



CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

**Approved**

**AFFORDABLE HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES**

**CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE  
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE  
CITY COMMISSION CHAMBERS**

**1<sup>ST</sup> FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM**

**MONDAY, JULY 9, 2018 – 9:00 A.M.**

<b>Committee Members</b>		<b>Attendance – July 2017 through June 2018</b>	
		<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Debbie Orshefsky, Chair	P	11	1
Roosevelt Walters, Vice Chair	P	11	0
Peter Cooper (called in at 9:17 a.m.)	P	11	1
Fran Epstein	P	10	2
Skeet Jernigan	A	5	7
Donnalee Minot	P	9	3
Edwin Parke	P	11	1
Mitchell Rosenstein	P	11	1
Brandon Stewart	P	11	1
Nancy Daley	P	2	0
Margi Northard	A	1	1

At this time, there are eleven appointed members to the Committee, which means six would constitute a quorum.

**Staff**

- Avis Wilkinson, Housing Programs Administrator / Staff Liaison
- Lian Chan, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.
- Myles Wright, Public
- Pamela Adams, Executive Director of Fort Lauderdale, CDC
- Gerri Washington, Public
- Dennis Wright Board Member, Fort Lauderdale, CDC
- Jenni Morejon, Executive Director, Fort Lauderdale Downtown Development Authority

**Communication to the City Commission**

None.

**I. ROLL CALL / DETERMINATION OF QUORUM**

Chair Orshefsky called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. Roll was called and it was noted that a quorum was present.

Chair Orshefsky questioned if Mr. Cooper was allowed to participate via telephone.

**Motion** made by Mr. Walters, seconded by Mr. Rosenstein, to allow Mr. Cooper to participate via telephone. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

## **II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – JUNE 11, 2018**

**Motion** made by Vice Chair Walters, seconded by Ms. Minot, to approve. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

## **III. OLD BUSINESS**

### **• Presentation by Fort Lauderdale CDC for completed CHDO Projects**

Mr. Wilkinson advised that about a year ago, it was this Committee's recommendation to give money to the Fort Lauderdale Community Development Corporation. Pamela Adams is here today to present the results as to what was done with the money.

Pamela Adams, Director of Fort Lauderdale Community Development Corporation, was present to report on how the HOME Funds, \$289,455, were used. Also present was Gerri Washington and Dennis Wright, Members of their Board, and Miles Wright, a student intern with them this summer. Ms. Adams thanked the Committee for having confidence in their Corporation to award the funds to them and for giving them an opportunity to tell how the funds were used. The Community Development Corporation (CDC) has been engaged in community service and advocacy around the issues of Affordable Housing, Community Development and Economic Development in Fort Lauderdale for 30 years. Their Mission Statement focuses on Affordable Housing for very low to low income families. Their grant objectives were to enhance community housing and revitalize the area and to improve the properties their residents live in as well as to improve their quality of life. The total grant sum was \$289,455. Their primary focus is to address chronic maintenance issues for the properties they own and to extend the life of properties they own. Almost a year ago, Chair Orshefsky asked why CDC was investing so much money in properties that were built in 1960 or 1970. The reason is that they have very low housing stock for rental families, not only in the City of Fort Lauderdale, but particularly in northwest Fort Lauderdale. They felt compelled to keep the properties they own and rent up to a certain level of standard for the residents and small business firms, primarily owned by people of color, were hired. In summary, the project cost total for 100 building was \$154,000; the 2<sup>nd</sup> Street property was

\$27,000. There are a number of properties; therefore, they had to prioritize the particular needs for each property and what residents were in need of. The 100 building is a two-story townhouse style rental unit with ten separate units. The size of the units range from two to three-bedrooms. There was a dire need for a new roof and new bathrooms. In the old days there was something called dog houses on top of two-story units, which that building still has. The dog houses were causing chronic problems, which was costing a lot of money from their regular Operating Fund. The funds were used to install impact glass windows to help residents with the environment and to reduce their AC and heating cost whenever needed. Two complete new kitchens were installed, new flooring, eight new bathrooms, and a new roof; the total cost for this project was \$154,900. The 1324 building, a low-rise, one-story, five-unit property, which typically houses older residents, received impact windows and a new roof. Their largest property is two buildings on one plat, which has a total of 16 units. Two new roofs were installed, and structural issues had to be addressed. Those chronic problems, which were dealt with on a regular basis, were addressed for a cost of \$77,962. Because of the funds awarded, there was enough revenue of their own to replace a poorly damaged fence facing the Jack and Jill Center and install new landscaping.

Vice Chair Walters thanked Ms. Adams for being responsible for the funds allotted to them, for finding locations that most needed renovations to make them livable, and for letting updating this Committee. Vice Chair Walters encouraged Ms. Adams and her company to continue looking for those types of situations.

Ms. Epstein questioned how many units were impacted.

Ms. Adams believed that 30 units were impacted.

Chair Orshefsky thanked Ms. Adams for this report. She questioned if any type of expedited or relief was given while going for permitting because they were doing Affordable Housing.

Ms. Adams replied, "Yes". Once the project was codified and submitted to Ms. Wilkinson and the Inspector who works out of her office, an orange card was received for every project, which they submit to the Building Department to get their approvals expedited. If anything gets stuck, they call Ms. Wilkinson. There were very few hiccups working with the Building Department. Ms. Adams thought it also helped that they had an excellent General Contractor.

Chair Orshefsky referenced the City Commission agenda from two weeks ago and noted that there was a disposition of several City owned parcels of land, which are residentially zoned and going out for sale. One of the things this Committee is working

on with the City Commission is making those lots for City owned properties more readily available for development for Affordable Housing. She requested that Ms. Adams look at those properties and see if any of them could be a project for the CDC and then report back to Ms. Wilkinson. That might be an opportunity and clearly, as this Committee sits with the Commission tomorrow during a Joint meeting, there is a huge push in the City to begin addressing the Affordable Housing issue. Working with the CDC might help step that up.

Note: Peter Cooper called in at 9:17 a.m.

Ms. Adams thanked Chair Orshefsky and stated that they would check into the City owned properties going out for sale.

- **Discussion of 2018 AHAC Affordable Housing Incentive Report**

Chair Orshefsky thought the Committee had a very productive conversation at the last meeting. In going through her notes, she realized that some of the revisions to the new recommendations made were not incorporated into what has moved forward. Chair Orshefsky did not want to get into that during this meeting but noted that there was some language tweaking from the last meeting that she would get to Ms. Wilkinson. As far as the overall work plan, this Committee is supposed to have the Incentive Report Draft done and ready for distribution for discussion at the August meeting. Today is the time to get any last comments into the Incentive Report.

Ms. Wilkinson stated that if the report is sent to her she will get it back to the Committee.

Chair Orshefsky mentioned that some people may not be able to attend the August meeting and requested that they send an email with any questions or comments they may have. A public hearing needs to be on that report in September, so it could be submitted to the City Commission since there is a deadline of November to get it to the Florida Housing Finance Corporation, which is a statutory obligation.

Vice Chair Walters referenced Recommendation #3 and questioned if suggestions will be made as to what could be that source of funding.

Chair Orshefsky thought it should be thrown out to the City. From previous conversations with members of the City Commission as well as the Administration, she did not believe that they fully understand the gap in financing. When speaking to different people, one will say there is a \$5 million gap, and another will say there is a \$15 million gap. There is no direction as to where the gap will be funded from until the Commission and Administration understand what the expense is.

Vice Chair Walters always believed that if something was going to be criticized that a suggestion should be made to make it right.

Chair Orshefsky commented that available funding sources is something the Infrastructure Task Force Committee has been looking at.

Mr. Rosenstein added that the chart was meant to be an informational source to both the Affordable Housing Advisory Committee and the City Commission. As discussed in a previous meeting, a little sticker shock might be a good thing.

Vice Chair Walters mentioned Recommendation #4 and questioned how to reasonably suggest the number of new Affordable Housing units to be built in the City of Fort Lauderdale.

Chair Orshefsky stated that Broward County is approaching this issue and the goal based upon the Miami-Dade experience. Miami-Dade, with their surtax, generates between \$24 million and \$30 million a year in Affordable Housing Surtax Subsidy, which has been translated into between 1,000 and 1,500 a year.

Mr. Rosenstein advised that Miami-Dade uses \$20 million to \$30 million as a gap subsidy, which is then paired with other things and that is what Broward County does not have.

- **Joint Meeting with City Commission Update-July 10, 2018 12 noon – 2:00 p.m.**

Chair Orshefsky questioned if everyone has seen the presentation for tomorrow.

Ms. Wilkinson indicated that the Committee has not seen the presentation; she will send a copy to everyone.

Chair Orshefsky thanked Ms. Wilkinson and the Administrator for allowing this Committee to have a great deal of input in building up the story to set the stage for these recommendations.

Ms. Wilkinson advised that Administration and the Commission want the Committee's ideas and tomorrow will be an opportunity to discuss the issues.

Chair Orshefsky stated that the presentation gives an overview of the gap analysis. The biggest issue is that the Administration and the Commission do not really understand the difference between 9% and 4% Low-Income Housing Tax Credit programs and how

the Fort Lauderdale Housing Authority has been able to use the 4% in ways the private section has not been able to use the 9%. The goal of the presentation is the sticker shock and understanding that the gap is a big number.

Mr. Cooper questioned the actual need within Fort Lauderdale and if 10,000 people are looking for affordable housing.

Chair Orshefsky responded that there is clearly a recognized need for affordable housing. In quantifying that, today, the Fort Lauderdale Housing Authority has a wait list of 300+ individuals; there is always a demand. In terms of percentage, there is a formula used by the Broward County Planning Council that is rather complex; it is a moving target because it is based upon what is on the market on a given day. It is not believed that need is as much of an issue as understanding what it costs to meet the need.

Ms. Daly indicated that Affordable Housing is a broad term and noted that it goes up to 140% of the affordable housing income. She would like to know the need in very low, moderate, and workforce housing.

Chair Orshefsky advised that a study can be obtained through the Broward County Planning Council; it was noted that the greatest need is for 60% and below. If a Low-Income Housing Tax Credit project is being done, it must be 60% and below because there is no public funding available for anything over 60%. It used to be referred to housing for individuals between 80% to 120% of the area income as workforce housing; however, in the workforce in Broward County, so many people earn 60% or below that the definition of workforce in Fort Lauderdale is different from the commonly accepted workforce housing.

Ms. Wilkinson added that through the City's program for Purchase Assistance, only the low-income is served, up to 80% of the area median income, and only very few moderate-income are served through the Repair Program. Most of the programs are addressed to low-income, up to 80%.

Chair Orshefsky commented that is consistent with Federal regulations on funding new construction or rehabilitation, which is 60%.

Ms. Cooper stated that if there is a wait list of 300 and that represents \$15 million to \$45 million in subsidy, that would be good to incorporate into the presentation to help Administration and the Commission understand.

Chair Orshefsky advised that the agenda is the Committee's presentation, then the Department of Sustainable Development will talk about inclusionary zoning, and then there is a Housing Authority presentation where 100 units on City owned land will be proposed.

Vice Chair Walters believed the definition of Affordable Housing, as used by the Federal Government, should be provided and questioned if a printed copy would be provided to the Commission.

Ms. Wilkinson advised that a printed copy could be provided.

Vice Chair Walters commented that the Administration and Commission need to be made aware that Affordable Housing goes up to 140% of the median income.

Chair Orshefsky mentioned as a Broward County matter, the 140% is a HUD regulation. Broward County's Land Use Plan and the City's Land Use Plan deals with workforce at 80% to 120%; they have never bumped it to 140%. The discussion was shifting more to how much of an individual's take-home pay is being spent on housing costs and if they are spending over 30%; if so, they are cost burdened. Part of the reason Broward County is ground zero for the need for affordable housing is because over 60% of the workforce is spending more than 30% or 50% of their income on housing. Financing talks income limits because the regulations require limits, but the reality is talking cost burdened.

Ms. Wilkinson advised that will be provided; it was originally in the presentation but was taken out.

Mr. Parke referenced Recommendation #2 and questioned if there was anything in place or if the Committee was asking them to do this.

Chair Orshefsky stated that the Committee is asking because the prior Commission refused to implement Affordable Housing.

Mr. Parke suggested rewording the recommendation and asking the Commission to create this process in order to get the 15%.

Chair Orshefsky advised that the Commission has the Affordable Housing Trust Fund. This recommendation says, "When you sell commercial and industrial lots, 15% of the net proceeds should go into the Affordable Housing Trust Fund". The Commission has the funding source and this Committee is telling them to put the funding into Affordable Housing. With regard to the presentation tomorrow, there will be some discussion

regarding the gap analysis and the 100,000-foot analysis so the heavy lift is appreciated. Next, there will be an overview of the Affordable Housing Trust Fund Administration and an opportunity to set the stage for Recommendation #2. Then, the soft incentives will be mentioned that have been done; working with Community Land Trust, supporting the Tax Credit and all of the soft recommendations that have been in the Incentive Report for years. The new recommendations will then be shared. Chair Orshefsky commented that since she would be going through the presentation she would appreciate any input as to what the Committee would like her to emphasize in each of the six recommendations.

Mr. Parke questioned if Linkage Fees would be mentioned.

Chair Orshefsky replied, "No". It was decided at the last meeting that Linkage Fees were beyond the scope. After the presentation is finished there will be a huge presentation by the Department of Sustainable Development on Inclusionary Zoning and it talks about Fees in Lieu and it is believed that in that context the Linkage Fee issue will come up.

Chair Orshefsky went through each of the recommendations as follows:

- #1 – The Overlay Zoning District. It is believed the key to emphasize is that this is something the Committee wants to accomplish citywide.

Ms. Epstein believed one of the concerns when talking about higher density areas is if a ghetto is being created. Ms. Epstein believed that is the perception for densely populated areas and she questioned if there was a way to describe in such a way that it dispels that myth.

Chair Orshefsky stated that the most densely populated area in Fort Lauderdale is the residential on Las Olas Boulevard, which is far from the ghetto. Density is not bad, and the citywide aspect is already in the recommendation. That was the key when this was discussed, that the Committee wanted something that had a broader applicability.

- #2 – The 15% is a great number. Sharing that the prior Commission was unwilling to do this; it is believed it is time to put the money into Affordable Housing. This will be on the heel of the presentation of the gap analysis.

Vice Chair Walters mentioned the 15% and stated that the Committee needs to walk away with something, if it is not 15% it could be 12% or 10%, but something is needed.

Chair Orshefsky indicated that tomorrow the Commission does not take any official action, but this is setting the stage for the November/December hearing where they

have to accept and approve the Incentive Report the Committee puts forward to them. It is clear that this Committee is committed to 15% in the Incentive Report.

Ms. Epstein questioned the objection to 15% and if 15% is realistic.

Vice Chair Walters stated that the Committee came up with this four years ago and the City Manager was opposed to putting anything on commercial or industrial sales into the Affordable Housing Trust Fund. There was a Workshop with the City Commission with the same issue, which was overridden by the suggestion by the City Manager.

Chair Orshefsky believed there was an appreciation by the new Commission for the need for the City to begin seriously funding Affordable Housing efforts. It was noted that the City Manager is looking for creative sources.

- #3 – There was a lot of discussion when this was formulated. It is a way for the City to begin to offset some of the construction costs. There are budget people who can figure out where the funds should come from.

Mr. Rosenstein questioned if the words, “or waivers” could be added after “grants”

**Motion** made by Mr. Rosenstein, seconded by Vice Chair Walters, to add the words “or waivers” after “grants” in Recommendation #3 so it would read “Create a funding source to provide **grants and/or waivers** to Affordable Housing developers to use to offset the cost of new construction improvements, etc., etc.”. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

- #4 – Aspirational goal.

Chair Orshefsky believed a decision should be made as a City as to how much to spend on this and then figure out what can be done each year. It is clearly \$1 per unit issue.

Vice Chair Walters stated that this talks about new construction and noted that whatever money is received for new construction does not affect rehabilitation.

Ms. Wilkinson advised that the City does not get money for new construction; they determine what the money will be used for and that is dictated through the Action Plan created for HUD, which is for the overall program. Years ago, Affordable Housing tried to encourage people to do new construction, but that requirement was removed, and the SHIP money was based on what the City wants to use it for and it is ultimately based on the needs of the community.

Ms. Daly questioned if the City determines specific segments of need.

Ms. Wilkinson indicated that the City determines specific segments of need because the SHIP program has set a size and based on set a size, a percentage of the money must be used for low-income, which dictates that at least 60% of the funding must be used for low-income; 40% can be used for a few moderates. When the annual reports are done, 60% of the funds, not 60% AMI, must be met and if the dollar amount is off because too much was used for moderates it will not be needed. Florida Housing created the area of median income up to 40% for Home Program and Federal Program can only be done up to 80%. Based on the total amount received, only 60% of the total funds can be used for low-income, which would be people up to 80% of the area median income. SHIP is where the 140% is if money is available to do that.

Mr. Rosenstein questioned which funds were discussed, SHIP or Home Trust Funds. Ms. Wilkinson advised that a specific amount is not required for new construction. SHIP Funds are the only funds received for the City from Florida Housing Finance; there are not any other funding sources. Home Partnership Investment Funds are received from HUD. SHIP has another fund set aside, what is called ownership and the funds must show that the City is supporting or preserving homeownership and then a portion must show that the City is doing construction.

Chair Orshefsky mentioned the \$746,000 in the Affordable Housing Trust Fund and questioned the source of those funds and if they were left over SHIP money.

Ms. Wilkinson believed when the Affordable Housing Trust Fund originally started, \$350,000 was put there as the result of an agreement with someone. Since the Affordable Housing Trust Fund was discussed and the Ordinance was done, money has been going in there from the sale of residential properties.

Vice Chair Walters commented on the set aside that must be done for people with disabilities.

Ms. Wilkinson stated that is 20% of the SHIP Funds.

Chair Orshefsky believed that a discussion tomorrow regarding SHIP would be a mistake. Part of the problem with SHIP is that the City does not get any money and next year less than no money will be received.

Ms. Wilkinson indicated that SHIP money was received a couple times; one time the City received over \$1 million. Ms. Wilkinson agreed with Chair Orshefsky and stated that SHIP would not be discussed at tomorrow's meeting, only the issues on the agenda.

Mr. Rosenstein suggested for long term, that it would be helpful to prepare a chart of different subsidies and what strings are attached.

Ms. Wilkinson replied, "Sure".

Mr. Parke questioned if the Affordable Housing Trust Fund gets any of the money from a piece of land the City recently sold for housing.

Ms. Wilkinson replied, "Not if it is commercial".

Chair Orshefsky advised that the property was commercial; it was a \$13 million sale. It is an Industrial Park.

Ms. Wilkinson indicated that there are no commercial proceeds at this time and that is what this Committee is going to be asking for.

- #5 – New Electronic Plan Review.

Chair Orshefsky stated this is to make sure there is consideration for expedited review for Affordable Housing, new construction, and rehab.

- #6 – Comprehensive List.

Chair Orshefsky advised that the City put out several residential pieces of land for sale and authorized whoever is going to market those to begin. The list exists; however, she would like to focus more on the underutilized. For example, maybe it is a City owned parking lot that could be incorporated into structured parking and a vertical development that could be done with the City throwing in the land. The third agenda item is clear that the City is looking to provide the land for the Housing Authority to do 100+ units on City owned property. The Housing Authority has its funding in place to do so and that presentation will be shown tomorrow.

Jenny Morejon, Executive Director of Downtown Development Authority, indicated that they have been a partner with the City and County for many years, if not decades, on Land Use policy specific to the Downtown in terms of residential development and looking at Affordable Housing policies. The Downtown Development Authority has been supportive of innovative ways to make sure both the City and County are working together. She looked up some of the facts the Committee was questioning in terms of the percentage of cost burdened renters; from a 0% to 60% of AMI it is upwards of 80%. Those are drastic numbers for Broward County as a whole, not just for the City. Also, with regard to the original Trust Fund money questioned, that was from some Downtown developers back in about 2005 when the units started to run out and there

was almost a race by the Commission to determine which project was going to get the units and developers were kicking in money. There was no formal policy in place but that is how the money got seeded. The last recommendation, #6, is not just City owned property but also County owned property, School Board property, and hospital district property. In terms of discussions of public owned land, there is a lot of synergy and collaboration that could be considered between other jurisdictions that own property in the City boundaries, which might be something during the dialogue tomorrow. Again, the City does not control that land but there may be partnership opportunities. The Downtown Development Authority is looking at that and leaning some of the efforts for areas where there is County owned land and City owned land, and they are looking at a larger joint campus development. At a higher level, not specific to the six specific recommendations, the County is focusing on lobbying to Tallahassee to preserve Sadowski Funding, which would be another good recommendation for the City of Fort Lauderdale to get onboard with. The County is also putting a ballot initiative for a vote to establish a Broward County Trust Fund for Affordable Housing. If this Committee could recommend to the Commission to help support those boarder efforts, it would help at the end of the day. She understood that this Committee is not necessarily opining or focusing in on Linkage Fees and Inclusionary Zoning but certainly that will be discussed tomorrow, and it is believed, at the Downtown Development Authority, that the recommendations the Committee has put forth are very practical, supporting the outcome of Affordable Housing. She thanked this Committee for their service.

Vice Chair Walters questioned why this Committee would recommend becoming part of the Broward County Affordable Housing Committee when the City of Fort Lauderdale would become a donor organization to that Affordable Housing Trust Fund.

Ms. Morejon believed if the Committee had a seat at the table and made recommendations, it could come with policy details of how the funding out of a Trust Fund could come back to the City potentially. Maybe it is just having a voice in the process, so the City of Fort Lauderdale does not become just a donor agency. Through this detailed policy list recommended, she has already heard the County, on multiple occasions, say, "Fort Lauderdale is probably taking the most strong and innovative steps towards looking at Affordable Housing" and she thinks partnerships can go a long way. Being proactive in recommendations gives that opportunity.

Vice Chair Walters stated that his concern with the Broward County Affordable Housing Committee is that the City of Fort Lauderdale would have to pay into that amount of funds but being a larger City, they would become a donor, which means they would get less back from that fund than what they put in. He did not see where that helps.

Ms. Morejon advised that the details of the sources of funding for the ballot initiative have not been determined. Her understanding was that this is just a request of the voters as to whether a Trust Fund should be established and if so, the County would determine how that funding would come about, whether similar to City discussions, that is part of the General Fund of Broward County. It goes back to incentive-based funding sources and the gap analysis adding sources available to fund the projects and meet the differential, which could only help. Being a part of that discussion process as opposed to waiting for a policy to be set by the County and then the City stepping in with concerns about being a donor after the fact would be concerning.

Mr. Rosenstein agreed. The City is already contributing in its own way to the Sadowski Fund, so it does not lose much for potentially joining the County's lobbying efforts in preserving the Sadowski Fund, which is a Trust Fund for Affordable Housing, which is what it was originally created for. As to the question of a secondary ballot initiative, he is of the mindset that more money in the County would be good for the City, especially if the City is a partner with the County on those efforts up front. His general impression is that the City could have a seat at the table, which would be a long-run benefit.

Chair Orshefsky commented that Ms. Morejon raised three things and questioned if there was any interest in adding or considering in Recommendation #6 that the City should work with the County and School Board to identify those properties.

**Motion** made by Ms. Daly, seconded by Mr. Walters, to add the point raised by Ms. Morejon regarding the Sadowski Fund to Recommendation #6. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Vice Chair Walters questioned if it should be added to Recommendation #6 or if it should be made Recommendation #7.

Chair Orshefsky stated that because the presentation has been published she is more than happy to raise it at the meeting as something that came up at this meeting. Depending on the reaction, we can decide whether to incorporate it into the Incentive Report and the draft being put forward, which is coming up in August.

In response to Ms. Epstein, Chair Orshefsky believed there was a consensus and would bring up the County and School Board properties and the Committee can consider incorporating that as a revision moving forward. The other two points raised were not part of the agenda. There is a platform and Chair Orshefsky questioned if there was any interest in indicating to the Commission that there is an urban agenda and a Sadowski Working Group. It is something that could bring significant dollars back to

South Florida and questioned if the Committee wanted to discuss this or it could be brought up in a “By the way, this is happening” fashion.

Vice Chair Walters believed it should be addressed in a “By the way” fashion.

There was a consensus to use the “By the Way” fashion.

Chair Orshefsky mentioned the third issue of the Broward County Affordable Housing initiative. A voice vote may be necessary and she questioned if the Committee wanted to get into that issue.

Ms. Epstein questioned if that draws attention away from what the Committee is trying to accomplish.

Chair Orshefsky advised that it is a question of the Committee personal perspective. Her perspective is that the City, in this effort, needs to focus on what it can do for itself. As far as Inclusionary Zoning, there is a discussion of Fees in Lieu, Payments in Lieu, and perhaps the Linkage Fees. Under Florida Law, the Commission is going to have to end up in some kind of Trust Fund and if they are in favor of Affordable Housing the funds should end up in the Affordable Housing Trust Fund. She believes the Committee should focus on the City of Fort Lauderdale rather than Broward County.

There was a consensus to focus on the City of Fort Lauderdale.

Vice Chair Walters commented that the Workshop is from 12:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m. and the Commission conference agenda starts at 1:30 p.m.

Chair Orshefsky understood that the Committee was moved to 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

Ms. Wilkinson indicated that she was not told of the change; she will update the agenda.

Chair Orshefsky advised that the next part of the presentation is about nine slides on inclusionary zoning.

Mr. Rosenstein questioned if someone will be speaking to the need in the City.

Chair Orshefsky stated that there was not a need issue. The Commission knows there is a need and she felt this Committee needs to talk about how to address the need.

Ms. Epstein questioned if the City was confident that the Commission is aware of the need.

Ms. Wilkinson replied, "Absolutely".

Mr. Rosenstein suggested that one or two statistics be ready to mention because he would not be surprised if someone asks for them.

Ms. Wilkinson stated that Mr. Rosenstein could bring information, but the Commission is aware that there is a need.

Chair Orshefsky advised that the only formula that analyzes need that is broadly accepted in Broward County is the one put forth by the Broward County Planning Council. She would be happy to see if there is a quick number and based upon that formula what they define as the need. Typically, it comes up that the need exists for very low income, which is 60% and below.

Vice Chair Walters noted that when people get out of jail they settle in Fort Lauderdale and do not go back to where they came from and become a need of the City of Fort Lauderdale. The Committee needs to be careful in trying to determine the true need of the City of Fort Lauderdale versus the need of Broward County.

Chair Orshefsky recalled that the published report from the Planning Council from a couple of months ago was that 53,000 units were needed in the very low income countywide.

Vice Chair Walters questioned why burden Hollywood, Fort Lauderdale and Pompano to provide Affordable Housing, but the same thing is not being done for Weston, Parkland, and Coral Springs. The City of Fort Lauderdale must not be responsible for all people who need Affordable Housing; it must be shared countywide.

Chair Orshefsky stated that it is being said that it needs to be citywide. Part of that is so the City of Fort Lauderdale looks beyond the Regional Activity Centers. The City of Fort Lauderdale is an employment center and as such, employees need a place to live and not have to own two cars.

Ms. Epstein believed that at least two members should be readily available to describe the need. Very low housing needs could be looked at now, but it is known that eventually workforce will become a burden in the future.

Chair Orshefsky indicated that she has a table published by the Planning Council, which Ms. Wilkinson can distribute. When someone says that 53,000 units are needed to meet the housing demand, that number is so large that it is overwhelming.

- **Affordable Housing Trust Fund Monthly Balance Report**

Chair Orshefsky advised that the current balance of the Affordable Housing Trust Fund is \$746,000 and change.

**IV. NEW BUSINESS – None.**

**V. AGENDA TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING**

Chair Orshefsky suggested that everyone be at the 8<sup>th</sup> floor Conference Room at 11:45 a.m. tomorrow so the meeting can begin promptly at noon.

**VI. GOOD OF THE ORDER**

None.

**VII. NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING DATE – August 13, 2018 - City Commission Chambers**

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 10:19 a.m.

Any written public comments made 48 hours prior to the meeting regarding items discussed during the proceedings have been attached hereto.

[Minutes prepared by C. Guifarro, Prototype, Inc.]