## Harrod, Rene

Subject: Attachments: FW: Resolving the West Lake Tower siting WLP - Echo Grande Conceptual Term Sheet.pdf

From: Josh Levy <<u>JLEVY@hollywoodfl.org</u>>
Date: March 23, 2021 at 6:10:38 PM EDT
To: "Ryan, Tim" <<u>TRYAN@broward.org</u>>
Cc: "Bold, Eugen" <<u>EBOLD@broward.org</u>>, "Meyers, Andrew" <<u>AMEYERS@broward.org</u>>
Subject: Resolving the West Lake Tower siting

**External Email Warning:** This email originated from outside the Broward County email system. Do not reply, click links, or open attachments unless you recognize the sender's <u>email address</u> (not just the name) as legitimate and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious emails to <u>ETSSecurity@broward.org</u>.

Dear Commissioner Ryan,

Further to our discussions on resolving the siting of the 16th P25 tower in concert with the Option B concept that was presented to the City through the attached document, I propose the following:

1. Land Swap: Since the County has great preference for implementing the land swap with the Aitken property, the City will forfeit its preference for an alternate land swap site in Hollywood so that the County may proceed with the Aitken swap without delay from us.

2. Cost: All construction and system integration costs for the West Lake tower will be borne by the County.

Please keep in mind that our city commission relied on the attached document to weigh the Echo Grande and West Lake sites.

We had a closed executive session to discuss settlement of this matter through Options A and B, as presented in the document. A consensus was achieved for Option B.

We were then asked to make open statements on the dais in support of Option B, West Lake, and we did that.

Just to remind, Option B clearly states that the costs for the West Lake option would be "borne by county."

Option A for Echo Grande included an element for "integration costs" and we weighed heavily that Option B did not.

Based on our open public statements in support of option B, the county dismissed its lawsuit.

The city and county both absorbed our own costs in our joint effort and decision to evaluate the Circ. That's done, and moving on via the Option B model was the basis of the lawsuit's

dismissal/settlement. There is no dispute where each side gets everything they prefer, and that includes both the city and the county in this case.

3. Permit Requirements: This issue seems to be concluded, since the county's contractor paid and picked up the permit on March 15. In reviewing the permit plan review history, I noticed there were some disciplines that provided conditional approvals. I know that city staff is eager to conclude any of the minor plan details that remain and are working amicably with the contractor/county staff to resolve. The city is not looking to impose any requirements beyond standard building code and fire access/safety compliance. If there is anything that the county finds onerous, please advise and we will look to accommodate.

4. Cutover: I am told and am thankful that things are going well with our city's cutover to the current P25 system, at our risk, until tower 16 is up and functioning.

My request, if it's necessary, is for the County Commission to pass a resolution memorializing the above direction at the next County Commission meeting, on April 6, unless the County Administrator can move forward with the above before then without the need for a board resolution.

Please confirm how we will proceed. I am happy to cooperate in any way with however we can help.

Josh Levy, Mayor City of Hollywood 2600 Hollywood Blvd. Hollywood, FL 33020 Tel: (954)921-3321 Email: jlevy@hollywoodfl.org www.hollywoodfl.org www.choosehollywoodfl.com

**Notice**: Florida has a broad public records law. All correspondence sent to the City of Hollywood via email may be subject to disclosure as a matter of public record.

Sent from my iPhone