

## **MINUTES**

### **INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD**

**August 16, 2023**

#### **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Phil Allen, Retired, Finance

Deborah Madden, Environmental Sciences, Florida Energy Policy Attorney,  
Southern Alliance for Clean Energy

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

Ronald Frazier, Architecture

Alan Hooper, Chair, Engineering/Construction Management, General  
Contractor and Real Estate Re-developer, Hooper Construction, Inc., and a  
founding member of Urban Street Development.

Erdal Donmez, Former City or County Manager

Alejandro Munoz, Public Transportation Consumer

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

#### **MEMBERS ABSENT:**

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

Pollack Brant Advisors and Accountants

**Also Present:**

Angela Wallace, Surtax General Counsel

Roy Burnett, Administrative Specialist

Gretchen Cassini, Board Coordinator

Tony Hui, Deputy Director, Broward County Public Works Department

Herb Vargas, Public Participant, via telephone

Eric Czerniejewski, Traffic Engineering Division Manager, The Corradino Group

Brynt Johnson, Director of Engineering and Building Services, City of Oakland Park

Richard Tornese, Broward County Highway Construction Engineering Division

Tashauna Williams-Wilson, Public Information Specialist

Laura Rogers, County Auditor's Office

Hazelle Rogers, Broward County Commission

Miriam Meneely, The Laws Group

A meeting of the Independent Transportation Surtax Oversight Board, Broward County, Florida, was held at 115 South Andrews Avenue, Room 422, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, at 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, August 16, 2023.

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

**WELCOME AND CALL TO ORDER - CHAIR COOLMAN**

CHAIR COOLMAN: Welcome, everyone. I'd like to call the meeting to order.

It's 9:34.

**ROLL CALL - ROY BURNETT**

CHAIR COOLMAN: Roll call, please.

MR. BURNETT: Douglas Coolman.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Here.

MR. BURNETT: Anthea Pennant-Wallace.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Here.

MR. BURNETT: Phil Allen.

MR. ALLEN: Here.

MR. BURNETT: Erdal Donmez.

MR. DONMEZ: Here.

MR. BURNETT: Ronald Frazier.

MR. FRAZIER: Here.

MR. BURNETT: Alan Hooper.

MR. HOOPER: Here.

MR. BURNETT: Debbie Madden.

MS. MADDEN: Here.

MR. BURNETT: Alejandro Munoz.

MR. MUNOZ: Here.

MR. BURNETT: And Shea Smith will join us a little bit later.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Shea's going to be a little late today, I understand. So he will be coming.

### **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

CHAIR COOLMAN: All right. Public participation. Do we have anyone that hasn't signed in? I don't believe we do.

I do realize that we are going to have one person talk on Item 2, but if there's anyone -- I guess they really can't speak if they haven't signed in, right?

MS. CASSINI: No, Mr. Chair, we don't have anyone signed up for public participation at this time.

### **ACTION ITEMS**

#### **1 - APPROVAL OF MINUTES, MEETING OF APRIL 27, 2023**

CHAIR COOLMAN: So we do have three action items to start this meeting off, correct?

The first one is the motion to approve the minutes of the April 27<sup>th</sup> Oversight Board meeting.

I'll certainly entertain a motion and a second, and then some discussion if we need it.

MR. FRAZIER: So **moved**, Mr. Chair.

MR. ALLEN: I'd second that.

CHAIR COOLMAN: So that was Mr. Frazier.

MR. ALLEN: I seconded.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Okay. Do you have any comments or additions to the meeting, corrections?

I have a motion on the floor.

CHAIR COOLMAN: All in favor?

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

CHAIR COOLMAN: Any -- any opposed?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIR COOLMAN: Okay.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

**2 - SHERIDAN STREET EXPANSION PROJECTS (FY 2023  
SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET REQUEST)**

CHAIR COOLMAN: Now we have Item 2, the Sheridan Street Expansion Project FY 2023 Supplemental Budget Request.

MS. CASSINI: Mr. Chair, Mr. Hui's going to be making a presentation, and I just wanted to make sure that we remember that we do have a member of the public that is registered to speak on this item when we get to the actual motion.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Okay. Tony?

MR. HUI: Good morning, Mr. -- good morning, Mr. Chair, Ms. Vice Chair, member of the board. Tony Hui, Broward County Public Works.

And this first item here is a request for your eligibility determination for one of -- a supplemental budget request for one of our projects in our fiscal year '23.

And what this project is is the Sheridan Street Expansion Project is actually two of our projects combined together that we're implementing together.

And the board, the Oversight Board, saw this project in FY '21 and approved the expenditures associated with it.

And at this point, we're requesting supplemental budget.

And let me just sort of go through it briefly. Actually, it's easier for me to show you.

This is a map of the Sheridan Street projects that we're talking about, R17 and R18.

Couple cities are involved here. Southwest Ranches to the north of the yellow line, which is the project area, and Pembroke Pines to the south.

Oh, thank you.

Pembroke Pines to the south. And then the Town of Davie just to the west of the project.

So three cities, towns are involved that have direct benefits of this

project.

And what this project would do is it will expand the current four-lane arrangement to a six-lane arrangement.

We're using a novel approach to this. We're using it as a design-build project.

The evaluation has been ongoing at this point.

We have received the low bid, and we've also did the evaluation of the contractor. And it's a very well-qualified contractor. It's ready to go and the projects is ready to proceed.

And this is just -- oh, excuse me. This is just a photograph of existing conditions. Congested area, obviously. We have room to expand.

The bottom two photos show some of the vehicles that are currently using the shoulder areas as additional lane to just kind of represent the congested condition in the area.

What the project will do is it will expand the current, as I mentioned, two lanes to three lanes in each direction, wide enough for buses, and they'll also be able to include multi-use -- multi-purpose path on both sides of the road that would benefit both pedestrian and bicyclist as -- all as part of the project.

Oh. So where we're at is, as I mentioned, the bids have been opened. The low bid for this project is 32.4 million dollars, and it exceed the FY '21



budget the board had previously seen, which is 28,000,000.

As I mentioned, the vendor's ready to go, well qualified.

And we really have two options at this point in time.

One is because the lower budget available, we can reject all the bids and then at some subsequent point in the future, we can rebid the project and see if the construction environment would improve.

That would only be benefit to us if we believe the cost of construction is actually going to go down.

We kind of don't believe that. We don't think -- the increases may slow, but we don't think the projects will actually decrease.

So the other option, obviously, is to request additional funding. And -- and then, if we do get the additional funding, we can proceed with this project pretty quickly, like -- because, like I mentioned, the project is -- the contractor is ready to go.

So -- so before we do that, one of the things that we want to be sure is to make sure that the bid that we receive is a valid bid, it's a good bid, and -- and there should be good reasons to account for the price difference in terms of what we expected and what we actually receive.

So one of the things we did is -- one of the things we did is is that we went back and we took a look at the database.

FDOT actually has a very extensive database of construction cost

through the years where we were able to access -- access that.

And what you see here is the -- is the -- on the blue bars, the blue bars is using the FDOT data for our type -- for these type of projects. These are the annual year-to-year -- excuse me -- the year-to-year increases over the last couple years.

As you can see on -- beginning in 2017, the year-to-year increases were relatively low, management. Two, three percent, in that range.

And what you see on the right end of the graph is between 2022 and 2021, actually jumped about 27 percent. And it's really reflective of the current environment that we see ourselves in.

And so if we take a look at -- at the green line there, the green line at the starting point in 2021, which is what we started from, is that we had estimated the project to be about \$25,million dollars.

And if you take that increase that we found from the FDOT data, multiplied that, it ended up in some -- it ended up being 30 -- approximately 32,000,000, which is right in the same range of what the bid price, the low bid price, came in.

So based on that determination and our understanding of the current environment, we believe that the bid that we got is a valid bid. It -- it's -- it's -- it's reflective of the current condition.

So we're -- we're asking to proceed with it.

This is just a summary of the project. As I mention, the Oversight Board and our Board previously approved \$28,million dollars.

About 2.8 million, about roughly 3,000,000 was set aside for construction inspection and permitting and all that type of things.

Left us with 25.2 million dollars.

The low bid, 32.4, we put a five percent contingency on top of that, 1.7 million dollars.

And the total is 34.1.

So the additional budget that we're requesting in order to proceed with what we believe is a good project, valid bid, is 8.9 million dollars for additional funding that we're asking the Oversight Board for eligibility determination, and then, also, you know, proceeding with the request to our Board.

So that's a quick summary of the project.

And I see there are questions.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Alan.

MR. HOOPER: How many bids did you get?

MR. HUI: Two. Uh-huh. The other one was very much higher. Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. And then the other thing that would be interesting going forward in the future would be with sales tax, if there's

inflation, then sales tax should go up, too, on -- on the -- on the sales tax of our revenue, right?

It has nothing to do with construction costs, but it would be interesting to see what our revenue increase is on a year-to-year versus all of the projects we're doing, because all of them are going up in cost.

And it would be interesting to see if revenue's going up at 12 percent and so are our costs, on average, you know, because some things, like concrete and probably road rock is expensive. Asphalt's probably pretty expensive right now.

Some of the -- there's other -- like if you start -- if we do a maintenance facility, there's other subs that are -- are starting to either level off or come down, but concrete and other structural subs are still inflating.

So that would be an interesting exercise so that when people ask us, well, why is everything so high, well, because of inflation, but, fortunately, people are spending money on more expensive goods and our sales tax has also increased at some pro ration of -- of what that is. Okay?

Anyway, do you typically get two bids, or is there usually more than just two bids? Are there only two players out there or?

MR. HUI: It -- it's -- we usually would get two to three bids on our projects. We got two on this one. It's --

MR. HOOPER: And you took the low bid.

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

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Mr. Allen.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chair, before we get into any more debate, perhaps it might be useful to hear from the -- I understand we had somebody that wanted to make -- or comment relative to the motion?

MS. CASSINI: Yes. It's up to you if you'd like to take public comment at this time. I believe that legal counsel has indicated that we can take that up at this time.

MS. WALLACE: Yes.

MR. ALLEN: Would you just make a recommendation that we hear from the public first before we have any more debate among ourselves?

CHAIR COOLMAN: I agree. So could we hear from the gentleman from the -- I don't know if it's a gentleman or woman -- from the public that would like to speak?

MS. CASSINI: Mr. Vargas, if you could un-mute your line, we're ready to hear your comments.

You'll have two minutes.

MR. VARGAS: Thank you. Can you hear me? Hello?

MS. CASSINI: We can hear you. Thank you.

MR. VARGAS: Okay, thank you. Yeah, my name is Herb Vargas. I'm

a civil engineer. I'm also representing Pembroke Pines, I'm a resident in Pembroke Pines. Which is the community just south of Sheridan Street, just south of the project.

For a long time, for the last two years, this project has been looked at, we have been requesting both the City, through Commissioner Siple, as well as the County, to see if we can have a -- if somebody from the City of Pembroke Pines could come to the project.

So far we were told, "we were not ready" and so far we haven't had a public meeting.

We are opposed to this project because one, as a civil engineer, and as a former (inaudible)engineer and transportation engineer, this project doesn't add any capacity, whatsoever to the mobility of the County. The problem we have is this area of the intersection of Sheridan and Flamingo, which is at capacity and -- actually, it's over capacity, and also the interchange of I-75 and Sheridan Street.

So the adding of extra lanes on Sheridan Street and maybe (inaudible) closer to the walls of Pembroke Falls. All of that will create a bigger parking space. And at night bring the traffic closer to the homes. And where we requested to put a soundwall or something to protect the community, I don't think our comments have gone any place.

So the little times, within the two years, that the people have been

looking at the project, the pavement on Sheridan Street has been invaded, considerably. There are potholes that are popping up. And this pavement needs to be done quickly, as soon as possible.

So our recommendation or our desire would be for -- (inaudible) the project for the project to be reduced to just resurfacing of existing roadway and adding a new bike path, a (inaudible) path on the big wide area that we have between the sidewalk and the -- and the roadway to add maybe (inaudible) bikers as well as joggers to use that, because right now they are using the sidewalks, which are really (inaudible).

And that -- and if you come here, you will see the demand for bicycles is quite high. There are at least, I don't know, 20 or 30 bicycles a day. I can't really count. But I always see bicycles in the roadway. And then on the weekend there more.

So I really ask you guys (inaudible) please do not add more money to this project (inaudible) useless and (inaudible) that we have to do a project that is a (inaudible) to the community and actually encourage (inaudible) bicycles (inaudible).

Thank you for the time.

CHAIR COOLMAN: I -- I have a question. Can you tell me who you represent again?

MR. VARGAS: I represent myself, right now. I -- I (inaudible). I used

to be (inaudible). I'm no longer (inaudible). So I cannot claim any (inaudible) representing the (inaudible) to ask (inaudible) speak officially (inaudible) communities of (inaudible) and (inaudible), which are the two communities right next to Sheridan and (inaudible) the people (inaudible) the project. That's why we want to (inaudible) --

CHAIR COOLMAN: So you --

MR. VARGAS: -- that's why (inaudible).

CHAIR COOLMAN: -- so you do not represent any of the municipalities in --

MR. VARGAS: No, I don't, I'm a member of the public (inaudible).

CHAIR COOLMAN: If I understand --

MR. VARGAS: -- (inaudible).

Thank you.

CHAIR COOLMAN: -- you correctly, you are interested in moving a project forward because the condition of the roadway is so bad right now that you don't want to wait until a -- maybe a --

MR. HOOPER: That's not what I heard.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Huh?

MR. HOOPER: That's not at all what I heard.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. VARGAS: Yes.



MR. HOOPER: Because it's hard to understand the gentleman --

CHAIR COOLMAN: Yeah.

MR. HOOPER: -- because the volume on the audio is so loud, it's echoing in here. So I -- I couldn't understand it, either.

But what I got, and I would like to ask you, sir, you said something about an intersection at Sheridan and then something over at I-75, that they're not -- they're not flowing through those two intersections fast enough, and that all you would be doing if you added more capacity in the road is just making a -- a larger parking lot, and you're not really fixing the problem which is at those two locations; is that what you said?

MR. VARGAS: Yes, that's correct. (Inaudible) of the project and (inaudible). I -- I (inaudible) audio (inaudible) just listen to music. (Inaudible) but if you look at that (inaudible) of the project, the biggest (inaudible) that we have (inaudible) in the (inaudible), but the biggest bottleneck that we have is the intersection of Sheridan and Flamingo.

There we have the Charter school system, we have a shopping center, and we have some apartment rentals on both sides, and those are constraining the right of way for us to do any significant widening of that intersection.

So it may be -- and it would require more money. So it may be another ten years or so before we do that, or five years or so to do that

widening.

When that widening happens, then it would make sense to do the six lane, because then traffic will be able to go someplace.

But right now, based on the constraints that we have, it doesn't make sense to do this six-lane widening just creating impacts for the residences and the homeowners when the need is really to create more capacity for the bicycles --

MR. HOOPER: Uh-huh.

MR. VARGAS: -- and all that in that area.

MR. HOOPER: I understood that.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Does that answer your question?

MR. HOOPER: It -- it does.

And there was another point that the gentleman made that I -- I tend to agree.

When I am out there, it's usually in the morning, because I go out there for races and stuff, running races. And there are a lot of bikes in that part of the County. And it's a bit dangerous, because they mix in with cars and they -- he mentioned adding a ten-foot lane or bike path in addition to the project.

Again, I don't know how that works. You know, if -- if it's part of a road project, maybe it works. But that was something else he brought up.

So I -- I'll stop speaking.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Yeah, I was going to ask Tony if he would like to comment.

MR. HUI: Yeah. Just a couple points, and let me just actually go back to the previous slides that -- before I come back to this one. All right.

Taking a look -- if -- if you take a look at this, the -- the yellow highlight is our project.

What I forgot to mention or I should have mentioned is is that to the west of that yellow line, which is -- and -- and passing through I-75, actually, FDOT improved the -- as -- as part of the I-75 improvement project, they expanded that area west of our project.

So that area right now is a six-lane roadway.

And -- and so when we -- when we construct our project, make it also six lane, it actually smooths -- facilitate traffic onto I-75 and take advantage of what FDOT has done.

I think it was about maybe a year and a half ago that they completed that, so it actually dovetail very well into improvements that they have already made.

Now, taking a look on the -- on the right side of it with regards to Flamingo. When we do our projects and we sort of hit the Flamingo roadway and so forth, what we also do is that we actually, when we make that six-lane

improvement, we actually go past the intersection. We go past Flamingo, make that a six-lane intersection. And then it dovetail back into what -- you -- you know, east of it, which is a four lane.

So east of that intersection, it's going to remain four lane because we just haven't gotten there yet in terms of our project.

But both in terms of the I-75 interchange and then also the Flamingo intersection, it will be a six-lane arrangement and it'll really -- in our opinion, really facilitate traffic in -- into that area.

CHAIR COOLMAN: So, Tony, so you're saying that part of this project is to rectify those two ends of the project that this gentleman is concerned about.

MR. HUI: I -- I -- not to rectify, but it -- I think it takes -- takes into -- it -- it meet -- it meets the conditions, it improves the conditions that this gentleman was referring to, because it wasn't to -- it -- not to hit on -- play on -- with words, but it -- it's -- it's an improvement that FDOT made that we're matching up with.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Now, and just another hypothetical question. If we didn't do this project but try to put a -- a bike lane or so to alleviate that issue, that may -- would probably take longer than if we did the project with a bike lane. I'm guessing.

MR. HUI: I wouldn't say it would take, you know, long, as in long. But

it certainly -- you know, we're -- we're doing this, we're -- we're putting in a multi-purpose path on both sides of the road as part of the project. We have room to.

It -- it's -- it's sort of a natural desire to increase -- you know, increase alternative mobility in the entire area.

So I think this project does take into consideration the concerns that the gentleman referred to.

MR. ALLEN: One last question before I go -- on that cross section, it does show 12-foot lanes on both sides, or --

MR. HUI: Yeah.

MR. ALLEN: -- bike lanes.

MR. HUI: Uh-huh. Yeah, on the bike lanes and multi-purpose path on both sides.

CHAIR COOLMAN: What -- what kind of timeframe, if you did this, would we be looking at versus if we just resurfaced and -- and maybe got a bike lane? I'm just curious. Is it --

MR. HUI: It -- it would take -- if were just to resurface it, it -- because if we were to resurface and construct the multi-purpose lanes, what we would really need to do is to -- in order to construct the multi-purpose lane, preserve future capability to increase a lane at some point in the future if we need to, it pretty much mean -- means that we need to shape the road the way it is right

now in order to set it up that way for the future.

So would it be less time? Yes. But it would be significantly less time?

I would -- I would not think so.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Alan.

MR. HOOPER: My question -- and, you know, the best person to give you advice on what an intersection is doing is the people that drive it every day, okay? So I'm going to say that this gentleman sounds like he knows what he's talking about.

My -- my thought would be, no different than the maintenance facility that we did at our last meeting, it -- it increased because it -- there as an additional purpose that we needed to add to that maintenance facility, and we approved a -- a large increase in cost, I say we look at I-75 intersection and Sheridan, and I say we look at -- in -- in all four directions.

I say we look at Sheridan and Flamingo, okay? And try to, if -- if not do it at the same time, do two phases where you work the intersections and you work this new project.

That way, you're -- you're doing your capacity for the future but you're also fixing the actual problem.

And then all the things dovetail.

I would like to explore expanding the project, because if we're going to sit here and do this, let's just do it right. I mean, otherwise, we're just -- if -- if

we -- if you take the advice of this gentleman on the phone, and it sounds like he's a local, we may just be doing -- we might be doing a percentage of the project, of the -- a -- of the solution when I think we should try to do the hundred percent of the solution.

So what are the possibilities of expanding it into the two intersections that he's talking about?

MR. HUI: Mr. Hooper, I -- I think the opportunity is --

MR. HOOPER: Or studying it.

MR. HUI: -- yeah. I think the opportunity is definitely there. This is a design-build project, so that means that a portion of the design -- we did the preliminary design in order to send out the documents. The actual design still needs to take place.

So what we can do is is that if there's any addition -- you know, when we go in -- in part of the actual design, if there's any additional improvements with regard to those two intersection, which -- which, like I mentioned, we had already planned to include the Flamingo. FDOT has done already some work.

But if there's certain elements of it that are missing that we can, you know, add onto it, we'll certainly be -- you know, be happy to consider that as part of the actual design.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Tony, I'm a little confused here, because I thought

you said that those two intersections were part of this --

MR. HUI: Yeah. Uh-huh.

CHAIR COOLMAN: -- project in this over -- this million -- how many million?

MR. HUI: It -- it -- it is. The -- like I mentioned, I-75 interchange is already done. It's already a six-lane section.

We're -- we're planning on doing Flamingo -- the intersection of Flamingo --

CHAIR COOLMAN: Right.

MR. HUI: -- as part of the project.

But, as Mr. Hooper mentioned, we can certainly -- you know, as part of the design, we certainly want to -- can take a look at it and see if there's any additional things that we have not considered at this point that we can -- you know, to see if it makes sense to include them.

We -- it -- the design is not complete yet, so there are room to do some of those if they are -- if they are reasonable and make sense. Uh-huh.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Mr. Chair, I would be -- it would also be good if we could get a sense of what the cost savings would be doing it now as opposed to doing it five, ten years from now.

MR. HUI: In --

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: As you're doing these assessments to



see whether or not we can add the -- the two lanes that the gentleman was talking about, what would it cost us now, and if we were to delay doing it today, what would that future cost estimate be? Because there may be some cost savings that -- and economies of scale to be had by doing it now.

MR. HUI: Yeah. We -- we can make an attempt to do that, but --

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. HUI: -- we're not great at predicting the future.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Well, I know, but I mean, you -- we all -- we -- we work -- you know, we're doing our five-year budget, right? And we're doing it with some estimates embedded in all of that.

So I'm just saying I -- I'm just thinking that there could be some cost savings for us to just do it right now, as Alan is -- is suggesting.

And just because, you know, you have the equipment on site already, doing this project, maybe it's just best for us to just do as much as we can --

CHAIR COOLMAN: Alan.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: -- to get the project where it needs to be.

MR. HOOPER: And to -- to follow up with what Anthea's saying, it also may be that on the -- I'm thinking -- Sheridan's east/west -- on the north/south, along Flamingo, it might -- it might be as much as adding some right of way of a right turn or a left turn.

You know, you're going to do the six lane through, but are there issues

coming into Sheridan from Flamingo and -- and or whatever.

MR. HUI: Yeah.

MR. HOOPER: There's always a bunch of --

MR. HUI: Yeah.

MR. HOOPER: -- different aspects --

MR. HUI: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: -- that affect traffic. And I'm no traffic engineer.

But, certainly, I think looking at it from a very careful perspective and doing a change order or an add-on would be a smart thing to do.

And -- and I think listening to what this gentleman is -- this advice he's giving us is -- is well founded.

MR. HUI: Yeah. Uh-huh. We -- we would certainly take a look at the intersection, both north/south and east/west and right in that vicinity.

We typically do that anyway, but, like I said, you know, we can definitely take this gentleman's concern into account and if there's anything that we can adjust easily, reasonably, then we'll be happy to do so.

CHAIR COOLMAN: I have a question for the gentleman. If we are able to ensure that the six-lane and the pedestrian walkways addresses Flamingo in the, I guess, east and I-75 on the west, would -- would that satisfy most of what he's brought here today for us to -- to take care of?

MR. VARGAS: Yes, do I have the floor?

CHAIR COOLMAN: I'm sorry, could you repeat that?

MR. VARGAS: Hello? Yeah, do I have the floor? Can I speak?

MS. CASSINI: Yes.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Yes. Okay.

MR. VARGAS: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR COOLMAN: So --

MR. VARGAS: Thank you for your time today.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Thank you very much.

MR. VARGAS: Yeah, sure, I'll be glad to do that. Also, I think --

MR. FRAZIER: Mr. Chair?

MR. MUNOZ: I have a question.

MR. VARGAS: I hear an echo, I don't know. Also I should say that I'm pleased that this project has been modified (inaudible) a year ago, a year and a half ago, because the project was ending at 125<sup>th</sup> Avenue before (inaudible).

Now I'm glad to hear that it's expanding and somebody's looking at Flamingo. So it looks like our comments, that we gave, have got to the County.

We do have tool -- I'm a traffic engineer. We do have a tool that we call traffic simulation. We can use (inaudible), we can use (inaudible), we can use any of those (inaudible), whatever, and the County can do a traffic

simulation model to see (inaudible) improvement.

In all fairness, without seeing the actual drawings, without seeing (inaudible) plans, I can only right now tell you my concerns.

And my biggest concern would be if they are adding additional lane on the east side of Flamingo, it will be in conflict with the access to the junior high school, the Charter, the Charter junior high school that the City of Pembroke Pines has.

So I don't know how the traffic operations work. Again, all you will be doing is moving the pin an extra three or 400 feet and still having the 2,000 or 2,012 --

CHAIR COOLMAN: Okay. I'm going to interrupt you.

MR. VARGAS: -- (inaudible).

CHAIR COOLMAN: Sir, I'm going to interrupt you.

MR. VARGAS: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR COOLMAN: We're not going to be able to get that fine. What we are going to do is ask Tony to meet with you so that he can understand exactly what your concerns are, because I believe we have a -- a process here to move forward that will solve the issue you brought up, and it looks like some of the things have already been taken care of, because you were looking at an older rendition of the plan.

So at this point in time, I think I'm going to cut off the public comment

and I want to hear from -- I think there's some lights on. Mr. Frazier's one.  
Alejandro, you've got another.

So we'll go ahead and bring it back to the board.

MR. ALLEN: I thought there were two. There was somebody else.

MS. CASSINI: No.

MS. WALLACE: No.

MR. ALLEN: No? Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. FRAZIER: I'm a little confused. I'm --

CHAIR COOLMAN: Join the club.

MR. FRAZIER: -- I'm looking at this cross section, so I want to put my  
question two parts.

As relates to the cross section we're looking at, that is between I-75  
and Flamingo Road, correct?

MR. HUI: Yes, this is --

MR. FRAZIER: And --

MR. HUI: -- what we're --

MR. FRAZIER: -- it's going to be the six-lane road.

MR. HUI: -- this is where we're planning to build.

MR. FRAZIER: Right. And it has a bike lane, I see is 12 feet.

MR. HUI: Yeah.

MR. FRAZIER: Okay? So what we're talking about now is the

transition between I-75 and -- and this improvement at that -- because it's going into a six-lane already.

And then we're talking about making some adjustment at Flamingo to make sure that the six-lane dovetails back into the four-lane.

So the additional items is -- is those transitions at I-75 and Flamingo? That's what the additional issues are, and not the -- this intersection that we're looking at?

CHAIR COOLMAN: Well, I -- I think, Tony, if I'm correct, those -- you have already included those transition points.

MR. HUI: They -- they are part of --

CHAIR COOLMAN: So if they're already in -- if you look at the --

MR. HUI: -- I-75 --

CHAIR COOLMAN: -- give us the yellow map again real quick.

And if you look at the yellow map, this goes through Flamingo --

MR. HUI: Right. Uh-huh.

CHAIR COOLMAN: -- and this ties into the six lanes.

So those transition points are already under consideration in this plan.

MR. FRAZIER: Then I'm confused about what the gentleman was saying.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Well, I think he --

MR. FRAZIER: What he described here.

CHAIR COOLMAN: -- was looking at --

MR. FRAZIER: An old plan?

CHAIR COOLMAN: -- an older plan that only went to X Street, I believe.

MR. HUI: Yeah.

CHAIR COOLMAN: And we've asked Tony to get with him and make sure we've clarified that.

MR. FRAZIER: Got you.

MR. HUI: We'll be happy to do that.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Alejandro?

MR. MUNOZ: So I just wanted to ask Mr. Hui and I guess maybe if the Public Works Department considers induced demand when it comes to these expansion projects, just because from what I've seen other expansion projects usually end up with congested roads anyway. Take, I don't know, 441 for example. There's -- there's still congestion on that road. Obviously, it's -- it's better.

But as -- I imagine as the population grows and more cars are put on the roads, it's just going to worsen.

Same thing with, let's say, I-95, the constant expansion.

So I'm wondering of this expansion project and -- and probably any other expansion projects, are just a temporary fix, let's say, for five, ten years

until congestion builds up again.

MR. HUI: It -- it -- the -- there's certainly some good points about that. I think what we, when -- when we try to do expansion -- capacity expansion projects, the -- what we only deal with is roadways that are currently in failing or close to failing conditions.

And so we're trying to deal with an existing problem or one that was in, you know, very much overwhelmed the exist -- the existing system.

There actually are not a lot of opportunities for us to do that throughout the County, because many of our roadways do not have additional capacity that allows us to do that.

In this situation, we do. We -- we have it. We can solve an existing problem, and then we can solve the problem for some period of time.

And -- and -- and there's no question that that's going to be additional traffic that's going to, you know, go through there.

As you can see on this map here, there's a lot of development on both sides of the road right now.

So, you know, we're trying to deal with an existing problem. We're trying to deal with it in a reasonable manner with -- you know, and encouraging different modes of transportation and to facilitate that.

So, yes, there is an -- a good argument about induced traffic, but we're trying to solve an existing problem where we have the capability to do



so while promoting alternative mobility at this point.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Tony, if I could add to that, I also believe that one of the purposes of this whole 30-year project is other modes of transportation.

There's going to be a point where we can't expand the roads anymore.

MR. HUI: Right. Uh-huh.

CHAIR COOLMAN: There's going to be a point where traffic is unbearable.

And, unfortunately, it takes that for people to get on these alternative modes, once we have them as an alternative that's functional.

And so this is only -- you can call it a Band-aid, a needed Band-aid, but I think, in reality, that's -- this is just part of the problem.

We're never going to fix capacity by just putting more lanes on. We're going to have these alternatives, which I think the taxpayers have voted for and we're working toward.

Alan?

MR. HOOPER: I'd like to make a **motion** to approve the project and - - and ask that staff work with -- or at least meet with the -- the gentleman from the public to see if there's any other modifications that could be done at the intersections, but at -- at this time, move forward with the project.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Can I have a second before discussion, please?

MR. DONMEZ: I will second that.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Okay.

MR. DONMEZ: Yeah.

CHAIR COOLMAN: You would like to say something?

MR. DONMEZ: How long is this bid, you know, good for?

MR. HUI: I'm sorry, can you --

MR. DONMEZ: How long is the bid, you know, good for?

MR. HUI: How long is it --

MR. DONMEZ: The current bid.

MR. HUI: -- good for.

MR. DONMEZ: Yeah.

MR. HUI: I think there's a certain period of time, 90 days or?

MR. TORNESE: It's up to the bidder.

MR. HUI: I'm sorry?

MR. TORNESE: The bidder can --

MR. HUI: I don't know the exact time period. I --

MR. TORNESE: Yeah.

MR. DONMEZ: Okay.

MR. TORNESE: Richard Tornese, Highway Construction Engineering  
Division.

It's up the bidder. Bidder can hold the price forever if they want. It's -- but there is no indication that the bidder is in -- is -- is rushing to -- to get to construction right away, because they've got to go through a process of paperwork and other things that we basically have to do in order for them to get to that point.

So we're working towards that end. We're nowhere near that now.

MR. DONMEZ: Yeah.

MR. HUI: But the -- we -- we would like to proceed on the -- we'd like to proceed on that as quickly as possible --

MR. TORNESE: Yes.

MR. HUI: -- because it is a changing and dynamic pricing environment that -- you know, that we have at this point.

MR. DONMEZ: And that's really my concern, you know, like everybody. It's a highly inflationary --

MR. HUI: Right.

MR. DONMEZ: -- you know, market. We already have adjusted, you know, the budget on several occasions.

And not minimizing any, you know, comments and -- and -- you know, made by the public, but just like any other project, we can always improve it, but at some point, we have to look at the project in totality. Are we ready? Is it going to deliver, you know, what we were hoping to do?

And time's also of the essence. And I think we can make modifications, we should make modifications, but at the same time, we need to move forward.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Mr. Allen.

MR. ALLEN: Tony, what was the -- the process to date on the -- I mean, to what level have the elected officials in the three cities that are impacted by this, have they been involved or have workshops been conducted through the planning process?

MR. HUI: Yeah, the -- all -- the -- the town, the Southwest Ranches and Davie -- excuse me, Pembroke Pines, have been closely involved in terms of developing the project at this point in time.

And then also, in the future, as we get into -- more into the detail design of it as more information becomes available, there will be additional public, you know, information sessions and so forth as we go forward, too.

MR. ALLEN: Well, I think the design-build process does lend itself for continuing information and improvements in the process before you get concrete, if you will --

MR. HUI: Yeah.

MR. ALLEN: -- laid on the -- on the ground.

MR. HUI: Right. And, yeah, it -- they still have to go through that

design process.

MR. ALLEN: Last year, the County Auditor had conducted a review of a project, I think it was a bridge project, relative to innovation of how you arrived at the pricing for those components that changed the process.

Has this been also through that process? Does that account for what the recommendations that the Auditor made in the process?

MR. HUI: I -- I believe we have. We -- this -- you know, this process is -- you know, I'm sure as we go forth, we'll continue to work with the Auditor and so forth. And when we -- you know, get through that process.

But, yes, I think we have followed all of the County procedures.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Mr. Hooper? Your light's on.

MR. HOOPER: I'm sorry.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Any other comments? We have a motion on the floor.

MS. CASSINI: You need to turn your mic on, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Any other comments? We have a motion on the floor for approval.

Do we need to do anything else before we vote on this?

MS. WALLACE: No. Just call the vote.

CHAIR COOLMAN: I'll call the -- can I call the question? Call the question.

All in favor?

MR. MUNOZ: No.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Anybody opposed?

MR. MUNOZ: Me.

CHAIR COOLMAN: One opposed.

**VOTE PASSES 7 TO 1 WITH MR. MUNOZ VOTING NO.**

CHAIR COOLMAN: Can I -- can I ask a question? Why not? I mean, I don't want to put you on the spot, but I'm curious to learn.

MR. MUNOZ: I don't think we should be funding more expansions.

MS. WALLACE: Okay. If I may?

CHAIR COOLMAN: You mean more roadway expansion?

MR. MUNOZ: Right. Yeah. Like I mentioned, induced demand is -- is a huge problem, and I think these are just temporary solutions that are just going to cost us even more money in the future.

MS. WALLACE: So, if I may. The -- the motion is with regard to the eligibility, the statutory eligibility of the additional funds, not with regard to, I guess, the -- whether, you know, you believe that expansion is appropriate for -- for the road.

So the -- what's within the purview of the board is whether the -- the project itself, project elements, and the funding associated with the project are eligible under 212.055 Florida Statutes.

And since this is the planning -- involves the planning and development and construction of a road, it is statutorily eligible.

Thank you.

MR. MUNOZ: Thank you for clearing that up. I understand that it's -- it's eligible. I don't know, what else can I say?

CHAIR COOLMAN: And I -- I also understand your frustration. But we can -- we can certainly -- there's very few places we're going to be left to expand a road, just because we're basically built out.

This is certainly going to make those residents in that area extremely happy for some time.

And I'm hoping that by the time this gets to its capacity, we'll have alternate ways of transportation for them to take, whether it's buses, trains, you know. So --

MR. MUNOZ: I can understand that.

CHAIR COOLMAN: -- that's fine.

MR. MUNOZ: I just --

CHAIR COOLMAN: That's -- that's fine.

MR. MUNOZ: Yeah. I -- I also think that maybe something else we don't really talk about too much is the impact on pedestrians and cyclists, as in if we expand, let's say, from two to -- to three lanes on each side, that's that much longer that a person walking across has to spend in front of cars.

There's an increased risk that someone will get killed, and that's a fact. More -- more -- more people are killed in -- on these arterials than -- than, let's say, on collectors.

CHAIR COOLMAN: All right. I agree with you. I do think, though, in fact, that we've got two 12-foot bike/pedestrian lanes on either side of this road that don't exist there today far outweigh that extra 12 -- ten -- 11 feet of asphalt in this particular case. But --

MR. MUNOZ: I do agree with the -- the 12-foot multi-use paths. That -- I think that's a great thing. Obviously, the -- that's something that wasn't there before, so.

CHAIR COOLMAN: One of the things that I might suggest is that when we get to our -- we have a retreat coming up, right? This is something that we could bring up more as a philosophical discussion, so -- but I do appreciate, Alejandro, your input.

MR. MUNOZ: Of course.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Anyone else? Anthea, you have your --

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: No, I'm good.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Okay. I'd like to -- oops. You guys have your buttons on over there.

I -- I think we're ready to vote. So -- or did we --

MS. WALLACE: I thought you've taken the vote.



CHAIR COOLMAN: We already voted. I'm sorry.

MS. WALLACE: Yes, you've already taken the vote.

CHAIR COOLMAN: I got distracted. We had -- we had an eight to one, right?

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Right.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Is Shea on the phone?

MS. CASSINI: Seven -- seven to one. Shea is not on the phone.

CHAIR COOLMAN: You're -- you're sitting very well in for Shea, I can say that much.

### **3 - CYCLE 3 (FY 2023) MUNICIPAL CAPITAL PROJECT DESIGN-PHASE CONVERSION REQUEST**

CHAIR COOLMAN: Okay. We're ready to go on Item Number 3?

MS. CASSINI: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'd also like to acknowledge and recognize the fact that we have one of our County Commissioners that have joined us, Commissioner Hazelle Rogers is in the audience.

And the next -- the next item, our last action item for this morning, is related to a conversion request from the City of Oakland Park.

And that is allowable under the second amendment. A city can formally request that design funding that was awarded in a particular fiscal year be converted to a construction phase of funding.

In this particular instance, the City of Oakland Park was recommended for design funding in what was Cycle 3, the MPO's Cycle 3 process, which was actually programming projects into the fiscal year 2027. So that was the new fifth year of the five-year plan last year.

City of Oakland Park reached out to us, indicated that they did not need the design funding, that they would prefer to have the \$471,000 programmed as construction funding.

And we are commending that conversion request.

And we do have an individual from the City of Oakland Park here to speak to you briefly if you all have any questions.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Good morning.

MR. CZERNIEJEWSKI: Good morning. Eric Czerniejewski with the Corradino Group, representing Oakland Park.

I don't have any additional from what Gretchen mentioned. So it's just a conversion request from design to construction, since design's taken care of at this point already.

MS. CASSINI: So Eric here -- is just here for questions.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Just for questions?

MS. CASSINI: Yeah.

MR. CZERNIEJEWSKI: Uh-huh.

CHAIR COOLMAN: How did you fund the design?

MR. CZERNIEJEWSKI: It was incorporated into the city's budget prior to, I think, the award of the prior funding.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Do we know what the cost for the construction is?

MR. CZERNIEJEWSKI: I can, you know, cross check --

CHAIR COOLMAN: In other words, how much of this 471 is going to cover the construction?

MS. CASSINI: Very little. This is another project that is heavily leveraged by other funding sources. We're going to talk about that a lot today.

But I'll let Eric give you the specifics.

MR. CZERNIEJEWSKI: The -- in the 20 -- in the past -- in the past budget, there was a little over a million dollars, I think, in 2025 that was outlined for construction. I don't have the exact number. I can look that up. But it's just over a million for construction.

MS. CASSINI: I think you have someone behind you that might have the exact numbers.

MR. CZERNIEJEWSKI: Hey, Brynt. Yeah.

MR. JOHNSON: Hello. Hi, good morning. Brynt Johnson, Director of Engineering and Building Services for the City of Oakland Park.

To answer your question, the construction costs are around a little

over \$2,000,000.

The other funding is coming by way of the MPO.

We originally applied for this project as a CSLIP, and, of course, the CSLIP got converted to a local agency program also known as LAP.

So we're getting funding from there, and we are also getting funding from another grant that we were awarded.

And so this will help cover the remaining cost that we need to complete the project.

CHAIR COOLMAN: So, oversimplified, the construction project is 2,000,000. You're using 471,000,000 of surtax dollars that were originally for design that you've already paid for. So we're leveraging 75 percent, right?

I -- I can't see no reason to approve something like this. Anyone else want to comment on that?

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: I'd like to make a **motion** we approve this project.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Second, please?

MR. FRAZIER: Second.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Any other questions or comments before we vote?

All in favor?

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

CHAIR COOLMAN: Any opposed?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIR COOLMAN: Unanimously approved.

Thank you very much.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you. I appreciate it.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you for all the work you've done.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Thank you for all the work you've done on this.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Yes. And for leveraging.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

MS. CASSINI: Now we have a special recognition and award presentation by our Chair and our Vice Chair.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Uh-oh.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Oh, boy, good.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Mr. Hooper, you're going to have to get off the computer.

MR. HOOPER: Really?

(Laughter.)

CHAIR COOLMAN: Yes, Alan.

MS. CASSINI: You're on deck.

CHAIR COOLMAN: What can I say? I -- I'd better read this, because I might get too emotional and ad lib too many things in.

As the first Chair, Alan Hooper has served the Transportation Surtax Oversight Board with persistence and demonstrated his commitment and leadership as we navigated the beginnings of a 30-year plan.

Guess what I'm doing? I'm reading the wrong one.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR COOLMAN: Ah. This is called the Alan Hooper Award.

MR. HOOPER: Oh, my goodness gracious.

CHAIR COOLMAN: As the first Chair, Alan Hooper has served the Transportation Surtax Oversight Board for the first -- for the last four years with persistence, and demonstrated his commitment and leadership as we navigated the beginning of a 30-yr, \$16,000,000,000 plan.

Mr. Hooper has contributed valuable insights and thought-stirring -- a thought-stirring perspective.

On behalf of Broward County residents, small -- small business owners, and MAP Broward staff alike.

We acknowledge and appreciate the time he has dedicated to this program, especially being the first to take on such a large-scale endeavor.

Mr. Hooper stepped up to the challenge and led the board with thoughtfulness, offering recommendations based on his vast experience with the private sector in construction management.

Alan was an asset to the Oversight Board and Chair and will continue

to be a regular member of the board. And we -- and we do and will not take his involvement for granted as a -- as the board is better for it.

Now join us in honoring the first Chair of the Independent Transportation Surtax Board, Mr. Alan Hooper.

(Applause.)

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

CHAIR COOLMAN: You've got to turn your microphone on, but Anthea may want to add --

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Mr. Chair, if -- if I could just --

CHAIR COOLMAN: -- something.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: -- add something.

MR. HOOPER: You should have roasted me.

(Laughter.)

MR. HOOPER: You shouldn't be saying nice things about me.

MS. CASSINI: She's about to.

MR. HOOPER: You should be roasting me.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: You know, I -- I -- I just wanted to add something. And -- and -- and you said it all, basically, Doug.

But, you know, I admire you so much as a leader. You are brilliant at doing this job, considering our beginnings, and just trying to figure out how to move forward. You did an excellent job.

I love the fact that you're so compassionate to the needs of the people in our community and that you're thoughtful.

Every step of the way, you've been thoughtful in how you've executed our mission.

And more than anything else, I love the fact that you are so extraordinarily courageous. Courageous to have taken the mantle in the first place, but just really pushing all of us to be our best and to be thoughtful and not to ever rubber stamp just because.

So I'm grateful to you for your leadership. And thank you for being my friend on the board.

MR. HOOPER: Wow.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Alan, before you --

(Applause.)

CHAIR COOLMAN: -- I guess we -- we -- we can hear your comments --

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Yes.

CHAIR COOLMAN: -- and maybe we should before we give you this, because we might not want to, but --

(Laughter.)

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, let me just say something. So, first of all, that -- I did not wake up this morning thinking -- it's my wife's birthday, not mine.



Okay?

But -- but thank you so much.

And I've got to say, though, and -- and I've told this to people at other boards I'm -- I'm a member of, other groups that I'm involved with, and I think Doug has heard it before at -- at some of the -- at the Broward Workshop, this board, this group of people, you guys are -- are super committed, and we put our time in on behalf of the community.

And -- and it wasn't just me. It -- Phil and all you guys, all you guys, are so concerned with the -- with the well-being of the -- of the community.

And the reason we sit here and do this and the hours of it is because we care.

The other thing that's very important to point out is that our -- the folks that are running this organization also stepped into something that was brand new, right? And it's being done very well.

And the professionals at the County, and the engineers, and the attorneys and the -- and management, the people that are managing for us, it -- I mean, we come here and we do this, but for the other 60 days until our next meeting, there's a lot of work that's being done.

So I'm very proud to sit on this board with you guys, and I always have been. But it's not just -- come on, come on. Maybe I'm the mouth talking --  
(Laughter.)

MR. HOOPER: -- and now we've got Doug over here that talks, so we'll be giving him an award at some point.

But, really, it -- it's all of us. And -- and -- and I -- I really believe that. I -- I was -- I'm very proud to sit on this board with you guys, because you guys are all really committed people.

So thank you very much.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIR COOLMAN: Alan, over here. I guess you should read this.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Oh.

MR. HOOPER: Let's not read any more stuff.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Yeah.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Oh, it's pretty short.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Oh, it just says MAP Broward Mobility Advancement Program brought to you by the Penny For Transportation recognizes the outstanding contributions of Alan C. Hooper, first Independent Transportation Surtax Oversight Board Chair, from 2019 to 2023.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: That's one.

MR. HOOPER: All right. Okay.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Now, how do I --

MR. HOOPER: Should we take a picture --

CHAIR COOLMAN: -- get into this?

MR. HOOPER: -- with each other?

CHAIR COOLMAN: We will. We have something else.

MR. HOOPER: Oh, my goodness.

CHAIR COOLMAN: We need a little Executive Director help.

MS. CASSINI: I've got it. Let me assist.

MR. HOOPER: Wow. Very nice. Oh, that's so cool.

MS. CASSINI: Right?

MR. HOOPER: Wow. You don't --

MS. CASSINI: For your office.

MR. HOOPER: Wow. Very nice.

CHAIR COOLMAN: I think you should be part of the picture.

MR. HOOPER: Definitely.

(Picture taken.)

MR. HOOPER: Thank you. Thanks, everybody.

(Applause.)

**ADJOURN**

CHAIR COOLMAN: Are we ready to open another meeting?

MS. CASSINI: We're ready to adjourn this one and then we'll open up the next one.

MR. ALLEN: **Move** to adjourn.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Second?

MS. MADDEN: Second.

CHAIR COOLMAN: All in favor?

Anyone opposed.

Meeting adjourned at 10:30.

(The meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.)