

MINUTES

BROWARD COUNTY PLANNING COUNCIL

January 26, 2012

MEMBERS Mayor Lamar Fisher, Chair

PRESENT: Commissioner Anne Castro, Vice Chair

Tim Bascombe

Commissioner Claudette Bruck

Frederick Burton

Sara Case

Kenneth Fink

Mary D. Graham

Commissioner Sue Gunzburger

Dan Hobby

Commissioner Michael S. Long

Sharon P. Ragoonan, via telephone

Louis Reinstein

Mayor Michael Udine

MEMBERS Vice Mayor Bobby DuBose

ABSENT: School Board Member Patricia Good

Commissioner Keith London

Commissioner Rita Mack

Commissioner Lisa Mallozzi

ALSO Henry Sniezek, Planning Council Executive Director

PRESENT: Barbara Blake Boy, Planning Council Deputy Executive Director

Andrew Maurodis, Legal Counsel

Dennis Mele, on behalf of Applicant

James Cromar, Livability Planner, Broward Metropolitan
Planning Organization (MPO)

Nancy Cavender, The Laws Group

(A sign-in sheet reflecting those present is filed with the supplemental papers to the minutes of this meeting.)

A meeting of the Broward County Planning Council was held at 10:00 a.m. on Thursday, January 26, 2012, in Room 422 of the Broward County Governmental Center, Fort Lauderdale, Florida

CALL TO ORDER:

Planning Council

01/26/2012

LG/NC

Chair Lamar Fisher called the meeting to order.

CHAIR FISHER: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I'd like to call to order the Broward County Planning Council meeting this Thursday, January 26th, 2012.

And I believe -- is Ms. Ragoonan going to join us on the telephone?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Supposedly.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Great. Okay.

Please stand for the Pledge.

THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE WAS LED BY CHAIR LAMAR FISHER.

CHAIR FISHER: Thank you.

ROLL CALL

CHAIR FISHER: Nancy, would you call the roll?

THE REPORTER: Yes, sir.

Mr. Tim Bascombe.

MR. BASCOMBE: Present.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Claudette Bruck.

COMMISSIONER BRUCK: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Frederick Burton.

MR. BURTON: Present.

THE REPORTER: Ms. Sara Case.

MS. CASE: Here.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Anne Castro.

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: Here.

THE REPORTER: Vice Mayor Bobby DuBose.

Mr. Kenneth Fink.

MR. FINK: Here.

THE REPORTER: School Board Member Patricia Good.

Ms. Mary Graham.

MS. GRAHAM: Here.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Sue Gunzburger.

COMMISSIONER GUNZBURGER: Present.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Dan Hobby.

MR. HOBBY: Here.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Keith London.

Commissioner Michael Long.

COMMISSIONER LONG: Pleased to be here.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Rita Mack.

Commissioner Lisa Mallozzi.

Ms. Sharon Ragoonan.

Mr. Louis Reinstein.

MR. REINSTEIN: Here.

THE REPORTER: Michael Udine. Mayor Michael Udine.

MAYOR UDINE: I'm here. Pleased to be here, also.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Lamar Fisher.

CHAIR FISHER: I'm present.

Thank you so much.

REAPPOINTMENTS

CHAIR FISHER: And just, again, to acknowledge Commissioner Gunzburger and School Board Member Patricia Good for the reappointments to the Council. We welcome you back.

MR. UDINE: Congratulations.

CHAIR FISHER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GUNZBURGER: (Inaudible.)

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

CHAIR FISHER: Now it's time for the election of officers. We do want to say please note the additional correspondence from Commissioner Mallozzi on that, as well.

And I guess -- Mr. Hobby?

MR. HOBBY: I'd like to nominate that the existing officers, I believe that's Mayor Fisher for Chair, and Commissioner Castro for Vice Chair, and just

Commissioner Mallozzi --

COMMISSIONER BRUCK: Commissioner Mallozzi, yes.

CHAIR FISHER: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER BRUCK: Second it.

MR. HOBBY: I pronounced that right, at least.

COMMISSIONER BRUCK: Yes, you did.

CHAIR FISHER: You did. You got Mallozzi right, yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR FISHER: All right. If it's the Council's wish that we can vote as a slate?

COMMISSIONER BRUCK: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: It's been moved and second.

Any further discussion?

All in favor, say aye.

Opposed?

Thank you. And thank you for the opportunity.

MR. FINK: We're not going to have nineteen debates.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Not today.

CHAIR FISHER: Not today, Mr. Fink. Next month.

COMMISSIONER GUNZBURGER: But there's one on TV tonight, if you're really --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If you're really bored.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

NOMINATIONS BY PLANNING COUNCIL TO EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

CHAIR FISHER: Our next order of business is nomination by the Council for the Executive Committee. It's four at-large besides executive officers.

We currently have Vice Mayor Bobby DuBose, School Board Member Patricia Good, and Dan Hobby. He's a member at-large.

If the Council wished, we can just have the same?

And, Commissioner Bruck, I believe you're on there, as well.

COMMISSIONER BRUCK: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER BRUCK: I was going to nominate Lisa Mallozzi.

CHAIR FISHER: Well, she would be on there as the secretary, anyway.

MR. FINK: I move the slate.

COMMISSIONER BRUCK: That's right.

Second.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. It's been moved and second on Executive Committee.

All in favor, say aye.

Opposed?

MS. RAGOONAN: Aye.

CHAIR FISHER: What was that? Ms. -- Ms. Ragoonan, hello there. How you doing?

MS. RAGOONAN: Good, thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: Good. Welcome.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

APPOINTMENTS BY CHAIR TO LAND USE/TRAFFICWAYS COMMITTEE

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. And last is the appointments of the Land Use Trafficways Committee. Currently serving there, of course, the executive officers, Tim Bascombe, Sara Case, Patricia Good, Keith London, Rita Mack, and Louis Reinstein. Is there anyone else that wishes to serve on that? There is no numbers there.

If not, can we move forward that same --

MAYOR UDINE: I'll move the slate.

MAYOR GUNZBURGER: Second.

CHAIR FISHER: It's been moved and second, the slate. All in favor, say aye. There we go. Opposed? The motion does carry. Thank you so much.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

CONSENT AGENDA

CHAIR FISHER: That places us now under our Consent Agenda, Items C-1 through 4.

Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER GUNZBURGER: So moved.

COMMISSIONER BRUCK: Second.

CHAIR FISHER: It's been moved and second to approve the Consent.

Any discussion?

All in favor, say aye.

Opposed?

MS. RAGOONAN: Aye.

CHAIR FISHER: Yes, sir, thank -- ma'am, thank you.

It is now passed.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

REGULAR AGENDA

AGENDA ITEM R-1

CHAIR FISHER: Now under our Regular Agenda, R-1, is a presentation of our MPO, I believe, Henry.

MR. SNIEZEK: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. We just invited the MPO staff to give a presentation on what they've been up to since the last time they spoke to the Council.

The MPO's broken off from under the County authority, and they're an independent agency now.

And, plus, since we have so many new Planning Council members, just thought it would be a good idea for them to come and give a ten minute or so presentation on what they're working on.

CHAIR FISHER: Look forward to it.

MR. SNIEZEK: We have James Cromar of the MPO to give you a little presentation.

CHAIR FISHER: Mr. Cromar, good --

MR. CROMAR: Good morning.

CHAIR FISHER: -- good morning, and welcome.

MR. CROMAR: Nice to see you all. Commissioner Bruck, we saw you earlier this week, so it's going to be a little different today.

So, again, my name is James Cromar. I'm the Livability Planner with the Broward MPO.

As -- as Mr. Sniezak mentioned, we did come before your Board a few -- couple years ago, and there are some new Board members, and we also made some progress with the implementation of our long range transportation plan, so we want to talk a little bit about with -- about that with you today.

The Broward MPO has set forth a vision with the long range transportation plan to transform transportation and address a variety of functions within the County, including economic vitality, protecting the environment, and quality of life.

So everything that we talk about today is in that context of working with you all to make the -- Broward County a better place to live.

A bit of -- a little bit of background for the Broward MPO, though. We are a Board that is authorized by the federal government to direct the distribution of federal funds for transportation.

So every year there are about four to \$600,000,000 that the Board votes to -- to direct toward specific projects.

We have 19 voting members. We have representation from all 31 cities within the County. Some County Commissioners are on the Board. School Board, FDOT, and SFRTA are all represented.

We also have some advisory committees from technical staff from the municipalities, a community involvement round table with citizens and different interest groups from around the County, and also the Broward

County Coordinating Board that deals with the transportation disadvantaged groups.

So as we look at what we're doing with Broward County, we recognize that we are not just looking at how Broward County relates to Miami, Orlando, or Tampa. We're looking at the context nationally in terms of how Broward County compares in terms of economic vitality and quality of life.

We look at cities that are comparable around the country with similar population bases, and we look at the transportation arrangements that they have there.

So if you look at a city like Portland, which is very environmentally sensitive, they have tremendous amount of light rail and different transportation systems.

We recognize we also need to look at cities that are a little more in character like Broward County, so we look at places like Charlotte or Dallas or Phoenix that have different population levels but also that have incorporated significant mass transit systems.

So we realize as we go forward for Broward County, it's important to recognize how we fit in the context of -- of the nation.

And as people look to where they're going to locate their businesses and where they're going to live, these are some of the factors that come into play. So for the Broward MPO, two years ago they developed the long range transportation plan, which took a significant shift away from emphasis on more road building and looked toward the improved efficiency in the use of the right-of-ways that we have within the County.

As we all know, Broward County is approaching build out of the developable area. There's limited space to build more roadways.

Acquisition costs for right-of-way to expand roadways is tremendously expensive. For example, in State Road 7 in Hollywood, the widening cost in the southern part will cost about \$20 million to \$30 million; the right of way acquisition was \$100 million to \$150 million.

So we recognize that we could spend a lot of money acquiring property, or apply it to different projects to improve our transportation system.

So the Board took a position to look toward multi-modal transportation, including an emphasis on premium transit --

CHAIR FISHER: Mr. Cromar, I just want to interrupt you. One quick -- one quick thing. Vice Mayor?

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: Real quick. On the graphic that's up there now with the hubs --

MR. CROMAR: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: -- it's my understanding that of 31 Broward cities, only about 20, maybe 21 actually have hubs; is that correct?

MR. CROMAR: We haven't -- I don't have it broken down by the different cities, so.

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: Okay. I'm going to assume that's correct --

MR. CROMAR: Okay.

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: -- because I think that's the answer. I don't usually ask a question until I know the answer.

But assuming that there are ten cities without hubs, in essence, they're not getting any federal FDOT monies or any MPO funds; is that correct?

MR. CROMAR: No, not necessarily.

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: Okay. How would they get money?

MR. CROMAR: All right. So with -- yeah, let me mention. And so the -- the expenditure of funds is tied to improvements to the transportation system with premium transit corridors. So the different lines indicate where we're looking to do improvements with either bus rapid transit in the dedicated guideway, or rapid bus that would have limited stops and -- and greater transit -- traffic signal prioritization to move more quickly through traffic, so that those are spread throughout the County.

We have then the mobility hubs, which are the intersections of where the transit system works, and where people can make their transfers, where we're looking to have a significant number of boardings and alightings, and then also redevelopment potential.

We're also looking to do investments in --

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: I'm sorry. If a city doesn't have one of those hubs, then they get no funding as far as being a transfer place or a place for people to --

MR. CROMAR: Okay.

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: -- change mobility?

MR. CROMAR: In terms of the hub itself --

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: Yeah.

MR. CROMAR: -- that's one of the pots of funding, that there could be some expenditures in the premium transit system and then in bicycle and pedestrian connectivity to those areas.

So, for example, in the western parts of the County, there's not a lot of transit potential ridership as much there is in the eastern parts of the County.

So we've had those conversations about there's not a lot of hubs and transit directed to those areas, but there are other types of -- of improvements that can be done and investments.

So -- but, yes, you are right. If there -- if there's not a hub, that is one particular category that there would not necessarily be investment.

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: And how are the hubs decided?

MR. CROMAR: Okay. And that -- that's good. That's a -- the hubs themselves were based on existing land use and densities, and then also the future land use plan, and where there were existence of CRA's and other high intensity land use designations.

We looked at also the transportation system in terms of congested corridors, and also where there is high transit ridership.

And so all those came together to develop this system of where we can make investments in our transit system, and then also where those hubs would be located.

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: Did we also look at past history, as far as where bottlenecks typically occur, to try to get people out of cars in those bottlenecks into transportation, since those are the paths they tend to follow, apparently?

MR. CROMAR: In terms of the past, they -- they'll be looking at current congestion. So some of that information is based on -- on data from the past. But it wasn't necessarily going back 20 years to see. It's more of a

forward-looking plan of existing and then looking to the year 2035.

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: Okay. Because the part about the whole plan that amazed me, and this is just a comment, not really a question, is there are some cities that had many, many hubs, and other cities didn't have any --

MR. CROMAR: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: -- and I can't believe there's not a city in Broward County that doesn't -- and I understand your point, west to east, urban versus more rural --

MR. CROMAR: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: -- but I still can't believe there's not areas of this County that somehow shouldn't have been part of the hub.

So I was a little surprised at that. So --

MR. CROMAR: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: -- that kind of took me aback.

MR. CROMAR: And let me mention in particular we have the Mayor from Parkland, and we've been doing some studies in Parkland.

And in discussions with the city staff there, we took direction that the staff, we expect got from their Commission, and transit is not necessarily part of the long term transportation picture in Parkland.

So we looked, well, what is possible. So there are some potential bike/pedestrian improvements that they're looking forward to. But they're not necessarily looking to some of the other improvements.

And, in particular, with your city, I think there are some discussions that are currently going on and that will proceed into the future.

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: Well, going into this process, we actually had designated TOC's and TOD's --

MR. CROMAR: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: -- to say the least. And then there are a lot of other issues. So I don't want to be parochial, as my friend, Mr. Fink, will remind me, and talk about just Dania Beach.

But I was amazed, because Dania Beach got no hubs. And we actually tried to sequester one out of Hollywood, and we failed on our mission. But that's okay.

MR. CROMAR: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: But Dania Beach notoriously has US-1, which is a bottleneck because it's four lanes. And it's never going to be six lanes, because nobody ever is going to acquire the property.

But that's just one example. I saw a lot of other cities on the map that I thought were in need --

MR. CROMAR: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: -- somehow, and that goes back to the representation, to me, on the MPO.

MR. CROMAR: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: All 31 cities, theoretically, you could say or argue, are represented, but they're really not. Like I was a third designee, but I'm the third designee behind the Chair. The chances of him not showing up are slim to none. I recognize that.

Luckily, he's a great guy and I love working with him. He listens, and I give him input, and he can do whatever he needs to do.

But I think the MPO needs to take a look at its long range structure of its organization to make sure all of the needs of the County are being represented in a more equitable fashion, especially when it comes to funding.

MR. CROMAR: Okay.

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: If you're going to be the funding source and the decision-maker, we need to not let just the big dogs on the block decide they're going to get all the money, and the little dogs don't get anything. So today I'm here as an advocate for all small cities.

Thanks.

MR. CROMAR: Thanks. I appreciate --

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: And I'm done.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: I'm sorry.

MR. CROMAR: I appreciate it.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. CROMAR: And a quick note, too, on that. The Governance Committee is looking at updating the rules, and they're currently meeting, so there's some opportunity to give some input into that. So --

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: Thank you.

MR. CROMAR: -- I appreciate that, so.

CHAIR FISHER: Continue on, sir.

MR. CROMAR: All right. So, basically, we have our -- our long range transportation plan. On one side, you see the different transportation, the transit modes, and then the different hubs that we talked about.

There's different levels with different funding sources attached to those. Okay? And we're showing some different kinds of transit sources.

And we just want to show, then, real quickly, what we are looking for in terms of the transit system itself. And it's sometimes easier to build some of the layers so it's clear what's going on.

We talked about the long range transportation plan, identified certain corridors for premium transit investments. Well, how will that happen? Let's talk about some phasing.

First, we're looking at the Wave Streetcar in Fort Lauderdale that will be the initial rail that is not Tri-Rail in Broward County. We are hoping that this serves as an example to other cities.

And, in fact, Commissioner Blattner, who's the Chair of the MPO, coming from Hollywood, recognizes that we have to start somewhere. So -- so there's been support for the Wave going forward.

Then we have the discussion of what's going to happen on the FEC corridor, and I'm sure a lot of you are familiar with the details of that.

We're talking about future, then, projects that can come forward. The Central

Broward East/West Study is looking at some options of going from Sawgrass to downtown. One option would bring it down on Griffin Road; another takes a State Road 7/Broward configuration with a combination of rail and bus rapid transit.

There is a study going on now to improve the transit use on Oakland Park Boulevard.

We're looking at State Road 7 also, then, in the future for premium transit. Initially, bus rapid transit, potentially light rail for the future when the funds become available.

And then, also, we're looking at University Drive that the Broward MPO just received a grant from the FTA for 1.5 million dollars to do an alternatives analysis to study how premium transit would work there.

Then, finally, coming back to the discussion of the hubs, we come down to a greater level of detail. And that is my role with the MPO, to look at the livability planning.

And I'm going to go briefly, and then let you ask questions.

But basically, with the livability planning study, if you take this upper level and then come down to the person on the street, and how does that transit system work for you. How is it that the -- the transit connections are laid out, and the investments in infrastructure.

And this is where there's some opportunities to work with the different cities. If they don't have hubs, there can also be bike and pedestrian connectivity, another transit infrastructure.

And the idea is to work collaboratively -- collaboratively with our communities. There are five general areas that come out of the livability planning; transportation improvements; land use, which is what you will deal with here. Again, we found that a lot of our hubs already have the land use designation in place. They may need some zoning design guidelines, adjustments.

And then it's important to look at economic activity and housing in various forms.

At the federal level, there's a partnership for sustainable communities. They've established six different livability principals.

And the reason I'm showing you this is to show that in relation to our livability

planning goals and what's coming from the federal government, we recognize that the Broward MPO cannot do all this work by itself.

There are certain things that the different municipalities and different agencies are in charge of. And the point is that we need to work collaboratively -- collaboratively among us all to achieve the different goals of this project.

Finally, as we go forward, we conduct -- the Broward MPO is responsible for congestion management, addressing short term improvements to -- to alleviate traffic concerns.

And we have combined congestion management process with livability planning.

The point is to achieve greater efficiencies. There's a lot of data that is -- that is the same that is compiled for both studies.

But there may be some different decisions made in terms of how to address traffic congestion when you take into -- take into thought the long range implications.

So, as Commissioner Castro mentioned, the idea of US-1, there are some things you can do to make traffic move more smoothly, but how does that fit into the long term vision of what's going to happen for those communities? And then, finally, in our recent FTA recertification, they took this congestion management process livability planning as a best practice and are -- are having us use this nationally to show other communities what can be done. In conclusion, I just want to mention there are a number of projects going on. We have some website links here. We can make sure you get the PowerPoint.

And then, in our handout that we gave you, the newsletter mentions the Transportation Outreach Planner, which is a tool that we have along with Palm Beach and Miami-Dade counties.

And as we go and work with your communities, you can go in and select a certain area and get demographic information. And then it can give some pointers on how public outreach can best achieve the goals of reaching different members of your community.

It's not going to give you the answers, but it points out where some of the discussions can start about how to reach different demographic segments of your communities. With that, I want to leave it open to any questions that you may have.

CHAIR FISHER: Mr. Hobby?

MR. HOBBY: Just a clarification, I may have missed it. What is the definition of premium transit as opposed to any other?

MR. CROMAR: Thank you.

The we have a lot of local service right now with the BCT system, and that does a number of stops every two to three blocks. And -- and so that -- every stop affects the -- the timing of the system.

That service is working very well to meet the needs of the transit dependent populations.

As we go forward and we look at cities across the country, they have taken steps to put in place transit that attracts choice riders, people that have the option to drive that might choose to take transit instead.

So part of premium transit is providing a service that is attractive for somebody that has that choice.

So premium transit involves potentially different kinds of vehicles, a limited number of stops so that it's not stopping every few blocks. Limited stops then can affect the travel time and can make it more attractive for people who have the choice.

Premium transit can also indicate a dedicated lane or -- or a lane that's used part of the time for that transit vehicle, so that the transit has a travel time advantage in peak hours with some of the other congested traffic.

And there may be a dedicated right-of-way like the FEC itself, so.

MR. HOBBY: Thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: Mr. Fink.

MR. FINK: Would that be what is commonly called in most municipalities express buses? Is that what we're talking here?

MR. CROMAR: That's one component of it, yes. So that there could be an express bus -- sometimes -- I'm getting into the details -- sometimes the express buses might start at an outward location, let's say Coral Springs.

MR. FINK: Coral Springs or Parkland.

MR. CROMAR: Yeah. And then it comes to a specific destination without a stop.

MR. FINK: Right.

MR. CROMAR: So that could be part of it, but it also could be buses that start and then they'll stop maybe once every mile or -- or two. So it -- it depends on what the needs are.

You -- you're probably familiar with the express buses service that's starting down to Miami downtown. The toll lanes on I-95 have provided funding for express bus service. So Miami-Dade now has service that comes up to Broward County and then out of Hollywood and Miramar, and -- yeah, there are some other places where there's service that has, you know, one stop service from start to finish.

And then, as the managed lanes are extended further north on 95, there may be opportunities for some of that express service from the northern communities to -- to downtown Fort Lauderdale and other locations.

MR. FINK: Thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: Ms. Graham?

MS. GRAHAM: Thank you.

I have a question. Commissioner Castro made a statement about being an advocate for the small cities. (Inaudible; audio feedback) Is that determined by geographic area or population (inaudible)?

MR. CROMAR: Population. And -- and so -- and to mention that a little further, what -- what she had mentioned, the voting for the Broward MPO, there are 19 voting members but 38 actual members.

So there's the question of a city such as Fort Lauderdale with 165,000, compared to City of Lazy Lakes with 20 people, do they each get one vote that carries the same weight?

So it's at that -- you know, at the federal level, the House and Senate, they -- they worked out that balance.

So they're revisiting that with the governments -- Governance Committee and expect to have some recommendations soon.

But the first meeting is after the MPO meeting in February, February 8th or 9th; I can't remember the date right now.

CHAIR FISHER: Mr. Burton.

MR. BURTON: First, I want to thank you. Public transit, in my opinion, is very important for the smart growth of Broward County.

But I had a couple of questions. The first is if I could get a copy of this slide and maybe get existing, what's there now, and then this is your 2035 plan, so you can kind of see what the, you know, improvements are going to be.

MR. CROMAR: Okay.

MR. BURTON: One of the things that I find is that because Florida has such urban sprawl, it's very difficult to take public transit, because you need a car to get to the public transit. But then once you get off, a lot of times you also need a second car to get where you really need to go.

So as you're doing these studies, for example, this 1.5 million dollar grant that you guys have on University, you know, seeing what current ridership levels are on existing buses or existing transportation may not give you the full picture if you were able to properly link transportation so that perhaps there are other riders from other parts of the County that would have access to that, rather than people that are just within, say, walking distance of those areas.

And the other kind of question I have is what type of coordination do you guys have with Dade County Public Transit, as well as Palm Beach Public Transit, so that Broward County can, you know, enjoy the benefits of bringing people to and from these other counties, as well as within the County?

MR. CROMAR: Okay. I'm going to take the first one, too. The -- the idea of the system itself and how people get to it.

And we recognize that the development patterns in Broward County are different than when they were historically developed.

And so that is something that we will need to continue to work on with you as the Planning Council, that as different communities come forward and request their mixed use designations with the RAC's and the LAC's and the TOD's and TOC's, it's a question of -- also of how those are designed, and then how they connect with the existing communities.

And with our University Drive study, there is a lot of information on who's

riding the buses now. And we have some significant data challenges in terms of figuring out the latent demand for transit ridership.

The people that aren't riding, how do you identify who they are or what are the potential?

And so -- so there's a series of steps of -- of gathering more demographic information. We're looking at some survey opportunities.

And there's also some real life testing. For example, the Miramar express service started off and the ridership has been increasing significantly.

So there's some testing that we can do in terms of the service and see how well that responds to the needs.

In terms of responding to the different communities, the Broward MPO, our role is to help facilitate some of the coordination within the communities -- and I appreciate the comments there -- and, then, also beyond our boundaries.

We have a slide that we didn't show today, but there are three different transit systems, plus the RTA, in two FDOT districts and two RPC's with different boundary lines in different places.

So we're working to address those challenges across our borders, because if you live in Broward, you know, you don't really care when you cross into Palm Beach or Miami for work or entertainment or shopping.

We're developing a regional transit system. Palm Beach has been very cooperative. Miami-Dade has been a little more resistant, but they have different political challenges at this time. So we'll -- we'll continue to try to work with them.

And then, in terms of a -- a regional approach, there are some challenges in terms of fare structure. So there's an Easy Card system with Miami-Dade and the RTA, and we're looking at ways that the -- Broward County and the Palm Tran (Phonetic) system can be part of that, too, so as a user of the system, you could just have one card that you could use throughout the whole system instead of having to have two or three different fares.

So there are attempts to move forward, and any particular assistance or advice you give would be beneficial to us.

MR. BURTON: Thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: Commissioner Bruck.

COMMISSIONER BRUCK: Yes. I'm going to ask you briefly a question that I asked previously, because I think it bears repeating.

When you make reference to a hub, are you referring to a location within a significant connectivity or a physical structure within a significant connectivity?

MR. CROMAR: I'm glad you asked that, because today we have better graphics that illustrate that idea of what we were talking about.

So if you look at the -- the different hub structures there, we had initially started this study with the idea that we would have structures that would be a place where everything comes together.

So if you think of Grand Central Station in -- in New York, we thought that might be appropriate.

As these studies have gone forward, we've recognized that there are limited opportunities for that in Broward County in terms of are there significant destinations where a lot is going on in a certain place.

And so we're looking at in places where it is appropriate to have a structure but in other places where the transit infrastructure can be integrated into existing development.

So, for example, the top picture there, the Gateway hub, it's kind of hard to see at this scale, but there is an area where the buses come in and then people can do the waiting. And that then ties into a plaza, public plaza, that serves a variety of functions.

And then there's some transit that is on the roadway, because that will affect some of the operations. And then there's also development that is tied directly to that.

So it's a question of how the pieces fit together, and they don't all have to be in one building.

Across the street here, as we're looking at the Broward County Transit Center, we are looking at the buses' operations. And FEC is right next to it, and the Wave is going to be in front of it.

And so all those pieces will fit together. And there are design issues that can make it seem, as a user of the system, that you're in a place that's all

together, but it will -- it can be separate structures that work together.

COMMISSIONER BRUCK: It can be either.

MR. CROMAR: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BRUCK: That's why I think it's important that everyone know.

MR. CROMAR: Good question.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Any further questions or comments? Commissioner

--

MS. RAGOONAN: Yes. I have a quick question.

CHAIR FISHER: Ms. Ragoonan, yes.

MS. RAGOONAN: Thank you. Good morning.

I just wanted to find out more, like do we -- is there like limited access highways that prevents, like, you know, pedestrian activity and bicycle activity?

And if there are any of those existing limited access highways, do you have any plans to address those so that we do have activity, that people can move about easily from Point A to Point B?

MR. CROMAR: Let me just clarify. You mentioned highways and bicycles? I just want to make sure I'm clear on --

MS. RAGOONAN: Yes. My understanding is that there -- there are certain kinds of highways, but I wasn't sure if there were -- if we have any in Broward County where it only basically allows for vehicular traffic. And so in terms of someone trying to go out walking or on a bike, there -- it's not a place to do so or maybe it's restricted.

So I'm wondering. Do we have any of those conditions currently? And if we do, how are you addressing it?

MR. CROMAR: Let me give you a specific example, looking at 595, that we're all probably familiar with.

595 is being reconstructed. They're preserving a portion of the right-of-way

for transit in the future in the center.

Unfortunately, they're not building it now, but that's a different question.

So you have that limited access roadway. Just to the north of it, along the canal, there's a bicycle facility that's going in. So it's taking advantage of this corridor to provide a safe pedestrian – or bicycle/pedestrian system that does not have a lot of cross streets.

We recognize the need to address the intersection crossings better, but that will be coming forward, too.

And as we look at 595, we identified some hubs in our long range plan that were right along the 595 corridor.

But then there's a problem of, as a pedestrian, do you really want to mix pedestrians and bicyclists in there with these heavy traffic movements and a lot of turns.

So we're, with our livability planning, looking at the details of how that works. So, for example, around the mid-town area, it may be possible to move a hub that's at I-595 and University, move it up a few blocks so it taps into the Fountains and the mid-town development that's going on, where it is safer for pedestrians to be moving around.

So there's a balance of the transit needs, operations, and safety for the users of the system itself.

I hope that answers --

MS. RAGOONAN: Thank you.

MR. CROMAR: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Any further discussion?

Mr. Cromar, thank you.

MR. CROMAR: All right. Thank you very much.

CHAIR FISHER: Very informative.

MR. CROMAR: Appreciate it.

CHAIR FISHER: And thank you for being here.

AGENDA ITEM R-3

CHAIR FISHER: Mr. Maurodis, do you have any Counsel's Report? Mr. Maurodis, do you have a Counsel's Report?

MR. MAURODIS: I don't have a report.

AGENDA ITEM R-4

CHAIR FISHER: Henry, you have an Executive Director's Report?

MR. SNIEZEK: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Just -- just one thing. I just wanted to mention that Commissioner London's not here today because he was invited to speak at a conference associated with his job as a Commissioner.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Very good. Thank you.

All right. That concludes our -- our Regular Agenda.

PUBLIC HEARING

AGENDA ITEMS PH-1,PH-3

CHAIR FISHER: We're now under our Public Hearings. Mr. Maurodis?

MR. MAURODIS: PH-1 is a quasi-judicial hearing. It has been waived. And if there is no one from the public who wishes to speak, and no objection to moving the staff recommendation, you can move right into that. And I believe there is no one from the public, other than the applicant, to answer any questions.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Do you want to make note that Mr. Reinstein, on PH-2, I believe, needs to abstain?

MR. REINSTEIN: Yes, that's correct.

MR. MAURODIS: Yes. And -- and as the -- the proper process is for you to indicate the basis for -- and it may not be -- constitute a -- a legally -- a legal conflict, but there is a provision in Florida law that if you believe that there is a well-founded concern that there may be an appearance of a conflict, that you declare it, you need to declare it on the record, and then, within 15 days, file an appropriate conflict form. So just if you could just state it on the record

the concerns that you have.

MR. REINSTEIN: So on PH-2, which is the first Public Hearing on Amendment to the Broward County Land Use Plan for the City of Coconut Creek, which Dennis Mele is here on behalf of -- of the applicant; the applicant is also here, Malcolm Butters, and my family has some investments with the Butters Company, and, based on that, I believe that I should abstain from -- from this vote.

MR. MAURODIS: It might not rise to a full level, but there is a provision that - - that permits that to avoid the conflict of an interest -- conflict of interest.

And so, with that, all Mr. Reinstein needs to do is file the form within 15 days, which will be provided to you, and you will have fulfilled the requirement of the law.

MR. REINSTEIN: Thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Now we've got the legal issues out, PH-1 -- anyone wish to pull one?

Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER GUNZBURGER: I had a question on PH-2.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: I'll move PH-1 for approval, please.

CHAIR FISHER: And 3, we can also, as well --

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: And 3.

MR. HOBBY: Second.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Been moved and second. Any discussion?

MR. BURTON: I have a question --

CHAIR FISHER: Mr. Burton?

MR. BURTON: -- on PH-2.

CHAIR FISHER: PH-2? We're going to pull PH-2.

MR. BURTON: All right.

CHAIR FISHER: We're voting on Items PH-1 and 3. Further discussion? All in favor, say aye. Opposed? Motion does carry. Thank you.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

AGENDA ITEM PH-2

CHAIR FISHER: PH-2, Henry.

MR. SNIEZEK: If the Council would like, we can have a brief overview of the amendment --

CHAIR FISHER: Please.

MR. SNIEZEK: -- from Matt Goldstein or --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR FISHER: Do you need an overview, Commissioner? Okay. Your question? Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER GUNZBURGER: Which I don't think will shock Mr. Mele at all. It is on the affordable housing.

It says that they will contribute to the fund. I'd like to know how much needs to be contributed -- how much needs to be given per unit to the affordable fund, and how much does it build.

MR. MELE: Dennis Mele on behalf of the applicant.

Coconut Creek has a linkage fee for affordable housing. It's been in effect since 2006.

COMMISSIONER GUNZBURGER: Uh-huh.

MR. MELE: The way the linkage fee works is similar to the way affordable housing analysis works for developments of regional impact.

The City actually assesses the fee against all types of non-residential development based on the amount of jobs they create in lower wage categories that generate a need for affordable housing within a reasonable commuting distance of the location.

So they actually don't charge residential. They charge industrial, commercial, office, and hotel. And they've been doing it that way since 2006 when they adopted the ordinance.

COMMISSIONER GUNZBURGER: Oh.

MR. MELE: Now, what they --

COMMISSIONER GUNZBURGER: How many -- how many units since 2006 of affordable housing has Coconut Creek built with this wonderful fund? It makes no sense. Well, I understand linkage.

MR. MELE: In the current program, and I don't know how many programs they've had before this, but the current operating program, there's been 14 closings, and there are additional ones planned.

And they're doing it in cooperation with a couple of developers in Coconut Creek who are building new housing now.

They're also providing mortgage assistance and second mortgages to people to do existing homes.

And then they have a program for repairs to homes to bring them up to current code.

COMMISSIONER GUNZBURGER: So we have nothing like the 15 percent, is what you're telling me.

MR. MELE: No, but remember that the policy that you have in your Comprehensive Plan, which is attested to by your staff in the backup --

COMMISSIONER GUNZBURGER: I understand.

MR. MELE: -- is -- that's only one mechanism to meet the requirement. The other mechanisms are other programs that municipalities have in place. And remember that the requirement is incumbent upon the municipality to show that they have a program in place for affordable housing.

Coconut Creek has done that to the satisfaction of the staff in the report, and that's the way they've been doing it since 2006, including the item that was just recertified a moment ago.

COMMISSIONER GUNZBURGER: Well, I -- I must say it sure doesn't come close to what I had proposed several years ago, in that 15 percent of any development over a hundred units would be set aside for affordable housing.

MR. MELE: But, again, that's only one of --

COMMISSIONER GUNZBURGER: I understand.

MR. MELE: -- multiple mechanisms.

COMMISSIONER GUNZBURGER: I understand what you're saying. I'm just saying how this one person feels.

And be sure, when I see this again, I will bring it up again.

CHAIR FISHER: Thank you, Commissioner.

Henry? Yes, and then I'll have Mr. Burton --

MR. SNIEZEK: Can I just add --

CHAIR FISHER: -- speak. Okay?

MR. SNIEZEK: -- just add some information that I just learned yesterday about the linkage fee program in Coconut Creek.

The information I have from the City is that they've collected over \$1,000,000 in this program since 2006. So I just wanted to let you know.

COMMISSIONER GUNZBURGER: Well, he just told me they only built 14 units.

MR. MELE: No. The current -- they -- they've collected over 1.5 million. The current balance is about 1.1. And they're spending it as they go.

Keep in mind that many of other communities, and I'm not suggesting this is the right answer, but many of other communities have suspended these programs because the prices of housing has fallen so much.

Coconut Creek has not suspended their program. They've continued it as they started it in 2006.

CHAIR FISHER: Mr. Burton.

MR. BURTON: Thank you.

I'm glad that Commissioner Gunzburger mentioned affordable housing. In reading through this, maybe I read it wrong, but is it true that this property,

before it was, I guess, industrial or commercial, that it was a mobile home park?

MR. MELE: No. That was PH-1. This property is vacant. It's been vacant. It was originally industrial. Then it was changed to commercial, and now to residential.

It's right on 441, along one of the major corridors for the map that's still up on the screen.

MR. BURTON: And --

MR. MELE: PH-1 was originally a mobile home park. It's been vacant since 2008. It was converted at that time from residential to commercial, and now from commercial back to residential.

MR. BURTON: Okay. Maybe there was just a mix-up in my book, because I read through here and it was part of PH-2.

And so that was also my concern, that there were -- if it was a mobile home park and then now all of a sudden it's not, and then there's no affordable housing, that --

MR. MELE: Well, what -- what happened, even though I know that's not the item we're talking about --

MR. BURTON: Yeah.

MR. MELE: -- I'd be happy to answer the question anyway.

MR. BURTON: Yeah.

MR. MELE: When the mobile home park owner decided to discontinue operation of the mobile home park, he worked with all of the residents in the area, and there's actually several other mobile home parks within a couple miles of that location, and most people relocated to one of those parks, other than people that wanted to move out of the area all together.

MR. BURTON: Okay. The other question I have is with regards to traffic analysis, and it talks about total p.m. peak hour trips.

Does it take into account any of the morning commuters?

MR. MELE: I know that the County initially used to have an average daily traffic method of looking at traffic. They went to a p.m. peak.

I think the reason they use a p.m. peak is usually the afternoon -- the afternoon rush hour is more traffic than the morning, because I understand it's compressed into a shorter period of time.

So typically, on most uses, like residential, you're going to have a bigger p.m. peak than an a.m. peak, and I think that's why they use it.

MR. BURTON: So -- so there's no study on how changing it to residential would change the morning commute on some of these corridors?

MR. MELE: I'll defer to staff.

MR. SNIEZEK: I'm sorry. What was the question about? The specific morning commute?

MR. BURTON: Yeah. The question was the traffic analysis that are provided talk about p.m. peak hour trips, and so, you know, my concern would be regarding morning traffic, say between the 7:30 and 9:00 o'clock hour, when there's morning commuters of people going to work, if there's any studies on changing to residential, how it affects the morning commute on some of the corridors.

MR. SNIEZEK: We did not do such an analysis for this amendment. As Mr. Mele said, the reason -- the p.m. peak hour standard is usually the one used, and that does usually represent the maximum impact on the roadway. So we use the maximum impact.

So I can't really answer your question about morning traffic patterns for this particular amendment.

MR. BURTON: Okay. All right. And the only other comment that I have is, you know, similar to Commissioner Gunzburger's with respect to that there's not really any affordable housing allocated towards this development. But that's just a comment of mine.

MR. MELE: Right. And I -- I just ask you to recall that the standard -- the policy in the Comprehensive Plan is not looking only at the individual development, but looking at the municipality as a whole and --

MR. BURTON: I understand.

MR. MELE: -- requires the municipality to have a program in place to address it.

Coconut Creek's program has long been accepted as a very good one, because they're the -- the only ones, to my knowledge, that are actually collecting money in this fashion.

And I know it seems unusual that you collect money from the non-residential, but, actually, the planning studies that have supported our developments of regional impact and other things nationwide show that when you're creating the jobs that create a need for affordable housing because the jobs are not at a high level, and when the increase in housing has outpaced the increase in income, that's why such a program is put in place.

MR. BURTON: Thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: Ms. Case?

MS. CASE: Thank you.

Mr. Mele, I wanted to talk for just a minute about the environmental aspects of this. There's a small wetland on the property. It sounds as though that will be protected with a conservation easement, which I'm glad to know.

The tree canopy is the question that concerns me a little bit. The Planning Council has -- has expressed concern many times of our loss of tree canopy in Broward County, and we have kind of limited jurisdiction. We're deferring to the Coconut Creek Tree Ordinance.

And I'd like to know what kind of a priority Coconut Creek is placing on preserving these trees.

MR. MELE: Could we put up the aerial photograph that's Map Number 1? And that'll help me answer your question.

First of all, let me say that I believe if you talk to the folks at Broward County EPD, they would tell you that Coconut Creek has one of the largest percentages of property purchased through the bond program since 2000, and preserved all along Hillsboro Boulevard.

You'll also see properties here that were preserved not with government funds, but just through this type of protection we're talking about.

When we get this map up, I'll show you what I mean.

But Coconut Creek's Tree Ordinance has also been certified by Broward County as being at least as stringent as the County ordinance.

I don't know if that's true of every city in Broward, but I know it is of most. And Coconut Creek's program, I know is a very good one.

When they put the map up, what you'll see is there is an area of -- in this area of Broward County, most of the wetlands are cypress based wetlands, as opposed to in southwest Broward County, where it's more marsh grass and that sort of thing.

But if you look on aerial photograph, you'll see the areas to our north and our south that say vacant. Those are also protected cypress heads.

You'll see, underneath the yellow shading, that we have some of that same type of habitat along our eastern and southern boundary.

And then you see that same habitat also exists to our east, further into the single family neighborhood.

So all those areas that were preserved in the neighborhoods around this will be preserved in the same fashion on our property.

MS. CASE: And this project will cut that off? I mean, I assume it goes through?

MR. MELE: No. The -- the -- it's my understanding that when you're doing the drainage program, for example, you might normally put a berm around all of your property. But when you're -- you have cypress areas like this that connect from one piece to another, you don't interrupt the flow. You don't go in the cypress head and dig it up or raise the dirt. You leave it like it is.

CHAIR FISHER: Mr. Fink?

MR. FINK: Thank you, sir.

Dennis, this is not for you. It's more for staff.

MR. MELE: Okay.

MR. FINK: But I'll get back to you.

MR. MELE: I'll stay close by.

MR. FINK: When staff evaluates plans and makes a recommendation, they take into account information submitted by the various agencies. In this particular instance, we're going to talk about the School Board for a minute. But if I read this correctly, this is going to result in the addition of 371 medium

residential dwelling units in Broward County.

MR. SNIEZEK: Right.

MR. FINK: And medium residential, Dennis, I guess this is in the form of going to be multi-family housing?

MR. MELE: Three-story garden apartment type structures.

MR. FINK: Okay. And their price range selling of about?

MR. MELE: It's planned to be rental, and the rental will be typical to what you see in the area.

MR. FINK: Okay. We now get to the part where Broward County School Board says the addition of 371 rental units is only going to generate 91 students, which is one-quarter of a student per household?

And having had the benefit of sitting on a P&Z Board for a local community, there is no rental community in this County that generates one-quarter of a student per housing unit.

So my concern is did staff look at this and say to the Broward County School Board is the information you're giving us correct?

Because it doesn't pass the sniff test on any zoning board that I ever sat on, where a rental community only generates a quarter of a student.

And my major concern here, we are 52 out of 52 in funding per capita student in the United States of America. We're behind Guam and Puerto Rico.

I understand that these schools are underutilized, so it's not that we don't have the capacity for the students.

But the fact of the matter is if we're going to bring on 371 housing units, it's going to be more than that number of students that are going to impact the community schools.

And I'm just concerned that staff is not looking at the reports being submitted to them and analyzing them properly.

That would be question one.

MR. SNIEZEK: Well, we -- we -- we do look at the reports, and we make

sure that the information we get from the various agencies lines up with our knowledge of that information.

The analysis done by the School Board was conducted. They -- they utilized the garden apartment rate for student generation. Garden apartments are often rental housing.

The student generation rates are prepared through the use of various studies that have looked in the past at actual student generation from -- from actual units, and from various studies and standards done nationally and locally.

So I believe that the information that the School Board uses for their student generation rates is the best available information we have, and I have no reason to -- to challenge the -- the numbers that have been generated in this report. And we did look at that.

MR. FINK: Okay. I'm done.

CHAIR FISHER: Any other questions?

Okay. Anyone else?

Is there a motion?

MR. HOBBY: So moved.

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: Second.

CHAIR FISHER: It's been moved by Mr. Hobby, seconded by Commissioner Castro. Any further discussion?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR FISHER: I haven't even asked for the vote yet. I just got the motion and second.

Ms. Ragoonan, you still with us?

MS. RAGOONAN: I am still here.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Very good. So we're voting. It's been moved and second on PH-2. All in favor, say aye. Opposed?

COMMISSIONER GUNZBURGER: Opposed.

MR. FINK: Opposed.

CHAIR FISHER: Commissioner Gunzburger and Mr. Fink as opposition to that motion.

MR. REINSTEIN: For the record, one abstention.

CHAIR FISHER: Yes. We've already -- we've already noted that abstention.

Okay?

So the motion does pass.

VOTE PASSES 11 TO 2 WITH COMMISSIONER GUNZBURGER AND MR. MR. FINK VOTING NO, AND MR. REINSTEIN ABSTAINING FROM VOTING.

OTHER BUSINESS

NEXT REGULAR SCHEDULED PLANNING COUNCIL MEETING

CHAIR FISHER: And that concludes our agenda, other than, of course, our next meeting will be on February 23 at 10:00 o'clock.

So any other further business?

ADJOURNMENT

This meeting is adjourned.

(The meeting concluded at 10:55 a.m.)