

MINUTES

BROWARD COUNTY PLANNING COUNCIL

August 25, 2016

MEMBERS Commissioner Michael S. Long, Vice Chair

PRESENT: Mayor Daniel J. Stermer, Secretary
Commissioner Richard Blattner
Commissioner Angelo Castillo
Thomas DiGiorgio, Jr.
Charles Fink
Commissioner Michelle J. Gomez
School Board Member Patricia Good
Mary D. Graham
Richard Grosso
Vice Mayor Rita Mack
Robert McColgan
Bernard Parness
Mayor Michael J. Ryan

MEMBERS Anne Castro, Chair

ABSENT: Commissioner Mark Bogen
Neal R. de Jesus
Michael Friedel
Commissioner Bill Ganz

ALSO Barbara Blake Boy, Executive Director

PRESENT: Andy Maurodis, Legal Counsel
Henry Sniezek, Broward County Environmental Protection and Growth
Management
Linda Sunderland, Broward County Environmental Protection and Growth
Management
Lenny Vialpando, Broward County Permitting, Licensing, and Consumer
Protection
Sue Gallagher, Broward County Children's Services Council
Robert Kellogg, Hillsboro Beach
Phil Steinmiller, Port Everglades
Molly Howson, City of Lauderhill
Steven Wherry, Greenspoon Marder
Sermin Tusegeu, ELRPD
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 9:00 a.m.,

Planning Council

8/25/2016

NC

Thursday, August 25, 2016.

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

CALL TO ORDER: Commissioner Michael Long called the meeting to order.

COMMISSIONER LONG: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to the Planning Council for Broward County's meeting for August 25th, 2016. We'd like to get started right now.

In the absence of our Chair, Anne Castro, I am going to take over the beginning of the meeting, then pass it over to Mayor Dan Stermer to take the rest of the meeting, because he has been running with Broward Next since the day it started. But if we could get started right now and stand for our Pledge of Allegiance. And if -- could -- could Mary Graham lead us in the pledge.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

(THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE WAS LED BY MARY GRAHAM.)

ROLL CALL

COMMISSIONER LONG: Thank you. Can we have roll call, please?

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Richard Blattner.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Here.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Mark Bogen. Commissioner Angelo Castillo. Mr. Neal -- Neal de Jesus. Mr. Thomas DiGiorgio, Jr.

MR. DIGIORGIO: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Charles F. Fink.

MR. FINK: Here.

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

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: Here.

THE REPORTER: School Board Member Patricia Good. Ms. Mary D. Graham.

MS. GRAHAM: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Richard Grosso.

MR. GROSSO: Here.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Michael S. Long.

COMMISSIONER LONG: Here.

THE REPORTER: Vice Mayor Rita Mack.

VICE MAYOR MACK: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Robert McColgan.

MR. MCGOLGAN: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Bernard Parness.

MR. PARNES: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Michael J. Ryan.

MAYOR RYAN: Present.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Daniel J. Stermer.

MAYOR STERMER: Here. Ms. Anne Castro, Chair.

COMMISSIONER LONG: Thank you very much. Let the record reflect we do have a quorum. And, with that, I will pass the remainder of the meeting over to Mayor Dan Stermer.

CONSENT AGENDA

AGENDA ITEM C-1 - APPROVAL OF FINAL AGENDA FOR AUGUST 25, 2016

MAYOR STERMER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. At this time, I'd like to get a motion on Item C-1, which is approval of the minutes.

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: So moved.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Second.

MAYOR STERMER: Moved by Commissioner Gomez, seconded by Commissioner Blattner. Any discussion with regard to the item? All those in favor, signify by saying aye. All those opposed? Item passes unanimously. Good morning, Nancy.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

AGENDA ITEM C-2 - AUGUST 2016 PLAT REVIEWS FOR TRAFFICWAYS PLAN COMPLIANCE

AGENDA ITEM C-3

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MAY 26, 2016

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JUNE 23, 2016

AGENDA ITEM C-4 - EXCUSED ABSENCES

MAYOR STERMER: Consent Agenda Items C-2, C-3, and C-4. Included within Item C-4 are requests for excused absences by Mr. Neal de Jesus, Mr. Michael Friedel, and Commissioner Bill Ganz.

MS. BOY: Yes, and, Mayor Stermer, I just would like to mention that School Board Member Good let me know that she's running late, so she should be here this morning.

MAYOR STERMER: Thank you, Madam Executive Director. Is there a motion with regard to the balance of the Consent Agenda, including those excused absence requests?

MAYOR RYAN: Motion.

MAYOR STERMER: Motion by Commissioner --

MR. DIGIORGIO: Second.

MAYOR STERMER: -- by Mayor Ryan, seconded by Mr. DiGiorgio. All those in favor, signify by saying aye. All those opposed? The motion carries unanimously.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

REGULAR AGENDA

AGENDA ITEM R-1 - WETLANDS REPORT

MAYOR STERMER: We are now on to the Regular Agenda. Item R-1, Madam Director.

MS. BOY: Yes, thank you.

Item R-1 is a -- a wetlands presentation by Broward County environmental staff. Linda Sunderland, I believe, is going to be making the presentation. She has a PowerPoint. You may recall that this was requested at your -- at your May Planning Council meeting.

MS. SUNDERLAND: How do I get this to come up to the screen?

MS. BOY: (Inaudible.)

MS. SUNDERLAND: Okay. Thank you. Good morning, Council members. Again, my name is Linda Sunderland. I'm with Broward County Environmental Protection and Growth Management Department as a Natural Resources Manager. Today, I'd like to bring you up to speed and sort of give you a history of the wetlands in Broward County. As you can see on your monitors, there are natural wetlands and constructed wetlands in Broward County.

And for those of you who may not know exactly what a wetland is, it's an area that is inundated, usually, or saturated by surface or groundwater that support specific vegetation. There are certain plants that will only live in certain areas, because they really like to have their feet wet.

The soils are always hydric or alluvial reducing soil conditions, which basically means it's decomposing. And muck soils are indicators of wetland areas. Why are wetlands important? Wetlands provide a lot of functions within the County. They interface between the land and the groundwater. They provide water storage, flood protection, pollution control, water filtration. And they're also biologically productive, as much as a rainforest or a coral reef, according to scientific studies. They provide wildlife habitat and recreational functions, as well.

This is an overview of all of Broward County. And you can see, a lot of it is wetlands. Everglades, the cypress areas. And let's take a little trip through history. So here's Heron Bay in 1953, and the Heron Bay area today. As you can see, it was a lot of just open areas with some ditching, some roads, not much in the '50s, and now it's fully developed.

Sawgrass Mills Mall area in West Sunrise. Again, there's some areas of forested wetlands, pasture wetlands, some ditching, not much development out there. And Sawgrass Mills today. City of Weston, 1969. Not much besides State Road 84 and the canal. And Weston today.

Pines Boulevard, 1980, not that long ago. And Pines Boulevard today. So for those of you who were interested in our level of protection in Broward County for wetlands, there is a Natural Resource Protection Code, it's Chapter 27, Article XI, and there's requirements in there as far as what you have to do before you can impact a wetland. You have to submit an application. We go through the review. We issue a license.

There are a few exemptions. There are some projects that qualify for general licenses. And there's mitigation requirements if you impact wetlands. So priorities of Chapter 27 and the Land Development Code say that wetlands should be avoided as much as

possible. If you can't avoid it, you have to minimize those impacts. And if you can't do those two or after you've done those two, you have to provide the mitigation for those impacts.

Preferably, according to the Land Development Code, the mitigation's provided in-County on site. Second choice is in-County off site, within the same drainage basin. After that, mitigation within eastern Broward County, which is basically east of the levee, and then mitigation off-site outside of the County, which would be a mitigation bank. For the last 32 years, our program has been active issuing licenses. Total number of licenses issued for just wetland impacts is 697.

Now, given a program for 32 years, that doesn't sound like a lot of licenses, but keep in mind that we also issue licenses for docks, seawalls, canals. There's a lot of other stuff we do besides just wetlands. Acres licensed for impacts of almost 19,000, and the acres of mitigation for those impacts is 10,000. You'll notice it's not a one-to-one. We get higher quality wetlands as mitigation than we do for some of the impacted areas, so it's not going to be a one-to-one ratio.

Applications for wetland delineations, a little over 1100. That's when a property owner or potential buyer calls us and says can you tell me if there's wetlands on this property. They submit an application. We go out and we look. We tell them yes or no, and then they decide what they want to do after that. They may get a license. They may not buy the property. They may buy it and develop it, you know, under the regulations.

So the current regulations require avoidance and minimization. It requires us to go out, investigate the property, and evaluate the application and the potential mitigation. When the project is issued, it requires a conservation easement so that we have long-term protection for the mitigation area. And we also require financial assurance from the applicant. This means they give us a letter of credit or a cash bond that says we're going to finish this project, and if we don't, you can take this money and finish it for us. We don't have to do that very often.

Current regulations, mitigation must be required, must be provided if impacts cannot be avoided. And there are certain situations where they can't. There's easements, there's setbacks, ingress and egress for fire department and the wetlands is right in the middle of the property, they can't really avoid it. We know that. Mitigation is not an acre for acre replacement. There's a methodology that we use. It's called the Uniform Mitigation Assessment Method, affectionately known as UMAM, that looks at several factors.

It looks at where is this project located. Is it in an area that's totally undeveloped and may not be developed? Is it pretty high quality stuff, basically -- or is it in the middle of an industrial park? Is it going to be impacted by what's going on around it? So when we say, the landscape, that's what we're looking at. Is it roads? Is it undeveloped? Is it residential. Is it commercial? The water environment, we mean how's the hydrology of the site? Is the hydrology good enough that it'll support a wetland being here and keep

it here in perpetuity? And then the community structure, we look at the plants. Is it all torpedo grass, which is an aggressive plant species, or is it good cypresshead that's been there for a hundred years? We look at the quality.

And we use all of that to run it through a calculation, and it tells us what's the functional loss if we lose this wetland. And if we lose this wetland, how much mitigation are they going to have to give us to offset that loss. So we have a functional loss and a functional gain. And those are the two things that we evaluate for an application. And we try to make sure that the habitat that's lost, whether it's a pasture wetland or a cypress wetland, is replaced with the same sort of habitat as the mitigation.

So here are some constructed wetlands in Broward County. Hopefully, driving by them you wouldn't know if they're constructed or natural. That's the idea. Here are some of our challenges. The County requires that we look at mitigation on-site first. The Corps of Engineers requires applicants to go through a mitigation bank. A lot of our projects require Corps permits, as well.

The FDEP, the State, prefers mitigation banks for most of the small projects, single family homes, small developments. We want mitigation in-County. We don't want to lose this biological function that it's providing. We work with the applicants. If it's a Corps project, we work with them. We recognize the Corps wants it to go to the bank. We will let them take it to the bank. We don't want applicants to have to double mitigate. That's not really fair to them.

There are no remaining in-County mitigation banks. We used to have one. It was the Florida Mitigation Bank out in Pembroke Pines that got sold out years ago. So now if someone wants to use a mitigation bank, they have to go to Everglades Mitigation Bank, which is down in south Miami-Dade. They go to Loxahatchee, which is just across the County line to the north, or the new mitigation bank, it's called the Hole in the Donut, and it's down in Everglades National Park.

Now, I often get the question why don't we have another mitigation bank in the County. Well, there's not a piece of property left big enough, because to license a mitigation bank, they usually want over 500 acres in one block of property, and we don't have that. So the question that Mr. Grosso asked last time is what are the wetlands that should be protected in Broward County? What can we do to protect those?

So mangrove wetlands are one of the limited resources in Broward County. They're coastal. They're highly, you know, targeted for impacts from developers who want to be close to the beach or on the beach or near those areas. So we have West Lake Park, which, thank goodness, was set aside years ago. It's a huge mangrove area. And there's some other privately held properties close to that. And if they're developed or when they're developed, they could impact mangroves and possibly also impact, have secondary impacts to the park. We also have some old growth cypress areas. The orange lines up there are just showing you a few of the lines of old cypress that are left

up in the Parkland area. There's not a lot of them. There's a few in Coconut Creek, mostly in Parkland and Coral Springs.

Most of the remaining wetlands are pastures. They've been agricultural, you know, farmlands for years. And this is pretty much a lot of what's left are pastures, Melaleuca areas, or Brazilian pepper areas. And they all provide a biological function, so we still protect them as much as possible. Now, the other -- second question was how well do our planning policies protect these. So all wetlands are important in Broward County. Whether it's Melaleuca, Brazilian pepper, pasture, or cypress, we look at it as a viable wetland that provides a biological function.

The County's ordinance are more stringent than a lot of the other regulatory agencies as far as requiring mitigation in-County, avoidance, minimization, and mitigation requirements. All of those are required. And conservation easements are required. So thank you for your interest.

MAYOR STERMER: We appreciate it.

MS. SUNDERLAND: And do we have any questions?

MAYOR STERMER: Anybody have any questions? Mr. Grosso.

MR. GROSSO: If -- if I may.

MAYOR STERMER: Please.

MR. GROSSO: Thank you. Thank you --

MS. SUNDERLAND: Certainly.

MR. GROSSO: -- for the -- for this. You know, I had a chance to work with Broward County staff last week, and a bunch of law students and young kids, on pulling out exotics from a piece of County-owned property on the North Fork.

MS. SUNDERLAND: Okay.

MR. GROSSO: And the County staff does a great job on --

MS. SUNDERLAND: Thank you, sir.

MR. GROSSO: -- on those sort of things. It was really a pleasure working with them. My -- you mentioned a challenge that we're sort of at the mercy of federal and state permitting laws and permitting agencies when we do wetland permitting, too. And my experience is that you're right about that. But yet, to me, the question to you really is have we maximized our land use planning authority?

When we rely on wetland permits to protect wetlands, we're preempted by state law. We have to use the UMAM, we have to do mitigation that's State required, but there's nothing about state or federal law that preempts the County's ability to say those remaining wetlands, they need -- those cypress wetlands, maybe those wetlands along West Lake Park, they really shouldn't be developed at anywhere near the level that our language now allows.

Have we maximized our land use planning authority on wetlands to say perhaps an urban intense development designation isn't appropriate for those? We're going to change that?

MS. SUNDERLAND: I think that's more of a -- a legal question than a scientific question, so, Lenny, do you want to take that one or somebody else?

MR. VIALPANDO: I don't know about the land use piece.

MS. SUNDERLAND: Yeah, I -- I don't know your land use authority enough to answer that question --

MR. GROSSO: Well, I think --

MS. SUNDERLAND: -- so that's --

MR. GROSSO: -- let's assume for purposes of my question that I'm right, because I am, that we have that land use authority. To me, it's more a question of, as a practical matter, how do we look at the language designation for our remaining wetlands and ask ourselves is that the appropriate designation, should that wetland develop the way this Land Use Plan currently allows it?

MS. SUNDERLAND: I don't know if the Council has done that or not.

MR. GROSSO: I think that's ultimately the most effective way we can protect wetlands. We clearly have the legal authority to do that, and that's the exercise that I think we should be engaging in. If the answer is there's so few of them that it doesn't -- it wouldn't make a difference, then that's one answer. If the answer is they're meaningful enough to protect, then let's use our land use authority to protect them. Then that should be the answer, and I think that's ultimately --

MS. SUNDERLAND: I'm not --

MR. GROSSO: -- the question we should be asking here.

MS. SUNDERLAND: -- Henry, step in if you'd like. But I'm not sure that there's enough of them left at this point that it's -- what you would do would be above and beyond what

we're already doing. I think we have enough authority in the Code that we can protect and make them avoid and minimize as much as possible without the Council spending a lot of time and -- and doing all that type of evaluation. Okay?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

MR. VIALPANDO: Leonard Vialpando, Broward County Environmental Protection and Growth Management Department. And just to your question, we have over 10,000 acres of wetlands currently under conservation easement, which are -- you know, we try to generally put them in larger pockets, make them easier to manage and, you know, places that we can actually keep the exotics that you mentioned out of. Most of the remaining wetlands are these small pocket wetlands, which one of the reasons why the federal government does require that you have mitigation banks is the small pocket wetlands are difficult to maintain. They're difficult to keep exotics out of, and they're often difficult for homeowner associations and such to be responsible for.

So, you know, the reason why we haven't necessarily looked at, you know, land use and trying to designate these areas is just that they're so small and they're so spread out that it's easier to make a scientific determine at the time of development as to the usefulness of that wetland and then make a decision about whether or not it should be protected or whether or not it can be relocated into maybe a larger area where we can aggregate that benefit and make it something that's more cost effective and more easily managed, while maintaining that type of resource in the County.

MR. GROSSO: Okay. Thanks.

MAYOR STERMER: Any other questions? Thank you all. We appreciate it.

MS. SUNDERLAND: Thank you.

MR. VIALPANDO: Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM R-2 - COUNSEL'S REPORT

MAYOR STERMER: Mr. Maurodis, Counsel Report.

MR. MAURODIS: I have no report this morning.

AGENDA ITEM R-3 - EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

MAYOR STERMER: Madam Executive Director?

MS. BOY: Good morning. Thank you. First, I just -- when we did the excused absence requests, I think you probably wanted to add Anne Castro to that for --

MAYOR STERMER: I -- I apologize.

MS. BOY: -- personal emergency. I just realized it afterwards.

MAYOR STERMER: Yes. I received a call from the Chair at about 8:30 that she had a family situation that she needed to deal with, and said she would not be joining us. She sends her regrets. Anne had -- the Chair has been the spear, the tip of the spear on the Broward Next project, so we know it's an important issue if she's not here with us this morning. So I'd add Chair Castro to the list of excused absences under C-4.

MS. BOY: Okay. Thank you. The other item I just wanted to bring up is Item PH-3 is a first Public Hearing on a land use amendment to amend the text of the Margate Transit Oriented Corridor. It's adding some uses and taking some away. Since it's the first Public Hearing, our rules require a courtesy notice be sent out. We sent out about 4500 of those notices.

Unfortunately for me, I made the error of putting a 10:00 start time, because it was before we changed the time of the meeting to 9:00 a.m. So the notices went out with the 10:00 o'clock start time. So our staff is going to go in the hallway at 9:40. We don't have anyone yet signed in to speak on that item. They're going to go in the hallway, take speakers until about 10:15 or whenever a natural break would be for you. So I'd just ask you to hold that item however you -- you take your actions or motions. So I just wanted to point that out. And then last thing is I would let you know that no one has signed in to speak on Items 1, 2, 4, or 5. And that concludes my report.

MAYOR STERMER: Thank you, Madam Chair (sic).

PUBLIC HEARING

AGENDA ITEM PH-1 - RECERTIFICATION PC 16-10

AGENDA ITEM PH-2 - AMENDMENT PC 16-6

**AGENDA ITEM PH-4 - FLEXIBILITY ZONE BOUNDARY MODIFICATION - PCFSBM
16-1**

AGENDA ITEM PH-5 - AMENDMENT PCNRM 16-1

MAYOR STERMER: Is there a motion with regard to PH-1, 2, 4, and 5, or does anybody --

MS. GOOD: I'll make the motion.

MAYOR STERMER: -- the Items PH-1, 2, 4, and 5 have been moved by School Board Member Good.

COMMISSIONER LONG: Second.

MAYOR STERMER: Second by Commissioner Long. Any member of the Board wish to pull any of those items and not move them? Madam Secretary, please call the roll.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Richard Blattner.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Mark Bogen. Commissioner Angelo Castillo.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Neal de Jesus. Mr. Thomas H. DiGiorgio, Jr.

MR. DIGIORGIO: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Charles F. Fink.

MR. FINK: Yes.

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

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: Yes.

THE REPORTER: School Board Member Patricia Good.

MS. GOOD: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Ms. Mary D. Graham.

MS. GRAHAM: Yes.

THE REPORTER: That was a yes?

MS. GRAHAM: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Richard Grosso.

MR. GROSSO: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Michael S. Long.

COMMISSIONER LONG: Yes.

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

MR. MCCOLGAN: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Bernard Parness.

MR. PARNES: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Michael J. Ryan.

MAYOR RYAN: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Daniel J. Stermer.

MAYOR STERMER: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Ms. Anne Castro, Chair.

MAYOR STERMER: Thank you. The item passes.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

AGENDA ITEM PH-6 - BROWARD COUNTY LAND USE PLAN TEXT AND MAP AMENDMENTS

- A. AMENDMENT PCT-16-5
- B. AMENDMENT PCT 16-6
- C. AMENDMENT PCT 16-7
- D. AMENDMENT PCT 16-8
- E. AMENDMENT PCT 16-9
- F. AMENDMENT PCT 16-7
- G. AMENDMENT PCNRM 16-2

MAYOR STERMER: But let's -- let's do this. Understanding we're going to wait for at least 10:15 on Item PH-3, let's begin with Item PH-6.

MS. BOY: Okay.

MAYOR STERMER: I presume we'll be here for a while. And I think this actually is a rather historic day to have this come forth today. This has been a work in process that has involved not only our staffs but the -- but other County staff, Mr. Sniezek. And it should be recognized, as this board knows, that there has been an extensive outreach program with regard to the Broward Next process.

I can't think of really a process that has involved so much outreach in recent history coming out of here that we really try to touch everybody that would be impacted by this. Barbara did. I'm sorry, not we.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'll second it.

MS. BOY: I didn't touch anyone.

MAYOR STERMER: Our Executive Director and our team have done, in conjunction with Henry and his team, and other parts of County government, have really done a yeoman and yeowoman's job of doing what needs to be done to bring this Land Development Code and the related things current, because times have changed since this was last done. So, Madam Director, on behalf of the Council, we want to thank you and turn it over to you.

MS. BOY: Thank you. Thank you so much, Mayor Stermer, for the kind words. It's really -- it really is exciting to be here. I think I'm really kind of a planner nerd. We were talking about where we are kind of in the process, and we started our kickoff meeting for this project on August 28th, 2014. So we've kind of come, you know, a long way in the two years.

And while it feels like it's taken a long time to get here, I think the -- the product that you have before you and the proposals is a really good effort, and it's really taken in so many of the comments that we received from the public and the community and municipalities. And I'm really pleased with what you have before you.

Just as a note from that, the books that we prepared that you received in the mail, we prepared them that way so that you can take them with you if you want to. You don't need to leave those behind. They're to-go books, if you -- if you want. You can leave them here. Whatever your preference is. But that's why we kind of packaged it like that.

So with that, Henry's here with me. I think if -- at the end, if I've missed anything, he'll maybe wrap up with that, but I'm going to get started with the presentation. And, as Mayor Stermer said, I want to take us back to 1977, because that's when the Land Use Plan was very first adopted. So in 1977, what was going on? We were watching Happy Days on TV, the Six Million Dollar Man. Maybe you were driving a Ford Pinto if you were around. Great fashion. You know, nice denim suit for the ladies. And we were watching Star Wars, and Jimmy Carter was president.

So there we go. So that was 1970s. So that was when the very first Land Use Plan was established in Broward County. Then it was updated in 1989. And what did the 1980s bring us? You were probably hanging out watching Cheers, watching Cops, kind of established in Broward County. Maybe that was related to the Land Use Plan. Maybe driving a Yugo. Some more denim fashion for the ladies, and I know we're going with the acid wash here. Watching -- Rainman was the Academy Award winner. And George Bush was president. So really the point of that slide is just to bring us to how did Broward Next really begin. So we had the Broward County Charter in the 1970s, so we

did initial 1977 plan, then updated in 1989 after the 1985 Growth Management Legislation, and we've been living with that plan, basically based off a 1977 plan, for close to 40 years.

Those plans were really based on lower density auto-oriented design, really a suburban kind of model. That's what we were looking at. So in 2014, the County Commission made a decision, and the Planning Council agreed with the initiation, it's time to have a major update to the plan. You know, kind of forget the evaluation appraisal reports that were, you know, required by -- are required by the state, but, really, let's take a comprehensive look at the Land Use Plan and see how we can bring this plan into the 21st century and really improve it and make it work for the County and municipalities.

So with that, I just want to touch on the outreach and coordination that Mayor Stermer was talking about. We had an ad hoc steering committee that was Planning Council members, League of Cities, County Commissioners. We had many workshops, over 80 visits to interested parties and municipalities. Our internet survey received many email comments. Here's a quick breakdown of what it looked like for our different audiences. You know, the font is small, but you can see we went to 22 city commissions, many interested party professional kind of groups, a student group, civic associations, the County Commission and government agencies. You saw presentations here. Many different advisory boards, County advisory board, municipal advisory boards.

So I really think that, you know, we really made an effort with the outreach. And if someone invited us, we showed up, and, you know, we were there to talk to them about Broward Next and about these efforts. So today, your Public Hearing, there's seven items. They're labeled in your book A through G. And each one of them interact together. So there's no piece of this that really stands on its own. All of these pieces are really going to work together.

I'm going to take you through each of the sections. Section 1 and 2, the highlighted regional issues and policies, we're going to touch on those first, then I'll take you through just a quick explanation of the definitions, how the permitted uses section has changed. Section 3, these recommended practices, these are should policies, programs that the County does not mandate but wants to promote for the municipalities and give them that, how the County Land Use Plan map would change based on these policies and permitted uses.

And then finally the Natural Resource Map Series, you know, how that map series is proposed to be adopted and changed with that. So Section 1 of the -- of the new plan, so this will be the first almost 40 pages of the plan, broken down into these seven highlighted regional issues: climate change resilience, targeted redevelopment, multimodal transportation, natural resource protection, attainable housing, disaster planning, and renewed partnership intergovernmental coordination. And all of these things are going to work together, and that's what we kind of see through this document, is none of these really stand on their own because they're all interact -- interacting with

each other, whether it's the transportation and housing section or whether it's protection of environmental resources when encouraging redevelopment.

Section 2, these are the policies that we're going to talk about. Enabling legislation for the countywide programs, anything that requires -- has a statutory requirement, how that policy plays in; implementation requirements and incentive programs. And we're going to go through the details of those. The next several slides are really a summary of key policies. This is outlined in your memo, and this is basically replicating the information that was -- that's in the report, you know, but if you have any -- I'm trying to just give you an overview, a quick overview of all those things.

So first with climate change resilience. This is kind of our -- our key, our number one kind of thing, because climate resilience is going to affect or impact development kind of across the board. So supporting further mitigation in the adaptation strategies consistent with the County's adopted climate action plan. You know, the -- you may be aware that the County has a Climate Action Committee, and so many of those recommendations are tied into this updated plan.

Support and utilize priority planning areas as part of the Land Use Plan amendment process. We're already doing that. We're going to continue to do that. And that's the establishment of if you're proposing a land use change and you're in a priority planning area, subject to maybe two foot level sea rise in 60 years, how are you or the -- and/or the municipality planning to deal with that, what are the policies that are in place. And then, finally, something that was just adopted early last year, the identification and adoption of Adaptation Action Areas. So these are further identified on the priority planning area map and areas for further planning consistency and perhaps more opportunities to get grants for planning and preservation.

Targeted redevelopment, maintaining the County approval requirements for Activity Center designations. So right now, which I'm going to tell you about in a few minutes, is that we're proposing to combine all mixed use area designations into a single Activity Center designation. This retains the County's approval requirement for that. So if you have an area already established, you maintain those intensities and densities, but if you want to establish a new area, you will be required to do a County Land Use Plan amendment.

Continuing to support smart growth policies and emphasizing the housing and transportation connection. We adopted smart growth policies into the County plan about six or seven years ago, but these policies are going to continue to be in the plan, and we've updated several of them. Supporting the redevelopment program, including use for attainable housing proposals, to -- tying the redevelopment areas to attainable housing opportunities.

And then also retaining the policies of -- about the barrier island development. Right now, there's limitations on whether or not there's enhanced approval process for a barrier island. For allocations of flex and reserve, you're limited to what you can do east

of the Intracoastal Waterway. We're retaining that policy throughout the document.

We're also retaining the golf course conversion review requirements. This was something that came into the plan in 2008 after several golf course proposals. So when a proposal is made to amend a land use on a golf course, there are several criteria that have to be met to even make the proposal. Historic trees, drainage, how it integrates with the surrounding community, if there -- if you're taking away open space, how you're mitigating for that open space.

This will retain the compatibility review requirements for allocations of flex and the new redevelopment units, which we'll talk about in a minute. This will really -- keeps this for established neighborhoods, single family. We know many of these areas want to continue to be protected. Many of the lower density areas want to be protected, so it maintains and retains that requirement. All Land Use Plan amendments allocation of flex reserve redevelopment units are going to be required to demonstrate adequate facilities and services, including public school concurrency.

That's very important. As I've been reviewing this with several different agencies over the past couple weeks, that's one of the primary questions, well, how can we just give this unit. Well, we're not. There's a -- there's a tick list of things that you have to demonstrate that you've met to be able to do these things, and public facilities and services is at the top of that list. So that's retained in the County Land Use Plan. Multimodal transportation, this was -- this was kind of our first highlighted regional issue, that this was our example that we created of how the plan would look. So the strategies here are really promoting Complete Streets where it's context sensitive and appropriate. We amended the Land Use Plan about three years ago to include these policies, so these strategies will continue to promote that, and always remembering where appropriate. You know, we're not talking about I-95 being a Complete Street, you know, and that sort of thing. Just keeping it in that context.

Retaining existing port and aviation Land Use Plan policies. Very important to plan for some of our biggest economic engines. And retaining the Broward County Trafficways Plan dedication requirements. Many of you are -- you know, are aware of the Trafficways Plan. It's one of your -- it's one of your main work programs. But it's saved the County billions of dollars since it's been in place, basically since the 1960s, for right of way dedication requirements. And that will be maintained in the policies. Natural resource protection, really, we've gone to -- we've taken the policies that -- that are -- have been existing in the plan since the -- since 1989, because it's been very successful, and we've carried those over to the new plan.

We'll also continue to have the requirement of open space of a minimum of three acres per thousand permanent residents for municipalities. Continue to protect historic, archeological, and paleontological -- sorry -- resources. Support the County's policy to oppose fracking. There's a new policy in Section 2 for that, to support that opposition. And supporting compatible urban -- urban agriculture. When we first started our

outreach meetings, it was -- it was a little bit surprising to me the amount of input that we received on being able to -- people who wanted how to -- how can we encourage urban agricultural uses. So we feel like we put the policies in the plan that municipalities, if they so choose, have the support of the County plan to enable that.

Affordable or attainable housing, one of the highlighted regional issues. This first bullet is about retaining Policy 1.07.07, which we know it as today. The number will be changing. We're retaining that policy. If you have a Land Use Plan amendment and you're proposing more than 100 new dwelling units to be added to the countywide Land Use Plan, you're subject to demonstrating your policies, your municipal policies for promoting and maintaining attainable housing within your community. The addition to this policy that's reflected in the copy that you have today is you may recall text amendment PCT 16-1, and that was tabled by the Planning Council at your May meeting. This language, you had asked the County Commission to make it as part of Broward -- the Broward Next package, and that's what we've done, is we've included that -- that language to the old 1.07.07 -- and I'm sorry, I haven't learned the new number yet. It's like 2.16.2, but --

MAYOR STERMER: We're going to have problems with that one.

MS. BOY: -- I'm pretty sure that -- I know. One of -- the County Attorney told me the other day, like, you can't change this number. This is what it's called. So that's reflected in the update of the plan. The strategies and the highlighted regional issues supports the identification and implementation of sustainable funding sources for attainable housing. I actually should have mentioned that, because it also supports it for transportations opportunities -- I left that out in the multimodal slide -- which I think is very timely and relevant.

Also related to attainable housing, we're going to -- the new plan will authorize an attainable housing density bonus program. And this is exciting to us because we have a density bonus program that's been in place for ten years that's never been utilized. And part of the reason was it was tied to the allocations of flex and reserve, and it was pretty complicated, the formulas were pretty complicated. Hopefully, we've simplified it so that anything that's -- will be maintained for at least 15 years will be able to maybe access market rate units, additional market rate units if they're restricting the units to moderate or low or very low.

Allowing municipalities to count efficiency and studio units as a half a unit for density purposes. I think this is also kind of an exciting kind of concept. So if you are building a unit which is less than 500 square feet, the municipality will have the option of counting that as a half a unit. Impact fees would still be paid on a unit -- per unit basis, so it won't have an affect there. It's really just for density calculations that we're proposing that. And municipalities can chose to use that calculation or can choose to use one unit to one unit. So this will just be an option that they'll be able to have. Supporting alternative construction techniques that meet building codes as maybe alternatives for cost savings

that can maybe promote attainable housing, the plan also promotes that. Disaster planning and post-disaster redevelopment. So, when I used to make this presentation, I used to say things like, gosh, it's been now 11 years since we've had a hurricane. It looks like we may yeah, something may be going on. That's what I'm saying. So even more important and timely now, supporting long-term recovery efforts, post-disaster redevelopment strategies.

It -- and housing is actually included here because if it's resistant -- wind load resistant, that could actually be an option. So this is kind of part of disaster planning. Addressing repetitive loss properties, we'll be adopting a new map into the Natural Resource Map Series eventually. Enhancing hurricane evacuation modeling. We've been working with the -- the Emergency Management agency to improve -- to improve that. And one of the things that I would note is that if a Land Use Plan amendment is proposed east of Federal Highway, they're subject to this modeling, and we get an estimate for the impact to whether or not it would impact evacuation times. So it is part of the current review that we go over, and that will continue.

Renewed intergovernmental partnership. This is -- this is kind of my favorite part, because, to me, this is the part where I think we've really done -- done a lot of work to work with the municipalities, to work with the development community and really come up with ideas that can positively impact the County and the municipalities, positively impact economic growth and development. I think it's a really -- this is -- like I said, it's my favorite part because I'm a planning nerd. So first thing here is reforming the County Land Use Plan flexibility rules by eliminating all of the flexibility zones.

Right now, the County plan breaks down every -- the entire County into 125 plus or minus zones, and now each municipality will become its own flex zone. While that doesn't sound really exciting, what it's going to do for a lot of communities, it's going to free up flex and reserve units that are kind of stuck in areas that will never be really redeveloped, the very low density, it's going to free them up to use in other places in the municipality.

You know, municipalities will identify receiving and non-receiving areas, they'll be able -- they'll be promoting those along transportation corridors and activity centers. I think it's a really exciting concept which we tried to actually put in place several years ago by encouraging a unified flex zone application, but, really, we only had three or four municipalities that participated in that, so this is going to do this for -- for all 31 municipalities.

We're also proposing to freeze the flex and reserve units, no net loss. Municipalities will be able to continue to utilize those units. And once they've gotten to the bottom of that pile, we're introducing a new pool of units call redevelopment units. And that's three percent -- based on three percent of the County units at the time of adoption of the plan. That's about 35,000 units right now. And those units won't be disseminated to the municipalities like flex and reserve will. Municipalities will be able to apply to be able to

access those. They can access them in pools of 500 units, and if they have an affordable housing set aside, they can apply for pools of 750 units. And that way, municipalities who aren't interested in providing additional density in their municipalities don't just have them kind of sitting there, kind of with no place to go.

Another really key thing that we've proposed is for these existing activity centers that we were talking about. You know, we talked about that we're combining the Regional Activity Center, Local Activity Center, Transit Oriented Corridors, Transit Oriented Development Mixed Use Residential category into a single Activity Center. When you look at your permitted uses section of your package, you'll see Activity Centers are listed at the beginning. And there will be -- there's no net loss to those. Those uses will be maintained.

But what this plan is proposing to do is that every five years, a municipality can increase its development pool, residential and non-residential development, by doing a local amendment only. If they need greater than that 20 percent or the 500 units, whichever is less, then they would have to come back to the County Commission for -- to the Planning Council and County Commission for a text amendment, but this will give a little bit more flexibility in how the local plan operates and -- and what they can do. This doesn't include the barrier island. Right now, there's just one activity center on the barrier island. That's in the City of Fort Lauderdale. So they will not be permitted this every five years. That would require a County amendment if they want to increase or change any of the uses in -- on that activity center.

So, like I said, that would be subject to the local Land Use Plan amendment process only, so we would only see that for recertification, confirming that it's consistent with the County rules, and was -- and was done consistent with that and gone through the state process. Another highlight is the authorization of municipal transfer of development rights programs. Again, this is around Policy 171 in -- in Section 2, and that really -- this was kind of the impetus for the start of Broward Next. There was a proposal that we should just be permitting transfer of development rights. The attorneys were of the opinion that it was not authorized by the countywide Land Use Plan. There was a lot of interest from municipalities. So this would be a program that would be optional for them to take advantage of if they meet the criteria, but, again, not required to. So this is something that's not required and is an option.

A lot of the input that we received in the beginning was related to the platting process and how that works. While we can't change exactly how the platting process works, we have proposed to increase the exemptions for platting requirements from five acres to ten acres. Supporting environmental and social justice for underserved populations. Again, you know, this is something that kind of came up in a couple of different conversations. You know, one person would suggest, hey, we should be protecting the aging populations when we're making transportation policy and decisions. And then someone else would say, well, we should be protecting children or racial minorities when we're doing this. So we developed a policy that I think really talks -- speaks to that

and really protects all underserved populations when making land use and planning decisions in the County. And I think that that's -- it's kind of groundbreaking for the County plan, because it wasn't a consideration, a formal consideration, earlier in the process.

So that's a quick summary -- quick summary of -- really, that's Section 1 and Section 2 of the policies. The next section in there is the Broward County Land Use Plan definitions. I'm not going to spend a lot of time on that, but what we did with the definitions, we went through to really extract anything that was obsolete or outdated, no longer a statutory requirement, was no longer in -- referenced in a policy in the County plan. So we just really changed those policies to -- to update the -- to reflect the 21st century.

The next section is the permitted uses section, also in Section 2. Permitted uses and implementation. And there are a couple of highlights here just to touch on, which I've already mentioned -- or maybe not. The first thing that we've proposed with the permitted uses section is to collapse the non-residential uses to create a commerce category. So that's collapsing commercial, industrial, office park, employment center high, and employment center low on the County plan, streamlining that.

Then there's a policy in Section 2 that says that municipalities can be more restrictive and can have multiple categories, but this would put it at the discretion of the municipality how they -- how that functions, and as long as their permitted uses are consistent with the County plan, they can have one category or they can have 16, as long as the uses are consistent. We're proposing to collapse the community facilities and utilities categories.

We're proposing to collapse, like I mentioned, the activity center, create the single activity center category. And, again, that will result in no net loss to the permitted uses, non-residential and residential, that are permitted by the plan today. We've proposed to allow for the minimal conversion of recreation/open space (inaudible) for a couple of uses. And the criteria that's set out is it's less than five acres for public use. And this was really developed because we've had about eight proposals over the past probably seven or eight years for fire station sites where municipalities have the location and the park that they want to -- that's the best location for the fire station, and they've had to do a County amendment to do that.

If the city chooses, they can allow this in the plan, and the criteria are -- is that it's less than five acres, it's restricted to a public use only, and that they continue to meet their three acres per thousand. So if they were going to drop down below that -- and also that they're going to continue to serve the neighborhood in which the open space exists. So that's going to be in the plan. If a municipality wants to enable that, they can. And if they don't want to, they don't have to. They can still require a County -- they can still require an amendment. And the bottom line, municipal plans can be more restrictive in these permitted uses. Very important. No net loss to the permitted uses.

Section 3 is the recommended practices section. And in this section, what we did is this is primarily existing policies, and, like I said before, they're policies that the County does not mandate but that it supports and wants to show the municipalities that they support. The next bullets are policies that we've added in based on input that we received. Discouragement of food deserts. You know, access to nutritious food kind of goes to that. Preservation of marine industry uses. Encouragement of safe routes to schools and parks. Reduction of light pollution.

And what I would say about Section 3, one of the important things is that additional policies may be added during the transmittal phase of this project. And I'll talk about that during the timeline at the end of the presentation. The Broward County Land Use Plan map. This goes -- this includes the proposed permitted uses changes, which is collapsing the non-residential uses to the commerce category, combining the activity center categories, combining community facilities and utilities into the public use. So that's -- sorry, I forgot I had a slide on this. So, again, no net loss to the -- to property rights. Local governments may always be more restrictive than what's depicted on this plan. So this is what the existing use -- existing map looks like today. And if the proposed changes are adopted, this is what it would look like.

And, really, what I think the difference between the two maps is the areas that we see in red here, it just becomes much more apparent where the non-residential uses are, and kind of those kind of economic centers. And then the blue areas are the activity centers, and you can see they expand from many of the transportation corridors such as Federal Highway and State Road 7. And then, you know, there's a few sprinkled out -- out in the western areas.

The Natural Resource Map Series, in your backup materials, there's a table. It goes through each of the existing maps that are in the plan today. There are two maps that are proposed to be deleted. They're also in your backup, but they're labeled proposed to be deleted. One of the important ones is the elimination of the urban infill area. When that was established in the 1990s, it had a different -- there was something -- there were different development patterns in the 1990s. So the urban infill area became one of the areas that, west of the urban infill area, the limitations for flex and reserve were exactly the same as east of the Intracoastal Waterway.

What we've seen for -- through development proposals and redevelopment proposals is the -- what we used to refer to as the suburban low density areas, they have a need and are -- and are working towards creating these kinds of town centers and creating these areas for their residents. So we've eliminated that -- that map and that -- that language. The exhibits that are in your backup, 1 through 5. Exhibit 1 is all goals, objectives, or policies that are proposed to be deleted from the plan. And those are policies that are no longer -- maybe no longer valid, they're obsolete, maybe they were taken up in the strategy section or changed in the policies. Or maybe we had six policies and we only needed one. So trying to really streamline the plan, refocus on these regional issues,

and that's what we were trying to accomplish. Exhibit 2, support documents and data. That's a listing of all the different plans and studies that we've utilized or taken a look at when we've been developing these policies.

Exhibit 3, the outreach meeting and email contact summary. That's a detailed listing of all of the meetings that we've had, the over 80 meetings. You can see what municipalities we were at, what -- what zoning boards, what homeowners associations, Smart Growth, Realtors Association, the -- sorry -- the Downtown Urban Core Workshop. You know, there's a lot of different agencies that we met with. So that's a listing of that, and then plus all of our email contact that we've had since we established the email list two years ago.

Exhibit 4 is the initial focus area comments that were received during our first outreach meetings on each of these topics. So that was part of how we developed our policies, also, if we could -- if we could address it. Survey results. We had done a survey in early 2015 based on these initial focus area comments. Those results are included in the exhibits. And then the outline, and that's the outline that you were presented with last summer, and basically follows the product that you have in A through G of your materials. And then Exhibit 5 is any written comments that we've received as of this writing. So, staff recommends approval.

That's kind of a joke, but it's not. Staff recommends approval of transmittal of this. The next step is to take it to the County Commission for their consideration for transmittal to the state review agencies. If you all support transmittal today, we'll be working with County administration to schedule that Public Hearing. Once the County Commission takes an action to transmit it to the State, the State will have 30 days to review the package.

Once that comes back, in a normal plan amendment, it would come back right to you the next month and -- and schedule the next Public Hearing. In this case, because of the -- kind of the extent of this proposal, we have 180 days to adopt the final product or even ask for an extension. And I think our plan is to continue -- not I think -- our plan is to continue public outreach and also making sure that things aren't conflicting within places of the plan, because I -- that's one of -- that's probably my main fear is we're going to get done with this and I'll be like I never even anticipated that was going to happen.

So we'll be taking -- it won't come right back to you. Once the State completes the review, we'll probably have some more workshops, still taking input, trying to make the changes and adjustments that will give you all the best plan that we can have. This is just a -- the -- a reminder of the timeline. May and June, you have presentations. Today is the Public Hearing date. The County Commission, we will coordinate with County administration to set that Public Hearing date. I anticipate the end of September or early October for that. And I would also ask that if you will all recommend transmittal today, that you reach out to your County Commissioners that appointed you to talk

about your support for this. Henry and I will be scheduling meetings with the Commissioners to go through the content and what's in the plan, but it would probably mean a lot if you were able to support it with your County Commissioner. Before I hand it over to you, I just don't know if Henry has anything that he wants to add to what I've said.

MAYOR STERMER: Mr. Sniezek?

MR. SNIEZEK: Just one minute. Good morning. Henry Sniezek, Environmental Protection and Growth Management Department. And I think, you know, Barbara did a great job summarizing it, so I'm not going to belabor anything, but just a couple comments. Number one is when I saw the slides with 1977 and 1989, it made me realize that in 1989 I had already -- I was in my fifth year at the Planning Council.

So it makes me feel -- actually, Mr. Fink was on the Planning Council. He was already gone from the Planning Council for three years in 1989, I believe. So it just struck me how long it's been since, you know, the Planning Council's been around. It's been a, you know, pleasure working with Barbara and her staff. She's worked very hard, and the whole staff's worked very hard. I've worked very hard, and the County staff has worked very hard on this. But, really, we couldn't have done anything without your support and the support a lot of people gave us. You know, we got comments from all over the place.

So I think the product that's before you today is -- is a balanced document that tries to weigh many different perspectives. And, you know, are there things in there that you're not going to like? Probably, you know. But, hopefully, the pluses outweigh any of the minuses you see. And that's what I'd ask you to support today. So -- so we await your comments and questions and the comments from the audience. And I also recommend that you transmit. Thank you.

MAYOR STERMER: Thank you, Mr. Sniezek.

MS. BOY: We have a couple people signed in --

MAYOR STERMER: Sure.

MS. BOY: -- to speak on this item. The first person is Sue -- Sue Gallagher.

MAYOR STERMER: Ms. Gallagher, good morning.

MS. GALLAGHER: Good morning, Planning Council members. My name is Sue Gallagher. I'm the Chief Innovation Officer from the Children's Strategic Plan. And I'm here this morning to commend the staff, who've done an amazing job. The Children's Services Council has been a partner at the table at Broward Next to ensure that there are community conditions where all children and families can thrive. So in addition to

providing programs and services for children in Broward, we also support community conditions that help families thrive and help children develop their full potential.

And the policy on environmental and social justice really speaks to the assessment of land use and public infrastructure decisions on vulnerable populations, which include many of the families and children that we work with, who are economically disadvantaged, racial and ethnic minorities, low income children, elderly, people who are homeless, and those with chronic physical and mental health conditions.

This policy is a mechanism to create communities where even the most vulnerable can thrive. And, again, it's been a pleasure to work with Barbara and Henry on learning about what does it take to extend the reach of the value of the Land Use Plan to all of our community members. So just want to thank you and encourage your support for this plan. Thank you.

MAYOR STERMER: Thank you, Ms. Gallagher. We appreciate your comments this morning.

MS. BOY: I have Robert Caine.

MAYOR STERMER: Mr. Caine, good morning.

MR. CAINE: Good morning. I'm Bob Kane with Smart Growth Partnership. We're a local non-profit all volunteer organization, and our goal is to encourage the development in Broward County and the cities in Broward County in accordance with Smart Growth Principles. And, basically, what that means is we're trying to encourage livable, walkable communities. This -- this week, our president sent a letter to the Mayor, indicating our support for Broward Next. We encourage you to adopt it. And I'd just like to quickly read that letter.

On August 22nd, the Board of Directors of Smart Growth Partnership of South Florida voted unanimously to submit this letter to you expressing the Board's support for the Broward Next initiative. The County's voluntary effort to upgrade its planning to address changing conditions is indicative of a proactive desire and determination to keep Broward County sustainable irrespective of the hard work that is sure to be involved. The changes that are proposed to the Broward County Land Use Plan and Broward County Comprehensive Plan are strongly supportive of Smart Growth principles and would assist in the realization of Smart Growth Partnership's vision of south Florida communities living those principles. On behalf of the Board, I want to thank you and your excellent staff for allowing us to be part of the Broward Next process. The Board urges you to adopt the Broward Next initiative and the proposed changes to the Broward County Land Use Plan and Broward County Comprehensive Plan as submitted. Thank you very much.

MAYOR STERMER: Thank you, Mr. Caine. We appreciate it.

MS. BOY: Steve Wherry, followed by Karen Friedman.

MAYOR STERMER: Mr. Levy [sic], good morning. Thank you for coming this morning.

MR. WHERRY: Thank you very much. Steve Wherry with the law firm of --

MAYOR STERMER: Wherry.

MR. WHERRY: -- Greenspoon Marder. I'm here this morning just to commend the good efforts of everyone involved in the Broward Next process. It's been an energetic effort and -- and one with extensive public outreach. With respect to the product that's -- that's come as a result of that, we strongly support it and we encourage you to transmit. Thank you.

MAYOR STERMER: Thank you.

MS. BOY: Karen Friedman.

MS. FRIEDMAN: Good morning. My name is Karen Friedman. I'm a Principal Planner with the City of Pompano Beach. We have appreciated the opportunity that the Broward County Planning Council staff has allowed Pompano Beach to participate in Broward Next, for so many of the priorities being addressed are important to Pompano Beach, most certainly attainable housing. However, I am here today to go on record that the City of Pompano Beach strongly opposes the methodology for attainable housing that's included and referenced within Broward Next.

We feel it does not at all reduce the concentration of impoverished areas. The city strongly opposes the proposed text amendments and the methodology, which we fail -- which we believe failed to connect the concentration of retail jobs and low-paying service sector jobs to those locations of affordable housing. We have also reviewed this methodology, which seems to lack the connection between median home values in those communities that are expected to again and again provide attainable or affordable housing in this County.

For instance, the City of West Park, which has some of the lowest affordable -- excuse me -- median home values shows a higher need of affordable housing than a city such as Plantation. And it's for those reasons we are strongly opposed. In the interim, the City of Pompano Beach has hired Lambert Associates to undertake our own housing -- affordable housing methodology study so that we can come up with a program that not only achieves the needs of Pompano Beach, but also is strongly focused on reducing the concentration of impoverished areas. Thank you very much.

MAYOR STERMER: Thank you, Ms. Friedman. Appreciate it. And, no, I didn't ask Ms. Friedman to come on behalf of Pompano Beach.

MAYOR RYAN: Mr. Mayor, if I could have some questions to --

MAYOR STERMER: Mayor Ryan.

MAYOR RYAN: Good morning. Thank you for coming, and thank you to Pompano Beach for being so engaged in this important topic. The specific areas that you -- that Pompano Beach objects to, have you all been able to put together any proposal? I know you are bringing in a consultant, but what is your interim or stopgap proposal for this --

MS. FRIEDMAN: Thank you --

MAYOR RYAN: -- Broward Next?

MS. FRIEDMAN: -- thank you for asking. We have continued to maintain open communication with the Broward County Planning Council staff on our concern with this issue, and we have submitted several documents highlighting our concerns. We have engaged the services of Lambert Associates. We're about one year into that contract. I apologize that I don't know the expected completion date, but I will say it's within the next six months. Looking into the specific issues of Pompano Beach, how our housing issues may be different from other areas of the County. But we are hoping within six months to have that report complete.

MAYOR RYAN: Okay. And is it your expectation from that report that it's something that can be replicated for other cities, or is this Pompano Beach specific?

MS. FRIEDMAN: I believe that the issue of attainable housing and affordable housing, while both a regional issue, regional in terms of south Florida, regional in terms of Broward County, is also an issue that should be considered on a municipality by municipality basis.

For instance, one of the failures with making this a countywide study is you see areas such as the City of Sunrise, which has some of the highest retail uses, has some of the lowest requirements of affordable housing from this methodology. So it's those types of links that we recommend a city by city review in order for cities to understand their own needs. Therefore, should the County or various municipalities want to undertake their own methodology, certainly that's up to them.

MAYOR RYAN: Okay. Thank you.

MS. FRIEDMAN: You're very welcome.

MAYOR STERMER: Anybody else? Commissioner Blattner.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Yes, I want to thank you for your comments, first of all. I know there are some really great things happening in Pompano Beach. Good for you. This -- that is the only area of this study that was a red flag for me. All the other areas were yellow flags, which for me meant these were things I want to talk to my city about and make sure we're running parallel and concurrent with the Broward -- with the Council.

I really think -- I think that Mayor -- former Mayor Castro would be standing with you on this issue, because it tends -- this -- this tends to continue the ghettoization of communities that already are struggling with large blocks of -- of affordable/attainable housing. I think the goal is wonderful, but I don't think it's been achieved here, when I know there are cities, some represented by members here today, but they don't have any attainable/affordable housing. And they'll rationalize to pay somebody else to do it in their community. I don't think it's right. So thank you for bringing it up, and thank you, Mayor Ryan, for your comments, as well, on this.

MAYOR STERMER: Commissioner Mack -- Vice Mayor Mack.

VICE MAYOR MACK: I would like to also go on record, because West Park also has that red flag.

MAYOR STERMER: Okay. Anybody else on this specific item? Let me -- let me say this, and I -- and the board's been receptive to my requests in the past with regard to this item. And, as Henry said in this, and I know you're all going to look at me as if I'm losing my mind, but this process has been a give and take. And I did have an extensive conversation with Commissioner Wexler, who's been the one that's been at the forefront since Commissioner Gunzburger left the Commission with regard to attainable housing. And my comments to Commissioner Wexler, who appointed me to this board, and I said to her, hey, I'm the one that's sort of holding up where you're trying to move this issue, has been I understand the County's desire to change or move to a different methodology. Whether I agree with it or disagree with it, I understand it, based on where we were and what started this process a couple years ago with a certain project in a certain city.

My concern is what this methodology allows. And, as I said to Commissioner Wexler, when we start to stratify or grade what type of housing is needed, besides just saying we need housing, and labeling it, I'll use the word, workforce, as compared to affordable housing, when we then start to stratify that, and, as we recall, Mr. Stone actually stood at a meeting and actually said that, yes, he would be coming to advocate on specific levels of housing, I have a problem with that. Because then we're starting to signify specifically in this project, we want this housing, in this project, we want this housing, instead of saying we need housing. And if someone's prepared to -- a developer is prepared to participate and do something with regard to resolving a problem we all know exists, nobody here doesn't think it exists, to then start to say they're prepared to do something but it's in the wrong grade of that housing, wait a second. We're missing the

mark. Someone's willing and wants to do something. It just might not be the level that Mr. Stone may want.

And I specific -- and -- and Mr. Stone knows -- I've and this conversation with him -- I have a problem with that. If we're going to address the issue of workforce housing, we need to look at it holistically. And I appreciate, Mayor Ryan and Commissioner -- and Commissioner Blattner and Ms. Mack, and I, too -- listen, I -- I've been one of the folks that says no, no, no. If -- I think what this requires, though, is a further conversation. And maybe what we do is we make sure that there is a trailing policy that says, should this be approved, that we don't want to hear and will not accept levels of gradation from Mr. Stone if someone's prepared to do units.

I mean, we -- listen, we're the Planning Council. We can create the policy we want. So I think we need to understand the community we're dealing with, involving all of us. There are carrots in this plan for cities, and there are some sticks. There are some good things for the County, and there are some tougher things for the County. So there has been the give and take in the two-year process of this. Does everybody get everything they want? Heck, no. And Henry's been saying that to me from the beginning. And I'm sure Henry's surprised that I'm actually saying some of the things I'm saying about attainable this morning, workforce housing this morning. And I'm sure so are you.

But I think part of it becomes we all recognize the need. And I -- I implored Commissioner Wexler, but her time is limited here, and maybe we have to try to do it again and be the lead group that does it, but to convene the conversation about workforce housing and how we holistically look at this issue. I said to Commissioner Wexler, you can't beat up a developer because that developer's not going to give you the 66,000 units that Mr. Stone says we need. Is four the answer that might come from a project, if that's what it requires? That's not going to solve the problem.

So I think we talk nicely about the issue. What are we doing to move the issue forward? And I think this plan, in its entirety, lets us do that. Am I thrilled about the methodology? I get it. As long -- to my -- in my way of thinking, if we stay away from the grading of types of housing, I'm in favor of that, because that, to me, sends a variety of signals when we start to grade things as well within a needy community. I think there are various stigmas that get attached to that.

But it is a countywide issue. But there are methods within the plan that allow cities to deal with how they do or don't want to do with it -- deal with it. And if it means contributing money to Broward County, into their fund, that's one of the available options. So every community has the ability to decide within its borders what's good for it and its community, but we need to, I think, as a region of 1.8 million people, need to look at it. But I just want you all to know my thinking, since I have been the one that has been sort of tabling the issue and holding the issue up. I -- and I appreciate you raising the concern.

But I wanted to just put on the record and be clear, I'm prepared to move this forward the way it is, but I want to have the conversation about how we deal with Mr. Stone and Mr. Sniezek when they bring forth items and say there are specific gradations of housing pursuant to the methodology that's embedded within this under whatever number the new number is. So, I thank you all. Thank you, Ms. Friedman. Mr. Parness.

MR. PARNES: Well, I hate to say this, but, knowing builders, if I can build a property on a piece of land and I can get X amount of dollars because I upgraded it to demand more rent, why would I build one lower? If we leave it up to individuals, you may find no workforce housing in the entire County, because if you're leaving it up to don't grade, no grade, why would I build a lesser rent producing property where, for the same money, I can produce one that'll bring more?

So what you're saying to the developer is, do what you want and we'll live with it. I think that's wrong. I think we do need low income housing. We do need work class housing, and we do need high class housing. And I don't think you can leave it to the developer or a particular town who says, let it be in another town, we don't want it in ours, because if every town took that attitude, there would be no work housing or low income housing in the entire County. And I think there's a need for that, so I disagree.

MAYOR STERMER: Let me be clear. This methodology provides for, in workforce housing, gradations of housing.

MS. BOY: Right.

MAYOR STERMER: That -- that's my concern. Not other luxury, median, and attainable. Within the phrase of workforce affordable housing, there are then gradations of affordable housing. That's my concern. Because there are then various levels of that. That's my concern. In addition, I'm not sure, personally, which is why I think there needs to be the bigger conversation of whether this is a developer issue or a government issue, and whether or not there needs to be a bigger conversation of whether or not who should be doing this, who should be doing this, in an effort to get it going.

It's an entirely separate conversation, but we know developers generally are desirous of making money. I'm with you a thousand percent. So the question is -- and there's a way to pay out of it, to pay the County, but the question is what's coming of it. We all know there's a need. Are we actually solving the need more than just saying the words? And I think it's time we figure out how do we really address the need. And I don't think it's development by development, you know, parcel by -- project by project, because you might only get out of a project four units. And if we need 66,000, what are you really getting? Is there a bigger conversation, and how do we have it to make it really be meaningful in this County? That's where I -- I think the conversation -- personally think the conversation needs to go. Mr. Grosso.

MR. GROSSO: On that point, we had these discussions about linkage fees and linking to higher-end development and linking to commercial, but we haven't demonstrated a real, you know, appetite for doing that. If we're not going to say higher-end development, retail development, that kind of commercial development that creates and exacerbates the need for affordable housing is going to pay a meaningful amount of money that the County and the cities can then use to build it themselves, what options are there going to be as part of that whole other conversation, which I definitely think we need to have.

MAYOR STERMER: I -- I think Mr. Sniezek will confirm this, I think what we -- the computation was if we did the commercial linkage fee, I think it was only going to raise like \$2,000,000. The number was a drop in the bucket. So, again, it sounds --

MR. GROSSO: It's not a silver bullet. There has to be a small suite of things.

MAYOR STERMER: Agreed, and I think that's the bigger conversation that needs to take place. I think we all want to have the conversation. I think, and, Barbara, maybe we need, again, to be the folks that try to convene it and -- and invite everybody to come back to the table. I mean, we did this a few years ago, and we'll do it again.

But I think it's important to do it in the context of this document, because this document is charting the course for what would be the next 30, 40 years, and how we're going to redevelop this County. And part of that will be inclusion of workforce housing in a way that it hasn't necessarily been done before. I think it's going to -- by collapsing some of the things we collapse in here, providing bonuses for things in ways of redevelopment, things may be -- may be easier to achieve than they currently are. So I think, in total, it's part of the package, and I think when you put the entire puzzle together it may, with this happening, lead to a productive conversation. That's my hope. Commissioner Long.

COMMISSIONER LONG: I mean, over time, we've been talking about this more than two years. You know, the linkage fee came out. That is not a solution. It's just not a good answer to what we're trying to do. Bernie, I really do agree with you on the fact that it's -- the developer will come up with the highest and best use to get the most money that they can.

And I think we -- we use the word, workforce housing, attainable housing, affordable housing kind of all loosey-goosey, and we blend it together, and there really are different striations within housing that is affordable to our population of 1.8 million. I think we have to start looking at people who are -- have an AMI of under 30 percent, or under 60 percent, or 120 percent, because they're still in -- you know, starting in the teens, people with maybe a family of four.

Where do they live? Because we're not addressing that here. We're addressing people that might be school teachers, beginning firemen, police officers. There's a lot more

people out there working in the restaurants that are serving you your sodas when you go to lunch. We are losing out on that. And if you've been down to Monroe County, you'll see, you know, the have and have nots, because they don't have affordable housing. They don't have attainable housing. They don't even have housing that, you know, people that are making a lot more money than the general workforce can even afford.

I don't want Broward County to be that way. I do think we have to look in the future, and I think we really have to focus on the definitions of housing and who the actual people that would be living there will be. And I don't know if we've addressed that over the last two years, because we think we do but, in essence, what's going to happen is that the people who may not have the ability to buy that house like we did 20 years ago or 15 years ago, but probably ultimately could in time, with savings, there's people in this world that will never have that opportunity and probably may not even have the funds to live in a safe apartment.

And we need to focus on that. We need to start thinking about our County of 1.8 and rising, or if it's the water, it may go up even higher than that, but just more compact. But we do have to focus on the housing piece. I don't like the idea of just kind of giving the best use to developers. And I think government, unfortunately, has to get involved, because this is what we do. We're the Planning Council. There's the County Commission out there that's trying to decide the future of Broward County. And if we don't start looking at housing in a very serious way, we're going to have workforce shortage. We're going to have extremely high prices when you're trying to eat dinner, breakfast, or lunch. We're going to have, still, terrible traffic.

As much as we want to be a -- an area and places where we can walk to work and things like that, there may not be really good jobs to even walk to. And the ones who are in living downtown Fort Lauderdale who would want to walk -- walk to work probably are retired anyway, so they're not going to have to worry about it, because the people that are trying to get jobs in the downtown area couldn't afford to be around that area. So let's take a serious look at this. Let's really focus on housing, the aspects of housing. Talk about the Housing Authority and Broward Housing Solutions and all the other groups who are dealing with this each and every day, because we have homeless people that need housing, and we have people that have been struggling for work, and people who do have work that still want to live in a better, safer community.

So let's start focusing on that and really get the definitions and understand the people we're talking about, not just the names. Not affordable, not attainable, not workforce. Let's understand the people and the jobs they have for this.

MAYOR STERMER: Mr. DiGiorgio.

MR. DIGIORGIO: Thank you, Mayor. I appreciate all the comments that were made today. And, really, I go along with what Dick said regarding the red flag. This is a fantastic document, a fantastic effort that everyone put together, and I really commend

the outreach, because it's true outreach. It wasn't optical outreach. It was real, and it was consistent, and they took the input back and made changes and addressed it throughout the whole document. And it's clear.

So overall, I'd give it an A-plus in effort here. So it's -- it's really fantastic. It really comes down to one highlighted section for me that I saw the red flag, and the words are the local government shall estimate its supply of affordable housing utilizing the data and methodology referenced within the Administrative Rules Document, Broward County Land Use Plan.

And it goes back to the methodology. That's what I've brought up in the past, and that's what I'm sticking -- you know, is sticking in my craw still today, because it's not -- it's forcing this methodology that one size fits all, which, in my opinion, does not. I think Ms. Friedman brought up an excellent point when she came here today and talked about the disparity that we have already across the -- across the County.

Regarding the differences in affordable housing and attainable housing, absolutely more discussion has to go into that, and we have to be much more thoughtful about it. I understand Mr. Parness's position, and Commissioner Long's position on this, but it really becomes difficult, because then I kind of lean with Mayor Stermer. Really, we're telling developers that are willing to do something that you can do this or nothing. And I think that's a mistake. But more thought has to go into it. But -- but specific to this, if there was a softening of this language in the highlighted area that says, or something, or the municipality may --

MAYOR STERMER: It does. And I -- on that point, because it is. We haven't done away with A through J --

MS. BOY: Right.

MAYOR STERMER: -- or -- or what Pompano --

MR. DIGIORGIO: I see this.

MAYOR STERMER: -- is able to do.

MR. DIGIORGIO: I see all this.

MAYOR STERMER: But I think that's important, that it doesn't do away with --

MS. BOY: There's no prohibition to a municipality submitting the additional information. The only thing that this change does --

MAYOR STERMER: Is the methodology.

MS. BOY: -- is have a starting point of -- of where we're at --

MAYOR STERMER: A baseline.

MS. BOY: -- as a County and by municipality. It doesn't demand a stratification. It doesn't demand that -- a set aside. It doesn't demand a payment. It says if you're proposing more than a hundred units, this is the base methodology we're going to start with. If the City of Pompano Beach wants to submit its information about what makes this such a special place and makes these things different than other places in the County, they can submit that. That's all considered as part of the review of this policy.

MR. DIGIORGIO: And I appreciate that. And it says that here. But it's also accepting the fact that there's 6600 deficit right now, you know, in -- in the city itself of Pompano Beach. And that's what -- that's the methodology that, if you do the math now, that's what it says. That's -- so that's forcing the City of Pompano Beach to accept that, to begin with, and then take all the other ones into consideration, because that's the methodology that's there, so.

MAYOR STERMER: Commissioner Castillo, then Mr. Grosso.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: I agree with everything everybody said. I just do. I mean, it's a complicated issue. It's -- and the reason -- and the reason for it is there's been a reluctance to ascribe seriousness to this issue. That's all there is to it. There has been a reluctance to tackle this concern. And it has been around for decades. We've known that we were in an affordable housing shortage for decades. What this does is it puts the issue at issue by forcing those who have enough influence to drive for the kinds of solutions that I think that Mayor Stermer is talking about.

I -- you know, without tooting the horn of my own city, when we had a deficit, we went out and we took a bond, and we build 800 units of affordable housing in Pembroke Pines. And it is paying for itself through low income affordable rents. We don't make money. We don't lose money. It pays for itself over the life of the asset. About six or seven years, those rents are now available for other uses, because they'll not be revenue, that -- that that will be gone.

Why that's not being done on a countywide level is a question we ask ourselves in Pembroke Pines all the time. I will tell you, we ascribe seriousness to it. We had seniors who were living on fixed incomes, and people who felt their kids, you know, we put all this effort into our kids, you know, improve the schools. Patty's constantly working on improving schools and all that. And as soon as they graduate from college or get ready to start careers, they have to move elsewhere, because they can't live here. They can't afford to. There's nowhere for them to live.

That -- when you talk about smart growth, that is central to the philosophy, which is that you've got a sustainable community means that everybody can live there and still be

part of a community and contribute in their own way. We are lopsided. Our housing stock in Broward County is lopsided. The County has known about this for decades, and we have not ascribed the seriousness to it. So by, I think, injecting a little bit of discomfort, I believe that what we will end up doing is building the muscle that's necessary to deal with it.

So I -- without disagreeing with anything that's been said here today, I'm going to support the policy, only because I think it brings us closer, a step closer to the solution, which begins with taking this issue seriously. And I just don't believe that's happened in Broward County before. I just don't.

MAYOR STERMER: I have Mr. Grosso, then Commissioner Mack and Mr. Parness.

MR. GROSSO: Is -- is it --

MAYOR STERMER: Mr. Grosso.

MR. GROSSO: -- part of -- is it -- thank you. Is it part of the city's objection, the young woman who spoke, is it --

MAYOR STERMER: Ms. Friedman.

MR. GROSSO: -- is it part of the objection that the methodology allows some cities to, in effect, under count what their real affordable housing needs are? Is that sort of what you all are saying?

MS. FRIEDMAN: Well, I -- I do want to say that we are happy to hear what Barbara just put on the record, that the city will be able to submit its own methodology, because it has not been our understanding --

MAYOR STERMER: I don't think that's quite --

MS. FRIEDMAN: -- that's --

MAYOR STERMER: -- what she said. That's not what she said. The cities -- the cities have always been allowed to, regardless of under the current 1.07.07 and what -- regardless of the methodology currently used, cities have always been permitted to provide their own studies and analysis of the affordable housing stock. Always.

MS. FRIEDMAN: Well, we appreciate that reassurance, because we felt like the way it was written in the latest reiteration -- or latest iteration, that that was not exactly clear. And that has been one of our concerns. We are concerned about the benchmark that is also being listed, in that it does not reflect what we believe is actually affordable housing needs of the various communities throughout Broward County. So we are specifically just opposed to that methodology that was prepared by the Meridian Group. Otherwise,

we are strongly in support of many, many, many of the components of Broward Next, including the -- the charge to go ahead and address attainable housing.

MAYOR STERMER: Thank you, Ms. Friedman. Mr. Grosso?

MR. GROSSO: I'm not sure that --

MS. FRIEDMAN: Okay. I'm sorry.

MR. GROSSO: -- my -- my question, though, is it a concern of yours that the default methodology we're writing into the plan would allow some cities to effectively project an affordable housing need that isn't realistic, that is too low for their city?

MS. FRIEDMAN: I mean -- I'm not sure I understand your question. Are you saying that we object to the methodology appears to show that some cities have a lower need than what we believe they have?

MR. GROSSO: Yes, that's what I'm asking.

MS. FRIEDMAN: Well, when you -- the -- the beginning of the methodology talks about that there's a direct link, which I think most of us know, between low wage service sector jobs and the need for attainable housing. And it makes this strong connection, which we support, but then it fails to show, through the actual numbers that are produced, that there is a linkage between cities such as Sunrise and other cities which have a high amount of retail businesses and their amount of affordable housing need. And where we see that lack of direct nexus, we have some red flags going up.

MR. GROSSO: Thanks.

MS. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

MR. GROSSO: Thank you.

MAYOR RYAN: I have a question about that.

MAYOR STERMER: What took you so long?

MAYOR RYAN: I first have --

(Laughter.)

MAYOR RYAN: I let it go the first go-around. I wanted to ask a question.

MAYOR STERMER: I think let's all recognize, and we know from the current methodology that's used, the numbers in this proposed methodology are different. And

there have been, my word, some significant swings of what City X shows under the current methodology compared to what the proposed methodology would be. We've talked about a certain city and what that swing is, to my dear Mayor two seats to the -- to the right of me.

I'm not -- I'm not saying good or bad. That's just what the methodology shows. And, again, my issue isn't as much with the methodology, but it's the underlying basis of then how that methodology gets stratified. That's where my concern is, because I think then we start -- if we say there are stratifications, we're going to continue to foster stratifications, which I'm not sure is a good thing, regardless of where it is. So that -- that's my concern.

The -- let's remember where this came from. A project came forth in Plantation that Plantation said its affordable housing stock was X. We all agreed, according to what at the time was -- what that methodology was, and it was different, and the project got approved. Whatever this methodology is, let's rest assured that if the County Commission doesn't like what it's doing it will change again. Let's just be clear. This is the methodology current, or to be placed currently. Is that subject to change? Yes.

Let's remember this methodology, the text amendment, was commenced by the County Commission, came here. First hearing, we recommended no recommendation and asked them to please hold off until it caught up with Broward Next. They voted to transmit. Then it came back to us a couple of meetings ago and we tabled it so it -- it would, again, catch up with this process and be included within it.

So it's properly in the conversation. Whether we like the methodology or not is a separate issue. But that is really what we've asked to have happen is happening. So I just want to say, procedurally, it's not like it's -- it's just getting jammed in here. It's not. This is where I always envisioned this conversation would take place, and I think it's a meaningful conversation.

The question is where -- where do we go with it, understanding the desire to -- we need to at least have a baseline. And the question is, what's the baseline? I also want to be clear, and Mr. DiGiorgio said it when he was speaking earlier, the other Chinese menu options of what we currently call 1.07.07 still exist. Those aren't going away. This is just that baseline methodology that 1.07.07 is based upon. So when a plan comes in, what it's measured against. That's really what this is. And I don't want us to get lost in the bigger conversation as to what this small piece, not insignificant, but small piece, because it's a very significant piece, in the bigger piece of the document. I just want to put that out there and be clear. Mr. Grosso, were you done?

MR. GROSSO: Yes.

MAYOR STERMER: Thank you, Ms. Friedman. Vice Mayor Mack.

VICE MAYOR MACK: Yes. Attorney Mayor Stermer, conversation is great, but I think that the Commission has given the charge to the planner -- the Planning Council to speak this through, to work this through so that at the end of the day, when it goes back to Commission, they won't have a big headache as to how to try to break up, give up, give to any individual municipality.

West Park and Pompano, though, is just -- just happen to be in the building. But if Anne, Chair Castro was here, Dania Beach would be in the building. So there are a couple of municipalities that are speaking on behalf of the constituents, and I don't understand why more municipalities haven't come through with some kind of conversation as Pompano Beach has, because we've been talking about it, actually, for a very long time.

MAYOR STERMER: And I will go back -- and I appreciate the comment. The -- when we had the methodology change before us a couple of times, Barbara knows because we -- we ensured that that meeting agenda with the items was specifically sent out to cities saying, please, speak up. And, if I recall, we've gotten less than five responses from municipalities on each of the times it was on. And I was one of the folks that ensured there was a response from my city. And I'm not saying good or bad, but it's not like this item quietly made its way through the process and no one knew it was here.

This item, the specific methodology issue, the PC -- PCT 16-1 was advertised and broadcast to cities every time it was going to be here, and when it was going to be before the County Commission. So the silence you're hearing is just -- I can't explain why cities haven't reacted, but it's not for --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: They don't object.

MAYOR STERMER: -- but it's not for lack of them knowing about it and having the opportunity to. I know Pompano responded, Fort Lauderdale responded, we responded --

MS. BOY: Pompano, Fort Lauderdale, Weston -- there was one other that I can't remember. Sorry.

MAYOR STERMER: I can't either, but there's -- literally, there's less than --

MS. BOY: There were four written.

MAYOR STERMER: -- five -- I'm sorry?

MS. BOY: There were four written responses.

MAYOR STERMER: There were four written responses. That's all there've been. So as much as I can stand here, and as I have, and you all have agreed to pound the table

with me, at some point, if people aren't willing, the local governments that administer the project when it comes into their first local jurisdiction, if they're okay with it, I -- I can't -- I can, but I'm not sure if it's beneficial, because, again, I think we're going to see where it goes, and if there's an issue, trust me, we will raise our heads about it.

I just -- I can't see continuing to hold up this process over a methodology, personally, when we all know it could change in a year from now if the nine people that sit on this dais on Tuesday don't like it. That's what it's subject to, because that's why this methodology -- methodology showed up, because they didn't like the FIU analysis from Dr. Ned Murray that they were getting. I mean, so that's where this came from. I had -- were you done, Vice Mayor?

COMMISSIONER MACK: Yes.

MAYOR STERMER: I had Mr. Parness, then I have Mayor Ryan, then I have Mr. DiGiorgio and Ms. Graham.

MR. PARNES: We turned down -- we turned down a project yesterday in Deerfield, and I -- I was against this project as a private citizen. It was along Dixie Highway. And I asked the builder where in District 2, which this is in, is there a supermarket, restaurant, CVS, or a Walgreen's? There are none. Yet the apartments start at \$1100 along the tracks of Dixie Highway in Deerfield. Now, what percentage of one's income should go for rent? Forty? Thirty? Can somebody give me a number? Because a minimum of \$1100 a month, I calculate that that person needs to make a minimum of \$30,000 a year to afford \$1100 a month. And that's the small apartments. From there, they go up.

The neighbors, which is all private housing and which rejected, for several reasons, one of which it doesn't conform to our code. Within 500 feet of housing has to look like the neighborhood. But the builder wanted to build a gated community with 300 apartments starting at \$1100 apiece across from the railroad tracks, where the only shopping in that neighborhood, if you walk, is a 7-Eleven to feed kids with. My question is we have to be more involved, as well as the towns. This particular project, in fact, had come in front of this board a while ago, and it was a zoning change, which was local, and they refused it. But it could have easily have been approved if one more Commissioner voted for it.

And that didn't solve the neighborhood's problem. I think we have to be involved, because I think towns sometimes will do what's expedient for the town. One of the reasons given for this project was it would bring almost a quarter of a million dollars in taxes to the city. That's well and good, but it still doesn't bring affordable housing to Deerfield Beach. So I think we have to be engaged. Yes, I want the conversation, and I will go forward with this, provided the conversation isn't shoved under the rug, and that we do have a meaningful conversation about housing in Broward County. Thank you.

MAYOR STERMER: And I just want to be clear that let's also remember this is a land -- we are -- we create land use -- we deal with the land use map and what is a permitted

use within the code. It's -- our job is not to -- that's the people that sit here after -- you know, we may see it, but then it comes up to the nine people that sit here, whether or not to change it after it goes through usually two hearings at the local government and it's processed. And I appreciate -- I was actually at your Mayor's meeting a couple weeks ago when that item was talked about.

MR. PARNES: Yes.

MAYOR STERMER: Been -- been there, done that. So it was an interesting conversation, and I stayed for some of it. But I think it is an important process. And what may make sense today compared to what may be coming in the future is a separate issue. And I think that's part of what's exciting about this whole Broward Next document is it's where we're going. We've lived for 40, 50 years under urban sprawl, and now we have to figure out how to go up as compared to sideways. And that's really what this is going to be.

And -- and maybe -- and maybe -- and I'm not necessarily picking on the Deerfield issue, but maybe residents in Broward that currently lived horizontally, maybe X amount of that property needs to be redeveloped vertically. That may be beneficial, and may be able to get into that community, as part of that mixed use development, a grocery store, some rentals, some professional space, and change the community in a positive way --

MR. PARNES: Agreed.

MAYOR STERMER: -- while all the -- all the while, it being affordable. So I think we -- part of it is our vision has to change from being horizontal in nature to being more vertical in nature, and I think all of it can happen.

MR. PARNES: It's happened in Deerfield. We've just approved, in fact, two structures more than 50 feet tall and we're changing our code that anything west of the Intracoastal can automatically be more than 50 feet.

MAYOR STERMER: Yeah. Mayor Ryan.

MR. PARNES: That --

MAYOR STERMER: Oh, sorry.

MR. PARNES: -- we will be going up.

MAYOR STERMER: Mayor Ryan.

MAYOR RYAN: So let me emphasize what I think has been raised on multiple occasions, and my learned colleague, Commissioner Castillo, has raised multiple times, and this is a regionalization issue. I appreciate Pompano raising the issue of retail in

Sunrise. I know that none of my communities, neighboring and otherwise, seem to object when they receive more of the sales tax dollars from the retail sales than we do in Sunrise.

And I don't intend to have a discussion about where hotel workers live and work, since we have very few hotels out west. I think the issue is turned backwards, because, as we have seen on multiple occasions, the methodology applied is questionable. Under one methodology, Sunrise had more than plenty affordable housing, and that was beyond dispute under the methodology. And then, when it changed, all of a sudden we didn't.

And perhaps I'd like to market Sunrise as being much more like Weston, that we have such high-end prices, but that's simply not the case. So while I appreciate being used as an example, I'm sure Pompano is not suggesting that retail workers must live in the cities in which retail, nor should hotel workers live where hotels are, nor should service workers live exactly where service is applied. Instead, this needs to be a regional philosophy --

MAYOR STERMER: Absolutely.

MAYOR RYAN: -- that links not only affordable housing, but transportation and otherwise. And that's what we fail to do. Bottom line. I understand the concerns of concentrating, and I think, as Commissioner Castillo's pointed out, there are methodologies to avoid that which could be implemented countywide. And that, to me, is ultimately what has to happen, not this back and forth as to whether some city is or isn't meeting it, but, rather, are we, as a regional powerhouse, doing that, because we treat so much more of our economic development as a regional philosophy. Climate control, regional philosophy. Transportation should be a regional -- regional philosophy. Infrastructure, regional philosophy. Affordable housing, regional philosophy. And, to me, that's where the discussion needs to move towards. Thank you.

MAYOR STERMER: Mr. DiGiorgio.

MR. DIGIORGIO: Thank you, Mayor. And great words, Mayor Ryan. I think it's important so you understand my position on this. There's -- there's never been a dispute in my mind or even a thought that we don't have a problem. There are 66,000 units that are needed in the County. And I wholeheartedly agree with Mayor Ryan that this is a regional issue. And my concern is the methodology goes back to Mr. Blattner's point where if we say that ten percent of the new units have to go to one municipality, just by saying they're 6600 units shorts, and I -- I'm remembering it's about ten percent. It's somewhere, 65, 40, I forget the exact number. But it's about ten percent of the units that we're short right now are targeted for one municipality.

And if we have some that are not as high or low, I think if we look at it that way, all of a sudden some municipalities are going to say, we've already met our affordable housing goal. But, in reality, it's a regional issue. The affordable housing goal -- goal is on a

Broward County issue. It's on a South Florida issue. It's not on a City of Pompano Beach or City of Sunrise. So I'm worried very much what Mr. Blattner says, that if we have to say, okay, 6600 of these have to go in Pompano Beach, there's only so many areas in Pompano Beach they can go. We've now designated a development district of strictly attainable/affordable housing. That's not a good model.

And that's, I think you used the term ghettoization or something like that, of the neighborhood. And I'm not sure it's as strong as that, but it -- it -- we've seen the model, and it doesn't work. When you put all the housing in one area, it's a bad model. So my concern is that we're looking at it in a -- in a regional way, but not doing enough on a regional basis to say we all are in this together. Let's make sure we address it in a regional, not just say, okay, I've met mine and I'm not going to -- City X has met their requirement, now we move on and we don't have to do this. I want to make sure we're all thinking about this for the foreseeable future.

And, as Chair Castro pointed out, this situation's not getting any better. It's getting much worse, especially when you look at our elderly. We've talked about the low income, but the elderly, who are now going from viable working to lack of income and on -- and on a fixed income, all of a sudden put themselves right in that same bracket.

So I think -- I forget the numbers, but it was something in the neighborhood of over a thousand units a year we're adding on to this just with the new folks going on to the fixed income. So let's make sure we're looking at it regionally, and there's so much more to be done on this. But I'm going to support the document.

MAYOR STERMER: Ms. Graham. I've got you on the --

MS. GRAHAM: Thank you. Thank you, Mayor Stermer. Just real quick, to Commissioner Castillo, the housing you referred to in your city, is that tax exempt? Do they pay property taxes that the -- that you developed?

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: The city is the owner, builder, and developer, so they do not pay property taxes.

MS. GRAHAM: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Which is a great model.

MS. GRAHAM: Okay. I wasn't going to bring this up, but since you did make that comment, I don't know if anyone caught the Commission meeting a few weeks ago where there was an existing 800 unit or so apartment complex in Lauderdale Lakes that was asking for some tax exempt status to be put to them. Originally, they had it -- long story short, they had it, it sunsetted, they wanted to put it back. And Commissioner Holness, who appointed me here to the Planning Council, explained how they need those property taxes from that complex to be able to pay for the services that they have

to have, not only for that property when police and fire respond, but just contributing to the entire city tax base.

And while they were having their discussion, I was working at my computer. I went online and went to the Broward County Property Appraiser page for that. I saw what they pay in property taxes. I saw the sales that had been -- transpired over the last ten years, and how the price had been raised each time. So all of a sudden, now you have this incredible purchase price for this property, with the corresponding property taxes, and now they wanted some kind of relief.

And I believe it was tabled. They're going to go back to it. But this goes back again now to what Bernie had said about Deerfield Beach wanting the tax base. It's a double-edged sword. You can't have your cake and eat it, too. If you need the tax -- and also the sales tax that Mayor Ryan had brought up, where 50 percent goes to the County, if I understand the way it's calculated, and then the rest of it is distributed through the cities. But, again, it's -- sales tax doesn't stay in your neighborhood.

MAYOR RYAN: Right. It's based -- it's based on population. 91 percent goes to the State. The remaining pennies, the County gets the lion's share, and then my neighbors who have a higher population get more than we do.

MS. GRAHAM: Well, and that's one of the reasons why -- since you brought that up, that's one of the reasons why --

MAYOR RYAN: And -- and you're all welcome, by the way.

MS. GRAHAM: -- the cities -- that's why the cities want to keep increasing their --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: May your gift giving never cease.

MS. GRAHAM: -- their population, because that's the only way they get more of the dispensing of -- of the funds. So there's -- it's -- it's like a simultaneous equation with four variables, not three -- or maybe there's five variables, because the property taxes at least will stay within the city, as Commissioner Holness had explained. But it wasn't willing to give that up.

But at the same time, we're talking about new housing now being developed, not existing housing. So the new costs -- I like that we had the wetlands presentation today, because they talked about how much of the County is wetlands. I mean, so there are so many factors that are -- I hate to say working against us, but our good intentions are not going to be something that's easily solved. And if the Commission changes after the next election, or five years from now, or what have you, perhaps they'll have some other plan. But if we're going to make it tax exempt, like Mayor Castillo said, I don't know how that would go over in Fort Lauderdale, but it's something to think about. I want to just weave those all together, in case anyone didn't see the Commission meeting from a

week or two ago. Thank you.

MAYOR STERMER: My guess, and I know this, and then I've got -- just so everybody knows, I've got Commissioner Gomez, Commissioner Blattner, and Commissioner Castillo on the queue left. I know Mr. Sniezek is hearing this entire conversation, and my guess is Mr. Stone is wherever he is. So my guess is there will be, whether -- well, let me digress.

My belief is based on the current relationship that the cities in Broward County currently enjoy, their collegial relationship, and, actually, our working relationship with Broward County with everything that's going on -- I'll save the conversation about educating you all later about the surtax until later -- but I think we're in a different dynamic than we have been in the past, where I think we can now collaboratively reach out to the folks who sit behind this wall as 31 -- as 32 local governments and actually engage in a conversation about the housing issue.

But, as Mayor Ryan said, it's -- it is important to note, and I'll digress for a second. Transportation is key to it, as well, because you can build it somewhere, and if the residents you think will want to live there can't get to their jobs, what have you attained other than an island? Developer X puts Building Y in City Z, and the folks can't get on a public transportation route, and they don't own a car, what -- have we -- what has really been solved? We've gotten the units. The count just went down by four units, but if those folks can't get to their jobs, what have we done?

So it's a housing issue, yes. It's a transportation issue, yes. So, at the end, I'll come back to everybody to remind everybody if you're not smart and educated yet on the surtax issue that's coming on in November, there's a whole bunch of us here who are prepared to educate and bring forth information. And we'd ask you to start to pay attention to that issue, because that surtax on the November ballot, of which you have to vote twice yes, is important, because it actually works hand-in-glove with what's contained in Broward Next. It's about where we're going. So -- and I just make that as an aside for a second. Commissioner Gomez.

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: Well, I thank you for that segue, because that was kind of on my mind. Basically, I agree with many of the comments, most of the comments from here today, and also want to throw the veterans who are also in need of housing, as well, into the mix. I think this has been said, but rounding it up, Broward Next's purpose is to clean up a lot of the issues that we've had over the past, since the '70s, to make it what we are today. And by doing so, by transmitting this now, as is, even if we have a little bit in our gut going ick, it's time to move forward, let this fix those problems, and now we don't have to have stumbling blocks from when we've been talking about attainable housing, workforce housing, affordable housing, and all that kind of stuff in a general bubble. We now have those items out of the way, because we've taken care of the land use issues.

And with that, it's not a vacuum. We have the surtax issue, which I wholeheartedly agree about our education and having it work together, and then, maybe in the future, besides if the surtax goes through with transportation and infrastructure and all the things that we need to get people from where they want to live to where they want to work or where they work and want to live, basically, it will allow us to move forward. And then there's other things on the table that are a bigger picture for government, for employment issues such as -- I just blanked on the word, but -- median income. We -- the --

MAYOR STERMER: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: -- median income, the -- the minimum amount to pay people. There are businesses that have gotten together who have started talking about what they're doing for their companies, for their employees. And starts a very -- a much larger picture. So we are a part of this piece, and I think that by transmitting something that's been worked on very hard, and a lot of information that has been put together, and you guys have done an excellent job, I think it's just -- we are the first step to get it going and come back and have that great conversation.

MAYOR STERMER: I have Commissioner Blattner, Commissioner Castillo, and Mr. Grosso. Commissioner Blattner.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Is there a motion on the floor to move this?

MAYOR STERMER: Not yet.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: I'll move it.

MAYOR STERMER: I'm going to -- I'm going to -- wait, we will have -- we have certain members of the public, so --

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: I know. So when it comes, somebody will make the motion.

MAYOR STERMER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: I've got just a couple of comments. I -- there are large numbers of people who work for our cities, who work for our County, and who work in private industry who earn salaries that would put them in the middle class or moderate income families who are living in apartments because they don't have enough money for a down payment. And that's really a big issue. If you can't get people out of their apartments where they're paying 1100 or \$1500 a month, which is more than they would pay in principal, interest, and taxes on a mortgage, in many cases, we're -- we're not taking advantage of an opportunity there, and maybe that's something to be considered, and how (inaudible) comes to Broward County for the purpose of affordable housing is

used for down payment assistance. The other thing I wanted to mention is -- and I found this in my own city, and it's embarrassing.

People who live in low or moderate income housing don't want more low to moderate income housing in their neighborhood. And yet, that's where they will go. And that's wrong. And that's what we're going to fight. So I agree with you and agree with you that we have to be in this together, but I think that's -- that's our role when we go back home is to say, I know you don't like it, but we have to deal with this issue on a local basis.

MAYOR STERMER: Commissioner Castillo.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: I actually raised my hand to make a motion, so I'll wait.

MAYOR STERMER: Okay. Mr. Grosso.

MR. FINK: Are we still on speakers?

MAYOR STERMER: Yes, we -- yes, we still are.

MR. FINK: Public speakers?

MAYOR STERMER: Yes, we still have three more that we have to get to.

MR. FINK: Okay.

MAYOR STERMER: Mr. Grosso.

MR. GROSSO: And then just quickly on the affordable housing, there's not a place that's desirable in the world that doesn't have an affordable housing problem. London, Key West, us. We should approach this issue not by beating ourselves up, not to have any shame in it. That's just the reality in a free market economy of what you've got. So we just need to deal with it very -- very radically.

MAYOR STERMER: Yeah.

MR. GROSSO: That's the only point I would make about affordable housing. I'll have some other comments after the other --

MAYOR STERMER: Thank you.

MR. GROSSO: -- speakers. Thank you.

MAYOR STERMER: Ms. Blake Boy, who's next?

MS. BOY: Thank you. Robert Kellogg, followed by Jodie Siegel, followed by Bill

Laystrom.

MAYOR STERMER: Mr. Kellogg, good morning.

MR. KELLOGG: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, board members. I'm Bob Kellogg. I'm the Town Manager in Hillsboro Beach. We're specifically concerned about the multimodal transportation section that you're going to be discussing and considering today, specifically the consideration for requiring bike paths on all roads. As you know, Hillsboro Beach has one road which services the whole community, and, as the Chairman has indicated, all the communities in Hillsboro Beach are -- and in Broward County, are unique.

And we would ask that you consider allowing for local control of whether or not communities should be allowed to require or not require bike paths on A-1-A. Included in your packet is some information from the Commission, as well as the Mayor. I would ask that you read it and give it consideration.

MAYOR STERMER: Thank you, Mr. Kellogg. Appreciate it.

MR. KELLOGG: Thank you.

MS. BOY: Jodie Siegel.

MAYOR STERMER: Ms. Siegel.

MS. BOY: Sorry. Followed by Bill Laystrom.

MS. SIEGEL: Good morning. Jodie Siegel, Dumar Allsworth (Phonetic.) I just wanted to thank you all for allowing us to be involved in this process. Your staff has been wonderful to work with for the last, I guess, two years it's almost been. And we appreciate that some of these land use decisions will now have the local governments more involved. And Barbara and Henry have both been very, very, very wonderful to work with. So thank you very much.

MAYOR STERMER: Thank you, Ms. Siegel. Mr. Laystrom. In some respects, the man that started it all.

MR. LAYSTROM: At -- at least on that issue, correct. Bill Laystrom. I'm not representing anybody today. But I've had the opportunity to follow this process throughout the course of your directions and the cities and the staff. It's been an outstanding process. They've reached out. I've been in multiple cities where they've -- they've been trying to present to anybody who would listen, any group that would listen. This policy, the original Land Use Plan was put in place before even I was practicing, and that's now been a long time. And it needed a refreshing look. On behalf of what I consider to be the municipalities, which is where I work most of the time, this provides a

lot greater flexibility for the cities to look at their land use and do as they believe is best for their cities, without obligating the cities to do anything.

And in the past, we've had a lot of I call it mandatory provisions which, from the cities' side, we certain resist to the extent that we can, because we think we know best for what each of our cities are. So I encourage you to move this forward. I think it's an excellent step forward. It's not perfect. Everybody probably could make one change or another change somewhere. But staff's done a great job in trying to hear everybody. It is a Land Use Plan. It's not, you know, micro managing individual issues. And I hope you will support it and bring it forward to the County Commission. Thank you.

MAYOR STERMER: Thank you, Mr. Laystrom. Ms. Blake Boy, let me -- can I ask you to respond to Mr. Kellogg, the City --

MS. BOY: Oh, sure.

MAYOR STERMER: -- Manager's response --

MS. BOY: Absolutely.

MAYOR STERMER: -- from Hillsboro Beach, because I -- I don't want to just say we heard it and didn't respond to it. If you could respond to that, please.

MS. BOY: Absolutely. And we have the -- we were invited to Hillsboro Beach in early January of this year, and made the overall Broward Next presentation and heard their comments. And at that time, and I would continue to assure Hillsboro Beach as well as other municipalities, the context of the Complete Streets policy is in the context sensitive manner.

So no -- no decisions are made without the participating municipality. This is not demanding bicycle lanes in specific areas. But this all just moves forward with the coordination for Complete Streets and promotes it in the County and where it's appropriate. And that's really the key thing, and ensuring that the municipalities are in favor of any of these kinds of projects or proposals. And there's nothing specific to any municipality in this plan.

MAYOR STERMER: Thanks. Mr. Kellogg, I hope you can go back to Mayor Tarrant and the rest of your Commission. We understand the concern, and that it's -- you know, what -- whatever's going to happen in the future is based on the context of what it's in. There's no bright line test here of what it is. It's more there's a desire. There's an emphasis of where we're going, but it also has to be contextual. So if you can report that back to your Commission, we'd appreciate it. Anybody else on this?

AGENDA ITEM PH-3 - AMENDMENT PCT 16-4

MS. BOY: The only other item I would report is that Item PH-3, which was put to the side because of the courtesy notice time of 10:00 o'clock, we have no public speakers on that item.

So if the Council wants to take action on that item before it continues its discussion --

MR. DIGIORGIO: I'll move Item PH-3.

MAYOR STERMER: Item PH-3 has been moved by --

MR. PARNES: Second.

MAYOR STERMER: -- Mr. DiGiorgio, seconded by Mr. Parnes. All those in favor, signify by saying aye. All those opposed? Let the record show, Nancy, that the item passes unanimously.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

AGENDA ITEM PH-6 - BROWARD COUNTY LAND USE PLAN TEXT AND MAP AMENDMENTS

- A. **AMENDMENT PCT-16-5**
- B. **AMENDMENT PCT 16-6**
- C. **AMENDMENT PCT 16-7**
- D. **AMENDMENT PCT 16-8**
- E. **AMENDMENT PCT 16-9**
- F. **AMENDMENT PCT 16-7**
- G. **AMENDMENT PCNRM 16-2**

MAYOR STERMER: Back to Item PH-6.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Move Item PH-6 for approval.

MAYOR STERMER: Item PH-6 has been --

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: Second.

MAYOR STERMER: -- moved by Commissioner Castillo, seconded by Commissioner Gomez. Any further discussion with regard to PH-6, or questions? Mr. Grosso.

MR. GROSSO: Mayor, quickly --

MAYOR STERMER: Yes, sir.

MR. GROSSO: -- I wanted to congratulate staff. This plan has brought us into the 21st century. We're still on Broward Next, are we not?

MAYOR STERMER: Yes. Yes, we are.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We are.

MR. GROSSO: Please interrupt me if I'm making a speech on the wrong issue.

MAYOR STERMER: No --

MR. GROSSO: As --

MAYOR STERMER: -- that's what we're back to.

MR. GROSSO: -- as -- as we go through the process as you laid out for us, transmittal, refinements, (inaudible) analysis, I want to make a few quick points that I hope will get consideration as we refine the document. As a fellow planning nerd, I think that we have a lot of language that everybody uses as planners about we're going to encourage this or discourage this. This is a priority, so is that. And I strongly recommend we consider the things we really care about. As opposed to this is one of many priorities, this is the priority when it comes to this or that.

Language where we say this should happen, if we really want it to happen, we should say it shall happen. Language in the plan that says we encourage or discourage something, when push comes to shove and you're implementing that on a daily basis or you're arguing about it, that language really doesn't mean all that much. And so I would recommend that we fine tooth comb nerd analyze the language for really prioritizing things and making clear priorities, because, you know, that we encourage natural resource protection, we also encourage low volume plumbing fixtures or walkable communities, well, if I'm going to put a walkable community in a natural resource area, which one of those is the priority?

Those are the kinds of fine tooth comb things that I think should happen before we get to final adoption, which I surely am going to support, because this really is bringing us into the 21st century. The last substantive -- two more substantive comments I'll make, I'm not we are doing enough to require specific amounts of native landscaping, as opposed to simply encouraging it as a way to address several of the problems, sea level rise and climate, that we are trying to emphasize here.

I'd really much want to see us require much more meaningful levels of native landscaping or development. On the transferable development rights and -- and Comp Plan amendments in our flood plains, our wetlands, and our vulnerable areas, I see us really clearly setting aside the barrier island. I'm not sure we're doing enough to make it clear we should not be or we shall not be increasing uses and densities in the flood plains, in the wetlands, and the sea level rise prone areas. I think we need to get a lot more serious about prioritizing those areas as places we're not going to increase infrastructure, where we're not going to increase uses or densities. And I'm not sure the

language that we use is going to get implemented on the daily basis is really reaching the ultimate goals that I think are great in this new plan. So those would be the comments I would make in terms of further refinement as we get through this process. Thank you.

MAYOR STERMER: Thank you, Mr. Grosso. Mr. Fink.

MR. FINK: Just one real quick point. I'd like to thank staff. I think it's a great document. Much better than 40 years ago. And, in particular, the staff that sits behind them. They're the ones that are putting all these documents together. We seem to forget them a lot. And last comment, we got a lot of items from the Transit Division as additional material. Are you going to have time to synthesize those and add those as necessary, as transportation's just as important as affordable housing?

MS. BOY: Yes, thank you for bringing that up. Actually, one of the -- when we were going through the product just a couple of weeks ago, one of the -- the language related to transit and transfer -- transit service always comes up.

You know, the MPO long range plan, what they were using a couple years ago, they're not using anymore. We had changed it to limited bus stop. We got a comment from Transit that that's probably really not the appropriate word. So we will be working to ensure that where you can get these bonus densities and these kind of transit routes, we're looking towards something where like four or more buses an hour. So we'll be working through that during transmittal, also.

MAYOR STERMER: Thank you. Anything further from the Commission -- from the -- from the Council? Sorry. There was a motion and a second. Madam Secretary, please call the roll.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Richard Blattner.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Bogen. Commissioner Angelo Castillo.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Neal de Jesus. Mr. Thomas H. DiGiorgio, Jr.

MR. DIGIORGIO: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Charles M. Fink.

MR. FINK: Yes.

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

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: Yes.

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. GROSSO: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Michael S. Long.

COMMISSIONER LONG: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Vice Mayor Rita Mack.

VICE MAYOR MACK: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Robert McGolgan.

MR. MCGOLGAN: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Bernard Parness.

MR. PARNES: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Michael J. Ryan.

MAYOR RYAN: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Daniel J. Stermer.

MAYOR STERMER: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Ms. Anne Castro, Chair.

MAYOR STERMER: Madam Executive Director.

MS. BOY: I get to vote? No, I'm just kidding. I support it.

MAYOR STERMER: Let me -- let me do this, only because I did actually get a text from Chair Castro, and she did want me to say emphatically that she thanked the staff. She, as we know -- as much time as we spend doing this process, Chair Castro exponentially spends her life, not only her professional life, but her time, on this project. Honestly, she has lived and breathed this project morning, noon, and night for the past two years. And she has worked very closely with Barbara and Henry and their respective staffs.

And the time and commitment, not only of the Chair, but of the staff to get it right and -- and do the best that they can, understanding not only where we are, but where we're going, is truly important, because it's -- it's easy to say where we are today, but part of this is, as we're talking, where are we going next. And this is a visionary document for that. And that's not easy to do. As a planner, you're used to seeing what's right in front of you and dealing with that in an incremental period. This is looking at a much larger incremental period.

So on behalf of the Chair and all of the members, I want to ensure that we are grateful to the Planning Council staff, Mr. Sniezek, and your staff, and every department of County government that participated in this, and we appreciate it. We look forward to the County Commission's transmittal of it.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

OTHER BUSINESS

MAYOR STERMER: And let me just close with this, and I'll ask you all, because I'll come back to where I started a few seconds ago, there are two questions that are going to appear on your November ballot with regard to infrastructure and transportation. I am not going to advocate. I'm going to ask that you become educated.

As you know, there's an education component to the campaign, and there's an advocacy component -- component to the campaign. I do both. But this morning, I will sit here and say, I will educate you. There are groups in the community that are actively involved in educating. Each city is working with the Broward Metropolitan Planning organization in conjunction with Broward County, together. The governments are working together to educate the 1.8 million people that live here about the importance of transportation and infrastructure. And they go hand-in-hand.

So, please, if you're not part of a local government -- I know every elected official sitting up here has gotten emails for the past few months about it, but if you're a non-elected and you're not sure about it and want to get more informed about it, please ask. Anybody here that's an elected can talk to you about it. I'm more than happy to. The MPO website is going to go live in the next few weeks with all of the educational information, which will have a website that every city project and every County project,

transportation for the County, infrastructure for the cities, we'll be able to see that project, what its cost is and what it's going to be.

And infrastructure's flooding, drainage, water issues, redevelopment type issues, security related issues. There are lots of things that can happen. Wrap that into transportation. How do we make this community more readily accessible to everybody to get from one side of the County to the other. And let me suggest this to you. Should the proposed taxes not be voted upon in the affirmative, and this is an educational thing, not a -- not an advocacy thing, certain forms of transportation that we keep talking about, light rail, will never come to be.

If we want this County to move forward to the things we're talking about that are permitted in this Broward Next, and I ask you to get smarter about them between now and November 8th, and allow us to educate you that you may become part of the group that wants to educate others and go out and advocate for it. That's my commercial this morning. And I haven't sat here and advocated. I've just said I'm -- the only thing I've advocated is to please get smarter, if you're not sure.

Because, at the end, the two referendums -- both must pass. If one passes and the other doesn't, you don't get the other one. It's an all or nothing proposition. So please get smart. It's an important project that needs everybody's participation. I want to thank the 32 local governments for getting us to where we are today. Every elected official weighed in on it, so I want to thank everybody for that. Do we have anything else before the Council this morning, Madam Director?

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Yeah, I just wanted to add --

MAYOR STERMER: Commissioner Castillo.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: -- I wanted to thank you for your -- for your leadership on that issue, Mayor Stermer. It was phenomenally difficult to do. And also you, Mayor Ryan. Both of you played an important role in that, and I want to thank you both for it. It's very, very important that we underscore the law, because the State has established a law where we may not advocate in one way or the other. We can't tell people how to vote. We can only educate. But I can tell you how I'm going to vote. I'm going to vote yes. Thank you.

MAYOR STERMER: Let me -- let me just define what Commissioner Castillo's saying. You can't use public dollars to advocate. You can use public dollars, tax dollars, to educate. So how are we going to advocate? Well, there's a political committee that's been created -- oh, I'm the Chair of that. Oh, Commissioner -- oh, County Commissioner Wexler is the Vice Chair of it. But we're not talking about that. Just I'm telling you it's out there.

But the cities can spend tax dollars to educate. And that's what they're doing. That's

what the MPO website's going to be. That's why Vice Mayor Mack, Commissioner Gomez, Commissioner Castillo, Commissioner Blattner, Commissioner Long -- we'll leave out school -- and Mayor Ryan, we can all literally talk on both sides of that issue, depending on what setting we're in.

So today we're in a public setting, so I'm talking about education. So please become more educated. It is a very important issue that will determine where we're going. Anything further from the Council? With that, thank you all for your assistance this morning. Thank you, Madam Director. Congratulations.

MS. BOY: I just want to say thank you to all the board members for your support of Broward Next. And, as Mr. Fink mentioned, our staff did a great job putting this together.

(Applause.)

MAYOR STERMER: And with that -- with that, we are adjourned. Thank you.

(The meeting concluded at 11:14 a.m.)