



MEMORANDUM
Harvey Ruvlin
Clerk of the Circuit and County Courts
Clerk of the Board of County Commissioners
Miami-Dade County, Florida
(305) 375-5126
(305) 375-2484 FAX
www.miami-dadeclerk.com

CCPI
Agenda Item No. 5A

TO: Honorable Chairman Jean Monestime
and Members, Chairman's Council for
Prosperity Initiatives

DATE: September 28, 2015

FROM: Christopher Agrippa, Director
Clerk of the Board Division

SUBJECT: Approval of Commission
Council Minutes

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Christopher Agrippa".

The Clerk of the Board's office is submitting the following Clerk's Summary of Minutes for approval by the Chairman's Council for Prosperity Initiatives:

June 29, 2015

Attachment
CA/jm



Stephen P. Clark
Government Center
111 N.W. 1st Street
Miami, FL 33128

CLERK'S SUMMARY OF

Meeting Minutes

Chairmans Council for Prosperity Initiatives

Jean Monestime, Chairman [2]; Daniella Levine Cava [8], and Barbara J. Jordan [1]

Housing Policies

Monday, June 29, 2015

9:30 AM

18th Floor, Conference Room 18-3

Members Present: None.

Members Absent: None.

Members Late: None.

Members Excused: None.

Members Absent County Business:

**REASONABLE OPPORTUNITY FOR THE PUBLIC
TO BE HEARD AS PROVIDED IN RULE 6.06**

1 CHAIRMAN'S OPENING REMARKS

Report: *The Chairman's Council for Prosperity Initiatives (Council) convened a meeting in the 18th Floor Conference Room 18-3, 111 NW First Street, Miami, Florida, at 9:30 a.m. on June 29, 2015. There being present upon roll call Chairman Jean Monestime; and Commissioners Daniella Levine Cava and Barbara Jordan.*

The following staff members were also present: Assistant County Attorneys Cynthia Johnson-Stacks and Altanese Phenelus; Ms. Griselle Marino, Director of Media, Office of the Chair; and Deputy Clerk Judy Marsh.

Chairman Monestime called the meeting to order at 9:48 a.m. He welcomed Commissioners Daniella Levine Cava and Barbara Jordan; and attendees. Chairman Monestime said the Council would continue its discussion on housing issues, and recalled that at the last meeting, inclusionary zoning and homeownership initiatives were briefly considered. He noted he would allow members of the public to comment on housing initiatives.

Chairman Monestime said presentations would be made by Mr. Michael Liu, Director, Miami-Dade County Public Housing and Community Development Department, on homeownership and mixed-income housing; and by Ms. Stephanie Killian, Manager, Affordable Housing Section, Montgomery County Department of Housing and Community Affairs (Maryland), regarding 40 years of inclusionary housing programs in Montgomery County. He indicated Ms. Killian would make her presentation first, via telephone.

Chairman Monestime advised that his office was working with the Administration on changes to the eligibility criteria regarding the homeownership program, and he would ask the Council to review his proposal after its introduction. He noted if consensus was reached before final adoption, he would invite the Committee members to be co-prime sponsors of the ordinance. Chairman Monestime pointed out that the County Code required that no less than 35 percent of Documentary Surtax funds could be used to provide homeownership assistance to low-income and moderate-income families. He indicated that he would report on the County's record of compliance with this policy in the near future.

2 PRESENTATIONS

2A

151539 Special Presentation

MICHAEL LIU, DIRECTOR
MIAMI-DADE COUNTY PUBLIC HOUSING AND
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
TOPIC: HOMEOWNERSHIP & MIXED-INCOME
HOUSING

Report: *Mr. Michael Liu, Director, Miami-Dade County Public Housing and Community Development, (Department), gave a presentation on homeownership and mixed-income approaches to affordable housing development in Miami-Dade County.*

Mr. Liu said Miami-Dade County had a wide array of programs and tools intended to assist low and moderate-income families. He noted the Homeownership Programs included second mortgages funded through Surtax, State Housing Initiatives Partnership (SHIP), Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME. Surtax funding was also part of the competitive process for developments, Mr. Liu said. He advised that the Department was closing out the Neighborhood Stabilization Program; and noted additional Homeownership Programs included the Infill Housing Program; Workforce Housing Program; Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Homeownership Option; and Section 32 Public Housing Homeownership Program. Mr. Liu mentioned that the Department had the ability to apply for dollars from the Federal Home Loan Banks, as well as various other entities and foundations that supported affordable housing.

Mr. Liu discussed the Second Mortgage Homeownership Program, and Surtax Development Financing Homeownership. He noted the Second Mortgage Homeownership Program was funded by four pools of funds; and depending on the funding source, different income groups could qualify at the highest end. Mr. Liu advised that under Surtax funds, the maximum income was 140 percent of Area Median Income (AMI) which represented \$94,800 for a family of four; under SHIP funds, the maximum was 120 percent of AMI which represented \$81,240 for a family of four; and under CDBG and HOME funds, the maximum AMI was 80 percent, which represented slightly above \$54,000 for a family of four. He pointed out that under special circumstances, mainly post-disaster scenarios, the

Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) would be more flexible on the AMIs that the programs could attain.

Mr. Liu explained that over the last five years, the Second Mortgage Homeownership Program had assisted 560 families to become homeowners, representing approximately \$31,250,000 in mortgages. He noted rough estimates indicated that only 38 percent of families who wanted to purchase a home had the financial ability to do so. Additionally, Mr. Liu observed that Miami-Dade County's (MDC) homeownership rate lagged behind the Statewide and national rates, resulting in a 10 percent significant gap. He opined that the Department must assist more than 112 families per year in purchasing a home, and noted the department had begun a detailed Second Mortgage Homeownership Program review. Mr. Liu said the County was facing a new interest rate environment with short, medium and longer terms that would impact homeownership tremendously. He emphasized the need to review the conditions that were attached to the Second Mortgage programs, including the length of time a purchaser must own the home before affordability restrictions were lifted; and how they related to new realities of an economy that encouraged job changes, and relocation. Mr. Liu indicated there were many ways to maximize long-term affordability, as well as providing incentives to initial homeowners; and to second and third homeowners, as it related to equity and value.

Mr. Liu commented that currently, there were instances in which the second mortgages were larger than a private lending institution's first mortgage. He recommended streamlining the underwriting process, possibly allowing qualified lending institutions to conduct the underwriting process, similar to HUD's Federal Housing Administration's Direct Endorsement program; and Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac's Delegated Underwriting Service. Mr. Liu noted the Department wanted to make stronger partnerships and align its programs more closely with successful homeownership non-profit organizations, such as Habitat for Humanity of Greater Miami, Centro Campesino Farmworker Center, and Opa locka Community Development Corporation. He indicated that the Department would develop a public awareness campaign regarding its Second Mortgage programs; and was excited about working with the County Commission and the Council members on

initiatives to promote homeownership.

Mr. Liu discussed the Surtax Development Financing Homeownership. He noted for the first time, the Department was allocating funds specifically for homeownership development in its current Request for Applications (RFA). He noted the Department had \$6 million for Liberty City as part of the Liberty City Advisory Initiative; and \$1 million for Little Haiti and West Little River, and he was hopeful that by targeting and aggregating these resources in particular communities and neighborhoods, that a larger footprint may be impacted, other than individual homes scattered throughout MDC. Mr. Liu said the Department wanted to ensure that at least 35 percent, after the deduction of 10 percent for initial expenses, of Surtax funds was allocated to homeownership. He commented on mixed-income approaches to development of rental and purchase of affordable housing, noting this was a key component of one of the new directions the Department had begun to incorporate into its programs. Mr. Liu said the Department was also considering replicating Atlanta's Housing authority's model of mixed-income communities; and the Liberty City's Resident Council leadership accompanied him last week to observe the models. He opined that it would be beneficial for some of the developers to observe not only the public housing, but the private sector surrounding communities such as those in Atlanta.

Mr. Liu noted the public housing RFA for Liberty Square had a requirement that any respondents would have to include in their proposals, an outcome that resulted in mixed-income community. He commented on the funding scoring criteria in the RFA for Surtax and SHIP multi-family rentals; Extremely Low Income (ELI) set-asides; and small developments. Mr. Liu cited the Supreme Court's ruling last week regarding de-concentration and poverty; and noted now there was a legal reason for exploring mixed-income approaches to affordable housing developments. He invited community input, and noted he looked forward to working with the Council and the County Commission, as the Department explored further opportunities and ideas regarding affordable housing.

Upon conclusion of his presentation, the Council members directed questions to Mr. Liu.

Mr. Liu responded to Chairman Monestime's

question regarding the relationship between housing and the retail/business development that would be part of mixed income communities. He said retail or other non-housing amenities would be part of mixed use; however, to the extent that mixed use could be part of mixed income redevelopments, it was the developer's responsibility to develop those separate townhouse amenities. Mr. Liu noted financially feasible projects; and the development entity's experience in mixed-use developments would be required if the Department's subsidies were involved.

In response to Commissioner Jordan's inquiry regarding the number of workforce housing units, Mr. Liu said the first units pursuant to the workforce housing ordinance were in the process; and currently no units were part of the workforce housing inventory. He noted if this first project proceeded, approximately 98 units would be part of the inventory with a 20-year affordability restriction. Mr. Liu explained that because a mortgage would be tied to the units, they could not be sold without the Department receiving legal notice; and any attempts to do so would result in legal action by the Department to ensure compliance.

Commissioner Levine Cava asked Mr. Liu to comment on the Department's outstanding issues with the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD); and Broward County's program in which fees were being charged on commercial development to be applied to housing.

Mr. Liu said the Department was still in negotiations with HUD regarding the County's repayment of \$4.7 million. He noted the Department had proposed that the amount be taken from future allocations, and HUD had requested additional information. With regards to CDBG, Mr. Liu said the Department was still waiting for a final bill from HUD which could be as high as \$8 million; and had counter-proposed a repayment of \$5-plus million which was being considered by HUD.

Concerning Broward County's review of linking commercial development to affordable housing, Mr. Liu said he believed it might be worthwhile to review the possibility of a separate type of fee tied specifically to commercial real estate, and perhaps exempting affordable rental projects. He indicated that he would meet with other

departments that would be involved to obtain their input; as well as input from the development and housing communities.

In response to Commissioner Levine Cava's inquiry as to whether the County should be pursuing more second mortgages, Mr. Liu opined that the Second Mortgage Program could be more effective by including more private sector involvement; as well as in combination with the Surtax Development competition.

Regarding Commissioner Levine Cava's comments about foreclosed properties in some major cities that had been acquired by non-profit organizations to keep the units more affordable, Mr. Liu said most of the foreclosures that were occurring were banks, Fannie Mae, Federal Housing Administration, or Freddie Mac foreclosures; and these entities generally worked with national non-profit organizations. He noted this did not preclude a delegation from MDC representing the Mayor's Office, the County Commission, and the Department, from meeting with some of the major banks, or secondary market entities that held the mortgages for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac; and discussing making that portfolio available to local non-profit organizations.

Chairman Monestime recalled his conversation with Mr. Liu regarding alternative(s) to address MDC's second mortgages that were being foreclosed on because of the first mortgage, and there was no opportunity to leverage the second mortgages on these properties due to the first lien. He noted if an opportunity existed to speak to the bank and to the secondary mortgage holders, this would provide an avenue to work with a non-profit agency or the appropriate entity to purchase back the first liens at a discount; allow these units to be placed back on the market to first-time homebuyers; or to former buyers to retain these properties under a rent-to-own basis provided they still occupied the property. Chairman Monestime indicated that he would discuss this issue further with Mr. Liu.

Commissioner Jordan referred to a Sunshine meeting last week with Commissioner Moss regarding a request from the People Acting for Community Together (PACT) organization to develop a dedicated funding source of \$10 million for low-income housing to be deposited into the Trust Fund.

In response to Commissioner Jordan's inquiry regarding the Surtax funds, Mr. Liu said this year's estimated overall Surtax funds was between \$35 million and \$40 million. He noted it would be difficult to estimate the amount of funds that would be dedicated to low-income levels, as some of those dollars would be based on the proposals received for affordable rentals; and proposals regarding targeting the Extremely Low Income (ELIs). Mr. Liu disclosed that the Department did not have a specific dollar amount targeted for ELIs, and this was subject to County Commission approval and policy discussions. He indicated that the Department might be able to allocate a significant number of project-based vouchers to assist in development of ELI projects that the Miami Coalition for the Homeless would like to develop.

Commissioner Jordan commented that the problems she was experiencing in her district resulted from project-based vouchers that were handled through federal HUD, and asked how the same principle of mixed-income developments could be applied to those projects.

Mr. Liu responded that the Section 8 project-based projects were separate from the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program/Project Based Voucher Program, in which different incomes could be integrated. He noted the Section 8 Project Based Program Commissioner Jordan referenced was from HUD's Housing Division. Mr. Liu explained that the problem with this program was that the mortgages associated with developing those projects, were generally mortgages that were made 30 years ago, and the program requirements indicated nothing about mixed income. He noted this needed to be addressed at a national level, and he suggested policy discussions be held regarding this issue.

Commissioner Jordan noted she would like these discussions to be arranged.

Mr. Newton Sanon, President and Chief Executive Officer, OIC of South Florida, directed questions to Mr. Liu regarding a parallel strategy for workforce development, particularly, for ELI participants; and Section 3 housing. He emphasized the need for a workforce component to create opportunities for economic self-sufficiency.

Mr. Liu acknowledged that a greater

understanding of the elements to create capacity with the education system was needed; or to marry them with initiatives such as Employ Miami in terms of job training. He commented on the Liberty Square Initiative as an example, and noted the Department was requiring that the successful respondent identify the type and number of jobs that would be set-aside for Section 3 qualified individuals, low-income or public housing residents; and if not, they would be unable to compete for future contracts.

Mr. Oliver Gross commended Mr. Liu on his leadership and efforts regarding mixed-income housing. He inquired whether the Surtax expectations of approximately \$40 million to \$50 million were for this year, noting the Department's current Request for Applications (RFA) had a smaller number.

Mr. Liu confirmed the Surtax expectations were for this year and explained that up to 75 percent of the amount had to be used for next in-line projects.

Mr. Gross also inquired whether consideration was given to incentives for developers and users of market rate units, and Mr. Liu responded that he had heard similar concerns in different communities across the country. He noted the real incentives were the County's subsidies; and the difference in price between a unit in Brickell versus a unit in Liberty City.

Ms. Renita Holmes questioned whether Mr. Liu could reference any other policies where Section 3 had been more enforceable at the local level so that tier access was possible, to which Mr. Liu responded that it was the Department's intent to enforce its requirements.

Mr. B. J. Chiszar inquired how more people could transition from rental units into an affordable mortgage; how capital could be made more accessible; and whether the County tried to develop housing specifically for other protective classes of individuals.

In response to Mr. Chiszar, Mr. Liu said he believed the Department could improve on its dissemination of information to the community regarding its programs. He noted the Department made preferences for certain groups, including the disabled, elderly and extremely low income, depending on the program. Mr. Liu also noted

Chairmans Council for Prosperity Initiatives

CLERK'S SUMMARY OF

Meeting Minutes

Monday, June 29, 2015

*there were other accesses to capital and financing
that the Department needed to explore,
particularly, the Federal Home Loan Banks.*

2B

151540 Special Presentation

STEPHANIE KILLIAN, MANAGER
AFFORDABLE HOUSING SECTION
MONTGOMERY COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING
AND COMMUNITY AFFAIRS (MARYLAND)
TOPIC: 40 YEARS OF INCLUSIONARY HOUSING
PROGRAMS IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY

Report: *Chairman Monestime introduced Ms. Stephanie Killian, Affordable Housing Program Manager, Montgomery County Department of Housing. He noted Ms. Killian's credentials and experience; and thanked her for participating in today's meeting via telephone.*

Ms. Killian thanked Chairman Monestime for the opportunity to discuss Montgomery County's inclusionary housing program. She noted the program was included in the Montgomery County Zoning ordinance and was designed to ensure that affordable housing was included in every neighborhood. She explained that the program began in 1974; was the oldest and largest program in the country; and since 1974, over 14,000 units were created; and 4,000 units had controls on them. Ms. Killian said any developer constructing a development of more than 20 units, whether rental or for-sale, must include Moderately Priced Dwelling Units (MPDUs) in their development. She noted developers received a density bonus for including the affordable housing; or the affordable housing was a requirement of a special zone or a special exception type of zone, conditional approval types of zone. Ms. Killian remarked that the density bonus could be up to 22 percent; and the amount of MPDUs they must provide were approximately between 12.5 percent and 15 percent, depending on the density bonus.

Ms. Killian said the MPDU program was automatic; was not up for debate and no one had to vote on it. She advised that currently, approximately 2,000 rental MPDUs, and approximately 1,700 for-sale units were in Montgomery County. Ms. Killian noted the for-sale units had 30-year controls; thus, an individual who purchased an MPDU must live in the unit; if the unit was sold within the 30-year period it must be sold at a controlled price; and the owner must first try to sell it to individuals who were certificate holders in the MPDU program.

Under the rental program, an applicant would apply directly to an apartment building, they must remain income qualified, and were recertified each year, said Ms. Killian. She noted the applicant's income could increase to 130 percent of Area Median Income (AMI); however, once it exceeded that amount, they must move out of the unit or lose their lower cost rent. Ms. Killian advised that the purchase program was designed to be at 70 percent of AMI as a maximum, thus, a household of four could make up to \$76,500; while on the rental side, it was designed to be up to 65 percent of AMI, and a household of four could make \$71,000.

Ms. Killian said the most important result from the MDPU program was that Montgomery County had diverse communities and affordable housing was everywhere. She noted the approximately 14,000 MPDU units was the largest number in the country of any jurisdiction; was probably close to being equal to all the affordable inclusionary housing units created around the country combined; and was automatic. Ms. Killian pointed out that MPDUs were included in every housing structure; however, they were difficult to create in high-rise condominium projects. She noted it was very expensive to build MPDUs; and the condominium fees often increased the development cost above the affordability of the homeowners. Ms. Killian said the department was working to resolve this issue. She mentioned that while the MPDU program was the centerpiece of Montgomery County's affordable housing program, it was only one of many programs for promoting affordable housing within the County.

Chairman Monestime asked about inclusionary zoning in affluent neighborhoods; and political resistance from these communities.

In response to Chairman Monestime's questions, Ms. Killian said MPDUs were included in all neighborhoods that had water and sewer. She noted occasionally, a developer would have \$5 million-dollar mansions in one area and the MPDU townhouses would be located adjacent to that neighborhood. Ms. Killian pointed out that Montgomery County did not allow gated communities, but allowed MPDUs to be adjacent to, or slightly separate from the rest of the development. In the townhouse communities, the MPDUs were usually integrated within the community, she noted. Ms. Killian commented on

high-rise condominium projects and noted the department was comfortable with the MPDU residents not being inside the condominium building, but, on the outside.

Ms. Killian said there was significant public will and the elected officials advocated for affordable housing. She acknowledged there were some inquiries from developers, and last year the department began allowing alternative payments (buyouts) in situations where the unit price plus the condominium fee would not be affordable to the homeowner. In those instances, Ms. Killian noted, the developer was allowed to make a payment that was equal to three percent of the total sale of the property, and was a transparent process. She pointed out that with the exception of high-rise condominiums with very high condominium fees, MPDUs were automatic.

Chairman Monestime opened the floor for comments/questions from the Council members.

Commissioner Levine Cava thanked Ms. Killian for her presentation and the work she had done over the years. She commented on Miami-Dade County's aversion to the term "affordable housing" and asked Ms. Killian what language she would recommend to overcome this aversion. Commissioner Levine Cava also asked about the Montgomery County policy regarding individuals below the 30 percent AMI level.

Ms. Killian responded that Montgomery County had a Workforce Housing Program which she believed was a more accurate term for any housing that served 50 percent above AMI; however, the County did not shy away from the term "affordable housing." She noted she believed that "workforce housing" or "moderate income housing" were probably more accurate terms. Ms. Killian commented on the difficulty in serving individuals below 40 percent AMI levels, noting the solution to individuals with lower income was not the traditional housing financing techniques, but some type of rental subsidy, or internal subsidies within the development. She said Montgomery County had its own Rental Assistance Program which was focused primarily on the elderly, and single head of households, and had a waiting list. Ms. Killian also commented on the Housing First and Homelessness Housing Program which had been very successful. She noted assistance was also provided to individuals below 40 percent AMI through Housing Choice

vouchers that the Housing Authority had project-based to some projects. Ms. Killian explained that if the financing was being done through the Housing Initiative Fund, there would be market-rate units, some middle-income units, and the department would require one, two or three units at 30 percent of AMI.

Responding to Commissioner Levine Cava's further comment regarding the challenge of bringing developers into a mixed income environment, Ms. Killian said the Housing Initiative Fund had been an incredibly helpful tool in turning around the financing and viability of rental affordable housing projects in Montgomery County. She noted groups that offered similar assistance included the National Community Land Trust; groups in conjunction with cities and counties; and many consultants. Ms. Killian acknowledged there was resistance by some developers who were accustomed to developing a product a certain way; thus, some advantage had to be offered to the developer; either through a density bonus, or as a condition of a special use zone. She noted affordable housing in Montgomery County was considered to be one of many choices that a developer had; however, MPDU affordable housing was being promoted as an essential, public amenity that was required.

Chairman Monestime thanked Commissioner Jordan for arranging Ms. Killian's presentation.

Commissioner Jordan commented on her visit to Montgomery County, Maryland; and Fairfax County, Virginia. She asked about the current median income for Montgomery County and Ms. Killian responded that she believed the median income was approximately \$110,000.

In response to Commissioner Jordan's inquiry as to how Montgomery County achieved its automatic affordable housing, Ms. Killian said the biggest advocate for the affordable housing program came from a coalition of churches; and other civic-minded and social service groups called AIM, Action in Montgomery, which promoted inclusionary zoning in the County's zoning ordinance. She noted there had been continued public will by the population and by the Montgomery County Council.

Commissioner Jordan commented on the similarity between Miami-Dade County's workforce housing program and Montgomery

County's program. She asked Ms. Killian to explain the Green Tape streamlined permit processing.

Ms. Killian said the Department of Permitting Services had a staff person who was identified as the Green Tape advocate, and projects including affordable housing received expedited processing through the department. She noted the Planning Department also had a program that was similar to the Green Tape program.

In response to Chairman Monestime's inquiry regarding the definition of "naturally occurring affordable housing," Ms. Killian explained that the County's housing stock was in good, solid conditions; but there were some properties that had lower rents. She noted the Housing Department was reviewing various programs that could help to ensure the viability of those properties. She commented on the Transfer Development Rights (TDR) Program, which primarily had been used in agricultural, and noted people were considering TDRs for naturally occurring rental properties. Ms. Killian said the Department was considering a similar TDR program in one of the Central Business Districts (CBD), and one of the concepts was that affordable, low-rise properties, would sell their development rights to the center core of the CBD.

Commissioner Levine Cava asked whether the Housing Department allowed for County dollars to be dedicated for the elimination of slum and blight in certain neighborhoods; and what sort of quid pro quo might be expected for housing affordability.

Ms. Killian said the Housing Opportunities Commission (HOC), and other non-profit organizations were allowed to purchase MPDUs, and could purchase up to one-third of the units in a development. She noted the units could be operated as rental housing or sold to clients. Ms. Killian remarked that the HOC implemented the housing program and she commented on the good working relationship between the HOC and the Housing Department.

Chairman Monestime opened the floor for questions from the audience.

In response to a question from a member of the audience regarding Montgomery County's approach to the most cost-efficient buildings, Ms.

Killian said the County developed many townhouse MPDUs which cost approximately \$150,000 to \$180,000 per unit. She noted stick-built condominiums were very affordable and some were currently available for \$94,000 per unit through the MPDU program. Ms. Killian explained that most of the units currently being built were three-bedroom townhouse units which cost approximately \$150,000 to \$200,000.

Ms. Truly Burton, Executive Vice President, Builders Association of South Florida, said she had also accompanied Commissioner Jordan to Montgomery County, Maryland; and Fairfax County, Virginia. She asked what would be the outcome if the community objected to an affordable housing project.

Ms. Killian said the community could not object to the MPDU program as it was automatic and was included in the Zoning ordinance. She commented on the success of the Housing Initiative Fund (HIF) which provided funding for individual projects that had to undergo a special exception process, or some conditional use process; and noted the spending of this Fund was delegated to the Housing Department. Ms. Killian also commented on the strong community support for affordable housing.

Chairman Monestime thanked Ms. Killian on behalf of his colleagues, for her presentation. He noted he looked forward to the community obtaining more information regarding Montgomery County's policies and how those policies could be utilized in Miami-Dade County.

Commissioner Jordan suggested that Ms. Killian be invited to discuss affordable housing when the automatic workforce housing issue was presented to the Board of County Commissioners.

Commissioner Levine Cava also suggested that Ms. Killian provide a video of a few of the affordable housing projects at that time.

3 DISCUSSION

4 ANNOUNCEMENTS

Report: *Chairman Monestime thanked Mr. Liu and Ms. Killian for their presentations. He noted the Council meetings would be held on the fourth Monday of each month; and the next topic to be discussed at the July 27, 2015 meeting, would be economic development policies, with a continuing focus on programming that would reduce the income inequality gap in South Florida. Chairman Monestime announced the Council would meet on: July 27, 2015; September 28, 2015; October 26, 2015; and November 23, 2015. He advised that no meetings would be held in August and December 2015; and that he would circulate a memorandum regarding the meeting dates to the Council members' offices and to the Clerk's office. Chairman Monestime thanked the audience for their attendance and participation.*

5 TOPIC FOR NEXT SESSION: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**6 ADJOURNMENT**

Report: *There being no further discussion by the Council, the meeting adjourned at 11:31 a.m.*