

MINUTES

BROWARD COUNTY PLANNING COUNCIL

April 27, 2017

MEMBERS Mayor Daniel J. Stermer, Chair
PRESENT: Thomas H. DiGiorgio, Jr., Vice Chair
School Board Member Patricia Good, Secretary
Brion Blackwelder
Commissioner Felicia Brunson
Commissioner Angelo Castillo
Neal R. de Jesus
Commissioner Michelle J. Gomez
Mary D. Graham
Robert McColgan
David Rosenof
Richard Rosenzweig
Mayor Michael J. Ryan
Mayor Jack Seiler
Commissioner Michael Udine
Commissioner Beverly Williams

MEMBERS Commissioner Richard Blattner
ABSENT: Mayor Bill Ganz
Richard Grosso

ALSO Barbara Boy, Executive Director
PRESENT: Andy Maurodis, Legal Counsel
Dr. Jennifer Jurado, Director, Broward County Natural Resources Planning
and Management Division
Chris Akagbosu, Director, Broward County Public Schools Facility
Planning and Real Estate
A. Nilgun Kamp, Tindale Oliver
Nancy Cavender, The Laws Group

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, April 27, 2017.

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

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Daniel Stermer called the meeting to order.

CHAIR STERMER: Good morning, everybody. I'd like to call to order the April 27th, 2017 meeting of the Broward County Planning Council.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

CHAIR STERMER: If everyone can please rise for the Pledge, and if we can please ask Mr. Rosenof to please lead us.

(THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE WAS LED BY DAVID ROSENOF.)

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you. Please be seated.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

ROLL CALL:

CHAIR STERMER: Members, we're lucky to have with us Ms. Cavender this morning. If you'd like to speak, just please do so loud enough so she can hear you, and make sure the microphone is on. As everybody knows, we are being streamed live on the web, so please remember, again, if you're going to speak, please ensure that the little red circle around your microphone is on. Ms. Cavender, can you please call the roll.

THE REPORTER: Yes, sir. Thank you. Mr. Brion Blackwelder.

MR. BLACKWELDER: Here.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Richard Blattner. Commissioner Felicia Brunson.

COMMISSIONER BRUNSON: Here.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Angelo Castillo.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Neal de Jesus.

MR. DE JESUS: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Thomas H. DiGiorgio, Jr.

MR. DIGIORGIO: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Bill Ganz. Commissioner Michelle J. Gomez.

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: Good morning.

THE REPORTER: School Board Member Patricia Good.

MS. GOOD: Here.

THE REPORTER: Ms. Mary D. Graham.

MS. GRAHAM: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Richard Grosso. Mr. Robert McColgan.

MR. MCGOLGAN: Here.

THE REPORTER: David Rosenof.

MR. ROSENOF: Here.

THE REPORTER: Richard Rosenzweig.

MR. ROSENZWEIG: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Michael J. Ryan.

MAYOR RYAN: Present.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Jack Seiler. Commissioner Michael Udine.

COMMISSIONER UDINE: Here.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Beverly Williams.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Daniel J. Stermer, Chair.

CHAIR STERMER: Here. And good morning.

OATH OF OFFICE - MR. DAVID ROSENOF; MR. RICHARD ROSENZEIG; MAYOR JACK SEILER:

CHAIR STERMER: At this time, I've got the distinct honor and pleasure to please invite up Mr. David Rosenof and Mr. Richard Rosenzweig, our two newest members. We're going to do it at the podium.

(Applause.)

CHAIR STERMER: We're going to swear them in as new members of the Planning

PLANNING COUNCIL

APRIL 27, 2017

DH/NC

Council. For those of you that are not aware, Mr. Rosenof was appointed by Commissioner Udine, who sits with us on this dais, and Mr. Rosenof was appointed by Commissioner Bogen. Both of those were -- were approved the other day at the Broward County Commission meeting. Mayor Seiler, when he gets here, will be sworn in. He was approved by the Broward County Commission the other day as an appointee of Commissioner Chip LaMarca. So --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR STERMER: Gentlemen, if I could ask you to please raise your right hands and repeat after me. I do solemnly swear --

MR. ROSENOF AND MR. ROSENZWEIG: I do solemnly swear --

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

MR. ROSENOF AND MR. ROSENZWEIG: -- that I will support, protect, and defend --

CHAIR STERMER: -- the Constitution --

MR. DIGIORGIO: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR STERMER: -- and government --

MR. DIGIORGIO: Mr. Chair?

MS. GOOD: Mayor Seiler just walked in.

CHAIR STERMER: Come join us. You get sworn in.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR STERMER: We'll go back to the beginning.

MAYOR SEILER: I do.

CHAIR STERMER: Please raise your right hand and repeat after me.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR STERMER: I do solemnly swear --

MR. ROSENOF, MR. ROSENZWEIG, AND MAYOR SEILER: I do solemnly swear --

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

MR. ROSENOF, MR. ROSENZWEIG, AND MAYOR SEILER: -- that I will support, protect, and defend --

CHAIR STERMER: -- the Constitution and government --

MR. ROSENOF, MR. ROSENZWEIG, AND MAYOR SEILER: -- the Constitution and government --

CHAIR STERMER: -- of the United States --

MR. ROSENOF, MR. ROSENZWEIG, AND MAYOR SEILER: -- of the United States --

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

MR. ROSENOF, MR. ROSENZWEIG, AND MAYOR SEILER: -- and the State of Florida --

CHAIR STERMER: -- and that I am duly qualified --

MR. ROSENOF, MR. ROSENZWEIG, AND MAYOR SEILER: -- and that I am duly qualified --

CHAIR STERMER: -- to hold office --

MR. ROSENOF, MR. ROSENZWEIG, AND MAYOR SEILER: -- to hold office --

CHAIR STERMER: -- under the Constitution of the State --

MR. ROSENOF, MR. ROSENZWEIG, AND MAYOR SEILER: -- under the Constitution of the State --

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

MR. ROSENOF, MR. ROSENZWEIG, AND MAYOR SEILER: -- and the Charter of Broward County --

CHAIR STERMER: -- and that I will well and faithfully --

MR. ROSENOF, MR. ROSENZWEIG, AND MAYOR SEILER: -- and that I will well and faithfully --

CHAIR STERMER: -- perform the duties --

MR. ROSENOF, MR. ROSENZWEIG, and MAYOR SEILER: -- perform the duties --

CHAIR STERMER: -- of a member --

MR. ROSENOF, MR. ROSENZWEIG, AND MAYOR SEILER: -- of a member --

CHAIR STERMER: -- of the Broward County Planning Council --

MR. ROSENOF, MR. ROSENZWEIG, AND MAYOR SEILER: -- of the Broward County Planning Council --

CHAIR STERMER: -- on which I am now about to enter --

MR. ROSENOF, MR. ROSENZWEIG, AND MAYOR SEILER: -- on which I am now about to enter --

CHAIR STERMER: -- so help me God.

MR. ROSENOF, MR. ROSENZWEIG, AND MAYOR SEILER: -- so help me God.

CHAIR STERMER: Congratulations and welcome.

MR. ROSENZWEIG: Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIR STERMER: Congratulations and welcome. Congratulations and welcome.

MR. ROSENOF: Thank you.

MAYOR SEILER: Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: What I'd like to ask the -- all the members to do is come down and we'll take our photo with all of our new members.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

(Pictures taken.)

CHAIR STERMER: Once again, congratulations to Mr. Rosenof, Mayor Seiler, and Mr. Rosenzweig for joining us this morning.

CONSENT AGENDA

AGENDA ITEM C-1 - APPROVAL OF FINAL AGENDA FOR APRIL 27, 2017

AGENDA ITEM C-2 - APRIL 2017 PLAT REVIEWS FOR TRAFFICWAYS PLAN COMPLIANCE

AGENDA ITEM C-3

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MARCH 23, 2017

AGENDA ITEM C-4 - EXCUSED ABSENCES

PLANNING COUNCIL

APRIL 27, 2017

DH/NC

CHAIR STERMER: First order of business is item -- are there any items to be pulled from the Consent Agenda?

MS. BOY: None.

CHAIR STERMER: Is there a motion with regard to the Consent Agenda?

COMMISSIONER UDINE: So **moved**.

MR. DE JESUS: Second.

CHAIR STERMER: Moved by Commissioner Udine, seconded by Mr. de Jesus. Madam Clerk -- All those in favor, signify by saying aye. All those opposed? The Consent Agenda has passed unanimously, which includes excused absence requests from Commissioner Blattner, Mayor Ganz, and Mr. Grosso. I just want the record to be clear that the three of them have excused absences.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

CHAIR STERMER: Before we begin, earlier this week, for those of you that may not have seen the couple of emails that came into your inbox. Tuesday morning, the Broward County Commission unanimously approved the Broward Next presentation. So now we embark on part two of our never-ending endeavor. And I want to thank Ms. Blake Boy and I want to thank Mr. Sniezek and all of the respective teams from the departments that put in their heart and soul into this project. Mayor Udine, who sits here with us, made the motion the other day to approve it. And it -- it's clear that we're -- we know where we want this County to go for the next 40 to 50 years, and that's the course we've set through Broward Next.

So this board, through its public meetings as well as all of the community meetings that many members attended, literally did a lot of work to get us to where we are today. But I want to specifically and openly thank our Executive Director and -- and our entire Planning Council staff, as well as Mr. Sniezek and his team, and also, it goes without saying, every member of the public who participated. Whether you're part of the development community, the engineering community, all segments of the community, public and private, were reached out to and had input in this. So where we go for the next 45 years is on the shoulders of this Council, and I think we -- we are happy to have that, and I think we're going the right thing by setting the course.

And I just wanted to let you all know that the other day it was approved, and now we get to move on to part two, which now moving on to the Land Development Code, which is the nitty gritty that underlies the policies and procedures that -- and the strategies, I should say, that we set forth in the -- in the Land Use Plan. And we'll have a conversation a little later this morning about that and some of the ideas in an effort to jumpstart how to do some of that quickly.

REGULAR AGENDA

AGENDA ITEM R-1 - FISCAL YEAR 2018 BUDGET PROPOSAL

CHAIR STERMER: But, Ms. Blake Boy, we're up to you.

MS. BOY: Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Item R-1.

MS. BOY: Item R-1 is the proposed fiscal year 2018 budget proposal. I made a presentation to the Executive Committee this morning. Planning Council staff, as well as the Executive Committee, supports the budget proposal of 1.042 million dollars for fiscal year '18.

The additional recommendation that I talked to the Executive Committee and requested this morning is related to the fee structure. We did an in-depth fee study and updated 3/2012. And I think I overlooked that when I was putting together the budget package, that the time has come, I think, really to evaluate whether or not the fee increase -- the fees need to be increased related to Land Use Plan amendment fees, platting interpretation letter requests, and that sort of thing. I feel like we have good strong studies to base the fees on, but there have been some personnel increases over the past five years from the -- approved by the County Commission to increase our salaries. So I'd like to take a look with the Budget Office at about how that would impact our fee structure.

I'd like to bring that back to the Executive Committee at their May meeting to make a recommendation to either proceed or not proceed to request for the County Commission to adopt an ordinance to increase the fees. That would also include an annualized cost increase if there were any increases to -- to salaries or such through the years. So the Executive Committee supported that request this morning.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, Ms. Blake Boy. And to just amplify on what the Executive Director said for the newest members, over the years, when times got tough at County government, the Planning Council really, really sharpened its pencil and went back to -- we use the phrase a lot -- its bare bones, and really hasn't gotten bigger or bloated since then. And Barbara and her team have always been effective and efficient in using every penny we get.

But a couple of years ago, back in '15, we started to institute back into the budget some dollars for travel, so our staff can actually go out and learn and make presentations that -- things that better them, and, therefore, better us as a Council and what we do, as well as for certain equipment upgrades, because we all know printers, computers, monitors need to be replaced however so frequently. So they -- they've instituted that. So if you've looked at the budget over the years, it's always been in line with what the

PLANNING COUNCIL

APRIL 27, 2017

DH/NC

Council needs. The request to look at the fees, we think is a reasonable -- the Executive Committee unanimously believed it was reasonable to look at it. Our costs keep going up, and we do -- most of us in local government do the same thing. We review our fee structure once a year, twice a year. And our fees here haven't changed in a number of years, so we approved of staff reviewing it and bringing it back and making another recommendation to us subsequent to today.

So the item before you today is to -- the Executive Committee is putting forth a recommendation based on a unanimous vote there to approve the budget, as well as the recommendation that staff commence a review of our current fee structure and come back at our next meeting next month with a recommendation, if any, with regard to what to do with it.

MR. DE JESUS: So **moved**.

CHAIR STERMER: Moved by Mr. de Jesus.

MR. DIGIORGIO: Second.

CHAIR STERMER: Second by Vice Mayor -- by Vice Chair DiGiorgio. Mayor Seiler.

MAYOR SEILER: Just a quick question, and then I fully support the budget and the proposed new language. But when we're looking at the expenses, are we looking at it from a cost recovery standpoint, an actual analysis of making sure we recover the costs?

MS. BOY: Yes. We actually have -- I have an Excel spreadsheet of a line item of every single piece that we do when we're doing a review of whether it's a Land Use Plan amendment or a platting interpretation letter. And then on top of the fee, for example, for a Land Use Plan amendment, we have a cost recovery fee for such things as courtesy notices that are required by our rules. So that fee's collected from the applicant prior to those being mailed out also. And also for legal advertisements.

CHAIR STERMER: Anybody else have any further comment with regard to Item R-1? Is there a motion with regard to R-1?

MR. DE JESUS: So **moved**.

CHAIR STERMER: Oh, there's -- I'm sorry. It was moved by Vice Chair DiGiorgio, second -- by Mr. de Jesus, seconded by Vice Chair DiGiorgio. All those in favor, signify by saying aye. All those opposed? The motion carries, the item carries unanimously.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

AGENDA ITEM R-2 - LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY REVIEW: PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE BROWARD COUNTY CODE OF ORDINANCES, CHAPTER 27,

**SECTIONS 27-192 AND 27-200, ESTABLISHING A FUTURE CONDITIONS
AVERAGE WET SEASON GROUNDWATER ELEVATION MAP**

CHAIR STERMER: Item R-2. Dr. Jurado, good morning. Ms. Blake Boy.

MS. BOY: Good morning. As Dr. Jurado's approaching, I would just mention that this item was presented to the Land Use/Trafficways Committee this morning, and the land use -- the Land Use/Trafficways Committee found it in compliance with the goals, objectives, and policies of the Broward County Land Use Plan. And with that, Dr. Jurado will give you an overview.

CHAIR STERMER: Translated, when we find it in compliance, we recommend that you support the item. Just to make sure that everybody gets it. Dr. Jurado, good morning.

DR. JURADO: Good morning again, and thank you, Council members. The item that is presented to you today is one that reflects significant work on the part of Broward County staff during the last several years as we've responded to our Commission's request to more aggressively address the future impacts of climate change on our community, namely, sea level rise. You're probably well familiar with the fact that we do see a great deal more in the way of tidal flooding and inland flooding that's associated with changes in our hydrology. And, in fact, we've measured, in many of our groundwater monitoring wells, an increase in elevations of a foot and more already in Broward County.

So the map that -- the map series, the Future Conditions Map Series is one that is being advanced for the intent of informing future infrastructure design for projects here in Broward in order to better account for changes in hydrology that will and have occurred with sea level rise. The wet season groundwater table map is one that is used to set the standards for drainage and surface water management system design. And because we are seeing changes in groundwater elevation, systems that have been designed under future -- historic conditions are no longer performing adequately. And our attempt here is to ensure that as we see new infrastructure design within Broward County, it will deliver the level of service that has been intended for decades to come, for the life of that infrastructure.

And so in working with the USGS, United States Geological Survey, we've developed very advanced hydrologic models that allow us to predict changes in groundwater elevation with time. That data has been translated to the map, the Future Conditions Wet Table -- Future Conditions Wet Season Table Map that is before you. And this will be the first map in a series of maps to inform our design of infrastructure here in Broward County. This table, this map, has been workshopped widely. It was supported by the Broward County Water Advisory Board to the Broward County Commissioners. Also to the Technical Advisory Committee for the Water Advisory Board. It was shared with the Surface Water Coordination Committee here in Broward County, which consists of Public Works individuals and water managers. It was presented before the Association of Civil Engineers, Broward Chapter.

PLANNING COUNCIL

APRIL 27, 2017

DH/NC

Also, we've held a round table and a workshop, two separate meetings, with the consulting community. And we're here today to request your support before moving forward with a request to our Board for an amendment to our ordinance to allow for the adoption of this new map. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, Dr. Jurado. Ms. Graham, I could see you peripherally. You want to say something.

MS. GRAHAM: I always speak about the groundwater --

(Laughter.)

MS. GRAHAM: -- and flooding, or potential flooding. Thank you very much. On this -- in the backup, by any chance do you have, even if it's just on the internet, a location of the wells, or a schematic of where those wells are that measure the groundwater across the County?

DR. JURADO: Those wells that we rely upon are monitored by the United States Geological Survey. We can send you a link to the wells that are located here in the County that are the basis for the calibration of this model.

MS. GRAHAM: Thank you.

MS. BOY: Yeah.

CHAIR STERMER: Ms. Blake Boy.

MS. BOY: I would just add to that that the -- that map was part of the Natural Resource Map Series that's adopted into our plan, so we can also share that link, we can share both with you.

MS. GRAHAM: Thank you very much.

CHAIR STERMER: Any other questions from any members of the Council with regard to the item? Is there a motion with item -- with regard to Item R-2?

MAYOR SEILER: So **moved**.

CHAIR STERMER: Moved by Mayor Seiler --

COMMISSIONER UDINE: Second.

CHAIR STERMER: -- seconded by Commissioner Udine. All those in favor, signify by saying aye. All those opposed? The item carries unanimously. Thank you, Dr. Jurado.

DR. JURADO: Thank you.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

CHAIR STERMER: Members, we are going to move on, we are going to take Item R-3, which is the School Board of Broward County Student Generation Rate/Impact Fee Study Interim Report and move that to the end of our agenda. There's an extensive presentation that will be made with regard to that, and we conceivably could move through our regular order of business pretty quickly, so that might not be much longer before we get there. But is there any objection to moving that item to the end of the agenda?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM R-4 - COUNSEL'S REPORT

CHAIR STERMER: Mr. Maurodis. Good morning. Is --

MR. MAURODIS: I will have Counsel's Report next month to do a damage assessment of the activities of the Legislature in regard to the myriad of bills that they are adopting. City fund (phonetic) position, maybe it's not damage. So I'll -- I'll wait until then until I see all the legislation in its final form.

CHAIR STERMER: And if it's not personal damage, it's just mental damage.

AGENDA ITEM R-5 - EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

CHAIR STERMER: Ms. Blake Boy, the Executive Director's Report.

MS. BOY: Good morning. Thank you. Congratulations and welcome to our new members. Mayor Seiler, Mr. Rosenof, and Mr. Rosenzweig. It's tough with the Rosens, getting both of them of them in there. But welcome, congratulations.

Second, we -- we do have an Executive Committee vacancy. It occurred last month when Ms. Good was elected as Secretary. She moved -- she was on the Executive Committee already. Your rules say four at-large members. Right now, the membership are the three officers, Mayor Stermer, Mr. DiGiorgio, School Board Member Good, and then Commissioner Blattner, Commissioner Castillo, and Commissioner Gomez. So you do have one vacancy on the Executive Committee.

CHAIR STERMER: Any volunteers?

MR. MCCOLGAN: Yes.

CHAIR STERMER: Mr. McColgan. Thank you for joining.

COMMISSIONER UDINE: **Motion** to appoint Mr. McColgan to --

MAYOR SEILER: Second.

CHAIR STERMER: Don't everybody jump up at once. All those in favor of the motion to appoint Mr. McColgan to the Executive Committee, signify by saying aye. All those opposed? Congratulations. Welcome. You now have a full Executive Committee.

MS. BOY: Thank you.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

MS. BOY: I just have a couple other things. Last month, we briefly talked about the new logo, the updated logo for the Planning Council. We were going to talk about it at the end of the meeting, and at the end of the meeting, everybody was ready to leave after the Broward Next presentation, I think, and discussion. So I just need some direction on how to proceed on choosing the selection of a logo.

CHAIR STERMER: Well, my suggestion, and I think -- I think our best course is to let staff come back with their recommendation for what they believe the logo should look like, and we'll vote it up or down. The problem is, if we start bringing back multiple logos, we'll be a cat chasing our tail and won't get anywhere. So my suggestion is you guys do what you do best. Bring us back a final item and we'll vote it up or down.

MS. BOY: Okay, great.

CHAIR STERMER: My guess is I would anticipate that if you guys think it's okay, there'll be a basis for it and, absent some shocking things, it'll be fine with us. So I think you should bring that back at our next meeting.

MS. BOY: Okay. Will do.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you.

MS. BOY: Also, just to follow up on what Mayor Stermer said, Broward Next was adopted on Tuesday. Very exciting time for -- for us to get through this process. It was actually initiated this same week in 2014 by the County Commission and Planning Council, three years ago. So to get through the process, we spent about a good two and a half years actually doing the work and doing the outreach meetings and going through Public Hearings. Staff is really excited about the prospect of implementing this new plan.

Along with the implementation of a plan, we will need a new companion document. The Administrative Rules Document, as it exists today, we will need to update that to implement the new redevelopment units and putting together any applications. I think we're going to try to streamline applications also for Land Use Plan amendments. So we

PLANNING COUNCIL

APRIL 27, 2017

DH/NC

would like to bring that, the kind of outline of the proposal, to the Land Use/Trafficways Committee. We would like to set up a May meeting. And then probably to the full Council in June, and then have an outreach meeting over the summer with the -- with the municipalities and interested parties to see that we can get that adopted possibly by August for the implementation.

And we'll clearly be working and continuing to work with all of the interested parties. And, as Mayor Stermer said, the next part of Broward Next will be the update of all of the other elements of the Comprehensive Plan. That's ruled by the Planning and Development Management Division. They also handle the Land Development Code. So those pieces, we'll be partnering with them. They'll be taking the lead on it, and our staff will be working closely with them and making sure that you all and your policies are represented during that process.

So you can anticipate seeing several updates to that, you know, come -- come the fall. So I'm real excited. And I got you guys a cookie cake that says congratulations on Broward Next. It's behind Commissioner Udine and Commissioner Castillo. So you guys can dig in whenever you want. Just as a treat and to thank you all for your support for -- for myself and for our staff. You know, it's been a lot of work, but I think it's very rewarding, and hopefully everyone's going to be very happy with how it proceeds. So thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you. And, yes, the selfie stick has taken a picture of the cookie cake.

MS. BOY: Yeah.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER UDINE: I hope Mr. McColgan's not mad he didn't get a picture (inaudible).

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER UDINE: But we do have to draw the line somewhere.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR STERMER: But the one thing I'd like to say and request, now that we've completed the land use portion and we're moving on to the Land Development Code and everything that underlies it, we know there has been conversation here and conversation in a host of other bodies, some of them who sit monthly in this building going through a Charter review process, and there's been a lot of conversation in the community about the platting process. I would like to ask staff to work and coordinate with County staff that the first order of business is that they review the platting issues related to what's in the Charter and what's required in the Land Development Code.

PLANNING COUNCIL

APRIL 27, 2017

DH/NC

We know there are issues out in the community with regard to it and what its current requirements are. We've done some things in Broward Next with regard to platting. But I think there is a concern out there about our current platting requirements, so I'd like to get the Council's concurrence to have staff move forward with the appropriate County folks to -- to start reviewing the platting issues. Is there any objection to that happening?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

MR. DIGIORGIO: Not at all.

MS. BOY: And I just -- if I could just add to that, in the review, the primary thing for the platting -- we have countywide platting authority, Broward County, and that's all the -- that's all the Charter says. And then the next piece falls in the Land Use Plan, and that's where the exemptions lie.

I'd also like to work with Mr. Maurodis and our liaison in the County Attorney's Office just to see what kind of legal issues there could be about increasing exemptions, because that's an -- a different piece that we could also play. So we'll also be working on that at the same time that we're working with County staff.

CHAIR STERMER: Appreciate it. But I think there's a -- a significant concern, and I know at some of the Charter Review Committee meetings, there have been conversations about the platting process. So if we can sort of get a little ahead of the curve in the time that we have available, irregardless of what the Charter Commission does, I think it's imperative that we do it as a -- as a body. We also again want to thank you and your team for your efforts. So thank you.

MS. BOY: Thank you all for your support.

CHAIR STERMER: And the cookie cake.

MS. BOY: And the cookie cake.

PUBLIC HEARING

AGENDA ITEM PH-1 - RECERTIFICATION PCR 17-3

AGENDA ITEM PH-2 - AMENDMENT PC 17-9

AGENDA ITEM PH-3 - AMENDMENT PC 17-10

AGENDA ITEM PH-4 - AMENDMENT PC 17-8

CHAIR STERMER: I know we've got four items on the Public Hearing agenda. Are there any speakers other than presenters who are here for questions?

MS. BOY: There aren't. There's no one from the public aside from applicants or agents signed in to speak.

PLANNING COUNCIL

APRIL 27, 2017

DH/NC

CHAIR STERMER: Okay. And with --

MS. BOY: The one that --

CHAIR STERMER: -- and with regard to Item PH-4 --

MS. BOY: Yes.

CHAIR STERMER: -- do you have a further --

MS. BOY: Yes.

CHAIR STERMER: -- update with regard to the recommendation as opposed to what's in the agenda?

MS. BOY: The additional agenda material that was distributed to you yesterday by email, and then there's a hard copy on the dais, is an update of the affordable housing policy requirements. Prior to the distribution of the agenda material, we had not received confirmation from the applicant.

We had received the information from the city, but the previous determination was made that the city did an analysis, met Policy 1.07.07, inclusive of a commitment for \$250 per dwelling unit to be used for County affordable housing programs. We did not have the commitment part for the \$250 per unit. So we had the city part that met the part of the policy, so we recommended denial in your agenda materials.

Subsequent to the distribution of that, we received confirmation that the -- the agent -- the agent for the applicant will be providing the \$250 per dwelling unit for the amendment. So the city data analysis inclusive of that commitment would have led to a recommendation of approval if we had had that prior to the distribution of the agenda material. So staff has no objection to a recommendation of approval, recognizing the voluntary commitment for the \$250 per dwelling unit and subject to a legally binding commitment.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, Madam Executive Director. Is there a motion with regard to the Public Hearing Items PH-1, 2, 3, and 4?

MR. DIGIORGIO: I'll **move** PH-1 through P -- PH-4.

CHAIR STERMER: There's been a motion by Vice Chair DiGiorgio. A second by Mayor Seiler.

COMMISSIONER UDINE: Comment?

CHAIR STERMER: Commissioner Udine.

COMMISSIONER UDINE: On PH-4, I'm generally in support of it, but I saw the late agenda item -- the late additional material that came in, and I would like to see if, within the commitment, the \$250 per unit that they're going to pay, they have this spread out through the entire permitting process of that project. I'd like to have a hard date when the entire affordable housing dollars are paid.

I don't know if it can be done at a specific time after site plan approval, but at some point, I think the entire affordable housing amount should be paid, and we shouldn't be waiting for each permit to come through. If it's approved that they're going to build the project, their delay -- we have an affordable crisis -- housing crisis now. We talk about it at every meeting. It's come on every County Commission meeting. I just think maybe 180 days from site plan, the entire affordable housing amount should be paid.

CHAIR STERMER: Mr. Laystrom?

MR. LAYSTROM: We'll work on it.

CHAIR STERMER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER UDINE: And I don't -- I don't mean to surprise -- I just got this --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, that's --

MR. LAYSTROM: Bill Laystrom on behalf of the applicant. We'll work on that between this first reading and the -- and the second reading to come up with a date. I haven't worked it through with our client. And we apologize for being (inaudible) --

MR. MAURODIS: Is that doable, though?

MR. LAYSTROM: Yeah, it's doable.

COMMISSIONER UDINE: Okay. Thanks.

CHAIR STERMER: Ms. Graham.

COMMISSIONER UDINE: Because I'd just like a lump sum to come in --

CHAIR STERMER: Understood.

COMMISSIONER UDINE: -- and then we can (inaudible).

MR. LAYSTROM: Makes sense.

CHAIR STERMER: Ms. Graham.

MS. GRAHAM: Yeah. Thank you very much. And thank you to Commissioner for

PLANNING COUNCIL

APRIL 27, 2017

DH/NC

bringing this up, because, as I watch the local City Commission meetings that are planning the future development, it's already before the Commission, they've talked about those thresholds that were set, particularly in Fort Lauderdale, where they said, are we going to leave the affordable units to the end. They didn't want to do that, but there was no way to compel the developer to do it. They just had to do it in -- in the process.

And, again, maybe it's not even all of the fees. You know, it's a commitment, like you had said, a hundred and -- 180 days, which would be six months after the site plan approval. But just some commitment, some funds that are generated, even if it's not a hundred percent. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Any other --

MS. GRAHAM: Even if they are held in escrow. I mean --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

MS. GRAHAM: -- you'll figure that out.

CHAIR STERMER: No, we'll -- it'll get figured out. There was a motion and a second with regard to moving PH-1, 2, 3, and 4. Can I have a roll call, please, Ms. Cavender?

THE REPORTER: Mr. Brion Blackwelder.

MR. BLACKWELDER: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Richard Blattner. Commissioner Felicia Brunson.

COMMISSIONER BRUNSON: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Angelo Castillo.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Neal de Jesus.

MR. DE JESUS: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Thomas H. DiGiorgio, Jr.

MR. DIGIORGIO: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Bill Ganz. Commissioner Michelle J. Gomez.

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: Yes.

PLANNING COUNCIL

APRIL 27, 2017

DH/NC

THE REPORTER: School Board Member Patricia Good.

MS. GOOD: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Ms. Mary D. Graham.

MS. GRAHAM: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Richard Grosso. Mr. Robert McColgan.

MR. MCCOLGAN: Yes.

THE REPORTER: David Rosenof.

MR. ROSENOF: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Richard Rosenzweig.

MR. ROSENZWEIG: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Michael J. Ryan.

MR. RYAN: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Jack Seiler.

MAYOR SEILER: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Michael Udine.

COMMISSIONER UDINE: Subject to my comments, yes.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Beverly Williams.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Daniel J. Stermer, Chair.

CHAIR STERMER: Yes. Thank you, Ms. Cavender. The item passes unanimously subject to Commissioner Udine's comments, which Mr. Laystrom will have worked out by the time it comes back. Thank you all for being here this morning. We appreciate it.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

AGENDA ITEM R-3 - THE SCHOOL BOARD OF BROWARD COUNTY STUDENT GENERATION RATE/IMPACT FEE STUDY - INTERIM REPORT

PLANNING COUNCIL

APRIL 27, 2017

DH/NC

CHAIR STERMER: Ms. Blake Boy. Let's go back to Item R --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Three.

CHAIR STERMER: -- 3.

MS. BOY: R-3. Just to give a little introduction, the School Board consultant is going to make the presentation, but just so that you'll kind of know what the student generation rate and school impact fee update study are about, this is required to be updated every three years by the interlocal agreement that governs school concurrency. So that's the reason why the presentation's here today.

Some of you may recall three years ago seeing a very similar presentation on the -- on these updates, just to give you a framework for that. With that, I will introduce Nilgun Kamp. And she is from Tindale and Oliver, and she will be making the presentation on the status of the study.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you. Good morning.

MS. KAMP: Good morning.

CHAIR STERMER: Good to see you again.

MS. KAMP: Thank you. Nilgun Kamp, for the record. I have a brief presentation to go through the little bit of the background and the technical study approach and the next steps. As mentioned, last technical study was updated in 2014. And the study has two main components. One is the student generation rate update, and the other part is the remaining variables, impact fee variables, primarily costs and credits.

The study uses what we call a consumption-based methodology, which is also the current adopted methodology, and it charges growth for the value of school capacity as consuming. And by legal requirements, the fee needs to reflect most recent and localized data. Impact fees are a one-time capital charge to new development, and the purpose is to cover the cost of growth. And school impact fees are only charged to residential land uses. The basic impact fee formula looks at cost of providing school infrastructure, that's the buildings, schools, classrooms, buses, and ancillary facilities, and, from that, any non-impact fee funding, so taxes and so on, that will be contributed toward this infrastructure by new development, will be subtracted.

So basically we can't charge new development twice for the same infrastructure. So this net cost then gets multiplied by demand, which is measured in terms of number of students per housing unit. This is the current impact fee schedule that the County has, and you can see the fees range anywhere from about \$200 for small multifamily units to eight -- \$8200 for larger single family units.

In terms of using impact -- use of impact fee revenues, again, they need to be for a

PLANNING COUNCIL

APRIL 27, 2017

DH/NC

capacity addition, so that could new schools, classroom additions, new additional buses -- these are not replacement but new additional buses, any debt service payment that was used to build capacity. So anything that relates to new and additional capacity, and not for replacement, not for maintenance. Definitely not for operations.

This is our schedule. We start the study at the end of January. First couple of months was primarily data collection. We are just getting into the analysis. We had interim updates to oversight committee couple weeks ago, and then today we are giving you the same type of update. And then we expect to submit the draft report May 19th. After that, we'll have a series of meetings to go over the results and get everybody's inputs.

In terms of the technical study, again, it has two main components. One is student generation rate. That is being calculated right now by two different approaches. One is your adopted methodology, which is based on new units that are permitted within the past five years. And then we're also providing an alternative approach, which is based on all homes. And the other impact fee variables are, again, the cost and credit.

So when we get into this two different methodologies, you'll see that the one that's your current adopted methodology that is based on new homes, it's really definitely relevant in the -- for planning purposes. So whenever we do school planning, we look at where the new homes are being built and where they -- what type of generation rate they have. And -- and that's what you've been using also in the impact fees.

The other approach comes from the thought that impact fees stay with land. They are paid one time for develop of the home. You have different families moving in and out. The generation rate changes over time. So that all homes may capture that better. So we'll provide both of them as options for you to consider. So the first approach, the steps of it is really looking at the permit data for the past five years. We get -- we get that from the County's permit database that has the details of folio number, residential category, number of bedrooms, number of units. These are matched with student addresses from the School Board's database. And then -- you know, and then we try -- we clean up and do additional research to match everything as much as we can. And then the student -- number of students per housing unit is calculated for this subset, again, past five years. This, in our mind, results in student generation rate of new homes, or those homes that are built in the past five years -- permitted.

The other approach is similar, but it takes entire Property Appraiser database and all the student addresses and it matches them and calculates number of students per housing unit by housing size and type. And then, in this case, one drawback, your fee, the fee is right now is tiered by bedroom. Property Appraiser does not have bedroom data for all the units, so we're looking at a sample for those that it has and see if we can have a correlation between square feet and number of bedrooms and maybe go from that route as a comparable. So that results in student generation rate of all homes.

This is the last two studies, not this study. Last two. 2007 and 2014 study student generation rates, just to give you a sense how it -- they can be fluctuating. You see big

changes in the smaller units especially. And so -- so we are going through this process now for the past five years. This is (inaudible). When we do these studies, we like to have a general understanding of the community just to see what we need to expect and not be limited to the immediate data, more -- and really would like to look at trends. So this is the -- all students, not just traditional schools, but all students in Broward County over time compared to the state. And you can see that, you know, in '80s, '90s, you had fewer students than state average, but then (inaudible) the County is getting younger, you have more students over time per housing unit. This is showing the age distribution. The green is Florida and blue is Broward County. And you can see, again, the County is younger than the state average, which is also consistent with the generation rates we are seeing. And this is a median age over time. It's been, again, below the state average, relatively stable since 2010.

This is the vacancy rates. Again, this kind of tells us that if there is a very high vacancy rate, the students will show up later. They are not there now, but they will show up eventually. And, again, we had that period during the downturn that the vacancy rates increased and now it seems to be going back decreasing again. And then seasonal homes. If we see a huge surge in seasonal homes, again, we expect that our generation rate will decrease over time. Broward County just -- this is something you are familiar, but it's -- it's one of the largest counties. It's second in population in the state. It's 31st in terms of population growth rate, which .76. So this is the growth rate projected over 2045 by Bieber.

What's interesting is I -- when I made this presentation two weeks ago, that ranking was 43rd. And that day, Bieber released updated numbers and added 90,000 people to your projection. So -- so it's coming. Just a warning. So it just jumped up to 31st. And in terms of absolute growth, number of people, it's projected that the County will add about 463,000 people by 2045. And 25th in student generation rates.

This is showing the building permit activity. The -- the green circle is the last study period. And you can see on the side that single family and multifamily were divided more equally during the last study period. There was 45 percent single family homes. Now, during this study timeframe, it's down to about 30 percent of the homes. So those -- when you are looking at a limited timeframe, there are those type of fluctuations that will come to your way, and those are the things that we want to be careful about.

This is showing the enrollment trends. Again, during the downturn, there was some decrease in enrollment, and then -- then we would expect traditional school generation rate to be lower. This is showing the charter schools, and the charter school ratio has increased over time, so they're absorbing more of the students compared -- compared to what there was in the past. And this is showing how many new students are being absorbed by charter schools. So between 2000 and 2010, there are -- observing about 1700. That increased significantly between 2011-13, and now it's about 2600. So if the new homes that are being built that we are looking at are in the areas where charter schools are dominant, then our traditional generation rate is likely to look low. So we just kind of want to understand what's going on with charter schools a little bit to have a

broader perspective.

In terms of cost component, we look at several variables. In the statewide construction cost, any schools built recently by the district, the insurance values of the existing buildings, we talk to architects and so on. So we try to look at more than one variable to get a -- get comfortable. And, for land, again, we look at any land purchases, appraisals, vacant land sales within the County of similar size and vacant land values. One thing we'd like to explain, the school infrastructure is very expensive. It's (inaudible) and expensive.

Between transportation and schools, what we find is 80 to 90 percent of the capital value a community provides is -- consists of transportation and schools. So transportation impact is charged to all land users, so the cost is distributed between residential and non-residential, but school impact fees are charged only to residential, so then they tend to be high because of that.

This is showing the construction cost trends using data from the Department of Education over time. And you can see the time period between maybe 2004 all the way to 2016 even, we had the runup, and then we had the decrease. So now we are starting to see some increase, and we are hoping that it will just stabilize and we will go back to the earlier years when things fluctuated little bit but it wasn't this drastic of a up and down.

This past 15 year periods, we have very hard time relying on in planning our work, because it's been so unusual of a time period. And then credit component looks at how the School Board funds new capacity. So it's basically look at how they use the taxes, how they -- you know, what type of revenue sources come past five years and next five years. And the goal is to understand the new developments' contribution towards the -- in -- in the form of taxes so that we can subtract that.

So, again, in terms of the next step, this is -- we will submit a draft report on May 19, and, you know, we will go through the meetings where I give everybody a chance to review all the results and, you know, explain and adjust. With that, I'll be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIR STERMER: I think what I would suggest we do, because some --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR STERMER: Sorry. I apologize. Thank you. What we'll do is we'll start with Mr. Rosenof and go around the entire dais, since I have a feeling many have questions. And instead of trying to put everybody in an order, let's just go around.

MR. ROSENOF: Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Mr. Rosenof.

PLANNING COUNCIL

APRIL 27, 2017

DH/NC

MR. ROSENOF: In general, all your projections assume the County to be a homogeneous county, correct? Are you taking the generation rates and looking at them, seeing if they're different in Weston, in Parkland as they may be in Fort Lauderdale or Dania Beach?

MS. KAMP: No, it's a County way -- countywide generation rate. And one reason for that is more and more with the School Choice Programs, kids are moving around and the school district has the ability to adjust the attendance boundaries to balance it. So it's not -- it's not -- kids are not limited to their neighborhood schools, so there's a lot more (inaudible).

MR. ROSENOF: And you -- you said something about that you were studying the effects of charter schools in a neighborhood. How do you do that if you don't drill down to a ZIP Code or something?

MS. KAMP: No. It -- in the sense that we are looking at past five years where the building permits are issued, so what I was just saying, if -- if it happened to be in an area that charter schools are dominant, that could affect the generation rate, but this is just sort of a -- trying to understand --

MR. ROSENOF: Okay. So you're making a correlation between permits and charter schools, not necessarily charter schools and public school attendance. It's just that if you see a lower generation rate, one of the driving factors may be the charter schools.

MR. ROSENOF: Okay.

MS. KAMP: Yeah.

MR. ROSENOF: Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Mayor Seiler.

MAYOR SEILER: Yeah, just a couple quick questions. On page 7, there was a reference -- I'm trying to find this thing where it talks about the use of impact fees. It says classroom additions, new additional buses and equipment, and debt service. It makes no reference to, you know, other facilities, whether it be field space, gym space, cafeterias. I mean, does that all fall under classroom additions, or is that excluded?

MS. KAMP: Yeah, those are just examples, but, yes, in new schools, I should have put that. So that would include all the core facilities, gymnasiums --

MAYOR SEILER: But how about an example, let's say we take Stranahan High School. And -- and Patty and I have talked about that at various times. Can these impact fees be used to expand that cafeteria if the enrollment doubles, or can it only be used for the three things listed here?

MS. KAMP: No, it can be used for any expansion of the infrastructure, yeah.

MAYOR SEILER: And then on the permit numbers that you had posted, are these only Broward County permits? These are not any city permits, correct?

MS. KAMP: These -- no, these are countywide, including the municipalities. These came from the Census, Bureau of Census.

MAYOR SEILER: That's -- I mean, we have more permits than that in Fort Lauderdale. That's what I'm --

MS. KAMP: This is all new homes, not any --

MAYOR SEILER: But we have 7,000 dwelling units in Fort Lauderdale under permit right now. I mean, that's why I'm trying to understand these numbers.

MS. KAMP: And they are --

MAYOR SEILER: That doesn't even include -- I mean, you have for all of Broward County 5,452 in 2015.

MS. KAMP: Okay. Well --

MAYOR SEILER: That doesn't make sense.

MS. KAMP: -- well, we can double check that, but -- what page was that?

MAYOR SEILER: Page --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Twenty-two.

MAYOR SEILER: -- 22.

CHAIR STERMER: Twenty-two.

MAYOR SEILER: I mean, we -- at any given time, we have to 16,000 permits open.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

MAYOR SEILER: We've got --

CHAIR STERMER: Jack, the question is is there -- are you talking about approved units or permitted units?

MAYOR SEILER: Well, that's what I'm trying to figure out. They're telling me the only number -- there was 5,452 permits pulled for residential units in all of Broward County

PLANNING COUNCIL

APRIL 27, 2017

DH/NC

last year.

MS. KAMP: It's an average.

MAYOR SEILER: That's impossible. And I don't -- I would think of all of us, even just from the cities where, you know, Mike Ryan, what you've got going in your city and -- and Dan and -- and, you know, Neal --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: I had that alone.

MR. DE JESUS: Is it -- is it possible they just counted developments instead of individual doors?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR STERMER: Go ahead.

MS. KAMP: These -- these came from the Census, but I will double check and get back to you on that to make sure that there is nothing --

MAYOR SEILER: Because you're looking back -- you're looking at like 2002, 12,000. That seems more in line with, I mean, the activity we're seeing, and I suspect, you know, Sunrise and Pembroke Pines --

MS. KAMP: Yeah.

MAYOR SEILER: -- others. So that's -- if you would double check that before we go further on that. And then the last part is on this enrollment. And I know you talked -- David asked you about, you know, charter. The other thing we're seeing a lot of is the private and parochial that I don't know where those students -- and -- and what -- I'm, you know not suggesting in any way that any of these dollars be used for that --

MS. KAMP: Uh-huh.

MAYOR SEILER: -- but are we calculating that in terms of the impact? Because a lot of these students, when you see the traditional schools, private schools, and Catholic schools and Christian schools all expanding --

MS. KAMP: Uh-huh.

MAYOR SEILER: -- even some of the -- I'm trying to -- we have a lot of Jewish day schools, too. They seem to be growing in enrollment. Are we calculating that into the mix saying it's not just charter schools that might be happening in Pembroke Pines, but other private schools?

MS. KAMP: Basically, when you see a decrease in traditional schools, traditional school

PLANNING COUNCIL

APRIL 27, 2017

DH/NC

generation rates, because, really, all we are including in the analysis is traditional school students. So what the school district is responsible for. So if you see a decrease, that could be another explanatory factor, just like charter schools.

MAYOR SEILER: Are you calling a charter school traditional or non-traditional?

MS. KAMP: Non-traditional.

MAYOR SEILER: And you're saying the Broward County School Board's not responsible for that?

MS. KAMP: They are not directly responsible. The money passes through the school district, but it's not their schools. They are publicly fund, but it's sort of a separately operated set of schools.

CHAIR STERMER: I think -- I think -- to your point, I think that's why we try to come up with a countywide student generation rate. Particularly with legislation that's passed the Legislature in the past few years, you can send the student to any school, regardless of where they live. So I think that's why it's not -- we can't necessarily look at what you're building downtown and say all those students are going to go to school downtown. They can end up in Parkland. They could end up in Weston. They could end up in Pembroke Pines, public, private, charter, whichever.

I think that's part of the reason we look at a generation rate based on unit type as compared to specifically where that project is because of changes in state law that allow student -- parents to make choice of where their students are going to go to school. I think just -- I think that sort of explains why you have to look at a unit type and what it generates. That's why it's -- one of the reasons it's done this way. There have been discussions over the past few years about student generation rate and how it's done, and whether it's current, my word.

MAYOR SEILER: Well, I think, and the last thing I'll add, just the whole issue is mobility, I mean, with the students. I mean, now it's going across county lines --

MS. KAMP: That's right.

MAYOR SEILER: -- I understand, with the new legislation.

MS. KAMP: Uh-huh.

MAYOR SEILER: So it's -- this is a difficult thing, but I think we need to make sure we're tracking this properly, because now you see kids that are North Miami coming into Broward and you see kids --

MS. KAMP: Uh-huh.

MAYOR SEILER: -- in Hallandale going down to Aventura. And that's going to change the dynamics even further.

CHAIR STERMER: Yeah, but if you can check on the -- the underlying numbers in the data --

MS. KAMP: Yes. Absolutely.

CHAIR STERMER: -- I think that will be helpful.

MAYOR SEILER: Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Commissioner Brunson.

COMMISSIONER BRUNSON: Yeah, my question, though, is sort of what Mayor Seiler was saying, are we tracking those kids that are leaving, because I know in the southern part of the County, a lot of those kids -- sorry -- in the southern part of the County, a lot of those kids do go to Miami, and then we have a lot of kids from Miami coming over. So are we tracking them? Yeah, are we tracking them? And then I, too, was concerned about I know the funding doesn't go to the private schools, but what about those students? You know, because they may come in and out.

MS. KAMP: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER BRUNSON: So how are we tracking them.

MS. KAMP: The impact fee itself is only looking at the students that are in the school system, that -- that the school district is responsible. So the traditional schools. And when we do our school planning studies, that's the type of analysis we get much more into. Where the students are coming. There are sub areas. Where are the hot spots, where are the exchanges are happening. Impact fees are just countywide current status quo what the generation rate is, you know, either based on past five years or all students. So that really treat it little differently.

COMMISSIONER BRUNSON: Yeah, I guess because we have a lot of transient students. You know, students come in, go from public, private, and charter, I mean, to homeschool. So how are we -- you know, when they leave one and come back to another --

MS. KAMP: Right.

COMMISSIONER BRUNSON: -- is that taken into account?

MS. KAMP: It's -- it's sort of a -- for impact fee purposes, that's -- the way it's calculated, it's like a snapshot in time. We are looking at today the past five year permits for all students, but it's not a generation rate that keeps evolving over time.

PLANNING COUNCIL

APRIL 27, 2017

DH/NC

When we do school planning studies, that's when we really try to get into the projections of what -- how much more we need to lose, how much, you know, ground charter school, private school is gaining or losing. But impact fee methodology is just sort of a snapshot what happened in that time period. And then that's why they get updated every three, four years, to capture those type of changes.

CHAIR STERMER: True. Let -- let me try to help you a little. School Board Member Good.

MS. GOOD: Yes. Commissioner, so as she indicated, the impact fees are a snapshot in time, but when the district does projections, it does consider that mobility factor. It does consider students that are coming in and out, going to charter, going to private schools. That's all considered by our planning staff for projection purposes, correct?

MS. KAMP: Yes.

MAYOR SEILER: What -- is it every three, four years only? Or do you do like an annual update on that at the School Board?

MS. GOOD: I'll let staff answer.

CHAIR STERMER: Mr. Akagbosu.

MR. AKAGBOSU: Good morning, Broward County Planning Council members. Chris Akagbosu, Director of Facility Planning and Real Estate Department. We basically have these demographic and student, you know, (inaudible) or department that does all of our project projections, even long-term. And so those factors are considered, like Mrs. Good said, in terms of the mobility.

But the student generation rate, again, is a snapshot in time, and we factor out, you know, the charter school students and -- and then the private school students. So those are not accounted for because the School Board is not responsible to provide classroom, you know, capacity to the students.

CHAIR STERMER: The --

MR. AKAGBOSU: So those are normally (inaudible).

CHAIR STERMER: -- the Mayor's question is how often do you do that review?

MAYOR SEILER: When is that snapshot done? Is it every year?

MR. AKAGBOSU: The snapshot, the interlocal agreement between Broward County and the 27 municipalities and the School Board we do it at least once every three years. That's what we do. But the projections is done every year by the School Board.

CHAIR STERMER: Right. The projections are done every year by the School Board. The impact study is every three years. It used to be longer. We --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Shortened it up?

CHAIR STERMER: -- we made it more -- a shorter timeline of it in the last interlocal agreement.

MS. GOOD: And --

CHAIR STERMER: Go ahead.

MS. GOOD: -- and also, Mayor Seiler, those are the same projections that are used for boundary purposes, so they have to be updated yearly.

CHAIR STERMER: And let's just be mindful and I know part of this is we're all concerned of whatever community we're in, elected or non-elected, families and homes that are going up in those communities and where they are, let's remember this impact fee is on a per new door basis, not necessarily whether that child goes to the local school.

So it's looking at the countywide school system and what a developer pays on a per door basis based on the projection, student generation rate of what the impact fee is. Okay. That's -- and it's not necessarily where the student ends up. It's just collecting the dollars for the School Board for its use as authorized by state statute along those lines. Commissioner Brunson, anything else?

COMMISSIONER BRUNSON: That's it.

CHAIR STERMER: Commissioner Udine.

COMMISSIONER UDINE: A couple things in combination with what David and Jack were talking about. So the numbers, I think, need to be rehashed out and -- and re-looked at. And when you're doing that, what I would like to see -- and I agree with everything that Dan said is correct legally and by the law. But I'd like to see some kind of breakdown lower than countywide of how we're doing with these predictions in the future.

So you said you look back and then you determine, you know, what happened over the five years to -- to get the new student generation number. Is there another slide or the ability for you to just at least tell us so that we have it how did we do with our prediction in 2007 versus those next five years? Because I'd like to see that. And I'd also -- not for assessing more impact fees, because we wouldn't be able to, but I'd just like that information. I'd also like the information broken down, and it doesn't need to be done by 31 municipalities, but maybe by different school zones of some sort, like Area A, B, whatever. If it could be done by -- even if you took the County and made it four

PLANNING COUNCIL

APRIL 27, 2017

DH/NC

quadrants and tell us what it looks like in those.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That sounds (inaudible).

COMMISSIONER UDINE: I'd just like --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

COMMISSIONER UDINE: -- to see that. I know we can't do anything with it, but I'd like to see that number, because, while we can't do anything with it now, that's something that may be looked -- we may need to look at in the future, because when I'm seeing your -- the slides that you're presenting here, we're getting, on the County Commission, different slides of demographics of what the future County is going to look like. And maybe the way we've been doing it with these impact fees, maybe the formula that we're using is not the greatest. You may come back and tell me that here's what we predicted it was going to be, and it was here, right on the money. But it doesn't feel like that to -- to the public in different areas of the community.

CHAIR STERMER: I think it's important to note, Commissioner, and you'll remember this, because you actually -- you were sitting on a city dais at the time when the last time the student generation was done, that's when we were starting to bring in the midrise and the high rise.

COMMISSIONER UDINE: Right.

CHAIR STERMER: And we -- there was a lot of uncertainty of what the generation rate would be once you got past a two story building, a garden apartment style building. So I think there was a whole lot of uncertainty, and everyone at the time, the last time a student generation study was done, we sort of crossed our fingers, saying part of this was our best information, our best guess at what high rise -- midrise and high rise would generate.

So I think it's important to understand that in the past X amount of years, those have -- in certain places, what's come on line in a lot of places, and the question is has the previous anticipated number wedded up with what the projection was. But I think your point's well taken.

School Board Member Good. I'm going to let -- only because some of this relates past what the study is to the -- how the School Board deals with things, so I'm going to let School Board Member Good respond to questions, because, gosh, she's -- you know, she's --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR STERMER: -- I know she's got a big catcher's mitt this morning.

MS. GOOD: I'm just trying to help out and maybe we can bring back some additional information. So with regard to the -- the information that's going to be presented moving forward, it has to be legally defensible, so everything we do is data collected and has to be verified and reverified. So you can collect information in a multitude of ways, but, ultimately, it has to be something that's legal -- legally defensible. And I say that because it's really important that, you know, as developers move forward and they want to pay their appropriate impact fees, we can't just make assumptions. We have to use projections. And so when -- Commissioner Udine, when you mentioned that you wanted to know if the numbers were the same as was projected, you were talking about projections, correct?

COMMISSIONER UDINE: No. What I'm -- I would just like to know for intellectual curiosity and so that I can see in the future. It doesn't even have to be in the end agreement. What I want to know is you're looking at prospective numbers based on the previous student generation numbers, some real facts. There must be a way for you to look at that and say in 2010, we said there were going to be X number of students, but it was really X plus whatever percentage, or X minus.

MS. GOOD: Okay. So --

COMMISSIONER UDINE: How did we do based on --

MS. GOOD: -- so you want --

COMMISSIONER UDINE: -- based on our assumptions?

MS. GOOD: -- to know how -- when -- when the district -- because I'm -- so I can better understand what we need to get you, you want to know that when a development went through and the district made a -- an estimate as far as students generated by that development, you want to know how accurate that was. Is that -- is that fair?

COMMISSIONER UDINE: I think that that helps. I think that that helps, and I think breaking it down a little bit more --

MS. GOOD: Well, and that's what I also wanted to --

COMMISSIONER UDINE: -- and I'm okay with not including that in the final report if that's not something that we -- I understand, and I agree with what everybody said. And I agree that that issue is not an issue that's before us. But if we have a consultant doing all this --

MS. GOOD: Sure.

COMMISSIONER UDINE: -- and they have all the raw numbers, that's something that I would just like to see, because I've been --

MS. GOOD: Sure.

COMMISSIONER UDINE: -- wondering about it for 13 years.

MS. GOOD: No --

CHAIR STERMER: Let me suggest at the end, this dais that you sit on gavels in what that number is, so if there's something that you think is important and you want to see --

MS. GOOD: That's why --

CHAIR STERMER: -- don't say you'd like to see it.

COMMISSIONER UDINE: Right.

CHAIR STERMER: If you want to see it, tell them you want to see it, because you're -- you're the -- you're going to be one of nine people at the end that votes on this.

MS. GOOD: -- well, that's why I'm trying to understand --

CHAIR STERMER: So if -- if there's something that you want in there --

COMMISSIONER UDINE: I understand that. And I --

CHAIR STERMER: -- you can just --

COMMISSIONER UDINE: -- I'm not asking them to bring us something that's not going to be legally defensible, and it's not something that may need to be included in the end document. What I'm saying is they have the data, they have the research. I'm just curious for that --

MS. GOOD: Sure.

COMMISSIONER UDINE: -- to be provided.

MS. GOOD: And I just wanted to understand what you were talking about, whether it's generation or projection. So he's looking at the generation and how close they were. And the other thing I wanted staff to clarify is we do collect impact fees based on benefit districts, correct?

MR. AKAGBOSU: For -- for our school impact fee zones, that's contained in the Broward County Land Development Code, correct.

MS. GOOD: And can you explain to everyone here what they look like? It should have been part of this, but --

MR. AKAGBOSU: They basically -- I mean, it's going to be part of, you know, when we come back. They basically are set by the Broward County land -- you know, Broward County Land Development Code, you know, basically meet with what you call the rational nexus test, meaning whoever's paying the impact fee, that has to benefit that project. So Broward County has these lines, one in, I think, the northern line, there's a -- there's a line from I think maybe around Commercial -- it goes from east to west. So that's how they go. So the School Board has the flexibility of spending that money within those zones. Those -- those monies are collected within those zones and then transferred into Broward County schools every quarter and we have to spend it in those zones.

MS. GOOD: So just getting back to what Mayor Seiler said, so I think moving forward --

MR. AKAGBOSU: Uh-huh.

MS. GOOD: -- an additional piece of information that's valuable to the group is to --

MR. AKAGBOSU: Sure.

MS. GOOD: -- see in the zones how impact fees are collected and where they -- they can be utilized.

MR. AKAGBOSU: Sure.

MS. GOOD: And a large part of those fees are utilized for debt service.

MR. AKAGBOSU: Uh-huh.

MS. GOOD: So I want everyone to remember that although you see some of your schools within your communities that have been there for quite some time, it takes a considerable amount of time to pay off that debt service, considering the fact that many of our high schools cost anywhere in the neighborhood range of 90, \$100,000,000. It -- it takes some time to pay that debt service off. So impact fees are utilized to pay off those school facilities. And I'm just -- I'm trying to -- that's it. Thank you.

MR. AKAGBOSU: Through the Chair, can I -- just to give further clarification, because I think this question may have come up sometime in the last study. So what, you know, Commissioner Michael Udine is asking for, if I get it, said the development we reviewed that have been, you know, seen by this Council, we said is going to generate X number of students. So you want to then see when in actuality that development came on line, what students came from that development as reported in the School Board's actual attendance?

COMMISSIONER UDINE: That's fine, if you do it like that. Just something so that we can look at that and say this is how we've been doing it in the past, and it's either working or it's not working.

MR. AKAGBOSU: Okay.

COMMISSIONER UDINE: I mean, for the -- for the people, obviously, that serve in municipal government, which is a lot of people up here, we all know the issue. No one ever wants to move what school that they're in. So we can talk about the four different school zone areas. I -- I know the maps. I've seen it a million times. But no one ever wants to move a school. And the development gets built near a school.

And take the northern zone. The northern zone is still so much larger that those dollars that come in by that particular school go to the entire area. And I get it. I know that that's legal, that that's how it's supposed to be, but the public doesn't understand that. And I'd like to have a better understanding so that I can make sure I can explain it the correct way. That's all I'm asking.

CHAIR STERMER: And just so you know, Mayor Hunschofsky's asked the same thing. Just -- just so you know. Your successor's gone the same way. Commissioner Castillo.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So this is -- this is actually my second tenure here on the Planning Council. I was originally appointed in 2004 and served for a while. And then I had a little time off. And then just when I thought they were -- I was out, they pulled me back in. And I know some of you sort of feel the same way.

When I got here in 2004, it was School Board Member (Inaudible) Carter who sat in that seat, and I remember us having this very conversation then, and even before that, as a private citizen. And I remember when Mr. Akagbosu used to come here all the time, my old friend. And even before that, in the '90s, we had student generation rates. And this has always been very, very difficult.

And I want to commend you, and all of you, for working on this issue. This is a very hard calculation to get right. And historically, while -- while the effort was always present, we never quite did. And the evidence of it is -- and this isn't to take shots at anyone. This is simply to lay it out historically. And the evidence of that is that we've had -- it's better now, but the history has been overcrowded schools, because we didn't calculate right. And -- and there have been other issues. So getting this -- so getting this right is important, particularly now that we're in a -- an age of class size requirements. So getting this right is essential.

So one of the things that I looked at was indeed your enrollment trends in charter schools. And I see that about 20 percent of public school students are currently in charter schools. And that trend has been growing. I mean, we -- look at page 24 and you'll see it. It's a trend line continuously moving upward. And my sense is it continues to move upward.

Yet when you look at it from the perspective as the Chair describes it, as how many --

PLANNING COUNCIL

APRIL 27, 2017

DH/NC

how many children bedrooms generate, you have to make an assumption, because you don't know how many of them are going to end up in parochial school or this school or that school. You're going to have to just make an assumption based on units. Yet at the end of the day, once these fees are paid, there's no switch back for these charter schools or parochial schools.

And in the -- in the case of -- in the -- in the case of private schools, one could understand that. In other words, you could say -- you know, and I don't want to offend any sort of ideological sensitivities here, but just -- just looking at the math of it, you could say, okay, maybe the ten percent of -- of school children -- Patty, I'm not sure if that's the right number or not -- that go to -- that go to a private tuition school, maybe that's sort of an imponderable. And so -- although I suppose there are historical trends and that that can be factored in a rate.

But when it comes to charter schools, it's not that the School Board isn't responsible for them, it's that they've chosen not to be responsible for them. Charter schools are public schools. This is a policy choice. There's nothing in the law --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: -- hold on. I'm not done. There's nothing in the law that says that they can't -- they've chosen not to do this. Similarly, there was a bond issue that went out 750,000 -- million dollars.

MR. DIGIORGIO: Eight.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: How much?

MR. DIGIORGIO: Eight hundred.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: 800,000,000. Everyone pays that evenly. Yet 20 percent of the -- of -- of the kids get a tiny fraction. And I'm thankful for the tiny fraction, but it's not evenly distributed.

Similarly, we all pay the same school tax -- well, property tax. But if you -- if you chose to send your -- your child to a public charter school, by policy choice, you don't get any reimbursement for capital on the local share. So it's difficult for me to conclude, when I look at this, that there isn't a -- an additional amount collected in this generation rate for a sizeable, one in five, going to charter schools, a number that will continue to grow. Who knows, in a couple of years, it'll be one in four. And the charter schools aren't paid that amount.

Now, it seems to me you pay in that amount, and you charge this rate, when you reduce it by 25 percent, because that's the trend, but if you're going to keep the additional 25 percent, that doesn't seem like the right rate. So can you help me understand that?

MS. KAMP: Yeah, one clarification. We are only calculating the generation rate of traditional schools. We are excluding all charter schools, all private schools. Only the traditional. So when we match the addresses to see how many students per home, those addresses belong to kids in traditional schools only. So we don't calculate everything a house is generating.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: I don't understand. Well, let me -- let me stop you. Maybe I'm asking the question wrong. So this is -- these are -- these are impact fees for new construction, right?

MS. KAMP: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Okay. So if I'm a developer and I'm going to put out a hundred four-bedroom houses on property that Admiral Seiler sells me, then I go out -- I go out there and I put out my -- my 100 four-bedroom units, and I'm going to pay X number of dollars to the School Board as an impact fee. You don't know where those kids are going to go.

MS. KAMP: No.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Okay. So I'm going to pay them to you, and it's going to be based on how many kids could fit in those -- against your model. But you're not accounting in that model for how many kids are going to go to charter schools or parochial schools.

MS. GOOD: The generation rate --

MS. KAMP: The generation rate is only accounting for traditional schools. So -- so the idea is --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: District schools.

MS. KAMP: Just the district schools, yeah. So -- so they are additional students. It's not a total generation rate (inaudible).

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Can you show me -- can you show us -- can you provide us with an email that says, so this would be the total number of kids, and then here's how many we subtracted for parochial and charter schools in order to come up with that rate? Maybe that would help.

MS. KAMP: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: And -- and show us the math of how -- of how you got from the total number of kids, irrespective of where they went to school, to the -- to -- to the ones you're charging now.

MS. KAMP: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: That's all.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, Commissioner Castillo. Ms. Graham.

MS. GRAHAM: Thank you, Chair Stermer. Commissioner Castillo, you always bring up some amazing points. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: You know he's the Chancellor of the Pembroke Pines Charter School, right?

(Laughter.)

MS. GRAHAM: No, I -- I didn't, I didn't know that. But he -- he's certainly the most informed about this.

MS. GOOD: I'll wait. I'll wait until (inaudible).

MS. GRAHAM: I guess a couple of things real quick. We know that when development comes before our Planning Council, there is usually, just say for math's sake, a two-year lag before they have a shovel in the ground or an occupancy, because by the time they go through here twice, goes to the County, goes to Tallahassee, comes back, the -- the project is open, the people move in, the kids go to school.

There should almost be like an overlay system, which I'm sure can be done, where you would take -- because you would have a two-year heads up as to what would be coming down the pike. I mean, I just look at all the golf courses that I've voted no against on development since I've been on this Council since 2011.

So we already know that there's something coming in Oakland Park. Pulte Homes -- just for example, Pulte Homes wants to put 800 homes in in this little site off of Prospect. So we know that if they get their approvals, they get their funding, what have you, there's going to be 800 homes there, and you're going to have a heads up as to how you calculate possible future students coming from there.

You look at Crystal Lake, which we just did on Sample Road a couple months ago. There's going to be homes in there, a lot of homes. Homes in Tamarac that are already under construction by the turnpike off of Commercial. You look at Atlantic Boulevard by the turnpike. Those apartment complexes are probably already leasing. I drive by there a couple times a week. I don't have time to go back and always check where they are in construction. You've got the schools on Commercial Boulevard just east of 441 that border Tamarac, North -- not North Lauderdale, Lauderdale Lakes. Those are already opening up, brand new. And, again, I remember all the development that comes before us because it's -- they were huge pockets of land, bare land. They weren't redeveloping it.

So, first of all, the overlay would be a good idea. But the second thing is we had a lot of land use amendment changes during the recession as -- and after we came out where we voted and it got changed from commercial to residential. We had stuff that went from industrial to residential, I believe, or a different type of commercial generation, because they had planned on doing something and the market wasn't correct and they shifted back and forth.

So just like Commissioner Udine had asked for that data to be able to go back and look to see -- because the analysis is very important. It's one thing to do the projections, just like the doctor who spoke about the water tables and looking at the historical weather patterns. Everything's based -- future projections are based on historical patterns. It'd be a chance for anyone who wants to look at it with a certain critical eye for what they're trying to, I guess, take out of -- extract from the data.

Mayor Udine's probably looking at Parkland and the northwest part of the County, but for any of us that are just looking at trends for -- just say other development, office or retail that would come up around homes, I mean, there's a whole way to pull all of this together. And some cities have a lot of development areas that can be increasing the density, and others can't. And then I think of Pembroke Pines and some of the municipalities out west.

I mean, I look at real estate for a living in -- in a different capacity, but I have my own things that I'm always looking at, whether it's Dade, Broward, or Jacksonville where I'm going to be tomorrow, or what have you. So I just think that that can somehow be incorporated. It would work for the School Board, it would work for any of the municipalities. And even if we don't break it down by ZIP Code -- because what I do understand is you -- with the permit activity, definitely the numbers seem a little off, as Mayor Seiler had said, because I just know what goes on in Fort Lauderdale, and they actually will post those. It's a backup to an agenda item, to see what the permits are. And sometimes people just put additions on houses. I know the impact fees don't come from additions and renovations, but there's an awful lot of that going on.

And the other things is when you generate the student rate, after the fact, do you send - - if you don't mind me asking, do you send out like a survey where you don't necessarily list your name, but you maybe list the number of children and their ages that live in a development?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR STERMER: I'm going to let Ms. Good answer.

MS. GRAHAM: Thank you.

MS. GOOD: So impact fees are paid at a specific point in time, and definitely not at land use. So when the land use applications come before this Planning Council, staff

PLANNING COUNCIL

APRIL 27, 2017

DH/NC

gives you a report that gives you projections and based on certain scenarios. But the -- the time of -- the impact fees are paid at time of permitting. And at that time, staff does an analysis. Mr. Akagbosu, can you just quickly mention? And that's the time that staff, I think, does a recalculation and an assessment of number of students, correct?

MR. AKAGBOSU: Yes. What we normally do, again, consistent with the interlocal agreement, the land use is reviewed and is based on what is called a consistency review to give you a picture of what's going on.

MS. GOOD: Right.

MR. AKAGBOSU: But we also now for the (inaudible) Planning Council we'll give you a snapshot of what's going on at that school based on the school concurrency review, which is done later at plat -- plat and site plan. So the bottom line is we use the same student generation rate. So that's what we do. And then that report is then used to determine whatever is capacity or not at that specific school.

MS. GOOD: Right. And what Mr. Akagbuso's saying is -- to your concern, because I don't think we need to generate another report --

MR. AKAGBOSU: Uh-huh.

MS. GOOD: -- what's done is at time of plat and permitting, that's the time that the district would do another analysis --

MR. AKAGBOSU: Uh-huh.

MS. GOOD: -- of which they determine if concurrency exists.

MR. AKAGBOSU: Uh-huh.

MS. GOOD: And if it doesn't, then at that time, the developer would have to work with the school district to deal with that impact versus just paying impact fees. They may have to do something above and beyond. So it all depends at that point -- point in time when concurrency review is conducted, and it's done at time of platting. And that's --

MS. GRAHAM: Okay. So this is already being considered --

MR. AKAGBOSU: Correct.

MS. GRAHAM: -- at some --

MS. GOOD: Yes, ma'am.

MS. GRAHAM: -- point within your --

MS. GOOD: Yes.

MS. GRAHAM: -- School Board?

MR. AKAGBOSU: (Inaudible.)

MS. GOOD: I just wanted you to know. So what comes before you is like a snapshot, kind of giving you an overview, but it really isn't determined for sure until time of platting, right before they get to open those homes, and then they'll make that determination.

MS. GRAHAM: Well, sure, because things do change.

MS. GOOD: Exactly.

MS. GRAHAM: Plat amendments are always made, just like over the years they've gone from non-residential to --

MS. GOOD: Yes, ma'am.

MS. GRAHAM: -- residential here and vice versa.

MS. GOOD: Yes, ma'am.

MS. GRAHAM: Thank you.

MR. AKAGBOSU: And just to add on that, we work very collaboratively with the Broward County Planning Council staff and municipal staff, and, you know, through a staff working group, where we have this thing called a quarterly report. So we maintain and collect data on, even after that other report is done, forecast, which development review trends are provided through our demographic (inaudible) office in terms of, okay, what are this number of platting or site plan, how much do you forecast to issue a C.O. So that's a very comprehensive linear process that goes through close to when, you know, the building permits are issued.

MS. GRAHAM: Right. So in reality, the questions that came up where they asked how frequently --

MS. GOOD: Right.

MS. GRAHAM: -- this is done --

MS. GOOD: Yes.

MS. GRAHAM: -- every three years, that may be the official release --

MR. AKAGBOSU: Uh-huh, uh-huh, uh-huh.

MS. GRAHAM: -- but mean time, there's interim --

MS. GOOD: Yes.

MS. GRAHAM: -- it's being revised and -- okay. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Every time a project t-- every time a project moves in for site plan --

MS. GOOD: Right.

CHAIR STERMER: -- that's when it's actually a specific analysis for that, different than the land use and what --

MS. GOOD: Right.

CHAIR STERMER: -- the land use category may generate. Then it's looked at what's planned specifically for that development and what will come out of it.

MS. GRAHAM: So the only thing we'd still be missing is the historical kind of summary or some other way to graphically or narratively put the data together so that Commissioner Udine --

MS. GOOD: Yes.

MS. GRAHAM: -- could then go back and do the analysis. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Mr. DiGiorgio.

MR. DIGIORGIO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'll be very brief, because most of my questions were already asked. I do want to reiterate just two points. I think Mr. Udine's request is a sound request, because it really gives us predictability of how sure we can be with what we're going to put out there for impact fees could be reliable. So I'd like to see that happen. I know -- again, I don't want to conflict anything out here, but I -- I do believe it's important maybe to be part of the record.

Further, I'd like to see, on Commissioner Castillo's request, where he said show us the slide that basically says the new development will generate so many -- so many school kids are going to be going to school based on this new development, and then we've deducted those that are going to the private schools and charter schools out of it, and here's what that looks like. Again, graphically, it can help us answer so we can then discuss this with others reliably and say this is -- this is a true model.

MS. KAMP: Let -- let me make sure that I -- I'm not misleading. What we can provide is all school age kids in Broward County. We have that. So those should be the students, your total student generation. And then from that, we can also show you traditional

PLANNING COUNCIL

APRIL 27, 2017

DH/NC

schools. We do not have address data or -- for the private school students or charter school students. So I just don't want to mislead you to think that I can do as much in that analysis as traditional schools.

CHAIR STERMER: Ms. Good.

MS. GOOD: I think that -- to help with what you're asking, what -- what we're saying is the projections does exclude out charters and students that may go to private. They take that into consideration when doing projections. So once those projections are developed, those projections are utilized to do the generation rate. So when a development comes through, it's already got that -- that component formula in in that --

MR. DIGIORGIO: And -- and I --

MS. GOOD: -- function. I guess there's no way to -- so when -- for example, when Mr. Akagbosu's doing the generation rates and the developer comes through and they're going to say X number of units generates X number of kids, they're not going to be able to tell you out of those students who's going to go where. But the fact that the generation, the projections that they're using does include assumptions as to a percentage may go to charter, a percentage may go to private --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: We should do --

MS. GOOD: -- am I saying that correctly?

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: -- we should do property tax that way.

CHAIR STERMER: Yeah, but I think part of what it is, and it goes back to part of what Commissioner Udine --

MS. GOOD: Commissioner Castillo --

CHAIR STERMER: -- but it goes back to part of what Commissioner Udine was asking is this. Based on the previous projection that said 2.3 students were going to be generated in this unit --

MS. KAMP: Yes.

CHAIR STERMER: -- how many actually showed up.

MS. GOOD: Now, that's a different question.

CHAIR STERMER: I'm just saying, I think there are data points that people are trying to see when we make these projections, are we close to being right.

MS. GOOD: And that --

CHAIR STERMER: I mean, that's part of --

MS. GOOD: -- that's -- that's it.

CHAIR STERMER: -- it's separate and apart from where the children -- separate and apart from when those 1.8 children show up as compared to the 2.3, where they go. We can't control where they go.

MS. GOOD: So we need to better explain what -- I think, to what you want to get, better explain how our projections are done that incorporate those factors, the charters, the private students, those students that may go elsewhere.

MAYOR SEILER: Well, I think what he's saying and how accurate you have been.

MR. DIGIORGIO: Yes.

MS. GOOD: No, that's right. Which is --

MAYOR SEILER: We want to see what happened from 2007 --

MS. GOOD: Yes, sir.

MAYOR SEILER: -- to 2017 so that we can say, okay, 2017, you're making this projection --

MS. GOOD: Yes.

MAYOR SEILER: -- what percentage of likelihood of success --

MS. GOOD: Yes.

MAYOR SEILER: -- we have.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MR. DIGIORGIO: (Inaudible) private schools happened.

CHAIR STERMER: And -- and everybody should actually recognize that this is a different consultant than used previously, just so everybody knows.

MR. DIGIORGIO: So -- so --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. DIGIORGIO: -- Secretary Good pretty much hit the nail on the head right there --

MS. KAMP: Yes.

MR. DIGIORGIO: -- is what we're looking for is the predictability and making sure we can go back and explain it. Do you understand what we're actually looking for, just to be clear so when you come back we -- we can then -- don't have to have the same discussion again?

MS. KAMP: Yes.

MR. DIGIORGIO: Okay. Fantastic. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR STERMER: School Board Member Good.

MS. GOOD: Yes. Yeah, I was going to speak at the end, but --

CHAIR STERMER: You want to speak at the end?

MS. GOOD: -- I -- I'll do that.

CHAIR STERMER: Okay. Commissioner Gomez.

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: My comments are -- my questions have been answered, so.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you. Mr. McColgan. Commissioner Williams. Push that little button with the face on it. Yeah, perfect.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS: There it is, there now. Thank you. A lot of questions, I have a lot of questions. A lot of them have been answered, but one that I'm thinking of, I will get more into this as I'm here on the board. How does the impact fee if a -- if a community comes in and it's senior citizens, are they still paying impact fees? They don't pay (inaudible) School Board.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS: Okay. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, the -- the --

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS: All right.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: If they buy a new house, they do.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MS. KAMP: Deed restricted --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Deed restricted, no.

MS. KAMP: -- age restricted, which is deed restricted housing does not pay school impact fees.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If it's a 55 and over community (inaudible).

CHAIR STERMER: So, Mr. McColgan?

MS. MCGOVERN: If things weren't already complicated, there's a brand new charter school that's proposed to be built in Hallandale on the County Line Road. And most of the list of people -- children who have signed up are from Aventura in Dade County. So we will soon see how that works out. How you figure those (Inaudible.) Many of the children in Hallandale have -- did not know about this. There will be hearings in the city and the City Commission will make a decision on this in the next two weeks.

CHAIR STERMER: Yeah. Mr. Blackwelder.

MR. BLACKWELDER: I'll pass. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Mr. Rosenzweig, welcome.

MR. ROSENZWEIG: Thank you. And being relatively new, this -- this entire discussion is one that never came to our community. Since we're an older community, our schools are older and not in real good shape. And so my story isn't -- isn't the impact fees, it isn't the students coming in.

However, we do have development happening now in the southern part of District 3. And Crystal Lake was brought up, about 400 homes going in there. And there's also discussion with the Toll Brothers actually buying property on the -- the golf course in Century Village, as well. And so that hasn't come to fruition, but I have a strong feeling that that probably will happen in the near future. So those will be issues that will have to be addressed at that time.

The only thing I'm just curious about is the number of charter schools that we've started, and a number of them have failed in the process. I'm just curious what that percentage might be for that. What impact does that have on student generation to the other schools around that area as far as planning and so forth? I don't know if that's anything germane to this discussion, but I'm just curious.

CHAIR STERMER: School Board Member Good wrote it down, so I'm sure she's going to answer it in part of her response, so. Anything else? School Board Member Good.

MS. GOOD: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. So just a little bit. Yes, you can -- you pay impact fees, I think, and I guess I'll allow our consultant and Mr. Akagbosu to -- to respond if I say anything incorrectly. But impact fees are paid, obviously, when a new development is coming in and the house is being built. It's residential.

Yes, a senior citizen may move into that home, but what you have to think of is that unless it's -- it's not -- unless it's deed restricted to a senior housing community such as the Century Village, per se, that through the life of that home, children could live there. I'm sure that we've all lived in communities where -- you know, my house, I had two children. They're in college, so I can no longer be part of that two -- two generation rate, correct?

But -- but communities change. Children come, children go. Certain communities, it's happening more so than ever. So that's why projections are so important, because it takes into consideration the changes within those communities. So communities that at one time were, you know, younger families are changing, and the communities that are older families are changing.

That's the dynamics of projections. Projections I think are vital to everything that we do as a district, and certainly through this -- this study moving forward. So I want to say that it's -- it's critically important that everybody understands the importance of the projections and -- and certainly, out of respect to Commissioner Udine's request, and others', it's really important that they understand how we're coming up with those projections and how we consider other choices that parents have in sending their children to receive an education.

And it could be from a traditional school to a public charter to a private setting to homeschooling. Parents have a multitude of choices, plus legislation now allows students to cross county lines. They no longer have to lie about it. They can literally live in Broward County and go to school all the way up through the State of Florida, if they so choose, as long as there's space and availability. So, you know, it is -- it is a dynamic, it's an important dynamic, and this is an important factor that we have to get right.

And so I want everyone here to understand that as one board member out of nine, I -- I certainly think this is critical to this district. So impact fees, again, are utilized for a specific purpose. I already reiterated the fact that a large part of it goes into debt service. With regard to the charter school component, you know, I just want to say again, that charter school component is considered within the generation rate. And so when a developer comes through, they're -- they're solely paying for what we feel would be an impact to traditional public school students. Charter schools are, again, governed very differently. In Pembroke Pines, as Commissioner Castillo, they're governed by a municipality and a government. Most are not. And so to say that impact fees are going to be used for charter schools in a plural sense when many of the charter schools within this County are privately owned pieces of property, I don't think that taxpayers want to see their dollars going into private property or private gain.

So, number one, it's -- we all need, I guess, a little understanding as to how charter schools are run and function, and many are not governed by a government agency. The issue of chosen to participate, I will say again, the district's given very little leeway with regard to charter schools. When an application comes before us, if they meet specific criteria, we must authorize that government agency -- or that governing body that's going to oversee the charter school. We don't oversee the day to day of charter schools. They get -- they have to meet certain criteria, the curriculum, they're going to meet the needs of all the students, but the state gives us very little wiggle room to deny an application. But we do consider their -- their operations. We do visit them. We do provide them services as a district. There's a multitude of services that we provide all charter schools through this County. And I will just say, I know a comment was made by Commissioner Castillo, and I guess -- and I respect him greatly. It's not an issue of chosen. It's an issue of the ability to have sufficient funds from the State of Florida.

And when the district passed the \$800,000,000 bond, because it was referenced here today, I will say to you that not every other county in this -- in -- in the State of Florida that passes a bond shared it with charter schools, but we did, by the way. And we spent several millions of dollars with regard to technology dollars that were attributed to charter schools, and all those pieces of equipment have been given to those schools. And, in particular, I will say that in Pembroke Pines, we shared over -- close to one and a half, 1.6 million dollars with regard to technology dollars.

So I think the issue of impact fees and how they're used, we -- we need to be careful because of the way that not every school is run for a public purpose. And just right now in Tallahassee, there's several bills that are being contemplated that are going to potentially impact how districts share funds with regard to millage. But as it relates to impact fees and getting back to the point at hand, impact fees and the impact study that we're talking about right now, projections take into consideration the opportunity for students to go to other schools other than traditional public schools, so whether they, you know, go to a charter or go to a private school.

So, Mr. Chair, I -- I will work through our staff and the superintendent, I guess, to ensure that we can get some additional information with regard to projections and how that's configured, because I think it's an important part of the conversation moving forward.

CHAIR STERMER: Absolutely. Commissioner Castillo.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: I -- I totally -- I totally agree with the comments that -- that my colleague made, School Board Member Good. I would actually like to see you include the charter schools in the -- in the rate, and I'd like to see the School Board distribute those dollars to the schools.

MS. KAMP: There's actually state legislation prohibiting use of impact fees on charter schools --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Really?

MS. KAMP: -- unless it's shown that they are mitigating a public school need.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: They all --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: -- they all are.

MS. KAMP: There's a very few, maybe like there's one case they showed that, I believe it was in Palm Beach County. But I can find out more about it and get that --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Yeah, please send that --

MS. KAMP: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: -- over to me, because I'd like to --

MS. KAMP: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: -- share that with -- with -- with my lawyers. However, what I'd like --

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: -- what I'd like to do, because that's -- that's a -- that's a novel -- that's a novel argument. But -- but, please, send -- send that over to me so that -- so we can show that to them. But I think -- I think that the answer here is -- because sometimes what happens is, well, you know, there's two different types of charter schools. There's the privately run and then there's the municipally run ones. But they -- but we end up in the same pot of getting nothing. There doesn't seem to be -- in other words, it's a difference without a distinction. And it's a problem without a solution. And it's an ongoing saga that holds us up from ending meetings. And so --

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: -- and so -- and so I look forward to -- to that and to other things. And I want to thank everybody here for the opportunity.

CHAIR STERMER: Let me -- let me try to bring this in for a landing. One, we thank you. School Board Member Good and I had the opportunity to see this presentation two weeks ago when it came before the Oversight Committee where we sit. And the presentation has gotten better. We thank you.

Let me also suggest to this board that you were spared some inextricably detailed data that went behind this that we could sit here for another week to talk about the data. So, really, we try to make this more of a high level conversation than really getting into the

PLANNING COUNCIL

APRIL 27, 2017

DH/NC

weeds, because the consultant has some of the things we're asking for in different forms and in different charts.

But let me just raise this, because if you look on page 26, and I raised this at the Oversight Committee meeting, so I -- I just want to put it out there now from this body that one of the things looked at in the cost component is the insurance values. And I, for one, I said it to you a couple weeks ago and I'll say it again sitting here this morning, people choose to insure their property and their physical plant and what they choose it to be. And that number doesn't necessarily have to be based on what it may cost to replace it. It's a value they are choosing to having it insured for.

So, to me, I'm not a believer in that use of that data, because I think it's a false number. To me, I think we need to, as part of what you have here and the other cost components, look across this state, understanding we have a statewide building code, and figure out, of the new schools built across this state, what a cost per square foot is, figure that in -- bring that into Broward County, understanding land costs may be different, because there's a land cost component.

But we can figure out, roughly, in the past two or three years what has been spent across the state, because new schools have been built, and there's a statewide building code that everybody has to build to. So it's not like you can build a school differently in Tallahassee than you can in Fort Lauderdale. The code is the code. So we can figure out what a cost per square foot is, understanding land is different. That's the variable that is, but we also know in Broward County the School Board owns most of its land already and it's land banked if they're going to build something new, or -- or they're going to build on a piece of property they already own.

So I'm just saying I think we're different than in some other places, but I -- to me, insurance values is a -- is a -- a slippery slope, because people choose what they want their property valued at for insurance purposes, and that might not have a real relationship to what it costs if that building gets destroyed in today's world. And I think there's been enough construction built, and we all see it driving around the state, of schools going up, so we can figure out what that number is. And I think we should rely more upon that number than the insurance numbers that we talked about a couple weeks ago.

MS. GOOD: Mr. Chair, if I may.

CHAIR STERMER: Yes.

MS. GOOD: So when you're saying for the statewide, but you're talking -- because schools are built not by building code, but SREF. So it's a little -- but that's what you're speaking about?

CHAIR STERMER: But all schools have to be built to the same standard, which --

MS. GOOD: Yes.

CHAIR STERMER: -- which is your reference.

MS. GOOD: Yes, that's true.

CHAIR STERMER: That's what I'm saying.

MS. GOOD: Okay.

CHAIR STERMER: I'm referring to the -- yes, the SREF, which is what the superintendent says us cities couldn't build schools if we wanted to do --

MS. GOOD: Yes.

CHAIR STERMER: -- which we could.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You did.

CHAIR STERMER: But that's a -- we're not going there.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yours are not (inaudible).

CHAIR STERMER: Wait, wait. We're not going there, because I think every mayor sitting here would say please give us the money and we'll build the facilities that -- whatever. We won't go there. It's a separate conversation.

MS. GOOD: Yes.

CHAIR STERMER: We'll stop there.

MS. GOOD: Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: So if you can focus more on the SREF --

MS. GOOD: Yeah.

CHAIR STERMER: -- cost per square foot across the state in the past two or three years, I think that gives us a more current number for what the cost of constructing a school on a per square foot basis is.

MS. KAMP: Yeah. And, absolutely, insurance values is only one of the variables. The graph we showed you was recently built schools. But just so you -- you have it also, we check with the Risk Management Department of the School Board, how do they determine the insurance values, and it's their -- they are looking at the construction indices, they are looking at that facilities. So that's their best estimate of the -- what it

PLANNING COUNCIL

APRIL 27, 2017

DH/NC

cost to build. So it's not -- you know, because it's there and we need to take a look at it, too, but it's only one of the variables, again.

CHAIR STERMER: To me, I -- I get a more independent number when I look at what costs are across the state of actual construction --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

CHAIR STERMER: -- today. No -- no disrespect to Broward County School Board staff. Whatever. Any other comments for the consultant? Mr. Rosenzweig.

MR. ROSENZWEIG: Just like to say, as my first meeting, this has been highly enlightening.

(Laughter.)

MR. ROSENZWEIG: I can't wait for the next meeting.

CHAIR STERMER: Trust me, we won't have -- we don't have many meetings like this with -- with conversations like this, but --

MR. ROSENZWEIG: Well --

CHAIR STERMER: -- I mean, this is part of --

MR. ROSENZWEIG: -- I wish we did, because this is -- this is the kind of information that -- that we need to understand what we're dealing with on the County level and -- and a local level at the same time. And so I appreciate the conversation. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: But let -- let me -- but let me say this --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: This committee -- this committee has always been major league.

CHAIR STERMER: -- this -- one of the things, and there's -- I know there's a meeting this afternoon that some members here may be going to, but for the new members, just so you're aware, this organization, this Council, over the years, has committed to -- and the Executive Director and I have talked about it again, we understand that affordable housing is a significant issue in this County. And this Council has every time talked about the old 1.07.07, which is now 2 point -

MS. BOY: 16.2.

CHAIR STERMER: -- 16.2, the affordable housing issue negotiated between the County and the cities on how to deal with (inaudible) of more than a hundred units and how those affordable housing issues need to be dealt with. But this board has been

PLANNING COUNCIL

APRIL 27, 2017

DH/NC

committed to really looking at the issue of affordable housing, and one of the things we talked about was convening a summit, separate and different than what Commissioner Rich has just done, because hers was more on the funding side and things like that as compared to coming up with issues that we did in this Broward Next with regard to density bonuses and how to go about doing things with regard to affordable housing.

But this Council, I think, has committed in the past, and one of the things we're going to try to put forth, and I'm going to ask the Executive Director to try to coordinate a workshop conversation between this Council, the Board of County Commissioners, and the Broward League of Cities. Let's get the three groups together to say, on a high level, let's -- it's easy to talk about affordable housing, mouth the words on a Tuesday, on a Thursday. And the question is what are we really doing. There's been extensive conversation, and it's come up again at the Broward County Commission, about linkage fees.

Well, I had the Executive Director pull the conversations we've had over the past two or three years about linkage fees, and the projection is it'll raise \$2,000,000, which is a drop in the bucket and doesn't really solve the problem. But it sounds nice. But is -- it's not the solution. We know Ralph Stone can stand here and say we're 60 -- well, we're now 58,000 units shy, because in the last year that we just updated through 2015, we improved Broward County by 8500 affordable housing units.

Whether any of us buy that or not, that's today's methodology. So in seven years, we're not going to have an affordable housing problem, according to the methodology we've all approved. I'm not saying I buy it, but I think we need to have the real life conversation of affordable housing, quality of life housing. Because there's a difference between new units and having units that are on the ground today that are really habitable and -- and substandard housing.

And I think we could solve a lot of things. But I think this group continues to talk about it, the Commission talks about it, and the League of Cities talks about it. And I think it's time, Barbara, on behalf of the Council, I'd like you to coordinate and extend an invitation to the County Administrator on behalf of the Board of County Commissioners that we'd like to convene a summit with the Board of County Commissioners and the Broward Workshop -- a workshop summit with the Board of County Commissioners, the Broward County Planning Council, and the Broward League of Cities. And we'd like to set that up as soon as --

MS. BOY: Correspondence from -- signed by you, I think, right?

CHAIR STERMER: Yes, absolutely.

MS. BOY: Okay.

CHAIR STERMER: More than happy to.

MS. BOY: Okay.

CHAIR STERMER: But I think that's -- and it's a different conversation than Commissioner Rich's conversation about funding related sources, because that's -- a lot of hers focused on funding related. But you know what? Now that we've gotten the County Commission two days ago to adopt Broward Next, and it has strategies in it, okay, let's now have the conversation. So I -- I'd ask you to pen together -- unless there's any objection by any member of the Council, to do that, and we'll get that done quickly and start that ball moving.

MR. DIGIORGIO: Mr. Chair, I think that --

CHAIR STERMER: Mr. DiGiorgio.

MR. DIGIORGIO: -- I think that's an outstanding idea, and I would like to make sure we give enough time for the League of Cities to reach out to the municipalities --

CHAIR STERMER: Yeah.

MR. DIGIORGIO: -- municipalities to get the feedback, because many of the municipalities are already working on the next steps in the implementation.

CHAIR STERMER: That's why we're trying -- especially now, because with the outreach that was done through Broward Next and the strategies that are in there, there are some creative ways to deal with affordable housing. And the answer is it's not, again, a one size fits all to say a development, just for the sake of putting it on the west side of the County, wherever, where there's not adequate transportation, you're creating islands.

Okay, we built four more affordable housing units in a building of a hundred, but if those people who then reside there cannot connect to mass transit, what have we actually done except create four units that people can't then move. You're then telling them they need a car. Well, part of the reason they're living where they are it should be attached to a mass transit system to move them around.

So we need to be smarter about it. And I think that's the conversation, because there is a direct linkage between affordable housing and transportation. And you all know why I - - I raise this issue, and you know my belief on this. And they're lockstep attached with a pair of handcuffs.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

CHAIR STERMER: And I think we have to have those conversations, and I think this board has and will do so again at the earliest convenience. School Board Member Good.

MS. GOOD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to, through you, if I can find out how we're going to best handle getting the information back to the full board that was discussed here today.

CHAIR STERMER: It -- it's my hope that the consultant will communicate further with the Executive Director.

MS. GOOD: Okay.

CHAIR STERMER: When she's got the stuff prepared, she'll get it back to us.

MS. GOOD: Okay.

CHAIR STERMER: At the same time, I would hope that as the consultant makes presentations through the rest of the schedule --

MS. GOOD: Yes.

CHAIR STERMER: -- that the information we've added -- asked for be implemented into her next presentations, so hopefully by the time it moves through the process, how the presentation continues to grow will be in response to various boards and organizations they see, and it may answer questions that others have. So at the end, the hope is that as the report grows, it will be as complete as those that would view it want it to be.

MS. GOOD: Sure.

CHAIR STERMER: That's -- that's -- as one person, that's my hope.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR STERMER: That's my hope.

MS. GOOD: Okay. Perfect.

CHAIR STERMER: So and the consultant, I think, gets that it's beneficial for everybody.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR STERMER: Anybody else have anything else?

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Yes, are we going to get city input on the generation rates?

CHAIR STERMER: There -- the answer is yes. There's now going to be a meeting with the staff working group --

MS. BOY: League of Cities.

CHAIR STERMER: -- which are the planners, which --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Right.

CHAIR STERMER: Yes. Absolutely.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Yeah, that's what I meant. The planning people.

CHAIR STERMER: The answer is yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR STERMER: Commissioner Seiler -- Mayor Seiler.

MAYOR SEILER: The only last comment I would have is all your comments about transportation and affordable housing, the east side agrees with every one of those. So I think we're in agreement. We have been for some time. And so I -- I very much appreciate you bringing that forward, and I hope we, as a body, address that.

CHAIR STERMER: We will. Anybody else? Mr. Rosenzweig.

MR. ROSENZWEIG: Mass transit, on transportation, Mayor Seiler, with the Wave going in in Fort Lauderdale and as Dade County's looking to expand rail, I think that, in our infrastructure, we have to look at some kind of mass transit expansion in -- in our County, and rail is one of the simplest ways of looking at it if we can find some -- some place to run it.

My thought, in Deerfield, I'd love to have a light rail running down Hillsborough Boulevard and loop around that whole area to move people away from coming down to the beach and be able to get there quicker and easier. So, you know, that's something I'd like to see happen at some point in time, where we have a rail transportation and infrastructure program to move people, not cars.

CHAIR STERMER: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR STERMER: If I keep saying some more things, there'll be another bad editorial written about me, so I just won't go there.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR STERMER: But I'll just say I agree with what you're saying.

OTHER BUSINESS:

CHAIR STERMER: With that, we stand adjourned. Have a good morning, everybody.
Thank you.

(The meeting concluded at 11:47 a.m.)