

**APPROVED**  
**AFFORDABLE HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**MIZELL CENTER – 1409 NW 6 STREET**  
**2<sup>ND</sup> FLOOR AUDITORIUM**  
**TUESDAY, JANUARY 10, 2012 – 8:00 A.M.**

**Cumulative Attendance**

<b>Committee Members</b>	<b>Attendance</b>	<b>7/11 through 6/12</b>	
		<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Jason Crush, Chair	P	4	1
Bradley Deckelbaum, Vice Chair	A	3	2
Margie Alexander	A	2	3
Peter Henn	P	5	0
Jonathan Jordan	A	4	1
Michelle Klymko	A	3	2
Edwin Parke	P	5	0
Brian Poulin	P	4	1
Janet Riley (8:14)	P	5	0
Amanda Spangler-Bartle (8:11)	P	4	1
Rebecca Jo Walter	P	3	2
Roosevelt Walters	P	4	1

It was noted that a quorum was present at the meeting.

**Staff**

Diana McDowell, Liaison, Housing and Community Development Division  
Jonathan Brown, Housing and Community Development Manager  
Angelia Basto, Administrative Aide, Housing and Community Development  
Barbara Hartmann, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

**Communications to City Commission**

None.

**Roll Call / Determination of Quorum**

Chair Crush called the meeting to order at 8:09 a.m. Roll was called and it was noted a quorum was present.

**Approval of Minutes – December 19, 2011**

**Motion** made by Mr. Walters, seconded by Ms. Riley, to approve the minutes of the December 19, 2011 minutes. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

**Discussion on Goals and Work Plan**

Ms. Spangler-Bartle arrived at 8:11 a.m.

Mr. Henn advised that he had provided material to the Committee members to help provide an analytical framework for the number of affordable housing units that would be generated by the construction of 100 market homes. This figure is determined by the number of individuals who would build, maintain, and service these market units. He explained that this was one way the City Commission could determine the appropriate number of affordable housing units to be set aside.

The amount of the payment in lieu of affordable housing units would be relatively easy to determine by averaging the cost of these units constructed in the City during the last year, with adjustments for inflation if necessary. Mr. Henn noted that other methodologies for establishing the payment in lieu could also be used.

He continued that the City Attorney's Office has included a statement that this methodology seems to work; however, that Office was not certain that Staff has the expertise or resources to do the work at this time.

With regard to inclusionary zoning, he observed that it would be necessary to include a brief report to serve as backup material for any draft Ordinance that might be created. Mr. Henn provided an example of report for the members, although he pointed out that local data would need to be applied for a report specific to the City.

Ms. Riley stated that she had provided materials sent to her by an entity that does a great deal of work nationwide on inclusionary zoning. The material was thought to be the most applicable to the Committee's needs for supporting inclusionary zoning.

Mr. Walters recalled that he had recently seen a news article stating since inclusionary zoning has been applied in nearby municipalities, neither entity has collected any funds in lieu or seen the construction of any affordable units. He asked if any of Mr. Henn's or Ms. Riley's contacts had some idea why the policy did not seem to work in these municipalities. Ms. Riley said she understood this to be because there was a two-year moratorium on development in at least one town due to the current economy.

Mr. Henn commented that if an Ordinance setting aside units for affordable housing had been in place in Fort Lauderdale in the early 2000s, it would have likely generated either a handful of affordable units or a great deal of cash. He concluded that the reason the policy did not work for the two local municipalities was due to timing.

Ms. Walter added that she had never seen an empirical study showing that inclusionary zoning prevented development. She suggested that it was being used as an excuse in some local municipalities. Mr. Walters explained that he was concerned the Committee would send their recommendation to the City Commission, which might be under the impression that the policy was not working nearby and should not be instituted in Fort Lauderdale.

Chair Crush noted that a threshold size could be established for developments that would trigger the inclusionary zoning policy. He proposed that this number could be adjusted upward, as developments with a larger unit count would have a greater budget. The policy could also be enacted with an effective date two or more years in the future.

Ms. Spangler-Bartle stated that the Committee should act as advocates for affordable housing and ask for as much as possible, leaving the final decisions, such as thresholds or incentives, to the City Commission. She agreed that development has dropped off nationwide, and felt this could be made clear to the Commission so they did not believe the lack of development could be traced back to inclusionary zoning.

Mr. Henn pointed out that the City Commission had unanimously advised the Committee to proceed with inclusionary zoning rather than other methods, such as linkage fees. He added that the fact that few projects would be affected at present by the Committee's proposals would be one reason to enact policy now.

Ms. Walter said she did not agree with the City Attorney's Office that there were not sufficient resources for the Committee to achieve its goals. She observed that they could work with the data available to them, and suggested that there was sufficient information available to take a position and make recommendations. She cited sections of her materials that could benefit from additional data, noting that the members could work with Staff to amass as much information as possible.

Mr. Henn stated that the most important thing the Committee needs is data from 2011, as it would help show changes in the affordability gap. Ms. Walter added that they should also keep in mind that the incomes are median household incomes rather than the incomes of the average service worker in Fort Lauderdale. Mr. Henn reiterated that the reports would be needed primarily to withstand potential legal challenges.

The Committee members discussed various areas of research, including comparative market rates, the costs of different types of units, hard and soft costs, data specific to Broward County, and other information necessary to the report. Ms. Walter said she would provide a spreadsheet to the members so they

could add information to it prior to their next scheduled meeting. She noted that if data from 2011 may not yet be available, data from 2008-10 could be used.

Mr. Henn advised that the Committee's goal should be to let the City Commission set the number of affordable housing units necessary for a development and the payment in lieu associated with these units. Ms. Spangler-Bartle suggested that multiple options could be provided to the Commission in the report so they could select the most appropriate action.

Mr. Henn continued that Staff had provided a link to the City Commission's and City Manager's discussion of a vision for their plan, and pointed out that the Committee should ensure this plan was not inconsistent with the Committee's goals. Ms. Walter stated that she had seen a section of the draft RFP that dealt with a study the City would ask the consultant to produce; further drafts of the RFP's language would be forthcoming. She said she would ask for the next draft to be sent to all members of the Committee.

Chair Crush asked if Ms. Walter had seen the scope of the request in the RFP. Ms. Walter said the scope had appeared to be how much affordable housing was needed in the City, where it is currently located, and where it should be placed in the future. Chair Crush observed that this scope could lead to incorrect use of the study. Ms. Walter added that the study also hopes to define "the right mix" of incomes, which also concerned her. Chair Crush said this could also be used to prevent approval of affordable housing developments in certain areas. Ms. Spangler-Bartle recalled that the request for a study followed a discussion in which some City residents had been opposed to affordable housing in their neighborhoods, and the result could be "not only where should they put [affordable housing] but where shouldn't they put it."

Ms. Walter continued that she had seen nothing in the proposed scope that dealt with inclusionary zoning or provided any overlap with the Committee's work.

Mr. Walters asked if any other studies were underway by other cities or Broward County, as these would show that Fort Lauderdale is not the only city considering a place for low-income housing. Ms. Walter said she had asked that the RFP consider all the studies that have already been done throughout the region. The addition of this language would ensure that the consultant refers to previous studies.

Ms. Spangler-Bartle said one issue could be if the study determines that a higher ratio of low-income housing is supportable in the northwest corridor. Ms. Walter said this was why it is important to emphasize finding the best locations that will expand the opportunity for self-sufficiency for low-income residents, supplying opportunities for transportation and employment. She stated that this should be the focus of the proposed study.

Chair Crush observed that the Committee has been working for several years to encourage such a study, but the study as described in its draft language might be done incorrectly. This would be a waste of City funds as well as the Committee's time and work.

Ms. Walter noted that while the Committee had deferred selecting a representative to sit on the City's selection committee for the RFP, she felt this should still be done in the short term. She recommended communicating this desire to the City Commission.

Mr. Henn pointed out that it could be preferable to let the City's process move forward, as it was still early in the year and the Committee would have the opportunity to express its desires and concerns at a later date. In lieu of making a motion, Ms. Walter reiterated that she would email the City Manager and ask that all the Committee's members receive copies of the next draft.

#### **Communications to City Commission**

None.

#### **Agenda Topics for Next Meeting**

Chair Crush noted that the Agenda topics at the February meeting would be the same as at today's meeting.

#### **Other Business**

Mr. Brown advised that his office had learned that the City Manager is putting forth an RFP to outsource all functions of Housing and Community Development within the City. While this RFP was originally slated to go out earlier in the week, Vice Mayor DuBose had requested that it be pulled for further discussion by the Commission. Mr. Brown did not have information on what the RFP entailed, but pointed out that it could create changes for the Committee in the future.

Ms. Spangler-Bartle asked if the City was moving in the direction of privatization for other Departments as well. Mr. Brown said at a recent Budget Advisory Committee meeting, there had been discussion of privatizing a few other Departments as well, although there was greater progression toward outsourcing Housing and Community Development than other Departments at present.

Ms. Spangler-Bartle expressed concern that outsourcing of programs often meant an outside company would be hired to manage programs, such as CDBG programs. Outsourcing a Department could mean there is no longer an individual

with institutional knowledge who oversees all programs for that Department, or develops an overall strategy.

Mr. Brown concluded that he was not certain if this issue would be placed on the City Commission's next Agenda, or if it would be raised as a walk-on Item. He had not seen it on the Agenda at this time.

### **For the Good of the Order**

Ms. McDowell stated that on a triannual basis, the Department is required to provide the State with recommendations on housing incentive strategies. This will be due in December 2012. She said more information would be available closer to that time. Chair Crush encouraged the members to reach out to their City Commissioners with concerns about this issue.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 9:01 a.m.

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