

MINUTES
BROWARD COUNTY PLANNING COUNCIL
June 27, 2013

MEMBERS PRESENT: Anne Castro, Chair
Commissioner Bobby DuBose, Vice Chair
Commissioner Michael S. Long, Secretary
Tim Bascombe
Vice Mayor Richard Blattner
Mayor Vincent Boccard
Neal R. de Jesus
School Board Member Patricia Good
Dan Hobby
Lynn Kaplan
Commissioner Michele Lazarow
Commissioner Rita Mack
Nicholas T. Steffens

MEMBERS ABSENT: Sara Case
Mayor Lamar Fisher
Mary D. Graham
Commissioner Martin D. Kiar
Mayor Michael J. Ryan
Mayor Daniel J. Stermer

ALSO PRESENT: Barbara Blake Boy, Planning Council Executive Director
Andy Maurodis, Legal Counsel
James Hickey, Assistant Director of Development Services,
City of Coral Springs
Jason King, Dover, Kohl and Partners
James Carras, Carras Community Investment
Nancy Cavender, The Laws Group

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

A meeting of the Broward County Planning Council was held at 10:00 a.m. on Thursday, June 27, 2013, in Room 422 of the Broward County Governmental Center, Fort Lauderdale, Florida.

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

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Anne Castro called the meeting to order.

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay. We're going to call this meeting of the Broward County Planning Council for June 27th to order.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

CHAIR CASTRO: We're going to first stand and do the Pledge of Allegiance. Thank you. We now have a quorum.

(THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE WAS LED BY MAYOR VINCENT BOCCARD.)

ROLL CALL

CHAIR CASTRO: Quickly, Mr. Hobby came in. Thank you, Mayor Boccard, for leading us in the Pledge. Now we'll do the roll call.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Tim Bascombe.

MR. BASCOMBE: Here.

THE REPORTER: Vice Mayor Richard Blattner.

VICE MAYOR BLATTNER: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Vincent Boccard.

MAYOR BOCCARD: Here.

THE REPORTER: Ms. Sara Case. Mr. Neal de Jesus.

MR. DE JESUS: Here.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Bobby DuBose.

COMMISSIONER DUBOSE: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Lamar Fisher. School Board Member Patricia Good.

MS. GOOD: Here.

THE REPORTER: Ms. Mary Graham. Mr. Dan Hobby.

MR. HOBBY: Here.

THE REPORTER: Ms. Lynn Kaplan.

MS. KAPLAN: Here.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Martin Kiar. Commissioner Michelle Lazarow. Commissioner Michael Long.

COMMISSIONER LONG: Here.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Rita Mack. Mayor Michael Ryan. Mr. Nicholas Steffens. Mayor Daniel Stermer. Ms. Anne Castro, Chair.

CHAIR CASTRO: Here. We have several absences. Some people are running late, so we'll hold off on any motion to excuse absences for a little bit.

I do need to remind everybody, because staff is giggling me to, we have monies needed for our little bagel fund. I think the jar is usually back here. If you'll throw in a couple dollars.

CHAIR CASTRO: Staff, where is it?

MS. BOY: It's in the kitchen.

CHAIR CASTRO: It's in the kitchen. Thank you. Staff will every time -- every meeting, make sure we have some bagels and juice and stuff like that, so if you can give generously, it would greatly be appreciated.

OATH OF OFFICE: MS. LYNN KAPLAN

CHAIR CASTRO: Next, one of the pleasures of being Chair or President of any group is, obviously, welcoming new members and providing them the oath of office. So this morning, we have the pleasure of greeting our newest member, Ms. Lynn Kaplan.

So if Ms. Kaplan -- Ms. Kaplan, you step over here, we'll go ahead and do the oath of office for you, and then we'll be doing group photos. So everybody get ready. Wipe off the cream cheese.

Really. I know. It's going to be a smaller group, so maybe next month somebody can come back if we're fuller and do another retake for her.

We'll get a picture for you. We'll be the Florida Five today, how's that? And I'll take this in smaller increments. If you'll raise your right hand please. I do solemnly swear --

MS. KAPLAN: I do solemnly swear –

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

MS. KAPLAN: -- I will support, protect, and defend –

CHAIR CASTRO: -- the Constitution and government –

MS. KAPLAN: -- the Constitution and government –

CHAIR CASTRO: -- of the United States and of the State of Florida –

MS. KAPLAN: -- of the United States and the State of Florida –

CHAIR CASTRO: -- that I am duly qualified –

MS. KAPLAN: -- that I am duly qualified –

CHAIR CASTRO: -- to hold office –

MS. KAPLAN: -- to hold office –

CHAIR CASTRO: -- under the Constitution of the State –

MS. KAPLAN: -- under the Constitution of the State –

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

MS. KAPLAN: -- and the Charter of Broward County –

CHAIR CASTRO: -- and that I will and faithfully perform –

MS. KAPLAN: -- and I will faithfully perform –

CHAIR CASTRO: -- the duties of a member –

MS. KAPLAN: -- the duties of the member –

CHAIR CASTRO: -- of the Broward County Planning Council –

MS. KAPLAN: -- of the Broward County Planning Council –

CHAIR CASTRO: -- on which I am about –

MS. KAPLAN: -- on which I am about –

Planning Council

6/27/13

LG/NC

CHAIR CASTRO: -- to enter --

MS. KAPLAN: -- to enter --

CHAIR CASTRO: -- so help me God.

MS. KAPLAN: -- so help me God.

CHAIR CASTRO: Congratulations. Thank you. Now, everybody, no, no, don't go too far. Now we head up to do the group photo.

CHAIR CASTRO: Nancy, let the record reflect Mr. Steffens just joined us. Thank you.

And we want to welcome Nancy doing the minutes today, so if you can make clear motions and seconds for the minutes for her, we'd appreciate it.

NOMINATIONS BY PLANNING COUNCIL TO EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE -- ONE AT-LARGE MEMBER

CHAIR CASTRO: Next order of business, we have a nomination to the Executive Committee with Mr. Reinstein's departure and moving people around. So is there anybody who'd like to volunteer?

MR. BASCOMBE: I'll move to --

CHAIR CASTRO: Mr. -- do you?

CHAIR CASTRO: That's okay. You're volunteering.

CHAIR CASTRO: No. When you said, I'll move -- you're moving somebody or you're -- so Mr. Bascombe is our new Executive Committee person.

MR. BASCOMBE: I'm already on it.

CHAIR CASTRO: Oh, you're already on it. Then you can't --

CHAIR CASTRO: No, no, no. We need somebody.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I thought you said, so moved, too.

CHAIR CASTRO: Were you going to move somebody, then, as --

MR. BASCOMBE: No, no, no. I'm sorry. I thought you were saying --

MR. STEFFENS: I mean, I would volunteer.

COMMISSIONER DUBOSE: Can we find out who's on it?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, who's on the Executive Committee?

CHAIR CASTRO: That's probably the one thing she didn't bring.

MS. BOY: The one piece of paper I didn't bring today.

CHAIR CASTRO: I know I'm on it.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Who's on it?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Raise your hand if you're on it.

MS. BOY: I know you four are on it, but that's --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Everyone that's here.

MS. BOY: -- everyone that's here, that's who's on it. That's why we need one --

COMMISSIONER DUBOSE: What about --

MS. BOY: -- because we need three officers and four at-large, so you're -- you three are the at-large --

COMMISSIONER DUBOSE: -- what about Vince?

MS. BOY: -- so you need one more at-large.

COMMISSIONER DUBOSE: Vince, are you on it?

MAYOR BOCCARD: No, I don't think so.

MS. BOY: You're not on it, no.

MAYOR BOCCARD: No.

MS. BOY: You're on the Land Use Trafficways Committee --

MAYOR BOCCARD: Right.

MS. BOY: -- but not on that.

CHAIR CASTRO: Didn't -- Mr. Steffens, did you --

MR. STEFFENS: I mean, I volunteered, but whatever --

CHAIR CASTRO: No. That's fine.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

CHAIR CASTRO: That's fine. Any objections? Seeing none –

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- we're –

MR. STEFFENS: Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- we're going to put Mr. Steffens.

MAYOR BOCCARD: I'll second.

CHAIR CASTRO: Do you need a motion or anything, Mr. Maurodis, or is that good?

MR. MAURODIS: No. I think we can -- we can say that by acclamation.

CHAIR CASTRO: Perfect. By acclamation, welcome aboard.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Congratulations.

MR. STEFFENS: Thank you.

CONSENT AGENDA

AGENDA ITEMS C-1 THROUGH C-4

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay. Now we're doing the – Consent Agenda. Any pulls or anything from the Consent Agenda? C-1 is the approval of the agenda, reviews of trafficways –

MR. HOBBY: Move it.

CHAIR CASTRO: Got a motion, Mr. Hobby. And –

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- and a second.

MS. GOOD: Second.

CHAIR CASTRO: School Board Member Good second. All in favor. Thank you.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

MS. BOY: Do you want to recognize the additional absences, absence requests?

CHAIR CASTRO: Do you want to give a few more minutes just to see if anybody else shows up, because I thought Ms. Graham, you said, might make it, or do you think we're pretty much out now?

MS. BOY: I mean, I don't know –

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay. We'll go ahead and do it. If she shows up, we'll let the record reflect that.

MS. BOY: Okay.

CHAIR CASTRO: May I have a motion to approve the additional absences, including Mayor Ryan and possibly Mary Graham –

MR. STEFFENS: So moved.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- as well as the ones –

MAYOR BOCCARD: Second.

CHAIR CASTRO: All in favor? Thank you.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

ADDITIONAL AGENDA MATERIAL

CHAIR CASTRO: Additional agenda material, you've seen. We've all been aware of that. Did everybody receive their comments and stuff? Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I don't know. I got a lot.

CHAIR CASTRO: There's a few.

REGULAR AGENDA

AGENDA ITEM R-1 - PRESENTATION: Seven50 Overview (Presented by Dover, Kohl & Partners)

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay. Now we're going to go to the Regular Agenda. To start with, we're going to have a presentation by Dover, Kohl and Partners. This is the

Seven50 review. This is something that Mr. Bascombe had brought up previously. Again, as a Planning Council, there are a lot of concerns in South Florida from water resources to climate change and so forth.

So, in order to help us look at the Land Use Plan and, you know, really find out if it's encompassing all the aspects of planning in South Florida we need to do, we thought this type of information or educational program is very helpful.

So we're going to bring these presentations in from time-to-time to help us out, because we're all busy. We don't have time to join all these committees and learn this. So this is a good forum to pick up some of this information. So with that, I turn it over to our guests.

MS. BOY: Mr. Jason King from Dover, Kohl and Partners.

MR. KING: Good morning. I'm Jason King, Dover, Kohl, and it's my pleasure to give you a quick, maybe even rapid, briefing on Seven50. We have 15 minutes for presentation. Then I can take questions and answer.

Seven50 is the plan for the seven counties of southeast Florida for the next 50 years. It's a plan that's been ongoing for the last year and a half, and we're in the final phase of the plan. It's ultimately funded by the federal government, by HUD, federal DOT, and EPA.

We have a regional partnership of 200 consortium companies and municipalities, of which Broward County is one. The project is administered by the two Planning Councils, South Florida Regional Planning Coast -- Council and Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council, and it covers Miami-Dade County, Monroe County, Broward County, Indian River, Palm Beach County -- let's see -- St. Lucie, and I -- and --

CHAIR CASTRO: It's like the last ocean. Don't worry about it.

MR. KING: That's right. I can't really read those from here. And I think it would cover Monroe County. Essentially, the project, we're showing an image. The project covers from Key West all the way up to Sebastian, which is in Indian River. So it's an area of over 6.6 million people, and it's a very diverse area.

And the purpose of the project isn't to blur the distinction between the different counties, but to see how we can partner in ways to kind of build a business plan for the region.

If you think of us in a kind of business sense, we're very fragmented with many different departments and many different divisions and multiple, sometimes competing goals, but we're a group that's going to increase rapidly in terms of population and wealth, the kind of market share, in the next 50 years.

And so the purpose of the plan is to think about joint efforts on the topic of infrastructure, highways, ports, and transit, on the topic of education, helping primary schools, colleges, and also get the workforce trained, so that way they're able to compete in today's creative class.

And also quality of life, the other very big portion of economic development, working on making southeast Florida even more of a paradise than it even is. So far, our project has included over 2,000 people in one-on-one -- almost 3,000 people -- in one-on-one kind of conversations like this.

We've done multiple summits. We did a road show in this very room. We've done workshops. We've had 38 meetings. And so a lot of people have had a chance to work on the plan. Our last summit we just had was last week.

There were 1100 people present in the three days of our summit, working toward a better region, which is very good for a planning project. So we've had many different meetings. Meetings with port and airport directors, the Long-Range Transportation Advisory Committee that we're working with, including the Broward MPO. We're working with bicycle clubs and Tropical Audubon and Florida Power and Light, and everybody is on board and, quite often, at the same table.

Online, we have an incredible amount of participation. Over 680,000 people have participated online to date, as of this morning. We have a poll. We're liked. We're followed. The online experience is very interactive, and we're able to get a lot of information, especially from communities that we're not able to reach as well.

Very briefly, here's a look at our timeline. So you see we're kind of in the last third of the project. We finished the summits, work group meetings. We're working now to develop the vision and blueprint framework. It's not too late for public input. We kind of just ended the beginning. And we're working toward a final report.

The project concludes in February. So the project, to give you a quick overview of some of the principles of the project, the project really got its focus at the very beginning of the process. We do these exercises like this one you see on the screen, one word card. We asked people at that first summit -- there were 800 people. We asked them, in one word, what comes to mind about southeast Florida now, one word, and in the future with one word.

Two hundred and fifty people responded. And this is a word cloud to kind of show that response that we got. In one word, what comes to mind about southeast Florida now. The more times a word was repeated, the larger it appears. And so disconnected, congested, crowded, fragmented, disjointed was the first word that came to people's mind.

Opportunity's still there. Paradise is there, kind of small. In one word, what comes to mind about southeast Florida in the future, connected actually came in enormous. So this is something like over 75 people saying that the word for the future is connected.

And it kind of threw us for a loop, to be quite honest, and the project has really been about defining what it means to be connected. Is that social networks? Is it transportation? Is it, you know, culturally? It's probably all of those things, and that's what we're working toward.

We have workgroups, individual citizen groups working in the six different spheres of the project. They're currently engaged. They're meeting every few weeks. They're part of our workshops. They're helping create the plan. There's 450 participants that we're talking to continually to generate the plan. Their information is going right into our policies and principles. And what we've been trying to communicate to everyone is just how much change happens in 60 years.

Our 60 year plan, we look back, imagine, say, in Broward County, Deerfield Beach. Here's an aerial from 1968. See Hillsborough Boulevard. You see where the rail line would come up. And in the last 60 years, a lot has changed. In this image, especially, you see 95 coming in. You see a lot of farmlands being reconverted.

Broward, you know, changed dramatically in these last 60 years. There's North Lauderdale west of here. That's what it looks like today. We're creating multiple scenarios. That way, the public can kind of actually choose their future.

We've been working -- there's an online tool where the public can get on and they can work with these scenarios. The four scenarios for the future that we've been working on are kind of described as trend and business as usual. Plan one is an urban expansion which continues to grow the way we have the last 50 years, just like those images that you saw.

There's strategic interventions. We're being very careful about public investment that could unlock private investment. And then there's a third scenario called the Next Gen Region, which is pretty radical in its envisioning of the region.

The difference between the different scenarios is transit oriented development -- and I'll talk about these specifically -- sea level rise, a commitment to community character. Especially in the north, they're saying we don't want to change the way those -- those aerial -- those images showed. Commute times. A lot of commute times are going to go from a half an hour to 45 minutes, or from 45 minutes to an hour, or from an hour to an hour and 15 in the future.

And so that's going to affect the future, and that's the differentiation in the

scenarios. We're looking closely at populations. We're looking closely at where jobs locate. And then we're going to model each one of the four scenarios based on a number of big things that could happen in the future that we don't know a lot about.

So we're looking at what happens when the Cuban embargo ends. Well, what happens is our energy portfolio diversifies. So what happens if there's a nuclear power incident which makes nuclear power unpalatable? What are the things out there that could happen that would change everything? Well, the gradual virtualization of education, rising insurance costs. We're trying to image, using the model, what would happen if a Category 4 or 5 storm like Andrew came across the coast.

We're looking at sea level rise in all the scenarios, but we're also trying to imagine what would happen if sea level rise was a lot more dramatic than any projection so far. It's a big part of the project. So it's probably very hard to see. I encourage you to go online to look at the scenarios. There's an online tool for working with the scenarios.

Let me show you something that they all have in common. The population of our region is expected to go from 6.2 million to 9.1 million by 2060. So if you remember southeast Florida in 1960 -- maybe a few of you do -- there was 1.6 million people in the region at that time. So there's going to be five times the number of people in 2060. So it's had an enormous effect on life in southeast Florida.

The other big factor is what we call transit oriented development. In each of the scenarios which are online there are these purple circles. And you know -- you understand this, Broward County especially, what transit oriented development is.

It could be like down in Miami in downtown Kendall where a lot of people live in quite high densities, quite compactly. Towers. Transit. The hottest spot right now in Miami is probably downtown Kendall. Or transit oriented development could be like West Palm Beach. City Place. It's not just a mall. People live there. It's compact. It's walkable. It's mixed use, pedestrian friendly. They have kind of a complete kind of life there in West Palm Beach. Transit oriented development, more places like South Miami could be developed in the future, are likely.

Or even going up far north like Stuart. Stuart was created by the Florida East Coast Rail Line. It was created as a transit oriented development, essentially people living there and using the car a lot less frequently. So the idea with that, with those purple circles -- and I'll show you Broward, and I'll show you where those circles fall in just a moment -- is instead of single centers, like say Fort Lauderdale, and an endless ring of suburbs around it, a more polycentric county, a more polycentric region, with multiple centers.

The other issue, of course, is sea level rise. And in all of the maps, we show two projections. A very conservative projection, and one that's a little more extreme. By 2060, two two-foot projections, one that shows constant inundation. The water would be just that much higher. You see that in the image on the left. It's blue. And then also we show it tidally adjusted, where the water could be during significant events. Flood events, high tide. It's quite drastic how much of a difference two foot of a rise makes.

Like I talked about, our commute times. We've looked at the traffic patterns currently. Our engineers from HDR Engineering, they show on the left an image which shows today and all the roadways which fall below peak, which don't allow free flow. According to our traffic engineers, red equals bad. And we're seeing failure already, which might be why people are late to this meeting this morning, that it's a difficult commute.

And if you project that out to 2060, right, it's just going to get a lot tougher. And we know this because we have a linear region, we can't bring -- build ring roads like they could in Atlanta and D.C. And so for as long as 98 out of a hundred of our trips involve the automobile, things are going to get a lot more frustrating.

I can show you very quickly, in urban expansion, we're imagining more of the population going north. Our model slides look like this. And what is happening in this urban expansion is highways like SR-836 are being continued down into the Redlands Farming District, if you know it.

And so what urban expansion is about, again, is growing the way we have in the past. You know, this is a model that shows a lot of short term profits being made through investments of the kind we've done before. Put in the infrastructure, and the population follows.

With strategic interventions, this one we're looking at another one word card. We got this is at the second summit. Here, when we asked the population what the biggest threat was in the region, they said climate change -- that's interesting -- as the number one threat.

Traffic, transportation, sprawl also appear, but climate change is the number one threat. And when we asked them what the solution was -- in this case, I think this was over 150 people -- they said some form of mass transit or public transit. So you ask people, this is a solution that they're giving you. They're asking us to look in this direction.

There's a great report, you know it, the Tri-Rail Coastal Link Stationary Opportunities Report by the RTA that talks about 1.4 billion dollars in new investment if we build the rail systems that were once here during the Flagler era, and if we build compactly along it.

And so that strategic interventions scenario imagines where we made investments, like along Metro Rail, and currently we have these Metro Rail sites and they're surrounded by parking lots. So it's imaging putting more of that 3,000,000 population into those areas, getting the investment that we intended in those public sites by looking at the regulations, looking at the land use through them.

And several of those sites, the existing Tri-Rail sites, are in Broward. Now, let's move -- for the Next Gen Region, we're doing the same. We're looking at those sites, and now we're actually focusing -- we're going all the way up north. We're imagining transit oriented development up in Stuart, more of the population living in those walkable centers. We're putting together illustrative plans for these places. We're imagining the investment that could be unlocked, you know, millions of dollars at each individual site, and we're imagining more of the population along those corridors.

We're also connecting those transit oriented development sites by minor TOD, or by, you know, bus rapid transit or trolley. And in this way, we very much look to Broward and your Wave program, you know, the trolley that you have going because in that could really very much create a kind of transformation in the region. Land uses would change. The way people would travel would change. The look of the place would change. We could bring investment where there wasn't previously. The effect that trolleys have is enormous.

So what about not just the Wave, but, say, 50 more systems of that kind in our region? Last part, it's going to be very difficult to see these maps. If you go online, encourage everyone to look, you can see what these scenarios would look like in the future. We go from existing conditions to the trends, where things are headed.

Hard to see, but you see a lot of blue appearing. The reality is, with two feet of sea level rise by 2060, these areas are going to be -- are going to need a lot of pumping. There's going to need to be back flow preventers. There's going to need to be all variety of resilient sort of infrastructure put in place, because water's going to become much more a part of our life.

We imagine, in the other scenarios, instead of the dispersed population, we imagine focusing them in those specific areas. You see red appear in these scenarios. The Next Gen Region has the concentrations of population, as well as the connecting system of trolleys. And here's the part I wanted to show you. This is kind of interesting. We took an X-ray of one of these scenarios. Right?

This is walkability in Broward County currently, as measured by a tool called Walk Score. In order to make these scenarios understandable to the public, we've taken many X-rays like this. So if you look at walkability in Broward right now, you see little -- you know, a lot of -- some yellow, which is often walkable.

You see very little green, which is walkable reliably. People can walk to the store. They can walk to transit. They can walk to school. They can walk to their job. There's very little of that actually happening in Broward County currently.

And you see a lot of red, areas that are just, by the way they're designed, car dependent. In the scenario called Plan 2, Strategic Interventions, right, by making those investments in transit, more of it becomes often walkable. There's a mode shift inherent in this. Instead of nine out of ten trips involving the car, maybe we can move in Broward County to seven or eight trips involving the car, and some other trips involving a bicycle or transit or people walking, you know.

And then in the Next Gen Region -- I like this -- so that big green spot is Fort Lauderdale. If more of the population located in Fort Lauderdale, we could build the real city that you all and people here are already working on. So much of the region, Broward, given the grid system that you have, can become often walkable.

The entirely car dependent pieces of the County could become very, very small. And there would be places that are orange, where people would have the option of walking, on occasion. There are enormous changes involved in this. And all of this -- this is very brief, just in the 15 minutes I was given -- and it was fine -- and -- but all of this is in detail on Seven50.org.

CHAIR CASTRO: I want to thank you. It was a really good presentation, and certainly gave us an overview. And then I'm going to open it up for questions. And does anybody have any questions, comments? Okay. I have a few.

Just out of curiosity, this is the first time that I'm aware of somebody doing a 50 year plan of this regional idea. So you have nothing to really go back to other than just you were showing historical maps. How did this come about? And I know you're going to develop a plan. And I'm assuming this plan's going to have recommendations.

But are any of those binding? Are you expecting local planning groups or elected officials, bodies, to adopt them? Or what's the plan for implementation of whatever it is you produce, in other words.

MR. KING: Sure. Non-binding, entirely. It's -- the only power of the plan is good ideas. So we're going to come back to you and come back to the County and go to all the municipalities and talk about the implementation strategies that were created regionally, and then it's kind of a toolkit, and you can take whatever pieces are of interest to you. Hopefully, there'll be partnerships that you can become part of, if you're interested.

Hopefully, there will be committees and task forces working towards certain ends. But that's how the plan gets implemented.

CHAIR CASTRO: And then you were talking about the 60 minute commute. I'm a Florida native, and, you know, you point to walkability. I see a lot of issues fraught in there.

I love the mass transit idea. My theory always, though, with the heat, especially in the summer months in South Florida, it's not likely to succeed very often. We've become very accustomed and, you know, I tell people you almost have to let the roadways get over capacity -- capacity, because you have to get them to the point of pain, that they don't want to do 60 minutes plus.

Have you all come up with a magic number that drives people to a train or a trolley or anything else or --

MR. KING: Yeah.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- is it 60 minutes?

MR. KING: That's a really good point. Yes. Psychologically, 60 minutes is the threshold where you start to think other things.

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay.

MR. KING: And the important thing about the walkability is the most dramatic mode shift that we can imagine, right, is we go from nine out of ten trips involving the automobile to six out of ten trips involving the automobile.

This region will always be car dependent. But the idea is if you never -- you know, a lot of people want to use their car strictly and only, but they like the idea that others have an option of using transit to get out their way as they drive to work. And you could think of it that way, and that alone would have a large effect.

CHAIR CASTRO: And, lastly for me, and then if anybody else wants, I'll recognize anybody, you know, the other challenge here is you try to build, you know, mixed use centers that you were talking about, where you have working, shopping living.

I also encounter the problem that most people don't like to live kind of where they work. And part of that is employers. So at what point does the private sector get involved in employers and maybe incentives get created that you hire from your back yard as opposed to hiring from -- and, again, I don't want to interrupt people's opportunity to get a job, but how do you kind of get them to live, work, and play in the same area so walkability becomes the factor, as opposed to -- and -- and I know cities like New York and Boston do this all the time. People will move to where they live.

South Florida, it's kind of like the opposite. You want to get as far away from

your job as you can when you go home at night. So how do you turn that around?

MR. KING: I haven't thought of that, actually.

CHAIR CASTRO: Oh, that's –

MR. KING: We'll have to pose that to experts. I kind of feel the same. I don't want to see the office every time I walk to the restaurant. So –

CHAIR CASTRO: Right.

MR. KING: -- let me look into that.

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Bascombe.

MR. BASCOMBE: Mr. King, thank you very much. You know my background's planning, so this is a subject, for me, that I think we don't talk about enough, the big scale, the 50 years, also the regions that we're talking about.

And I think the group of people that you have involved, your organization, and the fact that you've got money to do this is a fantastic thing. So I just want to say thank you very much.

The one thing I worry about when -- you know, when things like this happen is who is combining the data, and how do you keep the politics out of it, because we really need to talk about the nuts and bolts, but we don't need to talk about the politics at this point.

MR. KING: Well, you know, politics is -- it's a good question. It's a struggle. The actual data that we're creating, the maps that we're doing, is basically is the consultant, with some over-vision -- or somewhat being overseen by the Regional Planning Councils.

We're able to maintain that sort of objectivity which comes directly from the public, but it's still -- this is a very political process. There's a group that has come out sort of against this regional effort, Anti-Seven50. They're tied to the Agenda 21 conspiracy way of thinking. They've petitioned the Governor to stop our project. They're going to different municipalities to get municipalities to pull out of our project.

We had this summit in -- Friday. We had, like I said, 1100 people join our summit. They created a counter conference against our summit, in the same place, just two rooms from us at the Convention Center. So, you know -- so we're trying to maintain objectivity, especially in the numbers, but this is becoming very political very quickly.

MR. BASCOMBE: And when it comes to factual data, though, I mean, because that's always what gets thrown up and gets thrown out is that misinformation, how do you -- how do you make sure that the data that you're using is correct?

MR. KING: All right. So that's a good question. Peer review. The MPOs, the Metropolitan Planning Organizations, have been doing modeling into the future for a long time, and they have that down. We're essentially using their data. And our data will update their data, and that means they're doing a lot of quality control. They're watching this very carefully, you see. So that's a non-political organization that's right there, very involved in all of our calculations.

MR. BASCOMBE: Okay. Thank you very much.

CHAIR CASTRO: Mr. Hobby.

MR. HOBBY: You had mentioned this, that -- the buy-in from the cities and municipalities. How far -- I don't think my microphone is on.

CHAIR CASTRO: I was going to say, I don't think your microphone -- there you go.

MR. HOBBY: All right. How far along are you in the process of actually interacting with the different municipalities and other government agencies?

MR. KING: Well, we did a series of workshops in which we met with the planning directors in each of -- each sort of sub-region. So all the northern planning directors, the planning directors from Broward and Miami-Dade, and the planning directors in Monroe County, in which they reviewed all of the information that I showed.

So, you know, we're actively engaged. We just finished a very intense period where they were critiquing all of our maps, where they were giving us policy recommendations, and that was all happening at a very much staff or elected official level. It's not over. We're still continuing to.

MR. HOBBY: Yeah, but you will be going to -- making presentations like this to, say City Commissions and --

MR. KING: Yes. Especially once we have a draft plan.

MR. HOBBY: Let me ask another question that maybe you can't answer. I'm kind of surprised -- maybe I shouldn't be -- the -- as you mentioned, the anti group, more so the, apparently, organizational aspects of it. What -- in your opinion, what is it that they most fear from this?

MR. KING: Yeah.

MR. HOBBY: From your effort?

MR. KING: I think they would say fear of federal government, fear of big government, especially this current presidential administration. The funding for the project came from the federal government.

They're afraid that there are -- that there are strings attached, that there's an agenda being pushed here which is political. And I think that's what really gave them existence. And they're, in large part, very affiliated to the Tea Party, as well so.

MR. HOBBY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. KING: Sure.

CHAIR CASTRO: Barbara, go ahead.

MS. BOY: If I can, I just wanted to follow up on that. I was talking to Mr. King before the meeting started, and I received an email, and it seems like the fear is that this plan is going to supersede County and city Comprehensive Plans. And that's part of the statement, because I received an email this week from --

MR. HOBBY: I guess I should have one more question, then. Do you have a black helicopter? Okay.

CHAIR CASTRO: As somebody who lives near the airport, I don't appreciate that.

MR. HOBBY: No, I know.

CHAIR CASTRO: If you do, I'm just telling you now, but -- and, again, I think it's fascinating. Your plan, as you indicated, is non-binding --

MR. KING: It is.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- so I'm not sure where the fear is rationalized from. Maybe it's because you're talking about sea level and climate change, and some people don't believe in that. But, you know, it's just a plan. It's whether if it gets to implementation, and if it's not binding, I'm not quite sure what the fear is about.

I think, you know, whatever. But I like information. I may reject it, but I love information. Mr. DuBose, then I have Ms. Kaplan, and then Mr. Steffens.

COMMISSIONER DUBOSE: Just kind of a follow-up of those points about non-binding, being a toolkit, and how you're collecting the data. And just hearing your presentation, I'm just assuming this is like a living document.

So my question is as cities take on aspects or take part of it and kind of shape it and mold it to be their own, in essence, they -- they're changing the plan. So my question is, you know, do you plan to update this? You know, do you have benchmarks? Or you'll be done, and you'll put it out there, and it'll be a final product?

MR. KING: Yeah, it's a good question. We hope that the -- and we expect that the project will live on after the final plan. We're setting up indicators, like benchmarks, along a whole variety of categories, and we're -- we hope to track the progress, and we hope that municipalities can contribute to be part of the conversation and we can continue to track progress as it goes on.

Seven50 is probably going to turn from a public process organization to a kind of advocacy role for regionalism going on from here. Can't say exactly what that's going to look like yet, though.

COMMISSIONER DUBOSE: So, I mean, you know, we've had presentations. We have plans, and, you know, they go from 30 to 40 to 45 or, you know, I don't know where we're at on it, but -- so do we anticipate, you know, a Seven55, Seven60? I'm just trying to get an idea, long term, how this is projecting out.

MR. KING: That would be great. I mean, that you know, the plan we really like to look to is Daniel Burnham's plan 1908 --

MAYOR CASTRO: That was great.

MR. KING: Chicago. The Daniel Burnham plan for Chicago in 1908 is still the plan for Chicago over a hundred years later. Now, it's changed a lot. It's broken into different pieces. There are large portions of the plan which they have disregarded completely. They've added to it.

But for a hundred years, that's continued to be the plan. It's very versatile. So I would love to see -- you know, we would all love to see that happen. And there's a large partnership working to hope that this plan can stay, and we can do, right, Seven50 and Seven80, and we can continue with that.

COMMISSIONER DUBOSE: I mean, but is that in place, or is it kind of wait and see? The plan as presented, sounds like it needs to be a plan that grows and develops, but I'm kind of getting a sense that you're going to collect this data, put it all together, and put it out there as a toolkit.

MR. KING: The question. What's in place, you know, the fact that we have one of these summits and 1100 people come suggests that this has some momentum. We really don't want to see a plan that just goes on the shelf. We might not even create a hardcover plan. If it makes it more effective, we might actually just have the plan entirely online.

COMMISSIONER DUBOSE: So at this point, you don't have that structure in place. You're developing this.

MR. KING: That's absolutely right.

COMMISSIONER DUBOSE: Okay.

MR. KING: And a lot of municipalities are taking a wait and see attitude. They want to see what policies are in the plan, too, before they decide to become part of a structure that continues it.

COMMISSIONER DUBOSE: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: Ms. Kaplan.

MS. KAPLAN: Hi.

MR. KING: Hello.

MS. KAPLAN: One of the issues that you mentioned was the rise in sea level. Did I hear you correctly? Two feet is projected by 2060 and –

MR. KING: What's projected is a range from eight inches to two feet, by most estimates, by NOAA and the regional organization called Climate Compact. So what we've adopted is two feet by 2060, yes.

MS. KAPLAN: Okay. So that's where I was a little confused, because where you're drawing these statistics from, especially someone who hopes to retire on the water some day, and how about climate changes? Where do you draw that information from to come up with your data?

MR. KING: There's this organization called the Climate Compact. They've been working for the last three years on climate change matters and they are regional already. There are several scientists on the Climate Compact, including scientists from Broward County.

And so we follow the direction of Climate Compact. And, ultimately, their final numbers come from NOAA, which is a federal agency looking into this. And the two foot -- I know, the two foot sea level rise sounds very scary, but, you know, the reality is it's -- you know, if we invest in infrastructure, if we decide to build a more resilient community, we can do it.

You look to Louisiana, a much poorer state than Florida, to be honest, and it's astounding what they've been able to do in terms of their bulwarking. And so the plan needs to think about what we can do so we all get to stay.

MS. KAPLAN: Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: And I don't know where Louisiana gets their water from. I think the biggest crisis for South Florida with sea level rise is the push on the aquifers –

MR. KING: That's right.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- and then drinking or potable water becomes a real challenge. So, you know, we're going to have to go catch the rain soon, which we're not doing enough of. Mr. Steffens.

MR. STEFFENS: I was wondering, as part of your final document, whatever, whether that's an online or a hard cover version, are you going to provide proposed ordinances and legislation that cities can look at, maybe make amendments for themselves, and then introduce and hopefully pass?

MR. KING: Yes. It'll be a best practice of ordinances that already exist. Perhaps municipalities can look at what other municipalities are doing. And, yes, hopefully there'll be a package of specific resolutions, ordinances, text changes, land development regulation changes, that could work toward this goal.

MR. STEFFENS: Okay. This is something I always kind of bring up in this committee, because I live out in the northwest part of the County where it's very red on all of your walkability maps and those things. I was just wondering, are there -- I mean, the city I live in is totally unwalkable, by and large.

Are you going to have any proposals vis-à-vis to make those cities maybe a little bit more friendly towards those things? You know, we're looking at half acre, full acre lots, that's, I mean, a major impediment. But are there going to be proposals or ideas of people discussing that in your group?

MR. KING: The workgroup has already started to identify just certain intersections. One intersection, which if it saw a corner store in a walkable format, or if it saw a community playground, you know, or a farmers' market that was regular and allowed by zoning, in those very unwalkable areas, it's hard to retrofit them entirely. Really hard to imagine that.

But you can imagine certain select nodes where a certain portion of people starting to walk to it, you could actually create some community centers, you know, some centers of community life. So very strategic, very small interventions way out west, to be honest.

MR. STEFFENS: Okay. I was wondering, and then you said one of the portions of this was environmental concerns, obviously. We're talking about climate change and sea level rise. Is your focus, then, really more on getting people

compact? You're not proposing -- or maybe you are going to propose regulations vis-à-vis how we can taper off some of those environmental effects, or is it more just towards getting people together, decreasing car use, things of that nature?

MR. KING: There's both a portion of the plan which talks about decreasing our emissions as a region, and then there're a portion which talks about these resiliency efforts, infrastructure changes that could be made to bulwark certain areas. You know, climate change is a very big part of it. I'm answering your question.

MR. STEFFENS: Okay. My final question is what concerns or attention is being paid to -- another issue we face here, especially lately, is affordable housing.

My concern sort of is when, if you're going to be attempting to move these people towards these corridors, we all know, you know, you live on the good train line in the nice high rise, that's probably going to be an expensive unit, which is it what it is.

But have you given attention to affordable housing issues? Do you have affordable housing advocates involved in the creation of this plan? Where does that stand?

MR. KING: We do. The actual consultant team is 16 firms. And Jim Carras, from Carras Community Investment, is working on the affordable housing component of this. So whenever we draw those transit oriented development stops like you're saying, we're imagining affordable housing built in, probably protected in some way, in order to keep the value of the land rising such that affordability becomes impossible.

We're looking at design solutions to make these more affordable. And we're looking at a commitment from HUD to you know, to kind of work with us to select specific areas where affordability really needs to be a focus.

MR. STEFFENS: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay. We have Commissioner Long, Commissioner Lazarow, and Mr. de Jesus. Commissioner Long.

COMMISSIONER LONG: Just a quick question, because you had talked about affordability. When you talk about, you know, walkability, how far do people actually walk, or in this scenario, is it ten minutes, a mile, two blocks, when you're starting to create these things, especially in the urban core.

MR. KING: People will walk 1320 feet, a five minute walk. After that point, they'll think about using their car. But 1320 feet, you can almost see it --

CHAIR CASTRO: A quarter mile in Florida.

MR. KING: -- about a quarter mile. And then people will walk that.

COMMISSIONER LONG: Okay. Is there talk -- and up north, you can go through older neighborhoods and, you know, obviously, in northeast, where you actually have a little grocery store, basically in the middle of a residential area, or a little gas station right next to it.

Is that changing the northeast? I don't travel up there that much. Or is it something that could be down here?

MR. KING: Well, I was in Maine yesterday. We're working on a plan for Lewiston, Maine. And the idea of these small convenience stores, these small corner stores you know, they're everywhere. And people are there on the sidewalk in front of them.

Cumberland Farms is the one in the study area we were working. And it's such a small increment, you could imagine these being built. As long as there is certain flexibility in parking requirements, you know, as long as there's flexibility in zoning, I think you're right. I think there's a solution there that we can make more use of in southeast Florida.

COMMISSIONER LONG: Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: Commissioner Lazarow.

COMMISSIONER LAZAROW: Thank you. I'm sorry I was late. There was traffic. I'm sure -- as you know. I don't know how Vice Mayor Blattner got here on time. I'll have to car pool with you next time.

VICE MAYOR BLATTNER: My pleasure.

COMMISSIONER LAZAROW: Thank you. So Chair Castro did touch on my question, which is heat being a factor in walkability. I lived in New York City and I thought nothing of walking five miles. It didn't seem like five miles.

So I know that that's a big factor in Florida, and I'm not sure exactly what your answer would be to that question. Do you have any kind of comment at all in Florida?

MR. KING: Well, in Florida, shade. I mean, in the New England streets, quite often you don't need shade as much, and the sidewalks can be small. Here, we've got to just make sure that you're either in a colonnade or an arcade, or you're under a big street tree, because if you're not shaded, you're just not going to be walking to work, or anywhere. You're not going to arrive in a condition

that's appropriate –

COMMISSIONER LAZAROW: No.

MR. KING: -- professionally.

COMMISSIONER LAZAROW: I'm sure the guys up here in suits are going to agree with you. And then you mentioned the hundred year plan, which is the first time I've ever heard anything like that. It's very lofty, I guess would be the word.

And to Commissioner DuBose's question, in a hundred year plan in Chicago, I guess historically how does that work?

MR. KING: Well, Daniel Burnham's plan from 1908 was, just as this one is, non-binding. It was actually created by a kind of Chamber of Commerce for the City. And it was regional. It had implications for the whole of the region.

And a lot of the ideas that he put forward were just incorporated. So there are these large regional boulevards that go the length of Chicago, way out through many municipalities and into the suburbs. It was one of the first joint transportation efforts to construct these.

Or there are these barrier islands that were created under that plan, which they're still adding to and they're still building on. And there's just been many different implementing organizations under that plan. So the ideas just have to be that good.

COMMISSIONER LAZAROW: So I'm saying the ideas were good and they were feasible.

MR. KING: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LAZAROW: They were able to be executed. So do you feel that way also, obviously, about your plan? You would have to feel that way.

MR. KING: I like to think so. I mean, half of our clients at Dover, Kohl are private sector, and half are public. So we've been trying to see both sides pretty clearly. And so, you know, Urban Land Institute, which represents private interests, is an enormous part of this plan. And they're at every meeting, and we're part of every one of their events. So, you know, key to all this is private sector buy-in, and that's been a big focus for us.

COMMISSIONER LAZAROW: Okay. I think lastly my question would be other than the water, which also would be of concern, obviously -- of course, I'm not going to be here by 2060, unless you guys come up with a way to live an extra 20 years -- but is there a reason you picked 50? Is there a reason that you felt

Florida -- is it either 50 or a hundred, or is there some reason that you felt 50 was the right number?

MR. KING: Yeah, it's just a tidy --

COMMISSIONER LAZAROW: It's just a name.

MR. KING: -- name.

COMMISSIONER LAZAROW: Okay. I was just curious.

COMMISSIONER LAZAROW: Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: Mr. de Jesus.

MR. DE JESUS: Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Mr. King. I appreciate your presentation. I found it quite interesting. As I look through your slides and study this concept of regionalization, especially as it pertains to the transportation aspect of it, and then you talk about this being elective or optional for cities to participate. I'm not sure how you connect the dots, or what's the plan, I should say, for bridging those gaps when we're trying to look at a regional transportation system when cities in between opt not to participate.

MR. KING: Right. Well, I'll tell you this. For the first time, this plan has brought together all of the MPOs of the seven counties. And for the first time, there's a transportation model which is seven counties wide. Prior to this project, it had always just been one county or two counties or three counties, or four, at best, discussing it.

So, you know, just the fact that the MPOs are going to be using the same model I think suggests that that will necessitate conversations. But you're right. The opting out of any group could -- would definitely have an impact to the region.

MR. DE JESUS: And is there a plan to address that if they do? Is that where the County would step in, or the State would step in to bridge that gap?

MR. KING: It's a good question. I'm not sure.

MR. DE JESUS: Thank you.

MR. KING: Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: Commissioner Mack.

COMMISSIONER MACK: My question is do you need all of the participation in order for this to go forward?

MR. KING: Right. Similar to the last question. We're unlikely to have unanimous participation from the 127 municipalities just realistically. So we have to have a plan that can work even if there are gaps. I think that's –

COMMISSIONER MACK: I understand that you would. Thirty percent, 50 percent participation, what are the guidelines that you all are looking for participation?

MR. KING: It's a good question, and it's a hard one to answer.

COMMISSIONER MACK: That's okay. Just think about it, and let me know later.

MR. KING: Sure. Well, you know, as we go further, I'd like -- I'd love to come back. Once we have a report and we start to go to the city councils and the county councils, and we start to go to different organizations, I'd like to come back and report to you on our progress in building, you know, that group that continues into the future, and I'd like to give you a participation percentage, you know, next time we check in.

CHAIR CASTRO: That would be nice. I have Vice Mayor Blattner and then Mayor Boccard.

VICE MAYOR BLATTNER: Thank you. I think I'm the next to last person to speak today. Just a couple of observations, that in anyone of the categories that you've talked about, water, transportation, and all that, there are other groups that are already working on those things, and the -- what the significance of it is that the more people who are involved in all of these things, the more likely we are to get anything done.

But I have to tell you that, as much respect as I have for most city staff, it ain't happening unless elected officials make it happen and have a vision that drives the staff. Staff does what elected officials ask them to do, or directs them to do. And I think it's really important that you make sure that Commissioners -- again, we're going to have to do this every three or four years because with change, that we get involved.

Interesting conversation about Chicago. It reminds me that in our earliest cities, those cities were built around public spaces. Boston, New York, and Philadelphia. And they're still there. If you go to Philadelphia, Rittenhouse Square is still a pretty important place in the City of Philadelphia. We know about Central Park.

That didn't happen here. We didn't develop that way. It's not a criticism. It's just an observation. But what -- the follow-up observation is we're now trying to create those public spaces where people can gather.

But they don't have to be massive. I think that's what you were trying to point out with even the example of out west, if you have an intersection where people live a half a mile or a mile away, that if somebody would just open up a convenience store there, and the next place that would be opened up would be a dry cleaner. And then a shoe repair shop.

And then all of a sudden you're beginning to develop critical mass that people want to go to. Instead of getting in their car once a week to go to the dry cleaner, they can go when they need to go. So I would say, overwhelmingly, I think this is a great concept that people are going to be involved in many ways in it.

I mean, I'm involved in transportation. I'm involved in water. Somebody else is also. And just have to spread the message that you're trying to layer on all of us how important it is to plan for the future. Thank you.

MR. KING: That's right. Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: Before I go to Mayor Boccard, it was interesting; one of the slides, to your point, one of the things they were afraid of was politicians. And, you know, when they were doing their highlighted words and the size, I think it was about the fifth or sixth –

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Well, they shouldn't be afraid of us if we're not doing the things that we should be doing.

CHAIR CASTRO: Oh, you're absolutely correct. But that is the concern, and it changes constantly. Mayor Boccard.

MAYOR BOCCARD: Thank you, Madam Chair. Being a native south Floridian, I've come to survive by driving my car. There is no transportation other than the car.

I see it to be a very difficult thing to get people out of their cars in south Florida, because there is no opportunity for them. Is there, in your plan, any sort of marketing plan to get people out of their cars and to start using mass transportation, if it's provided?

And my other question would be the funding of all this. It's great to have a plan, but you've got to be able to pay for it.

MR. KING: Two good points. You know, demographically, things are changing in southeast Florida, and nationally. The baby boomers are getting older, to retirement age, beyond. The largest, most significant generation, statistically, the baby boomers, are reaching retirement ages and they want to drive less. And you're seeing that.

The second things that's happening statistically is the millennial generation, people who are in their early 20's now, this is a generation that's less enamored with the car. When -- they don't need to get into a car to see friends. They get on Facebook. They get on Twitter.

That generation of millenials are just driving a lot less, and they're a lot less interested in the costs of the automobile. So I think -- so those are two generations, groups which we might not have in this room so much, but they are going to be -- they are going to be looking for other options for walking and transit options, and that will have an effect in our region, number one. Or, at least, so the statisticians tell me.

To your other point, the fact that, you know, it would take a concentrated, street by street effort to build in walkability. We can provide certain principles, but in order for Fort Lauderdale to become that big green dot, you know, that I was showing, the reality is it takes you. You know, it takes your staff. It takes that level. It takes working with the city in order to implement that kind of thing.

And it can never be done regionally. And so, you know, so the plan will have to follow the lead of people working at the scale of the street in order for walkability to actually change very significantly in the future, I agree.

MAYOR BOCCARD: And how do you plan on getting that message out to the public?

MR. KING: Well, right now, for example, you know, there's 500 people who follow us on Twitter. There's 30,000 that are looking at our Facebook site every day. A lot of them are younger people, so they're really plugged in. If you look at our Facebook, if you look at our Twitter, you all of a sudden see a lot of young people, and you actually see a large percentage of them are from this Fort Lauderdale area.

The hip factor of Fort Lauderdale is enormous, if you don't know this. You're infilling, you're getting all of these units, you're getting these events that are occurring. And so the younger community, I like to think that the word is out, yeah. And I like to think that as they rise in significance and in power, their ideas will become more part of everyday policy.

MAYOR BOCCARD: I think one other point, that people will be not driving to office more in the future, I believe, because of the advent of the Internet, and a lot of people will be working from home, you know, via their laptop or their computer, and there won't be a need for them to commute in and out of a city, so there may be opportunity there, as well. And that's really the next generation that

—

MR. KING: That's right.

MAYOR BOCCARD: -- that we're seeing. Even my own kids are -- you know, they're working off their computers, and they're not traveling. So that's another aspect of transportation, as well.

MR. KING: That's true.

MAYOR BOCCARD: Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIR CASTRO: Real quick, two follow ups to his point. I think I was going to ask you, is education, obviously, a component. You're working with the various School Boards, I assume, because when you start changing densities and things like that, obviously, student generation and everything else becomes an issue.

But, like he pointed out, I think education eventually will even start being more remote, and physical classrooms may someday be a thing of the past. So you do include education, planning with the School Boards in this process? You're engaging them?

MR. KING: That's right. On our Executive Committee, which is 27 members, three of them represent the school boards.

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay. And then to Mayor Boccard's, I think, you know, he's right. Funding is an issue. I know municipalities are already kind of moving in a direction for aesthetic and quality of life and sense of place planning. So they're already starting to adopt wider sidewalks, streetscapes that have the trees and the arcades and that sort of thing.

But anytime a municipality undertakes that, especially if you're redeveloping an area that's, you know, pretty much been blighted and whatever, funding becomes an issue.

And, I mean, municipalities get unfunded mandates all the time. Taxpayers don't want their taxes to go up. So at some point, I think, you know, you try to create incentives to bring the private sector in to do the development for you.

I'm hoping you're going to include some recommendations or ideas of that to make that happen, because, obviously, the government can't afford to produce all these streetscapes and things that you were kind of addressing street by street. There is just not the money there, and taxpayers have a certain bearing about how much taxes they're willing to pay, so.

MR. KING: It's all a very good point. And --

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay.

MR. KING: -- you know, on the topic of taxes, I should mention that that plan

along the Florida East Coast rail line, Flagler's old rail line –

CHAIR CASTRO: Right.

MR. KING: -- that plan is private sector. That's All Aboard Florida. And they're buying a lot of properties. And you'd like to think that if they want their transit to work, that the businesses that are along those streets will have to put in things like street trees and awnings and colonnades.

So I'd like -- you know, hopefully, this is all going to be more integrated, and the burden won't be entirely on the public sector and on municipalities.

CHAIR CASTRO: Very good. Well, thank you very much. I think you had a lot of great questions, a lot of good responses, and, yes, we do invite you back for an update or whatever. Just reach out to Ms. Blake Boy and book it, and we'll look forward to seeing you. And we thank you very much for your presentation this morning.

MR. KING: Thank you for your time. Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM R-2 - COUNSEL'S REPORT – 2013 LEGISLATURE/LAND DEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

CHAIR CASTRO: We're on to Counsel's Report.

MR. MAURODIS: Yes. I have in your packet, as I indicated, a very brief summary of some of the new legislation that affects land development generally. Very little of it directly affects the Planning Council.

And, again, that's just to let you know kind of what you might be thinking about, what you may want to inquire further about. And I would invite anyone who wishes more information about it, please call me. I can provide you with the full text of the law. But I just kind of tried to put some highlights to see if there was anything that would interest you.

And, obviously, those of you who are representing – or who sit on municipal governing bodies certainly could contact your City Attorney or Planning Directors for more information. Can I answer any questions on it, or I'd be happy to have you contact me and I can, you know, go into depth with you.

CHAIR CASTRO: Mr. Hobby.

MR. HOBBY: This isn't on your report here, and this may be too soon for any thoughtful reflection, but the Supreme Court decision in St. John's River Water

Management District versus Koontz –

MR. MAURODIS: It certainly -- you know, most people would consider it another blow to the ability of local government to regulate, because it puts a local government at more risk with regard to developer -- what we call developer exaction, develop -- basically, impact fees, when we exact money from developers for certain things. And it's just another step of broadening it, extending those rights. I don't quite find it as radical an extension of the rights of developers as it seems to be made out, but it further –

CHAIR CASTRO: Mr. Maurodis –

MR. MAURODIS: -- indicates that –

CHAIR CASTRO: -- I'm sorry to interrupt you. Could you just give a synopsis of the ruling? Because other people in the audience may not know –

CHAIR CASTRO: -- what the ruling was.

MR. MAURODIS: It's another case dealing with situations where, as you know, when developers come in and seek to develop their land, government imposes impact fees or –

CHAIR CASTRO: Right.

MR. MAURODIS: -- the broader term is development exaction. Basically, you're exacting funds or improvements from developers. And the first thing it did was to reiterate the doctrine, and strengthen the doctrine that there has to be a rational nexus between the request and the impact of the development.

You just know, it's just not an opportunity to ask things from developers when they come in and develop. It has to be really -- we have to say, we're asking you for this because you're impacting us in this way, and, additionally, when you pay that money, it will benefit your development. We're not asking you to pay to develop -- benefit someone else's development.

So it reaffirmed that principle quite strongly and strengthened the way it would be -- the way it would be held. So it's just another step in the road in that regard, and it applies in a more broad fashion.

But, generally, that's the proposition that is being strengthened there. When government asks a developer, or demands from a developer, that they either pay monies because of their impacts, or to do something, build a road, build a school, do something like that, you really have to have a strong, rational nexus to do that.

MR. HOBBY: And, again, this is -- just, what was it, yesterday, I think it was, the

decision, but it really goes farther than that, doesn't it, in the sense that in this case the developer wanted to build on wetlands, and the -- whatever the authorizing agency was said, well, you can, but you have to restore wetlands -- off site, which most people would think, well, that seems like a reasonable solution, but apparently it was the fact that it wasn't on site or something like that that --

MR. MAURODIS: Well, yeah, it's a complicated, and you had several opinions on it, but it went back to that you really have to -- you really have to draw a really strict relationship between the request -- you can't say, you can do it if you improve something somewhere else.

And that's the doctrine which we've often used, and so it's going to pose some issues there, and it will be litigated in the Circuit Courts of Appeals as to how far that needs to go.

But it took it a step further. Because we always had the rational nexus test, but it took it that next step, and it seemed to strengthen where that is. That rational nexus needs to be a lot tighter than it used to be --

MR. HOBBY: Yes.

MR. MAURODIS: -- because, you know, it used to be, well, contributing to a wetland mitigation bank and that type of thing, and they've basically limited government somewhat further.

People reviewing the case, I've read a number of summaries of the case. I have not read the entire opinion at this point. And I'd be happy, if you'd like, at the next meeting to give you a further report on that, and maybe -- I'll look. If there are any good summary reports, I'll provide those to you.

But the -- what happens with these cases, they come out. Then everyone has their opinions, and then they get started to be interpreted, and, over the years, they tend to look different in application, and people get very, very -- I mean, I don't -- as a person who represents -- well, all I do is represent local governments. I would -- I can't say my hair didn't stand up, because I don't have anything to stand up, but I didn't -- it didn't create the -- quite the reaction that it did to some people.

Maybe I'm just reading it wrong, but I didn't have the foreboding that some people seem to have. And now a decision, and we looked at the -- you know, all the -- how the opinions are written are also going to be very important, because these things are going to be taken apart and every little sentence is going to be part.

Because now it's the -- and, remember, it was -- as I think about it, if I'm recalling,

it was actually referred back to the lower court, I think, for -- I have to check that out, but I think it was referred back to the local court for, you know, a decision consistent with this opinion. So, you know, this could be -- this could spawn another five years of litigation. These people are probably not finished yet. But I'll be happy to come back with a summary. I'll make a –

CHAIR CASTRO: That would be helpful.

MR. MAURODIS: -- note to do that for you.

CHAIR CASTRO: Do you have anything else?

MR. MAURODIS: Nothing else today.

AGENDA ITEM R-3 - EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay. Executive Director's Report.

MS. BOY: Good morning. I'd like to welcome Ms. Kaplan to the Planning Council. We had a great meeting earlier this week to go over your duties and the backup material. So, welcome, Ms. Kaplan. And I'm sure you saw that she got some beautiful flowers from her husband. Very nice.

MS. KAPLAN: Thank you, Barbara.

MS. BOY: Second, I just wanted to note that the reminder that the update that I sent out for the recommendation for Item PH-3 was just to remove the condition that prior to the second Public Hearing, because we got the signoff from the County staff that the transportation improvements were acceptable and mitigated the impacts of the amendment.

The third thing is I just wanted to mention also that the County Commission earlier this month approved the waiver of the fee for context sensitive corridor trafficways plans amendments for a period of two years, so hopefully we'll see some of those applications coming in. As you know, we're working on the Complete Streets items and projects with the County staff, so hopefully we'll see some of that coming up.

The final item I have is that there are no items as of this moment for the July Planning Council meeting, so if we get to the conclusion of the meeting and none of the items from today need to be carried over to next month, then it will be at your pleasure to potentially cancel that meeting, unless you want to come here, and then you're always welcome to, and we'll find something to put on the agenda.

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay. Thank you. There's some incentive.

MS. BOY: I just wanted to mention, do you want me to go through who we have signed up to speak?

PUBLIC HEARING

CHAIR CASTRO: I was going to ask you, now that we're on to the Public Hearing Agenda, who do you have other than applicants who are -- you know, want to speak to an item, please?

MS. BOY: So all we have are applicants only, except for Items 2 and 3, PH-2 and 3, and we have two residents signed in for each of those. And I understand that each of those residents are in favor of the projects for 2 and 3. For Item 7, we have two interested parties signed in to speak.

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay. So you have PH-1 through 7, knowing that there are two speakers for 2 and 3, but they're in favor of the item, does anybody wish -- we're going to pull PH-7. We'll just stipulate that now. Do we have any other items to pull for PH-1 through 6?

COMMISSIONER DUBOSE: I'd just, I guess, if staff would just speak to PH-2, just kind of where we're at, and then we're still working on something -- the last update I received, we're still working on some items, so there will be a second Public Hearing on this.

CHAIR CASTRO: I'm going to just pull PH-2.

MS. BOY: Okay.

CHAIR CASTRO: That will be easier, and we'll address it then.

MS. BOY: Okay.

CHAIR CASTRO: So we have PH-2 and PH-7 pulled. Anything else? And PH-3, again, the speakers are in favor of the application? Who are the two speakers for PH-3?

MS. BOY: The two speakers for Item PH-3 are -- hang on one second -- Mr. James Stubblefield and Ms. Sandra Jackson.

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay. And you're both in favor of it, correct? Let the record reflect they've indicated yes. So we have pulls PH-2 and PH-7.

AGENDA ITEMS PH-1, PH-3 THROUGH PH-6

CHAIR CASTRO: With that, may I have a motion for the other items, or --

MR. STEFFENS: So moved.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- to approve the other items.

MR. STEFFENS: So moved.

COMMISSIONER DUBOSE: Second.

CHAIR CASTRO: We have a first and a --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- second. Who was the first? Raise your hand for Nancy. Anybody raise your hand?

MR. STEFFENS: I'll be the first.

CHAIR CASTRO: Thank you. Who's the second?

COMMISSIONER DUBOSE: And I second the motion.

CHAIR CASTRO: Got it, Nancy? Okay. All in favor. Any opposed? Good.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

AGENDA ITEM PH-2 – AMENDMENT PC 13-3

CHAIR CASTRO: PH-2.

MS. BOY: Thank you. PH-2 is a proposed amendment in the City of Fort Lauderdale. It's approximately 24.6 acres on Broward Boulevard, or just south of Broward Boulevard and west of I-95. The proposed change is from medium high 25 residential to commercial land use.

Planning Council staff analysis noted sufficient public facilities and services, with the exception of the regional transportation network. There are a couple of impacts to -- adverse impacts to three lanes. So Planning Council staff was working with the MPO during the modeling, and identified some issues.

So it actually had to be remodeled, so the impacts were a little bit late being identified. So the applicant is currently working with County staff to identify the proper mitigation that will satisfactorily mitigate those impacts. So you have an outline of what's been proposed so far in your backup, and I know that the applicant is continuing to work on that.

So our recommendation says that if this one's not resolved prior to the second

Planning Council Public Hearing, then we would not support the amendment at that time. But we have no objection to the transmittal of it. I did also want to mention just about the neighborhood outreach, working with unincorporated Broward County, the applicant has been doing that.

The applicant is here if you have any questions. They are signed in to speak if you have any questions. And, as well, there were two interested parties, I believe, in favor of this, to speak for this also.

MR. STEFFENS: I –

CHAIR CASTRO: Go ahead.

MR. STEFFENS: -- I just have a -- maybe just a very simple question. Is this Fort Lauderdale or unincorporated Broward County?

MS. BOY: This is the –

COMMISSIONER DUBOSE: Fort Lauderdale.

MS. BOY: -- City of Fort Lauderdale –

MR. STEFFENS: Okay.

MS. BOY: -- and it is unincorporated Broward County to the north of Broward Boulevard.

MR. STEFFENS: Okay. But this is all south of Broward Boulevard?

MS. BOY: This is all south of Broward Boulevard –

MR. STEFFENS: Oh, got it. Okay. So they have to notice –

CHAIR CASTRO: So they have to notice.

MS. BOY: They're adjacent -- right. An adjacent municipality.

MR. STEFFENS: Got it. I understand. I appreciate that. Thank you for clarifying that.

COMMISSIONER DUBOSE: And I'll just say I wanted staff to give an update in regards to where we're at with this item. The developer's been working with the neighborhood and the outreach for over a year, so there's very strong support.

So there isn't any opposition from the city. However, that issue is pending, and I'm aware in that area that has been an issue, so just please keep us updated as

to how that's moving along from the County's perspective. If you could send an email or something as that develop -- as we move closer to the second hearing. But, with that, I'll move the item.

COMMISSIONER LONG: Second.

CHAIR CASTRO: I have a motion and a second. Quickly, I want to commend you and your staff for noticing a problem with the transportation modeling. And particularly -- I know Vice Mayor Blattner is the Chair of the MPO -- I want to commend the MPO for coming back and working with you.

And this was not something where there's a question of interpretation. It was just totally off, and, you know -- and they got together and they sorted out what the problem was and figured it out, which produced the new model, which is, apparently, now being addressed. So hats off to both teams for figuring that out and working through it. Any other thing? All in favor. Any opposed? Thank you.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

AGENDA ITEM PH-7 – AMENDMENT PCT 13-1

CHAIR CASTRO: PH-7.

MS. BOY: Item PH-7 is a first Public Hearing on a proposed text amendment to the County Land Use Plan. The proposal, which I'll get into the details in a minute. I just want to let you know what's been going on. The Land Use Trafficways Committee considered this at both its February and May meetings.

At the February meeting, the Land Use Trafficways Committee requested additional information, so we took some time, got that information together, which is also in your backup materials.

And then they had a lengthy discussion at last month's Land Use Trafficways Committee meeting regarding their recommendation. And the recommendation was not to support the item right now. And if the County Commission decided to move it forward, that they asked for additional information, including they thought that there should be a workshop with the Broward County Commission, the Broward League of Cities, and other stakeholders, clarification regarding the implementation in the process of the proposed rule, and then just consideration of a threshold or parameters as it would apply to the municipalities.

So, with that, I'll just give you a summary of what the actual text amendment is. So the County Commission, in September of last year, initiated an amendment basically to the affordable housing policy that's existing in your Land Use Plan. That's Policy 1.07.07. So right now, Policy 1.07.07 says that if you're proposing a Broward County Land Use Plan amendment that's going to add more than 100

new units to the Broward County Land Use Plan, you must address this policy.

And there's A through J, where you can meet the policy in all these different ways, but you must meet this policy. So applicants work with the County staff to get a signoff that they are meeting the policy or not meeting the policy. So what the County Commission initiated was we're going to add allocations of 100 or more flexibility or reserve units to non-residential property such as commercial or employment centers would also be subject to this policy. So that's really the crux of the policy. So first we had a joint workshop with the County planning staff in November of 2012, invited all the municipalities and interested parties-- held the workshop, talked about the idea.

And then it was forwarded to us, to Planning Council staff, from County staff. We sent it out to the municipalities for written comment. We received comments from five or six municipalities at that time. And then when the Land Use Trafficways Committee is giving people a second chance to comment in writing, as well as back to the League of Cities to see if they wanted to state what their position is regarding the text amendment.

So all of the information that we've received as of this date is in your backup. I'm not sure exactly of all the attachment numbers, but it's after Attachment 1. It's like 2 through 8, and then there's a couple of -- I think it's 2 through 8 for the municipalities.

The League of Cities did not take an action on it. They encouraged municipalities to comment back on it. So, subsequent to this report being issued for this Public Hearing, yesterday I received a letter from the Director of Housing Finance and Community Development Division for Broward County, stating his opinion on affordable housing in general.

I'm sure you had a chance to review that. I sent it out yesterday morning. If you didn't, I'll get you a copy. And that will be folded into the amendment report as it moves forward. We have two interested parties signed in to speak on the item, a municipal planner and an affordable housing expert. So we can either --

CHAIR CASTRO: Let's go to them first.

MS. BOY: Mr. Jim Hickey from Coral Springs.

MR. HICKEY: Thank you, everyone. Good morning.

CHAIR CASTRO: Good morning.

MR. HICKEY: Jim Hickey. I'm the Assistant Director of Development Services with the City of Coral Springs. We actually have a letter in the backup.

I just want to reiterate staff's position. We're actually agreeing with the Planning Council staff. The other thing I just wanted to mention is that the current rules require ten percent of the flex and reserve units to be affordable, so that's kind of already included within the flexibility and reserve restrictions that are in the Broward County Land Use Plan. So, with that.

CHAIR CASTRO: So, I'm sorry, just to be clear. You do have an issue with this to some degree as far as the rule coming back to the County another time because you feel like the rule -- your current environment already covers it, or you're in agreement that it can go back to the County?

MR. HICKEY: We believe that the rule that's in the current County Land Use Plan actually is sufficient for the affordable housing. We've worked with the County, and we will continue to work with the County on affordable housing issues. Just what's in the Land Use Plan currently, we believe is satisfactory.

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay. So you don't need any more of this. Okay. Got it. Thank you, sir.

MS. BOY: The second speaker is Mr. Jim Carras -- James Carras.

CHAIR CASTRO: James Harris. James Harris?

MR. CARRAS: Carras.

CHAIR CASTRO: Carras. I'm sorry. Oh, he's there. Are you Mr. Carras?

MR. CARRAS: Yes.

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay. You're up. Sorry. That's okay.

MR. CARRAS: Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: I know. I was like, okay. Sorry about that.

MR. CARRAS: Thank you. I appreciate it. Good morning. James --

CHAIR CASTRO: Good morning.

MR. CARRAS: -- Carras. I'm a resident of Fort Lauderdale, and I'm principal of Carras Community Investment. The bane of our existence, I was receiving a text particularly about this matter, so I'm going to miss the matter because I'm talking about it on a text.

CHAIR CASTRO: Well, we heard your name earlier, because you're in the Seven50 plan, apparently.

MR. CARRAS: Yes, I am.

CHAIR CASTRO: You're one of the principals on affordable housing. So it's good to see you.

MR. CARRAS: Thank you. I just wanted to speak briefly and -- to the point of affordable housing. And I know Ralph Stone sent you a letter that was released, I believe, yesterday or the day before.

And I want to echo some of the issues that have been brought up, because many of the letters that I read from the municipalities -- and I share their concerns about development and jobs and a number of the other issues that were brought up, and certainly Home Rule, which I respect.

However, I think many of them missed the mark on the issue of affordable housing. I think it's one of our great myths that the recession cured the affordable housing problem in Broward County and south Florida. It did not. The burden on renters, which we have -- and this is based on research that I did for Seven50, the percentage of renters has increased dramatically in southeast Florida and particularly in Broward County.

And the burden for those who are renting has increased dramatically. Coupled with transportation costs, when you take housing costs and transportation costs, the Miami/Fort Lauderdale/Pompano MSA is the highest in the country.

So when we talk to our friends in San Francisco, in Boston, in New York, and they say how expensive it is to live there, try living in South Florida. We have more people that spend more than 45 percent of their income, which is the national standard, on housing and transportation costs.

And so things are getting worse in Broward, not better. And, second, we've done a number of housing needs assessments over the past year in Broward and other parts of southeast Florida, and we have seen a dramatic increase in terms of property values.

Five, six years ago, I served with many of you on a committee from this Council to deal with affordable housing, and we came up with that list, the a la carte menu, for the municipalities. We were trying to deal with the affordable housing crisis at that time, in the midst of the crisis.

My suggestion is we don't turn the clock back. I think we need to move it forward. I think we need to keep our eye on the prize, which is really addressing the issue of affordable housing, not just for the so-called workforce, which is up to 140 percent of median income, but all the way down to folks who are in the workforce that are 40 percent of the area median income and 50 percent of the area median income.

We're one of the leading areas in the country in terms of low paying jobs, and that's a reality of our community. And I think all of us, County, municipalities, have to face that reality and address that issue. So I urge you to take any steps possible to continue to support affordable housing mandates and requirements, and that hopefully we work in partnership to address the issues.

CHAIR CASTRO: And if I could ask you a quick question, since you're kind of an expert in the field, you know. I was talking to somebody the other day, a friend of mine, and we were going over, you know, mortgage payments and stuff. And for the first time in my life, I realized, in the last few years my personal mortgage, over 50 percent of it now is insurance and -- you know what I mean?

So, you know, I definitely appreciate the affordable housing. And I don't care whether you own a building and you rent it or you own a building and you live in it, I think one of the issues we're still overlooking, and this is just a general comment, is the insurance component still. You know, I feel like I'm getting priced out of south Florida because of -- and I'll just throw out Citizens, but whoever you want to call for wind storm, whatever.

And at some point, I think we all need to address those issues in order for our housing to be affordable. Even if you're -- and I'm not supporting it or advocating for landlords, but if you own a building and you've got to pay rent -- you know, get rent brought in to cover your costs, if land values are going up, and you had to, you know, build a building on a more expensive piece of land, then you add your insurance to it and everything else, you have to come to a threshold rent to make money, quote, unquote.

MR. CARRAS: Absolutely.

CHAIR CASTRO: And I think somewhere in the affordable housing equation -- you all probably have more muscle than the regular, you know, consumer does. Somebody needs to bring some power to bear to say, okay, enough of the insurance nonsense, let's figure this out. And maybe that's where some of the regulatory schema we really need to look at and apply.

And that's just a comment on my part, because I feel like we're robbing Peter and Paul down here, when Joe's at the top with all the money, and it's kind of getting a little frustrating. So I just wanted to bring that out. But do you find that, too, that part of the cost of housing is the insurance component is getting bigger?

MR. CARRAS: I agree with you a hundred percent. It is a critical factor. And that only exacerbates the cost to a resident.

CHAIR CASTRO: Right.

MR. CARRAS: You know, that so-called example that you have in terms of a

new multi-family rental, insurance costs are up. Land values are up. Therefore, rents are going to be higher. I don't know about you, but the last time I saw people's income rising was certainly about ten years ago.

CHAIR CASTRO: Right.

MR. CARRAS: They're going in the other direction. And we're working harder, getting paid less. That's a national situation which is much more dramatic in South Florida because of the types of jobs that we have.

CHAIR CASTRO: Correct.

MR. CARRAS: And so it is a complex issue. And I think one of the things I've heard over the years, relative to affordable housing, well, it's really not me, that should be doing something, but we need to talk about Fannie Mae and Freddy Mac. We need to talk about over regulation. We need to talk about insurance.

Absolutely. This is part of a very complex issue. However, we can't keep passing it and say, well, it's not my issue, you know. It's somebody -- we have to fix this before you fix mine. So within your purview, within your mandate, I -- again, I hope you continue to support, as you have in the past, affordable housing requirements in Broward County.

CHAIR CASTRO: And, quickly, because I'm gathering you have a little bit of a planning background, yes?

MR. CARRAS: I'm sorry?

CHAIR CASTRO: Do you have a little bit of a planning background?

MR. CARRAS: Yes, I do.

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay. The gentleman from Coral Springs mentioned the regulatory schema or the process already includes the affordable housing, and this is kind of a redundant measure to bring it back to a Commission for the second time.

So for process, that ends up costing the stakeholders more money. Do you agree with him that it's already included, or what do you see this adding to the process, or how does it increase the affordable housing units?

Because what I'm hearing is the affordable housing units are the same. It's just coming back for a second approval for some reason. So could you comment on that?

MR. CARRAS: My comment -- and I'm not an expert in that type of planning, to

be quite frank with you, but my comment is I think that within the history of affordable housing development in Broward County, the reality is NIMBYism is alive and well.

And I think we need to have as much regulatory support and oversight to make sure that we pay attention to those affordable housing requirements. I am sensitive to the issue of cost, obviously, based on my previous statements, but I think that there needs to be that second layer, because, quite frankly, I'm not sure if all of our municipalities are rowing in the same direction relative to affordable housing.

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay. Thank you. Anybody else have any questions for Mr. Carras? Vice Mayor Blattner.

VICE MAYOR BLATTNER: Just a comment, in general, not necessarily to Mr. –

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay.

VICE MAYOR BLATTNER: -- Carras, if I may.

CHAIR CASTRO: Sure.

VICE MAYOR BLATTNER: A couple of weeks ago on public radio, I think the program's called On Point, there was a discussion that the City of Derry in Connecticut had turned down an ordinance which would have increased densities. And the speaker was saying that the reason that people turned it down was they were afraid that the increased density would create ghettos.

But ghettos at any level understand. And he was advocating that when there are projects which increase density, they must have diversity in them. And he was referring to diversity in housing style, in housing prices, in the demographics of the community.

I think that's what this may allow us to do, to prevent developments along transit oriented developments that were brought up before, that it would be easy for commuters to say, well, it is what it is without saying but let's make sure that there's enough diversity there that it represents the best of our communities.

CHAIR CASTRO: Got you. Do you have for Mr. Carras or in general? Are you addressing it to Mr. Carras or?

MR. HOBBY: I guess it's more general.

CHAIR CASTRO: Mr. Carras, you can sit down. I didn't want you to stand there any longer than you have to.

MR. CARRAS: Thank you very much for your time.

MR. HOBBY: Yeah, I think that I am -- I have long been an advocate of affordable housing. One of my great displeasures is that my daughter and her husband find it much easier, much more affordable, to live 30, 40 miles away rather than around the corner.

But I think that one of the things in Broward County that we have that I would hate for us to move in the direction of not allowing different municipalities to experiment with the best method for achieving affordable housing goals.

Obviously, the City of Lighthouse Point has different issues than, say, the City of Plantation or the City of Hallandale. And so I don't think that affordable housing is a one size fits all sort of situation, and although we may have affordable housing requirements, how we get to that point should be -- we should be open to the experiments or the diversity that we have here in Broward County, and let's see where it -- let's see where it ends up, not where it starts.

CHAIR CASTRO: Thank you. Commissioner DuBose.

COMMISSIONER DUBOSE: I'll just make a couple of comments. Did Mr. Carras leave?

CHAIR CASTRO: No, he's there. Mr. Carras, I think you're needed back up. Sorry.

COMMISSIONER DUBOSE: Oh, no. That's fine.

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DUBOSE: I just wanted to thank you for your comments. You laid it out well. And also with Anne bringing up some issues. I heard these numbers maybe a couple of weeks ago about the 45 to 50 percent of income that's being used, and it just blows my mind.

It was some years back when I served on the Living Wage Advisory Board for the County, and I think we were around 30 or so, but we were leading then. So we're still leading this trend, but now it's a greater burden.

You know, a couple of things that were pointed out, the insurance issue is huge, and it's affecting us disproportionately here in South Florida than the rest of the country.

As when I was President of the League, I started the Insurance Committee to take a look at it for this very reason. We are mandated, but we carry the largest percentage of flood insurance. I mean, we're looking at Citizens, but that comes

into play as well.

So when you look at the numbers, we're not really being served properly, so, you know, I've spoken of our Congressional folks, and, you know, see what we can do. But this is a broader issue, and we really have to take a look and look at it and think about it.

But Mr. Hobby, to your point, you were saying, you know, that you wish that your kids lived, you know, closer to you, but because of what's happening -- and we're not thinking long term, and we really need to look at this in the Seven50 plan -- but a lot of kids are going off to college and they're getting degrees, and they're coming home and they're moving right back in. So, you know, I have --

MR. HOBBY: Not that close.

COMMISSIONER DUBOSE: -- so, you know, as someone with a nine year old, you know, from what I'm learning and what I'm seeing is, you know, I've got to anticipate keeping that room and not converting it to a man cave and keeping it for my son. And who knows. I'm seeing a lot of young people that are coming out, and something, you know, was pointed out, and I think that you displayed it well when you talked about, you know, affordable housing, there's, as Vice Mayor Blattner pointed out, I think there are times when it's confusing to folks, and they take it as one thing.

But when we talk about affordable housing, we've got to look at it in the big picture, as I explain to people. We have young people that come out of college. They have decent jobs. They get married, and they can't afford to live here because of all these different issues that are here.

So I just wanted to say I was really glad that you got up there and you spoke, because I think you explained it well. And to Anne, you put another layer on it that most of the time this never comes up. It's never discussed in this fashion.

And people kind of follow one side or the other, and they look at it and they say, oh, my God, affordable housing, like you were saying, oh, it's going to create this type of living or this scenario, when affordable housing now in South Florida is everyone.

I mean, if we're spending 50 percent of our income on housing and transportation, you could have one major setback in your life, in your family, who knows, major operation, and then we're looking at a bigger issue.

I think that's what -- a lot of times, why people fall into, you know, three and four generations in a home or, you know, homelessness. I mean, we deal with that. I mean, this all contributes. So I was just really happy to hear the discussion. You know, I'm a strong advocate for affordable housing.

On this particular issue, though, that I'll speak to with staff, is I recommend -- I spoke to city staff to kind of get a sense of -- because we provided one of the letters, and what I got is we're still trying to figure it out, what the impact of this will be to us.

So I don't -- I'm not sure if this is something that I'm ready to move forward, just based on what I gather. I think the affordable housing component is important, but I hate to do things in a vacuum. And, also, you know, wearing my hat as a Commissioner and as a League person, I champion Home Rule first.

So I hate to put on another layer and, you know, just on the face of it, it sounds good, but it create a -- it can create a bigger issue. So I'm not sure if we should move forward with this at this point. I think maybe we need to have that broader discussion.

I would almost, you know, speak to staff and the rest of the Council, if Mr. Carras could, you know, come back at some point and have a discussion when, you know, the majority of us are here. We're really light. I just found the way you presented the issue was very informative, and I think that we may have put a better perspective on what affordable housing is and the impact on us as a region. So thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: I have Ms. Kaplan, Ms. Good, and then Mr. Steffens.

MS. KAPLAN: First of all, I totally support what Mr. Hobby brought out. Our cities are not cookie cut. You know, I look at Parkland, and I look at Lauderhill, and I think the needs are different. My husband and I recently returned from the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and I spoke with numerous Broward County Mayors on this very subject, especially once they found out that I was sitting on the Planning Council now.

And I can tell you that I did not meet one that supported this. I think that they see it more as not a bridge with the County Commission, but more as breaking down the link between them.

I personally -- just -- I'm just looking at my notes because after my conversations with the Mayors that I spoke with, I just wanted to make sure that I articulated myself as best as I could in relaying their opposition to this proposed amendment. I think they just kind of see it as yet more bureaucratic red tape, and that basically it should just be at the discretion of each municipality. Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: Thank you. School Board Member Good.

MS. GOOD: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair. I had the opportunity to serve on the Affordable Housing Council, and I can certainly see Mr. Stone's passion in his letter to us.

And I just wanted to ask staff when was the last time that we were able to have some information or presentation from the Housing Council or Mr. Stone's staff in regard to the affordable housing products available throughout the County?

MS. BOY: I can't even remember, so I would be happy to invite him to the August or September meeting. I know in September, I believe the MPO's coming, so I could see if he could maybe make it in August, if you were comfortable with that. Or July.

MS. GOOD: I'm not going to suggest July, unfortunately, I'm taking my daughter to FSU in August, so I will not be here. But I have served on the Council. I'm well aware of what was mentioned earlier and the lack of that product.

And, really, it's the rentals that we're really -- so many people believe that, because there's so many foreclosures, that that all of a sudden allows a great influx of affordable housing products within the market, but in reality, it's the rental product I think that we're lacking.

And I just think that information, regardless of how we move forward, would be of value to this group to clearly understand what our deficiencies are, so I would suggest that.

CHAIR CASTRO: And Mr. Carras, too, because Commissioner DuBose wanted Mr. Carras, if he could come back at the same time with Mr. Stone. Mr. Steffens.

MR. STEFFENS: Similar to the concerns I raised last meeting when Mayor Ryan and I were discussing how we were going to proceed in the subcommittee, my concern is timing and our ability to actually, in the end, have some influence on this.

From my understanding, and you can correct me if I'm wrong, the Commission doesn't come back until when? September?

MS. BOY: They come back in mid-August.

MR. STEFFENS: Mid-August.

MS. BOY: Yes.

MR. STEFFENS: And our next meeting, if we don't --

MS. BOY: Your next meeting is August 22nd.

MR. STEFFENS: All right. Okay. All right. And, then, so what I get the sense of - - obviously, we're not sure until we're done -- is that maybe what -- we're going to table this matter one more time, which the traffic committee tabled it once, and

my hope is at that time we're going to have, you know -- and I know we're missing at least two of our Mayors who I'm sure were very involved in the last discussion, so I certainly would like to hear from them.

It would then, at that point -- has the County -- my concern, again, from the traffic meeting last month, has the County given any indication, any -- you know, have you heard from the manager's office, hey, where is this project at, or are they still not -- it's not really on their radar screen?

MS. BOY: One of the Commissioner's offices has inquired just where it is in the process, who's actually here today listening in on what's going on.

MS. GOOD: She chairs it. Commissioner Wexler.

MS. BOY: -- I can't speak for the Commissioners --

MR. STEFFENS: Okay.

MS. BOY: -- or their staffs. Andy and I were just talking in a sidebar that, you know, if you felt the need to table or defer it, you know, one more month, to get this --

MR. STEFFENS: If we could do just one more month, yes.

MS. BOY: -- additional presentation and information, that we're comfortable with that, because we're not limited to the twice a year process anymore, so that frees up our schedules and timeframes a lot.

We have the ability to take it back to the Commission, almost as soon as your -- you make your --

MR. MAURODIS: And this is not a map amendment of an applicant that would be -- you know, so we -- if you think you need to deal with this in a longer way, we wouldn't see that as being a problem.

CHAIR CASTRO: Procedurally, let's just clarify a few things. Our goal here is either to recommend the change or recommend not making the change. Regardless of what we recommend, the County Commission ultimately can do whatever they desire to do, so --

MR. MAURODIS: Right.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- they could ignore us completely. So -- and I'm getting all that because, to your point and to Mr. Steffens' point as far as process goes, I also think that the -- and you correct me if I'm wrong -- the issue seems to be a Home Rule versus a duplication of approval of units, because from what I heard from Coral Springs is they already have a protection built in the first layer, but

now we're saying you have to come back to the County Commission for approval a second time. Is that correct?

MR. MAURODIS: I don't know that.

MS. BOY: I was going to say, well, what happens is, for flex and reserve -- just to go back to the very basics of this, flexibility units are created for the difference between the County and the city plan.

So they're units that are already included in the County plan. They are not new units to the County's plan. So I think that that's maybe where they're saying that there's a redundancy, because they're permitted in the --

CHAIR CASTRO: So the --

MS. BOY: -- in the County Land Use Plan.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- crux of this is the city -- and I'm going to get really nuts and bolts here, so we all understand. The crux of this is if the city wanted to do a specific development and not have any affordable units in it, because they have those flex units and they could use them someplace else, they could build a -- an apartment building or a condominium building that has no -- or even single family homes, that has no affordable housing component in it, but this would force that amendment to come back here and have the County Commission review it again.

MS. BOY: Right. There's no set aside requirement for any -- for anyone --

CHAIR CASTRO: Right.

MS. BOY: -- right now. So you can meet affordable housing. That's not the only way to meet it.

So even if it does go back before the -- through the County Commission for review of affordable housing doesn't mean they're going to be required to do a set aside. It means that they're required to demonstrate that they meet the policy, the A through J, in maintaining and promoting affordable housing within their city.

So in no situation is a set aside required, although a city could require that to meet A through J, but it would not be a requirement.

CHAIR CASTRO: And this is now adding on a set aside?

MS. BOY: It's not adding a set aside. It's adding that it has to be signed off by the County Commission on its staff --

CHAIR CASTRO: Another level –

MS. BOY: -- which we're not clear –

CHAIR CASTRO: -- of approval.

MS. BOY: Right. Another level of approval for units that are already permitted by the Broward County Land Use Plan because of the difference between the city and the County plans is what the big issue is.

CHAIR CASTRO: But the presumption is that they want to manage now where those units are. Otherwise, why bring it back a second time?

MR. MAURODIS: I think what they're saying -- yeah, what the cities are saying is that through flex, we have these units. These are ours –

MS. BOY: Right.

MR. MAURODIS: -- to do what we wish.

CHAIR CASTRO: Right.

MR. MAURODIS: Now, not so much because we now have to show them we have addressed these standards. Not necessarily a set aside, but we have to go prove that we have addressed these standards. So what used to be at our discretion is no longer.

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay.

MR. STEFFENS: Madam Chair, I wasn't quite –

CHAIR CASTRO: Go ahead –

MR. STEFFENS: -- done.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- Mr. Steffens.

MR. STEFFENS: Thank you so much. I -- and this may be -- and, again, I understand, as an elector, in my -- maybe just my naïveté, but I see -- it seems to me -- and, again, this could be just me, there are kind of two different components here.

Where my confusion is, and I think -- and if I need to come in and meet with you privately, that's fine. But I -- maybe I'd like to get a sense of the Council, is on what -- what are we -- I understand it's another layer and there are concerns about that. So we sort of have those concerns.

But I'm more -- I'm also curious about the actual impacts. What actual kinds of things would have to be changed? Who are we putting a burden on or an onus on? Those are things that I'm very confused about.

And you talk about flex units and all of those things. I mean, maybe I need to do some summer homework. But I think if we had some clarity on those issues, I think it would at least help the debate. And this -- again, this could just be me, but I think, for me -- I mean, I understand, you know, we talk about Home Rule and another layer and all those things. I get that.

But when we're talking about what the practical effect is of this on a potential development in the County, that's something that I'm confused about, and I was just wondering -- I mean, I don't know how we do this, but I was just curious if that's something maybe at the next meeting we could discuss if we do table this matter.

MS. BOY: Sure. We can absolutely prepare a very complete overview, give you examples of how this is in action and happening. We can do that at the next meeting, too.

MR. STEFFENS: Okay. And then just one very last thing, and then I'm done, I promise. One of the concerns -- I mean, because this is my third time hearing this -- is the timing -- what impact this would have on the time or the cost to developers in moving a project along.

And I'm curious, I mean, because, to me -- I could be, again, naïve -- I think it's none, because, from what I understood, you could kind of track this with other things along the way. So while you're getting your other approvals, you can be getting this approval.

But I was just curious if we could have some clarity on that issue, I guess, probably in August. That's another request I have.

MS. BOY: Right. Well, I would just say today that, you know, it seems, from what the cities are saying, right now they have to allocate flexibility or reserve units to a commercial property.

If they want to build a 150 unit dwelling unit apartment building right now, right now what the rules say is that that's by resolution or other official action that the city takes. So that's it.

So there is a case where a compatibility review could be required by the County, but that's very few cases. Access to the beach, next to an environmentally sensitive land, and if the adjacent municipality that's right next to the allocation asks for a compatibility review.

So right now that's the only County oversight as far as compatibility reviews. And since those rules have gone into effect, no compatibility reviews have been required. So now I think what the cities are saying is we are -- we have to do -- we can do this by resolution or action, but now we have to come back through the County and say, okay, you're confirming that we meet our affordable housing A through J Policy 1.07.07.

And, you know, the municipality is the one who prepares that information. It's not the applicant or developer that's receiving the units, works with the County staff.

So you have examples of that earlier in your backup materials. The Town of Davie, when they were going through the process for the proposed amendment because it was adding more than a hundred units.

So there's a sample in your backup for there, for Coral Springs for adding more than a hundred units to the Broken Woods site. You can see what Coral Springs and Davie provided, you know, to the County staff to get that signoff.

So part of it is, I think what the Land Use Trafficways Committee was talking about was they're not clear that that's how the process is actually going to happen.

And one of the things is that the Land Use Trafficways Committee wanted to be sure that it's not going to require going to, like, a Commission hearing, you know, for that signoff kind of thing, that it would be handled at the staff level.

So it seems like they were looking for clarification of that matter, also. And that's just the sense that I have from the discussion at the Land Use Trafficways Committee, as well the cities. I don't know if that helps you or not. Probably not.

MR. STEFFENS: Not really. Just kidding. No.

CHAIR CASTRO: We'll come back to you in a second. I have Mr. Bascombe, Commissioner Long, and then Mr. de Jesus.

MR. BASCOMBE: My question actually is for Mr. Carras. And I hate to get him off his text messaging. I hope that's an affordable housing question. But this problem seems to be creeping into the middle class, obviously, in Broward County, south Florida in general.

The issue with the term affordable housing, it's always been connected to low income. And you mentioned NIMBY, or not in my back yard. How is it being re-branded? Or is it being re-branded? Or is it just an education of politicians and the general public? So how do we deal with that issue?

MR. CARRAS: It's an excellent question, and I think that's -- I think that part of

the issue is over the years, we always get into this debate about, well, define affordable housing, and then we get into the nuances of what affordable housing means.

Years ago, and when I started my career, which was years ago, we called it low income housing, all right, a lot of us that were in the field. And because of that branding issue, we turned it into affordable housing. By HUD definition, low income is someone earning 80 percent of median income.

So take a look what the median income household in Broward County. I don't have the numbers in front of me. Let's say it's \$50,000. - \$55,000. If it's 80 percent of that, you're low income. I mean, I don't know who's in the room, but I'm pretty sure there are people here that are low income.

And tell me that, you know, it's a branding issue and there's a concern about I don't necessarily want to live next to someone that's low income, even though you already probably do. You work with them. They serve you.

So to your question, how do we brand it? Well, we -- in the latest round in the crisis before the recession, we called it workforce housing. And we expanded it to include the middle class, and I think rightly so. And we went up to 140 percent of median income.

But now I think the market has caught up to us and said, oh, you're really talking about affordable, and you're really talking about low income. It's a no-win battle, I think, in the sense of branding.

What we have to continue to do is educate with the facts in terms of what's taking place relative to demographics, relative to income, relative to costs and the variety of costs, relative to regulatory costs and development costs.

And that debate and discussion is not an easy one to have. And it's a difficult one. However, at the end of the day, I still come back to the issue, and the issue is that Broward County has a shortage of affordable housing units, and that the demand for affordable housing, however anybody wants to define it, is dramatic and it will only increase over the next few years.

MR. BASCOMBE: Well, I appreciate those comments, and I appreciate the comments that we got in the memo, too, because I was educated. I didn't realize that. And I think part of it is education, the re-branding process. Whether you're - - it's that or just educating people, it's going to solve the problem eventually.

But the other part of it is how we provide non-service jobs in our economy. And I read a very interesting article in the paper the other day about tech, you know, South Florida becoming the tech center. They want it to become that. Think it's a fantastic thing. So it's providing jobs that actually can bring people's income up

and educate them at the same time.

MR. CARRAS: Madam Chair, may I respond? Just one very quick comment. And Jason was kind enough to present some of the information that we're working on the Seven50 plan.

One of the interesting things about the seven county region is that 45 percent of our residents, of the 6,000,000 people who live in seven counties, have a high school education or less. 45 percent.

Seventeen percent of the region does not have a high school diploma. Right? So when you look at numbers like that and we begin to talk about where a targeted industry, such as high tech, which is absolutely critical for our economic future, we're still struggling with what do we do and how do we deal with 45 percent of our workforce that doesn't have that educational background to be able to work in these jobs.

Last week, we heard from Mayor Murphy, former Mayor Murphy of Pittsburgh, and he talked about there's actually a new steel mill being built in Pittsburgh, which is -- I didn't know that -- which is fascinating.

In the old days, a steel mill would have 5,000 workers, and you could have less than a high school education to work there. This steel mill's going to have 500 jobs. The minimum requirement to work there is that you have to have at least an Associate Degree to work there. Because it's all high tech --

MR. CARRAS: -- production, if you will. All right? And here's our challenge is that you're right, it is jobs, and it is an economic basis, but still the reality is our workforce is now being challenged doubly by the lack of affordable housing units.

It's a terrible cycle. It's the chicken or egg. Whatever metaphor you want to use, but it has to be addressed.

MR. BASCOMBE: Then you get into, also, the issue -- I'm not trying to get off subject here -- of affordable education, as well. It's not just --

MR. CARRAS: Yes.

MR. BASCOMBE: -- where you live, it's how you pay off your loans once you go to school. Thank you very much.

CHAIR CASTRO: Commissioner Long, then Mr. de Jesus.

COMMISSIONER LONG: Yeah, I guess my biggest issue is that, while we all agree that there's affordable housing issues out there, and I deal with it -- deal with it with the homeless, trying to get them into permanent housing, still the

bigger issue that remains for me, as an elected official, is the Home Rule. We're losing that piece of it.

It seems that each year in the legislative session we lose a little bit more, a little bit more, a little bit more, and the County wants a little bit more, a little bit more, to a point that they're basically telling the cities you don't know what's best for your own city and your own population.

So I do have the biggest concerns about that, and I think, more than anything else, that's what I'm reading is that, once again, it's, no, guess what, another layer of government's on here, and we'll tell you what's best for you as a city. So, my concern's there.

CHAIR CASTRO: Thank you. Mr. de Jesus.

MR. DE JESUS: Thank you, Madam Chair. Déjà vu all over again. Anybody feel that way?

MR. DE JESUS: It seems like the more we discuss this, the more informed I become on the issue, but the more confused I become at the same time. It seems to me that through -- the common threads throughout our discussions is there's certainly a recognized need for affordable housing.

The debate has been are we meeting it or are we not. The cities say we are in this recent email. The County staff says we're not. I think the issue is, at this point, the cities feel, have an opinion and an interpretation of what this text amendment means, and the County has a position and an opinion on what this text amendment means.

I thought, and I certainly could be misunderstanding, but at the last meeting, we had agreed or requested that we workshop this issue between the cities and County staff and us, so that we could bring all parties together and clarify what this issue is. Is it truly a Home Rule issue? Is it innocuous and it's really not doing anything other than laying another layer on top of this? Is it something we need to go through or not go through?

And I don't -- maybe I missed something. Maybe we didn't agree to that. I thought we did. And I haven't seen anything scheduled for that.

CHAIR CASTRO: Go ahead.

MR. MAURODIS: Go ahead, Barbara.

MS. BOY: I would just say we have the workshop in November, and that was with all the municipalities and the interested parties. My understanding at the Land Use Trafficways Committee and what ended up in the recommendation

was, I think, as part of Mayor Ryan's action or motion was that if the County Commission decided to move this forward regardless of what your recommendation was, that there should be some things that happen. And one of them was that the County Commission should hold a workshop --

CHAIR CASTRO: Right.

MS. BOY: -- with the League of Cities and interested parties and stakeholders. So that's why -- at Planning Council, we had a workshop at the staff level in November, you know, and that's how -- what led to the initial distribution of the proposal. So that's what's in the -- on the first page. So if there's something that needs to be clarified or changed to that, I'd be happy, you know, to take your input.

CHAIR CASTRO: And to your point, I think we've even reached out to the sponsor of this amendment --

MS. BOY: Yes.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- and, you know -- and the question became do we ask a County Commissioner to come here and present. And I think the answer was really no, because --

MS. BOY: Right.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- so --

MS. BOY: We sent -- we sent the invitation --

CHAIR CASTRO: -- so I don't know what the likelihood of getting a workshop would be.

MR. DE JESUS: So I think the only thing that's changed, then, since the initial discussion at the Trafficways Committee is that more cities have come on board and said we're opposed.

But yet there still seems to be a lack of common understanding on what the text amendment really means. And that's what I'm looking for clarification on. If that comes through a County Commission workshop with the cities, great. If it comes through a staff workshop, however it gets to us.

But as we continue to hear from the cities, they're adamant they're meeting it, they have everything they need to do that. And yet we continue to hear that we're not, and we need to do more.

CHAIR CASTRO: Well, and keep in mind we can make a recommendation with,

you know, attachments, basically. But to your point, you know, people are separating the Home Rule from the affordable housing.

To me, they're actually going together. And, again, I'm going to go back to how this all comes about, and you're going to step in and correct me when I'm wrong, because I know I'm going to be wrong throughout the process here a little bit –

MS. BOY: Okay.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- because I'm not the smartest -- smartest tool in the toolbox. But cities come in and they apply for flexibility units in their municipality boundaries.

MS. BOY: They don't apply for them. They're just -- it's a given.

CHAIR CASTRO: But they have to go through a planning process to get the approval –

MS. BOY: Well, when we when we initially certify a municipal plan –

CHAIR CASTRO: Right.

MS. BOY: -- when -- so when a very -- so when the City of Dania Beach first came in and they said this is our City plan – this is the difference between the City and County plan –

CHAIR CASTRO: Right.

MS. BOY: -- this is flex zone 84 and 85 –

CHAIR CASTRO: Right.

MS. BOY: -- and this is the difference and we have a hundred flex units in each zone.

CHAIR CASTRO: Right.

MS. BOY: So that's the initial accounty-- that's where the flex units come from.

CHAIR CASTRO: And the importance of that, and that's where I'm getting to, is the County has reviewed and approved that City plan.

MS. BOY: The Planning Council has.

CHAIR CASTRO: The Planning Council has-- by virtue of the County. It's consistent with the Broward County Land Use –

MS. BOY: Right.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- Plan. So it's gone through a review process. Can we agree to that?

MS. BOY: Yes.

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay. So now we've been reviewed, and we've said to the City, here's your chits. These -- are your coins. These are your whatever. You get to use them how you want to use them.

MS. BOY: Yes.

CHAIR CASTRO: Yes?

MS. BOY: Yes.

CHAIR CASTRO: Now, the City starts doing buildings and they want to throw up a building here that doesn't have any affordable housing. They're okay to do that today, as long as they met A through J --

MS. BOY: They don't have to for today, for the allocation of flex or reserve, they don't have to --

CHAIR CASTRO: Not for the allocation.

MS. BOY: Okay. Sorry.

CHAIR CASTRO: They're doing a site plan.

MS. BOY: Okay.

CHAIR CASTRO: They're getting a project approved of a hundred units or more. They have to meet some sort of qualifications from the County. Typically, it's student generation and traffic generation.

MS. BOY: For a Broward County Land Use Plan map amendment --

CHAIR CASTRO: That's correct.

MS. BOY: -- yes.

CHAIR CASTRO: Then there's also the affordable housing component. And there's no set aside.

MS. BOY: Right. Set aside does not --

CHAIR CASTRO: So, for instance –

MS. BOY: -- it's one of the ways that you can meet it.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- Coral Springs likes to offer a mortgage assistance program as a way to offset their affordable housing component for their plan. And that's acceptable, because that's A through J. That's one of the options.

MS. BOY: Yes.

CHAIR CASTRO: Some people don't like that. Some people want actual units in a building to Vice Mayor Blattner's point, for diversity. Not racial diversity, economic diversity.

Matter of fact, some people believes today that's the way for that building to succeed, or that property to succeed as it moves forward.

What this amendment does, for me, is it says after you've gone through your plan and everybody agrees your plan's okay, now the city gets to decide how they're building out their city.

But when it comes to affordable housing for any site that's a hundred or more, they have to bring it back here for review.

MS. BOY: Yes.

CHAIR CASTRO: And by here, I'm saying the County.

MS. BOY: Yes.

CHAIR CASTRO: And that's where the Home Rule versus the affordable housing piece goes together, because it's not just equal like a second review. It's a second review with a second layer of management.

And I'm not sure I'm for it or against it, but, you know, basically now somebody's reviewing your own site plans, the way you want to do it, and adding on, well, I want to make sure you're doing the affordable housing component the way we want to see you do it.

And that's been a challenge. And to some people's, you know, messages, one city is not like the other, and I've argued that before. To other people's messages, affordable housing apparently is needed everywhere.

And I don't know what goes on with the job market. I think sooner or later you basically price people, your workforce, out. That happens all over the world. It's not a pretty thing, and it's certainly not a good thing.

And I don't know what you do in an area like South Florida where we're tourist driven and they are low paying to Mr. Carras's point, mostly low paying service jobs.

And if your workforce can't afford to live here -- and I don't know that we're the place to micromanage all that or to make anything good happen there. So I don't know if people want to table it. I'm fine. I'm almost inclined at least to take a vote and either makes a recommendation to the County Commission or not make a recommendation to the County Commission and put whatever attachments or anything you want on it.

Because I think we all kind of are getting around the issue. We understand the issue. We're coming in from different aspects. And I don't know that it's going to be resolved with additional education and information at this point. That's just my point of view. School Board Member Good, and then Mr. Steffens.

MS. GOOD: Thank you, Madam Chair. And I love the way you explain everything. It just brought it to life. So I -- for me, then, I just need to understand the way it is now with regard to how the cities operate, there is no mandate to set aside X percentage of the proposed plan for affordable housing as it is.

MS. BOY: That is one of the options in A through J --

MS. GOOD: It's one of the options in A through J --

MS. BOY: -- of 1.07.07, but it is not a requirement.

MS. GOOD: So they're not mandated to set aside any particular. With the proposal that's before us, would it require a specific set aside?

MS. BOY: No, it wouldn't require a specific set aside. It would require that you're meeting A through J of the policy. So --

MS. GOOD: Again.

MS. BOY: It does not require a set aside. The review is not saying if you allocate 100 or more flex or reserve units to a commercial property within your city, within what you're -- you can do, now you have to come to the County and demonstrate that you meet A through J, much as the cities -- exactly like the cities have to do now for the Land Use Plan amendments that add a hundred or more new dwelling units to the Broward County Land Use Plan. And no -- in none of this review --

MS. GOOD: So up --

MS. BOY: -- is a set aside required. A set aside --

MS. GOOD: -- so the only thing --

MS. BOY: -- is just one of the ways that a city can meet Policy 1.07.07.

MS. GOOD: So this has really helped me out. So there's no additional requirement or mandate to set aside. Now they have to demonstrate to the County Commission --

MS. BOY: Right.

MS. GOOD: -- that they're meeting A through J.

MS. BOY: Yes.

MS. GOOD: And now they're demonstrating they're meeting A through J through --

MS. BOY: Only for a Broward County Land Use Plan amendment that adds 100 or more new residential units to the plan.

MS. GOOD: Okay.

MS. BOY: The flexibility and reserve allocations to non-residential property such as commercial or employment center do not have that requirement right now.

MS. GOOD: So I can see why the Home Rule issue is so prominent in the discussion, really. I mean, I can understand it more if one required a mandate of certain set aside and one didn't, then it would be crystal clear to me.

But what I'm seeing here is that it appears that it's more of just an additional review, is what I'm getting at. Is that --

MS. BOY: That can -- yes. And that's what many of the cities are --

MS. GOOD: Okay.

MS. BOY: -- stating in their comments.

CHAIR CASTRO: And I think the concern from the city perspective, and I'm not an elected official anymore, is during that extra review, there may be discussions about -- let's say the city approaches it with mortgage assistance, that the second review may say, you know, we don't quite think that's going to work here adequate, and you're going to get pushed to another box and maybe rightfully so.

To your point, and I'm glad you just kind of went the way you did, because it lit up something else for me. Why are we -- if we're going to do this, why are we doing

it over -- only on sites that -- or developments that are a hundred or more? If it's that important, let's apply it to everything. But I'm not really sure why that number was picked or what the purpose was. But we have Mr. Steffens and then I think Commissioner DuBose again.

COMMISSIONER DUBOSE: No --

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DUBOSE: -- that was my question --

CHAIR CASTRO: All right.

MR. STEFFENS: I -- and, again, I mean, I think I -- just because I just want to be clear about my position -- I just happen to respectfully disagree with the Chair. I think that if this body -- first of all, I think we're short some very critical voices today on this panel, the County Commissioner that sits, as well as two of the Mayors who have been very strong, with a different perspective than I have, I think, on this matter, but I still think we should hear from them.

My other point is -- again, this could be my naïveté again, which at some point I'll lose, I promise -- but my position -- my thought is if we were to say no to this with some conditions or attachments, at this point I think that would be potentially looked less favorably upon or taken less seriously than if we take -- have another meeting on this, have another full airing of the matter and maybe consider taking a different posture and approving it with conditions.

And is that something we can do, approving it as long as certain conditions are met going forward or is that --

MR. MAURODIS: It would be a recommendation.

CHAIR CASTRO: No. It's a recommendation --

MR. STEFFENS: Okay.

CHAIR CASTRO: -- only.

MR. STEFFENS: Okay. Right. That's fine. I think that would maybe carry some more weight with the Commission, which I think in the end, if this body has legitimate concerns, which I think it does, I think if we want those to carry the most weight, that should be a factor in considering how we handle today and how we potentially handle in two months, if we choose to table this matter.

CHAIR CASTRO: And just quickly, I -- you know, don't ever fear -- with respect or without respect, I'm good.

But you have a point, but I think, again, we're making a recommendation, and I defer to the County Commission. This is their purview of authority. It's really not ours. We're just here as an advisory capacity on this. But I think it's important, whether we vote for it or against it, that we include both the pros and the cons, because I think what this group is bringing up is a lot of concerns and ideas, whether it be from the cities' elected, the affordable housing perspective, that maybe some of those County Commissioners haven't been aware of or thought of, because nobody can know everything all the time, and that's why you bring a lot of people together.

So whatever we transmit, I hope it includes kind of a synopsis of the concerns, both for and against this, so while they're deliberating over it, if they can incorporate something to make it better, we're providing the ideas and the suggestions and the opportunities for them.

And, again, both for and against, because I think this is such a serious subject with the affordable housing component, people really need to get a good view of the whole process. I think -- was anybody else over here? And, Mr. Steffens, did you want to make a motion on that note, you're more than welcome to do that.

MR. STEFFENS: Yeah, I'll move that we table the matter --

CHAIR CASTRO: All right.

MR. STEFFENS: -- to next month's meeting.

MR. BASCOMBE: I'd second that motion.

CHAIR CASTRO: And next month would be July or August. We have to hear it in July, or can it wait to August, process wise? Do we know what the County Commission --?

MS. BOY: It can wait until August, because we're not on any set-on time schedule --

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay.

MS. BOY: -- to meet the Commission, because there's no more twice a year limitations by the State.

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay. And the chair is -- okay.

MR. BASCOMBE: Can I make one last comment?

CHAIR CASTRO: So can you stipulate that's to the August meeting instead of the next month meeting?

MR. STEFFENS: Right.

CHAIR CASTRO: Thank you.

MR. BASCOMBE: Madam Chair, can I just make one last comment?

CHAIR CASTRO: Absolutely.

MR. BASCOMBE: If nothing else, by tabling this, we're talking about it.

CHAIR CASTRO: Absolutely. And I think that's a good thing. And I'm hoping all this somehow is getting to the entire Board of County Commissioners, because, again -- I think everybody's bringing some really good points, that if they're going to modify it, they can modify it to a point that kind of appeases all sides and all parties. So I think you're right.

COMMISSIONER DUBOSE: Madam Chair?

CHAIR CASTRO: Yes, ma'am. School Board Member –

COMMISSIONER DUBOSE: School Board Member Good.

CHAIR CASTRO: Thank you, sir.

MS. GOOD: Yes, Madam Chair, with regard to the previous conversation we had with the presentation, did we mention, was that presentation going to take place in August, as well, during that same meeting?

MS. BOY: It seems like that that would be the thing –

MS. GOOD: I mean, I would think that would make –

MS. BOY: -- that would work best with the –

MS. GOOD: -- some sense.

COMMISSIONER DUBOSE: Yes.

MS. BOY: -- timeline.

MS. GOOD: Yes.

MS. BOY: Right. I'll ask him to attend the August meeting.

MS. GOOD: Thank you.

MS. BOY: Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: Good point. Thank you. Any other discussion? We have a motion on the table to table this to August. All in favor. Any opposed? Unanimous. Thank you, ma'am.

OTHER BUSINESS

CHAIR CASTRO: Anything else?

MS. BOY: Just the July meeting date.

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay. A motion to cancel the July meeting date.

COMMISSIONER LONG: Yeah, so moved.

COMMISSIONER DUBOSE: Second.

CHAIR CASTRO: All in favor. Anybody opposed? Hearing none, carries unanimously.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

MR. STEFFENS: I just have a very quick question –

CHAIR CASTRO: Shoot.

MR. STEFFENS: -- because, you know, this is sort of a thing I'm interested in. How much did these binders cost to prepare and mail out? Do you know?

MS. BOY: I didn't –

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: About 60 bucks.

MS. BOY: -- add up the cost of this one. I mean, I can tell you how much each piece cost, and then I can tell you -- so then I can figure out --

MR. STEFFENS: Okay. If you could just email the group between now and the next meeting.

MS. BOY: I know it's part of the budget. It –

MS. BOY: -- the estimate is between \$25 and \$60.

MR. STEFFENS: So this has to be a closer to a \$60.

MS. BOY: It's probably somewhere -- this is somewhere in the middle, probably.

MR. STEFFENS: Oh, okay. All right. Thank you.

CHAIR CASTRO: Okay. Anything else?

MR. DE JESUS: The dropbox works great.

MS. BOY: That's why we ask for them back.

CHAIR CASTRO: Dropbox works excellent. Thank you, Mr. de Jesus. Anything else?

ADJOURMENT

CHAIR CASTRO: Now we stand adjourned. Everybody have a great day and we'll see you in August. Enjoy your summer vacation. Be safe.

(The meeting concluded at 12:11 p.m.)