

MINUTES

BROWARD COUNTY PLANNING COUNCIL

December 17, 2015

MEMBERS Anne Castro, Chair
PRESENT: Commissioner Michael S. Long, Vice Chair
Mayor Daniel J. Stermer, Secretary
Commissioner Richard Blattner
Commissioner Angelo Castillo
Neal R. de Jesus
Thomas H. DiGiorgio, Jr.
Charles F. Fink
Commissioner Michelle J. Gomez
School Board Member Patricia Good
Mary D. Graham
Richard Grosso
Robert McColgan
Bernard Parness
Mayor Michael J. Ryan

MEMBERS Commissioner Mark D. Bogen
ABSENT: Michael Friedel
Commissioner Bill Ganz
Vice Mayor Rita Mack

ALSO Barbara Blake Boy, Executive Director
PRESENT: Andy Maurodis, Legal Counsel
Henry Sniezek, Deputy Director, Environmental Protection and
Growth Management Department
Ralph Stone, Broward County Housing, Finance and Community
Development
Mark Lubelski, Assistant City Manager, City of Sunrise
Robert Von, Meridian Appraisal Group
Chris Rotolo, Building Owners and Managers Association
Hope Calhoun, Big Ocean, LLC
Bill Laystrom
Dennis Mele
Joe Leva
Nancy Cavender, The Laws Group

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

A meeting of the Broward County Planning Council, Broward County, Florida, was held in Room 422 of the Government Center, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, at 10:00 a.m., Thursday, December 17, 2015.

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

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Anne Castro called the meeting to order.

CHAIR CASTRO: I'm calling the Broward County Planning Council regular meeting and Public Hearing for December 17, 2015 to order.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

CHAIR CASTRO: If we could all please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance. And, Mayor Stermer, if you would lead us in the Pledge.

(THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE WAS LED BY MAYOR DANIEL STERMER.)

ROLL CALL

CHAIR CASTRO: Nancy, if you would take the roll, please.

THE REPORTER: Yes, ma'am. Commissioner Richard Blattner.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Here.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Mark Bogen. Excused. Commissioner Angelo Castillo.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He's here.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So he's here.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There he is.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Neal de Jesus.

MR. DE JESUS: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Thomas DiGiorgio. Mr. Charles F. Fink.

MR. FINK: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Michael Friedel. Excused. Commissioner Bill Ganz.

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

Excused. Commissioner Michelle J. Gomez.

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: Good morning.

THE REPORTER: School Board Member Patricia Good.

MS. GOOD: Here.

THE REPORTER: Ms. Mary D. Graham. Mr. Richard Grosso.

MR. GROSSO: Here.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Michael Long.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He's here.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He's in the back.

THE REPORTER: Vice Mayor Rita Mack. Mr. Robert McColgan.

MR. MCGOLGAN: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Bernard Parness.

MR. PARNES: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Michael J. Ryan.

MAYOR RYAN: Present.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Daniel J. Stermer.

MAYOR STERMER: Here.

THE REPORTER: Ms. Anne Castro, Chair.

CHAIR CASTRO: Here.

CONSENT AGENDA

AGENDA ITEM C-4 - EXCUSED ABSENCE REQUESTS

CHAIR CASTRO: Pursuant to C-4, may I have a motion to excuse Commissioner
--

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

MS. GOOD: Move.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- Bill Ganz, Mr. Michael Friedel --

MAYOR STERMER: Second.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- and Commissioner Bogen?

MS. GOOD: Move.

MAYOR STERMER: Second.

CHAIR CASTRO: There's a motion and a second. All in favor? Any opposed?
Hearing none, carries unanimously.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

OATH OF OFFICE

CHAIR CASTRO: It's my pleasure and all of our pleasure to welcome a new member. We thought we were done with this for a while, but that's all right. We like new blood and new ideas. So I'm going to have the privilege of swearing in Mr. Charles Fink. After I swear you in, Mr. Fink, when you return to your chair, if you'd like to say a few words, you're welcome to do that.

MR. FINK: Okay.

CHAIR CASTRO: Please know, after we swear you in, there's going to be a Chinese fire drill while we all come together for the group photo.

MR. FINK: Got it.

CHAIR CASTRO: So everybody prepare to exit your chairs and come to the center. We have a busy agenda today relative to some of the items, so we want to go as swiftly and as efficiently as possible. So if you would please step to the center with me, sir. Raise your right hand. I do solemnly swear --

MR. FINK: I do solemnly swear --

CHAIR CASTRO: -- that I will support, protect, and defend --

MR. FINK: -- that I will support, protect, and defend --

CHAIR CASTRO: -- the Constitution and government of the United States --

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

MR. FINK: -- the Constitution and government of the United States --

CHAIR CASTRO: -- and of the State of Florida --

MR. FINK: -- and of the State of Florida --

CHAIR CASTRO: -- that I am duly qualified to hold office --

MR. FINK: -- that I am duly qualified to hold office --

CHAIR CASTRO: -- under the Constitution of the state --

MR. FINK: -- under the Constitution of the state --

CHAIR CASTRO: -- and the Charter of Broward County --

MR. FINK: -- and the Charter of Broward County --

CHAIR CASTRO: -- and that I will well and faithfully perform the duties --

MR. FINK: -- that I will well and --

CHAIR CASTRO: Faithfully.

MR. FINK: -- faithfully perform the duties --

CHAIR CASTRO: -- of a member of the Broward County Planning Council --

MR. FINK: -- of a member of the Broward County Planning Council --

CHAIR CASTRO: -- on which I am about to enter --

MR. FINK: -- on which I am about to enter --

CHAIR CASTRO: -- so help me God.

MR. FINK: -- so help me God.

CHAIR CASTRO: Congratulations.

(Applause.)

(Picture taken.)

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

CONSENT AGENDA

AGENDA ITEM C-1 - APPROVAL OF FINAL AGENDA FOR DECEMBER 17, 2015

AGENDA ITEM C-2 - DECEMBER PLAT REVIEWS FOR TRAFFICWAYS PLAN COMPLIANCE

AGENDA ITEM C-3 - APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF OCTOBER 22, 2015

CHAIR CASTRO: Mr. Fink has waived his few minutes of comments, so we're on to the Consent Agenda.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: So moved.

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: Second.

CHAIR CASTRO: We have -- who moved it? I'm sorry. Commissioner Castillo. Commissioner Gomez seconded. All in favor? Hearing none, passes unanimously.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

REGULAR AGENDA

AGENDA ITEM R-1 - LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY REVIEW: PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE BROWARD COUNTY CODE OF ORDINANCES, "NATURAL RESOURCE PROTECTION CODE," CHAPTER 27, SECTION 27-66, REGARDING THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

AGENDA ITEM R-2 - LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY REVIEW: PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE BROWARD COUNTY CODE OF ORDINANCES, CHAPTER 5, ARTICLE IX, "LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE," RELATING TO TRANSPORTATION CONCURRENCY AND A NEW DIVISION NAME.

CHAIR CASTRO: Regular Agenda.

MS. BOY: Items R-1 and R-2 were heard by the Land Use/Trafficways Committee immediately preceding this meeting, and the Land Use/ Trafficways Committee recommended approval of both items. Staff is available if anyone has any questions about either LPA review.

CHAIR CASTRO: And just a quick comment, because R-1 was the environmental, it's to do concurrent review of permitting type processes, which will actually be more effective and efficient, and we thank the County staffs for working with the cities and coming up with that. That was a good thing.

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

MAYOR STERMER: Move Item R-1 and R-2.

COMMISSIONER LONG: Second.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.

CHAIR CASTRO: Second, Commissioner Long. Mayor Stermer. All in favor? Any opposed? Hearing none, carries unanimously.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

AGENDA ITEM R-3 - NEW ITEM PRESENTATION: POTENTIAL BROWARD COUNTY NON-RESIDENTIAL LINKAGE FEE FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING

MS. BOY: The new item, R-3, is a presentation of an item that the Broward County Commission initiated a motion to direct at last Tuesday's, December 8th, Commission meeting. Henry Sniezek from the Broward County Environmental Protection and Growth Management Department is going to make a presentation. It's related to a proposed non-residential linkage fee to fund affordable housing opportunities at the County. So Mr. Sniezek's going to make a presentation.

MR. SNIEZEK: Good morning, Madam Chair, and Council members. Henry Sniezek, Deputy Director, Environmental Protection and Growth Management Department. Before I start the presentation, may I just congratulate Mr. Fink on being a Planning Council member? When I started at the Planning Council over 30 years ago, Mr. Fink was there. And he outranked me then; he outranks me now.

(Laughter.)

MR. SNIEZEK: He's very independent-minded, and he'll be -- he'll be a really good Council member. Thanks for inviting me to talk to you this morning about the proposed non-residential linkage fee. This was something that the County Commission -- as Barbara said, it's something the County Commission just initiated basically on December 8th, and we've started the process now of preparing an ordinance to the County's Land Development Code to put a linkage fee into the Land Development Code.

And there's going to be a public input process over the next several months. So you're the first group that I'm talking to, and the presentation I'm going to give you basically takes about ten minutes, and it's pretty much exactly the same thing I gave to the County Commission. They had a Board workshop on December 1st where they discussed this. So before we get into the nuts and bolts of what a linkage fee is and the issues with that, I just want to reemphasize that the status of affordable housing in Broward County, some of you were here at the morning

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

meeting where Mr. Stone talked about the County's crisis in affordable housing.

He mentioned the Harvard Joint Center did a study of 381 jurisdictions in the country, and we ranked number five, but not in a good way. We're number five as being least affordable. Also, just give you a couple slides on the County's economy and affordability as it stands basically right now. The first slide you see is just, you know, we have a service oriented economy in Broward County, so a lot of our employment is lower income jobs. So you can see sales and related annual wage is just under \$40,000. Food preparation and serving is just over -- just under \$24,000. Office and administrative support's just about \$33,000. These are relatively low income jobs.

The median wage in the County right now is between 45, and \$50,000. Next couple slides, this one focuses on owner costs. This breaks it down into your mortgage status, people with a mortgage and people without a mortgage. And people with a mortgage in the County right now, over 50 percent of them pay more than 30 percent of their income on housing. The rule of thumb is 30 percent. Even for housing units without a mortgage, about 26 percent of those households pay more than 30 percent of their income on housing.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's horrible.

MR. SNIEZEK: For rentals --

CHAIR CASTRO: I'm sorry. Could you step back? Why is that? Is that the insurance?

MR. SNIEZEK: It's probably a combination of many factors, but the --

CHAIR CASTRO: Insurance and -- it would be insurance and taxes, pretty much.

MR. SNIEZEK: Insurance, taxes, and mortgages. People probably --

CHAIR CASTRO: Oh, I thought you said people without a mortgage are paying like --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

MR. SNIEZEK: Oh, for people without a mortgage, it probably is that, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And association fees.

CHAIR CASTRO: And association fees, yes. Thank you. You're probably right.

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

MR. SNIEZEK: Now, for the renters, I'd direct your attention to the right side of the chart. You see a lot of red numbers. It just shows that the incomes at the very low, low, and moderate have a hard time affording just Broward County's median rent, which is just about \$1,200. The only income group that can afford that right now is the upper end of the moderate income. The other ones all have deficits if they are going to afford that. So that's a crisis in and of itself. So what happens is people start crowding units to be able to afford housing. Now, about the linkage fee itself. What we're going to talk about is what are housing linkage fees.

This is a way to raise funds to support the development of new affordable housing, and to rehabilitate or maintain existing affordable housing. To accommodate a linkage fee, you have to meet a legal test. You have to do a rational nexus analysis to demonstrate that the fee that -- who you're getting the fee from, actually they generate the need for that type of use. So what we're talking about here is non-residential, so what that assumes is that, as new non-residential comes on board, those uses generate new jobs, they pay certain wages. Some of those are in the lower scale. Those people need housing. And if there is a deficit between what those wages pay and what the cost of their housing is, that's a gap that -- that can be established through a study, and it justifies a fee that can be assessed.

So what the County's talking about is not unusual throughout the country, even within the County. Coconut Creek has a linkage fee program right now. They assess between 15 cents per square foot for office and \$2.42 per square foot for hotel uses. Winter Park has a fee. They assess 50 cents per square foot. Seattle, Washington, and we just saw a story about that, they have a linkage fee that assesses between five and \$17 per square foot for new non-residential development. San Diego, this is a chart that just shows you their fee. They assess right now between just under a dollar for most categories. They have a fee structure. It's going to go up to over \$2 for at least office through January 2017. So this is not unusual around the country, but you do have to have that legal assessment that's done to justify it.

A little bit of history. This was an issue that came before the County Commission back in 2006, 2007, 2008. The County Commission actually hired FIU Metropolitan Center to do a linkage fee nexus study in 2007, and that's the legally defensible nexus that needs to be established. So that was done. A -- implementation issues for such an ordinance were analyzed, and there were workshops. The County Commission had a workshop back in April, 2008, and they identified additional information. It got to a point where specific proposals were put forth by staff. After having workshops, they went to the County Commission. And they put it on hold in September 2008 because that's when the Great Recession started. So nothing much happened during the years of the Great Recession. But in 2013, the issue came up again, and the County Commission held a workshop in October of 2013.

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

They visited several tools for affordable housing. They wanted to revisit the linkage fee.

So FIU Metropolitan Center was retained to update their 2007 study. They did it. It was released about a year ago. And that establishes the new nexus costs. And then in May, staff held a workshop, mostly with municipal staff, but other -- also other people from stakeholders, development community representatives, et cetera. We had about 70 people show up and talked about not only the nexus fee, itself, the methodology, but also just implementation issues, which I'll get into shortly. So really quickly, how is the nexus cost estimated? What FIU Metropolitan Center did is they analyzed seven types of workplace buildings, which you see there. And I won't go through all of that slide, because it's -- I don't even understand all of it.

And Dr. Murray and his staff were unable to come today, so if you have any questions about the particular methodology, I'll just take it down and get back to him, and then share it with the -- with the Council members. But basically, as I mentioned earlier, you have building types for different types of uses. He estimates how many employees are going to be generated, what their incomes are going to be, and how many housing units are going to be needed out of that, and then he analyzes that with the gap of what the costs of housing in the community are right now. And if there is a gap, that's the nexus cost that needs to be filled. Quickly, just a table of what this looks like. This is for retail/wholesale building.

They -- all of them are over 100,000 square feet that he studied. In this case, he studied retail/wholesale buildings that are 145,000 square feet. I think he took actual data from the community to come up with this building size. And you can see for different kinds of household incomes. There's a housing unit demand for that type of use, and then there's a gap or a surplus that's estimated. And then it -- you add them up, you divide it by the square footage of the building size, and then you have the nexus cost per square foot. In this case, for a retail/wholesale building, the nexus cost per square foot, the gap, basically, is \$319 per square foot. So legally, from what I'm told by our attorneys, you could assess a linkage fee of \$319 per square foot for all new resident -- for all new retail buildings. But that's not what we're proposing. There's --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MR. SNIEZEK: -- there's the nexus cost per square foot for the other categories. You can see it ranges from \$224 per square foot to over \$883 per square foot.

MAYOR RYAN: Can I just stop you there for one -- can I ask a question on that --

MR. SNIEZEK: Certainly.

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

MAYOR RYAN: -- \$319? Let's just assume we charge \$319, which would then kill retail development --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

MAYOR RYAN: -- would that drive down, then, the gap, in and of itself, because nobody'd be working in the low income area?

(Laughter.)

MR. SNIEZEK: I -- I guess it would.

MAYOR RYAN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. SNIEZEK: But just to add to that, no one's proposing that. This is just a legal mechanism --

MAYOR RYAN: No, I -- I agree with that. I understand. But what we're talking about is a continuum of that --

MR. SNIEZEK: Yes.

MAYOR RYAN: -- the intersection of jobs and housing. And, just to use this one extreme, if we used -- if we were sincere about tackling it, right, and we were fully committed, we'd charge the \$319, in which case --

MR. SNIEZEK: Right.

MAYOR RYAN: -- we'd very quickly kill all retail development, drive jobs out of here, and we'd solve the gap problem without building a single affordable housing unit.

CHAIR CASTRO: And attacking our resources.

MAYOR RYAN: And that's part of the challenge that I think we face in this type of analysis. Thank you.

MR. SNIEZEK: Okay.

MAYOR RYAN: And I apologize for interrupting.

CHAIR CASTRO: No, it's okay.

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

MR. SNIEZEK: These nexus costs per square foot were higher than the 2000 study. Actually, all the categories in 2007 were under a hundred dollars per square foot. So part of that -- we talked to Dr. Murray and his staff, and part of that was just the information he had now, he feels is better than what he had in 2007. So he thinks that in 2007, if he had the same information, the nexus costs would have been higher. But I think it also just reflects the unaffordability of housing in the County currently. So we feel like we're on good ground for legal justification for our nexus fee if the County Commission wants to move forward with that. So the issues then become what do you put into an ordinance? What are the implementation issues? And I'm going to share with you basically the four main ones.

Number one is what would be the potential fee level that would be assessed. In 2008, the County staff, when this was done, they recommended a fee of a dollar per square foot for retail and office and 50 cents for other types of non-residential uses. Just for the sake of estimating, if that fee had been assessed, had been in effect and assessed in 2014 at the County level, approximately \$2,000,000 would have been collected. Just for the workshop, we talked about, you know, you go to \$5 per square foot or 200 -- \$2.50 per square foot for other non-residential, just to get an assessment, but that's kind of the target range that staff would be talking about, not something higher than that.

As far as exemptions and waivers, usually people want to -- you know, they want to see if they can get out of it. So public projects, including public schools, they've asked for exemptions or waivers. Houses of worship, not for profits. Our re-analysis of this, we basically still support that. Those things wouldn't really be exempt from the fee. The County still would have to find a funding source to cover those fees. It's like transportation concurrency fees are waived for -- actually, for affordable housing projects. So there is a funding source for that, so it would be covered.

The exemptions that can occur is that if a municipality already has a linkage fee program. Coconut Creek has that. So would they be exempt even if their fee is less than what the County would, or would the County just collect the difference between those? If a municipality did adopt its own linkage fee which was the same or collected more than the County, I think we would support them being exempt from the County fee. They would have the fee within the municipality. They can keep the money for the municipality and use it for affordable housing within the municipality. Even sub areas. I've had some people come up to me and say, well, what if a -- like a CRA or -- well, maybe not. CRA's not a good example. But maybe like a downtown had their own linkage fee that was assessed within a certain area of the city, would that -- could that be exempt?

And I think that is something we can look into. Now, how would the monies be

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

distributed? Back in 2008, there were like three options. One would be for the County to keep the money and basically finance Ralph's programs, but they'd still have to be spent within districts, because that's what the rational nexus requires. They have to spend the money in the area that you collect it. So the County could be split into like three districts to spend the money on programs such as -- that the County has. Some of the money could -- there was an idea about collecting the money and then splitting it up to the entitlement cities, but you really don't get a lot of bang for your buck that way. If you're going to collect \$2,000,000 or so a year, and you split it up to all the entitlement cities, it's not really going to add a lot.

Or a competitive process. You can collect some money. Just like the County has a redevelopment program grant process, you could do that for this. Collect some money. You just say we're going to give out grants. Come and show us your projects, and we can award grants that way. Timing of assessments, when would this occur? It basically would just occur -- this one, to me, is the easiest one. It would occur where transportation concurrency fees are assessed, or parks, or schools. Just at the development review process at our County -- our Government Center West.

Now, the last couple of slides I'm going to show you is just to provide some context of what we're talking about.

I guess staff's preliminary recommendation, County staff's, would be a dollar per square foot, because that is consistent with the non-residential default we have for Land Use Plan amendments of a dollar per square foot. So our Office of Economic and Small Business Development, they looked at four scenarios for different types of uses. To just give you an idea of what the total cost for that are, we added in what the concurrency fees are right now, so you can kind of see if you did assess a dollar per square foot, or something else, you get a -- an idea for the impact. So the first one they looked at is hotel at the hundred thousand square feet. So if it was a dollar per square foot, that's a hundred thousand dollars. The total development cost for that kind of use in the County as of about a year ago was between 18 and \$22,000,000, depending on some factors.

And transportation concurrency fees for that kind of use would be about \$85,000. I should mention that non-residential development, that they are not assessed park or school impact fees. So just want to put that out there. As far as retail use, looked at a 25,000 square foot building. The cost to develop that is \$5.1 to \$5.7 million. That's both hard and soft costs that they took into account. The concurrency fee for that for transportation is kind of high, \$225,000. Third example is a warehouse with 75,000 square feet. That's like 7.2 to 8.8 million. Concurrency fees for that, transportation, is about \$74,000 right now. And the last example is an office building, hundred thousand square feet. That's 14 and a half to \$17,000,000. Concurrency fee for that is over \$200,000 right now.

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

So just to give you some context to what we're talking about. Now, the next steps, what's happened is on December 8th, the Commission, they approved what we call a motion to direct. It's basically an initiation of a process to amend the Land Development Code, to come up with an ordinance. It includes an outreach effort. I guess this would be one of them. We're also -- have already been invited to the Broward Workshop and to a realtors' association. We're going to take this to the County's Housing Council for their recommendation. And I'm sure I'm going to be pretty busy in the next couple of months. I guess right now I haven't mapped out a strategy with County administration, and I need to talk to some of the County Commissioners, but I'm thinking maybe March is probably the earliest we're going to be able to take something back to the County Commission.

The Planning Council's role is actually legally very narrow. We would bring back an ordinance to you so you can decide whether it's generally consistent with the countywide Land Use Plan, just like you did on some other items today. So your role is kind of technically, legally narrow, but we definitely want to work with the Council and try to have something produced that you might be supportive of. So, with that, I'll be happy to try to answer any questions or hear any comments.

CHAIR CASTRO: Before we do that, I think there's one person here who wanted to speak on the item.

MS. BOY: There is one member of the public signed in to speak, Chris Rotolo.

CHAIR CASTRO: And then after that I have Ms. Graham, Commissioner Castillo.

MS. ROTOLO: Hello and good morning.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good morning.

MS. ROTOLO: My name is Chris Rotolo and I represent the Building Owners and Managers Association of Fort Lauderdale. We just wanted to share our opinion on this matter with you all. We believe this is an all -- that affordable housing is an all-inclusive problem that affects everybody, but we don't feel that it should fall on the backs of commercial developers alone. And while we strongly agree that something needs to be done about affordable housing, we do not feel that this is necessarily the appropriate way to go about this. We would like the planning staff to consider other options and to come up with a menu of other means of feeing, possibly an ad -- a non-ad valorem or looking at the State. I know that the State has some -- has appropriated some monies for this, as well. So, with that, thank you very much.

CHAIR CASTRO: Thank you. Ms. Graham.

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

MS. GRAHAM: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm going to ask some questions rhetorically. I don't know if I'll get answers from anyone, but I'm not real familiar about how all this works, so just excuse me if I ask things that just aren't within the purview of what you're trying to accomplish. But does the money have to come only from new construction? And is there any reason why, if the fees are lower, it wouldn't be included in renovations/additions? Because we're almost built out anyway. I'm only talking about Broward County, at this point, not this general program across the state or the country in other cities.

But people buy buildings. It's oftentimes -- if you have a good design construction team, it's sometimes easier to buy something that's existing and do renovations, additions, what have you, and bring it into the new code compliance. And some of these fees are just staggering. I mean, when I used to practice, I knew architects that were getting a dollar a square foot to design and sign and seal plans. So to be adding a charge like this onto new construction, and even trying to put it under soft costs, so it's rolled into the loan or something like that, that's just staggering. But, anyway, one other thing. I know there's doc stamps on sales. I'm not a realtor or a lawyer, but would there not be -- and, again, it's easier to take it if it's a much smaller fee. I don't want to say a nickel a square foot or something like that, but I just think if you spread it around, just like Ms. Rotolo said, to be hitting just new construction is amazing.

I mean, I look at buildings now where they don't have enough money for their capital improvements and their operating budgets, over the terms of their loans, and they have to allocate where they spend the money to keep the thing running after they pay taxes and insurance and all of that. So I'll keep going. County would collect this money. I don't know how they would split it with the cities, but one of the things I always hear the Fort Lauderdale City Commissioners talk about in their workshop is that they are -- they don't like the way the County gets the sales tax, keeps their portion, and then the rest goes within the City of Fort Lauderdale, because they never, I guess, get enough money. 50 percent goes to the County, unless I misunderstand the split.

So I think, depending how this money is split between the County collecting it and then the cities actually doing something with it, you mentioned that -- that economy of scale. You never get enough money within each municipality to really accomplish something. And then, finally, you know, there was a lot of federal money that came to the City of Fort Lauderdale, NFP-1 and 2 I think were the programs, where they bought houses and they rehabbed them. And one of the problems was they were buying houses, for instance, where the finished floor elevation was obsolete. It was too low.

But rather than rebuild it and make it comply, they put a lot of money in it to fix it up, hardened the exterior, the building envelope, the roof, so on and so forth. But

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

it still had the inherent defect, for lack of anything better, of the finished floor being too low. So then when these neighborhoods would have all the rains and the water was coming in over the threshold, they kind of didn't seem to understand that, but they didn't have design professionals or maybe people with a background like some of us up here would have to tell them this is where you spend the money and this is where you don't. So I'd hate to see the money squandered.

And I also have watched Broward County Commission meetings over the years where different developers came and participated in programs they had to get money. They were getting the sites and they were improving the properties, but they were now so above what the market is for that particular neighborhood as far as the appraisals and all, it didn't make sense. And then they were trying to sell these homes, and, for that same amount of money, you could maybe buy a fixer-upper in a -- in another part of the city or the County.

So, I mean, I think you just need real astute professionals, for lack of a better word, looking at how this is all going to be spent when you finally collect it. But, at the same time, my front-end questions about how you would collect it, I think it would be a much easier hit, perhaps, than, you know, a nickel a square foot for certain projects rather -- I mean, anything even approaching 50 cents a square foot, I just -- I think it's crazy. I think we're going to push developers to Dade or Palm Beach, you know. And just like Mayor Ryan said, you know, it -- it's going to even out the market real darn quick, you know. Thank you.

MR. SNIEZEK: Would you like me to address some of the questions?

CHAIR CASTRO: If you'd like to, sure.

MR. SNIEZEK: As far as what the fee would be assessed on, that one, I think I know the answer to that. It would be on new development. Now, if there was a renovation and they're going from a previous residential use to a non-residential use, then the fee would -- could be assessed in that case. It also depends on how you structure the fee. If you had different categories, like you're going to charge a different fee for office as opposed to retail. If something's going from office to retail and the retail fee's higher, you can collect the difference between that. Right now, we're -- since those nexus costs are so high, you're talking about \$220 to \$800 per square foot -- we just -- our recommendation at this time would be just have a flat fee for non-residential. So that would not -- so in that instance, you would only assess on a net new non-residential development.

So, yeah, we're built out as far as land, pretty much, but the -- the assumption's things are going to be going up. So there's probably still a lot of capacity out there as far as new development. You mentioned spending. That's an implementation issue that still has to be decided. I guess, you know, mentioned just collecting the

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

money and using it for established County programs right now, because you'd have the more bang for the buck, but that still has to be decided. That's just basically me and Ralph talking right now. And if the programs -- if the money is funneled to municipalities or others, you're right, you have to have very stringent standards to make sure the money's spent correctly.

MS. GRAHAM: Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: Commissioner Castillo.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: So in 2014, had we had this in place, it would have generated \$2,000,000?

MR. SNIEZEK: Approximately, yes.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: So after all of this, at about a hundred thousand dollars a door, you would have gotten 20 units. And I'm -- maybe that's a good place to start, because it just doesn't seem that this approach -- and I say this with great respect and admiration for all of you. I know the tensions that you work under. This just doesn't ascribe the level of seriousness that a deficit of 55,000 units would sort of suggest we need to have. And I'm not personally convinced that there is any rational nexus between this fee and affordable housing. I can be persuaded, if it was up to me, which it isn't, that there's a rational nexus between commercial building and transportation, commercial building and roads, commercial building and water and sewer use. I can -- I -- you know, I could see that.

But this seems just too tenuous. And, at the end of the day, I just don't see where it ends, except that developers are forced to pass that cost along in rents, which then can't be paid by smaller businesses or by the businesses that want to come in. And then you get into the scenario that Mayor Ryan discussed, where it's a contradicting sort of a strategy. So I don't -- I don't think this is the answer. I -- you know, my own approach is that affordable housing is part of the general operation of government, and that it is part of the quality of life of government. We have a significant homeless problem in the community. We have a frustrating set of new federal -- we have yet again another strategy to end homelessness within a certain period of time, as if. The last one didn't work either.

We have now contradictions within the continuum of care and how that's being done. I mean, it's just -- we're not approaching this and we're not ascribing the level of seriousness. And I'm not aiming this at you, Henry. You know that. Or any of the staff. I just think that we're finding solutions off of the page of where the solutions really are, and I just don't see this as being one of them, so.

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

CHAIR CASTRO: I have Mayor Stermer, and then I have Mr. Grosso, and then Mayor Ryan.

MAYOR RYAN: I think Mr. Parness also had his hand up earlier.

CHAIR CASTRO: Thank you.

MAYOR RYAN: Before me.

CHAIR CASTRO: Oh, then would you like to defer?

MAYOR RYAN: Yes.

CHAIR CASTRO: Mr. Parness. Thank you.

MR. PARNES: I see this as a tax on an industry. If we need money for affordable housing, then everybody should chip in and pay for it, not one industry over another. Because my experience has been when -- I had a night club and restaurant, and when my rent went up, the price of my drinks went up. I looked to cut personnel to save money so that I could eke out a profit. I see this as a stifler of new business rather than generating money. We need money. We have to generate it from everybody, not from one source, which will hurt them and hurt business. If I have a choice of renting an older building at \$1,500 a month and the new one, because of their tax, at \$1,800 a month, where am I going to rent? \$300 a month is a lot of cups of coffee.

And I think it'll stifle business. And if it stifles business, it stifles the growth of the County. And if we don't grow, we die. Because that's the nature of business today. You either continually grow to meet your needs or you wind up like Monticello, New York. Yup. Which died. After 50 years of being the center of the Borscht Belt, it died, because it couldn't grow anymore.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

MR. PARNES: All the hotels closed. So I cannot see this as the solution. Sorry.

CHAIR CASTRO: Thank you. I have Mayor Ryan.

MAYOR RYAN: Yes, thank you. Again, thank you for the presentation, and also I appreciate that you acknowledged that there are a number of outstanding issues that still need to be identified and resolved. And that's helpful. I'm sure some of my colleagues have other comments. I heard comments regarding how this interacts with BrowardNext in the context of 1.07.07. There's concerns, obviously, about the application of the funds, where they go. I think that with 1.07.07, I see kind of a

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

set-up here that these then have to be dedicated to the lower stratification, where we have the biggest problem, yet, as my colleague, Commissioner Castillo, pointed out, you're not actually tackling the problem even at the level pointed out.

But, fundamentally, what I have a bit of an issue, and I -- obviously, linkage fees have been employed in different areas, is when it's being done by a city, who understands its needs and its growth, and it applies and takes those funds and applies it to its affordable housing, I understand the legal nexus much better. When it's deployed by a county where you have municipalities that may have no commercial -- new commercial development, then what you've done is put on the backs of those municipalities that do have new commercial development the responsibility for funding this. And I'm not sure that that will -- again, I'll leave it to the lawyers, but I don't know that that's going to survive legally, particularly where now, to the extent what we're talking about is trying to provide affordable housing for either new jobs or old jobs, as was said earlier, why not do it on build-outs? And then that's really countywide.

The nexus right now as developed is only going to be on those that actually have new development. And we know that there are new -- there are municipalities that have no new commercial development, so they do not bear any of the impact of this at all. However, they may have redevelopment. They may have old buildings that are purchased and now, all of a sudden, you've given them a competitive advantage which was unintended, and still haven't tackled the problem. So I have significant legal concerns as to whether the County can do this in the current application as imposed on a narrow, as my colleague Mr. Parness said, in a narrow industry. So I'll leave it to the lawyers, but I suspect that we'll see some significant litigation on this if it goes in the current structure. Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: Thank you. Mr. Grosso.

MR. GROSSO: Thank you. I wonder if you could respond to a couple of musings on my part. Is it part of the nexus analysis that new non-residential tends to bring in folks from outside the community to work here, thus that's the creation of the new affordable housing demand?

MR. SNIEZEK: That's addressed in the report, yes.

MR. GROSSO: I'm sorry?

MR. SNIEZEK: That is addressed in that -- in the study, the nexus study. It is new employees to the County, yes.

MR. GROSSO: So that tends to create the linkage --

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

MR. SNIEZEK: Yes.

MR. GROSSO: -- fee that you've --

MR. SNIEZEK: Right.

MR. GROSSO: I'm sympathetic to the idea of -- I mean, redevelopment can create that same demand as new, but I tend to see it as a -- an effectiveness and a fairness issue that you might strongly consider the ordinance applying to redevelopment as well as to new development. Also, is it part of the analysis here that the increase in that kind of development, in the absence of some sort of program like this, has had the problems that it has created? The lack of affordable housing seems to be a major critical problem, and the growth, you know, the progress that we've had and a lot of us have benefited from has also created this problem on the other end for a sizeable portion of our population.

MR. SNIEZEK: Right.

MR. GROSSO: Is that the big motivation here?

MR. SNIEZEK: Right. I mean, this is a tool in the tool box. Certainly, this is not something that's going to solve the problems. But it is something that other jurisdictions have used when they have new non-residential development and that nexus has been established, that the new non-residential generates employees at the lower incomes, and there's a need for housing. It's naturally -- it relates to each other. You have new employees that need housing, and you need the housing. And if you don't have it or if it's not affordable, that justifies the fee that is used elsewhere.

MR. GROSSO: And then I guess, actually, the final question I have is is there an analysis that can be done that tries to find that sweet spot between a fee that really inhibits non-residential development versus one that allows it to continue but helps us meet the sizeable portion of this demand?

MR. SNIEZEK: Well, we're going to look into that. I mean, the dollar per square foot that we've thrown out, that's very conservative. But, yes, you want to find a balance. You don't -- we don't -- we're not up here trying to stop economic growth in the County. So we're thinking that the purpose of this is to find a balance between trying to do something for the community but not stifling economic growth. So I don't know what the -- if the answer's a dollar per square foot or something higher or something lower right now.

MR. GROSSO: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

CHAIR CASTRO: Thank you. Commissioner Blattner.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: I think it's really interesting the first item we had today was not unrelated to the issue of affordable housing and attainable housing and linkage fees, recognizes that there is a problem in Broward County. And someone mentioned homeless, which is also a problem in Broward County. I think it's everywhere in Broward County, no matter the degree of affluence in your community. And because these problems are countywide, I think that the financing solution needs to be countywide and spread out in that way. Otherwise, we end up with rewarding and penalizing cities, depending on where they are in their development cycle.

And if we're going to do it on the idea of development, then it absolutely has to include redevelopment. Older cities are redeveloping. And redevelopment can be tear everything down and build a new building, or it can be just take what you've got and make it better. But if you don't incentivize -- no, that's not the right word -- if you don't address the issue of where that money goes, also on a countywide basis, I have -- I have a problem with that. If you add this as millage, for example, and the County collects X numbers of dollars from it, how does it distribute that? By application? By grant? Who determines that? I think cities need to determine that. The communities need to determine where the money goes.

Maybe that's the other part of the answer is then the cities ought to determine where it comes from, also. I just am concerned that we don't want to -- we don't want to stop development in Broward County because we tax our -- tax it out of existence by adding -- some of the members -- I walked out of the room, and it was \$2.19, and I came back, it was a buck. I thought, it's going fast action. But even at a dollar, keep in mind -- keep in mind also, the economy ebbs and flows. In your own presentation, this was ready to go in 2007. 2008, the economy died. We had to stop it anyway. So I think there's a lot of work to be done on this. I wouldn't vote on it -- I wouldn't vote in favor of it today.

CHAIR CASTRO: Commissioner Long.

COMMISSIONER LONG: Yeah, I agree with pretty much everything that's been said here today. I think the bigger issue we have to really address is affordable housing, across the board, funding it across the board, not laying it on one industry or the next, but doing it across the board. Because, quite honestly, when we look at the ebbs and flows of the economy, that's when things get the worst for the people who have the least amount of money. So affordable housing needs go up even more. We really need to look at something as a County, whether it's millage, whether it's doc stamps or it's something, because I always question, every time we have these, you know, a dollar per square foot and this and that, where do the dollars actually go.

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

And, Henry, maybe you can tell me or -- I don't know if I've ever seen a report saying how much money has been generated by these type of, you know, set asides or whatever else we have, and fees attached to that. And then, secondly, what did that bring us? How many more affordable housing units have come on line because of that? And I know it goes into the County, and there's a lot of different programs there. And, Ralph, maybe you even know. But I don't see an improvement. I mean, we have, just from a homeless piece, you have, you know, 2,624 homeless people as of January this past year. Now, some of them are sheltered, but they're still not in a home. And if that's our goal, and our goal is to take the homeless people and put them in homes and provide supportive housing, you've got to fund that. You've got to fund the supportive piece.

You have a lot of issues within that. And just from workforce housing, there's not a lot of that. And when you start looking at wages, fairly stagnant among the lower end jobs, it's getting worse. So every day we talk about it and have no action, as a County, we have bigger problems. And I think we need to look at this piece a little more globally. This particular idea, it is one piece of it. I don't agree with it. I think we need to be a little more global in our thought, and I think the County and the divisions within the County need to be focusing on a big piece to solve this problem. Because it is a major problem. It's not getting any better. It's just going to get worse.

CHAIR CASTRO: Before I recognize Mr. de Jesus, quick question, Henry. I noticed in your presentation, all of the samples you gave were city governments. There were no county governments. Are you familiar where there's a county or state linkage fee anywhere?

MR. SNIEZEK: No, I don't have that information.

CHAIR CASTRO: And I think -- I'm not saying that to -- I think -- I don't disagree it should be County, but I think those are challenges that are going to be unique that these other organizations haven't experienced. And I think that's what you're hearing.

MR. SNIEZEK: Uh-huh.

CHAIR CASTRO: You know, how it's collected, how it's spent. Because of the dynamic between cities and County, that's the part you're going to have to really, as you've already alluded to, focus and flesh-out a little bit more to make everybody kind of comfortable and think that it's fair and equitable and the right things are going the right way. So that's why I asked the question.

MR. SNIEZEK: Thanks.

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

CHAIR CASTRO: Mr. de Jesus.

MR. DE JESUS: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm not -- I'll keep my comments short. I agree with a large majority of the comments made by my colleagues earlier. And, Henry, I thank you and your staff for the work on this. I just -- I believe, much like the affordable housing piece, it's more exclusive than it is inclusive countywide. And I believe it was Mayor Stermer who mentioned earlier that maybe that piece of the affordable housing belongs with BrowardNext. I see this as maybe an issue that belongs with BrowardNext, as well, so that it can be included globally, as Commissioner Long said. And because of those issues, I won't be able to support it today, either, but I'd like to see it more all-inclusive countywide. Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: Commissioner Gomez.

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: I basically agree with everyone who has spoken so far, with varying points, and so I want to thank you. And I -- if I understand correctly, you wanted some direction for how to put this together for -- to bring back to the County in a few months. Is that --

MR. SNIEZEK: Well, I'm certainly here to get comments.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: Yeah, you're getting them.

MR. SNIEZEK: But I think as we develop an ordinance, because we're going to talk to a number of stakeholders, I mean, certainly, we want to bring it back to the Planning Council just for your input on the ordinance, the -- in addition to your role, which is very narrow, which is to say whether it's consistent or inconsistent with the Land Use Plan, I mean, my experience is, honestly, that whatever we bring back, you're probably going to be advised that it is consistent with the Land Use Plan, because it's not going to conflict with the Land Use Plan. But, certainly, you might do something different, but certainly the substance of the ordinance, I'd like to bring it to you so you can weigh in on that as a -- not in an official capacity, I guess, but just to inform us as we take it to the County Commission.

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: Well, it's kind of like we're work-shopping this for you right now, and you see where your blueprint or your outline is for where we have some issues. And I think, as has been said, ultimately, it's always going to come back to the consumer. It doesn't matter. Developers will -- if they have to pay it, it's going to come back on the consumer renting it. If -- as Mr. Parness said, if it went up for his taxes for his rent, he was charging it to the person who was going to buy that cup of coffee or whatever being purchased.

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

It always comes back to the consumer. Millage rates, they are basically only based for those people who own homes and pay taxes on them. If it goes to the rent and then, at that point, if it's something going to be leased out to a renter, that renter's going to pay it, ultimately, in their rent. So it is a cyclical issue here that you're dealing with. And whether -- I love non-profits. I represent non-profits. I have fund-raised for non-profits, in my past. It does come to a point in time in dealing with some of our buildings and what we're dealing with, do we include non-profits for at least a partial payment versus the exempt?

And I bring that up because, as you're starting to do the planning, I think that's something that nowadays we need to start considering as what's to happen with those. So -- because waivers are important to assist them, but to what extent? And then it does go back to application. The money comes in. Where does it go? For the new development, I completely agree that that is a very important piece. And I work with Broward County Housing Authority and know that sometimes when we're dealing with people who get the vouchers, they decide to use it in a different method, or they stay on it longer than expected. How do we assist with getting people to get jobs that have a higher income so they're off the voucher, so we do alleviate some of the problem of low income housing and not having the stock for it? Because as you're coming up with a plan, it's for only new. As was mentioned, we don't have any plan for the past. How do we get that gap filled in?

So I'm happy to help on any side that -- you know, besides this, that we can, through any other hats that we all wear, but I know it's a problem, and I do wish you a great amount of patience and luck with this.

MR. SNIEZEK: Thank you. And I would -- you know, City of Hollywood staff's came up to me before the meeting, and I might be going to talk to them. So certainly anybody who -- you know, any city that wants to have a separate discussion at your City Commission or in a workshop, I'd be happy to come over in the next couple months.

CHAIR CASTRO: And we appreciate you bringing this to us in the raw form. So I know, again, we're a little heightened today because of all the subject matter that's on the agenda, so, you know, don't take this as attack. It's not meant to.

MR. SNIEZEK: Not at all.

CHAIR CASTRO: And I appreciate you kind of alluding to the fact that when it comes back in the form of an ordinance, and I think Ms. Blake Boy also, our role there will be very narrow, and that we might just be judging quantity or voting on quantity and not necessarily quantity at that time.

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

MR. SNIEZEK: Uh-huh.

CHAIR CASTRO: So that makes it really special that you brought it back, before you brought it as an ordinance, to let us kind of weigh in. So thank you very much.

MR. SNIEZEK: You're welcome.

CHAIR CASTRO: It's greatly appreciated.

MR. SNIEZEK: May I just say one, couple more things?

CHAIR CASTRO: Sure.

MR. SNIEZEK: Just about the timing, several Council members mentioned that. And, yes, this is being contemplated at the staff level as part of BrowardNext, so, you know, I was mentioning the earliest it would come back probably to you is February or maybe March. I mean, BrowardNext is basically just a few months behind that, so --

CHAIR CASTRO: Right.

MR. SNIEZEK: -- I understand the need to see a package together that -- you know, this and Policy 1.07.07, that's not the only things we're looking at. We're looking at bonus densities and other forms of promoting affordable housing. So, and then just the last thing I'll say is a lot of this is just economics. I took some economics courses in college. That was a long time ago. But, you know, are we more like Boston and San Diego and even Coconut Creek that have had -- have these programs and still thrive, or are we more like the city that Mr. Parness was talking about that's going to have something like this be so onerous it's going to like destroy the --

CHAIR CASTRO: Sure.

MR. SNIEZEK: -- the economy. So I think we're probably closer to the Boston/San Diego, but we're still going to sort that out.

CHAIR CASTRO: I have Ms. Graham, real quick, and then School Board Member Good.

MS. GRAHAM: Thank you, Madam Chair. To your point about were there any other counties that have done this in the past, Henry, Jacksonville is Duval County, as you know. The city is the county limits. And I'm going to do some research on that and look into that, because I do a lot of assignments up there. I've never lived there. But it's an interesting way that they've chosen to govern, because they

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

spread all their costs for everything on such a huge geographical area, and a tax base, as well.

But I think that's worth looking into. The other thing is maybe this coming up on the horizon will spur a lot of new development in Broward County real quick, just like Amendment 4. Remember when Amendment 4 was on the ballot? It was my first year on Planning Council. We had so many projects coming in because they needed to beat the -- beat the buzzer. So, anyway.

CHAIR CASTRO: School Board Member Good.

MS. GOOD: Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you for the presentation, and certainly I appreciate all the comments from the dais. So I just wanted to quickly mention, I noticed on the information provided, you noted the waiver provisions for public schools, and I wondered how that would work in sync with the charter schools, as well.

MR. SNIEZEK: That's a good question. I don't have the answer to that right now. That's something I'll have to look into. And I thank you for bringing that up, because that's -- like the devil's in the details. We'll have to look into it --

MS. GOOD: No, I --

MR. SNIEZEK: -- and let you know. I don't know the answer to that.

MS. GOOD: -- and charter schools are public schools, although some are managed by for-profit --

MR. SNIEZEK: Uh-huh.

MS. GOOD: -- organizations. So I just wanted to bring that to your attention so that in your review process you can consider those --

MR. SNIEZEK: Thank you.

MS. GOOD: -- opportunities. Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay. I have Mayor Stermer and Mayor Ryan.

MAYOR STERMER: And, Henry, thank you for coming. I'd ask that you reach out to the Executive Director of the Broward League of Cities and make this presentation to them, as well. I think it's an important group. And I think what you're hearing today, and, one, I don't think you're surprised you're hearing it, and as Commissioner Gomez said, it's -- while we are -- technically, we will review this

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

when it comes back as an ordinance because it's part of the Land Development Code, not part of the land use, which is what we deal with, I think what you're hearing is there's a desire on behalf of this body, which is a cross section of the County elected and residents, but 18 electors, that believe if we're going to talk about affordable housing, we need to put all of the pieces of the puzzle on the table at the same time and have a comprehensive conversation.

MR. SNIEZEK: Uh-huh.

MAYOR STERMER: To look at each piece and then say, where should we put it, without understanding what the entirety of the picture is is frustrating the process and not getting us any -- we're not getting any momentum or forward progress. And I also wonder, using your 2014 numbers that we would have generated \$2,000,000, what would the staffing costs to generate that \$2,000,000 be to manage, to have raised that \$2,000,000, to oversee the project and all of that? How much of it would then get spent on costs? Do you have any idea?

MR. SNIEZEK: Probably very little, since we already have the infrastructure in place to collect the fees. And if it goes to the County's programs, it's just -- it's just a matter of moving it into the existing programs. But, I mean, that's a legitimate question. It depends on how it's structured, how the fees are used.

MAYOR STERMER: Right. But I go back to Mayor Ryan's first question, when he opened up the chart and said if you did this project it would be \$319, and you got sticker shock from Ms. Graham saying, you know, a dollar, in certain instances, is crazy. In the scheme of things -- and, again, recognizing affordable housing isn't -- is a crisis issue, raising \$2,000,000 is a drop in the bucket. And this, to me, sounds as if this may be another one of those, we're saying we're doing something when the result of what we're doing doesn't accomplish anything significant.

And that's my concern. Instead of looking at the picture and seeing how all the pieces fit together and say, if we put this piece here, we have to deal with this piece over there, we're looking at it in a hodge podge fashion. And I think we as a community need to sit down and -- I don't want to use the word summit -- and who would be invited is a separate issue, because we've had them before, but the governments need to have conversations together about a County solution, a city solution, how there may be a mix. If you raise it in a city, hypothetically, that's bringing on millions of square feet but then it gets distributed someplace else, is that then part of the nexus issue?

MR. SNIEZEK: Uh-huh.

MAYOR STERMER: Again, countywide program, I get it. But is that fair to the community where that development's actually taking place, much less where are

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

the units going to be built? If you're on the west side of the County, are they going to be built in the center or the east side of the County, and there's no transportation to get those people to the new jobs that were just created.

MR. SNIEZEK: Uh-huh.

MAYOR STERMER: So there's a bigger issue. And I would welcome the opportunity and I would ask, and please deliver the message back, this board is desirous of having a holistic conversation with the people that sit here on Tuesday, the nine of them. How do we make that happen to look at the entirety of the affordable housing issue?

MR. SNIEZEK: Certainly. When the Commission initiated this, they didn't say, come back in two months or a month, so the issue of timing is out there, so I will report back to my bosses and discuss that. Because I figured that that was going to be a comment that I was going to receive about making this -- to see this in the context of a larger package.

CHAIR CASTRO: Mr. DiGiorgio, you good?

MR. DIGIORGIO: Two --

CHAIR CASTRO: Sure.

MR. DIGIORGIO: -- quick questions. I think, Mayor -- Mayor Stermer, thank you. That's really what I was going to say, a comprehensive look at all of this. Mr. Sniezek, thank you for bringing this in front of us. We appreciate to have this discussion and really workshop it with you. I think it's really important to go back to what Ms. Graham said, though, and what Mr. Castillo said, Commissioner Castillo. When we talk about the total scale of this, when we look at the last 15 years, I would argue to say we haven't built 3,000,000 square feet of new development in any one of those years.

So let's just say that's a goal. At 3,000,000 square feet, that gives us \$3,000,000. \$3,000,000 with the comment that Mayor Stermer said, what is the cost on that? Maybe it's at the County level, and if it's distributed through the city, there's going to be city costs on top of that. When we look at that, it really doesn't -- it again goes to whoever said it, it seems like we're doing something for the sake of saying we're doing something. It doesn't really get to the real issue. So the comprehensive approach to this that Mayor Stermer talks about is really important, to look at it in all the pieces of the puzzle. Let's put it together and do it in one package as opposed to just piece-mealing it.

I do think Ms. Graham had an excellent point that if you look at this, and we do

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

come up to it and say there is a need for this and there is a need for some type of a fee, look at it across the board, because then, if it's five cents or ten cents, whatever that number is, across all construction in the County, it might be a real significant number. You have to do the math on it. I don't know what that is. But I can tell you in new construction, we're just not going to get anything significant. Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: Commissioner Castillo, you want to --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Yeah, I just wanted to quickly mention, because in the earlier discussion on this at the earlier meeting, my city was mentioned, Pembroke Pines. And this is not a defensive comment, but sort of to illustrate a couple of different ways that this could be done. So we got tired of waiting around for this discussion, so we created 804 units of affordable housing that we own and operate, and the rents pay off the debt. So it's not costing the residents of my city a nickel to have affordable housing. If we need to do more, we'll do more.

But there's a lot of different ways to go about this. Capital funding is certainly one way. If it's offset by low income housing bonds, that -- that's another way. But if we've got a shortage of 65,000, I'm going to repeat myself, but if we've got a shortage of 65,000 units -- was that the number, Mayor -- we have to ascribe some seriousness to this. And, you know, I mean, this is just -- I don't see this as being an approach that's going to get us there. And, you know, there has to be a much more serious approach to this. Otherwise, we're not ascribing seriousness to it. And, again, I just do not see this nexus. And even if it exists, I think that the outcome will be worse. This is not the solution we're looking for.

CHAIR CASTRO: Commissioner Blattner.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Yeah, just to also suggest feedback to your analysis, it goes back to -- and the comments that the Chair made about poor small cities. There are a lot of poor small neighborhoods in not poor cities --

CHAIR CASTRO: In big cities.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: -- and there's no incentive to -- there's no funding available to incentivize development or redevelopment of those communities, even if it's just a rehabilitation. And there needs to be funding for that. The stock is there. It's okay. It's sustainable. But no one's making -- oh, yes, I'm wrong. Corporations are buying blocks of this property. It is rental. They put no money in it.

CHAIR CASTRO: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: They paint it to make it look better. But they do

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

nothing to improve the infrastructure of the home, to make it more habitable. It has to do with the concept of livability and livable communities. In Dania Beach and Hollywood and Pompano, that -- they're mentioned as the three cities with the biggest gaps. And in almost every other city, maybe except Parkland and maybe Weston, there are communities of properties that need to be rehabilitated for whom that this is the solution to our affordable -- to the gap for people in the lower and moderate income family areas.

So I'd like you to feed that back. And the distribution of any monies that might accrue as a result of a -- of a millage increase or whatever needs to be available for those purposes.

CHAIR CASTRO: Last speaker, Mayor Ryan.

MAYOR RYAN: Just a follow up. I know you put out a comment are we going to be like, and you gave some examples, thriving cities like Boston and others, are we going to be like what happened, Mr. Parness's scenario. I don't think that's a helpful analogy, because we don't know enough about how any one of those cities versus what this structure is county. So I would just guard against that, going forward, because I think it's a -- it's kind of leading not with your chin, but leading with the chin, because I don't think it's necessarily helpful.

I do want to drill down just a little further on what my colleague, Mr. Grosso, pointed out. I think it's a great point. Part of the justification, legal justification, is this assumption that this new development is bringing in new jobs. You know, we recently competed to -- nationwide to keep American Express in Broward County. And of those 3,200 jobs, I bet the vast majority are not new jobs. They are jobs that are being relocated from other cities. You kind of undermine the justification for this entire program in those situations, and you make it harder for us to compete to keep jobs here. And I would also add to that, you know, whether or not those are low paying jobs, they would be paying a big ticket. They would resent that, maybe have some sort of legal challenge.

And, again, even if it is a big project, if we have this transportation problem, then we've undermined the justification again. That is that we think there's new low paying jobs there, but the housing isn't going to be located nearby, and we don't have an infrastructure for transportation, and what was the point of getting the money from them if they can't get there to the job because there's no transportation? And, finally, I would not discount entirely this issue of the opportunity costs and actual costs of administering, as was pointed out.

Whether it's 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 that my colleague, Mr. DiGiorgio, pointed out, each city then who is applying has staff working on these applications, year in, year out, trying to get the funds. So we have hours on hours spent on it, and I

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

suspect that if we were to add up that, I don't think it's insubstantial. But if you say, look, it's going to go to the County programs, then we're back to the transportation problem, because you're going to locate it somewhere, perhaps, where the jobs aren't --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Right.

MAYOR RYAN: -- that were associated with the dollars produced from the city that had to bear all of the costs. So I think it's a long way of saying there needs to be a holistic view of this, and I think as long as it's laid on the back of new development, there's going to be significant legal challenges and significant factual challenges. Thank you.

MR. SNIEZEK: Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: Thank you very much for your time and your presentation. We hope we gave you some good feedback, so.

MR. SNIEZEK: Oh, definitely.

MAYOR STERMER: Happy holidays, Henry.

CHAIR CASTRO: Happy holidays.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Happy holidays, right.

(Laughter.)

MAYOR STERMER: And, Mike, just so you know -- Mike, just so you know, the city Mr. Parness mentioned used to be the home of Kutsher's, The Nevele, The Concorde, Grossinger's. It was a great place that literally died because they were all waiting for gambling to come to New York.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: But all those people came to South Florida.

MAYOR STERMER: They all came here.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

AGENDA ITEM R-4 - COUNSEL'S REPORT

CHAIR CASTRO: R-4, Counsel's Report.

MR. MAURODIS: No report.

CHAIR CASTRO: Nothing.

AGENDA ITEM R-5 - EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

CHAIR CASTRO: R-5, Executive Director's Report.

MS. BOY: I'll make it quick. I just want to welcome and congratulate Mr. Fink on his appointment. And I do want to mention Commissioner Bogen will be here at the January meeting. He had an unanticipated trip this week.

MR. MAURODIS: Yeah.

MS. BOY: I also want to follow-up on the united fund -- United Way fund raiser that many of you participated in. The football pool, we raised \$500. And the halftime winner of \$100 was from the County Attorney's Office, Moneyede Martin. And the final score winner was Matt Goldstein from Planning Council staff.

(Applause.)

MS. BOY: Won \$400. And, apparently, I just do want to mention that Matt Goldstein is taking that \$400 and leaving the Planning Council staff and going to work for Miramar. This is a true story. Tomorrow's his last day --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

MS. BOY: -- with Planning Council, so.

CHAIR CASTRO: Congratulations.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

(Applause.)

MS. BOY: So congratulations and best wishes to him. We won't let him play next year. Just kidding. But Commissioner Gomez also mentioned that she would like us to think about a Super Bowl fund raiser to do the same thing for January, so the timing might line up for the January Planning Council meeting, so I'll talk to her over the holidays about the details of that. I also want to just mention, I know I sent

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

an email, the County Commission approved the Fort Lauderdale Regional Activity Center, the 5,000 dwelling unit application last week. There was a lot of discussion. Mayor Stermer was at the meeting for another reason, so he got to enjoy the show, so to speak. But --

CHAIR CASTRO: Before you move on, Mayor Stermer wants to say something about that.

MAYOR STERMER: Everybody should know that what we thought was going to happen did happen. Ms. Boy stood at the podium and was pelted with comments by the County Commission about affordable housing. And she took back to the -- took what the Commission gave her and stood there and took it all and responded professionally, based upon what this board did. And, yes, she had the city manager from the City of Fort Lauderdale there, Mr. Feldman, but together they explained the process. And, at the end, it resulted in a unanimous vote from the County Commission, who raised a whole host of issues, but, at the end, all voted for it.

So I just want to give you kudos. I've been sitting here and going, gosh, if some people walk about and see what happens here, this is the easy part of the job. Taking something as big as that project was, when they're used to seeing individual projects, and that was part of the issue which we dealt with. But kudos to you and everybody for the job last week at the County Commission.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well done.

CHAIR CASTRO: Well done.

(Applause.)

MS. BOY: Well, I appreciate those comments. And, you know, Planning Council staff couldn't have gotten to the recommendation that we made without the participation of the County staff. So it was really a group effort in working with the City of Fort Lauderdale. So I was just the lucky one who got to stand up at the podium at the time.

CHAIR CASTRO: Or unlucky.

MS. BOY: But thank you.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: But I'll bet they didn't wish you happy holidays.

(Laughter.)

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

MS. BOY: Someone said I was kind. So that counts for something.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: You and Henry take a lot of abuse.

MS. BOY: And just in case I don't get to it at the end of the meeting, I just want to wish everyone a happy holiday season.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Happy holidays.

MR. DIGIORGIO: You, too.

MS. BOY: Thank you.

MR. FINK: Happy holidays.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We're adjourned?

(Laughter.)

PUBLIC HEARING

AGENDA ITEM PH-1 - RECERTIFICATION PCR 15-20

AGENDA ITEM PH-2 - RECERTIFICATION FOR PCR 15-21

AGENDA ITEM PH-3 A - RECERTIFICATION PCR 15-22

AGENDA ITEM PH-3 B - RECERTIFICATION PCR 15-23

AGENDA ITEM PH-4 - AMENDMENT PCR 15-24

AGENDA ITEM PH-5 - AMENDMENT PC 15-13

AGENDA ITEM PH-6 - AMENDMENT PC 15-14

AGENDA ITEM PH-7 - AMENDMENT PCT 15-4

MS. BOY: For the -- for the Public Hearing items, Items 1 through 8, we only have a speaker on Item 8. Items 1 through 7 are only -- any speakers are only for questions.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: I move 1 through 7.

MS. BOY: And the quasi --

MAYOR STERMER: Second.

MS. BOY: -- has been waived on all items.

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

CHAIR CASTRO: And may I say, before we vote, does anybody need to disclose anything? No? Okay. We have a motion, Commissioner Castillo, I think.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Yes.

CHAIR CASTRO: Second, Mayor Stermer. All in favor --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Aye.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- 1 through 7. Any opposed? Hearing none, carries unanimously.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

AGENDA ITEM PH-8 - AMENDMENT PCT 16-1

CHAIR CASTRO: Item 8, for you.

MS. BOY: Item 8. Thank you. Item 8 was -- actually, the beginning of this discussion was at the Land Use/Trafficways Committee this morning, and a couple of extra members were able to join the earlier discussion. I'm going to give a quick overview of the proposed policy change. Ralph Stone is going to make a few comments, and then Robert Von, the consultant, will give an overview of the proposed methodology.

Historically, Policy 1.07.07 was put in place in 2007. And I -- or, I'm sorry, 2006. And I do want to point out, one of the members, I think Commissioner Long, was talking about, you know, do we have any information on what's happened related to affordable housing. And the summary of that is included in this document, in Attachment 13, of all of the set-asides that have occurred for -- yes?

COMMISSIONER LONG: Sorry to interrupt, but my question --

MS. BOY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER LONG: -- specifically -- sorry about that --

CHAIR CASTRO: No, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER LONG: -- was give me the total amount of dollars --

MS. BOY: Uh-huh.

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

COMMISSIONER LONG: -- that have been entered into the coffers of Broward County and what did Broward County do with those dollars over and above what they've already been doing. That would be my question.

MS. BOY: Okay. Okay, so you don't -- all right. So, anyway, the -- so, anyway --

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Take your time.

MS. BOY: So Policy 1.07.07 was put in place in 2006 related to Land Use Plan amendments that were adding more than 100 dwelling units to the Broward County Land Use Plan. And the policy was set up after many months of discussion between the County, the Planning Council, municipalities, the League of Cities, and it offers a menu approach for when a proposed Land Use Plan amendment comes in, the different manners in which a municipality can demonstrate that it is able to promote, maintain affordable housing within its municipality. The County Commission initiated this proposed amendment based on the receipt of several studies through the year, because the current policy says estimated by the municipalities.

So I just should get to the point of what this policy change would do is it would take -- eliminate the requirement that municipalities submit the base data and change the base data to the methodology that's going to be presented today. So there -- every municipality would be operating off of the same base data, which right now, as the studies are submitted, they submit whatever base data they choose, so it's not always the same starting point for each municipality. There has been -- there was much discussion about this over the past couple years. Last year, we started with the implementation of Article 10, which outlined the implementation of the policy, because there was never an implementation side of the document.

So Article 10 of the Administrative Rules Document is also proposed to be changed as part of this policy update or change. The base data change will also -- it will not eliminate the -- that a municipality cannot still submit data that is unique to its municipality. So the base data would remain the same. Municipalities can still submit data that makes -- talks about their affordable housing issue in their municipality. So it would not eliminate that. So -- sorry, I just lost my train of thought. So the -- so the policy change in Attachment 1 is just to eliminate the municipality requirement, switch to the -- to the base data idea.

And Planning Council staff recommends approval of this. I would also mention that we took this to a workshop with municipalities and stakeholders in October. We received comments. Those are in Attachments 6 through 9. And then Attachment

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

12 is a response document that addresses those specific comments, objections, and issues that were raised by the municipalities, as well as several questions that were raised along the process. I think I'm going to hand it over to Ralph at this point to just give you a quick overview of affordable housing, and then Robert Von's going to give an overview.

MR. STONE: Good morning, Council members. I'm going to be much more brief than I was earlier. I think we've got a sophisticated group as far as understanding where we're at in terms of affordable housing in the County. I think we all know that we're one of the worst metro areas in the country for affordability, simply because we have historic low wages that are literally adjusted for inflation flat over the last 30 years. We have high housing costs. I mean, our median home price in Broward now is over \$300,000, and the -- as you heard Henry talk about the median rent is between 12 and \$1,300.

And we have the good fortune of continuing to produce a lot of jobs here, more than Miami-Dade and Palm Beach. But the occupations of those jobs are all low wage jobs, back of the house hospitality industry, retail, food services, et cetera. So we're falling farther behind. In terms of what you're just about to hear, the Board, as they hear the plan changes come through the Council, and particularly dealing with the affordable housing analysis and mitigation options, have expressed some frustration about the variation of the studies that were presented, so about a year ago they directed me to issue a request for proposal in an attempt to have someone develop a methodology that would have uniform base data, easily accessible, easy to use, and available to all of the local governments.

And what you'll hear from Mr. Von is the results of his development of that methodology. Fortunately, we have field tested what he'll be bringing to you. We have provided the methodology to all the cities and all the planners. My staff applied it to all 31 cities. Took them about -- about five to ten minutes per city. And it is capable of modifying itself any given day of the week, based on changes that we may have available in terms of the Census data. So I'll stop there. If you have questions for me -- last point, which is something I sometimes forget to mention is that in the last five years, the three main sources of affordable housing assistance, which are the two federal sources, the HOME funds and the -- and the Community Development Block Grant, which many of you all share those funds with us, and the state SHIP program, are down by 40 percent.

So while we continue to produce more demand, while housing costs increase, our key go-to sources of funds continue to reduce. And we fight every year. Yesterday, the Congress, you know, did next year's funding. There's a little bump up in HOME; everything else is even. But there was a serious, serious recommendation to completely zero out, nationally, the HOME program, and to eliminate the low income tax credit program. Those would have been devastating circumstances for

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

us. So resource side is a continual battle. It's not been a happy story. And we continue to kind of fall behind.

So Robert Von is President of Meridian Appraisal Group. His firm has done a number and continues to do a number of market studies around the State for affordable housing. He also does appraisals for affordable housing projects, sits on the Board of Directors of the Florida Housing Coalition, so he's schooled and lives this on a daily basis. And I'll turn it over to Robert to present his methodology. If you have any questions for me, or from Robert, or right now, I'd be happy to address those.

CHAIR CASTRO: Mr. Neal de Jesus has a question --

MR. STONE: Yes, sir.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- for you first.

MR. DE JESUS: I do. Thank you. I have a quick question on a comment that you made previously. I believe I understood it. I understand the way that you derived your methodology for this -- for this recommendation. However, you'd mentioned that you didn't have access to the methodology used in Dr. Murray's study.

MR. STONE: Yes, sir.

MR. DE JESUS: Is that because it's not available? County staff doesn't have it? Was there an attempt to get it?

MR. STONE: I believe it is available. And we've talked with Dr. Murray about the sources that he used to derive his data. And, you know, that -- his approach to defining affordability and demand and supply gaps is also available to us. We didn't want to rely on his approach. We wanted to kind of go outside and have a fresh set of eyes look at it. Although, FIU could have elected to present us a proposal, it was a competitive process, they did not. So we do have available to us the ability to go and talk to Dr. Murray about how he produced his results, yes, sir.

MR. DE JESUS: Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: Mayor Stermer I think has a question about that same process.

MAYOR STERMER: When did -- when did the County engage Dr. Murray?

MR. STONE: The -- it -- the last -- it was actually the Housing Council.

MAYOR STERMER: When did the Housing Council?

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

MR. STONE: I think the last update was in, I think, 2013.

MAYOR STERMER: And with regard to Dr. Murray's study, how much funding was provided, either by the County or the Housing Council, for Dr. Murray to perform his study?

MR. STONE: It was \$25,000.

MAYOR STERMER: Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay. Mr. Von.

MR. VON: Hi, good morning. I'm here to present the recommended methodology for supply and demand analysis within Broward County. Let's start with the location of the data set utilized in the analysis, the United States Census Bureau website, more specifically, the American Fact Finder section, which houses the American Community Survey Data Center. This is the home screen for American Fact Finder. We all know that the Census comes out every ten years. This is the full count of all households.

The Census also performs annual updates derived from a sample of households. Approximately 3.5 million households are surveyed every year to produce the one, three, and five year estimates. The five year estimates are the most accurate, as they incorporate more data and have the highest degree of reliability. Household participation is mandatory for these updates. We start by selecting a city, and, for this example, we're using the City of Fort Lauderdale. Now, the two data sets that we are looking for is in the housing tab which you see as the 2014 American Community Survey. When the methodology was developed, the 2013 was the most recent data available. The 2014 data set just became available just about a week or so ago, so we're going to use that in this example, the updated information.

Now, these two data sets are easy to download. You just click on them, download, and export into Excel. Then you can paste them into the template, which I have provided to the County. So the first data set goes in into input 1, the second data set goes into input 2, and the template produces the results. That's all there is to producing results for any geography that the Census includes. Now, we're looking at three different income bands. We're looking at the very low income band, which is zero to 50 percent of area median income; the low income band, which is 50 to 80 percent of area median income; and the moderate income band, which is 80 to 120 percent.

We start with a median income for Broward County which in 2014 was \$61,800, to

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

match the year of the American Community Survey data set. This is a hundred dollars more than it was last year. Let's look at the results. The results are -- the owner results are on the left-hand side of this chart, and the renter supply and demand results are on the right-hand side. So let's look at the owner analysis. There are 8,522 owner occupied households in the very low income band, that zero to 39 -- \$30,900. There are 7,570 units affordable to them, which results in a gap of 952 units. There are surpluses in the other two income bands.

On the rental side, there's 15,656 renter occupied households in the very low income band, but only 5,989 units affordable to them, which results in a gap of 9,607 units, which is actually worse than the 2013 results which showed 8,773 unit shortage. The other two income bands show surpluses. This gap for renter households in the very low income band is pretty consistent throughout the County. Just about all municipalities show a gap in the very low income renter households. So that's the methodology, the data utilized, and the results for the City of Fort Lauderdale. So I'd be happy to answer any of your questions.

CHAIR CASTRO: I asked earlier, and I want you just to delve a little bit deeper into it. I asked about the top three cities, and I think you gave me Pembroke Pines, Pompano, Hollywood, and -- who'd I miss --

MAYOR STERMER: Fort Lauderdale.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- Fort Lauderdale. And you said something about that may have something to do with the sampling or something. Could you elaborate on that or --

MR. VON: No, it doesn't have anything to do with the sampling. That's just the raw number. It's not a percent.

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay.

MR. VON: So if you want to do it fairly against all municipalities, I would use a percent. What percent of your households are in the very low income band? And that would be a -- probably a fairer methodology if you wanted to try and distribute the money, so to speak, on a percentage basis rather than on just, you know, biggest wins.

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay. Is there a way to do that?

MR. VON: Oh, absolutely.

CHAIR CASTRO: No --

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

MR. VON: (Inaudible) --

CHAIR CASTRO: -- is there a way for them to have you do that? I'm sure there's something about a payment involved here somewhere, so --

MR. VON: This is -- this -- this is --

CHAIR CASTRO: -- I'm treading tentatively and softly here.

MR. VON: -- I can show them how to do the -- do that themselves --

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay.

MR. VON: -- very cheaply. Won't charge you a nickel. It's --

CHAIR CASTRO: Thank you.

MR. VON: -- it's easy to do.

CHAIR CASTRO: You're -- you have brought us sunshine today. Could you get that information to Ms. Boy? --

MS. BOY: I was thinking --

CHAIR CASTRO: -- please?

MS. BOY: -- when we were talking about for the -- during the Land Use Trafficways Committee, I wrote a note that we should add columns. Attachment 5 outlines every municipality, kind of what the gap is based on Mr. Von's proposed methodology.

CHAIR CASTRO: Numbers.

MS. BOY: We could add percentage of households to that. So we could expand the table and the information that's presented.

CHAIR CASTRO: And -- and --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'd like to see it.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- I would like to see it. And, understand, I'm -- I'm not suggesting that all cities are equal. They're obviously not. You know, when people come to Broward County, they want to live in Fort Lauderdale and have that Fort Lauderdale ZIP Code, because that's what Broward County is known for. And I

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

get it. I was born there. Got it. But, I think for fairness -- for -- you know, we're not really -- I think it was to Commissioner Castillo or Mayor Stermer or Mayor Ryan -- we're not really targeting the problem areas, per se, let alone then collecting the money fairly and redistributing it fairly.

So we've got this whole thing, so we're back to a holistic approach to put in all of these factors to figure out the best way -- not methodology, that's your study, your - - not your study, your process -- this whole solution to this problem. So I would love to see that information, please.

MR. VON: And just -- just as an example, at the state level, the state breaks up the counties by small, medium, and large.

CHAIR CASTRO: Right.

MR. VON: Then they have different pools for small, medium, and large. So that's -- that's a good example of how do you try and equate the different sized of the municipalities.

CHAIR CASTRO: And I'm not sure the way they are -- their methodology of doing that is always fair, either, because --

MR. VON: I didn't suggest that it was.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- sometimes they --

MR. VON: I was just giving you --

CHAIR CASTRO: Yeah, I know.

MR. VON: -- an example.

CHAIR CASTRO: Sometimes they do it geographically, which is like, okay, you have a big one up north that has 20 people living in it, and now they've got --

MR. VON: Sure.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- a big grant. But --

MR. VON: Certainly.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- it is what it is. Ms. Graham.

MS. GRAHAM: Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Von, what is your first name and

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

what is the name of your company, please?

MR. VON: My name is Robert Von, and I'm the President of Meridian Appraisal Group.

MS. GRAHAM: Meridian Appraisal. Thank you.

MR. VON: Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: I think that's in the back of his report. Any other questions?

MAYOR STERMER: Madam Chair?

CHAIR CASTRO: All right.

MAYOR STERMER: Mr. Stone --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes?

MS. BOY: We have one person signed in to speak. I just didn't want to forget, before you --

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay. We'll do that next.

MAYOR STERMER: -- Mr. Stone, as we sit here today, can you explain to the Council what the deficiency is, if any, with Dr. Murray's study?

MR. STONE: I would defer to Robert maybe to discuss that. You mean in terms of --

MAYOR STERMER: Why we're having a conversation with Mr. Von about the new methodology. Is there something flawed about Dr. Murray's study? Or we just don't like the result? Or we don't like that cities have an option, through development and projects, to have the developer create a separate study based on data that they believe appropriate? Which of those issues are we really talking about today?

MR. STONE: Sure. In -- in terms of Dr. Murray's study, when we -- we went through this effort last time, we talked about applying his study, because we did ask him to go down and do a supply/demand analysis by city also. And the -- his output is different, but his process is different, as is the approach and process and output from the individual studies we got from the cities that have hired consultants to do it. So it wasn't a matter of concluding that his was right or wrong, or that any of the others were right or wrong. It was a matter of -- really, of two things.

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

One was trying to set some uniformity to try and create an approach that would be apples and apples across the board for all of the cities, and to create a circumstance where professional staffs at the city, and my staff could apply methodology as the data changed over time. I'll tell you frankly, as we get the privately done studies in, they're all over the map in terms of their approach. Some of them use proprietary data that they -- they pay for. Some of them take the Property Appraiser's data and manipulate it or make decisions about it.

Not to say that any of those are wrong approaches. It's just that I spend as much time trying to figure out what they did so I can understand how they arrived at it, and then it has nothing to do with the contiguous cities' circumstance. I just can't make sense of it in terms of any uniform way.

MAYOR STERMER: But when we previously had an ad hoc work group that was made up of members of this organization, the County Commission, and the Broward League of Cities, the silver bullet -- one of the silver bullets was Dr. Murray's study, because he could take his methodology and apply it to a city.

MR. STONE: Uh-huh.

MAYOR STERMER: So I'm -- again, is -- as you stand here today as the head of your division and department, is there something flawed -- understanding you might not have his algorithm --

MR. STONE: Uh-huh.

MAYOR STERMER: -- is there something flawed in what Dr. Murray has produced to the County today?

MR. STONE: We asked Mr. Von to look at Dr. Murray's study and the two private studies that were done since the last roll, and he found weaknesses in all three approaches, including Dr. Murray's.

MAYOR STERMER: And I am -- I would venture to say, based on comments received to date, there are others that believe there are flaws with Mr. Von's methodology, because his isn't a study, it's a methodology; correct?

MR. STONE: His is a methodology. And we have received questions and comments about it. The advantage of Mr. Von's approach compared to any of the others, including Dr. Murray's, is that it's strictly Census data based. All of the data is out there. It's objective, available, and it's updated annually. So we thought that was a huge advantage.

MAYOR STERMER: I'm trying to figure out if the issue is, again, Dr. Murray's

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

study or the part of the code that allows a developer to submit an independent study based upon what's going on in the area and the community in which that project's taking place.

MR. STONE: I think the bulk of the problem lies with the lack of uniformity of approach, the lack of transparency in arriving at the output, and, for me, in many cases, the consultant has been procured and paid for by the developer as opposed to the city, but the city adopts his output, and they may be happy to do that. I -- I personally don't find that an objective way to do it. I think if a city wanted the developer to pay for it, they should require them to front the money and then let the city procure it and it would be their study. That -- that's just my opinion. That's the way I've addressed things. When I was at a municipal level, I had a similar circumstance. But those are my perspectives on what's going on right now.

MAYOR STERMER: So let me ask it this way. If the opportunity for a developer in a city didn't exist to do an independent study and they had to apply Dr. Murray's algorithm, based on his study, which can be then broken down countywide to citywide, would that be acceptable to you? Because I'm trying to actually figure out is the issue Dr. Murray's methodology and the numbers or that Mr. Laystrom sitting six rows behind you, the County Commission didn't like his study a few months ago based upon a project in Plantation and we're trying to close that door.

MR. STONE: Yeah. No, it -- it's not a --

MAYOR STERMER: Or one of the reasons we're trying to close the door.

MR. STONE: Sure. Sure. Unfortunately, we have the advantage of having national and statewide academic and private assessment of our circumstances. They all come out and say we are -- we have huge demands in workforce, low income, and very low income. And, you know, the Shimberg Institute, which is kind of the gold standard at the state level, says we're among the worst in the state for very low. We know that. In their assessment, they state it a different way. In their assessment, they say we have 24 affordable and available units for every 100 families at a very low income level.

Different studies have come out all around 45 to 65,000 in terms of the unit deficiency. I don't really care. All I know is we're producing a couple of hundred a year. So we know that very low rental is the most need. We know the other cohorts are also in demand. And we know we have dwindling resources. So when we get down to the assessment and mitigation proposals at a local level, we're really looking for what's happening over time.

And if we don't have some uniform basis to assess that, and I don't care if we use Dr. Murray's, we use Mr. Laystrom's consultant, the Shimberg Institute, or we ask

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

Harvard, you know, to come down here and do it for us, as long as we have something that everyone is using and is adaptable and can be consistent over time, that's all I care about.

MAYOR STERMER: So basically it's your recommendation that the County impose its will over the 31 cities as to how they all define and look at affordable housing within their boundaries.

MR. STONE: No, I would -- I would prefer all of you all tell the County that this is the way you want to do it.

MAYOR STERMER: I understand the way you'd like it phrased, but --

(Laughter.)

MR. STONE: I just want you to use my --

MAYOR STERMER: I understand that. I can appreciate that. I want to be clear. The current draft of the change doesn't include this, but we keep talking about it, and Mr. Von talked about it, and you've spoken about it, the stratification.

MR. STONE: Uh-huh.

MAYOR STERMER: And some of this -- for those that were here earlier, I'm sorry, but some of you weren't earlier. If you had your way of drafting the rule in the code to read what it said, would it include the stratification?

MR. STONE: Yes, sir, it would.

MAYOR STERMER: Okay. I just want it to be clear that, as we walk down this road, we know what currently exists in 1.07.07 that started back in 2006, based on the year based amendments that were a negotiated resolution between the Board of County Commissioners and the cities as to how to deal with the affordable housing issue. And I think it's an important conversation that we try to find a solution to. But based upon your numbers earlier today, you said there were -- there's a deficit of 65,000 units. How many years would it take, based upon how things are currently in existence, or even under this proposed way of doing things, to take -- to close that gap of 65,000 units?

MR. STONE: It -- it -- you can't calculate it on my little calendar.

MAYOR STERMER: Okay. Thank you.

MR. STONE: But we're doing a hundred to 200 units a year.

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

CHAIR CASTRO: It would be the --

MAYOR STERMER: And in Fort Lauderdale, in the 5,000 unit project that was just approved by the County Commission, the city agreed to include within that 5,000 -- within that 5,000 units, 750; correct?

MR. STONE: Yes, sir. That was a -- an outstanding commitment on their part.

CHAIR CASTRO: It would be on the same scale as what it's taking the Broward County Aviation Department to sound insulate 1,800 homes, substantially completed before the operation of the runway started. And, just so you all know, we've done 300 of 1,800 homes.

MR. STONE: Yeah, I -- I think --

CHAIR CASTRO: And we're about eight to ten years away from getting everybody done. So you can multiply that by probably a hundred and get the number that the Mayor's looking for. Real quick, I'm going to -- he was alluding to something, and my experience in this problem the last year has been simple. It's stated for me. And that is the County Commission is looking to compare apples to apples every time one of these amendments come before them.

MR. STONE: In terms of a baseline.

CHAIR CASTRO: Yes.

MR. STONE: Yes.

CHAIR CASTRO: I'm going to call it a baseline. Methodologies, everybody's methodology's going to be criticized. It's like the IRS tax code.

MR. STONE: Uh-huh.

CHAIR CASTRO: There's no winner. It's going to -- because of the way methodologies are defined, they are never totally equal to every aspect or every participant. And I hope Mr. Von would agree with that. There's always going to be some nuance as the process goes, even if it's a mathematical equation, that's going to give somebody a little bit of a leverage or a foot up or foot down. So when the Commission asked for a uniform methodology to compare apples to apples, that's where Mr. -- Dr. Murray came in, that's how -- and, again, I don't care whose methodology it is, either.

MR. STONE: Uh-huh.

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

CHAIR CASTRO: I just see the same cities getting resources and the other cities don't. But that's my own personal pet peeve. Having said that, if you do the apples-to-apples, which is what the methodology is, what you're changing in 1.07.07 is when we settled this a few months back, the decision was to say and/or the city slash developer could bring in their own study to be bumped up against the methodology that the County was currently looking at; is that correct? That's what you're crossing out.

MS. BOY: So what we're crossing out is that the -- Broward County shall accept from the affected municipality those professionally accepted methodologies, policies, and best available data and analysis which the municipality has used to define affordable housing needs and solutions within the municipality.

CHAIR CASTRO: So what we're saying now is all the municipalities, when the County's looking at us, will be looked through the same glass.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The County's glass.

CHAIR CASTRO: The County's -- it's the -- it's --

MS. BOY: The same glass.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- the same glass. I'm not (inaudible). But you're also saying that it doesn't prohibit, even though this used to allow them to substitute something, the checks -- text change doesn't prohibit the city or developer from still putting something else in the record that might compete with the result of the glass view the County's using.

MS. BOY: Right. So they're unique circumstances. And then the other part of that is there's still the information that's provided about the programs and policies the municipality has in place to promote affordable housing. This sets the standard baseline.

CHAIR CASTRO: Right. And that's -- my issue is that latter part, which we haven't even touched, because that all -- what policies a city can put forward depends on their resources, and resources aren't all created equal. So that's a whole other ball game. So I just want to make it clear what we're talking about here. We're talking about supplanting Dr. Murray's methodology with Mr. Von's methodology so the County has an apples-to-apples comparison for them to review applications and development proposals. However, instead of allowing the developer city to supplant that with their own study, they are only allowed to now augment the package with a study, if that's what they want to do, or explain their extenuating circumstances. That's where we're at; correct?

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

MR. STONE: Yes, ma'am. And to provide the cities with the methodology so that they can use it to update it for their own purposes at any point in time.

CHAIR CASTRO: Right.

MR. STONE: They don't need to wait until they have a hundred unit Land Use Plan change to take it and kind of see what's going on.

CHAIR CASTRO: Well, and they can also get a preview of what's coming down the pike. If the methodology doesn't work -- quite work for them --

MR. STONE: Uh-huh.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- they can obviously start adjusting right away and saying, okay, I need to go find somebody else to say something different that I can augment the package with.

MR. STONE: Yeah, let me make a comment, also, because, you know, I end up getting the email from Barbara that says, check it out, Ralph, and then tell me what you think. This is -- this is not any kind of trick, if you want to use that word, to expect the cities to suddenly come -- become resource rich and provide full mitigation or anywhere close to it for what the developer is bringing forward for us to look at. And I think that all of you all have seen that when we have evaluated the studies that have been brought to us and the cities' capability to mitigate it.

You know, we know that no one can get close. We're just looking for understanding, some serious effort. And, in the -- in the case that Mayor Stermer mentioned in terms of the segmentation, I think it -- it's really important for us to start having a serious talk about very low income rental, because prior to this, when we get in these situations, we talk about workforce housing. And I think workforce housing sounds better and feels better, but the overwhelming part of the problem is at the very low income level for renters.

CHAIR CASTRO: Now we're calling it attainable. Or you -- you've missed --

MR. STONE: Attainable.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- you've missed a generation already, and you're in the business. We've already moved on to new nomenclature. I think I have Commissioner Castillo and then Commissioner Blattner. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: I have a question that's sort of always scratched at me a little bit. So when I think of Broward County, I think of a lot of single family

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

homes and a lot of senior condos. Not a lot of attainable, you know, middle income rental. We don't really have a lot of that. So I've always had the question, and there's a lot of reasons for that. It's part of how we developed. This was so much a retirement community, and then before that it was other things, and then the whole red roof thing came, and everyone was building red roofs and going out west and so forth and so on.

But -- so who's to say that, you know, right now, retirement is slowing down significantly in Broward County, so who's to say that that housing doesn't become, you know, affordable rental over -- I'm trying to figure out. Is it -- are we short, quote, unquote, affordable rental units or is it that those units that would be affordable are currently being rented by people who can't attain rental at the level that they might otherwise be able to afford in other areas? Where is the shortage? Is the shortage in per se rental or is the -- or is it just that people who need affordable housing don't have units, which is a different story than we're lacking affordable units.

I'm not clear on that. Have you guys looked at that whole thing of -- because who's to say we set up -- I mean, right now, the demand right now that I see in the residential community is building all of these quote, unquote luxury rentals where you're seeing -- and it's amazing, even in my community -- a one bedroom at \$1,800. (Snaps fingers.) Gone. A two bedroom at \$2,500. \$2,500 for a two bedroom. (Snaps fingers.) Gone. You can't -- I mean, the minute they're open, they're gone. So somebody wants to rent at that level. So is it that if we create more of those, more units would then be affordable which are currently being rented by them? What -- have you looked at that whole issue?

MR. STONE: Yes, sir, and you're right on both instances. And we have this phenomenon of units that -- a phrase you're starting to hear more and more is affordable and available. We have a lot of people out there that have incomes that could support a higher rent that are absorbing units that actually would -- would be affordable to a low income individual. They may be making 75,000 a year, and they're paying a thousand bucks a month for rent.

That takes that out of the pot for someone at a lower income that that thousand unit rent would be below the 30 percent kind of rule of thumb. But the biggest problem, or the problems, are -- are this. Wages have been flat for 30 years adjusted for inflation. Absolutely flat. And actually have decreased. Housing over that whole period of time has continued to increase, even adjusted for the recession --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Absolutely.

MR. STONE: -- and resources have been cut by 40 percent.

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: And that -- and that's shown in your percentage of income chart.

MR. STONE: And then on top of it, we are a job producer in this county. We're doing good. But the occupation categories are all modest wage workers. So we're getting hit in four directions, and, you know, we're just falling further behind. So when I -- I've been on the soap box for just getting people to pay attention to the very low income cohort only because that's where the overwhelming need is, and, by far, the cost for the subsidy exists. It's just -- it's staggering, the resources it would take to get there.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: I just think it's curious that one of many -- I'm not saying this should be the only strategy --

MR. STONE: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: -- but I'm open to the -- to the possibility that one of the strategies that we should be looking at to help deal with affordable rental is to create more workforce rental. Maybe that's a part of the solution, because then those units that they're currently living in, they won't want to live there anymore. They'll move out, and then those units, which are the older units that they're probably living in now, because all those folks are living somewhere --

MR. STONE: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: -- you know, will become more within the demand range of affordability. Now, that may not make those folks happy, but maybe one of the strategies is that we have to encourage more of this, you know, rental for folks in the 120 to 150 median income range. Maybe that's part of the answer. And if we're doing that, then we really shouldn't -- if they're helping us to create affordable housing, then maybe we shouldn't tax them so much. I'm not sure. I'm just -- I'm asking --

CHAIR CASTRO: Free thinking.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: -- a question. Uh-huh.

CHAIR CASTRO: Commissioner Blattner.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: That was a great discussion. This week, I was at a ULI workshop in Hollywood, and a young entrepreneur told me that he had just received permission from Wynwood to put housing in shipping containers. That's not a new concept, but in Wynwood, it's kind of a non sequitur in a way. And then

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

another developer asked me if Hollywood was going to approve -- and I can't -- I know this isn't the right terminology -- mini units, 500 square feet, apartments. Just -- that's just information.

You know, I think Fort Lauderdale, you know, was to be commended, as was mentioned, for committing to 750 affordable units, even though it wasn't -- whatever -- segments. But that is important, because the size of a unit has something to do with the (inaudible) of that unit. A lot to do with it. If you're going to do affordable housing, 750 affordable housing units out of 5,000, are they the same size units as the non-affordable units? And I'm wondering if there's any interest or there should be any interest in talking about unit size, numbers of units.

MR. STONE: Uh-huh.

MS. BOY: May I? As part of BrowardNext -- I'm just going to interject -- that's one of the things that we're looking at is these kind of micro or efficiency-size units, do they count as the same for --

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Uh-huh.

MS. BOY: -- facilities and service analysis? Can we look at attracting more affordable units in that manner also? So that's certainly part of the discussion, part of the attainable housing strategy, as well as, you know, you were talking about storage container -- I'm sorry, container housing. We're also talking about alternative construction methodologies that, you know, may be -- or methods that may be less expensive than traditional construction but still hurricane resistant and meet the code. So those are all strategies that we're talking about as we review the County Land Use Plan for BrowardNext.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: And just a question for Ms. Blake. The earlier material that Henry Sniezek presented showed the developer's contribution to transportation tax -- I can't remember what the correct terminology was -- transportation --

CHAIR CASTRO: Concurrency.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: -- transportation --

CHAIR CASTRO: Concurrency fee.

MS. BOY: Concurrency fees?

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Yeah.

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

MS. BOY: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Where does that money go?

MS. BOY: The County -- I would defer to County staff, but initially that -- those funds are collected through ten concurrency districts throughout the County, and then utilized for transit and also roadway improvements in the southwest and northwest sections. But that's how they're distributed, by the zone.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Okay. Because -- and it triggered this in me that new developments need to have access to public transportation. And if that money isn't being used to create that nexus, then we ought to talk about that some other time.

CHAIR CASTRO: Any other -- I've got Mr. Parness, Mr. DiGiorgio --

MAYOR STERMER: Ms. Graham.

MR. PARNES: I think we have a unique problem here. If the average middle income housing is going for 1,500, 1,800, \$2,000 a month, where do the poor live? Now, if you're in the construction business and you can build a house, an apartment house, that's going to bring \$1,800 an apartment, or you can build housing for the poor and get \$500 an apartment, what are you going to do? What are you going to build? In order to build public housing for those who are making \$10 an hour or less, \$7.35 is the actual minimum wage in this state, government is going to have to be involved in the housing market. Because it's not profitable for the private sector.

And once that realization sinks in, then something can be done. Housing has to be built that's affordable to workers who make \$400 a week. Multiply that out. How can I pay \$1,800 a month rent if my total income is 12? Impossible. If we want livable housing for the poor and low income factory worker -- whatever you want to call them, we have to build them, municipalities and the County. If you have to float a bond issue, create the money from somewhere, we are responsible for not driving the workforce out of Broward County because they can't afford to live here.

Or we have to have enough good public transportation to bring them in from the suburbs. We have neither. I come from New York. Where I grew up, a nickel, I got on the subway. I could go hundreds of miles through five boroughs -- four boroughs, actually, by subway.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: We kicked you out. Staten Island. Sorry.

(Laughter.)

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

MR. PARNES: Yes, you did. We used to take the ferry across for a quarter. But there was public transportation, and you could get anywhere you wanted to go for a nickel, a dime, a quarter. The subway's now probably two bucks.

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: Over.

MR. PARNES: Okay? Not the point. The point is you have to have one or the other. New York developed both. There's public housing and there's public transportation. We have neither. How do you give people a place to live if the private sector won't build it? That's my question. How do you do it? We certainly don't have great public transportation. How do you go from University Drive to Federal Highway? Bus? Once an hour? Maybe an hour and a half. Three hours to get to work, three hours to go home, and an eight hour day is a 14 hour day.

So we have to solve the problem. Can't leave it up to the private sector, because they're going to go where the money is, where they can make a profit. And who blames them? They're risking their money on the development, they hope they're going to return a profit. Why would you bring something that can't bring -- bring you a profit? And so it goes round and round and round and round, and public housing is not built, and the poor have no place to live.

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay. I still have Mr. DiGiorgio and Ms. Graham, but I also understand we have somebody from the public. Would you recognize them --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible) first?

CHAIR CASTRO: -- please?

MS. BOY: Mr. Mark Lubelski, Assistant City Manager for the City of Sunrise.

CHAIR CASTRO: Thank you.

MR. LUBELSKI: Thank you. Mark Lubelski, Assistant City Manager, City of Sunrise. I'll be brief. What we have going on currently -- concurrently, is three major affordable housing issues. We have Policy 1.07.07. We have the affordable housing linkage fee, and the BrowardNext policies. Very similar to the discussion of the linkage fee earlier, the City of Sunrise believes that affordable housing affects each and every community and city in Broward County, and we believe that those discussions should be done holistically and concurrently, and to process 1.07 without having the discussions and the linkage fee and BrowardNext would not be appropriate.

If anything, we recommend BrowardNext should be the primary, and then 1.07 and

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

the linkage fee follow after that. So thank you very much.

CHAIR CASTRO: Thank you.

MS. BOY: One other person -- sorry. One other person just handed me a sign-in slip.

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay. Please.

MS. BOY: Okay. Joe Leva.

MR. LEVA: Thank you for your time. I just wanted to request that -- I noticed that in the publicly available downloads from prior meetings, Mr. Von's methodology document's available. It references a template which contains the formulas which you referred to. I would just ask that those be made available to the public associated with this meeting.

CHAIR CASTRO: Thank you.

MR. LEVA: Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay. I have Mr. DiGiorgio, Ms. Graham --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Somebody going to --

CHAIR CASTRO: -- Commissioner Gomez.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: -- is somebody going to do that?

CHAIR CASTRO: Yeah, I think staff.

MS. BOY: Absolutely.

MR. DIGIORGIO: Thank you, Madam Chair. In reading the backup, there were several letters in opposition of different forms here from the municipalities. I think some of you know I'm the Chair of the Economic Development Council in Pompano Beach, and I really took their letter seriously when I read the backup here. And I'm looking at the first paragraph. I think they kind of hit the nail right on the head where they get into it and said the city's understanding is the goal of the proposed text amendment is to delete the language allowing cities to present their own professional accepted methodology relating to the city's affordable housing needs.

It's a big issue at the municipalities, big issue for Pompano. So I just want to point that out again, that we have to be really conscious of that. And I know we've all

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

talked about it here, but it's a big issue, not just from our standpoint, but for the municipalities. From an economic development standpoint, I want to point everyone to the second to last paragraph in the City of Pompano Beach's letter, which is really important. It says the inconsistency between median value of owner occupied housing units and deficit per the proposed methodology indicates that the proposed methodology fails to achieve an equitable affordable housing program. Rather, this methodology would continue to cluster affordable housing units in cities with the highest number of affordable housing units.

CHAIR CASTRO: Uh-huh.

MR. DIGIORGIO: If that is the case, that is an economic development detractor, not promoter. The best projects that you see out there are mixed unit, market rate, affordable, attainable, assisted. When we talk -- when we keep just clustering affordable housing, that is an economic engine stopper. So we've got to take that, if this is -- first, if the state -- statement is factual. I have not reviewed all the methodology and I don't understand all the algorithms there. But if the statement is factual, that's a huge issue for us to consider.

From the standpoint of the municipalities not having the ability -- although, as you point out, Madam Chair, that they can put something in the record, but really not to use that to come up with a solution and take a one-size-fits-all approach I think is a major issue.

CHAIR CASTRO: Thank you. Ms. Graham.

MS. GRAHAM: Yeah, just real quick.

CHAIR CASTRO: What? There we go. Thank you.

MS. GRAHAM: Thank you, Madam Chair. I wanted to say this early on and it slipped my mind. We talk about public transportation being needed to get everyone around, and we're putting the same County that's in charge of the housing overview with the transit overview. And it's ironic that, you know, so much was cut in 2010 with the routes, I mean, I watched the Public Hearings that the Commission had, because they knew they had to cut routes, and, at the same time, they were the author of their own misfortune, because I don't think they ever brought them back to the hundred percent level they were in 2008 or '09. They've increased some routes again, but not enough.

And I have yet to take the bus. Tried a couple times, but just couldn't figure it out. Separately, about the affordable housing, workforce housing, attainable housing that everyone's been speaking about, once they do build them, they have to almost plan for tax increases for the duration of the time that they're owning it and

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

maintaining it and running it, and then also insurance costs. And we've brought that up in the past, Madam Chair, about how those are not fixed costs they can plan on. And if you borrow money, you have to pay the loan back with the revenue you're making from your project, but, at the same time, you're having to put aside money for capital improvements, you know, needs a new roof in ten years or new water heaters in each apartment. You know, you get the -- what I'm going at with that.

And then even the people that are the occupants, they not only have rent, most apartment complexes that I go to look at are individually metered, and then some of them either have some metering of some sort for water, so there are all these extra other costs. And you just can't narrow it down into one or two, because those costs always go up. City of Fort Lauderdale has a nine percent water/sewer increase in their bill every August. And it's been that way since 2012. And if they have other things like cable or phone and -- it's -- there's just no fixed costs that you can bank on.

And there's inflation rates that we use in our charts as we prepare our cap ex, but, at the same time, there's other things outside of our control, like the cities. So I think the point that Bernie had made about transportation and affordable housing kind of going hand-in-hand, we're never going to have what four boroughs in New York have, but, at the same time, solving a problem with a very narrow scope, like the Commission might do, it's not enough, because there's costs outside of it the City of Fort Lauderdale is going to incur that those people are going to have to move because they're not going to be able to afford them after a few years. Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: Thank you. Commissioner Gomez, followed by Mayor Stermer.

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: I agree with basically most of the comments, again, that have been made by my colleagues and all bits and pieces. I just wanted to kind of bring forth a little bit that was touched on earlier about the senior population, because it's not just workforce. It's the senior population. We're living longer. They're retired. Their disability income or their regular income or their Social Security income is not increasing. And so while they may own a home, they may now have to start mortgaging it because they can't afford to live there anymore because they're living longer.

So are their homes considered affordable housing? How are we -- how are we classifying people who own their owns, who live in a retirement, over 55 or whatever it might be, where their income is no longer what it used to be to sustain themselves? So it's -- it goes back to what we've been saying all morning, which now I guess good afternoon, it basically is all interrelated. It does need that holistic approach. And I agree with the Assistant City Manager, as he put it, as

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

well, and I believe it was Mayor Stermer who said it, it needs to be taken as a whole and not just piecemeal. And so we may be looking at not maybe dealing with this issue now for one -- what was before us today and dealing with it through Broward Next first. Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: Thank you. Mayor Stermer.

MAYOR STERMER: Barbara, I have a couple of implementation questions. If this -- if 1.07.07 read this way when Mr. Laystrom's project came back in Plantation, what would have happened? How would the affordable housing component -- what would your recommendation have been if Mr. Laystrom wasn't permitted, on behalf of his client, to submit an alternative housing analysis, what would staff's recommendation of the project been with regard to 1.07.07?

MS. BOY: Well, it would -- actually, that's two things. I mean, one piece of it is as this policy proposal reads today, they would not be prohibited from submitting this additional information.

MAYOR STERMER: Understood.

MS. BOY: Okay.

MAYOR STERMER: But they -- but you would do the analysis for the City of -- or an analysis would be shown with regard to the City of Plantation. They would then be allowed to submit comments to say why they should be allowed to do something outside of what Mr. Von's methodology shows it should be; correct?

MS. BOY: Right. They would submit information about the city's affordable housing policies and programs --

MAYOR STERMER: Uh-huh.

MS. BOY: -- for promoting and maintaining affordable housing. And that's really the piece of the puzzle is that where the -- we get the comments regarding Policy 1.07.07 comes from.

MAYOR STERMER: Uh-huh.

MS. BOY: So I believe that if this was used, and this is just -- I'm just, you know, making a supposition here, if this was the information that we were using was Mr. Von's methodology for the base data and then there was additional information that's submitted regarding how the city proposes to maintain and promote affordable housing, there is a very high possibility that they would still have met Policy 1.07.07. Not the answer you want?

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

MAYOR STERMER: No.

MS. BOY: Okay.

MAYOR STERMER: Because I don't think it -- you apply the code. We've had a number of items over the past few years where, when staff applies the parameters of the code to a project, while you have in the past said, I understand what's happening, the code needs to be redone, but according to the constrictions of the code today, staff recommends denial. Would Mr. Laystrom's -- absent his ability to submit comments, would his project have met, if this was in place at the time, what would --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MAYOR STERMER: You know what? Andy, you understand what --

MR. MAURODIS: You're saying --

MAYOR STERMER: -- help me out.

MR. MAURODIS: -- take out the issue of whether they could add additional --

MAYOR STERMER: Comments.

MR. MAURODIS: -- information. That's just for the purposes of the question--

MAYOR STERMER: Correct.

MR. MAURODIS: -- would their application have met --

MAYOR STERMER: Correct.

MR. MAURODIS: -- the criteria just based upon that study?

MAYOR STERMER: Correct.

CHAIR CASTRO: What --

MR. MAURODIS: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR CASTRO: -- what does Mr. Von's study show for Plantation?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

MR. STONE: Since I would have gotten the memo, I think that it would have, because we happen to know that the City of Plantation has a fine affordable housing program.

MAYOR STERMER: Uh-huh.

MR. STONE: We would have a dialog with them about whatever the finding was, in terms of that program, and they would then use the options available to them in 1.07.07, in terms of mitigation, and they would explain to us how they would treat the findings that apply to their city. We, as I said previously, you know, we understand how resource limited everyone is in terms of providing mitigation for the current problem, much less anything that might be additive. So I think a lot of this has to do with allowing the city to take the information, and it would be in a -- an analysis that's uniform across the board, so, you know, all cities are getting treated the same, and make some local judgments about what they want to do about it.

And I think there's a robust menu of options, and I don't think they're illogical or punitive. I think they're common sense, and I think we try and bring a common sense approach to our judgment in that regard. So would possibly it have resulted in me saying to Barbara, we don't think the city's doing enough. We think they should apply the \$1 mitigation or, you know, fee? But that really still continues to be at the city's discretion; right, Barbara?

MS. BOY: Yes. And I would say in the review of Land Use Plan amendments, which this is the summary that's in the -- in the report, but about the Land Use Plan amendments that have been submitted since the implementation of Policy 1.07.07, the times that municipalities were determined not to meet the policy was because they did not submit any information. So those were the situations, and in those situations, you know, the developer, before Article 10 was even put in place, would come forward and either offer something, and that was what was accepted for them to meet the policy informally.

So we have not -- we've not yet had an incident where a municipality, you know, has not been determined to meet the policy if they have submitted information. We've worked with them --

MAYOR STERMER: But this --

MS. BOY: -- and worked through it.

MAYOR STERMER: -- this is here today for a -- for -- and staff has recommended approval.

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Uh-huh.

MAYOR STERMER: After today's action by this board, what happens next with this item?

MS. BOY: If the board -- the Planning Council makes a recommendation today on the policy, that recommendation would be forwarded to the County Commission for consideration of transmittal of the item to state for their 30 day review, then return to the Planning Council for a second Public Hearing, and then to the County Commission for adoption. So if you make a recommendation today, this will likely go to the Commission the end of January for Public Hearing. They will give the review back to you in March, and back to the County Commission in April. And in March you would see the piece for the administrative rules document update also.

MAYOR STERMER: So what I'd like to do, in an effort to bring this to closure, is **move** that we make no recommendation but to that -- but to direct that this item be subsumed in the Broward Next project to be dealt with holistically with regard to part of that project.

MR. MAURODIS: If I could just --

MAYOR STERMER: Please.

MR. MAURODIS: -- I would just say that you not characterize that as no recommendation.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

MAYOR RYAN: I -- if I may, Mr. Mayor, before that goes to a second, I would prefer you restate your motion that this in fact be considered as part of Broward Next --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MAYOR RYAN: -- affirmatively and not move forward --

MAYOR STERMER: But the problem is --

MAYOR RYAN: -- separately.

MAYOR STERMER: -- but the problem is staff is recommending -- wants us to vote to approve it for transmittal to the County Commission. That's a -- that's the conundrum we're sitting in, and I'm trying to say --

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Your motion is not to approve and make a --

MAYOR STERMER: -- well, I --

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: -- substitute motion.

MAYOR STERMER: -- but I -- but I don't want to deny -- the problem is I don't want to move to deny it. I think we need to wrap this into BrowardNext. Andy --

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay.

MAYOR STERMER: -- tell me --

MR. MAURODIS: Yeah.

MAYOR STERMER: -- give us your best legal advice as to how we get that done.

MR. MAURODIS: Maybe characterize what you're -- what you're attempting to do, because I believe you have to make a recommendation. So what you're doing will be a recommendation, but I think I -- we can accomplish. Your recommendation to the County Commission is that this matter not be finally acted upon until such time as they -- as BrowardNext, the entire BrowardNext package dealing with this issue is reviewed and done as a -- as a whole as opposed to piecemeal. So basically, your recommendation --

MAYOR STERMER: I'll adopt Andy's language as the motion.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Second.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I just have -- I have --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We have a second.

CHAIR CASTRO: Just so we're clear, what we're recommending is that we withhold any further action on this item for it to be folded into the Broward Next process.

MR. MAURODIS: Well, you're recommending that the County Commission not take any --

CHAIR CASTRO: Correct.

MR. MAURODIS: -- further action.

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

CHAIR CASTRO: Correct.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Correct.

MR. DIGIORGIO: That's important, further action as opposed to final action. The word he said was, final, originally, and I didn't like that. I didn't want to take any further action.

CHAIR CASTRO: No.

MR. DIGIORGIO: So that was the only clarification.

MR. MAURODIS: That will be your recommendation.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, correct.

MR. DIGIORGIO: No further action, not final action.

MAYOR STERMER: Correct.

CHAIR CASTRO: So any other discussion before we call the roll?

MAYOR RYAN: Let me just add one point here, and it comes to what Barbara said. And I appreciate how the staff went through this analysis as what would the impact have been had we been operating under this, and each of the -- you said each of the municipalities that failed hadn't submitted information. I asked myself, and I scratched my head then, what ill are we trying to cure.

MAYOR STERMER: That's a whole separate issue.

MAYOR RYAN: I mean, if we got to the same point, what are we doing here? All it's doing is putting a premium on what was already being done, anyway, and staff is admitting that, in all likelihood, they would consider Mr. Laystrom's report or what the city produces, anyway, in which case we've just done all this, and I now wonder are we creating unintended consequences for an ill that we did not really set out to cure. That's all I have. Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: Ms. Cavender, would you call the roll, please. We have a motion from Mayor Stermer --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Restate the motion.

MAYOR STERMER: Directing that the County --

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

CHAIR CASTRO: -- and Commissioner Gomez seconded amongst a lot of other people.

MAYOR STERMER: -- take no further action until this is wrapped into Broward Next.

CHAIR CASTRO: Is everybody clear on the motion?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

CHAIR CASTRO: We're good?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Richard Blattner.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Mark Bogen, excused. Commissioner Angelo Castillo.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Neal de Jesus.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Thomas DiGiorgio.

MR. DIGIORGIO: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Charles Fink.

MR. FINK: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Michael Friedel, excused. Commissioner Bill Ganz, excused. Commissioner Michelle J. Gomez.

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: Yes.

THE REPORTER: School Board Member Patricia Good.

MS. GOOD: Yes.

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

THE REPORTER: Ms. Mary D. Graham.

MS. GRAHAM: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Richard Grosso.

MR. GROSSO: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Michael Long.

COMMISSIONER LONG: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Vice Mayor Rita Mack. Mr. Robert McColgan.

MR. MCCOLGAN: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Bernard Parness.

MR. PARNES: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Michael J. Ryan.

MAYOR RYAN: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Daniel J. Stermer.

MAYOR STERMER: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Ms. Anne Castro, Chair.

CHAIR CASTRO: Yes. And before we adjourn, I want to apologize. I was supposed to recognize Mr. Fink, who had actually had a comment.

MR. FINK: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR CASTRO: Good. I don't want to leave your out your first day here.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR CASTRO: I want to give you every opportunity, but I should have done it before the vote, not after the vote, so my sincerest apologies.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Planning Council
12/17/2015
LG/NC/AS

OTHER BUSINESS

CHAIR CASTRO: Everybody, Happy Hanukkah, Merry Christmas, happy and healthy New Year. See you next year. Everybody be safe. Enjoy. Enjoy your families.

(The meeting concluded at 12:17 p.m.)