

**URBAN EXPANSION AREA TASK FORCE
MEETING SUMMARY
Friday, January 5, 2018, 1:00 P.M.
West Dade Regional Library
9445 Coral Way, Miami, FL 33165**

Task Force Members Present

Member	Representing	
Kerri Barsh	Rock mining representative	Present
Ashley McElheny	Florida East Coast Chapter of Associated Builders & Contractors	Present
Erin Clancy	Tropical Audubon Society	Present
William Delgado	Latin American Business Association	Absent
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	Absent
Mike Hatcher	Redland Citizens Association	Present *
Thomas Hawkins	1000 Friends of Florida	Absent
James Humble	Agricultural Practices Advisory Board	Absent
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	Absent
Bill Losner	Dade County Farm Bureau	Present
Francisco Pines	Property Owners' Representative for the Western UEA	Present
John Renne	Urban Land Institute – the SE FL/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 Ventura left at 4:03.

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; Manny Armada, Chief; and Robert Hesler, Supervisor for Demographics and Economic Development.

Other Miami-Dade County and Government Staff

Christine Velazquez, RER-Division of Environmental Resources (DERM).

I. Attendance

Ms. Stillings called roll of the members, 15 members were present. The meeting commenced at 1:14 pm.

II. Approval of the December 18, 2017 Meeting Summary

Ms. Brown noted a change to the meeting summary from the prior draft that was provided, to Page 8 under Task Force Discussion, the comments of Board Member Diaz were further detailed.

Motion. Board member Reynolds made a motion to approve the December 18, 2017 meeting summary. Board member Gomez seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously as follows:

Kerri Barsh	Yes	James Humble	Absent
Ashley McElheny	Yes	Matt Johnson	Absent
Erin Clancy	Yes	Robert Johnson	Absent
William Delgado	Absent	Yesenia Fatima Lara	Yes
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	Absent	Paul Schwiep	Absent
Mike Hatcher	Absent	Erick Valderrama	Yes
Thomas Hawkins	Absent	Larry Ventura	Yes

III. Staff Coordinator’s Report

Ms. Brown indicated that the online survey to board members will be going out next week. As follow-up to items requested at previous Task Force meetings, several items have been provided today, one is a map showing the depletion year by MSA; and another is a map showing the one-half mile buffer around the smart corridors in relation to the UEA’s.

Ms. Brown indicated that the next meeting date will be February 26, 2018.

IV. Scheduled Presentation: Seven50 Plan

Ms. Brown presented an overview of the Seven50 Plan, including:

- Seven-50 Plan was led by South Florida Regional Planning Council and included funding from the HUD Sustainable Communities Grant. It was a regional effort that involved 7 counties, and 121 municipalities.
- The Seven50 public engagement process reached more than 1 million people including over 2,245 survey responses. It looked at how anticipated population growth of 3 million more people regionally could be accommodated through the year 2060.
- The survey asked respondents to choose their preferred growth scenario. Options included a Trend Scenario and Suburban Expansion Scenario both of which resulted in increased development in southern and western Miami-Dade County including depletion of existing farmland and environmentally-sensitive land. It also included a Region in Motion Scenario that anticipated full implementation of the SMART Plan with growth being accommodated around transit stations. Over 73% of respondents expressed a preference for the Region in Motion Scenario. Ms. Brown noted some of the impacts of the various growth scenarios that were identified in the Seven50 report. For example, the Suburban Expansion Scenario resulted in significantly more farmland being depleted and higher infrastructure costs when compared to the Region in Motion Scenario.
- Ms. Brown indicated that the County undertook a similar survey as part of the Evaluation and Appraisal Report process that sought broad participation and closed in mid-November 2017. As part of the effort, the County released an interactive, web-based survey that presented various growth scenarios to accommodate population growth through the year 2040. Over 1,100 survey responses were received. Based on self-reported information, 93% of the survey respondents live, and a good majority both live and work in Miami-Dade County. Growth scenarios presented in the survey included a Future Trend Scenario which assumed that growth would occur at a rate of 17% within urban centers, consistent with historical growth trends. Additional growth was accommodated outside of the urban centers up to the depletion year for available capacity, after which, growth was anticipated to push outside of the current Urban Development Boundary. The Future Trend Scenario used the assumption that growth would occur at a minimum density of 10 dwelling units per acre.
- A second Future Urban Center Scenario showed growth being accommodated along the SMART Plan corridors. The Future Urban Center resulted in less farmland and environmentally-sensitive land being depleted, more efficient delivery of services, better support of transit ridership, and lower greenhouse gas emissions. Ms. Brown presented the results of the survey which showed that respondents strongly favored the Future Urban Center Scenario. In response to a request from Board Member Reynolds, Ms. Brown indicated that she could follow up with the percentage of respondents that favored or strongly favored the Urban Center Scenario.
- In response to a question from Board Member Diaz, Ms. Brown noted that the Future Trend Scenario did not show growth in Urban Expansion Area No. 3 because data from NOAA showed that area being vulnerable to sea level rise. In response to a question from Board Member Pines, Ms. Brown stated that the Future Trend Scenario shows growth occurring in the southern portion of UEA No. 2 and south of the UEA No. 2 boundary but reiterated that the assumptions depicted in the growth scenarios are strictly for the purpose of allowing the public to visualize the impacts of different growth policies.

Task Force Discussion. Board Member Losner noted it would be helpful if the presentations were provided prior to the meeting. Board Member Green inquired about whether the potential for vertical development inside of the UDB was included. Ms. Brown responded that the Urban Center Scenario included the assumption that additional vertical development capacity would be accommodated along the SMART corridors. Mr. Armada further noted that multi-family growth is included in the analysis and every time there is a CDMP cycle, the analysis is updated.

Discussion ensued regarding the County's capacity analysis as it relates to CDMP Policy LU-8F. Board Member Renne noted that at a previous meeting it was mentioned that development in the infill area has increased beyond what was forecasted, and asked whether there is a way to quantify the excess between the projections and what has been built. Mr. Armada confirmed that recent redevelopment in the infill area has exceeded what was anticipated. He further noted that the capacity analysis is a very fluid process and that it needs to be periodically updated to account for newly approved projects. Board Member Renne noted the importance of understanding the demand by housing type.

Board Member Pines asked for clarification on how the supply is calculated. Mr. Armada stated that the supply is based on what is available on vacant land and redevelopment. Demand is based on the population demand translated into households and the type of units. Mr. Armada stated that the supply analysis is very conservative. For example, the number of units are discounted to 50% for major approved projects. Mr. Armada expressed his opinion that these assumptions should be revisited since at this time they are fairly conservative. In response to a question from Mr. Pines, Mr. Armada noted that housing affordability cannot be directly correlated to the capacity analysis without considering various factors. Discussion ensued between Mr. Pines and Mr. Armada regarding depletion years by MSA. Mr. Armada noted that a project can be approved that will change the MSA depletion year in one day. Mr. Pines noted that MSA 6.1 currently has a depletion year of 2020 and asked whether that demonstrates that there will be a potential need in that MSA in 2020. Mr. Armada stated that it does demonstrate that there will be a potential need in that MSA but not in the broader market. Board Member Renne pointed out that the outer MSAs have a more recent depletion year than the inner MSAs. Mr. Armada responded that this is primarily due to the low density nature of development in the outer MSAs and that the inner MSAs are being redeveloped with higher densities.

Discussion ensued between Board Member Schwiep and Mr. Armada regarding the current practice of discounting major approved projects by 50% in the capacity analysis. Mr. Armada reiterated his opinion that this practice should be studied and revisited but noted that the projects are calculated at 100% once development commences. Board Member Schwiep asked to see a depletion map that did not include the 50% reduction. Mr. Armada speculated that a change to the percentage for major approved projects would have a greater impact closer to the urban core. In response to a question from Board Member Schwiep, Mr. Armada confirmed that the needs analysis for UDB amendment applications is assessed countywide. He further noted that the countywide depletion year is approximately 2030. Board Member Valderrama asked Mr. Armada

what improvements he would recommend to the capacity analysis. Mr. Armada suggested revisiting the 50% reduction for major approved projects and looking at the period between approval and construction to see whether the full unit count was developed. In response to a question from Board Member Schwiep, Mr. Armada stated that the supply analysis for vacant land and redevelopment parcels assumes the maximum development potential based on the zoning.

Board Member Reynolds pointed out that the results of the EAR survey and the Seven50 survey show that people want to be near transit and conserve farmland. She asked how County staff reviews UDB amendment applications that show a near-term depletion year in the MSA but plenty of capacity in other areas. Mr. Armada confirmed that it does, he noted that supply and demand looks at the whole market area which is Miami-Dade County. Board Member Reynolds expressed her opinion that this is the best way to calculate supply and demand to encourage development along transit. Board Member Pines noted that the survey represented a sample and not the total population and that

he has yet to find a viable transit corridor. He went on to state that he has reviewed the Miami-Dade County Infill Strategy Task Force Report from 1997 that addressed transit issues and not much has changed in the County since then. Board member Reynolds inquired about efforts made by RER to publicize the EAR effort and survey. Ms. Brown discussed the public outreach efforts, including six publicly advertised workshops, utilization of the County's social media outlets, an interview on WRLN, and through outreach partners such as the American Institute of Architects.

Board Member Losner indicated that the County needs to look at the economic viability of agriculture. He noted that farmers want to be able to sell their farmland for the highest and best price.

Board Member Renne asked how much capacity would be added by developing the UEAs. Mr. Armada responded that the analysis could be done but you would need to make certain development assumptions such as density. He made reference to the differing product types and how the product type has changed in the past 10 years as seen in past application outside of the UDB, where there has been a change from single family product type to a combination of uses. Board Member Pines stated that the change in the product type in those past applications was in response to the County's changes in the CDMP's where urbanistic concepts were desired.

Board member Barsh questioned how the capacity figures fit in with a project's usual zoning and t-plat approval. Mr. Armada responded that once projects were approved, they would pick up the additional units and include it in their computations. Board member Clancy inquired if the methodology understates the available capacity and overstates the need for additional capacity. Mr. Armada agreed, explaining that their methodology was based on conservative capacity estimates. Board member Reynolds noted that the task force should revisit and address the 50% capacity issue in a potential recommendation in the future. In response to Board member McElheny's inquiry, Mr. Armada clarified that vacant land is computed based on its existing zoning. In response to further questions from Board Member Pines, Mr. Armada stated that even though

the property is vacant and has no development plans, it still has unrealized capacity. Board Member Pines mad reference to the Lemon parcel in Doral and how nothing has happened nor is planned for that parcel yet the County still computes the potential maximum number of units from that parcel

Response from Ms. Brown to Board Member Green's inquiry on land supply and demand. Ms. Brown's one sentence response on Policy LU-8F from the CDMP, the needs analysis for an application requesting expansion of the UDB. It indicates that the County should maintain a 15 year supply inside of the UDB. If it is found that that depletion year is within that 15 year pin to date of the EAR, then there could be a demonstrated need.

V. Scheduled Presentation: CDMP Polices Related to Housing Affordability

Ms. Brown presented an overview of the CDMP polices related to workforce housing, including:

- Voluntary Workforce Housing Density Bonus Program –up to 25% density bonus for development of WHU (units priced for households between 60 and 140% of AMI).
- Objective HO-6. Increase affordable housing opportunities within reasonable proximity to employment, mass transit and necessary public services in existing urbanized areas.
 - Code requires 12.5% workforce housing units in Urban Centers

VI. Scheduled Presentation: Housing Affordability in Miami-Dade County

Manuel Armada, Chief of the Planning Research Division, Regulatory and Economic Resources (RER) provided a presentation on housing affordability in Miami-Dade County, including:

- Increasingly, working-class households cannot afford a mortgage or rent.
- Growths in rents and homeownership costs continues to exceed the rate of growth of incomes by a large margin.
- Without transportation improvements, growing transportation costs only make the situation worse.
- Housing affordability has an impact across the board for any region, in that people have to spend more and more on housing and less on other activities.
- The U.S. Census Bureau definition for a cost-burdened household: the conventional public policy indicator of housing affordability in the U.S. is the percent of income spent on housing. Housing expenditures that exceed 30 percent of household income have historically been viewed as an indicator of a housing affordability problem.
- Map depicting the cost burden of renters by MSA:
 - The measure counts the number of households where the median rent (the typical rent) as a share of the median (or typical) household income in an MSA is greater than 30%.
 - There was not a single minor statistical area (MSA) where the typical renter household wasn't cost burdened.
 - The cost-burden rate of households ranged from 41% of households in MSA 1.2 up to 69% in MSA 5.1.

- 18 MSAs had rates that were 60% or higher, with 69% occurring in MSA 5.1 where a large percentage of the population are on fixed incomes and significant amount are age 65+ households.
- Map depicting the cost burden of homeowners by MSA:
 - The measure counts the households where the median (or typical) share of homeownership costs as a share of the median (or typical) household income in an MSA is greater than 30%.
 - The rate ranged from 33% of households that were cost burdened in MSA 7.5 up to 64% in MSA 5.1.
 - 10 MSAs had rates that were over 50%.
- Map showing the cost burden of all households by MSA:
 - The measure combines the number of both renter and owner households.
 - The rate ranged from 41% of households in MSA 1.2 up to 68% in MSA 5.1 that were cost burdened.
 - 23 MSAs had rates that were over 50%.
- Map illustrating the transportation cost burden of households by MSA:
 - The measure compares estimated transportation costs by MSA from the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT) with the countywide Area Median Income (AMI) published by U.S. HUD.
 - At 15%, a household is considered cost burdened.
 - Every MSA had a transportation cost burden rate in excess of 15%, ranging from a low of 16% in MSA 4.7 to a high of 28% in MSA 5.7.
 - It is basically a factor of the distance travelled from people's homes to their work.
 - Only one MSA was located on the fringe that had a lower measure than the others, namely Doral, which may be due to its large employment center.
- Chart showing countywide trends of cost-burdened renter and owner households from 1990 to 2016:
 - Long before the bubble, however, nearly half of renter households and one-third of owner households were cost burdened.
 - While the numbers have improved modestly recently, more than three out of five renter households and two out of five owner households remain cost burdened.
- Chart showing countywide trends of cost indices for income, rent, home values, and construction costs:
 - The values of each variable was set to 100 in the year 2000 in order to facilitate a direct comparison of the change in the values over time.
 - From 2000 to 2016, construction costs increased over 55%; rent increased 86%; and home values increased 134%--in contrast to household income increasing only 28%.
- Comparisons showing the annual growth rate of jobs from 2010 to 2016 and the 2016 average annual wage by Miami-Dade County Sector:
 - Average annual wage in the County in 2016 was \$60,210.
 - Only 2 of the 10 fastest growing sectors paid an average annual wage greater than the county average.
 - The two were the very small mining and extraction sector, and the much larger professional, scientific and technical services sector.
 - The weighted average annual wage for the jobs created between 2010 and 2016 was just \$33,434--nearly \$27,000 per year below the 2016 countywide average.

- If one could find it, this annual income would be approximately enough to support the purchase of an approximately \$115,000 house.
 - Shows that the majority of growing industries are low-paying jobs.
 - The largest industry in terms of employment in 2016 was health care and social assistance. The 2016 average annual wage was \$31,984.
 - This annual income would be approximately enough to support the purchase of a \$112,000 house
 - The arts, entertainment and recreations sector grew 3.3% per year between 2010 and 2016. The 2016 average annual wage was \$44,928.
 - This annual income would be approximately enough to support the purchase of a \$155,000 house
 - The highest wage sector among the top-ten-fastest-growing sectors (excluding mining) was professional, scientific and technical services. The 2016 average annual wage was \$95,648.
 - This annual income would be approximately enough to support the purchase of a \$325,000 house
 - However, the median single-family home sales price in 2016 was \$328,000.
- Other factors affect affordability besides simply supply and demand functions, such as:
 - Residential construction costs
 - Psychological price momentum – a term coined by Case Schiller, alluding to how consumers feed into this by perceptions
 - International investors – especially in Miami-Dade County.
 - Speculative investors
 - Amenities – factors like if someone wants to live by a park or by the bay
 - Densities
- Solutions to consider, such as:
 - Innovative zoning approaches
 - Effective inclusionary zoning
 - Enhance the quality of jobs including wages and productivity
 - Community land trusts
 - Public-private partnerships to leverage redevelopment projects
 - Transit improvements and TOD inside the infill area.

Task Force Discussion. Board member Pines inquired if the housing affordability in the County was a crisis. Mr. Armada replied that there definitely was a countywide affordability problem, and depending on who you spoke with, may vary from a housing epidemic to a housing issue. In response to board member Pines' inquiry, Mr. Armada defined effective inclusionary zoning as one that worked to produce a significant amount of units, i.e. 300 units a year, as opposed to producing something like 3 units a year. Mr. Armada reiterated that there was not one single solution to housing affordability in the County, but rather many tools that could be used to ameliorate the issue of affordability, such as community land trusts and public-private partnerships. Board member McElheny inquired if Mr. Armada had compared housing issues here in the County versus other cities. Mr. Armada replied that they have reviewed housing affordability in other areas, contending that the problem exists in nearly all areas, with it more pronounced in some areas than others. Board member Schwiep inquired if there were requirements in the RFPs on TODs to provide affordability housing. Ms. Brown responded that the County's Urban Centers

required 12.5% of the units to be set aside for workforce housing. Board member Hatcher asked for the definition of affordable versus workforce housing. Mr. Armada answered that workforce housing was 60 to 140% of the AMI, and affordable housing was 30 to 60% of the AMI, with Ms. Brown adding that the CDMP put it up to 80% of the AMI. Mr. Losner inquired what category Section 8 housing fell under. Mr. Armada explained that Section 8 housing depended on a person's income and it was a form of government housing assistance, with a qualified person paying towards the housing costs and the government making up the difference. Board Member Schwiep asked for countywide data on the number of cost-burdened renters and homeowners. Mr. Armada indicated that he would follow up with that information.

VII. Other Presentations (as requested by the Task Force): Ken Metcalf¹

Ken Metcalf is Planning Director at Stearns Weaver Miller and consultant for Wonderly Holdings, Inc. and Limonar Development, Inc, owners of over 480 acres of land within UEA No. 2. He provided a presentation on the County's Land Supply/Demand projections, including:

- Outlined his experience as a former administrator in the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity (formerly Department of Community Affairs).
- Outlined the requirements of CDMP Policy LU-8F and LU-8G and pointed out that Policy LU-8F calculates need countywide but Policy LU-8G identifies where that allocation should occur by Tier.
- Discussed the County's 2010 Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) including:
 - The EAR showed a depletion year of 2016 for single-family residential, a depletion year of 2026 for multi-family residential and a combined single family/multi-family residential depletion year of 2021.
 - Redevelopment capacity was included for the first time.
 - Outlined the priorities for accommodating residential demand.
- Mr. Metcalf provided his views regarding changes to the growth management laws as a result of the 2011 Community Planning Act including:
 - his interpretation that state law requires proportionate allocation of population density to the unincorporated area,
 - his interpretation that state law requires a minimum land use allocation of 10 years,
 - other considerations include job creation, capital investment, economic diversification, antiquated development patterns, planned development strategies and operation of the real estate market.
- Mr. Metcalf asserted that CDMP Policy LU-8F does not meet the requirements of Section 163.3177(1)(f)(3), Florida Statutes which, in his view, requires the County to maintain a 10-year supply throughout the time between Evaluation and Appraisal Reports. He recommends that the County adopt a 20-year horizon for land supply.
- Mr. Metcalf expressed his view that the County's methodology for allocating countywide population without regard for municipal boundaries does not meet the requirements of Section 163.3177(1)(f)(3), Florida Statutes which states that "Absent physical limitations on population growth, population projections for each municipality, and the unincorporated area within a county must, at a minimum, be reflective of each area's proportional share of the total county population and the total county population growth". In his view, this will require the County to allocate 44% of population growth to the unincorporated area. He

¹ 'Other Presentations' include presentations requested by the Task Force members. The information provided is the opinion of the presenter and does not represent the views of a particular governmental agency.

indicated that he does not necessarily recommend strictly separating incorporated and unincorporated areas but that the unincorporated area could be categorized as suburban since it is less dense. He further opined that the proportionate allocation of population growth is important because the needs of the urban core are different than suburban areas, building expensive units Downtown and on the beach do not address the County's affordable housing needs. He expressed concern that many parts of the unincorporated area consists of single-family subdivisions.

- Mr. Metcalf stated that the County should focus on policies that will reduce outmigration, such as those addressing traffic and affordable housing, then adjust the population projections to reflect a reduced outmigration based on the anticipated outcome of those policies.
- Board Member Renne asked Mr. Metcalf to summarize the crux of his arguments. Mr. Metcalf said the crux of his argument is that one size does not fit all, the allocation of population to the urban core should not limit the ability to have some allocation in the unincorporated area. Board Member asked if Mr. Metcalf's argument is that there needs to be an expansion of the UDB to accommodate a different type of housing demand. Mr. Metcalf indicated that Mr. Renne's characterization is correct. Board Member Renne asked whether Mr. Metcalf had done any analysis to see what impact UDB expansion would have on traffic. Mr. Metcalf indicated that he was only there to address housing affordability.
- Mr. Metcalf presented some statistics from a 2016 report by Richard Florida that showed that Miami-Dade County is one of the least affordable metro areas in the country.
- Mr. Metcalf presented some findings from the County's 2010 Evaluation and Appraisal Report including:
 - Uncertainty and instability due to the severe mismatch between the upscale housing production and the unmet affordable housing demand.
 - Affordable housing imbalance has been exacerbated by the loss of rental housing to conversion and decline in rental housing production.
 - Land Use and housing policy at the local level affects the expansion of housing supply, in particular in the affordable housing range.
- Mr. Metcalf expressed his view that the Urban Expansion Areas should be developed as urban nodes to help urbanize suburban areas such as Kendall. Board Member Green noted that this view is based on Mr. Metcalf's opinion rather than an interpretation of the facts. Mr. Metcalf agreed that it was his opinion but indicated that it is supported by the urban center and smart growth policies of the CDMP. Ms. Brown noted that these policies are currently focused on the areas within the UDB. Mr. Metcalf reiterated his opinion that an urban village in Kendall could provide capacity for growth and support transit and affordable housing. Mr. Armada clarified that it is not a given that development outside of the UEA will address housing affordability, it depends on the type of development.
- Mr. Metcalf noted that the land supply analysis includes sites that have remained vacant year-after-year and indicated that it is important to determine why. We need to focus more on market demand and housing cost relative to income. We need to match our housing demand by price with our housing supply. Mr. Armada clarified that there are a lot of reasons that a parcel can be passed over for many years then suddenly be identified for development.
- Board Member Schwiep noted that existing incorporated areas such as Hialeah, Florida City and Miami Gardens, which are located on existing transit corridors, have the potential

to provide affordable housing options. Board Member Renne noted that there is a lot of affordable housing in older suburbs near Downtown. Mr. Metcalf reiterated his opinion that the analysis should account for the housing cost regardless of where it is located.

- Mr. Metcalf pointed out that a lot of the capacity in Downtown Miami will be unaffordable for most of the County's residents.
- Mr. Metcalf noted that the County's 'Business and Office' land use designation allows for residential uses but it is unknown how many of those parcels will be developed with residential uses, this does not allow for an accurate capacity estimate for these parcels.
- Mr. Metcalf identified specific parcels that, in his opinion, would not development with the capacity projected in the County's capacity calculation. Mr. Metcalf stressed the need for realistic supply assumptions and noted some examples where, in his opinion, the supply assumptions do not align with the land use policies and on-the-ground conditions.
- Mr. Metcalf noted the need for large parcels in the County that can accommodate employment centers and economic clusters. He also stated that projects are often developed in phases, with later phases frequently never being built. He stated that it is important for the redevelopment component of the capacity analysis to match how redevelopment has actually been occurring.
- Mr. Metcalf expressed his opinion that the UEAs can be developed with an urban center type concept but a good amount of land would be needed to allow density to decrease from the core to the edge.
- Mr. Metcalf concluded by stating that the UEA's provide a lot of opportunities to implement the CDMP's objectives. The UEA's provide design flexibility because of the size of the properties.
- Mr. Metcalf reiterated that the County should review the statutory changes, and extend the planning horizon in Policy LU-8F so that we are not facing a 3-year UDB between Evaluation and Appraisal Report cycles.

***Task Force Discussion.** Board Member Reynolds asked about the age of the data and whether the projects could have been approved for mixed use. Mr. Metcalf responded that the data was provided by the County around November 2017 and that the parcels he was discussing were vacant and did not have approved projects. Board Member Reynolds noted that she was representing Friends of the Everglades and asked Mr. Metcalf whether he was being compensated for his presentation. Mr. Metcalf noted that he was being compensated by Wonderly Holdings and Limonar Development for his presentation.*

Ms. Brown announced that the last speaker, Mr. Michael Pizzi, had a prior obligation and had to leave, and will be rescheduled for the February 26th meeting. She introduced Mr. Andrew Frey to speak on urban infill issues.

VIII. Other Presentations (as requested by the Task Force): Andrew Frey²

Andrew Frey is a housing developer and member of the Urban Land Institute. He provided a presentation on Urban Infill, including:

- Mr. Frey introduced himself as a housing developer who has built at the edge of the UDB and in urban infill areas. He also noted that he lives in a single family home. He projects

² "Other Presentations" include presentations requested by the Task Force members. The information provided is the opinion of the presenter and does not represent the views of a particular governmental agency.

include Signature at Doral, Signature at Kendall, and a small scale project in Little Havana. He is also a Tri-Rail board member.

- Mr. Frey stated that, in his opinion, the county has not crafted a larger vision for how we want to grow and this has led to contention about the Urban Development Boundary. Mr. Frey advocated for a more technical, and less political, method of moving of the UDB.
- But the UDB is still an important tool.
- Regarding the idea of urban infill, he said the project he built in Little Havana is on a 5,000 sf lot, 3-stories, and 8 units, which equates to 70 DU/Ac which is a very high density. He said there is an entire spectrum of other scales of infill development historically built in Little Havana, Miami Beach, and downtown Coral Gables, but that scale of development has not been considered in recent decades.
- Mr. Frey stated that we should make decisions and policy recommendations based on accurate data. He stressed the importance of considering fiscal responsibility in development and taking into account infrastructure costs. He stated that there are a lot of things that we are not doing true-cost accounting for in terms of patterns of development. We need to consider what patterns of development pay for themselves and what patterns of development generate enough in property taxes to cover the services they need. If we need more supply, consider where it makes fiscal sense to accommodate that growth. He noted that the non-profit organization, Strong Towns, has done research on the issue of fiscally responsible development.
- Mr. Frey noted that the issue of fiscal responsibility also extends to our transportation system, where we have made extensive investments in transit over the last 30 years yet housing has been built a significant distance from these systems. This has created a situation where ridership is inadequate to financially support the system.
- Mr. Frey stated his opinion that the greatest driver of affordability is supply. He said it should consider all of the costs of living including transportation costs.
- In conclusion, Mr. Frey said he has built in urban areas and at the edge of the UDB, and believes that there is great capacity in midrise, midscale urban development. Regardless of where the capacity is located, it is important to utilize accurate data in order to make good decisions.

Task Force Discussion. Board Member Reynolds asked Mr. Frey if he is working on infill projects today or projects outside of the UDB. Mr. Frey replied that he is working on urban infill projects right now. He noted that there are different products for different stages in life or preferences. However, it ties back to the larger vision of what kind of County we want to be, what it will look like and what kind of development patterns are most fiscally responsible. The answer will be different for different people but those are the criteria we need to consider.

Board Member Schwiep asked who was paying him to be here today, and whether the Little Havana project required entitlements such as variances. Mr. Frey replied that no one paid for him to speak, and the Little Havana project did not require variances or rezoning. Board Member Green said Mr. Frey had been quoted as saying that Cincinnati was a model for urban development that Miami should emulate, and asked in what way we should model Cincinnati, and what is our path for doing so. Mr. Frey replied that he loves Cincinnati, particularly the Over-the-Rhine neighborhood and, although it is a neighborhood in flux and may change, he likes that it has found a way to adapt existing urban buildings with new investment, while remaining economically and racially diverse.

Board Member Clancy asked what kind of incentives the County could create to make it attractive for developers to build affordable or workforce housing. Mr. Frey replied that the most prolific affordable housing program in the County is the LIHTC (Low Income Housing Tax Credit) program. However, that program is dictated by the State and is on a point system of which Miami-Dade County is awarded 3 projects per year. He said those projects average about 100 units each, so we gain about 300 affordable housing units each year. There are other programs but they are not as prolific. But the problem of affordability is extreme as we have 250,000 or more “cost-burdened” households in Miami-Dade County. So if the best program is providing 300 units per year, how do we address the needs for the remaining households? He said he believes the only thing that can generate units for that number of households is the private sector, so market rate housing supply has to be the centerpiece of our affordability strategy. He said we should continue LIHTC, the surtax and other programs, but acknowledged that our regional housing strategy should focus on encouraging market rate housing supply.

Board Member Pines asked Mr. Frey what was the price point for the units he built. Mr. Frey replied they are all rental units, and was approximately \$1.65 per sq.ft. in Doral and Kendall, and \$2.00 per sq.ft. in Little Havana. Board Member Pines also asked what hurdles he may have faced in developing in the urban core. Mr. Frey stated that water and sewer infrastructure in the urban areas is older and sized for much lower density and is in need of upgrades. Mr. Frey replied that he had to upgrade the water main which cost approximately \$70,000, but was not a large expense in the overall project budget. He added that the County has a donation program for water & sewer infrastructure. However, the County accepts the donations as if it is an asset, but if you consider the operations, maintenance, repair and replacement of that infrastructure, the property taxes generated by the development that enables the infrastructure is often not an asset, but a liability. We are donating a loss to the taxpayers, so it is important to see which patterns of developments pay for themselves. Board members discussed the federal consent decree which requires the County to make improvements to the existing sewer infrastructure. Board Member Valderrama noted that the cost to extend infrastructure may be greater closer to the UDB when compared to the urban infill area.

Board Member Reynolds noted that the Seven50 Plan provides a snapshot of how people want growth in the County to occur, it is just a matter of how to get there. She then said that, when offered choices, most people overwhelmingly choose better transportation and mobility, and that requires infill development. Mr. Frey reiterated that certain products are right for certain people at certain times in their lives. He said that he respected the thought and effort that went into the Seven50 Plan, but it is not law. We have to take the Seven50 vision and not just put it into a document, but establish a set of laws and operational procedures that will carry the vision forward without a constant fight.

Board Member Pines asked if the discussion around water and sewer infrastructure referenced WASD’s integrated water and sewer master plan, and if it addresses aging infrastructure. Ms. Brown replied that, with respect to the aging infrastructure, there was a recent effort to review commercial and industrial areas and infrastructure needs in those areas to develop a capital plan and prioritization. Mr. Armada indicated that many of the needed improvements have dedicated funding but he does not know the timing of those improvements. Discussion ensued between Board Member Pines and Mr. Armada regarding the cost of connecting to infrastructure in the urban core. Mr. Armada noted that if a project is located within an Enterprise Zone, the developer can receive a refund of

connection fees. Board Member Pines noted that the cost of connecting to infrastructure gets passed on to the end-buyer.

Board Member Diaz noted that there may be County-owned land that could be used for affordable housing and specifically mentioned the land near Homestead Air Reserve Base that was deeded to the County by the federal government.

IX. Public Comment:

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

- Ms. Kate Tobin introduced herself as a representative of the Riviera Isles Blasting Committee and spoke about urban expansion in relation to rock mining. She lives in west Miramar, approximately 900 feet from a quarry operated by White Rock. She said that in addition to the physical damage blasting has caused to their homes, the psychological impact on vulnerable citizens such as the elderly, children, persons with special needs, and veterans with PTSD (post-traumatic stress disorder), should also be considered. She said the human response to ground vibrations has been studied for over 100 years, and have shown that humans perceive ground vibrations at levels much lower than vibrations that could cause structural damage. She has experienced first-hand the fear, anxiety and other impacts of blasting activity in close proximity to their homes; this has affected their community for two decades and the industry's political clout has protected them from any effective oversight or consequences for their actions. When her time expired, she asked that additional documents (studies on the effect of blasting on humans and 4 emails from residents) be added to the record.
- Ms. Truly Burton, on behalf of the Builders' Association of South Florida (BASF), addressed workforce housing. She said her association has been very involved in this issue and has addressed it with the County. In regards to the earlier discussion of definitions, workforce housing is a relatively recent term. Miami-Dade County has its own definition, and HUD (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development) defines others, "affordable," "low," "moderate," etc. There is no federal definition for workforce housing (note: HUD is a federal agency). Second, the program has a limited set of incentives. She said BASF presented 10 incentives to the Commission sponsor but only got two approved: density, and certain things by right. She said that we cannot have an arsenal of one; we need to have a variety of options because every project is different. Typically, 28% of any home price is in government fees, such as building permits, development approvals, testing, compliance with regulatory issues, etc. For example, 28% of a \$350,000 home is \$90,000. That is a very important cost driver. They have asked the BCC to reduce or eliminate those fees, but they said they have no budget. She also said she constantly hears there is a crisis in affordability, which means we need to increase the density immediately in appropriate areas, along transit lines, and expand the UEA to add more land into the master plan. Ms. Burton noted that having more tools in the toolbox would help to increase workforce housing. She indicated that she will provide the list of the incentives developed by BASF.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:18 pm.