

**URBAN EXPANSION AREA TASK FORCE
MEETING SUMMARY
Monday, Friday, March 19, 2018, 1:00 P.M.
South Dade Regional Library
10750 SW 211 Street, Cutler Bay, FL 33189**

Task Force Members Present

Member	Representing	
Kerri Barsh	Rock mining representative	Present
Ashley McElheny	Florida East Coast Chapter of Associated Builders & Contractors	Absent
Erin Clancy	Tropical Audubon Society	Absent
Eric Guerra	Latin American Business Association	Present
Enid Washington Demps	Community Council 15	Present
Alex Diaz	Community Council 11	Absent
Nick Diaz	Property Owners' Representative for the Eastern UEA	Present *
Linda Benson	Sierra Club	Present *
Richard Gomez	Florida Home Builders Association	Present
Steve Green	Tropical Fruit Growers of South Florida	Present
Richard Grosso	Nova Southeast Shepard Broad Law Center	Absent
Mike Hatcher	Redland Citizens Association	Present
Thomas Hawkins	1000 Friends of Florida	Absent
James Humble	Agricultural Practices Advisory Board	Present
Matt Johnson	Biscayne National Park	Absent
Robert Johnson	Everglades National Park	Absent
Yesenia Fatima Lara	Community Council 14	Present
Maria Lievano-Cruz	Builders Association of South Florida	Present
Bill Losner	Dade County Farm Bureau	Present
Francisco Pines	Property Owners' Representative for the Western UEA	Present
John Renne	Urban Land Institute – the SE FI/Caribbean Chapter	Present *
Laura Reynolds	Friends of the Everglades	Absent
Barney Rutzke Jr.	Florida Nursery Growers & Landscape Association	Present
Paul Schwiep	Urban Environment League	Present
Erick Valderrama	Latin Builders Association	Absent
Larry Ventura	Homestead Air Reserve Base	Present
Vacant	Miccosukee Tribe of Florida	Absent

* Present after roll call

Board member Demps left at 3:13.
Board member Ventura left at 4:01.

Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources (RER) Planning Division Staff

Lourdes Gomez, Deputy Director; Jerry Bell, Assistant Director for Planning; Kim Brown, Supervisor of Long-Range Planning; Noel Stillings, Senior Planner; Mark Dorsey, Principal Planner; Manny Armada, Chief; and Robert Hesler, Supervisor for Demographics and Economic Development.

Other Miami-Dade County and Government Staff

Shailendra Singh, Planning Section Supervisor, Development Services Division; Jess Linn, Principal Planner, Development Services Division; Dennis Kerbel, Assistant County Attorney; and Stephanie Cornejo, Park Planner II, Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces Department.

I. Attendance

Ms. Stillings called roll of the members, 14 members were present. The meeting commenced at 1:26 pm.

II. Motion to Approve the January 5, 2018 and February 26, 2018 Meeting Summaries

Motion. Board member Hatcher made a motion to approve the January 5, 2018 and February 26, 2018 meeting summaries. Board member Demps seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously as follows:

Kerri Barsh	Present	James Humble	Present
Ashley McElheny	Absent	Matt Johnson	Absent
Erin Clancy	Absent	Robert Johnson	Absent
Eric Guerra	Present	Yesenia Fatima Lara	Present
Enid Washington Demps	Present	Maria Lievano-Cruz	Present
Alex Diaz	Absent	Bill Losner	Present
Nick Diaz	Absent	Francisco Pines	Present
Linda Benson	Absent	John Renne	Absent
Richard Gomez	Present	Laura Reynolds	Absent
Steve Green	Present	Barney Rutzke Jr.	Present
Richard Grosso	Absent	Paul Schwiep	Present
Mike Hatcher	Present	Erick Valderrama	Absent
Thomas Hawkins	Absent	Larry Ventura	Present

III. Staff Coordinator’s Report

Board member Losner mentioned that the survey is to be held as preliminary and feels that the task force should have compiled the survey. Ms. Brown explained that the survey results will not be considered final until incorporated into the final report. Presentation of the preliminary survey results is only intended to be a springboard for further discussion among the board. She further stated that the survey questions follow the charge of the Task Force as set out by the Mayor but additional survey questions can be proposed and will be sent as an addendum. Board member Losner questioned if the report would be presented to the task force, Ms. Brown responded that it would. Board member Losner then asked about the timeframe for changing the final report. Ms. Brown noted the time constraints associated with obtaining population projections that will be ready about two weeks before the Task Force is scheduled to sunset.

Discussion ensued regarding potential conflicts of interest among task force members. Assistant County Attorney Kerbel stated that, while local conflict of interest rules may not apply since the task force is in existence for less than one year, State ethics ruled do apply. Mr. Kerbel reiterated that the task force, by design, includes some members that may potentially have a conflict. Since the Mayor had indicated the importance of getting the input of all task force members on all of the issues under its charge, staff has determined that the fairest way to represent the opinions of all members is through a series of survey questions.

Mr. Losner asked whether the task force could request an extension to its timeframe. Mr. Kerbel responded that it would need to be approved by the Board of County Commissioners if it is in existence for more than one year and this may prove problematic for members that also serve on other County boards.

Ms. Brown noted that, in response to a request from a task force member, she has made available the inquiries that staff received for interpretations from the Commission on Ethics related to conflicts of interest. She indicated that they are available upon request.

Board member Humble pointed out that some people inside of the UDB don't want the UDB to move because it may impact their property and implied that this may represent a conflict of interest. He further stated his opinion that farmers do not have the same rights as those within the UDB. If farming of the land is no longer economically viable, they can't do anything else with their land. Mr. Kerbel clarified that people speaking before the County Commission would not have a conflict of interest, it only comes into play when voting on a board.

Board Member Lievano Cruz made a motion to add a presentation by Jeff Bercow to the next Task Force meeting, Board Member Humble seconded the motion. Discussion ensued on the motion. Board Member Green stated his preference to receive the information from Mr. Bercow in writing, noting that the task force needs to move on with substantive discussions. Board Member Renne agreed, stating that the task force has already heard extensive testimony on the issues and has already received the necessary information to move forward with discussions. Board Member Schwiep further agreed but questioned why the task force could not continue working beyond May. Mr. Kerbel reiterated that the task force needs to sunset within 364 days. Board Member Losner asked whether the task force could meet more frequently before May. Ms. Brown indicated that the task force could meet as often as they choose before May 15th. Board Member Humble expressed his opinion that it is important to listen to property owners.

Motion. Board member Lievano-Cruz made a motion to add a presentation by Jeff Bercow to the next Task Force meeting scheduled for April 6, 2018. Board member Humble seconded the motion. The motion passed 11 to 6 as follows:

Kerri Barsh	Yes	James Humble	Yes
Ashley McElheny	Absent	Matt Johnson	Absent
Erin Clancy	Absent	Robert Johnson	Absent
Eric Guerra	Yes	Yesenia Fatima Lara	Yes
Enid Washington Demps	No	Maria Lievano-Cruz	Yes
Alex Diaz	Absent	Bill Losner	Yes

Nick Diaz	Yes	Francisco Pines	Yes
Linda Benson	No	John Renne	No
Richard Gomez	Yes	Laura Reynolds	Absent
Steve Green	No	Barney Rutzke Jr.	Yes
Richard Grosso	Absent	Paul Schwiep	No
Mike Hatcher	Yes	Erick Valderrama	Absent
Thomas Hawkins	Absent	Larry Ventura	No

Task Force Discussion. Board member Green pointed out the time constraints and need for progress on the issues. Board member Hatcher suggested breaking the task force be broken into subcommittees. Board member Green noted he had already suggested that and it had been turned down. Ms. Brown noted that the point of the task force is to receive input from all board members on all of the issues. Board member Green reiterated the efficiency associated with breaking into groups and that breaking into groups does not abrogate any one member from weighing in on the product of subcommittee. Board member Losner reminded everyone that there are three meetings left and the need to move forward and focus on the UEAs. Ms. Brown reminded the board about the meeting agenda and the point of the visioning exercise is to discuss the details of each UEA. Board member Pines expressed agreement with breaking into groups. Ms. Brown raised the issue of additional meeting dates, Board member Green suggested a doodle poll. Ms. Brown reminded everyone that a doodle poll has been taken and it will be reviewed for potential dates. Board member Rutzke suggested discussing each UEA one at a time as a whole group.

IV. Scheduled Presentation: Visioning Session

Mr. Jess Linn and Mr. Shailendra Singh provided an introductory presentation to help facilitate a visioning exercise on the UEAs, including:

- An aerial photograph of the UDB line at SW 157th Avenue and SW 184th Street which depicted low-density residential development adjacent to the UDB. Mr. Linn posed the question of whether we want to continue to develop as we have in recent history.
- A hypothetical square mile which showed a development pattern with 5-acre home sites together with higher intensity development.
- A hypothetical development scenario that depicted home sites clustered on smaller lots to allow for greater retention of agricultural land.
- Two hypothetical development scenarios were presented for UEA No. 2. The first showed suburban residential development on canals with strip center shopping centers. The second showed more intense development with a significant amount of public open space, and grid pattern of streets. Mr. Linn posed the question of whether the CDMP should provide more guidance in terms of future development patterns in the UEAs.
- Images of a community near Madrid, Spain that represents an example of compact development with a variety of housing types, significant open space, a shopping center, civic facilities and a transit station that is centrally located. The community is also located adjacent to agricultural land with a greenbelt.
- Images of Coral Gables which developed as a suburban community but was connected by a trolley line and was designed to include many of the necessary services and amenities.

- Photographs depicting the intersection of SW 107th Avenue and Kendall Drive in the late 1960s and today.

Task Force Discussion. Board Member Humble opined that Everglades National Park is what should be considered the “western fringe” of the County and noted that 85% of the land is federally-owned. Mr. Linn noted that his use of the term “western fringe” referred to the edge of the developed area.

Board Member Pines noted that the slide depicting more intense development in UEA No. 2 resulted from the West Kendall Charrette process that involved 5 or 6 community meetings and an open design workshop. He further noted that nearby residents showed a preference for a more intense development pattern for UEA No. 2 similar to what is depicted in the second development scenario. Mr. Linn responded that input received at the charrette focused on the idea that, if the UEA becomes urbanized, it should not be more low-density development, but should instead provide more of a destination.

Mr. Renne asked whether the proposed vision would create additional traffic in the absence of available transit options. Mr. Linn explained the importance of transit being planned together with transportation infrastructure. Mr. Renne asked whether any of UEAs are within ½ mile of the SMART corridors. Mr. Brown responded that a very small portion of UEA No. 2 would likely fall within ½ mile of the western terminus of the Kendall corridor but noted that the exact location of the western terminus had not yet been determined. Mr. Renne noted that many of the UEAs are one mile from public transportation and noted that one mile should not be considered to be walking distance to public transportation. Mr. Linn agreed.

Board Member Losner stated that commercial agriculture does not mix with residential home sites. He noted there are already problems being created by the 5-acre home sites.

Board Member Pines stated that the idea of creating a self-contained community in UEA No. 2 is to keep people from traveling east. Board Member Diaz stated that the Turnpike is located near UEA No. 3 and the area could also be served by a trolley. He further noted the importance of creating labor hubs so people don’t need to travel outside of the area for work.

Board Member Renne stated that he has been doing research on the topic of self-contained communities as a professor and researcher for 20 years. He disputed the idea that communities can be self-contained communities, noting that all communities create traffic. He agreed that certain types of development can encourage a reverse commute but only when planned with adequate infrastructure. He further opined that surface roadway infrastructure is not adequate infrastructure.

Board Member Pines noted that the infrastructure in the urban core is aging and does not have adequate capacity, therefore, it is better to address the issue out west where new infrastructure can be created. Board Member Pines further stated that the infrastructure out west should be planned in advance. Board Member Renne agreed and inquired about the status of that infrastructure.

Board Member Losner stated that the current patterns of development in the County are creating classes of people. He stated that it should be more integrated.

Board Member Lievano Cruz asked how the development near Madrid came to fruition. Mr. Linn responded that he is not an expert on Spanish planning policy but stated that it is his understanding that the government puts it out to bid for a master developer. He speculated that it was spurred by the extension of the transit line into the area. Board Member Lievano Cruz noted that it is not a developer-driven process like we have here. Mr. Linn agreed noting that the government first designates it for urban development.

Board Member Barsh asked about the insights that could be gleaned from the Madrid, Spain example. Mr. Linn stated that it was intended to provide a contrast to the typical low density development that has occurred on the western fringe of the County.

Board Member Pines asked whether there are currently policies in the CDMP that would require development similar to the Madrid, Spain example. Ms. Brown responded that Policy LU-8H of the CDMP currently requires applications proposing expansion of the UDB to be at least 10 dwelling units per acre for residential uses, a minimum Floor Area Ratio of 0.25 for non-residential uses, and provide for the non-residential needs of a residential community. Board Member Pines asked whether there is or was ever a policy to look more favorably on areas that are greater than 500 acres located adjacent to the UDB. Ms. Brown stated that the CDMP does not currently contain such a policy and she is not aware of such a policy ever existing in the CDMP.

Board Member Renne asked whether the build out of the UEA as a mixed use development would create additional pressure to further increase the boundary on the fringe of the new development. Board Member Renne noted that commercial land uses would create more traffic than residential based on the Institute for Transportation Engineers trip generation rates. Mr. Linn noted that the idea is to capture more of the traffic internally. Board Member Renne stated that in terms of best practice for how a region should function, urban planning theory includes the concept of the "Transect" which is the idea that density should gradually taper down as you get closer to the edge. If you put a very intense use right at the edge, you would expect over time that it would create a new node and result in further outward expansion. Board Member Renne stated his concerns about the effect that opening up the UEAs for significant urban development would have on long-range planning efforts in the County and the possibility that it would lead to additional expansion until we are right up against the Everglades.

Board Member Green stated that the CDMP policies require a buffer zone where the development is adjacent to agricultural areas and noted that the graphics presented did not show a buffer zone.

Board Member Schwiep referenced the 1997 Urban Infill Strategy Report (which was reviewed again in 2014) noting the recommendation that the Land Use Element be amended to reduce pressure to expand the UDB by increasing density and intensity inside the UDB including providing incentives and removing barriers to infill development. He noted that Miami21 created new capacity inside of the UDB. He asked what is being done to increase capacity

inside of the UDB. Mr. Singh responded that the County has rezoned many areas designated as “urban centers” for higher density and intensity. Ms. Brown further responded that the County designates the Urban Infill Area as a Transportation Concurrency Exception Area and prioritizes infrastructure improvements in the Urban Infill Area to further incentive infill development.

Board Member Schwiep asked whether the capacity analysis currently considers development around future transit stations specifically those that would be designated as part of the SMART Plan. Ms. Brown responded that Policy LU-8F which is the policy that requires a demonstration of need for any application proposing to move the UDB indicates that the capacity analysis shall include consideration of the ability to develop around transit stations at the minimum densities identified in Policy LU-7F. Some of the areas along the proposed SMART corridors, such as those along the South Dade Busway, are designated urban centers and have already been rezoned for higher densities. The consultants for each of the SMART Corridors are still working to identify the station locations so the specific land use designations would follow once those locations are identified.

Board Member Lievano Cruz asked whether the SMART Corridor plans would take into consideration the Urban Expansion Area and further asked whether the Planning Division is working with the Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) to determine station locations. Ms. Brown replied that the Planning Division and TPO are working together to determine the station locations and are considering the Urban Development Boundary in their planning efforts.

Mr. Singh posed the question of whether availability of transportation is an important consideration for development of the Urban Expansion Areas. Board Member Renne responded that ULI has an interest in looking at smart, sustainable development. The demand for new housing and development tends to be in areas where there is accessibility to transit because traffic is at such a terrible level in this region that we can't just build without thinking about transportation. ULI would be supportive of development that offers more options than just driving. In response to a question from Mr. Singh regarding the current density requirements of Policy LU-8H, Board Member Renne noted that 10 dwelling units per acre would generate significant traffic without the availability of a public transportation option.

Board member Schwiep noted that the Northeast corridor of the SMART plan would be easy to implement, as rail currently operates there, and inquired if the CDMP policy for density was specific to rail. Ms. Brown clarified that CDMP policy LU-7F specifically set densities around rail stations. Board member Schwiep asked if that same policy is applicable if it was Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), and Mr. Bell answered that would be considered once the zoning was in place. In response to Board member Schwiep's inquiry, Ms. Brown stated that there was no automatic upzoning for rail centers; it would first be designated as an Urban Center on the CDMP LUP map with area plans and zoning performed. Board member Pines requested a map showing locations of the rail stations, and Mr. Singh explained that charrettes are underway for all six of the SMART plan corridors with no station locations decided yet, nor if the corridor will be BRT, rail, or some other mode. In response to Board Member Pines' inquiry, Ms. Brown answered that the Kendall corridor ended around SW 167 Avenue in the west. Board member Benson related her experience of attending the Kendall corridor

charrettes and how the participants did not want to give up a roadway lane for mass transit. Board member Schwiep agreed, observing that while reversible lanes were discussed it would be a slim percentage to having an actual transit system implemented on the Kendall corridor. Board member Hatcher related his participation on various boards and seeing the increased intensity and Urban Centers designated on the Busway. Mr. Singh stated that five Urban Centers were added to the CDMP, and certain densities were proposed and put in place, for anyone contemplating development there. Ms. Brown reiterated that the Urban Centers address all of the mass transit stations such as BRT and rail, and that Policy LU-7F specifically set the minimum densities around rail stations. Board member Humble related how the Palmetto Expressway used to be two lanes, ending at Kendall Drive and SW 107 Avenue, and the tolled roads are expensive which many drivers could not pay and thus used secondary roads, adding to the traffic congestion.

Board member Diaz stated that his interest was in UEA No. 3, and asked about its distance to the Busway (Transitway). Mr. Linn clarified that the UEA No. 3 was the one located east of the Turnpike, and responded that it was a distance of approximately two miles. Mr. Linn stated that the service areas for most transit corridors were one-half mile on either side, and that another type of transit facility might be needed to serve that area. Board member Diaz asked if an east-west trolley would be acceptable. Mr. Linn related how even with small and oddly-shaped parcels they were able to work with the business community and encourage development in the Urban Centers along the Busway. Mr. Linn stated that most buses operating on the Busway are full, with capacity crowds at the transfer point where the Metrorail ended at the Dadeland station. Board member Diaz asked if trolley service to the Busway was provided, would that UEA No. 3 be considered a good area for growth. Mr. Linn responded that factors such as the capacity of the Turnpike, efficacy of providing a feeder service to the Busway, desire of the community, and willingness of people to use transit would need to be considered. Mr. Linn cited as an alternative to typical suburban sprawl the Kendall Commons development located around Kendall Drive and SW 167 Avenue. Mr. Linn related that when the UDB was moved for that property, the BCC required it to be a Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND). Kendall Commons contains walkable streets, mixed uses, variety of development types, and live-work units consisting of townhouses where the ground floor is a shop. Mr. Linn stated that the design of the TND with shorter blocks produced a walkable neighborhood with goods and services within proximity to people living in that area. Board member Diaz stated that rather than people living in the neighborhood using transit, he was referring to people using the Busway to come to UEA No. 3, as a labor hub. Board member Diaz added that the areas next to the Busway are small areas where you could not create an office park or a “grand scheme.” Mr. Linn responded that was why he presented graphic images of alternative developments to the typical suburban sprawl, and explained that typical developments were not pedestrian-friendly and not conducive to walking. Board member Green remarked that it was premature for presenters to ask the board’s view on these issues which they have not discussed. Mr. Green maintained that narrowly looking at the traffic within Kendall Commons might be acceptable, but was not a model to emulate as there was a great deal of traffic getting to it within the larger community. Mr. Singh questioned if the board wished to discuss the issue further, and Board member Hatcher asserted that in his area of interest, the UEA Study Area, the agricultural industry is fighting to survive and contending with not only insects, economic issues, labor issues and international issues but also with neighbors moving into the agricultural areas. Board member Humble observed that some of

those people moving into the agricultural area were non-conforming businesses who paid \$44 million in fines last year, and opined that it was easier to pay fines than obtain a variance. Board member Humble detailed the challenges facing the agricultural industry including: 12,000 acres of avocado trees with almost 50% being lost to laurel wilt; tomato acreage reduced from 30,000 acres to 600 acres; concluding that the agricultural industry won't survive if there is no income, as it is a business.

Board member Renne commended Mr. Singh and Mr. Linn on their presentations, but pointed out that even in a pedestrian-friendly environment with transit available at best only 25% of people will use that transit. Board member Renne observed that this board needed to realize the implications of their suggestions: if there is development in the UEAs, then it will cause more traffic congestion and that the roadway system was not adequate to serve those needs. Board member Renne pointed out there was no evidence of anything planned or funding for transportation infrastructure in the UEAs. Board member Renne stressed that if development occurs in the UEAs' fringe locations it will ripple into the next generation as a demand to go further out, in a perpetual cycle. Mr. Linn responded that as a policy option perhaps a perhaps a more stringent concurrency system was needed for those UEAs for transit and roadway level of service. Board member Pines commented that the County should put infrastructure in place like Broward County did and then phase in the development, when the need arises. Board member Pines asserted that UEA No. 2 should be contracted and relocated to areas further south as CERP projects were located there, and that since it was such a political issue the UDB should be made permanent and relocated to Krome Avenue. Mr. Singh questioned that then for any kind of potential development to occur in the UEAS, that to make sure the transportation infrastructure was in place first. Board member Pines agreed, and stated that the MDX southwest extension project was being proposed, so it was needed out in Kendall. Mr. Singh stressed that if the UEAs contained a mix of uses in a live-work-play area it would probably add more density than just residential; and if it was all residential that those residents would be definitely commuting. Board member Pines reiterated that the UEAs are areas that get priority for inclusion, when the need arises as identified by Mr. Armada, RER Research Department. Board member Pines asserted that housing affordability was an issue, with a different market for the eastern side than for the affordable areas on the western urban fringe where the MSA 6.1 or 6.2 had a depletion year of 2020. Board member Pines asserted that needed to be addressed and should follow Broward County's example and set a UDB and make it permanent. Mr. Singh questioned if the board wanted to address the issue that if the UEAs are developed, then it would be expanded any more.

Board member Renne stressed that development expansion created further demand for development expansion, regardless if there was infrastructure. Board member Renne contended that the point of an urban growth boundary was to stop development from occurring in a particular area; and that if the board was to make a recommendation to expand into an area that down the road there would probably going to be pressure to expand it even further. Board member Pines stated that the County identified the UEAS as areas of future growth, once the UEAs are developed that the County should emulate Broward County: absent an extraordinary circumstance there will be no development outside the newly designated UEA. Board member Renne stressed that if the UEAs are developed it will create a market condition in which there will be incentive for people to try to change the policies in the future—to grow past that line. Mr. Singh stated that that was a possibility unless it was designed and

developed in a way that is responding to the existing infrastructure. Board member Lievano Cruz agreed with Board member Renne in that if the UEAS are expanded it needs to be planned accordingly and make sure the design is done where the transportation infrastructure is built in, but did not agree with Board member Renne's conclusion that it would encourage further development. Board member Lievano-Cruz cited Doral as a good work-live-play mixed-use example with trolley system in place. Board member Lievano-Cruz voiced her support of the MDX southwest extension project which will alleviate some of the traffic problems and for the future were building it before it gets there. Board member Lievano-Cruz stated as a board they could support through recommendations/the survey that they supported the MDX project, or the graphic presentations shown of the Madrid development. Board member Lievano-Cruz opined that the board should not just state to move the UDB, but that they were moving it and detail kind of development should be there. Ms. Brown questioned if that was something Board member Lievano-Cruz wanted to add to the survey. Board member Lievano-Cruz related that she was used to boards making motions and asked how she could take some sort of position to see transportation infrastructure in place first before any expansion is allowed. Mr. Bell stated that Staff would return to the next meeting with some drawings, synthesis of the information, and continue the discussion. Mr. Bell added that if Board member Lievano-Cruz wanted to make a suggestion for a survey question that could be done as well. Board member Schwiep suggested a survey question asking if the transportation infrastructure should precede any inclusion of the UEAs within the UDB and cited the example of Coral Gables having their trolley system in place first. Board member Schwiep related his experience of people in Kendall opposing changing the roadway to accommodate mass transit, and contended that if was done in reverse, the mass transit would be in place and made it a place where people could move. Board member Schwiep pointed out that the County's 1997 Infill Study called for discouraging people from moving out to suburban areas which increased traffic; and more intense development should be encouraged within the existing UDB. Board member Schwiep added that most young people desire to live in those dense, walkable areas like Brickell, and opined that is where development is going and needs to go. Board member Schwiep asserted that opposition to that came from people who have financial interests in the UEAs and are advocating to protect their property interests. Mr. Singh added that the urban centers have gone through the design process, and the idea is to intensify them as they are the future downtown Kendall's. Mr. Linn said Doral was intended to be industrial, so for it to have evolved from industrial into a city with multiple downtowns is interesting. Board Member Lievano Cruz said when Doral became a city it was master planned, and she hopes the County will do the same in the UEA's.

Mr. Linn said the SR 836 Extension, if aligned within the UEA, has a potential exit at Kendall Drive. He said this generally implies a certain type of development pattern, and if you look at what occurs at an expressway interchange with a major arterial roadway, you have a McDonalds, a discount auto parts store, a BJ's, Target, Marshalls, an office building, etc. all separated by parking lots and retention ponds. And again, is that the best use of land that is in limited supply. The expressway itself may be a good thing in terms of drawing people off of Kendall Drive and giving them an alternative route to their destination, but the implication of the future development pattern of the expressway itself needs to be contemplated, and do our policies have a shortfall in terms of providing guidance into something better, different or more desirable.

Board Member Humble replied that the proposed SR 836 route is not good and should go all the way to the levee just like Broward County, and he finds it amazing that it is going right through the middle of that agricultural area when it would be better off going west.

Board Member Losner stated that the subject of jobs was discussed, and South Dade, including Homestead is, and has been, a bedroom community for years. He said jobs are what is needed to help relieve the traffic. He said when American Bankers opened, they were glad because they created jobs for the people who lived nearby. He also said in order to create jobs, they tried to get HARB to become a joint use facility, and the City of Homestead created a tax-free zone to attract businesses to the area to hire area residents. He concluded that Miami-Dade County has to do something to create jobs in South Dade so that people don't have to drive so far. He said another example was South COM, which should have located at HARB rather than Doral.

Board Member Greene said the Tropical Fruit Growers of South Florida recently voted to object to the SR 836 Extension. He said they agree that the traffic situation is horrible, but it is not the solution. He said the better solution is what Board Member Humble had suggested, which is for the road to go west and then south. He agreed with what Board Member Schwiep had said, in large part based on two public comments. One was from Mr. Barry White, the president of the Kendall Federation of Homeowners, who made a plea to take note of the fact that just because the Task Force was convened, they don't need to recommend any changes. He said it may be best to recommend no change, particularly in terms of the added stress to already overburdened systems, especially transportation that any additional development would offer. He said the second comment was made was from Mr. Don Pybas, the former director of the County's Cooperative Extension Service who, in reference to UEA No. 2 but applicable to the others as well, which is that the increased traffic in UEA 2 would be devastating to the agricultural industry, as that is the major route used by many agricultural truckers going north on Krome Avenue, and adding more traffic to the overburdened road would have a grave economic effect on the movement of agricultural commodities. He thinks those comments together represent very different aspects of the public, and it's hard for him to find any argument that would persuade him to do anything until we have transportation infrastructure in place.

Board Member Diaz said they have talked about affordability being the issue. He said that his brother-in-law had just moved into this area and was looking for housing near the Dadeland Metrorail, but rents were about \$2,500 per month for a 2 bedroom, which most people cannot afford. And that is what makes the UEA's exciting because they are affordable. He said in South Dade, they have the Turnpike being expanded, they are close to the Busway, there are 2 exits within the expansion area, Exits 9A and 9B, and you can take a water taxi from Black Point Marina to downtown, there's a 230-acre regional park, and who knows what will happen to the Homestead Air Reserve Base in the future. He said there is a lot that can happen and thinks that things are in place for that area. That is what he thinks are the major points about UEA No. 3.

Board Member Pines echoed the other board members' sentiments that he too thinks today's meeting has been very helpful and productive in just dialoging. He said he would like to

continue in this way to see if they could come up with a recommendation based on the consensus of the board.

Discussion ensued regarding the addition of more task force meeting dates. Board Member Lievano Cruz suggested that, rather than adding meeting dates, the task force consider an early start time for future meetings. Ms. Brown asked if everyone would be amenable to meeting at an earlier time; there was informal agreement among the members.

Board Member Barsh asked if we can look at requiring, or trying to provide, flexibility with the planning for future transportation that we may not currently have the technology for, to allow for future flexibility. Board Member Barsh suggested that consideration be given to providing space for future transportation options, the number of lanes, etc. Ms. Brown asked if her question could be made into a survey question. Board Member Barsh replied that she will come up with more clear language.

Ms. Brown said there were a few additional survey questions that have already been mentioned that could be sent as an Addendum to the survey. At the last meeting they talked about a survey question related to whether CERP areas should be added as areas that shall not be considered. In response to Board Member Schwiep's comments, a survey question could also be added on whether UDB expansion should require demonstration of adequate transit infrastructure. Board Member Schwiep clarified that his question was more about sequencing, whether the infrastructure should be constructed before the expansion occurs. After a few clarifying questions, Ms. Brown said the question would work better if it could be turned into a yes or no question.

Board Member Schwiep noted that the wellfield protection areas are currently in the process of being revised. He opined that updates to the policies related to the Northwest and West Wellfields should be considered after that process concludes.

Board Member Pines said they have previously made reference to white papers, and asked what is expected of the members over the next few meetings. Mr. Bell replied that if they want to submit a white paper that it is fine, as well as survey questions. He said they are going to continue this type of discussion in the next meeting. The staff will take the input, what was heard today, and come back and represent it to them in order to keep the discussion ongoing. He said his focus is to continue this type of discussion, and they will continue to take survey questions, and if they want to submit a white paper as well that is fine. Board Member Pines said he preferred this format of open dialogue over submitting a white paper.

Board Member Gomez said he thinks traffic is the key, but all infrastructure should be included. Board Member Barsh said she would be interested in hearing the options Board Member Humble had said that farmers require. Board Member Humble lamented the loss of farmland to governmental agencies.

V. Public Comment:

The following speakers addressed the Task Force during the public comment period:

- Mr. Scott Mittleman. Mr. Mittleman stated that he moved to Miami in 1969 and has been involved in real estate and development, particularly in South Dade. He said he is the

largest holder of SUR's in Miami-Dade County, and that he has heard that this board has discussed SUR's, and he wanted to make certain that they consider how SUR's may be used in the UEA's and to increase density. He provided a little history of SUR's and their creation in the 1980s, when most of the development rights had been taken from landowners in far southwest Miami-Dade County, who agreed to exchange their development rights with the promise by Miami-Dade County for SUR's. He said they were told they could be used in unincorporated Miami-Dade County inside the UDB to increase density where growth should occur such as infill areas and closer to town. However, he said the County subsequently incorporated all of the areas where the SUR's were to be used, as well as wholesale annexations in other areas where they could have been used. So the two-thirds of SURs that remain, the demand is very low today, there's no place to use them, and there's very little land left within the UDB that has not been built on and developed. He is hoping the County will come up with more innovative uses where SUR's could be used, and the owners of SUR's will be able to get fair and equitable value for they're rights. Board Member Hatcher asked if the SUR's could be used in some of the receiving areas in the municipalities. Mr. Mittleman replied no, because they can only be used in unincorporated parts of the County inside of the UDB, and when those areas incorporated, the County had failed to tell those municipalities they needed to accept the SURs. Ms. Brown clarified that the Board of County Commissioners adopted an ordinance that allowed the SURs to be used in municipalities, however, it at the discretion of the municipality whether to allow for the use of SURs. Board Member Humble recounted his personal experience with the SUR program and agreed with Mr. Mittleman's arguments. Mr. Singh added that most of the urban centers that have been area-planned in the Zoning Code allow for SUR's for densities that go up to 60 du/ac.

- Ms. Truly Burton, on behalf of the BASF (Builders' Association of South Florida), said that she is pleased that for the first time they are talking to each other. She said it makes for a better dialogue and hopefully a better product. She said we all need to learn from the mistakes on transportation. Kendall relief is clearly needed as soon as possible. She said the takeaway from this is that mixed uses are a must. The old style of residential in one area and commercial in another was a mistake, mixed use is the way to go whether it is infill, in the middle, on the edge or wherever. Second, planning for infrastructure is very important. You not only have to include roads, but you also have to include water and sewer because of rainfall and storm runoff, so it has to be a package along with the proper development. And third, the UEA's were seen by the development industry as urban expansion areas where development was going to go, but it has not done so. She said the UEA's have been 'no go' zones for the last 25 years, and that some of them are misnomers because they also have environmental constraints. She said they need more land to build, whether it's mixed use or whatever, because housing affordability hangs in the balance because of constrained land supply. She added that the UDB has not functioned the way it was supposed to function, and that has caused an affordability issue.
- Mr. Dennis Sytsma said that he was appalled at the task force's lack of concern for protecting unique domestic farm land. He said he has seen vast removals from the land bank that is agriculture in Miami-Dade for urban sprawl and asked 'when is enough, enough' to satisfy all of the development needs, and at what point will we protect agriculture from development. He said that the business model for agriculture is difficult,

because farmers have to sell land to keep farming, but they also have to keep land to keep farming, so at what point do we extinguish tropical fruit growing and all of the crops that are unique to this part of the world? He said we are not going to solve the sprawl problem by moving the UDB. He said the presentation shows the wrong country, instead of Spain, they should have looked at Australia. Australia and New Zealand have tight immigration laws, and downtown Brisbane has banned vehicles; all of the vehicular traffic is underground. He said that cannot apply to South Florida, but we are not going to solve the problems by moving the UDB, we need to contain urban sprawl. Board Member Renne said that the interests on this group that represent the agricultural industry, and the farmers in particular, appear to be wanting the UDB to be expanded. Board Member Renne asked if the desire of farmers was to keep the UDB or to move it. Board Member Greene replied that there is no such thing as the 'farmers.' He said agriculture in this County is represented by distinct groups that have very little overlap in their interests. He said we have groups like his who represent over 100 farmers and packing houses. The median farm size in Miami-Dade County is 7.5 acres, and the vast majority of his group would prefer that the UDB shrink rather than expand. Others, like Board Members Humble and Losner, their interests are primarily with respect to property value and, as was explained to him by another farmer, property value is an essential part of a farming operation because the equity is used for loans. He then said there are those who identify as farmers but are not, but are land speculators who rent out land to take advantage of agricultural exemptions; and then there are agriculturists who aren't farmers at all but are nurserymen. He concluded that there is no unitary view for farmers. He said the biggest landowners would probably prefer that the UDB disappear, whereas the largest number of people prefer the UDB remain in place or even shrink to add more farm land. Board Member Losner replied that Board Member Green forgot to mention the farmer who rents farmland from a speculator and does not want the speculator to develop the land.

Task Force Discussion.

Mr. Bell reviewed the next steps, which will include a continuation of this dialogue at the next meeting, and a synthesis of the results. Mr. Bell announced that the next meeting will be from 11:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m on April 6, 2018. He also said they could e-mail any additional survey questions. He asked for a vote on the 11:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. schedule for April 6; there was a unanimous voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:12 pm.