

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

Meeting - June 11, 2021

9:30 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Phil Allen, Retired, Finance

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

Douglas Coolman, Vice 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.

Dr. Consuelo Kelley, Resident Consumer of Public Transportation

Allyson C. Love, Former City or County Manager, Assistant City Manager,
City of Delray Beach

Anthea Pennant, District Director of the Broward College Office of Supplier
Relations and Diversity

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

Pollack Brant Advisors and Accountants

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Also Present:

Angela Wallace, Surtax General Counsel

Gretchen Cassini, Board Coordinator

Audrey Thompson, Administrative Support Specialist

Laura Rogers, County Auditor's Office

Bryan Caletka, Director of Transportation Policy, Broward County MPO

Tashauna Williams-Wilson, Public Information Specialist, MAP Administration

Greg Burns, Thorn Run Partners, via telephone

Mike Jorgenson, Broward County IT

Ernesto Carreras

Johnny Caldera, Laws Reporting, Inc.

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., Friday, June 11, 2021.

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

CALL TO ORDER - CHAIR HOOPER

MR. HOOPER: All right, we're going to call the meeting to order.

Okay, can I start?

MS. CASSINI: Yeah.

MR. HOOPER: All right, good morning everybody. Let's call the meeting to order for the -- let me see here -- the Independent Surtax Oversight Board.

Today is June 11th, 2021.

ROLL CALL - AUDRY THOMPSON

MR. HOOPER: Can we get a roll call, Ms. Thompson?

MS. THOMPSON: Sure, Chair.

MR. FRAZIER: Where would you like me?

MS. THOMPSON: Alan Hooper.

MR. HOOPER: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman.

MR. COOLMAN: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Phil Allen.

MR. ALLEN: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Ronald Frazier.

MR. FRAZIER: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Consuelo Kelley.

DR. KELLEY: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love.

MS. LOVE: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Deborah Madden.

MS. MADDEN: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Anthea Pennant.

MS. PENNANT: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: And Shea Smith.

MR. SMITH: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: We have a quorum.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

MR. HOOPER: Is there any public participation?

MS. CASSINI: No, Mr. Chair. No one has signed up from the public to speak.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Great.

REGULAR AGENDA

ACTION ITEMS

1 - APPROVAL OF MINUTES, MEETING OF APRIL 29, 2021

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So the Regular Agenda, we have action items.

The first one is a motion to approve the minutes from April 29th.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. COOLMAN: I so **move**.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: It's important.

MS. CASSINI: Operator, could I please ask that the participants on the line mute themselves?

Thank you so much.

MR. HOOPER: Okay, I think we have a motion from Mr. Coolman to approve the minutes.

Do we have a second?

MS. LOVE: I'll second.

MR. HOOPER: Okay, is there any discussion on the minutes from April 29th?

Hearing none, all those in favor?

Those opposed?

Okay. The motion -- the minutes are approved.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

**2 - FY 2021 MUNICIPAL CAPITAL PROJECT (MCP) APPLICATION
RESULTS AND RECOMMENFATIONS FOR THE NEW FIFTH YEAR OF
THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN (FY 2026) - BRYAN CALETKA, DIRECTOR OF
TRANSPORTATION POLICY, MPO**

Number two, fiscal year 2021 municipal capital project application

results and recommendations presentation. I believe that's -- I'm going to try to pronounce this -- Bryan Caletka.

MR. CALETKA: Perfect. Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: All right.

MR. CALETKA: Good morning, Mr. Chair, Vice Chair --

MR. HOOPER: Good morning.

MR. CALETKA: -- and board members.

I first want to thank Mrs. Cassini for inviting me here to give this presentation to you.

As it says, I'm Bryan Caletka, the Director of Transportation Policy for the Broward Metropolitan Planning Organization.

So we are tasked with up to doing four different tasks for the MAP Administration.

The first is develop procedures and process. This must also be approved by the County Administrator.

Task two is to rank the new capital projects that didn't either make the first 110 or they were brand new and they were not conceived of during the initial stages of surtax implementation.

The third, which I'm talking to you about today, is to recommend municipal capital projects within the MAG, which is our budget.

And then there's an optional fourth, which is the County Administrator

can request us to recommend above the MAG and to review and recommend projects within the budget that she provides to us.

So Cycle 1 is what we're focusing on. All of the cities insisted that we go in order of the initial ranked Cycle 1 projects, those that are contained in the first 1 through 110.

This year's budget was 39.8 million dollars. We subtracted the 19,000,000 for the community shuttle. We subtracted 11,000,000 for the Miramar Parkway Extension to give an installment towards that very expensive large project.

And then our remaining budget was approximately \$10,000,000.

So this is what 10,000,000 can get you.

I digress.

All we do, it's very mechanical. You just take the next un-funded project from the five-year plan, we fund it until we run out of money, which is the remaining, you know, 21,000,000 after the community shuttle is taken out.

So here, we're presenting to you Projects 73, 74, 75, and 76 today. You have already approved these projects. You've seen these. They just didn't make it into the five-year plan, and now we're recommending that they do.

The project that this board has not seen is project that was ranked 18

from the Town of Pembroke Park.

There were questions about eligibility. We believe that these questions have at least initially been completed, along with some of the documentation that they've provided us and to the County.

And we further believe that it will be ready for construction in 2026.

So this is the only project that you haven't seen.

When you combine all of the allocations for each of the projects that are also in a construction cost index provided by the Florida Department of Transportation, there is a remainder of about 1.2 million dollars that the County is at liberty to do many things with, including if that index is under what it needs to be, it can accommodate the construction cost.

They can use it for rehab and maintenance, or they can roll it over to 2027 MAG for further projects.

So here's my contact information. I'm available to answer any questions --

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chair?

MR. CALETKA: -- and I know there's going to be at least one.

MR. HOOPER: Yes. Mr. Allen.

MR. ALLEN: Bryan, in your presentation you -- you speak in terms of adding these projects to the fifth year of the program.

MR. CALETKA: Yes, sir.

MR. ALLEN: And the question I have after reviewing the interim financial statements for the first six months of this year, it reflects that there's \$175,000,000 worth of municipal projects.

The total amount of municipal projects approved by this board and budgeted have not incurred any expenditures.

And I'm -- I'm just questioning why we're continuing to add municipal projects when, in fact, the existing projects do not appear to be moving.

MR. CALETKA: So the first part of that question is that there are projects that have actually been completed, like they've completed the design allocation that they received from 2020, but they haven't filled out the forms to get the reimbursement. That's only happened for a couple of the projects.

But this is also just for the rolling fifth year of 2026, so it gives them basically five years to get ready for construction at that time.

So it's just the fifth year budget.

MR. ALLEN: But there are other projects that may have -- from cities that have not been ranked yet and projects that are construction ready, when we're holding money in reserve, in effect --

MR. CALETKA: Uh-huh.

MR. ALLEN: -- for these other cities who are not -- even with what they told us were construction ready projects that have not, in fact, moved.

It seems like it's -- it's unfair to those other cities who have other projects that are legitimately, quote, unquote, construction ready, that they are waiting in line to even be authorized to -- to proceed in the planning or whatever the phase is that they're -- they're moving forward on.

MR. CALETKA: Yes, sir. I actually share that concern, but it was the cities that insisted that we go in order for Cycle 1 first.

MS. WALLACE: Right.

MR. CALETKA: And that's what --

MS. WALLACE: If I may --

MR. CALETKA: -- everybody as a collective agreed to.

MS. WALLACE: When you're finished.

MR. CALETKA: Oh, sorry.

MS. WALLACE: No, when you finish.

MR. CALETKA: I'm done.

MS. WALLACE: Just -- okay. Thank you. Good morning, Chair, Vice Chair, board members.

Mr. Allen, with respect to your question, yes, there was, between FY '19 and FY '20, \$125,000,000 in funds allocated for municipal projects, and an additional 5,000,000, I believe, in 2000 -- within the current fiscal year, 2021.

So that's the \$175,000,000 that you're referring to.

The -- there were 110 ranked project -- municipal capital project, 97 of which this Oversight Board recommended as eligible, and for which funding was received.

There were another 40 municipal rehab and maintenance projects for which funding was allocated.

Of those 137 projects, we've only received documentation for a portion of those.

So there are 80 projects in total, 56 municipal capital and 24 municipal rehab and maintenance projects, for which we have not received any documentation to prepare agreements.

We have finalized some funding agreements for municipal projects for which funding was allocated, but the -- and we've received documentation for some.

And for the ones that -- for which we've received complete checklists and documentation, we are working with the municipal attorneys to finalize those agreements.

But when we understand your concern about funding additional projects, there are new -- no new municipal capital projects being recommended for funding yet.

So while the -- the interlocal agreement among the County, the municipalities, and the MPO requires the -- the MPO to accept applications

for new projects each year and -- and rank them, so the -- the -- the MPO did that.

But none of those ranked projects for this year are being recommended because they're not -- the -- there's no funds available within the MAG.

So what we have to do, based upon the current language of our interlocal agreement, is get through the 97 -- well, I guess 110, because like for Number 18, the municipality withdrew the project from consideration last year, but it was within the 110 that the MPO recommended. They deferred the project until this year.

And so the County is required to fund the remaining phases of the 110 projects, those which were -- that are eligible through -- with -- within the MAG until all of those projects are funded, until they're finalized, either withdrawn -- and there are some, you are correct, that, you know, are not ready for construction.

There are other projects that could possibly be ready for construction.

But the agreement requires us to follow the process that Mr. Caletka outlined today.

And if the -- if the MPO -- I -- I guess if the County makes additional funds available above the MAG for municipal projects, there will be additional funding that's allocated while the projects that were already approved are not

really moving.

MR. ALLEN: Well, what is the mechanism for -- if I could proceed --

MR. HOOPER: No --

MR. ALLEN: -- Mr. Chair.

MR. HOOPER: -- I'm interested.

MR. ALLEN: What is the mechanism -- are you saying that all 110 projects that have been approved must be complete before any new projects are added?

MS. WALLACE: The interlocal agreement says that we have to fund the -- the remaining phases of those projects within the minimum annual guarantee, which is the County's committed ten percent, before we fund anything else.

So if -- if the County makes --

MR. ALLEN: Well --

MS. WALLACE: -- funds available --

MR. ALLEN: -- I'm sorry, but if -- if one city out of -- of -- with one project out there doesn't proceed with that project, they're holding up the re-funding for other new projects that may come along from the other cities.

MS. WALLACE: That's correct.

MR. ALLEN: Is there any mechanism to carve that out and say, hey, you told us you were proceeding with this project and nothing has happened

after three years --

MS. WALLACE: So --

MR. ALLEN: -- what -- what is our option to move forward?

And is this a role that this body can influence?

MS. WALLACE: -- so that's contractual. And the -- for projects for which construction phase funding was allocated, the municipalities have three years from the -- the time of the funding allocation to -- to -- to begin the construction of that project.

So that -- to have their agreement in place for the funding and to begin construction.

If they do not begin construction within that three-year timeframe, then the County has the ability under the contract to cancel the project.

So -- but the ones that are -- for which planning or design funds have been allocated that are not moving, we do not have a mechanism in place for that.

So if the municipality does not want to proceed with the project, then the municipality has to submit written notification to the MPO and to the County that they want to withdraw the project.

It is our understanding that there are some such projects, but we have not received written notification of the municipalities' desire to withdraw it, so the project still sits on the books.

MR. ALLEN: Again, is there any role for this body to monitor or to grade performance or to make recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners relative to -- to these contractual relationships that are not proceeding?

MS. WALLACE: So part of the evaluation process of the projects will include whether the project is delivered and whether it's delivered timely, whether there was delay. And so those are all factors that are -- are considered and will be included in recommendations regarding what should proceed -- what should occur with that project and the municipality's interest in future funding.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman, I -- I -- I raise this issue, I think this something I'm very concerned with, and I have been since the very beginning of the -- the establishment of this body.

This community has, over the last many years, had a great deal of attention focused on a \$800,000,000 school bond levy which was promised -- projects that were promised as part of that program that have, in fact, not proceeded and now are many million dollars over budget, one of the reasons being that either they didn't do the estimates right or, because of the delay in moving forward, those projects have gone beyond the budgets.

And I have raised this issue relative to the performance of the MAP program, that we don't want to get into that same situation that -- that we've

seen across the street.

I bring this to the board's attention that we need to start paying attention to the expenditure of these funds to ensure that they, in fact, are -- not only are they meeting the requirements of the state statutes, but they are proceeding reasonably in concluding the projects that have been promised to the voters of Broward County.

And this board needs to be focusing on that on a periodic basis to see how are these projects proceeding, is there a problem, what's the holdup, can we involve -- can County staff assist the cities in getting these projects moving. What roles do we have to influence going forward?

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. ALLEN: And I would, you know, --

MR. HOOPER: Let's have a discussion about that.

MR. ALLEN: Pardon?

MR. HOOPER: I think we should be discussing that right now.

MR. ALLEN: Well, I don't think --

MR. HOOPER: You said that --

MR. ALLEN: -- I don't know that we have the time to discuss that right now --

MR. HOOPER: Well, you started it.

MR. ALLEN: -- I think there are too many questions as to which

projects, you know, are proceeding, which ones aren't proceedings, which ones have asked to defer.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. ALLEN: And this needs to be an agenda item, perhaps at our next board meeting, that we really bear down on this particular aspect.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Mr. Coolman.

MR. COOLMAN: Yeah. And following on what Phil's suggested here, I have two -- a question and a comment.

The first question is how many projects are out there, that aren't -- aren't funded yet but are ready to go? Is it one? Is it a hundred? Is it 15? How much money's involved. That's the first question.

The comment is I do think we have a role. We're writing our own rules, to a certain extent. This is new, the whole thing is new.

And to find out that -- I don't know, 60, 70, 80 percent of these projects are -- are -- haven't even moved forward that are approved for money, I -- what is -- what are we doing or staff doing to these cities to say, you know, your agreement says you have three years, but we need to see some movement here?

This is not fair to anybody, not the taxpayers that voted for it, the people that are being shut out.

So I think we need to do something to -- to move the cities that are

approved that are holding up others.

And then to follow that, if we find out that the list is -- there are cities that are shovel ready that could start, then let's find the money. Maybe we don't have to upset that apple cart, but is there money available to more some of this stuff a little different?

You know, we're only in year two of this, or three, and we're learning. So let's do something.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So his first question, can you answer that, about how much -- how many projects are out there, how many have been stalled, and what amount is that?

MR. CALETKA: So the exact dollar amount I don't have in front of me, but there are at least two projects where the community is choosing not to move forward at this time.

One of them is a community where they had an election back in November and they had a change of a couple of their voting governing body members.

And they're in a holding pattern because they're not sure if they want to move forward with it or not.

I personally have pursued trying to get a letter saying, hey, you're not moving forward with this. And when -- they're basically they're misunderstanding. They think that if they don't use it for the project that they

were given the money for, that they can use it for something else, and that's not the way it works.

It's the County's money, so it goes back to the County. It doesn't go with the municipality.

And when they learned that, they got scared that they would go to their governing body and say I just gave away \$10,000,000, and look like the bad -- you know, bad person.

So they -- they immediately stopped taking phone calls when they realized that it wasn't their money.

And I don't know why they believed it was theirs to begin with, but it -- they're looking at making a -- an official decision within the next year.

So at least for a couple of the projects, it has to do with the governing body has changed.

MR. HOOPER: Did you want to say something, Mr. Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yeah, if I could.

So a couple of things. One, I think this idea that there's no claw back on the design phase sounds like a mistake to me, that they -- they can be approved for design, and it sounds to me, unless I'm misinterpreting, that there is no three year termination to start that design phase.

So they can just stall indefinitely. So that, to me, sounds like a problem, if I'm understanding that.

Secondly, I think a very simple way to look at this is from, you know, a taxpayers' and a citizens' perspective where if the funds accumulate into the funds that we're managing and into this program to a very large extent, and things just aren't moving, that's just the baseline we have to get back to.

We are here to represent the citizens. And if I'm a citizen, which I am, it -- it would be upsetting to approve something -- I mean, the money's still coming in.

So to the extent -- from a very simple perspective, to the extent that it's not moving and these funds are just growing, we really do have to figure out a mechanism, because that will just look like a bloated, slow governmental project, and people will rightly criticize it.

So I do think we have a role. I mean, we're here to represent the -- the voters.

And -- and so I think we have a role.

MR. HOOPER: Well, the -- if -- just let me say something.

First of all, we're talking about the MPO's program, the ten percent, okay? So the County is moving forward on all the projects that we've approved on those.

Am I correct, Ms. Cassini?

MR. CASSINI: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Yes, the County continues to bring new projects that are actually

accelerated, that are moving ahead of schedule, and that are on time and on budget.

MR. HOOPER: So -- so the issue is we have 30 -- I don't remember if it's 32 or 33, but we've got a bunch of cities out there, okay? I'm in the construction business, okay? When someone says construction ready and I have to sign 110 contracts, right? We've got to go through 110 agreements.

We approved these how long ago?

MS. WALLACE: This time last year.

MS. CASSINI: August.

MR. HOOPER: So --

MR. CASSINI: It was August.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So I'm just going to tell you --

MS. WALLACE: June of FY '20.

MS. CASSINI: Sorry, I was talking about -- yeah.

MS. WALLACE: Yeah, August for the FY '21.

MR. HOOPER: I -- I've negotiated a trillion general contracts and leases, and they take time, okay? And then when you put them on the County Attorney's lap and you put them in to the -- and then you have to deal with 33 city attorneys, okay? All right?

So now a lot of this stuff isn't happening because it's -- it's just part of the -- the tentacles of what it takes to get a job started.

Second, you know, you're going to have those -- you know, they're like kids, 33 kids. You're going to have some of them that don't know how to operate. They're going to think, wow, I'm going to lose the money now, what can I do.

You know, and, honestly, I think that if there is a log jam in the MPO's system, the one that they're managing, and there are a few cities that are jamming everything up, I've to feel there's going to be an amendment coming, right? There should be, if they're smart.

And they should come up with an amendment that puts a timeline on something and divides it into phases and timelines on those phases, because sometimes architectural or design, engineer work, takes a certain amount of time. Teeing it up to construction takes a certain amount of time. Actually, executing the construction will take longer.

So you start putting timelines on those things. And if you don't hit that timeline, you can terminate that agreement and move on to the next -- the next project.

So I think there is a way to do it, but it's going to fall on the MPO, who is managing these 33 cities and all of these projects, to realize and to probably go -- come and speak to the County and say, hey, let's do an amendment to the interlocal agreement so that if we have a log jam, we can push one aside and bring the others in.

I think this is -- and this is the first -- this really, truly is the first real round. And it's a five-year deal, okay?

So I -- I -- I'm so happy that Mr. Allen has his eyes on the road and he brought this up. I think it's something we could discuss further in our workshop.

But I also think that it's part of a start, a beginning, a growing pain, and it's also -- it's very complex to get 110 projects at well over -- how much? A hundred -- 175,000,000?

MR. ALLEN: 175,000,000.

MR. HOOPER: \$175,000,000. It's a very difficult thing. And -- and for -- and we can't fault ourselves or the County for it happening, or this program for it happening, because chances were it was going to happen.

MS. WALLACE: Right.

MR. HOOPER: Okay?

MS. WALLACE: So if I may, Chair --

MR. COOLMAN: My -- my -- my question, Bryan, was -- maybe you can bring this to the workshop -- how many city projects out there are shovel ready that aren't in this 110 that could start, and how much money is it, and can we find that money without --

MR. HOOPER: Doing that.

MR. COOLMAN: -- doing this other thing, too?

I think the other thing needs to be fixed, Alan. I agree with you. But --

MR. HOOPER: This is the MPO's part of the money. This is the ten percent. We can't just go and say, okay, let's find the money for the --

MR. COOLMAN: No.

MR. HOOPER: -- other cities that have not --

MR. COOLMAN: Well --

MR. HOOPER: -- that are being held up.

MR. COOLMAN: -- I'm saying there may be -- if -- I think we need to fix what, Mr. Allen, you were talking about. I agree a hundred percent. Maybe it's an amendment, whatever it is.

But I'm just curious how many cities are we delaying that are shovel ready with projects? Do we know that?

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MR. COOLMAN: And if it's not a lot of money, is there a way to fund that so we're not holding them up while we fix this other problem, that's all.

MS. WALLACE: Mr. Chair --

MR. HOOPER: I just want to make it clear. Don't say we. It's not we. Okay? Right?

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: Right.

MS. WALLACE: So if I -- if I may, Chair.

So that'll be 137 projects for which funding was allocated.

There are 80 projects for which we have not received any documentation for purposes of preparing the agreement to provide the funds.

That's a lot.

MR. HOOPER: That's a lot.

MS. WALLACE: So, I mean, in -- in -- in order to prepare the agreements, we need the checklist -- we have established a process within the County. There are checklists for each type of project, there's documentation that must accompany that checklist in order for us to complete the -- to prepare the agreements.

There are a lot of projects that were included on the list -- list of recommendations and were -- for which funding was allocated where it was represented that the project was ready for construction.

And ready for construction means, as you know, complete construction documents.

MR. HOOPER: That's right.

MS. WALLACE: Ready for construction bid. Well, they're not.

MR. HOOPER: Right. Okay.

MS. WALLACE: So, I mean, those are the things that need to be addressed.

It's -- the -- the bottleneck doesn't start with the County. The

bottleneck is before -- it hasn't gotten -- the documents haven't gotten --

MR. HOOPER: Right.

MS. WALLACE: -- to us.

MR. HOOPER: That's right.

MS. WALLACE: And so -- and the MPO doesn't control what happens inside the municipalities in terms of their preparing these documents to submit to the County.

But I think Mr. Caletka properly explained the MPO's role, which is to review the submittals from -- the applications from the municipalities and make recommendations to the County, but they're not involved in the preparation of the documents for the agreements with us.

So --

MR. ALLEN: That may be an area of attack we might want to consider, is forming some kind of a task group that would just focus on moving paper, moving these projects forward.

That's not under, as I understand it, MPO's part of the contract. It expires when they -- or it is completed when they had made the recommendations to us for projects to fund. It doesn't go on to a continuing basis of monitoring to ensure that the cities are complying with the contract.

And I don't know whether that task force or that task group, the TAC team or whatever you want to call it, would be County staff or MPO staff or,

you know, -- or, you know, hiring some kind of a -- a consultant, if you will, to just help the cities move these projects forward, whether that be in assisting them in their advertising projects or selecting project completion things, or just moving paper, how to get, you know, in contact with the County Attorney's Office, or how to get these things going, and then attack each one of these projects and focus on those until they get moving.

MS. WALLACE: And that --

MR. ALLEN: And that -- that's a role we might want to consider down the road or recommend down the road.

MS. WALLACE: -- and the -- the ideal scenario would be -- which is not provided for in our agreement, but which we attempted to get, I know it was my recommendation that these projects and the status of the projects be evaluated annually.

But -- and prospectively, once we get beyond the projects that were included in the Cycle 1 recommendations, that is the process.

So the -- the projects that were submitted, applications for projects that were submitted the -- in the process this year were ranked, but there's no funding available within the MAG, those will not hold that ranking.

So the MPO next year will have another application process, and then we'll review the submittals, and through that process, readiness and leverage -- funding leverage and all kinds of other factors that will determine the true

readiness of the project will be evaluated in its recommendations for funding.

MR. CALETKA: That's correct.

MS. WALLACE: But the municipalities insisted upon those originally ranked projects maintaining their -- their status, which is not feasible, and it's resulted in -- in this -- the scenario that we find ourselves in now.

And it would require an amendment. So the municipalities whose projects could be moving, that are not happy with the current status, would need to push on another amendment to the agreement that would require annual analysis and evaluation of each of the projects for recommendation for subsequent funding.

And if it's not moving, then we should be able to fund other projects that are ready.

MR. HOOPER: That's right.

MS. WALLACE: But that is not -- contractually, that isn't -- we don't have that option with regard to the Cycle 1 ranked municipal --

MR. ALLEN: Has this --

MS. WALLACE: -- capital projects.

MR. ALLEN: -- has this issue come before the MPO? Have they even addressed this concern at this point in time? Do you know? Can you tell us?

MR. CALETKA: Well, no, because we rank and recommend, as required by the second amendment. We adopted it, of course. We're a party

to the second amendment.

MR. ALLEN: So -- but the MPO as a policy-making body has not, that you are aware, raised this as a -- as a concern or an issue?

MR. CALETKA: No.

MS. CASSINI: Mr. Chair?

MR. HOOPER: Ms. Cassini, and then Ms. Pennant.

MS. CASSINI: Thank you. I --

MR. HOOPER: Sorry. I'm sorry.

MS. PENNANT: No, no problem.

MS. CASSINI: I just wanted to address specifically Vice Chair Coolman's question about construction readiness and just kind of provide, in case there are municipalities that are listening, the encouragement that there -- there are construction ready projects that are not capital projects that are not within the purview of what the MPO is doing.

So as Angela pointed out, there were 97 projects of various phases that were brought forth through --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: -- the MPO's process. Those were capital projects. And they were in planning, design, and construction phases.

Very few of those were construction phase. In fact, 33 were construction phase. The whole rest of the list were all planning and design

phase.

There are -- sorry -- there are 30 -- 40 construction phase rehabilitation and maintenance projects. Those are managed by the County, and it's the County's process.

And many of those projects are, in fact, construction ready.

And we would encourage those municipalities that have rehabilitation and maintenance projects -- one of the criteria in order for a municipality to be recommended for funding was the ability to construct that project within 12 months of execution of the agreement.

And we did that purposefully, because we know that these construction projects are an economic stimulus during a pandemic.

So, again, we would encourage those municipalities that have rehabilitation and maintenance projects that were approved by this body and appropriated funds in 2020 to submit the documents that are necessary, the construction checklist documents, because that will help to address some of the concerns of this body.

And that's why we have those processes.

And I also -- I wanted to go back to the question that several of you asked, which is, what are we doing to try to get the cities the technical assistance and support that they need. That's what we're here for. That's what the staff in MAP Admin do.

The seven people that work in MAP administration are constantly doing workshops, providing technical assistance, reaching out to each municipality on a regular basis, checking in, have you submitted the documents, do you need any assistance.

We have, you know, teleconferences where the lawyers are involved. It's -- it's a ongoing discussion and dialog, trying to make sure that the municipalities have the resources and understand what is necessary so we can get these projects executed.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. PENNANT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm glad we're discussing this issue.

I -- I'm curious to know what are some of the common problems that these cities are reporting? You say they're in touch with you. I was going to ask that question, but then you --

MS. CASSINI: I'm sure Angela is going to have a different perspective because she's communicating directly with the legal counsel.

We're talking more with the technical staff, the project managers, the surtax points of contact.

So from my perspective, what I'm hearing is there's a great deal of staff turnover. There are a lot of people that have been, as you know, working from home for an extended period of time. There's kind of a

disconnect in communication.

And there are also misunderstanding, in some instances, of what the process is.

So we've been doing workshops, we've been providing, you know videos, we -- we have all kinds of recordings and -- and municipal partner resources on our website to try to help. FAQs. Everything, you know, we've been talking about here, trying to make sure that people understand what it is that needs to be done.

But there's a great deal of -- of -- there's a disconnect, procedurally.

So I've had multiple municipalities call and say where -- where's my -- where's my funding agreement? And we say, well, you know, have you submitted the documents? Well, what documents?

So it's -- it's a -- it's -- it's an educational process, because you are dealing with 29 different municipalities, all of varying sizes.

You know, some of these municipalities are very small. They might only have five or six staff people that are doing multiple things.

So some of this is just an education. As the Chair pointed out, this is the first time that we're doing it --

MS. PENNANT: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: -- and people are trying to understand exactly what it is that is expected of them.

MS. PENNANT: And then my last question is how does this affect cost? Because I'm thinking the longer this --

MR. HOOPER: It does.

MS. PENNANT: -- gets dragged out, it's going to impact the cost of the projects.

And who is going to bear the burden of that cost? Is it going to be the County? Or, you know, more being expended from the penny tax budget?

MR. CALETKA: Well, I'm happy to say that through this new process in the second amendment, not only do we use the construction cost index to account for the change in inflation for the cost of the project, but we also this year required each of the municipalities to get an independent verification of their cost estimates.

So it's not just I think it's going to cost \$10,000,000 for this project, it's here's the breakdown of the cost, and have an independent agency verify that that is true and correct.

So it adds an extra layer of comfort that the cost is reasonable and not underestimated and going to cost the County more later.

MS. PENNANT: All right. You know, I've always believed that, you know, for some of these design and planning projects, that the -- the municipalities should have skin in the game. I really believe that.

And I think for them to drag it out more and potentially increase costs

that might end up being -- going back to the County or any other funding source, penny tax, is unfair.

And I -- I would like to know how we're going to, moving forward, try to remedy that -- remedy that.

MS. WALLACE: If I may, the contract requires that any cost for the municipal projects in excess of the funds allocated by the County are borne by the municipality.

MS. PENNANT: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: So if they exceed the cost estimate, they exceed what's been allocated so far.

And so there's a -- a -- the -- the FDOT factor, multiplication factor for construction that is calculated as part of the five-year plan, but the -- the planning and design projects for which funding has been allocated thus far, if those exceed the -- the funds that have been -- and even construction.

If construction costs exceed the amount that's allocated by the County, then the municipality bears that cost.

The -- the agreement allows the municipality to request additional funds, surtax funds, if there are unforeseen conditions that are discovered during construction, but that's a request. It's not required that we allocate funding to cover those costs.

MR. HOOPER: Doug.

MR. COOLMAN: Yes, I have two questions for Gretchen which may answer Ms. Pennant's comment.

One, do you need more staff to specifically set up a task force to work more closely with the cities?

And, two, do you need a motion from this board to develop an amendment to the existing condition to clear up this log jam?

MS. CASSINI: Vice Chair, to the first question, I don't believe so.

We do have a request in our fiscal year 2022 that you'll be seeing in August, hopefully. I don't know if it will be recommended, but we did ask for an additional financial position to assist with getting the type of financial documentation that's required.

But, no, I think we are adequately staffed and resourced to be able to provide the technical assistance.

There's also a Project Management Office that's working on this. I think you heard from them last year.

We have an engineer that -- senior engineer that's providing technical assistance specifically to the technical aspects of these projects.

And I'm going to prepare an analysis, based on the discussion here today, of exactly where we are with all of the projects.

It will be brought forth to you during your workshop on the 19th of August.

And at that point, I think we'll have a better understanding of exactly where we are and what strategies we might need to employ to be able to move forward.

MR. ALLEN: I think -- Mr. Chairman, I think it comes down to an issue of ownership. The cities doesn't claim any ownership of this project -- or this program. And -- and until the citizens recognize that their cities have been approved for funding projects that, in many cases, are critical projects within their neighborhoods, within their cities, that are not in fact proceeding, somebody in the city is going to get a -- a -- an ownership colonel to say, hey, we need to do something about this.

It -- it's a matter of ownership. The -- the County can't force them to spend the money. They can apply for it and -- and -- and we can approve those projects, but it really comes down to the cities to execute once they have received the approvals to move forward.

And -- and the elected officials within their cities need to take some ownership for their citizens, for their taxpayers, to make sure these projects get moving.

MR. HOOPER: All right. Can you -- can -- can I make a recommendation? I -- honestly, I think that I'd like to wait for Gretchen to get all the information together, and maybe at our next meeting, or even our workshop, we can discuss it and how we'll -- what our plan of action will be at

that point.

I think, honestly, the MPO's here. He speaks -- they speak to the 33 cities. And I -- I think it's an issue that -- that they need to be made aware of, honestly.

And if you -- if you -- if you look at some of the way the projects were presented and how others were, some of them were very well organized. It looked like they were ready to go.

It's going to be those projects and those cities that are organized that are going to demand that the other cities get it together, or they're going to -- there's going to be a log jam, okay?

So I think really the MPO could take -- go back right now and take the first stab at letting the cities know what's starting to happen, and then let's -- let's formulate a plan, and then we'll -- we'll -- we'll -- we'll either send a message to the County as a recommendation and/or to the MPO.

We can talk about what the next cycle of projects, how those are being dealt with.

I love the idea of valuing shovel readiness at -- at a much higher level. And maybe we can make that recommendation to the MPO.

And I appreciate Mr. Allen's catching this, because it was really -- it's really an important piece of the program.

MS. LOVE: I have a question. I understand the cities have -- in the

agreement, have three years to begin construction; is that correct?

MS. WALLACE: For the -- for -- yes. For projects for which construction phase funding has been allocated, they have three years to begin to execute their agreement for the funds and to begin construction.

And if they do not within that three years, then the County can cancel the project.

MS. LOVE: So have any of these cities exceeded that three year period that's -- at this point?

MS. WALLACE: No. So there are projects for which the funding was allocated in June of last year, and if the construction -- for which there are no -- there's no agreement, so they've lost a year.

MS. LOVE: But they're still right now in compliance with the procedural aspect of they have three years.

MS. WALLACE: Correct. Because it's only --

MS. LOVE: So that seems to --

MS. WALLACE: -- it's only been --

MS. LOVE: -- be time --

MS. WALLACE: -- one year. Last year was the first time that funding was allocated, so they have two more years to actually execute the agreement for the construction funding and begin construction.

MS. LOVE: So for the purposes from a procedural standpoint, the

cities are in compliance. They're not -- they haven't exceeded anything yet.

MS. WALLACE: Correct. Based upon the terms of the agreement, yes, that was worked into the terms of the agreement.

MS. LOVE: Right.

MS. WALLACE: So they are in compliance.

And I think the issue is that's causing a backlog.

MS. LOVE: Yeah.

MS. WALLACE: Yeah.

MS. LOVE: But right now, it -- the issue is not a issue because they do have three years.

MS. WALLACE: That's true. Right. Good point.

MS. PENNANT: Right. But -- but -- but maybe the -- the rules or the basis for compliance was incorrect in the first place.

MS. LOVE: Right.

MR. HOOPER: Sure.

MS. PENNANT: So that's something that we need to look at, either for future contracts, so we can adjust moving forward or, right now, make addendums to what is established --

MS. WALLACE: Well --

MS. PENNANT: -- because --

MS. WALLACE: -- I have to tell that that takes agreement among the

parties. So it is a -- an agreement, a written contract among the County, the MPO, and 29 of the 31 municipalities.

And the reason it is like that is because it was what the municipalities requested.

So -- and, you know, it was an accommodation, because there was a lot of, oh, well, we want to keep our place in line.

And so, well, I -- it will take a majority of the participating municipalities to be upset about those who are holding their place and line and therefore holding up money.

MR. HOOPER: That's right.

MS. PENNANT: Well, I -- I -- this -- this is definitely a issue that needs to be revisited. I think that even the cities need to be part of that discussion so they now understand.

Because at the time that the rule was made and they all agreed to it, they were operating with limited perspectives.

And I think now that we're in the reality, then I think they all need to understand what the impact could be for all of them, because today it might be your project, but next time it could be -- you know, today it might be somebody else's project, but tomorrow it's your project. So we still -- I -- I don't think that we -- we can leave this alone.

I think all parties need to be aware of the impact that's -- that's -- that's

taking place, and maybe there needs to be some kind of itemization of what the impacts are so we can make a strong case for why change is necessary.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. I think we'll -- we'll be taking about this more at the next meeting.

Thank you, Phil, for bringing this up.

DR. KELLEY: I do have a quick question.

MR. HOOPER: Oh, go ahead, Dr. Kelley.

DR. KELLEY: Do -- did I hear you say that there are projects that have been completed?

MS. WALLACE: The -- the agreement for the surtax funding, the interlocal agreement which provides the surtax funding to the municipality for the project has been completed.

And there are municipalities who are in the process of the -- the construction bid process for those projects. Davie I know is one of them I think that has two or three construction projects.

We've completed the -- the agreement providing the surtax funds, and they are preparing for the or in the construction bid process right now.

DR. KELLEY: But -- but not actually constructing. In -- in other words --

MS. CASSINI: There -- there are no municipal projects that are surtax funded that are currently under construction with the surtax dollars. I want to

be clear about that.

DR. KELLEY: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: Because there are some projects where surtax funds are coming in to augment an existing project.

But we have not released the first advance for funding. We have executed contracts in the pipeline, but we have not received any invoices yet from municipalities requesting their first funding advance.

Now, just for clarity on the record for anyone in the -- member -- members of the public, we're talking specifically here about municipal projects.

There are County projects that are in construction, that have been completed.

So I want to just make -- make it clear that this is a very small proportion of the overall program that we're talking about here this morning.

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

DR. KELLEY: No, I understand that. I just was wondering if there was any way in terms of incentivizing the cities to move -- move along, you know. Anything that we could highlight on -- online, on the website that, you know -- you know, look what's happening here. This is positive, the city is moving -- I don't know.

I just was wondering if there was anything we could highlight.

MS. CASSINI: Well -- well, very briefly, Mr. Chair, if I could just -- that's one of the reasons why we recreated the dashboard, and it's one of the reasons why we're having a big special event with all of the municipal marketing and public information officers next week, to try to get them excited.

We've created branding kits for every municipality and their own special MAP Broward brands and logos so that they do start to feel some excitement and some energy around communicating about these projects.

MR. ALLEN: I -- if I look at the six month financial report, unaudited financial statements, it reflects that the County has incurred expenditures of about a hundred and -- oh, 140, \$150,000,000 has been expended by the County for County projects, and that includes mass transit expansions, paratransit, et cetera.

So, you know, the -- we are funding projects, and the County is taking advantage of the funding, but the cities have not.

MR. HOOPER: Right.

MS. CASSINI: Well --

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: -- except for the community shuttle program, which we have been funding since 2020. And it's expanding.

I hope in this particular fiscal year there's some interest in expanding

the services.

So the -- the surtax is funding 18 municipal community shuttle programs, both the capital and the operations and maintenance in full.

And it's -- it's a significant amount of money.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah. Okay. Let's -- let's move to -- we --

MS. MADDEN: Mr. Chair?

MR. HOOPER: -- we --

MS. MADDEN: Mr. Chair, I'm sorry.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. MADDEN: I'll be very brief.

MR. HOOPER: That's okay.

MS. MADDEN: Does each municipal project that's number have a separate funding agreement? Is that -- and they're all negotiated individually?

MS. WALLACE: Yes. So we have to have -- it's a project-specific agreement. So --

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MS. WALLACE: -- the scope for each project and the funding for each project is tracked separately.

MS. MADDEN: Okay. Are those available so that each -- as each municipality comes in to negotiate their own agreement, they could review

what the criteria and documents have been to successfully get to a funding agreement?

MS. WALLACE: So when we receive the -- so the -- there is a process by which the County Attorney's Office communicated with all of the municipal attorneys in the preparation of the Surtax Project Funding Interlocal Agreement.

MS. MADDEN: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: So they all participated, provided comments.

The -- it is a form agreement that was approved by the County Commission in August of 2020.

So it is a public document. It is available and has been made available to everyone.

And it's a matter of populating, you know, certain sections with municipal contact information for notices, who their project manager is, and providing the exhibits, the construction documents, the -- a schedule for design or construction, for providing the -- the actual scope, the design scope for the -- the firm that will be doing the design, or the complete construction package.

But those are the documents. The exhibits to the agreements are what are needed in order to prepare the agreement.

MS. MADDEN: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: And if the construction documents are not complete and they haven't been submitted to us, we can't prepare the agreement.

If the design scope for the -- for the design firm is not complete and we don't have it, we can't prepare the funding agreement, because the design document, the actual design scope for that project that the -- that the design firm is going to design for the project is the exhibit to the agreement.

MS. MADDEN: Okay. Thanks.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Anymore discussion on this item?

A - MOTION TO APPROVE AS ELIGIBLE FOR SURTAX FUNDING A ROADWAY DRAINAGE CONSTRUCTION-PHASE PROJECT ON SW 25TH STREET FOR PEMBROKE PARK, PPRK-002

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So we do have a -- we were in the middle of an item, and it was about those -- what were they, six or eight projects that were still unapproved, right?

MS. CASSINI: So, Mr. Chair, at this point, there's actually an eligibility determination just for the West Park project --

MR. HOOPER: Oh, the one --

MS. CASSINI: -- 002 --

MR. HOOPER: -- that was --

MS. WALLACE: Pembroke Park.

MS. CASSINI: -- that was -- I'm sorry. Pembroke Park.

MR. HOOPER: Pembroke Park.

MS. CASSINI: Thank you.

002 that was ranked 18th in the first cycle. That was deferred, so you all never saw the -- the project in 2020.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So the question would be is it shovel ready?

(Laughter.)

MS. WALLACE: So the hope is that -- the expectation is that it will be shovel ready in 2026. So the --

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: -- proposal is to --

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: -- is to recommend Pembroke Park Project 002 for construction funding in the new fifth year of the rolling five-year plan, which will be FY 2026.

So for eligibility purposes, you know, surtax funding can be used for planning, development, construction --

MR. HOOPER: Uh-huh.

MS. WALLACE: -- operations and maintenance of roads, bridges, and -- and transit.

And so the Oversight Board's role under the ordinance is to review proposed projects and their proposed expenditures for eligibility under

212.055 Florida Statutes.

This particular project, Pembroke Park, PPRK002, is for the construction of roadway and drainage improvements on Southwest 25th Street in -- in the City of Pembroke Park.

And while there are -- the -- the -- the design hasn't been completed and we don't have the construction -- the construction documents, the project type if eligible, and I would recommend that the -- the project as eligible subject to review of the complete construction documents and the construction cost estimate for eligibility related to enhancements under Section 3 of the interlocal agreement.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So we need a motion to approve.

MR. ALLEN: I **move** approval.

MR. COOLMAN: Second.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Do we have any discussions on that approval?

Hearing none -- should we take the roll call or can we just yea or nay?

MS. CASSINI: Yea or nay.

MR. HOOPER: All those in favor?

Those opposed?

Hearing none, the motion passes.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

PRESENTATIONS

**1 - MAP BROWARD VIDEO (PRODUCED BY ADG STRATEGY GROUP) -
MS. NICHOLE KALIL, PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER, MAP
ADMINISTRATION**

MR. HOOPER: Okay. We now have a presentation, a MAP Broward video.

Ms. Williams-Wilson?

You go by Ms. Williams?

MS. WILLIAMS-WILSON: Williams-Wilson.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Thank you.

MS. CASSINI: She's newly married.

MS. WILLIAMS-WILSON: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: Well that's great.

MS. WILLIAMS-WILSON: Thank you. Good morning, Board members. I'm Tashauna Williams-Wilson, Public Information Specialist for MAP Broward. Nice speaking with you all again.

I am here to give some background to this presentation.

Over the past month or so, your Public Information Officer, Nichole Kalil, and I have been hard at work on our ongoing rebranding initiative, as you all know, for MAP Broward.

You all have received the branding materials and such that we've given you over the last few board meetings.

We are happy to say that we've conducted a smooth solicitation done using the County's Office of Public Communications Qualified Vendor List to create a corporate video and have been working on our first full-length video with the Emmy Award-winning ABG Strategy Group, who is in the audience today. Melissa, if you could give a wave.

So this CBE firm that we're working with has worked tirelessly to create a draft brand video for MAP Broward which I will present to you today. And hopefully more to come as we attempt to use this video, break it down into one-minute and 30-second snipper reels, teaser videos for our marketing strategy future.

We welcome your feedback on this video, hence why we felt we needed to present it to you all today, to gather your input from the Oversight Board members, stakeholders, and prior to finalizing this video so that we can use it in digital marketing strategies, event presentations like for next week and such, and moving forward in our strategies.

So without further ado, here is -- give me a second -- this -- our MAP Broward corporate video.

Excuse me. Public Communications team, we seem to be having an issue with volume. If Mike Jorgensen or Manny could come out and help for a second. Or just give me a wave when the volume's all good.

Sorry for the delay, members.

MS. CASSINI: Many colors.

MS. WILLIAMS-WILSON: Thank you.

(Video plays.)

VIDEO AUDIO: 2,000,000 people, at the beach, on their way to work, headed to see grandma --

(Video pauses.)

MR. JORGENSEN: Wait until I get back there before you play it.

MS. WILLIAMS-WILSON: Okay. Sorry. Brief pause.

Okay. I've been given the green light.

(Video plays.)

VIDEO AUDIO: 2,000,000 people, at the beach, on their way to work, headed to see grandma, constantly on the move.

Each of us may be headed to different places, but we all face the same challenges going from Point A to B: congestion, safety, and quality of life.

In 2018, Broward County residents voted to do something about it, approving the Penny for Transportation 30-Year Plan. Using discretionary sales tax, we would take mobility challenges head on.

Today, the plan is not just a plan, it's a program of smart projects that will innovate the entire County.

MAP Broward projects will create connectivity, improve transit service,

traffic management systems, enhance multimodal options while ensuring economic development benefits.

MAP Broward will improve technology and deliver transportation solutions which will relieve congestion and create safer commutes.

VIDEO AUDIO: To make our morning drop off safer.

VIDEO AUDIO: To make the commute to work easier.

VIDEO AUDIO: To keep us pedaling towards a greener future.

VIDEO AUDIO: Penny for Transportation is now Broward County's Mobility Advancement Program, or MAP Broward.

Covering 16 project areas, MAP Broward's projects include electric hybrid buses and last mile transportation solutions, resilience plans that upgrade roadway and bridge improvements, traffic management systems that utilize fiberoptics to react to traffic flow in real time, and other mobility enhancements that make walking, biking, and enjoying your community easier and safer.

Built on foundational elements such as transparency, accountability, and resilience, we're committing \$16,000,000,000 over 30 years to improve the place we work, play, go to school, call home, and welcome visitors from all around the world.

Because we know the destination is important, but so is the journey.

We invite you to see what's on the horizon for your neighborhood.

See it all right now on our interactive project dashboard. Get started now.

Visit MapBroward.Broward.org.

(Video ends.)

(Applause.)

MS. WILLIAMS-WILSON: Give me one sec.

Thank you to ABG Strategy Group.

I will now open the floor for any and all feedback from our Oversight Board.

MR. HOOPER: Anybody like to say anything?

MR. SMITH: I think it was really, really strong. The only thing I would like to see that I see that is maybe missing a little bit is showing multimodal in the sense of like bikes alongside cars.

I feel like the pictures of bikes were on a trail that's nowhere near anything, and my opinion is we need a lot more interactivity, right, because we're very dense in Broward. And especially look at a city like Fort Lauderdale. We're going to have to co-exist.

So I would like to maybe see a little bit of that imagery, perhaps, but really, really solid. I thought it was good.

I loved the reference to the dashboard and getting people on there and looking at the projects near them.

So it was very good.

MS. WILLIAMS-WILSON: Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Any other comments?

DR. KELLEY: I've got a suggestion.

MS. MADDEN: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: Yes, Dr. Kelley.

DR. KELLEY: Just had a suggestion, although I -- I mean, I think it's just great.

But I know -- like you -- I didn't get much of a sense of like what it's like for -- from -- from an interior perspective for a commuter, whether they get on a bus, whether they -- it's the multimodal to some extent, but also, for instance, on the buses they're having wi-fi, you know, that whole experience, and the electric buses.

And I -- I don't know if I was -- I might have missed it, but I didn't see any paratransit vehicles. So it might be nice to include one.

MS. WILLIAMS-WILSON: Okay. That's fair. Anyone else?

MS. MADDEN: Mr. Chair? I thought it was really well done. Thank you for preparing it.

MS. WILLIAMS-WILSON: Thank you.

MS. PENNANT: For me, I just -- I don't know, I guess I wanted to see more about celebrating the economic impact that this investment is bringing to the community.

MS. WILLIAMS-WILSON: Okay.

MS. LOVE: I loved the vibrancy of the video and the sites and everything that was presented, and the quality of what was presented as well. Excellent.

MS. WILLIAMS-WILSON: Thank you.

MS. PENNANT: I did, too.

MS. WILLIAMS-WILSON: Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, I -- I thought it was great and -- and it really puts a -- a stamp on the idea that the investment is being made in the community, and it's going in for everybody.

So I thought you guys did a great job.

MS. WILLIAMS-WILSON: Thank you.

DR. KELLEY: Very exciting.

MR. HOOPER: Anything else? Okay.

MS. WILLIAMS-WILSON: All righty.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you very much.

MS. WILLIAMS-WILSON: Thank you.

MS. PENNANT: Thank you.

2 - FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE UPDATE (SURFACE TRANSPORTATION REAUTHORIZATION) - MR. GREG BURNS, THORN RUN PARTNERS

MR. HOOPER: We have another presentation. We're going to get an

update on the federal legislation, the Surface Transportation Reauthorization.

Mr. Burns.

MR. BURNS: Hello. Good morning.

MR. HOOPER: Good morning.

MR. BURNS: So my name's Greg Burns. I'm with Thorn Run Partners in Washington, D.C. Happy to join you all this morning.

I work on behalf of Broward County on a host of issues, but certainly supporting you all on transportation issues is one of those priorities.

So, you know, today I'm here to chat about what's going on with respect to transportation and infrastructure and those conversations in Washington.

So with respect to the Surface Transportation Authorization situation, I think you all are familiar with what's known as the FAST Act. And the FAST Act is the existing Surface Transportation Authorization bill that underpins all federal surface transportation investment across the country.

That bill expires at the end of September of this calendar year.

And so the House and Senate are both feverishly working to develop new iterations of the bill for the next five-plus years.

And, in fact, both the House and Senate just in the past month have released bills that would do just that.

The House bill is -- is very similar to what was introduced in the last

Congress. It's still known as the Invest in America Act.

The Senate bill is not the same as what was introduced actually in 2019, but it's -- it's still very bipartisan, and the title's a little different, but that's sort of neither here nor there.

The point is they're both working towards the common goal of passing a new authorization bill sometime this fiscal year, in FY '21, in order to have that be ready for the expiration of the past act.

So the two bills are both five-year bills. They do both propose to have significant boost in transportation funding.

The House bill I think proposes 54 percent increase over the baseline FAST Act Bill.

The Senate bill, on the other hand, is about a 30-some percent, 33, if I recall correctly, percent increase.

It's only at the moment for highways, and this gets a little complicated as to why, but the Senate has three different Committees of Jurisdiction that ultimately have to act in order to create a surface transportation bill, and thus far they've only done the highway portion.

So the highway portion would increase funding by about 33 percent over the FAST Act level.

So both propose significantly more money than we're currently spending today.

Both bills do include climate change sections, so they are focused on that issue more than any other transportation authorization bill has been in the past, which is -- is notable.

And I think the -- another notable item is that the House bill does include so-called member-designated projects, and I would just call these earmarks.

Right now, in the House bill, there are a number of projects that are -- have been requested by Broward County municipalities as well as the MPO, and several of those priorities are funded in the House bill.

Ms. Cassini has a list of those that we've provided to her if she wants to share those with you in the future. Maybe she already has.

The Senate bill does not include earmarks at the moment, and so there's a question, to be honest, as to whether or not these -- these earmarks will really make it through the process.

One of the reasons is that the House has them and the Senate doesn't. We're not really sure what the Senate will ultimately do, if they'll agree to accept the House projects.

But at the moment, they're in the House bill.

The Senate bill right now is -- is bipartisan. It was reported out of committee -- at least, again, that highway portion was reported out of committee in a completely bipartisan manner. It received unanimous

support.

The House bill is much less bipartisan. The Invest in America Act, when it was reported out of committee on Thursday morning, only received two Republican votes.

If we move ahead to the next slide, you'll note that this is a graphical depiction of the overall funding levels, both with the FAST Act, the Invest in America Act, and the Senate highway bill so far.

And, you know, note that each mode, highway funding, transit funding, and rail funding, all receive pretty significant boosts in funding under the Invest in America Act compared with the FAST Act.

The -- the largest boost, quite frankly, is for rail funding, as you'll note. That's the gray shaded part.

The transit and highway also receive pretty significant boosts.

And, again, you'll note that the Senate bill also does include a pretty significant boost thus far for highway spending.

I should note that the Senate Commerce Committee next week will be considering the rail portion of the Senate Surface Transportation Authorization Bill.

It is a boost in funding compared to the FAST Act, but it is still less than the Invest in America Act.

So when the Senate Banking Committee gets around to the transit

portion of that bill, you -- you should expect that it will short of fall within those lines, meaning it will be more than the FAST Act proposed but likely less than the Invest in America Act.

So if we move to the next slide and we look a little bit more closely at what the Invest in America Act will do, which is, again, out of the House, it really does try to mirror the President's American Jobs Plan.

I mentioned that it's much like the bill was when it was introduced last year, and when it did actually pass the House, but it's gotten a little bit more robust in terms of overall funding, and some of its priorities have -- have shifted a little bit.

For instance, investments in electric vehicle charging and infrastructure is something that's been added to the bill that was not as robust in the prior iteration.

But broadly speaking, you know, this bill is focusing on reducing greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector, which, of course, is a huge priority in the American Jobs Plan that the administration's released.

It does do a lot to fund EV charging infrastructure. I think along the lines of what you all will also be interested in, it significantly boosts funding for transit and for electric buses.

It also focuses much more on how transit and housing development

align and how they can sort of work together to create really vibrant, healthy, strong neighborhoods and communities.

The new surface transportation bill introduced by the House would also fund much more resilient infrastructure investment.

You know, I think in the past we've -- we've definitely had a -- not as much of a focus on trying to ensure that these investments that we make will -- will be functional in the future. And this bill wants to make sure that any investment that we make is functional in a changing -- with a changing climate.

And then last but not least, I think it's important to note that this bill does focus on -- from a highway perspective, it focuses on repairing and maintaining infrastructure before building new roads.

So that's not necessarily the case for the transit investment but -- or rail investment, for instance, because they are talking about significant investments in new transit and rail infrastructure. But from the perspective of roads, it really focuses on taking care of what we have and not necessarily building new roads.

Moving to the next slide, you know, how does all this fit into the broader infrastructure discussion.

You -- I'm sure you're hearing a lot about all the conversations that are going on amongst the White House and the Senate in particular, but also, to

a lesser extent, the House at the moment, where they're all trying to work together to come up with some big, broad, and bold infrastructure package.

You know, while bipartisan efforts are, I think, useful and good to get -- to -- to help move the ball down the -- down the field, ultimately, I think it is unlikely that the White House and the Republicans will be able to agree on any big infrastructure package.

I could be wrong. I hope I'm wrong. But I think that there's a lot that separates them, and a couple great differences as to why those -- what those separations are.

One is the focus on the climate. The administration and certainly progressive Democrats believe very strongly that we cannot continue the status quo with respect to our investment in transportation and that we have to incentivize a transition to, you know, a much greener transportation sector.

And then, two, it's really about how you pay for these bills. The White House and progressive Democrats do not believe that we should be essentially increasing user fees or the gas tax. Those are regressive taxes.

And, instead, they very much support, you know, a minimum corporate tax, they support increased taxes on wealthy Americans. And -- and some of the recent news items that have come out have, you know, sort of fed into that, where we've found that some of the richest Americans aren't paying as much in taxes as some people believe they should, and whereas many

corporations we know also arguably might not be paying as much in taxes as -- as many people think that they should.

So I think those pay-fors and the focus on the climate are really the things that will keep the Democrats and Republicans from being able to negotiate a bipartisan agreement, but we'll see where those conversations go.

So where does that leave us? You know, I do think it is possible that the House and Senate could get together and pass a surface transportation bill that would look something like a middle ground between the Invest in America Act that's come from the House as well as what the Senate is still working to put together.

That's a -- that's a reasonable scenario, I think.

There's some chance that it could get some -- well, it would have to get some bipartisan support, obviously, in the -- in the Senate, and we'll see where that goes.

That then could be, you know, followed up by a bigger infrastructure package that would be considered by the Congress via the reconciliation budget process that you became familiar with because that's how Congress passed the American Rescue Act in March.

So, you know, I expect these conversations to continue for months at this point. None of this is going to be wrapped up quickly. None of it's going

to be dealt with quickly. This is not the way that Washington works.

But, you know, infrastructure is certainly dominating the debate in D.C., and it will continue to do so I think for the foreseeable future, you know, and we may see something finally done, you know, hopefully by the end of September, but -- but maybe even as late as, you know, November or December timeframe.

So that's the end of my PowerPoint discussion, but I'm happy to answer any questions that anyone may have, or if anyone wants to make any comments, I can certainly respond.

Thanks for your time.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

Do we have any questions? Mr. --

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chair.

MR. HOOPER: -- Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Greg, the -- the Invest Act, does it have a pay-for issue?

MR. BURNS: So -- actually, great question. Both the House and the Senate Authorization Committees, they propose the spending and, frankly, the different committees and the Ways and Means Committee and then another committee in the Senate have to come up with the financing.

So, to be blunt, they both do have some struggles in that regard, too, because they do propose, you know, vastly more spending.

And -- and, to be honest, those conversations have not even begun.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Any other questions?

Okay. Well, thank you very much for that report. We really appreciate it, Mr. Burns.

MR. BURNS: Thank you.

MR. ALLEN: Just --

MR. HOOPER: Oh, is this for a different thing?

MR. ALLEN: -- yeah. Well, it's interrelated. It doesn't apply to the federal but the state --

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. ALLEN: -- budget, the government or the -- the -- this -- this year's state budget. There were projects that were out there that were approved as line items within the governor's budget.

Did those affect Broward transit or any of the highway projects?

MS. CASSINI: I am not aware of there being any earmarks in the state budget that were related to this program.

I will double check and -- and make sure to get that to you if there were.

NON-AGENDA

MEMBER REPORTS

MR. HOOPER: Do any members --

MS. CASSINI: So --

MR. HOOPER: -- have anything they want to report?

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: Go ahead.

MR. COOLMAN: The City of Fort Lauderdale has hired the Pace Foundation to work on this plus-or-minus 20-mile trail system, and I just want to make sure that the County's greenways people are talking to the PATH group so there's nothing lost in the transition.

I -- I'm -- I ran into someone at the opening down by the port that I didn't realize the County was working on a bicycle path system or whatever, correct?

MS. WALLACE: No. So --

MR. COOLMAN: Huh?

MS. WALLACE: -- there -- there is an existing Greenways Master Plan --

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MS. WALLACE: -- but for purposes of surtax eligibility --

MR. COOLMAN: I'm not even talking about surtax eligibility necessarily.

MS. WALLACE: Oh, okay.

MR. COOLMAN: I'm just talking about the fact that I'd like to make sure that the County's greenway system and the city's trail system, almost 20 miles, are talking to each other, because they need to interconnect physically.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. COOLMAN: And that -- that's just -- I didn't know it had to necessarily had to deal with surtax.

MS. WALLACE: Oh, okay.

MR. COOLMAN: I think it has to do with our mobility question we've been talking about.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. COOLMAN: And here's a chance for -- to make the County and the city's trail system work together.

I didn't know if the County and the city were talking about that.

MS. WALLACE: We can inquire.

MS. CASSINI: Yes.

MS. WALLACE: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: We -- we have a person on staff who is actually surtax-funded --

MS. WALLACE: Yeah.

MS. CASSINI: -- who is a Senior Mobility Planner and whose focus is

primarily on multi-use paths --

MR. COOLMAN: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: -- and greenways who is actually from the City of Fort Lauderdale and is working closely with other municipalities on their multi-use paths and greenways.

MR. COOLMAN: What is her name?

MS. CASSINI: Her name is Josette Severyn.

MR. COOLMAN: If you will send me that information, we'll make sure it gets to the PATH Foundation, and they can talk.

MS. CASSINI: I'm sure that she's listening.

MR. COOLMAN: I -- it -- they --

MS. CASSINI: And I will make sure that she connects --

MR. COOLMAN: Okay. Thank you.

MS. CASSINI: -- with you.

MR. COOLMAN: Thank you.

MR. SMITH: Quick --

MR. COOLMAN: For the good of the County and the cities.

MR. SMITH: -- quick -- very quick comment. I think the tie-in, though, is multi-modal is part of the solution to congestion.

I know I've gone on record and said this before. We haven't done much with it here in South Florida. Doesn't mean we can't. There are so

many national examples.

It's not about bikers, it's not about exercising, it's about creating solutions with density, and it should be part of our -- our purview here -- I'll just make that kind of macro statement -- over time.

Just because we haven't done it doesn't mean we can't do it, so --

MR. HOOPER: And we're going to have a workshop in August, so maybe we can discuss that more. I mean --

MS. WALLACE: And --

MR. HOOPER: -- all those kinds of things and the connections with other programs that aren't necessarily surtax.

MS. WALLACE: Right. And so -- but in follow up to Mr. Smith's comments, for purpose of surtax eligibility, it needs to be multi-use paths that are ancillary to road projects. So --

MR. HOOPER: That's correct, right?

MS. WALLACE: -- what you're saying is correct.

MS. CASSINI: Yeah, the Oversight Board did approve a Greenways Master Plan both for 2019 and 2020 with very specific components --

MR. HOOPER: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: -- but we were having to go back and review the eligibility determination that was made at that time.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

GENERAL COUNSEL REPORT

MR. HOOPER: Does General Counsel have anything?

MS. WALLACE: I think I've said enough for today. Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: So has Doug, but he's going to have to say something before we're done, right? No, I'm kidding. I always mess with Doug. He's my buddy.

MS. PENNANT: Just --

MR. HOOPER: Yes, Ms. Pennant.

MS. PENNANT: -- I -- I just won't be able to attend the next meeting, so that's going to be my first absence. Because I am taking my daughter up to her now school, Howard University.

So she's been there --

MR. HOOPER: Well, all right.

MS. PENNANT: -- but now she has to be physically located. So I'm going to hate missing the workshop, so just wanted --

MR. HOOPER: Well, we're going to miss you.

MS. PENNANT: -- to let you know.

MR. HOOPER: We're going to miss you.

MS. PENNANT: Thanks.

MR. ALLEN: You can phone in.

(Laughter.)

BOARD COORDINATOR REPORT

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Gretchen, do you have anything?

MS. CASSINI: I do, Mr. Chair. Just a few brief things.

First thing, I'd really like to take an opportunity to say goodbye to an integral member of the Mobility Advancement Program, and the gentleman who created your internal dashboard back in 2019 to track all of the projects from the original --

MR. HOOPER: Wow.

MS. CASSINI: -- plan and also the beautiful public-facing dashboard and many of our data visualization tools.

He has been taken by Broward County Transit, and so he'll still be part of the family, he'll still be working on the overall program, but he will no longer be supporting you.

I just wanted to take an opportunity to say goodbye to Mr. Carreras. If you would just stand up and --

(Applause.)

MR. HOOPER: Nice job.

MS. CASSINI: He's been very generous. He's going to help do some knowledge transfer with his successor and -- and help us with the selection process.

So very grateful for that. And I'm very grateful for everything that

you've done for the program so far.

So thank you.

The only other thing I wanted to just mention was we have had some initial meetings with the FTA and with Miami-Dade County.

Obviously, you know that Broward County is in a -- an MOU with the Florida Department of Transportation's District 4.

We're working closely also with District 6 on the commuter rail project.

And so that is really moving at quite a clip. I'm on the project executive committee, so I'm -- I'll be bringing you back regular updates on that particular project.

And we were also invited -- Tim Garling, the Deputy Director of Broward County Transit and I had the opportunity at Gerry O'Reilly, the District Secretary's request to meet with FDOT's Central Office.

They have discretionary funding, much like the federal government. They have a new starts program of their own.

And they were generous enough to give us about two hours of their time to talk about this program and some of the discretionary grant opportunities that we might be able to avail ourselves of.

Met with the Chief of Innovation, which was really interesting.

And I also wanted to just mention, too, because you're all very interested in leveraging the surtax, that we have two RAISE grants, which

are discretionary grants for the new BUILD, for those of you that might be familiar with the -- the previous USDOT program that was called BUILD, RAISE is that next generation.

And both Broward County Transit and our Public Works Department are pursuing RAISE grants, due in July, that would be able to potentially leverage surtax funds.

MR. HOOPER: Awesome.

MS. CASSINI: That's it.

MR. HOOPER: That's great.

Does anybody else have anything they'd like to say?

MS. LOVE: I just wanted --

MR. HOOPER: All right.

MS. LOVE: -- to share, Anthea reminded me, I may also not be present at the budget workshop. I, too, am taking -- helping my daughter with transitioning to a dorm North Carolina.

MR. HOOPER: Oh, cool.

ADJOURN

MR. HOOPER: All right. Well, meeting is adjourned, and thank you, everybody.

Have a nice weekend.

(The meeting concluded at 11:06 p.m.)