

**URBAN EXPANSION AREA TASK FORCE
MEETING SUMMARY
Monday, February 26, 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 | Absent |
| Ashley McElheny | Florida East Coast Chapter of Associated Builders & Contractors | Absent |
| Erin Clancy | Tropical Audubon Society | Absent |
| William Delgado | Latin American Business Association | Present |
| Enid Washington Demps | Community Council 15 | Present |
| Alex Diaz | Community Council 11 | Absent |
| Nick Diaz | Property Owners' Representative for the Eastern UEA | Present |
| 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 | Present * |
| Thomas Hawkins | 1000 Friends of Florida | Absent |
| James Humble | Agricultural Practices Advisory Board | Present |
| Matt Johnson | Biscayne National Park | Absent |
| Robert Johnson | Everglades National Park | Absent |
| Yesenia Fatima Lara | Community Council 14 | 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 | Absent |
| 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 Demps left at 3:25.
Board member Delgado left at 3:28.
Board member Ventura left at 4:02.

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

Other Miami-Dade County and Government Staff

Craig Grossenbacher, RER-Division of Environmental Resources (DERM); Charles LaPradd, RER-Agricultural Manager; Shailendrah Singh, Planning Section Supervisor, Development Services Division; and Dennis Kerbel, Assistant County Attorney.

I. Attendance

Ms. Stillings called roll of the members, 15 members were present. The meeting commenced at 1:11 pm.

II. Welcome

Miami-Dade County Commissioner Javier D. Souto, District 10, welcomed the members of the Task Force to the Westchester community and reinforced the importance of their efforts.

Approval of the December 18, 2017 Meeting Summary

Board Member Pines stated that he has provided recommended changes to the meeting summary and would recommend deferring approval until staff and the other Task Force members have had an opportunity to review those changes. Board Member Reynolds asked that the proposed changes be forwarded to the entire board; Ms. Ms. Brown agreed to do so.

Motion. Board member Pines made a motion to defer the January 5, 2018 meeting summary until the next meeting, after review of Board member Pines' comments. Board member Losner seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously as follows:

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--------|---------------------|--------|
| Kerri Barsh | Absent | James Humble | Yes |
| Ashley McElheny | Absent | Matt Johnson | Absent |
| Erin Clancy | Absent | Robert Johnson | Absent |
| William Delgado | Yes | Yesenia Fatima Lara | Absent |
| Enid Washington Demps | Yes | Maria Lievano-Cruz | Yes |
| Alex Diaz | Absent | Bill Losner | Yes |
| Nick Diaz | Yes | Francisco Pines | Yes |
| 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 |

III. Staff Coordinator's Report

Ms. Brown announced that the primary purpose of today's meeting was to discuss the results from the survey that was distributed to the taskforce members. She had received 15 surveys, from a total of 26 appointed members, but had hoped for 100% participation, and the taskforce could discuss the survey format or other issues before discussing the results. Board Member

Losner asked who compiled the questions for the survey. Ms. Ms. Brown replied that the survey questions followed the charge of the taskforce as set out by the Mayor's memo in creating the taskforce, but staff is available to answer any questions they may have. She said there may be more time to complete the survey and their input would be incorporated into the final report of the taskforce; and others will be able to resubmit their comments.

Board Member Losner opined that the survey was premature and should have been completed at the end of the taskforce. Ms. Brown replied that the taskforce will sunset in mid-May, and we are getting close to that date. Board Member Green agreed with Board Member Losner, but believed that the taskforce is not on track because it has not had sufficient open discussion. He said they should look at each of the UEA areas individually and then discuss/decide what information they would need pertaining to that area. He felt that most of the topics presented have not directly addressed what they need to know about each area, nor has it given them an opportunity to discuss amongst themselves the issues. Board Member Reynolds said that the survey had a deadline and should have been completed within that timeframe. Board Member Pines agreed with Board Members Losner and Green, specifically the need to determine the depletion and supply analysis that was discussed at the last meeting, and there are still pending documents from staff. He said their role is to determine need and expansion, and how those areas are to be used when the need arises. Ms. Brown replied that we have the staff in attendance to answer those questions. Board Member Rutzke also agreed that the survey was premature and the taskforce needed more information in order to accurately complete the survey. He asked if the first survey would be discarded if they resubmit a new survey. Ms. Brown replied yes, and that the revised survey would be submitted in the report.

Board Member Losner made a motion that release of the survey be held as "pending" and not be released until further information is received from the remaining meetings. Ms. Brown replied that the survey gives us input to discuss at the meetings, and will help to ferret out additional information. Board Member Washington Demps stated that she had already completed the survey and did not want it to have been a waste of her time. Board Member Schwiep asked if there had been any pushback on completing the survey before the deadline. Ms. Brown replied that there had not, and noted that some people contacted her with questions, to which she was able to guide them through the survey. Board Member Reynolds disagreed that they be discarded and suggested that an extension would be better, and the taskforce could use the surveys as an interim step and for those who want to resubmit their comments. Ms. Brown replied that three weeks should be enough time to incorporate revised survey results into the final report.

Board Member Losner reiterated that his motion is to have the survey pending until we get more information and not to throw it out. Board Member Gomez expressed his opinion that compiling survey results just results in a report and not actual recommendations. He said the taskforce has not had enough discussions to come to a consensus and draft a document that would provide a clear direction. He said they should have open discussion and have a formal recommendation and not just a response to a survey.

Mr. Dennis Kerbel, Assistant County Attorney, addressed the difference between the survey and creating a set of recommendations the board would vote on as a body. He explained

there is a limitation on the board's ability to vote on recommendations as a result of an ethics opinion from Mr. Joe Centorino, Commission on Ethics, since there are property owners and other interested parties on this board who, under state ethics rules, could be prohibited from voting on issues or recommendations that could affect their interests. And this is why at the end of this process there will be a series of surveys that staff will compile into a document that can be shared with the PAB and the BCC. It will guide them in their recommendations as the Evaluation and Appraisal Report goes forward. This is a limitation of State ethics laws that we cannot control. Board Member Gomez asked when this came into effect because he has sat on other boards that have formulated recommendations. Mr. Kerbel replied that this board is unique because it includes property owners who are actually affected by the regulations. So there are limitations in state ethics laws that we cannot get around. The opinion by Mr. Centorino was limited as to whether this taskforce is, or is not, a county board—which it is not—and there is not enough time left in this process to obtain an opinion from the State as to their ability to vote.

Board Member Reynolds asked whether Mr. Centorino's opinion was provided to the Task Force members. Ms. Brown replied that it was included in the email with the survey. Board Member Delgado replied that he remembers over 20 years ago there was a similar task force in South Dade to deal with the UDB and they provided recommendations to the BCC; but today we have a taskforce that has less power because we are now turning in surveys. It would have been better to sit at the table in like-minded groups and come up with compromises that could be provided to the BCC. Other than that he doesn't see a solution to this problem, but he supported Mr. Losner's motion. Ms. Brown replied that she hopes that we will find points of agreement through our conversations and that no one will feel that their recommendations were not important.

Board Member Green suggested that we conceive of this survey as an initial straw vote as to where there is currently agreement and to help future discussions, then submit another survey that would either confirm their earlier position, amend their previous position, or be considered as a first time submittal. Mr. Kerbel replied that a lot of what was said could work. A straw vote presents the same problem as a final vote, and was hopeful that through this discussion the points of agreement and disagreement would be apparent and that would lead to the discussion, but unfortunately, a vote is a vote, and the taskforce is limited by those rules. Mr. Jerry Bell, Assistant Director for Planning, replied that staff will schedule a charrette/visioning exercise next month, to allow more of the type of discussion and different perspectives they seek. He said the staff was unaware at the outset that the taskforce would have this issue with voting, and expressed that staff wants their input and that can be done via the survey and charrette process.

Board Member Grosso asked if the recommendations would be synthesized into themes or proposals that have emerged from the survey results. Ms. Brown replied that they would. Board Member Schwiep replied that he understood there may be financial conflicts of interest for property owners voting, but asked for those who don't own property why they cannot vote. Mr. Kerbel replied that if the owners can't vote on these items it would defeat the purpose of the board. He said the purpose is to get a sense of all of the stakeholder's views and the taskforce was designed to include representation from property owners on the board. So if they can't vote on the item, their voice would be eliminated, and that would present an issue

about what the ultimate recommendation would be. So in order to assure that everyone's views are heard and assessed during this process, they need to have surveys and staff will filter the results into a final report. He said that because of the ethics opinion there cannot be a vote on the final report. But it opens up the opportunity of a visioning session as long as this board is concluded within 364 days of when the board was formed which was May 16, 2017.

Board Member Losner stated that he felt staff has a deadline and is pushing the taskforce to fulfill the report before they are ready to do so. Board Member Humble said he agrees with the motion on the floor. Board Member Garcia said it would have been helpful to have reviewed the questions before filling them out.

Board Member Valderrama expressed that he also expected more dialogue and debate and said the survey questions are not yes or no answers but have grey areas. He had read some of the infill reports from 1997 and said that all of the recommendations made then are still there and have not been put into place. He asked rhetorically what he would do, as a commissioner, with a pie chart of percentages on how people voted on a survey, and how would that be used constructively. He said he has been on other boards that have been very involved and had presented detailed information, and the BCC were still challenged to respond; if we are just filling out a check list, he didn't understand what was accomplished. Mr. Bell replied that is the reason staff was considering a charrette/workshop, to encourage dialogue and debate and to receive their input. Board Member Reynolds, for clarification, asked if the survey was just a tool to get them to a recommendation that staff would put together for the BCC. Mr. Kerbel replied that it will not be a recommendation from the taskforce, but would be similar to the format of a charrette. Board Member Pines noted that a West Kendall charrette was previously conducted for the West Kendall area and asked that the Preface and 'Statement of Legislative Intent' portion of the CDMP be circulated to the board. Ms. Brown agreed to do so.

Board Member Schwiep reiterated the process and said the survey results are already there for the public record and asked what the point of the motion was. Ms. Brown asked Board Member Losner for clarification on the motion. Board Member Losner replied that the motion is that the survey be held pending and not be incorporated into the study until they have further information. In response to an inquiry from Board Member Leviano-Cruz, Mr. Kerbel stated that if a taskforce member owns property within that particular UEA they could not vote, but if no one owned property in the UEA they could. Board Member Leviano-Cruz then suggested that those members recuse themselves from voting. Mr. Kerbel replied that they could, but that was not the point of this body; he said the point of this body was to include property owners, so it would be an issue if they could not vote on the recommendations. Board Member Leviano-Cruz then suggested that the board take motions on each UEA and make a recommendation as to what should occur within that UEA and to look at the policies and comment on those as well. She felt the taskforce was not able to deliberate or suggest what they would like to see in UEA 1 or 2, and all they had was a survey which was at times confusing. She hoped that going forward they could vote on each UEA and if there was a conflict that member would recuse themselves, but submitting the report would not be reflective of what this board feels.

Mr. Kerbel replied that a vote on each UEA is possible if there are no property owners included. He said the problem the taskforce faces is that the board, by design, included people who technically and legally have a conflict because they are voting on something that directly affects their property. It would defeat the purpose of the task force if those people cannot vote on the recommendations. He suggested that a charrette-type process would allow for discussion on the issues while avoiding a formal vote. Discussion ensued between Board Member Humble and Mr. Kerbel regarding what could constitute a financial conflict.

Board Member Ventura asked for clarification of the motion and its pending status. He said they completed the survey and it is already public record; it is not the end of the process, and there is more process to follow, all of which would be made public and the recommendations will go to the PAB and BCC, so before voting on the motion he wanted to know what “pending” means. Board Member Losner reiterated his point again and agreed that the surveys are public information, but said it is also on the record that others thought the survey was not thorough enough, and therefore the survey should be held pending rather than being encompassed in the study. Ms. Brown replied that staff is amenable to considering the survey results preliminary until it’s incorporated into the final report.

Board Member Gomez inquired about how revised surveys would be incorporated into the final report. Ms. Brown replied that any member can resubmit a survey and that amended survey will be the one to be included in the report. Board Member Pines asked if they could go through each UEA, determine where the conflicts are, then vote on the ones that do not have a conflict. Ms. Brown deferred to Mr. Kerbel, who replied if no one has a direct financial conflict, there would be no problem with the vote. Board Member Losner said as the Dade County Farm Bureau member he represents owners, so why would that not be a conflict. Mr. Kerbel replied that the opinion Mr. Centorino issued applied to those who have a direct financial conflict in the outcome of the vote. Board Member Garcia asked if there was a list of which board members own property that may present a conflict of interest. Ms. Brown replied that with ethics issues people need to be self-governing and consult with the ethics office if there is a questions about whether a particular interest would represent a conflict.

Motion. Board member Losner made a motion to hold the results of the survey received so far and consider as preliminary until the Board considers them final at a subsequent meeting. Board member Pines seconded the motion. The motion passed 15 to 1 as follows:

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

| | | | |
|----------------|--------|------------------|-----|
| Mike Hatcher | Absent | Erick Valderrama | Yes |
| Thomas Hawkins | Absent | Larry Ventura | Yes |

IV. Other Presentations (as requested by the Task Force): Michael Pizzi¹

Michael Pizzi is a local attorney. He provided a presentation on the impact of rock mining operations on residential uses, including:

- Mr. Pizzi urged the task force to seriously consider the compatibility of residential uses in proximity to mining.
- Mr. Pizzi recounted his personal experience with the impacts of the blasting associated with rock mining operations including his daughter’s crib shaking. He lamented the fact that nothing has changed in the approximately 30 years since he experienced these issues. He noted that his neighbors have noticed cracks in their homes.
- Mr. Pizzi provided a study by Lampl Herbert Consultants that was conducted for the State Fire Marshall which documented 53 complaints in 2013, 63 complaints in 2015, and 239 complaints in 2016. He discussed resident efforts to end blasting in Homestead, Country Club and Miramar including resident petitions.
- Mr. Pizzi read from a 2016 Miami Herald article that quoted Luis Dominguez, a U.S. veteran, who stated that the blasting transports him back to the combat zone. His wife who has Alzheimer’s disease becomes scared and confused when she hears blasting.
- Miami-Dade County created a blasting task force to study the effects of mining and issue a report. The blasting task force issued recommendations for consideration by the Board of County Commissioners. Shortly afterwards, the State of Florida amended jurisdiction over mining activity which had the effect of removing local authority over regulating blasting. Mr. Kerbel confirmed that Miami-Dade County cannot regulate blasting.
- In his opinion, the blasting standards that the State has established are insufficient.
- Mr. Pizzi urged the task force to consider the concerns of residents as it relates to blasting as they consider the expansion of residences near mining.

V. Scheduled Presentation: UEA Task Force Survey Results

Ms. Brown presented an overview of the results of the UEA Task Force Survey, including:

- 15 members out of 26 appointed members have participated thus far.
- The survey followed the relevant CDMP texts and highlights the most important considerations with regards to the purpose of the Task Force.
- State law requires a ten year supply of land for continued development. The UDB is not permanent line, at the same time the 2030 UDB line can be misconstrued as areas that will be brought into the UDB within the long-range planning horizon. Perhaps there is a better way to present the UEA’s and the process for including those UEA’s into the UDB.
- **CDMP Policy LU-8F.** The UDB should contain developable land having capacity to sustain countywide residential demand for a period of 10 years after adoption of the most recent evaluation and appraisal report plus a five year surplus. The estimation of this capacity shall include the capacity to develop and redevelop around transit stations at the densities recommended in Policy LU-7F.

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.

Ms. Brown highlighted the survey comments related to Policy LU-8F including recommendations to expand the supply to 20 years and others to retract it to 10 years. Board member Pines inquired about obtaining updated land use and population figures. Mr. Armada replied that land use calculations are updated on almost a weekly basis, and a portion of that information was contained in an earlier presentation made to the Task Force. Mr. Armada explained that, based on population figures from 2013, there is currently more than a 10-year supply of residential land. He further explained that the County is working on updates to the population projections. Board member Pines expressed his doubts about how the Board could formulate a recommendation for Policy LU-8F without having the most current figures. Mr. Armada stated that the Board was tasked with other issues which they did not need the population figures and could make recommendations on. In response to Board member Valderrama's question, Ms. Brown responded that the Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) is conducted every seven years. Mr. Armada added that, even though the 15-year supply requirement is tied to the EAR, the land use analysis is performed in every CDMP cycle by MSA to determine the amount of land that is available, and that currently the estimated countywide depletion year is approximately 2029. Board Member Pines opined that the supply of residential units impacts housing affordability and reiterated the importance of having the most current population projections. Mr. Armada stated it would take approximately six to eight weeks to compile those figures, and Ms. Brown reiterated that waiting on those figures would leave little time for the Board to discuss those results.

Board member Schwiep stated that the 50% calculation used in the methodology calculation did not make sense. He further questioned if the SMART plan was included in the calculation as there was a CDMP policy regarding an increase in density around transit stations. Mr. Armada responded that the SMART plan was still ongoing, and that the 50% calculation figure was to insure that the methodology was not overly optimistic and to recognize that some developments might not materialize. Mr. Armada added that the methodology would be examined along with any other changes that might happen, during the EAR process. Board Member Reynolds asked to see the capacity calculation with the 50% reduction for major approved projects and without the reduction. Board member Green opined that projections and policy were not two static items, but dynamic; that if the policy is changed, the projections were then changed. Board Member Losner asked for clarification on the land supply requirement. Mr. Armada explained that for land supply the state requires 10 years, the County self-imposed a 15-year requirement, and currently the land supply was due to run out in approximately 2029. Board member Lievano-Cruz inquired if the capacity was broken down between single-family and multi-family residential housing units. Mr. Armada answered that the overall supply for the depletion year was combined, and that figure could be broken down between single-family and multi-family residential housing. Board member Valderrama inquired if the figure could be broken down by MSA, and Ms. Brown responded that information was previously provided to the Board in a map.

Board member Reynolds questioned the difference between the state requirements in Chapter 163 of Florida Statutes and the County's requirements for land supply. Ms. Brown reiterated that the state law required 10 years, but that the County requirement is for 15 years. Ms. Brown added that the state law does not have requirements for how the

capacity calculation are conducted, and that the County's capacity calculations were very stringent. Board Member Reynolds inquired about the source of the population figures. Mr. Armada stated that the County used its own population figures, and not the state's figures from BEBR (Bureau of Economic and Business Research). In response to an inquiry from Board Member Reynolds, Ms. Brown confirmed that the capacity to accommodate population growth could be accommodated through infill development rather than moving the UDB. Board member Humble asked about housing prices and supply, and mentioned the influx of Puerto Ricans into the County. Mr. Armada replied that the influx of Puerto Ricans into the County up to now has been minimal, based on information obtained from the School Board and other sources. Mr. Armada explained that many factors affect housing affordability including location and personal taste, and it is not a simple formula of more housing supply equating to more affordable housing prices. Mr. Armada cited an analogy of unemployment theory equating people would leave places with high unemployment to seek better opportunities elsewhere. Mr. Armada explained that this has not been the case in Miami-Dade County, as people may not leave due to reasons such as family affiliations, language, childcare arrangements, and personal network.

Board member Diaz asked if there were any places left in the County to build low density single-family, or if this was becoming predominately apartments. Mr. Armada responded that although there is less land available than there was ten and twenty years ago, there is still land available in the south and west with the Lennar Company still building zero lot lines and townhomes. Mr. Armada responded that there were still opportunities for resale, and transitioning areas like Westchester which was built out and lost population between 2000 and 2010 due to an aging population and children leaving the home and moving elsewhere.

Board member Garcia asked if having the most current population figures would extend the May 2018 completion date for the Task Force. Upon hearing from Ms. Brown that it would not, Board member Garcia inquired if it was realistic for the Board to wait for the population figures in order to make decisions. Mr. Armada responded that he could obtain the current population figures within six weeks and added that the upcoming visioning/charrette session could be performed without having those numbers. Board member Garcia observed that the population figures would increase, and that the Board could move ahead with certain things without the current population figures. Board member Schwiep stated in regards to unexpected actions, how was the City of Miami's Miami 21 zoning code factored into capacity calculations. Mr. Armada responded that that no one could have imaged the intensity of redevelopment that occurred in that area. Mr. Armada added that entire redevelopment area had probably over 18,000 units waiting to be built, and that was it factored into the capacity calculations.

Ms. Brown reminded the members that the recommendations of the Task Force would be represented in the survey responses and asked that the motion clarify exactly what action was being delayed pending receipt of the population projections. Discussion ensued between Board Member Pines, Mr. Kerbel and Ms. Brown regarding the ability of the Task Force to vote on issues where there is clearly no conflict of interest. Ms. Brown explained that the purpose of creating the Task Force was to get the input of all the members on

these issues, and that it should not be parsed in that manner. Board member Pines stated that the conclusion of the survey should be delayed until current population figures were received from the County. Board member Hatcher mentioned that he had worked on numerous EARs and while the specific numbers used in the calculation might change, the most important consideration is the policies. Board Member Valderrama inquired if the capacity calculations would include Urban Centers and the SMART plan, and if it was broken up in brackets for certain types of household income. Mr. Armada responded that the figures were not done by income, but by MSA which takes that into account; and would include Urban Centers but not the SMART plan, which was still being completed. Board Member Valderrama's asked for details on how the final Task Force report would be structured. Ms. Brown clarified that she hoped to have a draft final report to the Board, for them to discuss the final report format. In response to Board Member Pines' query about the SMART Plan, Ms. Brown stated that the Transportation Planning Organization is working on the SMART plan, and might be recommending amendments for adjacent land uses to the corridors, and Mr. Armada estimated that some aspect might be completed by 2019. Board member Pines asked how many transit stations there are currently that would be considered as part of the analysis required under CDMP Policy LU-8F. Ms. Brown responded that Policy LU-7F related specifically to rail transit stations, and Mr. Armada added that perhaps as a result of the SMART plan more stations might be added. Board member Valderrama added that all those aspects regarding the SMART plan were still policy decisions, and that it could be many additional years before a person would actually be riding it.

Motion. Board member Pines made a motion to delay the deadline of the survey until the Department completes the population projections. Board member Lievano-Cruz seconded the motion. The motion passed 9 to 8 as follows:

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

Ms. Brown introduced the survey recommendation to conduct a separate needs analysis for the unincorporated area as part of Policy LU-8F. Ms. Brown stated that Staff felt Countywide projections, and not just UMSA, were the best way to account for Countywide growth considerations, and that the Department of Economic Opportunity has indicated that the County's methodology complies with state law. Board member Pines asked whether it would assist in determining the price point noting that the east side of the County

has a different price point than the west side. Mr. Armada noted that the capacity is calculated countywide and by MSA. He further noted that it cannot be compartmentalized by subgeography because people move around. Board Member Pines asked whether the computation separates single family and multi-family housing. Mr. Armada confirmed that it does and that the information can be provided. Board Member Pines requested to see the information separated by the east side and the west side of the County. Mr. Armada indicated that the information could be provided but noted that everything on the east side is not going to be high-priced.

Ms. Brown introduced the survey recommendation to reduce the required land supply in Policy LU-8F to 10 years. Board Member Garcia asked about how reducing the required land supply would impact the County's review cycles. Ms. Brown noted that the Evaluation and Appraisal Report will still occur every seven years and the required capacity would still be tied to that process. Board Member Garcia asked whether reducing the supply requirement would change the timing of the County's population projections. Mr. Armada responded that the County calculates the population projections about every four years and this would not change. He further noted that the County assesses the capacity every cycle even though Policy LU-8F links it to the time of the Evaluation and Appraisal Report and indicated that the Board of County Commissioners may consider this interim data in their decision about whether to move the UDB.

- **Policy LU-8F.** The adequacy of non-residential land supplies shall be based on land supply within the UDB. The adequacy of land supplies for neighborhood- and community-oriented business and office uses shall be determined on the basis of local subarea geography such as census tracts, minor statistical areas and combinations thereof. Tiers, half-tiers and combinations thereof shall be considered along with the countywide supply when evaluating the adequacy of land supplies for regional commercial and industrial activities.
 - Ms. Brown highlighted some of the survey comments including:
 - Note that it is not the intent that each subarea must continually increase development capacity.
 - Recognize need for employment centers
- **Policy LU-8G(i)(a).** The following areas shall not be considered: The northwest wellfield protection area located west of the turnpike extension between Okeechobee road and NW 25th Street.
 - Ms. Brown noted that there was 100% agreement among the survey respondents to retain the portion of the policy that relates to the Northwest Wellfield Protection Area.
 - Board Member Schwiep inquired about the timeline of the effort to update the boundaries of the wellfield protection areas for the Northwest and West Wellfields. Ms. Brown noted that the updates to the boundaries will likely take a couple of years to complete.
- **Policy LU-8G(i)(a).** The following areas shall not be considered: The West Wellfield protection area west of SW 157 Avenue between SW 8th Street and SW 42nd Street.

- Ms. Brown summarized the survey comments which recommend updating the policy once the wellfield protection areas are updated.
- Board Member Reynolds asked about the reason that the Policy Constraints Map was amended to only show a portion of the West Wellfield Protection Area. Ms. Brown noted that only a portion of the West Wellfield Protection Area is constrained by Policy LU-8G and noted that the map was corrected to reflect the area that is constrained by Policy LU-8G.
- **Policy LU-8G(i)(b).** The following areas shall not be considered: Water conservation areas, Biscayne aquifer recharge areas, and everglades buffer areas designated by the SFWMD.
 - Ms. Brown stated that CERP projects are currently identified as areas that “shall be avoided” but noted that the projects mentioned in Policy LU-8G(i)(b) are interrelated with CERP. Ms. Brown stated that the survey results included nuanced discussions about the specific CERP authorizations that should be considered in the policy. She provided the suggestion that areas identified in the CERP Restudy could be identified as areas that “shall be avoided” and projects that have advanced to a Project Implementation Report could be identified as areas that “shall not be considered”. Board Member Grosso expressed his support for moving CERP to areas that “shall not be considered”. Board Member Humble stated that very little of the CERP plan has been funded. He further stated that CERP should not be used as a reason to restrict development in south Dade County. He noted that agriculture is the primary activity in that area and it has declined over the years. He stated that the agriculture industry is heavily affected by federal policies including trade agreements. There is very little tomato industry. The nursery industry is only successful because there is no competition among imports. If the limitation on the importing of soil were to be lifted, the nursery industry would also decline. Restrictions on the importing of mamey and boniato has prevented competition among those crops. Agriculture is a business and when it no longer makes money, it will disappear. The only asset farmers have is their land. Board Member Humble stated that the area east of the L-31 canal is not part of the everglades and was not historically part of the everglades. He asked why this area would not be considered for urban development when there is very little land left. Board Member Humble expressed his opinion that the Homestead Air Reserve Base should purchase properties that they feel conflict with their mission rather than just recommending denial of development applications. Board Member Garcia stated that some of the areas in the everglades have been designated for farming and noted that this poses a problem when trying to restore the historic water flows. He also stated that many of the areas of the County were drained to allow for urban development and this also poses an issue when trying to restore the water. CERP is the process of trying to restore those historic water flows. Board Member Grosso stated that once farming is no longer economically viable it may justify changing the policy at that time. Until that time, the policy should reflect current conditions. He restated his opinion that CERP should be included as an area that “shall not be considered”. Board Member Grosso expressed his interest in taking a vote of task force members on whether CERP should be included as an area that “shall not be considered”. Discussion ensued regarding an opinion

from Joseph Centorino, Executive Director and General Counsel of the Miami-Dade Commission on Ethics and Public Trust and how it impacted the voting procedures of the task force. Mr. Kerbel clarified that procedural motions are acceptable but motions on certain substantive issues may run up against the issue that Mr. Centorino stated in his opinion. Ms. Brown stated that the survey and visioning session would be the primary mechanism for garnering the input of the members. Board Member Lievano Cruz suggested that each member submit a white paper. Ms. Brown stated that the survey would be expanded to ask the specific question of whether CERP should be included as an area that “shall not be considered”.

- Ms. Brown stated that state law allows the South Florida Water Management District to designate prime aquifer recharge areas but it has not done so to date.
- **Policy LU-8G(i)(c).** The following areas shall not be considered:
The Redland area south of Eureka Drive.
 - Ms. Brown noted that the boundaries of the Redland area have never been defined in the policy and highlighted the survey recommendation to define the boundaries. She indicated that the policy could be amended to utilize the boundary that was established in the Redland Preservation and Tourism Plan.
 - Board Member Rutzke stated that there is already hardship in farming and they need to have a way out once there is no money in farming. Board Member Garcia asked whether it would make sense to identify an area specifically for farming in order to protect it. He further stated that this would remove speculative interest among these property owners. Ms. Brown stated that the CDMP currently requires the County to take steps to reserve sufficient land to maintain an economically viable agricultural industry. She further noted that a report conducted by the County some time ago found that approximately 52,000 acres was needed to maintain an economically viable industry and we currently have between 57,000 and 58,000 acres remaining. Board Member Humble expressed his opinion that it is unfair to have policies that treat farmers differently. Discussion ensued regarding farming subsidies and Board Member Humble stated that farming in south Florida is not subsidized. Board Member Diaz stated that in UEA No. 3, very few farmers are producing and most property owners are just meeting the minimum requirements for an agricultural exemption.
 - Board Member Losner asked whether the policy would restrict development in the Redland area forever. Ms. Brown stated that it is the policy of the Board of County Commissioners and can be changed by the Board. Board Member Losner recommended that it be amended to specify that it is restricted until such time as agriculture is not economically viable but then further stated that farmers should not be singled out at all. He indicated that the Redland boundary is much larger than the area identified in the Policy Constraints Map. Board Member Green stated that agriculture cannot be viewed as a unitary enterprise. Some crops are no longer economically viable, however, farmers in the area have become inventive and found crops that are economically viable such as specialty crops. The decline of one type of crop does not mean that the whole area is in decline. We have different kinds of farmers, some are land speculators that just farm to maintain a tax exemption, some farmers see their land as their legacy, and some farmers

really enjoy the farming lifestyle. Board Member Losner recommended that the County separate out the 5-acre and 10-acre parcels that are home sites since this is primarily lifestyle farming. Commercial farming is not as big as you might think, the agricultural exemptions do not give a proper indication of the extent of commercial farming. Board Member Diaz stated that property owners in the agricultural area currently have the right to develop 5-acre ranchettes which would eliminate farming. Board Member Reynolds asked whether farming is occurring on smaller lots. Mr. Green stated that the median size of farms in Miami-Dade County is about 7.5 acres.

Task Force Discussion. Board Member Valderrama suggested that staff be mindful of how the survey results are being aggregated and summarized to make sure that they provide an accurate picture of the survey results. Discussion ensued regarding the possibility of clarifying the “amend” category to specify whether the recommendation made the policy more or less restrictive. Mr. Valderrama asked about the format of the remaining task force meetings. Ms. Brown stated that the remaining meetings will be used to continue discussion on the preliminary results of the surveys, then to conduct a visioning session then work toward a final report. Mr. Bell further stated that any organization that would like to submit a white paper is welcome to do so.

VI. Public Comment:

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

- Mr. Walter Vick identified himself as a landowner that is being represented on the Task Force by Board Member Nick Diaz. Mr. Vick expressed concern about Board Member Diaz not being able to vote on certain issues. Mr. Kerbel clarified that the task force has been structured in a manner that will specifically allow his input to be included. Mr. Vick stated that there is a proliferation of landfills near UEA No. 3 in the vicinity of the South Dade Landfill noting that Inland Marine purchased forty acres of land that they plan to use for spoil from the dredged channels. There is an entire block there that is nothing but landfills. On the east side of UEA No. 3 there is a gas line, there is a new sewer line coming in, all the infrastructure is basically in place. He noted that he received a letter related to eminent domain for SW 137th Avenue. Board Member Reynolds asked Ms. Brown to provide clarification on the use of land for spoil near UEA No. 3.
- Ms. Truly Burton, on behalf of the Builders’ Association of South Florida (BASF), stated that her members are concerned about the misdesignation of the Urban Expansion Areas. She noted that densities have not been significantly increased and housing affordability is ticking upward every year, much of this is due to the constrained amount of land we have. In order to provide urban centers, we need sufficiently large parcels that can accommodate those uses. That’s how you get self-sustaining employment centers.

Task Force Discussion. Board Member Valderrama noted that the County is building the West District Wastewater Treatment Plant that will redirect flows to the west to relieve pressure on some of the other treatment plants. He noted that this same concept can be applied to the urban expansion areas. Board Member Pines asked for aerial photography showing development around the Urban Expansion Areas such as Google Earth views. Ms. Brown noted that aerial photographs were provided previously but they can be revisited during the visioning session.

Ms. Brown announced that the next meeting will take place on March 19, 2018 at 1:00 at the South Dade Regional Library.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:19 pm.