

**MINUTES**  
**INDEPENDENT SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD**  
**APPOINTING AUTHORITY**

**January 6, 2023**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Mr. Randall Vitale, designee of the Broward Workshop, Chair

Mr. Sidney Calloway, designee of the Urban League of Broward County

Dr. Colin Polsky, FAU Center for Environmental Studies, via telephone

Mr. Dan Lindblade, designee of the Broward County Council of Chambers

Ms. Monica Cepero, County Administrator

The Honorable Jack Seiler, designee of the Broward League of Cities

Mr. Filipe Pinzon, designee of Hispanic Unity, via Zoom

**Members Absent:**

**Also Present:**

Gretchen Cassini, Assistant County Administrator, Board Coordinator, MAP

Broward

Angela Wallace, County Attorney's Office

Roy Burnett, Administrative Coordinator, MAP Broward

Tashauna Wilson, Public Information Specialist

Erdal Donmez, applicant

Miriam Brighton, The Laws Group

A meeting of the Independent Surtax Oversight Committee Appointing Authority was held in Room 430, Governmental Center, 115 S. Andrews Avenue, Fort Lauderdale, Florida at 10:30 a.m. Friday, January 6, 2023.

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

**CALL TO ORDER - CHAIR, RANDALL VITALE**

CHAIR VITALE: So good morning, everyone. It is 10:32, Friday, January 6<sup>th</sup>. We'll call this meeting to order.

**ROLL CALL - ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR, ROY BURNETT**

CHAIR VITALE: If we can start with the roll call, please.

MR. BURNETT: Good morning, everybody.

Randall Vitale?

CHAIR VITALE: Present.

MR. BURNETT: Sidney Calloway.

MR. CALLOWAY: Present.

MR. BURNETT: Monica Cepero.

MS. CEPERO: Present.

MR. BURNETT: Thank you.

Dr. Colin Polsky

DR. POLSKY: Present.

MR. BURNETT: Thank you.

Jack Seiler is present and will join us in a few minutes.

Dan Lindblade.

MR. LINDBLADE: Present.

MR. BURNETT: Thank you.

And Felipe Pinzon is on Zoom. Mr. Pinzon, if you can indicate that

you're present.

MR. PINZON: Present. Yeah.

MR. BURNETT: Thank you, Mr. Pinzon.

We have a quorum.

Thank you.

CHAIR VITALE: Great. Thank you.

Welcome to Felipe, who is not with us in person. We are thrilled to have you on the Appointing Authority, and look forward to seeing you in person at a -- at a future --

MR. PINZON: Thank you.

CHAIR VITALE: -- meeting.

He is the president and CEO of Hispanic Unity.

And would you like to say anything to introduce yourself, since this is your first meeting with us?

MR. PINZON: Thank you so much. I'm sorry that I'm -- I'm not there with you guys. I'm under the weather.

But it's just an honor to be part of this group. And, again, yes, Filipe Pinzon. I'm CEO and president of Hispanic Unity of Florida, a non-profit that serves the immigrant community in Broward County, south Florida, and helps them to become self-sufficient, productive, and civically engaged.

Thank you.

CHAIR VITALE: Great. Thank you. And, again, welcome.

So we are -- hopefully, everyone had a chance to review. We're together again here to do our Appointing Authority business, and everyone had a chance to review all the material that was provided.

## **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

CHAIR VITALE: I would like to start by asking if there's any public participation that we are aware of. Okay.

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

CHAIR VITALE: Seeing none, if you go to the meeting agenda, we have two discussion items and three action items.

### **1 – OVERSIGHT BOARD MEMBERS' SURVEY AND FEEDBACK -**

#### **CHAIR RANDALL VITALE**

CHAIR VITALE: And for the discussion items, I'd like to share some feedback -- and this is more for discussion purposes, and if anyone has anything you'd like to share, I really want there to be discussion.

So I -- at the last meeting, we shared if anyone wanted to go ahead and reach out to Oversight Board members who had asked to be reappointed.

I went ahead and reached out to all of the Oversight Board members who were asking to be reappointed and got some feedback.

And I was trying to think of a way to incorporate something that was

more objective, other than attendance, which we knew was a good objective measure, and I didn't really come up with something very well -- good.

So I just did an informal survey. Most of it was feedback, and I'm going to share some of the feedback with you all now.

And I did ask all of them these four questions and had them rate, on a scale of one to five, with five being exceeds -- exceeds expectations and one being does not meet expectations.

And I'm going to give you the average for these four questions.

Have the meetings met your expectations? And, again, this is an average of all the Oversight Board members who are asking to be reappointed.

They gave that a 4.6.

Is your time well spent? Which we all know there's a lot of time invested on the Oversight Board members.

A 5.0 out of five.

Do you feel like you're making a difference? 4.6.

And is staff meeting your needs? Again, 4.6.

So the feedback was overwhelmingly positive as far as their time invested, the amount of work that they're being asked to contribute, and the support they're receiving from staff.

I felt the -- the time well spent was really the most important question,

because it's a huge commitment they're asking with really no, you know, opportunity to benefit in any way, by design.

And for all of them to give a five out of a scale of one to five, I felt was, you know, a really good sign.

Some other comments and ideas -- I had some open-ended questions, as well, for all of the members. And here's the bullet points as I kind of was able to gather them.

One, attendance is key, and reinforcing -- reinforcing the importance of doing the homework in advance of the meeting, especially as it relates to their respective disciplines.

So if you're, you know, the environmental services person and there's something that comes up regarding environmental services, the expectation is, you know, you will have done that.

Overall, they were very happy with the work that was done, but, you know, just kind of consistently reinforcing that, because there is a lot of backup material.

Staggering the terms so there's no loss of institutional knowledge. Right now, we have four-year terms, and we're going to be reappointing for four-year terms.

So the idea, as many other boards have, is to have, you know, a one-year term or a two-year term or a three-year term so that there's a -- a

frequent roll-off and -- and onboarding of new members so that no -- at one point, there's not a huge institutional loss -- loss.

So if at any time you guys want to stop me with any of these questions, just kind of raise your hand and -- and -- and let me know. Otherwise, we'll just -- I'll just roll through these and then we can have a discussion.

For those who come on as new members, that there should be an expectation that there is going to be a steep learning curve.

You know, those who are on the board have already been doing it for four years. There's been a lot of ramp-up.

And when there is a new member that is going to be joining, we should plan -- or the staff and the -- the County should plan that there will be a learning curve involved there.

And then, finally, succession -- under this bullet point, succession planning with a longer runway for new Oversight Board members.

So if we know that in two years, if we decide -- however the County decides to change and have staggered terms, or one-year or three-years, do some recruiting many, many months in advance so that there can be an onboarding and potentially have that individual attend meetings in advance of them being appointed so that the learning curve can be smoothed out a little bit.

So just planning for succession with recruitment of new Oversight Board members.

Next -- next comment is continue to try and increase public engagement.

This can be done in a number of ways, and I was -- maybe Jack can -- can share his experience. There's something called telephone Town Hall meetings, which the City of Fort Lauderdale did -- Dan, you'll recall some of those when we were doing the visioning plan for the City of Fort Lauderdale - - which is an outbound dialing of the numbers in the database. And people just kind of pick up their phone and say, hi, this is, you know, the Mayor of Fort Lauderdale or the Oversight Board Chair or County Administrator, and we're doing a telephone Town Hall meeting to solicit input on projects, or to get feedback on issues that are coming up.

And it seemed like it was a very effective way to have -- you know, every time that the City of Fort Lauderdale was doing it and we were doing it for this project, to get hundreds and hundreds of -- of residents to weigh in on topics.

And so you could vote. They'd ask a question. You could vote. Press one, press two, press three. And all of that would be gathered in real time.

And so just continuing the public engagement aspect.

It doesn't need to be telephone Town Hall meetings, obviously, but

that's just an example of what -- what could be done.

Other comments were -- around public engagement, more pulse taking from other groups, business groups, community groups, neighborhood groups. And also, you know, just continuing to engage at a high level with the County Commission so that perhaps there's a -- a County Commission champion, a Commissioner who's a champion for the Oversight Board, or two.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR VITALE: He went the other way.

And so, you know, that's just a potential takeaway, Monica, for you or for Gretchen or whomever, that having a County Commissioner or two or three, whatever makes sense, be a champion for the Oversight Board as they liaise as frequently as possible with them on -- on issues.

Jack, we are on Discussion Item 1, and I was just going over some of the comments that I got in my informal interviews with the Oversight Board members who are asking to be reappointed.

More frequent and more visible PR, especially when there is something to share.

And so, you know, having projects or things that are exciting and do have some sizzle, making sure that those projects and that word does get out.

Having a crisis communication plan. And I -- I -- during my briefing with Gretchen, I shared this with her, and she had mentioned to me that the County and the Oversight Board, through the County, has access to this already, but, you know, just making sure that the Oversight Board is aware of that so if there are things that come up, you're immediately in a position to respond to whatever crisis communication plan that is needed.

The ability to hire -- hire legal counsel to represent the Oversight Board on an as-needed basis.

And, obviously, we have great support from the County and Angela and her team as it relates to legal support, but the feeling was sometime there may be issues that come up that they would want to have the flexibility, as an Oversight Board, to hire independent legal counsel that is not part of the County's attorney -- the County Attorney Office -- if I'm saying that correctly -- on an as-needed basis.

And just in general, there was a feeling of, you know, it's an exciting time, Oversight Board, we want to just create urgency and have a sense of urgency on getting projects through the system.

You know, we're a few years in already, and we've had some -- some great wins, but there's a lot of money to be deployed, and everyone on the Oversight Board felt like -- that I spoke with who said let's just continue to act with urgency.

So those were the themes and the comments and ideas that were shared with me.

I was really pleased with the feedback I got from the Oversight Board members.

And all were, you know, thankful for the opportunity to serve, and all were thankful for being reconsidered.

Again, they had all raised their hand to say, yes, we would like to be reconsidered for appointment --

MR. LINDBLADE: Not all of them.

CHAIR VITALE: Everyone I spoke to.

MR. LINDBLADE: Oh, okay.

CHAIR VITALE: Yeah. And there was a couple who did not seek reappointment for -- for different reasons.

So any discussion around any of those topics?

MR. SEILER: Of course, I want to ask on the legal -

MR. LINDBLADE: Use the microphone.

MR. SEILER: -- sorry. Just on that comment about the legal counsel, was there a specific issue that came up that they indicated they would like to have their own legal counsel, or did -- was it just a general discussion?

CHAIR VITALE: So, to me, it was a general discussion. I know -- I believe. I haven't attended those meetings -- that there was -- has been

Oversight Board issue -- issues at Oversight Board meetings, is that right, that have come up where that has come up?

MS. WALLACE: There's been an issue with regard to the eligibility of standalone sidewalk projects --

CHAIR VITALE: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: -- and there was at least one particular Oversight Board member who wants us to fund standalone side -- sidewalk projects, and that -- that was an issue.

CHAIR VITALE: So as it relates to my conversation with them, we didn't go into that level of detail. It was more high level, when things come up, we would like to be able to have the flexibility to hire an attorney to represent that interest.

MR. SEILER: The only thing -- just as a follow up to that, the only thing that concerns me about that is trying to be most efficient. We -- you have County staff, and unless the issue was a conflict between the board and County staff, which then I think then you may want to give them that flexibility to resolve that.

But if it's just that, hey, we don't agree with some opinion we've gotten from the County staff that doesn't raise a conflict, I don't think they should have separate counsel.

I think, you know, you've got the resources here. You've got a good

team of lawyers at the County, I think one of the best county teams anywhere -- you know, anywhere in the state.

I'd hate to see us start bringing in legal counsel, billing that to the -- this fund, and then, all of a sudden, it's -- you know, we're -- we're diverting resources from transportation projects.

So that would just be my thought on that.

CHAIR VITALE: Please.

MS. CEPERO: So I -- I tend to agree, Jack, with you.

I will say that, you know, the County Attorney's Office, if they -- they feel there is a need for an outside counsel for -- and we do this in other areas of the government, at times, then they always have that ability to go and request that of the Commission.

And at that point, it would probably come to the Oversight Board, because it would be from that same source of funds.

So that's -- I think that authority kind of already exists if they feel they need additional resources within the County Attorney's Office.

MR. SEILER: Got ya.

CHAIR VITALE: (Inaudible.)

MR. CALLOWAY: Mr. Chair, I also tend to agree with both Jack and -- and Monica on this issue.

I would ask the question of perhaps Angela and Gretchen -- and Jack

mentioned, you know, a scenario relating to a conflict of interest.

Are there areas in the nature of the mission of the board that would surface a -- or -- or trigger some level of a potential conflict of interest between the County Attorney's Office and the board?

MS. WALLACE: No. Not that I can think of.

So the board's responsibilities are to review projects for statutory eligibility and -- you know, and are to consider the -- the ordinance says, the opinion, the legal opinion, of the Surtax General Counsel, and they monitor project progress thereafter.

So once the project is determined eligible and the County Commission actually funds the project, the Oversight Board monitors the progress of the project delivery.

So there are no legal issues that would present a conflict in the County Attorney's Office advising the Oversight Board with regard to statutory eligibility of projects, which is their only function prior to monitoring project delivery. They only have those two functions.

MR. CALLOWAY: And perhaps also -- Mr. Chair, I'm sorry -- perhaps also compliance with the statutory regime for the surtax fund.

MS. WALLACE: Right. And so -- and responsibility for administering the surtax funding is the County's statutory responsibility.

The County levied the surtax. The County created the Oversight

Board by ordinance. And only the County Commission allocates funding.

So it is the -- the County Commission's legal obligation to ensure statutory compliance.

And, you know, we can't have -- it would -- it would not be advisable to have someone come in and provide an alternate opinion that conflicts with the County Attorney's Office, which is responsible for representing the County and ensuring the County's legal compliance.

Mr. CALLOWAY: Yeah. So, again, Mr. Chair, so I -- I agree with Jack's overall assessment that the County Attorney's Office is responsible for legal opinions on eligibility, ultimately, and compliance with the statutory regime for this.

And so to the extent that there are other differing opinions, I just don't think there's -- there's room for inviting the board to have access to a -- another legal opinion.

I -- I just think the County's opinion is where it should stop.

MS. WALLACE: And if I may, the Charter makes the County Attorney responsible for representing the County Commission, County staff, and County-created boards.

So it's a Charter issue, and that would be up to the County Attorney. Like the County Administrator indicated, the County Attorney has the ability to seek and retain outside counsel to represent the County or a County board.

I don't think that a County board, in and of itself, has the ability to do that.

MR. CALLOWAY: As well -- Mr. Chair, excuse me -- the County Attorney also has an ethical responsibility for determining the extent to which they can represent a client without, again, impinging on ethical concerns as well.

So, again, I -- I think Jack's point is well taken.

CHAIR VITALE: Okay. Thank you all for your comments.

Is there anyone else who would like to comment on any of the other topics?

Again, these are not recommendations from me. These are kind of a flow-through of the communication that I received from -- from the Oversight Board members in my interviews.

Yeah.

MR. CALLOWAY: Mr. Chair, just one other subject. You mentioned the survey of the members seeking reappointment.

I think it also would be a good idea to survey the entire board, but particularly to survey members of the board who are exiting to, again, give us some indication as to whether or not we think we can do something better or that we may hear something that may be important out of those conversations, as well.

CHAIR VITALE: I -- I agree. I attempted to, and was unsuccessful between -- I started meeting with folks in November --

MR. CALLOWAY: Yeah.

CHAIR VITALE: -- and have not been able to connect with one of them. And then one, I know, is not able to.

MS. CASSINI: So I will share with you that one member, for medical reasons, is unable to continue serving and needed to move out of state, which made her ineligible to continue serving.

The other member was retiring and also moving and made her ineligible to continue serving.

MR. CALLOWAY: Yeah.

CHAIR VITALE: Yeah, still -- I still wanted to speak to them to get the feedback, as well --

MR. CALLOWAY: The feedback.

CHAIR VITALE: -- I agree.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. CEPERO: Yeah, like an exit -- an exit interview kind of thing, right.

CHAIR VITALE: Right.

MS. CEPERO: Yeah. So I think -- yeah, Mr. Calloway, I agree, you know, to -- to think about an exit interview, like when someone leaves

employment, you know, what -- what they -- their thoughts are in general.

I had a comment.

So -- so, first of all, thank you for doing that. I think that -- that's helpful information for all of us to know.

So thanks for taking the time to do that.

As a -- as a follow up to that, apart from you sharing this with us, what kind of happens to these suggestions? Is that something that is for us to opine or have a recommendation on all of these, or just by nature of this discussion we -- we're expressing what our thoughts are? And does it ultimately go back to the board and then they ask for it of the Commission, or -- or back to me? Is -- I mean, procedurally, how does that kind of work?

CHAIR VITALE: Yeah, that's for us to decide.

MS. CEPERO: Okay.

CHAIR VITALE: So we didn't have -- we don't have a precedent, right? And then we didn't have this feedback.

Now we have some feedback. So I briefed Gretchen on these items, as well. And so the Oversight Board, obviously, can bring this up at any time at any of their meetings.

I think some of these items, in -- in particular, the -- the terms and staggering of terms, is a -- is a takeaway. I don't know that it needs to be a recommendation on how that should be done from us, but either just through

you or through Gretchen or Angela, you know, that's a discussion that should at least be had.

I think it would be a disservice to not consider --

MS. CEPERO: Right.

CHAIR VITALE: -- the term limits and -- not the term limits, excuse me, the term staggering so that there isn't a big drop off, because the Oversight Board would, I think, lose a lot of institutional knowledge if you had five, six people drop at the same time.

MS. CEPERO: Sure. And it makes sense to me.

You know, Angela, I'll -- I'll ask you. How -- how would that type of recommendation or proposal -- you know, what would be the proper format to take that under consideration?

MS. WALLACE: We would need a motion to direct our office to revise the ordinance to address the -- the terms.

I think we -- we will be bringing -- putting one forth based upon the next discussion item, the one position --

CHAIR VITALE: The categorical, yeah.

MS. WALLACE: -- yeah. And the -- that one category that needs to be addressed in the ordinance.

So along with that, simultaneously, we could address the staggering of terms and when that would begin.

All of them started the same term because there was -- it was a newly created --

MS. CEPERO: Sure.

MS. WALLACE: -- board, but prospectively, how that would -- how staggering would be addressed could be addressed in an ordinance revision brought before the County Commission.

MS. CEPERO: Thank you.

So the proper format would be through our County Commission process, and then it seems to me that we certainly can have an -- an opinion amongst -- as the Appointing Authority, but I think also should probably come from -- from the Oversight Board, as well, themselves.

I know you said you got some feedback. I don't know if that was one or five or, you know, what have you.

But I don't know how we feel here. But I would be comfortable with engaging in that conversation further.

Clearly, we can't talk amongst ourselves unless we're here, so I'm -- I'm glad we're having that conversation now.

I'd like to know if anyone else feels the same.

CHAIR VITALE: Yeah. Yes.

MS. CEPERO: I mean, I think it's -- it seems reasonable.

MR. LINDBLADE: Yeah, I've worked with both ways, and it's much

easier when you have staggered terms, for the point you're making, Mr. Chair.

So I would be in support of that.

CHAIR VITALE: Yeah, I see nodding of heads.

MR. SEILER: Yeah, I also agree.

MR. CALLOWAY: Yeah, I agree.

Mr. Chair, the Administrator's comments also at least raised in my mind can -- if this Appointing Authority, the level or the scope of our mission and -- and -- and authority, does it include these subjects?

CHAIR VITALE: I think it would just be making the recommendation --

MR. CALLOWAY: Recommendation?

CHAIR VITALE: -- so that --

MR. CALLOWAY: Yeah.

CHAIR VITALE: -- the County Administrator and the County Commission could get some feedback to say, well, how did the Appointing Authority feel about that.

So I don't believe it's within our power to make more than a --

MR. CALLOWAY: Right.

CHAIR VITALE: -- a recommendation.

MR. CALLOWAY: Right. Well, I certainly think it would be good for us to at least recommend.

CHAIR VITALE: Okay.

MS. CEPERO: Well, as the Administrator, I hear the feedback.

(Laughter.)

MS. CEPERO: And -- and I guess we could talk with the Oversight Board Chair or what have you and see if it's something that might be appropriate to include in the -- an ordinance proposal.

CHAIR VITALE: Yeah. So it came up a couple of times in the interviews.

I didn't have any leading questions, so I wasn't asking specifically like how do you feel about this or how to you feel about that.

But at -- at least two, I believe three, people brought it up and said, I'm happy to serve another four years. I would hate for there to be a huge drop off after that point if all of us, you know, dropped off at the same time.

MS. CEPERO: You don't want to do it forever?

(Laughter.)

CHAIR VITALE: So far, not yet.

Any other discussion or feedback on the comments from the board?

MR. SEILER: Thanks for doing that.

MS. CEPERO: Yeah.

CHAIR VITALE: Sure. My pleasure.

## **2 – OVERSIGHT BOARD CATEGORY, DIRECTOR OF THE BROWARD**

**COLLEGE OFFICE OF SUPPLIER RELATIONS AND DIVERSITY; PER ARTICLE V, SECTION 31 ½ - 75(d): “TERM OF OVERSIGHT BOARD MEMBERS. THE DIRECTOR OF THE BROWARD COLLEGE OFFICE OF SUPPLIER RELATIONS AND DIVERSITY SHALL SERVE FOR AS LONG AS HE OR SHE IS EMPLOYED IN THAT POSITION.”**

CHAIR VITALE: Okay. The next discussion item, Discussion Item Number 2, has to do with the Oversight Board category Director of Broward College Office of Supplier Relations and Diversity.

So this was the only seat, you may recall, on the Oversight Board that was specifically called out by a job function.

Everyone else had to apply based on the discipline and then was appointed by this body.

This specific role was -- this specific seat was --the person who is sitting in the chair with that job title at Broward College was the person who was appointed.

I'm going to hand it over to Gretchen to give a little history as to what's occurred since their last appointment.

MS. CASSINI: So since -- I think it was late 2021, we were advised that the individual that was in that position had been appointed to a new job, but she was still going to have some of the previous job functions, but that the new job -- sorry, '22. '22. The -- some of the job functions would

continue, but, for the most part, it was going to be a new position.

And then I think both Randall and myself and Angela even spoke with the general counsel for Broward College to try to get a better understanding of whether or not this position still existed, whether or not this job title was going to continue to exist. If somebody else was going to be placed in that job title, would they be the designee or would they want -- because they -- they have the opportunity to designate someone. Would they be designating the existing person?

And over the course of a -- a few months, it became clear that the position is not likely going to be filled. And so we are in a -- kind of a quandary as to what to do.

The individual would like to continue to serve. A very active member of the Oversight Board.

And so we just need to try to get some direction from you all about how best to go forward.

CHAIR VITALE: So I think the -- the comment that's important is Anthea, who's the -- the woman who is in the role, does want to continue to serve.

It's my understanding that Broward College wants her to continue to serve.

However, we're now out of alignment here, because the position is

one that is called out by job title.

And so, as Angela was referencing, there is probably going to need to be a County Commission item to address this in some capacity.

And so we'd like for this group to discuss what that recommendation could be to the County.

Dan?

MR. LINDBLADE: Can you remind me the thought process about putting this position on the authority?

CHAIR VITALE: It was handed to us. So I don't know the background.

When we were appointed to the Appointing Authority, it was already in the (inaudible).

MR. LINDBLADE: I understand that, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR VITALE: I don't (inaudible).

MR. LINDBLADE: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR VITALE: Why doesn't the County Commission provide us the background on it?

MS. CEPERO: Yeah, let's -- I think Gretchen might be --

MS. CASSINI: There was a --

MS. CEPERO: -- able to do that.

MS. CASSINI: -- a Commissioner at the time that felt that supplier

diversity and relations was a key component.

It was the same Commissioner that placed a 30 percent small business goal on the entire program over all eligible projects.

So those things were tied together. The idea of having a 30 percent CBE goal and having someone consistently on the Oversight Board that was kind of the champion for small businesses and supplier diversity were married, I think, in that particular Commissioner's mind.

And that is why the individual job title was selected and not a categorical appointment.

MR. LINDBLADE: Mr. Chair, then I understand. Thank you.

So I think Broward College is a -- an important entity to have on the oversight, so I'd be in favor of allowing President Haile to recommend someone if everyone agrees.

I -- I don't think that this -- any singular position, because titles change, people move. I think that's not the right way to handle it, from my perspective.

CHAIR VITALE: Thank you. Jack?

MR. SEILER: Yeah, to -- to Dan's point, I -- I think, to me, it's obvious why the position exists is that, you know, we're all trying to focus on making sure we're giving equal opportunity. And that applies to both, you know, supply, production, contracting, subcontracting.

To Dan's point, though, I -- you know, I don't know if it makes sense to make it a designated individual within Broward College that represents that interest and maybe do it that way, or the flip side might be to say a public, you know, institution of higher learning's designated representative from this.

So maybe FAU might, within Broward, might have an opportunity to do that.

But I do think it's important that that focus on supplier relations and diversity remain, because it would be, I think, a terrible message.

I mean, I know -- I think the Commissioner that put this in is no longer on the Commission, as I understand, but I do think the importance of what was put in place needs to remain.

So I would be happy either doing what Dan said, letting the President of Broward College, whoever that may be, you know, appoint or designate somebody as the official for supplier relations and diversity, and that position is with the -- appointed, you know, with the Authority, or, B, we identify any public institution within Broward County and that designated position so that, you know, maybe if there's not the right person to place at Broward College, we could go to FAU, or we could go to some other institution.

But, you know, I do think we should not move away from the importance of that position.

CHAIR VITALE: Okay. Thank you, Jack.

Colin?

DR. POLSKY: So building on that, I'm wondering, I recall a lot of discussion around conflicts and these people couldn't serve unless they were clearly not conflicted and were committed to not being conflicted.

So whether it's BC or other local public institutions, was there a provision made to get around that?

Because otherwise, it seems like difficult to accomplish.

MS. WALLACE: Yes, there's an exception for colleges and governmental entities and so forth that have -- so applicants from -- who are employees of those entities can -- or constitutional officers -- can serve on the Oversight Board.

There was a revision to the ordinance that provided for that, because the County does have contracts with most of the institutions of higher learning and, you know, there was an issue with regard to one of the Oversight Board members who wanted employment with one of the constitutional officers, and the revision to the ordinance provided the ability to do that.

Because there's no actual conflict when you're serving in the -- those -  
- one of those capacities, so it was revised.

MR. CALLOWAY: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR VITALE: Sure. Your mic.

MR. CALLOWAY: Mr. Chair, I also believe that the matter pertaining to supplier relations and diversity should continue to be a key component of this particular position.

I also agree, again, with -- with both Dan and Jack in saying that the simple solution for me would be to pass the -- or recommend to the County Commission that they revise the ordinance to allow this appointment to be made by the President of Broward College or a appointment by the college president of someone, again, with skill or experience related to supplier relations and diversity.

And I think the president can find his way from there.

CHAIR VITALE: Okay. Monica?

MS. CEPERO: So I appreciate all the comments, and -- and I'm going to take a little bit from each of you, because as -- I thought I had a -- a really good thought, and then, as you guys all spoke, some other things came to mind that I thought would be worthy of conversation.

And, Filipe, please don't -- we haven't forgotten you, so if you want to chime in, we're going to let you do that. I want to make sure we hear from you, too.

But --

MR. PINZON: Okay.

MS. CEPERO: -- as I sit here and recall how we got this position on

the board, you know, I think we'd be restraining ourselves by just calling it for one college or university, or even a public institution -- public college, because we have some private institutions that may also be eligible.

When you look at governments, when we have -- you know, Angela, when you spoke about the exclusion or -- or the exceptions that we have in place, you know, who knows. What if there is a local government that has an Office of Small Business and Economic Development like we have that may have a lot of exposure or experience with supplier diversity or those types of groups.

I just don't want to limit ourselves. And I've just found that when you start limiting yourselves, we -- we constrain our -- the applicant pool that might be interested or -- or giving opportunities to folks to express some interest.

So, you know, to kind of hit all of this, I think if we -- you know, if we kind of think about it from the lens of maybe something like, and somebody with experience with supplier diversity, we still get all of that, but then those applicants can come to us and we do the same like we do with any other categorical type of appointment.

And it still can come from Broward College. It still could come from FAU or NSU or whoever, or a private institution or -- or a governmental entity.

I just think it gives us a broader reach and -- and still hitting that same

objective.

That's just some thoughts I had.

CHAIR VITALE: Jack?

MR. SEILER: Yeah, Monica, I don't disagree with you except for one thing.

The problem with using a city, for example, is it's an end -- it's a recipient of these funds in the -- the end game, which is what concerns me would be, you know, hypothetically, Coral Springs' Office of Supplier Diversity's person gets appointed, and all of a sudden Coral Springs is getting some disproportionate amount, and somebody says, you put on there a representative of a city that's a recipient.

So I don't mind broadening beyond Broward County to go into FAU or other -- I just don't think the Office of Supplier -- of Supplier Relations and Diversity should be someone that could be a recipient of the funds, because I don't think we want to create a conflict where one doesn't exist.

CHAIR VITALE: Angela wanted to comment on that.

MS. WALLACE: The ordinance already addresses that. So Broward County cities that are recipients -- so Broward MPO or municipalities in Broward County, their employees cannot -- they're not allowed to participate or -- or serve as members of the Oversight Board.

They're specifically excluded so that they can be a non-profit entity,

college, university, state agency, federal agency, or an independent constitutional office that has a conflict -- has a contract with the County but that -- that doesn't create a conflict of interest.

So the municipalities, since they are recipients of surtax funds, would have a conflict. And a -- and a municipal employee could not, is excluded under the ordinance --

MS. CEPERO: And --

MS. WALLACE: -- from participating on the Oversight Board.

MS. CEPERO: Thank you.

I just want to clarify. So what I was talking about was experience in that. So maybe they --

MR. SEILER: Got ya.

MS. CEPERO: -- formerly served in that. I -- I didn't --

MR. SEILER: I got that. All right.

MS. CEPERO: -- articulate that so -- but, anyway.

MR. SEILER: And I -- I think we're on the same page.

MS. CEPERO: Yeah, I just was talking about, you know, maybe they served in that role and now they don't. Like maybe Sandy, when he retires and he wants to do something. Who knows? Hopefully that never happens while I'm still here, because he's great.

MR. SEILER: Yeah, with that clarification, I'm -- I'm fine broadening it

a little bit, if it helps.

MR. CALLOWAY: Mr. Chair, I hear the point on this and -- and I -- I would be in favor of it with the only exception here, I think Broward College, I believe has been historically critical to the County's advance on some of these issues relating to supplier relations and diversity.

And I think that's probably part of the historic nature of why Broward College was selected, if you will, in the first place, or this position was -- was made as it was.

So I think there's value in maintaining that particular aspect of having this appointment be made by the President of Broward College.

And, again, particularly concerning their historic and increased activism as a college in this area throughout Broward County.

So, again, my sense would be -- my first position would be I'd like to maintain it as it is with the only exception is allowing the president to make that appointment.

CHAIR VITALE: Okay. Monica has a question.

MS. CEPERO: I have a question for our -- our counsel.

Would either of those changes allow the incumbent to continue to serve? Like if it's simply something as generic as experience with supplier diversity? Or if it's -- obviously, you know, simply states Broward College, obviously she's staying employed with them.

But I just want to know if either of those types of scenarios would -- would allow that incumbent to continue to serve.

MS. WALLACE: Yes, either would. So if -- if it's general and not specific to Broward College and open to any applicant with -- with relevant experience, the person could apply and be considered along with other applicants.

And if it becomes the designee or the person appointed by the President of Broward College, it would be up to the President of Broward College, but the president could appoint this person to continue to serve, if that were the change to the ordinance.

MS. CEPERO: Thank you.

CHAIR VITALE: Filipe, do you have any questions or comments on this topic?

MR. PINZON: I do not, no.

CHAIR VITALE: Okay. So this is really a discussion item. I think it's up to the County Commission.

So we can send a formal communication, or we can just leave it with Monica as having the incorporated the feedback.

I'm fine with whatever the group wants to do.

MS. CEPERO: Well, since there's some other opinions other than -- than what I had proposed, I think it would probably be appropriate for this

body to kind of vote. And that way, we can send an official communication to the Board.

Because that way, that can be, you know, the position that they can take under consideration to -- to change the -- the ordinance.

I mean, that's what I would feel comfortable with, because I'm only one of the votes here and -- and, given the nature of my position in my day job, I don't want to, you know, take too much liberty with that.

So I'd like to -- you know, I -- I will certainly express my vote when we -- we come to vote, but I think it's probably the appropriate course.

CHAIR VITALE: Agree. And --

MR. CALLOWAY: This is a vote to recommend -- I'm sorry, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR VITALE: Yes.

MS. CEPERO: Correct.

CHAIR VITALE: So if anyone would like to make any motion, it would be appropriate now.

Dan?

MR. LINDBLADE: Mr. Chair, so I would make a **motion** that we recommend to the County Commission that we modify Article V, Section 31 ½ - 75(d) --

CHAIR VITALE: Let's just call it Discussion --

MR. LINDBLADE: Oh --

CHAIR VITALE: -- Item 2.

MR. LINDBLADE: -- yeah. Yeah. Thank you.

(Laughter.)

MR. LINDBLADE: Thank you.

To state -- and you're going to have to clean it up, but to state that we allow -- or we recommend that they have someone in supplier diversity from Broward College and/or any other public entity -- public or private entity to submit their name.

That's a really bad motion, but you get the gist of --

CHAIR VITALE: See if I can --

MR. LINDBLADE: -- what I'm saying.

CHAIR VITALE: -- clarify that.

MR. LINDBLADE: Yeah. Thanks.

CHAIR VITALE: So I believe Dan was making a motion to make a recommendation to the County Commission that this Discussion Item 2 for the Oversight Board category be opened up or changed to incorporate someone with experience in supplier diversity, to include Broward College or any other public institution that would qualify.

MS. CASSINI: And I think --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. CASSINI: -- (inaudible) -- he did mention private. And -- and I

wanted to ask is this higher ed or is this any institution?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

MR. LINDBLADE: Well, my -- my intent, Mr. Chair, is that it's public and private higher education institutions.

CHAIR VITALE: Okay. So that is the motion.

Is there a second?

Okay. No second.

So would anyone else like to make a motion?

MR. SEILER: I'll make the same **motion**, but I'm going to say that it be -- it be someone from a institute of higher education, a public institute.

So I would think it would probably remain -- to Sidney's point, it would probably either be Broward or someone from FAU.

I don't think we need to add private in here. I think we have enough private appointments to this board. And I think it would look bad that we are moving away from the public good, and we will if Broward College -- and, again, to Sidney's point, he raised a really good point about the critical role Broward College has played, especially with the last two leaders there have been front and center on diversity and issues like that, social justice equity.

So I would take the motion and say that the Oversight Board member be appointed by a public institute of higher education as a designated official of supplier relations and diversity.

And that gives us a little more flexibility, to Monica's point, but I think it right now would probably then fall upon an -- a nomination from either Broward College or FAU.

CHAIR VITALE: Designated or has experience with?

MS. WALLACE: Right. That's my question.

MR. SEILER: I think the designated official, because I do think that allows -- here's my concern. If -- to Greg -- I'll use Greg Haile as an -- if Greg Haile says, look, I -- this is the person we've designated for supplier relations and diversity, and we go, yeah, but we don't want to use that, we want to go beyond your designee and say you've got someone on staff that has experience, I think part of working for a public institution is that public institution has designated someone to be their official on that.

So I would like that -- I think it's a compromise between what I heard and I -- I think that would work.

But I'm -- again, I'll make that motion.

CHAIR VITALE: Okay. I know, to clarify, there was a motion.

Gretchen had a comment.

MS. CASSINI: Well, really, I have a question.

CHAIR VITALE: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: And I think the question that I wanted to pose is if you open it to public institutions of higher education to have a designee, what if

FAU and Broward College both brought forth a designee, how -- how is --

MR. SEILER: We -- we select from them.

MS. WALLACE: So I think it's an application -- if I'm hearing correctly, it's an application process. And the category would be a person with experience in supplier diversity, right?

MR. SEILER: Correct.

MS. WALLACE: And -- and the application process would follow like the other categories. We have architect. We have construction management. We have former city or county manager. So it would be the category, and the -- we would have -- we would receive applications.

We'd follow the same application process for that category, and those applicants would be brought before this body for consideration and for appointment.

MR. SEILER: Or -- or --

MS. WALLACE: Is that --

MR. SEILER: -- or if not. If you think about it, I would suspect if -- you know, whether the President of FAU talks to the President of Broward College, says, you have somebody that's going to fill this role, you put that person forward.

I think we all want to see the person there now remain there. I think we've heard nothing but positive feedback.

But we should never make any rule or law or ordinance for any one individual.

So I think this gives us a little flexibility but probably ensures that we have some continuity.

MR. CALLOWAY: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR VITALE: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You've got a motion on the --

CHAIR VITALE: I was going to say, we have a motion.

MS. CEPERO: We need to second it.

MR. CALLOWAY: I understand. I'm just asking the proponent of the motion, Jack, if he will consider a amendment to that motion --

CHAIR VITALE: I think we need a second first.

MS. CEPERO: We need a second first, yeah.

MR. CALLOWAY: Okay. I'll second the motion.

CHAIR VITALE: Okay. So we have a second.

Sidney, now do you have --

MR. CALLOWAY: Yeah. I would just ask Jack if he would consider amending the motion to have the position be the president of the public education institution or his or her designee with training, skills, knowledge, and some prior relations in diversity.

MR. SEILER: That's acceptable.

CHAIR VITALE: Okay. So the motion has been amended with a friendly amendment.

Is it clear --

MS. CEPERO: No.

CHAIR VITALE: -- to the group? Okay. So let's clarify.

MS. CEPERO: I -- I want to -- I have a couple questions. So --

CHAIR VITALE: Okay.

MS. CEPERO: -- as I understand it, it would be the president of one of our public higher education institutions would either serve or appoint someone. That -- that someone would then be authorized by this Appointing Authority?

Because what if --

CHAIR VITALE: Would be eligible --

MS. CEPERO: -- if they don't come together --

CHAIR VITALE: -- would be eligible to be considered, is what I heard.

MS. CEPERO: Okay. So --

MR. SEILER: Yes.

MS. CEPERO: -- would be eligible to be considered.

So we could see -- I just want to make sure I understand. We could see ourselves as having to entertain two applications, one from President Haile or --

MR. CALLOWAY: Or --

MS. CEPERO: -- himself, or from -- and I'm sorry, I don't know who the President of FAU is.

DR. POLSKY: Interim.

MS. CEPERO: Interim. Okay. So but -- but I'm saying we could see ourselves, as an Appointing Authority -- I just want to make sure I understand --

MR. SEILER: We have that on every appointment.

CHAIR VITALE: Yeah.

MS. CEPERO: Right.

MR. CALLOWAY: Yeah.

MS. CEPERO: But --

MR. CALLOWAY: Yeah.

MS. CEPERO: -- to -- to --

CHAIR VITALE: That's --

MS. CEPERO: -- Sidney, your point earlier, you wanted -- you know, your original position was to have Greg himself choose. But now it could be Greg or someone or --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

MS. CEPERO: -- another president or their designee, as long as there's some sort of experience in supplier diversity.

MR. CALLOWAY: Yes, and -- and unless I hear, and I haven't heard that there was consensus around maintaining this position for the President of Broward College and/or his or her designee with skills, knowledge, and experience in supplier relations and diversity, my backup would be a -- the president of any public --

MS. CEPERO: Got it.

MR. CALLOWAY: -- education institution of higher education or his or her designee with experience, skill, or knowledge in supplier (inaudible).

MS. CEPERO: I -- I'm totally clear now. Thank you. And --

MR. CALLOWAY: Yes.

MS. CEPERO: -- I'm comfortable with that.

I -- I don't know if there's any other discussion, but I'm happy to -- to call for a vote. I don't know --

MR. SEILER: Actually, I think that's Randall calling a vote.

(Laughter.)

MS. CEPERO: I'm sorry. I meant make a motion for it to move forward --

CHAIR VITALE: So we have a motion and a second.

MS. CEPERO: -- ends discussion.

CHAIR VITALE: Any other discussion?

MR. LINDBLADE: Mr. Chair, I just want to clarify the private side of it.

So this excludes NSU from consideration, and that's why I included it originally.

CHAIR VITALE: I -- I understand. I believe the consensus was public or has been public.

MR. LINDBLADE: Correct. I'm just clarifying.

CHAIR VITALE: Yeah.

MR. SEILER: Just so we're clear, in full disclosure, I serve on the NSU Medical School Board, so I -- I do a lot with NSU. I have a lot of respect.

I just think we have to keep the transparency of a public institution, which is why I -- I mean, I think NSU's awesome.

But the other problem you're going to have, Dan, if we open it up to private, you're going to open it up to Keiser, you're going to open it up to Arizona School of Nursing, you're going to open it up to anyone of 15 -- Everglades, you know, that I -- I think it could create a really difficult situation with -- I mean, I think there are probably ten to 15 private universities in Broward County right now.

CHAIR VITALE: Okay. I think we have consensus.

Is there -- Sidney, is there anything else?

MR. CALLOWAY: Yeah, the other question now is we did say a public education institution of higher learning.

Are we saying with geographic headquarters in Broward County?

MR. SEILER: How about a geographic presence in Broward County.

MR. CALLOWAY: Okay.

MR. SEILER: Not headquarters.

MR. CALLOWAY: (Inaudible.)

MR. SEILER: Because FAU's obviously --

MR. CALLOWAY: But -- but, again, I want to make sure that we add that in, because otherwise, I can imagine there are other --

CHAIR VITALE: I think that's required already.

MR. CALLOWAY: I'm not sure.

CHAIR VITALE: (Inaudible), but I think we should incorporate it. I mean, I believe FIU has a campus here as well --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

CHAIR VITALE: -- (inaudible).

MR. SEILER: That might give us more flexibility.

CHAIR VITALE: Okay. So we have a motion and a second.

Is there any other clarifying questions or discussion?

Colin?

DR. POLSKY: I've just lost track of what this is --

CHAIR VITALE: Okay.

DR. POLSKY: -- that we're voting on specifically, given all the

amendments.

CHAIR VITALE: Okay. So would you like me to take a pass at it?

Okay.

So the recommendation -- the motion by Jack, seconded by Sidney, is a designee -- a individual who is a president or their designee of an institution of higher education with a presence in Broward --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Public.

CHAIR VITALE: -- who has -- public. Thank you. A public institution in Broward County that has a presence in Broward County that also has experience with supplier diversity, and doesn't necessarily need to be in that role, but needs to be qualified.

They are -- so that is the motion.

Practically speaking, it could be one or more individuals that would then be brought to the Appointing Authority, and the Appointing Authority would make the choice of who to choose, given all of the other people already on the Oversight Board.

MR. SEILER: The only thing I would add is supplier relations and diversity --

CHAIR VITALE: Thank you.

MR. SEILER: -- because it's a little broader.

CHAIR VITALE: Yes.

MR. CALLOWAY: And the only other thing that I would clarify is it is the president of the public education institution of higher learning or his or her designee.

CHAIR VITALE: Designee.

MS. CEPERO: Yeah.

MR. CALLOWAY: Okay.

CHAIR VITALE: Yeah.

MR. LINDBLADE: Aye.

CHAIR VITALE: Colin is that clear?

DR. POLSKY: Crystal clear.

CHAIR VITALE: Okay. Does anyone else have any questions or discussion?

Filipe?

MR. PINZON: No, I don't.

CHAIR VITALE: Okay. I'm going to call the vote, but before I do, I'm going to let you know that I'm going to abstain. The President of Broward College is on our -- our board, and my wife does work with Broward College, so just -- I don't think it matters here. I didn't have any discussion on it, but I wanted you to know that I'm going to abstain on the vote.

So all those in favor of the motion --

MS. CEPERO: I have a question. Go ahead, Angela. I think you're

probably going to say what I'm about to ask.

MS. WALLACE: Because if -- if the motion is not specific to Broward College and it is a public institution of higher education, the president of a public institution of higher education with a geographic presence, you're not voting specifically related to Broward College. It's -- it's public colleges in general that you vote for, and there's no conflict.

CHAIR VITALE: Thank you. Then I will vote. I appreciate it. I'd prefer to, so.

All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, same sign.

Seeing none, please note that the motion carried unanimously, and that is our recommendation to the County Commission.

Thank you all for that discussion.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

### **ACTION ITEMS**

CHAIR VITALE: Okay. Moving on to action items. We have three action items

#### **1 - MOTION TO APPROVE October 26, 2022 MEETING MINUTES**

CHAIR VITALE: The first is the motion to approve the October 26, 2022 minutes (inaudible) --

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

MR. LINDBLADE: Second.

CHAIR VITALE: Thank you.

They were moved and -- moved by Sidney, seconded by Dan Lindblade.

Any discussion?

Any opposition?

Seeing none, the motion to approve the minutes has been adopted.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

**2 - MOTION TO REAPPOINT EXISTING MEMBERS TO SUCCESSIVE FOUR-YEAR TERMS PER SECTION 31 ½ - 75(d) SERVING IN THE FOLLOWING CATEGORIES PER Section 31 ½ - 75 (a):**

- 1 ACCOUNTING - SHEA SMITH**
- 2 FINANCE - PHIL ALLEN**
- 3 - LAND USE OR URBAN PLANNING - DOUGLAS COOLMAN**
- 4 ENGINEERING OR CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT - ALAN HOOPER**
- 5 ARCHITECTURE - RONALD FRAZIER**
- 6 ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE - DEBORAH MADDEN**

CHAIR VITALE: Item Number 2, motion to reappoint.

We have, as you all are aware, six individuals who have asked to be reappointed.

It is my understanding that we are able to accept all six of them as a slate, and that slate would include Accounting, Shea Smith; Finance, Phil Allen; Land Use or Urban Planning, Douglas Coolman; Engineering or Construction Management, Alan Hooper; Architecture, Ronald Frazer; Environmental Science, Deborah Madden.

MR. SEILER: So **moved**.

MR. CALLOWAY: Second.

MS. CEPERO: Second.

CHAIR VITALE: Moved and seconded to accept the slate.

I will like for the record to show all of these applicants have been reviewed by Legal and they do qualify and meet the requirements as required by the body.

Okay. Moved and seconded.

All those in favor of the motion accepting the slate, please signify by saying aye.

Any opposed, same sign.

Okay. So Item 2 on the action item is unanimously approved.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

**3      CONSIDERATION OF APPLICANTS IN THE FOLLOWING VACANT  
CATEGORIES FOR THE INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX  
OVERSIGHT BOARD**

**A RESIDENT CONSUMER OF PUBLIC TRANSPORTION PER ARTICLE V, SECTION 31 ½ - 75(a)(7), “ONE RESIDENT CONSUMER OF PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION - A PERSON WHO RESIDES IN BROWARD COUNTY AND IS A USER OF THE MULTIMODAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM;”**

**i Applicant 1, Alejandro Munoz**

**ii Applicant 2, Hanif K. Ali**

**B FORMER CITY OR COUNTY MANAGER PER ARTICLE V, SECTION 31 ½ - 75(a)(8), “ONE FORMER CITY OR COUNTY MANAGER - A PERSON WHO HOLDS A PROFESSIONAL DEGREE, HAS PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE AS A CITY MANAGER OR COUNTY MANAGER, AND IS NOT CURRENTLY EMPLOYED AS A CITY MANAGER OR A COUNTY MANAGER IN THE STATE;”**

**i APPLICANT 1, ERDAL DONMEZ**

**ii APPLICANT 2, ALAN J. COHEN**

CHAIR VITALE: Number 3, the consideration of applicants in the following vacant categories for the Independent Transportation Surtax Oversight Board.

So also in the backup material that was sent to everybody, we have two openings that we are going to be appointing today.

Number one, letter A on the agenda, is the resident consumer of public

transportation.

We have two applicants.

And, again, this relates to both openings, all of the applicants have been approved and are vetted as qualified by Legal, and they meet all of the requirements, and they've all -- as a reminder, everyone who gets to us has already gone through the process.

So we have Applicant Number 1, Alejandro Munoz, and Applicant Number 2, Hanif K. Ali.

And we -- I think what I'd like to do is have a discussion, first.

Briefly, as a reminder of kind of our historical discussions, which were we really, as a group, had decided -- this can always change, but has decided to look at the board in its totality and all of the Oversight Board trying to represent the community as much as possible in every aspect, geographic diversity, age diversity, experience diversity, you know, gender, all of that.

And we always had previously looked at each of the individual seats as being qualified but also as they related to all of the other members of the Oversight Board.

So I would like to point out that we have three, two women, who are no longer on the Oversight Board, and one who may or may not be reappointed, given our most recent discussion item.

And also, too, the -- there was a woman who was a -- for this category

who was, I believe, Hispanic, as well, and also an individual with a disability.

For the former city and county manager, Ms. Love, woman, and also not in Broward County, I believe, right? She was living --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR VITALE: She -- she was living in Broward County?

MS. CEPERO: Miramar.

CHAIR VITALE: In Miramar? And also a woman of color.

So just kind of bringing everyone up to speed on who we lost on the team for the Oversight Board and who the applicants are within that context.

So does anyone have any comments or discussion or questions around that?

MR. SEILER: I have a question only on --

MS. CASSINI: Mic.

MR. SEILER: Sorry. If I may.

CHAIR VITALE: Please.

MR. SEILER: On Munoz, the comment was written, I have lived in Broward County most of my life. And then says, I've been driving through the County about ten years.

But looking at the resume, first entry for job's like '15. I know age is not a factor. I'm just curious about experience.

Is this someone that's 30 years old or 50 years old when they talk

about all -- most of my life? And I can't tell from reading this whether --

CHAIR VITALE: I -- I believe, without any other information other than a LinkedIn search, that he graduated from high school in 2012.

MS. CEPERO: So ten years ago.

CHAIR VITALE: So that would make him in his --

MR. SEILER: The first job was --

CHAIR VITALE: -- late twenties.

MR. SEILER: -- 2015 with -- it looks like -- I'm sorry -- 2017 with FedEx.

CHAIR VITALE: So that -- that's what's on his LinkedIn profile, that he graduated from high school in 2012, so that would make him --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Twenty-eight.

CHAIR VITALE: -- 28, 29, 30 --

MR. SEILER: Got ya.

CHAIR VITALE: -- plus or minus.

MR. SEILER: And then -- all right. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR VITALE: Right. I believe Shea Smith is probably the youngest member of the Oversight Board, and he's my contemporary. So he's probably 45-ish.

MS. CEPERO: Very young.

CHAIR VITALE: Very young.

(Laughter.)

MR. SEILER: Well, I'm not -- again, age is not a -- a factor, but experience is a factor to me. When somebody says most of my life, and I'm trying to figure out how long this person --

CHAIR VITALE: I had the same thought, Jack, which is why I just Googled him -- everything else has been around -- All right.

MS. CEPERO: All right.

CHAIR VITALE: Okay.

MR. CALLOWAY: Mr. Chair.

CHAIR VITALE: So --

MS. CEPERO: Mic.

CHAIR VITALE: -- go ahead, Sidney.

MR. CALLOWAY: Oh, I'm sorry. I would just point out that, at least from my perspective, particularly as an older adult male, having that demographic of young professionals as part of our public discussions I think can be terribly important as we look towards the future on that, too.

So that -- I mean, that's a general comment, but I think there's something to be said for youth in these discussions.

CHAIR VITALE: So, process-wise, at some point what I will need is a motion to recommend either Mr. Munoz or Mr. Ali.

We could have as much discussion as we want. If -- if anyone on the board would like to discuss the city or county manager position, as well, to me, it's fluid. The conversation can be fluid.

But we will need two separate motions to make recommendations for Applicant 1 or 2 for the resident, and Applicant 1 or 2 for the former city or county manager.

So if anyone would like to discuss anything, just raise your hand and let's -- let's do it.

Jack?

MR. SEILER: The only thing on this is it appears the second applicant can be more mature in age, perhaps --

MR. LINDBLADE: Seasoned.

MR. SEILER: -- seasoned, works in Miami-Dade County, predominantly does the commuting in Miami-Dade, not in Broward, if I'm reading that correct.

CHAIR VITALE: I believe --

MR. SEILER: (Inaudible) U.S. Department of Justice --

CHAIR VITALE: -- I believe he takes the 595 express buses to Miami-Dade and has for many years.

But, yes, and then also uses other forms of public transit in Miami-Dade, once he arrives.

**MOTION TO APPOINT RESIDENT CONSUMER OF PUBLIC  
TRANSPORTATION**

MR. SEILER: All right. So having looked at that and taken into consideration Sidney's comments, I'll -- I'll **move** Mr. Munoz.

MR. CALLOWAY: Second the motion.

CHAIR VITALE: Okay. There's a motion to accept Alejandro Munoz, Applicant 1, for the Oversight Board position of resident consumer of public transportation.

Is there any questions or discussion?

Monica?

MS. CEPERO: Yeah, just for discussion purposes.

I think I like the age component. I think it -- it will help the group to have -- I always am a strong proponent of having diversity of thought and diversity of experience and diversity of not just what we look like or where we're from, but all -- all the components of what makes that word up.

So I think that'll be a good fit from, you know, what we have in front of us.

And I will also say I also thought it was, you know, of note that most of our categorical, you know, positions on the Oversight Board are some of the traditional things we think of, the construction side and all that.

But this person that is nominated here in front of us has a different

type of experience, more of the multi-modal kind of component that we don't, you know, automatically lean to immediately when we're thinking of transportation surtax.

So I think that'll give some additional perspective to the board that I think will be beneficial.

So I'm comfortable with that as well.

CHAIR VITALE: Thank you, Monica.

MR. LINDBLADE: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR VITALE: Yes, Dan?

MR. LINDBLADE: My only concern is I -- I know the players on that board, and they're very strong A-types. And I've been on some boards where we've brought in younger professionals, and it took them quite a while before they found their voice.

So that would be my only concern.

MS. CASSINI: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR VITALE: Yeah, Gretchen.

MS. CASSINI: So I would like to give you a level of comfort that this individual did participate in one of our focus groups.

We had the opportunity to watch the engagement and the level of confidence and comfort that the individual has.

I think the individual will fit in well.

The person that they are replacing was a more quiet member of the Oversight Board, actually. So I think you might actually see more activity, more engagement out of this particular individual in that category.

MR. LINDBLADE: Thank you. Thank you for that. That's important.

CHAIR VITALE: Thank you, Dan. Great comment.

Filipe, is there any questions or comments regarding this motion and second?

MR. PINZON: No. I agree. I just agree (inaudible).

CHAIR VITALE: Okay. Great. His comment was he supports it because of the diversity of age and everything else. Paraphrasing.

Okay. There's a motion and second.

Any further discussion?

Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

Any opposed, same sign.

Seeing none, Alejandro Munoz has been appointed to the Oversight Board by the Appointing Authority.

Thank you very much.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

**MOTION TO APPOINT: FORMER CITY OR COUNTY MANAGER**

**ADJOURN**

CHAIR VITALE: Next item on the agenda is, again, same process. Discussion and our role here is to appoint a former city or county manager as described.

We have two applicants. Applicant 1, Erdal Donmez, who is also in the room with us. Thank you for joining us.

Applicant 2 is Alan Cohen.

Both applicants, again, are qualified and have met all the requirements and have -- as a reminder, we, in the past have taken a position when there are individuals in the room, we did not open up the discussion or ask questions, in the past.

That's kind of the approach that we have taken, so just kind of putting that back out on the record.

And two great applicants. Happy to open it up for discussion or a motion.

MR. CALLOWAY: Mr. Chair --

MS. CEPERO: Your mic.

MR. CALLOWAY: -- sorry. I'll make a **motion** to appoint Erdal Donmez as the former city or county manager for -- under Item B of the agenda.

CHAIR VITALE: Okay.

MS. CEPERO: I'll second that.

CHAIR VITALE: Okay. Sidney Calloway with a motion to appoint Applicant 1, Erdal Donmez, and seconded by Monica.

Discussion?

MR. SEILER: Yeah. Just -- and, again, I think we have two extremely qualified candidates. I want to make sure that's clear on the record.

MS. CEPERO: Uh-huh.

MR. SEILER: I just -- and, you know, obviously worked with Alan on so many things through the years. Tremendous respect for him.

I just -- I'm curious how that would look with him departing the County then getting on this board like it was -- I think the appearance is what concerns me.

And, again, I could -- certainly know both are qualified to serve.

CHAIR VITALE: Yeah.

MR. SEILER: But the public perception of someone -- a former Assistant County Commissioner being on this --

MS. CEPERO: Administrator.

MR. SEILER: -- role -- I'm sorry, County --

MR. CALLOWAY: Administrator.

MS. CEPERO: Assistant County --

MR. SEILER: -- Administrator.

MS. CEPERO: -- Administrator.

MR. SEILER: Excuse me. Yeah, being in this role might send a message that I think might be inconsistent with what we're trying to accomplish.

So under any other scenario, I would gladly appoint Alan. I'm going to say that publicly. I'd appoint him to something if I was still Mayor of Fort Lauderdale. I think the guy's extremely talented and qualified.

But I think we have to be careful of appearances here.

And I'm going to support that motion, but I wanted to make it clear for the record it has nothing to do with qualifications. It has to do with appearances.

CHAIR VITALE: Okay.

MR. CALLOWAY: Mr. Chair, I, too, would concur in the comments from Jack on -- on this point.

Certainly have no hesitation in saying that -- that Alan Cohen is as capable as anyone that would be on this list.

But, again, I think the history of the surtax discussion here in Broward County, again, does warrant some level of prudence on our part to be sensitive to public opinion.

And that is to say, again, it has nothing to do with the qualifications of Mr. Cohen.

Certainly, I think it's in the best interest of the surtax board to -- to

have -- to not have that distraction, if you will, or potential distraction.

CHAIR VITALE: Okay. Thank you, Sidney.

Monica?

MS. CEPERO: Yeah, so, again, thank you, Jack and Sidney for your comments. I agree. Both applicants are well qualified.

I did want to also share with the group, you know, from -- from the perspective of -- of where we're headed with the surtax, I think it's important to, you know, be reminded of the -- of the magnitude of the municipal component.

And I think, you know, Erdal showed great leadership as one of the leaders in the municipal subcommittee when we first went out for the surtax. And I want to thank him for that.

And -- and I think that was really critical in -- in getting this passed, and -- and also the relationship building we've got with municipals -- municipalities is important.

And so I -- I think, you know, not -- you know, just focusing on why not to choose somebody, I really wanted to put on the record also why, you know, the nomination that you made, Sidney, for Erdal is a very strong one as well.

So I want to thank him for his service, and I think he will -- he will serve the Oversight Board and the County well in this regard.

Thank you.

CHAIR VITALE: Great. Thank you.

Any other comments or discussion?

Filipe, anything you'd like to add or share?

MR. PINZON: No, I'm okay.

CHAIR VITALE: Okay. Thank you.

So I'm just -- my -- my two cents. I have worked with Erdal. I've worked with Alan. And I respect Alan a lot. He's got a tremendous reputation -- reputation within the Broward Workshop as somebody who got a lot of things done.

And I think that Erdal represents a lot of really positive things, to build on what's been said. In particular, west Broward is not very well represented. And the fact that he was a city manager and assistant city manager for so long for such a big and important city in Broward County is a really important factor and will, I think, smooth the discussion when things come up with, you know, the municipalities.

As Monica said, it is so important to have a great working relationship with the County and the city on these projects.

And they're not easy. These projects, to get over the finish line, are not easy.

So having someone with his experience and expertise I think will add

a lot of value to the Oversight Board.

So I also support the motion.

Any other discussion?

Okay. I'll call the question.

The -- again, to clarify, the motion was to appoint Erdal Donmez as the appointing -- Oversight Board member in the category of Former City or County Manager.

All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

All opposed, same sign.

Seeing none, please note that he is approved unanimously by the Appointing Authority.

And thank you for being here today.

MS. CEPERO: Congratulations.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

MR. SEILER: Thank you. Can I just -- I want to thank staff.

MS. CEPERO: Yeah.

MR. SEILER: You guys --

(Applause.)

MR. SEILER: -- (inaudible) serving well in advance the stuff you sent and the information, and that helped. I know we didn't have to jump on a Zoom, but it is nice to know that it was so well organized and so well set

forth.

And if we could have our next meeting set up the same way where we know -- and can we do that today, set a time?

And do we need to meet for any purpose on this last issue with the appointment of the --

MS. CASSINI: Yes.

MR. SEILER: -- diversity?

CHAIR VITALE: Yeah, I -- I think the answer is yes. We will need to appoint one more open --

MR. SEILER: Right. That's what I was thinking.

CHAIR VITALE: The when, you all might be able to better clarify the calendar of when you think that might be able to get through to the County Commission level.

MS. CASSINI: Right.

MS. WALLACE: So it would -- it does. It --

MS. CASSINI: No, I meant the appointment.

MS. WALLACE: Oh. So the -- the ordinance, we'd have to have a motion to direct on, and possibly could have it on the January 24<sup>th</sup> agenda.

MS. CEPERO: Yes.

MS. WALLACE: And then it would have to be set for Public Hearing to modify the ordinance.

I guess this board could provide direction with regard to applications. Do you want us to follow the same application process or what you'd like us to do, and then we can -- once -- once the Board approves the revision to the ordinance, we could reach out to determine availability for a meeting to consider applicants.

MR. SEILER: The only issue I would have on that is will she be able to remain in that position, serving, until this ordinance is cleaned up? Or -- I would rather make it an urgent thing if she can't, because I think the -- we need to keep the momentum going forward. We need not have delay.

CHAIR VITALE: Right.

MR. SEILER: So I would either ask that maybe Monica, in her role as the head of the County, can probably get this thing turned around pretty quickly, if we can -- and then come back in like March and actually make this -- because I would hate to see us lose any of this momentum.

I think we have a very talented person in that position. I would just hate to be sitting here in June with somebody saying, well, they haven't --

CHAIR VITALE: Right. Gretchen, did you have --

MS. CASSINI: Yeah, I just need a little bit of direction here, because what I heard, the motion that was adopted was that this was going to be a -- the president of a public higher education institution with a presence in Broward County --

MR. SEILER: With a geographical presence.

MS. CASSINI: -- or his or her designee with experience in supplier relations and diversity.

That means that we would do a -- something much more similar to how you all got here, where we -- we reach out to the institutions. We -- we tell them that this is happening. We -- and we would ask for whether or not they -- the president wanted to serve. And if not, did the president have a designee with this type of experience, and let them formally identify if there is anything.

And then we would bring it to you.

MR. SEILER: Well, I --

MS. CASSINI: And that's going to take a little bit of -- it would take time, because, keep in mind, the County Commission has to act. The ordinance has to be changed. Then we have to -- we can simultaneously do some reaching out --

MS. CEPERO: Right.

MR. SEILER: Right.

MS. CASSINI: -- certainly. We don't have to do it in -- you know, in sequential order.

But it is going to take a little bit of time, and I would say March is probably reasonable.

And in the meantime, Ms. Pennant would not be able to formally participate.

Maybe she could come to the meeting --

CHAIR VITALE: She could attend.

MS. CASSINI: -- but she wouldn't be able to vote or, you know, anything like that.

MR. SEILER: Can I clarify? So what I'm thinking is on the next agenda or the following one, you have the language so that that gets approved. I don't know if it requires one or two readings with Broward County.

MS. CEPERO: Just -- it's just one.

MR. SEILER: One reading.

MS. CEPERO: Well, you can speak to that. (Inaudible.)

MR. SEILER: But if it's one -- but then, secondly, then reach out, once it's approved. Because I think --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. SEILER: -- if you reach out beforehand, you know, the County may reject this idea, right? So I think it has to get approved by the County. Then you reach out to FAU, FIU, Broward College, tell them that this language has been approved, and then have the submissions.

And if we only get one name back, we have a five-minute meeting

whenever that is.

CHAIR VITALE: Yeah.

MR. CALLOWAY: Yeah. In -- in other words, there -- I don't necessarily believe we have to give the public institution option and time to decide whether their president wants to do it and then or whether or not they have someone else they'd like to designate.

I'd say we let them know that this is the process, president and/or your designee can do it. Here's the time prescribed for submitting your responses to that.

CHAIR VITALE: So I think we have the gist of it, but we do need to wait to see what the County Commission says. I think that's key.

**\*\***MS. CEPERO: Oh, I was just going to suggest, I think there's a lot of work that can be done behind the scenes, and get it ready. The second they adopt it, it can go out the same day, you know, the letters out to the public institutions.

And from a standpoint of -- when is the next Oversight Board meeting?

MS. CASSINI: They meet on January 27<sup>th</sup>.

MS. CEPERO: And then after that it's --

MS. CASSINI: They don't have their meeting -- so what they chose to do in this particular year is different than all of the previous years, calendar

years, because they wanted to wait for the new members to be seated and then select their dates for meeting.

Because, again, you know, with two new people, you don't know what their availability's going to be.

So on the 27<sup>th</sup>, they will select their calendar for meetings for the rest of the year.

They always meet in August for the two days --

MS. CEPERO: Yeah.

MS. CASSINI: -- for the --

MS. CEPERO: Yeah.

MS. CASSINI: -- budget workshop. But sometimes they like to meet in March. Sometimes they prefer to meet in April. It depends on the spring break schedules and things like that.

MS. CEPERO: Got it. So -- sorry. Angela, what were you going to say?

MS. WALLACE: They have to have meetings quarterly. So January's meeting will be their first quarter. And so their second quarter meeting will have to be between March and June.

MS. CEPERO: Right.

MS. WALLACE: So -- but the calendar, the Oversight Board members usually vote on their quarterly meetings in the first meeting of the year.

CHAIR VITALE: Go ahead, Monica.

MS. CEPERO: Thank you both for clarifying that.

So what I would suggest, Jack, is, you know, ask staff to get everything ready to go out the door the second that the Board adopts this.

And, Angela, correct me if I'm wrong, but, you know, we get the motion to direct on the 24<sup>th</sup>, we could do the set for and the -- the Public Hearing in one month, given when the meetings fall --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MS. CEPERO: -- in February.

And so that could be done by the end of February --

MS. WALLACE: Yes.

MS. CEPERO: -- and which means we could then meet quickly.

MR. CALLOWAY: Yeah.

CHAIR VITALE: Yeah.

MS. CEPERO: The letters go out at the end of February. Maybe by two weeks later we can have something in place for us, and then it can maybe be for an April --

MS. CASSINI: Would you -- would you like to put a hold on your calendars, since I have you all here?

MR. CALLOWAY: I'm ready.

MS. CASSINI: Okay. Can you pull 4/30 up at the same time?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

MR. SEILER: What about the last Friday? I mean, this kind of works well, this Friday morning. How about the last Friday in March? Does that -- or is that like just a holiday or --

MS. CEPERO: Let me pull the Commission calendar up really quickly, because I know they go -- they don't have a meeting the last week of March.

They have a meeting March 14<sup>th</sup>, the Commission, but then we need to look to see if -- that would technically be --

MS. CASSINI: Friday the 31<sup>st</sup> of March. It's the --

MS. CEPERO: -- let me look.

MS. CASSINI: -- very last Friday.

MR. SEILER: That's not --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That is --

MR. SEILER: -- that's not Good Friday or anything, is it?

MS. CEPERO: I think it is Good Friday.

CHAIR VITALE: Or Easter --

MS. CEPERO: Let me look.

MS. CASSINI: I think --

CHAIR VITALE: -- (inaudible).

MR. SEILER: Yeah, so Good Friday's the following Friday.

MS. CEPERO: Is it? Okay. Hold on.

CHAIR VITALE: It's fine for me.

MR. SEILER: So that works for me if we can --

MS. CASSINI: Is it open?

DR. POLSKY: No, the 7<sup>th</sup> is Good Friday.

MS. CASSINI: Okay.

MS. CEPERO: The 7<sup>th</sup> is Good Friday.

MR. SEILER: Right.

MS. CEPERO: Yeah.

MR. SEILER: So the 31<sup>st</sup> would not be Good Friday.

MS. CEPERO: Hold on a second. Let me look at --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

MS. CASSINI: You're correct.

MR. SEILER: So if we took the same time, that would --

CHAIR VITALE: So we have March 31.

MS. CASSINI: And this room is open.

MR. SEILER: March 31 at 10:30? Does that work for -- I don't want  
to speak for --

CHAIR VITALE: Yeah, it works for me.

MS. CEPERO: And I was just checking our County Commission  
calendar. So they meet on March -- I'm sorry -- February 7<sup>th</sup> and the 21<sup>st</sup>.  
So those could be the set for and the Public Hearing so that --

MS. CASSINI: And if we got the letters out on the 21<sup>st</sup> and gave them one week to respond, do you think that would be sufficient for us to process those? Okay.

MS. CEPERO: The only issue, then -- well, no, because you have a whole month, right? Because if we're --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. CASSINI: Oh, oh, oh. Yeah, you're right. We have a whole month. So we can give them multiple weeks --

MS. CEPERO: Two weeks --

MS. CASSINI: -- to respond.

MS. CEPERO: -- and then get us information on the applicants --

MS. CASSINI: We'll hold it 10:30 to 11:30 on March 31<sup>st</sup>.

MR. SEILER: Right. And then the -- the board could schedule their April meeting as --

CHAIR VITALE: Knowing that.

MR. SEILER: -- just mentioned (inaudible).

MS. CASSINI: We'll make sure.

MR. SEILER: Awesome.

DR. POLSKY: I had a quick clarification question on that exchange. The "they: was the presidents of these universities, giving them a week to respond?

MS. CEPERO: Two weeks.

DR. POLSKY: Two weeks?

MR. SEILER: Are you worried about getting appointed?

DR. POLSKY: No.

MS. CASSINI: We can give them longer now, because if we do get everything done the third week of February and we're not meeting until the --

MS. CEPERO: End of March.

MS. CASSINI: -- basically, the fifth week of March, then we can give them three weeks to respond with their appointments, still put the packets together relatively quickly. It shouldn't be an issue.

MS. CEPERO: And I'm sure staff will also not just send a letter but call and reach out and make sure they got it and --

CHAIR VITALE: We'll have more notice once the first reading is done, or two, to be like, hey, this is what the rule's going to be.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: At least you know, right.

CHAIR VITALE: You know, please start preparing who you think you might recommend, if anybody.

MR. SEILER: I would think that those three presidents are going to get on a call and decide who they agree to put forward, right? And I think if -- Randall, I know you're very active. I think if you -- you have the ability to reach out on our behalf, just communicate, because it seems to me like the

individual in place now is something very --

MS. CEPERO: Yeah.

MR. SEILER: -- very wise to let her continue in that role.

CHAIR VITALE: Okay. Is there any other discussion items or items that the group would like to bring before the board?

## **ADJOURN**

CHAIR VITALE: Seeing none, we are adjourned. 11:54.

MS. CEPERO: Thank you.

CHAIR VITALE: Thank you all very much.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR VITALE: Happy New Year.

(The meeting concluded at 11:54 a.m.)