

MINUTES

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

April 27, 2023

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Phil Allen, Retired, Finance

Douglas Coolman, Vice Chair/Chair, Retired, Land Use and Urban Planning

Erdal Donmez, Former City or County Manager

Ronald Frazier, Architecture

Alan Hooper, Chair/Member, Engineering/Construction Management,

General Contractor and Real Estate Re-developer, Hooper Construction,

Inc., and a founding member of Urban Street Development.

Deborah Madden, Environmental Sciences, Florida Energy Policy Attorney,

Southern Alliance for Clean Energy

Alejandro Munoz, Public Transportation Consumer

Anthea Pennant-Wallace, Vice Chair, Designee of Broward College, Supplier

Relations and Diversity

Shea Smith, Accounting, Director of Audit and Attest Services, Berkowitz

Pollack Brant Advisors and Accountants

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Also Present:

Angela Wallace, Surtax General Counsel, via telephone

Gretchen Cassini, Board Coordinator

Roy Burnett, Administrative Support Specialist

Tashauna Williams-Wilson, Public Information Specialist

Laura Rogers, County Auditor's Office

Stephen Farmer, Deputy Chief Financial Officer

Scott Bassett, Audit Partner, RSM

Sardou Mertilus, Audit Manager, RSM

Tony Hui, Deputy Directory, Broward County Public Works Department

Coree Cuff Lonergan, Director, Broward County Transportation Department

Arethia Douglas, Assistant General manager, Capital Programs at Broward
County Transit

Tim Garling, Deputy General Manager, Broward County Transit

Derrick Chan, Director of Rail

Barney McCoy, Director, Broward County Transit, Service and Capital
Planning

Ahn Ton, Director, Broward County Highway and Bridge Maintenance

Alice N. Bravo, WSP USA

Nichole Francis, Small Business Development Specialist, Office of Economic

and Small Business Development

Miriam Brighton, The Laws Group

A meeting of the Independent Transportation Surtax Oversight Board,
Broward County, Florida, was held at Room 430, Broward County

3

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD
April 27, 2023
9:30 A.M.
dh/MB

Government Center, 115 South Andrews Avenue, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, at
9:30 a.m., Thursday, April 27, 2023.

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

CALL TO ORDER - CHAIR HOOPER

MR. HOOPER: All right. So then let's go ahead and start the meeting of the Transportation Surtax Oversight Board.

Today is April 27th, 9:30.

ROLL CALL - ROY BURNETTE

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

MR. BURNETT: Good morning, everyone.

MR. HOOPER: Good morning.

MR. BURNETT: Alan Hooper.

MR. HOOPER: Here.

MR. BURNETT: Debbie Madden.

MS. MADDEN: Here.

MR. BURNETT: Thank you.

Anthea Pennant-Wallace?

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Here.

MR. BURNETT: Thank you.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Could you say that again?

MR. BURNETT: Anthea Pennant-Wallace.

(Laughter.)

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: I just got married, so.

(Laughter.)

MR. BURNETT: Douglas Coolman?

MR. COOLMAN: Here.

MR. BURNETT: Thank you.

Phil Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Here.

MR. BURNETT: Erdal Donmez?

MR. DONMEZ: Here.

MR. BURNETT: Alejandro Munoz?

MR. MUNOZ: Here.

MR. BURNETT: Thank you.

And Shea Smith and Ronald Frazier are absent at this time.

And we have quorum.

Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Well, I'm going to welcome the -- the two -- two new -- oh, no -- yes. Two new members here today, right?

MR. COOLMAN: You weren't here last time.

MR. HOOPER: Was there more than --

MR. COOLMAN: This is not the first time.

MR. HOOPER: Oh. Oh, it's not. Well -- oh, my knee. My surgery.

Okay. All right.

Well, welcome, you guys. I haven't met you, so pleasure. And --

MR. MUNOZ: Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: -- look forward to working with you.

MR. MUNOZ: Thank you very much.

MR. DONMEZ: Likewise.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So let's go to Public Participation.

Is there anybody in the -- in the audience that wants to say anything?

MS. CASSINI: Mr. Chair, we have no one signed up to speak.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. All right. Okay. Our -- our boy Shea Smith is in the house.

MR. SMITH: Good morning.

MR. HOOPER: How you doing, Shea?

ACTION ITEMS

1 MOTION TO APPROVE MINUTES OF THE January 27, 2023

OVERSIGHT BOARD MEETING

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So we're going to move to our action items.

The first item is a motion to approve the minutes from January 27th.

Do we have a motion?

MR. ALLEN: I'd **move** that.

MR. HOOPER: Do we have a second?

MR. COOLMAN: I'll second it.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. All those in favor? Okay.

MR. COOLMAN: Any opposed?

MR. HOOPER: Any opposed?

Minutes are approved.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

2 RSM SURTAX FUND AUDIT REPORT, FY 2022 - RSM

MR. HOOPER: The next one is the RSM Surtax Fund Audit report.

So do we have anybody from --

MS. CASSINI: Mr. Chair, we do have --

MR. HOOPER: -- anybody present?

MS. CASSINI: -- a presentation from RSM.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Great.

MR. BASSETT: Good morning. My name's Scott Bassett. I was the engaging partner on the Transportation Surtax program this year.

As your external auditor, our job is to come in and under general accepted auditing standards and give opinion on the financial statements.

The firm was able to issue an unmodified, clean opinion on the financial statements.

But, as your external auditor, I report to the Oversight Board, we have some required communications.

With me to day is Sardou Mertilus. He's going to go through our

required communications, do a high-level look at the financial statements.

Then, if you have any questions concerning our process, we'll be happy to answer those for you.

So, Sardou, if you want to go ahead and jump in, that'd be great.

MR. MERTILUS: Yes. Thank you, Scott. Good morning, everyone.

So I actually want to start with the other document. I see you have the financial statements up.

There's a report to the committee.

Okay. Yeah. So I can scroll myself, right? Okay.

Sorry about that, guys.

So if you turn to page one, as Scott mentioned, these are required communications as the auditors.

So our responsibilities with regards to the financial statements was described to you in our arrangement letter dated November 16, 2022.

As it relates to accounting policies and practices, the surtax program did not adopt any significant accounting policies, nor have there been any changes in existing significant accounting policies during the current period.

We did not identify any significant accounting policies in controversial or emerging areas for which there is a lack of authoritative guidance or consensus.

We did not identify any significant or unusual transactions.

And management's judgments and accounting estimates were evaluated and summarized in the attached Summary of Significant Accounting Estimates.

Moving on to the next page, as it relates to audit adjustments and uncorrected misstatements, there are no audit adjustments made to the original trial balance presented to us to begin our audit.

That goes to show the quality of the finance department that's handling the books of the surtax program.

Now to highlight observations about the audit process.

We encountered no disagreements with management over the application of accounting principles.

We were aware -- not aware of any consultation management had with other accountants about accounting or auditing matters.

We did not encounter any significant difficulties in dealing with management during our audit.

Now, this next section talks about our shared responsibilities as it relates to independence.

Moving on to page 4 of the document, we identified the following significant accounting estimate that's fair value of investments.

We have our -- the County's accounting policy as it relates to fair value of investments, management estimation process, and also our basis

for concluding the reasonableness of the estimate.

As attached in Exhibit A, that's the signed management rep letter -- management rep letter signed by management at the conclusion of our audit.

And this brings us to the conclusion of our presentation.

We'd like to open up the floor to any questions.

DISCUSSION OF SURTAX FUND

MR. HOOPER: Do we have any questions from the members?

MR. SMITH: I have something real quick.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: Well, first off, good job, and nice presentation.

Appreciate it.

In terms of these being special purpose financial statements, so, basically, they're a carve out, in essence. So have you -- I know you guys are required to document, you know, the internal controls relative to the audit of the special purpose financial statements.

Did you note anything -- any -- I don't want to say difficulties, but anything related to that carve out? In other words, is it complicated to achieve or do you see that as being streamlined, the way the numbers are -- are coming out? Did you notice anything relative to those internal controls --

MR. BASSETT: Uh-huh.

MR. SMITH: -- you know, to get this information where it is, because

this is a -- you know, in essence, a part of the County operations, but it's not the whole picture, as we say in the report.

MR. BASSETT: Of course. So, sure, I'd be happy to answer that question.

From a County standpoint, we do do a -- give a report on -- from government auditing standards which references internal controls.

And as we go through that process, we looked at the significant transaction cycles.

And since this is a carve out, as you mentioned, we do have to take a look at the -- the sources between revenues and expenses and -- and look at those.

So I guess to answer your question, we do look at that from a County level. It does get driven down to these special purpose financial statements.

And with that, we did not have any issues that we'd be responsible or required to -- to -- to communicate to you.

I always looked at it, as Sardou mentioned in his presentation, no audit adjustments were -- were needed as we went through the process, so it is a carve out, but it is included within the whole body. And since we are opining on these financial statements, materiality drops to a very low level in which we have to audit and opine on -- on these statement.

So the answer to your question, we did not come across any internal

control deficiencies that are required to be communicated to this board.

MR. SMITH: Okay. And then the other -- another quick question. In terms of like -- I guess two things. One is -- one is more for this group and just to kind of put it on record is that we have a -- there's a large fund balance, right, which is, in essence, equity, right, for lack of a better term.

I know in governmental accounting, which I'm not an expert in by any means, we kind of refer to that as a fund balance. And you can correct me where I'm wrong.

But my overall general comment is that we don't want that to get too large, right, because that means that dollars are coming in and -- I don't want to say they're sitting, but to the extent we can get those out and into projects, that's part of what we're supposed to be doing here.

So that's just like a general comment.

And then in terms of the way these columns work, where we have the fund balance is the total of the transportation surtax and then transportation surtax capital, and then it gets to a total.

Can you just speak to what is going on there as far as what those represent, the different columns that get us over to the total?

MR. BASSETT: Sure. So each -- each column basically is --

MR. SMITH: Sort of like programs?

MR. BASSETT: -- it's like a program, I'd say. So you have an

operating fund and the capital fund --

MR. SMITH: Yeah.

MR. BASSETT: -- which kind of combine to your total -- total column.

So I guess that's a great way to -- to --

MR. SMITH: Okay.

MR. BASSETT: -- to define it, as a program.

MR. SMITH: All right.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chair?

MR. HOOPER: Yes, Mr. Allen.

MR. ALLEN: I had asked for some additional material to be provided to the -- for your consideration during the board meeting or the -- this board meeting.

Is there anybody from the Finance Department that can respond to investment policies?

Could you identify yourself?

MR. FARMER: Good morning. Stephen Farmer, Deputy CFO.

MR. ALLEN: Okay, Stephen. If you look at the financial statements for the fund, and going back to the fund balance issues of spending the appropriations as necessary for the projects and also to try to speed those projects, about 20 percent of the County's overall investment pool, cash on hand, is represented now by the fund balance of this particular organization.

And if you look at the financial statements, I think it's on page 4, you'll see a significant -- what I consider a significant impact on the financial statements due to investments and the current market conditions that have occurred over the last 18 months between the US Treasury raising interest rates, the County policy for investments.

The primary purpose of investments in the County's funds are to preserve capital. And, as such, normally those investments are rather restricted as it relates to the types of instruments that are held by the County for investments, primarily designed by US Treasury's World Bank, et cetera, with a duration probably of about 18 months or two years as the overall average length of that investment that is held.

Is that correct, Stephen?

MR. FARMER: The investment policy allows us to invest for a term out to five years, but the average duration is -- is probably around one and a half or -- one year --

MR. ALLEN: To two?

MR. FARMER: -- to two and a half years, yeah.

MR. ALLEN: Okay. And as everybody knows, or at least should know, that the Fed, over the last 18 months, has been increasing interest rates. The impact of that is when you look at a maturity of 18 months or two years, those interest rate impacts of the US Treasury increasing those yields

on those instruments causes a -- when you look at it from a standpoint of the -- I'm sorry, the change in -- on the overall market rates, when you do a valuation to the current situation because these financial statements are presented as of a point in time, so you may have in your investment portfolio instruments that are maturing in -- in out years.

And because of the County policy also that -- that encourages holding to maturity rather than trade -- active trading in -- in those instruments, when you go to do that valuation, you create a -- a potential -- I think some people would call it a paper loss -- that it -- it's -- it's immaterial, but it -- when you look at the statements, there's \$109,000,000 revaluation of the investments of this fund as that particular point in time.

Now, that's not to be a significant concern unless you start to liquidate those instruments that are below water or below current interest rates. If you're holding those to maturity, eventually those -- those will mature with income to the investment; is that correct, Stephen?

MR. FARMER: That is correct, Mr. Allen. As -- as you stated, these are unprecedented times in terms of the increase in the interest rates at -- at a very fast pace.

As a matter of fact, there's still talk that next week the Fed may even continue with another bump. You know, so as a institution that -- that has a buy and hold policy, which is industry -- industry standard for municipalities,

we -- we are -- we are at the mercy of -- of those -- of those increasing interest rates.

But -- but the issue is, though, that those are unrealized losses that -- that you are referring to. And -- and it -- and it amortizes out based on -- based on maturity.

So we -- it is not a -- not a realized loss until -- until they're sold. And we hold to maturity.

MR. ALLEN: Well, that just shows -- I mean, one of the concerns here is that it does not appear to be a problem as it relates to a -- a real concern to this particular fund, the transportation surtax, as long as those maturities are allowed to -- or those instruments are allowed to liquidate on maturity rather than trying to sell short or, you know, to change that.

All I'm saying is that from a standpoint -- if you look at the financial statements in and of themselves without consideration of the -- the -- the changing climate, you could be concerned that you don't have as -- you've got -- you incurred a loss of \$109,000,000 to the fund for that period.

But that's not a concern that needs to be ongoing unless you are in a process of -- required to liquidate that through a short sale to the -- against a market that is higher today.

So I just wanted the board to be aware of it. It's not anything that requires our actions. I think the County's policies, again, are industry

practice and should not be a concern.

But somebody just looking at -- pulling your financial statements and looking at that particular entry, accounting entry, might be concerned that you have incurred a loss, which you have not incurred a loss as of this point in time.

MR. FARMER: Yeah.

MR. ALLEN: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

Do we have any other comments? All right.

MR. COOLMAN: I do have a question for --

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. COOLMAN: -- Mr. Allen. Not being an accountant, I would assume what you're saying is our investments have a set rate, mature whenever they do. Today, they're paying more, but the policy of the County is not to play that game. They are going to wait and sit.

So in theory, even though there's no loss there when we sell it, that's because we're not allowed to sell it, right?

MR. ALLEN: No, the policy discourages any type of movement of that kind.

MR. FARMER: Yes, Mr. Allen. So our -- our strategy is buy and hold. We do not actively trade. That -- that is a more risky strategy that -- that we

do not feel is appropriate. So -- so we are a buy and hold shop.

And -- and the fact of the matter is that if -- in a rising rate interest rate environment like this there are unrealized losses --

MR. COOLMAN: Sure.

MR. FARMER: -- that are showing. However, on the other end, in a -- in a environment where interest rates are falling fast, you know, then -- then we would have a unrealized gain there.

So, I mean, it's -- it's -- it's what happens, you know, as a result of -- of market condition.

MR. COOLMAN: But, over simplified, our investments today are at what percentage of interest earning? And today, if we had invested today, they would be at a higher percentage, is what I assume is causing this theoretical loss; is that correct?

MR. FARMER: Yeah.

MR. COOLMAN: What's the difference between what we're being paid currently under our long-term and what is -- what is the government offering today? I'm just curious.

MR. ALLEN: I'm sorry.

MR. COOLMAN: The difference in the interest rates.

MR. FARMER: I mean, right now, the average rate for our portfolio is about a 2.4.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay.

MR. FARMER: And interest rates right now are probably at -- you know, just depending on --

MR. COOLMAN: Twice that.

MR. ALLEN: Treasury rates are four and a half, I think, right now.

MR. FARMER: -- well, depending on -- on --

MR. COOLMAN: Okay.

MR. FARMER: -- the timing, actually, because --

MR. ALLEN: Right.

MR. COOLMAN: I have no problem with what we're doing, but to say that we're not -- when they mature, we're not going to have the loss, I don't understand that philosophy, because --

MR. ALLEN: If they mature, they won't produce a loss as long as you've held it to maturity. There's --

MR. COOLMAN: But they're only --

MR. ALLEN: -- there's no loss of capital.

MR. COOLMAN: -- going to pay at two and a half.

MR. FARMER: Right.

MR. ALLEN: That's correct.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay. Okay. So, if we didn't have this restriction, if it was me and I took those and sold them and reinvested them at -- oh, I

would lose it -- I would lose the two and a half and I would be gambling that the four and a half stays there?

I don't understand that it's a gamble.

MR. ALLEN: You just --

MR. COOLMAN: I don't understand why we're saying we're not technically losing money, but, in reality, when these --

MR. ALLEN: There's an opportunity --

MR. COOLMAN: -- mature --

MR. ALLEN: -- lost. You're correct. There's an opportunity lost.

You could, if you were an active trader, you could, you know, short that up now and -- and then reinvest. But --

MR. COOLMAN: But in reality, because we're not allowed to do that, and it's just --

MR. ALLEN: It's not a -- it's not considered standard --

MR. COOLMAN: Okay. Fine.

MR. ALLEN: -- practice. It --

MR. COOLMAN: Okay. I just --

MR. ALLEN: -- happens occasionally and --

MR. COOLMAN: -- wanted to understand --

MR. SMITH: When he kicked it --

MR. COOLMAN: -- how it --

MR. SMITH: -- when he kicked it off, he -- he opened with we have like a capital preservation strategy. I'm not sure if -- if -- if -- if you said that or you said that, but one of the gentlemen said that.

And that -- it's just a different -- it makes sense, right, for a municipality. Like, that's the -- that's the -- the strategy, right? You're not trying to --

MR. COOLMAN: I'm not --

MR. SMITH: -- yeah.

MR. COOLMAN: -- disagreeing with it. I'm just trying to -- in reality, we are not making as much as we could because of our historical --

MR. SMITH: Yeah.

MR. COOLMAN: -- practice.

MR. ALLEN: But you are also risking the potential that you would not do as well and --

MR. COOLMAN: That's right.

MR. ALLEN: -- in the public sector --

MR. COOLMAN: I'm not --

MR. ALLEN: -- that is not something that I --

MR. COOLMAN: -- I understand.

MR. ALLEN: -- would encourage you to -- to do.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Can I ask a question? So liquid cash, including investments, we have a 1.2 billion? Is that correct? As of September 30th, 2022, based on this --

MR. FARMER: 1.1 --

MR. HOOPER: -- I don't know what page -- I'm looking at --

MR. FARMER: -- yeah, so 12, 1.2 --

MR. HOOPER: What do -- what do we have in cash today? And investments?

Do we know?

MR. BASSETT: Yeah, I mean, as of -- our statements are in September --

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

MR. BASSETT: -- so --

MR. HOOPER: That's why I said 1.2.

MR. BASSETT: -- you're about -- the -- between the -- the -- the cash equivalents and the investments, 1.2 as of September --

MR. HOOPER: Right.

MR. BASSETT: -- 2022, yes.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Yeah. Because that question's been coming up a lot in the circles that I move around in, about cash and how much we have.

Okay. But, well, let's -- let's finish up this -- is there any -- do you have any more -- any more questions?

MR. COOLMAN: I --

MR. HOOPER: You have a question?

MR. COOLMAN: -- I understand the reason we have this cash is we have some very big numbers coming down the road that we're going to have money to spend, and that's why it's sitting there.

It's not -- there's a -- it's -- whether you call it earmarked or whatever you want, but we're going to have some very big projects and we need the money in the bank to pay for it.

So we're looking ahead. That's why it's there. Not just by accident.

MR. HOOPER: No, no, I understand.

Are there any other questions or comments from our board? Anybody else?

**MOTION TO NOTE FOR THE RECORD FY 2022 FINANCIAL AUDIT
OF THE SURTAX FUND**

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Is that --

MR. ALLEN: **Motion** to --

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MS. WALLACE: To accept.

MR. ALLEN: -- note for the record?

MS. WALLACE: A note for the record, yes.

MR. ALLEN: That's the receipt of the management letter, the financial statements, and the auditor's opinion.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. We have a motion.

MR. COOLMAN: Second.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. All those in favor?

Is there any discussion on the motion?

All those in favor, say aye.

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

MR. HOOPER: Those opposed?

(No verbal response.)

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. BASSETT: Thank you --

MR. HOOPER: Thank you --

MR. BASSETT: -- very much. Have a great day.

MR. HOOPER: Nice job. Thank you.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

3 SELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

MR. HOOPER: Okay. I'm trying to -- okay. The next one is the selection of a Chair and a Vice Chair.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman?

MR. HOOPER: Yes, sir.

MR. ALLEN: I'd like to propose the nomination of a new Chair for a two-year term. I would like to -- that motion to be that our current Vice Chair, Doug, be acceptable to the board as an incoming chairman of the committee for a two-year period.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. And is there any other motions for either Chair or Vice Chair?

MR. COOLMAN: Yeah. Yeah, I'd like to nominate Alan to stay right where he is.

(Laughter.)

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Are you serious?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes, I am serious. I am. I think you're doing a wonderful job. I think another two years, you know --

MR. HOOPER: You got to take a compliment and run with it sometimes.

MR. COOLMAN: I understand, but I really want to make it clear that I believe you are doing an excellent job and I'd love to see you sit there another two years.

Now, I know you have other obligations, so it's really up to you, as far as I'm concerned.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Allen, I don't know what to do here.

MR. ALLEN: Well, I --

MS. WALLACE: Well --

MR. ALLEN: -- you open the floor to -- does he want to make a nomination of you as --

MR. COOLMAN: I --

MR. ALLEN: -- Chair?

MR. COOLMAN: -- I -- yes. I -- I want to -- so, Alan --

MR. HOOPER: I can -- I can tell you, if I'm a member, just a regular member, or a Chair, I will participate. I'll come to the meetings. So you don't have to worry about me stepping down or not being around.

But I -- I'm happy to do it if you want -- you don't want to do it, I'll do it.

Is there anybody else that wants to be Chair, at this table?

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman, if I could respond.

MR. COOLMAN: I didn't say I didn't want to do it. I'm saying that I think another two years of your leadership would be good for this board.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: And I -- I have to say I second that, even though, you know, certainly, Doug, I -- I could appreciate the nomination. But, you know, you're doing an excellent job. It's like, I don't know.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: It's not broken, kind of -- that's my

thought. It's up to you.

MR. HOOPER: So --

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman, I -- can I just --

MR. HOOPER: Sure.

MR. ALLEN: -- perhaps provide clarity for my motion?

We, over the last several months, have taken strides to increase the continue -- continuation of appointments. In fact, the Board approved a change in our -- their policy on the Appointing Authority for any vacancies that occur are appointed at a four-year term --

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MR. ALLEN: -- rather than the remaining part of the term, in order to provide continuity going forward.

You have been -- done an outstanding job as Chair of this committee during its formation period over the last four years and in my recommendation or my nomination of Doug, it was just a recognition that we need to provide some opportunity for other board members --

MR. HOOPER: I understand.

MR. ALLEN: -- to cycle into the -- the experience of being Chair of the committee going forward.

MR. HOOPER: Agreed.

MR. ALLEN: It's -- it's not against you as Chair or --

MR. HOOPER: I -- I don't --

MR. ALLEN: -- that you have failed us --

MR. HOOPER: -- take it that way.

MR. ALLEN: -- in any regard. You've been outstanding during the last four years.

MR. HOOPER: I don't take it that way at all, and, as a matter of fact, I agree with you on that. So if Doug doesn't want to do it, that's his choice.

MR. COOLMAN: I didn't say I didn't want to do it.

(Laughter.)

MR. COOLMAN: I said I -- and I agree with the transition. Maybe I was just taking an issue of when it happens.

MR. HOOPER: What do you want to do? Because if you want to do the Chair, I'm good. I'll step back and you do it.

MR. COOLMAN: Well, we could simply vote and then we don't have to worry about it.

MR. ALLEN: That's right.

MR. HOOPER: Let's do that.

All right. So we have two --

MS. CASSINI: We didn't get a second. We need a second.

MR. HOOPER: I guess we have two folks that have been nominated.

MS. CASSINI: We didn't get a second for one of these.

MR. HOOPER: What's that?

MR. COOLMAN: Pardon?

MR. HOOPER: Second from -- which one?

MS. WALLACE: So there was a motion -- well, there was -- I think you called it nomination, and a second for Mr. Hooper, but there was no second on the nomination of Mr. Coolman.

MR. HOOPER: Do we have a second for Mr. Coolman?

MR. SMITH: I'll second it. And I'll just give a little bit of rationale, also, to add to it.

I think it is good to show -- in a public role like this, I think it's good to show a cycling and a changing in leadership in very general terms.

I think Alan's done an amazing job.

I would step up and do it. I just have too much going on.

So I think it does need to be appropriate for the person and that they have the time to do it.

But if somebody is willing to step into that role, I just think it's -- it's probably a good thing, so that people on the outside don't sit there and say, oh, the same person's been the Chair for X number of years.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MR. SMITH: Because people find things to criticize, and that could be something that, even though we know that he's doing a great job and is

independent and all these things, it's just -- I don't know. I don't want to open us up to any sort of criticism, so.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So we have a second. So I guess let's just -- do you guys mind saying who you want to vote for and just go down the line? I mean, I -- I do not take this personally at all, so, I mean, honestly.

Mr. Frazier? For Chairman.

MS. CASSINI: Don't forget to use your mic.

MR. FRAZIER: Alan Hooper.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Allen.

MR. ALLEN: Doug Coolman.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Munoz, right? Munoz.

MR. MUNOZ: Thank you. Mr. Coolman.

MR. HOOPER: Ms. Madden.

MS. MADDEN: Mr. Coolman.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Coolman.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Okay. So I need to say something before I -- I understand. The point's made that it's important for changing of the guard. So even though I think you've done a fantastic job --

MR. HOOPER: I understand.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: -- I get it.

MR. HOOPER: So you're vote?

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: So Coolman.

MR. HOOPER: Coolman.

MR. COOLMAN: Mr. Hooper.

(Laughter.)

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Donmez.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Oh, my goodness.

MR. DONMEZ: Well, this is the second meeting I'm attending, so --

(Laughter.)

MR. DONMEZ: -- you know, I'm still learning the faces. It really makes no difference, you know, for me. I can vote for either one of you.

MR. COOLMAN: You can abstain.

MS. WALLACE: No.

MR. COOLMAN: He can't do that?

MS. WALLACE: No, he cannot abstain. There's no conflict. Unless there's --

MR. HOOPER: Go ahead.

MS. WALLACE: -- you can only abstain if there's --

MR. HOOPER: I think he's already won away.

MS. WALLACE: -- an actual conflict.

MR. DONMEZ: I'm going to vote for you.

MR. COOLMAN: Thank you.

MR. DONMEZ: Mr. Coolman.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So -- so Mr. Coolman will be the Chair.

Should I hand over the gavel now and let him do the Vice Chair --

MS. CASSINI: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: -- vote?

So there's nothing to hand over. You're -- you want to switch seats?

(Laughter.)

MR. HOOPER: All right. You're the man. Go.

MR. COOLMAN: So I'd assume we are now going to talk about a nomination for Vice Chair?

MR. HOOPER: Vice Chair.

MR. COOLMAN: Anybody on the board would like to make a nomination?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MR. COOLMAN: Mr. Frazier.

MR. HOOPER: Oh.

MR. FRAZIER: I nominate Phil Allen.

MR. COOLMAN: I'll second that.

MR. HOOPER: The Chair, second?

MR. COOLMAN: Wait a minute. Can Chair -- can a Chair second

things?

MS. WALLACE: No.

MR. HOOPER: I don't think so. Can he?

MS. WALLACE: No.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay. I'm sorry. I withdraw my second.

We need a second for Mr. Allen -- I mean, for Mr. -- yeah, for Mr. Allen.

We need a second for Mr. Frazier for Mr. Allen.

MR. HOOPER: I mean, I'll -- I'll second it, but I also have a nomination. Just so that there's a -- it's -- I wanted to nominate Ms. Pennant-Wallace.

MR. COOLMAN: Could we have a second for that, please?

MR. FRAZIER: I'll second it.

MR. COOLMAN: Are there any other nominations?

MR. ALLEN: Just to clarify, the make of the -- or the seconder of the motion, can they nominate somebody else --

MS. WALLACE: Yes.

MR. ALLEN: -- in addition to that nomination?

MS. WALLACE: That's not an issue.

MR. HOOPER: And -- and, again, this isn't any -- I was about to do it before you were nominated, so I just wanted to be fair and let it work its way out.

MR. COOLMAN: Are there any other nominations --

MR. ALLEN: I will second that.

MR. COOLMAN: -- from the floor?

MR. ALLEN: I mean, was there a second for that?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MS. CASSINI: Your mic.

MR. FRAIZER: Yeah, I second.

MS. WALLACE: I think Mr. Frazier seconded the nomination.

MR. ALLEN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. COOLMAN: Are there any other nominations from the floor?

So be it closed.

Go ahead. Vote, please.

MS. WALLACE: Are we going to --

MR. HOOPER: We got to go forward --

MS. WALLACE: -- are you going to --

MR. COOLMAN: What?

MS. WALLACE: -- follow the same process that Mr. Hooper followed
and just --

MR. HOOPER: You can follow the same process. Start with Frazier
and work your way around.

MR. COOLMAN: Well, let's start on the other end.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: Please use your mic.

MR. COOLMAN: That's being a little unfair to the new member, but.

MR. DONMEZ: I'm going to go for Ms. Wallace.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. COOLMAN: I'll take the prerogative and go last, thank you.

MR. HOOPER: I will go with Anthea.

MR. SMITH: Same. I'll vote for Anthea Pennant-Wallace, please.

MS. MADDEN: Ms. Wallace.

MR. MUNOZ: Mr. Allen.

MR. ALLEN: Anthea.

MR. FRAZIER: Ms. Wallace.

MR. COOLMAN: I guess I don't need to vote, right?

MS. WALLACE: Yes, you need to vote.

MR. COOLMAN: I've got to vote for Phil, though, just because.

MR. HOOPER: Yes, you need to vote.

MR. COOLMAN: Congratulations, Anthea.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Okay, keep going with the meeting.

**4 BOULEVARD GARDENS MUNICIPAL SERVICE DISTRICT
ROADWAY DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS - MR. TONY HUI,**

DEPUTY DIRECTOR, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

MR. COOLMAN: Are -- Gretchen, are we ready for Item 4?

MS. CASSINI: I believe we are, Mr. Chair. And Mr. Hui is coming up to the podium to begin the presentation.

MR. COOLMAN: Thank you.

MR. HUI: Good morning, Mr. Chair, Ms. Vice Chair, and members of the board. I'm Tony Hui, Broward County Public Works. And I'm going to speak to you this morning about two projects, asking your approval for their eligibility for funding.

It's -- and I think what -- you'll like what you hear about these two projects. So let's get started.

So the first project concerns our -- one of our Municipal Service Districts. It's the Boulevard Gardens Municipal Service District.

We put together a project to improve the drainage of this area.

What you see in front of you is a map of the area. It's essentially bounded by Sistrunk on the north, Broward Boulevard on the south, and 27th Avenue on the east and 31st Avenue on the west.

It's an older neighborhood, has older infrastructure. We have identified issues with drainage in the past because of the undersize drainage. And some of them are in conditions that are getting close to and beyond their service life and so forth.

So -- let -- let me see. Okay. So I'm going to go back a little bit.

We've identified some of the drainage issues, and I -- I think everyone here is aware of the issues that we had couple weeks ago and in terms of, you know, drainage all throughout the County. I have put together some photos -- oh, thanks Gretchen.

I didn't -- sorry, I didn't get a chance to put it into the presentation, but I was able to put the -- print out some photos of some of the things that we saw.

And I'm going to wait a minute here for it to go around before I continue.

MR. COOLMAN: Could I ask a question, Tony? These photos are from this thousand-year storm?

MR. HUI: Yeah, Uh-huh. Yeah, it's from --

MR. COOLMAN: We had problems before, right?

MR. HUI: -- we -- we -- we have had issues before. I did -- this is just the most recent. I think they were taken on April 13th, which is the Thursday, the day after the -- the major rain event that we had.

MR. COOLMAN: With -- with these improvements, I assume, though, that even a thousand-year storm is going to cause a problem.

MR. HUI: Yeah. Right. Uh-huh.

MR. COOLMAN: But a hundred-year storm would not.

MR. HUI: Right.

MR. COOLMAN: And it is now.

MR. HUI: You -- you're absolutely right. I think, you know, from a standpoint of dealing with the issue that we had couple weeks ago, you're absolutely right. It -- it's not something that can, you know, be reasonably dealt with.

But, obviously, not all storms are in that magnitude, and we're going to be able to handle a lot -- you know, a lot of that.

So it -- it's -- again, is -- is just an illustration of some of the issues that we encounter. Lot of flooding in the streets, as you can see in the photos, and so forth.

So -- and -- and from the standpoint of being in the position to deal with some of these issues, given the circumstances that we had, we are kind of in a fortunate position, you know, being in a position to deal with them. Not so much to the residents that are handling the individual, you know, damages and so forth.

So the -- the project that we put together, we actually submitted for a grant for it. And the scope that we put together is, as you can see on the slide here, is to reduce flooding in roadway and swales, control the drainage -- oh, excuse me -- control the erosion, and then also reduce pollution because of the roadway runoff.

And the way we are going to plan on doing that is to essentially and design and replace an aging undersize stormwater system.

That's not going to be enough. We also need to add additional drainage, additional piping to it in order to bring it up to -- again, not to this thousand-year standard, but to a reasonable design standard for a system like that.

And then, as part of the grant, one of the -- is the -- is the Resilient Florida Grant from the Florida Department of Environmental Protection. There is -- we are going to include a lot of green infrastructure, as much as we can, into the -- in -- into the project to reduce pollution and then also increase percolation in the groundwater and that type of thing.

So the total estimated cost in our grant that we submitted to DEP is -- it's 17 and a half million dollars.

And the breakdown of that is we're requesting 8.75 million dollars from the surtax, and the Resilient Florida grant is going to provide eight -- again, a 50/50 match, with 8.75 million dollars by reimbursement.

So we need to request the whole amount up front, be able to fund it, and then, as the project proceed, they will provide 50 percent of the funding, up to 8.75 million dollars.

So it's a very good leverage for the County in terms of using the surtax funding.

So, this is -- this -- this is the request. And if I -- any questions, I'll be trying and answer them.

MR. COOLMAN: Yeah, Mr. Allen.

MR. ALLEN: This is a request? It hasn't been approved yet by the state?

MR. HUI: Oh, no, no. They -- the grant has been approved by the state. We're in the process of approving the documents to -- to formalize it, but we have received official notification from the state that we have the grant.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay. Mr. Allen, did you have something?

MR. HOOPER: I'm Mr. Hooper.

MR. COOLMAN: I mean Mr. Hooper.

MR. HOOPER: Yes, I do.

So -- so are we -- are we voting on eligibility here? Is that what we're doing?

MS. WALLACE: Yes, this is an eligibility --

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: -- review.

MR. HOOPER: And I have something to say about this neighborhood, because I drove through that neighborhood. It was like -- like two days after the flood. And while everybody else had -- the water had gone down and

people were back to their normal lives, these folks were buried in water, and it was -- I had to go through there because Broward was closed. I guess maybe because all the cars had been left there or something. And I was cutting through, and I have a pickup truck, and I -- I was wading through that.

This was not on the day of the storm, and these people were trying sit like up -- they couldn't be inside, probably because their houses were completely flooded.

It's a horrible situation. And I thought that this was just one of a hundred spots, probably, in the County. But, clearly, this is -- this is a really bad situation. And I think if we can -- and -- and, basically, they were -- you -- unless you had a pickup truck, they weren't coming or going from their houses. Their roads were closed.

So from a transportation standpoint or an access standpoint, it was completely shut down to anybody in a normal vehicle.

I'm sure it also causes issues for safety and everything else that goes with trying to live a normal life.

So if we could -- if we could push this one through and approve it, I think it's the right thing to do, and I think it's the perfect project.

MR. COOLMAN: I would agree with that.

I also think, Tony, it's -- it's great that we're able to double our money.

The question I really --

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MR. COOLMAN: -- would have is let's just assume the price goes up. Are they committed to 50 percent of whatever the price is, or are we -- we only this amount?

MR. HUI: I -- typically in these grant type situations, they commit to a maximum amount. So it would be 8.75 million dollars. And it's really up to us to kind of, you know, manage it and deal with it and then, you know, do the appropriate things in terms of trying to keep it within, you know, the budget that they have provide.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay. Whether it goes up or down, we'll --

MR. HUI: Yeah. Right.

MR. COOLMAN: -- we'll take the difference. I think it's worth it, whatever it comes in.

**MOTION TO APPROVE AS STATUTORILY ELIGIBLE
THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND EXPENDITURES IN THE
AMOUNT OF \$17,500,000 FOR DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF
ROADWAY DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS IN THE BOULEVARD
GARDENS MUNICIPAL SERVICE DISTRICT; \$8,750,000 WILL BE
REIMBURSED BY A RESILIENT Florida GRANT (OFFERING 50
PERCENT LEVERAGE ON SURTAX FUNDING OF \$8,750,000).**

MR. FRAZIER: Mr. Chairman --

MR. COOLMAN: Mr. Frazier.

MR. FRAZIER: -- I'd like to **move** the item, move that we approve it.

MR. HOOPER: I second it.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: I -- I have a quick question. How quickly can we get this done? Because I'm concerned when I think about hurricane season around the corner, I'm wondering how quickly can we get this started?

MR. HUI: It -- it -- so the -- the -- the next step in the process is the official signing of the agreement between Resilient Florida grant and then also Broward County.

So the -- so that's the reason where we need the -- the funding in order for the County to be able to commit to, you know, the grant agreement and so forth.

And after that, we -- we go through a design process. And then design process, it goes through a construction.

So it is not a type of thing that we're going to be able to deal with it from a standpoint of the next hurricane season, and probably not even the next.

But I think from the standpoint of us being the -- you know, in a position -- as an organization, being in a position to deal with the issue as quickly as possible rather than trying to develop a project at this point, I think

we're -- you know, we're steps ahead of, you know, where we could have been. Uh-huh.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman?

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: All right. Thanks.

MR. ALLEN: Tony, can we be more realistic as it relates to the timing of this project? I mean, the reality is you've got to bid engineering support, you've got to bid contractor. You know, this is probably a three-to-four-year project.

MR. HUI: Yeah, I -- I believe so. And just to be --

MR. ALLEN: So don't be thinking it's one year or two years.

MR. HUI: Yeah. Right.

MR. ALLEN: It's probably three or four years out.

MR. HUI: It -- it will be, because it -- typically, for an engineering project to be done right and be able to accommodate and make sure the residents get, you know, the input into -- into the system, we -- you know, that -- that is the timeframe that we're talking about, Mr. Allen.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: All right.

MR. COOLMAN: Tony, one question. Is there anything we can do to shorten that period? Because if we just put this in the normal chain, we know how long it's going to take.

MR. HUI: Yeah.

MR. COOLMAN: Is there anything that can be done?

MR. HUI: Yeah, I -- and I -- and I think that, you know, couple of the things that our maintenance staff continue to do on a regular basis is is that, you know, one of the things that our maintenance staff did during the storm was that they went out and they clear the storm drains, you know, when it was raining and so forth.

So -- so, you know, a key part of our all of this is that, in conjunction with our capital program, you know, we continue maintaining the system to the best of our ability so that we can, you know, do some of the things that we're -- you know, that -- that -- that -- to minimize the impact.

So, you know, any time that there is repair that needs to be done to the system, any time that maintenance can be done proactively on a frequent basis, we're taking the steps to do them, to minimize the impact while we, at the same time, proceed as quickly as we can with the design and construction.

MR. COOLMAN: Any other comments?

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chair, just --

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Mr. Chair --

MR. ALLEN: -- just to -- to clarify that particular point. There was an audit conducted of that very successful bridge project where the County -- you know, the -- we've talked about it past -- I forget what bridge it was.

MS. CASSINI: Oakland Park.

MR. ALLEN: Oakland or something. And there was an audit that, while it did not find any violations of policy, it encouraged, you know, a full-scale bidding process for future projects.

And I just -- you run -- in government, you run the risk of trying to speed things up and getting, you know, outside the lines versus following established procedures, even though established procedures may never have perceived a 28-inch rainfall.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Mr. Chair.

MR. COOLMAN: Anthea?

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Is it -- so as -- as -- as we're talking through this, it's making me feel that we probably need to start looking at areas in the County that this kind of situation could happen, so we can be ahead of it as a part of our strategy.

MR. HUI: Absolutely. And -- and -- and, in fact, the board -- this board approved a project last year with a similar grant funding contributions for Broadview Park.

And so -- you know, so this is the second one of the projects that we had -- we have major leverage in terms of dealing with this issue.

So it's -- it is the, you know, foresight of the board to have these projects approved on the eligibility so we can do exactly what you're talking

about.

Now, in terms of the other areas, we're going to continue to seek grant funding opportunities in the next cycle so we can continue to do, you know, what we need to do. Uh-huh.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay. I think we can take this catastrophe and maybe learn from it.

MS. CASSINI: Yes.

MR. COOLMAN: And because of the fact that it was so severe -- the severity is a factor that -- there's water standing still in places. And they're going -- Mother Nature's going to tell us where we need to go next.

MR. HUI: Yeah.

MR. COOLMAN: I think we need to --

MR. HUI: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: That's right.

MR. COOLMAN: -- look at the aerials and get ahead of the game, as you said.

If there's no -- any more discussion?

MR. DOMNEZ: I have one.

MR. COOLMAN: Sorry. Go ahead, Erdal.

MS. WALLACE: Please turn on your mic, Mr. Domnez.

MR. DOMNEZ: Oh, sorry.

MR. COOLMAN: Turn your light on, I know you have a question.

MR. HOOPER: There's a new sheriff in town.

(Laughter.)

MR. DOMNEZ: Turn it on and then I don't -- forget to turn it off.

Considering this was, you know, part of the emergency declaration and, you know, subsequently by the state, and I believe White House either has or is considering, you know, declaring it as -- as -- as a, you know, emergency zone, does that give us any latitude as far as advancing this particular project or similar ones, you know, putting it ahead of the schedule of -- I know there's always, you know, more projects and needs, but at the same time, this is truly an exceptional one.

And considering the board is, you know, truly united, wanting to, you know, make this project done as soon as possible, and obviously we're going to, you know, follow the regulation, rules, and engineering. We don't to shortcut anything.

But if there is a way to, you know, just give additional, you know, priority and -- and -- and then maybe steps in the process.

Is that an option? Is that a possibility?

MS. WALLACE: We can look into whether the declaration of an -- of an emergency, and this particular incident, qualifies for an exception.

I -- there are Florida statutes that require competitive solicitations.

One in particular is the CCNA statute as it relates to engineering and architecture and other professional services.

And so we -- I don't think we can -- we can't circumvent that process that's required by statute for the design of the project.

But I guess we can do an assessment of the available options and -- and see whether there's another way to -- to address it.

MR. DONMEZ: Thank you.

MR. COOLMAN: Any other comments? I think we need to have a motion for approval?

MS. CASSINI: She needs to --

MS. WALLACE: So I know that --

MR. HOOPER: We already have the motion and the second.

MS. WALLACE: -- Mr. Frazier made the motion, and I believe it was seconded by --

MR. HOOPER: I seconded it.

MS. WALLACE: -- Mr. Hooper, yes.

MR. COOLMAN: All right. So we're ready to take a vote? Okay. Can we do it -- do we need individual or to just --

MS. WALLACE: Just all in favor.

MR. ALLEN: Can we ask for counsel to read in her standard eligibility?

MS. WALLACE: Thank you, Mr. Allen.

Yes, so the project involves the design and construction of roadway improvements and roadway drainage, and other improvements will be associated with the project.

And under 212.055 Florida Statutes, such improvements are eligible for surtax proceeds.

MR. COOLMAN: All in favor?

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

MR. COOLMAN: Anyone opposed?

(No verbal response.)

MR. COOLMAN: Motion passes unanimously.

MR. HUI: Thank you.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

SHERIDAN STREET EMERGENCY BRIDGE REPAIRS - MR. TONY HUI, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

MR. HUI: The next project that I want to speak to you about is actually a project that the board has seen before. I think we have -- some of our new members may not have had that -- the benefit of that discussion.

But it is -- excuse me -- it is our Sheridan Street Bridge project. We talked about it last year as part of our budget discussion back in August.

And just as a -- as a brief reference, what it is is the Sheridan Bridge is

owned by the County. It -- in this section of the bridge that we're talking about, this is the section that goes over the Turnpike.

It is one of our older bridges, and when it was constructed, it was constructed, you know, at the height that was appropriate the standard at that point in time.

Over the last number of years, we have had a number of trucks that exceed the statutory standard but hits our bridge. And it damages the support beams underneath the bridge, and we have had been in the position of having to fix it, sort of not regular, but a semi-regular basis.

So last year when we talked about this project -- and this is a -- an excerpt from the budget discussion that we had last year. So this was back from -- in -- in August when we had that discussion.

At that point in time, the photos that -- that's included at that presentation was a recent bridge strike that we had. I think it was -- it occurred sometime in June or July, sometime in that timeframe, a couple months right before our budget discussion.

And then at that point in time, what we were -- talked about and -- and -- and the board approved the eligibility for 5.3 million dollars for design and construction to temporarily -- not temporarily -- but to raise the bridge by 18 inches. That was the discussion we had at that point in time.

And couple of the key points, if I remember the discussion correctly, I

think the board recognized that it was something that was necessary, that needs to be done, but because of the way that the bridge -- because the -- the Turnpike Authority was going -- planning on expanding the Turnpike, that -- raising the bridge at that point in time was going to be a temporary solution.

I think there was some discussion about that, and then there was some discussion about the amount of money that -- that we need to fund for this project.

And because it also interacts with the Turnpike, that the Turnpike should participate in some of those -- that funding.

And I think, even given the discussion, the board recognized that that was something that's absolutely -- from a safety standpoint, that needed to be done. And that was -- you know, that -- that was what we had.

So since that point in time, a couple very important things have happened since that discussion.

We had that discussion, as I said, back in August. In October, two months later, the bridge was struck again. And this time it was struck again and with such force that it was probably the worst strike that we ever had.

It actually damaged two of the crossbeams on the -- underneath the bridge, and we were significant -- there was significant concern about the viability to the bridge at certain points.

So we actually -- after the bridge was struck in October, we actually had to close down one of the lanes on Sheridan -- on Sheridan Street and the Sheridan bridge, in order to maintain safety for the public until we could -- until we could repair it.

So we -- we did the emergency repair in December. So on top of what -- what -- what the board saw in -- in August, you know, before we even had the opportunity to fix that, it got struck again.

And -- and so -- so that happened, and then we actually -- in that repair, we actually had to replace two complete crossbeams that support the bridges. So that -- that was an important thing that happened.

As part of it, a second thing that I think we also had some discussion about that was that the Florida Turnpike also started putting advance warning signs into -- you know, in -- on -- onto the -- I think some of you -- I -- I know I've seen it. I've seen -- some folks might have seen that, too.

So -- but I think what is -- what was more importantly than that, in addition to above the -- those two items, is is that the Turnpike recognized the issues they were having in terms of expanding the bridge, and they found a way to do it that doesn't require them to modify the -- the -- the piers and supports.

So what that means for us is is that when we were raising the bridge by 18 inches and -- and believed that the Turnpike has to come in and

change it at some point, because they were able to modify the design concept, we can raise the bridge now and have it be a permanent solution.

And -- and so we -- that -- the Turnpike was able to come up with that solution for the design. We're able to now kind of convert our concept of temporarily raising the bridge to make it a permanent solution.

And then what -- what's great about all of that is is that as part of it, they have asked us, instead of raising it just by 18 inches, is to raise it up to 21 inches, get it higher, and then do certain modifications to accommodate their design.

And they're going to put in a \$4,000,000 contribution in terms of the overall project.

So it's -- it -- it addresses -- you know, certainly addresses some of the issues and some of the concerns that we have. It's a permanent solution, and there's financial contributions, you know, as part of it.

So this is the quick summary of where we -- you know, of where we're at and what we're asking, the determination of eligibility.

The raising of the bridge to 21 inches and certain modifications that we have to make and so forth, the cost of that is \$8,000,000.

The emergency repair that I told you -- talked to you about that we had to replace two complete beams and so forth that we had to do back in October and so forth, cost us about 2.3 million dollars to do that work.

So add up with a total of 10.3.

The board last year had approved the eligibility of 5.3 million dollars, shown in red there.

So the difference between that is \$5,000,000 that we're asking for the eligibility determination for.

So -- and -- and, again, this is a reimbursement type arrangement. The County has to be in a position to fund all of that money, incur the expenses, do the repairs, and the Turnpike will be reimburse -- will reimburse us for \$4,000,000.

And we are currently in the stage that -- that -- that we're working with the Turnpike Authorities to finalize a draft -- finalize an agreement for board approval for this amount of money.

MR. COOLMAN: Any questions of Tony?

MR. FRAZIER: I -- I have a --

MR. COOLMAN: Mr. Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: -- a question. Is there any way to add the words, a threat to public safety and life to this motion? Because what you've described here --

MR. HOOPER: Yeah. Right.

MR. FRAZIER: -- is a threat to public safety and life.

MS. CASSINI: We've already addressed it. Yeah.

MR. FRAZIER: Huh? You can't do that? Can -- can you add some language like that to this agenda item, as well as the other one? Because the other one is -- is in the same boat.

MR. HUI: Go ahead, please.

MS. WALLACE: So when the original emergency repairs were done, we used the emergency declaration to do the improvements to stabilize the bridge. The -- in the Fall.

MS. CASSINI: That was in October.

MS. WALLACE: That was in --

MR. HUI: December, right.

MS. WALLACE: -- October --

MR. HUI: Uh-huh.

MS. WALLACE: -- in December. So we were able to do that at the time, to make the emergency repairs to stabilize it so that it didn't present a danger.

But the actual design and like reconstruction, we'll have to look into whether we can, under the procurement requirements, utilize that same provision under these circumstances.

MR. FRAZIER: The reason for that question is his last comments was that the bridge was hit again, and which substantially weakened the supports.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Yeah.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. FRAZIER: So apparently it is -- it is not repaired.

MS. CASSINI: No, it was repaired.

MR. HUI: Yeah.

MR. FRAZIER: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: It was repaired --

MR. FRAZIER: But it's on life support.

MS. WALLACE: -- it was repaired and then it was hit -- there was a significant impact once again.

MR. FRAZIER: That's what I'm talking about.

MS. WALLACE: Right.

MR. FRAZIER: So now it's on life support.

MR. HUI: No, the --

MS. CASSINI: No.

MR. HUI: The bridge -- just for clarification, the -- the bridge, when -- when it was struck in October, definitely was weakened. And that's the -- that's the reason we had actually closed the lane of the Sheridan bridge, in order to maintain safety.

When we repaired it in December, we actually replaced those two damaged beams. And -- and so the bridge, right at the moment, is fully

operational, functional. There's no restriction on the bridge.

So -- so the safety -- the -- the bridge has been repaired. Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

MR. COOLMAN: Ms. Madden?

MS. MADDEN: Thanks.

I was wondering about the reimbursement for this one and -- and even the grant in the other item. Does -- does the money get reimbursed to the surtax fund or just the County in general?

MR. HUI: It -- it's -- it would be -- I'll let the attorney speak on that. Uh-huh.

MS. WALLACE: It would be replaced into -- redeposited into the surtax fund.

MR. COOLMAN: Mr. Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Okay. I -- I think the threat to life and safety is more the guy driving the truck whose body just went through the windshield. You know, you -- you come to a halt like that, and that's hugely dangerous.

And, for me, fixing that bridge beyond emergency repair is as important as anything.

As a matter of fact, I can't believe -- if there's one bridge on the turnpike, one bridge, that is lower than all the others, then that's the -- that's the -- that's the bar that you set for what semi-trucks -- the height of the

highest vehicle can be.

And if they don't have something like -- you know when you go into a garage and they have a PVC thing, and your car hits it so that you don't hit the sprinkler pipes and stuff if you come in? That's your limitation.

I'm surprised there's no limitation at the entrance of every Turnpike entrance that -- that is at the lowest point, because you're sending a driver into a place that they think they're okay, and they're slamming into a -- into a -- into a bridge and coming to a complete halt. Probably going 70 miles an hour.

I mean, we've got to fix this thing as fast as possible, because those are the folks that are losing their lives, I'm sure.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: It sounds awfully scary to me, not just the truck driver, but the vehicle behind --

MR. COOLMAN: Behind him.

MR. HOOPER: Right.

MR. HUI: Uh-huh.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: -- behind the truck driver. If he stops, they're -- they're -- they're out as well.

MR. HUI: Yeah.

MR. ALLEN: The was personal injury on that -- that second accident, wasn't there?

MR. HUI: I'm sorry?

MR. ALLEN: There was personal injury, I thought, on the second accident.

MR. HUI: Ahn, do you know?

MR. TON: On the -- on the first accident, there were injuries for the vehicle following the truck.

MR. HOOPER: There you go.

MR. TON: The second one, he was by himself, so there was no other injury.

And I'm sorry Tony's so scary today.

(Laughter.)

MR. COOLMAN: Tony, I have a couple questions. who owns this bridge?

MR. HUI: I'm sorry?

MR. HOOPER: The County.

MR. COOLMAN: Who owns the bridge?

MR. HUI: Broward County owns the bridge.

MR. COOLMAN: Broward County, because it's the road going over the Turnpike.

MR. HUI: Right. Uh-huh.

MR. COOLMAN: So therefore, their 4,000,000 was part of the original

eight. We're responsible for the emergency repair because it's our bridge.
And we're getting at least some of our money back.

MR. HUI: Yeah. Uh-huh.

MR. COOLMAN: Thank you.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Yeah, I -- I think about liabilities. I mean, the County could be sued. I mean, how -- how do we -- the signage that is there, is it sufficient -- or maybe that bar that you're talking about -- to make sure?

I mean, maybe that bar should be installed, you know --

MR. COOLMAN: Now.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: -- a mile or two away so that the drivers coming understand that that's an issue. if your truck hits this bar --

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: -- you need to turn around or something.

MR. COOLMAN: You better put it in before it --

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: What -- what can we do?

MR. COOLMAN: -- so they can get off.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Yeah.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah. But still --

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: That's what I think.

MOTION TO APPROVE AS STATUTORILY ELIGIBLE PROPOSED

**ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$5,000,000
FOR DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF IMPROVEMENTS TO
SHERIDAN STREET BRIDGE OVER TURNPIKE.**

MR. HOOPER: Can I -- can I make a --

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Because I use the Turnpike all the time.

MR. HOOPER: -- **motion** -- can I make a motion to approve this
request or?

MR. COOLMAN: May I have a second, please?

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: I'll -- I'll second. I'll second. Anthea.

MR. COOLMAN: Any more comments?

(No verbal response.)

MR. COOLMAN: All in favor?

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

MR. COOLMAN: Any opposed?

(No verbal response.)

MR. COOLMAN: Motion passes.

MR. HUI: Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Thanks, Tony.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Oh, my goodness.

MR. HOOPER: Scary, huh?

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

**6 BROWARD COUNTY TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT COPANS
ROAD OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE FACILITY
RENOVATION PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST - MS. COREE CUFF
LONERGAN, DIRECTOR, BROWARD COUNTY TRANSPORTATION
DEPARTMENT**

MR. COOLMAN: Item Number 6?

MS. LONERGAN: Thank you. Well, it won't be Tony and Coree today.

So good morning, everybody.

MR. COOLMAN: Good morning.

MS. LONERGAN: Really excited to be here today to meet you all. My name is Coree Cuff Lonergan, and I'm the new Transportation Director for the Transportation Department here at Broward County.

And I am going to step aside and let Arethia Douglas share this presentation with you. she's largely responsible for pulling it together.

And I'm going to come back to you later with a discussion about the PREMO plan.

Thank you.

MR. COOLMAN: Thank you.

MS. DOUGLAS: Good morning. Good to see you all. Arethia Douglas. I'm the Assistant General Manager for Capital Programs for the

Transportation Department.

We're here this morning to talk about a project that came before you previously in 2020, and this is for the rehabilitation and reconstruction of our Copans Operations and Maintenance Facility.

For context and for orientation for those of you that may not know where we're located, we are --

MS. LONERGAN: Go back a little bit. Start with the background.

MS. DOUGLAS: Thank you.

We are -- the site's located on Copans Road between the Turnpike to the west and Blount Road to the east.

Just a little bit of background on the project and how we got here.

The original project was for the rehabilitation of existing structures and construction of new -- of a new operations building and training building.

We were also looking to construct a new parking garage structure and do other miscellaneous site improvements.

And that grant was submitted to the federal government under a Bus and Bus Facility grant, which was awarded to us in 2019.

In May 19, 2020, we took the project and -- to the Commission for the approval of that 17.275 million for us to rehabilitate and reconstruct the project, with the original budget at the time at \$51,376,208, with transportation surtax providing the non-federal matching funds.

Again, on July 28th, this board approved and found the project statutorily eligible, and we continued to look at the project to keep moving it forward.

And that project budget was increased in fiscal year 2021-2022, and increased by another 14.8 million.

So where are we today? We saw an opportunity at the site to take a new look at the project to see if we could do some innovative type designs, look at the feasibility of maximizing the use of the 25-acre site to meet some of our needs.

We're transitioning our bus fleet from diesel to a hundred percent electric, and have a transition plan in place to do so through 2035.

In order to do that, we need to -- we will be increasing the number of buses in our fleet, so we'll need additional parking for the buses on -- on our two garages that we currently have.

So we looked at this project and also did a condition assessment on the site and found that the -- the site that was originally constructed in -- in 1982 had passed its asset life. Most of the systems on the site was beyond its asset life.

And we saw a new opportunity to -- to take a new look at the project, which led us to rescoping that project.

And now we are looking to not rehabilitate the bus maintenance

facility, but to construct a new building, larger footprint, about 46 percent greater in scope, and will give us the ability to park buses on the roof.

The -- the new revised scope will also help us to optimize the -- the site for future expansion, like I mentioned, to an all-electric fleet.

It will also allow us to improve employee facilities and enhance site access and traffic patterns on the site.

We come off Blount into the facility and we'll be able to look at potentially an additional entrance or access that will allow us better flow as we come in and pull out in the morning for service.

The existing parking garage -- sorry -- the existing site currently holds 257 buses.

With the increase in parking and what we're proposing, we'll be able to park 89 additional buses on the roof. And I'll -- later in the presentation, I'll show you some renderings of what that will look like.

So in April 4, 2023, the Board of County Commissioners approved the revised project scope for a new project budget of 225,680,000 and -- which brought us here.

The funding gap for us for this project is 149,000,000 with 139,000,000 being proposed to be met with surtax funds.

So here's the location. You'll see the -- we currently have surface parking on the northwest -- sorry -- the northeast side of the facility with

employee and staff parking and visitor parking closer to the Turnpike.

In the center of the -- the site is the old maintenance building, the one that we're proposing to demolish and reconstruct.

This is a rendering of what we're proposing. It shows surface parking to the center of the site, relocating that maintenance function to the northeast part of the site. That would then allow us to park buses on the roof as we come into the site off Blount Road.

Some renderings of what the site will look like.

This is the proposed maintenance building, showing how we will get up onto the roof and we'll park the buses there.

What we'll do, too, on the roof of that building is charge these electric buses that we're proposing, and we'll also install canopies -- solar canopy above the buses to offset some of the electrical loads for the site. So we'll be generating power on the site also to -- to feed some of the loads that will be created by the electrification of the fleet.

Here we -- we're showing just different views and elevation of that maintenance building.

And we -- we have also proposed the construction of the new training building, state-of-the-art, that we'll be able to train our mechanics, our operators. We'll do miscellaneous IT training.

And other County departments will be able to use this site, because

it's going to be state-of-the-art, allowing a lot of training opportunities for -- for the County.

So what we're asking for today is for the board to approve this project as statutorily eligible for proposed additional expenditures in the amount of 139,440,000 for the additional improvements that I mentioned.

Thank you.

MR. COOLMAN: Questions? Mr. Hooper.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, so this is an incredibly large amount of money, and it has moved from being -- looks like a \$61,000,000 surtax participation to double -- more than double that.

And I -- there are questions I have. There is information that we're missing for me to feel comfortable approving this, at least my vote, because I want to know where in the plan did we have -- I mean, we were always contemplating electric buses and all these other things, but that's a big number. And it's going to eat into the surtax.

It's a big change.

I'd like to know where we're saving. Like did we have other maintenance facilities spread around the County that now we can just consolidate into one?

Are we going to get some credit for that?

Were there offices or whatever the things that we are fulfilling in this

maintenance facility, show me where in the budget before there was this stuff so that we are fulfilling that in the plan, tit for tat.

Because I think that this is an incredible amount of money, and, you know, in one of the prior meetings, I was told -- because this -- this achieves one thing. It achieves bus riders. It helps bus riding, okay?

But I asked the question a year ago about the synchronization of intersections. And I can't tell you how many times I'm driving around this County and I'm scratching my head, why the traffic flows the way it does.

And if we're going to spend an extra 70,000,000 on a facility, why can't we -- and we have money, cash in the -- sitting in the account, why can't we find enough money to fast track the synchronization of the intersections, spend more money on more people, more equipment, more fiber, and enhance the lives of those that are in cars at the same time as we do something like this?

Because this is a big number, and we didn't have this -- we didn't approve this before, so I think it's a big ask.

And I'm -- I think we need to look at a lot of things. But I have questions as to what this new number replaces and saves for the surtax.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Mr. Chair?

MR. COOLMAN: Anthea.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: So my question is about the training

facility. You know, I think that there is obviously some thought being put on how to make the space very efficient, you know, just, you know, what you're doing with the buses on the roof and all of that.

So I can appreciate that. You're certainly trying to make sure that there is that -- you know, you're being energy efficient and so on.

But I guess I'm trying to figure out what's the level of utilization of the training room, why this has to be merged into the cost, and could another location that currently exists be used for training, right?

And I also really wanted to know what percentage of this increase does this training represent? Because I don't think that was in the original scope.

MS. DOUGLAS: The training building was included in the original -- it was included in the original scope. That is not something we have rescoped.

The training needs of our department is extensive. We have hundreds of maintenance mechanics, Facilities Maintenance mechanics that needs to be trained, and 880 bus operators that we train. Classes come in, I think quarterly, and have to be trained.

Currently, we are making do of the best situation that we have, but in expanding our fleet to -- we're currently at 413 buses. We are going to increase our fleet up to 700, approximate, buses. So that's new operators to train, new mechanics to train, new facilities folks to train.

It -- it just rolls down the hill with the needs for training. And this facility will address that for our agency.

So we -- we felt that consolidating that training, which is now spread out for us all over the County, is -- is more efficient and will ultimately be more cost effective as we -- we train up our -- our workforce.

The key point here for us, too, is as we go electric with our vehicles, it's a totally new technology, different systems. We're looking to implement and include those new type systems into this facility to -- to educate and to train up our staff.

It doesn't preclude other County sections or divisions from -- from use. We will be making the facility available to anyone else that -- with similar training needs. They can use the facility.

But this building and this part of the scope was always in the project.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Right. And I -- if I can just add, I recognize that there are definitely some cost increase because it's been --

MS. DOUGLAS: Yes.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: -- a project in the works for a long time.

MS. DOUGLAS: Correct.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: And we know cost of living has gone up.

MS. DOUGLAS: Correct.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: But I think it would be good if we could

get a sense of the -- the value being added. You know, what's it bringing to the County, because you -- you want to go ahead and build this training facility, what does that value represent, so, to Mr. Hooper's point, we can justify this kind of investment, you know?

MS. DOUGLAS: And I can speak a little bit about some of our previous plans.

We have always -- we've been -- for the last ten years been looking for a third maintenance facility for a -- a site for a maintenance garage to -- as we expand our fleet, we're challenged to park vehicles. And we've gotten very creative in -- in the use of the sites we have.

So we've been looking for a piece of property for ten years. We have not been able, to date, to identify that.

That project was in -- is -- is funded and is identified in the surtax budget.

But what this project allows us to do is to defer the need for a third facility by maximizing the use of this site.

So that -- it -- we -- we are -- that project was previously budgeted, and we do have it budgeted for both land acquisition and for the construction of that third garage site.

We -- by able -- us being able to do this and -- and maximize the use here by being a little bit creative with parking buses on the roof, we're able to

increase the parking on the site by 35 percent and the space on the new building by 46 percent.

So we'll be able to expand and grow through our transition through 2030.

So that's what this allows us to do and will defer our need for that third maintenance facility.

MR. HOOPER: And I'd like to know just how much that --

MR. ALLEN: Yeah, what was budgeted for that?

MS. DOUGLAS: The -- the original budget for that third maintenance facility was 97,000,000. And -- and the land acquisition dollars are separate.

So a total budget for that -- you know, it's difficult to say what the land acquisition piece would be, but we -- we have \$75,000,000 budgeted for that.

So we -- this -- these numbers and dollars exist currently in -- in -- in the surtax plan.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chair?

MR. COOLMAN: Anthea, are you done?

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Well, you know, just one last comment.

I am excited about the -- the fact that over 300-plus new job opportunities will come from this.

MS. DOUGLAS: Correct.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: And I think that's part of the value added -

-

MS. DOUGLAS: Correct.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: -- to be articulated as well.

MS. DOUGLAS: Correct.

MR. COOLMAN: Mr. Allen.

MR. ALLEN: So why don't we reduce the budget for those other projects that this will supplement or supersede the need to expend those monies for those other projects?

MS. DOUGLAS: And, as you see, our five-year capital program this year, you'll notice changes in our capital program for the five years that accounts for this.

So, yes, we have -- we have -- this does not represent additional funding. We have reallocated funds from other projects that we're deferring, the third maintenance facility being -- being one.

MR. ALLEN: I -- I just don't know why the request that comes -- the explanation that comes to us doesn't provide that information, that that supersedes the need to spend those other dollars. And we -- we continue to reserve surtax monies to pay for projects that are going to be superseded by this project. No?

MS. CASSINI: Well, because I don't -- I don't think what I'm hearing is that it's being superseded. I think it's being reallocated and it's being

deferred.

MS. DOUGLAS: Correct.

MS. CASSINI: But there's definitely not -- I don't want you to leave here with the expectation that there won't be a third maintenance facility --

MS. DOUGLAS: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: -- or there won't be land acquisition requirements.

Even though you've provided \$76,000,000 in a previous budget for land acquisition that hasn't been successful doesn't mean it won't be necessary as they expand their fleet.

MS. DOUGLAS: Thank you.

MR. ALLEN: Phil, do you have any other questions?

MR. COOLMAN: I have some questions --

MR. FRAZIER: I have --

MR. COOLMAN: -- or comments.

MR. FRAZIER: -- I have a -- a question.

MR. COOLMAN: Mr. Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: I wanted to ask about the small business participation in the A and E services. I see you have sketches or what have you. Has an A -- A and E design team been selected --

MS. DOUGLAS: Yes, sir.

MR. FRAZIER: -- for this project?

MS. DOUGLAS: We -- we issued NTP for this project June of 2022.

MR. FRAZIER: Okay. And what is the SB participation on this?

MS. DOUGLAS: Thirty percent CBE.

MR. FRAZIER: Do you have the names of the firms that --

MS. DOUGLAS: Not with me, but I could provide that. But we have a 30 percent CBE goal associated with the project.

MR. FRAZIER: Okay. What I'd like to know is who the prime A and E is --

MS. DOUGLAS: IBI Group.

MR. FRAZIER: -- and -- and their subconsultants that make up that CSBE participation of 30 percent.

MS. DOUGLAS: We'll be happy to provide it.

MR. FRAZIER: Okay. Thank you.

MR. MUNOZ: I just wanted to say --

MR. COOLMAN: Alejandro.

MR. MUNOZ: -- yeah. I like the idea. I think it's -- I think it's a good thing.

And it does seem like a lot of money, like Mr. Hooper was saying.

But I also wanted to say that it's good that we're getting a lot more buses, and that's going to increase ridership, hopefully, but I think at the same time, we need to be thinking about how these buses are going to get

around at a faster rate than the cars. By that, I mean BRT.

Just because we have more buses around, those same buses are going to get stuck in traffic, so --

MS. DOUGLAS: And --

MR. MUNOZ: -- I think at the same time, we should --

MS. DOUGLAS: -- and if you give us ten minutes --

MR. MUNOZ: Yeah.

MS. DOUGLAS: -- we'll show you the next presentation --

MR. MUNOZ: Oh, okay.

MS. DOUGLAS: -- which includes our -- our high frequency, high-capacity transit actions, and BRT is one of them.

And a key part and element of BRT for us is transit signal priority. And the other traffic treatments that was mentioned before has to be incorporated in that for that service to be successful, because we're proposing -- I don't want to steal Coree's thunder -- but we're proposing higher frequency service that will need the treatments that was mentioned before to move traffic forward so all our buses can move forward. And other vehicles, right along with the buses, will have the opportunity to move forward faster.

So we'll present that in the next presentation that we're about to come up with.

MR. MUNOZ: Okay. Thank you.

MR. COOLMAN: Shea?

MR. SMITH: I do see where we need the capacity. The facility seems innovative.

It is a huge number, so if we get some more details, maybe that's good.

I just want to bring up kind of an overarching point that we've talked about here before, which is none of this makes sense unless we get ridership up, right?

So, in other words, I think it kind of opens everyone up to criticism to the extent that people look at this and say, hey, look, they're building this grand facility for no one to ride the buses.

And I know that sounds like super cynical, but that's what the average person thinks about the bus system.

So just in line with all of this, we just have to keep in mind ways that we're going to get people on these buses once we have the capacity.

And I just think that those plans have to be front and center and in the public purview, right, and have -- we have to really be thinking about that as -- as we move.

And I'm sure that we are, but I just -- it's a very relevant part of this conversation, right, because I -- I think I've heard this described a little bit as, you know, we'll build it and they'll come type of thing, which maybe is true,

but we have to change the narrative around public transportation in Broward County.

I mean, it's a huge -- it's a huge issue, right? And I think that the average person out there doesn't think it's going to catch on.

So I just want to -- the public perception thing is huge.

MS. DOUGLAS: And we agree. And with your help and support -- we'll talk a little bit more about some of that. And I know Coree will address that. Because that is -- that is true. And we are looking for all the help and support that we can get to do that.

MR. COOLMAN: Mr. Domnez?

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Mr. Chair? One -- one quick -- go ahead.

MR. COOLMAN: Go ahead.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: No, I was just curious, with the third location, you know, you talked a little bit about -- I mean, is it possible to reallocate some of the funds from that project to this project and then just kind of put that on hold and let's see how successful this project is --

MS. DOUGLAS: So --

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: -- in terms of increasing ridership and -- you know, so you can better articulate the impact of this site?

MS. DOUGLAS: -- this is what I -- this is what we're -- we're -- we're thinking will -- we will do, because the need for that additional facility's

deferred, because this facility allows us to expand through our expansion plan through 2030. So it does give us that ability to -- electrification of the fleet is not a one-to-one option, a swap, so we expand full electrification.

And for the BRT services that we are going to talk about in a few minutes, they'll need space and bus parking for those buses for those new services that we're planning.

Those initial buses, those services, will be accommodated on this site.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Awesome. Thank you.

MR. COOLMAN: Mr. Donmez.

MR. DONMEZ: My concern is similar to the other members of the board over here. It's not the project suitability, viability, or meeting the statutory requirements, but the project has grown from 51,000,000 to \$76,000,000 until, you know, not too long ago.

Now it is from 76,000,000 to \$225,000,000. Again, not questioning, you know, what is changed in scope --

MS. DOUGLAS: Uh-huh.

MR. DONMEZ: -- and the need and the expenditures and associated with that.

It's just too much of a jump all at one time. Just I think it will be helpful in the future to get more information in advance, you know, for us to feel comfortable and also --

MS. WALLACE: Okay. If I may.

MS. DOUGLAS: Uh-huh.

MS. WALLACE: Okay. I guess additional information will be presented as the project progresses --

MS. DOUGLAS: Uh-huh.

MS. WALLACE: -- but, you know, our purview here with this body is statutory eligibility of the proposed expenditures.

MS. CASSINI: Right.

MS. WALLACE: So the project has been determined statutorily eligible. Previous expenditures for the project have been determined statutorily eligible. The proposed increased expenditures are statutory -- meet the statutory requirements.

And the action item today is to determine the eligibility -- this body to determine the eligibility of those additional expenditures.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman?

MR. COOLMAN: Go ahead, Debbie.

MS. MADDEN: May I -- yes. I wanted to inquire a little bit about the statutory eligibility. I'd like to understand that and whether that is ever broken down, because I -- yes, it looks like a wonderful project, but, for example, solar panels for charging -- adding electrification to this facility, are -- are those items, you know, specifically needed for transport?

And maybe there's other things, too. The training facility, other additions that I just don't know if they're specifically statutorily eligible. So I'd like to understand that, please.

MS. WALLACE: Okay. So the electrification of the fleet makes the electrification -- the infrastructure for electric vehicles -- or for the electric buses necessary.

And so yes, the electric charging infrastructure for the electric buses is an eligible expenditure because it's Transit.

The facility is a Transit Operation and Maintenance facility, and the expenditures for Transit operations and maintenance is eligible under the statute.

In addition, the training facility -- I think everyone needs to understand that transit is a highly regulated industry service by the Florida -- the Federal Transit Administration and the Florida Department of Transportation.

There are safety-sensitive positions throughout the transit service, including, you know, the operators, the -- and so they have the -- the -- lots of training. ADA training, drug and alcohol training. There's drug and alcohol testing. There are all sort of regulatory requirements that impose training requirements on not only newly hired operators and mechanics when they're brought on board, when they're onboarded, but continuous training throughout the year, and certifications for the safety-sensitive, in particular,

employees.

And there's a significant number of bus operators and bus maintenance employees that provide all of these services to operate and maintain the buses.

That -- there's an existing training facility for that purpose, and this just expands the training facility for that purpose as the system and the services expand.

You know, as we implement rail and light rail and those -- there -- there are safety-sensitive positions associated with that, and there's training - - there are training requirements associated with the implementation of rail as well.

So the training facility for Transit and all of their required requirements for training or operating and maintaining the Transit system are all eligible under the statute.

MR. COOLMAN: Mr. Allen, Ms. Wallace, then Mr. Hooper.

MR. ALLEN: The item was already approved by the Board of County Commissioners --

MS. WALLACE: The --

MR. ALLEN: -- subject to our authorization that it meets the requirement of the statute.

MS. WALLACE: Correct. The -- the --

MR. ALLEN: Was -- what was the level of discussion when this item was before the Board? Are any of these issues that we're raising relative to cost increases and the justification for these projects, were those discussed publicly by the Board?

MS. WALLACE: There were briefings. I don't know that there was a discussion during the County Commission meeting regarding that.

There were -- the County Commissioners were individually briefed, as they are on other matters, prior to the at Board action regarding this item. And any, I guess, questions or information that we requested by the County Commissioners was -- was provided prior to the action.

And so -- and it was -- the -- the -- the funding was approved by the County Commission subject to the eligibility determination for -- of the additional expenditures.

MR. ALLEN: Has -- have we ever had similar projects that were approved by the Board before this board took their required actions?

MS. WALLACE: I'm not aware of that. I don't know.

MS. CASSINI: So early on in the program's implementation and standing up, the process was completely reversed. So the Board of County Commissioners would act first, and then it would come to you all.

So, over time, the process has changed, and we -- in this particular instance, because this is a project that has come before you multiple times

previously, and there was a level of urgency around getting the grant agreement signed with the funder, the federal funder.

As you heard Arethia explain, this was a grant that was actually approved in 2019. So there is a time limitation for us to get under agreement for that -- those matching funds of 17.275 million dollars.

And that was one of the reasons why the decision was made to bring it to the County Commission subject to your determination of eligibility.

MR. ALLEN: That -- I -- just the question that I have really goes more back to the policy of what is the procedure and what are the scope of our responsibilities.

This committee, you know, clearly, under the ordinance, has to sign off as it relates to eligibility. But feasibility or how it fits into an overall master plan are not really part of our responsibilities.

Certainly, we have acted in the past to raise issues to the Board and suggest that they should look at this or that particular item. I think that has been an accepted exercise of the power of this board.

But it does raise that issue, is if the -- if the Board of County Commissioners, who have to make the appropriations for these projects, if they have approved these things, you know, other than our role of trying to be oversight or -- I guess the difference between oversight and -- which has more of a connotation of you have to pass this before you move forward, or

consultation, I guess, is the other phrase or -- or role of this board of providing consultation as it relates to how this may be viewed within the role of the overall transportation surtax program.

So I guess that's the dilemma that we --

MR. COOLMAN: Before --

MR. ALLEN: -- face with that.

MR. COOLMAN: -- Anthea, would you like to say something, Gretchen?

MS. CASSINI: So that's what I was going to suggest. If you all would like to provide specific recommendations or requests for additional information in your oversight role -- so this is a project that has come before you previously, meaning that it is a current project over which you have oversight responsibility.

If you'd like to provide some information as part of the transmittal letter, we'll capture that and we'll make sure, before you have a chance to sign it --

MR. COOLMAN: Okay.

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

MR. COOLMAN: Ms. Wallace.

MS. CASSINI: -- that you agree.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: So I -- I mean, certainly, this is a project

that meets the eligibility standards, in my opinion, right? So that's clear.

I think the concern is that it's so much more money that we're being asked to sign off on. But it has also been, what, four or five years?

I mean, that's a long time. A long time. And I'm sure when you contemplate all of the increases due to the pandemic and so on and so forth, I mean, it is understandable why the cost has gone up. So I get all of that.

You know, and of course, you know, we're trying to be good stewards in our own way of the oversight dollars. And I think the fact that you are putting on the burner, the back burner, the other project, I think it's okay for us to move forward.

And so I am open to making a **motion** that we approve this project and certainly I think it's a good idea if you can come back at a later time and just kind of articulate in some way from the value add that this -- doing this project will bring to the table so everyone here can feel, you know, a little bit more comfortable.

But that's my motion.

MR. COOLMAN: I would request you hold that motion. I haven't said anything yet.

MR. SMITH: Oh, here we go.

(Laughter.)

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. COOLMAN: Mr. Hooper, you're next.

MR. HOOPER: So, honestly, I -- and I heard -- I kind of -- I get where you're going, Phil, and it's like we can -- we can approve eligibility, but we're somewhat consultants on the rest of it.

And, honestly, if I'm -- if I'm relegated to a consultant, I'd just as soon not sit on this board.

This is -- we are here as the citizens of Broward County. We're supposed to be looking out for the tax and how it's being spent.

And if we have an issue, we should say it, and not just look at eligibility.

And I also believe that you can vote for something and they need our vote.

And I agree that this facility is probably consolidating and it's the right thing to do. I'm -- I am not against this facility at all. I think it's going to really help a lot.

But at the same time, we should -- we could make the motion or we could approve a motion that includes the deferral of the -- of the other line items to a point beyond 2030.

And whether -- whether it has anything to do with eligibility or not, we're on the record as being the representatives of the citizens of Broward County, and we've made our statement. Okay?

And that's -- I think that is our job. And we can argue over eligibility all day long, but the only way we're going to continue to have any say in what goes down is to vote our -- on our -- on our conscience and on our heart.

And I -- I'm not going to be relegated to a consultant. I'm not. I -- I want to be -- because I'm sitting there -- and this is something that the County should hear.

We are out there, and we're being told, what's going on, nothing's happening. And we sit there and we want to be the cheerleader. We want to be the cheerleader, we want to let them know that PREMO's coming. We want to be all part of the program.

But at the same time, if we -- if we're feeling a little angst because 149,000,000 is being spent versus 71, which is what we approved, or 67 or whatever that number is, and then we ask, well, can we defer or supersede things, that's a -- that is a legitimate and reasonable request, and it should be taken seriously.

Because when I'm out there and someone says, why -- you guys are wasting money. All you're doing is buses, all this stuff, I want to be the one that cheerleads.

But if I'm not -- if I don't feel good about what I just did, and I'm sitting in a business meeting with a bunch of business leaders, I'm going to tell them what I think.

And I want to be on the team that's doing things that the citizens want done. Okay? Not -- not eligibility, you know.

So that's how -- that's how I see it, and that's why I'm asking the deferral of the budget line. I'm trying to be -- I -- I'm hoping we can be good stewards for our money, because this is a lot of cash that this -- this -- this surtax program has under its wing.

And if we don't do it in a way that sounds financially sound, and people that are either in the audience or that are listening to us or that hear it on -- on TV, they're like, you guys are just wasting money, or, you guys aren't like being good stewards.

So that's the way I see it.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay. I'd like to say a few things. Two things.

First, for Ms. Douglas, love the last name.

(Laughter.)

MR. COOLMAN: Secondly, I -- I'm trying to understand the dollars. Let's talk about the first project was how much money, and how much of it was ours and how much of it was somebody else's. It -- was it 79,000,000? What was it?

MS. DOUGLAS: We -- we started with the project at -- I'll go back to the slide. Sorry. The original project, when we scoped it, we saw an opportunity to leverage surtax dollars, which is one of our goals for the surtax

fund.

MS. CASSINI: One more.

MS. DOUGLAS: I'm sorry?

MR. COOLMAN: I think you've got to go one more back, right?

Basically, we had a -- we approved a project for X million, but it wasn't

--

MS. DOUGLAS: Correct.

MR. COOLMAN: -- it wasn't the project we're really talking about today.

MS. DOUGLAS: No.

MR. COOLMAN: Go ahead.

MS. DOUGLAS: The -- the original project was to rehabilitate and existing maintenance building, to build a new -- a new operations building and a new training building. That's the original project.

We -- we were awarded 17.275 million. For that project, which was 61,000,000.

MR. COOLMAN: And that's -- okay.

MS. DOUGLAS: So the difference --

MR. COOLMAN: So --

MS. DOUGLAS: -- would be surtax funded.

MS. CASSINI: Yeah, 34,000,000.

MR. COOLMAN: -- so 51,000,000 was surtax and 17 -- try again.

MS. CASSINI: No, you're -- so -- so the 51,000,000 is all in, inclusive of the 17 --

MS. DOUGLAS: Correct.

MS. CASSINI: -- that was federal. Which means that you had a -- you know, approximately 34,000,000 of --

MR. COOLMAN: Okay. So we had --

MS. CASSINI: -- surtax in the original project --

MR. COOLMAN: -- the original we --

MS. CASSINI: -- as contemplated.

MR. COOLMAN: -- approved was an upgrading of an existing --

MS. DOUGLAS: Correct.

MR. COOLMAN: -- facility --

MS. CASSINI: That was beyond its --

MR. COOLMAN: -- 51,000,000.

MS. CASSINI: -- useful life then.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: Yes.

MR. COOLMAN: All right. Now, it also then increased by 14,000,000 for whatever.

MS. CASSINI: That --

MS. DOUGLAS: The escalation, when we took a look at the -- kept the scope the same, in 2022, those were escalating dollars.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay. So we have a \$76,000,000 project in which 17,000,000 was coming from somebody else.

MS. DOUGLAS: Correct.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay. Then we are looking at upgrading a facility, totally different, in -- in theory, different from this because --

MS. DOUGLAS: Correct.

MR. COOLMAN: -- it's going to buy us some time --

MS. DOUGLAS: Correct.

MR. COOLMAN: -- because of this third facility that we haven't been able to find a site for.

MS. DOUGLAS: Correct.

MR. COOLMAN: Just so everybody knows, I tried to figure out if we could make this site bigger so we didn't need a third. We really can't.

Plus, if you're going to have a third facility, you don't want it in that location, because you want to service --

MS. DOUGLAS: Correct.

MR. COOLMAN: -- buses and whatever the case.

So the fact of the matter is we're still going to need a third facility, but it looks like we can push it off. Maybe we officially want to push it off.

So we've now gone -- it says, transfer an additional 139,000,000 over and above the difference between 17 and -- and whatever -- the 76. Okay?

So that's what we're asking us to do, is an additional to that.

So of the -- of the 250-some million, we're only getting 17,000,000 from somebody else.

So basically, this is a surtax funded, right? Okay. So that's -- that's the numbers.

But what we're getting for those numbers seems to be reasonable.

That's my first set of comments. Thank you for your answer.

The second thing is where Alan was coming from, which I really had wanted to take issue with Angela, and I agree with you. I think we have -- maybe we can only vote on eligibility, but we need to send a message to the Commission as to the fact that we are concerned about the dollars, and we should have the ability to at least comment on the dollars.

And if we can't, what are we doing here.

Okay. So I think that we -- I think we're all in agreement that it's eligible.

MR. HOOPER: Uh-huh.

MR. COOLMAN: But I think it ought to come from -- from this group with some conditions to it.

And maybe, because we're conscious of the money -- how much

money are we setting aside for this third facility? 172,000,000?

MS. DOUGLAS: No. Currently, we have 97,000,000 budgeted.

MR. COOLMAN: What do -- I thought we had a budget for the land, too.

MS. DOUGLAS: And then the land.

MR. COOLMAN: So we have about \$170,000,000 that we had budgeted.

MS. DOUGLAS: The entire 75,000,000 for land acquisition is not just for this project. That is money set aside for other property acquisition for other park and ride lots, other --

MR. COOLMAN: All right. So --

MS. DOUGLAS: -- type of facilities that we need.

MR. COOLMAN: -- the 97,000,000 was the budget for the facility --

MS. DOUGLAS: Uh-huh.

MR. COOLMAN: -- and some of the 75,000,000 --

MS. DOUGLAS: Correct.

MR. COOLMAN: -- was for the land acquisition, which we don't own exactly.

MS. DOUGLAS: Correct.

MR. COOLMAN: So in theory, of the 139 we're asking for now, we could take 139 from the 172 future allocation.

And we're just borrowing from what we've already approved out here and putting it over here now, and delaying spending another \$139,000,000, right?

MR. HOOPER: I guess. Can I ask a question on that? It relates to --

MR. COOLMAN: That's fine.

MR. HOOPER: How -- how -- you said that this facility will give us an opportunity to fulfill our needs until 2030? Is that what you said?

MS. DOUGLAS: Correct.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

Can I make a motion?

MR. COOLMAN: Well, I mean, am I -- am I making any sense?

MS. WALLACE: Yeah, so if I may. We can -- so the -- the motion will be with regard to statutory eligibility and then there could be recommendations regarding --

MR. COOLMAN: Where we get the money.

MS. WALLACE: Right. So those are separate things.

MR. COOLMAN: Well, what we're saying is we -- we can only send an approval of eligibility with --

MS. WALLACE: Recommendations.

MR. COOLMAN: -- with recommendations. Okay. Thank you.

MOTION TO APPROVE AS STATUTORILY ELIGIBLE PROPOSED

**ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$139,440,000
FOR ADDITIONAL IMPROVEMENTS AT THE COPANS ROAD
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE FACILITY RENOVATION
PROJECT**

MR. COOLMAN: Alan, would you like to --

MR. HOOPER: Can I make a motion?

MR. ALLEN: One recommendation might be to just approve the authorization as meeting the requirements, but to suggest to the Board that the prior approval of the 71 or whatever it was is rescinded until they come back with additional justification.

MR. COOLMAN: Well, I -- while we're still discussing this, to me, there's 97 that's sitting out there that's not going to be used for -- 2030 at the soonest. There's another portion of 76,000,000 for land acquisition. And --

MR. HOOPER: Well, they might need it for something.

MS. WALLACE: Absolutely. So I -- I think that -- we're in 2023 right now. 2030 is not that far away. And if we're going to be -- if this is going to meet capacity for 30 -- 2030, we need to -- there's preparations that need to be made leading up to 30 -- 2030 for additional facilities.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: And it's not just for bus facilities. You know, the -- the -- the funding that was -- has been allocated for Transit facilities is more than

just bus facilities. We -- there -- there are light rail and -- and I guess you're going to -- I don't want to steal Ms. Lonergan's thunder, but BRT and light rail and commuter rail all need land acquisition for -- for -- for stations --

MR. COOLMAN: Okay. You made a sale on that.

MS. WALLACE: -- for -- for rail maintenance.

MR. COOLMAN: I get you.

MS. WALLACE: So, you know, I -- I -- I think context --

MR. COOLMAN: We'll leave the 75 --

MS. WALLACE: -- is important.

MR. COOLMAN: -- million there.

MR. HOOPER: Can I -- can I make a motion, please?

MR. COOLMAN: Well, let me clarify something. The 97,000,000 is not needed because of this facility until, we're guessing, 2030.

MS. WALLACE: That is not correct. So you don't -- we may not -- we will need to acquire land for a third maintenance facility, but that's not the only land acquisition for Transit --

MR. COOLMAN: I'm not talking about --

MS. WALLACE: -- that's needed.

MR. COOLMAN: -- the 75,000,000 land acquisition. The 97,000,000 supposedly was to build a third facility, which we are saying we've been able to put off to 2030.

MS. WALLACE: And that's seven years from now.

MR. COOLMAN: That's seven years from now.

MS. WALLACE: How long will it take to acquire land and design and build it, right?

MR. COOLMAN: I'm not stopping you from acquiring the land. I'm just saying that if you're saying the 97,000,000 is design and the cost of construction --

MS. WALLACE: So it's for an additional facility. And we don't know what that -- where that facility will be located or what it will cost.

MR. COOLMAN: All I was suggesting was we have -- it looks like we have -- of the 39,000,000 you're asking for today, if we -- numbers-wise, if we allocated 42,000,000 --

MS. WALLACE: We're not allocating. We're determining eligibility of the additional --

MR. COOLMAN: No.

MS. WALLACE: -- expenditures.

MR. COOLMAN: We are talking about a recommendation, okay? Not -- forget about the word allocate.

Our recommendation is that we -- we authorize an additional 42,000,000 and they utilize the 97,000,000 that was previously approved, so we don't -- we're not taking all that out of the pot today.

That's all I -- that's just being fiscally wise. It may not be as clean as something, but I'm just saying, you can make whatever motion you like, but I'm -- mentally, that's where I'm coming from.

MS. CASSINI: Tim.

MR. HOOPER: I'd like to make a **motion** that we approve the project and that we -- that -- and that the -- is it a third facility? Third maintenance facility, or it's just another -- the next maintenance --

MR. COOLMAN: Don't mix them.

MR. HOOPER: Please, sir. What is it?

MS. DOUGLAS: So what -- what is the question?

MR. HOOPER: It -- what is the -- the facility that you may need in 2030. What is it?

MR. GARLING: Third.

MR. HOOPER: A third facility.

MS. DOUGLAS: A third maintenance and operations --

MR. HOOPER: And that the --

MS. DOUGLAS: -- facility.

MR. HOOPER: -- and that the third maintenance facility for buses, not light rail, but for buses, is deferred as a budget line item until 2030, at least until 2030.

That's my -- that's my motion.

MS. WALLACE: Okay. And the motion is not appropriate. So you -- there can be a recommendation with regard to the -- the future maintenance facility, but the motion has to be with regard to statutory eligibility of the -- of the -- the proposed project that's being presented, and a recommendation with regard to any other matter.

MR. COOLMAN: Alan, will you --

MR. HOOPER: No.

MR. COOLMAN: -- you won't amend it?

MR. HOOPER: No.

MR. COOLMAN: Well, then, do we have --

MR. HOOPER: No one has to -- no one has to second it.

MR. SMITH: Well, we have a couple other --

MR. COOLMAN: Comments.

MR. SMITH: -- we have a couple other comments, let's hear those and then we'll figure out the motion.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay.

MS. MADDEN: So I still have questions about the eligibility. It's not a foregone conclusion to me.

And from what I'm seeing is the project was brought to us and we were told it could be done, the function, the project purpose, could be accomplished for 76,000,000 -- or -- yeah.

And then -- and that was to park 257 buses and have the training facility and have the -- I guess the maintenance facility.

And now we're told it's being increased by 89 buses.

So the math looks to me like we were able to park buses for \$272,000 per bus and then, adding 89 buses, we're adding a cost of 1.5 million dollars per bus.

I don't know if that's the appropriate comparison, but, you know, some -- I'd like to understand this a little bit better.

MS. DOUGLAS: There -- there are some other scope items that we -- is not here. Like as mentioned before, there's other things in this that needs to be addressed.

There are flood issues, right? We haven't talked about that.

There's the needing -- elevating the site that's included now into this project.

There's additional scope items that's costed that -- that's included here.

For instance, that's just one of the additional elements to this.

We all know what happened, but we had already included elevation and meeting the hundred-year elevations on this site and addressing that.

We -- there's other things to note. The existing building, we did a conditions assessment. Many of the systems -- most of the systems -- will

need to be replaced by a certain time.

We -- there are other issues. We can't maintain our articulated fleet from this building.

So there's a lot of other things that -- that needs to be addressed that this project and the expansion of this project addresses. And sometimes it's not that easy to quantify a cost per, whether it's per bus or per square foot or cost per this in the -- in -- in -- in the scope.

MR. COOLMAN: Shea?

MR. SMITH: So just to -- I think this ties into the crux of what -- what Mr. Hooper was mentioning. And just going back to what I mentioned before, I think with this, I'm not as concerned with moving the money out, because we have the funds.

What I'm concerned with is the accountability over the longer term as to ridership, because the only way that this makes any sense is that it does help with the congestion issues on the roads, and that means more people in buses period.

So to the extent -- and this is where the public perception role comes in, and that's where I want to see the recommendation, is that we're coming and speaking up as citizens and saying that we're noting out there in -- in the public perception, that's where people could look at this and say, look, there's all these extra things.

Those might be appropriate to the extent that it increases ridership.

So I don't think that that should be mysterious. So to the extent that these dollars go up and we're thinking in these big ways and it's innovative and there's so much more parking, yeah, I don't want the buses parked there, literally parked, and no one on them, or a bus with -- that's like 20 percent full, because then we haven't done what we're supposed to be doing.

That -- that's my -- that's where I really have the passion for this, is that we really have to make sure that people are getting onto these things.

And I think we've failed a little bit to date. I know we're still pretty early on, but in swaying public opinion. I've said that for a long time.

I don't think our efforts have been splashy enough. I don't think they've been out there enough. I don't think we're getting the views we need to get on this. I -- you know, there's -- so that -- that's where I think we just need to -- to come back to.

MR. COOLMAN: Alan?

MR. HOOPER: And then the other thing is there's information that, clearly, we -- we needed to make this decision.

When we are given information on these line items, it includes money. I mean, if all we were doing was -- was approving eligibility, then don't even bother giving us the numbers. If that's all we're doing, okay?

And if -- if -- and then why do we even audit the -- the books, if

numbers don't matter? If the budget doesn't matter? If the master plan doesn't matter and the numbers that were associated with that master plan.

This money is -- belongs to people, okay? And we need to -- we're getting information that talks about numbers. We're being told what the difference of the numbers are, but yet we have no right to vote on those numbers? Or -- or make a -- or -- or comment or -- or make a motion that includes, okay, well, if we're spending money here and you're telling us that we're -- we don't need this facility until 2030, then our motion is to approve this money now and move this over to -- past 2030. That's all we're asking.

And I don't think -- I -- I think we should make a motion that includes that, and I think we should approve it that way, and then take it to the County Commission and let them do what they want with it.

Why -- I mean, we're the -- we are the citizens of Broward County. We represent them. We're oversight. We are overseeing this system. So let's -- we don't -- we can do it how we want.

Or we vote against something, and then they can figure it out and come back to us and say, okay, well, we'll move this to 2030 because you guys didn't vote for it. Okay, then we'll vote for it.

MR. COOLMAN: What a great day to be the new Chair. Anyway --
(Laughter.)

MR. HOOPER: Yeah. I -- I --

MR. COOLMAN: Wait. We're still discussing --

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chair?

MR. HOOPER: -- and I have --

MR. COOLMAN: -- we're still discussing your motion. Hold on, please. Go ahead, Gretchen.

MS. CASSINI: I -- I just want -- I wanted to try again, because I know we've talked about this in the past, and we do have some new members. So I wanted to try to just attack the ordinance and the way that it's structured currently.

So both are correct. When you are approving something, you are approving a proposed project and a proposed expenditure with respect to its eligibility under the statute.

And you have very specific requirements that are set forth in the ordinance for you, that it's either fully eligible, partially eligible, or not eligible at all. And if it's not eligible or partially eligible, it has to be explained in writing within 30 days of your action exactly why and what portions.

When it comes to project oversight, which is Subsection J of the ordinance, you have broad project oversight authority.

This is a project that's been in front of you many times, that's already been approved as to its eligibility. The proposed project and its expenditures have come in front of you three different times.

So I'm going to read into the record Section J. This is where your transmittal letters come in. This is where the Oversight Board's review, critique, and assessment for the duration of the project or expenditures. It's -
- it's unfettered.

The Oversight Board shall issue reports on the performance of ongoing projects and shall provide recommendations to the County Administrator and the Commission for any proposed projects.

So there's two separate things, and we do it every time that you all have recommendations, critiques, or assessments.

So you can approve the project and then you can explain what aspects you have concerns about that you would like to see changed, what your review, your critique, and your assessment of the project is.

And if you want a more in-depth report of the performance of the project with respect to ridership, that's something that you can also provide in your transmittal letter.

MR. HOOPER: Can I --

MR. SMITH: One quick follow up on that. So I understand that these are -- we're laying this out they're two separate things.

But let me ask you this. If something doesn't -- at the end of the day, a line item in one of these things, if we were to say we don't think that that actually helps congestion -- because it's not -- I understand that it relates to

transportation and, broadly speaking, direct transportation costs are included.

But isn't the whole purpose of the surtax to alleviate the congestion in Broward County?

MS. WALLACE: Well --

MS. CASSINI: It -- it's not the whole purpose, no. It's one of five major goals. Every goal is equal.

So there's the goal of relieving congestion, which is -- the way we refer to it is traffic system management. Because you can't really alleviate congestion. You can look every place that they expand roads, congestion comes behind it. So you're managing congestion.

It -- we're also trying to improve our transit system, which is the conversation that we're having right now and the presentation that's coming up. Multi-modal options. That was a big piece of it.

And then economic development and benefits, which is that CBE component of the program.

So those are the five major components, and then you have kind of the underpinnings of resiliency, which is supposed to go across the entire program over the 30 years.

MR. SMITH: So I do think that one could argue that, even strictly speaking about approving it as statutorily eligible, that if the ridership wasn't going to be there, then is it really eligible.

MS. WALLACE: Yes, because it's transit. It's eligible.

MR. COOLMAN: Mr. Frazier.

MR. FRAZIER: I wanted to make a **motion**.

MR. COOLMAN: Well, we have a motion on the floor --

MR. FRAZIER: I didn't hear the motion.

MR. COOLMAN: -- that was not seconded --

MR. FRAZIER: I didn't hear the motion.

MR. COOLMAN: -- by Mr. -- excuse me -- Mr. Hooper --

MR. FRAZIER: I -- I didn't hear that -- hear his motion.

MR. COOLMAN: -- Mr. Hooper made a motion --

MR. HOOPER: He didn't hear it.

MR. FRAZIER: I didn't hear the motion. I --

MR. COOLMAN: Well, that's okay. It hasn't been seconded. We were discussing his motion.

MR. FRAZIER: Oh, okay.

MR. COOLMAN: And, apparently, it may not get a second for now.

Any seconds to Mr. Hooper's motion?

MR. SMITH: I'd like to hear it repeated, also. I -- I did hear it, but I think if we're going to try to second it, let's hear it again.

MR. HOOPER: I made a motion that we -- that we approve the -- the project with a deferral of the third bus maintenance facility until at least 2030.

MS. WALLACE: And I will restate that it's not a valid -- validly considered motion at this time. That it -- it's not permissible under the statute to require or -- or affirm -- under the ordinance to require a deferral of a different project.

MR. ALLEN: If you change that to --

MS. WALLACE: We're limited to --

MR. ALLEN: -- just a recommendation --

MS. WALLACE: -- a recommendation --

MR. ALLEN: -- to the Board that they --

MS. WALLACE: -- if it's a recommendation, yes.

MR. ALLEN: -- give consideration relative to the need for the -- continued need for the third transit facility.

MS. WALLACE: So that would be --

MR. COOLMAN: Mr. Hooper, would you accept that amendment that says your motion is to approve the eligibility of this project with the recommendation that the County Commission --

MR. ALLEN: Calls into question --

MR. HOOPER: I would -- I would accept the -- the -- the amendment, and I would say that -- that your letter to the city -- the County Commission follow up with that motion, and that I'm hopeful that the County Commission'll listen to it and follow and act in the way of our recommendation.

But I will tell this board that there are times when maybe you've got to vote against something, you know? And I'm not talking about this thing, by the way. I'm just saying when -- if -- if we're recommending and we are representing who we represent, then I would hope that our recommendation would fall on -- on ears that listen.

MR. COOLMAN: Before we call the question, I'd like to hear from Mr. Frazier.

MR. FRAZIER: Well, what I was going to do was try to clarify Mr. Hooper's motion. He sort of went a little long on that last piece.

So if he just repeats the motion --

MR. HOOPER: It's the one he --

MR. FRAZIER: -- with the recommendation --

MR. HOOPER: -- it's the one that Phil Allen just made.

MR. COOLMAN: It's the one that apparently is now legally --

MR. FRAZIER: Okay.

MR. COOLMAN: -- approved --

MR. HOOPER: It's a recommendation -- it's a --

MR. FRAZIER: Restate the motion so I can --

MR. HOOPER: -- approval of the -- of the project and, as Mr. Allen amended, with the recommendation that the -- that the third facility is deferred until 2030.

MR. FRAZIER: Now, as I understand it, I'm going to read how it's written here and then ask what you said.

This motion is to approve as statutory eligible the proposed additional expenditures in the amount of \$139,440,000 for the additional improvement at Copans Road Operation and maintenance facility renovation project, and whatever you just said.

MR. ALLEN: Reconsider --

MR. FRAZIER: And that a recommendation to what?

MR. ALLEN: -- that we request the Board -- the County Commission give consideration to the continued viability of the third maintenance facility in a future consideration.

MR. FRAZIER: I second that.

Now, can we vote?

MR. COOLMAN: I -- I think it needs some cleaning up a little bit, but we'll -- we'll do that --

MR. FRAZIER: We're doing that.

MR. COOLMAN: -- before -- because I guess I get to sign the letter. I'll make sure it says the right thing.

MR. SMITH: Can the viability be kind of tied into ridership? I mean, I think that's what this -- right? -- to -- to need. That's where I'm --

MR. COOLMAN: I think --

MR. SMITH: -- coming from.

MR. COOLMAN: -- there can be some words in there so --

MS. CASSINI: You can -- you can request ongoing reports related to ridership as part of your program performance assessment of this project.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chair?

MR. COOLMAN: Everybody happy with that?

MR. ALLEN: Yeah.

MR. COOLMAN: Call the question.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Yes.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman --

MR. COOLMAN: Go ahead.

MR. ALLEN: -- the audience has a --

MR. GARLING: Mr. Chair, just for --

MR. COOLMAN: Yes, sir.

MR. GARLING: -- just one -- one thing to add. My name's Tim Garling, Deputy General Manager of Broward County Transit.

I would just like to make two quick points, right?

First, about the facility, the importance of a maintenance facility to making ridership grow and work.

The maintenance facility provides important vehicle reliability, right?

Vehicles have to be maintained on time. Without a first-class maintenance facility, we can't ever achieve our ridership goals unless our vehicles are running all the time without --

MR. COOLMAN: On time.

MR. GARLING: -- without delays. So there's a direct tie to that.

The -- the second thing, directly to the motion that you're talking about, what you're going to hear in a few minutes about the PREMO Plan, which is going to address some of the -- a lot of the issues about what the future's going to be and whatever, but it also means that with the -- with the PREMO Plan that's coming, the five-year capital program that we had proposed, there's going to be changes in that, you know, hoping to move things, you know, forward.

So to this issue of the viability of -- of the third maintenance facility, I -- I think it's -- it's fair that that be considered in this next five-year proposal or in the future proposals. We just have to figure out the right way to fit that in, given, as Ms. Wallace was walking about, needs to purchase property, maybe needs to start design, may -- there might be some activities that may be needed before, you know, 2030, whatever, if, as we come back in our normal processes with the five-year plan, to give us an opportunity to fit in, to address these issues about how it fits in , how much it costs.

This project does buy us some time, right? It buys -- as the Chairman

talked about, buys us 89 more spaces.

So I think to that end, thinking about how we could put this project into the next five-year program would be appropriate.

MR. COOLMAN: You might even include some history on ridership to see where it's going, just as an add -- add-on to that.

MR. GARLING: Absolutely. Sure.

MR. COOLMAN: Anyone else have any comments? Okay.

MR. ALLEN: Call the question.

MR. COOLMAN: Call the question.

All in favor?

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

MR. COOLMAN: Any opposed?

MS. MADDEN: Nay.

MR. COOLMAN: One nay?

MR. HOOPER: I don't know.

MR. COOLMAN: Debbie has a nay.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Can I say something real quick?

MR. COOLMAN: Certainly.

MR. HOOPER: All right. So I just think that this kind of conversation is very constructive, and -- and -- and if we don't do this, if -- if all we did was vote on eligibility and we just said, okay, next one, oh, eligible, okay,

approved.

If all we become was a -- and I don't think any of us feel that way, okay? But if this board were more of a rubber stamp, then we're not doing our duty, okay?

And if we don't have hard conversations or discuss these things -- and I think you guys are listening to what we're saying, and I think the County Commission will, too. Because the people that we represent vote.

And so we have to ask the hard questions. We've got to ask where is this money coming from and where is that going. Is it viable, is it going to create more ridership?

And the answer in this case is yes.

And I just think these things are important. And we can't ever fall asleep at the wheel. Otherwise, we're not doing our job.

And that's why -- I know this was a long process and there was a lot of talk and a lot of conversation, but that's what we're here for. And I think this was a -- a good exercise.

MR. COOLMAN: Anyone else have any comments?

VOTE PASSES 8 TO 1 WITH MS. MADDEN VOTING NO.

PRESENTATIONS

MR. COOLMAN: Okay. I guess we're ready to -- where's my agenda? Ready for presentations? All right. Go ahead.

117

By the way, thank you, Ms. Douglas.

MS. DOUGLAS: Thank you.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Thank you.

**I PREMO PLAN OVERVIEW - MS. COREE CUFF LONERGAN,
DIRECTOR, TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT**

MS. LONERGAN: Well, I'm back again, and --

MR. COOLMAN: One -- one of the things, maybe you should have been the first thing we talked about.

MS. LONERGAN: Just -- well, what a way to -- to warm the room, right?

Thank you so much for having us. Very good discussion and -- and we really do appreciate it. And I don't want you that we didn't hear what you said.

You know, your role here is very important to us, and we respect your role in this process. And so we're happy to come back and bring you information. And we should.

So I kind of just want to set that up.

So what I'm going to talk about is a little bit about some of the questions you just asked. And I hope after you hear this part of the presentation that you'll feel a little more comfortable with the direction that we're heading in. Okay?

So, having said that, I'm excited to present to you our Premium Mobility Plan.

Next slide, please.

So with me in the room are a lot of the folks that have been working on this plan much longer than I have been here. And so you've already heard from Arethia and Tim, but in addition, we have Barney McCoy and Derrick Chan and our colleagues from WSP, who've been very instrumental in helping us from a consulting perspective get to this point.

So today I'm going to give you a little bit of a history. I'm sure some of you are new and some of you've been here a long time, you know that background. But just going to try to bring everybody up to speed. Talk a little bit about what the plan looks like, and then a -- how we feel we actually make the -- the plan materialize.

Talk a little bit about some of the risks as we see them, and then speak to you about some of the next steps that we are -- under recommendation.

So just to reaffirm, what the strategy originally was was to provide a premium network of services that improve mobility in the County, that became convenient, attractive, safe and reliable, and more frequent.

Next slide, please.

So, as Gretchen said earlier, some of the goals that we are following

and -- and are showing up in the implementation of this is, first of all, to integrate and serve our communities. If we're not doing that, then why are we here, right? So that -- that's a -- that's a premise and a primary goal of the project, improving mobility for all.

So there's been some conversation in the room about, you know, automobile traffic and mobility and -- and Transit. So, yes, we're trying to get to a space where there is mobility for all and it is improved to implement equitable solutions, right?

So let's make sure that we are including everybody in the process, improve our safety, security, and our environmental resiliency, and, lastly, to provide a -- a platform for economic development.

So with the implementation of the PREMO Plan, we will be able to add 200 miles of new premium transit service.

We'll have a ridership of approximately 23,000,000.

We'll have a 100 percent electrified bus fleet.

We'll have new intelligent transportation system on our roads. I'll talk a little bit more about that in a little bit.

And then one of the things that we feel is really important to do whenever you introduce new service into communities is for that -- the facilities that support that service, that they reflect the community, architecturally, aesthetically, that they're -- they're positioned in. So that's

really important to us.

Next slide.

So one of the outcomes that we're truly excited about for the -- with this Premium Plan is that we will be able to connect the economic engines that the County owns, such as the port, the airport, and the seaport. So that's one of the things that we're super excited about. And that will alleviate some of the traffic between those three areas.

Next slide.

So one very important statistic that I'd like to share with you, and this comes from the American Public Transportation Association. That is APTA. That is our trade association. It represents all transit properties across the US. And basically, what they say in some of the research that they've done over the years, that -- is that for every \$1,000,000,000 that is spent on new infrastructure for transit, that we -- that that ends up being about 49,000 new jobs.

So I think that when we talk about the opportunities here for economic development and growth in our County, I think Angela Wallace mentioned that earlier in her discussion, is that we do know that as we implement these projects, that we will see new jobs coming to Broward County. And -- and also, people that are here will be able to participate in that job market.

Now, the -- the -- the jobs that we're talking about -- so I know I have

some engineers and planners and architects in the room -- you know, we're talking about, you know, minimum wage slash jobs, right? So minimum -- livable wage jobs all the way up to high skilled jobs, too, which are sometimes at a higher income.

So we have that broad spectrum of new jobs that we will be producing.

It's a catalyst for economic development. And so there was a comment made that, you know, trust us, build it and it will come, right? I heard that. Appreciate it. But there is a little bit of truth to that when it comes to commuter rail and light rail.

So if you look around the country, you could actually see examples of light rail systems going in and commuter rail systems going in and then a rebirth in economic development in those areas. So that's something that -- that does happen.

It will also be a foundation for transit-oriented development, so we affectionately call that TOD. And TOD is -- is really something that kind of takes advantage of the transit system and combines walkable communities and environmental stewardship and all these livable environments for people to walk, work -- I'm sorry -- walk, live, work, play, right, which is something that we all say we want to do here in Broward County, and the transit is there to support that.

So that's one of the outcomes of the investments in transit.

One of the key interests of our Commissioners, as part of the strategic planning that we did about a month ago, a lot of folks talked about affordable housing. Anybody in the market buying a house right now knows that it's not always affordable, right? And it's certainly not affordable for everyone on every economic spectrum.

And so as part of this transit-oriented development, what typically happens is you have an opportunity partner with developers to establish a percentage of property for affordable housing. And that is something that we would like to do as part of this program.

Lastly, looking at the -- the scope of this, right? So the surtax -- I'm sorry -- the -- the goal to approve the surtax, right, that whole effort, was founded in the opportunity for small businesses. And I know that's something that this board takes very seriously, that we have the opportunity for local businesses to participate in the program.

The dollars that we're talking about investing for the Premium Mobility Plan will set us up for the opportunity for some very great small businesses to have growth potentials and revenues that they may not otherwise -- have had otherwise.

Next slide, please.

So I want to talk a little bit about the methodology, because I think it's

really important to establish that, you know, we did use WSP as our consulting firm. They're -- if you're not familiar with them, maybe you are, they're an internationally renowned transportation company that specializes in transportation in the US market.

And they use a lot of data to drive some of the decisions that we are going to speak about in just a little bit.

And I want to just mention there that that data is -- is data that's based on best practices in the transit industry.

As example, the ridership model was based on the STOPS model. And that STOPS model is actually approved by the Federal Transit Administration.

The Federal Transit Administration not only regulates us, but it funds us. And it funds all the transit properties across the country.

They're putting a lot of dollars federally into many different capital improvement programs. And, as such, they kind of validated this model as being something that they could stand behind and say, okay, if you use this model, we trust that you will achieve this ridership level.

It's important, because part of how we get to this becoming reality, it's not only surtax money that we're looking at. We're also looking at federal funds as well as state funds.

So if we use one of their best practices and a model that they already

endorse, we know that we have a better standing when we go for a grant application.

The other thing is is that from a cost perspective, we looked at cost data from the national transit database as well as our APTA, which I mentioned earlier, in terms of helping us understand what the cost would look like.

We also used existing studies that have been done by the MPO and other organizations that have studied ridership and trends and transit in the Broward County.

The last thing is is we did extensive community outreach. We had 59 engagements throughout the County before getting to this point. And those engagements were primarily at community-based events. And we were able to get a lot of feedback from the community that helped inform where we are today.

And I just wanted to reassure you that, you know, what we're talking about here has been data driven, and we're very serious about how we got here as well as the material that we looked at to get here.

So let's talk a little bit about project delivery. And I know everyone in the room probably already knows this, but I want to just point out something very important here.

As we go through the project delivery phases, right, so we start off

with planning and we end up with construction, as you know, costs become more refined, right?

So when you're in a design phase, you are -- have a better understanding of what your costs are compared to where you are in the planning stage.

So we are at the planning stage. We have identified the corridors that we would -- that we're recommending that we put certain loads on, but our costs are at a rough order of magnitude at this point.

Additionally, we don't have all the profiles that you typically see in a more refined plan.

So as we get through the design process, you will see more, and we will be happy to come back to you and share that with you.

And also, as we go through the NEPA process, we'll have more refinement on directionally where we're going.

So next slide, please.

So just to kind of bring everybody to the same place of understanding what we're talking about here is, as part of the recommendation for this Premium Mobility Plan, we're looking at four new modes of transit, right?

So the first one is commuter rail. We don't have commuter rail in the -- in -- in -- we do have it in the region, so we do have Tri-Rail, and we do have Brightline that's providing some level of commuter rail. But we -- we don't

have it established in Broward County as a service that we're providing directly.

We also don't have light rail transit. That's something new. And whenever I think about light rail transit, and I kind of simplify it to the lowest level, I just think about Mr. Rogers, right? So you know the trolley that, you know, ding, ding, on Mr. Rogers? We all love Mr. Rogers. I did, anyway, as a kid, and I still watch it. I'll own it.

But, you know, that is what we're talking about. We're talking about not -- not the trolley trolley system, but a very light kind of vehicle that runs on rail, compared to a train, which is on a -- a different type of track which is - is pretty heavy. So that's kind of the distinction between the two types of equipment.

And then we have bus rapid transit, which we dabbled in the discussion earlier. And the bus rapid transit is a service that either you have exclusive lanes of traffic, so the -- the bus kind of goes along and it's integrated into the -- the traffic system but it has its exclusive right of way.

It also has the priority at an intersection to move through the intersection before anybody else can, right?

So that's kind of the bus -- bus rapid transit model.

And the last one is high frequency service. So basically what you're doing is you're taking your traditional buses, you're adding more of them to --

to a particular route, and they're operating at a higher frequency.

So that's what we're talking about here from a service perspective.

And if you look at this chart, you can see that the frequencies of service vary from commuter rail being the longest during rush hour, we're proposing at about 30 minute frequency, all the way down to the light rail, which will probably be at a five-to-ten-minute frequency.

Each type of service has a different capacity level. So from a commuter rail perspective, we can put more people on -- on trains, right? There's just more seats, lot more cars, so you can get people moving at -- at one time.

However, when you talk about the high frequency service, you're looking at a bus, and that doesn't have the same capacity as the rail.

Lastly, I just want to talk about the far left -- the far right columns.

So one of the good things for the commuter rail is that we do have an established right of way with -- with established tracks on it.

So from a cost perspective, the commuter rail service, which traditionally would be much more expensive because you have to assemble contiguous land masses, right, to get the -- the service going; then you have to go and you have to build it, and then you have to put the tracks in and all the access and all the signals and all that other stuff that goes with it.

In this case, we don't have to do that, because we're proposing to use

the Florida East Coast right of way, which is where Brightline goes now. And so that's an established right of way. It's got established track.

What we will have to do is we'll have to add capacity, because right now it's only operating the Brightline service and freight. When we introduce the commuter rail service, that's going to add additional stressors on that system, and so we're going to have to provide a way for those additional trains to be able to operate safely.

I don't know what happened there. Okay.

Lastly, what I was going to say also -- that's okay -- is that our light rail system would usually be less expensive than the commuter rail, but, because we're starting from scratch, so we're in a green field environment for the light rail, that's going to cost more.

So the dollars on this chart are a little upside down, and I just wanted to make sure everybody understood why.

Next slide, please.

So let's talk about the plan. So drumroll, please. Just kidding.

So this is the recommended network. So we're looking at 11.5 miles of commuter rail south of the New River, 23 miles of light rail transit, 76 miles of bus rapid transit, and high frequency bus of about a hundred vehicles -- I mean a hundred miles.

And so if you look to the right, you can see the different modes and

how they interplay and where they go.

So just to acquaint you with the key, the yellow or orange, depending on what screen you're looking at, is our commuter rail service, proposed.

The blue is the BRT.

The pink is the light rail.

And the green is the high capacity bus service, or high frequency bus service.

The -- you know, we -- we -- the locations that we are were informed by the data that was generated and the assessment that was done as part of that methodology that we talked about earlier.

So the next couple of slides, I'm going to do a deeper dive into each one of these lines, and then, so you don't have to do mental math, because we will be talking about some numbers, I have a summary slide that kind of pulls all this together.

So first I'm going to talk a little bit about the Broward County commuter rail south service. So this service, again, is on the FEC corridor. It's 11.5 miles of service, of -- of stations.

It includes stations in Hollywood, at the airport, and at Fort Lauderdale.

And for this one, we're anticipating annual ridership of about 1.2 million, exclusive to Broward County. And when you add Miami-Dade in, it's

about 4.8 million. And that is -- the connection on this line will -- will take you from Broward County to Miami and vice versa, Miami to Broward County.

Eventually, you know, when we cross the -- the New River, we will go up onto Palm -- Palm Beach, and be able to be more of a regional provider there.

So for this one, we're looking for an implementation date of 2027. And the cost here is about 29 -- \$297,000,000.

Next slide.

So this is the beginning of our light rail service. So this is the initial investment that we'd like to make into our light rail.

This is an elevated structure that would connect the airport, seaport, and the Convention Center. It's on the -- County-owned -- primarily County-owned property, so, again, that kind of helps us with some of the cost.

Right now, the maintenance facilities and the locations of those maintenance facilities have not been determined because we, you know, have to acquire -- we'll have to acquire some property to support any kind of maintenance for light rail equipment.

Back to the earlier discussion, right? So we have bus facilities to -- to maintain our equipment from a bus perspective, but we do not have them to support any rail or light rail service.

So we will need to have those maintenance facilities and land

acquired to accommodate them.

So we're anticipating about six -- six -- 666,000 annual ridership, and we're looking at an opening date of 2028. And the estimated investment is about 1.25 billion dollars.

Next slide.

MR. HOOPER: Can you go back to that map?

MS. LONERGAN: Sure.

MR. HOOPER: I'm wondering, so --

MS. CASSINI: Mic.

MR. HOOPER: -- what -- where are we where the -- it does that -- that U-turn? Where is that? Is that the -- is that the Convention Center right there?

MR. CHAN: No, that's the midpoint --

MS. WALLACE: Your microphone's not on.

MR. CHAN: -- midpoint --

MR. HOOPER: It -- it's on.

MS. WALLACE: Oh. Oh, I didn't see the light. It was lit.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. LONERGAN: Seaport.

MR. CHAN: Midport.

MS. LONERGAN: Midport.

MR. CHAN: Midport.

MR. HOOPER: Oh, and then the final end at the top of the page is the Convention Center.

MR. CHAN: Convention Center, yes.

MR. HOOPER: So -- oh, yeah, because that terminal's in that -- where the U-turn is, right?

MR. CHAN: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: I got you. Okay. Thank you.

MS. LONERGAN: Sure. No problem. Good question. Thank you. Okay. Next slide, please.

So now, we're -- we're progressing this light rail service, right? So we're going to go east and west and -- west and north, sorry. And we'd be adding another three additional miles of light rail service.

And now -- originally, we were elevated. Now we're going to go down to street level at this point.

We're anticipating an annual ridership of about 2.7 million, with an opening date of 2031, and estimated investment of 442,000,000.

So you can see the difference in the investment and the cost. Elevated, obviously, is more expensive, and as we get to grade level, it becomes a lot cheaper for us.

Okay. So this is --

MR. HOOPER: I've got another question.

MS. LONERGAN: Sure.

MR. HOOPER: Sorry. You're going to have to --

MS. LONERGAN: Yeah. Sure.

MR. HOOPER: -- you're going to have to tell us where you're going when you -- like, you've left the -- the Convention Center. You head down 17th Street. And it -- are we then going down Andrews? Are we -- where are we going to get to Broward Boulevard?

MS. LONERGAN: Andrews, right?

MR. CHAN: Yeah, we're going up Andrews and we're proposing a one-way pair. They're coming down Andrews going --

MR. HOOPER: Wow.

MR. CHAN: -- so that's --

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. CHAN: -- that's what we're trying to get to.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. All right. Thank you.

MS. LONERGAN: Thank you for the question.

MR. HOOPER: I may have more, I'm sorry.

MS. LONERGAN: That's okay. I have a team here to help me.

Okay. So -- because I am day 58, I think, on the job. I'm just learning, so I need a little help. I need a phone-a-friend.

And so then we're -- here, we're going west, right? So we're on Broward Boulevard. And you see those dotted lines on Commercial and Sunrise. And the reason why those are hashed or dotted or whatever way you want to look at it is because either one of them are viable.

The Sunrise location has a little bit more ridership, so that's obviously viable to get out to Sawgrass -- saw mills -- mall.

But the Commercial -- the -- Boulevard is more green field, so it presents itself more for economic development.

So at the end of the day, in an ideal situation, we would have this nice little loop going around there, and, at some point, we can do that, but the initial recommendation at this point is to choose between the two.

Next slide, please.

So now I'm going to get into the BRT conversation. This is the bus rapid transit. And these are going to feel very repetitive, so I'm just going to kind of set them up and say all things will be like this going forward.

The first thing is we will have branded stations. So each line will have a set of stations where people can board that service.

That's very different than our local service, where we go block to block to block.

So we'll have the BRT lanes, or the BRT service, rather, and that service will skip many stops, right? Because the idea is that you want it to

move fast.

We don't want it mired in traffic, so it'll have the preemptive signal -- signaling in place.

So essentially what will happen is as the bus approaches -- the bus approaches, everything else stops and the bus goes, right?

However, here's what happens for those folks that are driving in the same direction as the bus. They get to go with the bus. So everybody else has to stop, but the bus keeps going and that traffic keeps going.

So that is a benefit to the rest of the -- of our colleagues who may be in cars.

And we're looking at 15 miles on this first leg on Oakland Park. We would have 16 branded stations here. We would supplement that service, as I mentioned earlier, with local regular bus fixed service that we typically run.

And here we're looking at an annual ridership of about 3.2 million, and we're looking to open that end of year 2028. And then our estimated investment is about 226,000,000.

MR. COOLMAN: I have a question on that investment.

MS. LONERGAN: Sure.

MR. COOLMAN: It seems low, so what -- how did you estimate that cost? I mean, I'm looking at umpteen more than that for this bus maintenance facility, and I'm only looking at this much.

What am I -- what are we getting for \$226,000,000?

MS. LONERGAN: It's a good question. So here we're just looking at traffic devices, right, changing traffic signals. We're also looking at some equipment, new buses. And we're assuming that the maintenance facility is either going to be at Copans or some other maintenance facility somewhere in the future.

But right now, the Copans facility that we just talked about is proposed that this would be the location where we would berth and service this bus rapid transit service.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: I have a question. Can you go back to the slide before where you're -- you're talking about going to Commercial over to the Sawgrass? Is that the train? Is -- are you saying that pink dotted line is rail?

MS. LONERGAN: Yeah.

MR. HOOPER: Light rail.

MS. LONERGAN: Light rail.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: But this is a residential area, you know, between Sunrise -- how are we doing that?

MS. LONERGAN: So we would use the existing -- either it would be in right of way on the -- on the -- on the street, or expand a little bit into the -- on the sides of the streets.

So the streets will have to be a little bit reconfigured to accommodate that.

MR. HOOPER: Do they share? With the -- with the cars?

MS. LONERGAN: The light rail?

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MS. LONERGAN: Yeah. So it would be the same kind of concept.

MR. HOOPER: So you're not losing capacity.

MS. LONERGAN: No, you're going to improve it.

MR. HOOPER: Because people complain all the time that if you bring light rail, then you're going to have a dedicated lane and you're going to --

MS. WALLACE: Alan --

MR. HOOPER: -- and you're going to lose capacity, but you won't lose capacity here. You'll have -- you'll be sharing with cars, right?

MS. LONERGAN: Yeah.

MR. HOOPER: Kind of like in Boston and other places.

MS. LONERGAN: Yeah.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: I -- I'm just curious about how we're going to be able to pull this off with this being like a whole residential area, going all the way to Commercial. You're going over to Parkland area.

How -- how does that work?

MS. LONERGAN: So I'm going to phone a friend for just a second. Derrick's in charge of our rail program, so Derrick's going to step in and help me out.

MR. CHAN: So I just want to talk about, you know, we're -- we're proposing a few options, alternates, for rail.

One option is to have it like a semi-exclusive railway lane in the center of the road. That's one option. And if there's, you know, available right of way, that's what -- you know, the -- the best way to operate light rail.

But if you don't have that, as we get closer to, you know, the -- the center core of the city and stuff like that, we may -- we may propose elevating the service.

Or the other option, of course, is to run a mixed traffic, right? Where we -- we could run rail and cars together in the same lane.

So right now, we're early in the planning, so we're looking at multiple alternatives. So I just want to throw that out there.

And, you know, there's nothing set in stone yet, but we're looking at the three options.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Yeah, you know, I'm just curious, because I -- I'm thinking of the 595 running from where it is located. And it seemed like if you're trying to move people from east to west, why not build rail in that same area?

Now you're bringing this into, you know, residential areas. I'm just thinking what impact that will have to the residents who live in that area, how it impacts their property value when you're inserting a rail in the middle of these neighborhoods.

I -- I just -- I -- I'm really just trying to picture how that works.

MR. CHAN: Okay. So this is how I see -- this is how I see rail work. There's different modes of rail. There's commuter rail, there's metro rail, and there's light rail.

So light rail, you know, has -- is -- you know, brings in development opportunities, brings in different service. Light rail is, you know, typically run through residential areas.

I -- and I came from San Francisco, and I live -- I used to live like no more than two, three blocks. I mean, if you live in San Francisco, you're within probably three to five blocks from some sort of either rail or bus system.

So typically, that's the option that's -- that we could look at.

Again, right now, we're in the early part of the -- the -- the planning process, so we're looking at how we're going to implement light rail into the County, and here are some of the recommendations that we're providing.

The -- the 95 option, I think, to -- to me, is more of like you could run metro rail or -- or a multi-county type of system, like in the Bay Area where I

came from many, many years. It's more like BART, you know, like a metro rail system that we have in Miami here.

So those are the options we could -- we have to look at, and we're going to, you know, develop those options in the planning process.

Thanks, Coree.

MS. LONERGAN: Thank you, friend. Okay.

MR. COOLMAN: Are we going to go on --

MS. LONERGAN: Do you need --

MR. COOLMAN: -- Gretchen, did you have something?

MS. CASSINI: I just -- I wanted to make sure, because -- is your question -- actually, do you -- do you still have a question?

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: I -- I -- I have a lot of concerns --

MS. CASSINI: Okay.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: -- about this insertion of rail in neighborhoods where -- first of all.

And then, to add to that, I'm just thinking a lot of people that live on the west side, they have vehicles. So what would the need -- where is the need coming from to support rail in there?

I mean, I understand north and south, but I -- I just -- I just don't get --

MS. CASSINI: So --

MR. COOLMAN: Gretchen?

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: -- the idea of doing this.

MS. CASSINI: -- may -- may I try? So there are -- as -- as Derrick was explaining, there are different modes. And if you have lots of stops, which is what a light rail transit system is intended to have, you need to have it in a residential area.

You -- you wouldn't want -- try to imagine people accessing a rail car from the middle of 595, where there's the ability to run rail very -- so, that's -- that would be a limited stop type of service, which I think they're going to talk to you about when it comes to bus rapid.

Maybe what we could do is to kind of show you some visualizations and how light rail transit integrates into residential communities, how it actually improves property values.

And what it does is it drives ridership. But the idea is that you want to give people who do have cars the option of not utilizing those cars and try to increase the ridership in our public transportation system.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: That certainly would be helpful, because I --

MS. LONERGAN: Yeah.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: -- I -- I'm -- I'm seeing, you know, residents really fighting against this and delaying the project and so on and so forth.

MS. LONERGAN: No, we understand. And -- and I'm glad you brought that up, because we do have public involvement. So now that this is done, we do have the public involvement phase, which we will get a lot of input, I'm sure, similar to what your -- your concerns are.

I think also one thing to -- to keep in mind, the -- there's two things here that we're trying to accomplish. One is to make transportation or public transportation convenient to people that are immediately adjacent to public transportation, right?

But the other problem that we're trying to solve is for people who want to go from Point A to Point B, and they don't want to deal with the traffic, right?

So we do know right now that there is a large portion of people that come to the seaport and go out to Sawgrass Mills Mall. And so this would be an alternative for them to use for the through put perspective.

So it's -- you know, we just really have to try to balance what, you know, will work for the community and then what will work from a through put perspective, too.

MR. COOLMAN: You know, this is part of the -- a bigger system. And I think it has been said. Until we provide an alternative to the car, you're not going to get them out of the car. I don't care how good your trains are. Because if it doesn't all work together -- so I see this increasing property

values. And I think it's going to get cars off the road, which is part of what we're trying to do.

Yes, Alan.

MR. HOOPER: As a -- as a developer, I think I can shed some light on what you said about the green field. The -- see, affordable housing, in some cases, is going to be due to new developments being set along lines of transit.

This is -- I'm just trying to give you like where maybe that will be a benefit to a neighborhood.

And so if there's a bunch of parcels along the way that haven't been developed, say like what she was mentioning on Commercial Boulevard, then I would put something there, like an apartment building or something, and maybe I'd even pay for a station or, if I'm close to a station, then my residents would find that as a valuable asset to getting to downtown, where they might work, or the -- or to the port or to 17th Street, where there's a lot of hotels. Or they might, you know, whatever.

But that's -- that's kind of -- you're now giving -- you're giving the workforce this thing that they know for sure, better than a bus. It's on a -- it's on a rail, it's coming by, and I'm going to be able to get on it and go to work every single day. And I'm putting -- I'm putting development on its line.

You're going to find a lot of developers are going to find that to be

utilizing both Commissioner Geller's recent ordinance and you might even see that Live Local Act become something where they want to put stuff close to transit and develop workforce housing. So --

MS. LONERGAN: Okay. Thank you.

So now we are going north to south with our BRT lane, and this is where we have a lot of colors on -- on the map here. But they have meaning.

So the blue one is the BRT lane. We just -- we talked about all the benefits of BRT. Now we're introducing that high frequency service. We're taking that all the way up to Sandalfoot Road.

This is 15 miles of BRT, 16 branded stations, and where -- where we can, exclusive lanes of traffic for the buses.

And then we still will have that local service.

This is about an estimated annual ridership of 3,000,000. And then you're looking at a projected opening of 2030 at a cost of 223,000,000.

Next slide, please.

Powerline Road, same thing, right? So this is 10.5 miles of new BRT lanes. Again, this is perhaps not a developer, but it may be attractive to some folks who are interested in doing some kind of economic development along this line.

Here we're looking at an estimated annual ridership of 2.5 million, an early opening date in the 2033 timeframe, at a cost of about \$198,000,000.

I would like to echo something that -- that you just said, sir, about the -
- the Geller, you know, land use. It is imperative for this stuff to really work
well is that we have kind of a comprehensive look at -- at land use planning
and -- and the incentives for -- for the -- the private sector to get engaged
and -- and come along and support these kinds of investments.

So it -- it's just something that we just really need to keep in the back
of our minds that that's going to help spur some of that development
opportunity. And the economic growth that we've, you know, talked about, is
one of the benefits of the investment.

So the next area, we're on University Drive now. We're still going
north to south. We're looking at 16 branded stations. We're estimating the
annual ridership of about 3,000,000.

Looking at an opening of mid-2035. Estimated investment is
334,000,000.

Next slide.

So, you know, this is Commercial Boulevard. And, again, we're
bringing everything together. Light rail, high speed -- I mean high frequency
service, and BRT.

So the BRT is going to go along Commercial Boulevard. Not entirely,
because as we go to the west, you know, as I earlier mentioned that that
ridership's a little, you know, iffy. But once the -- once the communication

goes out about our plans, I suspect that we will -- if -- if the history follows in the past, you will start to see some changes in that area accordingly.

So, until that time, we're going to have that high capacity or high frequency service, and then that eventually will, if we choose to go north on Commercial Boulevard as we continue our studies, that -- then we would have the Commercial Boulevard option in the light rail.

So at no point are we putting anything in that would preclude us from going between the mode of bus and -- and rail. So just want you to not feel like, oh, we're going to build something and then tear it down, you know, two years later. That is not the intent.

The intent is to have everything be compatible and interchangeable so that when the next mode goes in, it can be used.

Next slide, please.

This is the -- you know, the southern portion of that loop that we talked about along Sunrise Boulevard. That's exclusive from end to end. BRT. It's 14 miles long.

We're going from A1A all the way out to Sawgrass Mills Mall. We're looking at 12 branded stations in this case, and, eventually, if we go with the Sunrise option, that would be replaced with the rail service. In the year 2038 at a cost of 240,000,000.

So let's talk about implementation. So one of the things that has not

been lost on this team is the fact that we have been working really hard for the last five years to get to this point.

And we understand that the voters passed the surtax in 2018, and I'm sure they're wanting to see some progress, right?

So we're -- we -- that's not lost on us, and we're taking that very seriously.

So what we did was we said, okay, we have all this opportunity. What can we do now, right? What can we do sooner than later?

And so what we can do is offer, in 2026, high frequency corridors launching, right? So all we need to do that is more buses. So we can do that the quickest. They say, well, do it now, right? Well, we can't. Partially because we don't have the buses to do it with.

So we need to spend this time to acquire the buses so that we can make that a reality.

2027, our commuter rail comes online.

And then 2028, our bus rapid transit and light rail transit opens.

So, you know, '23, '24, '25, what are we doing? We're looking at service integration. We're doing our NEPA requirements. We're procuring equipment. We're designing -- developing our design criteria and developing design in general. And then we're getting our workforce ready.

So this is not -- I'm sure not lost on the room. We are a bus company.

That's what we do right now.

We will be adding these additional modes on, and so, as we do that, we need to be ready to take on that additional responsibility with a dedicated staff that is skilled enough to do so and has the -- you know, meets the requirements, as Angela mentioned, from a regulatory perspective, because we are highly regulated, that we have everybody ready to assume these new roles.

So this pulls it all together. This is the overall schedule. So I promised you that there would be -- this would all come together, and there is a quiz. You know, which one did we start with.

But in all -- in all seriousness, again, like, we know that we need to make up time. We understand that. And we are taking that very seriously.

And this schedule is aggressive. It is bold. But we have to do something, right? And this is something, and we feel that this is the best guess at this point in time as to how we can make this all happen along this trajectory.

We're not trying to do everything at once, and I'll tell you why in just a second.

But, you know, this takes us from 2027 with some real hard dates of things opening all the way to 2038.

The next slide, please.

And then this is our high frequency service implementation plan. 2026, you know, we're looking at Sample Road, Hollywood Boulevard. US-1 North, 2027, as well as US-1 South. Atlantic Boulevard 2028, with Sheridan Street as well. And then Dixie Highway in 2029.

So as your new director, I kind of said, okay, wait a minute. Like this is a lot, right? This is really a lot. And -- and that's okay, because we're up for the challenge.

But what we wanted to do was we wanted to see what -- what it would look like over the horizon, entire totality of this initiative.

And, you know, you look at 2027 and 2028, and that's when we peak. And we will have concurrently at that time eight projects running.

And that is huge, right? And so while we -- all we have to do now is just really work hard to get ready for that, because it's going to require a different way of how we do business at Broward County Transit, and we're going to need help.

And the next slide will talk a little bit more about that.

So how do we get there? So, number one, first of all, leveraging our internal resources as a County. We have a lot of smart people that work in the County, and we have a lot of support organizations that we need to help us get all this done, right?

So we need for those organizations to recognize the priority of the

PREMO program and support us accordingly. So that's kind of like step one in the process.

The other side of it is this is a tremendous opportunity for us, again, to bring some economic development opportunities to the -- the business community, right? So we need help. We need bodies. We need technical expertise. This is bringing consulting firms and this is bringing suppliers in. This is bringing contractors in to help us deliver on this.

So to the extent that we use all those resources to -- to help us make this happen, we are going to do a couple things in the immediate term to engage with the -- the community, the -- the supply chain community.

So first we'll be working with Sandy's team. I think Sandy's giving a presentation a little later here. And we're going to go to the small business event that he has on June 2nd to roll this out so that we can build some interest and excitement among the small business community and make them aware of what's coming so they can start getting prepared.

The other thing is that we are going to do an industry day with primes and subs, likely sometime in June as well, so that we can expand the awareness to primes and subs that -- and suppliers, because we're going to need all kinds of equipment to support this.

And then -- and then, lastly, we're going to have an industry sounding day, right? So this is a market sounding. We're going to ask the market to

help us figure out some of the tricky points that we may not be seeing right now.

Again, these are some best practices that have been used around the country to engage the design, construction, supply chain -- supplier community to support these major lift projects.

Number two, I heard earlier in the discussion about, well, how do you move stuff faster, right? Like these projects just, you know, take quite a bit of time to go through the design/build -- well, the design/bid/build process.

So we are looking at alternative delivery strategies for our projects so that we can move these along faster.

So we're looking at design/build, design/build/operate/maintain, construction manager at risk, and the progressive design/build.

We have a repertoire of options out there from a delivery perspective to use to advance these projects and, quite frankly, in the schedule, some of the assumptions that we built into that was that we would be using these alternative delivery models.

We just need to -- the County, we just need to get comfortable with it, because it is best practice, and it has been used around the country, depending on the type of project and what your risk -- what risk profile you're trying to address.

The last thing of three, our procurements just have to move. You

know, we just have to -- to make the move a lot faster.

And on four, we recognize that, you know, the surtax isn't going to be able to a hundred percent fund this, so we're looking at our options from a grant perspective from the federal government, as well as whatever state funding we can get to support the project.

And then the thing that I think is most important is that we continually learn as we evolve our projects. So I know everyone in the room knows that when you start a program like this, typically, the first couple don't go according to plan, right? They just kind of -- they just don't, right?

And so we recognize that we may have some issues early on that we will capture lessons learned.

So as we go on, as the projects unfold over time, we'll get better.

And that's a best practice for programs of this nature, but also, you know, as you get better, you get faster, you get a better product, you -- you just do things better because you don't make the same mistakes that you made early on.

When we talk about risks for the project, we all know, and we feel it in the pocketbook every day when we go to a store, prices are rising. Construction -- the construction industry has not been immune to that. We've seen quite a bit of market viability -- volatility. And so pricing is a risk that we don't have any control over, but something that we need to keep an

eye on.

And -- and so, you know, from a supply chain perspective, that also affects our suppliers, right? So when we talk about equipment and material, we don't own light rail vehicles right now. We don't own commuter rail trains. We have to procure those.

And in that process, they are also being held captive to market conditions. So those prices potentially could be higher, and the schedule could be forced out a bit as they ramp up to respond to our needs from an equipment perspective.

And the same is true for material, same -- same issues.

Consensus building. We've got to get the communities on board with what we're doing here, and that could cause some delays if that doesn't happen.

And then the other thing is federal and state reviews. So when we have federal dollars attached to our -- our efforts and state dollars, there -- they have a review responsibility to the -- to ensure that the funding that they're providing is being used in the way that we say it is and meets all of their requirements.

So that's something that will be a potential delay in our schedule.

We have to adopt the -- the -- the delivery methods that we talked about.

Another risk here is we do not own the FEC Railroad. It is not ours. And so we have to figure out a -- an agreement between Brightline and FEC to use their tracks to run our service.

And right now, we have made some progress, but we still have to continue to -- to negotiate that and to define what those commercial terms are.

If they become cost prohibitive, there may be, you know, a decision made whether we pursue commuter rail or not. But that's something to be decided at a later time. But we need to, you know, keep that on the -- on the radar.

Regulatory risks. I want to just talk to the funding requirements, because some of the grants that we're going to go after, they have a cash flow requirement, right? So they want you to put sometimes as much as six months of escrow aside when you start the project so that you have the money as soon as the revenue -- as soon as the service goes into service, right?

So we will have to secure those dollars. You -- you just can't promise them. They don't trust you, right? But they just want to make sure that when you open, you have the money to pay to keep it open.

And at the -- the reality is, on day one, while we will give our best efforts to fill every one of those vehicles with people, that might work for

about a week, because, you know, we -- we do something super special for them to -- you know, to generate interest.

But, you know, from a long-term perspective, we're going to have to keep those riders engaged. And from an adoption perspective, we're not going to fill up right away, right? Over time, we will, but not right away.

So that's why the -- the -- the federal government typically wants, for those specific grants, some security and a surety that you will do what you say you're going to do.

I talked about workforce readiness and organizational maturity in rail. We don't have it.

We have seated the organization with some folks that have project delivery experience, construction, large construction and -- and engineering project experience, rail experience.

But, you know, we're going to have to acquire that talent as well as use our construction -- our contract resources.

And then, obviously, public perception and expectations. We're going to really need to deliver, as well as, you know, keep the public informed on progress.

So that's a risk. If they don't feel like we're moving fast enough, they may not be happy.

Okay. So very quickly to summarize everything. You know, 200 new

miles of transit service, premium transit service, and this will be transformational for the County. And we are super excited to see this really happen.

And we'll be connecting our major economic engines and we need your support, your help, your questions. Challenge us, please. I know you will, so I don't have to say that.

But -- but, you know, we -- we need that -- that guidance to, you know, make sure that, you know, we're doing our due diligence here in what we're trying to establish.

So all of this for how much, right? So it's about 4.3 billion in total. So, big number. I -- I -- I totally agree, it is a big number.

And it may be a little scary, but this is what this kind of investment costs.

The property that I just came from before joining Broward County, we were spending or we had an authorized budget of about 2,000,000,000 a year. Larger system, admittedly, but that's what we were spending on our capital side.

So in the -- from an industry perspective, it -- it's not a big number, but the optics are definitely big numbers.

And so we feel that we're in the ballpark of where we need to be to understand what our exposure is financially on this.

Next slide, please.

So right now, we are in front of you, which is part of our schedule. So we're here on April 27th. We've had briefings with Commissioners prior to today.

We're going to be doing our public outreach beginning tomorrow and into May, and then bringing the Commissioners back together on the 23rd through a workshop.

And then it's our hope that on June 13th, we'll be able to adopt this program with a vote from the Commissioners.

At the end of the day, the schedule is tight. We -- we recognize that. We're just trying to really, really jump start this and get it going.

And I know everyone's been getting asked, I'm sure, when are they going to do it. So, you know, we're trying to answer that now.

Having said that, I'm happy to answer any questions that you have.

MR. COOLMAN: Questions?

MR. FRAZIER: I just have a comment. Let me congratulate you on a very comprehensive and extensive presentation. To be such a small person in stature, you did a tremendous job in explaining a very complicated subject.

Thank you.

MS. LONERGAN: Thank you. I am actually really five feet and a half inch, for the record.

(Laughter.)

MR. COOLMAN: Shea.

MR. SMITH: I'm just going to say I -- I applaud us going big and bold here, because we have to. I mean, we are behind the curve, right, as you mentioned. And we have population growth to still deal with. So that part, I am well behind.

And I love how you started it, you know, with methods and -- and policies and procedures and so forth that are under federal guidance, where they've seen this sort of thing work.

And I am curious, you know, is there a community in history that has gotten to the population density that we have without that infrastructure and then put it in successfully. I'm just kind of curious. Like if we're able to navigate this, we'd be kind of the -- on the leading edge of that, because it is -- I mean, when I started doing, you know, bike/walk advocacy and things like that, starting at the city level, really looking at this, I started to realize that it just -- it wasn't taken into account.

So if you start with a master plan community and you say, hey, we're going to have bike/walk and transit, it's so much easier than doing it the way that we're doing it.

So it is very challenging to do that. So I just applaud, you know, that way of thinking. And you came in and said, look, it's a big challenge. And it

is. But I'm up for it.

But I'm just curious. I mean, I'm just wondering if this has ever happened before.

MS. LONERGAN: So I'm going to call a friend in a second. But before I call the friend, I will tell you that this is -- this is not ideal, right? You know, you want to plan for, to your point, growth in any community, and you want to have land use policies that support growth and control it.

Traditionally when you build rail, you build it out and then there's an infill. There's -- you know, you build it to somewhere and then the -- and there's infill.

But, you know, internationally, I think we have examples of that. Let me do a little more research and get back to you on that question, because it's a really good one, and, off the top of my head right now, I can't think of anything.

But let's just say it doesn't exist. Wow, we'll be on the cutting edge. Look at us.

MR. SMITH: Yeah.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MR. SMITH: It was more of a curious point --

MS. LONERGAN: Yeah.

MR. SMITH: Because I -- I really do recognize the issue. We've

grown -- grown so fast down here, right, with limited infrastructure. I think about it all the time, just driving around.

I mean, you go down just somewhere -- like I'll just give an example here -- like Andrews, and all of a sudden, it's like narrow, and you just realize that we've just outgrown where we are in our infrastructure.

So going back and refitting that is going to be a challenge.

But, yeah, really great presentation.

MS. LONERGAN: Thank you.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay. I think the order is Alan, Anthea, Alejandro, and Phil.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Okay.

MR. COOLMAN: Alan?

MR. HOOPER: Oh, this Alan. I thought it was Phil Allen.

MR. ALLEN: Who's next?

MR. HOOPER: I'm sorry?

MR. ALLEN: I said, who's next.

MR. COOLMAN: He's first.

MR. HOOPER: Oh, okay.

MR. COOLMAN: He got his light on first.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So one of the things that I think would help with this -- and, by the way, I, too -- I applaud all the work and -- that you've

done. And it -- it's a great plan. And I'm very, very optimistic about it.

But when I do hear other folks asking me -- people that don't really use public transportation but that are, you know, providing money through sales tax, they -- I think adding the -- adding a section in here that speaks to light synchronization and to be putting a prolific amount of energy into that while we're doing this.

And if we are doing that, showing a timeline for that as well, would help a lot, because that's part of the other piece of the puzzle. I mean, if you asked everybody in this room who drove their car to work today, a lot of people would say yes.

So I would ask that we add that to it.

And then I wouldn't say scary budget anymore.

(Laughter.)

MR. HOOPER: I think you say, hey, this is what world-class transportation costs, and here's our budget. And do it with confidence.

MS. LONERGAN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Because for sure it's expensive and people will look at it that way, but definitely don't -- don't even blink. Just show it to them. Let them sign on the dotted line.

MS. LONERGAN: Thank you for that feedback. Appreciate it.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: I'm next?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes, you're next.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: So excellent presentation, by the way.

MS. LONERGAN: Thank you.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: And all the background work that was done. Compliments to your team.

I'm curious to know what was the driving factor for deciding on the Commercial/Sunrise loop? I know you mentioned the Sawgrass, but I think about areas like in the southern section of the County, Miramar, Pembroke Pines area, even just on Pines Boulevard, going all the west -- all the way west, you have a lot of people living.

Was that area considered?

MS. LONERGAN: So my --

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Is that part of the plan later on, to do a, you know --

MS. LONERGAN: -- so I -- a couple of things. That was a great question.

My understanding is from the -- the -- the analysis that was done, that these would be something in the future that could be under consideration.

And like I said, we're going to continue to improve. So as we go through, you know, we may have more development, you know, five years from now and then we have to say, okay, this makes sense to do it here now.

But that's something that we will have to continue to look at.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Okay. So it was the Sawgrass, where it's located, that drove it, or just really the congestion concept that drove --

MS. LONERGAN: It was both. Destination --

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Okay.

MS. LONERGAN: -- right, and then the congestion or the opportunity for ridership and economic development.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Got it. Thank you.

MR. MUNOZ: Yeah, great presentation. It was really cool, and I feel like I've been waiting for this type of stuff for a while.

And I understand that it'll take a long time, but I imagine it will be worth the cost and the wait in the end.

But I just had a question about bike lanes, actually. I'm wondering if there was any consideration to double the use of BRT lanes as bike lanes as well. I'm not sure if they're going to be protected or separate -- physically separated BRT lanes.

But I've seen that implemented in other cities where bikes can go down the same lane. But I'm -- I'm wondering if that was a consideration.

MS. LONERGAN: We did not consider that, but we'll take an action and take a look at it.

MR. MUNOZ: Okay.

MS. LONERGAN: Yeah, thank you.

MR. MUNOZ: Because I think it's going to take a lot of space.

Obviously, maybe we're going to remove a lane of traffic in those BRT implementations, and I imagine maybe a bike lane or something. So that's why I ask.

MS. LONERGAN: So I will say this. Be deeply concerned to have rail and bikes in the same environment, right? And largely because of science. Rail just can't stop.

MR. MUNOZ: Right, yeah. I just had about BRT.

MS. LONERGAN: Yeah, the friction's not there, so, you know, it's a safety concern. But --

MS. CASSINI: He's only talking BRT.

MS. LONERGAN: -- yeah, no, I know. I'm just saying it just to -- to preempt it.

MR. MUNOZ: Yeah, I know rails and -- and those kinds of things --

MS. LONERGAN: Yes.

MR. MUNOZ: -- don't mix well, but, yeah, it was regarding the BRT lanes. But, yeah.

MS. LONERGAN: Sure. We got it.

MR. MUNOZ: Okay.

MS. LONERGAN: Thank you.

MR. MUNOZ: Any time.

MR. COOLMAN: Mr. Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Some of you may have been around when the Sawgrass was completely impossible to do and nobody's going to go there and that's just going to be an asset that sits out in the middle of the swamp.

And, you know, 35 years later, where are we with the Sawgrass and congestion and et cetera.

So, having said that, how are you organized? Do you -- does each one of these segments have a project team that is doing that piece of the work?

MS. LONERGAN: Not yet.

MR. ALLEN: All right. And so to -- who has done the planning? Have you involved -- you point out that some projects, like the -- I'll call it the people mover -- have been around for, you know, 15, 20 years now --

MS. LONERGAN: Uh-huh.

MR. ALLEN: -- have proceeded through various phases of federal and state approval, but sits dead in the water and -- and, in fact, the technology hasn't even been decided as to what the technology's going to be.

So what involvement have there been in the agencies that have some overlapping priorities to their services?

MS. LONERGAN: Okay. Sure. So for the commuter rail -- let me please start with that one, sir -- the commuter rail, we have -- FDOT has been very involved. In fact, they're doing the preliminary work, the planning work, and the PNEP -- the NEPA and all the other environmental analysis and early design development.

So that -- they've been involved.

We are working very closely and -- and we will be -- hopefully shortly, we'll have an interlocal agreement between Miami, Broward County, and -- and Palm. So that is the intent there.

We have committees -- the committee structure that meets regularly to discuss that service and what it's going to look like, and contributions, and we're -- we're just really working all that out.

For the -- for the light rail, FDOT also has been in the lead role on that project.

Regarding my organization, we are seeded with some folks with a lot of great experience in terms of large projects delivery.

I've got to build the staff.

And we have some contracting vehicles right now in place for general engineering services that can help us with some of the early work stuff that we have to do to get done.

But we're -- we're going to have to build some resources internally.

The model that we're looking at primarily is to an integrated model where we have some expertise externally, we have people with some experience internally. They work together, and then the -- and that builds out our team.

And then we get folks up to speed, and then we have that internal institutional knowledge available within the team.

A lot of folks want to come to Broward County, so I don't think we'll have a problem recruiting.

MR. COOLMAN: Debbie?

MR. ALLEN: Can we have --

MS. MADDEN: Yeah --

MR. ALLEN: -- copies of this?

MS. LONERGAN: Absolutely. Yes.

MR. ALLEN: Okay. Either print version or even electronically so that we --

MS. CASSINI: We'll get it to you electronically.

MR. ALLEN: -- we'll have that?

That's all I have.

MR. COOLMAN: Debbie?

MS. MADDEN: Yeah, my question was along that line.

Thank you for the presentation. Nice to meet you. Thanks for coming

here.

The PREMO Plan was rolled out to us as a big project. The WSP's involved.

Is there a report? I'm picturing like, you know, thousands of pages of backup materials, modeling analysis that might have been done that could be used to build off for each of these projects.

MS. LONERGAN: So I'm going to -- Alice, you want to take that one for me, please?

MS. BRAVO: Good afternoon. Alice Bravo, with WSP. Glad to be here today.

And -- and, yes, there's -- a series of documents have been prepared. There's a transit definitions report, there's all the assumptions in the modeling.

And -- and the modeling efforts were very extensive in terms of using an unconstrained model just to see where the real demand was everywhere in the County. And that's how these corridors were selected.

So that -- that information's being compiled and will be on a project website.

MS. MADDEN: Okay. Is that the County's project website or is that a WSP link? Is --

MS. LONERGAN: Oh, no, no. It's ours.

MS. MADDEN: Okay.

MS. LONERGAN: We paid for it.

MS. MADDEN: Okay. Thanks.

MR. COOLMAN: I have one more question/comment before we take a break. I think we've been asked to take a break after this.

I want to step back and go about a 10,000 feet. I need to understand the dollars and cents here. Our surtax is supposed to raise in 30 years how many billion?

MS. CASSINI: About 16.

MR. COOLMAN: How many?

MS. CASSINI: About 16,000,000,000.

MR. COOLMAN: 16,000,000,000. This particular project looks like it's looking for four or \$5,000,000,000, of which how much is anticipated of that being surtax? Is it all? Part?

MS. CASSINI: No. It is not all surtax.

MR. COOLMAN: Well, is it half?

MS. CASSINI: Each project in the PREMO Plan is going to bring forward a different set of financial assumptions, and participation at both the state and the federal level.

MR. COOLMAN: Would it be fair to say that we'll probably be able to match as much of this 4,000,000,000 as we've matched with what we've

matched to date?

MS. CASSINI: I think it would be fair. And I think I'm going to pass this over to Coree.

But based on all the conversations that we've had internally about this previously, I think it would be fair that you would leverage more in major transportation/transit projects than --

MR. COOLMAN: Would it --

MS. CASSINI: -- perhaps that you would leverage in a Public Works project.

MR. COOLMAN: -- would it be fair to say that this project, if we didn't get any funding, is about a quarter of our budget, right?

MS. LONERGAN: Yeah, that would be about -- if it's, you know, based on a 16,000,000,000.

I -- I think --

MR. COOLMAN: Now --

MS. LONERGAN: Oh, sorry.

MR. COOLMAN: -- that's not my whole thought. Would it be fair to say -- I don't know, I'm assuming someone has got a big budget sheet that shows \$16,000,000,000, and this is in here at some number.

Would it be fair to say that this project is a quarter of everything else we're doing? Or more? Or less?

I mean, I've -- I just -- I mean, what I'm trying to do here is understand whether we have enough money in the pipeline to do this. And my biggest concern is the cost estimates that I've seen for every one of your projects, which are wonderful, are totally inadequate.

And I have no basis but my experience in the world, okay? Totally inadequate.

So I'm trying to see how much excess or fluff we have in our program here, because I can tell you right now, these -- if we were building these today, the numbers wouldn't work. And I assume they're going to escalate, and our money's going to escalate, so that takes care of itself.

But I really have concern. That's why I'm trying to understand what -- are we going to have enough money in the pipeline.

MR. ALLEN: Be careful here that those numbers were capital costs, and there's going to be the operating expenditures, which are going to be --

MR. COOLMAN: Well --

MR. ALLEN: -- significant.

MR. COOLMAN: -- that's what I understand. We're -- we're -- if we -- we're lucky, we're only going to have to come up with half of this, which cuts the four or five to half, but then we're -- that's why I wanted to know is this a quarter of what we're doing? Is it a tenth? I mean, I don't -- I don't have a -- a handle on that.

MS. CASSINI: So we're -- we're just confabbing back here on the original plan. So the original surtax financial plan had four -- a little over \$4,000,000,000 just for light rail transit, that was capital and operations, from the surtax.

So we can bring you back, if you'd like -- I mean, this is going to be an ongoing conversation over the next ten years. I'm happy at our next meeting, because it is our big budget workshop, and it's the two-day meeting, we can include some information about what some of our assumptions were from the original financial plan around BRT, LRT, both capital and operations, as well as some of the assumptions as far as federal and state participation, just to kind of give you an order of magnitude --

MR. COOLMAN: We can do it at that time --

MS. CASSINI: -- of what we assume.

MR. COOLMAN: -- but I just want to make sure that we're -- we're looking at the big picture in the long-term.

Thank you. great presentation.

MS. LONERGAN: Thank you, sir.

And I do -- you mentioned the operating, the trailing costs, right? So my understanding of some of that was in the financial model initially, so that's part of it, too, sir.

MR. COOLMAN: Anybody else have any comments?

MR. MUNOZ: I just had one more --

MR. COOLMAN: Alejandro.

MR. MUNOZ: -- question regarding public outreach after, I guess, today.

What's that process like as far as getting more attention on these projects?

MS. LONERGAN: So it is multi-faceted, and it involves going to established groups in the -- in Broward County, as well as reaching out to all of the cities and all of the mayors and all of the elected officials, and then doing some grass roots plus online engagement with the general public, and some advertising and media activity.

MR. MUNOZ: Got it. Thank you.

MR. COOLMAN: I know we're close, but I think we've been asked to have a short break, one -- until 1:00 o'clock, okay? Break until 1:00.

Thank you.

MS. LONERGAN: Okay. Thank you for your time. Really enjoyed meeting you all.

MR. COOLMAN: Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: You're going to give me a whole seven minutes?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes, that's it, Alan. I hope you don't have to wait in line.

(THE MEETING RECESSED AT 12:53 P.M. AND RECONVENED AT 1:02 P.M.)

MR. COOLMAN: Gretchen, while we're warming up here, I do have a question of our last speaker, but I can ask if of you --

MS. CASSINI: Sure.

MR. COOLMAN: -- if it's okay, on the record.

I wanted to understand where Coree Cuff Lonergan --

MS. CASSINI: What --

MR. COOLMAN: -- how she's being funded. Is she part of the new staff?

MS. CASSINI: No.

MR. COOLMAN: So the surtax dollars are not paying for her and her new staff?

MS. CASSINI: No.

MR. COOLMAN: Who's paying for that?

MS. CASSINI: Well, the way that the surtax operates in Transit is unique. So the -- the way the financial plan was structured, it looked to deficits in the Transportation Department.

And what the surtax does, and you've seen this every year when we've brought you the -- the annual budgets, the surtax basically comes in and it -- it covers a deficit in the transportation operations.

So the -- when we had the pandemic, I don't know if you'll recall, there was a table. And Chris Walton at the time, and then later Tim, was explaining to you that we thought we were going to have this huge deficit. But, because of the CARES Act and ARPA and all of this, it actually created a situation where they didn't even have to take any money from the surtax to augment their operational deficit.

So this will be the first year, when they come to you in August, where they'll be asking for a significant operational subsidy from the surtax.

So the agreement that the County made with the people of Broward, and the voters, was that they would maintain a \$27,000,000 General Funds contribution to Transit's operations throughout the life of the entire plan, escalated at 2.7 percent per year.

That happens.

Then they have federal and state grants and formula money and fare box recovery and all of those other things.

And then whatever the difference is is what they ask for from the surtax.

As a result, not a -- no specific people in Broward County Transportation Department are funded with the surtax.

MR. COOLMAN: As of currently. Okay.

MS. CASSINI: As of currently. It's just a general kind of operational

subsidy that covers everything that they do, because they have, I think,
almost --

MR. COOLMAN: So it doesn't --

MS. CASSINI: -- a thousand --

MR. COOLMAN: -- say they --

MS. CASSINI: -- employees.

MR. COOLMAN: -- couldn't come back years and need some
assistance?

MS. CASSINI: Absolutely.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: And I'm -- and I'm expecting that it will change, of
course, over the 30-year program.

And it's the same in Public Works, Mr. Chair.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: There are only -- there's one position that's filled that's
actually funded with the surtax that's in Public Works.

MR. COOLMAN: When we move, if ever --

MS. CASSINI: It's --

MR. COOLMAN: -- to our new location --

MS. CASSINI: -- and you will in August.

MR. COOLMAN: -- will that group be moving with us that she's going

to be running or not?

MS. CASSINI: So that's the beauty of where you're moving and why that particular place was selected after a lot of conversation, as you know, is it allows for co-location.

So right now, Transit administration is in that same building, on the third floor. Paratransit is in the same building on the second floor. Public Works, Highway Construction and Engineering --

MR. COOLMAN: Oh, we're Johnny come lately.

MS. CASSINI: Yeah. Well, I mean, the -- the whole idea is that it -- there's a lot of surtax-related functions already there.

MR. COOLMAN: All right. Thank you.

MS. CASSINI: Okay?

MR. COOLMAN: Anyone else have anything before we start? Which is -- oh, my word, Sandy-Michael McDonald? Where is he.

**II CBE GOAL ATTAINMENT UPDATE - MS. NICHOLE FRANCIS,
SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT SPECIALIST, OESBD**

MS. FRANCIS: You're actually getting Nichole Francis today.

MR. COOLMAN: Oh, okay, Nichole.

MS. FRANCIS: Hopefully I'll be a good substitute.

MR. COOLMAN: You've got some big shoes to fill, I can tell you that.

MS. FRANCIS: I do. Literally.

MS. CASSINI: Now, to your question, Nichole is actually a surtax-funded position --

MS. FRANIS: Yes.

MS. CASSINI: -- in the Office of Economic and Small Business Development.

MR. COOLMAN: But Sandy's not.

MS. CASSINI: No.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay.

MS. FRANCIS: Okay. So as I stated, I'm Nichole Francis with the Office of Economic and Small Business Development. So I'm here to speak with you about MAP Broward activity up until December 2022.

So first I'm going to go over the projects we reviewed for a CBE goal.

So, as you know, this funding is both for County and municipal projects.

So out of the County projects we've looked at, we've looked at 65 of them, with an estimated estimate of about \$462,000,000, and of that, we set an average CBE goal of 30 percent.

Now, on the municipal side, we've looked at 110 projects with over \$118,000,000, and that goal we're setting on that is a little higher at 34 percent.

If everything goes as planned, based on the estimates, CBEs are

projected to get \$128,000,000.

Now, this is just projected. So what happens is we initially set a CBE goal on a project, and once it's actually awarded, the prime vendor can opt to increase their participation.

So just letting you know, at first, this is just a goal. This number could actually go up if the prime vendor commits to a higher percentage.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Have they ever though?

MS. FRANCIS: Yes, they do. I'm going to show you those numbers right now.

So it's actually good. We're exceeding the 30 percent, so we're doing great right now.

So now this information is for awarded projects. So I want you to get the terminology right, because when we say awarded, what we mean is the project has gone out for bid, it's actually been awarded to a vendor. So these all are awarded projects.

So on the County side, we've awarded those 29 that we're monitoring right now, with over 175,000,000 has been awarded. And the CBEs are projected to get over \$55,000,000.

We have 57 CBEs actually participating on these County contracts, and the commitment is 33 percent.

So, as you see, they're committing to even more than the 30 percent.

So we're doing really good.

On the municipal side, there's 27 projects that have been awarded to vendors, with 47,000,000, over 47,000,000, and 12,000,000, a bit over, is supposed to go to CBE firms.

We have 52 CBEs on that side, and the CBE commitment is even higher, at 41 percent.

So we're really excited. Firms are actually using CBEs. And you're going to hear some great information about CBEs being awarded these projects.

So just to give you a little overview of the type of industries that we're seeing CBEs participate in, small business are in architecture, communications, construction, cost estimation, demolition and debris removal, electrical, engineering, landscaping, marketing, surveying, mapping, and the list goes on.

So it's a good different variety here of CBEs can get in and participate on these projects.

So we're always, again, going to keep track of where our CBEs are located, because we're always looking at the Prosperity Broward ZIP Codes. So, again, those are the six economically challenged ZIP Codes.

So of those 78 CBEs that are participating on these projects, about 23 of them are located within these six ZIP Codes.

So now for the celebration time. Again, a lot of these -- what we tell a lot of our firms is a lot of these municipal projects are on the smaller side, so this is a chance for CBEs or smaller firms to actually become primes and grow their business.

So we're going to now tell -- tell you about projects where the CBEs actually won the contract.

So from the municipal side, we have a Weston project where Her Homes won it with \$319,000.

We have a Wilton Manor project with Green Construction with over 310,000.

And a Hollywood project with Tectonic Group international, with 289,118.

If you look at the actual Excel report we submitted, you can get a name of all the firms that are on all of those awarded projects for both the County and municipal side.

And then the last one from municipalities, we have a Dania Beach project where Keolis, I believe, Corp is how you say it, they were actually awarded a project over \$2,000,000.

So, again, we're seeing CBEs actually not only participating as subcontractors, but they're actually winning some of these projects as well.

So now we're going to get to the actual --

MR. COOLMAN: Can I ask a question about that?

MS. FRANCIS: Sure.

MR. COOLMAN: When we talked about those percentages, 34, 51, are those affecting those percentages because they won them as -- not as --

MS. FRANCIS: As a prime contractor?

MR. COOLMAN: Yeah. Are they in that percentage or is that above that?

MS. FRANCIS: Yeah, that's inclusive of --

MR. COOLMAN: Okay.

MS. FRANCIS: -- of everyone.

MR. COOLMAN: Fine. Thank you.

MS. FRANCIS: You're welcome.

So now we're going to speak about the awarded projects on the County side.

So the Transportation Department has two projects on here that have been awarded to CBEs. The first one is Advance Service Management, with 5.5 million. So that's great. And we have Premiere Design Solutions at 5,000,000 as well.

The Office of Public Communications, Adept Public Relations has a project with 700 -- 787,500.

And, lastly, again, another project with the Transportation Department

where Interstate Construction was awarded 3.9 million.

So we're seeing real impact, real opportunities, and CBEs are getting involved. So it's really exciting information.

So now we're going to go over to the economic impact part of it. so now we're going to get to how is this impacting our community overall.

So we have direct impact. Direct impact is that these firms that were awarded these projects, they're going to pay, right? They're going to need employees, so we're looking at job creation of 1,535 jobs. And they're going to pay those employees, so we're looking at 96,000,000 paid in wages.

And, of course, they're going to have to pay for their materials, their service, and they're going to have their profit.

So that's direct money. We're paying out 237,000,000. That's the direct impact.

But then there -- that money goes even further into indirect and induced, because those employees are going to go to the gas station, they're going to pay their rent, get groceries. And also, those suppliers are going to have employees that are performing on the job as well.

So when we look at those indirect and induced impacts, there's an additional 861 jobs created and an additional 140,000,000 that goes through our economy as well.

So when you total both the direct and the indirect and induced, we're

projecting that it's going to be over \$377,000,000 and 2,396 jobs created.

So my last side here is going to be on the race and gender and ethnicity. Again, we just started providing this information by request.

So if you look on the -- based on the 78 firms that are participating on here, CBE firms -- disclaimer, our program -- let me read it like a disclaimer voice.

Broward County CBE program is a race and gender neutral. There is no race or gender requirements for CBE certification.

So I just want to put that out there. It's race and gender neutral, so if you're getting certified, that does not affect their CBE certification.

So I'm seeing that out of the 78 CBE firms, 52 are male and 26 are female.

And if you look at the bottom here, in terms of race, 33 percent Caucasian/white; African-American, 22 percent; Hispanic, 29 percent; Asian, eight; subcontinent Asian, six. And we have one percent undisclosed.

And if you want to look on the left and right, those boxes tell you out of Caucasian, 14 male, 12 female; African-American, 12 male and five female CBE firms. Hispanic has 17 male firms and six female CBE firms. The Asian had four male, two female. Subcontinent Asian have four male and one female. And, again, we have that just one undisclosed firm that was a male firm.

So this concludes my presentation. Any questions for us?

MR. HOOPER: Well done.

MR. FRAZIER: I just have one comment.

MS. FRANCIS: Yes.

MR. FRAZIER: And that is to say that I think you did an excellent report. You're a very good substitute for Sandy. I see you both have that type of personality and what have you.

And I -- I think that the way you've broken this down answers a lot of my questions, because sometimes people only look at the surface and they don't see how it flows down.

And the way you guys have set these reports up, it allows us to track not only the names in that big spreadsheet, which I do all the time, but it also allows us to look at the different communities in which the people are residing in, and the kinds of jobs.

And I think it's going overboard, when you look at the males and females and -- and especially in the back. And I think that's sort of will put a stop to whether or not the program is successful or not because you have provided all the necessary information.

Thank you.

MS. FRANCIS: Thank you.

MR. COOLMAN: Anyone else? I'll just ditto Mr. Frazier.

MS. FRANCIS: Thank you.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Thank you.

DISCUSSION ITEM(S)

OVERSIGHT BOARD TERMS - UPDATE ON COUNTY COMMISSION

APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO THE ORDINANCE

MR. COOLMAN: All right. We are now in discussion items, Gretchen. Oh, an update on the County Commission approval of amendments to the ordinance. They might have listened to us.

MS. CASSINI: They do listen to you.

So, in January, you all had a conversation -- this has already been brought up earlier -- about how best to accomplish a more staggered term.

And in February, the Board of County Commissioners took action based on the recommendations so that now, when you do have a vacancy in any particular category -- I do think it's important to point out that we now have nine categories; previously we had eight. We are now -- all nine are categorical appointments. And when there is a vacancy, the date that that vacancy is filled, that appointment is made, is when that four-year term begins running.

We'll see how that works. And what I intend to do is kind of, on an annual basis, give you -- I mean, if there are any vacancies, kind of give you an idea of what the terms look like, when those terms would expire, and --

and see if that stagger is working as intended.

MR. COOLMAN: Any comments? Okay. Thank you.

MS. CASSINI: You're welcome.

RESCHEDULING 2023 OVERSIGHT BOARD ANNUAL RETREAT

MS. CASSINI: All right. So the -- the second to last item is a request to -- well, it's a suggestion that you all consider rescheduling the Oversight Board retreat.

When we set the meeting calendar for 2023, it did not -- I did not realize that the date that we had selected for the retreat was the Friday before the Thanksgiving week.

I know many of you do travel at that time, so the recommendation that I'm bringing forward is that we use October 20th, which was a date that we asked that all of you keep clear on your calendar.

It is being held currently for a regular meeting. And if we need to take any formal action on that day, we can still do so, and then use the rest of the day for the retreat, if that works.

And we do anticipate that we'll be doing that retreat in the new space.

MR. COOLMAN: Did you say in the new space?

MS. CASSINI: I surely did. And I -- I have -- I have lots of people that are seeing that it's coming together, and we fully anticipate being able to utilize the space for your August meeting, but absolutely for the retreat in

October, if everyone is okay with rescheduling the retreat.

MR. COOLMAN: That's October what?

MS. CASSINI: 20th. Friday, October 20th. Everybody good?

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MS. CASSINI: Okay. Great.

MR. FRAIZER: That would give you a chance to get our former Chair a suite during this time.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, that's right.

MR. FRAZIER: It has your name on it.

MR. HOOPER: You guys don't realize the perks you get for playing Chair. You know you get a car. Did you know that?

MS. CASSINI: Car allowance.

MR. COOLMAN: I understand you did, but I don't.

(Laughter.)

NON-AGENDA

MR. COOLMAN: Are we ready to go into Non-Agenda?

MS. CASSINI: Yes, we are, Mr. Chair.

MEMBER REPORTS

MR. COOLMAN: Members reports. I have one, but I'll listen to anybody else first. It's not really a report.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Well, I just had a question. Are we going

to have breakfast and not lunch in the future? Just because I had something to eat earlier, but I thought we were going to have lunch.

MS. CASSINI: We've already had a discussion --

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Well, I missed it.

MS. CASSINI: -- Madam -- no, no, no. Internally. So I'm happy to have it on the record.

This meeting was anticipated to be shorter --

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: -- than it was. There was a lot of unanticipated discussion, and we did think that we would be finished by 12:30, which is why we did -- we chose not to serve lunch --

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Ah.

MS. CASSINI: -- and have kind of a big breakfast.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: But in the future, if we do do that, then we're going to make sure that the food from breakfast remains so -- it does not get picked up, because they at least you all would have been able to have some snacks.

So that's on us, but we -- we apologize for that.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Thank you. I know it's not so pressing, but for me --

MR. COOLMAN: Got our priorities straight, anyway.

These little things have expired, and I didn't -- they didn't look, and I didn't say. Are we scheduled to get them, or we don't need them?

MS. CASSINI: When you all meet for your next meeting out in GC West, we will make sure that you get your badges. Because right now, the badging, what -- what has happened, and I -- I did share this with -- I think someone else brought this up during their one-on-ones, the badging office is actually relocated out to the Governmental Center West, right across from where our suite, the surtax suite is.

So once you all -- once we are meeting out there, we'll make sure that you get your badges updated.

But right now, they are being very lenient about the expired badges, so.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay. Anyone else have anything before we move on to General Counsel?

(No verbal response.)

GENERAL COUNSEL REPORT

MR. COOLMAN: Angela?

MS. WALLACE: Nothing to report. Thank you.

MR. COOLMAN: Oh, short.

BOARD COORDINATOR REPORT

MR. COOLMAN: Board Coordination Report -- what? Coordinator Report.

MS. CASSINI: Yeah, I'm so sorry.

MR. COOLMAN: That's you, huh?

MS. CASSINI: It's me. Even though we've kept you so long, may -- may I -- may I request just another few minutes to show you the beautiful animated e-version of your FY '22 Annual Report?

I'm going to let Tashauna Wilson show it off, because it's her work. She's the one that created this video, so she gets all the credit.

And we are really excited about some of the opportunities that it will give us on social media, on YouTube, and when we go out and do public engagement and educational -- there are videos embedded in it. I think you're really going to like it.

MS. WILSON: Good morning, everyone. Once again, Tashauna Wilson, your Public Information Specialist.

(Video plays.)

MS. WILSON: You're welcome to follow along in your physical copies, if you'd like.

Well, this is your Annual Report, you will notice the project videos we've been speaking to, which are now available on our YouTube for viewing.

Visualization of our light synchronization efforts.

As you can see, users can hover over each city and find out the surtax point of contact in their municipality.

(Video ends.)

MS. WILSON: So thank you all for your time in entertaining me. I hope that this is splashy and engaging. We will use this. We will post this up on our YouTube, share this with our fellow municipalities and the organizations, we'll share it with all of you, and we hope you can share it to your fellow organizations. We've encouraged the Appointing Authority to do the same.

And this is just one layer, in our multi-layer efforts, to increase our public outreach and get the word out in an engaging way.

MR. COOLMAN: Thank you.

MS. WILSON: Thank you.

MR. COOLMAN: I do have a question. How do we -- how are we able to get this so we can send it to people?

MS. WILSON: We will share the link with you soon.

MR. COOLMAN: Number one.

Number two, even though this is an annual, based on what we saw this morning about the presentation of all the mass transit and stuff that's happening --

MS. CASSINI: Oh, PREMO, uh-huh.

MR. COOLMAN: -- can we do like a -- in three or four months, do a little up -- like a -- an update electronically to say, by the way, here's something that's happening this year? Because it -- it's really -- that was a pretty comprehensive report she gave.

MS. CASSINI: So normally --

MR. COOLMAN: I don't know.

MS. CASSINI: -- when it comes to things like PREMO, they're going to be doing community outreach, they're going to be coming back and giving you all updates on -- on a fairly regular basis.

And then, keep in mind, when you have your budget meeting in August, they're going to be bringing back specific requests.

I mean, one of the things that we were talking about during the break is that when they bring back their new five-year plan, it's going to look very different. A lot of the assumptions from the previous five-year plan are going to be shifting.

So you'll be -- you'll -- you're going to be hearing a lot about PREMO.

MR. COOLMAN: Well, I'm suggesting maybe we don't wait a year to hear about it. That's all.

MS. WILSON: No, and as Coree said, starting tomorrow they're initiating their public outreach efforts, which is also going to include a lot of

video, per their -- oh, Lynn left -- so per their marketing manager informed me that they will be putting out a lot of videos promoting the PREMO plan, and they already have a lot of activations at our government buildings.

MR. COOLMAN: Thank you.

Does anyone else have anything else? Phil, is your light on, or am I seeing --

MR. FRAZIER: Mine is on.

I'd like for us to close out this meeting by showing our appreciation for our former Chair, Alan Hooper, who has done a tremendous job since this committee was started.

(Applause.)

MR. FRAZIER: So, Alan, we just want to give you a hooray, hooray, hooray.

MR. COOLMAN: I think we -- this should be a standing ovation, please.

(Standing ovation.)

MR. HOOPER: Give me a break. Hey. Okay. Well, I'd like -- I'd -- honestly, thank you so much that you guys allowed me to do it, because there's always somebody better that can do it, but I really do appreciate it.

It was an honor being the Chair, but I'm honored to be on this board with you guys. You guys are great.

And this board -- and I say it every time people ask -- this board participates fully and they're totally engaged, and we're all good board members.

And I thank you for letting me be your Chair.

MR. COOLMAN: Thank you, Alan. Hearing --

MR. HOOPER: It's been a long time.

MS. CASSINI: Four years.

MR. HOOPER: I was wondering when you were going to kick me off.

(Laughter.)

ADJOURN

MR. COOLMAN: It's 1:29. We -- can we say we're adjourned?

MS. CASSINI: Yes.

MR. COOLMAN: All right. Thank you all.

(The meeting concluded at 1:29 p.m.)