken out in the three major categories that we talked about yesterday.

And then the analysis that I was able to show you briefly of how the fiscal year 2021 requests break out, 61 percent to Transit, 21 percent to Public Works, 17 percent to municipalities, and one percent for planning and support services.

2 Approval as to Eligibility of FY 2020 Proposed Supplemental Expenditures

MS. CASSINI: The actual motion is here. So, what we tried to do is

do this in order. We -- we're asking you to make a motion to find the FY 2021 supplemental expenditures eligible first.

So now Angela's going to walk you through each of those motions.

MS. WALLACE: Actually, FY 2020.

So, the first motion would be with regard to the fiscal year 2020 supplemental budget, and it would be a motion to find the FY 2020 proposed expenditures eligible under 212.055(1)(d)(4) of the Florida Statutes.

And that would be the Assistant County Attorney position and the 4.1 million dollars in contingency for municipal Cycle 1 projects.

MR. HOOPER: Do we have a motion?

MR. ALLEN: Excuse me. Angela?

MS. WALLACE: Yes?

MR. ALLEN: Can you give us your opinion as to whether these expenditures meet the statute?

MS. WALLACE: Yes. It is my opinion that the proposed expenditures for F -- the FY 2020 supplemental budget are eligible under 212.055 Florida Statutes.

MR. ALLEN: Based on that, I would **move** approval.

MS. LOVE: I second.

MR. ALLEN: This is Phil.

MS. LOVE: Allyson.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Any discussion on the motion?

All those in favor, say aye.

(WHEREUPON, the committee members all responded with “aye.”)

MR. HOOPER: Do we have any opposed?

Okay. The motion passes.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

3 Approval as to Eligibility of Proposed Projects and Proposed Expenditures for FY 2021 - Year 1 of the Five-Year Plan

MS. WALLACE: Okay. The next motion would be a motion to find the FY 2021 -- 2021 proposed projects and proposed expenditures eligible under 212.055 Florida Statutes.

So -- and it is my legal opinion that the projects and expenditures that have been presented to the Oversight Board for approval for FY 2020 are eligible under the statute.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman?

MR. HOOPER: 2020 or 2021?

MS. WALLACE: 2021. Sorry.

MR. HOOPER: Yes? Yes, Mr. Allen.

MR. ALLEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Can I -- we are recommending these as meeting the statutory requirements and that they are eligible.

Is it possible that the motion could be expanded to also include our recommendation and -- and -- as it relates to funding of the projects as

presented?

There was some discussion relative to certain of the expenditures were not in the recommended budget for the County, and is -- is it a -- possible for the -- our board to make not just a certification that they meet the eligibility but that they are recommended for funding as proposed?

MS. WALLACE: Yes, Mr. Allen.

So, the items that were presented to the Oversight Board which were not published in the -- the recommended budget on July 15th but were presented, the Oversight Board can make a recommendation -- make a determination that those projects and expenditures are eligible and recommend that they be funded in the FY 2021 budget.

MR. ALLEN: Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Are you making a motion, Mr. Allen?

MR. ALLEN: I would so **move**.

MR. COOLMAN: I will second. Coolman.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. All those -- is there any discussion on that motion?

Okay. All those in favor, say aye.

(WHEREUPON, the committee members all responded with "aye.")

MR. HOOPER: Any opposed?

Okay. The motion passes.

Thank you.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

4 Approval of Years 2-5 (FY 2022-2025) of the Recommended Five-Year Mobility Advancement Plan

MS. WALLACE: Okay. The next motion would be approval of the five-year plan.

As we've indicated, the expenditures that were listed in the five-year plan are continuations of existing projects.

Most of them, at least the municipal ones, have been determined eligible.

And the -- the five-year plan consists of projections over the next five years for planning and programming purposes.

And they're programming County and municipal projects over five years.

Additional information will be brought forward during the -- the funding -- the budget cycles for each of those fiscal years.

But for now, we want to -- we're requesting that the Oversight Board approve the five-year plan for programming and planning purposes.

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

MS. WALLACE: So, the motion is motion to approve staff recommendations for programming County and municipal projects in the five-year plan, fiscal years 2022 through 2025.

MR. HOOPER: And to be clear --

MR. FRAZIER: So, **moved**, Mr. Chairman. Frazier.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Okay, Mr. Frazier.

Is there --

MS. LOVE: I second.

MR. HOOPER: -- a second?

MS. LOVE: Allyson.

MS. WALLACE: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: Sounds like Ms. Love seconded it. so --

MS. LOVE: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: -- all those -- is there any discussion?

Okay. All those in favor, say aye.

(WHEREUPON, the committee members all responded with "aye.")

MS. WALLACE: And --

MR. HOOPER: Any opposed?

Hearing none, okay, the motion approved -- is approved.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

5 Motion to request that the County Auditor conduct an audit of the MPO agreement for transportation surtax services

MS. WALLACE: Okay. We have one other motion that was requested by Mr. Allen during the workshop yesterday on August 13th with regard to the MPO contract.

And I believe that that's a motion to request that the County Auditor

conduct an audit, both performance and financial, of the MPO agreement for transportation surtax services.

MR. ALLEN: Is there any -- I'm sorry. This is Phil.

MS. WALLACE: Yes, Mr. Allen.

MR. HOOPER: Go ahead, Mr. Allen.

MR. ALLEN: Is there a representative of the Commission Auditor's Office available?

MS. CASSINI: Yes, there is.

MS. ROGERS: Hello, yes.

MS. CASSINI: There she is.

MS. ROGERS: Hello. Yes, my apologies. I was on the call yesterday, but had a hard time being heard. But we are available.

MS. CASSINI: And for the record --

MR. ALLEN: Okay. Thank you.

MS. CASSINI: -- that's Laura Rogers. Laura Rogers is on the phone.

MS. ROGERS: Sorry. Yes.

MR. ALLEN: Yeah, Laura, are you aware of the request that I've asked for some consideration relative to the request to do a performance audit of the contract between the MPO and the County as it relates to services that they are providing under the surtax funding?

MS. ROGERS: Yes, I -- I heard your comments yesterday. And in addition to that, I would also like to ask if any other members or yourself have

additional items that we -- you would request we look at.

MR. ALLEN: From my --

MS. ROGERS: If you have.

MR. ALLEN: -- perspective, the -- the review that you have provided to the Board of County Commissioners back in April raised issues as it related to potential conflict of interest between the MPO and the County as it relates to services for cities.

My request -- and that report noted that it was not an -- or an audit conducted with the general accepted accounting principles.

And my concept of what's being requested here would be that kind of performance audit that is conducted in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, which would include performance under the agreement, staffing, issues of a performance nature as to how that contract is being performed and operated.

MS. ROGERS: Yes. The -- the memo that you're referring to was an advisory memorandum.

And, yes, if we initiate an audit, it would be in accordance with those principles, and we can include performance and financial aspects, as well as contract compliance issues and staffing, all items related to that.

You -- yourself or your members can also request anything, as I've said, but, also, we may even go beyond that request as appropriate.

MR. ALLEN: One additional consideration. The -- the format of this

request, is this something that we need to direct to the Board of County Commissioners as it related to this being included in the work program for the Commission Auditor that is the normal process, or is this something that your services to the Surtax Board would allow the Surtax Board to give that recommendation to you now?

MS. ROGERS: You can do the recommendation now.

MR. ALLEN: Thank you.

I would then so move a **motion** to direct the -- to request the Commission Auditor to conduct an overall performance and program review of the contract between Broward County and the MPO.

MR. HOOPER: Do we have a second? Is that a motion? Do we have a second?

DR. KELLEY: I second. Dr. Kelley. I second.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you, Ms. Kelley.

Okay. Is there any discussion on that motion?

MS. LOVE: I -- this is Allyson. Yes, I have a discussion.

I wanted to -- I'm just saying I'll get a copy of what you're referring to that was sent to prompt -- to prompt the request for the performance audit, which I'm okay with. I just wanted to see the document that you all are referring to.

MR. ALLEN: This was an April --

MS. LOVE: If you can --

MS. CASSINI: Ms. Love, I -- I just sent --

MR. ALLEN: -- this was in April.

MS. CASSINI: -- sorry.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh. Okay

MS. LOVE: I understand. I just didn't -- I -- I don't recall seeing it. So, if you could just resend it to me, that would be great.

And then the second part of it is how much is this particular request, in terms of how much the -- this is just part of the responsibilities of the Commission Auditor that's under the surtax, so it's just -- it's not independent of, it's just going to be included in the scope and there's nothing separately charged for it, is my question.

MS. WALLACE: Yes. This is Ms. Wallace.

That is correct. So, the County Auditor serves the function -- performs the function of auditing any and all -- and has the authority to audit any matters that are funded or within the purview of Broward County.

So, this is --

MS. LOVE: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: -- Ms. Rogers is in a surtax-funded position within the Auditor's Office, but that is the -- the County Auditor's role is to -- to audit all matters funded --

MS. LOVE: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: -- with -- with County funds.

And I just wanted to note that in addition to the advisory opinion that Mr. Allen referenced that's dated in April that came from the County Auditor Office -- Auditor's Office, there are a few correspondence that we've received from the MPO related to that particular contract, and at least one response from the County.

And we will compile those documents and -- and provide them to the Oversight Board members for your reference.

MS. LOVE: Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Is there any other discussion?

Okay. All those in favor, say aye.

(WHEREUPON, the committee members all responded with "aye.")

MR. HOOPER: Those opposed?

Hearing none opposed, the motion passes.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

MR. HOOPER: I do have one other item I want to bring up.

I -- this -- this format is difficult, I think for not only board members and staff, but also people in the public.

I did get a request to ask to discuss our budget as it relates to marketing and communication and outreach.

And so, Gretchen, I would just like to ask how much is budgeted for fiscal year -- what is it coming up -- 2021 for -- for marketing and outreach as it relates to the surtax.

MS. CASSINI: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

In previous years, we've brought forward, in fiscal year '19 and in fiscal year '20, a request for \$62,500 for outreach and marketing. It was -- not outreach. It was marketing and branding.

And then in this year, as I mentioned, there is no funding that was included in the recommended budget that was published, and we are recommending additional funds which are going to be the subject of discussion, I believe, at our -- our workshop on the 27th.

And so once I have a -- a clearer understanding of exactly what, if any, is going to be budgeted in fiscal years 2021 and beyond, I'll be happy to report back to the Oversight Board.

It's -- it -- it's a subject of -- of discussion and our FY 2021 budget.

MR. HOOPER: And -- and what is -- what's the amount that's being discussed right now?

MS. CASSINI: We have a marketing -- we have a marketing budget of 62,500, so that's for two years.

So that -- we are -- we would be requesting that we would continue to receive funding at at least that amount.

Then we also have a separate, completely separate and distinct request for outreach around the five-year plan that is -- do you know the number off the top of your head, Cindy?

I don't have it in front of me, but I can get it for you.

MR. HOOPER: And -- and -- and when can you get it for me?

MS. CASSINI: She's pulling it up on her computer right now.

MR. HOOPER: Oh. Oh, okay. Thanks.

MS. CASSINI: I'm going to ask Ms. Malin, the Public Information Officer, who compiled the -- the request for our five-year plan around outreach and engage -- public engagement to come to the podium and let you know what the request is for fiscal year 2021 in that separate category.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Thank you.

MS. MALIN: Good afternoon, Oversight Board.

For fiscal year 2022, we have it broken out by advertising, promotion, print shop, video/PSA, miscellaneous, which can include ADA compliance.

This does not include the 62 five for the agency.

So, for fiscal year '22, we have 120 -- or 125 for advertising -- excuse me -- 75 for promotional, 25 for print shop, 50 for videos and PSAs, and five for miscellaneous.

I do have a budget that has this broken down by topic by year.

We asked for more in '23, equivalent in '24, and a little less in '25.

And this is based on how the projects are going to roll and how things are going to happen. So, the promotional budget is based on what we think to promote those particular items.

And it all is broken down by advertising --

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. MALIN: -- promotional, et cetera.

MS. CASSINI: It -- it's very much project specific, so it's creating signage and -- and -- and making sure that when we are delivering projects, whether it be a County project or a municipal project, that we have very consistent messaging around that project, and that it's -- it's visibly signed.

So, it's -- it's -- it -- it varies based on the number of construction projects that we expect in any given year.

MS. MALIN: And it -- it includes things as social --

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

MS. MALIN: -- media advertising, banners, signage, display artwork, many different --

MR. HOOPER: And -- and how much in it -- how much is budgeted for 2021?

MS. MALIN: Let me pull that up.

MS. CASSINI: Nothing is budgeted for 2021, as I mentioned. So, these are all in -- in a request to the County Administrator.

MS. WALLACE: Right. And this -- with regard -- to clarify -- this is Angela Wallace.

To clarify with regard to the branding and marketing contract, which is currently being negotiated, there's only \$62,500 a year for two years that was included in the FY '19 and the FY '20 budgets, for 120 -- for a total of \$125,000 in surtax funds associated with the four categories that were

included in the solicitation that the County issued for those particular services.

There's nothing recommended, no additional funds recommended for that particular solicitation included in the recommendations for FY 2021.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. And -- and do we -- and I'm -- I'm asking the team -- and when I say the team, the board, the staff -- shouldn't we dig into the details of that at all? And when we're looking at -- because we -- we talk about how important outreach is and -- and branding and marketing, and -- and I -- information.

Shouldn't we be talking about that budget line item, too, and -- and make sure that it's suitable to you guys to manage from the surtax perspective and -- and the public?

Shouldn't we be looking at that carefully, or is that not something we should be looking at?

MS. WALLACE: This is Angela Wallace.

At this time, we should not have a discussion regarding that particular matter, because the cone of silence is still in effect. That solicitation is still open and --

MR. HOOPER: Right.

MS. WALLACE: -- until such time --

MR. HOOPER: And I'm not -- okay. But I'm not talking about -- I'm not talking about the solicitation. I'm talking about when we plan for future

years, shouldn't we be looking at those numbers or those ideas and how much we should be spending, or what the program should be?

Again, I'm -- I'm looking ahead.

MS. CASSINI: Yeah. So, we absolutely agree with you. That's why I asked Cindy Malin to come and let you all know and try to give you some comfort that we do have a five-year plan and it's multifaceted, and it has all kinds of different elements in it.

And when you look at the slide that I showed you yesterday for the fiscal year 2021 request of almost a million dollars, you know, one of the four major categories that I wanted to highlight for you was the importance of a public educational campaign and -- and outreach efforts that are specific to the five-year plan project.

So, what I can offer is that when we meet in September, in the afternoon, if you'd like I can -- I'll be introducing you to your new Public Information Officer, because that's the last time you're going to see Cindy Malin, and she's retiring today. Today is her very last day.

And we'll be happy to show you the five-year plan that we have and -- and highlight some of the efforts that we hope to undertake, and -- because at that point, I'll have clear direction on exactly how much money is going into the recommended budget for that.

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

MR. HOOPER: Hi, Phil. Okay.

MR. ALLEN: Pre -- when we approved the -- for eligibility the 2021 proposed projects and expenditures, that was inclusive of the recommendation to fund the \$978,000 for MAP Administration that was not incorporated in the recommended budget from the County Administrator, but the board has already taken a position, based on that motion, to recommend that for approval.

MS. WALLACE: That's correct.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. All right. So, we have -- there's a -- there's a contract that's under cone of silence, and we're going to talk about the future budget in September, correct?

MS. CASSINI: Yes, sir.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. All right.

MR. SMITH: And, Mr. Chair, that -- but when you say the future budget, that will be 2021 we'll still be discussing in September? That's what we're saying?

MS. CASSINI: Yes, because by --

MR. HOOPER: -- come up --

MS. CASSINI: -- by September 22nd -- on September 24th, when we meet, we will have our -- we will have completed our final budget Public Hearing, which occurs on September 22nd. So, I'll have some clarity around what amount we will be working with in fiscal year 2021 for our five-year plan roll out.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. All right. All right, then is there any other discussion?

DR. KELLEY: Mr. Chair, if I might?

MR. HOOPER: Sure.

DR. KELLEY: If I might. Dr. Kelley.

MR. HOOPER: Yes. Go ahead.

DR. KELLEY: Yes. I just -- I agree with you about drilling down on -- on the outreach and branding and marketing.

And related to that, yesterday was the first day that we saw the blueprints or the drawings for the new Government Center West public space, you know, that the public's going to come into.

And I feel like it's a huge opportunity for Broward County to showcase, you know, not only what the surtax has accomplished and is accomplishing, but this County's awareness of its aging population and its -- you know, the Silver Tsunami, and also just accessibility for not only mobility impaired people like myself, but for blind people and deaf people in terms of being able to get around the County that they love and that they, you know, need to get services in.

So, I guess what I'd like is your permission to write something that -- that says -- or offer some constructive suggestions on how the public space be extremely mobility accessible and also sort of showcase how Broward County is -- makes that public space accessible for disabled people and

elderly folks coming in to see how they can be helped.

What would be the --

MR. HOOPER: And --

DR. KELLEY: -- protocol? Could I write a letter to -- to the -- the design team or the -- to Gretchen, or what would be the proper procedure here?

MR. HOOPER: Maybe to make a recommendation from this board to the County Commission to include that into the program or the budget for 2021?

DR. KELLEY: Right. To the extent that the -- you know, that the space can still be modified, you know, without adding cost, but simply to showcase how -- you know, how aware Broward County is and how accessible it's making transportation for all.

MS. CASSINI: Mr. Chair?

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. PENNANT: Mr. Chair?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. PENNANT: Mr. Chair, this is Anthea Pennant.

MR. HOOPER: Go ahead.

MS. PENNANT: I -- I -- if I understand you correctly, I think you have an interest in making sure that whatever the plans are for marketing what we're doing, that the board has some input.

And if that is the case, I am in absolute agreement. I think that we should have --

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. PENNANT: -- marketing.

MR. HOOPER: Right. But how do we do that? Because the -- and I'm not talking about getting -- interfering with a contract that's going on right now. Just --

MS. PENNANT: Right.

MR. HOOPER: -- I want to make sure that we make a recommendation that in 2021 that there is something set aside for marketing and outreach that's -- that is --

MS. PENNANT: Right.

MR. HOOPER: -- suitable.

MS. PENNANT: Well, I -- I think prior to the next contract going out that maybe we meet with the County's marketing department to kind of get a sense of the direction they're taking, where -- what is their area of interest, and that way we can chime in if possible.

MS. CASSINI: We will make sure -- through the Chair, Ms. Pennant, we will -- that's the whole point of bringing the marketing plan in front of you and getting your buy-in.

And we had always anticipated doing that once we have a clear understanding of what our five-year plan is going to look like.

MS. PENNANT: Awesome. And with that, I'm going to have to sign off because I have a -- at 12:00.

Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Thank you.

Okay. Yes, if you could bring us that information in September, that would be great, and maybe we can forward a recommendation to the County Commission. Okay?

MS. CASSINI: Absolutely, Mr. Chair. I've noted that and --

MR. HOOPER: All right.

MS. CASSINI: -- I just wanted -- are there any member reports that you -- you want --

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chair? Mr. Chairman?

MR. HOOPER: Yes. Yes, Mr. Allen.

MR. ALLEN: Thank you.

I would ask the staff to incorporate in the agenda of our -- one of our upcoming meetings, hopefully in September, a short presentation from our external auditors as they put together the work program for this year's audit that will be ending September 30th.

I think we need to just have a discussion with them relative to the results of their audit that they conducted last year, which was a clean audit. There were no concerns relative to internal controls, et cetera.

But we, I think, as part of the formality, need to consider the request to

-- and the work program that they have in place for the 2020 audit.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: So, Mr. Chair, the last item on the agenda today was just to let all of the Oversight Board members know that when the -- the workshop on the surtax does occur on the 27th of August, that there is an expectation that the Board will be considering and discussing the recommendations that you formally forward -- forwarded with your Cycle 1 approval transmittal back in June.

And if you would like to get more information or to participate in that meeting, please contact me and let me know.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. That sounds good. I think, in fact, if people have the availability, we should be involved with that workshop if it's possible.

MR. SMITH: Can I -- Mr. Chair, this is Shea. Can I ask a quick question?

So how -- how does that -- can we just explain a little further how this budget workshop will work in relation to what we're looking at?

So, for example, which I -- I share the concerns about, you know, outreach and so forth, so we're going to look at that in September. How does that interrelate with the budget workshop that's going to happen prior to that?

Are you saying you're going to have clarifying information but are -- what happens in that workshop, I guess is -- what comes out of that from a procedural standpoint as it relates to us?

MS. CASSINI: Certainly. It's an excellent question. I'm happy to elaborate.

Workshop -- budget workshops are in the -- they're the forum by which the Commission is able to have a dialog with one another about elements that are in the recommended budget that was published.

So, each of the Commissioners received the -- the recommended budget, just like we did, and the public did. And this is now one of several opportunities that they have to have discussions about what's in that recommended budget with one another.

And they're not allowed to take votes. So, it's a consensus building, it provides a level of direction to the County Administrator and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget so that they can further refine the recommendations before we have our Public Hearings.

And there are two required budget Public Hearings that occur in September. And then the public has an opportunity to weigh in, and there are additional refinements that occasionally occur.

And in an environment like this, having lived through the -- the recession while working here at the County, I can tell you that in an environment where things are shifting rapidly, and data is coming in on a daily basis with updated projections, there's always the potential for continued changes to that budget occurring even through September.

And then once it goes to a final budget Public Hearing on September

22nd, it becomes basically finalized, and it goes into effect on October 1.

And then, as you've noticed through your time serving on the Oversight Board, as adjustments are needed to the budget throughout the year, there are things called supplementals.

And we've done -- when the Oversight Board first convened back in 2019, it was in the middle -- it was after. It wasn't in the middle, but it was after the fiscal year started. So, you were about six months into the fiscal year when you all met and took action for the very first time on April 25th of 2019, which required us to then take that back to the Commission through a budget supplemental process.

So there -- what -- what will happen is that you all will take action today, and your action will be transmitted formally to the Board of County Commissioners with your recommendations.

And then they will receive that, and that will form the basis of the discussion that they have about the surtax, I'm sure along a variety of other things, because I'm sure there are a lot of other people talking to them as well.

And then they get to have an open, transparent discussion about where they want to see dollars shifted or things that they would like to see emphasized.

And -- and hopefully you all will also have an opportunity to participate in that as well.

MR. SMITH: Got you. Okay.

So -- but does seem -- the ordering, to me, seems a little bit off, though, because if we start looking at, for example, this outreach, and we turn around and we say, well, you know, we -- let's just make up something and say, look, we don't think it's enough for -- for how large this program is or the work we have to do, whatever the case may be, they're -- they're then hearing that recommendation kind of after the fact, after they've started these discussions.

I mean, shouldn't we be putting that forth now to them to the extent that we can to say, hey, consider this because this what we think is important in terms of being kind of public representatives of this initiative?

MS. CASSINI: That is the whole purpose of inviting you to the 27th budget workshop.

So, it is not after the fact. It is right in the middle of the development of the budget and prior to it going to its first Public Hearing.

So, it's a -- it's a very -- I think very timely for you to be taking action --

MR. SMITH: Action. Okay.

MS. CASSINI: -- now, sending your recommendations over prior to the -- the workshop occurring, participating in that workshop, which is one of several, and -- and then even again, if you feel that your recommendations need to be further emphasized or refined, you have the opportunity to do that as a member of the Oversight Board and the public during the budget Public

Hearings.

And I think Angela wanted to weigh in as --

MS. WALLACE: Right. I -- I -- yes. This is Angela Wallace.

And I just wanted to make it clear that this is the -- the process for the County Commission to consider the entire 2021 budget.

So, in addition to budgeting -- allocating surtax funds, it'll be all of the other funds, General Funds or whatever, for all of the County agencies.

So, there will be workshops, and there will be segments, there will be agendas, and there will be segments of the -- of the -- the budget workshops that address the various components of the County's overall budgets, one of which is surtax.

So, it's -- it's -- it's a comprehensive review of proposed funding for fiscal year 2021 for the County.

MR. HOOPER: So -- so Shea, you know, what -- I kind of hear what you're saying, and, you know, I think the way to -- to at least send a message is to make a recommendation or we -- we make a motion as a recommendation to the County Commission to make sure -- I mean, what we're talking about are hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars being spent on all this stuff, and -- and -- and maybe -- and there needs to be something that's set aside in the budget for robust marketing and outreach.

And maybe you might want to make a motion in that regard to -- I can't, as the Chair, but in that regard --

MR. SMITH: Yeah. And that's --

MR. HOOPER: -- and it's purely --

MR. SMITH: -- that's exactly my concern.

MR. HOOPER: -- and it's a -- it's a recommendation, which we're not -
- but --

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman? I --

MR. HOOPER: Yes, Phil.

MR. ALLEN: -- go back to the -- the previous motion that was
approved, which was to not only determine eligibility of the 978,000 that staff
is recommending, but that that be incorporated into the budget.

So, we've already made that motion and -- and been approved to do
that.

MS. WALLACE: Right. And --

MR. SMITH: But I think that -- I think we want clarity around how
robust it is, because I think we got stuck in seeing exactly what is included in
there for this outreach, and that was what was going to come back to us in
September, if I'm following correctly.

So, it's a little bit --

MR. ALLEN: I unders --

MR. SMITH: -- of a circle here.

MR. ALLEN: -- well, but the first step is to make sure that there is
money in the appropriation by the Board, that -- that 978,000. Then we, as a

board, can recommend what is to -- what the -- what the makeup of the overall program is.

Staff is telling us that they need that 978 to put a -- a -- a ballpark estimate out there, but then the program will have to come back to us for approval.

MR. HOOPER: But the 978 is for staff, isn't it?

MS. WALLACE: No.

MR. HOOPER: Can you -- can you -- can I get clarity on that?

MS. WALLACE: A portion of that is --

MS. CASSINI: A portion --

MS. WALLACE: -- for outreach.

MR. CASSINI: -- of that is for public outreach, signage around projects. And it will -- as Cindy mentioned, it will fluctuate based on the number of construction projects that are occurring in any given year.

We have wraps, so we -- we want to purchase wraps for our new building, for the windows.

There are -- you know, there are a variety of different items.

As Cindy mentioned, a great deal of money needs to go into ad buys. So, you know, we want to be able to purchase advertising as part of rolling out the five-year plan.

A lot of the low-cost or no-cost options of doing grassroots public engagement and community outreach that we utilized for the actual

educational campaign around the surtax are -- at this moment, it's very difficult for us to know whether those are going to become a reality again, if we're going to be able to do those in fiscal year 2021.

And so, one of the things is that we have a great deal of uncertainty around what our public engagement and outreach campaign can look like in - in a COVID environment.

So, we -- we hear you. We -- we will make sure that if you -- if any Oversight Board member wants to get a copy of our marketing plan, we're happy to share it with you. We can share it with you today, what we're -- what we're thinking about, what we're looking at.

And then when we have some -- when there's some definition around how much has been approved in the budget, then we were going to bring you an even higher level of detail in that plan and try to get your buy-in and your input and your feedback before we actually put it into place.

MR. SMITH: Gretchen, I think --

MR. ALLEN: We're not -- we're just -- Yeah, go ahead.

MR. HOOPER: One of you guys speak.

MR. SMITH: Yeah, Alan, I go back to -- I think this is just not entirely clear, and I would **motion** that we just bring some clarity to it. The marketing plan is what it is that brings all these buckets together, as you mentioned, there's staff, that some of it says marketing and outreach, but my -- my broader concern is that, as you mentioned, Mr. Chair, we're putting hundreds

of millions of dollars out there in the projects, and we're behind on the public outreach.

So, I think the concern that should be sent to the County Commission is that we want to make sure that the -- from our perspective, that this effort is robust enough.

If they're making these decisions, then I don't think it should be kind of piecemeal and let's see what we can do.

I think that everyone else has adapted to the environment that we're in, and communicating with people, you know, whatever methods they're using, they're -- they're doing it.

So, I think if -- the information is out there to figure that out. We're just not taking the steps yet.

And that is -- that is where my concern is, because I think public opinion, at some point, could sway the other way on -- on this group and what we're -- we're doing, because it's hard to get this message out in the right way for something so large, and to a whole County.

I mean, it is -- it is a feat to be able to do. And my concern is that it's going to get kind of lost in the mix at the County level, you know, with a -- with a lot of other stuff that we're doing to administer this program.

So, however we can kind of make that more clear, I would be advocating for that.

MR. HOOPER: So, why don't you make a motion to recommend that

-- that money be set aside for marketing and outreach?

And whether that comes out of the 978,000 or from some other bucket, you know --

MR. COOLMAN: Alan, this is Doug Coolman. I've got a comment on that.

It sounds like we have --

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. COOLMAN: -- money allocated. I think the issue we're concerned about --

MR. HOOPER: I'm not sure we do.

MR. COOLMAN: -- is we don't know if it's enough or not enough.

And maybe the motion should be we need to alert the Commission that we think our outreach program is falling behind, and that we may need to come back to them sooner than later with some additional. Just let them know that we're concerned.

We've got stuff in the pipeline, and I think our concern is that we aren't sure it's enough.

So, I don't know that we have to make -- I think -- I think that's the issue, as opposed to -- I think we have this concern that our outreach program is falling behind and we may need to do the more than we've got programmed to do.

That's my two cents.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So, is someone going to make a motion to that -- to that effect, or do -- or do we just want to leave it at that?

MR. SMITH: Yeah, I -- I'll make a -- I'll make a **motion** to -- to that effect, and that the amount should be substantial and clear.

And I know that those are just terms, but we still don't have -- to everyone's points, we -- it's still buried in this overall budget.

So, what I would like to see is just some clarity around how much specifically is going to go to -- to outreach and external-facing marketing, what those buckets are, and that that's in front of the Commission.

So, however we can make that clear from a recommendation from our board, I'd like to put that forth.

MR. COOLMAN: I'll second that, and I will simply ask our staff to help us with that, Gretchen.

MS. CASSINI: And -- and what we can do is send you a copy of the marketing plan that we have developed.

MR. SMITH: That'd be great.

MR. COOLMAN: I -- I don't think that -- that's -- that's not what I was talking about. We know we have one. It's either going too slow or it's not being given priority.

And that's different than just taking a look at what we have.

MS. CASSINI: Sorry. Mr. -- Mr. -- through the Chair, Mr. Coolman, we don't have one. So, we don't have one.

And I think that that's where the -- the confusion is here.

We -- you approved \$62,500 in '19 and '20 for marketing, branding, logos, social media services, and crisis communications. And it was going to be spread out based on what we needed.

We knew that what we really needed initially, and we talked about this publicly at your last budget workshop, so we needed work around branding and a logo. We needed to figure out who we were going to be.

So, it wasn't a substantial amount of money, but, you know, the problem is what Angela was just describing to you before is that that contract hasn't moved forward, so that -- those services haven't occurred.

And they -- they're not services that are inside of the County.

And I don't want anyone on the Oversight Board to get the impression that the surtax marketing plan is a County-run plan. It's an externally-facing plan that's managed by someone who works here in the MAP Administration Office. That's why we have a PIO.

So, the marketing plan that we've developed has not gone into effect yet because it's around the five-year plan, and the five-year plan has to be approved.

And so, once the five-year plan is approved, then that marketing plan will go into effect.

And that's the marketing plan that I was offering to share with you.

MR. COOLMAN: Well, I think the frustration --

MR. ALLEN: Mr. -- Mr. Chairman --

MR. COOLMAN: -- is that it hasn't gone ahead.

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MR. ALLEN: -- Mr. Chairman?

MR. HOOPER: Is that Mr. Frazier?

MR. ALLEN: No, this is Phil.

MR. HOOPER: Oh. Phil.

MR. ALLEN: The -- we're getting -- I -- I think we're getting confused between the request that is already in -- in process to hire an external advice, if you will, or marketing type to guide us in development of the overall plan.

That contract is in process of being awarded or considered by the County Commission. That has been delayed, as I understand it.

So once that external advisor is on board, then our staff can work with that advisor to develop the overall program, marketing program for the surtax program; is that correct?

MS. WALLACE: That is correct, Mr. Allen.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. I -- I think it's -- I think it's suitable and it's -- it's -- it's reasonable just to make a recommendation that the -- the city -- the County Commission consider a robust line item for the 2021 budget as it relates to surtax and -- and -- and -- and outreach and marketing, and leave it at that.

That's just a recommendation.

MS. CASSINI: Thank you.

MR. SMITH: I -- I agree. We -- should add, though, that our consensus -- or at least I -- I feel that we are behind in this effort, in the public outreach, and I think that we should express our concern in that area, that this gets --

MR. HOOPER: And that gives --

MR. SMITH: -- moving along.

MR. HOOPER: -- that gives -- that gives a recommendation to the County Commission. It -- it -- it -- it -- it can -- it can go through that budget, it can -- our staff can utilize it, and -- and -- and I just think it -- it -- just to send a recommendation.

So, if somebody can make that, we'll see --

MR. ALLEN: Well --

MR. HOOPER: -- yes.

MR. ALLEN: -- on page -- page 126 of -- or 186 of our packet of materials, there are a series of recommendations that the board -- that the -- the advisory board has already made recommendations.

I think that perhaps that should be an additional item that goes into that -- those recommendations forward by the Oversight Board to the Board to add another bullet point to that to incorporate our strong opinion that a marketing plan needs to be developed and that, in fact, we are behind the eight ball, if you will, in moving forward.

MR. HOOPER: And why don't we add --

MR. SMITH: I don't want it to get --

MR. HOOPER: -- I -- I --

MR. SMITH: -- lost in there somewhere.

MR. HOOPER: I agree with you on that. I would only add that -- that -
- that -- that there be an allocation of -- of -- of monies in the budget for that.

But I agree with that. So --

MS. CASSINI: We captured your --

MR. ALLEN: So --

MS. CASSINI: Oh, do you need --

MR. HOOPER: I don't know, I think -- does there need to be a motion
to add that to the bullet points?

MS. WALLACE: That would just be, I guess, included with the list of
recommendations that would accompany the -- the action items on the five-
year plan, the FY '20 and FY '21 budget approval recommendations.

MS. CASSINI: So, through the Chair, just as you sent these
recommendations that Mr. Allen was just referring to with your Cycle 1
transmittals, we will capture that recommendation and include it in the
transmittal for all of the action items that you took today.

MR. HOOPER: Very good.

Is everybody happy with that?

MR. COOLMAN: I just don't want it to get --

MR. SMITH: Yeah. Yeah, I'd like to see how this is going to be listed out and communicated in terms of the list of recommendations.

Going back to the points that we made, you know, we're behind, to Phil's point, and I want to make sure that what it -- you know, our efforts are substantial and that we get some clarity around this.

So, however -- maybe what we do is as an Oversight Board we review kind of this listing of recommendations exactly as they're written, you know, via email, before they're sent out.

And maybe prioritize them in a way that -- that draws attention the way that we see fit.

MS. CASSINI: So, I'm sorry, I just wanted to let you all know that I did send them to you prior to distributing them to the Oversight Board and having them finalized by the Chair.

And I'm happy, in this particular round, if you would like me to send you the -- so these have already been distributed and provided to the Commission back in June when you sent over your transmittal approval of the \$150,000,000 of municipal and the few Public Works projects that we brought to you.

So, these recommendations as they were stated were provided to you and then sent to the Commission.

I'd be happy to send you what I plan to write as your recommendation around the robust outreach and the fact that you feel a level of concern that

we're behind in communicating and messaging about the positive impacts of the surtax to the public.

And I will make sure that I send that to you for your approval before I include it in the transmittal memo that the Chair signs on your behalf.

MR. COOLMAN: Mr. Chair and Gretchen, I think that will work. I just - - I don't think it needs to get confused with what was done before, so I'd like that as a separate item.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. She's -- I think Gretchen's going to send me a - - a -- a transmittal or a memorandum that -- that I'm going to sign, okay? Correct, Gretchen?

MS. CASSINI: That's absolutely correct. Every time you all take action and have to transmit, but what I was suggesting, that perhaps I could send it to all -- everyone on the Oversight Board and -- and get some feedback before I finalize it and provide it for your signature, Mr. Chair.

MR. HOOPER: I think that's a great idea. It gives everybody a chance to provide input, and then we will finalize the draft and I'll sign it and send it.

So, I think that's a great approach.

And it gives us a few more days to -- to think, too, on what you want to send, the message that we want to send.

Okay. Anything else on that?

MS. WALLACE: Not on that.

MR. HOOPER: All right.

MS. WALLACE: If we're finished with that --

MR. HOOPER: I think --

MS. WALLACE: -- I have one more -- this is Angela Wallace.

I've been in contact with --

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: -- the liaison with the Supervisor of Elections --

Supervisor of Elections Office regarding the Form 1s, and just want to ensure that we have a copy of the Form 1s for each of the board members so that I can submit them directly to the liaison and we can ensure that the -- your Form 1s are appropriately displayed on the Supervisor's website going forward. But --

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chair, could we provide both years?

MS. WALLACE: Yes, please.

MR. ALLEN: To you?

MS. WALLACE: Yes, please.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: And, Mr. --

MR. HOOPER: I will -- I can -- how do you want us to send them? Do we send them through that -- that email channel that -- that we set up through the County, or can we sent it through an email direct? What do you want me to -- what do you want us to do?

MS. WALLACE: They can be forwarded to my email address and from whichever email address you would like.

And that is ajwallace@broward.org.

But it can be from either of your -- your emails that you select, your email address. Okay?

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Very good. I'll get you mine.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW TEAM MEMBERS

MS. CASSINI: And, Mr. Chair, if I could just ask your indulgence for just a couple more minutes. I did want to introduce the three new members of your support services team that have come on over the last couple months and -- and just let them say a few words.

Is that -- would you be okay with that?

MR. HOOPER: For sure.

MS. CASSINI: Awesome.

So, we are so excited to have Jeffrey Napier, who's joining us after an illustrious career in the federal government. He was the Director of Procurement for the CDC during the pandemic, so he was happy to be able to retire and come to us, I do believe.

And I'm going to let him say a few words.

We also have Ms. Lina Silva, who is acting as our Program Project

Coordinator -- oh, I failed to tell you that Mr. Napier is the Procurement Strategist for the Transportation Surtax.

Ms. Silva is our Program Project Coordinator and is going to be working closely with the municipalities once we get all of these project funding agreements underway.

And then we have our new PIO. We're said to see Cindy go, but so happy that she gets to go off into her retirement.

And Nichole Kalil is acting as our new PIO. She'll be -- it looks like she's going to be on deck at your September 24th meeting. She's got a lot to show you with our inaugural report, annual report, and she'll also be giving you a presentation on the marketing plan.

So, if I could have each one of you come forward and just say a couple words and -- so they -- they know who you are.

MR. NAPIER: Hello, everyone. My name is Jeff Napier, and I'm very happy to be here, and I appreciate the warm welcome.

I'm a career-long purchasing guy and contracts, so I look forward to digging in and sharing as much of my experience as I can with the board and also the staff here, too.

Thank you.

MS. CASSINI: Welcome.

MS. SILVA: Good afternoon.

MR. HOOPER: Welcome. Thank you.

MS. SILVA: Good afternoon, everyone. Lina Silva, Program Project Coordinator.

I have been with the County for over four years, and I'm excited to be a part of this new initiative.

So, thank you.

MS. KALIL: Hello. Nichole --

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

MS. KALIL: -- coming to you with a nice variety of experience in marketing in private and public sector, as well as public affairs and crisis management.

I've been lucky enough to work at the state and city level, and now I get to work in between on the County level.

I look forward to meeting everybody and letting the world know about our wonderful program.

MR. HOOPER: That's awesome.

MS. CASSINI: That's all I have for -- thank you. I appreciate you letting me do that, Mr. Chair.

MR. HOOPER: No, we're glad to have them, and welcome aboard, everybody.

Okay. Do we have anything else to discuss? Okay. I guess we're done, huh?

MS. CASSINI: Woo-hoo. Happy Friday.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: Out and our next --

MR. HOOPER: Happy Friday. Okay, everybody.

MS. WALLACE: The next meeting is --

MR. HOOPER: Until September.

MS. CASSINI: The next meeting will occur on September 24th at 1:00 p.m., location to be determined, but likely here.

And I will be sending out holds for all of those, for the September and October meetings this afternoon.

Thank you so much.

ADJOURN

MR. HOOPER: Thank you, guys, for all your hard work. We really appreciate it.

MR. COOLMAN: Thank you.

MR. SMITH: Thank you.

MR. ALLEN: Thanks, everybody.

MS. LOVE: Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Bye-bye.

DR. KELLY: Thank you, everybody.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, everybody.

(The meeting concluded at 12:32 p.m.)