

MINUTES

BROWARD COUNTY PLANNING COUNCIL

April 28, 2016

MEMBERS Anne Castro, Chair
PRESENT: Commissioner Michael S. Long, Vice Chair
Mayor Daniel J. Stermer, Secretary
Commissioner Richard Blattner
Neal R. de Jesus
Tommy DiGiorgio
Michael Friedel
Commissioner Bill Ganz
Commissioner Michelle J. Gomez
Mary D. Graham
Vice Mayor Rita Mack
Robert McColgan
Bernard Parness
Mayor Michael J. Ryan

MEMBERS Commissioner Mark Bogen
ABSENT: Commissioner Angelo Castillo
Charles F. Fink
School Board Member Patricia Good
Richard Grosso

ALSO Barbara Boy, Executive Director
PRESENT: Andy Maurodis, Legal Counsel
Ralph Stone, Broward County Housing Finance and Community
Redevelopment
Henry Sniezek, Broward County Environmental Protection and Growth
Management
Nancy Cavender, The Laws Group

A meeting of the Broward County Planning Council, Broward County, Florida, was held in Room 422 of the Government Center, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, at 10:00 a.m., Thursday, April 28, 2016.

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

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Anne Castro called the meeting to order.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- Broward County Planning Council regular meeting and Public Hearing for April 28th to order.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

CHAIR CASTRO: If everyone would stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE WAS LED BY ANNE CASTRO.)

ROLL CALL:

CHAIR CASTRO: Thank you. Ms. Cavender, if we could have the roll call, please.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Richard Blattner.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Here.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Mark Bogen. Commissioner Angelo Castillo. Mr. Neal de Jesus.

MR. DE JESUS: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Thomas DiGiorgio.

MR. DIGIORGIO: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Charles Fink. Mr. Michael Friedel.

MR. FRIEDEL: Here.

MR. FRIEDEL: Here.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Bill Ganz.

COMMISSIONER GANZ: Here.

THE REPORTER: 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. Commissioner Michael S. Long.

COMMISSIONER LONG: Here.

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

MR. MCGOLGAN: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Bernard Parness.

MR. PARNES: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Michael J. Ryan.

MAYOR RYAN: Present.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Daniel J. Stermer.

MAYOR STERMER: Here.

THE REPORTER: Ms. Anne Castro, Chair.

CHAIR CASTRO: Here.

CONSENT AGENDA

AGENDA ITEM C-4 - EXCUSED ABSENSE REQUESTS:

CHAIR CASTRO: I believe most of the people who have indicated their absences in advance.

MAYOR STERMER: Move to approve the excused absences.

MAYOR RYAN: Second.

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay. So we have a motion to approve those excused and second. All in favor. Hearing no objections, we're good.

MS. BOY: I just wanted to add -- recognize that Commissioner Bogen called in. He's sick this morning. So he was in addition to the four that were listed on the request. Thank you.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

PUBLIC HEARING

AGENDA ITEM PH-4 - AMENDMENT PC 16-2 - THE APPLICANT/CITY OF DEERFIELD BEACH HAS REQUESTED THAT THIS ITEM BE TABLED:

CHAIR CASTRO: Before we get ready to go to the regular agenda, I'm going to pull something a little bit out of order, and that's Item PH-4, so that later when we get to it, I don't forget to take it out and somebody moves the agenda. There's -- Deerfield has asked that we table the item. So if I could have a motion to --

MAYOR STERMER: Move to table Item PH-4.

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: Second.

CHAIR CASTRO: I have a motion and a second. All in favor. Okay. It'll be tabled until the next Council meeting. Thank you.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

CONSENT AGENDA

AGENDA ITEM C-1 - APPROVAL OF FINAL AGENDA FOR APRIL 28, 2016
AGENDA ITEM C-2 - APRIL, 2016 PLAT REVIEWS FOR TRAFFICWAYS PLAN COMPLIANCE
AGENDA ITEM C-3 - APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MARCH 24, 2016

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay. Now we're to our Consent Agenda.

MAYOR STERMER: Move the Consent Agenda.

MR. DIGIORGIO: Second.

CHAIR CASTRO: All in favor. Any opposed? Seeing none, carries.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

REGULAR AGENDA

AGENDA ITEM R-1 - FISCAL YEAR 2017 BUDGET PROPOSAL:

CHAIR CASTRO: Regular Agenda.

MS. BOY: Good morning. Item R-1 is the fiscal year 2017 budget. The executive committee reviewed the item prior to this meeting, and recommended approval of the \$1,029,700 proposed '17 budget.

CHAIR CASTRO: Is your microphone on?

MS. BOY: It is on. They can't hear me?

MR. MAURODIS: Yeah, it -- it's on but it's not --

MS. BOY: Can you hear me now?

CHAIR CASTRO: Yes. That's better

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

MS. BOY: Do you want me to repeat what I just said?

CHAIR CASTRO: Please.

MS. BOY: Okay. Good morning. The executive committee reviewed the proposed fiscal year 2017 budget of \$1,029,700 at their meeting immediately preceding the Council meeting. They recommended approval of the proposed budget as it is in your -- in your package. It's about a -- less than a \$9,000 increase from the adopted FY 2016 budget. And, as we reviewed in the committee, those -- that increase really results from a couple of things.

Last year, the Council approved and asked for additional monies to be put back in the capital budget that had been previously removed during really the recessionary times. Also, some additional funds were placed back in the -- in the travel budget. In addition to those budgetary items, the County Commission approved a three percent salary increase for unrepresented employees in December of last year, so that was also part of the increase.

And then the County also did a classification and compensation study for -- and also resulting in some unrepresented employees' increases to salary. Planning Council staff participated in that study and saw an adjustment to three positions based on that information.

So that's really where the just under \$9,000 increase comes from. And the executive committee, I don't know if anyone has any other comments from the executive committee that they want to review. With that, we would just ask that the Council recommend approval of the proposed FY '17 budget.

CHAIR CASTRO: Do you have any --

Planning Council
4/28/2016
NC

MAYOR RYAN: So moved.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- questions? I have a motion --

COMMISSIONER LONG: Second.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- Mayor Ryan. Second, Commissioner Long. Before we vote, any issues, any questions for staff? Any other comments?

MAYOR RYAN: Actually, I would just move forward my comments from the Executive Director.

CHAIR CASTRO: Thank you, sir. Anybody else from anybody who's not an executive? Okay. All in favor? Any opposed? Seeing none, carries unanimously. Thank you. Oh, wait. Ms. Graham?

MS. GRAHAM: Madam Chair, I wasn't at the executive committee. Would Mayor Ryan just maybe summarize what he put on the record?

MAYOR RYAN: Yes, absolutely. Thank you. I apologize. I was just not trying to delay. A couple things. One, staff's going to, in the future, provide us the actuals for previous years so that we can track it, too. There's an effort by the County on trying to get a potential three percent reduction. I suspect that when we look at the actuals, that's already been adopted each year through salary savings.

Three, to the extent I asked whether they needed more training or travel budget, so that we could make sure we're prepared for that. Four, we talked about the impact of Broward Next, that it won't hit likely in implementation until the -- well, into late '17. And that, finally, we hope that, to the extent the County doesn't put pressure on the three percent, if it happens, that the worst that we want to see is a single position going to part time. We'd hate to lose a position. Thank you.

MS. GRAHAM: Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: Any objection? You're going to stick with your vote? Okay. Thank you.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

AGENDA ITEM R-2 – BROWARD NEXT PRESENTATION/ATTAINABLE HOUSING:

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay. We're moving on to R-2.

MS. BOY: Item R-2 is a presentation related to attainable housing. Henry Sniezek and

Ralph Stone, and, actually, I'm going to participate in the presentation, also, but Henry's going to kick off the presentation.

MR. SNIEZEK: Good morning. Henry Sniezek, Deputy Director of Broward County Environmental Protection and Growth Management Department. Thank you for letting us have a chance to talk to you this morning about housing and attainable housing issues. Quickly, why are we here? As you, the Council members know, back late last year there were two items that came before you that generated a lot of discussion. One was about a change to the Policy 1.07.07, the affordable housing policy, and the plan about standardizing the methodology.

And then I presented to you an initiative of the County Commission to look into a linkage fee for non-residential new development. And, at the time, there were questions about, well, how does -- how do these things fit in with the larger picture, especially what Broward Next is doing. So that's kind of what we would like to do today. I think the presentations we have total would be like between 20 and 30 minutes, not counting any questions or comments you have. So how we're going to do this is that we're going to start high and go low, I guess.

First, Barbara -- we asked Barbara, and she was kind enough to agree to just give you an overview of the Broward Next recommendations as they pertain just to general housing, how some of the recommendations are going to loosen up the ability for cities and the County to accommodate housing in the County, especially in activity centers. And then we'll switch to housing affordability, and we asked Ralph Stone, our Housing Division Director, to come and just once again talk about why that's a big issue in the County, now and in the future, just the housing affordability.

And then I'll come back up and talk about the Broward Next initiative again, but just focusing on attainable housing recommendations. And then the last thing is just to give you an update on the linkage fee, where we are. Some of you have seen before, but I'll just give you an update on where that is. And with that, that'll be our presentation. So, with that, I'll turn it over to Barbara.

MS. BOY: Good morning again. When Henry, Ralph, and I were talking about this presentation, the reason that we're starting with kind of the Broward Next, the summary of really the new criteria for the Land Use Plan, is because this is some of the big pictures items, and these are some of the things that are really refocusing the plan on how to create additional housing opportunities throughout the -- throughout the County. So I'm just going to take you through a quick summary of how some of these new policy and criteria ideas will work. The first thing that we're proposing is to eliminate flexibility zones.

Right now, the County's divided into almost 125 flexibility zones, so we would replace those with just municipal boundaries. So right there, we're freeing up any flex or reserve units that exist. The second piece of that is carrying over those existing flexibility and

reserve unit pools. You know, we've been looking at -- so there would be no net loss to the municipalities. So however many units were authorized as part of flex and reserve would remain in the municipalities, and now they would have the ability to use them without -- throughout the municipality as opposed to only within the zones, because we do have some municipalities where it seems like these units are kind of trapped, for lack of a better term, because there's no real opportunities to allocate flex and reserve there. The third piece of this, the flex zone, the flex and reserve units, maintaining, carrying over and maintaining, is the authorization of a new pool of units.

And the idea behind that is right now we're calling those redevelopment units. When -- a little back in history, as the County plan was established and flex and reserve concepts moved forward, those are really the differences between the County and the city plans. And then reserve units are additional units that were available above and beyond that. So while we're freezing those and carrying them over for use and no net loss, we'll authorize a new pool of units, redevelopment units.

Right now, we're looking at approximately three percent of units. There's approximately 1,000,000 units, just over 1,000,000 units available on the County plan, which would equate to almost 40,000 units for the three percent. So we'll be authorizing new units for municipalities to be able to use for redevelopment and economic opportunities, really looking at prioritizing the plan to really focus on downtowns and transit -- and transit corridors and transit hubs, transportation corridors. These activity centers are really where a lot of the municipalities are finding its development and opportunities, so we really want to queue that up and make sure that that's where -- where redevelopment and housing opportunities are prioritized.

Authorizing the municipal transfer of development rights program. This was kind of the impetus for Broward Next. This was the idea that kind of started the Commission and planning -- Planning Council authorizing this idea, but making sure that municipalities can participate in that program. Also the ability to transfer not only residential, but non-residential development rights, and preserving some sort of open space or public use behind it.

Another really important criteria for the activity center as it relates to -- right now, you know, there's adopted permitted uses in the County plan, and there -- many of them are on transportation corridors. So right now, if a municipality wants to increase the pool of permitted uses, whether those are housing uses or non-residential uses, they have to do a County Land Use Plan amendment. So we're developing a tool that would allow for a percentage increase in density and intensity that could occur via a local amendment only, and then be recertified by the Planning Council.

And we're looking at a percentage increase that could happen every five years or so. So, for example, if a -- if an activity center allows a thousand dwelling units in the adopted countywide Land Use Plan, every five years that would be -- could be available -- there could be an increase available for that. We're talking about between ten and 20

percent, and it would have to go through the local amendment process, demonstrating sufficient facilities and services, and then being recertified here. So that would be another tool that municipalities would be able to use. Attainable housing density bonuses. Right now, those -- that rule is tied to the use of flexibility units and flexibility rules.

So the new Broward Next would actually allow, if you are committing to a very low, low, or moderate affordable unit for a period of -- we're also changing the period of years from 30 years to 15 years, but if it's tied to that 15 year, you would be able to access those density bonuses without having to allocate any flex reserve or the new redevelopment units to that. The -- there's also a proposal as part of Broward Next to treat efficiency type units differently. Right now in the plan, if you have one efficiency unit or studio, it's counted as one full dwelling unit. There's no exception in the plan. So we're looking at a revision to the density calculations, kind of like we do for hotel calculations right now, where a -- basically, an efficiency type unit would count as a half of a dwelling unit.

And all of this is actually proposed in the context of sufficient facilities and services being available. Potable water, (inaudible), sewer, schools, drainage, transportation. So I don't want to lose sight of any of that as we're kind of going things that we're going to loosen up the plan and provide additional housing opportunities, that there's still focus on sufficient facilities and services as part of this. The last couple things, these criteria are really talking about the integration of smart growth and Complete Streets principals. This goes back to transportation and transit corridors also promoting residential opportunities along those corridors.

And then the revision of platting requirements. Currently, there is an exemption in the -- in the County plan. If you're building up to two dwelling units, you're automatically exempt from platting. And then there's also an acreage exemption. And we're talking about increasing the acreage exemption, which would likely impact some of these smaller infill development for residential units that we've seen, increasing from five -- five units to ten dwelling units. So that was where we just wanted to start to give you kind of the really highlights of what we're proposing as part of -- part of Broward Next that will really increase and influence the dwelling unit and the residential opportunities throughout the -- throughout the County. Ralph's going to pick up with a review of housing attainability in Broward County, the current status.

CHAIR CASTRO: Before he starts, does anybody have any questions on what she just went over with Broward Next? Go ahead, Ms. Graham.

MS. GRAHAM: Is there a PDF that we can have?

MS. BOY: Sure. I'm going to send this power point. I should have said that to you. I'm going to send this PowerPoint out after the conclusion of the meeting so everyone has access to all of the information. If -- do you prefer a PDF, or do you want the PowerPoint

presentation?

MS. GRAHAM: Whatever's easiest. Just --

MS. BOY: Okay.

MS. GRAHAM: -- because I'd rather pay attention to what you're saying rather than trying to take notes (inaudible).

MS. BOY: Sure. Yeah, yeah. I definitely -- we just didn't have it quite ready for the -- for the mail out. Thanks.

CHAIR CASTRO: Some real quick hits is if you had flexibility zones within a jurisdiction of a city, now the whole city is the flexibility zone, for lack of a better way to express it. You can use your flex units anywhere you want. You do not have to come back, provided all the other, you know, roadways and schools and everything are in place, to come and get -- to the County for any other permission after that; correct?

MS. BOY: Well, right. For the flex zone.

CHAIR CASTRO: For the flex units.

MS. BOY: For the flex zone. Well, in the redevelopment units, what we're proposing, there may be a process to go through the County for access to those additional three percent units.

CHAIR CASTRO: To -- to go beyond what you're using.

MS. BOY: Right.

CHAIR CASTRO: I --

MS. BOY: Right.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- understand.

MS. BOY: Yes.

CHAIR CASTRO: What were some of the other major hits, just real quick?

MS. BOY: I think one of the really important things is the Regional Activity Centers, because so many of those are along transportation corridors. So this increase that municipalities can implement without having to do a County Land Use Plan amendment. So they've gone through the process to establish the activity center. And, like I said, generally those are along transportation corridors. And they would be able to do a local

amendment to do a percentage increase to the densities and intensities of that. And we're looking at a time frame for every five years. Because if they wanted something in the interim, then that would be cause for -- for a County amendment, clearly, if they can't accomplish it throughout that increase. But I think that -- that's a -- I think that's a big deal.

CHAIR CASTRO: No, it's huge. So, again, the mechanisms are in place, though, for issues of regional impact, such as transportation, school concurrency, and things like that but it will free up a lot of things to be done at the local level.

MAYOR STERMER: Madam Executive Director, it may also be helpful, we know -- some of us here were at the ad hoc steering committee meeting last week. And I know with those agendas, you forward it out to the members of the ad hoc steering committee. It may also be helpful on the larger sense to have those emails distributed to all the members of the Planning Council, because that way they'll see, before it comes here, let's say for this what's been happening and have -- I don't want to say the back story, but more --

MS. BOY: Sure.

MAYOR STERMER: -- of the details --

CHAIR CASTRO: Good point.

MAYOR STERMER: -- than --

CHAIR CASTRO: Yeah.

MAYOR STERMER: -- you know, may come out today, and they will have -- continually haven't had an opportunity to see the documents and raise questions if they have them.

CHAIR CASTRO: And see the whole picture.

MAYOR STERMER: Right.

MS. BOY: Okay.

CHAIR CASTRO: Nothing else?

MAYOR STERMER: Just a thought.

CHAIR CASTRO: No, it's a good thought. I liked it. Go ahead.

MS. BOY: Okay.

CHAIR CASTRO: Thank you.

MS. BOY: Well --

CHAIR CASTRO: Mr. Stone.

MR. STONE: Good morning, Madam Chair, Council members. I just have a couple slides I'll share with you. And, for the most part, these are items that you all have seen previously. Which button? The first is just a reflection on where we stand as far as renter demand and cost burden. You can that, of 381 metro areas in the country, we're ranked seventh. And I have a little more updated data that I'll share with you that just came in in the last month or so.

We have a shortfall of 68,000 units for very low income residents. Those are generally people that are at 60, 50 percent of area median income, below -- and below. And 51 percent of the mortgaged homes are cost burdened.

COMMISSIONER LONG: Ralph, quick question. Can you define from a dollar point of view what the 50 to 60 percent is low AMI?

MR. STONE: It -- it would depend on family size, but, for example, a single income family at 60 percent is probably going to be around \$26,000.

COMMISSIONER LONG: Okay.

MR. STONE: As -- as you all know, and as we've talked about before, I think eight or nine out of the top ten occupations in Broward County are service related wages, retail, restaurant, hospitality, admin jobs. And we are producing those at a pretty high rate. We're, among the three county area in South Florida, producing more jobs than either West Palm or Miami-Dade. Many of those jobs are in this area, which just adds to our burden as far as the need for affordable housing, particularly rental units.

Then you can see what the -- the wage just there, the median annual wage for those kinds of positions. Just a little more data there. We have a unique situation, a number of unique circumstances in Broward in terms of resources and demand. In 2010, the federal government cut the block grant, the Community Development Block Grant, and the HOME grants by 40 and 30 percent respectively. And that same year is when the state totally eliminated the SHIP funding.

The federal grants have kind of stayed steady since that time. The state SHIP money has come back to about half its original level. The state continues to slide a big hunk of the housing trust fund over to general fund activities, unfortunately. So we find ourselves, six years later, still around 50 to 60 percent of the resources that we had in 2010, while the demand continues to rise.

There have been a couple of studies -- and these come out very regularly. Probably hardly a month goes by that I don't get something from either an academic institution or professional association like the -- the national low income housing group. But this is from a study -- I'll -- I'll give you two real quick -- from the New York University Furman Center that focused on rental housing nationally, and it basically concluded that South Florida, our metro area was the worst in the country.

And, you know, some people might think, well, that's Miami dragging us down. Well, it's really not. We're hand-in-glove with Miami in terms of demand, wages, and rental availability and rental costs. One of the -- the striking findings was metro areas with higher rents generally had higher incomes -- that would be something like New York City, San Francisco, et cetera -- while areas with lower rents had lower incomes. But South Florida uniquely pops out as a troubling exception with high housing costs without high income. So we -- and we know that. We know our wages have been stagnant for some period of time.

So that was something that came across my desk in March. And then just a couple weeks ago, there was a new national survey on severely cost burdened households nationally. And those are households with -- that pay more than 50 percent of their income on housing, whether it's renter or home ownership. And again they found that South Florida, Broward County and Miami-Dade, was the worst in the country.

And in terms of individual municipalities -- this is a little surprising -- Miami was fourth worst in the nation -- excuse me -- with almost 20 percent of its residents being severely cost burdened. But right behind them was -- Pembroke Pines was sixth, with 19 percent of their residents, Fort Lauderdale tenth at 18 percent, Hialeah 11th with 18 percent, Hollywood 14th with 17 percent, Pompano Beach 41st at 14 percent. And this was an analysis of 167 cities. So the bottom line is that we're -- we have a -- a troubling and -- and persistent circumstance where we have a very low inventory of affordable, particularly rental units.

We really don't have a single business model that works to produce additional units other than the nine percent tax credit process that you all have heard me talk about that comes down through Florida Housing. We get a set aside that generates about a hundred units a year. I also serve as Executive Director of the Housing Finance Authority. We're able to cobble together about a deal a year. So we're doing about 200 units a year of new affordable rental at the very low level, at the 60 and below. In contrast, Miami-Dade, which has their own doc stamp, is doing about 1500 to 2,000 new units a year, because when their nine percent tax credit applications, which we number probably around ten to 15 a year, they're numbering 80 to 90 a year, come back unfunded, they then turn to their doc stamp resource and they fill the gap, and they're able to do like five or seven more deals.

And Ms. Castro is painfully aware of how -- how that affects us in terms of -- of their circumstance. So, bottom line, resources are low. They've been cut severely over the

last six years. Demand is up. Wages are flat. And one final statistic I'll leave with you, you all remember Robert Von who did the work on the methodology. He also does a statewide evaluation of every county in the state as far as affordable housing demand. And, you know, he again concludes that Broward is -- is among the worse, Broward and Miami-Dade.

But this year, for the first time, he looked at elderly demand, and we are the worst in the state as far as elderly demand for people at very low income levels. We've got a deficiency of 17,000. And as I -- as I hear statistics, you know, on business radio like a million people a -- a day are turning 65 in this country, and that -- that the average income as they retire is 35,000, we know that people are -- will be coming out of jobs where they're not in low income categories, and immediately the day they retire, they're going into low and very low income categories.

And if they don't have the benefit of having a home paid off, they're going to be adding to our normal building inventory of people in the workforce. So just something to -- to give some thought to. I think that elderly affordable housing is going to be a tip of kind of a bigger problem that's going to add to the existing circumstance.

CHAIR CASTRO: Can I ask a few questions?

First, he alluded to me, and that's because in the Florida Housing Trust, our application came in second this year. I told my board I would have rather come in fifth like last year than come in second, but it is what it is. We will try again this year, and, hopefully, now that we're second, we can move to first and maybe put some units on the ground somewhere in Broward County soon. But the total proposals to solve this problem on the table so far as I understand it are the linkage fee; yes?

MR. STONE: Well, we're -- we're down to the bottom of our -- our toolbox, and linkage fee is kind of the last thing left on the table in terms of generating any significant resources.

CHAIR CASTRO: Right. And the document stamp is a DOA; it's not going anywhere?

MR. STONE: It's in the Board's legislative package every year. We can't get out of the batter's box on that.

CHAIR CASTRO: And that's at the state level?

MR. STONE: That's at the state level. The legislators interpret that as a tax, and they're not supporting any new taxes. That's kind of the bottom line on things, even though all -- all we're asking for is the ability to put it on as a referendum issue, to ask our constituents if they would support a doc stamp like they have in Miami-Dade.

CHAIR CASTRO: And we don't have enough juice in Tallahassee to get that done.

MR. STONE: No, ma'am, we don't.

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay, then. That's (inaudible). What about the CRAs geared towards only redevelopment of attainable workforce housing? Has that been vetted or discussed?

MR. STONE: It's been discussed. There really aren't any CRAs that have taken on affordable housing as an initiative. There are some that have done really well. I would consider them near market rate in terms of their areas, and have a tax increment tax flow that could support an affordable housing deal. I won't single anybody out, but --

CHAIR CASTRO: Well, let's step back. I think you're going in the wrong door. Same church, but wrong door.

MR. STONE: Okay.

CHAIR CASTRO: I would like the County to create a special CRA, especially for cities that don't have CRAs, in the blighted area, that are non-TIF today, to give us a TIF for affordable housing component. And it's a win/win, because the housing that's in the already blighted area, affordable housing would be an improvement. So nobody's going to complain; right? But the money from the TIF doesn't go to fancy mixed market rate developments, but strictly towards attainable workforce housing. And there are several TIF-less --

MR. STONE: Right.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- CRAs, and you could pilot with us, and then, after that, we could look around the rest of the County and create TIFs to help generate funds. That way, it's more amenable for the County to help fund, because it's taxpayer dollars that are going to it. It's directed funding as opposed to the County touching the money first and moving it someplace else; right?

MR. STONE: Yes, ma'am. We --

CHAIR CASTRO: So --

MR. STONE: -- we have not had that discussion.

CHAIR CASTRO: Would you, please?

MR. STONE: We -- I will be happy to share that with Ms. Henry.

CHAIR CASTRO: And that way, everybody's in; right? The property owners are in. The businesses are in. Everybody's in. So everybody's going to be paying in, which

makes everybody feel better about the whole process. See, everybody doesn't want to -
- I don't want to have to pay for it. The developer doesn't want to pay for it. The cities
can't afford it. Okay, let's put everybody in.

So using the taxes as a directed funding source is probably the way to go. And, again, if
you already have an existing CRA, the area's already blighted, nobody's going to get
upset about building affordable housing there. The biggest challenge you have to
affordable housing is certain cities don't want it in certain places. Some cities don't want
it at all; right? So you've got to figure out how to do this and not concentrate it all the
time in certain areas.

And CRAs tend to be big enough that you don't have to build on a five square block
area. You can spread it out a bit. So it's just a suggestion. So my concern is we all
keep beating this to death, and the County Commission keeps beating it to death, but
nobody's really looking for any out-of-the-box solution how do we fix it.

And it's only -- last year when you were here it was 55,000. We're now up to 68,000.
And I can tell you from the calls I get every day, I get seniors who are absolutely
desperate. All's they have is Social Security which is in the \$700 range. And I tell them
quite bluntly you need to think about moving out of South Florida. Seriously. And I'm
not joking with them. I don't want them eating cat food and not eating at all. So I tell
them, you really need to think about moving out of South Florida. And it's sad, but that's
the way it is.

And then there's families that call me every day, and there's no place for them, either.
How about -- and this'll get everybody excited, and I'm just throwing this out because I
thinking it when he was talking about it, because we're talking about space. How about
a luxury house tax? I know nobody likes taxes, but if you're four -- a family of four living
in 5,000 square feet and taking up that space, how about paying a little extra tab for
that? Boy, that sounds like Socialism, which I'm not, I'm going to say. But I'm just
throwing some stuff out there. Do you know what I'm saying? Let's offset the haves
with the have-nots a little bit, because the haves want their Starbucks coffee, so
somebody has to pour it.

MR. STONE: Well, there's no doubt that -- that the issue --

CHAIR CASTRO: A luxury tax --

MR. STONE: -- is about --

CHAIR CASTRO: -- is usually what it's called.

MR. STONE: -- is about resources, and it's about ongoing resources. And, you know, to
-- to give you a context, a hundred-unit affordable project like a nine percent tax credit
project requires a subsidy of about \$50,000 a unit.

CHAIR CASTRO: Right.

MR. STONE: So that it pencils out over a long period of time. It keeps that subsidy in place and has maintenance and cash flow for 15, 20 years. So it's an extraordinary level of funding that would be necessary to start making a dent. In the neighborhood of something like Miami-Dade, we're talking 20 to \$30,000,000 a year to -- to start getting at a thousand units a year. So it's a very difficult circumstance.

CHAIR CASTRO: But having said that, you mentioned something very important there. The subsidy portion is only \$50 a door -- \$50,000 a door.

MR. STONE: 50,000.

CHAIR CASTRO: 50,000. The reality is the developer will bring in the rest, provided they draw the income off the project for so many years until it's stabilized, does whatever. The banks will do the rest. So it's not that you have to get 30,000,000 to build a new apartment complex.

MR. STONE: That's correct.

CHAIR CASTRO: You really just need the subsidy to get the developer and the bank to the table. I mean, and so that's really, in the bigger picture, a lot less. And I know it's a challenge. I'm facing it. But it's a lot less than if I had to go out and find \$30,000,000 myself --

MR. STONE: Yeah.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- right?

MR. STONE: And -- yes, ma'am.

CHAIR CASTRO: Yeah.

MR. STONE: And, again, just for context, if -- if you add up the home, the block grant, and the SHIP funding for all 16 entitlement communities in Broward, it's seven and a half million dollars.

CHAIR CASTRO: Which is nothing.

MR. STONE: Right.

CHAIR CASTRO: Right.

MR. STONE: Very -- very little.

CHAIR CASTRO: Yeah. Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Just -- just a point of interest, if the infrastructure sales tax that's being promoted by the MPO passes, that money could be used for affordable housing, among many other things.

MR. STONE: I -- I don't know what the -- the funding it would generate would be.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Well, it would be up to the recipient cities to decide how to use the money. That -- that is -- I don't want to get into a discussion of it here, but -- but it is an eligible activity and depends on what passes.

CHAIR CASTRO: Does anybody else have any ideas --

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR CASTRO: -- about how to fund attainable affordable housing or any thoughts, suggestions? Yes, Ms. Graham.

MS. GRAHAM: Madam Chair, I was going to wait until Mr. Stone finishes his presentation. I didn't know if you were finished, or -- or you were just asking a few specific questions.

CHAIR CASTRO: No, he's done.

MR. STONE: I'm all done.

MS. GRAHAM: I made a list, and I don't know if this ought to go to the end so that I don't taint anyone else's questioning or perceptions or comments.

CHAIR CASTRO: I think we're at the end. I don't think anybody else has any questions.

MS. GRAHAM: Okay.

CHAIR CASTRO: Anybody else have comments?

MS. GRAHAM: Okay. Just real quick, and, again, just as fast as you can answer this so I don't take up any more time. You mentioned the 2010 cuts to the block grants and all of that. Roughly what drove that? I mean, we were in the -- in the middle of the administration after the President had been elected the first time. So was that Congress that --

MR. STONE: That was Congress, the shift in Congress as far as --

MS. GRAHAM: Okay.

MR. STONE: -- priorities in an effort to cut -- cut funding.

MS. GRAHAM: Okay. Because I actually had seen the study. A couple things real quick. I sent something to Barbara yesterday from the Wall Street Journal back around the 24th or 25th about how -- and I'll let her send it to everyone else if you didn't see it -- but all these cities now that want to create their own downtown. And, of course, they were using specific examples in the New York City regional area and also in San Francisco, but Fort Lauderdale's trying to do that. And it's interesting that everyone has this goal, but there's really not enough warm bodies all over the U.S. to drive the densities that they all want.

That's something to look at. It doesn't affect low income housing or affordable housing, but it just affects the dynamic and the synergy that they're trying to do by getting a lot of people in one area for this live, work, play that everyone seems to think everyone wants. The other thing is in yesterday's Wall Street Journal there was an article about Google cities. I don't know if anyone saw that. Alphabet is going to develop a city from scratch, basically, and they want to implement all of their planning tools and everything else. It's -- I don't know if it's going to be a utopia or not, but they're going to, obviously, avoid all the problems that maybe we face now because of the existing infrastructure. You mentioned about the doc stamps. Dade County got to have those because it was in their Charter from way back, but yet Broward can't do that?

MR. STONE: Miami-Dade has had a longstanding affordable housing problem. This goes back three decades. They're 30 years into their first doc stamp. And they did it by going to the Legislature before there was the Sadowski Act and the SHIP program --

MS. GRAHAM: Okay.

MR. STONE: -- and saying, please do this for our county. And that's how that evolved.

MS. GRAHAM: Okay. And our chances of getting that are pretty slim. The only reason why I think that might be a little bit better than the linkage fee is, I mean, I personally would not support a linkage fee, you know. But if I'm only one voter going to the polls on a referendum, I -- I just -- I think it would end up having very unintended consequences. And, in the end -- we're also a very small county. Broward is -- are we the smallest county of the 67, but, I mean, we just don't have that much, and I -- what we're to do --

CHAIR CASTRO: We're one of the largest counties.

MS. GRAHAM: Huh?

CHAIR CASTRO: We're like one of the top ten largest counties.

MS. GRAHAM: No, area.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Land-wise.

CHAIR CASTRO: No, even land-wise, I think we're fairly large.

MS. GRAHAM: Okay. Well, Palm Beach is like the largest, from what I understand. So when I look at the County and I see what we have, we really don't have all that much. And I think after living here for so long, I don't know if there's a way to be able to create this database, but in -- because what ends up driving the increase in housing cost is taxes, property taxes on non-homesteaded property, and then insurance. We talk about that all the time.

And if you go back and you could create a database where you could look at all of the multi-family housing, whether it was four units or less, which comes under the threshold of the state implementing certain oversight by statute, or units over, five and higher, but if you could take all of that and actually look at the way the valuations have been devised by the Property Appraiser, you would see that.

When I look at the deals that I have to work on, and I look at what these people are paying in taxes, and I look at the cash flow in the rentals, I don't know how they're making a profit. I don't know how they do it. But I'm busy, because I'm doing that for the people that want to loan money on this stuff. I think that's the biggest problem.

The other thing is putting housing in blighted areas, like Madam Chair had suggested, if you have children and they're in schools, if the schools aren't good, it doesn't matter how nice the housing is now in the blighted areas, it may not work. So, I mean, there's -- there's so many different factors that have to be looked at at the same time, concurrently, and just people always asking questions. I mean, we may not solve it, but at least the -- the query is out there for someone to eventually address or prioritize.

But I really think the valuation of the properties, as we came out of the recession, all the municipalities touted how their property base had increased by two percent or five percent or whatever, but, at the same time, that's a double-edged sword, because as the values have gone up on the non-homesteaded rentals, it's -- it's -- they've got to raise the rents. Even if it's just \$10 a month or \$50 a month, that can maybe break someone who's trying to make ends meet.

The other thing is all the line items in the tax bill for the fees. I mean, I know what I pay just living in Fort Lauderdale, but you've got your School Board taxes, and if there's any bond deals and things like that. I personally have never looked at the tax bill and compared them for the multi-family properties. That's on the -- it's on the Property Appraiser website. I could do that. But I think if we were all to be realistic and look at

that bill for a complex, whether it's ten units or 110 units, all of a sudden you see why the affordable housing just doesn't work, or why the cash flow isn't what we want it to be. And then, lastly, the luxury tax, is that like a value added tax? Is that --

CHAIR CASTRO: No.

MS. GRAHAM: I -- I just -- personally, I don't think that would fly. And I don't live in a 5,000 square foot house, but I just -- I think it would be really hard to sell that. I -- I think there's other ways to arrive at the goal rather than just start plucking those kind of ideas out and saying, let's do it, because right away it immediately creates a chasm that we'll never bridge that.

Those are -- those are not even in your toolbox, let alone at the bottom of the toolbox. And then, finally, for the affordable housing, even if we give them workforce housing, we can build it and everything works, they still have to pay their electric bill; correct? And is the water sub-metered, or does everyone get their own meter? Do they -- or does it depend how the developer builds the project?

MR. STONE: Well, it's a cost that's passed along regardless of whether it's individually metered or not.

MS. GRAHAM: Okay. So whether it's based on square footage or -- I mean, some complexes I go to, it's based on the square footage. Other times, it's the number of occupants. It all depends how they decide to make their money. But that is the big fallacy even with people buying their first house, is they look at their mortgage payment's going to include property taxes and insurance, but all of a sudden you have all these other things to add on to the monthly bill.

And if you're in Fort Lauderdale, we have a franchise fee tacked on to your FPL bill, which is a kickback to the city, because, in the end, all of this is simply driven by the municipalities wanting revenue. And if we're never going to go back to maybe the '80s or the '90s, when property taxes were lower and the whole valuation base of the County was lower, I don't see how we're ever going to get below rents that are 1100 a month or 1250 a month or whatever the threshold would be where you've come up with those calculations so far. But I -- I personally just don't think the linkage is -- is a better -- is a good idea. I would find some other way to try to achieve that.

CHAIR CASTRO: I'm going to jump in and make a couple comments to her comments. Number one, the CRA in Dania Beach has an A rated school. Schools in blighted areas actually tend to be better schools. Because the area's blighted, they tend to get a lot more resources because the student population is socioeconomically poorer than most. Secondly, my idea about the luxury tax, I was trying to stimulate a conversation and ideas and thoughts of anybody who had any possible solutions as remote and regardless of how crazy they sounded to solve the problem.

We can keep talking about affordable attainable housing, but we're not solving it yet, because we're not finding any solutions yet. I don't know if I support the linkage fee or not. From what I saw in your presentation last time, it didn't generate a lot of money. And if it's not generating a lot of money, I'm not sure it's any good. You can do it. I'll take any drop in the bucket, probably, in the end, because the point is now it's not just the insurance and the wages and -- and it's not even the electric bills and the phone bills. Right now, the demand is for rental housing so that people don't have to pay those things.

They don't pay the property tax. It's built into the rent. And I get it. The rent is higher, but that's also because of the units that are available on the ground. The demand is for lower cost units, and we don't have a supply. That's what we're talking about doing with the affordable housing component. So all of that gets thrown out of the door, because the whole purpose of an affordable housing complex, which, by the way, the construction today is amazing, and they look as nice, if not nicer, and they're, you know, Cat 5 storm, all that kind of stuff, is just as good as the housing stock that's on the ground now. Matter of fact, one of the solutions that Mr. Sniezek has mentioned, and I totally agree with him, is the better use of modular homes.

Now, south Broward in the past, or Broward, has never thought about modular homes, because of hurricanes. But the modular homes today are very, very affordable, very affordable, and they will stand up to a hurricane today because of the way the technology, the construction, development, everything has changed. My point is, last year we're at 55,000, now we're at 68,000, and nobody has any concrete solutions. And I'm like -- I'll throw anything at the dart board, and that's why I'm asking anybody, do you have any thought that could trigger something else that might be workable, as absurd as it might be. Please, don't be shy. Don't be afraid.

This is a serious problem. And but for the grace of God go all of us. And if any of you have senior parents or know older people in the County, you're probably already facing it, because they're going to be moving in with you soon, because they don't have any other place to live. So I'm trying to stick out anything, because I'm going to take the moment, whenever Mr. Stone or anybody steps up to the microphone and talks about attainable affordable housing in Broward County, because I am now intimately aware of the situation and the problem. So I feel like it's my cause to go out and try to fix it. So I just want to put that on the record. Yes, sir.

MR. PARNES: I understand in Florida if you buy a yacht over 35,000, you're tax exempt.

CHAIR CASTRO: That's correct.

MR. PARNES: Why?

CHAIR CASTRO: More resources.

MAYOR STERMER: Bernie, it's more -- it's more than that. Go buy a suite at the BB&T.

MR. PARNES: I'm -- I'm just saying. But that's just one example.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. PARNES: Why? Why, when you take a booth at a ball park, get tax exempt, big corporations? Why can't these people pay? You go to the ball park, buy a ticket, you pay tax. Why are they tax exempt? Why is somebody buying a \$6,000,000 yacht tax exempt? Why is somebody belonging to a gun club, why is the club tax exempt? This is money that could be used for affordable housing.

I have nothing against the very rich, but I -- my heart goes out to those who are living on the street because they can't -- or in their cars because they can't afford a place to live. I don't know about the rest of you, but when I see it in Deerfield, it tears my heart out that there are people that can't afford a roof over their head. Are we responsible for them? I guess we are, because we're a community. I think earmarking certain taxes for affordable housing and nothing else would be a solution. We can't give the city money and hope they're going to put affordable housing in, because city says we need a new community center. That's more important. We want to fix this. That's more important. We want to re-sand the beaches because it makes money. More important than somebody having a roof over their head.

Taxes can be made perhaps even on a County level that are earmarked solely for affordable housing. Not given to the cities, not given to anywhere else, but earmarked specifically for affordable housing. It's the only way you're ever going to solve the problem. It's the only way you're going to raise the money. If you make it too expensive for the builders, they're not going to build it. Why would you build affordable housing when it costs you almost as much today to build nicer housing where you can get double the rent? Or condo and sell them.

The answer has to be because we make it affordable enough for builders to acquire the land and put up affordable housing. The only way you're going to do that is to raise revenue. I don't see any other way to raise revenue than finding a way to get rid of loopholes so that a lot of individuals who avoid tax don't avoid it anymore.

CHAIR CASTRO: Thank you. Mr. DiGiorgio.

MR. DIGIORGIO: Madam Chair, I just wanted to applaud your passion on this issue. I appreciate it very much. It's a -- it's a very big issue that we're dealing with. There are some studies right now that -- that the City of Pompano Beach is undertaking, looking at the affordable housing there in the city, and it's very clear that the very low income, the housing out there's just not available. And when we talked about 13,000, and we talked

40 -- 55 to 68,000 units in a year, a 13,000 unit demand, what Mr. Stone just said about our seniors, that's a -- that's a huge issue. And I -- again, no matter how outlandish your proposals may sound, I appreciate you throwing them out there. I don't support the luxury tax, but I do throw it out -- I do appreciate you throwing it out there. But I think when we talk about a linkage fee and we come up with a handful, five, six homes a year, and we're -- and our -- our need is increasing by 13,000, we need to think out-of-the-box.

I don't have any great solutions for us right now, but I do appreciate you bringing it up on a regular basis, and I do hope we really don't continue to just talk about it and take little pieces out of it. I really hope we address the giant problem that it is, and -- and make sure that we don't feel like we're doing something because we pass a linkage fee and get five or six homes a year.

Again, it's a little bit, but it doesn't do anything. It does have -- as Ms. Graham said, it may have some unintended consequences. So I really -- I really hope that we continue to talk about it every chance we get, and continue to really throw out the wild and maybe somewhat raucous -- that cause a raucous discussion. So thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: Get people's attention. Commissioner Long and then --

COMMISSIONER LONG: And, Bernie, to what -- what you said, I mean, the people that we have homeless, you know, that continues to grow. We haven't gotten a pit count for this year. Don't know why that's taking so long. But when we talk about affordable housing, and that's why I asked the question, you know, what is it? How do you define that? And it's like, you know, 26, \$27,000. That's not talking about the homeless. Their, you know, AMI is 30 percent or below. Or zero. I mean, they're not making money. There's no money out there.

That's a whole separate issue, and I -- I constantly ask the question of, you know, how many -- when we do these set asides, ten percent here and there, where is that going? How many places has that built, and for who? You know, it's even a bigger picture than this. And, really, the doc stamps, politically, doesn't go over, especially in a Democratic county with a Republican led Legislature, and, you know, the northern part of the state is all Republican. So we're probably not going to see that drastically change over the years.

But, you know, Dade County's success was because of the doc stamps. And if we had that in Broward County, it would solve a multitude of problems that we have here. The linkage fee is \$2,000,000. That's nothing, you know. And -- and don't forget, everybody has their hand out. The County's going to take administrative fees here and there. But, you know, when we look at the bigger picture, we have to realize that our County, it's a very large county, but half of it's all Everglades. There's no development there. There's no taxation over there.

So we cram everybody in this thing, so there's only so much land. The land continues to go up. We're seeing that increase again now with all the different building. So the value's going to go up. We're going to have the problem. If you look at the ALICE report, which I think was kind of commented there with the, you know, asset limited, income constraint, I mean, it's getting worse for us, and it will get worse. Every time they update that report, it will be a lot more difficult for any affordable housing, however it's defined either workforce, for teachers, for firemen, for people working downtown serving our restaurants and -- and nurses that are starting out. I mean, these are some of the people we're talking about.

So even taking the homeless piece off the board, you have people that you see every single day when you walk outside, and these are the people that may be tending to your medical needs. These are people who are serving you dinner. It's the one who's putting out the fire. It's the one that's saving you from being robbed. These are some of the other people we're talking about. And if we don't have workforce housing available, how do we fill those key and critical jobs? And I think there has to be a bigger dialog going on in the County, in the state, because, as has been mentioned, South Florida is kind of inverse to what most of the country is and the state itself. You know, you go to Lake County, cheap. Land is cheap.

South Florida doesn't have that. Palm Beach. Palm Beach still has some less expensive property in the -- in the western areas, but most of it is agriculture, although it sounds like they're opening that up as well. But Broward County right now, we're pretty much built out. Whatever agriculture we have is -- is slowly dissolving. And we've got to start looking on a bigger picture, and looking -- we should have been doing this ten years ago. I'm sure we did, but there just wasn't that pressure there. And if we want to talk about affordable housing, attainable housing, and workforce housing, however it's defined, from the homeless up to the people who are putting out the fire the next time you have one, we have to take a serious look at this. And a -- to me, the doc stamp is the way to go. Unfortunately, it's not politically correct. Maybe we need to change that political correctness there for the better of Broward County and South Florida in general.

CHAIR CASTRO: Thank you. Mr. McColgan.

MR. MCCOLGAN: My name's Robert McColgan. I'm from Hallandale. I think one of the things the County lacks or lacks their involvement or their independence, we need some better input from the CRAs. We need the CRAs to get more involved in affordable housing. The money was allocated from the County Board of Commissioners to the CRAs to handle blight and housing. Blight and housing, there seems to be a misunderstanding with the CRAs with blight and housing and helping on affordable housing.

I would even go to the point of the CRAs have been asked many times to attend meetings on affordable housing -- this is a critical statement against the CRAs. They need to get more involved in affordable housing. That's all I have to say.

CHAIR CASTRO: And I just want to emphasize, not all CRAs are funded. There are several TIF-less CRAs out there. And he's actually right about the funded ones. Commissioner Gomez.

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: I more or less have comment and questions. Along with the seniors, which is a very big population that is having trouble making their ends meet, as well, when we talk about our -- our low income, we also have children out there. The last amount that I had, I believe it was like 2500 children who are living in shelters, who are going home every day -- they go to school every day, and they fake it. They try to be that everything's the same as their neighbors. But they don't. They don't go to a house when they're done.

So they're also a critical need. And when we worry about our population and our educating of our children, it's a little hard when some of our children are going home without eating, and then they don't have the ability to focus on their studies, and they're -- they're sidetracked from where we are trying to make sure our kids live kids' lives and be happy and become one of those people who contribute to society. So it's one big integrated mess. I do have a question to what was the problem with the doc stamps. I guess I don't understand the history of it, and if this is not the right time, if I could be educated at a later time, I'd appreciate it.

CHAIR CASTRO: Before you answer that question, I also want to mention a group that nobody's mentioned. And I will tell you this is where HUD is guiding most of their resources today, and it's not just homeless, and it's just regular people. And that's to the vets. This country has more and more vets coming home every day because of all the different wars we've been in in the last decade, and because of survivability. You know, in previous wars, a lot of times vets never made it home, especially if they were injured or -- or wounded in some way.

Well, today, because of gain of science, we bring a lot of vets home, either with issues with, you know, brain injury, or amputees, or things that sometimes hold them back from fulfilling their complete potential in a career environment. And HUD is really, really trying to redirect a lot of funds, vouchers, whatever you want to say, in that direction. Which means families, some of them have families, some don't, but that means it's a whole new world out there as far our people who are trying to afford to live. And if anything else, if somebody should come up with a program in the County somewhere, would be if you don't want to do a CRA to fund just for anybody, at least put some money on the table for the vets, because God knows most of them have sacrificed as much as they could for our behalf, and at least we should be able to give them a place to live when they come home. Now, who would like to answer the doc stamp?

MAYOR STERMER: Can I just before we --

CHAIR CASTRO: Go ahead.

MAYOR STERMER: -- go further on the conversation and get an answer to Commissioner Gomez, can we just take a ten-second pause? Move the rest of the agenda. Let the professionals that are sitting here --

CHAIR CASTRO: Oh, sure.

MAYOR STERMER: -- if they want to get out of here get out of here, and we can keep the conversation going?

CHAIR CASTRO: Unless those professionals --

MAYOR STERMER: And if they want to stay, they can participate in the conversation.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- unless those professionals can help us get money for affordable housing, they can keep their seats.

MAYOR STERMER: No, I understand. But I -- I'm saying --

MS. GRAHAM: If that's a motion, I'll second it.

PUBLIC HEARING

AGENDA ITEM PH-1 - RECERTIFICATION PCR 16-4

AGENDA ITEM PH-2 - RECERTIFICATION PCR-16-6

AGENDA ITEM PH-3 - RECERTIFICATION PCR 16-7

AGENDA ITEM PH-5 - AMENDMENT PC 16-3

AGENDA ITEM PH-6 - AMENDMENT PC 16-2

MAYOR STERMER: I'll move PH-1 through PH-6, excluding PH-4. That was already tabled.

CHAIR CASTRO: Any other pulls?

MS. BOY: And we have no speakers.

CHAIR CASTRO: No speakers. All in favor? Any opposed? Seeing none, carries. Thank you, sir.

MAYOR STERMER: Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: Very nice. Well done. Yeah. Let's just -- he doesn't care about affordable housing.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: I certainly do. I just don't have any money.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

REGULAR AGENDA

AGENDA ITEM R-2 - BROWARDNEXT PRESENTATION/ATTAINABLE HOUSING:

MS. BOY: I also just want to add, in this commercial interruption, that there is a remaining portion of the presentation, so --

CHAIR CASTRO: Right.

MS. BOY: -- I don't -- I just want to make sure that --

CHAIR CASTRO: We haven't forgotten about Henry.

MS. BOY: -- that was brought to your attention.

CHAIR CASTRO: We know. He's gotten up and down a couple times now. Just explain the doc stamps and we'll move on.

MAYOR STERMER: I just didn't want --

CHAIR CASTRO: No, it was good. Thank you.

MR. STONE: The issue with the --

CHAIR CASTRO: I appreciate it. It was good.

MR. STONE: -- support of the doc stamp really has simply been that there's -- we cannot garner a majority of the legislators in Tallahassee to support an initiative that would allow Broward to put it on as a referendum item because they associate it with a tax.

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: So are we ask -- are we asking to increase it from the 70 cents per hundred or are we just asking to get a piece of the 70 cents per hundred?

MR. STONE: It would be added to the 70 cents.

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: And is there a number that we've thrown out that's been -- or just in general? It's not even letting the conversation (inaudible).

MR. STONE: Well, we -- we would like to model it pretty much the way Miami-Dade does. And I don't remember off-the-top-of-my-head what their particular cents are, but their program is raising probably in a -- an average year, between 20 and \$30,000,000 a

year for affordable housing.

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: Miami's at six -- 60 percent per hundred, but, okay. Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: Also, my understanding was the -- there are certain people or groups that oppose it. And I know the real estate -- Board of Realtors and those originally opposed it. I think they've softened that position in the last maybe two or three years, from my little bit of work I did with the Broward Housing Council.

So there are some pretty strong people that felt that it would slow down their industry or their business, which obviously didn't help. But I think, like I said, at least I know the realtors, I believe, have now softened their position on it a little bit. Real quick, and then we've got Henry. Yes, ma'am.

MS. GRAHAM: Is there a way to compare the volume of properties historically up until now that have come onto the tax rolls that are owned by non-profits and don't pay property taxes? And I'm not going to single anyone out, but in Fort Lauderdale I'm aware of a non-profit entity that has been acquiring property over the years to serve the needs that they have, and we are literally talking about hundreds and hundreds of acres that are no longer on the tax rolls. And at one time, they were businesses, because they were -- there were there when I was first aware of them, and they're not anymore. And if there was a way to make a chart or a graph to be able to see this, likewise the same data information, you would see that, instead of everything on a trajectory, slow but sure increasing, because we added so many buildings to the total in the County, and yet the revenue's not there. So there is something that's inverting the value that we think we're going to be having.

CHAIR CASTRO: I think the key there is not non-profits. I think it's tax exemptions.

MS. BOY: Yes.

MR. MAURODIS: That's right.

CHAIR CASTRO: Yes. And I think you could probably get that from the Property Appraiser's Office. I think Ms. Blake Boy is writing it down, to find all the parcels and the ownership on the tax exempt properties in Broward County.

MS. GRAHAM: Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: Uh-huh. I'm sorry. Mr. Friedel.

MR. FRIEDEL: My question was --

CHAIR CASTRO: Commissioner --

Planning Council
4/28/2016
NC

MR. FRIEDEL: -- have we studied good models from other regions in the country that have successfully addressed this problem, maybe with systems we haven't discussed here, like the linkage fee or the luxury tax, as it were?

MR. STONE: Yes, sir, we have. We -- the most popular approaches are something like a dedicated revenue source like a doc stamp, but supplementing that are really two key things. One is -- and I hate to say it out loud -- linkage fees, but they are much more robust than we're proposing at a dollar a square foot. You're talking 15 and \$20 a square foot, for example, like Seattle some of those areas.

The other is because the linkage fee is appended to commercial development. On the residential development side, they require percentage set asides for the residential development community. And this is pretty common in the high cost areas around the country, where if you have a hundred unit development, 15 percent of those units have to be set aside for affordable housing.

MR. FRIEDEL: And my final question is if we did a full court press and gave you everything that you wanted, what would be the timetable to address the 68,000 or 69,000, you know, units that are missing?

MR. STONE: Well, I think a --

MR. FRIEDEL: I know that's a --

MR. STONE: -- well --

MR. FRIEDEL: -- pie in the sky.

MR. STONE: -- a good indicator is the number of tax credit applications we get a year, because the -- the Board of County Commissioners does the tax credit match on everything that's presented. And it's usually between ten and 15 deals a year. So if -- if we could do ten years a deal, that would be about a thousand units a year.

MR. FRIEDEL: Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: Commissioner Blattner.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Well, just to make the situation worse, in a way, is if you calculate -- and it's easy to do -- the number of -- number of residences in your community that pay no taxes because of homestead exemptions, and senior exemptions, and veterans' exemptions and so forth -- and I'm not saying those things are wrong, because we passed them, but it takes a lot of money off the tax rolls. In our city, I forgot the number now, but it -- it goes up every year. And the people that we're talking about needing help are going to end up living in places where, because of their

income, they're not going to pay much, if any, taxes.
It just gets worse.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right. It's a problem.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: The other side of it would be wouldn't it be wonderful if you had more high paying jobs in Broward County.

CHAIR CASTRO: Sure. And lower insurance.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

CHAIR CASTRO: Just for the record, my exploit earlier about a luxury tax on luxury homes, I wasn't serious, just so we are clear on that. I was just trying to stimulate conversation. And I don't want everybody who knows me calling me, especially you developer attorneys, and go what are you thinking? So I'm just saying. And, yes, I even have some friends who are wealthy, and I don't want them getting on me.

MAYOR STERMER: I'm not sure you backpedaled quickly. You on that one or Donald Trump on something else he said recently. Or, you know, somebody like that.

CHAIR CASTRO: Hey, what's that? If he's going to play the women's card, deal me in. Okay. I'm a woman. There you have it. Mr. Sniezek.

MR. SNIEZEK: Thank you. I guess even though Mayor Stermer took away my excuse to shorten my presentation, I will anyway. And, actually, I'll even shorten the linkage fee, because I'll just try to reinforce and supplement the good discussion you've already had. And just from the comments I hear and what Ralph and I have learned, you know, we've done a little road show about the linkage fee, so we've heard a lot. And, you know, this is a -- this is a big issue, and it's bigger than this board and what County staff or even the County could do. It really -- to address this appropriately, really, the County would be a partner with the municipalities and the private sector.

I mean, just some of the things that Ms. Graham mentioned, it's going to take a lot more than Ralph and I and Barb -- working with Barbara and you all to come fix it. So, you know, we're talking about land use policy, so there are some things we can do, some things the municipalities can do, some things we can do with the private sector. So that's kind of what we're focused on. But we recognize this is a large issue, it's not going away, and it really take -- takes -- going to take a lot of effort in a bigger stage to come up with some really good solutions.

So, with that, I just -- I'm going to go back to Broward Next. You know, you've seen me. You've seen Ralph. We're talking about some of the things that are perceived as sticks. You know, the -- the methodology change to the policy, the linkage fee. So, you know, as Barbara was mentioning, there's some of the carrots that we're throwing in here, too,

so you can see the bigger picture. So there's four strategies for the housing, the highlighted strategies. And it's kind of a three-pronged approach. And it's not even talking about the state and the federal government. You know, they have a responsibility for this issue, too.

So but for the County plan, I guess we're talking about things that the County -- within the County. So, obviously, the first one is -- is a sustainable funding source. And, you know, obviously, I'm going to talk about the linkage fee. That could be a small funding source. Another thing I can mention is the County has a grant program called the Broward Redevelopment Program that funds projects in municipalities for economic development. Right now, that program does not allow that money to be used for affordable housing. That's something -- talked about with County administration. I think there is some support to -- to include that as part of a funding eligibility for that program. So that's a couple, but certainly need more. I heard the thing about the sales tax, if that could be, would free up some money.

So we're open to other funding sources, but, you know, within the County, these are the kind of tools we're doing, and it's very hard to go in and -- and sell something to raise more money, obviously, you know, as we've learned through the linkage fee. Second is to engage the development community. As was mentioned about, you know, we just had a presentation at our Housing Council about shipping container housing. They look like traditional housing. They can look like very industrial housing for hip people. It seems like they did a -- this group who's doing this, they did a financial feasibility study. It shows that there is some promise for that to be introduced in the area if the municipalities want it.

The issue they have still is land costs and building codes. So we're sending them to the Board of Rules and Appeals, our -- our building code people to make sure that what they're talking about is something that could meet the County's codes. But they also said that they had a Town of Davie official, building official, that was on their group, their advisory group, and he said that he thought it was. So that's a very promising thing, but, you know, modular housing, other types of techniques are also out there. So we'd like to, as part of the -- a policy in the Land Use Plan is to engage the development community to see if there's some new products out there that we can promote within the County. And, of course, these are all -- would be something subject to municipal approval. We're not trying to just say municipalities have to do this.

Another approach is obviously the bonus density. Barbara mentioned that. I'll go into the details about that later. And then also a -- trying to treat efficiency units or single occupancy as a lower density. That's something we are promoting or recommending to put in the Land Use Plan, but then it'd be up to the municipalities if they want to do it. So if you don't want to do that, you don't want to count efficiencies as less density, you don't have to. It's just something the County would say the County doesn't have a problem with that.

And then the last strategy, obviously, is something -- municipalities have a role in affordable housing. I think most municipalities recognize that and support that. So but as things come before the -- the Planning Council and the County Commission in the future for land use amendments and their recommendation is to keep some level of review of affordable housing strategies. And one of the reasons I thought Barbara's presentation was really important is because a lot of those recommendations are going to open up housing throughout the County at the municipal level.

So you won't even have to come to the County as often anymore to approve Land Use Plan amendments. But when you do, I think the County Commission is going to be interested in seeing what municipalities are doing to address affordable housing. So that's why that recommendation is staying right now. So as far as implementation, really, again, we're just talking about retaining a version of Policy 1.07.07. One thing, I think you're going to see that next month for -- for a Public Hearing, you know, we've been using that methodology already in other -- in some cities, just informally. It's worked fine, so I just throw that out there as something to keep in mind as you -- as you think about this and when you come back next month.

Again, the studio housing be counted as less dwelling units. One thing that kind of was touched on by some people is this public land banking program. We've learned over the last few months that some cities are investigating that or have that, and the County is thinking about doing something like that, too. We'd like to use the countywide plan and the efforts, the collaborative efforts, to kind of coordinate that a little bit to at least have a clearinghouse to say, you know, you don't have to just know what the Fort Lauderdale program is, you can come to the County and say, well, Fort Lauderdale has one, Davie has one, you know, et cetera.

And then the last implementation is just to support the innovative, you know, basically reach out to the -- the development community and see what -- you know, what they can offer. Now I'll switch to the bonus density formulas. This is kind of based on the formula we already have now, but it's not used because it's tied to the allocation of flexibility.

So we're going to take that part of it away. And we've run these by several people in the -- the housing industry, and we got -- the only comment we got back that was sort of negative was this -- was this tied to flex. So otherwise, it seemed like the response we got was positive. So for moderate income, it's going to be two levels of bonus. One would be two market rate units for every one moderate income unit. And that's -- moderate's up to 120 percent of median family income. That one, we would include areas least of the intracoastal waterway.

Built into all these recommendations is how you treat the barrier island, and the County's policy right now is to treat the barrier island as very environmentally sensitive and not promote density there. So recommendations right now are to keep it that way. But the bonus would be higher, four market rate units for every moderate income unit for

anything in an activity center, like Regional Activity Center, or projects that are located close to a rail stop or premium transit stop. So that is very coordinated with -- hopefully, with the outcome of this sales tax to promote transportation throughout the County or -- or other efforts that are done to promote development within activity centers along transit corridors.

That bonus would not be allowed in the -- on the barrier island. And then the bonus gets higher for very low and low income. Four market rate for every one low income, and then six to one if you're in an activity center or near a rail or transit stop. So I think that this has a chance of actually spurring some interest. I guess it would be something you'd have to just adopt and then see what happens. And you can always adjust it.

And, again, this would not be something, just because it's in the County plan, the cities have to do this. This would be something that a city would have to allocate. This would just be something authorized by the County plan. So that's just about the Broward Next initiative. Just trying to make the case that there's some carrots to go with some of the sticks we've been talking about, and that it's a large issue and needs to have a collaboration with many others.

CHAIR CASTRO: Does anybody have any questions on that? Commissioner Gomez.

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: With the AH3 density, and I saw that it's a may count it as -- for efficiencies, studio apartments, studio use --

MR. SNIEZEK: Right.

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: -- it's a may?

MR. SNIEZEK: Right. That's to allow the municipalities to enforce that or not. It's not a --

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: To determine it?

MR. SNIEZEK: -- not a requirement by the County plan. We're trying to prevent, I mean, a developer coming to a municipality and saying, well, the County plan says it's a shall, you -- you have to do this, and you have no authority to say no.

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: I'm sorry. Is it the mandate for building it, or is the mandate for counting it as there are people in that unit? I'm --

MR. SNIEZEK: The mandate is the way you would treat that type of unit.

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: But if -- I -- I grew up in New York City, so efficiencies are all over the place.

MR. SNIEZEK: Right.

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: They're full of people. So it means that there are people who are in their cars, they are using services like the water and the electric. So I guess I don't understand the reasoning behind seeing it as a may count it as a density issue when it actually has people in it, which is a density.

MR. SNIEZEK: Well, this was -- we -- we studied this several years ago and made a rationale that small units -- I mean, some of them do have more than one or two people in it. That's true. But generally, an efficiency or single-room occupancy unit has one or two people in it. So that's a less of an impact, usually, on facilities and services. That would still have to be dealt with at the municipal level. It's not like you get a free pass. It's just for the purposes of your density. Instead of saying that one efficiency counts as one full unit, you can have two efficiencies as counting as --

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: Okay.

MR. SNIEZEK: -- as -- as a full unit. Just for the purposes of density. Not -- nothing else. All the impacts still have to be considered.

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: You still have to count the unit in your density. You're giving them the option to count it as a half --

MR. SNIEZEK: That's correct.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- going forward. That's all.

MR. SNIEZEK: That's correct.

CHAIR CASTRO: Because it's a smaller area.

MR. SNIEZEK: Yes.

CHAIR CASTRO: So it's always been counted, so.

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: I'm just hoping it's not having six people living in it because of whatever.

CHAIR CASTRO: You could have --

COMMISSIONER GOMEZ: Yeah.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- a three bedroom house with 12 people in it. We're going to be --

look back to my luxury tax here in a few minutes. Go ahead, Ms. Graham.

MS. GRAHAM: Thank you, Madam Chair. A couple things just real quick. You know, at one time, the ULDR for Fort Lauderdale actually had minimum lot sizes for building on and they actually had minimum square footage for buildings that had to be built. So it's nice to see that maybe they're shifting to a small is better, because that's happening all over the country, it's happening --

CHAIR CASTRO: The world.

MS. GRAHAM: -- in Japan. Okay, here's my points now about what you just presented. It's a double-edged sword in Fort Lauderdale to be trying to add workforce housing or affordable housing, because our infrastructure has not been up kept and maintained like it should have. And only because you still live in Fort Lauderdale, so I presume you're hearing about all the things that we're wrestling with as to the infrastructure and the water and sewer.

I mean, they're going to -- they're either going to do a bond deal or they've already done a bond for the water and sewer because we have to maintain what we've got. I don't even know if there is the capacity for the infrastructure to add on more units where they want to use them, especially if we take the flex units, now we no longer limit them to a small area of the city, but now it can be citywide. Because if they -- if they already have something on the property and they demolish it and they build something newer, you still have to do the calculations and the impact fees and whatever else if you're increasing the density. That's one thing.

As to the land bank issue -- and I've been to the land bank conference that the community groups put on. I went to one in Detroit. And it's -- it's a good idea. It's just our land is so valuable that, you know, you're not going to get the same results like some of the municipalities and the legacy -- old legacy cities are in the United States.

But I would propose the land banking for the storm water issues. And I think we even had a workshop that had been held in one of the smaller rooms back in February three or four years ago, because the whole idea of that is if there's nothing on the property, or there was something and we take it down, at least we have it for storm water drainage and percolation.

So all of a sudden now, we have -- it's like a simultaneous equation with four or five or six variables, X, Y, Z and A, B, and C, because it's not just a matter of adding the housing and -- and -- and increase density. We still have to deal with the storm water, and then have the services, water and sewer, to provide to them. So I don't know if any of that is kind of getting worked into your presentation. Even if we had the funding to go ahead and put the units in in Fort Lauderdale, do we have the capacity of the area. Somebody would have to study that in the Public Works Department in Fort Lauderdale. And I don't know if they could do that, and I don't know if they would necessarily be

honest in the way they evaluate it, because Fort Lauderdale's desperate for the tax base increase. But, at the same time, if we don't all already have newer and sewer infrastructure, or at least not so aged that it can't handle it.

On the other hand, our CRA in Fort Lauderdale's getting audited right now. I mean, they're -- it was ordered a few months ago, and I don't know where they are, simply because this money that comes in from the taxes, they've finally realized it -- it's just not being spent wisely. I mean, the squandering of the tax money is just -- it's eye opening, to say the least. So you've got to be judicious with what you have. And if it's not your money, I don't think people are judicious.

MR. SNIEZEK: I think the only thing I could say, I think, that's related to what you're saying is just to kind of echo what Barbara said earlier, is you can almost assume every recommendation we're making is going to have a provision that says, subject to the availability of adequate public facilities and services. So there's nothing that we're saying or recommending that's going to just say, well, it says you can build housing here and who cares what the traffic or impacts on water and sewer are. That's not the case. And, actually, maybe this was already said, is that when we had the ad hoc committee, there were draft implementation provisions so you could see like how the bonus density -- I'm -- I'm showing you the -- the formula, but there's also provisions that go with it that are taken basically from the existing one.

But it's like saying, well, you can't like triple the density on a piece of property here or there. I mean, there's exemptions for activity centers, but there's a whole bunch of provisions, you know, like, you know, have to have it restricted for 15 years, that type of thing, and, you know, you can't build all of your market rate units and then like, oh, I guess we -- we didn't get around to those affordable units. You have to kind of build your affordable units before you finish the market rate units. So those kind of provisions are there, and I recommend that you take a look at that and give us some feedback on those particulars.

CHAIR CASTRO: Mr. DiGiorgio.

MR. DIGIORGIO: Yes, thank you. Mr. Sniezek, appreciate that presentation. Under (inaudible) two, I think it's great that we're really thinking about modular units, going back to what our Chair stated earlier, and the out-of-the-box thinking with the container use. We've seen them work all over the world. So, again, it's just kind of a stigma to them.

Monroe County is fighting this issue worse than we're fighting the issue because the land that they have. And they are truly a service-based community --

CHAIR CASTRO: Right.

MR. DIGIORGIO: -- and they don't have the affordable housing. They've turned to a lot of these alternatives to help fill that gap. We need to start thinking out-of-the-box like

that, so I appreciate you putting that in there. Secondly, the other thing is really engaging the development community and working with them on a -- density bonuses for -- especially within the activity centers. I think it's an excellent idea. I thinking by able -- I'm thinking by be -- by enabling them to be part of the solution and giving them an alternative to what they're already doing is really going to help this. Those are the types of thinking that I think engages the development community in a very positive way. So I applaud you for that.

MR. SNIEZEK: And -- and they've been very positive in responding and helping.

MR. DIGIORGIO: Excellent. Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: Also, a lot of the resource questions also get addressed at site plan review, too.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

CHAIR CASTRO: You can't build it if it isn't going to have the basic necessities, and cities then have to evaluate how much water could they supply, how many cars do they want on the road. And that becomes a local issue. But eventually, if you build a -- an inferior product, it's not going to be successful. So to build something -- you know, and - - and it'll be done. I'm not saying it won't be done. It will be done. But people then have all of a sudden a lot of affordable housing, because nobody'll want to live there, and it'll become affordable. And that's the irony of that situation. Sir.

MAYOR STERMER: I just want to say thank you to Henry and Barbara. It's -- Henry has said it a couple of times, but he says it real fast --

CHAIR CASTRO: Yeah.

MAYOR STERMER: -- that there are an awful lot of carrots involved in this process. Yeah, there are some sticks, and Henry and Ralph particularly know that on some of these stick portions I get vocal on them. But what's great about this conversation -- and that's why I said to the -- to the professionals that were here, they could stay for the conversation, is -- and we keep talking about it, is the how do we get to where we need to be. And is it a project by project issue? Is it a block by block issue? Is it a city by city, or is it the regional issue?

And I think that's really -- and Ralph knows this, because he and I have had these conversations for years, I just find it frustrating when we try to say, this project is going to generate X, and in the scheme of things, it's the proverbial drop of water in the ocean. You know, as we keep saying, the number's now from 55 to 68. And when we politely try to, you know, extract X amount of -- three units out of the developer, is that -- what are we really doing other than saying we're doing something? What are we really doing?

So I think it's wonderful to have the conversation, and it's important. But I think there needs to be more of an emphasis put on -- and I don't normally say this -- what's the government fix for the problem, because this problem isn't going to be solved by the development community, a developer, or a project. And, again, I'm not saying building bigger government, but the problem is to resolve -- to try to tackle this issue, they're one of the people that are equipped to do it. They have the professionals that deal with it. They know the markets well enough. Not that other entities don't. I'm just saying --

CHAIR CASTRO: Right.

MAYOR STERMER: -- maybe it's great to have nine people who normally sit here on Tuesdays say what they say, but not go near the real -- the solution to the issue. Maybe it's time to say, hey, we need to create a development agency that does this, and that's what it's mission is, and here's how we're going to fund it. There's been lots of conversation in the past few weeks about putting a one penny tax on the ballot, whether it's for transportation or infrastructure. And you have certain members of the County Commission who turn around and take that conversation and turn it into an affordable housing conversation.

Well, no. It's either a transportation penny, or it's an infrastructure penny. It's not money to go to affordable housing or other things that this County says it wants to do but can't currently afford to do, or properly allocate its resources to do. The question is if we see the issue, what's the real solution and how do we get there. So I think it's potentially time -- and I appreciate the land use issues, and you know I do. And we appreciate the carrots. That doesn't mean that if there's a stick out there some of us have to occasionally pick up our head and question the stick. Ralph know next month's meeting when he brings back the methodology, we can have --

CHAIR CASTRO: (Inaudible) baseball bats (inaudible).

MAYOR STERMER: -- we can have another conversation. I may be on the losing side of that conversation. That's okay. But I also think the County Commission, in a preview of where we're going to be next month, transmitted it knowing it was coming back here a second time and knowing the Broward Next project was going on. So wherever that conversation ends up. But I just want to say I think we need to think bigger than we do when we see a project show up here and then try to do what we do within the confines of 1.07.07.

CHAIR CASTRO: Right. Add a drop to the bucket each time. That's -- but the drops are adding up, so --

MAYOR STERMER: Not -- not significantly enough that really you actually see water covering the bottom of the bucket.

CHAIR CASTRO: Right. We're -- we're not even warm.

MAYOR STERMER: And it's -- yeah.

CHAIR CASTRO: And, again, the nice thing about CRAs, it's tax incremental financing meeting the change. So the County isn't losing anything. They get the same money they got last year. It's up above which gets dedicated to the affordable housing or attainable housing component.

MAYOR STERMER: Your mouth just fell on the floor. You couldn't believe I said what I said.

CHAIR CASTRO: Yeah, there you go. So any other comments? From the staff, any other comments or concerns?

MR. SNIEZEK: So I guess I could wrap this up on a happy note --

CHAIR CASTRO: Yes.

MR. SNIEZEK: -- and talk about the linkage fee.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Save it.

MR. SNIEZEK: Just -- just to --

MAYOR STERMER: You got Mary's attention.

MR. SNIEZEK: I shortened it. I've already gone through some slides I'm not going to show you, because I just -- I think this group already knows, you know, why it was initiated. But just to give -- just to give you a refresher on the main components and then where we are, the fee level, and I showed you this chart before, like the range. Ralph and I are recommending a dollar per square foot right now, and that's what's being -- going to be probably put in the draft that the County Attorney is preparing.

As far as exemptions and waivers, there's a provision in the draft. I've seen a draft. It's not like official yet, so that's why I can't share it with anybody yet, but they consulted with us. And, you know, we're going to put a waiver in there for some things, but the County's going to have to identify a funding source for that. So that's -- that's a little hurdle that we still have to deal with Budget over.

And if you have -- if a municipality wants to adopt its own linkage fee to retain the money within the city, as long as it's the same as or greater than the County's, that's -- that'll be a provision in there, and you can -- that's your opt out if you don't want to do it at the County level. There's one city that has a linkage fee program right now that's active. It's Coconut Creek. They'll be exempt from it, because it's just -- you know, they should be

rewarded for what they've already done. So that'll be there.

Distribution of revenues. Talked about the options before. Right now, our recommendation is to have the money collected at the County level, be -- and be used so that it meets the rational nexus test. And then the money would be collected at the -- the -- the environmental review process counter over at Government Center West, just like any other impact fee.

So where we are is, you know, December's when the County Commission officially initiated this. Since then, Ralph and I, including being at the Planning Council December 17th, we've had outreach presentations with a number of groups, mostly like Chambers of Commerce people, real estate people. So you can imagine what kind of comments we received. And the ordinance now is officially with the County Attorney's Office, and they're -- when they issue that, which I expect sometime shortly, we promise to hold a staff level workshop, so we will present to -- you know, we'll notify our interested parties list, including the Planning Council. We'll have a staff level workshop, probably in this room or someplace like this, and get comments on the actual draft ordinance.

And this will be back before the Planning Council. I guess the earliest that could happen is next month -- probably not. June would probably be the earliest, but it may very well happen after the Commission's summer break. So that still has to be worked out as far as the timing. But you would have a chance to review it as a local planning agency, and we also have to have a County internal local planning agency review. So those -- those will be two hearings before it goes to the County Commission. So that's where we are right now as far as the linkage fee. Be happy to answer any questions.

MAYOR STERMER: So you actually have two atoms of hydrogen and one of oxygen to make the drop to go in the bucket, to (inaudible). I mean -- the simple question is I know you put in a dollar. Does that really get us anywhere? I mean, more than are we just saying we did something, it exists, are we really accomplishing something with that amount? I -- and I'm not saying I'm not supporting the linkage fee. I'm just --

MR. SNIEZEK: Right.

MAYOR STERMER: -- asking the question.

MR. SNIEZEK: It -- it will help a little bit, yes. I mean, in some ways, we hear it from both sides about this is a tax. How could you do this to us, and the other side, maybe we feel guilty we aren't recommending something a little higher to make it mean more. So we tried to be balanced.

MAYOR STERMER: Understood.

MS. GRAHAM: Madam Chair?

Planning Council
4/28/2016
NC

CHAIR CASTRO: Yes, ma'am.

MS. GRAHAM: The other thing is the linkage fee could probably garner support if it's a small linkage fee. But then we need aggregate sources of the revenue, just like Mayor Stermer said. Whether it's -- okay, if we can't do doc stamps, maybe it's something else, but maybe it's also a half penny sales tax. I mean, it -- it can be small things, but when they all add up, we would have some money coming in. Because once you have a couple of successful projects, it might then change the tide and people will support it. And -- and maybe the economy will be better. Maybe the -- the detriment effects that I'm thinking of may not happen. But I -- I think that's something you can sell. I know it doesn't add up to the big millions that you need every year, but it's a start. Because we'll still be in the same boat two or three years from now if we don't have the sources.

MAYOR STERMER: I -- I guess one of the best ways, and I won't -- won't take Chair Blattner's podium on the infrastructure taxes, but let's say the infrastructure tax is put on the ballot in November, and let's say it passes. If I recall my numbers correctly, there would be, for at least 30 years, 139, \$140,000,000 a year coming to Broward County to use for infrastructure. And how Broward County chooses to use that infrastructure is up to Broward County.

So whether it's the transportation tax that the County has proposed sharing 70/30 with the cities, but those are more restrictive dollars for transportation and transportation related issues, compared to the -- what is currently over 54 percent of the daises in Broward County have voted in favor of putting on the infrastructure tax, which would be split with the Counties, as well. The County's share of the infrastructure tax would be about 139, \$140,000,000 a year to use for how it saw use of infrastructure dollars. So.

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay. Anything else? Any other business? Good.

MS. BOY: For the sign up?

CHAIR CASTRO: Yeah -- no, for anything.

MS. BOY: Wait. We have two quick things.

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay.

MR. SNIEZEK: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Madam Chair.

CHAIR CASTRO: Thank you, sir.

MS. BOY: Oh, this is -- just real quick.

AGENDA ITEM R-3 - COUNSEL'S REPORT:

MR. MAURODIS: Just -- yeah. I'll be very quick with this. You have in your -- you -- you were provided a brief legislative summary of land use and related legislation. It was not one -- one of the more active years. Minor changes in the DRI process. Some people might be interested in ag land. It's a very wide definition of what is an agricultural activity, agri-tourism activity provided. For those near airports, there's been a little additional authority granted to local governments, as long as they're consistent with the FDOT provisions and FAA.

And for public/private partnerships, which is a big push, there is a state law on it which is almost incomprehensible, and the Legislature decided to also allow cities -- this was a nice thing they did -- to develop their own types of partnerships without complying with the state law. So, you see -- if anyone has any questions on them, you can contact me. I'd be happy to give you more information. But nothing really earth shaking this session.

CHAIR CASTRO: Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM R-4 - EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT:

MS. BOY: And just in your backup materials, I have a review of the Charter Review Commission and the subcommittee structure. So we'll -- I'll continue to keep you all posted on that and what occurs. Mayor Stermer, at the minimum, is going to join me at Tuesday's Infrastructure Committee, and Mr. McColgan just let me know that he's also going to attend that meeting. I'll send out a summary afterwards.

And then also, we just talked about a tentative Broward Next Public Hearing schedule in discussion, and I will send more information out in an email so that all the members can be privy to that. And I'm going to be sending out some of the other information they asked for at the meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

CHAIR CASTRO: Thank you. Anything else? Seeing none, we stand adjourned. Thank you, everybody.

MS. BOY: Thank you.

(The meeting concluded at 11:34 a.m.)