

## MINUTES

### INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

AUGUST 20, 2021

#### **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.

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

Shea Smith, Accounting, Director of Audit and Attest Services, Berkowitz  
Pollack Brant Advisors and Accountants, via Zoom

Dr. Consuelo Kelley, Resident Consumer of Public Transportation

#### **MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Anthea Pennant, District Director of the Broward College Office of Supplier

Relations and Diversity

**ALSO PRESENT:**

Angela Wallace, Surtax General Counsel

Gretchen Cassini, Board Coordinator

Audrey Thompson, Administrative Support Specialist

Tashauna Williams, Public Information Specialist

Laura Rogers, County Auditor's Office

Chris Walton, Director, Broward County Transportation Department

Tony Hui, Deputy Director, Broward County Public Works

Althea Lewis, Surtax Program Management Office

Neil Lyn, Mobility and Innovations Team Supervisor

Margaret Dalley-Johns, Finance Manager, MAP

Nichole Kalil, Public Information Officer

Tim Garling, Deputy Director, Broward County Transportation Department

Lina Silva, Project Coordinator, MAP Administration

Alexander Mayorga, Program Performance Analyst

SunJin Zanker, Budget and Management Analyst

Jeffrey Napier, Procurement Strategist, Broward County Transportation

Department

Sandy-Michael McDonald, Director, Broward County Office of Economic and

Small Business Development

Johnny Caldera, Court Reporter, Laws Reporting Inc.

\* indicates signed in to attend/participate in the meeting telephonically

A meeting of the Independent Transportation Surtax Oversight Board, Broward County, Florida, was held at 115 South Andrews Avenue, Room 430, Fort Lauderdale, Florida at 9:30 a.m., Friday, August 20, 2021.

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

**CALL TO ORDER - CHAIR HOOPER**

MR. HOOPER: Okay, we're going to start the meeting of our -- the second day of our work for the Independent Transport Surtax Oversight Board, August 19<sup>th</sup>.

Can we get the roll call, please?

MS. CASSINI: This is the 20<sup>th</sup>, just --

MR. HOOPER: I'm sorry. August 20<sup>th</sup>. Your agenda says August 19<sup>th</sup>.

MS. CASSINI: Different agenda.

MR. HOOPER: Oh, am I on the wrong agenda?

MR. FRAIZER: Wrong page.

MS. WALLACE: Further down.

MR. HOOPER: Sorry about that.

MS. WALLACE: It's all blend in.

MR. FRAIZER: No, it follows.

MR. HOOPER: Oh, okay. Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah. Okay.

**ROLL CALL - TASHAUNA WILLIAMS**

MR. HOOPER: Well, anyway, let's do a roll call, please.

MS. WILLIAMS: Certainly.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

MS. WILLIAMS: Shea Smith.

Ronald Frazier.

MR. SMITH: I'm here.

MR. HOOPER: There --

MS. WILLIAMS: Oh.

MR. HOOPER: -- he is.

MS. CASSINI: Shea Smith.

MR. FRAZIER: Here.

MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. Alan Hooper.

MR. HOOPER: Here.

MS. WILLIAMS: Debbie Madden.

MS. MADDEN: Here.

MS. WILLIAMS: Phil Allen.

MR. ALLEN: Here.

MS. WILLIAMS: Allyson Love.

MS. LOVE: Here.

MS. WILLIAMS: Douglas Coolman.

MR. COOLMAN: Here.

MS. WILLIAMS: Dr. Consuelo Kelley. And -- excused.

And Anthea Pennant, also excused.

MS. CASSINI: We have a quorum.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Good deal.

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

MR. HOOPER: Are we going to open it up to any public participation, if there is any?

Obviously, please take your mask off if you're here in the room while you're speaking.

And if you're on the phone, please identify yourself.

And for those of you that are on the phone, please don't put us on hold with music on the background.

And also mute your phone so that we can have the meeting in -- in peace.

Okay. I'm going to let you --

MS. CASSINI: Mr. Chair, there is --

MR. HOOPER: -- take it.

MS. CASSINI: -- there is no public participation at this time.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Fantastic. So we'll go ahead and move with the meeting.

Now -- now, this is -- this is -- the next part, where it says Regular Agenda, is after, right?

MS. CASSINI: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: We're going to continue to workshop. We're going to

finish up with the five-year plan, and then we're going to move into our regular meeting.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Thank you.

MS. CASSINI: No problem.

MR. HOOPER: Thanks, Phil.

## **WORKSHOP**

### **I - OVERVIEW OF FIVE-YEAR PLANS**

MS. CASSINI: So, good morning. We are working on the new five-year plan, so our rolling five-year plan, which is going to cover fiscal years '22 through '26.

And using a plan like this is no different than our normal capital improvement plan process that we do in the County and most of the municipalities. It gives individuals in -- inside of our organization an opportunity to community about what's planned, what's expected over the next five years.

Also gives us an opportunity to coordinate projects for efficiency and to do proper public engagement on some of our bigger, more exciting, high-capacity transit -- preview Transit initiatives.

So with that, I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Chris Walton.

### **A - BROWARD COUNTY TRANSIT**

MR. WALTON: Good morning, Mr. Chair and Vice Chair and

members of the board.

MR ALLEN: We know who you are.

MR. WALTON: Okay. Thanks.

(Laughter.)

MR. WALTON: Okay. This is where the numbers start to get bigger. And I say start to get bigger because this is -- we're -- we're going into the planning and design phase.

When we go to the construction phase, they're going to get much bigger. So I just want to prepare you for -- for the shock, because the -- the larger numbers are coming.

You should understand that when we get into just the -- the rail portion, we're talking about over four and a half billion dollars just associated for just the 26 miles of capital and operating for the light rail for -- in the 30-year plan.

So the numbers are going to start getting much larger.

So what we have here, and we've -- we've separated the -- the Transit capital into, well, really four different areas.

Transitways, which are the LRT, light rail transit and the bus rapid transit. We're asking for, in the next five years, for \$221,000,000.

And I'll go through each of these categories a little bit later with a bit more detail.



Transit, you know, we're -- we're talking about buses, we're talking about paratransit vehicles. We're also talking about studies, asking for 98.3 million.

Transit infrastructure has to do a lot with, you know, the West Broward Intermodal Center we talked about, some of the other capital facilities that we plan to build. Park and ride lots are in there. And a new downtown terminal administration building.

So summarizing the -- the slide you just saw, these are the primary elements that will be purchased in that five -- in the five-year plan.

The two major corridors of bus rapid transit will be studied, and we hope to get started on construction in at least the first one.

And from the surtax dollars, we plan to buy 52 fixed route electric buses. Of course, there will be other buses coming from our federal capital.

Surtax will also pay for 280 paratransit vehicles. Most of them will be replacements, because they typically have a five-year life, and, you know, the miles that we put on these vehicles, they -- they accumulated quite rapidly.

There'll be -- depending on ridership, how the pandemic and how our ridership bounces back in paratransit, there may be some growth in those numbers.

Forty-two community shuttles, primarily replacement; some growth.

Two multimodal facilities. As I mentioned, downtown Fort Lauderdale.

We are -- you've probably heard about the discussion between the County and the city for replacing this building with a Joint Government Center.

We would be part of that complex that would be on the property that we currently own across the street. And the front -- or the Broward Boulevard half would be dedicated to the -- the new facility for Fort Lauderdale and the County. And the back half, we would redo our downtown terminal.

On top of that, we would build eight stories of parking, and on top of that, we would built about 80,000 square feet for Transit offices.

As I mentioned yesterday, we want to go and start going to design for our third bus facility, because we're very, very close to our maximum capacity at the two we currently operate out of.

The rehabilitation for the Copans Road, we -- that's a \$61,000,000 project. I think I mentioned to you yesterday that we have -- we've leveraged over \$17,000,000 in federal dollars for -- for that one.

The plan calls for 75 new bus shelters a year, so we will build 375 over the next five years.

And general planning consultants, about 10.8 million dollars.

Okay. So --

MR. COOLMAN: I have a question.

MR. WALTON: Yes.

MR. COOLMAN: We're looking at years '22 through '26. Is -- are these numbers for those expenditures in those five years or are these number for 2026?

MR. WALTON: No, these are -- this is the five-year.

MR. COOLMAN: So we've eliminated 2021 expenditures. I mean, they're not in here.

MR. WALTON: Right. We're -- right.

MR. COOLMAN: And this is rolling along. How much -- so this is what we're -- what's new in 2026 that wasn't included in 2021 to 2025 is what I'm trying to understand.

MR. WALTON: Okay. The planning and design for the LRT systems is new.

The studies and the construction for -- in this next slide. In fact, the question -- the next slide answers a lot of that.

The -- the planning and design for the BRT and the LRT.

And we plan to go to construction for the first BRT corridor in '23-24.

We plan to go into -- hopefully go into the second BRT corridor in '24-25.

And what is in the previous plan, when I mentioned the 52 buses that are electric, those would be for fixed route.

Even though the BRT will be fixed route, the 19.2 million dollars here

are dedicated for the BRT corridors.

So the -- these are all new.

MR. COOLMAN: May -- maybe another way to look at it, we have -- we're going to spend -- projected to spend 856,000,000 from 2022 to 2026, correct?

MR. WALTON: 850 --

MR. COOLMAN: Looking back to the previous sheet. We spent, obviously, X million in 2021.

MS. CASSINI: Go -- go back one more. There you go.

MR. COOLMAN: So most -- a lot of this money was already going to be in the '21 to '25. I'm trying to understand how much it grew for 2026.

MR. WALTON: Oh. Okay.

MR. COOLMAN: Is it a million dollars? Is it 200,000,000? Is it ten percent of it? Or how much did it --

MR. WALTON: No.

MR. COOLMAN: -- grow --

MR. WALTON: Okay.

MR. COOLMAN: -- in that jump year?

MR. WALTON: Yeah, and I'd have to go back and I can get that for you.

MR. COOLMAN: I -- I mean, just roughly. Is it -- is it --

MS. CASSINI: I can get it, if you want me to.

MR. WALTON: Yeah, why don't you? Because I would have to --

MS. CASSINI: Okay.

MR. COOLMAN: That's okay.

MR. WALTON: Okay.

MR. COOLMAN: Later on. Excuse me. Go ahead.

MR. WALTON: All right.

MR. COOLMAN: I'm sorry.

MS. WALLACE: Well, FY '26 was -- is new, right? So we haven't had a previous year where the expenditures that are being proposed for FY '26 were ever presented. Am I --

MR. WALTON: For -- for the '26 year.

MS. WALLACE: For '26 year.

MR. WALTON: Right.

MS. WALLACE: So the -- the current five-year plan includes FYs '21 through '25.

MR. WALTON: '25.

MR. COOLMAN: I understand that.

MS. WALLACE: And -- oh, okay. So FY --

MR. COOLMAN: But I --

MS. WALLACE: -- '26 --

MR. COOLMAN: -- that's what I'm trying --

MS. WALLACE: -- had not --

MR. COOLMAN: -- to understand is --

MR. WALTON: The increase.

MR. COOLMAN: -- what is 2026 going to cost us.

MR. WALTON: The increase. The increase in '26.

MR. COOLMAN: Yeah. Is --

MS. WALLACE: So you want the itemized projects for --

MR. COOLMAN: -- I know, but until you --

MS. WALLACE: -- 2026.

MR. COOLMAN: -- if I can't see what we -- what the number for 2025 -- '21 through '25. I don't know if it jumped ten percent or 50 percent. I don't know.

MR. WALTON: And I -- I got -- we -- we -- we'll get --

MR. COOLMAN: Okay.

MR. WALTON: -- the answer for you.

MR. HOOPER: And to be clear, we're -- we keep rolling five-year plans, correct?

MS. WALLACE: Correct.

MR. HOOPER: Every year?

MS. WALLACE: Yes.

MR. WALTON: That's correct.

MS. WALLACE: Yes. So we're in FY '21 now, and so the five-year plan rolls, and FY '22 becomes the first year of the five-year plan and we add FY '26 to the back.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, so --

MS. WALLACE: So --

MR. HOOPER: -- so then, Doug's --

MR. COOLMAN: No, I understand that.

MR. HOOPER: -- Doug's position --

MR. COOLMAN: I -- it might be better --

MR. HOOPER: -- is probably --

MR. COOLMAN: -- just to say, okay, we're going to roll over and, by the way, we're adding --

MR. WALTON: How much more is going -- added for '26.

MR. COOLMAN: Yes, that's --

MR. HOOPER: Yeah. That's a --

MR. WALTON: Got it.

MR. HOOPER: -- good point, Doug.

MR. WALTON: Okay. All right. So, again, the -- the -- for the LRT, the \$221,000,000 surtax.

And I -- I would also mention that we are anticipating assistance from

the state and the federal government for -- the total for these projects would be 306,000,000.

So the -- the non-local, the non-surtax would -- would be eight -- 85.8 mil.

And these are the projects that we're -- we plan to use the two -- the \$306,000,000 for.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman. Your comment relative to the federal participation, is your assumption based on current law or potential changes to federal grant processes?

MR. WALTON: Current. Current.

We anticipate, based on what we're hearing out of D.C. from our lobbyists and -- and what we see across the industry, that, particularly in the next couple years, there'll probably be a boost in dollars available for -- for transit infrastructure. So, you know, the -- the percentages may even be -- we may even get a larger percentage of federal dollars.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Fraizer, you have a question?

MS. CASSINI: There's two separate questions. One is just the additional prospects, but also the change. The total change in Transit capital and we'll pull that right now too.

MR. WALTON: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: But you can go through those if you want to. Mine was



just in addition to the '26, but --

MR. WALTON: Okay. Wait a minute, wait a minute.

MS. CASSINI: Can you see? Do you need me to read them? It would be down here, so it would be that, that -- no, this one, this one.

MR. WALTON: You know tell you what, I'm going to ask them to come back to this --

MS. CASSINI: Okay.

MR. WALTON: -- separately.

MS. CASSINI: Okay, that's fine.

MR. WALTON: Okay. I -- what I'd like to do is just get through this and then come back to you and answer that, because that's going to take a little time.

MR. COOLMAN: Fine.

MR. FRAZIER: Before -- before you move forward, I have a question regarding community small business participation.

You have three funding sources. You have the local, which is the surtax. And you have non-local, which is going to be fed and -- and state? FDOT and -- and the -- the feds?

MR. WALTON: That's correct.

MR. FRAZIER: Well, both FDOT and the feds have a DBE program.

MR. WALTON: That's correct.

MR. FRAZIER: Now, will the local community small businesses have to become certified in those areas so that those criteria could be used in terms of selection process or how -- how does that work?

MR. WALTON: In -- in many cases, we -- we -- we reciprocate. If they're -- if they're certified for DBE and the -- the feds and the state, we use them here.

And -- and I'd have to check with -- with -- so it works both ways.

So if small businesses are certified CBE, they're also certified under the -- the federal DBE for FDOT and -- and USDOT.

MR. FRAZIER: Okay. I guess -- I guess the small business guy would have the answer to this, whether or not additional criteria, selection criteria, can be put into the fold because of the federal and the state immunization funds.

MR. WALTON: And I know there's been some conversation about that. You want to take the lead?

MR. MCDONALD: Yeah.

MR. WALTON: Okay.

MR. MCDONALD: Morning, Mr. Chair and other members.

As Chris was stating, currently, and even definitely going into the future, and even with the federal government if they decide to do this infrastructure, any funds that come down from the Department of

Transportation, we're then required to use 49CFR, which is the DBE program.

So if Chris sent over a project and that project had multiple funding streams, if it was surtax funds, I can put the CBE program in place.

If it was funds that was going to be leveraged for DBE, I am required to put the DBE program in place.

But when we certify our local firms, if our local firms are eligible to be DBEs, we're also a certifying agency for the Department of Transportation. So our CBEs, or some of them, are also DBEs.

And some of the DBEs who are throughout the state and have gravitated to this area also can become our local CBE.

So we look at each one of his projects and, based on the funding stream, I can do my local CBE, I can do my DBE, but, yes, some businesses happen to be CBE and DBE, and they'll be able to participate now as well as the federal funds.

MR. FRAZIER: Could you clarify for the members here the difference between those classifications?

MR. MCDONALD: Oh, by all means. So --

MR. FRAZIER: I understand --

MR. MCDONALD: Yes, sir.

MR. FRAZIER: -- but they may not.

MR. MCDONALD: So our program, the CBE, the County's Business Enterprise Program, is a race and gender neutral program. So all we simply say, you need to be in Broward County at least one year, the personal net worth of the owner has to be 1.32 million or less, not counting his or her primary residence, and that they have to provide a useful function.

A useful function means you provide a service in your regular day of business that the County procures.

You also have to demonstrate that the revenues of your business -- and most of my industries, it's \$5,000,000 or less over three years, and construction-related industry, it's \$9,000,000 or less over three years.

If you fit in that box, you can be a County Business Enterprise.

The DBE program, the federal program, requires that the personal net worth is also 1.32 million or less, doesn't have a specific timeline on how long you needed to be here or in the state or into business.

However, the DBE program is based off of women and minority demonstrating that they are socially and/or economically disadvantaged.

So you have to be socially and/or economically disadvantaged and be a minority or a woman to participate in that program.

Fifty-one percent of the ownership of that business must be by the woman, the minority who is socially and economically disadvantaged.

So 49CFR, if you want all of that long reading, is the document that

will explain the DBE program.

And, again, anytime one of the County agencies, or the states, or some city uses money from the Department of Transportation, they're required to use that methodology to then determine off of that project what would the goal be.

We have established the 30 percent, and we try to go 30 percent and beyond.

It's not a number we selected by a Commission when it comes to the federal program. I have to run their methodology to determine if the goal would be ten, 15, 20, or 30.

The federal requirement for good faith effort starts at ten. So every project that comes out, and you hear about infrastructure being talked about, they're all going to hit the street starting at ten.

But based on a tri-annual report that we all are allowed to create, based on assessing or disparity studies or historical data or regional information, we can then determine that our projects can go beyond the ten.

Actually, for transportation, right now I think I've got Chris somewhere around 21 percent for goals, and I have our Aviation Department somewhere around 25 percent for goals.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

MR. WALTON: All right. So this -- you see the projects listed that we

plan to spend the \$220,000,000 surtax on for the -- the what we call transitways or LRT or BRT.

We intend to purchase about \$60,000,000 -- or use about \$60,000,000 to buy 52 electric buses in the five-year plan, and 24.3 million dollars for replacement and growth for our -- our paratransit vehicles.

The 2.8 million dollars, you know, we actually operate the largest propane operated fleet in the southeast. Many of the vehicles that we buy don't come with propane converted engines, so we actually do the conversion after we receive the vehicle.

So that's where the 2.8 million dollars comes in.

For facilities and infrastructure, we're asking for, over five years, 346 and a half million dollars.

Operational facilities meaning our -- our -- our bus terminals, our bus shelter and bus stop infrastructure improvements at 57,000,000.

The new transit infrastructure and land, where you -- yesterday, we talked about the \$50,000,000 that we're requesting for land. The other -- the additional 17 is for security and IT improvements that we need at Transit.

And customer facilities are -- you know, we -- we look at our park and ride lots, our neighborhood transit centers, places where our -- where we have more -- it's larger than a bus stop, but we have congregation -- congregations of our -- our -- our passengers, such as -- as the Lauderhill

Mall facility that you saw yesterday.

I should point out here, the bottom line where we -- we talk about the surtax funding request for operating, you'll see that in '22 and -- and '23, the numbers are significantly smaller. That's because of a significant infusion of federal funds that came in through the -- the CRRSAA funds, through the American Resource Recovery Plan funds, as well as the -- the big -- the first one -- I forget it -- all of them that came to support the -- the -- the -- all of them that came in to support virus mitigation. We have received as a -- as an entity, all -- just north of \$200,000,000. So we -- and those dollars are primarily used to support operating.

So we're -- you know, we have been able to use those dollars to keep our employees employed, to do a lot of safety mitigation. We've been able to offset a lot of the dollars that would have normally come from surtax for operating. They've been supplemented by the federal dollars.

MR. HOOPER: Uh, Chris, does -- does that -- that helps mitigate the -  
- those routes that you're running where you're -- you're maybe half full so that there's spacing between. It helps mitigate in -- right?

MR. WALTON: Yeah.

MR. HOOPER: The operation to be able to do that.

MR. WALTON: It -- it does cover our revenue loss in terms of --  
because what we try to do, or what we're doing, is -- I think I mentioned

yesterday that our ridership has recovered to about 53, 54 percent, but we're running 90 percent --

MR. HOOPER: Right.

MR. WALTON: -- of our regularly scheduled service. And we do that to try to maintain distancing on the buses --

MR. HOOPER: Right.

MR. WALTON: -- so that the buses don't get overcrowded. I mean, there -- there's still an occasional situation where that might happen, and we will then add service to that location.

But the -- the objective here is to try to keep the passenger load no greater than 20 passengers on any bus at any time.

MR. HOOPER: So then this kind of helps with that.

MR. WALTON: It absolutely does.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, see, yesterday, I never came back to ask you that question. Now the circle has been -- been closed. I didn't -- I didn't know how we were doing that.

MR. WALTON: Yeah. You know, when you -- when you see the buses on the street now, you won't see as many passengers as you saw in the past because we actually have more service out there than, quite frankly, we would have had in the past.

But that is because we need to maintain that social --



MR. HOOPER: Right.

MR. WALTON: -- distancing.

MR. HOOPER: That's good.

MR. WALTON: Okay. So -- and I haven't forgotten, but I'll get back to you, Mr. Coolman.

MS. CASSINI: So while Tony makes his way up, I did want to just give you all kind of an overview of where we are with surtax revenue projections.

When we met with you last year, we were expecting to see the numbers that are on the top outline in green for the five years.

Of course, that only went out to 2025. That's why you see Not Applicable in that final box.

But as you can see in our recommended budget for 2022, the Department of Revenue has been giving us updates, and our revenues -- expected revenues from the surtax have declined. It's not a lot. Realize, you know, we're around the five percent mark.

But I did want to bring to your attention that between 2022 and 2025 the cumulative impact of those reductions is \$64,000,000 on the program.

And so now I'll turn it over to Tony.

MR. HUI: Good morning, Mr. Chair, Mr. Vice Chair, and member of the board.

MR. COOLMAN: Can I ask one question? How long do you think that

lesser amount is going to continue to occur?

MS. CASSINI: Well, I mean, it's just -- it's a -- a bit lower than what they were projecting last year at this time, and I -- I believe that that continues to occur because of COVID.

But what's important to point out is that it's just lower than what was projected last year. It may bounce back and we may start to see these numbers coming up.

And in our conversations with --

MR. COOLMAN: Or --

MS. CASSINI: -- budget --

MR. COOLMAN: -- or maybe our projections were a little over optimistic?

MS. CASSINI: Right.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: It's -- it's --

MR. COOLMAN: Because I -- I know -- I would think if this was caused by COVID, you'd certainly see this going the other way. And I don't see it going but up, so --

MR. HOOPER: But it's a projection. It's not actual.

MR. COOLMAN: No, I understand. But I'm saying --

MR. HOOPER: I tend to agree with you, but, at the end of the day, it's

-- it -- the -- the target is pretty -- pretty darn close.

MR. COOLMAN: Very -- very close, considering the percentage difference. So -- but I would think we should take a look at the next 24 years because, based on the first six our projections were a little optimistic.

MR. ALLEN: But, Gretchen, these numbers are based -- changes are based on what we have done last year, what you had told us last year.

MR. HOOPER: That's right.

MR. ALLEN: But they're going back to the time of the projections for the overall MAP, you know, what was it, 2018-19, or whatever that was. Those numbers have already been reduced from that before last year's estimate.

I mean, so, I mean, if you really wanted to do a comparison, you would show what the original plan was versus what was done last year and what the new estimate is now.

MR. HOOPER: And -- and what was that? What -- that's interesting.

MS. CASSINI: So we -- we had been doing that for you each year. And, in fact, I had a slide in -- in here, but the decision was made, based on discussions with Budget, that it --

MR. HOOPER: It's not for them.

MS. CASSINI: -- going back to that original plan at this point in time really doesn't have a lot of value.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MS. CASSINI: I absolutely have it, though, if you'd like me to tell. It'll just take me a second to pull it up.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, and -- and just, again, things change and we don't know how and, you know, there's all these northeasterners moving down here, and if Doug would just buy some more consumer goods, we might get more sales tax revenue.

But -- but it does come down to that. It comes down to changes in trends and cycles.

So, honestly, I -- I don't -- I don't know what kind of value there is in -- in looking at 2023 and '4, because it could go way up.

MR. ALLEN: It's just that sometime somebody's going to ask us, well, how have you done against your original plan, and we ought to have the -- the basis to know how much, you know, we had originally projected when we went out to the voters and told them with this amount of money, this is what we're going to do.

Granted, times change, and even projects change from the --

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MR. ALLEN: -- just need to be prepared when the time comes for somebody to come forth and say, well, how are we doing against what you told us back when you held the election.

That's -- that's the only reason that that's --

MR. HOOPER: Yeah. I guess.

MR. ALLEN: -- needed.

MS. LOVE: But the -- the information is out there. It's just not in front of us now. So that projection from the original to current, we could get at any --

MS. CASSINI: I'm pulling it up right now. It's actually on our website. I can leave this presentation, pull it -- pull it up from the website, but I'm going to do it over here so that we don't have to do that and I'll let you know what that is.

MS. LOVE: I just think it's important to note we can -- that data is there.

MS. CASSINI: And -- and we do track it.

MS. LOVE: Yes.

MR. COOLMAN: As a more positive thing, I think you have gotten other funds greater than this loss in the projection, so we actually have -- we're -- we're ending up with more money, in a way, that's not all coming from surtax.

## **B - PUBLIC WORKS**

MR. HOOPER: So, you want to go?

MR. HUI: Good morning again.

I'll be talking, well, over the next couple slides for -- with the Public Works five-year plan over the next couple years.

What you see in the diagram in front of you is a plot of planned expenditures over the next five years.

Yesterday, we talked about the 60.4 million dollars for FY '22.

For the remaining four years of our plan, it's -- the budget is actually pretty consistent. There's a little bit of a drop in '23 and '24, but that's mainly -- the reason for that is it's mainly because of the timing of the projects, design of it -- design of projects going on before they get into construction.

So a little bit of a dip.

And then once the -- once the design gets completed, construction catches up again.

So we're going to be roughly around the \$60,000,000 per year range in there.

And what we also try to do in terms of long term planning and scheduling of our projects is that we have a steady diet of design projects and construction projects, so there will be a continuation of design rolling into construction as we go forth.

So this is our game plan for the next five years.

In sum, the -- over the next five years, it's a total of 284.6 million dollars. Again, the breakdown in terms of the types of projects that you can

expect to see, which is very similar to what we have discussed in the past.

Yesterday, Mr. Vice Chair, you had a question on how many projects the County has in our five-year plan, and I have the answer for you.

It's over the next five years, we're going to have 193 separate projects. Many of these projects could have multiple phases with it, like the planning and design and construction over the five year period, but in terms of the discrete number of projects, 193, to answer your question from yesterday.

MR. COOLMAN: So it's about twice the city projects. No?

MR. HUI: I'm sorry.

MR. COOLMAN: It's about twice the city projects 190 --

MR. HUI: Yeah. Uh-huh. Yeah. It's -- it's -- we're --

MR. COOLMAN: -- it's -- it's -- that goes -- that's fine.

MR. HUI: -- we have a good steady number of them that --

MR. COOLMAN: Thank you very much, Tony.

MR. HUI: Uh-huh. Okay.

So this is -- this is our five-year plan. If there's any questions, I'll be happy to try to answer them.

Thank you.

MS. CASSINI: Mr. Chair, would you like me to provide the information on --

MR. HOOPER: The information we were waiting for?

MS. CASSINI: Well, not Chris's information, because I think he's pulling that, but the question that you posed right before Tony's presentation -

MR. HOOPER: Sure.

MS. CASSINI: -- and I can walk you through --

MR. HOOPER: Sure.

MS. CASSINI: -- okay. So in the original surtax financial plan -- and I'm going to go back to the slide so that you can easily compare, if I can make the slide -- okay. Now it won't go back. Going to have to do it from there, I guess. Oh, there we go. We got it. It finally listened.

Okay. In the original surtax financial plan, we were projecting \$377,000,000 worth of revenue versus the 342.6 that you see on the slide there now, which is the second -- the -- the 342.6 is what we are now expecting to receive in fiscal year 2022 based on Department of Revenue information.

So in the original financial plan, we were expecting \$387,000,000 in '23, 397.6 million in 2024 versus that 361, 408.3 million versus the 371 for 2025, and 419,000,000 versus the 381 -- 381,000,000 that's now being projected for fiscal year 2026.

So you can see, approximately 30,000,000 on average for each year



down over what the original projections were.

MR. HOOPER: You know, to really get a -- a solid -- a clear visual on what this means, you also should weigh in what we had planned to get in grants, federal and state, and then you may be getting more federal grants.

At the end of the day, provided -- in my -- this is purely my opinion, I think that, provided that the County is utilizing the funds that come from sales tax as efficiently as possible and leveraging and partnering with the other agencies, and that we are moving forward in a very efficient manner, to me, it meets the goal.

And I think it would be very difficult to project 30 years in advance. I can't do it with a income-producing property, let along something like this where people are spending money and one penny is coming from every dollar.

So I think it would -- some -- one day in the future when we have a workshop, it would be interesting to know what -- what the value of the leveraging has been, because that really is interesting, and it could be a really good -- it could be good information for the public to know about as well.

MR. COOLMAN: Just as a reference --

MR. ALLEN: Coincidentally it looks like from the numbers -- that brief comparison of the numbers is that the growth has been postponed by about

two years, the -- that incremental or growth -- annual growth, you know, has been locked two years out of the COVID years, I guess.

MR. COOLMAN: The original projection, was it 30,000,000,000 in 30 years?

MS. CASSINI: It was 16.5 billion was projected to be generated by the surtax over the 30 years.

MR. COOLMAN: Repeat that, please?

MS. CASSINI: I'm sorry. 16.5 billion was projected to be generated by the additional one percent.

So surtax over the 30 years, with 2.5 billion in leverage.

And there are assumptions that are built into that financial plan every single year about grants, about when something is going to be constructed, about when we're going to go into design or -- I -- you know, a lot of -- one of the slides that I thought was important that Chris pointed out is light rail transit construction has been pushed out.

So there are a lot of assumptions in that financial plan that we made back in 2017, 20 -- early 2018 that we can bring back to you, and I'm happy to do that during the retreat. I think --

MR. COOLMAN: Well --

MS. CASSINI: -- it would be a fun exercise for Margaret, right, to -- to go back and look through the financial plan back -- starting in 2020 through

2026 and -- and see how many of those assumptions have -- I mean, it -- it will be a stark difference because of COVID.

MR. COOLMAN: Well, starting -- based on the Chair's comments, \$30,000,000 for 30 years is 900,000,000, or nine-tenths of a billion, and you just told us that your extra money was 2.5 billion, so we're ahead of the game, even with those adjustment.

MR. HOOPER: Asterisk. These are just projections and market conditions can vary.

MS. CASSINI: Right.

(Laughter.)

MR. COOLMAN: We're ahead of the game in projections.

MR. HOOPER: It's true.

MR. WALTON: Okay. Just for -- for the record, the term that I was trying to remember when I had kind of a brain freeze was CARES money. That was the --

MR. HOOPER: That's right.

MR. WALTON: -- the first distribution. So, anyway, but to answer Mr. - - Mr. Coolman's question, the -- the new fifth year in the five-year plan, which is 2026, adds a total of 194.2 million dollars.

Capital dollars are 95.5 million, and operating dollars are 98.7. So that one year adds 194.2.

MR. HOOPER: What's next?

**C - MUNICIPAL PROJECTS**

MS. CASSINI: We're going to move into the municipal capital five-year plan. I'm sure that will generate some discussion.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MS. CASSINI: And I wanted -- because I know that the municipalities are likely watching, and they're very interested in -- in this and their five-year plan, because one of the things I failed to mention at the outset of the workshop on the five-year plan is that the interlocal agreement does permit, under certain circumstances, for a municipality to advance a project that they see in this five-year plan in an out year using non-surtax revenues.

They have to act as if they are under agreement -- under a project funding agreement with the County. They have to follow all of our rules in order to be eligible to request reimbursement.

But it is important to them.

And I did also want to acknowledge that there are a lot of requests. We didn't really talk much about this yesterday because we were pressed for time.

There were a lot of requests that came from municipalities to advance projects or to have projects that are below the -- the 76 -- I think it's 76. We'll get there in one second -- pulled out.

And because so few projects have formally withdrawn, and because projects hold their ranking and we need to ensure that we have a -- an appropriate level of funding for projects should they move forward, we haven't really been able to entertain very many of those.

I'm going to point the ones out that -- that we have felt comfortable entertaining, but for -- for those that might be listening, it's -- it's -- this is not a hard no, and we do intend to come back to you in early 2022 after we get our arms around the -- the withdrawals and projects that have large ineligible components, how much cost savings there are, and -- and entertain some additional requests.

So I just wanted that to be clear to them, because Bertha felt very strongly that she didn't -- she didn't want this to come out and this -- this is it. This is -- this is -- we're constantly looking at these requests and evaluating them with the best information that we have.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. I -- and I know I'm opening up the same can of worms, but I've just got to ask this question.

So do we ever know when a project isn't feasible as we are reading the projects that are being proposed?

I mean, is it all left to the cities to -- I mean, because we're -- we're -- we are voting on eligibility, right? And if something isn't feasible, why would we approve it?

MS. WALLACE: So -- excuse me -- good morning, Chair, Vice Chair, members of the board.

So we have a contract, the second amendment to and restatement of the Transportation Surtax Interlocal Agreement among Broward County, the MPO, and the -- and 29 of the 31 municipalities, which governs our relationship with them.

In addition, you know, the -- some of the requirements of the interlocal agreement are outlined in the Transportation Surtax Ordinance.

The -- both the -- the ordinance and the agreement require municipal capital projects to be reviewed and ranked by the MPO.

And the MPO's rankings come to the County, and the County is required to fund projects in the order of ranking by the MPO.

The agreement requires the County to fund the FY '20 MPO ranked projects and all of their remaining phases in the order of ranking.

So we do not -- while the County does receive, in the new process, information regarding new applications, which started in FY '21, and you can see and provide comments and request additional information through that process, the FY '20 process, we are contractually bound to follow.

So whatever review and analysis occurred by the MPO with regard to those projects and their rankings are what we are bound by.

MR. HOOPER: So then why are we reviewing them?

MS. WALLACE: So -- well, the -- the MPO reviews and ranks those, and they recommend them to the County for funding, and they come to the Oversight Board pursuant to the agreement and the -- and the -- the ordinance.

The Oversight Board reviews the proposed projects and the proposed expenditures for eligibility under the statute.

So the review occurs, and, if you'll recall, when the FY '20 projects were -- were recommended, there are -- there was notations in the recommendations that the ineligible components, that some of them had ineligible components --

MR. HOOPER: Uh-huh.

MS. WALLACE: -- and they -- those projects were approved subject to further review and analysis regarding eligibility of those components.

So they come to the Oversight Board for that purpose, because the MPO didn't eliminate, say, sewer elements to certain roadway projects, or -- or utility, electric utility relocations. Those things are not fundable by surtax. So when those -- those projects are recommended to the County, to -- to the Oversight Board for consideration, under the statute, we have to look out and -- and -- and indicate sewer repairs and electric utilities not eligible, therefore, those components of the projects will not be funded.

MR. HOOPER: So we're only allowed to reject something if it doesn't

meet the eligibility requirements in the ordinance.

MS. WALLACE: Correct. And so --

MS. CASSINI: In the statute.

MR. HOOPER: In the statute.

MS. WALLACE: In the statute.

MS. WALLACE: And so prospectively, I mean, this -- the ordinance also allows the Oversight Board and provides the Oversight Board with the responsibility of viewing performance.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MS. WALLACE: And one of the things that -- the issues that we discussed yesterday after it was raised by Mr. Allen was including the -- the previous project performance in the review process for new projects.

So if you have projects that are -- that have not been withdrawn and, for whatever reason, have not moved forward, then that would be a factor in considering whether projects will be recommended for funding. Right? And then when you consider --

MR. HOOPER: Additional projects --

MS. WALLACE: -- poor performance.

MR. HOOPER: -- that are similar to that.

MS. CASSINI: No.

MS. WALLACE: So any. So either withdraw it -- if it's not feasible, if



you know that FDOT is not going to allow you to construct a project on their corridor or that, you know, you don't have a -- a community shuttle program, therefore you can't install --

MR. HOOPER: Uh-huh.

MS. WALLACE: -- bus shelters because the -- the --

MR. HOOPER: Uh-huh.

MS. WALLACE: -- Transportation Department installs bus shelters for the fixed route service.

So we've received those types of requests. They're projects that have already been funded and completed for which funding -- funding -- construction funding was allocated.

That project can't happen, but the municipality has not withdrawn that project. So we can either -- you know, if the municipality does not withdraw that construction project, there's a desire to take that money and apply it to something else, which is not permissible.

So the County has the ability, two years from now, to cancel that particular project because --

MR. HOOPER: Uh-huh.

MS. WALLACE: -- construction is not going to happen. It has already occurred.

So those are the -- we have to operate within the parameters of the --

the -- the agreement that governs our relationship with the municipalities, and that's what we're doing.

MR. HOOPER: Help me understand performance and if they don't perform on one project, we can stop all projects from moving forward?

MS. WALLACE: So it can be a factor. The proposal is to -- to have the -- whether a project has been advanced by a municipality be a factor in considering or evaluating their request for new funding.

And the -- the idea, I guess, is that there would provide a stick, or an impetus, for the municipality to withdraw the project that they know is not feasible in order to have the new project considered.

But Mr. Allen may want to kind of --

MR. ALLEN: Sure.

MS. WALLACE: -- explain his thought process.

MR. ALLEN: But does that --

MR. HOOPER: Does your question have something to do with this?

MR. ALLEN: -- performance -- consideration of project performance for future project approvals, that would require an amendment to the interlocal?

MS. WALLACE: No, the -- the evaluation criteria for applications for new funding is included in the seconded amendment, the MPO's evaluation criteria. It includes performance, what -- what has occurred with their

existing, previously funded --

MR. ALLEN: And -- and who's --

MS. WALLACE: -- projects.

MR. ALLEN: -- who makes that determination? This board?

MS. WALLACE: So there will be reports submitted regarding performance, and the -- yeah, I guess the board could provide its recommendations with regard to projects or municipalities whose projects have lagged in performance for the next application process.

MR. ALLEN: But that only applies to construction projects, though?

MS. WALLACE: No. So it would be --

MR. ALLEN: So if a design -- if -- if we have approved a project for design, or planning, even --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. ALLEN: -- there is no action over some period of time, a year, two years, and we still don't have documentation that they're doing anything with that project --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. ALLEN: -- this board could make a determination that you have asked for X amount of money for a new project, your past performance says you have not performed on this other project, therefore we're not going to recommend ranking of that project?

MS. WALLACE: So -- right. The -- the --

MR. ALLEN: The new project?

MS. WALLACE: -- the performance reports will come to this Oversight Board and then the Oversight Board can -- can make recommendations with regard to municipalities whose projects have not -- have not progressed for the next MPO review -- application review process and say, we've reviewed performance. It's part of our role to review performance. And these municipalities have not performed with regard to these projects. In the event that they submit applications for new projects, we recommend that, you know, they be viewed as poor performance, or whatever the Oversight Board deems appropriate, with regard to applications for new funding.

MR. HOOPER: For that city.

MS. WALLACE: Correct.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. I -- I --

MR. ALLEN: When is that next review to occur, though? When are the new --

MS. WALLACE: The start of every year.

MS. CASSINI: Next May.

MR. ALLEN: -- when does -- when does the door open for new applicants?

MS. WALLACE: The application process --

MS. CASSINI: Next May.

MS. WALLACE: -- begins in February of -- of each year, so it'll be February 2022.

MR. ALLEN: So it should behoove this board, then, to have some consideration go out to the cities, don't bother submitting an application if you haven't performed on a past project.

And we have to have the ability to tell them how they did not perform.

MR. HOOPER: It has to be based on three years, correct?

MS. WALLACE: No. So the -- the construction project -- projects for which municipal capital projects for which construction funding has been allocated have three years to begin construction.

The other projects do not have a -- a cutoff under the agreement.

So, you know, we could get to the end of this year and it will be a year and a half since the FY '20 projects -- funding was allocated for those projects.

We can provide reports. We have a November meeting and there's also a January meeting of -- of this body.

Once the information is provided, we can give a point in time status of the projects that have been funded and the Oversight Board can -- can consider what approach it wants to take with regard to performance and -- and -- and request regarding how those -- the performance is evaluated by

the MPO in the next application process.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Mr. Frazier, you had a question.

MR. FRAZIER: Yeah, it's in relationship to MPO. Now, the MPO is like our arm in terms of selecting projects based on criteria and things like that?

MS. WALLACE: We have a contract with the MPO for surtax services that -- pursuant to which, the MPO receives applications from municipalities for capital projects and they review and evaluate those projects.

MR. FRAZIER: Now, I -- I guess the question is -- is -- because you talked about feasibility. That's what the Chairman said.

Don't they have a responsibility to determine whether a project is feasible as a part of their analysis and --

MS. WALLACE: Yes.

MR. FRAZIER: -- if so, do they have any liability when a project comes in and it's not feasible?

MS. WALLACE: So the second amendment outlines the evaluation criteria and what must be submitted.

And things that need to be submitted, you know, is a documentation of feasibility so that we don't run into the issue of -- you know, prospectively, of municipalities planning projects on FDOT corridors with -- without FDOT permission. They have to obtain that written permission and submit it along

with the application.

So there's certain documentation that's required through the application process prospectively that will eliminate a lot of the problems.

So it's lessons learned --

MR. FRAZIER: Uh-huh.

MS. WALLACE: -- and -- and -- and solutions have been built into the -- the application process prospectively to -- in an effort to avoid these situations.

A construction project has to have signed, sealed construction documents to be ready for construction.

MR. FRAZIER: It appears that we're trying to put pressure on -- on -- on the municipalities and the cities and we don't have any authority to do that, it appears, but we do have a contract with the MPO and -- and maybe they're the ones to have to put the pressure on municipalities as a part of this review process.

MS. WALLACE: So with regard to the MPO, the MPO has been working with the County and communicating with the municipalities in an effort to obtain the required checklist and documentation for the projects or, you know, encourage the municipalities that have infeasible projects to withdraw them.

So they are working with us in that regard. But they can only request.

MR. FRAZIER: I notice the item that's missing is called rejection.

MS. WALLACE: The stick, uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MS. WALLACE: The stick is missing.

MR. FRAZIER: Somebody has the authority to say you can't come forward.

MR. HOOPER: That's right.

MS. WALLACE: Well, that's why --

MR. COOLMAN: Mr. Chair --

MS. WALLACE: -- prospectively --

MR. HOOPER: Yes, sir.

MS. WALLACE: -- it's important to, you know, indicate that, you know, until the -- this funding that is currently bottlenecked moves, one way or another, then, you know, there's no more money, because the projects that are in line, they're -- we only get to, I think, 76 or so out of the hundred and whatever, in -- in FY '26.

And so the County has the ability to fund projects above the MAG, but there's no incentive to do that, and it doesn't sound as though there's a -- any will of this body to recommend funding above the MAG when we know that there are projects that -- that have been funded that are not feasible and will not move.



If there are going to be new projects, if you clear out the existing bottlenecks, then convince there's plenty of funds available to -- to fund additional projects without adding to the 175,000,000 that's already been allocated.

MR. HOOPER: Yes, Mr. Coolman.

MR. COOLMAN: Yeah. I -- obviously, we're all going through growing pains, and yesterday, I think we feel that the cities are being maybe not as efficient as we'd like, but that could be it's all new.

One of the things I have heard, though, and this is really a question for -- for staff is some of the cities have been told they've got eight projects in the queue and they're -- they want them to get the first project approved formally before they submit the other seven.

So I believe some of these projects are -- are -- are being held up because the cities have been told let's get your first one all correct and then when you submit the second through the eighth, ninth, or tenth, we won't have so many issues.

Is that --

MS. CASSINI: So --

MR. COOLMAN: -- is that also causing some of the delay?

MS. WALLACE: No.

MS. CASSINI: -- that -- that occurred before the second amendment.

That -- that was the case, and we were hearing that a lot, and I know you all were, I'm sure, that communicate with cities.

The -- that was -- that was what I was trying to articulate yesterday is there was a period of time where only projects could -- you all were evaluating in ranked order, and cities were being told that we are not going to even entertain looking at your documents for rehabilitation and maintenance projects until these capital projects are dealt with, and we're looking at these from construction projects first.

But that has long been not the case. I mean, I know we had that discussion previously, but the second amendment addressed all of those issues.

I -- I think it's important, too, from a feasibility standpoint, that the Cycle 1 projects that we are stuck with, we've -- we've addressed many of the concerns.

FDOT has imposed a review process. If anything is happening anywhere near one of their state roads, intersecting their state roads, on their state roads, it has -- it -- Angela has pointed out everything perfectly.

The issue with feasibility for Cycle 1 is that we can't go back and impose those requirements retroactively.

We addressed the issues for reimbursement from Cycle 2 on, from fiscal year 2021 on. Municipalities can now do a project and seek

reimbursement for it.

But not for any of the Cycle 1 projects. So in the situation where a city went out, used money to address a -- you know, a -- a need, a construction need right away, they were hoping they were going to be able to get reimbursement. It -- it's not permissible for those Cycle 1 projects.

And the feasibility reviews were not done in -- for a lot of these projects, clearly, now -- now that we're looking at them.

So what we need is to also have municipalities withdraw projects, and then it wouldn't count as poor performance if they weren't able to go into an agreement.

They -- they -- they shouldn't be, I don't think, they shouldn't be harmed in future application processes if things have changed and the project is no longer wanted or it's, you know, found to be infeasible, as long as they withdraw it.

MR. HOOPER: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: They just need to withdraw it so that we can free this money up for other things.

MR. COOLMAN: When was that amendment done? What month?

MS. CASSINI: It was last --

MR. COOLMAN: It's only been out how many months?

MS. WALLACE: No, February. So we had a sufficient number of

municipalities --

MR. COOLMAN: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: -- approve the second amendment in February. The MPO approved it in January. And the County Commission had previously approved it and authorized the County Administrator --

MR. COOLMAN: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: -- to execute it.

MR. COOLMAN: Well, I -- I'm -- I'm a little -- feel a little better, because I think some of this is just growing pains, a whole new system, and I think we'll see a -- everybody proceed better in the future, I'm hoping.

Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: I -- I -- is the MPO here?

MS. WALLACE: No, Mr. Caletka wasn't available to participate today.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So, you know, maybe at our next meeting, give everybody a chance to let the MPO know how we feel.

And it might not be a bad idea, okay? And then they can go back and tell their members that the Oversight Board is going to be looking at performance in the future and there'll be a discussion about that, and it'll create a little bit of anxiety.

And -- and, you know -- and all we're trying to do is just allow some of the other cities that are performing to be able to move forward with their

projects.

So I think that -- right? Can we arrange that?

Thank you. All right.

MS. CASSINI: Yes, Mr. Chair. I will invite the MPO to come to the retreat.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MS. CASSINI: Do you want them to come to the retreat or the -- the regular meeting in January?

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, any -- I -- I think the -- the sooner the better, and -- and then this board'll just kind of -- well, retreat would be a great time to --

MS. CASSINI: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: -- just kind of air our grievances.

Okay. Let's keep moving.

MS. CASSINI: Okay.

MR. COOLMAN: Maybe we should have a pot for the 29 cities for an hour. I don't know.

MR. HOOPER: Boy, I don't want that.

MS. CASSINI: We won't be able to socially distance.

(Laughter.)

MR. HOOPER: Plus, I don't want to.

MR. COOLMAN: By the time it happens, we won't have that problem.

MS. CASSINI: I certainly hope you're correct, Vice Chair.

So I will move into the municipal capital five-year plan at this point.

Much like what the Vice Chair mentioned previously, you've seen many of these projects. They were in the last five-year plan. And so you can focus in on 2026, because that's what's new.

2026 was originally recommended by the MPO to you all on June 11<sup>th</sup>, and it included a Pembroke Park project number ranked 18<sup>th</sup> in the original Cycle 1.

MS. WALLACE: The footnote indicates that it was received by the MPO in FY '21, but it was actually 2020.

MS. CASSINI: Oh --

MS. WALLACE: So it was recommended in 2020 and withdrawn by the municipality or deferred by the --

MS. CASSINI: Right.

MS. WALLACE: -- municipality and then submitted --

MS. CASSINI: In 2021.

MS. WALLACE: -- in '21 -- '21.

MS. CASSINI: Yeah, that's why --

MS. WALLACE: So just --

MS. CASSINI: -- I -- I said it that way.

MS. WALLACE: -- clerical. Yeah.

MS. CASSINI: So it was a part of the original list of projects, and then it was resubmitted during the 2021 cycle by Pembroke Park to the MPO with the -- with the desired additional information.

It was brought here to you all and -- for eligibility determination.

And because of how highly it ranked, and because we were able -- we lost a project, which I'll show you -- I think I showed you all yesterday for '22 from Parkland, the bike lane project, we had sufficient funds available in '22 to be able to entertain this project, which is construction phase and very highly ranked.

So that is one change to the five-year plan I wanted to highlight for you.

On the next page, the projects that are in red are projects that were removed. There is that Parkland project that was planned for construction 2022 that was removed, the two Southwest Ranches projects that Angela mentioned yesterday that were roadway drainage.

I -- I think I did point out to you that they were pretty low dollar value projects, which is one of the reasons why we weren't really able to entertain some other requests from cities to move projects up.

The projects here on this final -- yes. Sorry.

MR. ALLEN: Question.

MR. HOOPER: Oh, go ahead.

MR. ALLEN: Before we get too far here, on the Pembroke Park project --

MS. CASSINI: Yes.

MR. ALLEN: -- do they have any other projects underway?

MS. CASSINI: Yes.

MR. ALLEN: And have -- are those proceeding as intended? Again, getting back to our discussion of are we going -- we doing a review of past performance in making changes?

MS. CASSINI: I mean, it's hard -- and speaking -- speaking for -- for the folks that are trying to do these grants contract administration, it -- it's hard to say that a project is performing when we only have documentation for 15 projects fully executed at this point.

I mean, there really aren't very many municipal projects that are actually underway. We have two in construction for Davie. I know that Weston is -- is moving along with, I think, three of their projects. We have North Lauderdale moving along.

I -- as far as I know, Pembroke Park has been relatively responsive, but I -- I would have to defer to Angela with respect to whether they're submitting all of the documentation that they need to.

MR. ALLEN: Are you waiting -- Angela, are we waiting on -- or are you



waiting on documentation for Pembroke Park projects at this time?

MS. WALLACE: Yes. We have been in communication with Pembroke Park regarding their other projects.

They have a design project, which is not a huge dollar value, but we're stilling waiting for documentation for -- for that one.

MS. LOVE: I see a project for Pembroke Park for 2026 for 1.2 construction, but in the year 2026?

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh. The construction phase, which means that design proceeds that. And so --

MS. LOVE: Right.

MS. WALLACE: -- there would be design funds. So design funds were allocated for some Pembroke Park projects in FY '20.

And so the design would need to be completed and then the -- the planned construction would be out in 2026.

MS. LOVE: Right.

MS. LOVE: So that's where -- why we have this new funding --

MS. WALLACE: Yes.

MS. LOVE: -- it's not new, but we had already -- we had already did the other two aspects.

MS. WALLACE: It's part of the phases, yes. It's the next phase.

MR. ALLEN: Well, that -- I guess that just shows the -- the -- the level

of uncertainty we have at this point in time as to, you know, we have a desire to consider performance, but we don't have a mechanism to determine what that performance is.

MS. CASSINI: Well, and -- and, Angela, please correct me if I'm wrong, but I think that when we are talking to you about performance, we're talking about new municipal capital projects.

So there's an evaluation process that's laid out in that second amendment, the things that should be scored higher, that should have more weight.

Bertha has to actually approve --

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: -- the evaluation criteria that they propose to us. And that was done.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: And performance is a component of that, but it's not a big component of that.

So I also don't want anyone here to leave with the impression that performance is going to be the deciding factor on a great project that's, you know, hitting all the other boxes. It's probably not.

And it's incredibly important to point out that you don't see any new municipal capital projects coming before you for approval. You didn't --

you're not seeing them, because there's no money.

The performance of these projects has no bearing -- I mean, I don't know how -- the -- the performance component of this evaluation is for new municipal capital projects that aren't appearing because we don't have sufficient funds available to recommend any.

So whether or not somebody submits their documentation for these projects, I -- I'm not sure what carrot or stick or anything that we actually really have.

I -- I don't know that we have the ability to not bring them to you in their ranked order, even if the city is not being responsive.

MR. ALLEN: Well, I -- it just goes back to -- I hate to harp on it -- the -- we -- we seem to be making -- or you have made a recommendation here to move a project forward.

MS. CASSINI: Uh-huh.

MR. ALLEN: Number one, you've got the money because another project isn't proceeding for one reason or another, this was the highest ranked construction project, and therefore it's ready to go forward.

And -- and I'm -- I assume that the city is asking for that consideration for us to approve moving that forward in a five-year plan so that it can start now.

What I'm saying is if we don't have an ongoing comfort that a city is

capable of carrying out, you know, their promises.

I mean, these were all supposed to be construction projects that were

--

MR. HOOPER: Shovel-ready.

MR. ALLEN: -- ready, shovel-ready, to use the term.

And we're, you know, two years out, and the shovels haven't turned yet.

MS. CASSINI: And -- and truthfully, if the project -- if Pembroke -- Pembroke Park 18, ranked 18, is not ready and we get notification from them because we are still waiting for some clarifications -- they were going after a FEMA Hazard Mitigation grant, and in their original documentation, they -- they identified that as a source of leverage for this project.

The surtax funds that are being recommended do not appear adequate to cover the entire cost of the project as it was scoped.

So unless they've found other revenue sources, you know, this project may not be able to move forward. And -- in which case, we're going to come back to you and say we're going to push it back out to 2026 where the MPO had it, and maybe we would entertain a different project, if that was something that, of course, budget and the County Administrator --

MR. ALLEN: Well, you know, I -- I don't want Pembroke Park to think that I'm picking on them.

MS. CASSINI: No, no, I --

MR. ALLEN: I mean --

MS. CASSINI: -- understand.

MR. ALLEN: -- they were -- I'm just using that as a -- an example --

MS. CASSINI: We --

MR. ALLEN: -- of trying to resolve this issue of project performance.

MS. CASSINI: -- I -- I prefaced this presentation with I -- we will be coming back to you with an updated five-year plan in early 2022 because we know that there are things that need to -- to move and need to come off of this.

We just don't have enough information to bring that to you yet.

And because of the budget process and the time constraints and the fact that we need to get this done and in front of our County Commission, this is the best information that we have right now.

And as soon as we have better information, we are going to bring it to you with additional recommendations.

So I'm just going to close out by highlighting that we are -- we did entertain a request from Cooper City to bundle some projects. I think I mentioned to each of you in your briefings that this was something that both the County -- both our office and the County Administrator felt was an important thing to try to do for efficiency purposes, because there is a

rehabilitation and maintenance project that was approved in -- in 2020.

The City has agreed to move -- to delay accepting that money to be able to bundle all three projects together and design them as a single project.

And we're -- so even though they are out of ranked order, we are able to do that because we are funding '23 and '24 above the MAG.

So I just wanted to point that out. And I think that's it -- oh, sorry.

Community shuttle programs. The community shuttle program is a component of the total funding that goes to municipalities.

And when you talk about that minimum annual guarantee of ten percent, community shuttle comes off right off the top.

So the five-year plan for community shuttle, both existing, so those 18 programs that were in place at the time that the surtax passed, as well as expansion listed there.

So you've got your expansion, operating, capital, and the total.

Very popular program. I did want to point out -- you're still here -- North Lauderdale and Plantation are still on target to come online this Fall.

And we've been in lots of talks with the City of Oakland Park and Wilton Manors about the potential for having them come into the program.

MR. HOOPER: So I know the cities used to manage that. I sat on the TMA for Fort Lauderdale. And it comes off the top of the -- of the municipal funding that they get, and yet it's 18 cities or, I don't know, maybe there's

more than one in one city or something.

How do the other cities feel about that? Because, really, what we did -

-

MS. CASSINI: They agreed --

MR. HOOPER: -- was --

MS. CASSINI: -- to it. They agreed to it in the -- I mean, in --

MR. HOOPER: Okay. No, no.

MS. CASSINI: -- I mean --

MR. HOOPER: I'm not saying they didn't. And -- and -- and I'm just -- you know, because I remember when I was sitting on the TMA, we struggled. There was a match from the city and the County and the DDA and other people put money into it.

And so by the County taking it on, which ended up being in the municipal's bucket, it took the -- it took it -- it took the -- the burden off of the city.

MR. WALTON: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: So I don't know. I just -- it -- it seemed -- but it's -- it was very -- we -- we started to reduce just to the routes that were hugely popular, and they started to get packed. Some of them were packed.

So I'm not -- I'm not -- I -- I -- I know it's a popular program. I just don't understand how it works in the municipalities and then they start to rank. It

just seems odd.

Anyway, I -- it may not even be a question.

MR. WALTON: Oh, okay. All right.

MR. HOOPER: It just might be a statement. I mean -- anyway, let's keep going. I --

MS. CASSINI: Okay. I think --

MR. HOOPER: -- I'm sorry. I've ranted, and I'm sorry about that.

MS. CASSINI: No, no, you're not ranting. I -- I -- I do think that it's -- it's important to bring up, because there are going to be municipalities that are never going to qualify. They've never going to have the ridership because of the -- their --

MR. HOOPER: It's true.

MS. CASSINI: -- characteristics and --

MR. HOOPER: Destiny.

MS. CASSINI: -- and that's why -- that's why Chris was talking to you yesterday about the micro mobility. There -- so it -- it could become an issue in the future, certainly.

MR. WALTON: Yeah. It's a good point, Gretchen. The -- the ridership standard for a community shuttle is 7.1 passengers per revenue hour.

Again, we've relaxed that during COVID, but there are some communities that will never be able to -- because of the density, will never be



able to meet that number, so that's why we're going to introduce, as a pilot program, the micro transit program, which will have half of that ridership standard so that they -- and it actually will be part of the community shuttle program.

So, yeah, I -- I -- I get your -- your question about, you know, what other cities feel about it, but the cities that have -- the smaller cities will have a -- the same opportunity to participate under a slightly different model that will probably be much more effective for them.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, and -- and the -- and -- and, again, I know that it is a workshop. In the overall scheme of things, you know, you've got different modes of transportation that are touching all areas of the County, and some work in some areas and some don't in others.

I remember that the Lauderdale Lakes to downtown route was so crowded that we -- we were -- we had to like not let people on. We -- and we were trying to figure out a way to put another bus on that route, because it was actually becoming -- for the ADA folks, it was difficult to -- it was really -- some of those routes were really popular, and -- and the buses didn't touch those areas.

And then we had some neighborhoods where we only went along the outskirts, and there was like a deep neighborhood that the micro transit would help -- would have helped connect people that wanted to take those --

I mean, it's a hugely popular program.

But that's why I brought it up, is because it just seems like -- I guess it does fit. I guess it does fit as part of the municipal --

MR. WALTON: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: -- thing.

MR. WALTON: It does.

MR. HOOPER: But, anyway.

**D - SUPPORTIVE SERVICES**

MS. CASSINI: Okay. We're almost done with our workshop.

This is the five-year plan for, basically, your supportive services. And supportive services include the positions in MAP Administration, your legal team, your auditor, the Program Management Office, which -- but it also includes the Office of Economic and Small Business Development for the purposes of this particular slide.

We're trying to keep --

MR. COOLMAN: I have a question.

MS. CASSINI: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: Me, too.

MR. COOLMAN: What -- what percentage are we --

MS. CASSINI: Uh-huh.

MR. COOLMAN: -- is this representative of?

MS. CASSINI: So we showed you a chart yesterday, and we are doing what you've asked. We're trying to stay at one percent.

I will say that because of -- and I've mentioned this in previous years -- because of the move and the capital construction and all that has had to go into getting us co-located out at G.C. West, we do exceed that next year, but it's 1.5 percent.

But I do believe that once all of that construction is completed that we'll be able to get back down under the one percent.

And we're -- we're monitoring it and we're -- and we're --

MR. COOLMAN: When will you be in that space?

MS. CASSINI: We will be in that space next Friday, and could not be happier about it. Angela and her team have -- or at least part of her team, have been in that space for a couple of months.

And the construction for your area, so that we can bring the entire group out, because it also includes another, I think, seven offices, is slated to start in two months, which, you know, probably will slip, but it's still -- it -- it's moving, and it's very exciting.

So I'll give --

MR. COOLMAN: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: -- you an update during the retreat of where we are on that.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, that was my question. I was going to ask about the office and when we were going to get a chance to start visiting.

But, thank you.

All right. Let's --

MS. CASSINI: All right.

MR. HOOPER: -- any other questions? All right. Let's keep going.

## **REGULAR AGENDA**

### **ROLL CALL**

MS. CASSINI: Great. We're going to move into the regular meeting now, Mr. Chair. And --

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: -- I'll ask Tashauna --

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. CASSINI: -- to take the roll again --

MR. HOOPER: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: -- to make sure we have a quorum.

MS. WILLIAMS: Shea Smith.

MR. SMITH: Here.

MS. WILLIAMS: Ronald Frazier.

MR. FRAZIER: Here.

MS. WILLIAMS: Alan Hooper.

MR. HOOPER: Here.

MS. WILLIAMS: Debbie Madden.

MS. MADDEN: Here.

MS. WILLIAMS: Phil Allen.

MR. ALLEN: Here.

MS. WILLIAMS: Allyson Love.

MS. LOVE: Here.

MS. WILLIAMS: Douglas Coolman.

MR. COOLMAN: Here.

MS. WILLIAMS: Dr. Consuelo Kelley is excused, and likewise for  
Anthea Pennant.

We have a quorum.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: Do you want to --

MR. HOOPER: You take it.

MS. CASSINI: -- call the regular meeting to order?

MR. HOOPER: I'm sorry?

MS. CASSINI: Do you want to call the regular meeting to order now?

**CALL TO ORDER**

**(CHAIR ALAN HOOPER CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER.)**

MR. HOOPER: Oh, okay. All right. Let's --

MS. CASSINI: Because you're going to -- you're going to have to vote on the minutes and all of that.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Well, we -- but that was the roll call, right? So I guess we've done the roll call, and we'll call the regular meeting to order.

It's August 20<sup>th</sup>. The Independent Surtax Oversight Board. And let's start the meeting.

### **ACTION ITEMS**

#### **I - APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE JUNE 11, 2021 OVERSIGHT BOARD MEETING**

MS. WALLACE: Good morning again. Just to summarize --

MR. ALLEN: **Move** -- move approval of the minutes first?

MS. CASSINI: Yes, that's right.

MR. WALLACE: I'm sorry?

MS. CASSINI: Sorry --

MR. HOOPER: I'm sorry. I'm blind.

MS. WALLACE: The minutes, yes.

MR. ALLEN: Here you want these?

MR. HOOPER: No, I got it. I can look through this, if you guys don't mind me using his glasses. Yeah, okay.

Do we have a second?

MR. FRAZIER: Second.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. All those in favor of the minutes?

Those opposed?

The minutes are approved.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

**II - ELIGIBILITY ACTION ON FY 2022 PROPOSED PROJECTS AND  
EXPENDITURES**

MR. HOOPER: Okay. The second item is eligibility action on the 2022 proposed projects and expenditures.

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

Okay. We are in the midst of the County's annual budget process.

And pursuant to Chapter 31½-75 of the Broward County Code of Ordinances, staff proposes projects and proposed expenditures for Oversight Board consideration as to eligibility under Section 212.055 Florida Statutes, with consideration of counsel's recommendation.

And that process, after the Oversight Board reviews and makes the eligibility determination, sends a transmittal to the County Administrator advising the County Administrator of its recommendations with regard to eligibility of the projects and expenditures.

And the County Administrator incorporates those recommendations into the County's budget process for approval by the County Commission.

And so, I guess, on page 143 of the slide, also eligible uses. Eligible

uses of the statute are planning, development, construction, design, operations and maintenance of roads, bridges, fixed guideway systems, transit, and it allow for supportive services.

And so the -- I guess Slide 143 includes the requests for allocations, funding allocations in FY -- FY '20-22 budget.

I have reviewed the proposed projects and expenditures against the statute.

We have had some internal discussions regarding matters such as, you know, one of the matters that Mr. Allen brought up with regard to projects and their readiness, and some with regard to possibly including other funding sources, and that's part of the -- been part of our discussions yesterday and today as well, leveraging other sources and funding possible items within the surtax plan with other funds.

So, that being said, subject to further analysis of some of these projects and expenditures, I recommend the proposed projects and expenditures as eligible under 212.055 Florida Statutes.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Do we have a motion to approve the -- the proposed projects and the expenditures?

MR. FRAZIER: So **move**.

MR. HOOPER: Do we have a second?

MS. LOVE: Second.



MR. HOOPER: Do we want to have a discussion? Anybody?

Okay. All those in favor?

Those opposed?

Okay. It's approved.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

**II - APPROVAL OF FIVE-YEAR PLANS**

MS. WALLACE: So with regard to the five-year plan, the five-year plan incorporates FY -- the -- '22 as the first year of the five-year plan, and then the additional years for planning purposes, FY '23 through '26.

And so I have reviewed the proposed projects and expenditures with regard to their eligibility under 212.055(1) Florida Statutes.

And, subject to further review and analysis, as we've discussed, regarding some of the projects and the items included in the plan, I recommend the proposed projects and expenditures as eligible under 212.055 Florida Statutes.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So do we have a motion to approve the --

MS. WALLACE: Five-year plan.

MR. HOOPER: -- five-year plan?

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

MR. COOLMAN: I second.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Is there any discussion?

All those in favor?

MR. COOLMAN: I have a comment after the fact, just a comment.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Let's -- is there anyone on the phone?

Any opposed?

Okay. The -- the motion passes.

**VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

MR. HOOPER: Go ahead, Doug.

MR. COOLMAN: Just a clarification so I understand.

We approved the 2022 expenditures, correct? We --

MS. WALLACE: Correct. For inclusion --

MR. COOLMAN: -- we --

MS. WALLACE: -- in the budget.

MR. COOLMAN: -- the plan is for '22 to '26, but right now, we didn't approve any new projects and municipal projects in 2026.

MS. WALLACE: The --

MR. COOLMAN: Because you didn't have money to do it.

MS. WALLACE: -- it's the next phase.

MR. COOLMAN: Yeah.

MS. WALLACE: So the municipal slide includes the next phases of the projects in order of ranking.

So there are no new ones. It's just the next phase of previously

approved projects, and it's actually recommending the funding in those out years.

So it's planning the funding in those out years, because we can only -- the County Commission can only allocate funds for the upcoming fiscal year. You can't allocate funds --

MR. COOLMAN: Right.

MS. WALLACE: -- for the out years.

So the -- for planning purposes, it allows us to, you know, figure out how to position --

MR. HOOPER: Five-years.

MS. WALLACE: -- projects prospectively.

MR. COOLMAN: So hopefully --

MS. CASSINI: Vice Chair --

MR. COOLMAN: -- we'll get all this -- there's --

MS. CASSINI: -- you --

MR. COOLMAN: -- glitch --

MS. CASSINI: -- there's --

MR. COOLMAN: -- glitches worked out so that --

MS. CASSINI: -- there's 15.1 million dollars right now programmed in 2026. I did want to make sure that you -- that was clear. So -- you did approve new projects.

MR. COOLMAN: But -- but those are also --

MS. CASSINI: Those aren't new.

MR. COOLMAN: -- the old projects.

MS. CASSINI: Well, the -- right.

MR. COOLMAN: From the old list.

MS. CASSINI: It's just the -- it's just --

MR. COOLMAN: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: -- the next phase.

MR. COOLMAN: All right.

MS. WALLACE: Right.

MR. COOLMAN: Thank you.

MS. CASSINI: Right.

MR. COOLMAN: Thank you.

## **NON-AGENDA**

### **CHAIR REPORT**

MR. HOOPER: Non-agenda. Reports from the Chair.

Well, I'm pretty happy about where we're going. I'm very excited about the rapid bus and the -- and the light rail.

And I'm really happy with the marketing and the work that everybody's doing on staff.

I can't wait until we have an office, really.

And -- and I think our board has done a great job of participating, asking good questions, seeking transparency -- transparency, and also, you know, the whole thing with the CBE and -- and -- and keeping our eye on the ball there.

It's just -- it's been a pleasure working with you guys so far.

And that's my report.

### **MEMBER REPORTS**

MR. HOOPER: Do any members want to say something?

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman, oh --

MR. HOOPER: Yes, sir.

MR. ALLEN: -- Doug?

MR. HOOPER: Doug, and then you.

MR. COOLMAN: Go ahead.

MR. ALLEN: We should have some discussion relative to the -- the transmittal letter to the Board.

We have a draft that Gretchen and staff put together last night based on our discussions yesterday.

I think the format or the process is that our actions today to approve the five-year plan and -- and the appropriations for next year and the -- the budget for next year need to be transmitted, and the normal practice is that's transmitted to the County Administrator and presented then to the Board for

their consideration when they adopt the County budget.

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MR. ALLEN: So -- but there's a transmittal letter that normally goes along with that, and we have a draft in front of us proposed by the -- by Gretchen and staff.

My comment, number one, it's an excellent letter, I think. Really captures our discussions, both yesterday and today as regards to continuing performance, of particularly municipal projects.

We've seen the County projects proceed expeditiously, but it appears that some of the municipal projects aren't -- for -- for various reasons, are not meeting our expectations and our desire to get these projects moving to fulfill our responsibilities as a board.

So I would recommend that we -- we take action on that transmittal letter.

One comment that I have is under the ideas that have been presented, or we have tossed around for solving, or potentially solving, this issue, I don't see the one additional one which might be to consider a formal amendment to the interlocal agreements to -- going forward.

You know, we have -- let me put my glasses on so I can point them out.

We have suggested that the -- requesting formal correspondence from

each City Commission or Mayor -- these are recommendations to the County -- or to the Board of County Commissioners -- relaying the Oversight's concerns, creating a special status for those planning and design projects with no documentation has been submitted 18 months after the funds were allocated, and moving those projects to a separate inactive area project dashboard to assure the information be -- for public -- provided to the public accurately reflects real and active projects.

But there's another solution also that might be considered down the road is consider amendments to the interlocal agreement that would expand our existing capability to cancel projects based on three no-activity -- or not completion within three years, but to incorporate other factors in it so that this board -- this board, this body, has the ability to take action, enforcement action, or recommendations to the Board to take enforcement action, if we see that planning and design projects are not moving forward as we had been told.

So that was the only recommendation I would have in that -- or change -- proposed change in that letter, addition.

MR. HOOPER: I have something to say. I -- it's a long letter. I have not had a chance to review it. There's a lot of words in this letter, and I am very much a stickler as to what things say.

So if we could have a chance -- some time to review the letter, if you

don't mind.

I -- I know that the concept of the whole thing is probably agreeable to all of us, but I just want to be careful.

And -- and -- and then I -- you know, we don't have any -- we haven't had discussions with the MPO, and -- and tried to kind of figure out where their head was.

And maybe there's some alignment in interest there, too.

So I just want to -- and then they -- there might be a suggested solution as well.

So I'd like to, before we throw out a letter like this, is to think -- first, let me read it and let the other members read it very carefully, and then let's -- I don't know, when can we get back to approving a letter -- the letter?

MS. CASSINI: So I think you have some options.

We do need to do a formal transmittal of your action and approval on the '22 --

MR. HOOPER: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: -- budget and the five-year plan.

MR. HOOPER: Uh-huh.

MS. CASSINI: And that needs to be done relatively quickly --

MR. HOOPER: That's --

MS. CASSINI: -- because the --



MR. HOOPER: -- that's fine.

MS. CASSINI: -- the workshop -- the County Commission workshop on the surtax will occur on the 31<sup>st</sup> of August.

But if you want to postpone submitting the recommendations that are outlined in this letter until after you've had an opportunity to -- to have the retreat and bring the MPO here --

MR. HOOPER: When is the retreat?

MS. CASSINI: The 19<sup>th</sup> of November is our next meeting.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: Do you want to look at an earlier date?

MR. HOOPER: It -- it's up to the board members. I -- I'm sure I can find a day that I'm available but --

MR. COOLMAN: Alan, I -- I would think -- I've had a chance to read it. I -- and I agree with what Phil's saying.

I -- I don't have any problem deferring to you and our Executive Director wordsmithing it and getting it going. I don't have a problem with that.

I think in general it's -- it's got everything there.

You guys take a couple of days, a week, I don't care, but I'll be more than happy with what you -- the two of you come up with. I don't have a problem with that.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Well, I -- I just -- I'd like to read it before I sign

it.

MR. ALLEN: I think in the past you have reviewed that and sent out copies of the draft before so that we could --

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MR. ALLEN: -- make recommendations or comment, not so much wordsmithing really.

You know, I -- I don't think we can compose a letter by committee. It takes the Chair's action to do -- to do that, and I would be more than willing to say that, you know, give direction to the Chair to proceed with all due haste in getting this transmittal letter done, but that staff would provide us the opportunity to do our own wordsmithing, if you will.

MR. COOLMAN: Yeah, a final view after Alan has one.

MR. ALLEN: Right.

MR. HOOPER: So should we do two letters? One letter for the approval of the --

MS. CASSINI: I mean, if -- if this is something that can be done relatively quickly, --

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: -- I don't have any concern about that whatsoever.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

I'll send a draft to you and --

MR. HOOPER: And we've done that in the past.

MS. CASSINI: -- you can work on it. Of course. And then I will send it out to everyone.

Angela has already weighed in on this version, but, you know, I generally share it with -- with her, as well, once you send me back your edits.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: And then we'll share it with the rest of the group.

MR. HOOPER: Very good.

MS. WALLACE: And my only comment for inclusion would be to modify it with the subject to further review and analysis of certain items, which was the -- which was consistent with the motions today, so far.

But I did provide edits so far.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Very good.

MR. COOLMAN: My member comments --

MR. HOOPER: Yes, sir.

MR. COOLMAN: -- are totally different. We have a responsibility, looking at the big picture, for what I consider the mass transit transportation countywide.

And when I hear comments, well, it wasn't in the original list, in the -- I think these lists were put together in a few months, and we're going to be looking at projects for the next 30 years.

So I -- it bothers me a little.

I mean, I also, when we get comments about, well, that project's ineligible -- specifically, this is related to the -- the crossing of the New River, whether it's a tunnel or a -- a bridge.

What we don't know -- we can't put money in privately owned entities, in other words. I'm going, well, wait a minute. We are -- we're trying to put together a -- a transit system, and who cares who necessarily owns it?

I mean, I'm -- I know that maybe that's what the book says, but if we end up building, let's just say for discussion, a bridge, and we own the bridge, whoever, you know -- although I don't know who owns it when the money's going to come from all different places, but I would hope that this -- to me the -- moving people north and south so we can fill our buses going east and west and all that is important.

And I would hope that we start to think about how we can help fund, in this case particular, our -- our mass transit system that relates to the -- to whatever you want to call it, the Brightline or however.

And -- and I don't -- all I hear is, oh, well, that's owned -- that's a private entity.

So I don't know that -- I -- you know, we're not allowed to talk to each other, so I'm -- I'm trying to bring this up, because I think it's an important issue --

MS. CASSINI: I --

MR. COOLMAN: -- that we get in position to lead and be part of.

MR. HOOPER: Sure --

MS. CASSINI: Mr. Chair --

MR. HOOPER: -- go ahead --

MS. CASSINI: -- may I? Okay.

MR. HOOPER: -- Gretchen.

MS. CASSINI: So I -- I -- I do, since you brought it up, Vice Chair, I think it's important, on the record, to let everyone here know that I am a member of the Project Executive Committee with Bertha and Chris and Vince Ruddy on behalf of the County, with FDOT and their main consulting team for the commuter rail project.

I'm -- I also serve on the Financial Committee.

Chris and his team have members on all of the various committees.

We have folks that work for you, that are your support staff, that are on the modeling -- Traffic Modeling Committee looking at potential congestion impacts.

So we are very involved.

The surtax is certainly going to be a revenue source that has to be looked at.

And Angela brought it up yesterday, and I will just reiterate it today that

if you don't have a local dedicated source of revenue to be able to support the operations and -- and maintenance of a -- a system like that for -- what is the useful life, Chris? 40 years? Or 30 years with the buildings being 40, I mean, we -- we are looking -- the surtax is being looked at. There's -- there's no question.

But we have to get this in front of our County Commissioners.

We need to have a locally preferred alternative identified.

We need to get through the public kickoff meetings.

We need to determine the -- the -- the feasibility, the viability.

And we expected, actually, to bring you a presentation at the right time, and we weren't sure if it was going to be during the retreat, if we were going to be ready at that point, or if it would be early in 2022.

But, you know, the County Commission has to take formal action on this.

And the MPO has to include it in their long-range transportation plan, and also have to take a formal vote on it.

And -- and once those things occur, I don't want you to think that -- I mean, clearly, commuter rail service is eligible. There are certain components of this project that are not going to be funded with the surtax at this point, unless there's a change that is made by our policy makers.

MR. COOLMAN: Well and that's maybe what --

MS. WALLACE: Your microphone.

MR. COOLMAN: -- certain elements might not be eligible.

MR. HOOPER: Microphone.

MS. WALLACE: Your microphone.

MR. COOLMAN: When you say certain elements might not be eligible, when this thing was written, in a relatively short period of time, trying to understand what's going to happen over the next 30 years, maybe some of these things about eligibility need to be rethought of.

That's all I'm saying. We need to -- we -- maybe we need to think outside the box, because what's coming down the road in a few years now, and what may be coming down the road in ten years, we don't even understand it.

So we wrote an eligibility requirement a few years ago, right?

MS. WALLACE: No, I think there's confusion with regard to eligibility.

MR. COOLMAN: Pardon?

MS. WALLACE: So I think there's confusion with regard to eligibility and the plan.

So eligibility is defined by Section 212.055 Florida Statutes. It specifically says what surtax proceeds can be used for. That's how eligibility is determined.

Rail is fixed guideway system, and that is specifically eligible under

the statute.

Now, whether surtax funding was planned for that in 2018 when the surtax -- the -- the transportation plan was developed is a different issue.

But it -- it doesn't -- whether or not it was anticipated, commuter rail was anticipated in 2018 when the plan was developed is not dispositive of whether surtax funds will be utilized for commuter rail.

But there's a process, a huge process that has to be undertaken.

Because of the substantial cost associated with funding rail, we have to include a financial plan that would incorporate federal dollars.

There's a process that must be followed, including the PB and E, the locally preferred study that includes a locally preferred alternative, public input, there's a whole list of steps, hoops that must be jumped through --

MR. COOLMAN: Oh, I understand, and they're going through --

MS. WALLACE: -- in order to be --

MR. COOLMAN: -- that.

MS. WALLACE: -- eligible for federal funding.

And then so use of -- of public dollars is also governed.

And so this has to be structured.

I think what you're referring to is, you know, Brightline and -- and FEC and the corridor being owned by FEC.

We have to make sure that we comply with either having the rights to



utilize the -- the -- the property for a -- a -- a period of time that is permissible under the statute for -- for -- under Florida law for use of public funds when we're dealing with private entities.

And so we can have a long-term agreement, but -- but we have to be careful to ensure that to we are in compliance with all of the state and federal requirements with regard to implementing this type of project.

MR. COOLMAN: I'm just glad we're thinking about it. That's all I -- because I haven't heard anything yet other than --

MS. WALLACE: It's a process.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, you -- you need to --

MS. CASSINI: Trying not to get in front of my --

MR. HOOPER: -- can --

MS. CASSINI: -- Commissioners.

MR. HOOPER: -- can you -- can you forward Doug, and maybe the rest of us, I -- I've sat through a couple of Zoom meetings where there's been a -- it was like a committee for the New River bridge crossing and they -- they had RTA, they had everybody. There were so many players at that table. And all -- a lot -- almost all of the people in this room that work -- that -- that we -- that work with us, okay?

And they are diligently trying to solve this issue.

MR. COOLMAN: Oh, I know. And the train is moving down the

tracks.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. But Miami and Palm Beach are the beneficiaries of our problem, okay? And we're taking the time it takes to do it properly.

And if it takes a little bit longer, well, so be it. And that's the way I see it. And -- and that's just my opinion. But -- and -- and we're going to do it right, and we're going to go through all the alternative.

And it's -- so I think it's going to happen, but it's just a matter of taking the time to do it --

MR. COOLMAN: I -- I do, too. I'm just glad to see this --

MR. HOOPER: You should sit through it. It's really informative.

MR. COOLMAN: -- piece of the -- piece of the program --

MR. HOOPER: It is.

MR. COOLMAN: -- because to me, this is --

MS. CASSINI: I --

MR. COOLMAN: -- this is all great, but that can't -- that has to be part of the game plan.

MS. CASSINI: -- in -- in fact, and I would be remiss if I didn't share with all of you that it was a request by the -- the project development environmental team to come before you and make a presentation, because this is the right forum where we can bring all the -- I explained to them that

many of the municipalities are already watching, and there are a lot of folks that they are trying to make sure have the information.

So, you know, yes, we -- we are going to come and -- and make a presentation. You'll -- many of you will have already seen it, but it -- this -- this is going to be probably very exciting --

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MS. CASSINI: -- you know, six months on this project.

MR. COOLMAN: I assume that will be, what, after the PB and E study is brought out?

MS. CASSINI: That's why I said I wasn't sure about --

MR. COOLMAN: Yeah.

MS. CASSINI: -- the timing, because initially they thought that the November 19<sup>th</sup> retreat would be perfect --

MR. COOLMAN: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: -- timing in their -- their overall project timeline, but it may be pushed out to the first meeting in 2022.

MR. HOOPER: It's good, though. It's moving.

Do any other members want to say anything? It's open mic day today.

All right. Well, thank -- is that it? Is the meeting over? 11:15.

## **ADJOURN**

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Thank you, everybody, for participating in our

workshop. Thanks, staff, everybody. You guys are great.

And let's have a great -- well, I'll see you guys in November.

Enjoy. Thank you.

(The meeting concluded at 11:18 a.m.)