

MINUTES

INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION SURTAX OVERSIGHT BOARD

May 2, 2025

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Phil Allen, Retired, Finance

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

*Arrived at 9:48 a.m.

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

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

*Left meeting at 1:36 p.m.

Erdal Donmez, Former City or County Manager

Raymond McElroy, Public Transportation Consumer

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

Ronald Frazier, Architecture

MEMBERS ABSENT:

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

Also Present:

Nathaniel Klitsberg, Surtax General Counsel, Broward County Attorney's Office

Gretchen Cassini, Board Coordinator

Roy Burnett, Program Project Coordinator

Sandy-Michael McDonald, Broward County Office of Economic and Small Business Development

Greg Burns, Thorn-Run Partners

Marty Cassini, Broward County Office of Intergovernmental Affairs

Alexandra Lopez, Kent Walia, Lissy La Paix Puello & Peter Haliburton - FDOT District 4

Scott Bassett & MS. McINTYRE, RSM

Barney McCoy, Assistant General Manager, Service and Strategic Planning, Broward County Transit

Rasem Awwad, Director, Traffic Engineering, Broward County

A meeting of the Independent Transportation Surtax Oversight Board, Broward County, Florida, was held at One North University Drive, First Floor Boardroom, Plantation, Florida 33324 at 9:30 a.m., Friday, May 2, 2025.

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

CHAIR COOLMAN: We're going to start a few minutes late. May 2, 2025, 9:36 a.m. Transportation Surtax Oversight Board regular meeting. We'll call to order. Roll call, please.

Roll Call – Program Project Coordinator, Roy Burnett

MR. BURNETT: Good morning, everybody. Alan Hooper? Alan Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: What? Oh! Here.

MR. BURNETT: Anthea Pennant?

MS. PENNANT: Here. Good morning.

MR. BURNETT: Good morning. Douglas Coolman?

CHAIR COOLMAN: Here. Thank you.

MR. BURNETT: Erdal Donmez?

MR. DONMEZ: Here.

MR. BURNETT: Thank you. MR. ALLEN?

MR. ALLEN: Here.

MR. BURNETT: Raymond McElroy?

MR. MCELROY: Here.

MR. BURNETT: Ronald Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: Here.

MR. BURNETT: Thank you. Shea Smith is absent, and MS. MADDEN will be here shortly. Thank you.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Thank you. Gretchen, do we have anyone from the public that wants to speak this morning?

MS. CASSINI: We do not have anyone signed up from for the public to speak this morning.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Do we have anyone from the cities that would like to speak this morning? That hasn't even signed up? Nobody from the City today? Okay. Or nobody that wants to speak. All right, with that, moving to regular agenda ---

MR. KENNEDY: This is Carl Kennedy from the City of Pembroke Pines.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Should we move on to the regular agenda?

MS. CASSINI: There is someone on.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Ah, someone online.

MS. CASSINI: Hi, Carl. Thank you so much. So, Carl Kennedy is here from the City of Pembroke Pines on the Action Item related to Action Item #3, related to the conversion. Thank you, Carl.

MR. KENNEDY: Okay, no presentation, just here to answer questions.

MS. CASSINI: Thank you so much. Sorry, Mr. Chair.

Motion to Approve Minutes of the February 28, 2025 Oversight Board Meeting

CHAIR COOLMAN: That is fine. Can I have a motion to approve the minutes of the February 28, 2025, Oversight Board meeting?

UNKNOWN: Move to approve.

CHAIR COOLMAN: All in favor?

ALL: Aye.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Anyone opposed? Motion passes.

(Inaudible)

Motion to Note for the Record 3. Motion to Approve FY 2024 Financial Audit of the Surtax Fund

CHAIR COOLMAN: Then we have a motion to note for the record the 2024 financial audit surtax fund.

MS. CASSINI: Mr. Chair, could you put your mic on, please?

CHAIR COOLMAN: Sorry about that. I said we have a motion to note for the record the 2024 financial audit of the surtax fund report.

MS. CASSINI: The auditors are here. We have individuals representing the accounting division as well as RSM that will be making the presentation. Please come forward and introduce yourself.

MR. BASSETT: Is this on?

MR. BASSETT: Good morning. My name is Scott Basset. I'm a partner with RSM with me is Ashley McIntyre and we performed the audit for the surtax funds for September 30th, 2024. This morning we're going to go through our required -- our required communications to you as the Board, the results of the audit, a clean, unmodified

opinion on the statements this year. And with that, Ashley can go through our required communications, open it up for any questions that you may have about our process.

MS. McINTYRE: Good morning, everyone. If you could, turn to page one. We'll go into the plan, scope and timing of the audit.

MR. BASSETT: There's two booklets that you have.

MS. McINTYRE: Oh, this is the communication -- the transportation surtax program of Broward County, Florida, our communications letter, which is on the screen now. So, we previously issued a separate communication, a letter dated November 19, 2024, regarding the scope and the timing of the audit and we identified the significant risk at that time as it relates to our accounting policies and practices. Management selected the preferable accounting practice as it relates to adoption or changes in accounting policies. There have not been any changes in existing significant policies that we identified during the audit. As it relates to significant accounting policies, we did not identify any significant policies in controversial or emerging areas. We also did not identify any significant unusual transactions. We deemed the accounting estimates identified during our testing to be reasonable. There were no audit adjustments or uncorrected misstatements.

And we'll turn to page two, which covers our observation about the audit process. We had no disagreements with management and there was no consultant with any other accountants. We had no significant issues that we discussed with management and there were no significant matters that required consultation. And then, this last section just goes over our shared responsibility for independence. And then on page three, we're

going to our significant written communications between management with you and our firm, which you'll find in Appendix A. That letter was signed by management. And lastly, we have our significant accounting estimates. So, we identified the fair value of investments as a significant accounting estimate, and during our testing, we concluded that the values recorded were reasonable. So, credit to management for another smooth audit and thank you. Is there any questions?

CHAIR COOLMAN: Does anyone have any questions?

I guess I have one. How do we stand with our projections versus what we actually collected? Because to me, that's kind of the bottom line of it, I think.

MR. BASSETT: So your budget results, basically --

CHAIR COOLMAN: In other words, "We have so much, we project so much, we spend so much." How are we doing to what our projections were?

MR. BASSETT: In your financial statements, there is a schedule for the year. You know, what you budgeted and what the actual revenues were and the expenditures were. So, from a surtax -- transportation surtax, you had budgeted, you know, 500 million and 536 million came in. So, you were to the good for \$36 million. We had some interest income that's not budgeted for. So, I guess to sum it up, your revenues came in 120 million over - more than expected. Your total budget was 476 and the actual was 597. And from an expenditure standpoint, you had -- you spent, in the current year about 155, but you transferred out 679. So, on page nine is the budgetary summaries that you can look at, just from a snapshot of October 1st through September 30th for the year. And

then at the conclusion of that, you have your fund balance which is the excess revenues over expenditures since the start of the program.

CHAIR COOLMAN: So, oversimplified, we are on target?

MR. BASSETT: I don't know the management plan, but this is a point in time. And as of September 3rd, 2024, you did have a fund balance of 781 million in that fund. So, how the money is spent is based on timing and things, but you know, as you're budgeting and what your projections are impact that financial --

CHAIR COOLMAN: Gretchen, do you feel happy with that?

MS. CASSINI: I am sorry --

CHAIR COOLMAN: Do you feel happy with that? This is a little out of my league, so I am just trying to --

MS. CASSINI: I try not to have any emotion about that. It is -- what you're seeing is an audit. Right? And what you're asking about, I think, Mr. Chair, is more budget and projections, which is not exactly what they are looking at. But when we bring you the budget in August, we always do talk to you about projections and forecasts and how we're doing. At the moment through 2024, we've been doing very well.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Okay. Anyone else?

MR. KLITSBERG: Mr. Chairman, sir? This item is more, I guess, later on in the meeting when we talk about the performance audit that we have directed the County to perform on the activities of the Board. And I just wanted to bring it up here, making a distinction between the financial audit and the performance audit

that will be forthcoming, hopefully. And we need some status, I think, this afternoon as to where that may be. That is all. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MR. BASSETT: Thank you. Thank you very much. Have a great day.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Althea?

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: Oh, no, I just wanted to say thanks.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Thank you, very much.

MS. MCINTYRE: Have a nice day.

MR. BASSETT: We appreciate it. Thank you.

Motion to Approve FY 2024 Financial Audit of the Surtax Fund the City of Pembroke Pines' request to convert \$132,938 in recommended Cycle 1 funding from a planning phase to a design phase for municipal capital project PPIN-039

CHAIR COOLMAN: Now we have a motion to approve the City of Pembroke Pines request to convert \$132,938 in recommended in Cycle 1 Funding from a planning phase to a design phase for municipal capital projects. I'm glad to see Cycle 1 funding being spent. Is someone here from Pembroke Pines or did we not need that today?

MS. CASSINI: So, Mr. Kennedy, Carl Kennedy, that introduced himself earlier, he's here to take any questions that you all might have, but I'm happy to -- through the chair, I'm happy to walk through what the request is, if you'd like. So, the city of Pembroke Pines is requesting to convert planning phase funding of approximately \$133,000 into a design phase. This is a municipal capital project that was recommended in Cycle 1. They

have been in the process of completing their checklist so that they can get under agreement and they determined that they did not need the planning phase funding, that they would prefer to roll that funding into a design phase so that they can get under agreement, begin the design, which was actually programmed this fiscal year in 2025. They have construction funding that has been programmed in our five-year municipal plan and that is, as you can see there, for \$3.7 million and that is expected to be programmed -- I'm sorry, appropriated in the next fiscal year. Mr. Kennedy, would you like to add anything about the project?

MR. KENNEDY: It's a replacement project in a portion of the city. It covers about a third of the area that we were planning on putting sidewalks in. So -- and they just started construction, so we're right on schedule now.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Alan?

MR. HOOPER: So, are we paying for the full amount of this project? Soup to nuts? Design, construction -- does the surtax pay for everything?

MS. CASSINI: So, the surtax was originally expected to pay for everything, planning through construction. What you're hearing is that the City doesn't need the planning funding. They'd like to roll it forward into other phases, which implies that the City has covered the planning costs themselves. But I would have to defer to Mr. Kennedy to confirm that on the record.

MR. HOOPER: What I heard was they forego the planning side. That is what I heard.

CHAIR COOLMAN: No, I think, they paid for the planning side.

MR. HOOPER: What was the planning side?

CHAIR COOLMAN: Huh?

MR. HOOPER: Okay, so if they didn't do the planning side --

CHAIR COOLMAN: No, they did.

MR. HOOPER: They did.

CHAIR COOLMAN: But they paid for it themselves.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

CHAIR COOLMAN: So, they're moving the funds that they would have spent of surtax later on if they need them, and if they don't need them, that gets credited back, some of it.

MR. HOOPER: Okay, but is the design amount still \$531,000?

MS. CASSINI: The design amount will increase by 132,938.

MR. HOOPER: How much does it cost to do the design?

MS. CASSINI: Well, again, it will be whatever --. So, they have access to the full amount, but if it doesn't cost that much, it rolls to the next phase, and then if construction doesn't require that funding, they return the money to the program. We've been receiving quite a bit of returned money back from municipal projects.

MR. HOOPER: Okay, thank you.

CHAIR COOLMAN: I think it's a pretty good thing. I would ask for a motion to approve.

MR. ALLEN: Move to approve.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Do I have a second?

MS. PENNANT-WALLACE: I'll second.

CHAIR COOLMAN: All in favor?

ALL: Aye.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Anyone opposed?

(Inaudible)

Selection of Oversight Board Chair and Vice-Chair

CHAIR COOLMAN: Now, selection of Oversight Board Chair and Vice Chair.

MR. KLITSBERG: Mr. Chair, your microphone is off again.

CHAIR COOLMAN: I did not want anyone to hear that, right? The selection of the Board Chair and Vice Chair. It's been two years, I guess, huh? I don't feel I should comment. Someone needs to.

MR. HOOPER: What's the process? Do we nominate people?

MS. CASSINI: Yes, sir.

MR. HOOPER: Can I nominate Anthea Pennant for the Chair's position?

MS. CASSINI: Do you have a second?

CHAIR COOLMAN: Second.

MR. KLITSBERG: Are there any other nominations?

MS. CASSINI: You need to get on the mic.

MR. KLITSBERG: I'm sorry. Doing it myself. So, no other nominations for Chair?

MS. PENNANT WALLACE: Thank you for the nomination.

MS. CASSINI: She's interested in service.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Seeing no other nominations, I will call for a vote for Anthea for Chair. All in favor?

ALL: Aye.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Any opposed? Thank you. We need to move on to Vice Chair. Do we have any nominations from the floor?

MR. MCELROY: Who is our current Vice Chair?

MR. HOOPER: Anthea is our Vice Chair.

MS. MADDEN: I'll just say I'm interested in serving as Vice Chair.

CHAIR COOLMAN: I didn't hear that.

MR. MCELROY: I'll nominate Debbie, then. Can she self-nominate? I'll nominate Debbie as Vice Chair.

MR. HOOPER: I'll second that.

MS. MADDEN: I nominated myself.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Any other nominations --

MR. ALLEN: Move to close the nominations for Vice Chair.

CHAIR COOLMAN: Pardon?

MR. ALLEN: Move to close the nominations for Vice Chair.

MR. HOOPER: Second.

CHAIR COOLMAN: I did not hear all of that. Do we have two nominations?

MS. CASSINI: No, you had one nomination. You had one nomination of Ms. Madden for the Vice Chair. And then MR. ALLEN moved to close the nominations and there was a second. So, now you may take a vote.

CHAIR COOLMAN: All those in favor of the vice chair?

ALL: AYE.

CHAIR COOLMAN: All opposed? Hearing none, congratulations.

MR. KLITSBERG: Both of you.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: All right, I love this. This is great.

MR. COOLMAN: Does this mean that I get to step down? Oh, okay.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Right away?

UNKNOWN: Just hand her the gavel.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Oh, my goodness. Wow. Just like that. All right.

MS. CASSINI: You'll have to turn your mic on, though.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Wow. This is historic, I think. So first of all, I want to thank all of you for nominating me and having faith in my abilities to chair this Board. I look forward to a very productive year, the next two years at least, and to speeding through our agenda as much as we can, as efficiently as we can. I am grateful to have you, Debbie, as my Vice Chair and I look forward to continuing to work with all of you. Debbie, I don't know if you want to say a few words, but --

MS. MADDEN: Thanks, Anthea. I look forward to supporting you and the rest of the Board.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Wonderful. So, let me adjust myself to this new role and move forward with moving this agenda forward. We have selection of the Oversight Chair, Vice Chair. And I think our next presenter is from the Office of Economic and Small Business, Sandy Michael McDonald.

MR. MICHAEL-McDONALD: Good morning.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Good morning.

MR. MICHAEL-McDONALD: And congratulations to the Chair and the Vice Chair.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Thank you. Turn your mic on.

Office of Economic & Small Business Development CBE Goal Attainment Update

MR. MICHAEL-McDONALD: So, good morning again and congratulations to the Chair and the Vice Chair. This morning I was asked to give you some more emphasis on 30 for 30. So I'm asking Nathaniel to act as if he didn't hear that and some of you others who are sports fans, because I didn't make up 30 for 30. You know, I think it belongs to ESPN and one of their series.

MR. ALLEN: (inaudible)

MR. MICHAEL-McDONALD: Okay, Appreciate it. I'm borrowing 30 for 30. But what we want to do -- we'll get away from that. When I was putting this together for you, I did decide, you know, five years in robust activity. I want to make sure that we're clear about the 30 for 30. I want to speak slowly today about how we start with your goal. We

come out of your goal with a commitment based on the activity and then we monitor the commitment. And similar to the last time I spoke to you, that's why you're going to see a similar slide. Our cities and primes are exceeding the commitments. But what I think I want to add that will help you more like, in real time -- I want to start in our next quarter with the slides with updated activity. But I'm also going to show you what I have in the coffer, what I have in the portal, for reviews. So, then I can also show you based on what the reviews are, if a project is going to solicitation, county or city, you can see where they are. And then if a project that went to solicitation eventually is being awarded, you can see where that is.

Then the majority of what we do post-award, you can then see how we monitor every single month, though I know I'm only coming to you quarterly, but if you so choose, you can take any one of those projects or a couple of those projects, and just like us, you can monitor it all the way through to completion. Or just like us, you can see if there's any disruption or interruption. Or just like us, you can end up seeing how the cities and the primes with the goals that become commitments are actually exceeding it. And then it goes to why we're here today about the 30 for 30.

The main thing I'm trying to make sure that we are driving the point home -- with the program as originally proposed, the recommended goal with the county and the city is 30 percent. Now, if it's less than that, because we don't have some of the specialties, we do that, too. 25/17 or what have you. But it's proposed at 30 as the recommended goal. You will see in these slides there are several commitments. That means whatever happened with the prime, they're committing more than the goal -- that's a good thing --

but we also remind the prime. So, I'm going to monitor you on your commitment because I recommended 30.

But in this instance, if I take the 16th Ave, the recommendation was 40; you committed to 61. So, for all the months of monitoring the project, I'm expecting you to get to 61. But as this example, they actually reached 100. It's important for us to recognize that because you also need to understand we don't force that on the cities or on the prime. And we have a friend of ours who we work closely with now who did have some concerns in the beginning, never wanted to go past 10, but his last three projects was 41, 42, 47, you know, so -- and these are also things that we want to celebrate with our cities as well as with the primes, and I have to be inclusive of the prime. I don't want folks to believe, based on the program, it is us versus them. We're all really one. And that's why even when we make the original recommendation with the City, the City still has to approve the recommendation that they're going to put in their solicitation, that no matter who the primes are, you got to respond to that recommendation. And if you so choose to commit to a larger number, we're then very clear with them on the front end, we're going to hold them to the larger number.

The reason why we want to do this, and this is the slide that I said in the beginning I'm going to expand on. I'm going to start showing you what's actually been reviewed, what's in our coffers, what's in our portals, but then carry in front of reviews. You should see how long it takes to go to solicitation or when it goes to solicitation, or as it's actually being awarded what's taking place, because again, after that review, we can't do anything until it's actually awarded, and now we begin to work with the primes.

When you look at this example -- and the reason why I wanted this here, based on what I was explaining -- if the reviewed projects just happen to make it to award, then happen to make it to monitoring, then happen to make it to completion -- just this snapshot of those that were reviewed as of September last year, guys, that's an additional 415 million of real activity, of real payments to CBE's. And that's why even though I might give you the beginning and I might give you this slide, that's why I do want to start giving you the other activity in the middle, because sometimes it does take a little while from review to actually get to solicitation, and from solicitation to actually get to award. But when we get there, if the monitoring stays on pace, these are the kind of numbers we're actually talking about for your program.

And so that I can make sure we're continuously building the relationship with the cities as well as the primes, we just had a great training, just the basics of how to work with our office. We just did that -- Lorraine and I, we just did that on Wednesday. But later this summer, no later than September, later this summer, we're going to do the next training. But the training is specifically designed for County agencies and for municipalities to bring to the workshop projects they have that should hit the street in the next three to six months, not a year to two years, because we want to get primes and small businesses excited. So, they're going to be bringing those projects that they'll share with the audience of primes, they'll share with the audience of small businesses. And then the small businesses and the prime will have a chance to speak to the City and the County agencies about what will eventually roll out, violating nothing similar to clone of

silence. We're doing this all on the front end, but it's a way of engaging for the primes and the CBE's early on.

What I am going to add to that is what I just got through talking about. I am going to acknowledge, and I am going to bring some of the cities and the primes up and talk about exactly what it is they did, because it didn't have to be about us in our office. What is it that they did that when I said 30, somehow this prime said 45? At the end of the day, he ended up reaching 80. We want to know that, but we want to share that with the other cities as well to make sure that we're communicating that even though folks or some in the beginning didn't think it could happen, we have real cities and real primes who are demonstrating it can happen. So, this whole idea about today's presentations being about 30 for 30 is just to say that we're actually there with the numbers and if we can just continue where we are -- and I think as I said, the last quarter, it's not perfect, so I don't want to act like it is perfect. We don't hit each one of them as proposed. We know some why we don't. We know some on the front end of a recommendation why it doesn't hit. We know some when the goal request. We don't even set a goal. Remember, we don't set goals when it's \$250,000 or less. You know, I got to have specific specialties to set goals.

So, with all that considered, it's just important that we continue to build the relationship with the cities and with the primes. And one way to do that is to give them the kudos, give them the shout-outs and let them know that it's actually working. We always tell our story in our social media about the small business, but I do want to do more to make sure cities know we appreciate what they're doing, we appreciate their

efforts, and the same with the primes, and it's not just me. Those slides that you just saw, those are real numbers. That's why I'll end with this. Next Friday we have our 8th annual Broward and Beyond business conference. Some of you attended last year and I thank you. Some of you plan to attend this year. Matt Broward is one of our biggest supporters. But the idea is we will have at the convention center approximately 800 plus businesses and I'll have at least 75, if not 90 vendors or exhibitors from cities, from chambers, from access to capital from community partners to capital readiness simply to support the business community, the small business community, in understanding everything about their opportunities, including MAP. We'll spend a full day, we'll have a morning speaker, we have a lunch speaker, we've got workout sessions.

But the key is, how can I make sure as a part of MAP, they also know there's other cities? They also know there's training and development? They also know that there's work opportunities that they can leverage with primes? I have a -- new this year and a part of the convention center, I have what we're calling, "primetime gallery." Once again, Nathaniel, I hope I don't get in trouble with Deion Sanders, but I'm using primetime. So, I got primetime gallery. 30 for 30, primetime. Y'all see I watched ESPN, okay? In that gallery I have like, seven prime contractors. Three have had major activity across the county and the city with MAP. They're going to be there because they too want to meet in a less formal opportunity with the CBEs. They want to engage them; they want to make sure that they're filling out the pre-qualification forms in advance. They want to get entertained, all the questions asked by the CBEs. Exactly what do I need to do to do business with you? And then it's just another way, again, as you understand small

business, people do business with who they know and they trust. So we have to make sure as many times as possible we put our small businesses in the face of the cities, of the county and of the prime contractors.

So again, if you can join us, that's next week. And if you can't stay all day, then at least join me around 12:30 and have lunch with us and hear the lunch keynote speaker. But I think you'll be impressed of what we -- not just us, all of our cities and our community partners are trying to do to support, develop and grow our small business community. And that's inclusive, which is going to be a part of the thing this year. That's inclusive of everything that's happening nationally. All through Tallahassee, we still got to make sure small business is recognized before you got any of these certifications. You were a business first. We still need to support you being a better or continuous business for the opportunities that are still going to continue, whether we have certifications or not. So, that's the thing for all of my speakers and all of my presentations and all of the panelists. I want them to make sure that they're empowering while challenging, but encouraging small businesses to stay focused. Yep, keep your ear to the ground to everything that's happening. But we still want to make sure that they recognize where the opportunities are.

So, thank you for this morning. And, again, next Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Broward County Convention Center, and you get a peek of this beautiful facility. I probably just need to go ahead and share. We were originally told on that project -- it's not MAP, but it's our regular program. "Well, you know, Sandy, you might get about 100 or 125 million over the time of small business utilization." As of February, 208 million has

been paid to local small businesses, approximately 79 of them on that project. Smallest contract can (inaudible) 35, 55, 53, 53, 75 to the largest contract, 8 million and everything else in the middle. So, it actually is working. When you work with all the partners and when you have good information on the front end, you do hold your businesses accountable for being business first. But again, we're excited to share that with you. We've already shared that with the commission. Actually, Office of Public Communications is going to come up with a new update next week and that information will be there. So, surtax to me is the same. As long as you're speaking with everyone, everyone understands the program, you understand the guidelines, you're holding each other accountable, but you're always communicating. Think about what you originally said. This was going to be the short side of 10.1 billion with leveraging, maybe 16. Everything wasn't going to be about small business. So, we only carved out about 53 million a year. But the reality is, over 30 years, we was hoping to get to about a billion. Yes, I should say we should continue that push because definitely, you want to make sure at least a billion stayed home, if not more, which are local. So, I thank you and I'll entertain any questions you may have.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Okay. First of all, Sandy, I get so excited every time you come to make your presentation. There's just so much greatness that is happening in your department and in the County.

I want to reserve my comments until after I hear from my fellow team members. I think someone wanted to say something.

MR. FRAZIER: I wanted to commend you on the program as well, but I have a couple questions.

MR. MICHAEL-McDONALD: Yes, sir.

MR. FRAZIER: You know, when the state decided to get rid of preferential programs, the usual the reaction of the market is everybody disengages. And so they don't have to do anything, regardless of the kinds of programs you have, but you managed to succeed in this particular area where a lot of municipalities -- the big guys say, "Well, I don't have to abide in any of these rules anymore, so I'm not going to look for any small businesses or anything like that." So, I have to commend you, because it appears that these businesses are committed to making this success.

MR. MICHAEL-McDONALD: Well, thank you. Just let me take 5 percent of that. 95 percent of that is you guys. It is how this program was written, voted on by the people. Legal keeps me in line in terms of what we should and should not be. So, we're covered in that regard. But you are right about one part, which is why I want to take the five. We have had my prime come when they've heard this news and say, hey, does that mean we don't have to anymore? And I get to slowly say, "No, that wasn't for you." You still have to be convinced, you know, but we haven't had any major pushbacks or things of that nature. So again, it goes back to what I said earlier. Again, it really isn't about me but as long as we're really communicating and we can share real information and we can make sure that the primes understand it's never been about us versus you, but as a commitment for economic impact, for all the things that MAP is going to provide, it's actually been working. And the best thing about that -- because it is affecting my local

program, it is affecting my federal program, and that's some of the same small businesses.

But the thing about it -- you heard me say earlier, small business is no different than big business. People do business with people they know and they trust. So, MAP right now is a safeguard for all these small businesses who are working with these cities and who are working with these primes. The best thing I can tell them - build real relationships, be accountable, be on time, be on dollar value. So, if a day comes and the certification or MAP doesn't protect you, you really have built a relationship and this person now just hired you because, "Hey, you worked for me for five years. You were on time, you did quality work, the budget was right. I might as well continue." Business needs business. Yes, business takes advantage when they don't have to of certain programs. And small businesses certainly want to leverage every small program or certification. But in the end, business takes care of business. So, we want to make sure our small businesses know, especially now during MAP, we're covered. But you should be building and nurturing a real relationship that you can cover beyond Broward. That's why the conference is called Beyond Broward. I don't want you just working with Styles on a Broward project. I want Styles to like you and he takes you on another private contract. That's the intent.

MR. McELROY: I had two questions. Yeah, it's really great what you're doing. I'm glad we can push all this money back into communities and small businesses. Do you think it would be possible at all to see or maybe do an open survey with your small businesses for quality of life for the workers who we're hiring in these small businesses

to see their access to healthcare and median wages to make sure if we are pushing such a big community business program, we're being mindful that it is -- sometimes small businesses just can't offer the same quality of life to workers as the bigger businesses.

MR. MICHAEL-MCDONALD: Worth doing. Absolutely.

MR. McELROY: Just so we have the data. I totally understand small business and the multiply effect. And when it comes again to more capital-intensive projects, what's your plan to ramp up some of these companies to get some of that work? I guess, will sub work count to hit the quota?

MR. MICHAEL-MCDONALD: Yes, the sub work will still count, and that's a good question, too. And we've discovered that though sometimes we think national, it has to be the big one, and I'll use the -- I'll use the bypass road as an example. Our teams worked with us, you know, and of course we were all expecting big national firm. The lead on the project happened to be a CBE. You know, small businesses really do have capacity. You know, SBA calls a small business 1 to 500 employees. In case you didn't know, because I'll be saying this at the PDA luncheon later this afternoon, Broward has a registered 85,000 businesses. I got a whole bunch not registered. I got 85,000 at least that's registered in the 1,300 square miles, 31 municipalities of Broward. But what most folks don't know to that point -- small is big, because 89 percent of that number, no matter what the industry in Broward County, of the 85,000 businesses, 89 have 20 employees or less. So, they might not be the 80, the 200 to 400 employees like SBA "small". Our 20 or less really have some capacity. And at the end of the day, they're starting to show not just through MAP -- I've had several of those opportunities to show through the

Convention Center that, "Oh, I got that skill set, I got that capacity. I have that insurance and that bonding. And I even have the staffing." So, the idea that we want to continue to grow our small so that the prime subcontractors will always have someone to go to, but we are encouraging our small. And I've had previous slides that I've shown you where we tell some of our small businesses, "Yep, you can wait around for the 30 percent go, but if you can really do the project, you ought to be bidding with the primes." And we've had several slides that I've shown you where our CBE's have bid with the primes and actually won the contract. So, we are serious about trying to make sure we do grow up to scale and that they're accessible and available. And when they -- we don't want to force it -- when they believe they have capacity, by all means go out there and compete with the big boys.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Alan? Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Just kind of playing off what has already been said. But because I was a small business when I first started and I would not have had any idea how to apply or to put myself in a position where I could do work for the County, and I didn't, never did, and it probably made it a little more difficult for me. And so, all small businesses, they can get -- can get an assistance. This may not be a prereq legally, but it's a promotion. And it seems to me it's like a poster for what other programs should be doing around the country just to help small businesses. And typically, small businesses are people that are everybody. You know, it's not the big primes like the Styleses of the world. And then, I do like that idea because then they lead to -- now you put them in a position where they're doing County work and someday, they may get bonded. And when you get bonded, you

become -- you are in a new game in a small business, and maybe a small minority business is now moved up to a position where they're bondable and they can do major work, and that's when their ability to grow and for this perpetuation of success continues. So, I love this program. I love the fact that you're excited about it, but more so that you're trying to pull small businesses that wouldn't be thinking about this stuff because, you know, they go look for a drywall job or asphalt job doing someone's yard or the driveway or something. Nobody ever thinks to do that when they're first starting out. So, I really appreciate this program and thank you so much for everything you do. Thank you.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Anyone else? All right. So, I just want to close by thanking you again. You know, I've been a longtime advocate for small business owners. I celebrate it all the time. I think when people have -- develop an entrepreneurial mindset, I feel that way about even at the comps that we should be educating students across academic pathways to become more entrepreneurial, because it really shifts everything. Even if you're going to college just to get a job, if you have that entrepreneurial mindset it will help you to be better in any job that you have. But I know that the work that you continue to do over the years has just been extraordinarily impactful to our community, and I just wanted to take this moment to thank you and commend you for excellence.

MR. MICHAEL-MCDONALD: Thank you, Chair.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: You make us proud. Thank you so much, Sandy. Have a great day.

MR. MICHAEL-MCDONALD: Thank you all. Have a great day.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: I believe we have one more report before lunch break. It seems kind of early. I'm not sure how long the next presenter will be, but --

Transportation Systems Management and Operations (TSM&O) Briefing

MR. AWWAD: All right. Good morning, Chair, Vice Chair and members of the Transportation Surtax Oversight Board. My name is Rasem Awwad, the Director of the Traffic Engineering Division here at Broward County.

MR. MICHAEL-MCDONALD: Good morning.

MR. AWWAD: Good morning. And we are very pleased today to welcome our partners from the Florida Department of Transportation to highlight their Transportation Systems Management and Operations program. Another acronym for TSM&O, industry acronym, which is really the top bullet here. It's the Federal Highway Administration's definition of it. It's really a set of strategies, operational strategies that are meant to maximize the benefits, the efficiency and the safety of the transportation system as a whole without necessarily physically changing the roadways, the capacity itself.

So, with that said, the Florida Department of Transportation's central office has an extensive program. So does the District 4 office here, which extends from Broward County north to Indian River County. They have a lot of area to cover. And we have two experts today, so thank you very much for joining us. Ms. Alexandra Lopez, she is the TSM&O Program Manager out of District 4 Traffic Operations. And we're also joined by Mr. Kent Walia. He is the Planning Supervisor out of District 4's Planning and

Environmental Management Office. I want to get it right. And with that said, I'll turn it over to them and they'll be happy to answer any questions at the end of their presentations. Thank you very much for being here. Thank you.

MS. LOPEZ: Good morning and welcome, Chair and Vice Chair. Congratulations and thank you very much for having us. Thank you, Mr. Awwad, for that introduction. My name is Alexandra Lopez and I'm with FDOT, the Florida Department of Transportation, District 4. We cover quite a large geographical area and I am in charge of managing the Transportation Systems Management and Operations program on behalf of the state. So, what I'll do -- I'll give you an overview of what this means. You know, it's a lot of work, a lot of letters. So, hopefully by the end of this presentation, you will have a better understanding of what the program is and what it does for especially Broward County. And then afterwards, I'll pass it to Kent. He will be giving you an overview of the TSM&O Master Plan effort that we're currently undertaking on behalf of the state. Lissy, as well, will be giving you a bit more detail of what that plan entails. So, we're trying to go kind of like, high level with my presentation and then a little bit more detail as to where we're going next.

So, the Transportation System Management and Operations program can be hopefully easily explained in terms of what services we provide. What is the purpose and the mission of the program? So, our services can be broken down into three major areas. The first one is incident management. The second one is traffic management and the third one is traveler information. Obviously, there's a lot of parts and a lot of people behind the scenes making this happen, right? There's a lot of infrastructure investment that we

have to do on our roadways in order for us to be able to provide these services. Very quickly, traffic incident management entails responding to crashes, responding to lane-blocking events that happen on our interstates, such as I-95, I-75, but also, we have some footprint within our arterial roadways in Broward County. Traffic incident management is just managing traffic, and we do that by utilizing technology. We have cameras and we have a transportation management center which is actually housed where Rasem has his office. It's a Broward County building. So, you know, Broward County and FDOT, it's a partnership and so we try to manage traffic as best we can with the tools that we have.

And finally, we obviously gather a lot of information, so we like to disseminate that information back to travelers so that they can make smart decisions. We do this through various means, including changeable message signs on our roadways that hopefully you will see as you drive. We also do this through FL 511. There's an app and there's a website as well with that information. And we also have partnerships with Waze and the Googles of the world. So, a lot of the incident data that you get through your Google maps or your Waze maps comes from our center, from the information that we gather and also social media. I'm going to go through into three kind of areas that I think are most relevant to Broward County and the MAP program and MAP Broward, so the first one. I'm sorry, before I go into that, just a quick overview of what the district is. The Florida Department of Transportation -- it's broken down into various managing districts, and the first One is District 4. That's where we are, right? So, it's Broward County, Palm Beach, Martin County, Indian River and St. Lucie.

Like I said, Broward County is quite a bit of -- a lot of the work that we do happens here because of how urbanized the county is. Obviously, the northern three counties are a little more rural. So, we do have a lot of innovative strategies that we tried to implement here in Broward. As you may or may not be familiar, we also manage quite a lot of the freeways and within those freeways, we have the express lanes. So that's I-95 Express, I-75 Express and I-595 Express. And all this management happens from that room that you see on the top in the little circle. That's what we call the control room, and that's where we are able to get all this information from the roadways and we have individuals 24/7 watching the cameras and monitoring the data so they can respond to whatever events may happen over those roadways. So, like I said, I wanted to go over a few focus areas within the program that I feel are the most relatable to the individuals here sitting in front of me. The first one is the Traffic Incident Management Program. This highlights some of the activities that we've had in the past year. So, you can see the magnitude of the program and the impact that it has on travelers. I mean, just by highlighting the 80,000 assists from our road rangers, that literally means how many times they went out and they assisted a traveler with either it being a crash, being a flat tire, et cetera. So, this is, you know, the magnitude of the program. Obviously, this is district wide, so that covers five counties. Like I said, Broward County is very active.

We have been trying quite a bit of innovative strategies for our program, such as having the ability to assist electric vehicles if they run out of battery on our roadways. So right now, our program, the Road Ranger Program, provides a gallon of gas if you happen to run out of gas on one of our interstates. So, you know, now we have electric vehicles,

right? So, we can't give them any gas, obviously. So, we have been piloting portable chargers in case that we encounter any electric vehicles that are running out of charge. So, that's just one example of this area of the program. Another one that is very relevant to, obviously, the county is our active traffic management area. This shows -- this slide shows just a quick overview of how many activities we've had within our active traffic management sub program. We've had over 1,400 signal timing changes. So, this is done in conjunction with Rasem's group for changing signal timing when -- you know, in reaction to a crash, for example. So, if there's a lane being blocked, obviously your capacity is decreased. And so, we try to adjust the signal timing so that more vehicles are able to pass through this intersection even though a lane of traffic has been taken away at that moment.

And like I said, we have several equipment out deployed in the field to enable us to do that. We have cameras that our operators will be able to watch and so that's how we identify a lot of these issues. We have the dynamic message signs, et cetera. Some other ones that I wanted to highlight on this slide is kind of new initiatives that the state is embarking on. The first one is the ramp signals. So, this one is when you get on the interstate, we're trying to meter the traffic at which the -- at which people are entering the interstate so that we can meter and avoid breaking the flow of the main line. And then a second one is the wrong-way detection program that we have to be able to detect and actually advise wrong-way drivers before getting on the interstate, which becomes a high safety hazard. The last area I wanted to highlight is what we're calling the Smart Work Zone Program, so this one is -- there's a lot of construction going on, obviously, in the

county as well as throughout the district, so we are using portable devices. We're using our resources to be able to manage that work zone but also the impact that the work zone may have on the network. So, it's not only concentrating on where asphalt is being moved, but also where are vehicles going, where are pedestrians going or bicycles going to avoid this construction zone? And so we're using various technologies for us to be able to manage that.

So, just as a segue for the following presentation, I wanted to close on future, right? Because the master plan that we're creating is kind of our roadmap to where we're going next. So, the state is very focused on what we're calling the compass, the FDOT compass. That's the circle you see at the bottom of the presentation. We have workforce development, safety, resiliency, supply chain, technology -- all of it surrounding communities, right? Because at the end of the day, we are serving our community and that should always be our kind of compass, right? We're going north. That's where we're going, following the stars. So, this one, this last slide just kind of presents where is it that the program is going next. Workforce development, you know, trying new infrastructure, new technology. And at the end of the day, you know, coming up -- coming together with the community and making sure that our program serves them, because that's what we're here for. And so, with that, I wanted to thank you for having me and then I'll pass it on to Kent.

MR. COOLMAN: I have a comment.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Go ahead.

MR. COOLMAN: Under your future initiatives, I think the Florida Department of Transportation is missing a great opportunity, and that is the beautifications of our roadways. We have -- I hate to say it -- the ugliest highway system that I have ever seen. You go all over the United States and different places. I would like to -- maybe this is not our purview, but as a landscape architect, I think your future initiative should be greening of the highway system. It's something that's -- you'll see it once in a while, maybe around Daytona or Disney, but that's probably done independent of FDOT. I would hope that FDOT would take a broad look at the whole state, certainly your area, and we can do a lot more for our environment. You know, it's a lot of land, but it needs to be green. So, would you put that in the -- it may take another 20 or 30 years, but I think it ought to be a priority of FDOT.

MS. LOPEZ: We will take that down and bring it back to our leadership. I mean, I wish I had some better knowledge to give you to talk about this. My understanding is that there is a certain percentage of construction projects that are allocated to landscape, but I would have to maybe investigate that a little more so that I can really let you know what the Department is doing on that aspect. But we'll take that back.

MR. COOLMAN: Just get it on the agenda, that's all.

MS. LOPEZ: You got it.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: I agree. The only other -- I was just curious about the frequency with which you're seeing people using electric cars needing assistance. Is there an uptick on that?

MS. LOPEZ: There is an uptick because there are more electric vehicles. But with the pilot program that we are running, it started because of the last hurricane evacuation we had from the west to us. So, we had the fear of people being stranded while evacuating. I remember maybe in the last few months, maybe once that we've had to use the electric charge once or twice. So, it's not -- yeah, it's not very significant, but we have it just in case.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Okay, good. All right, thank you very much, Alexandra.

MR. WALIA: Good morning, everyone. Kent, Walia, Planning Supervisor, FDOT. Thank you so much for having us today. I will be going over the TSM&O Master Plan update. I'll provide a briefing and then I will turn it over to Lissy La Paix of CTS.

I do want to give a special recognition to Victoria Peters. She's in attendance, our Transportation Planning Manager at FDOT as well. And to kind of give you a little bit of an overview of what our TSM&O Master Plan is, as Alexandra mentioned, she gave you an overview of what the Transportation Systems Management Operations, TSM&O, technology is. So, if you're driving down I-95 and you see that dynamic message board on the top that says, "Hey, accident five miles ahead," that's this type of technology. If you're going onto the highway like around Cypress or Commercial and you get that kind of red and green to say stop and go, that's congestion management. It's allowing X amount of vehicles to enter on I-95 during a congestive time, AM or PM. So, these technologies helps manage traffic and helps restore capacity, as mentioned at the beginning of the presentation.

So, the master plan that we have is an FDOT plan. It's updated every five years and it contains strategic corridors throughout our entire district. So, as mentioned on the state highway system, as Alexandra mentioned, our district goes from the bottom of Broward County to the top of Indian River County. So, we oversee five counties and it's a large step of area. So the strategic networks that are in the master plan that's being developed, we don't have a draft yet and we'll probably come back to the Board with a draft for your review and presentation -- it looks at corridors that have TSM&O technology or are in need of TSM&O technology to increase and expand and maintain the current infrastructure. We make sure that we work with all stakeholders throughout our district. So, we have counties that we work very closely with TSM&O technology and also some cities as well such as Boca and St. Lucie; they also manage their own operations, so we work very closely with them. This master plan has goals, objectives and strategies that Lissy will present in just a moment that improve and expand our network, and I will pass it to Lissy. Thank you.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Thank you.

LISSY LA PAIX PUELLO: Thank you very much, everyone, thanks for having us. My name is Lissy La Paix. I work as a consultant at FDOT District 4 in the update of this master plan for the TSM&O. Well, together with Peter Haliburton, we have been working -- and the whole team from CTS, we have been working on several add-ins in this master plan. We will see now along the presentation how this project started. So, the agenda for today is we will see a quick introduction of what is the plan, the phases, more or less the scheduling, very high level, what we call the strategic network and how did we arrive

to that shape. The strategies -- so, the extensive review of the strategies and the selected ones or pre final ones and some projecting priorities. Since we are now in the phase three, as we will see later, so we have, let's say, a lot of material to present even though we are still working on it. We will also see the next steps in the last slide.

So, as Ken just mentioned, what is the main goal of the master plan. So, we work on optimizing the resources, trying to make the network more efficient and also developing the network and infrastructure based on the priorities of DOT and the uses.

So, the phases of this master plan, we can divide in three. So, first we started identifying existing condition, as we can see in the slide. We develop the goals and the measures, so we gather information on which are the priorities, what are the locals and the NPOS the counties working on, which are the projects they have, which are their goals. So, we develop the goals of this master plan, also considering all of those areas in the uses. So, we considered freight, we consider ports, multimodality transit, so very - we would see it very comprehensive, so we identify existing conditions as well in phase one. Then in phase two we work on the strategy network, which is prioritizing the segments, identifying the needs based on those goals. Then we work on strategies and the (RITSA) Regional IT Architecture and that's what means that acronym. And then finally, the phase three, that is now ongoing. Works on priorities and projects we would see in these slides how we identify those projects, those segments, those corridors. We have been working on the implementation and developing the final report that is due now in June, so very very soon. Very excited about that.

So, we have six goals in this master plan. I just mentioned based on seven areas. The first one is safety and it is there as a first one for a reason. It's a very common goal that goes to all the plans we reviewed in the previous plans from TSM&O. We develop indicators for each area, so we will see -- we have a list of indicators. In this case, the indicator for that one would be a crash ratio. The second one would be mobility, and when we talk about mobility, it means people and goods. So, in that, we are also including freight, not only people, and we develop the indicator for traffic volumes and volume-to-capacity ratio in this case, and buses per mile as a representation of transit. The third one would be reliability, and in that one we work on reliability of travel time as well freight and good— people and goods, sorry. And then the fourth one would be information, as Alexandra just presented as well. TSM&O works a lot on deploying the infrastructure to keep the users informed to make informed decisions. In that one, we work on the extent of the fiber optic network. Fiber optic network is a crucial part for all TSM&O activities, as all devices will need to be connected to send information to the RTMC.

The fifth one would be adaptation, and the last one would be technology, but not least. So, with these two indicators or these two goals, we are covering how the network can be adapted to or can be resilient in this case or could be adapted to extreme conditions -- can be weather, can be congestion, can be incidents. So, we are working with already developed information from District 4, which is the vulnerability assessment, the Southeast vulnerability assessment, and we explored and reviewed this information to quantify the needs, so we identify the needs. We will see now how we identify those

needs. And the last one, the technology. The main area for that one would be connectivity, because we are also reviewing other emerging technologies and how the system is prepared for those.

Then you see in this slide a high-level overview of the methodology. So, this slide, let's say, is a very complete picture of what we have been doing in the last, let's say, 10 months or so. To identify the existing condition, as we can see in the first part of the slide, we developed seven indicators and we see here those names. So, we have the crash ratio, the volume-to-capacity, signal density, and so on. There is a little bit of waiting in this list because some indicators -- one area can be represented by more than one indicator, like volume capacity ration and bottlenecks can both be related to mobility, right, and reliability. Then we have also drop ratio which is related to drop volumes and vulnerability, which is the date of the assessment we mentioned in the previous slide. The second step would be to develop this strategy network and this strategic network means eligibility. We analyze an entire network of minor arterials and above of the District 4, of the five counties, and we developed a strategic network, which ended up being about 30 percent of this network, so about 1,200 miles. We identified corridors and segments and we had to analyze how they will end up logically, so we wanted to determine future projects but also have a logical meaning for all of them. Then the strategies that will cover those needs or will help to improve those needs are based on a state-wide national level research, and we identified at least 58 strategies from the first screening and from there we drop down to about 20 strategies that are now being in our pre-final list.

Based on that, we also analyzed how the regional ITS architecture is ready for those strategies. So, if we need to develop any packages for those strategies. Then the last step is develop the projects. We develop the projects as well based on the priority. We will see now what we call priority. So, for each indicator we have quartiles and the quartiles we have in the slide -- red, high priority, then medium, which is orange, yellow, and green is low priority. So, everything that is in red, which is the highest values, right - - so the top part of the values, which means the segments with more congestion, the segments with more crashes, so those will show in red. They will be high priority. Then we develop the total score. So, from the seven indicators, we develop this mathematical zoom of the seven, right, and then we select from this total score the high priority and the medium priority, and they go to the strategic network.

For example, in Broward, we have the map of the strategic network in this slide so we can see in this slide the TSM&O strategic network for Broward. Broward is about 20 to 30 percent of the strategy network in total that we developed, as we suspected by the density of the network and also the traffic use, the traffic density. We also have in this slide the six corridors, which are an important part of our analysis, and the freight activity areas. So, we can -- when we review the segments for future projects we can understand which role they play, right? If they are close to freight activity or they are close to urban areas. So, the strategic network is the highest-need corridors, and then we try to understand which strategies will help solve issues in those segments. Right?

So, the strategies -- the picture in this slide aims to just simply show a tool, it's not to read through the right side of the slide. So, what is represented is the analysis of all

the strategies which was a comprehensive analysis based on how each strategy is related to the goals. The strategies were ranked as well, so we can see in the center column from darkest green, then it goes to yellow, orange, red. The darkest green are those strategies with let's say more connection to more goals, so they solve multiple needs. So, we look at this strategy like preferred, right, so they go to separate lists, like a pre-final strategies list. We know that with those strategies can help more the network. Then, we also look at the cost of those strategies, of course. Some strategies can be more well-known or very popular but less common because they are high in cost, like for example, autonomous vehicles. They are very effective but very effective as well. So, we developed this implementation score, which we can see there is strategies in lower costs and more effectiveness. We try to work with those strategies, mostly. We also take some other strategies that could be higher in cost, but we take it in another level, what we call Level 2. So, we have Level 1 strategies as the less expensive and more popular, more effective, and Level 2 are those that are in a higher cost bracket.

So, we consider those two elements when we develop the strategy selection and then we assign the strategies to the different segments. We also consider what is the context class of the segment, so we know that for urban areas we have a selection of strategies. For example, (indiscernible) crossing, pedestrian detection more related to urban areas where we have more pedestrian activity. We prioritized the needs, which we select from the indicators are the maximum. So, what is the leading indicator in the segment is, is the segment having mostly safety needs or mostly mobility needs or freight needs? So, that's this step, right? So, prioritize the needs, then the third one would be

identify the critical needs. Then, based on the strategies list, we assign those strategies depending on their needs of each segment. So, as we can see, it's a very one to one review. So, for each segment we had to understand what is the existing condition and what is more applicable.

There is also a lot of inter-agency coordination through the master plan and also proposed in the report, which will be related to all the different stages of the project, so from planning level to deployment and maintenance. So, we have been through several meetings with the locals to explain the different stages of this study. Then when we develop the project, that's what we have in this slide, so we work on the segments with the highest needs, but we also try to fill the gaps, so we want to have a smooth corridor from beginning to end and then we develop a project for that corridor. We will see one example in the next slide. The strategies we have identified have at the top level what we call essential elements and these essential elements are very in line with what TSM&O is working on, what Alexandra just presented. So, first of all, we have the traffic detectors -- can be microwave in this case. We have the cameras. We have message signs, which is the dynamic message signs like the example Ken just mentioned, and we also have roadside units. So, we see in these pictures those elements and we identified detectors, cameras, and DMS as essential elements, which means they are recommended to be deployed in all segments of the project priorities.

Currently there are 85 projects as project priorities over the entire district, and this is about 300 miles of projects, so this is let's say the result up to now. As an example, we have in this slide a project in Broward County. This is Dixie Highway by Oakland Park

and Wilton Manors so when we develop this project -- let's say we propose this project. We identify the facility, Dixie Highway, the beginning and end from Sunrise Boulevard to Commercial Boulevard. We identify the leading indicator, which is in this case safety. Second -- let's say second priority was mobility, then freight and multimodal. Then we identify the essential elements; we assign them, as I just mentioned, right?. So, all projects should have the essential elements recommendation. Then we recommend as well strategies on safety, like target safety programs. This is a very generic strategy. It can be, for example, communication campaigns or educational campaigns for drivers to yield to pedestrians or for pedestrians to make use of the intersection push buttons or safety improvements at intersections. As well we have strategies like traffic signal optimization and timing, which is also part of TSM&O activities. Then we have the rapid flashing beacons. As this is a very urbanized area, as we can see in these pictures, there is a high school that is a business area that is Oakland Park City Hall and so on. This is also part of what we call pedestrian crossing detections. These detections can be, for example, adding roadway lighting for the drivers to see the pedestrians better during night, let's say. And they could be an automatic detection of the -- for the systems where the pedestrians approach the crossing, then the lights will be on.

We work a lot the arterials in this master plan, but we also cover the freeways. The freeways have received a lot of attention from TSM&O already. Therefore, we first explain the whole system for the arterials and we reserved a spot for the freeways. Like, we don't forget them, but we know that they already got a lot of attention and there is already a lot ongoing, as we saw in the presentation from Alexandra before on the freeway. So, with

the same structure, we identified the needs of the freeways with the crash ratio, with mobility ratios and so on, and we identified those priority segments. We see in this map we are showing six labels – in yellow -- these are the labels of the projects on the freeways. So, we see we have (indiscernible) on I-95 on I-595, right, on this map.

Which strategies are we looking at right now? So, we are looking at ongoing activities like wrong-way driving. Wrong-way driving is a strategy that in District 4 is very well-known. It's used and it's very successful so we are working on ramp candidates, also based on what District 4 has developed their priority list. So, we reviewed those lists of ramps, so there are, say, about 200 ramps from two years ago beginning planning to be implemented fiscal year '26, '27, '28, right, so we work on cross checking those priorities and then make the recommendations for those ramps or supporting those recommendations in the master plan. Other systems like queue warning signs -- queue warning signs could be in full deployment, or we could also see the system in use like in the DMS in the picture, where information about congestion is released to the drivers based on the system by the queue warning system. Other measures or strategies could be implementation and deployment of CCTVs to eliminate the gaps. We've reviewed the network and identified where those CCTVs would be needed; like for example, in 595. We see in this map as well -- we see the projects but we also the ITS existing. For example, we see -- the blue circles are the cameras, so we see what are all existing cameras along the freeway, the DMS detectors, wrong-way driving. So, very compact and very exciting as well.

So, next steps. Working on the final report. We also -- we will also be holding other meetings as follow-up meetings with the stakeholders, and the aim is to complete everything in June and also produce the final presentations. Any questions? Thank you very much.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: All right, thank you, Lissy. Any questions?

MR. COOLMAN: I just have a comment. This is the master plan for District 4, correct?

MS. LA PAIX PUELLO: Correct.

MR. COOLMAN: Are other districts doing the same thing? And what is the cross-pollination between -- do we have a sixth district?

MS. LA PAIX PUELLO: Yes.

MR. COOLMAN: Is there -- is a lot of that going on between the other districts?

Ms. LA PAIX PUELLO: Well, we -- so from the beginning, we reviewed what other districts are doing on their latest master plan as well, like District 6, for example, and District 5. Coordination -- there is coordination, because we are working around the same or similar goals, and the types of projects that we are recommending are well in line. There is also a phase of master plan implementation, like the implementation action plan, that will as well consider communications between the districts.

MR. COOLMAN: Because I think there'd be some lessons to be learned if we did it in different areas.

MS. LA PAIX PUELLO: Lessons learned. Yes.

MR. COOLMAN: Thank you.

MR. WALIA: And if I may add, FDOT District 4 was actually the first district to have a TSM&O master plan. This is our second update. The other districts either completed their first one, such as District 6, which is Miami-Dade and Monroe, and then are District 1 -- they're starting to create one too, as well. So, we did learn from other districts and also learned from our own master plan and how we beefed up some of our strategies and our methodology as well.

MS. LOPEZ: From a statewide perspective, Tallahassee's Central Office, they also have a strategic master plan, a TSM&O strategic master plan, which kind of seeks to have this holistic approach to the entire state given those high-level, far-reaching goals. So, the master plan that Kent and his team are creating kind of funnels into that TSM&O strategic plan as well, and so do the other districts.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Anyone else?

MR. McELROY: I am going to kind of get into the weeds here for a second, if that's okay. So first, to understand our relation to the Surtax Board and you guys, this master plan will be used in conjunction with the County to develop projects that would be submitted to the MPO that would be funded by the surtax?

MR. WALIA: I can help answer that question. Great question. So, what we do is our master plan is going to be for the State Highway System and FDOT. Obviously -- like, take, for example, Broward Primo. They have their own plan. So, what you want to do is you have the strategic network. We're going to be doing some things; Broward is going to be doing some things. Having that kind of overlap so that your coordinating efforts is the key to looking at those types of strategies.

MR. McELROY: So, will the surtax money be used to fund these projects?

MR. WALIA: No. Not necessarily. But there could be some overlap. So, imagine, if you will, we have strategic corridors. We have multiple stakeholders. The MPOs, the counties and some cities. What our master plan does is it looks at the corridors and says, "Here's what exists and here's what you can do to increase the technology." The different plans look at those strategies and they can influence some of their strategies. They can take some of those, they can do them on their own. FDOT has, you know, a finite budget. We can do some of our own. This plan looks at projects for the next five years. Obviously, some of these projects will carry on, because some can be implemented; some will just have to get deferred.

MR. McELROY: Okay. So, my opinion will only matter so much if it's not what we're funding, but I'll just give my critique of your master plan. There's a few things I'd like to see. Maybe if you could present it or send it to Gretchen, I'd be interested to know all the arterial roads that are counted within this master plan, because there's some contradictory information for us and our goals as a Surtax Board. If you go to slide 34, goals and existing conditions, there's a few things that call out to me here. Number one, in the safety column. I don't think we're -- I don't think that's comprehensive enough, just to look at a crash review. I don't know if your data is looking at pedestrian and bicyclists killed?

MS. LA PAIX PUELLO: Yeah. So, for us to identify the presentation and let's say the one with the best data available across all counties, we first explored the crash density, but that didn't consider the traffic over the years. That's why we developed

secondly the crash ratio, because that was a measure that was more balanced for all counties, because we observe when we use crash density the northern counties were showing only green. So, we said that cannot be because then we have -- the northern county is underrepresented. So, we went to this crash ratio, which is global of crashes, but as a performance measure we are considering not only the crash but also the non-motorized crashes, like pedestrian-involved, bicyclist-involved.

MR. McELROY: And are those weighted more heavily?

MS. LA PAIX PUELLO: We recommend these performance measures, and also, when we identify the strategies, we look at those specific values of fatalities, of pedestrian fatalities, bicycle, for those areas in high urban density. One is the indicator, but the other one is the review that we do corridor by corridor, where we incorporate additionally that observation of the pedestrian activity and pedestrian-involved crashes.

MR. McELROY: Okay. And then back to the other slide, on 34. So, this is where it ties into the next one, reliability. The stated goal -- and again, I know this is a PowerPoint and this probably isn't comprehensive, but I just want to make sure there probably is an element to this. It says "improved travel time, reliability for motorists, transit users, and freight." Again, there's no recognition of the quality-of-life experience for pedestrians and bicyclists. And I don't care about this -- if this is only to the freeways. But when it comes to the arterials, particularly arterials in Broward County, it goes against what the surtax and some of our multimodal master plans that have been presented to us. It's crashing, because improving travel time for motorists is an inverse relationship with the safety and experience of a pedestrian along the arterial.

MS. LA PAIX PUELLO: Yeah, yeah. So, the same -- in this right-side picture, that represents the big spreadsheet where we analyze all the projects and all their indicators with their colors based on priority. Right? Like the red, the (indiscernible) and so on. Then we have a list of strategies and there were about 25 strategies; let's say like six of them were related to safety. And that safety was also including multimodal safety, like pedestrian safety. And we also have -- like we show in the example, the definition of the strategies very direct to pedestrian crossing, pedestrian safety, pedestrian crossing detection. The way to identify that was based on their pedestrian activity for each corridor. And so first, we consider is that a safety leading indicator? And then when we take all those points that have safety leading indicator, then we analyze the pedestrian safety for those corridors.

MR. McELROY: So again, this might be asking you guys to maybe produce more data -- I might be asking for more data than is actually capable of your office, but would you be able to submit, for the arterials particularly, what your recommendation of reliability was in crash data, maybe to Gretchen to present to us so we would understand that if this master plan gets built, it might be inverse to us. I'm going to -- I'll just say like, a personal anecdote real quick. There was -- I live near Broward Boulevard and I95, and it's just not a safe road since I've lived there. Obviously, it's an arterial and it's near a freeway entrance. And I reached out to the commissioners years ago when I moved there in 2018 or so, and there wasn't anything that could get done, right? There wasn't the budget, there wasn't the space, there wasn't the right of way.

And then a kid in my neighborhood was crossing the street and he got killed. He was an eight-year-old. And it didn't really seem like it made sense and I reached out again and the feedback was that we couldn't do anything. It was one of the reasons I'm on this Board. Fast forward to a few months ago. I get a traffic -- I get a flyer from FDOT saying that there's going to be an intelligent transportation system update on this corridor, so there was no funding for safety. Yet the feedback loop was completely broken, because we're now spending \$3 million on this portion of Davie Boulevard and it's not for safety. I know this is not your decisions, but I'm just expressing what I want to express -- and what it was to create was -- I'll say it-- it was installation of fiber optic cables, CCTVs and it was because it was going to create better data to dispatch road rangers and notify the public and traffic conditions via the overhead signs, the ADMS, and it was a \$3 million project.

I just want to make sure that when we lock ourselves into a master plan, FDOT and me just speaking as a resident of Broward and the state of Florida, that these master plans have the correct feedback systems in place, that when people are dying, we're not just bulldozing through and putting in things that we think are safe but are not actually addressing the root cause of why this kid got killed. So, I'll just leave it there.

MR. WALIA: Thank you.

MR. AWWAD: If I may just expand on this, FDOT also has a safety office that is very much involved and a partner to all this effort that's focused on safety as well as the Broward MPO, as you know, as the Broward Safety Action Plan, to which Broward FDOT offices are a partner to, which actually is going to address Broward Boulevard that you just mentioned as one of the priority corridors when it comes down to safety. So yeah,

there's a lot more in the background as far as coordination regarding the safety being the driving effect.

MR. McINTYRE: Ok, I just want to make sure.

MR. HOOPER: I just want to make one point, just from 50,000 feet. I don't understand why Miami-Dade, Broward and Palm Beach are not part of one district. And if you had to go farther south just to pick up Monroe, I guess you could. But to me, you're disconnected from Stuart and Jupiter and Indian County and the three counties that are producing the most density and that need to be the most coordinated are the Palm Beach, Broward, and Dade. It just seems strange. I guess you guys divvied out the districts years ago, but just seems like that should be the district. And then go north to the softer counties like North Palm Beach, Jupiter, Stewart, Indian County. That's a totally different program, totally different experience. Just a thought.

MR. WALIA: That's a very good question. You're right. They do function differently. They have different identities. There actually is a group called the Southeast Florida Transportation Council. That is Miami Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach. The MPOs get together with the County staff, and they have that organization.

Then there's another one for the Treasure Coast, completely separate, which is the Treasure Coast Transportation Council. That's Martin, Indian River, and St. Lucie. They're together too as well. So, they do a regional transportation plan. As a matter of fact, they're working on their 2050 Regional Transportation Plan now. Have a master plan, a hard document, a summarized version, and a website. And they're also working

closely with the Safe Streets 4 All, SS4A, to adopt some of those safety features in there, too, as well.

As far as the FDOT jurisdictions, that predates me, but duly noted. And we do look at that, especially for our TSM&O master plan. We almost -- it was almost -- it was actually two volumes in the first round. You had Broward, Palm Beach, and then the Treasure Coast. We're still kind of treating them -- weighting them separately because they have different needs, so that they're both treated fairly. So, we are acknowledging that. Thank you.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Anyone else? Thank you very much.

MR. WALIA: Thank you.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: I'm going to just ask everyone 's indulgence. I know we were going to break for lunch. Before we do, I kind of, you know, became Chair and kind of sped through the agenda because I knew that Sandy had to leave. But I wanted to take a moment while we still have some folks in the audience to thank our outgoing Chair. I sit in this new role on the shoulders of Alan and Doug, who both preceded me as Chair, and I would be remiss if I didn't celebrate their great leadership of the foundation that they have built since this Spending Tax Oversight Board has begun. First, I want to thank you, Alan, for everything that you've done to set us up and for nominating me again, for the second time, Chairman now, and Vice Chair. And then, of course, Doug, I wanted to give you an opportunity to say a few words. We are so grateful for your leadership. I enjoy sitting next to you and doing our little banter back and forth, but I wanted to give you an opportunity to say something.

MR. COOLMAN: Are you sure you want me to talk?

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Yes, I do. I do. I absolutely do.

MR. COOLMAN: Well, all I can say is as a member of this Board -- this Board is extremely diverse, extremely talented, and we're fortunate -- and I have and Allen is, and you will be -- to have a staff headed by Gretchen, which makes your job a lot easier. We're going to hear later about the legislature. We're at a crucial time in certain things and we also have the third amendment coming up, which to me is extremely important. We're just finishing our, what is it sixth year? Well, you were four and I'm two. And it's been a learning experience, and I would encourage you to continue with pushing the buttons so that we can continue to have a positive influence on the money that citizens have voted for transportation, which includes pedestrians, bicycles, more than just roadways, as you know. And I wish you all the best. I plan on sticking around for a little while.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Wonderful. I'm glad to have you here. And this certificate just really reads that -- this is being provided to you on behalf of the MAP Broward folks in recognition of your dedication and service as Chair of the Independent Transportation Surtax Oversight Board. 2023 through 2025. Thank you.

MR. COOLMAN: Thank you.

[Applause]

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Then of course I just want to -- I'm going to continue the agenda, but I wanted to thank you for your very in-depth presentation. Quite informative, and I really love that we kind of took a pause on the safety issue. It's

something that has been discussed by this Board on numerous occasions. We believe that safety is paramount, and we will continue to push that agenda. With that, I -- we're not going to take a break for lunch, because it's still a little early.

MR. COOLMAN: I have a question. Are they ready for us yet? For lunch because they didn't say - if they're not ready, let's go ahead and do the next item.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: No. We're going to move forward. Yes. We're going to move forward. We're going to move forward. Thank you for your report. All right. Next item on the agenda, the 3rd Amendment to the Transportation System Surtax Interlocal Agreement Overview. I'm not sure who is -- Nathaniel, okay.

3rd Amendment to the Transportation System Surtax Interlocal Agreement Overview

MR. KLITSBERG: Good morning everybody. So, by way of an update as to where we are with the third amendment, which is a fresh restated interlocal agreement because of the significance of the changes to a great number of things. By way of where we are right now, is earlier this month, the Broward County City Managers' Association reviewed the last proposal that had been submitted through County Administration. They came back in conceptual agreement with nearly all of the items. There are a few last -- I won't even call them sticking points, but just some items that need to be discussed internally within the County, which we have planned for next week. So, hopefully that will finalize those issues. Just yesterday, Commissioner Lamar Fisher on behalf of the Board, as well

as Gretchen, myself, and representatives from County Administration, spoke to the Broward League of Cities -- I think there were 26 of the 31 municipalities present -- and gave a presentation similar to what you're seeing in your backup materials now.

I think that the meeting went extraordinarily well, and there was a lot of positive feedback on all of the things. So, this may be the first time depending on what kind of communications there have been between the City managers and different elected officials as to what's going on -- may have been the first time that they're seeing some of these details, and they were, I guess, a universal positive response from the cities. So, in terms of our timing now, is after meeting with County Administration next week, I'll be finishing up the draft of the third amendment, the amended and restated interlocal agreement. And I'm going to speed through some of this, because I want to be very respectful of your time. You have the presentation materials, and I would be happy to take any questions.

The main goal for all of this was an issue of streamlining, simplifying, and distributing that would be the best way I could describe it. We looked at the way that the program has been operating since the second amendment. There are many positive things that relate to that. But two items that were of particular importance were finding a way to give surtax money to every city every year rather than having them compete against each other through the municipal capital program process, where every city, whether they really have projects or not, felt the need to submit three projects. When we all knew that given what funds are available, you're not going to have anywhere close to a majority or even, I would say, not even 20 or 30 percent of those projects would wind

up getting approved. And, the bread and butter of road improvement projects is rehabilitation and maintenance, and what we did was flip that on its head.

Because right now, under the second amendment rehab and maintenance projects, milling and resurfacing fixing sidewalks making them ADA compliant making them safer, making crosswalks safer, ensuring that streetlights are functioning properly, wayfinding signage and street signage — those are all the lowest priority items in the second amendment because those are the rehab and maintenance projects that only get funded at the bottom of that waterfall as things move down. You have your community shuttle. You have your municipal capital projects, and then if there's anything left over, it can go to that.

In conversations with the BCCMA and with the elected officials in the municipality, I think that all of us, as residents of Broward County, know what kind of complaints do city elected officials get on a relatively frequent basis? There's a pothole in front of my house, and every time I pull my car out, something bad happens, or the sidewalks are broken on my street. My kids can't ride their bikes, some can't use a mobility scooter, can't -- just broken sidewalks, crosswalks that are not safe. There are streetlights that are out. Those are the typical complaints that city elected officials probably get more often than maybe any other kinds of complaints.

And, we all know, because money does not grow on trees, that there are no cities that don't have some deferred maintenance with regards to that. So, the goal of this third amendment, in some part, is to help alleviate that issue. It's not going to solve it for the cities problems. We're never going to be able to fund them enough so they don't have

deferred maintenance on their road work, but maybe we can get them closer to the top of the curve. So, the third amendment creates an annual formula-based allocation to each participating municipality, for supplementing — not supplanting — supplementing their existing capital improvement program and operation and maintenance budgets.

This is not Florida lottery that we are not taking money that would have otherwise gone into education and taking it out and giving them this other source. This is to supplement.

We've had a number of cities that have requested the ability, especially those cities that don't have community shuttles, that they wish to have micro transit programs. Micro transit is a permissible use of surtax funds under Chapter 212 it's on-demand transportation. So as part of that annual formula-based funding, they have the ability to use it for rehab and maintenance or micro transit or a combination of both. It's annual money that goes to everybody. Everybody has contributed in. Everybody will get some out every year.

The municipal capital program is, given the goal of the Surtax Program is to leverage surtax dollars against other people's money, mainly the state and federal government. Rather than having a competitive municipal capital program where the cities are competing against each other for a limited pot of money, for which in many circumstances there is no state or federal funding that's being attached to it. Is that it's being converted into a grant-match program so that when a city comes to us and says we have an ability to get a state appropriation this year it requires a 25% or 20% local match from our city, we would like some grant-match money to help defray the local portion of

that project. And that's one of the elements of the third amendment. There's a fair bit of cleanup that's happening.

We looked at and had a number of requests from cities that wanted to have certain decorative elements attached to their projects. Even though they have had engineers that can say this lasts just as long as a standard element, the answer has always been no, that's not Surtax eligible. Just because something looks good doesn't mean that it's not surtax eligible anymore. The third amendment eliminates that, it basically says that if your engineer of record says your decorative element your decorative streetlight, your decorative paver crosswalk, if you're doing a greenway and you're putting benches down or things of that nature. If you want to have artistic elements to them and your engineer says they last as long as the standard one, they're eligible up to the cost of the standard one. We're not – there will be no gold-plated street signs that are paid for with the surtax.

We would be giving the money or allowing them to use the money under their annual program, through the grant-match program or through any of these other programs, to use up to what the standard cost would be for a standard element. And, if they choose to spend their own money to make it decorative, they can choose to do that. One of the things that I saw when I originally looked at the second amendment was that we allow cities to create parking structures, parking and rides, things of that nature, but they were limited to only charging for parking an amount equal to the operation and maintenance costs of that facility, even though that may wind up being significantly below what other parking areas charge.

That seemed a little bit too big-brotherish, and under the third amendment we have eliminated that prohibition, provided that the money that they do get from a market-rate parking charge flows back into other transportation-related projects within the city that would have otherwise been eligible for Surtax money.

So, the revenue that's generated from a Surtax-funded parking structure continues to flow back into transportation related projects in that city road, and we're not going to oversee that in any way shape or form, but they will be subject to audit so we can make sure that they're doing that. We're also going to be, in the third amendment, eliminating the prohibition on using surtax funds to maintain Surtax-funded projects, because it would seem to be there are cities that just don't have a ton of money in their capital program projects for O&M, so the worst thing that could happen is for us to have funded a project in the city and because they don't have enough money to maintain it, that it becomes non-maintained and just sort of deteriorates.

So, eliminating that, that will require an ordinance change that we will be submitting when the third amendment or shortly after the third amendment gets submitted to the board for review. And of course, the key goal is maintaining the transparency and accountability within the program. Some of these you've already heard because we've implemented them sort of administratively, but they're going to be formalized in the agreement, which is that standalone sidewalks, paths, greenways that are used for transportation are surtax-eligible. If it gets you from A to B, it's surtax-eligible, because those are roads. They may not be roadways, but they're roads.

Just to skip along a little bit, the minimum annual guarantee to the cities remains the same. It will be subject to annual true-up with the city because, as you just heard now, there are times where at the beginning of the year we tell the cities X dollars are available for your projects, and we may get X plus \$20 million. Well, that extra money, because we've given them a percentage, will flow back in so that we're ensuring that we meet the commitment for the 10 percent minimum annual guarantee. That also goes both ways.

So, if there's a year that we have an economic downturn and we told the cities at the beginning of the year you're expecting X and we put X dollars out into the system, it turns out to be X minus \$10 million at the end of the year, there's a true-up for following years. These are all items that the BCCMA and the elected officials from the Broward League of Cities heard from us. So, because we have projects that are in the pipeline right now, there are really three funding priority time periods to talk about. The first of which is the one that we're currently in, from fiscal 2025 through 2029. Community Shuttle remains the number one priority in terms of funding. Then it's the existing five-year plan for MCPs and cycle one R&M.

Then we have a formula funding for R&M and micro transit, and we'll get to that slide momentarily, but that is based on cost savings from various parts of the program over some period of years that we're now able to give a cash infusion out to the cities so that they can start working on some of these R&M projects.

And then the fourth is the grant match program. From 2030 to 2033, we still have Community Shuttle leading the way in terms of priority. Then it's municipal capital program "tails," so it's those last phases of projects that we've already funded in earlier

phases, because we would not be good stewards of taxpayer money if we funded your design and because we changed the agreement, well you don't get to build it.

So that remains a priority so all the projects, I believe that there are eight projects that are in the pipeline that we are going to ensure get funding for their tails from 2030 to 2033. Then we have the formula funding for micro transit, R&M, and the grant match program. And then for the last half of the Surtax, 2034 through 2048, again Community Shuttle, and then we divide up the remaining funds after Community Shuttle is budgeted, with 60 percent going to the formula-based funding out to the cities and 40 percent going to the grant-match program.

On this next slide, we were asked by the BCCMA to come up with two different formula models, one of which was purely based on the centerline miles as reported by FDOT every year, and another one that was based on a modification of that, that included things along the lines of how much has each city gotten in funding from Surtax on a rolling five-year basis as well as median income. The BCCMA, and in conversations yesterday with the Broward League of Cities, everybody has selected to go based on the centerline miles distribution. So that's what's going to be in the agreement. The dollar amounts that we see here under the second column, "Distribution if Based on Centerline Miles," that is the fiscal 2026 dollar amount assuming that the cities sign off on the third amendment, that we will be handing out as checks to the cities for their micro transit and their rehabilitation and maintenance programs. Sure.

UNITIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The second is for plus modifiers?

MR. KLITSBERG: Yes, and that was—we gave them both options, and they took the first one. So, the second one is not what the cities have selected and because it is money on the city side of the ledger, we certainly did not want to dictate that as a county that's the selection that they've make. So again, municipalities will have the option to use formula funding for any surtax-eligible rehabilitation, maintenance, or micro transit, or both. And if there's a city that doesn't have any community shuttle and has less than one percent of the total municipal centerline miles, I believe there are four, three. Those cities have the ability to say, you know what, we're never going to have a community shuttle and we're never going to have a federal or state appropriation, so we'd like to just waive out of those two things, and they're going to get an enhancement to their annual R&M funding so that it's a fairer system for those cities that just don't have the ability to ever get access to those other two things.

Municipalities that have a community shuttle don't get to drop it because, in many cases, we just paid for their buses, and so they must continue to maintain their community shuttle programs through the end of their agreements or through the end of the useful life of vehicles that have been paid for by the county. At that point, they can make different choices in terms of whether or not they want to have community shuttle, and that's not really different from what we have now.

Their agreements run for periods of time so that if they're getting buses the agreement runs through the life expectancy. Micro transit and R&M just a little bit more on that, so the goal of the third amendment is that we're now in year six of the program. Actually, year seven of the program. Six? Six. Six of the program. I went to law school to avoid

math. Sixth year of the program. It's a matured program at this point, and it's time, the example that I use is, when I first taught my kids to bowl I made sure there were bumpers on the side, the bumpers have the ability to come off now. So, if the city wants to use part of their formula-based funding for micro transit, great.

They provide us a copy of the agreement, they provide us a copy of the insurance, it's making sure that the county and the city are both named insured, risk of liability to the county I think is negligible or nil because all we are is a funding source because we're not operating the program or managing it. And the cities are agreeing that they're going to ensure their operators comply with all legal requirements for running a transit system, that includes all the FTA requirements, all the Title VI, making sure that there's ADA accessibility for those micro transit vehicles. There are a number of the micro transit operators that basically said if you build, you know, if you fund it, we will come, so they are going to have ADA-accessible micro transit vehicles. They're not all the cutesy golf carts that you see out east –

MR. HOOPER: (Inaudible)

MR. KLITSBERG: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: How are you getting a wheelchair in that today?

MR. KLITSBERG: So what we've been told from a number of the municipalities is that the micro transit programs are app-based and you have the ability to select that you need an ADA accommodated vehicle. And, they're going to be responsible for ensuring that happens, because I'm sure none of these cities want to get sued for an ADA violation,

nor does Circuit or Cricket or Freebie or whatever the heck these companies names are. I don't know them all.

So, it's going to be on the city — they wanted to get the bumpers taken off, they have responsibility and they have accountability for this. Again, we also set some basic insurance requirements, because some of those vehicles are in fact the cutesy golf carts. And then, municipal rehab and maintenance, again this is to supplement not supplant their programs in order to get access their annual funding they provide us with a list of the projects that they intend on doing with their start and completion dates, information that we'll need from app administration to be able to track the project and for Sandy's shop to be able to issue a CBE goal memo associated with it and other than reviewing it to make sure that it's statutorily eligible, which again, road rehab and maintenance, I can't imagine a road rehab and maintenance project not filling within the definitions in chapter 212 for surtax.

We do a legal review to make sure that they are an eligible project, map administration and others within the county will make sure that their proposed rehab and maintenance project doesn't conflict with a county, state, or other municipal project. You know, we don't want them doing milling and resurfacing on Sample Road in their city and then the next city is also doing milling and resurfacing at the same time because that just makes life miserable for everybody. But the answer is never really going to be no to the cities for an eligible project. It may just be you need to start it a little bit later, you can delay. The municipality and this was actually something that got brought up by a couple of members, elected officials yesterday at block, was what happens because you saw

from the schedule some cities will have enough in a single year to be able to do sizable rehab and maintenance, others may not because it's based on centerline miles. If they wish to defer receipt of their funding for a couple years, up to three years for larger cities, up to five years for the smaller cities, they have the ability to do that with notice to the county. Their money is their money and even though the money rolls into the next year, it doesn't get counted for the MAG for the next year. It's counted for the MAG for the year that the funding was made available to them. So, when they're ready to do that project they'll be able to get a much larger lump sum at that point for a couple of years.

MPC takes, so we're still working on the reviewing, ranking, and recommendations of MCPs. The cycle 3 projects are that are in a design phase that were not subsequently recommended for construction funding for '28 or '29. There's five cycle 4 projects that potentially are going to be further on down the road, so of the eight projects that have not yet been recommended for construction funding in the current 5-year plan are going to be prioritized for funding in cycles 6 through 10. So, That'll be even with that funding for those projects to make sure that they get constructed since we've paid for design, we will have money we expect to have money left over for the R&M and micro transit allocations every year.

So, grant match program, again we will advise the cities of how much money is available in the grant match program every year. They can submit an application to us saying hey this is the project we want to do, this is where we think we're getting the money from. We're going to make every effort to avoid a competition, so, if two cities come they're doing the same kind of project in the same kind of area, we may suggest that they submit

a joint project. If there's something that may conflict with a county project or a state project at the same time, again, it's basically bumpers off and we're just reviewing to make sure that it's not creating a conflict with other projects that are ongoing. Funding is generally going to be available on a first come first serve basis, subject to review and consideration to make sure that it's the maximum leveraging of funds from state or federal sources, making sure that it aligns with all of the project goals of the surtax program and the County Commission's strategic plan. Each city is only going to be eligible for one funding under the grant match program every year, so nobody can submit, say, I'm going to get eight different grants this year. I would like all of the money. Everybody is entitled to get one. Yes, Mr. Hooper?

MR. HOOPER: Is it grant match? Is it based on that total on the –

MR. KLITSBERG: No, that total on the other slide that is just a pure cash infusion for the annual formula based.

MR. HOOPER: Okay, so, so now, if you have a program you want to do and you've got a grant, you can come and get additional funding, provided that it meets whatever requirements.

MR. KLITSBERG: That's exactly the point of it, which is typically the state or federal appropriations require 20 or 25 percent local match, so if the city comes to us and says, we would like some Surtax money to help defray the local match, that's what it's for. So that we can say, okay, you need it's a 100 million project, they're giving you 75 million, you need 25 million, come to the county for the Surtax Program to get some of that.

But we do require, and this was an item that was brought up by a number of our county commissioners at various meetings over the past year, that the city should have some skin in the game too, so they're only going to be eligible for up to three-quarters of the local match portion. They've got to come up with some of their own money for this.

MR. COOLMAN: Nathaniel, what's the rationale between only one versus six or eight? I mean if the whole idea is to match your money and do more, what was the rationale of limiting?

MR. KLITSBERG: Because it's coming in on first come first serve basis and somebody can come in and basically encumber the entirety of the grant match program for things they think they're going to get and then what happens to all the other cities that may also be getting—

MR. COOLMAN: Once you go through, it's like a draft you get the first draft. If there's money left, do they go back to the nut? That's my question.

MR. KLITSBERG: Well, it's again, since every city—if there winds up being extra, and I'll talk about what happens if there's extra money in the grant match program at the end of determination of who's getting it. The BCCMA and the city officials were understanding of the fact that nobody should be able to monopolize the grant match program in any given year and everybody felt that there was and we're going to tell them what the maximum amount you can get from the program is as well per project depending on how much money is actually available in there, again, with the goal of getting as many projects funded as possible. If there is and I, this is going to be skipping a little bit further down in the presentation, but I'll answer it now based on your question. Which is, if you

have a leftover money in the grant match program, let's say everybody submitted their applications we encumbered funds based on the fact that it looked like you were going to get your money from the state of the feds and those all fall apart. And what do we do with the money at that point that's in the grant match program? There's some options that in terms of rolling it over, but what we've talked with the BCCMA about and they were amendable to is one of those options is we can basically notify the BCCMA that we have X dollars unspent in the grant-match program. You guys go to your cities tell them to submit applications to you, your own city managers association for them to conduct the evaluation, similar to what the MPO is doing right now, and make recommendations to the county on maybe funding one or two capital projects because there hasn't been money spent. Gretchen, please?

MS. CASSINI: I just wanted to add that what the BCCMA is really interested in is flexibility. So, what we would do is just say we have X amount of dollars that are available. BCCMA, what would you like to do? Bless you. Would you like us to make more money available in grant-match pot? Would you like us to do a municipal capital application process through you? Would you like us to roll it forward for rehabilitation and maintenance next year? You let us know what a majority of your members would like to do with that unencumbered money, and then we'll do that.

MR. KLITSBERG: Right. And again, it's again that flexibility, responsibility, accountability — this is money that's on the city side of the ledger, and we want to make sure that they have as much of a voice and control over what happens in those circumstances, so that we are serving our municipal partners as well through the program.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Nathaniel, I have a question on that. I am curious about the annual formula. How exactly is that configured?

MR. KLITSBERG: Okay, so Gretchen has more technical details on this, but it's based on the centerline miles within each city as reported to and compiled by the Florida Department of Transportation. So,

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: I just want to make sure that there's some equitability and I want to know understand how, how they're arriving at these numbers.

MS. CASSINI: That's exactly correct. What Mr. Klitsberg just shared with you, that was actually the BCCMA surtax subcommittee's' proposal. They put forth the centerline miles formula — basically you just look at the total centerline miles that are owned by municipalities throughout Broward County, and then the number of miles attributable to each municipality becomes a percentage, and that percentage is then applied to the total dollar value that's available from the county in that pot.

So, for the first distribution, as you saw in one of the previous slides, the total cost savings that's been made available to the municipalities is \$30 million. So based on the number of centerline miles that a particular municipality has, the percentage of the total then gets applied to that \$30 million. And as Nathaniel pointed out, we were asked by the surtax subcommittee of the BCCMA to look at other options.

We looked at dozens of other options and ran all kinds of variations and modifiers to the formula. One of the biggest pieces that we heard consistently from the BCCMA during our negotiations was, "How do we create something fair?"

So, if we're going to go forward with this kind of formula process, how do we acknowledge the amounts of money that cities have already received through the Surtax Program try to create a little fairer baseline. So, that was one of the biggest pieces, so we heavily weighted the amount of funding that every municipality had received and that would be through the Community Shuttle Program, capital projects, rehabilitation and maintenance projects?

But again, when they saw how that looked, when they actually saw how that impacted them, the majority of the municipalities chose to stick with the straight centerline miles. So that's where we are.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Interesting. You know, I think about things like population levels of congestion, and all of those other issues would have been more of a determinant of how much money each city would receive but the centerline model.

MR. KLITSBERG: They elected to use centerline miles.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Okay.

MR. KLITSBERG: Ours is not to question why — ours is just to—so. Oh, sorry

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Sorry, go ahead.

MR. DONMEZ: I also, you know, wanted to mention that there were so many different standards, you know, considered including the population and the miles and some hybrids, you know. But, in the end there is really, we're a big county. We have a lot of cities. We have many large cities and many small cities and everything in between. So, one formula, even a hybrid formula in many cases didn't optimize it. So, I just want

to thank you, you know leading the negotiation with Gretchen and also county administrators office.

These negotiations are never easy, parties always, you know, ask you for more, but -- in the end, we're all trying to serve the same large community in totality and we have municipal unit jurisdictions, but I think this is so much of an improvement of what we have now. And as far as streamlining funding, optimizing funding and clarification the eligibility requirements and adding new programs, you know, the grant match programs. I think that's going to help, you know, perhaps to be more creative.

But these are all new tools in the toolbox and anytime you have more parties negotiating for the same agreement it complicates things. I just want to thank you all and also the BCCMA staff taking the lead role, the subcommittee taking the lead role negotiating on everybody's behalf -- I think this is going to be so much better, clearer and also serve our Broward County community in so many ways better.

MR. KLITSBERG: That's the goal. And as I often said when, when we were looking at this, it's about 10% of the money it should cause you about 10% of the aggravation. If there's a disparity between those two, you need to fix one of them. So again simplification, clearness, making sure that everybody gets something every year to help them do the things that they need to have done. It's just to help. So next thing to talk about is the last of the cycle one projects. We're really done with these things. There's like a couple of stragglers, but they're done. And everybody has agreed that we can kill them, as part of the third amendment. They do have the ability to seek review from you for an additional 90-day extension.

After we said from the county side your cycle one project is not under agreement, it should have been under agreement four years ago. We are terminating it. If they don't like --if the city doesn't like that, they have the ability to request a review and come before you as an oversight board for you to decide whether or not to give them an additional 90 days to go under agreement.

And by the way, this is a change it's going to require an ordinance change because we are providing this would in essence be additional delegated power and authority to this board in an oversight capacity which is, hey, this is a project that we looked at five years ago and it was supposed to be moving. You're either getting another 90 days or you're not getting another 90 days and the termination that was done by the county stands. So that is something that's going to require ordinance change and it provides you with that authority when the cities come. There's only a couple of them now, but if they were to come and sing for their supper.

MR. HOOPER: So, we get to be the bad guys?

MR. KLITSBERG: You don't get to be the bad guys. No, no. Actually, the county has already terminated the agreement.

MR. HOOPER: Good.

MR. KLITSBERG: You are just deciding whether to give them another 90 days to get under agreement. And realistically speaking, Mr. Hooper, at this point if they're not under a surtax agreement, they're never getting under a surtax agreement, but you never know.

MR. COOLMAN: Nathaniel.

MR. KLITSBERG: Yes, sir.

MR. COOLMAN: I want to thank you for that and Mr. for Phil Allen. This is really the Phil Allen amendment, right? Thank you very, very much. Four years later.

MR. KLITSBERG: A couple of other things going forward. If a city is not under a surtax services agree — a surtax funding agreement in a year where their project was construction ready and there's all the county approvals have happened, everything needed to happened -- and they're just not under agreement. The county also has a right to terminate those agreements. And again, when these agreements get terminated, the money flows back onto the city side of the ledger from other cities projects. Whether it goes into the grant match-pot, whether it goes into additional formula based funding, whether it's a new MCP, it goes back to the city side of the ledger. And that was a key component to this. And I think something that the city's recognized was this was a cash grab. You have cities that for good, bad or ill reason have money that is encumbered, that could have been used for other city projects. So, I think that they realized that it was a good thing to let those funds flow back into the city side of the ledger. Mr. Allen, I see your light is on.

MR. ALLEN: Madam Chair?

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Yes, go ahead.

MR. ALLEN: Will the ordinance giving the power or responsibility to this August body, will it define the basis for our decision making or is it as wide open as they say?

MR. KLITSBERG: I would like to, again, I think that limiting it other than for, you know, you can't make a decision that's arbitrary, capricious, which you can't do anyway.

The city should come and give their reasons. And if you feel that it's a compelling reason, then it's compelling reason to you. And there's nine of you and if there's a vote, and 5 say yes, then they get their extra 90 days. They get their extra time. The termination still stands. It doesn't remove the termination; it just delays that termination if they're able to get into an agreement within that time period.

So, I think we can just go to the last slide. So again, in summary, this is again to increase simplicity and fairness to access surtax funds by the city and retaining transparency and accountability for the entire program. We have that formula-based distribution so that they can do the bread-and-butter projects every single year that we know that they need to do. It offers an ability for the cities to get access to money for micro transit which they have wanted for years and we're able to do that now.

We're increasing leverage which was a primary goal of the surtax program by eliminating the standard municipal capital program projects capital program and converting it into the grant match, again to improve efficiencies. It establishes greater municipal control and flexibility, responsibility, and accountability. And it does revise the oversight board to focus on program oversight activity. Because once the determination has been made that a project is eligible and has come before this board, you've confirmed its eligibility, this county commission has decided to fund it. Now we're in an oversight role. What is happening with those dollars? What is happening with those projects and putting that making sure that, that is for some of the things that you're doing right now.

These terminations don't have to come before this board. They're done administratively.

But giving the cities that one last opportunity after a decision has been made on the

administrative level to terminate their project to come before a citizen board and request additional time for hopefully for a good reason. I don't expect you to get a lot of them, but if you do and you feel that they are deserving some extra time you have the ability to give it to them. So again, I'm happy to answer any questions collectively or individually when we're on break. Not collectively, when we're on break, which we'll talk about during the afternoon session. So, if there are any questions, I'm happy to take them.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: One.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: I see we have two. Go ahead. Then Allen.

MR. McELROY: Thanks guys. I'm sure this was- this looks like a lot of work. It's probably just insane.

MR. KLITSBERG: Yes.

MR. McELROY: The one question about the Objective 7.

MR. KLITSBERG: On what page?

MR. McELROY: Page 48. Okay, I'm sorry, it's up quite a bit.

MR. KLITSBERG: Sure. No worries.

MR. McELROY: I think that's it an overview of objectives.

MR. KLITSBERG: Yes.

MR. McELROY: So, I think we've talked about this once before. So, eliminating prohibition on using surtax funds to maintain capital assets built with tax funds. The example I always think of is if a city is struggling with the roadway and resurfacing budget and then file for a road widening project, they now have double the maintenance and we're going to be allowing them to use surtax funds to maintain that new roadway that's

wider so it would be increasing their debt. And this alarms me, only in the sense I wish the surtax goes on forever. But we are under threat from the state and everything else. I don't know. Like the fiscal discipline of increasing capital debt without them already having the ability to maintain it seems inverse.

MR. KLITSBERG: It is a great point, a great question. And if we were continuing the municipal capital program project the way that it currently exists, where everybody throws in their three applications, the NPO makes recommendations and there's five, six, eight projects that get put out every year. All we're dealing with right now are the projects that have already been approved. And then we're talking about those projects that we have the tails that are left that we would be funding the construction phase for something that we've already paid for design or a project that's already completed.

And, in weighing the equities of is it worse for us to have spent \$10 million of surtax money to help them with a -- it may not be a road widening. It could have been a sidewalk, could be any capital. Watching it, watching it be, you know, watching it deteriorate because they don't have sufficient funds in their O&M budgets every year to maintain it may be like fifth priority project and they may not get to it for years if they're getting that money from the surtax for the formula based funding for things that are rehab and maintenance. The determination was made that it was--The benefits outweigh the detriments to making sure that the stuff that we pay for to have built is maintained properly. And again, since we're not going to be having the same breadth of a capital programs going forward, you're not going to have the cities fighting for a road wide, you know, road widening project. If the state is going to give them 75% of the money or the

feds are going to give them 75% of the money for something, then again we're providing that grant match money and then they would be able to use their annual formula based funding to again make sure that something that we help them build, or provided them funding to help them build is maintained properly.

MR. McELROY: Okay.

MR. KLITSBERG: So that's the best way that I can explain. I understand your point.

MR. McELROY: What do you think, in like, the future I don't want to see but if the surtax isn't here in X amount of years, with these assets

MR. KLITSBERG: I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.

MR. McELROY: I guess it's just. Yeah, I guess we don't have to think of that. I just think of it in the sense of fiscal discipline for the future.

MR. KLITSBERG: It keeps me awake at night. Yeah, it's part of the program and there's no answer. I don't have a good answer.

MR. McELROY: I appreciate you guys.

MR. KLITSBERG: Mr. Hooper?

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Yes, Allen.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah, great job, Gretchen, Phil, Nathaniel, the Board, anyone that participated in that - that took something that was brain damage and turned it into something that's going to be easier to deal with. So, thank you for that. And then the other thing I just - me being cautionary. You're going to bring in - you're going to -- there's going to be an amendment to the ordinance.

MR. KLITSBERG: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: I would just ask that you highlight- we're going to get to review it?

MR. KLITSBERG: I will be happy to because of the timing of this and the start of the new fiscal year and that the fact that the county commission goes out on its summer recess late June. There's only one meeting. The goal is to have the third amendment before the -- and again, third amendment is consistent with this. The ordinance change is going to follow that. And as soon as we're done with the draft of the ordinance change, I'm more than happy to distribute that out to every member and have individual conversations.

MR. HOOPER: And if you could highlight, you could highlight the additional roles that are going to be given to the surtax and if you could highlight any roles that are going to be removed from the surtax or that impact this board's authority, things that it is required or not required to do as of today. If there's any changes to our authority, I would like it highlighted so that we can see it might just be added role. I don't know.

MR. KLITSBERG: So I will tell you that, in terms, there is one role that is going to be clarified and I know that this is something that's been brought before this board before I think even the county attorney came one time to talk about it, which is the issue of eligibility of programs under the statute. That's going to be done through a presentation rather than vote since the issue of whether something is statutorily eligible because, again, it is- This board is an oversight board over how projects that have been deemed eligible and that the county commission has elected to fund are being performed. So, the language regarding eligibility is going to be clarified as I know that -- that has been

something that has come up a number of times in the past. All projects will still come before this board. All expenditures will still come before this board. That does not change.

MR. HOOPER: Okay, but you're bringing something in front of the board that is going to change something because of eligibility or what. There's obviously a perception that this board sees things a little differently than the county does or that the legal department does. And so before, if it's going to change the authority of this board and if this board was placed here by a referendum, then we should be able to discuss that in an open.

MR. KLITSBERG: And you will be able to, given the timing of this since the agreement is going to be going before the board. The agreement, the ILA goes before the board and the provisions that relate to expanded or changed roles for this oversight board are noted in the third Amendment as subject to ordinance. You know, you know, upon an ordinance change allowing x, this happens. So we're -- we have some "if/then" statements in the agreement because of the timing and we will be meeting again in August while the commission is still out of recess. And I there should be no reason that I don't have it done by then and we can have a robust discussion at that point. Absolutely.

MR. HOOPER: Perfect. Thank you.

MR. KLITSBERG: And again, once I send it out to everybody which should be -- once it's sent out, which should be well in advance of that meeting, I'm happy to have as many conversations with anybody that would like to talk about it because the goal is to have you in a meaningful, and I said this is the last meeting, a meaningful role without

overburdening the oversight board with new things to do for the sake of having things to do, because you are all volunteers here. This is not your job. This is part of your service to the community. So, we don't want to add 20 hours a month of extra activity for you.

MR. HOOPER: But we agreed to do the job. And granted, it's a volunteer job, but it's a role that is required by the voters and the citizens of Broward County. And I would, I would ask our board members to read what Nathaniel sends us, especially the legal minded ones. And then -- and I'm sure it's all going to work out to where we're happy with it, but I just want to -- These are things that I think as a board, we should take it seriously.

MR. KLITSBERG: Absolutely. I know this is a concern you have raised in the past even well before I came here -- when we talked about a third amendment, I take it very seriously.

MR. HOOPER: I know you do.

MR. KLITSBERG: And in terms of the ordinance change, the goal is there's so much within the ordinance that works that we need to maintain. There are a few things that again, just are kind of wonky and they don't necessarily track what was in -- They do track what was in the language in the ballot initiative, but place you in a role that is not an oversight role and would place you in a legal role which didn't make sense the first time I saw it. You know, I've gone through it. So there's some -- When I say there are minor changes on those issues, I mean very seriously, there are minor changes on those issues. And again, you'll get it well in advance. We can talk about it individually and collectively at our workshops in August.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you very much.

MR. KLITSBERG: My pleasure.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Thanks, Nathaniel. Doug, I think you had something?

MR. COOLMAN: I don't know if this is a fair question but I am always looking out for the city. How would you handicap, percentage wise, what the cities wanted and what they got in the third amendment?

MR. KLITSBERG: I think the cities- I think the best way to describe it is that the cities got the vast majority of what they really wanted, not necessarily how they conveyed it. There were things – there happened to be a number of things that they didn't know they wanted. That when we talked to them about it, they thought were very good ideas. I often think it, like to some extent, these kinds of agreements, because you've got 30 other parties, there's never going to be unanimity amongst everybody on everything. I try to treat agreements like this, like Apple treats the development of products. We're trying to come up with something you wouldn't know you wanted yet. And when you see it, you're like, oh, we would like that. And again, the grant match pot, for example, seemed to be universally liked amongst the cities, but it was not one of their ideas.

MR. COOLMAN: Thank you for your tenacity. And how long, however long it takes for amendment four will tell us about what a great job you did on three.

MR. KLITSBERG: It will never happen.

[laughter]

MR. KLITSBERG: By the way, if there do need to be minor tweaks and changes to the agreement, we are putting in language that says it does not require an amendment

signed by 50 – excuse me, 50% of the cities – representing more than 50% of the population. So, that is my sneaky way of saying, no fourth amendment.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: All right. So I think there are no other questions, we will break for lunch. I know we had previously allotted an hour but we if could do it in 30 to 40 minutes. That would be best. That way we can get through rest of the agenda.

(Whereupon, a lunch break was taken at 12:04 p.m.)

(Resumed at 12:48 p.m.)

Federal Legislative & Discretionary Grant Update

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: We would like to go ahead and resume. Everybody's here. Let's move this agenda forward. Great lunch. Thank you everybody who was involved in that. We're ready, essentially, for the legislative and discretionary grant update. Is Greg here?

MS. CASSINI: Madam Chair, Mr. Burns is joining us from Washington, D.C. on the line.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Okay.

MS. CASSINI: Greg, are you there?

MR. BURNS: I am here.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: All right, we're ready. Thank you.

MR. BURNS: Thanks, everybody. Sorry that I'm not able to enjoy your tasty lunch. I could actually use some of that right about now. But I am here to provide you all with a legislative update with respect to what's going on in Washington. So, we'll go ahead and jump right in. My name is Greg Burns with Thorn Run Partners. By the way, I work on behalf of the County and have for a number of years. If we can advance to the next slide.

MS. CASSINI: I was going to ask. Thanks, Greg.

MR. BURNS: Thank you. So, no, I'm sure, as everyone is aware, it's been a very busy 100 days. I think we're either at 102 or 103 days of the Trump Administration and things have not let up. Some of that has to do with transportation issues that I'll try to focus on for you all today. But of course, there's other stuff going on as well that I just want to briefly touch on to give you a sense of overall scope of what's happening here in Washington. So, you'll note that this PowerPoint mentions 130 executive orders that were signed as -- as of the middle of the month. I think that's actually up into the 140 level now. We've gotten quite a bit higher.

However, about 90 of those have been either paused or, at least, challenged by the court systems. You know, executive orders are not bills. They are not really able to do much other than message. So that's why many of them have been challenged and folks have sought to temper some of the efforts of the administration. And then in the meantime, we have the Department of Government Efficiency, you know, doing quite a bit. I know some of that may be winding down. At least you're hearing some of that talk that Elon Musk may not be as front and center with respect to the Department of

Government Efficiency, but I think some of the work that they have been doing -- or undergoing will continue.

And of course, we've had a lot of shakeup with respect to the federal workforce. Many people have taken a variety of offers to leave service voluntarily. The administration has certainly let go of most probationary employees, those who have less than one- or two-years experience, depending on the agency. So, there's been a lot of turnover and a lot of folks who have decided to move on from the organization -- or the federal government.

Meanwhile, aside from the administration's activities, we do have Congress. They still exist and are intending to function, at some point. And I'm sorry, it's a Friday afternoon, it's been a long week. So, I hope you all understand that I'm saying much of this in jest and kidding a bit. Maybe I'll try to be a bit more serious. Congress has been very focused on what they're calling a "reconciliation bill," which is going to primarily focus on extending Trump tax cuts that were first enacted in 2017, and which will expire at the end of this calendar year.

I could go into a whole bunch of depth as to, you know, what's happening with that. But I think I'll try to keep it high level. They are going to do quite a bit of policy in this bill as well. So, you'll note in future news articles that you've probably seen that there's a whole lot of stuff going on with bill that's not just related to tax cuts, but that is the primary focus of that bill. Two things I want to note with respect, specifically to transportation impacts, they are very seriously looking at doing away with tax exempt municipal bonds, which would mean that local governments, in order to do bonds, would have to have to

issue taxable bonds. Therefore, making those bonds more expensive and costing the taxpayer more money. So that's a big impact.

We should know more about the outcome of that conversation later this month, once one of the committees releases text of their portion of the bill. So that's something we've been following very closely and would certainly have an impact on transportation spending, but also local governments in general. We also have an annual fee for -- actually not just EV car owners, but for hybrid car owners as well. That's part of this reconciliation bill. So just this week the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee released their proposal which was going to levy a fee of \$200 per year on EV car owners, \$100 per year on hybrid car owners, and a \$20 fee per year on all other car owners. So, this is meant to make up for, or the fact that the gas tax does not keep up with the spending that we do on our surface transportation system, which primarily throughout history, has been financed by user fees.

So interestingly, there was a lot of pushback on the \$20 fee for all car owners. So that was erased. And the House Transportation Infrastructure Committee changed the approach to now \$250 for all EV owners annually and still \$100 for all hybrid owners annually. So, we'll see where that goes. But that's in the draft house version that they are working on. So next slide.

So, in terms of what else is happening with respect to transportation, of course we do still have the bipartisan infrastructure law. It's still the law of the land, with respect to the surface transportation bill and also with respect to, you know, just all the opportunities that bill created. Generally speaking, that bill will exist through the end of 2026, but for

the surface transportation portion that we'll talk more about in a moment, it will exist through the end of September next year.

So of course, the administration has sought to pretty significantly change a variety of these grant programs and change the award criteria. You know, I won't get into a lot of detail about that, although I could, just for the sake of time. It's been interesting to watch how they've adjusted these programs already. And I think that will continue to happen. I do think that the administration will likely, you know, spend the money that's available in the law. You know, personally, I don't know why they wouldn't get it out under their own rules and regulations and will their own criteria and, you know, award projects and then take credit for them.

So, I know there's been a lot of talk of freezing funds and canceling funds, and some of that has occurred in the transportation space. But I think most of the money from the infrastructure law, you know, is likely still to make it out the door, given the fact that it's there. We have seen a slower rollout of many grant programs. And then of course, there, there is, you know, sort of the most controversial program, I suppose, from the administration's perspective, have been ones that focus on EV charging.

They've really tried to curtail the expenditures on those programs. However, there was a recent judicial ruling that targeted the Office of Management Budget asking DOT to force them to spend the money. So, we'll see how the administration responds to that. Time will tell. But again, I still think that most of the money that's in the law will ultimately be spent. Another reason why today is so busy is because President Trump released his - the first iteration of his budget for the next fiscal year, starting October 1st.

So that's fiscal year 2026. It only came out at 10:00 this morning. So, it is also only what's as a "skinny budget," meaning it's really devoid of many details, but it does have enough, enough detail for us to get a sense for the first time, really, of how Trump hopes to change the federal government in the way that he sees fit. So, we're certainly following that pretty closely. We'll send out an update to the county team probably early next week, which with our takeaways on what this means. I think one thing to remember is that a budget really is just an outline of what the administration wants, but they are not the ones that write the law.

So therefore, Congress will have to begin work on appropriations bills to fund the government for fiscal year '26, and those will ultimately be the recommendations that will be made by the federal government to how to spend funds in the future fiscal year. But this, you know, this will be the first time again that we've seen you know, a codification, I suppose, or a writing on paper of, you know, some of the changes that the Trump administration has already begun to make, through the Doge efforts and other things to shrink and or eliminate federal agencies or sub agencies, or whatever, or programs. This is the first time where they really have to pen the paper. So, we'll see where Congress goes with these recommendations.

You will see a lot of, you know, news articles, I think, about impacts of the president's budget, but just know that their recommendations, not final plans. I'll just add that Congress does have to work on a bipartisan manner. I didn't really talk about that much with respect to the reconciliation bill. That's a very specific legislative approach that can only be used once a year, that only requires majority support in both the House and

Senate. But traditionally, all other pieces of legislation, including appropriations bills to fund the government, do require bipartisan support, particularly in the Senate, where they require 60 votes to move pass filibuster rules.

So, next slide. So, of course, I've already talked a little bit about how the bipartisan infrastructure law will expire. I mentioned that surface transportation programs will expire even a little bit before that. I think it's important to note when we talk about what the next iteration of the surface transportation bill will look like. The bipartisan infrastructure law was, in part, a surface transportation authorization. So, on the right, you'll see a visual. \$650 billion was kind of the surface transportation part. It was focused on, really, reauthorizing existing programs, so it wasn't really new spending. And then that other portion in the pie chart is shown in the red, \$550 billion, of which some went to transportation, but some went to other types of projects and programs related to infrastructure, was roughly half of the overall bipartisan infrastructure law. So, it's a little confusing. But, you know, in many ways, this next iteration of the service transportation bill is going to look very different because we don't anticipate a lot of that new spending to continue. And so, in many ways, you'll see a lot of programs disappear. You'll see a lot of, you know, things will feel like, in a sense, that they could be cut. We'll talk a little bit more about that in just a moment. But, you know, it's going to be a hard, hard issue to get through.

You know, anytime that in today's environment where you're looking to spend more money, even on things that are traditionally as bipartisan as infrastructure can create challenges in Washington, how do you pay for it? What other kinds of things could you

be doing with the money? Could you be trying to devolve some authority to states and locals? What other kinds of changes might you make? So those are all kinds of things that they're going to get into.

You know, the House and the Senate have begun to work on this new version of the surface transportation law. They don't traditionally get these bills done prior to the expiration of the previous one. They often will reauthorize existing programs for some period of time. So that's possible in this case as well, but they are beginning to work. In fact, the House has already solicited feedback on, you know, sort of big picture priorities that, you know, entities have or transportation organizations have.

The Senate is also doing something similar at the moment where they're taking feedback from senators and some Senate offices are being proactive about soliciting feedback. You all do in the state of Florida have some representation on the committees of jurisdiction.

You've got Webster is the most senior member who represents parts of Central Florida, Congressman Mast, who represents portions of Palm Beach, St. Lucie and Martin counties, and then Congresswoman Wilson who represents a sliver of Broward but also a portion of Miami Dade County, are all on the House Transportation Infrastructure Committee, but none of them are on the subcommittee of jurisdiction. And neither Senator Scott nor Senator Moody are on committees of jurisdiction. So, they don't have as much of a role to play in the transportation discussion. Next slide.

So, you know, I mentioned that Congress is hard at work at trying to reauthorize this very complicated bill. You know, I think there's been some pretty clear signals as to

what the next version of this bill will look like. Depending on when that occurs, it could change. But as of today, if it really, if it were to pass within the next 14 months, I think it would be a struggle for Congress to spend much more than what they've spent over the past couple of years for the surface transportation portion of the infrastructure law.

So that would be roughly \$650 billion over five years. That would be level funding.

So, I guess even in an inflationary perspective, that would be less funding that's provided.

So, we'll see where that number ends up. I don't know that I'm exactly right on where that will be, but it's probably not a bad prediction. You know, it is true that this level of funding can't be supported by the gas tax.

It is possible that it could be supported by additional EV fees or those fees that I mentioned for hybrid vehicles that are, you know, potentially going to come into law in the next couple of months. But, you know, we'll see. I don't know if anybody's fully run the numbers on that. If they have. I haven't seen those. I think under any scenario, the next iteration of this surface transportation law is going to look different, feel different than the current infrastructure law simply because it won't have that expanded portion of funding and a lot of programs will probably disappear.

So, I mentioned that consolidation of programs. So, you know, Congress believes, at least today, I shouldn't say Congress as a whole, but the majority believes that all of the discretionary opportunities have been available to people, some of which you all have in the region have tried to take advantage of, have led to, you know, delays in getting the funding out. And so, I think the Republicans, the majority primarily would like to see money go out the door faster and they'd like to see the money go towards what they

consider to be traditional surface transportation programs. So, they really want to focus on, you know, your basic stuff.

Although honestly, I don't think that the Biden administration was focused on a ton of non-traditional infrastructure. But I think that's been a talking point that Republicans have picked up on. So that's what they're likely to focus on in the future. I think they are going to send much more of the money via formula to state DOTs. There is a possibility that MPOs could receive slightly more direct funding, but we'll see how that plays out. I think traditionally, you know, sometimes these bills kind of ebb and flow.

Sometimes particular majorities will come in and create a lot of new programs to try to address issues that are concerns that they've heard about over the years. And then on the flip side, you'll have other groups come in who will say, "well, that funding's been too slow to get out the door, it's too hard to access it. You know, my communities haven't been able to access it. So, I wanted to go out all to the state DOTs."

It'll be much more efficient, you know, they think, and we'll get the money out the door. So that's probably where we're headed. I mentioned privatization also. You know, I just think that certainly the majority would like to emphasize efforts to enhance privatization, if they can. So, we'll see what that might look like in practice. They could create some pilot projects or pilot programs, I should really say programs not projects but programs to help bring in more private investment into the surface transportation network.

So, all these things that reduce production and funding, you know, people not having as many opportunities to seek funding, you know, difficulties in paying for the bill

and having to do general fund transfers to pay for it, all of these things are going to make this bill very difficult to pass.

So, it's very possible that we get to the end of September, they have to pass an extension of the existing law and that we would have new congressional majorities potentially helping to develop the bill. So, this is kind of where things stand today, but we'll see where they stand, you know, in a year. Next slide.

So, I want to focus real briefly on transit funding, because I think that this is one place where things really could change pretty substantially for locals. You know, I think that there has been a conversation in Washington occurring amongst members of Congress where, you know, transit got bailed out during COVID because of, you know, the lack of passengers and yet the need to still maintain service. And so, there's a lot of additional money provided during COVID to transit systems.

You know, again, primarily to deal with operations, not necessarily investment systems, but still, they receive money. And, you know, there's this sense that maybe that was enough and certain people in Washington don't want to do more. You know, you may have heard of or seen some of the recent DOT letters to a variety of transit systems across the country suggesting that they're crime ridden and et cetera, et cetera. And so that sort of feeds into that narrative. And I think it feeds into the narrative that, you know, transit may not be worth the kind of investment that it's received from the federal government over the past, you know, just recent time.

So personally, if I were to make another prediction, you know, I don't know that they'll do a ton of additional money for transit funding. I think importantly for Broward

County, not only do you have the Broward Commuter Rail South Project, but also the broader Commuter Rail North Project is trying to advance into what's known as the Capital Investment Grants Program. You're going to have other investments that you'd like to make through that program, but I am very concerned about CIG funding being dropped pretty substantially.

So, in the past couple of years, it's benefited from a significant infusion of funding into -- or from the infrastructure law. And of course, I mentioned that some of that additional funding is likely to go away, and I do think that there could be efforts to even drop those numbers down more substantially and encourage locals to take on more of the responsibility for investing in new and existing transit systems.

We also see, these are predictions, you know, certainly is not what I want on behalf of Broward County, but I am trying to just share with you, you know, kind of the flavor of what's happening here. Also, I want to note, during the first administration of the- of President Trump, they did demand overmatch for a variety of DOT, well they didn't demand, I shouldn't say- that's the wrong word. They encouraged overmatch for a variety of DOT competitive grant programs. So, I think that's probably likely to continue and they definitely did have a policy to delay what are known as full funding grant agreements for projects in the Capital Investment Grants Program, which is the transit investment program.

What that did is by delaying or not providing that full funding grant agreement, you're basically limiting the expenditure of federal funding. So that did occur during the first Trump administration. We'll see if that occurs again next time. And then, just briefly

on the right, you're seeing a chart that shows cumulative spending on highways versus transit and then the bottom, the red and the blue are showing sort of the split between highways and transit for each of those surface transportation bills we've had over the past nearly 40 years. Next slide.

Oh, well, that's it. So, I'm happy to take or answer any questions. I hope I haven't been, I don't know, too disappointing, with respect to how things are up here. Like I said, it's been very busy. We're just trying to keep up and make sure that, you know, we're certainly trying to protect what we can for all transportation investment nationwide.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Does anyone have any questions or?

MR. McELROY: I guess I have one question. It's in regards to the bridge versus tunnel debate between the County and the City of Fort Lauderdale, right now. Sorry to bring this up, but do you, I'm sorry, but I would like to ask. Do you think you know if we can build a grassroots support to push the City of Fort Lauderdale to make a decision faster? Do you think it's that's good or that the, like you know, the ship has already sailed kind of thing?

MR. BURNS: To be honest, I'm not sure I'm the best one to answer that question, just because of the fact that you know, ultimately, we up here in Washington wait for locals to make those kinds of decisions locally and to determine the kinds of projects that they want to put forward. So, I know that's something that the county team is working pretty extensively on and I'm, you know, just not the best person to answer that question. I mean, those are really local decisions, and I think your members of Congress would probably say the same type of thing.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Anyone else? Alright, well I think that's it. Thank you, Greg, for your very detailed report.

MR. BURNS: Thank you very much. You all have a good Friday afternoon.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: All right. You too. Take care.

MR. BURNS: Bye-bye.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: All right, now, our last and final report for the day. I think that's Mr. Cassini. We have our state legislative update. We're anxiously waiting to hear from you. Good to see you.

State Legislative Update

MR. CASSINI: Good afternoon.

MS. PENNANT WALLACE: Good afternoon. I'm good. Happy to see you again.

MR. CASSINI: You too. And good to see the whole group. How's everybody doing? Marty Cassini, Director of Intergovernmental Affairs. It has been quite a session to say the least. It's been something I have never seen in my 18 years of doing this. I can tell you that it is supposed to come to an end today but that's just the scheduled regular session, mostly of policy bills. There's a couple of joint resolutions that are going to go to voters in 2026 but as of right now, they are -- the House and the Senate are very, very wide apart in terms of, how they plan to allocate state dollars when it comes to the state budget. And, of course, constitutionally the legislature is only required to pass balanced budget every year.

They're actually not required to pass a piece of other legislation aside from that, but they are estimated to be about \$3 million apart still. And they just were not able to come to any kind of conclusion before the end of the regular session. So there's a lot of rumor that's going on right now about when they will come back to finalize their budget.

The Appropriations Chair and Senate actually said that Tallahassee is very nice in the end of May, beginning of June. It would be nice to be here during that time. I think he forgot about the pollen. So -- So that remains quite up in the air and that's really what's taking a lot the air out of the room up in Tallahassee right now. Although, there have been some other substantial bills that passed. I think that I did have a -- One sheet or two --

MS. CASSINI: Madam Chair, there is a document in your binder.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Yes.

MS. CASSINI: On, I believe, the left side

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Yes.

MS. CASSINI: That was provided by the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs last night that is the update on the bills that affect the transportation surtax.

MR. CASSINI: I really wanted to just go through the really important ones, which are the two on the top of page. So, House Bill 1221 and Senate Bill 1664 really kind of caught us off guard when they were initially filed. Didn't really know where this was coming from. But essentially, the bills would have required all discretionary local options surtaxes.

So not just transportation but infrastructure, school board, bonding, the beverage tax down in Miami-Dade, healthcare. I mean, you know, you're talking anything, I mean, you know, you're talking anything that would require the local vote that would add an extra cent perhaps whatever the local government wanted to do it would have required a referendum every eight years to renew. Yeah, so exactly. So just the inability to engage in any kind of long-term planning would have been near impossible if anything like this had really moved through.

We met with both the House and Senate sponsors on this, explained to them our positions on this, especially around this program. And we were surprised to find at the like third week of April that the House decided that they were going to kind of scrap their plan and they were going to completely just erase all of the local surtaxes, except the tourist development tax. And essentially, what the House pivoted to was an idea that you would be able to use the tourist development tax for any public purpose because right now you're only really allowed to use it for infrastructure for tourism, beach renourishment, marketing, promotions, very specific uses that you're allowed to have and use this for but, this would have opened it up to anything.

It would also require the local entity, local governing board to actually reduce milage by that amount that was collected. So it was, it was quite a -- quite an interesting development that we also had to respond to and to explain the investments that the County has made and the Convention Center expansion, the new hotel. Although we don't use TDT for the hotel, but that you know, as a tourist destination, as a premier tourist destination in Florida, and in the United States, how important these dollars were. The

Senate would not take that language from the House. So, they stayed with the eight-year referendum, the every eight-year referendum and both of those bills have the -- excuse me -- 1221 absent the surtax, was passed off the House and also included into the tax bill 7033.

Yes, Bless you.

And the Senate did not move forward with trying to put a vote on 1664 on the 8-year referendum. So, they are finishing up right now. The House can only take returning messages, so they keep amending bills in one chamber and send them back to the other, expecting one to blink, playing a game of chicken and we'll see where everything falls. But we're very happy with the way this turned out for this session, but we will be, of course, watching this when the budgetary process comes back, because generally when they do go into a special session, they will limit the types of bills that would be considered, and we would of course, expect that it's going to be only relevant to budget and taxation issues. So, I'm happy to take any questions.

MR. McELROY: Do you know the status of TriRail funding? I heard it was cut from the governor's budget and then someone at TriRail told me it's no longer going to be funded, coming up.

MR. CASSINI: There has been some conversation about that. I've read a couple articles in the paper; but that was not something that was generally discussed during the time—nothing was adjusted in any of the transportation bills that passed. So that's definitely something that will be worked out during the budget process

MR. McELROY: So – TriRail will still have the budget it's going to have or no?

MR. CASSINI: That remains to be seen. We're just not sure.

MR. McELROY: Oh, because they haven't said anything? I am kind of confused.

MR. KLITSBERG: It'll be part of the budget reconciliation process.

MR. McELROY: Oh, this happens -- so it has been talked about -- but we're not going to know until reconciliation happens.

MR. CASSINI: Correct. It was not dispensed of -- in any form of -- legislation.

MR. McELROY: Is there still a chatter about cutting it, you think, up there?

MR. CASSINI: I think there has been so much, so many different type of things and priorities that are moving, that it just has not been on the radar.

MR. McELROY: Can I ask you, Nathaniel, if it does happen where TriRail is eliminated from the state budget, would the surtax be able to pick up in accordance with if the County Commissioners wanted to do it? Would that be our legal ability to fund it?

MR. KLITSBERG: We haven't -- there have only been preliminary looks at that right now, given the lack of legislation that had passed. I'm sure it'll be something that'll be part of -- fervent discussions if something bad were to happen. And then I can't speculate beyond that.

MR. McELROY: Okay, I think, I don't know where I heard it -- I think some county commissioners, I think, speaking about it. They weren't very -- they didn't really want to fund it. It kind of seemed like their language, maybe they're thinking it was going to come from the general fund. I am talking about the Broward County Commission, so I just wasn't sure. So, if we could backfill that because it seems like, you know, going forward building a lot of capital-intensive projects, to not take care of the one asset we already have that

is running and works, pushes people up and down through our county every day. It would seem like a miss. That is all I have to say about that.

MR. CASSINI: We will continue to watch.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: So any other, any other questions? Oh, sorry. Any other questions? Oh, that's it.

MR. CASSINI: Thank you.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: All right, thank you.

MR. ALLEN: Just a second. Madam Chair? Just a question. Did we ever identify what the target was for the House and Senate and bills, relative to the eight years and the whole bit?

MR. CASSINI: It really depends upon who you talk to. So, in the House, specifically, they were actually looking at the replacement of *ad valorem* taxes with the TDT bill. The Senate, the sponsor said publicly that, you know, "some of these local option taxes were put into use decades ago and that they hadn't been renewed, and sometimes some of them don't even have an end date.

As a matter of fact, as part of our advocacy, I think one of the things that we were really successful in getting to the sponsors was the fact that this program was -- obviously has an end date, which was very important to them, and was the first program that was audited by OPPAGA. And that actually went quite a long way in convincing them that what this program does is correct. Because there were exemptions for existing bonds that were being leveraged on those things. But as a pay-as-you-go model, essentially

behind closed doors, the legislators are like, “You guys are doing it right, that is what we want to see.”

MS. PENNANT WALLACE: Yeah, go ahead, go ahead.

MS. CASSINI: Specifically to your question, Phil, when 1664 was last heard in its last committee of reference, Senator Trumbull, that was the sponsor of the legislation said on the record that he was trying to tie the time frame for the referenda to their -- in the House and Senate they had eight-year terms, so he was trying to tie it to their term limits.

MR. CASSINI: Which was another bill that was moving through the process that ultimately did not make it, which would have limited county commission term limits to 8 years. So –

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: All right, thank you.

MR. CASSINI: Any time.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: I think that was our last item on the agenda until we go into our session, our training. But before we do, I wanted to thank the team for this wonderful booklet showcasing the work of Map Broward. I know there's a lot of effort that goes into doing these every year. So, I wanted to take some time to acknowledge that. And I also wanted to just take a point of privilege to thank everybody for their condolences during the time of my loss. I lost my father and that's why I was not here at the last meeting. Thank you for the cards and the well wishes. I also want to say that, you know, this opportunity to chair this board is very meaningful to me. I think about my journey to this spot, even serving at Broward College as Associate Vice President.

When I just came to Florida, back in 1982, as a college student, I literally had to – I took the bus for my job at American Express to the South Campus at Broward College. And at 9 p.m. when classes were over, there were no buses running, and so I literally walked from the South Campus to where I lived on Johnson Street and University to get home. But because I wanted to be in school so badly, so desperately, I did it every night until I could afford to buy a car. So, the idea that I am serving here in this capacity on behalf of Broward College as an Associate Vice President and now chairing this Penny Tax Oversight Board that is about enhancing transportation to the residents of Broward County is very gratifying. And I am so extraordinarily grateful to all of you for choosing me to lead in this way. And I pledge to serve our community—to serve my community—with excellence. Thank you.

[Applause]

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Thank you. And I think we adjourn to our training.

MS. CASSINI: And, of course, if any other members have anything? And, I think Nathaniel and I both have a quick thing before you adjourn.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: And do we adjourn before the training or-

MS. CASSINI: So, you have the reports out. So, if you will ask the other board members if they have anything.

MR. KLITSBERG: We are on to the non-agenda portion of the agenda before we go into the workshop.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Okay, All right.

Member Reports, Board Coordinator & General Counsel Comments, Adjourn

MR. McELROY: Then I have one non-agenda item I would like to bring before the board and see if, Mr. Nathaniel, if you can help me out with the correct language to use.

MR. KLITSBERG: Sure.

MR. McELROY: So, this is a preemptive oversight. This is not something that's been passed at the Broward County Commission level yet. I'd like to bring it for you guys to see if we can get a jump on it. On the May 6th upcoming Broward County Commission meeting, they're sending out a scope of work for the light rail transit project. And within the scope of work, they defined various things. I looked over it with some of my friends from the Better Streets Broward group. There was one piece of language that struck out, and I would like that we could take a vote to send and transmittal a letter to the Broward County Commission asking if we can strike through it. Just so everyone has the reference, it is -- let me -- give me a minute here -- item 27 on the May 6 agenda. It is specifically page 36 of Exhibit 1, and I'll say it's a service overview. The item that I'd like to get scratched out, it says, "The project will have exclusive elevated transitway with at-grade segments where feasible." I think we should scratch out the word, "at-grade", that would dictate that the LRT and the engineers are studying it, to be the portions that are feasible to be at grade. I think the engineers who are undergoing the scope of work should have full leeway to make their own determination if the project should be elevated or at grade without us preemptively pointing that out. This might be, I might be jumping the gun, in the sense that maybe the engineers are going to have -- present a more

comprehensive scope of work that they present to the County Commission. But I just want to make sure we catch this beforehand. Is that appropriate? In your view? Or?

MR. KLITSBERG: I'll address the legal components to this. So, this Board -- and it wouldn't be a formal vote -- but if this Board decides that it wants to send a letter to the County Administrator regarding a matter that is within your purview and you have the ability to do that, discussions about that in the past, in terms of being able to write a letter. With regards to the specifics of this particular project, I can answer specific questions because our team was the one that negotiated the contract for the legal end with the consultant. The scope of work started out as a nine-page document with the solicitation and over the course of negotiations became about a 70-page scope of work for the PD&E study for the project. The scope, as it currently sits, was in large part developed in consultation with the engineering firm that was the first-ranked firm. So, I can't speak to, you know, the technical components of it because I am not an engineer.

If for some reason this Board collectively thought that it was important or valuable to send a comment to the County Administrator with regards to a particular agenda item, I believe something like that may have happened once in the past, maybe once. So, it is not impermissible. It is not a traditional oversight activity. Because the issues that this Board is governed by in terms of its ordinance role and under the referendum is to determine whether or not a project is eligible as a surtax project, and light rail is one specifically enumerated uses of surtax funds, it's a fixed guideway system, and then to monitor and provide oversight to how the funds are expended, in terms of the project.

And as I mentioned to you, previously during the briefing, you know this Board does not weigh in on the wisdom of a particular project or on whether a project is a good project or a bad project. Because ultimately, pursuant to the statute and the Supreme Court decision that actually invalidated the Hillsborough County transportation surtax, it is the County Commission that makes the ultimate policy decision about whether or not a project is going to be funded and what the nature of the work is that's to be performed is.

So, from a legal standpoint, the will of the Board is the will of the Board as to whether or not to send a communication to the County Administrator regarding this particular issue. But again, it is not something that is not something that is, traditionally within the scope of oversight of a project scenario.

MR. COOLMAN: A question, Nathaniel? The contract that was negotiated was it based on the fact that they were only going to study at-grade?

MR. KLITSBERG: No, it says that the scope of work includes "elevated and at grade, where possible" is the language used.

MR. COOLMAN: So, maybe rather than "strike that," what was stricken, said it should be at-grade or other, because it would be consistent with what you're saying is in the contract, right?

MR. KLITSBERG: Well, again, the scope of work, at this point, in the contract is going before the board on May 6th, which is next Tuesday. If there was going to be any change in the scope of work that would have to be agreed to by the vendor and everything else – before the board.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay, so you're saying that just because it's worded that way in that paragraph, the consultant is not constricted to doing it only at-grade?

MR. KLITSBERG: They will not be doing it only at grade.

MR. McELROY: The language was at grade where feasible –

MR. KLITSBERG: Okay, so there's wording in there.

MR. COOLMAN: So, my comment would be, if there's wording in there to cover your concern, I wouldn't get in that fight, myself.

MR. KLITSBERG: Again, I don't have an opinion with regards to that issue, because, again, the way that it's framed is that it is elevated, and they are studying it at-grade, where feasible.

MR. COOLMAN: Okay. So, I also would have to say that if this Board wanted to do that, I think we should, because we're responsible for seeing that the money is spent properly. And if that wasn't in the way it's worded, I would agree we should do it, even though you're saying it may not be traditionally done. There's nothing traditional about our six years. Okay.

MR. KLITSBERG: Absolutely.

MR. COOLMAN: I mean, we're trying to establish what's going to be traditional. So, I think things are great to be up. It sounds like I wouldn't muddy the waters; I wouldn't use my heroes on that one.

MR. McELROY: I guess I -- Maybe I could defer to Debbie, if I could put you on the spot. Obviously not a legal opinion but – you sit on the board and what would you define – think of as feasible, I guess, I would just be afraid the report comes back, and

they push more sections of the LRT project down to at-grade because the deemed more of those to be feasible, and I think we could end up with a domino effect, where we get this report back and we're like, of course that's more feasible, but the solution across multiple cities across North America has proven a peer elevated system as the best system for user, ridership, etc. Gretchen would – yeah, sorry.

MS. CASSINI: I just wanted for the purposes of the Board, to be clear, that what you're talking about is the Airport-Port, SeaPort Convention Center Connector. So that particular alignment is kind of a unique alignment in that it's going to have to, obviously, go over U.S. 1. It's not intended to be at-grade as it moves through the port for obvious reasons.

So just for your consideration, I wanted you to understand what specific project we're talking about and what specific alignment we're talking about. I also wanted to let you know, Madam Chair and board members, that there is an individual here representing Broward County Transit to talk about this, specifically. If you want to get into the weeds on it, Mr. McCoy is here.

MS. MADDEN: Jump in because I don't have anything to add. I am not familiar with the program so I – the project that is proposed is — so I would love to hear from the county person. Thanks.

MR. HOOPER: Can I, can I just say what I was going to say real quick?

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Go ahead, Allan.

MR. HOOPER: So that makes sense. If it were going out to Plantation or to, then it sounds like they're prioritizing at-grade by saying that. So, words do matter, and I would

agree with you. I just wanted to respond to -- The county can spend the money on things, but this Board does opine on performance, right? And we can also audit performance in the future, which could affect the viability of something continuing forward or not. So, I just wanted to make that point, because I do think the point you're trying to make affects performance—whether it's the people in the cars or the people riding on the train itself, it does matter. But the fact that it's the airport-seaport connection makes a difference. Thank you.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: If I can just piggyback on what you're saying, Allan. I think it's also important that we are the eyes and ears of the community, as well, to pay attention to any project that we think could have some issues that we need to bring to light. We have a platform that allows us to be advocates, so I think we should be able to do that when we see fit. And there's a time and place, certainly, and there might be sometimes when it's not necessary because we don't understand the full gamut of the project. But I certainly wouldn't want to sit here knowing that something is not going well and say nothing. I just wanted to say that for the record.

MR. McELROY Yeah, I guess, Mr. McCoy

MR. HOOPER: So I have to -- I have to leave. I'm sorry. I did.

(1:36 p.m. Alan Hooper left the meeting)

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Did we want to just -- You could give a brief overview, if you will, since we brought it into the forefront.

MR. MCCOY: Good afternoon. Good afternoon, Madam Chair, board members. My name is Barney McCoy. I am the Assistant General Manager for Service and Strategic Planning for Broward County Transit. Specific to this project, where we are right now heading into the project development and environmental. And as part of that process, part of the federal process everything that's been done to date will be reviewed. So, they're not going to go in, you know, with a myopic view if they this is the only thing they're going to review. They'll go back and review the recommendations made through the alternative analysis. They'll go back and review project justification. When you're in alternate analysis there's a portion of environmental that you look at when you enter into project development, there's a heavy component specific to (NEPA) National Environmental Policy Act. All of that, will determine or address some of what you're speaking to specifically to at-grade versus elevated, if you're talking about feasible, you know, that things that determine feasibility as related maybe to ride way, to environmental concerns, but the firm is not charged going with a myopic view based solely on that language. What they'll be giving you is a comprehensive view of the work that is done today and then what we need to do to move forward in the environmental process and the DCIG process for the FDA.

MR. McELROY: So, you think the scope of work would produce a product that would show a peer elevated system as well?

MR. MCCOY: Say that again.

MR. McELROY: The scope of work, the firm being contracted for the scope of work, will, with the possibility if they think it's the best solution show a peer elevated system?

MR. McCOY: It is possible. It's quite possible that your LPA could change during the PD&E process because the fact they'll be doing a deeper dive on some of the things that came out of the alternative analysis. So, just because it's identified as an LPA with maybe, you know, which you could say a directed or a non-directed approach to what that should be. It's possible that could change in the PD&E process.

MR. McELROY: Do you think the language 'accurate when feasible' is redundant, then or I guess, what's the purpose of including that language?

MR. McCOY: It's just an options. This is part of the FTA process. You know, whether you say at grade or elevated those are the only two methods that you can use for this particular alignment, but again what the firm is going to do is look holistically. They're not going to go in, you know, based solely on the language. This is what the County wants us to look at.

MR. McELROY: Okay.

MR. McCOY: You want the firm to do that, and again, we're not trying – we - the language is not meant to be prescriptive. It tells you what the options are in terms of what the analysis will be.

MR. McELROY: Okay, Yeah. I guess that's what I want to make sure, that language is not being prescriptive. That would limit their scope of work. That we're looking

at something comprehensive I mean, you guys are the experts on this, and I defer to you. It makes sense what you're saying—that the firm won't be limited by the language written in this scope of work. It just caught my attention that it said at grade when feasible and feasible is a very vague word, and I was afraid of getting a project that comes back to the Board it gets finished and has more sections than not pushed down to the ground, when there's more conflict of interest for everybody.

MR. McCOY: Now, also, as part of the PD&E process, there's a lot of public involvement in that as well. So, it's not like the firm makes a recommendation and go before the board and approved. That's not the process. You've got public involvement integrated into that process and they'll be part of the review process for the alternatives that come out of the PD& E process.

MR. MCELROY: Okay, alright. Sounds good. Thank you, Barney.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Yes, go ahead. Go ahead.

MS. MADDEN: Thank you. For the NEPA analysis, and if you're accepting public comment at a future point, I mean, I think part of the goal of NEPA, was the effect on the human environment as well. So the point that he's making—it should include if there's impacts from at-grade to humans in the use of the project— or maybe that could be studied, maybe you're already planning that?

MR. McCoy: It is part of the NEPA process, yes, Ma'am.

MR. KLITSBERG: And I can speak to that issue as well. There are several segments that talk about community meetings and communications out to various communities of interests along the line within certain distances—it's all part of the required

– FTA and NEPA process—where there will be feedback obtained from local community groups and things of that nature, on the various options. That will be coming out of the PD&E process.

MR. McELROY: It was exciting to see that scope of work is going to the commission. So, congrats on getting that work done and I'm glad we're moving forward there. That's it for me.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: All right. I think that's it. Thank you so very much. All right, now—any other members? Oh, any other members?

MR. ALLEN: Madam Chair, I mentioned earlier in the meeting, my concern of the status on the performance audit last year, this board, spent a great deal of time working with the county auditor to give us performance report on how we are doing as- in accordance with the authorizing legislation and monitoring the programs. And I haven't heard anything relative to the current status of where that audit is in the process. Perhaps we can get it now.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Oh, Okay.

MS. ROGERS: Hi. Laura Rogers, with the Office of the County Auditor. We have not started it yet, but we anticipate starting within the next 90 days.

MR. ALLEN: How long?

MS. ROGERS: Within the next 90 days.

MR. ALLEN: Okay. And do you have a scope of how long this is likely to take?

MS. ROGERS: I -- I don't because that has not yet been developed. But it may take a few months. But it may take a few months, I wouldn't expect less than six for a final report.

MR. ALLEN: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Thank you. Any -- anyone else?

MS. CASSINI: Madam Chair, if I could just, I'd like to announce that we did add a -- we brought in a new person that I didn't have a chance to introduce to you at your last meeting, and I did just want to acknowledge Carol Munemura if you want to just stand up and let them see you. (applause) Carol is working on a series of high priority, very complex technology innovation and ETS and financial centralization projects for us, as well as our website. So, we're thrilled to have her, and thank you very much. Thanks for your indulgence.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: All right. Wonderful. Anything else?

MR. KLITSBERG: Sure. Just very briefly, I mentioned to you at the last meeting that the attorney that we had brought on that joined the office. He's actually here today. Douglas Gonzalez, who's in the audience (applause) -- Doug is working with us both on our rail projects, on a variety of different things, including our rail projects for the commuter Broward Commuter Rail South and potentially Broward Commuter Rail North in the near future, as well as working on municipal agreements for certain cities and is one of the two folks in our office that are being tasked right now with drafting new surtax agreements with municipalities that will be done under the Third Amendment to the ILA.

He's been a tremendous resource, has a long history in Broward government legal service, and has been wonderful to work with. So, I just wanted to introduce him.

I also just wanted to also say, as we were sitting here, I got a text message about your comment, and one of the reason that the at-grade when feasible—and again, all options are on the table in terms of what they may come back with—is this is a good chunk of where this light rail project exists does not cross either pedestrian or vehicular roadway intersections.

So having certain segments at-grade in areas where there's not any intersection crossing is, since, you know, obviously, the price differential between elevated rail and at-grade rail, that's one of the -- We didn't want to just be stuck with all elevated over areas where there are no crossings where pedestrians or vehicles need to cross.

MR. MCELROY: Makes sense.

MR. KLITSBERG: And again, if this was a broader light rail system, obviously that would be a very different thing, mentioned by a couple of boards members. But again, since this is just airport through the intermodal center to the seaport and the convention center hotel, and again given the security areas through the port and whatnot, large segments are going to be elevated, but where it can be at-grade and it is not impacting traffic or pedestrian movement—yeah, that was a key component to it.

This is a project where we are going to be seeking FTA discretionary grant funding. And having a project that meets certain budgetary requirements through potentially having certain segments at-grade is important to that piece.

MR. McELROY: All right, I appreciate that.

MR. KLITSBERG: I just wanted to thank one of the other lawyers on our team, Gavin Rynard, who had messaged me that he was the primary attorney working on this particular agreement.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: All right. Is that it? I think. I just want to thank each of our board members for your service today. And we'd like to get a motion to adjourn our meeting.

MR. COOLMAN: So moved.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Second?

MR. ALLEN: Second.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: All in favor?

ALL: Aye.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: All right, so we retreat to our training area, I guess. Or is it taking place here? Nathaniel?

MR. KLITSBERG: Yes. And again, we are now moving into just pure workshop. No recording or anything else like that. There'll be summary meetings.

CHAIR PENNANT WALLACE: Thank you to our audience.

(Meeting adjourned at 1:50 p.m.)

