

APPROVED
AFFORDABLE HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MIZELL CENTER – 1409 NW 6 STREET
2ND FLOOR AUDITORIUM
MONDAY, JANUARY 24, 2011 – 8:45 A.M.

Cumulative Attendance

Committee Members	Attendance	7/10 through 6/11	
		Present	Absent
Janet Riley, Chair	P	5	1
Jonathan Jordan, Vice Chair	P	5	1
Margie Alexander	P	6	0
Jason Crush	P	3	2
Bradley Deckelbaum	A	3	3
Peter Henn	P	6	0
Edwin Parke	A	0	1
Brian Poulin	P	5	1
Amanda Spangler (arr. 8:53)	P	3	2
Rebecca Jo Walter	P	3	3
Roosevelt Walters	P	6	0

Staff

Susan Batchelder, Liaison, Community Development
Angelia Basto, Clerk / Typist III, Housing and Community Development
Barbara Hartmann, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to the City Commission

None.

Roll Call

Ms. Batchelder called the meeting to order at 8:48 a.m. Roll was called and it was noted a quorum was present.

Board / Staff Introductions

None.

Approval of Minutes – November 15, 2010 & December 20, 2010

Motion made by Mr. Walters, seconded by Mr. Henn, to approve the November 15, 2010 minutes. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Mr. Walters advised that because there was no quorum at the December 20, 2010 meeting, the minutes cannot be called minutes but are more accurately

called notes. He made a **motion**, seconded by Mr. Henn, that the notes from the December 20 meeting be approved. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Affordable Housing Strategic Implementation Plan

- **Proximity of New Development**

Mr. Jordan distributed copies of his draft report and asked the Committee members to review the document. He requested that they could email any comments on the draft to Ms. Basto's office.

He explained that the document suggests there are existing properties in the City's inventory which could be made available to developers. There is also a recommendation to locate future housing close to existing and/or future transit corridors as determined by the Broward County Long-Range Transportation Plan.

Mr. Henn asked if Mr. Jordan had addressed issues such as an affordable housing overlay district from a zoning/land use point, or if the focus was entirely on affordable housing aspects. Mr. Jordan said his report is more general, and pointed out that there must be available land and appropriate zoning for affordable housing. Additionally, the infrastructure to support additional housing, transportation, and utilities must be in place.

Ms. Spangler arrived at 8:53 a.m.

- **Infill Strategies**

Ms. Walter recalled that Staff had been asked to provide a list of suitable City-owned properties on which affordable housing could be built. Ms. Batchelder said the City is currently focusing on properties that are not suitable for construction. She said she could arrange for a Staff member to attend the March 2011 meeting and review these properties.

She added that Community Development is working with the Economic Development Department on a marketing plan for these properties. She will let the Committee know when this issue is scheduled to appear before the City Commission again.

Ms. Alexander asked for further clarification on why some of the City's properties were not appropriate for affordable housing. Ms. Batchelder explained there are several properties owned by the City, but the lots being sold by the City cannot be built upon because they are too small, landlocked, or have insufficient access. These properties are being sold in order to get them back on the tax rolls if

possible. She said this did not mean the City was “eliminating” affordable housing, but meant these properties cannot be built upon for various reasons.

Mr. Henn recalled that when the list of City properties was presented to the City Commission, he had suggested dividing it into three categories:

- Sites that the City needs for government purposes;
- Sites that should be sold at a reasonable market value;
- Sites that could be used for affordable housing opportunities.

He proposed that when the list is finalized, the Committee should suggest to the Commission that some sites are appropriate for affordable housing. He offered to help Ms. Alexander prepare her final report on infill strategies.

Ms. Spangler advised that it would be best to make specific recommendations in the form of bullet points: for example, she suggested the report could say that all residential infill lots taken over by the City could be used for affordable housing. They could be donated to a nonprofit or sold to a small developer at a discount; if they are sold at market rate, the money could go into a fund for affordable housing.

Chair Riley said the format for the report should be uniform, and agreed that a bullet point format may be best. Mr. Henn said the goal is to make recommendations and have Staff and the City Attorney’s Office review the document.

Communications to the City Commission

None.

Other Business

Ms. Walter said for the past two years, the Committee has been tasked with preparing reports and plans. She suggested that they could decide on one item per meeting that they could implement and take to the City Commission. She said this might be a list of basic resolutions that would help the City move in the right direction from the Committee’s point of view.

Ms. Spangler asked if the Committee is supposed to evaluate what the City is doing with regard to affordable housing. Ms. Walter said when the new resolution was passed to establish the Committee, it stated that they were to “review and make recommendations.” She felt they should take a more active role, and suggested that the members consider what this role might be.

Ms. Batchelder said on February 3, the City will hold its planning meetings for Community Development Block Grants (CDBGs) and federal home dollars. The

public is invited to this meeting; however, very few members of the public usually attend, so not many comments are generated at the meetings. She suggested that interested Committee members could attend and add their comments to the public record.

Ms. Batchelder said the City receives four entitlement grants: roughly \$2 million in CDBG, \$1 million in HOME partnership, \$100,000 in Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG), and the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS, which is administered for the County. The planning meetings will discuss these grants.

Ms. Walter asked if the public could give input on the selection process for these grants. Ms. Batchelder said the selections are made by an advisory board, and there is "an application process that is dictated by HUD." She said the application process is made as fair and equitable as possible.

Ms. Walter said it was clear to her the previous year that the application process was not done fairly. She stated there were possible conflicts of interest with some members of the deciding advisory board. Ms. Batchelder explained that while she understood this concern, it was not possible to dictate how members were to score applicants.

Ms. Walter said the advisory board should determine how they would score the applicants before the meeting and not during. Ms. Batchelder said this process has "already been revamped." Ms. Walter concluded she would share her concerns at the upcoming planning meeting.

Mr. Poulin suggested that the members determine "some very concrete plans" on how to finish the report over the next month or two, so the Committee's focus could then be shifted to other activities. He expressed concern that there was "no plan" to complete the report.

Mr. Henn noted there are five sections to the report, and "some materials" are complete for these sections. He suggested that a volunteer could cut and paste these materials together; this compiled draft could be distributed to Staff prior to the next meeting. The members would then review and comment on the draft document at the next meeting, and a completed draft could be prepared in advance of the following month's meeting. He felt the report should be the Committee's first priority, as there will be a report due for the State Housing Initiative Partnership (SHIP) by the end of 2011.

Mr. Henn asked Ms. Spangler if she could compile a one-page list of what the Committee has discussed. Ms. Spangler said she could do this, but recommended that it would be best if all the members compiled a list as well.

Mr. Henn explained that due to the Sunshine Law, members are not allowed to discuss Committee business outside official meetings. He said he could send a document to Staff, who could distribute copies to the members; members could comment on the document and return it to Staff.

He proposed that the next Committee meeting could convene at an earlier time and hold a “joint draft session” to work on the draft report. The other members agreed with this suggestion. They discussed the format for the report.

Mr. Henn asked that everyone on the Committee send “whatever you want Staff to consolidate” in the report to Staff by Friday, January 28. This could be compiled into a draft document, which the members could work on further at home prior to the next meeting. These documents could then be sent back to Staff to be included in the agenda package for the next meeting. This would allow all the members to see each other’s suggestions.

Ms. Spangler suggested including a final category of “other” for recommendations that do not fit within the existing categories.

It was decided that the next Committee meeting would be held on February 14, 2011, at 8:00 a.m. Notice of the change would be posted for the public.

Good of the Order

None.

Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 9:28 a.m.

[Minutes prepared by K. McGuire, Prototype, Inc.]