

**URBAN EXPANSION AREA TASK FORCE
MEETING SUMMARY**

Miami-Dade County, Stephen P. Clark Center
111 NW 1 Street, Room 18-3, Miami, FL 33128
December 1, 2017

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	Present *
William Delgado	Latin American Business Association	Present
Enid Washington Demps	Community Council 15	Absent
Alex Diaz	Community Council 11	Absent
Nick Diaz	Property Owners' Representative for the Eastern UEA	Present
Dany Garcia	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	Present
Mike Hatcher	Redland Citizens Association	Absent
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	Absent
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	Present
Barney Rutzke Jr.	Florida Nursery Growers & Landscape Association	Present
Paul Schwiep	Urban Environment League	Present
Erick Valderrama	Latin Builders Association	Present *
Larry Ventura	Homestead Air Reserve Base	Present
Vacant	Miccosukee Tribe of Florida	Absent

* Present after roll call

Board member Schwiep left at 2:58

Board member Grosso left at 3:45.

Board member Delgado left at 3:47.

Board member Losner left at 4:10.

Board member Humble left at 4:12.

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

Jerry Bell, Assistant Director for Planning; Kim Brown, Supervisor of Long-Range Planning; Noel Stillings, Senior Planner; Mark Dorsey, Principal Planner; Helen Brown, Principal Planner; Robert Hesler, Supervisor for Demographics and Economic Development, and Charles LaPradd, RER-Agricultural Manager;

Other Miami-Dade County and Government Staff

Jess Linn, Principal Planner, RER-Development Services, Maria Valdes, Chief, Comprehensive Planning and Water Supply Certification, and Jose Ramos, Division Director of Aviation Planning

I. Attendance

Ms. Stillings called roll of the members, 14 members were present. The meeting commenced at 1:10 pm.

II. Approval of the November 17, 2017 Meeting Summary

Motion. Board member Delgado made a motion to approve the November 17, 2017 meeting summary. Board member Pines seconded the motion and asked Ms. Brown to send a link to the County’s Storm Surge Planning maps to the members. The motion passed unanimously as follows:

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

III. Staff Coordinator’s Report

Ms. Brown acknowledged there was discussion about protocol and the process moving forward, and indicated that towards the end of December 2017 Staff will send a survey out to the Board members to complete and turn in. Ms. Brown stated that once the input session are completed the Board would reconvene to start formulating their recommendations based on that input.

Board member Schwiep called attention to the presentations from Board member Barsh made on behalf of the Miami-Dade Limestone Products Association and by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection. Board member Schwiep suggested to round out that discussion that the Board should also hear a presentation about the proximity to the rock mining and its effect on the homeowners.

Motion. Board Member Schwiep made a motion to add to the last input session an additional presentation concerning rock mining’s proximity and impact on nearby homeowners such as

blasting and traffic. Board Member Reynolds seconded the motion. The motion passed 10 to 5 as follows:

Kerri Barsh	Yes	James Humble	No
Ashley McElheny	Absent	Matt Johnson	Absent
Erin Clancy	Yes	Robert Johnson	Absent
William Delgado	No	Yesenia Fatima Lara	Absent
Enid Washington Demps	Absent	Maria Lievano-Cruz	Absent
Alex Diaz	Absent	Bill Losner	No
Nick Diaz	No	Francisco Pines	No
Dany Garcia	Yes	John Renne	Absent
Richard Gomez	Yes	Laura Reynolds	Yes
Steve Green	Yes	Barney Rutzke Jr.	Yes
Richard Grosso	Yes	Paul Schwiep	Yes
Mike Hatcher	Absent	Erick Valderrama	Absent
Thomas Hawkins	Absent	Larry Ventura	Yes

Board Member Losner stated he would like to hear a different viewpoint other than sea level rise is going to occur. Board member Green disagreed, stating it would be a waste of time and that viewpoint has no scientific credibility. Discussion between Board members Ventura and Losner occurred regarding potential difficulties in finding a person in time for the input session.

Motion. Board member Losner made a motion to add an input session for a presentation by a person who does not believe in sea level rise, by January 5, 2018, and if that does not occur to move forward without that presentation. Board member Diaz seconded the motion. Motion passed 9 to 7 as follows:

Kerri Barsh	Yes	James Humble	Yes
Ashley McElheny	Absent	Matt Johnson	Absent
Erin Clancy	No	Robert Johnson	Absent
William Delgado	Yes	Yesenia Fatima Lara	Absent
Enid Washington Demps	Absent	Maria Lievano-Cruz	Absent
Alex Diaz	Absent	Bill Losner	Yes
Nick Diaz	Yes	Francisco Pines	Yes
Dany Garcia	No	John Renne	No
Richard Gomez	Yes	Laura Reynolds	No
Steve Green	No	Barney Rutzke Jr.	Yes
Richard Grosso	No	Paul Schwiep	No
Mike Hatcher	Absent	Erick Valderrama	Absent
Thomas Hawkins	Absent	Larry Ventura	Yes

Board member Pines made a motion to add a presentation by a private land planning consultant, Ken Metcalf, to the housing affordability input session. Board Member Humble seconded the motion. Discussion ensued on the motion. Board member Renne emphasized that housing affordability was an important issue for the organization he was representing, the Urban Land Institute. Board member Renne stressed that housing affordability involved certain nuanced issues such as current zoning which is restrictive to expanding affordability in infill locations. He asked that those issues be addressed and indicated that the Urban Land

Institute could recommend a speaker. Board member Pines clarified that he wished to have a private consultant, Ken Metcalf, speak only to the CDMP issues concerning needs analysis and methodology. Board member Schwiep stated that he was willing to hear from a private consultant but would also like to hear as well from the Urban Land Institute on those nuanced issues. Board Member Pines amended his motion to include a member of the Urban Land Institute in addition to Ken Metcalf. Board Member Humble seconded the motion, as amended.

Motion. Board member Pines made a motion to have two presentations added to the housing affordability session, private land planning consultant Ken Metcalf and a person from the Urban Land Institute. Board member Humble seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously as follows:

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

In response to Board member Delgado’s inquiry, Ms. Brown announced December 18, 2017 at 1:00 pm at Government Center in downtown Miami would be the date for the next UEA Task Force input session concerning transportation. Ms. Brown expressed concern that the additional presentations might result in lengthy agendas and that an additional session might be needed. Board member Pines asked that staff from the County’s Planning Research Section be available to answer questions at the housing affordability input session.

IV. Scheduled Presentation: CDMP Criteria for Expansion of the UDB

Ms. Brown provided a presentation on the CDMP criteria for the expansion of the UDB including:

- Overview of Section 163.3177(1)(f)(3), Florida Statutes which indicates that the comprehensive plan must be based on at least the minimum amount of land required to accommodate the medium population projections for at least a 10-year planning period.
- Overview of Section 163.3177(6)(a)(9), Florida Statutes which states that the future land use element and any amendment thereto shall discourage the proliferation of urban sprawl

and outlines sprawl indicators to determine whether a particular plan amendment discourages urban sprawl.

- CDMP Policy LU-8F which outlines the requirements related to the demonstration of need for applications requesting expansion of the UDB.
- CDMP Policy LU-8H which outlines the criteria that must be met by applications requesting expansion of the UDB, after need is demonstrated in accordance with Policy LU-8F.
- CDMP Policy LU-8G(iii) which identifies the areas that shall be given priority for inclusion into the UDB (after need is demonstrated in accordance with LU-8F) including:
 - a) Planning Analysis Tiers having the earliest projected supply depletion year;
 - b) Land within the UEAs and contiguous to the UDB;
 - c) Locations within one mile of a planned urban center or extraordinary transit service;
 - d) Locations having projected surplus service capacity or where necessary facilities and services can be readily extended
- Overview of Chapter 163, Florida Statutes and County policies concerning military compatibility:
 - Ch. 163.3177(3)(a) requiring future land element to include criteria to achieve the compatibility of lands adjacent/closely proximate to military installations
 - CDMP Policy LU-8G: areas within Homestead Air Reserve Base (HARB) accident potential zones shall not be considered for UDB expansion
 - County zoning ordinance that limits the uses that can occur in the accident potential zones and 75 decibel noise contour of HARB, and prohibits public assembly within those areas, along with height restrictions for areas within the flight path of HARB.
 - HARB Commanding officer by state law is a reviewing agency for land use plan amendments near HARB.

V. Scheduled Presentation: Land Use Supply and Demand

Ms. Brown noted that the scheduled presenter, Manny Armada, was not able to present due to an unexpected medical appointment, and introduced in his place Robert Hesler, Supervisor for Demographics and Economic Development, Miami-Dade County Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources, Planning Research Division. Mr. Hesler provided a presentation on land use supply and demand, including:

- Available residential capacity being determined based on units from vacant land, plus units from approved development, plus units from redevelopment potential.
 - Units from vacant land – capacity is determined as:
 - Based on existing land use, zoning, municipal plans, covenants and other legal restrictions.
 - The net capacity of the vacant land equals the gross capacity (100% of a sites allowable capacity); minus 20% to allow for build-out limitations; minus 3% to account for the existence of small vacant or underutilized parcels.
 - Units from approved development projects:
 - Projects analyzed are large-scale projects approved by Miami-Dade County or a municipality, have an unexpired permit, and capacity is determined:
 - Capacity of projects yet to start construction at the time of the analysis is reduced by 50% due to the possibility that they will never commence. Capacity

of projects under construction at the time of the analysis is counted at 100%.

Units from Redevelopment Potential

- Only existing residential parcels and parking lots are currently analyzed to evaluate redevelopment potential (excluding single-family-type parcels).
 - Only parcels inside the Urban Infill Area are considered.
 - Redevelopment Potential Calculation:
 - 1) The building-to-land value ratio must be 0.75 or lower.
 - 2) The structure must have been built before 1970.
 - 3) The ratio of allowable-to-existing density must be 4-to-1.
 - 4) The parcel must be greater than 0.25 acres.
 - The net increase in units is added to capacity.
 - Mr. Hesler stated that some of the redevelopment ratios may have to be revisited, such as the 1970 requirement and the 0.25 provision due to current trends concerning affordable housing and micro-housing.
- Residential Demand Analysis
 - Begins with the Countywide and MSA population projections. Population projections entail a two-step process:
 - 1) Using a widely-accepted peer-reviewed component methodology incorporating births, deaths, and international and domestic in-migration and out-migration, a countywide population projection is developed for the planning horizon.
 - 2) Using a mathematical algorithm incorporating historical population trends and the remaining residential capacity in each area, the countywide projection is then allocated to each of the 32 minor statistical areas (MSAs).
 - The population projections are then converted into housing unit demand by using Census “persons-per-household” data. It is also adjusted downward to account for seasonal and second homes using Census data.
 - To determine the depletion year, the total adjusted demand for housing units is subtracted from the adjusted capacity. The depletion year is the point when the demand equals or exceeds the capacity.
 - Projections do not represent predictions or desired outcomes. Mr. Hesler emphasized that the local housing market is extremely vulnerable to internal and external shocks.
 - Non-Residential Capacity (Commercial)
 - Commercial capacity and demand projections are measured by acreage of land use in commercial activities.
 - Commercial Land Use Sectors include: Retail Trade, Wholesale Trade, Finance, Insurance, Real Estate and Rental and Leasing, Professional and Business Services, Education and Health Services, Leisure and Hospitality, Other Services.
 - Methodology:
 - Obtain historical control totals for commercial acreage, commercial employment, and population totals
 - Based on analysis of North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) by Sector, and for the purposes of estimating the control totals, Commercial Employment includes:
 - 1) 100% of Employment in Retail Trade; Finance, Insurance, Real Estate and Rental and Leasing
 - 2) 95% of Employment in Information
 - 3) 75% of Employment in Professional and Business Services; Education and Health Services; Leisure and Hospitality; and, Other Services
 - 4) 8% of Employment in Wholesale Trade

- Using the historical control totals, a linear regression is run to estimate Commercial Acreage from Population and Commercial Employment. The resulting Commercial Demand Coefficients are then applied to population and employment projections independently derived by County staff, to generate the projected demand for commercial land uses.
 - Next, the projected countywide demand for commercial land is allocated to each MSA. The historical trend of the average annual change for “in-use” commercial land is calculated in each MSA. The change is either positive, negative or zero. If this average change is negative or zero the MSA’s share of projected countywide demand growth is set to zero. If the average change is positive the MSA’s “in-use” growth rate is averaged with the population growth rate to ensure the fastest growing MSAs will capture the largest share of projected commercial demand growth.
 - Finally, the projected demand for commercial land in each Tier and MSA is the basis for an absorption and depletion rate to be applied to the physical supply of commercial land. The end result is a depletion year for commercial land uses by MSA, tier and countywide to be used in the CDMP amendment process.
 - Finally, the projected demand for commercial land in each Tier and MSA is the basis for an absorption and depletion rate to be applied to the physical supply of commercial land. The end result is a depletion year for commercial land uses by MSA, tier and countywide to be used in the CDMP amendment process.
- Non-Residential Capacity (Industrial)
 - Mr. Hesler indicated that the Industrial capacity calculation is similar to commercial with the primary difference being that it is not driven by population, it is driven by economic conditions.
 - The first step is to obtain historical control totals for industrial acreage and industrial employment.
 - The historical industrial acreage and employment data allow for the calculation of the ratio of industrial land to industrial employee, the Industrial Demand Ratio.
 - This Industrial Demand Ratio is applied to the industrial employment projections independently derived by the Planning Research and Economic Analysis staff to generate the countywide projected demand for industrial land.
 - Methodology:
 - Industrial employment is defined as: 100% of Manufacturing employment, 92% of Wholesale Trade employment, 30% of Construction employment, 20% of Transportation and Warehousing employment, 15% of Other Services employment
 - Next, the countywide projected demand for industrial land is allocated across each MSA. The historical trend of the average annual change for “in-use” industrial land is calculated in each MSA. The change is either positive, negative or zero.
 - If this average change is negative or zero the MSA’s share of projected countywide demand growth is set to zero.
 - For all of the MSAs where the average change is positive, the growth in countywide demand for industrial land is allocated proportionately to each according to its historic “in-use” rate of growth.
 - Finally, the projected demand for industrial land in each Tier and MSA is the basis for an absorption and depletion rate to be applied to the physical supply of industrial land. The end result is a depletion year for industrial land uses by MSA, tier and countywide to be used in the CDMP amendment process.

Task Force Discussion. Board Member Renne questioned if the 20% reduction for build-out limitations and 3% reduction to account for small vacant or underutilized parcels were ever tested. Mr. Hesler responded that the methodology was tested when originally developed, as that was where the numbers came from but Mr. Hesler acknowledged that things had since changed including affordable housing is now done on much smaller parcels, and that perhaps it could be revisited.

Discussion ensued regarding the 50% reduction of units for projects yet to start construction when calculating the capacity. Board member Schwiep contended that no reductions should be done for projects that have not started. Board member Reynolds observed that it would be interesting to see how often the 50% ratio was wrong and where 100% of that capacity came to fruition. Mr. Hesler responded that some of those projects were permitted but took a long time to commence. Board member Barsh asked if there was an explicit definition of what constituted a large scale project. Mr. Hesler explained that there was not an explicit definition and the term generally referred to large projects. Mr. Hesler added that smaller projects for redevelopment should also be considered, and related his experience viewing small redevelopment projects occurring on smaller parcels in the north central part of the County. Board member Humble observed that the 50% reduction for projects not commencing was likely due to financing. Mr. Hesler concurred, stating that financing likely was a part of it and that there were numerous reasons why projects did not commence such as changing market conditions.

In response to a question from Board Member Reynolds, Mr. Hesler clarified that staff constantly analyzes capacity, looking at changes in zoning here in the County or in municipalities that could impact the capacity.

Board member Pines asked if there was a difference between the analysis for incorporated areas versus unincorporated areas. Mr. Hesler explained that the analysis was done at the MSA and tier levels. Mr. Hesler stressed that it would be a mistake treating unincorporated areas monolithically as there was a great variety of various housing and commercial developments.

In response to Board Member Renne's inquiry, Mr. Hesler explained that much of the redevelopment potential refers to the Urban Infill Area (UIA) which is the area generally located east of SR 826 hypothetically extended down to the Bay. Ms. Brown responded to Board Member Renne's request and stated that she would provide a copy of the UIA map to the board. Board Member Reynolds indicated that elevation should be considered when drawing the Urban Infill Area given the anticipated impacts of sea level rise. Board Member Schwiep asked why redevelopment capacity was not calculated for an area beyond the Urban Infill Area, perhaps to the Turnpike. Mr. Hesler responded that there may be benefits to including those areas in the analysis. He indicated that there may be a lot of redevelopment potential in Homestead and Florida City, for example that is not reflected in the analysis. Board Member Schwiep asked when the requirement that a building be built prior to 1970 to be considered for redevelopment was last updated. Mr. Hesler indicated that it has not been updated in some time. Board Member Barsh asked whether the analysis considered the availability of infrastructure. Mr. Hesler indicated that it is not one of the criteria that is considered for redevelopment potential. Board Member Renne indicated that a significant amount of residential redevelopment is occurring on former commercial parcels and offered an example from Miramar. Mr. Hesler indicated

that it is not reflected in the analysis. He further indicated that mixed-use development is not captured in the analysis.

Board Member Pines asked whether the Land Supply/Demand Methodology is published. Mr. Hesler replied that it was published as part of the last Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) and will be published again as part of the next EAR. Board Member Reynolds asked how commercial vacancies are incorporated into the non-residential analysis. Mr. Hesler indicated that high vacancy rates would reduce the rate of growth of “in use” commercial development and reduce the allocation of projected demand. Mr. Hesler indicated that vacancies are not considered in the residential analysis because they are already counted in the capacity.

Board Member Grosso asked whether “persons-per-household” changes over time. Mr. Hesler indicated that it does change and that there have been discussions with Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR) on what those figures should be. Numbers come from the Census. The Decennial Census and the American Community Survey have been different in the past. Board Member Grosso inquired about the reason for using past trends at the MSA level to project future growth. Mr. Hesler indicated that using past trends is one of the most reliable methods for projecting future growth because there is inertia. We look at carrying capacity and past trends.

Board Member Grosso asked when the needs analysis in Policy LU-8F was added. Ms. Brown replied that it was added in the mid-1990s and further clarified that the policy indicates that the County “should” maintain a 15-year supply. Board Member Grosso inquired about the appropriateness of maintaining a 15-year supply as the County continues to grow and mature and asked whether the threshold could be reduced to 10 years and still comply with state law. Ms. Brown indicated that the capacity requirement could be reduced to 10 years and still comply with state law.

In response to a question from Board Member Grosso, Mr. Hesler indicated that we currently only consider planned and zoned density as residential capacity. Board Member Grosso questioned the appropriateness of this standard indicating that the property could be rezoned to a higher density in accordance with the overriding land use. Mr. Hesler indicated that the higher density would be included once the rezoning occurs and indicated that the numbers are constantly being updated.

Board Member Green asked whether undocumented individuals are included in the population figures. Mr. Hesler indicated that it only captures undocumented individuals that file a tax return or complete the Census. Board Member Green asked why the analysis did not utilize non-linear regression (rather than linear regression) that weighs more heavily factors that have been more important in determining recent trends. Mr. Hesler indicated that linear regression is the simplest and it would require careful analysis to change it.

Board Member Losner inquired about the impact of a possible influx of population from Puerto Rico. Mr. Hesler indicated that we will not know the exact impact until the next Census.

In response to a question from Board Member Pines, Mr. Hesler indicated that the basic assumption that increasing the supply of housing will reduce housing cost has not held true. For example, there has been a massive increase in supply along the coast yet prices have continued to increase. The housing market is very complex, there are so many types of demand.

Board Member Pines asked to see the population projections by MSA and Board Member Renne further asked for a build-out map by MSA showing areas that are more built out and those that are less built out. Mr. Hesler indicated that the information could be sent to the members. Mr. Hesler also added that information on the depletion year is published and population is updated during the EAR process.

Board Member Humble indicated that much of the housing market is being fueled by wealth from other areas. He also stressed the importance of building infrastructure in advance of growth. Board Member Humble stated his opinion that the Urban Development Boundary should be expanded to the western levee.

Board Member Barsh asked how the commercial percentages are determined. Mr. Hesler responded that County staff looked at employment by NAICS Codes.

Board Member Clancy noted that the capacity appears to be underestimated and inquired about whether staff is aware of how much the current calculation may be underestimating the capacity. Mr. Hesler indicated that he does not know but stressed the need to make sure that capacity is accurately being measured.

Board Member Grosso reiterated that housing supply is not linked to affordability and emphasized that many cities are facing housing affordability issues. He noted that fixing the affordability issue will require real action to ensure that affordable units are built and not just using housing affordability as a reason to allow for more development.

Board Member Reynolds asked whether the market is leading towards renting rather than purchasing, and whether that is accounted for in the capacity analysis. Mr. Hesler said no, because they are very close substitutes, as the price of housing goes up the population shifts toward rentals, the population follows the market. The greater question is the affordability, the challenge we face in the data is the number of affordable workforce housing units and the number of low income housing units, there is an extreme shortage of affordable units. There is plenty of working poor who pay over 50% of their income on rent. It is not a question of which type is available, it is the supply and the affordability of new development.

Board Member Losner expressed concerns with the large number of affordable Section 8 housing apartments in the charrette areas in south Dade, as the land is cheaper. Board Member Pines indicated that he is particularly concerned about workforce housing.

VI. Scheduled Presentation: Military Compatibility – Homestead Air Reserve Base (HARB)

Mr. Lawrence Ventura, Environmental Flight Chief, United States Air Force, Homestead Air Reserve Base provided a presentation on military compatibility including:

- Board Member Ventura gave background information on HARB which is hosted by the 482nd Fighter Wing. Its Mission is Air Superiority using the F-16C, the fighting falcon, which protects our national interests here and abroad.
- Major tenants include SOCSOUTH special operations command. Other missions by Florida Air National Guard they fly the F-15 which protects our shores here. US Customs and Border Patrol fly helicopters, turbo props and jets out of the HARB. Special Operations Command staff. The largest storage area for munitions south of Eglin Air Force Base, and dispose of ordnance of military finds of police departments from West Palm Beach to Key West. The Florida Army National Guard is also at the HARB.
- HARB is in consideration to host the F-35 jet.
- Mr. Ventura presented data showing the economic impact of HARB on the local economy and indicated that HARB is the 2nd largest employer in South Dade.
- Mr. Ventura provided a map of the Safety Zones and Noise Contours around HARB which were established in the Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study (AICUZ). The Safety Zones are comprised of three areas; the Clear Zone, Accident Potential Zone 1 (APZ1) and Accident Potential Zone 2 (APZ2). The Clear Zones are closest to the runway and represent the greatest risk for crashes. APZ1 extends out from the Clear Zone followed by APZ2. The risk of crashes decreases as you move further from the runway, however, Mr. Ventura emphasized that crashes can occur outside of the Safety Zones.
- The Noise Contours represent the noise impacts of flight operations and include four decibel levels that decrease as you move away from the runway. Mr. Ventura emphasized that the noise contours are not static and can change depending on flight operations. Mr. Ventura showed a map of historical noise contours to demonstrate how they have changed over the years. If HARB gets the F-35, noise contours will change but it not yet known how much they will change.
- Mr. Ventura showed a map depicting a safety zone for ordnance disposal. It puts out a low decibel sounds which can cause impulsive noise impacts. HARB receives complaints from development that has built up around HARB.
- Mr. Ventura showed a map of areas subject to height restrictions around HARB called “Imaginary Surfaces” which stretch out 5-miles from the base.
- Encroachment is activities that could interfere or pose a threat to safety or with the mission of HARB. Bases are typically built away from development but over time, developments move closer and closer. People will move near the bases, then complain about the impacts. The AICUZ study provided recommendations on what is compatible usage and what is not, from density to noise, types of businesses, etc. The expansion of the UDB and UEA may allow future incompatibility, thereby limiting the base’s activities and future growth.
- Mr. Ventura described the history of HARB from an active full-fledged base in the 1980s to a reserve base following Hurricane Andrew. He presented a map showing how development has moved closer to the base since 1980 and emphasized concerns with urbanization near the base. Mr. Ventura showed images of crashes that occurred at other military installations. Mr. Ventura presented a map with the crash locations from other bases superimposed on a map of HARB to demonstrate where those crashes would have occurred if they had happened at HARB. He pointed out that some of the crashes would have occurred outside of the Safety Zones. In June 2010, a HARB plane had to jettison

its 2 fuel tanks over Biscayne National Park and in August 2016 an F-16 crashed into a safety barrier off the runway from an aborted takeoff due to a bird strike.

- Mr. Ventura presented relevant sections of state law including Sections 163.3161, 163.3175, and 163.3177 F.S., which identify the importance of protecting military installations and require local governments to address compatibility in their comprehensive plans.
- Mr. Ventura highlighted CDMP Policy LU-4I which indicates that proposals for future land uses on land adjacent to HARB shall maintain or improve compatibility with HARB. Mr. Ventura showed a map depicting current incompatible land uses near HARB. Mr. Ventura pointed out that UEA No. 4 is within the Accident Potential Zones and the obstacle evaluation area for runway 6, non-precision approach. He emphasized that the UDB is the best line of defense against encroachment and continued urbanization towards HARB may prevent or curtail the ability to train as we fight. Protecting compatible land use and mitigating incompatible uses is a dynamic process; future HARB missions may include other aircraft, expanded noise contours, expanded ammunition storage and urbanization could limit future expansion of the HARB.

Task Force Discussion. Board Member Humble asked why HARB doesn't purchase land in vulnerable areas. Mr. Ventura indicated it is economics, this problem is all over the world. There is a directive that if money becomes available to purchase lands or easements in the clear zone. After that, it is up to the communities to protect the base. In response to a question from Board Member Losner, Mr. Ventura indicated that HARB did purchase easements on nearby properties in the 1950s, but they are not complete. The state tries to purchase easements, HARB tries to partner with other groups, such as environmental, agricultural groups, DOD, etc. to purchase easements, but it is a difficult process to get all parties to agree.

In response to a question from Board Member Reynolds, Mr. Ventura indicated that HARB has opposed applications requesting to move the UDB near the base. Board Member Losner indicated that the farm worker housing was there in the 1940s and south of that location there was a German prison camp. Mr. Ventura indicated that, during the war, the housing was rented by the base.

Board Member Diaz inquired if other bases around the country have concerns with nearby development. Mr. Ventura indicated that all bases have an AICUZ for the same reason, compatibility issues. Board Member Diaz noted as a farmer and land investor for many years, the idea they had was as long as you were not in the crash zones, takeoff or landing zones, you were ok, it seems now that this has expanded out to other areas. He referenced a recent experience where HARB recommended denial of an application he had filed. He noted that Miami International Airport (MIA) has more flight activity and yet people live in close proximity, he further indicated that HARB has more limited flight activity. Board Member Diaz further inquired about the F-35 coming to the HARB. Mr. Ventura indicated that MIA is subject to Federal Aviation Administration regulations which are designed to protect the aircraft whereas the military standards are trying to protect the people on the ground. The military installations include operations and maneuvers that are not present at commercial airports and may increase the potential safety hazards. He emphasized that the military has conducted studies, such as the AICUZ, with the purpose of identifying and addressing safety and compatibility issues.

In response to a question from Board Member Diaz, Mr. Ventura replied that incompatible development can curtail operations because there may be a point in which complaints,

or an accident, or a new incompatible development may result in a reassessment of the base's operations. Board Member Diaz asked if some of the bases that have population around it have closed. Mr. Ventura replied that they have, every time there is a Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round bases get closed, including Homestead. Board Member Diaz then asked if there is any research to see if the politics are realistic for future BRAC. Mr. Ventura replied that he could not discuss BRAC.

Board Member Diaz inquired about the differences between a reserve and active base. Mr. Ventura replied that an active duty base has all of the infrastructure components for the personnel such as housing, school, shopping, hospital and recreation. It's a closed community; they have their own power plant and treatment plant. He said a reserve base doesn't have all of these components. It has the basics such as airplanes, pilots, and the mission being conducted, but they generally do not have the same family support structure, housing, etc. They are not all the same, but typically that's what they consist of. He said the pilots are Reserve pilots, and the staff are Reservists. They come on base to do their training on weekends and during the week, and in times of need, and they will fly overseas and/or deploy worldwide to support the war effort. The difference is that Reservists have civilian jobs during the week they could be a commercial pilot, then train on an F-16 on weekends. Board Member Diaz asked if Reserve bases only fly older aircraft. Mr. Ventura said no. They did in the past, but he has been on a Reserve base when they received new planes directly off of the assembly line. Traditionally, the Reserve bases received the older equipment and active duty bases received the new aircraft. But that's no longer the case because the military now operates under "force integration," which has active duty and Reserve components come together. We now have active duty staff at our base working with our reservists and flying Reserve airplanes. But we are now in line for the F-35, a brand new aircraft and air frame. The F-16 is a sunset weapons system and its days are limited. So if we want a fighter base to continue, HARB needs to get the F-35, or continue on as something else, so we want to position ourselves as best we can, including encroachment, to make sure we get the new aircraft.

Board Member Diaz asked if noise reducing construction techniques, such as impact windows, can mitigate the noise impacts that would be expected from an F-35. Mr. Ventura replied that you can, if the noise contours are stagnant; if you know what the noise is going to be now and into the future, then yes you can. There are provisions in the City of Homestead and County ordinances to build homes with sound attenuating materials in order to reduce interior levels to a certain decibel. But this presupposes that we know what the noise level would be in the future. Board Member Diaz then asked if the decibel level of the F-35 is more than that of a Lufthansa aircraft. Mr. Ventura did not know the answer.

Board Member Losner replied that Mr. Ventura has been very tactful, but what he has not said is that the planes carry bombs, rockets and bullets, and in past operations may have even carried a nuclear bomb or atomic bomb. So we would not want an airplane falling at all, whether there is development or not. Board Member Renne indicated that it seems odd that the responsibility is on the local governments to provide protections for these military bases rather than Federal or State governments. Mr. Ventura replied that the Federal government places the burden of protecting the base on the local government. Mr. Bell reiterated that there are statutory provisions that require local governments to provide for military compatibility. Board Member Renne asked Mr. Ventura to clarify what limitations on development are necessary and what limitations

would be nice to have. Mr. Ventura replied that some of what they are dealing with are unknowns such as future missions. He said these are not “nice to have,” but are areas we wish to protect. He said they have purchased easements in the past, and continue to do so, but now it is very difficult because the bulk of them were purchased in the 1950s, when there was only farmland. There are regulations in place at the city, state and county levels, but they cannot protect everything. But the government is not about to take away development rights. So we are trying to work towards compatible development, which is what we have been doing successfully in the city for the last few years. He said there is development going on right now in the Park of Commerce, which is inside the Accident Potential Zone (APZ). And there is development that is compatible, but our first and best line of defense (for HARB) is the UDB. If urbanization comes closer, there is no guarantee what is going to happen, what will go up and where, or what their future missions might be, and the Air Force is trying to prevent that. He said they have a good relationship with the (Homestead) Speedway and Biscayne and Everglades National Parks because they each have a vested interest in preventing encroaching development.

Board Member Diaz asked if existing compatible development would close the base as of now. Mr. Ventura replied that he cannot speak on BRAC issues at this time but, as for now, he had no reason to believe that existing compatible development would close the base. Board Member Humble questioned why the Air Force could not purchase land around the base similar. Mr. Ventura replied that it is not practical for the Department of Defense to purchase land around every military base around the world.

Board Member Reynolds asked why the UEAs were designated within the flight path. Mr. Ventura replied that the Accident Potential Zones did not exist until AICUZ came out in the 1970s. Ms. Brown added that the UEA boundaries were designated in 1983, but the Accident Potential Zones became areas that “shall not be considered” for expansion of the UDB as recently as the last Evaluation and Appraisal Report. Board Member Diaz stated that a large portion of the property owners in this area are from generations long before 1942 when this base started, and he is representing those people. Board Member Barsh asked if the AICUZ was established by the Federal government. Board Member Ventura replied that it was established by the US Air Force and that each branch has its own version and it is site specific.

VII. Scheduled Presentation: Urban Centers and Charrette Plans

Ms. Brown introduced Mr. Jess Linn, Principal Planner in the Miami-Dade County Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources, Development Services Division. Mr. Linn provided a presentation on Urban Centers and Charrette Plans including:

- He will focus on those centers down south near the UDB. He will also talk about charrette plans, particularly one charrette conducted for the West Kendall area that addressed the type of development that should occur there.
- The CDMP Future Land Use Plan map depicts urban centers throughout the County, which are identified by circles. He said the County’s policy is that urban centers will intensify over time. They are nodes of development that occur primarily at Metrorail stations and major commercial nodes, such as Dadeland, Aventura, downtown Miami and other areas. South Dade has two urban centers, Princeton and Naranja. These urban centers allow relatively high intensity development abutting the UDB and agricultural lands, which creates an interesting contrast. He noted that these two urban centers are

adjacent to the area that CDMP Policy LU-8I indicates should be studied for possible designation as an Urban Expansion Area.

- Mr. Linn showed the existing zoning within the Princeton and Naranja urban center districts, which includes a core, center, and edge sub districts. The core centers on the Metrorail station and includes intense development, and the edge sub district is less intense and is further away from the core. The most intense land uses occur along U.S. 1 and the Busway. High density residential occurs near the busway stations and tapers away from U.S. 1. He said the urban centers were adopted in 2005-2007, and are in various stages of development. He indicated that the area near SW 232nd may be a good candidate for a future urban center since there is a lot of vacant land in the area.
- He said that urban centers are intended to reflect an urban character with buildings fronting the streets, sidewalks, on-street parking, and to encourage people to use the streets as pedestrians and bicyclists. He provided examples of various buildings and homes recently built within the Naranja and Princeton urban centers. There has been a lot of multi-family and affordable home construction, but recently they are seeing more market rate homes being constructed which are indistinguishable from the affordable units.
- In 2014, the Development Services Division held the West Kendall Corridor Study, a planning study of the area from SW 132 Avenue to Krome Avenue, which included a portion of land outside of the UDB and within one of the urban expansion areas. He indicated that the process included a charrette with members of the community to develop the Charrette Planning Report. The report identified several parcels within the study area that could provide development or redevelopment opportunities including the Baptist Hospital site, and the Kendale Lakes Mall property. Mr. Linn showed conceptual designs for these sites as well as roadways in the area from the Charrette Planning Report. He stated that the primary preference of charrette participants is to keep the UDB where it is. However, if the UDB were to be expanded into the UEA, the charrette participants did not want to see more of the same low-density, strip mall development, but prefer more walkable streets, mixed uses, parks and open space, etc.

Task Force Discussion.

Board Member Pines asked whether development of the UEA in the manner described in the West Kendall Charrette Report would alleviate traffic in the area. Mr. Linn replied that alleviating traffic is the desired outcome but it is unknown whether this will occur in practice.

Board Member Losner stated that he participated in the charrettes that created the urban centers along the Busway and did not think the urban centers would be zoned until public hearings were held. He expressed concerns about the amount of Section 8 housing in the area. Mr. Linn replied that zoning does not control whether an area becomes Section 8 housing.

Board Member Reynolds asked if the identified zones in West Kendall overlay with the Smart Plan (transportation). Mr. Linn replied that it does, but at this time FDOT is conducting studies, and he does not know what mode will be used or where the stops may be located. He said the urban centers were added to the LUP map years ago. Board Member Reynolds replied that these areas should be identified according to public transportation rather than be disconnected, so she would like to see the higher density areas aligned with planned public transportation, as it is along the U.S. 1 corridor,

because having this amount of density out west, without the supporting transportation, is concerning.

VIII. Public Comment

Ms. Brown opened the public comment period and noted that one speaker card had been received from Daryl Jones. Mr. Daryl Jones introduced himself and stated his background as a former Florida state senator and nominee for Secretary of the Air Force under President Bill Clinton, to which he served in that chair for one year. He stated that he has also represented the community on base realignment and closure (BRAC) commissions in 1995 and 2005. He said that he was here to make the Board aware that there are at least two other points of view to consider, which is the Air Force at-large, from a national perspective, and from the communities located around those bases. Mr. Jones stated that he was an F-16 fighter pilot, who served 30 years, and is a retired Air Force Colonel. He spent 18 of his 30 years stationed at Homestead AFB, and was the acting Mission Support Commander, and Mr. Ventura's department was under his command.

He showed a photo of Naval Air Station Fort Worth Joint Reserve Base, and others, and stated that it is the first base to have a squadron of F-35's. He pointed out that there is development surrounding the base and said that development was not an issue for locating the F-35.

He stated that the Air Force will, on occasion, spend money on easements, and in special cases they will purchase land, but that is not to be expected here. He said what is to be expected is compatible development that does not affect the mission in a negative way. He emphasized that there is already development right up to the base's gates and noted that there were 7,000 people here when Homestead was an active Air Force base prior to Hurricane Andrew. Mr. Jones showed a picture of the base in 1994 and pointed out that there was development around the base at that time. He further stated that if Homestead was an Air Force base today, they would still be doing the same.

As for crashes, he said HARB has one of the best safety records. The probability of a fighter aircraft crash is far safer, when you compare hours of operation to crashes, than driving a car; the probability is very low. The locations of those fighter crashes that Mr. Ventura cited, were not here, but if you were to look at where those crashes did occur, they were open fields where highly trained pilots sought to find the safest place to land. That is not true in all cases, and you do have crashes into buildings. But the reason these communities have decided to build around those bases is to mitigate the noise, and because of the low likelihood of damage to the community.

Mr. Jones indicated that military bases represent a huge economic engine for most communities, and people will locate near bases even when they are in remote locations. Thus there are two types of development that occur: businesses surround a base to take advantage of the huge population of an active duty base, and then there is development that fills in the middle. He indicated that this is how development occurred near HARB.

IX. Task Force Discussion

Board Member Delgado stressed the need for members with opposing views to communicate more directly with one another to find common ground. He noted that the UDB line doesn't seem logical. Mr. Bell indicated that staff would provide a survey then hold facilitated meetings to get the input of the Task Force members. Board Member Grosso indicated that the survey may be an opportunity to identify common ground by having each member identify one issue from the opposing side that the member could support. Discussion ensued among Board Members Grosso and Renne about the best way to identify common ground. It was agreed that the Staff Coordinator would seek to elicit information on the survey that will allow common ground to be identified once the Task Force convenes to formulate recommendations.

Board member Reynolds suggested possibly having one-on-one conversations or break into groups to hear other members concerns on the issues. Ms. Brown indicated these meetings are required to be conducted in accordance with the Sunshine Law and she would find out from attorney how that could occur. Board Member Barsh indicated that she provided considerations on the last page of the presentation she distributed at the prior meeting to provide the basis for discussion.

Board Member Reynolds mentioned the Seven50 Plan and asked if there is a way information from the plan could be presented to the board. Ms. Brown replied that she could provide a link to the Plan. Board Member Reynolds moved that the Seven50 Plan visuals be shown to this Board, whether it be by County staff, or by someone involved in planning, such as Victor Dover, as it shows what can be done if we force infill development; the motion was seconded by Board Member Clancy. Ms. Brown clarified that a motion was only needed if the presentation would be made by someone other than staff. After a brief discussion, it was decided that staff would present the Seven50 Plan at a future meeting and the motion was withdrawn. Board Member Reynolds reiterated that the request is to show the visual representation of the Seven50 planning effort.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:22 pm.