

MINUTES

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

November 19, 2021

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Phil Allen, Retired, Finance

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

Ronald Frazier, Architecture

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

Dr. Consuelo Kelley, Resident Consumer of Public Transportation

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

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

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

MEMBERS ABSENT:

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

Also Present:

Angela Wallace, Surtax General Counsel

Gretchen Cassini, Board Coordinator

Audrey Thompson, Administrative Support Specialist

Roy Burnette, Administrative Specialist

Nicholas Sofoul, Broward County Transit

Tim Garling, Deputy Director, Broward County Transportation Department

Tony Hui, Deputy Director, Broward County Public Works

Lary Mahoney Director of Real Estate Development, Broward County
Administration

Vincent Ruddy, Broward County Chief Negotiator, Broward County
Government

Steve Braun, Director of Transportation Development, Florida Department of
Transportation

Phil Schwab, Project Manager, Florida Department of Transportation

Greg Burns (remotely)

Bryan Caletka, Director of Transportation, Broward MPO

Todd Brauer, President / COO at Whitehouse Group. Fort Lauderdale, FL

Jeff Napier, Procurement Strategist, Broward County Transportation
Department

Alexander Mayorga, Program Performance Coordinator, Broward County
Government

Anissia Herne, Natural Resources Specialist, Broward County

Margaret Dalley-Johns, Finance Manager, MAP

Neil Lyn, Mobility and Innovations Team Supervisor

Lina Silva, FCCM · Program Project Coordinator at Broward County

Government

Devona Reynolds Perez, Assistant County Attorney

Josette Severyn, Senior Mobility Planner, MAP Administration

Johnny Caldera, Court Reporter, Laws Reporting Inc.

A meeting of the Independent Transportation Surtax Oversight Board, Broward County, Florida, was held at Room 422, Commission Chambers, 115 South Andrews Avenue, Fort Lauderdale, at 9:30 a.m., Friday, November 19, 2021.

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

CALL TO ORDER - CHAIR HOOPER

MR. HOOPER: Okay. All right. So, let's call the meeting to order -- what did I do to this thing -- to the Independent Trans Surtax Oversight Board, November 19th, 2021.

ROLL CALL - AUDRY THOMPSON

MR. HOOPER: Ms. Thompson, can we get a roll call, please.

MS. THOMPSON: Sure, Chair.

Alan Hooper.

MR. HOOPER: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Doug Coolman. Doug Coolman.

Phil Allen.

MR. ALLEN: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Ronald Frazier.

MR. FRAZIER: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Dr. Kelley.

DR. KELLEY: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Allyson Love.

MS. LOVE: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: Deborah Madden.

Anthea Pennant.

MS. PENNANT: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: And Shea Smith.

MR. SMITH: Here.

MS. THOMPSON: We have a quorum.

MR. HOOPER: Great. Thank you, Ms. Thompson.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

MR. HOOPER: Okay. I guess this is the moment for public participation.

Is there anybody in the public that would like to say a few words or address the board?

Okay. Hearing none, we'll move to the next item.

REGULAR AGENDA

ACTION ITEMS

1 - MOTION TO APPROVE MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 20TH, 2021

BOARD MEETING

MR. HOOPER: We've got action items. We need a motion to approve the minutes of the August 20th board meeting.

MR. ALLEN: So move.

DR. KELLEY: **Moved.**

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. ALLEN: Second.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Do we have any discussion on the minutes?

All those in favor?

Those opposed?

The minutes are approved.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

2 - MOTION TO APPROVE SURTAX FUNDING IN THE NOT-TO-ESCEED AMOUNT OF 2.75 MILLION DOLLARS PER YEAR FOR UP TO FIVE YEARS (13.75 MILLION DOLLARS TOTAL) FOR A BROWARD COUNTY TRANSIT (BCT) COMMUNITY MICRO-TRANSIT PILOT PROGRAM

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Number 2 is a motion to approve surtax funding in the not-to-exceed amount of 2.75 million for up to five years for a Broward County Transit Community Micro-Transit Pilot Program.

Do we want to -- are we going to have any kind of presentation?

Okay. Great.

MR. SOFOUL: All right. Good morning, Chair Hooper, distinguished members of the Oversight Committee Board.

My name is Nichols Sofoul. You might remember me. I think I spoke to you a year ago in my former capacity as -- in the Innovation Team for MAP Admin. I am now over at BCT, settled in over the last year.

And I'm once again here to present some innovative mobility solutions for your consideration today.

The very first program is a community micro-transit pilot program.

So this is the program where we're going to be using to try to facilitate connectivity in areas of the County where we don't quite have the identities supportive of fixed route transit service, and we want to be able to still provide critical linkages for connectivity for those particular areas where we know there's still demand in the community but we just don't have the

numbers to justify, let's say, a community shuttle or a fixed route bus.

So the goal is, on the slide, to provide convenient and flexible on-demand transit options to complement the BCT Community Shuttle program.

So what we did was we really want to focus on some of these areas of the County where they've either had community shuttle service or have requested -- either had community shuttle service that has not been successful to rise to the level of meeting our 7.1 passengers per hour threshold, or areas of the County that have requested service but, through our service analysis, we've determined that the area would not really be a good candidate for that type of service.

So what micro-transit is, it's ability to kind of mesh together the best of both worlds of the best of transit with the convenience of a TNC, like an Uber or a Lyft.

And it provides the ability for folks to be able to hail a ride on a mobile app, through a smartphone or via online, or even we could have a call center, which is on there as well, for people who don't have access to smartphones.

But the idea is for folks that live within these designated zones, you can actually get a trip to your exact destination, you know, to pick you up where you are and drop you off anywhere within that zone.

It would be free of fare, so -- because it's complementary to the community shuttle system.

Designed for circulation within the micro-transit zone but also to be able to get people out to our main trunk lines for BCT service.

So if you live deep within the community -- and we know we have some suburban neighborhoods where there's not really good street connectivity, and for you to walk, you know, from your house to, let's say, one of our BCT main lines, it might look on a map like -- the way the crow flies, it might look like it's a, you know, half a mile walk, but in reality, it might be two miles by the time you go all around through the community and get out to the exit.

These types of services will actually meet them where they live and then bring them to their destinations.

So this is a very exciting solution for us.

In developing this pilot program, we pulled information from across the nation. So we looked at pilot programs and micro-transit implementations over in L.A. Metro; we looked over in DART in Dallas; we looked at Miami-Dade, where they have a very successful program right now to provide first and last mile connectivity from the Metro Rail; and we also looked at other partners up in the state, HART in Tampa, JTA in Jacksonville.

So we wanted to pull kind of the best information from across the nation to be able to come up with the best pilot we could for this particular implementation.

So the request is for a turnkey pilot implementation. And what a turnkey means is every aspect of the service is provided under the single contract.

So that means we're going to have a vendor that's going to provide

the technology, the actual app, the software, so when you pull up, you can book your trip and have that dynamic routing.

They're going to be providing the actual physical vehicles that will be used for the service.

They'll be providing the operations of the service, the operators.

They'll provide the maintenance.

They'll be providing some marketing, the cleaning of the buses.

And pretty much everything, soup to nuts, that's revolving micro-transit service is going to be done through the vendor.

The idea of this is so that we can first get this thing rolling as quickly as possible for this pilot program.

Our proposal is for an initial three-year contract with an option of two one-year extensions.

The idea is it usually takes about six months for any transit service to ramp up before you really know how successful it is.

Then we're going to need some time to evaluate how it's actually going. We're going to get a lot of feedback from our customers.

And in doing so, we expect that, through the pilot program, we're going to be making some adjustments. You know, we might end up having to adjust this band of service, we might have to adjust the geographic area of some of these micro-transit zones, might be tweaked a little bit, you know.

But through that process, we want to develop the most efficient service we can for the public and kind of have a proof of concept moving

forward for micro-transit services.

At the end of the three-year period, we'll have the option if we want to renew for an additional two years up to a total of five years. You know, that's for -- let's say it's going really well and there's really no reason to make any changes or to go out again for another solicitation, we have two more years where we could potentially go out and not, you know, upend the apple cart if things are going well.

If we want to make a change, we'll have the option at that point, at the end of that three years, to go ahead and do that.

One of the reasons why you have a three-year pilot, though, because it seems a little bit long for most pilot programs, is really because when these operators have to make investments, like in providing vehicles, there's a capital cost to that. And they need to be able to recoup their costs of the investments they're making in the service.

And if we make the duration of a pilot too short, we feel like we'll either not be able to fully vet the service, but it also is going to significantly increase our costs on the provider to be able to recoup the fact that they're having to put a lot of front end money, you know, into the software development and into the development of the vehicles.

So already went through here. There's going to be five micro-transit service zones. Let's talk a little bit about this.

So three of the zones are areas where we have had community shuttle service and it's just not working out. You know, it's -- the -- the routes

are struggling, they're not doing very well.

And so we're trying to use this as an ability, at a very similar -- so if you look at the cost of poor -- cost per trip of poorly performing community shuttle routes -- and these are routes that maybe have service maybe once every 60 minutes. We're not talking about a very high level of service for some of these poorly performing community shuttle routes -- the cost of offering micro-transit, where we're going to be guaranteeing a 15-minute maximum wait time per passenger is roughly equivalent to what a poorly performing community shuttle would be.

You know, so we're trying to provide, at a very similar cost per passenger, a much higher level of connectivity and service.

And that's kind of the benefit of adding micro-transit to our suite of mobility options that we're developing over at BCT.

As I mentioned, it's going to be free of fare because it's complementary to the community shuttle program, so we don't want to charge anyone for this service.

The micro-transit trips will provide up to three miles.

We did a lot of research and talked to a lot of providers across the country, and what happens is if you develop micro-transit zones that have larger trips than three miles, your wait times start to become really inefficient for folks to find this system to be convenient.

You know, you'll end up with wait times of 20 and 30 minutes-plus, and that's really not the kind of service we want to be able to have with

micro-transit.

So it's really about targeting the right areas, trying to facilitate trips no more than three miles, and being able to guarantee a 15-minute maximum wait time as a standard across the board in each service zone.

We set an initial service band from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. That was in consistent with other agencies we saw across the country.

However, I want to stress that because this is a pilot project, that is completely modifiable.

If we are working from the zones and we're receiving customer feedback, we totally -- we expect that we might get feedback that says, hey, we really need this service to start at 6:00 a.m. instead of 7:00 a.m., or we need it to start at 5:30 a.m., or we need it to go later if it's a community that's more coastal and maybe has some more late night activities.

You know, we're going to be flexible to that as a part of this pilot program, and we're going to be receiving that customer information and feedback as we go through the pilot program.

Our scope has a preference for no- and low-emission vehicles. We didn't want to make it -- we didn't want to mandate at this point low- and no-emission vehicles, just because of the time to get some of infrastructure set up, and the cost associated with it, but we will be providing a preference for that in the scope.

The vendor has to provide a fleet that meets all state and federal requirements for operations on all roadways, including arterials.

So what this means is you might have seen some of these low-speed vehicles operating kind of micro-transit type service in some of our coastal areas, you know, using kind of low-speed golf cart-esque type vehicles, you know, that fall under Florida statute for low -- low-speed vehicles.

Those vehicles will not be eligible under this particular solicitation because we're going to be providing service out in the suburbs along arterials that have speed limits greater than 35 miles an hour.

So that actually increased the cost of the service, because we need to make sure we're providing real vehicles, real safe vehicles, that meet all state and federal compliance.

We will have MAP Broward branding on every single vehicle. So unlike the community shuttle system right now, which you see that a lot of municipalities have kind of branded each system themselves where they have -- you know, you can see the -- the LauderGo Shuttle, for instance, you know, in Fort Lauderdale, you know, or other systems, Lauderhill Transit.

This system is going to be completely branded as a Broward County service, and it's going to be a MAP Broward service. And we're going to be able to see that on the roads.

So this project is going to have a great amount of visibility throughout the cities to be able to see that.

They're not going to be unmarked vehicles. You're not going to be able to not see that we're providing the service.

We want to make it highly visible to the public that this is a service that

we're offering.

The other ability of having common branding is that if we have common branding across our fleet, we have the ability to rotate vehicles to different service zones depending on service demand.

So let's say we initially set out and we have two vehicles per service zone, but then we find out through the program that in central County, Municipal Services District, they have a real peak crunch in midday, for whatever reason. Schools are getting out or something's going on. We can actually relocate and shuffle buses from our other zones to then meet that demand and then have them go back to their standard zone.

You know, so they have the flexibility to be able to scale the system across the various zones because we don't have branding per zone; the branding is of the system, which provides us a great amount of flexibility and will provide us some cost savings as well.

And in the end, we really feel that this is going to be a great program. We're very excited about it.

I just want to note, we have a separate initiative through our General Planning Consultant contract where we're going to be providing for monitoring standards and benchmarking for this pilot project as we're going.

So we're not just going into it without monitoring the performance. We're going to have a performance monitoring plan, a benchmarking plan.

They're also going to be assisting us to create a marketing plan for these services.

So we're excited about that.

And just to put the note in there, you know, that's a part of our General Planning Consulting contract. We have CBEs on that contract. And the CBEs on that contract are going to be helping us to create the marketing strategies, you know, for these implementations.

So that gives us another ability to be able to kind of make that CBE connection in with this new service.

So we're very excited about that.

And I'll be happy to answer any questions you have on this one. This is a great program, and we're excited to get it rolling.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Allen.

MR. ALLEN: I'm sorry. A couple questions.

The service is within district only? Within the service area?

MR. SOFOUL: Correct. So what makes the service feasible, you know, and economical, and keeping those wait times low is that there's a designated geofence service area. And that service area is set where that there'll be no trip greater than three miles.

And that keeps that wait time at an acceptable level where we can promise folks a 15-minute wait or less for the service.

MR. ALLEN: So people can access the service through a smart phone application, they can call the dispatch center.

MR. SOFOUL: Correct. So three ways of booking. You can either book through the smart phone. That predominantly -- across other

implementations nationwide, that's the predominant use. Most people are going to be able to book those trips through the smart phone application.

Second way to do it is through a mobile website. You can do it that way.

Or, for folks who do not have access to smart phones, there will be a call center that has to be in operation the entire span of service plus an hour or two before and after service ends to be able to answer any customer inquiries and also to be able to book trips for folks who don't have access to smart phones.

MR. ALLEN: And you've started the acquisition process?

MR. SOFOUL: We have a scope prepared, and we're planning on trying to get -- we're planning on going to the Board to have approval for the concept to move forward, and we'll have an RFP out on the street sometime early next year.

MR. ALLEN: And your target date for starting -- for commencing the service?

MR. SOFOUL: I would love to be able to start before the end of this next fiscal year, so before September.

And one of the issues that's kind of a little challenging right now, you might be aware it's very difficult to get vehicles. There's kind of a backlog in the whole vehicle pipeline right now with the chip crisis and whatnot.

So we're expecting that the time to procure the vehicles on the vendor side might be a little bit longer than we would usually anticipate for an

implementation like this.

MR. HOOPER: Ms. Pennant --

MR. FRAZIER: Mr. Chair --

MR. HOOPER: -- then Mr. Frazier.

MS. PENNANT: All right. So -- good morning. Thanks --

MR. SOFOUL: Good morning.

MS. PENNANT: -- for this presentation. I've been looking forward to hearing from you.

I have quite a few questions, so bear with me a little bit.

MR. SOFOUL: Sure.

MS. PENNANT: There are a couple of things that I -- I wanted to know.

You said that they're going to have control of the app and the marketing and so on and so forth.

And then I want to know are you going to have rights to that -- whatever they're collecting? How are you providing some oversight so -- to ensure that they're not fudging the numbers or whatever it is?

MR. SOFOUL: We're -- we're -- we're --

MS. PENNANT: That's one question.

MR. SOFOUL: -- that's a great question. So as a part of the -- our solicitation RFP, we're requiring that they -- that the vendor provides us all information and data, you know, to Broward County. And there's going to be a very robust monitoring program.

We actually want to be able to have our own kind of look in to their system. So we're not --

MS. PENNANT: That's what I'm talking about.

MR. SOFOUL: -- going to be provide -- so it's not going to be --

MS. PENNANT: That they can't be entered then.

MR. SOFOUL: -- we get a third-hand spreadsheet. We're actually going to be able to have a tap in to their network and to their system.

And we're also really excited for that data, because let's say we find through a couple years of the implementation that we're seeing a lot of origins and destinations to the same locations.

MS. PENNANT: Uh-huh.

MR. SOFOUL: That might tell us, hey, we actually might be able to do a shuttle service here instead, you know, and we might be able to morph the service into something else. By receiving that data, we're able to see that there's -- or we can see that there's greater needs in the market for certain distinct areas.

So that's another really good value of this is that we're going to be looking at all the data and analyzing that as it goes, where people are coming, where people are going.

And then more -- most importantly, monitoring to make sure they're meeting our service requirement --

MS. PENNANT: Uh-huh.

MR. SOFOUL: -- of no more than a 15-minute wait. That's going to

be critical in the compliance on the vendor side.

MS. PENNANT: Okay. That's good.

I -- the other question I wanted to know was -- the -- the other thing that I wanted to know was why five zones? It seem -- I don't know, when I looked at the price tag for this program, I was a little shocked, right? And I keep thinking of a pilot being something so much smaller.

So I'm curious to know why five zones and, you know, could we start at a smaller scale? Because we don't know if it's going to work, right? This is something that is being proposed.

And I somehow feel like it should be a smaller project.

And then the other thing I'm thinking about is do we have local companies -- and you may not know this. This might be something for Sandy. Do we have local companies that have the capacity to take on a project like that?

So if we're going to spend \$13,000,000, I want to know that a local-based company has the ability to do so.

I'm also wanting to know in addition to them doing work with CBEs, that they're looking to employ locally as well from some of those communities that they're seeking to serve.

MR. SOFOUL: Sure. So I can start by addressing the -- the number of zones.

So we started off looking at what municipal- -- we have some of these cities -- let me give an example. You know, Town of Hillsboro Beach, right?

Smaller community. They've been a partner in the Community Shuttle Program since 1993.

They have been in this program, you know, but they have seen over the years their ridership degrade over time, you know, to the point now where it's just not quite feasible, you know, for that service.

So, given that they've been a long-term partner of the County, we really tried to go back to the drawing board and say, well, what can we offer these communities so we're still providing them connectivity -- you know. And so that's how, for instance, Hillsboro Beach, you know, became added to this, added to the service.

The same story kind of goes for West Park and for this western area in Hollywood. So we're not talking about Hollywood east and the beach, where all the Activity Centers are. We're talking about where the community is up to the west where they don't have the same level of connectivity.

We're talking about areas of Hollywood, you know, between 441 and the Turnpike, you know, where there really isn't the same level of connectivity as you have out by the beach and those areas.

We wanted to make sure that we provided these folks, you know, a level of connectivity and service, you know.

So we had those three municipalities that we really wanted to provide some sort of assistance to be able to get them some connectivity.

And then the two areas in the BMSD, in the unincorporated area, these were areas that we committed to as a part of the surtax initially, to

provide them some level of community-level circulation.

That was a commitment that we made through the surtax process.

You know, we did our due diligence on our side at BCT and we really came out to a conclusion that micro-transit is going to be best served for those areas. So --

MS. PENNANT: Right.

MR. SOFOUL: -- we want to make sure we get those in, because that's actually a commitment that we made to the voters in that area, that we would provide them some level of community-level circulation.

We do feel, as I mentioned before, the -- the cost of this service is very similar to the cost of what a struggling or a not-as-good community shuttle route would be, you know. So to give kind of an example, you know, we have -- we offer paratransit services, right? Those operate at about 1.5 passengers per hour, and the cost per trip, a lot of times, is around -- averages around \$33 per trip.

It's expensive.

On our fixed route services, you know, it goes down to about \$4 per passenger trip.

And on struggling community shuttles, it's usually around \$13 per trip.

We're expecting this to be about in that range, in that \$13 per passenger trip.

So we do feel that we'll be able to get a certain level of efficiency out of it.

The overall cost is just because this is a turnkey implementation, you know, so they have to provide for the vehicles, they have to provide for meeting all the federal and local regulations.

Just to give an idea of the magnitude of cost, you know, Miami-Dade implemented a micro-transit system not so long ago. The -- their -- the costs of the actual service to the agency is close to \$50 per revenue hour of service.

MS. PENNANT: Uh-huh.

MR. SOFOUL: You know, so --

MS. PENNANT: And --

MR. SOFOUL: -- that -- that's --

MS. PENNANT: -- how is that working for them?

MR. SOFOUL: It's --

MS. PENNANT: I mean --

MR. SOFOUL: -- it's working very well for them, you know. So they're using it a little bit differently than we are, because they have high-capacity networks. They have Metro Rail.

So they're using this as a first and last mile connection to get people to the Metro Rail.

And it's been very successful for them, you know, in that respect.

You know, they also have a separate zone operated with a municipality to do something similar that we're doing, where it's community-level circulation. Also doing well in that.

So, you know, I envision long-term we'll ultimately be using micro-transit more to provide first and last mile connection once we build our high-capacity network.

So at the point that we start to implement our BRT service, you know, our light rail service that comes out of our Transit Systems Plan moving along, I envision that micro-transit's going to become a much bigger player in providing that first and last mile test case.

MS. PENNANT: Okay. All right. I -- I'm going to try to restrain myself. I just -- sometimes I think about how much we spent for additional buses, general buses, right? So we approved that previously, and now we're doing this.

And I keep thinking, are they going to be competing for the same residents --

MR. SOFOUL: Mm-mm.

MS. PENNANT: -- you know?

MR. SOFOUL: We -- go ahead.

MS. PENNANT: And could we just roll out in phases, where we're doing two communities first and let's get some data from that and see how it's working?

It just seems like a big hit, 13,000,000.

MR. SOFOUL: Well, we have -- well, it's 2.75 million per year, and we don't have to go -- we wanted the options to be able to extend beyond three years --

MS. PENNANT: Uh-huh.

MR. SOFOUL: -- you know. So if we ended the program at three years, you know, you would be closer to the nine and change million dollar mark, you know.

MS. PENNANT: Uh-huh.

MR. SOFOUL: But we wanted to have the ability, if everything is going well, you know, why go back out again?

We could continue this on for a five-year term if we decided to do so, or we would have the time to evaluate and then switch.

The other piece I want to bring up is that when you look at the communities we're targeting -- so you have Hillsboro Beach in the north, central County BMSD, and central County Broadview Park, and in the south, the communities of West Park and west areas of Hollywood.

That gives us a lot of geographic diversity as well for the pilot, you know, you're seeing these dollars and these monies being spent, you know, across the County in various communities.

Also different types of communities. We have a --

MS. PENNANT: Right.

MR. SOFOUL: -- coastal community in Hillsboro Beach, where they have to go out to the barrier island.

We have the central County communities, and one of our zones in the south, in west Hollywood, we're actually making connections to Broward County -- Broward College south.

So that's a -- kind of a college/university-based implementation.

So by having the diversity of these zones, we're able to test different use cases, you know, of it.

And that's part of the point, too, of having the number of zones that we decided to settle on.

MS. PENNANT: Excellent job. Thank you.

MR. SOFOUL: Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Frazier.

MR. FRAZIER: I have two questions. One deals with your selection criteria.

You mentioned these five communities. You didn't indicate the criteria that was used to select them.

And I wanted to know whether any of these are underserved communities.

I know the names, but I don't know the --

MR. SOFOUL: Yeah.

MR. FRAZIER: -- abstracting community.

MR. SOFOUL: Absolutely. Absolutely.

MR. FRAZIER: The second part --

MR. SOFOUL: Go ahead.

MR. FRAZIER: -- deals with the economic side, and that is you're going to select vendors to provide those services, and you have mentioned CSB's will be a part of it.

In terms of that procurement solicitation, are you going to be able to put into that solicitation that the primary vendor if -- in fact, has to utilize CBE partners or joint ventures or subcontractual relationships?

Usually on the business side, people forget about that. They're looking at employment.

But I'm also looking at how businesses could be a part of this operating system.

MR. SOFOUL: Sure. Sure. Great question. So I'll start by addressing the first one, the underserved communities.

So Hillsboro Beach, as you might be aware, is quite a wealthy community, right, on the coast, on the barrier island.

You know, we all talk about, you know, they have the Hillsboro Mile, you know, but the folks who need to travel there are not those same people who need to travel there via transit. But they still need connectivity to get there for employment opportunities.

That corridor is served by no current BCT fixed route services, so there is zero connectivity via transit.

So that's going to provide a critical link for anyone who does need to work along that stretch of Hillsboro Mile to be able to get to that place.

We also -- that zone actually also not just encompasses the Town of Hillsboro Beach, it actually comes inland to Pompano, because we need folks to be able to make connections from our fixed route services that operate around Federal Highway and then using the micro-transit to get them

out to the barrier island and to Hillsboro.

The unincorporated areas, BMSD, in Broadview Park and in central County, have always been some of our historically disadvantaged communities. You know, we're going to provide them that connectivity to be able to get them to our main lines.

Particularly in Broadview Park, there are some folks that live in areas there where if you looked at their street grid, you might have to walk for miles just to get to our 441 corridor bus, you know.

So this is going to provide them connectivity to be able to get there, but also to be able to make some local community connections, like, for instance, at Broadview Park community where they -- the zone actually extends north along 441 to get to Plantation General Hospital and some of the retail there. It also gets to the east.

So we tried to connect in some grocery stores and so we can try to make sure that we have access to fresh foods and things of that nature.

Then to the south, West Park has always been a -- an area that also needs connectivity and service, and this west area in Hollywood as well.

So these are areas that are not -- these are not the -- the areas you think of of the cities, these are not the areas you see on the postcard, you know, when you look -- when you think about the City of Hollywood, for instance. You know, this is not the Young Circle area; this is not the beach. This is the community out west by 441 corridor, you know.

And so these are folks that really need that linkage.

In terms of the CBE vendor situation, we are working with Sandy's group to try to determine if we have capacity to be able to utilize CBEs on this contract.

It might be, at this current time, there might not be a vendor that's able to have the capacity to implement this on the timeframe that we have.

That being said, I just came back from the American Public Transportation Association Expo in Orlando last week, and I had the privilege of speaking to a couple vendors who operate service and are interested in CBE certification.

And I certainly encouraged them to go through that process so we have more competition and we have more availability of CBEs in our market that can provide these types of services.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And thank you for the presentation so far.

So I'm interested in these newer solutions and these pilot programs, but where I get a little bit stuck -- and I think just for the record, what the litmus test is here is is it going to decrease congestion, right, in the County. That's what we're here to try and do.

So to me, that means are cars going to come off the road, which means are people going to be aware of this, right, and is it going to be successful.

So looking here, like the fifth bullet down is marketing. And up above,

it says vendor will provide the turnkey solution.

So I guess the first question is, is this one vendor or is this multiple vendors?

And what I kind of struggle with there, like assuming it's one vendor, are they -- if they're good at operating vehicles, are they really good at marketing, or are we doing the marketing?

And it could just be the way that this is worded --

MR. SOFOUL: Sure. Sure.

MR. SMITH: -- but big picture, that's my concern. And some of the use cases that you kind of mentioned. So if someone's in the western part of Hollywood and they can go three miles, how does that turn into less cars on the road and less congestion?

I mean, is it they're linking to a different transportation solution and they're going to get on a bus and go further? Because I see where a lot of the traffic really arises is people trying to get further.

So, you know, I just get concerned that this is not going to get fully picked up, right? We have an issue here with adoption around anything that's viewed as public transit. It shouldn't be that way. We need to change the narrative and change how it's viewed.

So maybe this would be a cool way to kind of do that, but in order to do that, the marketing has to be right. We have to get people to use it and leave their cars at home, or else it's not really --

MR. SOFOUL: I agree. I agree.

So I think, addressing the congestion point, in terms of our MAP goals, I would say this addresses the goal of connectivity, first and foremost, you know. You know, congestion, probably secondary.

You know, the idea here is to be able to get these folks either to transit or to be able to replace some of the local trips they have.

One of the -- some of my conversations with folks who have used micro-transit other places, and when I had some conversations -- I -- I went to L.A. and I did -- I went on Metro Micro, their system. And they had a lot of folks using their micro-transit system to be able to go to the grocery store, because it's easier to get your groceries and have some bags and bringing them on a smaller shuttle than to carry all your bags on a large transit bus, right? It's just inconvenient to do so.

And so what a lot of folks are doing right now in Broward County, we've heard this, where folks need to go grocery shopping or do some of those local trips like that, they'll actually take a taxi to go there, in a single-occupancy vehicle to be able to get to those trips.

This actually allows them the ability to use a micro-transit solution to be able to conveniently make those trips.

You know, so from that perspective, we do see that by pooling more trips together you are reducing congestion, but the primary goal that you're trying to solve of the MAP goals would be the critical connectivity from these areas across their communities and to the connections to the transit system.

In terms of marketing, the -- we have kind of a two path system on the

marketing, so follow me, if you would.

So we have a separate General Planning Consulting contract that's been in place now for about eight months. That contract has a number of vendors, including CBEs and there's a 30 percent CBE goal on that procurement.

And so we have the ability to tap into that contract to help us create the framework for the monitoring and performance management of this.

We're also going to be using that to create the marketing strategy.

So they're going to help us, what is the brand of this micro-transit service, what will the vehicle wraps look like how will we get the information out, what's our social media strategy going to be, what's the messaging going to be, and then what means of communication are we going to get that out.

So our own contractor that we have on our site -- excuse me -- our CBE, on our General Planning Consulting contract, is going to be helping us to create that particular strategy.

And that CBE consultant, you know, is a consultant that has worked extensively in the past with South Florida Commuter Services, so they're no stranger to transportation and marketing transportation solutions across the region.

So they're going to be helping us direct the strategy.

Our anticipation is that we'll use some of our own marketing leveraging to be able to get some of the information out, you know, as we

can on our buses. For instance, we have onboard information screens on all of our buses. We're going to have slides on there, on every single bus running, to explain and promote this service, you know.

We'll push it through our e-transit flash, push it through our social media, you know, push it through all the various outlets that we have as a transit agency, but then we're also looking to see what we can do beyond that, you know.

And it's going to be a lot, I think, connecting with these municipalities, connecting with the cities to help them get the message out to their residents.

So we want to work, you know, with the City of Hillsboro Beach, with -- with our -- truly, ourselves, for our Municipal Services District. We have the capacity to be able to do outreach with our own unincorporated area, and in the cities of West Park and the City of Hollywood, as well.

But, we expect to have a very robust strategy, and these vehicles are going to be very visible on the road.

And I'm hoping that the visibility of the vehicles on the road will start to spark some curiosity, right? Folks will be around and, you know, maybe they don't really use transit. They live in the area. Then you see this vehicle that has its own separate branding, never seen it before, and what is this? And then they look it up. And maybe they find out that they live in the zone and they could use this on the daily to be able to go get their groceries or do -- get to a local appointment across the system, you know.

And it's convenient where it will pick you up, you know, on your street

corner with no more than a 15-minute wait, for free.

MR. SMITH: Thank you.

And then kind of similar on the technology is the thought that the operator, the potential operator, would be developing this app as well. And do we think that this would be an entity coming in that has already done this, or they would be building this?

MR. SOFOUL: No, we expect to have an entity that already has extensive experience building micro-transit dispatching apps across the country.

MR. HOOPER: Ms. Love, did you have something?

MS. LOVE: Yes. Thank you. Great presentation. Appreciate it.

Just needed to just understand the budget that's tied to the 2.75 million, specifically, dealing with the, you know, type of hard cost for this program.

So I see vehicles, but what are we talking about? How many operators?

So do you have the basis for the 2.75?

MR. SOFOUL: The way we're writing the RFP is we're actually not dictating the number of vehicles or the number of operators. But what we are dictating is the level of service.

So we're going to require the operator to maintain no longer than a 15-minute wait in each service zone for trips. That is really the standard.

Now, how the operator decides to meet that, how many vehicles that

the operator needs to do that, you know, is going to be what we're going to be looking for when we receive the solicitations back from our RFP and how they plan to meet that particular goal.

But we're not directly dictating the number of vehicles per service hour.

MS. LOVE: How did you come up with your number?

MR. SOFOUL: So we made an estimate of what we think the number of vehicles and hours we would need. So we took our span of service. You know, so we know we're doing a 12-hour span of service and about five days a week. And we know we have five service zones.

And we took -- we estimated -- and this could be different, depending upon what we -- where we got -- but we estimated roughly two vehicles to three vehicles per service zone at any given time.

You know, and then that kind of extrapolated to get us to our cost. And we used the cost that we saw in a recent solicitation in Miami-Dade County for Miami-Dade Public Transportation and Public Works, you know, which was around \$50 per revenue hour, and we escalated that, you know. And they have a very similar contract right now working turnkey with a company called Via that's going very well down there.

MS. LOVE: And what was the vision for the dedicated call center? What does that look like?

MR. SOFOUL: I'm sorry? I --

MS. LOVE: Dedicated call center.

MR. SOFOUL: Oh. The call center is a requirement for us to meet all of our ADA requirements. So we have to have some sort of call center.

We don't anticipate this being like a large customer service call center. We anticipate that the operator is going to have a couple dedicated positions available to answer phones at any given time, to be able to manually input information into the dispatching system to be able to provide those linkages and trips to folks who don't have access to the smart phone to request a ride.

MS. LOVE: So that's from the 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. timeframe, and I think you said a hour before and a hour --

MR. SOFOUL: Yes.

MS. LOVE: -- after?

MR. SOFOUL: Yes.

MS. LOVE: So you're talking from a staffing and equipment, those kind of things?

MR. SOFOUL: Correct. Correct. So they have to provide everything needed to be able to operate that, that call center operation.

But, as I mentioned, I -- this isn't going to be a -- a large call center operation, but they do have to provide a call center. If folks do not have access to cell phones or smart phones or technology, you know, they can -- they have to be beneficiaries of the system, you know, and they will be, through that call center option.

MS. LOVE: Whose role in the County will be to look at this whole thing from an accountability performance perspective? Who does that?

MR. SOFOUL: Sure. So we were planning on doing that through Broward County Transit and making reports available publicly as we go on through the process.

I mentioned that our General Planning Consultant is going to help us to create a framework and a benchmarking plan for how we're going -- how we should be measuring up and get the performance measures for each one of these service zones.

And we're going to be monitoring these service zones extensively as it rolls out.

We do expect, though, that with -- as with any transit service, usually there's about a six to eight month ramp up, so it takes some time to get folks to know the service is available, it's in their neighborhood, getting the marketing out.

So it's going to take a little bit of time for it to ramp up, but at the point at which we get, you know, to, you know, that kind of place once people -- we feel the information's out there, we're going to be monitoring it extensively.

So if we have to -- this is a pilot, you know, and so if we have to make changes, if we have to change the service areas, if we find out that one community really needs service Thursday through Tuesday, you know, five days a week, you know, as opposed to Monday through Friday, you know, or something of that nature, you know, we want to be able to provide the span and days of service that are going to be -- going to generate the most amount of ridership.

We really want this to be successful, and we want to have the flexibility -- and the reason why you have the word pilot in there is because you have that flexibility. We want to be able to be reactive to the public as we're getting information going on.

Another piece of the marketing and kind of benchmarking I didn't mention is that we are going to be doing surveys throughout the process of the passengers on there.

We're also going to want to get customer testimonials. So we're going to go out there and talk to the folks who are riding it and find out what they like about it, what they don't like about it, get those testimonials.

And if it's had a positive improvement on their life, we want to hear that, and we want to be able to market that as a part of a -- as part of this program.

MS. PENNANT: I'm kind of curious as I'm sitting here listening to you, I've been curious about how this will impact Uber and Lyft. I mean, I know it's free, so certainly it will be adverse for them, but I'm just wondering how many of these people actually use that service currently and -- or those services currently, and how it might impact that as a business. But --

MR. SOFOUL: Yeah --

MS. PENNANT: -- listen, free for our residents, great.

MR. SOFOUL: Exactly.

MS. PENNANT: Thanks for living up to your promises.

MR. SOFOUL: No. No, you're welcome. I think, you know, Uber and

Lyft will take you anywhere, right? If you want to take a 50-mile trip on Uber, you know, they might take you that 50-mile trip. This is going to be very isolated in those service zones during those -- in that certain span of operation.

So outside that span, or if they want to take a direct trip greater than the -- than that service zone, then Uber still remains an option for folks to be able to travel around the County.

MS. LOVE: So I still don't -- I'm not sure of a response to who overall will be looking at this program from the County side.

I understand the contract and their responsibilities.

Is this a new -- this is a new program, a new scope, so who on your staff -- because I would assume people are doing other things now, so who would be responsible for the compliance part of this, monitoring the performance of the contract? Who is responsible for that?

MR. SOFOUL: We have a section in our -- within Service and Strategic Planning Division at Broward County Transit, you know, that work -- and we have a position we're currently hiring for, a Mobility Administrator.

MS. PENNANT: Okay.

MR. SOFOUL: Okay? And that Mobility Administrator will be the primary person responsible for monitoring this contract as time goes through, and being that direct contract between -- being the direct contact between the County and the vendor to ensure the vendor is meeting all their obligations under the contract.

MS. LOVE: I see. Okay. Thank you.

MS. PENNANT: Excellent job. Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: I have something.

MR. SOFOUL: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: So I did the math, okay? And I took the \$13 and divided it into 270 -- 2.75 million dollars, and then I took five-day weeks, and I divided that. Then I took five zones, and I divided that.

And it comes out to, over a 12-hour day, 13 passengers per hour. Is that -- did I get the math right?

MR. SOFOUL: No, because you -- because you have multiple vehicles.

MR. HOOPER: No, no, no, no, no. I get that. I get that.

So if you have multiple vehicles, and they're all working and in that zone --

MR. SOFOUL: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: -- potentially, you could go up to 13 passengers an hour.

MR. SOFOUL: Correct.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So then this is a zone where we were getting one passenger an hour on a community shuttle.

MR. SOFOUL: Three to five is what we were getting prior.

MR. HOOPER: Three to five. Okay.

MR. SOFOUL: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: All right. So then this is going to be a -- hopefully, a more attractive way of getting people into it, and then you're hitting 13, which is a home run in terms of community shuttle --

MR. SOFOUL: Correct.

MR. HOOPER: -- per hour, right?

So -- okay. So that's kind of where we are, okay? We're trying to get 13 passengers in a zone per hour.

It seems -- I don't -- I think it's ambitious, but it's a pilot.

MR. SOFOUL: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: And then the other thing that concerns me is if -- and it's kind of in line with what Ms. Love is talking about --

MR. SOFOUL: Sure.

MR. HOOPER: -- when you get to 13,750,000 over five years and we don't hit some of these milestones, like the 13 passengers per hour, now we're doing six passengers per hour, but we've cut a -- we've got a contract that's got us at 2.75 million, is it -- is the value there and can we pare it down or is there a way to re-look at it on an annual basis so we don't, you know -- you know, just to -- what do we -- the audit? The performance audit. So to look at it on an annual basis and make sure that we're getting -- we're not spending more than \$13 per ride or because we're only getting six riders an hour, now it's costing us twice as much per rider.

MR. SOFOUL: Sure. So if we don't have -- we really -- based upon pilot programs and the conversations I've had across the country with folks

who have implemented micro-transit services for a turnkey solution, if you do not offer a vendor a minimum of a three-year contract, your rates are going to be absolutely astronomical.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. SOFOUL: So you're talking a -- so you might only have a contract for a year, but instead of it being 40 or \$50 an hour, you might be looking at a contract rate that comes back to us at \$80 an hour plus, because they are making the upfront investment in the vehicles --

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, but we --

MR. SOFOUL: -- you know, so --

MR. HOOPER: -- don't know what those vehicles are, because you told Ms. Love that we don't know how many vehicles they are.

So we don't know how many vehicles we're talking about.

MR. SOFOUL: We --

MR. HOOPER: And that's what -- that's what confounds me a little bit.

MR. SOFOUL: -- I guess we have -- we have an idea, right, an estimate, but we didn't want to dictate in the procurement the number of vehicles. We wanted to dictate the service levels.

Because ultimately, the goal we're trying to get to is to ensure that everyone in the community in these zones is able to get a trip in a 15-minute wait time.

MR. HOOPER: Uh-huh.

MR. SOFOUL: You know, so we're kind of leaving that on the -- the

reason why this is an RFP instead of a bid is because we don't fully know every nook and cranny and detail, we want these different vendors to come to us with solution on how they're going to meet these objectives, you know.

So we have an idea in the back of our mind that we know two to three vehicles per zone, you know.

And we expect the vehicles to be probably traditional passenger minivans, maybe something a little bit more elegant than that with some additional features on it.

There's going to have to be some vehicles that have ADA, you know, that have wheelchair capabilities, because we actually have to maintain the same level of service for folks who require wheelchair boardings as we do for people who don't require wheelchair boardings.

You know, that actually reduces the capacity of some of the vehicles to be able to provide that wheelchair space on the vehicle.

So there's a lot of things that go into it.

But we're looking, through the pilot program, that we're going to have three years and we're going to be working with the community to try to adjust this program as necessary.

If we are not meeting those benchmarks, we want to meet those benchmarks, so we'll make adjustments as time goes on.

If we get to the point of three years and it's looking like this isn't going, we do not have to execute year four or year five.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, that was going to be my next question, because

maybe we have a buy-out or something that's cheaper than continuing forward for two more years if the three years doesn't prove itself.

And one last question --

MS. PENNANT: Mr. --

MR. HOOPER: Oh, go ahead. Is it

MS. PENNANT: I just want to piggyback --

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Go ahead.

MS. PENNANT: -- on what you're saying.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. PENNANT: I'm hoping that the 15-minute wait time is not the only variable that's being measured, because I'm concerned about the uncontrolled variable of people actually going on it -- on --

MR. SOFOUL: Oh, no.

MS. PENNANT: -- taking the ride --

MR. SOFOUL: Of course.

MS. PENNANT: -- right? Because if we're trying to hit 13, how are they going to control or influence people?

You know, you can market, but sometimes people still don't buy, right?

So I am concerned a little bit about that.

MR. SOFOUL: That's --

MS. PENNANT: I would like to know what are the other markers that you are measuring them by, other than just 15-minute ridership --

MR. SOFOUL: Rider --

MS. PENNANT: -- time, wait time.

MR. SOFOUL: -- ridership is --

MS. PENNANT: Wait time.

MR. SOFOUL: -- you know, ridership is always the number one performance measure we measure in the transit industry.

So, you know, I didn't mention ridership probably because for me it's a given in the industry, right? I don't have a choice.

Ridership is our number one performance measurement benchmark of how we are doing and how successful our services are within the community.

So ridership as a whole, ridership as measured per passengers per hour, ridership measured in terms of subsidy per passenger, all these various measures and performance metrics that relate to passenger efficiency are absolutely going to be a part of the benchmarking and monitoring process.

MS. PENNANT: Are we holding them to a number? Like, the 15-minute, we -- that's clear. What's the measure for ridership daily? Maybe not necessarily per --

MR. SOFOUL: We -- we're going to be -- we're going to be creating that performance benchmarking plan --

MS. PENNANT: Uh-huh.

MR. SOFOUL: -- and we don't want to hold the vendor to the rider to the ridership. The -- we control the service zones. It's our service that we are dictating where the service goes.

So if the service is not meeting the expectation, it's not really the fault

of the vendor. It's the fault of us and our planning process and being able to make those adjustments as needed through time goes on.

So we want to be able to make those adjustments and be reflective --

MS. PENNANT: That could be faulty --

MR. SOFOUL: -- as --

MS. PENNANT: -- marketing, too, because depending on who you get as your marketer for those demographics will really impact participation --

MR. HOOPER: All of it will.

MS. PENNANT: -- you know? I would recommend getting churches and synagogues and all of those religious groups on board.

MR. SOFOUL: Absolutely.

MS. PENNANT: Grassroots strategies.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So --

MR. SOFOUL: Absolutely.

MR. HOOPER: -- so let me get back to -- so then we got -- so I did it at max efficiency --

MR. SOFOUL: Yeah.

MR. HOOPER: -- right?

MR. SOFOUL: Got you.

MR. HOOPER: So we know we can't hit max efficiency. And she's right, the -- it may -- the likelihood is it's going to be you that determines it.

And then, I would like to -- I would like to know what our target it.

So if 13 is max efficiency, is it six an hour per zone? That would be an

interesting thing to know so then at some point, in three years, we can measure the performance before -- because we're going into this without a target -- a target ridership per hour --

MR. SOFOUL: Right.

MR. HOOPER: -- right?

MR. SOFOUL: Right.

MR. HOOPER: That's how we do it all, right?

MR. SOFOUL: Right.

MR. HOOPER: So that, and then the other thing that I think -- like you think of Hillsboro Beach, and I think of maybe there's condos there and stuff, and -- and there's folks that some of them are -- the age group want to get to the hospital or something like that.

MR. SOFOUL: Right. Right.

MR. HOOPER: I'm just kind of guessing, because I -- I don't know much about Hillsboro Beach.

But you've got a radius, half of which is going into the ocean, right? And the other half is heading mostly west, right? North -- west, north, and south. And there might be a hospital.

So why wouldn't we be more flexible on that radius and create more of a rectangle something that starts at a major street and goes to another --

MR. SOFOUL: Oh, we -- we have.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. SOFOUL: We have.

MR. HOOPER: So you're doing it that way.

MR. SOFOUL: We're -- we're not using -- we're not using a as the crow flies, just buffer zones --

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. SOFOUL: -- to determine the zones.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. SOFOUL: Absolutely not. Absolutely not.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. SOFOUL: We --

MR. HOOPER: Yeah. Because there could be those --

MR. SOFOUL: -- we followed the geography and the street grid --

MR. HOOPER: Perfect. Okay. That was just a question I had --

MR. SOFOUL: Yeah.

MR. HOOPER: -- for you.

MR. SOFOUL: Yeah, so that --

MR. HOOPER: So -- so I -- you know, for us to -- to do a performance audit, and I would want to do one at the end of the three years, it would -- we would like -- I think I would like -- that's what I would like, is to know what the goal is on a per hour basis.

MR. ALLEN: In -- in fact --

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Allen.

MR. ALLEN: -- I was thinking in terms of perhaps amending it to require coming back to the board at the end of three years with that

performance audit before we grant the final two years.

MS. PENNANT: Can we get some --

MR. SOFOUL: Sure.

MS. PENNANT: -- ongoing monitoring? I don't want to wait until three years. How would we make any corrections? I mean, why can't we get an annual update as to how they're doing?

That way, if we can suggest something there's more revenue that's needed, I mean I wouldn't want to wait ultimately three-years.

MR. SOFOUL: I have no objections to coming back and giving presentations on how this program rolls out as we go out through the -- through this process.

Tim, did you want to --

MR. GARLING: Yeah.

MR. ALLEN: That may create some contract issues in terms of the investment that the vendor is providing, which is going to be subject to an annual termination period if we determine that the performance is not meeting our objective.

That's why I suggested the three years.

MS. PENNANT: Well, I mean, it's evaluating where they are. And discussing opportunities for us to assist in some way, or -- you know, what if more revenue is needed? I don't know.

But I don't want to wait until the end of three years and then we're like, oh, my God, it's been a failure.

MR. HOOPER: I don't disagree with you, and I don't think it's impossible for you to give us performance measures on an annual basis.

We know we're not going to kill the deal because it's a --

MR. SOFOUL: Correct.

MR. HOOPER: -- three year contract. But at the end of the day, we could -- it's just like you said. The hours and the passengers per hour is driven by the program and not by the vendor.

MR. SOFOUL: Correct.

MR. HOOPER: So potentially, we could come up with ideas that could improve it in year one so that it doesn't allow it to die in year three.

MS. PENNANT: Right.

MR. HOOPER: So -- but my goal would be to know what the target is and so that we can make a decision later as to whether or not it's performing, because -- but -- and I hope it does perform, because I think it's a valuable service that you're going to be providing.

MR. GARLING: Mr. Chair?

MR. HOOPER: Yes. What am I looking at here?

MR. GARLING: I'm sorry. Okay. Hi.

MR. HOOPER: Oh, yes.

MR. GARLING: Hi. Tim Garling, Deputy General Manager in Broward County Transit.

I just want to emphasize that, you know, we'll come back on an annual basis and asses the performance.

I do think you've got to kind of think about this as we have to understand what the demand is and try to meet the demand, right? And if it's lagging, are there things we can do, are there adjustments we can make, and that absolutely takes annual monitoring. And the -- that's the value of the pilot.

So I think coming back here, looking at it -- and demand could be different in each of these zones, you know. So it's understanding the market, because I think there's a fundamental here.

People will use transit that serves them, right?

MR. HOOPER: Right.

MR. GARLING: That's going to be the fundamental. And it could be different in each of these areas.

So this just -- that's what the value of the pilot is. It gives us a chance for an adjustment period to make some changes for days or hours, et cetera.

So we certainly will be coming back.

MR. HOOPER: And, honestly, if you market it right, this is going to kill it. Sorry, but it's too easy. It's like on demand, free transit.

So I think -- and you go get groceries. It's going to kill it. We've just got to make sure everybody knows about it, so --

MS. PENNANT: And Mr. Chair, I think, too, I mean, the opportunity with the annual updates is that maybe we'll spur other zones, right? Maybe there are other zones that you may want to look at so at least at the end of three years you may say, well, there are two other zones that we want to look

at because this has been going so great, right?

MR. HOOPER: Okay. All right. So talked about it.

We need a motion --

MR. CASSINI: Mr. Chair, we had both the Broward County Transit initiatives together in one motion. If you'd like to get through the next one?

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, sure.

MS. CASSINI: Is that okay?

MR. HOOPER: That'd be great. Sure.

MS. CASSINI: All right? So we have Action Item 3 up next.

**3 - MOTION TO APPROVE SURTAX FUNDING IN THE NOT-TO-EXCEED
AMOUNT OF \$2,000,000 PER YEAR FOR UP TO FIVE YEARS
(\$10,000,000 TOTAL) FOR A BCT OVERNIGHT SHUTTLE SERVICE
PILOT PROGRAM**

MR. SOFOUL: So -- so I'm still here. All right. So --

MR. HOOPER: Okay, great.

MR. SOFOUL: -- this is the -- this is the second of our kind of innovative pilot programs that we want to roll out.

So this one involves providing connectivity to folks who work overnight shifts after Broward County Transit services have suspended for the evening, you know, and to provide them a flexible mobility option to get those late shift workers, you know, from their homes to their place of employment.

So the Broward County Transit system starts to ramp down services

for the evening typically around 10:00 o'clock at night.

We do have some routes that go all the way past midnight, but systemwide, you start to ramp down around 10:00 o'clock.

In the mornings, it's kind of the same thing. We have some routes that have service pulling out and going in, in the morning at 4:30, 4:50 a.m., you know, and the 5:00 o'clock hour, but we really don't get fully ramped up until 6:00 a.m.

So that leaves that span of service in the middle of the evening where folks who are reliant upon Transit has no ability to get to work, you know, and limits folks' employment opportunities for overnight work.

When we first started looking at this, we did some research, and we -- our first -- our minds initially went to we need to provide overnight connectivity for the tourist industries on the coast, or hospitality industries. Our hotel workers, our restaurant workers, food service, bars, things of that nature.

As we started doing more research, we really realized that we have a whole lot more late-night shift workers than just in those industries. We have a lot more jobs starting to crop up in warehousing logistics -- logistics and where -- warehousing logistics and -- and kind of those Amazon-type warehousing type jobs that would require overnight employment.

You know, we have folks that do overnight call centers. We have folks who work in access control and security at night. And we have folks in healthcare.

And so we really wanted to find a solution that was not only tailored to the immediate coastal areas of where the complex of our hospitality industry is, but creating a pilot program that would be all encompassing countywide.

And that's what kind of led us to this solution versus some other solutions, versus, let's say, a -- a shuttle solution or a micro-transit solution. We wanted to have a countywide implementation and provide that connectivity and access late night.

So how we'd like to do this is we would like to use an existing contract we have with a company called Cab Connect that runs -- they -- they're currently running a -- a program in our -- in our Paratransit Division side where they provide subsidies for people who qualify to be able to hail a taxi to be able to get them to their destination. And they get a subsidy for that ride.

So we want to do something very similar in this -- in this case, so that the concept is we would have folks who work overnight shifts be able to register and sign up with us. They have to verify that they have overnight employment. And then we would give them a Cab Connect card, a payment card that has a certain number of vouchers they can use per week for taxi rides, you know, or TNCs, because we actually are -- TNCs are not excluded, but they have to be a part of the Cab Connect program. I'll get there in a second.

But they -- we have a -- all -- a whole list of taxi companies. Yellow Cab tends to predominantly, you know, get most of the trips, but if you look

on the list, there's a whole lot more than Yellow Cab.

Most taxi providers in the County are able to accept this payment card.

And the idea here is that we would provide eligible riders a \$15 subsidy, you know, per trip, up to five trips per week to get them either to or from home.

We estimate that \$15 will get them about six miles on a taxi with no traffic. You know, we -- when we did some calculations, we found that to be pretty significant.

Over about 50 percent of the County, their jobs are located less than ten miles from where they live. So a lot of folks are going to be able to go a pretty far distance, six miles, you know, on the subsidy.

Any amount of fare on a taxi beyond that \$15 would be the responsibility of the person taking the taxi. So they would just pay for the amount in excess of the \$15.

So if it's less, you pay that.

I will mention we are requiring a \$2 trip per fee as well. So in order to get the \$15 subsidy, you essentially have to first pay the equivalent of a one bus ride honor system. So a one bus trip right now costs \$2.

So you would have to pay \$2, and then you get the \$15 subsidy to be able to complete your taxi trip to get you to and from your work or your home.

These cards are going to be configured, you know, so that folks cannot use this system to joyride in -- joyride around the County at night to

other activities. It's going to be locked to their registered employment destination or origin.

So if their -- if their employer's address is not either the origin or the destination of the trip when using this card, it's going to reject the subsidy. It's going to be only used for folks to be able to get that -- be able to get to work, which is why we used Late Shift Connect as the -- as the name of the program, to be able to make that -- to be able to make those connections.

As I mentioned before, it's going to be five days per week they can use this.

That provides up to a \$300 subsidy per month.

If you were to use it all five -- if you use all five trips per week and all month long, and you used the full subsidy, it's a maximum of \$300 of benefit, you know, towards taxi or TNC.

So that's a substantial savings for folks. I really think this is going to increase people's accessibility and access to jobs.

Another component of this when we were kind of looking across the country at solutions, we think that this is really going to increase the ability of folks and comfort of folks to be able to access some of this late-night employment.

We know there's a lot of folks out there who would not be comfortable waiting on a street corner for a bus at 2:00 o'clock in the morning, or 3:00 o'clock in the morning.

You know, this service has the benefit of you hailing and using

whatever taxi company you want to get from your home directly to your place of employment safely, without having to stand out on the street.

You know, so that's something that we saw as a benefit. And in a lot of the literature reading, you know, there are some barriers. You know, we -- we'd love to be able to get to a point where we can make some sort of late night, late owl transit service work. That certainly has its place in a -- the transit suite of options.

But we think this is a really good one for kind of a start, test case and pilot program to be able to get folks, you know, to and from their place of employment.

Very similar to the last program I mentioned. We're using our General Planning Consulting contract to provide monitoring and benchmarking, you know, for this particular initiative.

So the exact same kind of processes we're going through for micro-transit, this is actually on the same work authorization.

You know, so they are going to be providing what the benchmarking is, what is the monitoring of this, what are the origins and destinations people are going to.

We -- again, we might find out through the data that we have the same origins and destinations popping up time over time over time, and then maybe we look at this and say, well, you know what? We actually can do a late night shuttle route, or a late night flexible shuttle route, or some sort of other option, you know, using other transit methods.

So we really want to receive that data as time goes on for the origins and destinations.

We're going to be making adjustments to this based on customer feedback. Same thing as with the micro-transit.

We want to do surveys of the customers who are using it. We want to do customer testimonials. We want to be able to do some focus groups.

We want to get out there and they can see how this service will have an impact on people's lives.

Marketing is going to be a huge component of this one, because we're going to have to really get down into the grassroots and let people know that this is available, you know.

So the marketing strategy for this is we'll of course be working with the large organizations like South Florida Commuter Services and the Greater Fort Lauderdale Alliance and the big names, but we also know we're going to have to target the smaller level, right?

We're going to have to go down and look at individual municipal Chambers of Commerce and areas Chambers of Commerce to get the word out there.

We also want to get the word out to our transit riders. A lot of these folks who don't have access to get to work late at night use our services during the day when they're available, you know. So we're going to be doing a lot of marketing onboard our buses and to our passengers to let them know, hey, if you're looking to find connectivity to your job late at night, here

you go. You have that. You have that option.

You know, really, the goal is, you know, to be able to provide people the comfort. So I don't know if you've -- you've seen this on job applications. There's this dreaded question of do you have reliable transportation to work. It's kind of a coded question, right, on what they're really asking you, you know.

And so we want people to be able to check yes, they have a reliable mode of transportation to work, even in the overnight hours. And this program would allow them to do that.

MR. HOOPER: Got anybody?

MS. PENNANT: You tell me.

MR. HOOPER: You want to go first? Oh. Let's let Dr. Kelley.

MS. PENNANT: Go ahead. Go ahead.

MR. HOOPER: We haven't heard from her today at all.

DR. KELLEY: Thank you very much.

This is, in terms of the pilot, much easier for me to get my head around in terms of I definitely would like to say I support this idea.

And the card sounds very much like what I use, the Riders' Choice --

MR. SOFOUL: It's the --

DR. KELLEY: -- for paratransit.

MR. SOFOUL: -- it's the exact same program, except it will be a different card. It will be a parallel program on the same contract, so it works the exact same way.

DR. KELLEY: So my question is basically, you're -- you are envisioning helping late night -- late shift workers with a five-day work week, right? Five days a week. And -- but the subsidy, it says a maximum of five trips per week. Are those round trips?

MR. SOFOUL: Those are --

DR. KELLEY: Sorry.

MR. SOFOUL: -- those are one-way trips. When we -- when we did some research on this, what we discovered is a lot of the way the shift times work, you can actually use transit to either get to work or to get from work within the span.

There are very few jobs where you would have to have a round trip, you know, where you couldn't use transit on one side or the other of the span.

DR. KELLEY: But getting from home to work late night and from work back home, why wouldn't it be ten trips a week instead of five, the subsidy?

MR. SOFOUL: As I said, you know, we looked at that, and initially, when we did the research, a lot of folks -- let's say you have to be at work, you know, at 10:00 o'clock, you know, and then you get off work eight hours later.

You know, you could take BCT services to get to work by 10:00 o'clock, but then the way home, you wouldn't have any way to go home. So then you would use the transit -- this transit service.

Conversely, if you had to be at work at midnight, you know, you

wouldn't be able to do that, but eight hours later would be 8:00 o'clock in the morning, and our services are fully running by that time.

So the idea would be that, you know, you could use it for one of the two trips, either going to work or from work, but our span of service at the -- at the County is wide enough, you know, so that we could accommodate one side of that trip with traditional public transit.

DR. KELLEY: But this is door to door.

MR. SOFOUL: Correct.

DR. KELLEY: BCT, it's not --

MR. SOFOUL: That's correct.

DR. KELLEY: -- door to door. So essentially what's happening here is that a person needs to only use it either to get to or back from work. And I'm just suggesting that, you know, I would strongly encourage you to make it round trip. I really would.

MR. SOFOUL: Sure. We are open to -- for instance, it's five trips per week. So if you don't work five days per week, if you work less than that, you know, and you wanted to use your five trips one day for a round trip, you could use two of those trips to do so.

So we have that flexibility built in.

But, again, this is a pilot program, so the idea, again, is that we can modify these criteria as time goes on. And we want to get the customer feedback and find out -- because we might find out that our assumption's completely wrong, right, and that you need to provide a greater number of

trips to be able to get people to and from.

But our initial analysis suggests that most folks will have the ability to use BCT services on either one end or the -- either front end, to, or the back end, from, from their place of employment.

DR. KELLEY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Did you want to say something, Ms. Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Yes. What's your name?

MR. SOFOUL: Nicholas.

MS. PENNANT: Nicholas. You're doing an excellent job.

MR. SOFOUL: Thank you.

MS. PENNANT: So I'm curious about share ridership, the opportunity where you have multiple, you know, individuals working for the same company getting off at the same time, the opportunity for them to perhaps not even have -- having to subsidize any aspect of their ride because both of them -- you know, like a bonus ride --

MR. SOFOUL: Uh-huh.

MS. PENNANT: -- I don't know. You know, they do that with Lyft and -
- all the time. If you share the ride, then it costs you less, essentially. And that would give them the ability to not have to pay anything.

So I'm curious to know whether or not you've done any work on that.

And then the other piece is marketing this opportunity to employers, because, you know, we hear it all the time that there's a crisis, shortage of workforce. And so I'm just thinking even when they're announcing job

opportunities that they could co-partner with us, essentially.

MR. SOFOUL: Uh-huh.

MS. PENNANT: And this gives greater visibility for the work that we're doing, so I want them to be able to say that they have this program as part of an employee -- I don't know -- benefit? I don't know. Through the County.

I -- I'm just wondering if there's a way to -- maybe there's some conflict, but for employers to also use this as a way to engage employees --

MR. SOFOUL: Yeah.

MS. PENNANT: -- and to market it to their employees.

MR. SOFOUL: Sure. So in terms of shared rides, there actually already exists a program through South Florida Commuter Services that provides for van pools. So folks right now could contact South Florida Commuter Services and get a van pool set up.

So if you have a lot of people going to work at the same time and they live in a certain geographic area, they can actually sign up right now, and they'll provide a vehicle and -- at a less cost to be able to have them run their own van pool program to get to and from.

You know, so that type of service already exists.

In terms of shared service via taxis, that's something we haven't fully looked into only because this particular service is a -- we don't have -- the way the Cab Connect system works, we actually don't have direct contracts with any of the taxi providers, you know, or TNCs.

We have a -- we have a contract with the payment provider that

provides the card that you can then use to access any of the companies that are on the network, you know.

But moving forward, we can certainly look at other strategies, you know, that involve, you know, pooled rides or possibly a -- you know, having a contract that's more direct with the provider, a taxi or a TNC provider, to be able to provide some pool trips.

MR. HOOPER: Mister --

MR. SOFOUL: And then -- I'm sorry. I missed the last question about -- about getting out to the businesses. A hundred percent agree.

We want to tackle this from both sides. We want to be able to let our passengers know, who currently ride transit, that you have this option late at night now, doesn't exist currently, but we also want to engage employers directly so that they're aware of it and so they can start advertising the service to their employers [sic], or they have people coming on board who might be -- might be hesitant of working overnight hours, that this option is available to them.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Allen.

MR. ALLEN: We have so many -- or will have so many service options for people to get transportation through mass transit.

Do we have a program in place where we can sit down, either on a one on one basis, or with a group of employees and provide individualized counseling to help them design how they're going to access the various options that they will have in front of them, to decide what is best, either

through employment issues -- you know, a new company coming in or, you know, they're going through a rehiring process, to counsel individuals on what are your options to having a car? You know, we will design a trip for you, take this bus to here, or this community shuttle to here to connect to a bus to connect to the shared ride or whatever.

Do we have that capability in mass transit?

MR. SOFOUL: That's really interesting. So we -- we have a customer call center, obviously. Anyone can call, whether it's an employer or whether it's a customer, you know, in terms of -- and they're familiar with all our suites of services, right, and every -- every level of service we provide, you know.

So they can provide some information on, you know, how you would get from one place to the next place --

MR. ALLEN: Right.

MR. SOFOUL: -- you know, at any time during the day, you know.

So they have that capability.

But I think you do raise a point of us needing to provide additional materials as we start to roll out these new services to make sure people are aware of all these various options, that not just the people know, also employers know, and that we provide feedback for folks to be able to quickly be able to discern, you know, and create a trip for them that's convenient.

MR. ALLEN: I think that program needs to be expanded and --

MR. SOFOUL: Sure.

MR. HOOPER: Do you want to say something? You got to hit the

microphone.

MR. ALLEN: I was just saying that that program seems to have a -- you know, to fit that requirement, but it needs to be publicized --

MR. SOFOUL: Yes.

MR. ALLEN: -- it needs to be able to work through the employers, saying, you know, you complain that the people can't get to work or they can't get home, we can come in there and design transit plans for each of your employees. Or even --

MR. SOFOUL: Uh-huh.

MR. ALLEN: -- you know, paratransit, what have you.

MR. HOOPER: So I have a hard time tying these two together, the Item 2 and Item 3.

And the reason why is in Item 2, we're providing a vehicle -- whether it's through a vendor or not, we're providing a vehicle and a program, and a system, that's going to move people. So there's a mobility aspect to it.

In the -- in Number 3, I almost feel like we're doing the job of -- we're -- we're creating a program that it's paying for the employers when the employers should be the ones paying this.

This is my opinion. I think that a hotel should be paying, instead of -- they should be paying everybody a 150 bucks a month more, okay? And I don't know why it's our job or why it's the surtax program's job to pay for these employees that -- I want these employees to have access. So I'm not trying to be mean to the employee.

MR. SOFOUL: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: I think the employer needs to be ponying up the dough. I do.

And so I just feel like it's like we're doing something and let's call it what it is. We're subsidizing the salaries of these folks so that -- that they can get to work and back.

And let's remember, too, because I'm kind of in the restaurant business, too, we're dying for people, okay? So we're paying them more money now. We're competing with others, and the hourly wages -- even in construction right now, I'm paying huge bucks for laborers, okay? Way beyond what we ever paid before. And they're getting more money.

So I'm wondering why we're doing this. I'm wondering why this is a mobility program, and why the surtax has to -- and does it even meet the surtax -- the ordinance?

MS. WALLACE: So both of these programs qualify as on-demand transportation services under 212.055 Florida Statutes.

So the statute provides for roads, bridges, and transit, and this is a -- and on-demand transportation services.

So both of these, one being -- the first one being a vendor that's providing rides on demand, and the other being the customer selecting the on-demand service provider, they're both on-demand service, and it is permissible under 212.055 Florida Statutes.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So that's -- but, that's my issue. That's my --

THE COURT REPORTER: Microphone.

MR. HOOPER: -- personal -- you know, I just have a philosophical issue --

THE COURT REPORTER: Microphone.

MS. CASSINI: Mr. Chair, please use your mic.

MR. HOOPER: -- I -- this is my issue, and -- and I have a philosophical problem with subsidizing for -- where -- where the employer should probably be the one that's paying it.

And it's falling on the back -- so the sales tax, we all pay sales tax. And, granted, the tourists are paying some of it, so, yeah, restaurant goers and hospitality goers, guests, are paying for a portion of it.

But so are we. So are a lot of people in this County paying for it, just citizens of this County. And so we are subsidizing, basically, the salaries of those employees.

And that's my issue, and that's why I want to -- I want to vote on both issues, and I have a problem with Number 3.

MS. PENNANT: So I'm going to chime in a little bit. I hear what you're saying, but I don't know that the people who are going to use the service can in a very strenuous way lobby their employers to pony up that 150, right, a month.

And so what -- what excites me about this, it allows us to deliver something to that demographic of people who are impoverished, for lack of a better word underserved communities, who are also taxpayers.

And so they may not see some of the other projects that we have to offer, but it's a way for us to say, you know what? We want to do something a little significant for you, and let's see how it works.

We don't know that if it's going to work, right? And maybe it's that we morph the micro-transit program into that, this cab thing.

But I think it's -- the cab drivers benefit from this, right? It -- it does --

MR. SOFOUL: Absolutely.

MS. PENNANT: -- provide some --

MR. HOOPER: Cab companies do.

MS. PENNANT: -- cab -- the cab --

MR. SOFOUL: Mobile --

MS. PENNANT: -- companies do.

MR. SOFOUL: -- mobile companies.

MR. HOOPER: Big time.

MS. PENNANT: The cab companies do.

You know, I -- I -- I hear your point --

MR. HOOPER: Nah, I wish we had --

MS. PENNANT: -- but --

MR. HOOPER: -- I -- I kind of like your -- your -- I kind of like your point where you're carpooling the thing together.

MS. PENNANT: Right.

MR. HOOPER: Okay? Or -- or let's --

MS. PENNANT: So it reduces the cost. I'm just find -- trying to find

ways to reduce this price tag.

If we could carpool, you know, other employees at a particular site where we're picking them up and then, you know, there's a shared ridership. They're already exposed to each other, so it would be okay, you know.

MR. SOFOUL: I --

MS. PENNANT: So --

MR. SOFOUL: -- if I may, we -- when we first started looking at solutions for late night service, the first thing we looked at was, you know, could we provide traditional late night bus service, could we provide an owl service. you know, that's kind of -- you know, the -- kind of the first line solution for overnight, could we run a certain network of our bus routes late at night.

And we -- and we found that we just don't have the density of origins and destinations late at night to do that.

MR. HOOPER: Right.

MR. SOFOUL: You know, so this kind of became, you know -- and micro-transit could have some merit here, but, again, you're only limited to those three-mile trips.

So if you have a overnight commute, you know, and you have to go, you know, from Plantation and you need to get out to the hospitality area on the beach, you can't do that with micro-transit. But you can do that through this program.

So we looked at those various options. We think this is the best

option for the current time.

However, as we receive the data, if we start to see clustering of origin and destination points to the same employers, to the same areas, I think then we have some justification to look at -- go back and look at maybe we could do a route here, or some sort of other pooled or shared mobility option for the -- for the folks who have these origins and these destinations to be able to reduce the cost.

So we are going to be analyzing the data as we move forward.

MS. PENNANT: Or you could morph a component of the micro-transit program to do exactly that, right? Because now you have the bus, it has the capacity, because it seats more than just one or two people.

And, you know, we're not stuck where you -- the micro has to be three miles. You have the ability to extend it to six or ten at nighttime.

And it would probably create greater efficiency in the long run in terms of ridership.

MR. SOFOUL: Yeah.

MS. PENNANT: Just a thought.

MR. HOOPER: Are they allowed to do Uber, too?

MR. SOFOUL: So you're allowed to go with anyone who is on the Cab Connect payment system, because Cab Connect really provides a card.

So it's kind of like a -- it's kind of like Visa or MasterCard, right? They have -- the cab companies have to be able to accept a Cab Connect payment card.

Right now, we are in conversations with Uber. They are very interested in adding it, and they're currently in the process of trying to become a member of that program.

So we anticipate that by the time this program fully rolls out, you'll have the option of any of these local taxi companies that are currently on the list of -- of providers, you know, and/or Uber to make the trip.

MR. HOOPER: Is there any way we could -- we could get a partnership going here with businesses? You know, I just -- it's just bothering me a little bit that, you know --

MR. SOFOUL: We could --

MR. HOOPER: -- anyway. Okay. So is there any other questions? Okay.

MS. PENNANT: Is it possible to morph the micro-transit program a little bit --

THE COURT REPORTER: Microphone.

MR. HOOPER: You got to hit your microphone.

MS. PENNANT: -- into something that --

MS. WALLACE: Your microphone's not on.

MS. PENNANT: -- sorry -- is it possible? You know, I think I'm talking loud without the microphone, but is it possible to morph a component of the micro-transit? Because we're going to invest in these vehicles anyway. Some of them are likely to be under -- underutilized on some days, right? Is it possible that that could be utilized?

MR. SOFOUL: It would be difficult, because when you -- when you start to have trips greater than three miles.

So let's say you even do have that clustering of trips. We find that there's some -- first of all, we don't even know where the clusters of trips are right now. We know that it's very -- we know the trips are very dispersed, but we don't know who the actual users are going to be of the system, you know.

However, when you have those trips longer than three miles, if you start having, you know, a micro-transit or a shuttle vehicle have to provide a trip from, let's say, Plantation or Weston all the way out to the beach, you know, and then someone else requests a trip late at night, you know, for another area, their wait time can be 30, 40, an hour. And that's not going to get them to work on time, you know, reliably, you know, for that employer.

And so you end up with a lot of issues with -- you know, can you do it? Yes. Could you do it where they could get to work reliably on time? probably not, using that type of mode.

MS. PENNANT: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: Sorry to ask so many questions. How much again is it per person? It's 150 a month divided by 20 --

MR. SOFOUL: It's up to \$15 per trip five trips per week.

MR. HOOPER: \$15 per trip.

MR. SOFOUL: So it's -- it's up to \$300 per month if -- that's only if you have the maximum subsidy. So if your trip is shorter and you don't use all \$15, your trip might only be \$6. And so then it's \$6 instead of 15.

MR. HOOPER: So they can't use more than the -- than the allotted days.

MR. SOFOUL: Correct.

MR. HOOPER: I got you. So then it's --

MR. SOFOUL: Correct.

MR. HOOPER: -- probably going to be less than that.

MR. SOFOUL: Absolutely.

MR. HOOPER: And it's going to cost the same amount of money as a -- as the micro-transit.

MR. SOFOUL: That's what we're -- that's kind of what we're getting to.

MR. HOOPER: You're just trying to figure out how to put --

MR. SOFOUL: That's what we're trying to get -- that's exactly what we're trying to get to.

MR. HOOPER: -- people in wheels for less money. I got it.

MR. SOFOUL: That's right.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. All right.

DR. KELLEY: But the true cost --

MR. HOOPER: I -- I -- I'm fine.

MS. WALLACE: Her microphone's not on.

DR. KELLEY: -- the true cost of that trip is --

MS. WALLACE: Dr. Kelley, your microphone. Because it's recording.

So we need to speak in the microphone so that the recording can pick up the

comments.

DR. KELLEY: Is that working?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

DR. KELLEY: I'm sorry.

So but the true cost to the rider or, in this --

MR. HOOPER: Zero.

DR. KELLEY: -- Number 3 is \$4 because they have to --

MR. SOFOUL: Two.

DR. KELLEY: -- per trip is 2, they --

MR. SOFOUL: Yeah, it would be two.

DR. KELLEY: -- it's 2 and 2.

MR. SOFOUL: It's \$2 -- they have to pay a -- kind of a \$2 co-pay,

which is the cost of a one-ride BCT pass.

So you pay \$2, you know, towards the fare, and then you receive the \$15 subsidy.

DR. KELLEY: So it --

MR. SOFOUL: Per trip.

DR. KELLEY: -- it really isn't free to the rider.

MR. SOFOUL: Correct. It is -- it --

DR. KELLEY: It's \$2?

MR. SOFOUL: -- this program is not free to the rider. This -- this would require a \$2 co-pay --

DR. KELLEY: Which --

MR. SOFOUL: -- equivalent to a one -- a one-ride pass on BCT.

DR. KELLEY: Right. And then I share Chairman Hooper's concern that there are -- that employers aren't kicking in anything here and get all -- basically all of the marketing benefit in the employee or recruiting of employees benefit.

So it would be nice if we could explore some way to get them to kick in at the outset, something.

MR. HOOPER: And one other question.

MR. SOFOUL: Sure.

MR. HOOPER: How do we determine that the person is needy? Like what if somebody's like the GM of a hotel? Okay? And he's making \$200,000 a year, and he lives in Weston -- or she -- and they get into a cab. How do we -- is there -- is there a way -- is there a income level or something?

MR. SOFOUL: We're going to ask them to self-certify on the application that they do not have any other means to get to and from their place of employment overnight.

MS. PENNANT: Based on?

MR. HOOPER: Because I have a friend who's -- who's rich that doesn't own a car, okay, so he has no other way to do it, okay. I mean, I don't think he would ever do it, but I'm just saying.

MR. SOFOUL: Yeah. Yeah.

MR. HOOPER: I'm sorry.

MS. PENNANT: They're going to self-certify based on --

MR. SOFOUL: They're going to have to have a question -- they're going to have to answer yes to a question, you know, do you -- you know, do you or do you not have a means to get to work during these hours.

If you do not have a means to get to work during those hours, you know, then you -- and -- and you can provide evidence that you actually work an overnight shift, you know, so it's kind of two parts. You have to prove you actually work that overnight shift hours in that span and you need the service, but then second, you also have to certify that you do not have any other means to be able to make that trip. Then you qualify for the program.

MS. PENNANT: But it's not based on income?

MR. SOFOUL: No, it's not based on income.

MS. PENNANT: I'm surprised.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Allen -- Mr. Allen.

MR. ALLEN: I'm trying to follow here. The other purpose of the program is efficiency in traffic reducing.

So they have a car but they would prefer to use this, you're saying that would not be available to them?

MR. SOFOUL: That would not be available to them. Because if you have a car --

MR. ALLEN: But if you want --

MR. SOFOUL: -- then you have another means --

MR. ALLEN: -- to have a --

MR. SOFOUL: -- to go.

MR. ALLEN: -- reduce the number of cars out there is to provide an alternate to the car.

MR. HOOPER: You're still putting a car out there.

MR. SOFOUL: This is using taxis and TNC vehicles, you know, so it -- it's still going to be the same car on the road. The -- this isn't -- this particular program, the Late Night Connect, is not pooling riders together, so it's still just a single-occupancy vehicle or a lower occupancy vehicle to get people to take the trip.

MR. ALLEN: But that cab is going to be out there on the street anyway, whether they're carrying a passenger or not. Your car is going to set in your garage --

MR. SOFOUL: True.

MR. ALLEN: -- or your --

MR. SOFOUL: True.

MR. ALLEN: -- driveway --

MR. SOFOUL: True. To -- to that point, correct.

MR. ALLEN: -- if you don't --

MR. SOFOUL: Yeah.

MR. ALLEN: -- you know, need to take your car.

MR. SOFOUL: Yeah, that's true.

MS. PENNANT: I take it congestion wouldn't be such an issue at night, right?

MR. SOFOUL: Right. This is -- this is for -- first and foremost, this is providing connectivity to people who do --

MS. PENNANT: Right.

MR. SOFOUL: -- not have connectivity to their jobs or employment --

MS. PENNANT: Right.

MR. SOFOUL: -- late at night.

MR. HOOPER: Let's call it. So I'm going to go with it.

AGENDA ITEM 2

MR. HOOPER: Let's call the motion on both of them, please.

MS. WALLACE: If I may, I need to clarify the motion, first. Okay. It's -

-

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, but somebody's got to make it, right?

MS. WALLACE: No, I -- I -- I would like to make it and just have someone so move it, because it -- it's --

MR. HOOPER: Good enough.

MS. WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

It's motion to approve as eligible pursuant to 212.055 Florida Statutes the project and proposed expenditures in the not-to-exceed amount of 2.7 million dollars per year for up to five years for the Broward County Transportation Department's Community Micro-Transit Pilot Program.

MS. PENNANT: So **move**.

MR. FRAZIER: Second.

MR. HOOPER: Where are we here? We've got so moved --

MS. PENNANT: I said so move.

MR. HOOPER: -- do we have a second?

MS. PENNANT: Anthea.

MR. FRAZIER: Yeah, second.

MR. HOOPER: Oh, you seconded, Mr. Frazier.

Do we have any comments?

MR. ALLEN: Yeah. We don't need to have an amendment, I believe, but with the understanding that before the options years four and five, that this board will have the opportunity to review the performance of the program.

MR. SOFOUL: Absolutely.

MS. PENNANT: That's fine.

MR. ALLEN: I don't think it needs to be amended in there, but that's the understanding that we have.

MS. PENNANT: Perfect.

MR. HOOPER: You know, I want to add an amendment, and you guys can vote it down if you want to, okay?

Here's my amendment. Here's my amendment. All right? On Number 3 --

MS. WALLACE: This was just -- this was just the micro-transit. We'll take --

MR. HOOPER: Oh, we're doing one at a time?

MS. WALLACE: Yes, please.

MR. HOOPER: Good. Okay. Okay. So --

MS. WALLACE: This was just --

MR. HOOPER: -- I don't need an amendment --

MS. WALLACE: -- this was just for the --

MR. HOOPER: -- for this one.

MS. WALLACE: -- the eligibility, statutory --

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: -- eligibility of the project and funding for micro-transit

--

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: -- the micro-transit pilot.

MR. HOOPER: So we have a motion and a second.

Is there any comment?

MS. PENNANT: Well Phil's comment.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, yeah.

MS. PENNANT: Is noted. Is done.

MR. HOOPER: No other comments, though.

All those in favor?

Those opposed?

Okay. That motion passes.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

AGENDA ITEM 3

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Before we even go in there, before we make a

motion, okay, I would like to add to this program that when they certify -- because you're -- you're basically swearing that you are that, which -- you don't have a car to get to work and that you're working -- what -- what is it? You don't have a car to get to work and --

MR. SOFOUL: You don't have a means of travel to get to and from work, and that you work an overnight shift --

MR. HOOPER: That's right.

MR. SOFOUL: -- job.

MR. HOOPER: And the third thing, that you can't -- you can't afford to pay it yourself. That -- I want something where they're saying that they need this -- it's a needy -- it's a thing, right?

What is it that we could say? What is that we could put in a certification that would assure us that a general manager or somebody who makes in excess of some amount --

MS. PENNANT: Right. I think an income threshold --

MR. HOOPER: Even if it's just you --

MS. PENNANT: -- could be --

MR. HOOPER: -- certifying that I -- that this is something that, without it, I could not get to work. Without this program, I could not get to work.

MR. SOFOUL: That's -- that's what we're looking for, exactly. Without this program, you could not get to work. And that's the question that we want to answer, we want the applicants to answer and to certify.

MR. HOOPER: And then I -- what --

MS. PENNANT: Why -- why -- why wouldn't you consider an income threshold?

MR. HOOPER: I don't understand why we don't have an income threshold.

MS. WALLACE: There could be other reasons people can't --

MR. SOFOUL: Yes.

MS. WALLACE: -- drive.

MR. HOOPER: What's that?

MS. PENNANT: Okay.

MR. SOFOUL: Yes, there can be other reasons other than income that someone could not drive to and from work.

MS. PENNANT: Okay.

MR. SOFOUL: And so we want to make sure that we're being inclusive.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: We don't ask anyone to certify their -- their income to use public transportation.

MR. HOOPER: That's true.

MS. CASSINI: This is public transportation --

MR. HOOPER: You want people to use --

MS. CASSINI: -- and we want people to use --

MR. HOOPER: -- yes.

MS. CASSINI: -- public transportation.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. All right.

MS. WALLACE: Okay? Are we ready?

So it would be a motion to approve as statutory -- as eligible pursuant to 212.055 Florida Statutes the project and expenditures in the not-to-exceed amount of \$2,000,000 a year for five years for the Broward County Transportation Department's Late Shift Connect Pilot Program.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MR. FRAZIER: So **move**.

MS. LOVE: I second.

MR. ALLEN: Second.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. All those in favor?

Those opposed?

Okay. It passed.

MR. SOFOUL: Thank you very much. I really appreciate it. I'm excited for this.

MS. PENNANT: Oh, my goodness.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

4 - MOTION TO APPROVE SURTAX FUNDING IN THE NOT-TO-EXCEED AMOUNT OF \$500,000 TO BROWARD COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS TO BEGIN A BROADVIEW PARK (UNINCORPORATED BROWARD COUNTY) DRAINAGE STUDY (PREPARING FOR GRANT-FUNDED PROJECT)

MR. HOOPER: All right. Who's got Number 4?

MS. CASSINI: I could have --

MR. HOOPER: -- Public Works --

MS. CASSINI: -- Mr. Hui come --

MR. HOOPER: -- Broadview.

MS. CASSINI: -- forward.

MR. HUI: Okay. Good morning, Mr. Chair, members of the board.

Tony Hui, Broward County Public Works Department.

I'm here today to ask for your consideration and approval for a new project. There's a road drainage project in the Broadview Park neighborhood. And it potentially carries some good news with it.

So let me just describe it very briefly. The Broadview Park neighborhood is one of the County's in -- is in the Broward County Municipal Service District. Its location of it is is bounded by State Road 7 on the east, Turnpike to the west, 12th Street on the north, which turns into Peters, and then also on the south side, it is bound by essentially 595 that -- you -- you -- you know, in -- in that area there.

It's a lower income neighborhood. And the road drainage from this neighborhood, essentially, there is three outfalls that drain into the New River that's just -- runs parallel to 595.

Over the last couple years, we just have had significantly more road drainage issues in this neighborhood than we have in the past.

It's probably due to a combination of reasons. It's probably due to the continued aging of the pipes that have been -- that are in the ground.

And then also that area's also tidally influenced, so you -- you know, the tide -- tidal effects and -- and climate change and, you know, certain level of sea rise probably has something to do with it.

And it's probably a combination of both things.

So over the last two years, we have had significantly more drainage in our roads than we have had in the past.

You've seen some pictures of it. There -- there's -- we have many of more. These are just two typical pictures of it.

So in terms of trying to resolve these issues of this neighborhood and be able to provide a reliable road network and transportation system for the residents, we actually submitted a grant for this project to improve the drainage of this neighborhood.

And we submitted to the Florida Department of Economic Development, and the grant that we submitted was for a total estimated cost to improve the drainage for about 21.7 million dollars. Yeah, 21.7, with the request that DEO, Economic Opportunity, provide 16.7 million dollars for the project and the County, as a match, would provide \$5,000,000 as part of the match.

So it's roughly just a little bit over 20 percent, our match, you know, somewhere in there.

Since the application was submitted, we actually have had a number of very positive responses back from DEO.

After our application was reviewed, it was shortlisted. We had

interviews via video conference.

We have had a virtual site visit with the team and, actually, this past Wednesday, our team had a field visit with the DEO team out in the field, went through the -- went through the project, so that they got to physically take a look at, you know, some of the things that we're talking about and that type of thing.

And everything so far has indicated that it would be very -- it -- it's very positive. But you guys know how these things go in terms of, you know -- so I don't want to oversell it, but there certainly is a very good potential. Their team really likes the technical aspects of this project.

So the timing of it is a bit of issue, and that's why we kind of want to get the board's approval for an initial study and then also to get our Board's approval to get this thing started in the event that we get this grant.

So when they're -- what they have told us a couple days ago is that they're planning to announce the award winners of this grant in late January, February of next year. And -- and so the -- the part of is that there is going to be a tight timeframe with the project.

So what we would want to do is is that when -- let's say, assuming that we're the, you know, recipients of -- of, you know, this -- this grant is is that we want to initiate a detailed planning study, because this is also concept -- concepts that we have spoken with -- you know, as -- as part of grant application so far is that we would, you know, initiate the study.

It's -- we estimated the study would be less than \$500,000, but, you

know, somewhere in that range.

We will get that started. Again, assuming that we get the grant and then we'll get that started, and then we'll get on top of trying to -- not trying to, but we will have to meet the pretty stringent timeline that they have.

So this is the initial step. If you approve it and then if our Board approve it, conduct the study. We get the grant, we will come back to you at a later point for the remaining four and a half million dollar match for -- you know, for this project.

So, again, it's a very positive outlook that we have at this point, but don't want to oversell it, and there's a potential that -- you know, that it -- it's - - we'll have to just wait and see.

But it's very positive so far, and so we're asking for your consideration for a new project, \$500,000 for this initial study. Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Allen.

MR. ALLEN: The projects that we had -- municipal projects, we ran across some project, and I think Tamarac was one of those that there was a roadway flooding issue and we determined that there were parts of the projects that were outside of the permitted roadway impact. In other words, they wanted to put pump stations or something like that in in areas outside of that program, and we had said, no, you can't use the surtax for those programs.

MS. WALLACE: So the issue involved a different municipality, and the project was found partially eligible. The municipality wanted a pump, to

install or replace a pump in a canal.

And the criteria requires -- so roadway drainage is permissible. Planning -- the statute allows for planning, development, construction, operation, and maintenance of roads and bridges.

So if the road is flooding, there's -- roadway drainage is a part of the construction of any roadway.

And in this instance, the drainage is not functioning properly, and the roads are flooding.

So the -- to redo the drainage and improve the road is permissible under the statute.

The issue with the other -- and that particular municipality and all of the municipalities have to follow the same criteria that the County follows, which is they have to measure the right -- from the middle of the road to a certain extent into the right of way, and so -- and provide drainage calculations.

And drainage improvements for the road that cover drainage on the public -- within that measurement of the -- of the public right of way are permissible.

And so that particular municipality just has to provide a drainage analysis that reflects the amount of drainage or runoff from the public roadway, and the amount of funding that would be eligible would be the funding associated with the runoff -- the drainage for the roads, public roads.

MR. ALLEN: I hate to bring this up, but that -- the -- you know, we've

all read over the last couple years all of the issue relative to Fort Lauderdale and their storm drainage and -- and water --

MS. WALLACE: Sewer. Theirs is particularly sewer. And sewer, that type of infrastructure is not permissible under the statute.

MR. ALLEN: Even if that sewage is flowing in over the road.

MS. WALLACE: Right. Because the -- right. The -- no, the -- the sewer system is not part of the roadway drainage system.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MR. ALLEN: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: So it's --

MR. ALLEN: Unless they have them --

MS. WALLACE: -- sewer infrastructure is --

MR. ALLEN: -- combined.

MS. WALLACE: -- not permissible. Utilities are not permissible. It's roadway -- roadway drainage.

MR. ALLEN: Okay. And this project here does not extend beyond the boundaries of what is necessary for the drainage of the roadway.

MR. HUI: Mr. Allen, we would treat ourselves the same way that we do within the cities. We would -- as part of this initial study that we'll be performing, we will also be doing an analysis to verify that the surtax portion, the payment from the surtax will only be related to the road portion of it.

So we'll treat ourselves -- we treat ourselves the same way as anybody else. Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. And so we're going to do 500 grand, which is going to get us through the study. And it's going to -- it's going to get you to the point where you can get the grant, right?

MR. HUI: Well -- okay. So just to clarify, because we just got new information from the DEO just a couple days ago.

They will announce the winners of the grant late January or February. So we will -- we obviously wouldn't have started the study by that -- by that point in time.

MR. HOOPER: So you're going to start the study after you get the grant.

MR. HUI: Yeah. We're going to study but --

MR. HOOPER: You just want it teed up so that you're ready to go.

MR. HUI: Exactly. Because there's going to be a final agreement that needs to be signed --

MR. HOOPER: Got you.

MR. HUI: -- you know, they actually -- an agreement. That will be signed a couple months down the road, and then -- but we'll be teed up for that final agreement.

MR. HOOPER: So the sequencing is grant, spend the 500,000.

MR. HUI: Right. Uh-huh.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. So when we do this motion, I would want it to be contingent on the grant being approved before we spend 500,000.

And I know that that's -- that we're -- that's what we would do, but --

MS. WALLACE: Right. So --

MR. HOOPER: -- we should say in the -- in the motion.

MS. WALLACE: -- what we're doing is reviewing for statutory eligibility. And so --

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: -- and in the event that -- so the -- the project is eligible. And whether the funds, I guess, get used will be -- will depend upon what happens through that grant evaluation process.

But for purposes of now, I guess, we're just reviewing for statutory eligibility and in the event that additional funds are needed, it would come back later. All right?

MR. HOOPER: Okay. All right. Motion?

MS. WALLACE: Okay. So motion to approve as eligible pursuant to Section 212.055 Florida Statutes the project and the expenditure in the amount of \$500,000 for the Broward County Public Works Department to begin a Broadview Park drainage study to prepare for grant project funding.

MS. CASSINI: I believe the request, though, Chair, was contingent upon the grant being awarded.

MR. HOOPER: Right. That was my --

MS. WALLACE: It's eligible --

MR. HOOPER: -- request.

MS. WALLACE: Right.

MR. HOOPER: But she said that's not a request I can make.

MS. CASSINI: Yeah. You could. You can put it at the end of the motion that --

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: -- the 500,000 is approved contingent upon the grant --

MR. HOOPER: I would then --

MS. CASSINI: -- being awarded.

MR. HOOPER: -- then let's add it to the end of the motion. Can I add it to the end of the motion?

MS. CASSINI: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: Okay. So a motion to approve as statutorily eligible the project and expenditures of \$500,000 to the Broward County Public Works Department to begin the Broadview Park drainage study to prepare for grant funding contingent upon --

MS. CASSINI: The grant being awarded.

MS. WALLACE: -- so the funds would be -- so the recommendation to the County Commission would be to allocate the funds contingent upon the grant award --

MS. PENNANT: Grant.

MS. WALLACE: -- the grant being awarded.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Is there a motion to --

MS. WALLACE: That was the motion.

MR. HOOPER: Right. Can we have a so moved?

MS. PENNANT: So **moved**.

MS. LOVE: I second. Allyson Love, second.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. We have a motion and a second.

All -- any discussion on the motion?

All those in favor?

Those opposed?

Okay. That motion passes.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

**5 - MOTION TO APPROVE SURTAX FUNDING IN THE NOT-TO-EXCEED
AMOUNT OF \$29,000,000 FOR THE DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION, RIGHT
OF WAY ACQUISITION, DRAINAGE, LAND ACQUISITION, AND
ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION REQUIRED FOR THE PAT SALERNO
INTERCHANGE PROJECT PARTNERSHIP WITH FDOT, TURNPIKE
AUTHORITY**

MR. HOOPER: Let's go to Number 5.

MS. CASSINI: Mr. Chair, could I -- could I just ask if Mr. Coolman --
Vice Chair Coolman is actually on the line? He did indicate that he was
going to join virtually.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: Mr. Coolman, are you on the line? Okay. Just
checking.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Okay. So Number 5. Who's got that one?

MS. CASSINI: Mr. Mahoney is going to come to the podium and
present the Pat Salerno Interchange.

MR. MAHONEY: Good morning.

My name's Lary Mahoney. I'm with County Administration, and I'm here today to talk to you about the Pat Salerno/Sawgrass Expressway Interchange.

Okay. So we're here today to follow up on some other meetings that we had with you beginning back in 2020, in August, where we brought to you the proposal to construct a full interchange at Pat Salerno so not only that it goes from the south as it does now, it will also go to the north.

At that time, we didn't have all of our funding needs in line, and we said we'd get back to you for the final funding.

Back last January, we came to you for another agreement where we had a deadline to meet with Florida Turnpike Enterprise regarding the funding of the project, and they said they would give us another year to move forward if we were able to fund part of the design for the interchange to move forward.

But we have now come to the point where it's at the end of the year again for us, and we have reached an agreement, tentatively, with all the city also the Florida Turnpike Enterprise to move forward.

So we're now at that point where we'll be asking for \$29,000,000 for funding that would be needed for the project to move forward with us.

And if you -- I'll go through the project, if you would like a little bit more information.

We have already spent 3,000,000 of the 29 that we're asking for. This

allows for the Pat Salerno Bridge Drive over the freeway to be torn down. A new one would be brought up.

We would have full access both north and south in all directions.

And do that, we have to go through some areas where we have to get -- acquire some property.

That also includes drainage; it includes mitigation, and the construction of everything.

So the project as you look on the chart there, you'll see there's a new northbound ramp there over there. It happens to be braided with the bridge so that the -- the cars coming and going in different -- different directions will not have crash -- a distance for crashes.

And -- and also, on the coming -- going off -- going south, you will get off now at Oakland Park and you will be an access road running along the Sawgrass Freeway that'll take you up to the Pat Salerno.

The other two on the south side are just modified a little bit to go forward.

So we're here today to ask for the approval. We hope you can approve that.

Also, I forgot to mention, up on Oakland Park, part of the thing for the braiding and also for the -- the -- the -- the access road, there is some work on that bridge there, too, for its -- that's where we're looking at.

And just making it quick.

So looking at a little bit of the cost, I know that's going to come up.

For the design and construction, we're looking at 600 and -- excuse me -- \$65,000,000-plus. 65 -- 5,418,000. Of that, the state's going to put up 45,400,000 of that. We are only putting up 20,000,000 of that price, it's right there.

That's our guaranteed maximum from the state, that it will not go above the 20,000,000 cost for us. That's our price. It's for the local funding.

For the --

MS. CASSINI: Lary? 29,000,000, correct? 29. Because that's what on the slide.

MR. MAHONEY: I'm sorry. I'm going to put my glasses on.

MR. HOOPER: You're like me.

MR. MAHONEY: The 29. Yes. I'm sorry.

MR. HOOPER: Mine's look like --

MR. MAHONEY: I'm trying to read something here. I'm sorry. I apologize.

So right now -- we're looking for the 29. The portion of that for construction would be for the 20,000,000 the County would put up.

There's another 9,000,000 we're looking at for the acquisition of right of way mitigation and drainage for the property there, too.

MR. HOOPER: Do you have any questions? Go ahead, Doug. Oh, let -- Doug, you joined us.

MS. PENNANT: Like magic.

MR. COOLMAN: Sorry I'm late.

MS. WALLACE: Turn your mic on.

MR. COOLMAN: But I'm -- I'm glad to see that we're having partners in this. It needs to be done --

MS. WALLACE: Mr. Coolman, will you turn on your microphone, please?

MR. COOLMAN: Isn't it on?

MS. PENNANT: No.

MR. HOOPER: No, it has to have a --

MS. PENNANT: Yeah.

MR. COOLMAN: How about that one?

MR. HOOPER: There you go.

MR. COOLMAN: All right. Sorry I'm late.

I'm glad to see that we're only putting a portion in and everybody else is helping, and that means we're stretching our surtax dollars.

So I'm very much in favor of it.

Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Allen.

MR. ALLEN: This project will inure to the benefit of the Turnpike Authority through increased revenues that will -- from tolling that will occur; is that correct?

MR. MAHONEY: It will use -- it will -- all the money from the tolling will go to the Turnpike Enterprise.

MR. ALLEN: And Pat Salerno Drive was built by the Turnpike

Authority in an agreement with the Panthers to have a revenue sharing for the increased revenues that would come from the -- from Pat Salerno Drive.

Rather than people getting off at Sunrise, they would come off at Pat Salerno Drive, which would be tolled at 75 cents and -- at that point in time.

That agreement, I don't know if that was still in place at the time or at this time, or when it was refinanced, perhaps that disappeared.

But shouldn't the Turnpike Authority participate with us relative to the revenues?

MR. MAHONEY: Originally -- I know what you're saying there. But originally, our agreement with the Florida Turnpike Enterprise was we'd pay for half of the design and construction costs, whatever that would be.

Now that -- what's going on with the -- for the construction costs, the state is paying \$45,418,000 of that cost.

MR. ALLEN: But is that for the -- that's not just for the Pat Salerno Drive, but that's also for expanding the lanes. That whole interchange there is part of --

MR. MAHONEY: That -- it's --

MR. ALLEN: -- that project, right?

MR. MAHONEY: -- this is just to get the -- no, it's really to get just the bridge and everything else in there.

So the cost of this, yes, there are more lanes going in there, but that's -- if it's related to the Turnpike, this -- to the interchange this is their cost.

So, remember, right now, if we didn't have this agreement, they went

back to say we pay half, instead of the -- us paying \$20,000,000, we'd be paying about \$34,000,000, \$33,000,000.

So it is a savings to us in that.

MR. ALLEN: Okay. And what participation level is City of Sunrise for this project?

MR. MAHONEY: This project, right now, the City of Sunrise is going to provide seven parcels that we need for drainage. They're going to pick up the cost for that.

MR. ALLEN: What's the value of that? I mean --

MR. MAHONEY: We haven't --

MR. ALLEN: -- have you --

MR. MAHONEY: -- appraised that --

MR. ALLEN: -- put a value on it?

MR. MAHONEY: -- right now, but we look at that as a substantial investment by the County.

MS. PENNANT: Mr. Chair, I kind of like where you're going with this, Phil. I mean, can we get back something from the Turnpike to reinvest?

MR. MAHONEY: Well, that was the agreement originally, as they said to us, we decided to -- not to charge you half of what -- the original statement was we'd pay for half of the design and construction.

MS. PENNANT: Uh-huh.

MR. MAHONEY: But now we're not asking you for -- to do that.

So they -- we've asked that question. We've pushed for that question.

The answer is no.

MR. HOOPER: Remind me, past history, I think that also originally the plan called for one -- either an ingress or egress improvement, and now we're doing both in and out, right? I mean, wasn't that the -- the original Pat Salerno plan was --

MR. MAHONEY: We discussed all different ways originally. The MPO, through the city's urging, went back and said, you know, the support only a -- a full interchange.

MR. HOOPER: Right.

MR. MAHONEY: So we're back at that, and we agreed to move forward under those corrections.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. All right. Does anybody else have any comments?

Should we go ahead and make a motion?

MS. WALLACE: Yes, Mr. Chair.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

MS. WALLACE: So it's a motion to approve as to the statutory -- the eligibility pursuant to Section 212.055 Florida Statutes the project and expenditures in amount not to exceed \$500,000 for the Broward County Public Works Department -- oh, no.

MR. MAHONEY: Woah, you're reading the wrong one there.

MS. CASSINI: Yeah, Angela, this has already been approved as eligible --

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. CASSINI: -- when they did the 3,000,000.

MS. WALLACE: So it's the funding, but you still have to determine that the -- that the funding is eligible. We have not done that.

So the funding in the amount of 29,000,000 --

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. WALLACE: -- for the design, construction, right of way acquisition, drainage, and land acquisition for the Pat Salerno Exchange with the Turnpike.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Does anybody want to so move that?

MR. COOLMAN: I'll move it.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

DR. KELLEY: I'll second.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Great.

Do we have any comments to the motion?

All those in favor?

Those opposed?

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

6 - MOTION TO APPROVE SURTAX FUNDING IN THE NOT-TO-EXCEED AMOUNT OF 2.35 MILLION DOLLARS TO SUPPORT COUNTY'S ROLE IN MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH FDOT

MR. HOOPER: Okay. We're at Number 6, MOU, Broward Commuter Rail for the PD&E.

DR. KELLEY: Can we take a short recess for five-minutes?

MS. WALLACE: Mr. Chair?

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. WALLACE: Dr. Kelley's asked for a brief break.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, you want to have a recess.

(THE MEETING RECESSED AT 11:32 A.M. AND RECONVENED AT 11:35 A.M.)

MR. RUDDY: All right. Thank you. Good morning, Chairman Hooper, other members of the board. Thank you very much for the opportunity to present.

I'm Vince Ruddy. I'm County Chief Negotiator. Started working back in April and I've been, among other things, working with a team of people from different departments of the County and also with our friends from FDOT and some other key stakeholders to move along this long-awaited project for a commuter rail.

So I'm going to make a -- a brief presentation, kind of an intro, kind of a -- I'm going to call it a refresher, because I think many of you saw a presentation back -- I think it was in January of this year, January 29th, where a -- a summary was given, you guys were given an overview.

So this is going to be a chance to kind of like refresh your memories, give you some information about how far along we've come.

We do have a motion to provide for surtax funding for some initial preparatory work.

And then my colleagues from FDOT will make a more detailed presentation of sort of the -- where they're coming with the -- the project development and environmental study.

And, also, I was very encouraged to see on the agenda that there's a subsequent presentation on the Investment in Infrastructure and Jobs Act, which you will see is very relevant to this project.

So next slide, please.

THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Ruddy, please pull down your mic.

MR. RUDDY: Is that better?

THE COURT REPORTER: Perfect.

MR. RUDDY: All right. Thank you.

Once again, this project and the PD&E study that's now underway represents a partnership between FDOT and Broward County.

The MOU was actually signed just the day before I think your -- your board meeting. It was on the 28th of January.

FDOT's leading. They're taking the technical lead on the PD&E Study itself.

Some of you I think maybe participated in a workshop last night that was held in this room that was focused on the New River crossing, which, among other things, they will be getting more details in shortly.

They're focusing on the PD&E Study, the environmental aspects, the various engineering and physical aspects, initial conceptual designs.

And they're doing it in a way to maintain eligibility for federal funding,

capital investment grants, or CIG grants, and other potential sources of funding.

The County's responsibilities, per the MOU that was signed, we are -- first of all, we're leading on the financial plan. If this project does go ahead, we will be the -- the primary financer for it, or the -- the main sponsor for it.

We are supporting stakeholder outreach.

We've also been coordinating with FDOT and with local municipalities on the question of where stations will be located.

We're looking at a number of agreements. The -- the County's going to be responsible for all of the local agreements and the agreements with the rail companies that will enable the project to take place.

So these are interlocal agreements on such things as funding, interlocal agreements on access, right of ways, these types of things.

We will be identifying the local share of capital costs and annual O and M funds.

And working, again, very close with FDOT, that's doing the technical work.

This graphic here sort of shows the overall organization approach.

I mentioned that this is being done in a way that's consistent with Federal Transit Administration rules. The idea is that this project will be -- we'll apply for grants through the FTA, and to do that, we're sort of managing all the aspects so that it's all compliant with the FTA and with the associated NEPA, or National Environmental Protection Act, guidelines and

requirements.

The funding sources that we anticipate for this project will be federal. The grants can cover up to 50 percent, the FTA New Starts Grants.

The State of Florida, the state has its own new starts program that we anticipate would kick in up to another 25 percent.

Then you have the local government portions, which include the County as well as municipal governments.

The municipal governments, in this case, we're expecting them to pitch in a portion to cover the local station development. And for that reason, we see they have a number of mechanisms, potential revenue sources they can use for that. Some of them are listed on this slide.

Worth mentioning, the private sector. Many of these transit projects which spur transit-oriented development open up opportunities for private developers to collaborate and do joint development projects.

And the FTA actually encourages that. You actually get certain incentive and bonus points if you can bring in private investment and private development to do joint development or P3s as part of the project.

So that's another element of this project that we are -- we're looking at.

The various approaches that we'll use for the financing plan that we're developing, a lot of it's going to depend on, you know, certain things such as track access and other agreements.

We've talked a little bit about who owns the rights. The rail itself, the

corridor, the FEC corridor, is owned officially by the FECR Railroad Company. However, Brightline has a passenger easement. And to get the rights to operate passenger service on this rail corridor, we're going to have to negotiate and arrange for an access fee agreement with Brightline.

And we'll also be negotiating maintenance and operational costs that the passenger rail service will generate on that same -- on that same infrastructure.

I mentioned before the local and private funding. It is key. You've got to -- you have to be able to demonstrate not just that you want to or you plan to, but you're -- there's a solid commitment and a confirmed funding source from the local source. Not just the County, but any of the municipal players that are involved.

And if you're bringing private developers into the equation, you also have to show firm commitments and clear evidence that that funding is going to materialize.

The government doesn't want to give you funding and then have the project not happen.

Worth mentioning to this board is that this project itself, the commuter rail, was not included in the original financial plan that was used to substantiate the surtax ballot initiative.

The surtax itself is good news. It improves the prospects for this kind of a project, but because it really was not included, it's a pretty significant investment, we have to -- you know, it really puts the emphasis on the fiscal

discipline and how important that's going to be, how important it's going to be to leverage not just federal but also state funding and municipal funding.

The surtax budget, as you know, included funding for up to 26 miles of light rail transit, along with seven bus rapid transit corridors.

This commuter rail, BCR, is not considered light rail. It's a different concept altogether.

And we want to make sure that as this north/south connectivity is created, if it does go forward, that it doesn't sacrifice east/west connectivity.

Next, please.

And so this slide, again, a little bit of context. What I've found is that when we talk about commuter rail or, as it used to be called, the Coastal Link project, a lot of people see that as -- they understand it to be different things, right? A lot of times, commuter rail's not what you originally thought it was.

I used to use the Metro up in Washington, D.C. area before I moved down here to Florida six years ago, and, you know, I used to commute to work on it. And I thought, hey, it's rail. I commute. It's commuter rail. No, it's not.

That type of service and down in Miami, the Metro Rail that they have down there, stations are close -- are spaced closer together, the train accelerates and stops much more faster. They're using electric motors and electrified third rails, in many cases.

That type of a heavy rail orientation is now what we're talking about here. It's not easy on commuter rail.

So what this say is that commuter rail's typically put on freight rail lines. You're basically leveraging taking advantage of an existing piece of infrastructure, which is good, right? We can -- we're not building a -- a -- a greenfield project from the ground up. We're actually leveraging existing assets, existing infrastructure.

But that infrastructure is on -- it's a freight rail. And there are certain limitations on that.

The freight companies do not want to have an electrified third rail right next to their trains at street grade, and -- and it -- it's just not possible.

So there are certain limitations.

Historically, commuter rail has served, you know, dense urban centers by bringing people to and from the suburbs into the cities to commute to work. So it kind of has that background, that demographic.

I mentioned the spacing of stations, a little bit further apart. You can't have them every half mile or mile. Typically, they're more like two, two and a half to five miles apart because of the nature of the -- the locomotives. They're heavier diesel electric engines that are pulling, you know, three or four, maybe five passenger cars, so it does take them some time to pick up speed and slow down. If you put too many stations too close together, it operates at a very slow speed, and it becomes not very practical.

There are safety and traffic considerations. I mentioned that you're unable to put a third rail at that grade.

And for all these reasons, you know, depends on the place, the

specific city or context. Sometimes commuter rail makes sense, sometimes it doesn't.

So before we run into this, we're doing this study, we're doing the project development and environmental study, and we're really making sure that we -- that this project does make sense.

So we've also -- you know, we do have -- this was not the first project, right? In the United States right now, there's about 31 different commuter rail projects or programs that are already operating.

This slide here shows on the map where they're located. And you'll see that, you know, New York, the Northeast, highly dense, a lot of commuter rail projects. Also in California.

Some of the most effective or cost effective, I would say, on an operating cost per trip basis, are in California, Colorado, Utah, and Pennsylvania.

You can see the operating cost per trip data for those top five commuter rail services.

Interestingly enough, there's two existing commuter rails right now in Florida. One is Tri-Rail, which you all know. And then the SunRail project, the SunRail commuter rail service up in Central Florida.

The operating costs for the Florida systems to date have not been as cost effective as some of the more established in other locations. So it's something to keep in mind.

And we believe that as we look at this specific Broward Commuter

Rail Project, because of this history and because of this fact, it will be worthwhile to really scrutinize, as I said earlier, think about fiscal discipline, looking at cost effectiveness so that we can have a higher performing project.

This slide kind of shows here some of the future feasibility issues.

There's some really positive developments.

We signed the MOU.

This corridor, compared to the CSX corridor where Tri-Rail operates, is much closer to the urban cores. We do expect higher ridership than Tri-Rail.

Most of the municipalities are on board to share the cost for stations. We've gotten, you know, supportive positions from the municipalities in that regard.

And the business community is very supportive of this project.

The other good news is that Dade County, which is the southern extension of this Coastal Link commuter rail service, is already moving ahead. They just received formal notification from FTA that they have been allowed to enter into what's called project development phase. So they're moving ahead.

They have -- their locally preferred alternatives I think are either confirmed or close to being confirmed.

There are very interesting potential synergies and economies of scale possible because of Tri-Rail. If the FRTA is actually selected to operate this, it should be possible for them to take advantage of existing overhead, some existing resources, and do more with less or, you know, be more cost

effective than if you build a standalone independent new organization to do this.

And I mentioned the federal funding being possible, of course, for the passage of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, is very encouraging. Now there's going to be a lot more money available.

I expect there's still going to be a competitive environment. It's not just us and others talking about, hey, infrastructure is coming now and it's -- it's a big opportunity. Everybody's doing the same thing, and a lot of projects are being developed and submitted.

So there will be a competitive environment, but there should be more funding available to go around. So that's good news.

I think the -- our colleagues that are making a presentation later can talk more to that, that issue.

The challenges. I mentioned before that the project wasn't in the initial surtax finance plan. This project, even though we're doing a good study now, the PD&E thing is moving ahead, it is separate from the Broward County systemwide transit study. We need -- we will need to integrate and kind of make sure the two studies are closely coordinated. We are doing that, with the help of the Broward County Transit and Transportation Department.

Governance structure has not yet been defined. It's -- we're having conversations right now with Miami-Dade. We believe that any decisions in terms of how the governance will be done and how the operators will be

selected will need to be coordinated with the other county being served which, at this stage, is just Miami-Dade.

I did mention the need to us to -- for us to negotiate a track access agreement. And that fee that's anticipated is going to add to the operating costs.

I just mention that because there's other projects that have had the luxury of already having the track access. In the case of Tri-Rail, the track was actually purchased outright. They -- it was owned by -- I believe, by FDOT, and they lease it back now to the freight company.

And the same applies in some other projects. I think in -- SunRail up in Central Florida also did a -- a buy-out of the track access so they don't have to pay an annual fee for it.

So in our case, it does not seem likely that FECR or Brightline are going to sell outright the track, so we're looking at a -- probably an annual access fee.

And then, of course, one of the bigger challenges is the New River crossing, which was the subject of last night's workshop.

Fortunately, the FDOT team is identifying the alternatives, looking at each one, and some of the pros and cons.

And that process is moving along. I thought last night's workshop was actually quite good. We got a lot of feedback, a lot of good questions, comments, and suggestions that the team is taking onboard.

So this project is not ready to go. Some people might say it's not even

a project yet. It needs further analysis, more studies.

And we are coming to you because the time has come, we believe, to start using some -- a small amount of surtax funding to complete the studies and to do the other obligations that the County has under our MOU with FDOT to collaborate on this PD&E Study.

So we're proposing the use of limited surtax funds, a total of 2.35 million.

This table here shows the breakdown of that. 100,500 is for a financial advisor specialized in transit projects and FTA grant applications that will work with us.

They've actually begun working for us already using non-surtax funding. We've started using general County funds to begin developing a financial model, but we'll need to spend additional money to use that model to run scenarios and do other aspects of the financial plan.

We have a strategy and procurement support consultant. We've identified an expert, former leaders and other experts from New York, actually, from the New York Metro North system. It's, I think, the second -- it's either the largest or the second largest commuter rail project.

We have some very experienced experts that are helping us to kind of prepare our overall strategy and the procurement needed to have the resources onboard to support this on our side.

And the County Attorney has also identified outside counsel, I guess they call it rail counsel, that specialize on rail projects.

And I'll let my colleague Angela Wallace speak more to that, that particular element of the project.

Angela, you want to say anything about the rail counsel component?

MS. WALLACE: Well, the firm just specializes in negotiating with rail entities, the FEC and the CSX. And they've represented Tri-Rail in their negotiations related to the crossing between -- the east/west crossing in Miami-Dade from the Tri-Rail tracks over to the downtown terminal.

So it just -- their expertise in dealing with access agreements for rail is why they're being engaged to assist with the planning process for commuter rail.

MR. RUDDY: Thank you.

And the last line item for general engineering consulting services, or GEC, contract, 2.1 million, the largest one. That is to make sure that the County has our own independent access to technical expertise, engineers, planners, and strategists that can support us as the negotiation goes forward with Brightline and with other key players, and to help ensure that we have the ability ourselves, as a County, to do technical work that's required to advance the project.

The FDOT team is doing a lot on the PD&E Study, but it's very focused and narrowly focused.

To fulfill our role to do the financial plan and to negotiate and set up the agreements with Brightline and with other players, we do need our own independent source of a GEC contractor.

So that's not the full amount that's going to be needed if the project goes forward. This is an initial amount just to cover the studies and the negotiation and preparation of agreements.

If we do reach that stage where the LPA is confirmed and the FTA approves us to go to project development, a much larger budget for project development and for engineering type work will be required.

But we will cross that proverbial bridge, or tunnel, when we get to it. at this stage, we're just doing initial studies to make sure we can, you know, finalize this, this PD&E Study, and confirm that the project is indeed viable and can go forward as a grant application.

With that, I'll open it up to questions.

MR. FRAZIER: Mr. Chairman, I have a question.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Frazier.

MR. FRAZIER: Since our -- the surtax has the community small business participation as a part of this, what's being done to ensure that they're going to be a part of these four expenditures that you've indicated? That's one.

Second part is that if it goes forward and you're going to need all this additional money and all these different agencies will come into play, which entity would be in charge of ensuring that there's CBE participation? Because you've got the feds coming in, you've got the state, and you've got Broward County and what have you. Each of those entities have small business participation, so which one will end up taking the lead on something

like this?

MR. RUDDY: Yeah, we expect a good portion of these services to be eligible and we'll have CBE participation in them.

But I must say that when federal funding comes in and is used for any of the projects, we're not able to impose a CBE requirement. The federal government doesn't allow it.

So we're going to be very careful.

For these -- for this initial work where federal funding is not coming in, we will have a lot more latitude. And for those services which -- for which CBE firms are available and can provide the service, they will be used. The 30 percent requirement will be included in the solicitation documents.

When federal funding is --

MR. FRAZIER: The feds have a DBE requirement, so --

MR. RUDDY: Yeah, feds use DBE. And what we've seen in other cases, like, for example, in Miami-Dade, when they have put out solicitations, they've said that work may be funded either by local or by federal. If federal funds are used, it's different rules. It's DBE. Here's the requirements. If it's local funds, you know, they use their own local rules.

And to answer your question about who is going to ensure that and oversee that and ensure that that -- that's done, it will be our Office of Small Business and Economic Development, Sandy-Michael McDonald, with whom I just spoke to yesterday about this matter. So we're in close coordination with them. Any procurement done for any of these will be coordinated very

close with Sandy-Michael McDonald and his team.

MR. HOOPER: Phil.

MS. PENNANT: Mr. Chair?

MR. HOOPER: Oh. I'm sorry.

MS. PENNANT: I'm sorry.

MR. HOOPER: I'll let Ms. Pennant go first.

MS. PENNANT: I was curious. You mentioned something about some fees that Brightline will be charge -- how will you be able to control those fees?

MS. WALLACE: It'll be pursuant to contract. Whatever's negotiated with the -- through a contract.

MR. RUDDY: Yeah, those -- it's not a -- it kind of -- you negotiate that upfront. Typically, you do a -- a long-term agreement over 30 years, 50 years, whatever it is, and you say, this is what we agree to pay for access --

MS. PENNANT: Okay.

MR. RUDDY: -- to the rails over this period of time. That's typically how it's done.

MS. PENNANT: Right. Right. I just wanted to make sure that there is some thought on that, so it doesn't become a runaway train, so to speak.

MR. RUDDY: Yeah, I mean, I would say that having -- Brightline is a train company that's using the top engineers and experts in rail services. You know, that's -- that's their business.

County is -- we're not like Miami-Dade. We don't have existing rail

service, so we don't have a built-in in-house pool of expertise that we can draw upon.

So having that, being able to procure that and have that alongside of us as we negotiate with Brightline, we think that's going to be very important so that we don't get --

MS. PENNANT: Railroaded.

MR. RUDDY: -- taken advantage of or railroaded in the negotiations.

But it -- you know, we -- we want to be on an equal level playing field and have experts on our side that can defend our interest.

MS. PENNANT: I'm done.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Allen.

MR. ALLEN: Last night's meeting relative to the New River crossing, that was a component, eventually, of the total project.

There were numbers that were thrown out last night and in the newsletter that I read recently, you know, of a tunnel costing up to \$1,000,000,000 dollars and various bridge options of 300,000,000 or whatever.

What is the magnitude of cost of the total system from Deerfield to Miami-Dade? I mean, is there a number out there that --

MR. RUDDY: Until the locally preferred alternative is confirmed for the -- in this case, for the New River crossing, it's going to be hard to tell you this is the total estimated cost.

If it's tunnel, if that is the option that's selected, it obviously is a much

larger cost.

MR. ALLEN: Right, but what I'm saying is there were four numbers, or four series of numbers given last night. How does that compare to the range in numbers for the rest -- the balance of the system?

MR. RUDDY: Yeah, I think the rest of the system, those capital cost estimates are just recently being prepared, and they're still under revision and being looked at.

But just to give you a sense, so you could have a sense of the magnitude, it's in the -- in the neighborhood of about a half billion dollars.

And it could be lower, and it could be higher, depending on a number of factors.

MR. ALLEN: Now I heard comments that said that to meet the standards -- and I think those numbers were in the presentation here relative to the range of cost of passenger cost, trip cost for these similar type of systems in federal guidelines that say that I think somewhere in the neighborhood of nine to \$10 a trip in order to meet the threshold of FTA.

You know, that in order to reach that, you couldn't include the bridge option or the New River crossing option as being part of that \$10.

MR. RUDDY: That's our current expectation. And I believe what you're referring to is the FTA, as part of its New Starts Grant application --

MR. ALLEN: Right.

MR. RUDDY: -- policy has a -- a criteria and scoring, you know -- what do you call that -- it's a formula, right, with a number of different

criteria.

There is a cost effectiveness criteria, which is one of many. It has a weighted average score. And to achieve a medium score on the cost effectiveness criteria, your total annualized capital and operating cost per boarding per -- per trip needs to be in a certain range.

At the top of the range, yes, it's \$9.99 for a medium score.

We're going to be struggling to hit that, even if the New River crossing

--

MR. ALLEN: Even if -- without the New River.

MR. RUDDY: -- is outside.

MR. ALLEN: So, I mean, you've got --

MR. RUDDY: So --

MR. ALLEN: -- the New River that -- now defines that that becomes a local cost of the project not subject to availability of federal funds to provide match money.

MR. RUDDY: -- it could still be -- that -- that New River crossing could still qualify for federal funds, but it would not be the New Start Grant. It would be a different funding source.

We're not sure. It could be an earmark, it could be a different grant program, but it would not be included in the FTA grant application that has been spoken about for a New Starts Grant.

It would be packaged separately. And -- and that's what we're currently looking at. That is, we think, going to be the option that maximizes

our score and solves the problem of the cost effectiveness criteria.

But I should simply say that the County has to be responsible stewards of the taxpayers' dollars, including the surtax, obviously. And we're not going to just say, oh, it's -- it's separate and, you know, there's another funding pool that we're just going to build the bridge or the tunnel or whatever.

We have to be careful and responsible and make sure that the cost effectiveness is in an acceptable range.

It might not be the same range that FTA is using. It might be a little bit higher. The score might be medium low. But we don't -- we need to that part of the financial analysis, the financial modeling and the overall financial plan is something that we have not yet completed. It's just -- the cost estimates were literally -- the initial estimates came out last week, so we're kind of at the early stages of determining that and plotting out our next steps, our -- our plan.

And the financial advisor portion of this ask is going to be a very important portion of that. We're bringing in advisors with a lot of experience with these types of transit projects.

MR. ALLEN: Who is the financial advisor that you've selected?

MR. RUDDY: At the moment, we're -- used one of the advisors that's on our bench, which is called PFM, and they have a transit practice which is very well-established, you know. And they're centered up in Chicago, but they have also presence here. They're actually working with Miami-Dade on

some of the transit projects that they have.

MR. ALLEN: I'm familiar with the firm.

And going back to your original comment, as you started your presentation, you pointed out, rightfully so, that this project was never contemplated for surtax funding. And I think that's something that we need to keep that in mind. And --

MR. RUDDY: Yes.

MR. ALLEN: -- you know, you can plan these projects for the next 20 years and during which point in time public sentiment, political sentiment, et cetera, change.

I mean, we saw that with the Wave, that we spent an awful lot of money and a lot of commitments to be subjected to a change in political atmosphere relative -- that killed the project, eventually.

You know, we've got some, you know, pretty tough issues as it relates to our role. I mean, we don't get to vote on the final determination. We can recommend and we determine that it meets the statutes. That's our role, basically.

But we also, I guess, are somewhat guardians of that public purse as it relates to the surtax, and we make a recommendation.

I just -- this is something that's going to be around for a while, and we all need to -- to consider that.

MR. HOOPER: Agreed. Mr. Coolman.

MR. COOLMAN: Yes. It's unfortunate that it wasn't part of the surtax

program, but that's somewhat understandable. I think there's going to be things come down the pike for the next ten, 15, 20 years that weren't ever programmed.

So I have really two questions. One for you, Vincent, and, by the way, I really enjoy your presentation. You're right to the point. Very.

And the second one is for Gretchen over there.

You have a -- you have a request today for 2.35 million, and I think it's a valid request, because I think the County should be using some surtax dollars for it.

But what do you think -- and this is maybe easier than the total cost of the project -- what do you think your ask is going to be over the next -- let's make -- make five years. How much money do you think you're going to come back in here for the surtax?

You can think about that while I ask Gretchen the next question, which is based on our budget and looking at our budget, I know there's some part of discretionary and stuff, and things of this nature. Where does this 2.35 fit into this budget, and how much discretionary income are we having? Are we doing better by -- I know tax collections went down and things, you know.

How we -- how does this 2.35 and what new number Vincent's going to give you fit into the -- our overall budgeting process?

MS. CASSINI: Well, thank you very much, Vice Chair, for the question --

MR. COOLMAN: Take your mask off, please. I'm hard of hearing, but

I'm really hard of hearing with people in masks.

MS. CASSINI: -- thank you for the question, Vice Chair.

So I think, as we mentioned to you during our budget workshop in our presentation to you on the 19th and the 20th, with respect to the fiscal year 2022 budget, our County Administrator and our Budget Director anticipated that there would be the need for a potential surtax investment, because, as I mentioned during our briefings, the County has been absorbing the funding necessary to fulfill our obligations under that Memorandum of Understanding with FDOT since January, when we entered into it.

So they did set money aside in reserves.

In those reserves were a variety of different projects, some of which have come before you today. This is one of those.

And they have been planning for the potential outlay of funding for the commuter rail.

So specifically to this 2.35 million, we have it and we planned for it and we have adequate resources to cover this and then some.

But with respect to how revenues from the sales tax are going, I'm going to have to wait until we have all of the final numbers. I think Ms. Dalley-Johns, when she sent out the finance report, mentioned to you in her email that we're still doing all the close out, we're looking at exactly where we are for '22 versus what we anticipated.

And we're going to be bringing that back to you, hopefully when we meet with you all in January.

MR. RUDDY: And to your question, Vice Chair, I'll just say that I would like to as to be able to come back and answer that question perhaps at your next meeting. We only just started developing the financial model, and I don't think it would be a good idea to start throwing numbers out at this stage.

I mean, you've -- you've asked a question about the New River crossing and the balance. I gave you a really rough kind of starting point.

But one way to look at this is if FTA comes in and approves the grant and it's the typical 50 percent contribution, and FDOT, you know, the state comes in and -- and kicks in another 25 percent, we're at 25 percent of capital costs. That doesn't include the ongoing operation costs, because, yes, there'll be some fare box collection and some other lesser sources of revenue.

But in general, you know, public transit, you all know that it tends to be subsidized, and this will be no exception.

To give you a number of what that subsidy would be over time, it's too early.

MR. COOLMAN: Very acceptable answer.

Just a general comment for the board, I think even though we do not have a final say in everything, there are times when we're going to have to maybe decide on priorities, because there are going to be things that are on the list, there's going to be things that are coming to the list. And sometimes we may be asked to prioritize things.

I happen to think this one is a big priority, regardless of numbers at this point. Just -- that's my -- I think it's very important to this community.

So thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: So -- and -- and this is -- maybe adds to the items to come back with and just something to think about.

I'm definitely curious, not just about cost, but at what point in the process we can kind of establish the viability.

And what I mean by that is, like we mentioned maybe what these negotiations would look like with FEC and Brightline, I think are the parties, right? So will they come to the table? Like at what point will we kind of know that, right?

Because I -- I feel like the risk here could be we get to a certain point and there's just kind of no deal.

And is there a history of there being no deal in situations like this?

Would this be one agreement amongst three parties? How complicated is that?

You know, I'm not really sure, but that -- you know, I feel like they're in a strong position and we kind of need something here.

So just curious about your thoughts in terms of how we spend down this money to build our case.

And then do we have any idea at all as to whether they'll come to the table and want to make this happen?

MR. RUDDY: I am -- with regard to your last question, I am pretty convinced that, yes, Brightline is very interested and they will come to the table. They've been coming to the table and knocking on doors. They did it down in Miami-Dade and they're doing it here with us.

They realize that we have certain limitations. For example, we're not able to formally start negotiations until a much later stage. The FTA does not allow it.

And if we're going to get that -- that federal funds, they don't want to see a track access agreement that's been negotiated and signed ahead of time. That will -- that will prejudice us.

So they've give us -- we're taking onboard that type of advice.

Now, have we had discussions with Brightline? Are we kind of preparing for the day when we can negotiate? Yes, we're doing that.

And I believe several Board members from our Board of Commissioners have inquired about the status of appraisals. Appraisal work has been done. The County itself used its own funds, not surtax funds, but General Funds to cover the cost of appraisal.

So preparatory work is being done and a negotiation strategy will be developed.

But we really need these specialized resources, the engineers, the lawyers, and the financial advisors to become a part of our team so that, you know, in addition to the great work that FDOT's doing more on the technical side, we can really look at this in a more holistic way and address some of

the interests.

But timing-wise, you know, I -- I don't think it's going to be really -- you know, we'll be into summer of next year, I believe, before we really see our ability to kind of have a more clear picture and the viability is more confirmed.

I think the LPA is planned to be confirmed by then, the locally preferred alternative, I should say. And that's where we'll know costs and -- and other factors.

MR. SMITH: Okay. I mean, I want to voice my support for it as part of the board. We need solutions that are not just cars. So hopefully can keep it moving forward.

MR. HOOPER: Ms. Pennant.

MS. PENNANT: Yeah. Real quick. I'm supportive as well.

But I'm just curious to know what are the possibilities, is it high, that we'll get, you know, a good chunk of this infrastructure money to help support this?

MR. RUDDY: It might be better for -- who's making the presentation on the Investment in Infrastructure and Jobs Act?

MS. CASSINI: Mr. Chair, may I?

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, yeah.

MS. CASSINI: I -- we do -- we do have a presentation scheduled from Thorn-Run Partners. We're going to have to do that presentation in this room, because it is a virtual presentation, and we don't have the capacity to do that in our workshop room.

And I think that Mr. Burns is going to talk you through some of the options, but I will just say, based on all the conversations that we've had thus far, until the funders -- until the various agencies actually develop the grant guidelines, the guidance, the eligibility criteria, until we have a better understanding of what some of these new discretionary grant programs are going to look like, it's going to be very difficult for any of us, whether it be County staff or FDOT, to be able to tell you what the chances are of us being able to access those funds are.

MS. PENNANT: Got it.

MR. HOOPER: I appreciate --

MR. ALLEN: You turned it off.

MR. HOOPER: I appreciate the fact that, first of all, the County hired a Chief Negotiator. I love that.

And I also appreciate the fact that we're going to put money into a legal counsel that has expertise in rail and that type of investment.

So I think this is money well spent. And on that, I'll -- let's call the motion.

MS. WALLACE: Okay. And I guess -- I saw Mr. Allen looking at me. It is Chuck's Patornic, the one who negotiated with -- for the port.

Mr. Allen is familiar with the firm and the attorney from a previous port project while he was with the County, so --

MR. COOLMAN: I have just one more question.

MR. ALLEN: We used -- we used them for the Tri- -- or not the Tri-

Rail, the inter --

MS. WALLACE: Intermodal.

MR. ALLEN: -- ICTF, Intermodal Container Transfer Facility, as well as the overpass. And he was very capable and assisted us in those negotiations with FEC at that point in time.

MS. WALLACE: Uh-huh.

MR. ALLEN: And that's -- another point that I continue to make is, yes, passenger traffic and options for mass transit, et cetera, are important, but not forgetting the impact of trains -- or freight on the rail line, and whether double tracking is sufficient to -- to preserve not only commuter rail but also the freight transport, which is going to be even more important in the future.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Is your question, does it have to do with the -- the motion or is it --

MR. COOLMAN: Yeah.

MR. HOOPER: -- more conceptual of the whole --

MR. COOLMAN: Well, I wanted to first of all say I -- I agree with Shea, but I want to ask Gretchen, this --

MR. HOOPER: Go ahead.

MR. COOLMAN: -- this is the first request of surtax dollars for this project that wasn't in the original budget, correct?

MS. CASSINI: Yes. As I mentioned just a few moments ago, we've been using General Funds and in-house staff to perform all of the responsibilities under the PD&E thus far.

MR. COOLMAN: I'll make a **motion** that we pass.

MS. WALLACE: If I might?

MR. HOOPER: Let -- you'll just assume her motion, what she says.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: Motion to approve -- well, first of all, the planning, development, construction, operation, and maintenance of fixed guideway systems are permissible under the statute. And rail is a fixed guideway system, is -- and is permissible under the statute.

So the motion would be to approve as eligible pursuant to 212.055 Florida Statutes the project and expenditures in the not-to-exceed amount of 2.35 million dollars to support the County's planning, development -- planning and development for Broward Commuter Rail Project.

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

MR. HOOPER: Do we have a second?

MS. PENNANT: Second.

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Is there any more comment?

All those in favor?

Those opposed?

Okay. Thank you very much.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

MR. HOOPER: Are we --

MS. CASSINI: Mr. Chair, may I -- may I just explain what will have to -- what will have to happen logistically?

So we have FDOT here in person to do the very next presentation, and then we have a virtual presenter. That's Mr. Greg Burns doing the infrastructure update.

We need to remain in this room in order for him to be able to participate virtually and go through his presentation.

At that point, you can adjourn the regular meeting, because everything else after that is presentations and the retreat, and we can move into the other room. We can eat, we can do the -- the last presentation, I know the MPO is also here in person, so I want to make sure that they have an opportunity.

We can delay one of our presentations, since we are running behind. We can postpone that one and -- and do that at a later time.

MR. HOOPER: So there's only two that have to be done in this room.

MS. CASSINI: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: So let's -- you guys okay going? Okay. Please.

PRESENTATIONS

I - BROWARD COMMUTER RAIL UPDATE, FDOT DISTRICT 4 - MR. STEVE BRAUN AND CONSULTANT TEAM LEADING PD&E STUDY

MS. CASSINI: Okay. So at this time, if I could ask FDOT to come forward.

MR. COOLMAN: I think we're ready, right?

MR. BRAUN: Okay. Yeah. Great. I was going to say good morning,

but good afternoon, everyone. I'm Steve Braun, the Director of Transportation Development with the Florida DOT District 4 Office.

And just piggybacking on that last presentation by Mr. Ruddy, we're going to be giving an update on the Broward Commuter Rail Project.

So, again, we appreciate the opportunity to present and give you an update on this project.

Vince covered a lot of material, obviously, related to this. And I'd like to commend this board for that last action you took.

We sincerely appreciate the partnership with the County and other stakeholders as we're working through this project. And it has been a tremendous partnership per the MOU with the County. And, you know, we're looking forward really to the next steps and continuing the momentum on this project.

You know, I'm going to touch on this slide. Really, and just to reiterate it, a lot of the discussion this morning touched on this as well, just the importance of commuter rail, not only to the community, the County, but -- but the region.

So just a couple of key points here which align a lot with -- with your goals and objectives, as well as other stakeholders' on this project.

So, again, everything from economic and -- and residential growth, development, transit-oriented development came up earlier in a couple of presentations.

Enhancing the quality of life. Right, just providing those mobility

choices for the region and for the County.

Access to employment, you know, things, again, that continue to come up in -- in front of this board and other stakeholders.

You know, being sensitive to the environment.

Providing those travel time choices, improving travel times.

And someone mentioned earlier on something as an alternative to automobile.

So, again, exciting project. We appreciate the partnership with the County.

And with that, I'm going to have it over to Phil Schwab. He's our project manager for this project. And he'll get into some of the details of the project and -- and really bring you up to speed on the latest status and -- and some of the next steps.

So, again, thank you for the opportunity.

MR. SCHWAB: Thank you, Steve.

We're going to do a quick switch of the slides. There was an update we made.

THE COURT REPORTER: Could we get your name one more time, please?

MR. SCHWAB: Phil Schwab.

MS. CASSINI: For the recorder, the spelling of the name is on the very first slide, I believe, the presentation slide. I hope.

THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

MR. SCHWAB: Sorry about that.

All right. Good afternoon again. Again, I'm Phil Schwab, DOT Project Manager for the Broward Commuter Rail Project.

The graphic you see over to the right is the limits of the project, so we actually start in Miami-Dade County at the Aventura Station, and we'll run up to Deerfield Beach.

The Aventura Station and commuter line to the south is actually being done by Miami-Dade County under the Northeast Corridor Project. So they actually got started a couple years ahead of Broward County.

I didn't touch anything.

So they actually got started a couple years before Broward County.

And, ultimately, Palm Beach County, we're looking at commuter rail continuing up there. They're all part of what was done under a study called the Coastal Link, which covered 85 miles of track in all three counties.

Each county's moving forward in different -- different timeframes, with Miami-Dade, again, starting a couple years ago, Broward County now with the MOU, and DOT moving forward this year.

And we expect Palm Beach at some point to be able to move forward as well.

We have identified as part of the study six locations for stations. So we've made technical recommendations.

We've been doing a lot of coordination with FECR. And Vince mentioned it, regarding the rail corridor itself, you have FECR and Brightline

on that corridor, which we do a lot of coordination with them, as well as the Miami-Dade County project team.

So on the corridor, FECR owns the right of way. So they own the right of way. They also run the freight.

Brightline has a passenger rail easement. That easement that they have with them envisions a commuter line coming on as well. So both FECR and Brightline had envisioned that as they worked out that agreement.

We really have to satisfy both. I know you mentioned with Vince's presentation the concern about freight. They will be the number one priority when it comes to ensuring that they're meeting their timeframes and so forth, which is part of the easement that they have with Brightline.

Sorry.

So the environmental study looks at many environmental considerations. The social, the natural, the physical, the cultural. Along the corridor primarily, and you'll see as part of the New River crossing is that we have a Historical Society and areas around the -- centered around the New River. So we have a concentration of cultural aspects with that, but also the social with the different communities, making sure that we have a cohesive project that doesn't separate community but can help bring them together.

Another aspect that we hear a lot about is the east/west traffic. Adding trains, we'll have more grade crossing closures to get those trains across.

Now, it is commuter line, so it's going to move much quicker, similar to

like a Brightline trains. They can move much quicker through those grade crossings versus the freight.

But there will be more trains, so we're -- we've projected traffic, we're going through that, getting that approved now, what the traffic will be in 2045 so that we can analyze what kind of impacts the additional grade crossing closures will have and develop any type of mitigation strategies that are needed if we see any type of concerns.

But that traffic analysis is ongoing, so we'll have that done in the next month or two.

So one of the big things, when we talk about alternatives, it's really centered around the New River crossing.

And I know you talked earlier about that. There -- there's four options that were done at the feasibility study that was done in 2020. One includes a tunnel, and then there's three bridge alternatives. You see those at the lower left.

And those cost ranges are for those alternatives.

So outside of that, as Vince mentioned, you're in -- you have another 25 miles of track and so forth that have to get improvements and stations and so forth, and that's in the ballpark of a 500 to \$600,000,000 outside of that.

So this comparison that we have there, just from the cost standpoint, has a range.

So typically we'll do an estimate on a -- on an alternative, and then we'll look at what if it's 35 percent lower and what if it's 15 percent -- or 35

percent higher and 15 percent lower, I think is the range we kind of put in there.

So that's where that range comes from.

And I'll explain the different alternatives to you in just a minute, but it is a balance.

As you can see from the picture to the right, there's a lot of development going along the corridor.

The freight line there, which you see a blue highlighted line over, is the existing freight line.

And the bridge is actually down.

And the freight line will remain, in all cases, at that level, but these bridge alternatives will be just to -- just to hold the Brightline trains and commuter line trains.

So the freight line, we are coordinating with FECR about shifting that track in order to minimize the impacts around the New River crossing.

This will allow us to get through there without impacting the historic district and help save on some of the right of way that potentially is needed.

To the north, which is the upper left of that picture, you see the Brightline station.

So those alternatives that I -- that you see below, they also include the station, because the station is so close, and because of the geometry, which you're going to see in a minute when I show you the profiles, there -- there's a major impact to that station.

What you'll see is on the mid-level, high-level and tunnel options, it's considerable where the station has to be elevated for the mid-level bridges or it has to be underground 63 feet, I think, underground, for the other.

So it has a big influence on it. So when we talk about those alternative costs, you'll see from this next diagram, which are your profiles, which the blue line on the top, those are profiles.

So if you look at the area where we have MHW, which is mean high water, at the top there, and those different dimension lines just show the distance of the different alternatives, either above that water line or below it.

So we have the tunnel, which needs to go about 66 feet under it, because we have to keep a certain distance from the top of the tunnel to the bottom of the canal. There's a requirement there.

So because of the extension and the profiles that the -- the -- that we have to get the track back up and meet the existing track, it takes quite a distance.

So you can see the tunnel is 3.25 miles, that influence area.

The other things that influence some of the -- the tie-in points and what we can and can't do is the existing track geometry.

If we have horizontal curves, we can't also introduce vertical curves.

So it really creates a lot of challenges when we're working the geometry on that.

But just going back to the alternatives so those are clear, the one that has the least impact is the 25-foot above mean-high water, where we call that

the low-level bascule bridge. So it'll have a bascule bridge.

So the marina industry not supportive of the low-level bridge, because the marinas deal with boats that are mostly greater than 25 feet. So they -- they -- they seem more supportive of mid-level or even the fixed or the tunnel, but they -- they seem to think the mid-level really serves all their needs from a boating standpoint.

And that mid-level is 56 ½ feet above mean high water, and that'll have a bascule bridge, so that'll open and close.

These bridges are anticipated to remain open. Similar to the existing FEC line, it'll remain open until the train comes. Then it'll lower. Train goes by, then it opens again.

And then the high-level goes up to 80 foot, and with that we don't need a bascule bridge, so that can be a fixed bridge so you don't have the openings or closing, and it accommodates all the boats that need to go through there.

The tunnel, of course, it's a little bit longer. It goes 66 feet. The station, in that case, would be underground, just north of Broward Boulevard.

I do want to point out that the -- the tunnel and the mid-level and high-level bridges, all of those bypass the Broward Boulevard road, so from a traffic standpoint, there's less trains that are going to be going through there, so that's -- that's a benefit whenever you have that.

So these are just some of the renderings that were done back at the feasibility study.

And what we've done is also break down the costs a little bit more. I know we provided you ranges on the previous page.

Particularly when it came to the tunnel, we were getting a lot of concerns about the tunnel costs and what we're projecting for tunnel costs. So we have a great amount of detail that's available for anybody who wants to review or look at the cost, scrutinize -- scrutinize the cost. So we want to make that available to anybody.

So we just summarized some of the major items there, which includes the stations and so forth, so that you can kind of see the different impacts each alternative has in that area.

But the stations become a fairly large part of the cost, especially when you look at we're required to have a 25 percent contingency from FTA, so we have that in the cost.

The professional fees go up to about 30 percent of the cost.

So when you look at just the straight construction numbers, they're lower than what the ranges are because within those ranges, we have to include all these additional costs that are true project costs.

So a lot of times, when you talk to contractors, how much does it cost you to build something, they'll tell you a pretty good number, but then when you add in all these other things that have to go with it, the price goes up and up, but.

So we have the mid-level bridge on the bottom there, and a low-level on the top.

And then the graphic on the top here represents a fixed-level bridge.

And then, of course, from the tunnel in that area, you wouldn't -- you wouldn't see anything. The tunnel will be underground.

We have looked at the low-level, I want to just go back. From the feasibility study, we had a 21-foot clearance at the feasibility study, but we're also closing the Himmarshee Road.

We've developed the geometry in a way that we bumped it up to 25 feet. Now we can keep Himmarshee open.

One of the goals of the project team is to improve on any concerns or issues we were having with each one of the alternatives, including the tunnel alternative, where we had a single bore, which was becoming a challenge from a constructability standpoint. Now we are looking at twin bores as part of that tunnel alternative.

So I know you've already talked about cost and cost effectiveness.

The assumptions right now by the -- by the team is that the capital costs would be a split between 50 percent federal funds and 25 percent local and state funds.

The operating costs, though, would have to come from the local source. And that could be generated from fares, some of your local sources, as well as whether there's advertising or sponsorship opportunities.

And then when it comes to the cost effectiveness, I know Vince already covered it fairly well regarding potential for two projects, meaning the New River crossing would have to be a separated out from the cost

effectiveness model in order to rate.

And, again, that's for the New Starts Program, the FTA New Starts. Doesn't mean that the New River crossing can't qualify for other federal funding and so forth, which I think the target would be to keep that 50/25/25 ratio, if possible.

And, of course, with the new infrastructure bill, I think everybody's hopeful that it can help their communities and so forth. So I know there'll be a lot of talk about that and a lot of research on that in order to take advantage of the opportunities that now present themselves.

So as far as our next steps, we're planning a public workshop, alternatives public workshop.

I know we held a workshop specific to the New River crossing last night. We're going to continue working with those stakeholders throughout in order to get these alternatives to a certain point where people can make decisions or opinions to help support and build a consensus to a locally preferred alternative, because that's really the critical part of the project is that if there's consensus for a locally preferred alternative, that allows us to get into FTA's project development. That's when we can start competing for that New Starts money and complete the NEPA study that -- that -- that -- that will be required as part of that.

Moving into what we anticipate, a Public Hearing in the summer or fall of 2022.

And, of course, the County Commission would make that vote on the

LPA.

Ultimately, the MPO will adopt a work program that -- that supports it as well, so they'll have to concur.

And then we expect the PD&E to be completed early 2023, but the final design and -- and -- can start, you know, and overlap with that toward the end of 2022.

With that, I think that was all I had. Okay?

MR. HOOPER: Questions? Mr. Allen, Mr. Coolman after.

MR. ALLEN: I have a technical question as it relates to freight.

There will be, or has been, some ongoing concern, particularly from the maritime interest, as it relates to the existing bascule bridge.

And I know the study assumes that freight continues to operate with the low-level bascule bridge that is in place today, maybe a different alignment or whatever.

There is some -- or I have heard issues as it relates to, well, why don't you put freight on either the mid-level or the high-level or the tunnel.

Technically, can a freight operation operate with those kind of grades?

MR. SCHWAB: No. The freight can't operate with the grades that we're creating --

MR. ALLEN: Okay.

MR. SCHWAB: -- and -- and they will not go in a tunnel, for sure.

I will let you know that we are running operations models. So when we run operations model, we include the freight and we include projected

freight. We include Brightline trains and our own commuter line trains.

Just recently, the Coast Guard approved -- they're -- they're actually a citation or a regulation for the FEC bridge. So they have to keep the bridge open when they can, but they -- they're -- they have to have it open the first ten minutes of every hour.

So that's part of their operations model.

We would suspect that we would fall in line with the commuter line bridge if it turns out to be a bridge. A mid-level bridge or a low-level bridge, we would have to operate under the same circumstances.

And I think from the marina industry, as long as they know what that schedule is, you know, they can plan accordingly.

So we have been working with them.

One of the things that came up last night was the boating industry is just doing tremendous. It is growing and growing. So they're concerned about the overall -- you know, how many more boats are going to be out there and so forth.

So even though a low-level bridge can serve a large percentage of total boats, you know, it could be 90 percent of total boats go under that bridge, the 80 percent that -- 80 percent of the marina traffic is -- is greater than that.

And so they don't want the water jammed up with all these boats when they are trying to get through as well.

So they bring up different points like that for us to consider as we

move forward.

MR. ALLEN: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: Doug.

MR. COOLMAN: Yeah, you had stated early on that there'll be no -- the freight will still go at grade.

Obviously, based on the profiles you have here, the freight train cannot go in the tunnel.

If the tunnel was longer, though, the freight can go in a tunnel, but not the one you're studying right now, correct?

MR. SCHWAB: No, in discussions with FECR, who runs the freight, they said they will not go in a tunnel, period.

MR. COOLMAN: Well, I'm a little confused, because they run tunnels with trains in them all over the rest of the world, number one.

Number two, they cannot operate at this profile, I agree.

MR. SCHWAB: Yeah.

MR. COOLMAN: And it would probably make the tunnel twice as long, which would be great for the east/west traffic. Maybe we can't afford it, but that's a point.

One thing's always bugged me. How many freight trains a day, how many Brightline trains a day projected, and how many commuter trains -- trains a day in the next -- give me an average over the next five years, because, obviously, they're going to go up.

I'm just curious. It's the first time I've heard that the Coast Guard

requires it to be open for only ten minutes, which is interesting.

MR. SCHWAB: They want a fixed schedule for the bridge, and so it's open ten minutes of the first hour from, I think, nine -- 5:00 a.m. -- I don't -- I'll have to pull up the regulation, but there's a certain time period that they have to have it open.

And it's the first ten minutes -- well, actually, it's ten minute -- a schedule for ten minutes of an hour, and then between the hours of noon and 2:00, they have to have two -- an additional ten-minute/hour or it's --

MR. COOLMAN: For -- for the --

MR. SCHWAB: -- an additional --

MR. COOLMAN: -- boats.

MR. SCHWAB: -- ten minutes --

MR. COOLMAN: For the boats.

MR. SCHWAB: -- for the boats.

MR. COOLMAN: So the -- maybe the simpler question is when we have all three of these going across, can you have all of the trains and still meet that requirement?

MR. SCHWAB: Yes.

MR. COOLMAN: So, in theory, you don't need either the bridge or the tunnel.

MS. PENNANT: No, that's not right.

MR. SCHWAB: I'm not sure I'm following your question.

MR. COOLMAN: Well, if you're telling me that all the trains in these

things can all go through there and -- with the exception of they can't use it for the ten minutes an hour, and we can still accommodate all the trains with that existing bridge --

MR. HOOPER: That's not what he said.

MR. SCHWAB: That's not -- that's not what I'm saying.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay.

MR. SCHWAB: I'm saying the existing bridge has a requirement that they must have it open, open to boats --

MR. COOLMAN: Right.

MR. SCHWAB: -- ten minutes of every hour.

MR. COOLMAN: Yes.

MR. SCHWAB: And between the hours of noon and 2:00, they have to have an additional ten minutes.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay. With that requirement, the freight that's going over there seems to work. Some of the Brightline seems to work, but there're going to be more. And the commuter rail, we don't know.

But my question is in that 50 minutes in a typical hour, can we accommodate all the rail traffic or not? Do we have to have the -- have to have the bridge?

I'm just asking a --

MR. HOOPER: You've got to have to do --

MR. SCHWAB: Well --

MR. HOOPER: -- the commuter. To do the new commuter, you have

to have it.

MR. COOLMAN: Well, wait a minute. Wait a minute.

MR. SCHWAB: -- well, I understand what you're saying.

MR. COOLMAN: Yeah. I mean, I'm not running these trains at the same time on the track. They obviously have to have time in between them.

But for 50 minutes, how many trains can you run through that opening?

MR. SCHWAB: Right. Well, you've got to remember, these trains have to stop and -- and --

MR. COOLMAN: I --

MR. SCHWAB: -- at the stations and -- and so forth. So from an operational standpoint, you may be able to show that it could work, but the projected trains that --

MR. COOLMAN: Okay.

MR. SCHWAB: -- we have to project for --

MR. COOLMAN: Another way to think about it is we're at 20 percent capacity or 40 percent capacity today, and if you had all this, we'd be at 200 percent capacity.

So you're saying we have to have a relief valve.

MR. SCHWAB: Yes.

MR. COOLMAN: When do you think you have to have that relief valve?

MR. SCHWAB: I don't think we've tried to project that, because

typically the trains on Day 1 most likely will run similar to what they do in 2045, from a commuter line standpoint, so that you can have 60-minute headways, you know, off peak, and 30-minute headways during peak hours.

So you may have trains that are fuller as you go into the future, but you'll probably have the -- still the same amount of trains.

MR. COOLMAN: All right. I'll --

MR. SCHWAB: If that helps.

MR. COOLMAN: -- I'll -- I'm -- I'll ask my questions at another meeting, not this one, but I -- I -- I was just shocked to find -- I found out that trains can go through a tunnel if it grades properly.

You're telling me that the FEC won't put their train in a tunnel, which is the first time I've ever heard that.

MR. HOOPER: It's their track.

MR. COOLMAN: I'm not saying it isn't their track, Phil.

MR. HOOPER: They just don't want to do it. They don't want to do it. It's their track, and they don't want to do it.

Am I right about that?

MR. COOLMAN: I don't know that we could even afford it --

MS. CASSINI: Well it wouldn't be us building it.

MR. COOLMAN: -- if they wanted to do it.

MR. HOOPER: But it's a no -- non-starter.

So I was there yesterday. I learned a lot. It was a good workshop.

And, you know, there are times when I -- the -- the tunnel, it -- it -- it --

the intent of the tunnel is good, because it -- it's looking at our city in -- in a long term.

And I know that the Mayor of Fort Lauderdale has been pushing it, and he cares about the consequences of doing something that might affect a city long-term. And then you decide -- you've done it, and then you think, oh, my God, what did we do.

So I am on the same page with him on that.

And I'm saying this now because we're all here and we represent the community. And this is a -- this city is our County hub. It -- it's our -- it -- it's where a lot of people work. It's a big generator for economic development for tourism and when people come into our downtown.

So I think we need to be super careful as to how we move forward.

And money, although it has to be one of the considerations, so does the quality and value of our County seat.

So -- and so as I was looking at it, there were some comments that were made. I think one of the Commissioners made a comment where if it's one on top -- if it's a bridge, a 56-foot bridge, it's only 40-something feet to come down. And if it's a tunnel, you've got to come out of the ground, you've got to take some sort of elevator or some way to get up.

But I -- honestly, I don't know if that -- to me, it doesn't make much of a difference, because you can take an escalator -- you're going to have to take an escalator up or you're going to have to take an escalator down, and everything that comes up must go down type thing.

So -- and you're going to have to improve the station no matter what to accommodate whatever it is we do.

When I sat through the aesthetic part of it, it seemed pretty clear that the taller and the more slender the bridge, the aesthetic -- more aesthetically pleasing it is.

And I just feel like if we don't do the tunnel, that taller bridge, you're going to get a hundred percent of the boats are going to go over it -- under it.

You're not going to need a -- a -- a -- what's it called? A bascule?

MR. SCHWAB: A bascule bridge or --

MR. HOOPER: That's --

MR. SCHWAB: -- or --

MR. HOOPER: -- bascule.

MR. SCHWAB: -- like a bridge tender --

MR. HOOPER: It --

MR. SCHWAB: -- operation.

MR. HOOPER: -- it looks very modern and very -- so I'm supportive, personally, of the tunnel or the 86-foot bridge. I just think it's going to -- and the higher you get, the less you separate out two neighborhoods, west and east, right?

And I just think it treats our downtown, it treats our neighborhoods that are surrounding it in a more clear and unobtrusive way.

So -- but I do think that we need to support this, and when they do come to us and ask for our support, I think this is one of the biggest things

that we will be doing when it comes to transportation, along with some of the east/west stuff that we're going to be doing in the future.

And it's super important that we support this.

And I really appreciate the work that you guys are doing. And, you know, I hope we can get this thing on its way.

MS. PENNANT: Mr. Chair? A quick --

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

MS. PENNANT: -- question. And you may have touched on this, and this may sound a little naïve, but the underground tunnel concept, does the water table affect that in any way, shape, or form? You hear about, you know --

MR. SCHWAB: Yeah, sea level rise?

MS. PENNANT: -- no, it doesn't? Sea level rising.

MR. SCHWAB: Actually, sea level rise came up last night in the meeting, which is a good point, and we'll continue to work on that and let everybody know how that may or may not affect any of the alternatives.

They're -- they -- they brought it up more from a how many boats can pass under a bridge if the -- if the water's now four feet higher and that type of stuff.

As far as sea level rise, when it contains -- you know, a tunnel's in the water table anyhow. So it's more at the portals where -- where the tunnel comes up whether you have to provide extra protection.

You know, if you're going to come up in an area that tends to flood and

you normally have, you know, protection around there that would prevent waters from getting into the tunnel area, you -- you -- they may have to be higher walls. I don't -- I -- I don't know.

We haven't looked at it in that kind of detail yet, but that's what I would anticipate as far as sea level rise --

MS. PENNANT: Okay.

MR. SCHWAB: -- and tunnels.

MR. HOOPER: I'll tell you that concrete that they're making, the mixes now, are self-healing, so when cracks occur --

THE COURT REPORTER: Microphone, Mr. Chair.

MR. COOLMAN: You turned it off.

MR. HOOPER: -- nowadays, the concrete that they're doing when they make a tunnel or a piling that is used for a bridge, it has a -- -- it's called -- one of the mixes is called Penetron, but it's got a -- a crystalline mixture that fixes cracks and doesn't allow water to come through.

And there's really advanced technology -- as it goes -- as it -- as concrete. Right? Am I right or wrong about that?

MR. SCHWAB: Yeah, I mean, the tunnels go through water tables all the time. So --

MR. HOOPER: Yeah.

MR. SCHWAB: -- so it's going underwater anyhow. I -- I think the sea level rise aspect of it is more the type of pressures that you would get and whether they can withstand that, and then also at the portals where you

would have flooding that could impact or have to have, you know, continuously.

They'll have pumps in those tunnels anyhow --

MR. HOOPER: Yeah. Right.

MR. SCHWAB: -- that'll pump water out. Like rainwater still gets in it and -- and just water and --

MR. HOOPER: It's amazing.

MR. SCHWAB: -- so forth. So they'll have to pump that out regardless.

MR. COOLMAN: Mr. Chair?

MR. HOOPER: Does anybody -- Yes, sir.

MR. COOLMAN: My comments were not that I didn't support a tunnel or a bridge. I do.

MR. HOOPER: Right.

MR. COOLMAN: My comment was trying to figure out when the existing facility is going to be overburdened and how soon we have to get something done, because we're going to -- we have the freight, we're going to have Brightline. We're trying to have the commuter rail.

And eventually, if we don't do something, we're going to have a log jam. That's what I was trying to figure out.

And I -- I haven't got an answer.

MR. HOOPER: Does the commuter rail --

MR. COOLMAN: I don't --

MR. HOOPER: -- happen if we don't fix the bridge or the tunnel alternative?

MR. SCHWAB: Does --

MR. HOOPER: The commuter, the Coastal Link, that doesn't happen unless we do the bridge or the --

MR. SCHWAB: Yeah, you have to have a New River --

MR. HOOPER: -- so --

MR. SCHWAB: -- crossing.

MR. HOOPER: -- it's not changing until --

MR. SCHWAB: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: -- we come --

MR. COOLMAN: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: -- up with a --

MR. COOLMAN: So --

MR. HOOPER: -- alternative.

MR. COOLMAN: All right. And it's going to be a few years, even if -- if we had a decision today, it'd be a long time before we have something physically in place.

MR. HOOPER: That's right.

MR. COOLMAN: So that's where I was trying to find. Thank you.

MR. SCHWAB: Yeah, it it would not go operational north of the river until --

MR. HOOPER: Right.

MR. SCHWAB: -- the additional crossing was in place.

MR. COOLMAN: In fact, that's -- may have to happen just based on timeframe.

MR. SCHWAB: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: Are there any other questions? Okay. Thank you very much --

MR. SCHWAB: Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: -- for your effort. Really appreciate it.

MR. SCHWAB: Thanks.

II - FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE UPDATE, THORN-RUN PARTERS - MR.

GREG BURNS

MR. HOOPER: Do we have one more -- okay.

MS. CASSINI: One more.

MR. HOOPER: I'm getting hungry.

MS. CASSINI: Greg? Greg, can you confirm that you can speak? I just want to make sure that we can all hear you.

Greg, are you on the conference line?

So he confirmed to me that he was on and that he could hear us, but I'm not sure that we can hear him.

Can anybody in the booth help with technical issue here?

MR. BURNS: Gretchen, can you hear me now?

MS. CASSINI: Great. There he is. Okay.

So, Mr. Burns, go right ahead.

And if you'll just let me know when you'd like me to advance your slides, please.

MR. BURNS: Sure. Thanks. And apologies for the delay. I had to hit some key thing on my end.

Anyway, good afternoon, everybody. Sorry to continue to force you to sit in this room for longer than you may have planned to do, but I'm here to provide you all with a legislative update this -- or this afternoon in primarily the infrastructure package.

Next slide, please.

So this bill, the -- now known as the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, the IIJA, which, as someone may have mentioned earlier, is going to be quite the mouthful for the next couple of years, became law on Monday afternoon at about 3:00 o'clock.

I think when I wrote this slide, it had not yet been signed into law, but we anticipated that it would be at that time.

It is now a -- or finally a 1.2 trillion dollar bill that includes two main parts. And it's really important that we begin to understand some of these details, because I think they're really going to help you inform discussions that you all have about a variety of federal funding for needs in the future.

The two main components are roughly half of the bill is an extension of surface transportation law that we've had before, which most recently has been known as the FAST Act.

So that is really considered to be sort of baseline spending, continuing

what we've done before.

Now, granted, this 1.2 trillion dollar bill does include a boost in spending compared with the past surface transportation bill, the FAST Act, but it is still a continuation of the existing programs. So I think that's important to note.

There is about \$550,000,000,000 in additional investment that this bill also makes, the IIJA. So that's where the new money comes from.

Keep in mind that this is meant to be a five-year bill, or it, frankly, is a five-year bill. So there is about \$110,000,000,000 per year.

Looking ahead, this gives you a good -- this next slide gives you a good picture of what the infrastructure proposal that President Biden initially proposed looks like compared with what was eventually passed in the final bill.

You'll see that much of it was cut out and much of what remained got smaller.

Remember that President Biden initially proposed 2.6 trillion dollars in infrastructure investment and that Congress ultimately passed a 1.2 trillion dollar bill, but only included 550,000,000,000 in new spending.

So it's roughly one-fifth of the initial proposal that the president made.

Next slide, please.

So of that -- of the new spending, more than half of that is for transportation, which obviously is good for you. It's for both roads, but it's also for transit. And we'll talk a little bit more about that in a moment.

It's really key to note that of the new spending, more than one-third will be actually granted by DOT via competitive applications.

This is new. It wasn't that long ago, before, really, the TIGER Grant program, that almost a hundred percent of federal funding for transportation was -- at least surface transportation, was provided at formula funding to states and -- there was very little ability to go after discretionary funds.

That is beginning to change, as you can see through this bill, where about a third of that new spending on transportation, about \$105,000,000,000 over five years, will be granted.

So right now Keith Gudrey(phonetic) and the administration are going to have a say in how these funds are doled out, but it's also important to keep in mind that this is a five-year bill, so that the new -- there could be a new administration in three years that would end up implementing the final two years of this bill.

So I think whatever this administration prioritizes is important to take note of for the next three years, but after that, there could be, hypothetically, another administration that would change priorities.

I think it's important also to note that, really, this bill is not as transformational as originally envisioned.

President Biden had really focused on greening the transportation sector significantly and also doing a lot more in the sort of environmental justice realm.

This bill really doesn't do as much of that. It kind of maintains the

status quo. It maintains a lot of the same programs. It maintains, you know, people in wherever -- whatever state in the country maybe able to simply -- excuse me -- build new highways without reevaluating other investments that they might be able to make in order to not build those new highways.

So, again, not as transformational.

I think that, while there's a lot of winners in this bill, I think that rail is the biggest, probably, and that's less important to you, but that -- that money will primarily flow to Amtrak and I think much of it will be spend in the Northeast Corridor.

And last but not least, a key takeaway is that this is not the Obama era stimulus bill.

We've already talked about how it's a five-year bill.

It's -- there is no focus on job creation or putting people back to work.

Instead, people are trying to invest in the best and smartest investments.

So with respect to the surface transportation programs, there are about a -- well, I think about 15 new programs that will be created that are discretionary grant programs that will have opportunities for competitive grants.

I think you all are familiar with, for instance, the recently passed American Rescue Plan, that did provide money for state and local governments.

Just to give you a -- an idea of how the process is to develop new

programs, that bill included maybe two, three pages of legislative text to provide this funding to state and local governments. Broward County's a recipient, as are all communities across the country.

We then had Treasury put out 45 pages of guidance, followed by 20 pages of frequently asked questions, roughly.

And then they took public comment on the guidance, and they're still finalizing that guidance now, eight, nine months after the fact.

So it's going to take some time for DOT to set these new programs up, so we're going to have time to plan and prepare.

But they're going to be focused on a lot of different transformational projects, certainly safety, resiliency, some carbon reductions, et cetera, et cetera.

And then I think it goes without saying that some the existing programs that you are familiar with, RAISE/BUILD/TIGER, which is all the same program, just under different names under different administrations, that's going to continue to exist, but with more funding, as is the -- the INFRA program.

Next slide, please.

With respect to transit funding, this is key, because this is the new start funding that you've heard about through the Capital Investment Grant Program because of all the discussion just prior to me about the Broward Commuter Rail Project.

So transit funding is also a pretty significant winner. Broadly speaking,

there is about a 63 percent increase in funding from current levels under the FAST Act.

There are increases in formula and grant programs. So, for example, one of the primary formula programs is the 5307 program. You'll see that Miami, the UZA, which you're a part of, received \$173,000,000 in fiscal year 2021, but by 2026, that will actually go up by about \$70,000,000, which is a very significant increase.

So just locally, in terms of formula funding, you all will be seeing more.

And then importantly again, this Capital Investment Grant program will have a tremendously larger amount of money to help support Broward Commuter Rail and any other programs that you might try to pursue through the CIG program.

Next slide, please. Sorry, you're already there.

So what's -- what do -- what to expect next. You know, we've already heard, for instance, that the Department of Energy is apparently going to hire a thousand new employees. I would imagine the Department of Transportation is probably going to have to do something similar.

It's likely that even FDOT, for instance, will have to hire new people. I mean, the amount of money coming to FDOT is going to increase immediately, just for traditional surface transportation by about \$500,000,000 in a year. And that's aside from the discretionary funds.

So a lot of additional money will be flowing to the state, a lot of additional money will be flowing locally for transit investments. And that's

going to take manpower and people.

Not only is it going to take some hiring on the construction end, I'm sure, as well.

So if there are existing grant opportunities like the RAISE program, for instance, like the INFRA program with new funding, I would anticipate the administration will be able to turn out those programs pretty quickly.

They actually just released the prior round of RAISE grants. They made the announcements today with respect to which projects were funded.

For new grant opportunities, and I mentioned there were, you know, 12 to 15 new opportunities that will be available over the next five years, it's going to take some time to develop those. Could require public participation. So that'll give us a chance to sort of weigh in as appropriate on -- on helping DOT shape some of these programs.

But there will be a lot to do.

And, again, I think the final point I'd make is just remember it's a five-year bill. Funding is not going to come out all at once.

Again, in terms of transportation -- or in terms of overall new spending under the bill, that \$550,000,000,000, that averages out to, you know, 110,000,000,000 per year.

So it is going to come out over the next five years. So, you know, not everything needs to be done and/or ready to go today.

We have time to help get you all in a good spot to compete for these funds over the next several years.

So with that, happy to any -- answer any questions you may have and appreciate your time.

MS. PENNANT: Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Does anybody have any questions?

No more -- okay.

Well, thank you very much for all the information. We really appreciate it.

MR. BURNS: Happy to share. Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

ADJOURN NOVEMBER 19, 2021 MEETING

MR. HOOPER: All right. So we're going to head over to the -- I forget the --

MS. WALLACE: We're going to adjourn the regular meeting, right, and then the rest of it will be in the workshop.

MR. HOOPER: Sorry?

MS. WALLACE: So we are adjourning the regular meeting --

MR. HOOPER: Okay. Yes.

MS. WALLACE: -- of the Oversight Board, and we'll resume in an other -- in Room 430, where we'll begin the workshop.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, and we'll probably do one or two presentations that we missed, and -- and that'll be part of the workshop --

MS. WALLACE: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: -- correct? Okay.

Very good.

MS. WALLACE: Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Thanks.

(THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 1:02 P.M.)