

**MONROE COUNTY  
AFFORDABLE HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MEETING VI SUMMARY/MINUTES  
JANUARY 22, 2016**



Unanimously approved 3/18/16



Robert Jones, Facilitator  
Affordable Housing Advisory Committee  
FCRC Consensus Center, Florida State University

**AHAC JANUARY 22, 2016 MEETING VI SUMMARY/MINUTES  
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

*Contents*..... 2  
*Executive Summary*..... 3

**AHAC MEETING SUMMARY** ..... 7

**I. INTRODUCTION**..... 7

    A. Review of Agenda and November 2015 AHAC Meeting Summary ..... 7  
    B. Review of Committee Work Plan ..... 7  
    C. Workforce Housing Updates and Other Matters ..... 8

**II. INCLUSIONARY HOUSING** ..... 10

    A. Inclusionary Housing Defined ..... 10  
    B. Village of Islamorada’s Inclusionary Housing Program ..... 10  
    C. Review of Previous Inclusionary Housing Proposals-2007-08 Task Force..... 14  
    D. Monroe County Inclusionary Residential Housing Policy and Program..... 15  
    E. Developing a Monroe County Inclusionary Housing “Nexus” Study ..... 16

**III. WORKFORCE HOUSING CONSTRUCTION COSTS** ..... 17

    A. Debbie Batty’s Presentation on Construction Costs ..... 17  
    B. Hana Eskra’s Presentation on Construction Costs ..... 18

**IV. PUBLIC COMMENT**..... 19

**V. NEXT STEPS AND ASSIGNMENTS** ..... 19

*Appendices*

    1. AHAC Organizational Meeting Agenda ..... 21  
    2. AHAC Members..... 22  
    3. Meeting Evaluation Summary..... 23  
    4. Overview of AHAC Charge ..... 24  
    5. AHAC Draft Work Plan..... 25  
    6. Inclusionary Housing Defined ..... 26  
    7. Overview of Previous Monroe County Inclusionary Housing Proposals-2008 AH Task Force ..... 27  
    8. Overview of Monroe County Residential Inclusionary Housing Program..... 28  
    9. Net Affordable Housing Impacts- Two Cases- Bill Hunter Presentation ..... 29  
    10. Committee LHAP Recommendations and AHAC Inclusionary Housing Survey Results ..... 31  
    11. Costs of Construction- Affordable Housing..... 33  
    12. Intergovernmental Roundtable Format and Draft Agenda ..... 34

**MONROE COUNTY AFFORDABLE HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**MEETING VI, JANUARY 22, 2016**  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Bob Jones, the Committee' facilitator, welcomed Affordable Housing Advisory Committee (AHAC) members as well as the public to the Committee's 6<sup>th</sup> meeting. He asked members present to introduce themselves and noted that several members had indicated they would be unable to participate in today's meeting but there was a quorum of members to proceed. The facilitator reviewed with the Committee the proposed meeting objectives and agenda with the Committee's focus on inclusionary housing, presentation and discussion of costs for developing affordable housing and a review of the agenda and approach for the intergovernmental roundtable in February. The Committee unanimously agreed to adopt the agenda as well as the Committee's draft December 18, 2015 summary/minutes circulated in advance without changes. Prior to adoption of the December 2015 summary, the Committee offered an opportunity for public comment but no comments were offered.

The facilitator noted that the first three meetings of the Committee had a primary focus on developing a response to the Committee's first three tasks. The November meeting focused on incentive strategy recommendations to address the requirement for the County to develop a Local Housing Assistance Plan every three years and recommend a surplus land inventory list to the Board of County Commission. He noted that because the February 2016 roundtable will be devoted to intergovernmental discussion, an additional meeting is being added to the schedule for July. Going forward, he noted the plan is for the Committee to complete an initial review of the remaining tasks assigned by the BOCC by Spring 2016 followed by a process to develop consensus on options and recommendations that address each task with a final set of recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners to be completed by July 2016.

In terms of updates, Commissioner Murphy announced that the BOCC hired Charles Pattison as the new Land Authority director. Mr. Pattison has a long history of work in the Keys and in Florida on growth management and other issues. The Committee suggested staff invite him to address the Committee at a future meeting. The Marathon Work Force Housing Committee will be meeting February 16, 2016 and will be reviewing the FIU report on workforce housing. It was suggested that future Committee agendas should include an item covering current events related to affordable housing in the Keys, e.g. the affordable housing development in Big Coppitt.

In addition the Committee discussed how to address public concerns with affordable housing proposals, the need for more consistent income level definitions and a discussion of the relative importance of focusing on moderate, median, low and very low for workforce housing. The Committee also discussed targeting relative rental vs. homeownership to advance workforce housing in the County and municipalities; construction costs and incentives for workforce housing; micros housing; government staff and workforce housing.

Bill Hunter presented information to the Committee on two projects. Stock Island Village Marina bought Seahorse RV Park on Big Pine Key and transferred 100 RV spaces to be used on Stock Island for a 100 room hotel. Oceanside Marina bought from the bank mobile home parks with 32 transferable ROGOs and enter into a development agreement with the County using the ROGOs to rebuild affordable housing and transferring ROGOs to Oceanside where they are building 79 residences which

will become vacation rentals with lock outs. RV spaces and hotel rooms are treated the same but RV units do their own laundry, cook meals, etc. while hotels need service worker, maids, maintenance and dishwashers. The Committee discussed the presentations cover the following topics: onsite or offsite affordable housing; setting the 30% figure; County staff salary increases; big developments and impact fees; public agencies helping to house government employees.

Staff presented a working definition for inclusionary housing that refers to a range of local policies that tap the economic gains from rising real estate values to create affordable housing—tying the creation of homes for low- or moderate-income households to the construction of market-rate residential or commercial development. It was noted that inclusionary housing ordinances vary substantially among local governments and the variables can include such things as: percentage of units to be dedicated as inclusionary housing generally ranging between 10 and 30%; whether inclusionary housing must be built on site; and minimum size of development, as well as other issues.

Cheryl Cioffari, Village of Islamorada planning director presented their experience with their inclusionary housing regulation adopted in 2007 reviewing its implementations and lessons learned. Ms. Cioffari noted that in advance of creating the program in 2007, the Village conducted an inclusionary “nexus” study with assistance from the Clarion Group and Dr. James C. Nicholas, reviewing both residential and non-residential development impacts in each land use category. She provided an overview of the elements of the program. When the study presentation was made in 2007 prior to the economic downturn, they reflected the full true costs and impacts of development and redevelopment in terms of the need for workforce housing. The Council decided to set the number at 30% of the actual costs of development and the program shows the workforce housing need created by each new development. While there were some concern about the potential for litigation, the program was not challenged in the courts. In 2012, the Village Council amended the code to further reduce the non-residential in-lieu fees by half from 30% to 15% for 2 years until 2014 to stimulate development.

The Village adopted into their code the specifics for how the fee was calculated and provided that the certificate of occupancy will not be issued until the affordable housing requirement has been met. The Code also sets the minimum size of units at 500 square feet for a 1-bedroom, 750 square feet for a 2-bedroom and 900 square feet for a 3-bedroom. The affordable housing units are deed restricted in perpetuity (30 years plus 10 year automatic renewals). For every new development in Village following the adoption of the inclusionary housing program developers were encourage to build units on site. If the developer proved that this was not practicable on site, they could build off site, or convey land to the Village, or pay in lieu mitigation fee which goes into a special fund for affordable housing. Ms. Cioffari noted that this incentive didn't appear to have spurred development but did lower the threshold for them to construct units on site. The Village planning staff encourages developers to build on site or off site even if the inclusionary housing fee is not triggered. As an example, she highlights the Islander was building a museum that triggered a fee but they wanted to convert existing dorm style affordable housing into 2 units (1 two bedroom and 1 one bedroom). There is currently \$200,000+ in the affordable housing fund which must be spent on constructing units within a set period of time or the developer can request a return of the fees.

Islamorada has formed an Accessible Housing Committee and The Village Council has asked the Committee to identify land for suitable for affordable housing. The Council is currently reviewing the length of deed restrictions.

AHAC member questions and comments covered the following topics: developer reaction to inclusionary housing; deed restrictions in perpetuity; building on site affordable housing; inclusionary off site units; setting the inclusionary housing fee; mitigating only 1/3 of the impact; cutting down on % of impact fee didn't stimulate more development in the recession; limited land availability affordable housing and habitat protection; build out date; non-residential units and evacuation; micro units and evacuation; certificate of occupancy; income certification; redevelopment; Calculation of # of employees; and school construction and affordable housing.

Mayte Santamaria provided a briefing on inclusionary housing proposals from the 2007-2008 affordable housing task force. Jim Saunders, a member of that Committee, noted that in the face of the economic downturn in 2008, the recommendations for expanding inclusionary housing were not acted upon

Mayte Santamaria reviewed the County's residential inclusionary housing program. She noted that the Monroe County Code Section 130-161 requires residential developments that result in the development or redevelopment of three (3) or more dwelling units [or ten or more mobile homes] to develop or redevelop at least 30 percent of the units as affordable housing units to ensure that the need for affordable housing is not exacerbated by new residential development and redevelopment of existing affordable housing stock. She noted the County also has an alternative compliance path as well. Developers can also donate land or pay in lieu fees which are a set price and not a sliding scale like Islamorada. The Committee discussed the program and suggested consideration of recommending retaining and perhaps strengthening the current residential inclusionary housing program

A "nexus" or support study provides the required background and technical documentation to put in place an inclusionary housing program. Mayte Santamaria noted that staff has reached out to the Clarion Association, that conducted the study for Islamorada, to explore what a scope of work might entail to conduct a County nexus study on applying inclusionary housing policies to transient and commercial development. She noted that any proposed program would require current data to support the scope and fees associated with it and would have to be approved by DEO.

The Committee discussed the need to help the County establish numbers that are supported by data and analysis unanimously adopted the following motion: **The AHAC recommends that the Board of County Commission support and fund a nexus study as the first step in considering the expansion of the current County residential inclusionary housing program to cover transient and commercial development in the County.**

The facilitator noted that the Committee will receive a presentation from Jim Saunders at the March meeting on developing affordable housing and the residential inclusionary housing program. He noted that Task 10 asks the Committee to consider inclusionary housing for the hospitality and commercial sectors.

Ed Davidson raised the question of addressing issues and making recommendations related to providing workforce opportunities and education through schools. He noted that the service sector is importing employees when we might be better off hiring locally. The facilitator noted that the importance and value of building and sustaining communities in the Keys might be addressed in a preamble but probably not in a recommendation as it falls outside the 10 tasks the Committee has been assigned.

The Committee received two presentations on actual construction costs for affordable housing developments from Debbie Batty and AHAC member Hana Eskra. Both presentations highlighted the

risks and challenges that affordable housing developers assume and face in building affordable housing in the Keys including the gap in costs and subsidies.

Debbie Batty and Sarah Surplock, City of Key West offered public comments on inclusionary housing.

The facilitator reviewed with the Committee the draft agenda for the Roundtable and the requests being made of the local governments participating in terms of data on workforce and affordable housing. The Committee suggested providing participants with information on the Committee's charge and recommendations to date, clarifying that an objective of the roundtable was to support intergovernmental cooperation across jurisdictions.

There were no public comments offered at the end of the meeting.

The facilitator reviewed the potential topics for the March 2016 AHAC agenda including completing the review of inclusionary housing and discussing options and reviewing a overall format and outline for the Committee's report to the BOCC. The Committee completed a meeting evaluation form and adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

**MONROE COUNTY AFFORDABLE HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**MEETING VI, JANUARY 22, 2016**  
**MEETING SUMMARY/MINUTES**

*AHAC Members in attendance:* **Jim Cameron, Ed Davidson, Bill Hunter, Hana Eskra, Ken Naylor, Jim Saunders, Stephanie Scuderi, Randy Wall, & Heather Carruthers, Monroe County Commission Liaison Sylvia Murphy, Monroe County Commission Liaison**

*AHAC Members unable to attend:*, Warren Leamard, Kurt Lewin, Tim Root, Ed Swift, Jodi Weinhofer & Bill Wiatt

*Staff:* **Mayte Santamaria, Carol Schreck, Steve Williams, Kevin Bond, Peter Morris, & Tiffany Stankiewicz**

*Facilitator:* **Bob Jones, FCRC Consensus Center, FSU**

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

### **A. Review of Agenda and December Meeting Summary/Minutes**

Bob Jones, the Committee's facilitator, welcomed Affordable Housing Advisory Committee (AHAC) members as well as the public to the Committee's 6<sup>th</sup> meeting. He asked members present to introduce themselves and noted that several members had indicated they would be unable to participate in today's meeting but there was a quorum of members to proceed. The facilitator reviewed with the Committee the proposed meeting objectives and agenda with the Committee's focus on inclusionary housing, presentation and discussion of costs for developing affordable housing and a review of the agenda and approach for the intergovernmental roundtable in February. (*See Appendix #1*). The Committee unanimously agreed to adopt the agenda as well as the Committee's draft December 18, 2015 summary/minutes without changes. Prior to adoption of the December 2015 summary, the Committee offered an opportunity for public comment but no comments were offered.

### **B. Review of the Committee Work Plan**

The facilitator reviewed with the Committee the effort and outcomes for the first six meetings of the Committee. He noted that because the February meeting will be devoted to the intergovernmental roundtable, an additional meeting is being added to the schedule for July. The Workplan calls for some additional briefings on charges and beginning in March the development of consensus recommendations aimed at addressing the 10 workforce housing tasks the Committee has been assigned by the Board of County Commissioners with a final set of recommendations to be completed by July 2016.

### **C. Workforce Housing Updates and Other Matters**

Commissioner Murphy announced that the BOCC hired Charles Pattison as the new Land Authority director. Mr. Pattison has a long history of work in the Keys and in Florida on growth management and other issues. The Committee suggested staff invite him to address the Committee at a future meeting.

It was announced that the Marathon Work Force Housing Committee will be meeting February 16, 2016 to review the FIU report on workforce housing. It was suggested that future Committee agendas should include an item covering current events related to affordable housing in the Keys, e.g. the affordable housing development in Big Coppitt.

#### **1. Workforce Housing, Public Engagement and NIMBY Issues.**

These affordable housing proposals are often being met by public concerns or opposition based on actual, potential or perceived impacts on property values, loss of view, increased traffic, etc. The Committee needs to appreciate the public reception of workforce housing proposals as it develops recommendations. The NIMBY reaction may require ideas in terms of management and maintenance of these properties. The Committee should develop recommendations regarding best practices for public engagement on workforce housing.

#### **2. Consistent income level definitions and relative focus on moderate, median, low and very low for workforce housing.**

The Rockland and Big Coppit Key affordable housing proposals, which are focused on rental housing, raise the issue of what is the right mix among moderate, median low and very low income levels. This should be an issue the Committee addresses along with the consistency of definitions of income levels for the county and cities in the Keys.

#### **3. Relative focus on Rental and Homeownership**

The Committee should also review its recommendations in terms of the relative focus on rental vs. homeownership in its recommendations to advance workforce housing in the County and municipalities.

#### **4. Developers, Construction Costs and Incentives for Workforce Housing**

The Committee should look at the challenges for developers to create new workforce housing in terms of the gap between subsidies and actual costs of construction and finance as well as the costs of responding to public resistance. Developers can build workforce housing with surety here but it remains more profitable to build market rate vs. affordable housing. The facilitator noted the presentations planned for later in the meeting on construction costs. It was suggested the Committee may need more information on how tax credits function for low and very low income housing.

#### **5. Workforce micro-housing and density**

As a part of the Committee's charge we will receive information at a future meeting and address the issue in terms of recommendations. A couple of years ago proposals to re-purpose hurricane proof containers (hurricane proof) may have been in conflict with code.

## 6. Government Staff and Affordable Housing

Employers have responsibility for workforce housing. Public employees in Monroe County with the County, Sheriff, the School District and Community College need affordable housing. Bill Hunter reviewed the published government salaries and categorized them by housing income limits noting that the bottom line is that over 90% of all government employees in Monroe County qualify for some level of affordable housing assistance.

## 7. Review of Two Projects and Impacts on Affordable Housing.

Bill Hunter presented information on two projects. Stock Island Village Marina bought Seahorse RV Park on Big Pine Key and transferred 100 RV spaces to be used on Stock Island for a 100 room hotel. Oceanside Marina bought from the bank mobile home parks with 32 transferable ROGOs and entered into a development agreement with the County using the ROGOs to rebuild affordable housing and transferring ROGOs to Oceanside where they are building 79 residences which will become vacation rentals with lock outs. *(See Appendix #9 for more information)* RV spaces and hotel rooms are treated the same but RV units do their own laundry, cook meals, etc. while hotels need service worker, maids, maintenance and dishwashers.

### *AHAC Member Questions/Comments*

- Is Seahorse was mobile home park or RV park? *A: RV park.*
- If it did transfer mobile homes into residential/vacation rentals, since it is not a hotel would it be subject to residential inclusionary? *A: The developer submitted an alternative compliance purchasing a mobile home park Oceanside Marina), and transferring mobile home market rate to Oceanside to build residential units. The developer has ability to use as vacation rentals or they can live there if they want. All mobile homes that previously functioned as affordable housing were deed restricted protecting them from being rented, sold or redeveloped at market rate.*
- In the past Sunshine Key was granted 400% allowable density specifically only for RV use. It was never intended to allow conversion 1 for 1.
- If RV parks are seen to be functioning as permanent residential, this can impact residential evacuation times which will in turn put greater pressure on the ROGO system and undevelopable lots. If we start to count those "rooms" we may be backing ourselves into a corner. We should be careful how we categorize RV parks.
- Would this require a separate definition or equation for inclusionary rules? *A: Don't know but will explore with the consultant.*
- Should the Committee consider the need for inclusionary housing fees when changing from a RV park to a hotel? RV is transient units, not ROGOs. The problem is the RV and Hotel space are considered the same thing. *A: The Committee could consider whether a different standard for mitigation (e.g. one at 25% another at 35%) when switching from transient to transient.*
- **Onsite or offsite affordable housing** will have to address restrictions such as zoning and density issues. Where ever the affordable housing is built is a good thing. County was smart to provide for offsite affordable housing. The reality is the cost of developing affordable housing.

- **30% figure.** What was the reasoning behind setting 30%? *A: I believe this was based on 2004 needs assessment that had information the previous committee drew upon (2005-2007). Underscores why we need a current nexus study as the 30% could a higher percentage.*
- The Islamorada study provided for 100% of the impact, but the council choose 30%. While a nexus study will provide data, the interpretation and judgment about right level will be for policymakers to determine.
- The spreadsheet on salaries covers household or individuals? *A: There are three categories: single / 1 income: couple 1 income / couple 2 incomes .*
- We hire people to work here, come here and they leave because they cannot afford.
- **County staff increases.** Every time the Commission discusses staff salary increases there is push back as this is politically difficult territory to navigate.
- **Big developments and impact fees.** Historically a number of studies have demonstrated that big developments rarely pay 50% aggregate impact fees so the true costs are publicly subsidized. We should be looking at the aggregate incremental cost to the community of development beyond just workforce housing, e.g. costs of teachers and classrooms needed for additional residents.
- **Public agencies helping to house government employees.** Do public agencies have the responsibility to help house government employees? If private employers aren't paying for housing costs, why should government?

## II. INCLUSIONARY HOUSING

### A. Inclusionary Housing Defined

Staff presented a working definition as follows: Inclusionary housing refers to a range of local policies that tap the economic gains from rising real estate values to create affordable housing—tying the creation of homes for low- or moderate-income households to the construction of market-rate residential or commercial development.

It was noted that inclusionary housing ordinances vary substantially among local governments and the variables can include:

• Mandatory or voluntary ordinance.	• Percentage of units to be dedicated as inclusionary housing generally ranging between 10 and 30%.
• Minimum size of development	• Whether inclusionary housing must be built on site.
• Income level or price defined as "affordable," and buyer qualification methods.	• Whether fees can be paid in lieu of building inclusionary housing.
• Appearance and integration of inclusionary housing units.	• Which types of housing construction the ordinance applies to.
• Longevity of price restrictions attached to inclusionary housing units, and allowable appreciation.	• Whether housing rehabilitation counts as "construction,"

### B. Village of Islamorada Inclusionary Housing Program

Cheryl Cioffari, Village of Islamorada planning director presented their experience with an inclusionary housing regulation adopted in 2007, reviewing its implementations and lessons learned. Ms. Cioffari noted that in advance of creating the program in 2007, the Village

conducted an inclusionary “nexus” study with assistance from the Clarion Group and Dr. James C. Nicholas, reviewing both residential and non-residential development impacts in each land use category.

She noted that local governments must determine the affordable workforce housing need that new residential and non-residential developments create, as a legal basis for establishing a workforce housing mitigation program. The Village established the policy that all employers generating development which is not exempted will provide affordable housing for 30% of the number of households that the development generates. The Village inclusionary housing policy established that developments with 1000 square feet or more would be covered by the inclusionary fee. Redevelopments that do not increase square footage do not pay an inclusionary fee. All developers, including government, are subject to the inclusionary fee.

Ms Cioffari noted that residential development was split into two categories with full time and part time residents. An initial implementation problem faced implementing this was how to prove full time residency. As a policy, Islamorada decided that all residents will pay the part time residency fee in order to have one stable fee that is clear and easy to implement.

The study classified all non-residential development into land use categories; determined individual employee and household earnings per land use category; determined the amount of building space provided per employee for each land use category; and calculated the demand for workforce housing units per 1,000 square feet of development for each land use category. The nonresidential study broke out development categories that include: Governmental, Industrial, Institutional, Office, Retail, and Tourist (including restaurants).

When the study presentations were made in 2007 they reflected the true costs and impacts of development and redevelopment in terms of the need for workforce housing. The Council decided to set the number at 30% of the actual costs of development and the program shows the workforce housing need created by each new development. While there were some concern about the potential for litigation, the program was not challenged in the courts.

The Village adopted into their code the specifics for how the fee was calculated and provided that the certificate of occupancy will not be issued until the affordable housing requirement has been met. The Code also sets the minimum size of units at 500 square feet for a 1-bedroom, 750 square feet for a 2-bedroom and 900 square feet for a 3-bedroom. The developer will determine what works best for them in terms of the affordable housing units they build. The affordable housing units are deed restricted in perpetuity (30 years plus 10 year automatic renewals). There are currently two categories of affordable housing: pre 2007 have deed restrictions of 20 years; the post 2007 developments are in perpetuity (30 years with automatic 10 year renewals).

For every new development in the Village following the adoption of the inclusionary housing program, developers were encouraged to build units on site. If the developer could prove that this was not practicable on site, they could build off site, or convey land to the Village, or pay an in lieu mitigation fee which goes into a special fund for affordable housing. For redevelopment, credit would be given for existing housing and the developer would be assessed on the difference between that and new units.

In 2012, the Village Council amended the code to further reduce the non-residential in-lieu fees by half from 30% to 15% for for 2 years until 2014 to stimulate development in the recession. The incentive didn't appear to have spurred development but did lower the threshold for them to construct units on site. The Village planning staff encourages developers to build on site or off site even if the inclusionary housing fee is not triggered. As an example, the Islander was building a museum that triggered a fee, but they wanted to convert existing dorm style affordable housing into 2 units (1 two bedroom and 1 one bedroom).

There is currently \$200,000+ in the affordable housing fund which must be spent on constructing units within a set period of time or the developer can request a return of the fees.

Islamorada has formed an Accessible Housing Committee and The Village Council has asked the Committee to identify land for suitable for affordable housing. The Council is currently reviewing the length of deed restrictions. Not much new development has occurred in the Village and redevelopment by hotels has been mostly of existing square feet and surface renovations so the inclusionary housing threshold is not met.

#### *AHAC Member Questions and Comments*

- **Reaction to inclusionary housing.** Has there been much push back on inclusionary housing? *A: No, it is as it is seen as part of the impact fee process. Runs about \$1/square foot on a sliding scale. The bigger the house, the higher the rate goes because you're going to draw on more resources with a larger house.*
- **Deed Restrictions in Perpetuity.** Going back to 20-year deed restrictions would be a bad policy. We are currently experiencing this in Key West. Once the 20-year deed restriction expires, within a year all current affordable housing residents have been removed as market rates are charged.
- Why is the Council considering 20-year deed restrictions? This is a concern. It's a step backwards. AH doesn't mean developers won't make money selling as there is no guarantee in the market either.
- Keep in mind if we don't extend deed restrictions we are kicking can down the road when it will be certainly more expensive to protect and restrict workforce housing. Think of it this as an investment in infrastructure and a stepping stone that allows people to live in our communities and this does not just apply to low income. Only way I could live in safe, clean place was with affordable housing, e.g. \$40k salary with \$950 rent + utilities and bill.
- If we down grade the number of years hold affordable housing as deed restricted, we may lose public confidence in this effort. There appears no good reason for considering shorter deed restrictions.
- We are missing the "middle" in our communities in the Keys. It's critical that those that build can us help to put it back into the community. *A: There is talk about working with county and other municipalities to do larger AH projects which is great, but we still have to build in our community.*
- **Building on site affordable housing.** If a developer has a water front parcel, under the Code, will they be required to build a waterfront AH unit(s) or can they go offsite to offset and even add extra units. *A: Code requires they prove they can't build on site. Maybe consider putting units up in front of the lot. Designer fit in The Village policy is to avoid, where possible, creating segregated communities.*

- **Inclusionary housing fee.** Is the inclusionary fee the same for commercial and non-residential? *A: It's computed using a matrix worksheet using units per 1000 square feet So for tourist new development .00029 units per 1000 square feet.*
- Why is this based on square feet and not on number of hotel units? *A: It is based on the size of unit as the Study showed the larger the development, is the more employees you will need to service that development.*
- How is new development treated (i.e. a new courthouse) that moves employees but doesn't increase new employees? *A: Developers can submit an alternative development plan with site-specific numbers. Generally if there is an increase in employees, you will pay for that increase.*
- Has having to spend the inclusionary housing fee within period of time or provide a refund proved burdensome? *A: This is tied into legal considerations. If paying an impact or inclusionary fee, based on the impacts the development has on affordable housing, it should fulfill the need. The Village has donated money to Habitat for Humanity in the past. The Village is working on developing a list to purchase land to do smaller developments or donate to someone who can.*
- In lieu fee used subsidizes to build low end? Has that been considered where tax credits aren't available? Can that be a subsidy to make from moderate to low? *A: This is possible as the use of inclusionary and impact fee fund is broad and it can subsidize the development of affordable housing.*
- If a developer wants to build affordable housing but there are no tax credits available, can these fees be used to subsidize costs of AF? *A: Yes, the Village gave habitat land and \$100,000 as a subsidy for affordable housing development.*
- Do you know why the Village figure is 2.56 people vs. Monroe County's figure at 1.9. *A: No*
- **Mitigating only 1/3 of the impact.** The Inclusionary housing program presents a problem in that it is only mitigating 1/3 of new impact and may even be resulting in the conversion for market rate a few affordable accommodations. We need to watch this. Is there an Achilles heal in the Village Code that you feel the county should address on county level would be helpful? *A: Dorm provides flexibility but was not seen as the best option for employees. Ailing parent – can't find place to live. Heard that a lot. Taking care of my parent and can't find a place to live. Generally dorms are not conducive to building community. More positive houses and units than dorms. Also NIMBY concerns with dorms and micro-housing and for the most part workers need cars in the Keys.*
- **Cutting down on % of impact didn't stimulate more development in the downturn.** When times get tough, lesson is, don't cut back on the ordinance. It doesn't stimulate anything.
- When economy turns down, small developers aren't able to get capital and credit while big developers can still move forward.
- **Limited land availability.** Seems there is limited available land and square feet for new development in the Village. The inclusionary housing potential and opportunity seems limited for new development and not redevelopment. Where will new development happen? *A: There is an opportunity with smaller developments, e.g. 1500 square feet building (Marine boat lifts), their development didn't trigger the need for more units, but they decided to put 2<sup>nd</sup> unit on top.*
- **Affordable Housing and habitat protection.** Commercial is restricted partly due to the important habitat protection that is in place. Be careful in balancing habitat

protection with affordable housing. County is in better shape because of tier designations that protect habitat and avoid lawsuits.

- **Build out date.** Will there will be an end date for build out? *A: At some point the Village and County will be built out. However we are not close to that yet.*
- **Non-residential units and evacuation.** Since non-residential units don't impact evacuation the state is less interested in regulating.
- **Micro units and evacuation.** Working with state to get their buy presenting evidence regarding whether additional vehicles will trigger additional allocations.
- In the Islander example going from a dorm to affordable units, did they lose beds along the way? *A: May have lost beds, but they had 4 single dorm rooms that shared common area. There was a tradeoff in making into 1 and 2 bedroom units, however the quality of the units increased.*
- We should be looking for a mix of dorms, 1 and 2, bedroom. Dorms fill the need for much of low wage service workforce that are generally single.
- **Certificate of Occupancy.** A really good thing is the affordable housing must be addressed before certificate of occupancy has to happen before CO on development. Planning and Building must be communicative and alerts set.
- **Income certification.** One problem that Islamorada has income certification for occupancy and this is up to developers and trying to get those documents from renters presents a challenge. How to make easy for developer to move forward but also staff to administer properly.
- **Redevelopment.** Does a redevelopment change in how the trigger is used? E.g. Publix? *A: Yes. Publix was retail to retail.*
- Redevelopment should help to mitigate some of the mistakes of past. Government shouldn't be required to perpetuate mistakes of the past once we realize we should have done it better.
- **Calculation of # of employees.** In terms of square feet to number of employees to units (2.56 occupants) are they all considered employees? *A: 2.56 is the average number of people living in unit. If you had to house 30 people, you'd put into the matrix the mix e.g. 1-bedroom houses 2 people; 2-bedrooms house 3.5 people; 3 bedrooms house 5 people.*
- **Inclusionary off site units.** Putting inclusionary offsite can work well in some instances. In Key Large a developer building 6 apartments decided to construct two affordable housing units off site and designated them as deed restricted in perpetuity.
- **School construction and affordable housing.** Plantation Key School will be constructed in next 6 months. What are the affordable housing and inclusionary housing implications of that as a new building. Are we taking into consideration housing for teachers? *A: The School District is exempt from the inclusionary housing program and the school is a replacement. In the end there will be no old buildings remaining and the new buildings will not provide for a greater number of students.*
- We should be focusing opportunities and situations happening now. It is disappointing that there is not an effort to address housing with the construction of this school.
- Ed Davidson noted that this was a fair criticism based on his suggestion that redevelopment should correct the mistakes of the past. He promised to give this issue some further thought and go back to the School Board to consider donating some impact money to the Affordable Housing fund.

### **C. Review of Previous Inclusionary Housing Proposals- 2007-08 Task Force**

Mayte Santamaria provided a briefing on inclusionary housing proposals from the 2007-2008 affordable housing task force (*See Appendix #7*). The Task Force reviewed two nexus studies for the Village of Islamorada and Marathon that used data that was county wide and provided analysis and specific numbers related to the need for workforce housing created by both residential and non-residential development. The studies calculated the employees and workforce housing units needed based on 1,000 square feet of non-residential development for each land use.

Jim Saunders noted he was a member of that Committee and noted that in the face of the economic downturn in 2008, the recommendations were not acted upon and put into an ordinance for the County. He noted the committee felt at the time that it did not make sense to exclude commercial and transient developments from the inclusionary housing program that applied to residential development, as they were generating the need for employees and workforce housing. The committee also debated whether it should be a higher percentage.

### **D. Monroe County Inclusionary Residential Housing Program**

Mayte Santamaria reviewed the County's residential inclusionary housing program (*See Appendix #8*) She noted that the Monroe County Code Section 130-161 requires residential developments that result in the development or redevelopment of three (3) or more dwelling units [or ten or more mobile homes] to develop or redevelop at least 30 percent of the units as affordable housing units to implement Goal 601 of the Monroe County Comprehensive Plan and to ensure that the need for affordable housing is not exacerbated by new residential development and redevelopment of existing affordable housing stock. She noted the County also has an alternative compliance path as well: minimum for 400 square feet can build onsite or offsite deed restricted affordable housing units. Developers can also do in lieu fees and land donations. The in lieu fees is set price, not a sliding scale like Islamorada and is equivalent to the maximum sales price of 1-bedroom unit which today is calculated at \$264,000. To my knowledge, no one has used in lieu fees.

#### *AHAC Member Questions/Comments*

- The Committee should consider recommending retaining and perhaps strengthening the current residential inclusionary housing program

### **E. Developing a Monroe County Inclusionary Housing “Nexus Study”**

A “nexus” or support study provides the required background and technical documentation for the workforce housing need created by new development and remodels, develops a methodology for determining housing need, and provides statistical support for mitigation fee calculation. It usually reviews and covers: What does the support study allow; which type of development will pay the fee; how much square footage of development should be exempted from fees; how much will each type of development pay? What is the timeline for payment of the fees; and what will the funds be used for?

Mayte Santamaria noted that staff has reached out to the Clarion Association that conducted the study for Islamorada to explore what a scope of work might entail to conduct a County nexus study on applying inclusionary housing policies to transient and commercial development. She noted that any proposed program would require current data to support the scope and fees associated with it and would have to be approved by DEO.

The Committee discussed the need to help the County establish numbers that are supported by data and analysis and Bill Hunter made the following motion and Stephanie Scuderi seconded:

**The AHAC recommends that the Board of County Commission support and fund a nexus study as the first step in considering the expansion of the current County residential inclusionary housing program to cover transient and commercial development in the County.**

*AHAC Discussion of the Motion*

- Trying to make policy on this in the absence of data doesn't make sense.
- In order to defend Committee recommendations, we need to have current numbers.
- How long will it take to get current data that is defensible? A: Staff is hoping the scope of work will be under \$50k and would not require a request for proposals. If that is the case the study could be conducted in 4-6 months.
- Timing of the survey and interview data collected in the height of season numbers are going to be different. This should be taken into consideration by asking the consultants to consider including data from two time periods: high and low times of the season. This might affect the timing of the study and results.
- Would suggest that they should determine the high season count as the basis.
- They may not have to conduct during high season as they will be interviewing employers.
- There should be significant benefits to commercial developers providing workforce housing on site by relieving employers of calculating housing costs into salaries and taking advantage of some potential IRS tax benefits.

The Committee provided an opportunity for public comment in the inclusionary housing discussion and motion.

- Debbie Batty noted she was supportive of inclusionary housing however in the Seahorse example with 124 units, because of code and density issues, Habitat for Humanity was only able to build 25 or 31 representing a big loss of units.
- Sarah Spurlock, City of Key West planning noted that the City is doing a comprehensive review of their Land Development Regulations (LDRs) and Affordable Housing LDRs. There will be a joint workshop on February 1, 2016 at which affordable housing will be discussed including: inclusionary limits, incentives for developers, fee waivers including redevelopment and not just development. The City has continuing challenges with recruiting and retaining employees.

The Committee then voted unanimously to support the motion as a resolution to the Board of County Commission.

The facilitator noted that the Committee will receive a presentation from Jim Sanders at the March meeting on developing affordable housing and the residential inclusionary housing program. He noted that Task 10 asks the Committee to consider inclusionary housing for the hospitality and commercial sectors.

### III. WORKFORCE HOUSING CONSTRUCTION COSTS

#### A. Debbie Batty's Presentation on Construction Costs

Ms. Batty introduced herself and her work in affordable housing in the Keys. She provided a handout (*See Appendix #11*) which included an estimate and breakdown of the costs for one modular home not including land costs or carrying costs in Islander Village which has 89 deed restricted units in a 120% moderate income rate community. This development was half built and then a period of 7 years elapsed before it was completed. These affordable modular units are 90% complete when they arrive on the site and are relatively expensive to build at around \$230,000 per house. A similar budget for Habitat for Humanity's affordable housing development in Big Coppitt which included County donated land and Habitat is building 10 modular units for about \$213,000 each because they have volunteers for painting, etc.

#### *AHAC Member Questions/Comments*

- Are these modular wooden houses? *A: Yes*
- How does the financing work when there is a delay in completing the project? *A: The loan was based upon appraised worth. Construction loans do allow the developer to sell houses but only secure rent as guarantee to pay mortgage.*
- The Florida Keys appear to be one of riskiest places in the country for affordable housing development. Also the presentation doesn't include some of the land costs and carrying costs. What was basis of land? *A: \$3.6m and then county purchase 65% appraised value for a 100 year deed restriction under a 2005 formula.*
- Looks like an additional \$40,000 per door for the land cost. So \$230,000 plus 40,000 plus to pay carrying cost plus another 20,000 in expenses. So in the lower Keys a large affordable housing project may be looking at \$300,000 or more per door. *A: Yes building affordable housing is expensive and there is a lot of risk associated. If someone willing to take risk there has to be support by County to do that. If the unit is sold for ownership the maximum in 2015 they can sell is \$299,000-\$334,000 for a 3-bedroom = \$334 max sales price. At this number there is nobody willing to do that without subsidies.*
- Why not develop for the smaller unit, 1-bedroom market to serve the tourism industry workforce? *A: Affordable housing is needed at every level. Rental at 50-60% low income is covered because of the Federal tax subsidy program. Habitat for Humanity is focused on home ownership for families and building stable communities. The Lower Keys Habitat does rentals but the Habitat focus is on ownership. Working families want 2-3 bedrooms for ownership or rental. We have proposed on two properties to build 1 -bedroom modular homes that look like a conch house but have not been able to build them. We have built 1 bed/bath rentals to serve different level of the 80% median income level at the Railway development in Key West. In terms of 1-2 bedrooms for ownership, they could sell 10 per month if they were available.*
- Why is the sale of ownership affordable housing all the same price for the different income categories? *A: City of Key West has different levels but Monroe County does not.*

- Is this an area for possible recommendation?
- What about the qualifications for living in units that are subsidized with Federal tax credits? The Federal poverty standards don't apply in the Keys as the cost of living for a family of four is 3 times the national rate. HUD doesn't index cost of living against national poverty limits in the tax credit discussion. *A: The problem nationally is this impacts most the resort communities such as Vail, etc. The view is there is more work that can be done at the state level vs. the national level.*
- Monroe County does get priority for 1 project per year for 90% credits with the Florida Housing Finance Corporation. No other county has this guarantee but eh County needs to make sure that several projects are cued up and ready to go in light of issues such as public opposition.
- We cannot take for granted the set aside for Keys. It is attacked annually in the legislature. It is the first thing that gets funded off the top. Developers in the past have tried to remove the set aside to go.
- Habitat for Humanity was offered \$50,000 per unit but couldn't find a way to get it done due to the gap in costs and subsidies.

## **B. Hana Eskra's Presentation on Construction Costs**

Hana Eskra, an AHAC member, presented a hypothetical example of a Gorman Company Project and Feasibility Summary of a 32 unit development built north of MM 80 to provide a summary of the costs involved in the construction of affordable housing in the Keys (*See Appendix #11*). These were all concrete rentals. These are 1 and 2 bedroom units built for hotel and other workers but not at low/low income levels. It costs \$40,000 annually in insurance for the 32 units if out of the flood plain. If in the flood plain it would be over \$60,000 a year. The operating costs are considerable at more than \$6,300 per unit per year.

### *AHAC Member Questions/Comments*

- In terms of rents, the vacancy rate on this project never hit 7% but lenders won't let us calculate on anything less than 7%. In terms of income and costs there is little cushion.
- \$81,000 gets us \$1.2 million in credit/debt for the 32 units meaning have to have subsidy. 60% we can get low income tax credits and we make up the remaining from housing trust fund and tax credit equity.
- What about inclusionary housing? Inclusionary housing is an issue for affordable housing developers. You are asking employers to subsidize a unit by over \$200,000. If you ask them to do 30 additional units probably won't work, whereas 3-5 units maybe possible.
- Good to have current data. Cautionary notes: these are aggressive operating cost assumptions and the developer is taking on significant risk. Costs in the Upper Keys appears considerably cheaper. *A: With several projects you might realize economies of scale and shows this in the operating cost assumptions. It's the insurance numbers that makes me nervous.*
- It looks like you have \$375,000 per unit total cost and \$335,000 total subsidy and tax credits and SAIL loan from the Florida Housing Finance Corporation. As Committee should say if 800 AH ROGOs and things cost \$\_\_\_\_\_ as we toggle income levels how much subsidy will that create? 800 x \$335k subsidy. If we do that exercise, we can see the

real revenue needed in terms of funding. A: This does include \$1,200,000 for the land. Getting to math and getting construction down is *very* risky.

- What's the payoff for your company? A: Developer fees, the Florida Housing 60% on tax credits. Before we close we have \$750,000-1,000,000 costs incurred. We need to get to construction closing otherwise we lose. An incentive is we will get the fees up front.
- What about down the road? A: We have 500year land use restriction and 99 years with the County. The problem is after 15-20 years, we need to recapitalize to renovate. If we do it right we can make some income. If there are overruns, we won't. E.g. concrete costs on one project went up 10% within 6 months and was the most expensive thing on site.
- Somebody must provide housing for employees.
- Cost of recapitalization 20 years down road as a part of ownership may be more attractive to developers. A big issue is cost and what can we do to help attack those cost including land purchase, building on top of commercial in strip malls, and the County construction company and don't worry as much about labor costs as a not for profit entity. Should the County take on these burdens?
- Costs are what they cost. You get past weigh station going south and costs go up. Modular in Key West makes sense in this context but you still have to truck them down. Even if you cut costs in half per unit, it still only supports \$38,000 even if it is a micro house.
- In terms of the inclusionary housing fee, the difference is the commercial developer has other income to offset unlike developers of affordable housing.
- There are additional costs with bigger project costs (environmental, etc.). With only so much tax credit available and with inclusionary housing covering only a portion, you can't dump this on new businesses. This reinforces expanding the inclusionary program to cover tourist businesses.

#### **IV. INTERGOVERNMENTAL ROUNDTABLE REVIEW**

The facilitator reviewed with the Committee the draft agenda for the Roundtable and the requests being made of the local governments participating in terms of data on workforce and affordable housing. (*See Appendix #12*). The Committee suggested providing participants with information on the Committee's charge and recommendations to date, clarifying that an objective of the roundtable was to support intergovernmental cooperation across jurisdictions.

#### **V. PUBLIC COMMENT**

An opportunity for public comment was offered at the conclusion of the Committee's discussion of each agenda task. The public was also encouraged to consider providing written comments using a comment form. There were no public comments offered at the end of the meeting.

#### **VI. NEXT STEPS AND ASSIGNMENTS**

Ed Davidson raised the question of whether the Committee would be addressing issues and making recommendations related to providing workforce opportunities and education through schools. He noted that the service sector is importing employees when we might be better off hiring locally. The facilitator noted that the importance and value of building and sustaining

communities in the Keys might be addressed in a preamble but probably not in a recommendation as it appears to fall outside the 10 tasks the Committee has been assigned.

The facilitator reviewed the potential topics for the March 2016 AHAC agenda including completing the review of inclusionary housing and discussing options and reviewing a overall format and outline for the Committee's report to the BOCC. The Committee completed a meeting evaluation form (*See Appendix # 3 for an evaluation summary*) and adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

## Appendix #1 Agenda

<b>MONROE COUNTY AFFORDABLE HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE</b> <b>MEETING VI—FRIDAY, JANUARY 22, 2015—9:00 A.M.-1:00 P.M.</b> <b>MARATHON GOVERNMENT CENTER</b>
---

### *COMMITTEE MEETING OBJECTIVES*

- ✓ To review and Approve Regular Procedural Topics (Agenda, AHAC December 2015 Summary/Minutes)
- ✓ To review the Committee’s Draft Work Plan
- ✓ To receive presentations on inclusionary housing requirements for workforce housing and discuss initial options in response to Task #10
- ✓ To receive presentations on the cost of developing and constructing workforce housing and discuss implications for AHAC’s remaining Tasks.
- ✓ Review the Objectives and Format for the February AHAC Workshop with Municipalities
- ✓ To Identify Next Steps, Assignments
- ✓ To Hear and Consider Public Comment

### *MEETING AGENDA—FRIDAY, JANUARY 22, 2015*

*All Agenda Times—including Public Comment & Adjournment—are Approximate and Subject to Change*

<b>9:00 AM</b>	<b>Welcome, Roll Call, Introductions, Review and Approval of Agenda</b>
<b>9:10</b>	<b>Review, Public Comments and Approval of AHAC December 18, 2015 Draft Summary/Minutes</b>
<b>9:15</b>	<b>Review of the AHAC Charge and Committee Work Plan</b>
<b>9:25</b>	<b>Update on Actions, Activities since the December 18 AHAC Meeting</b>
<b>9:30</b>	<b>Workforce Inclusionary Housing Strategies- Task 10 Overview and Definitions</b> <i>Task #10. Develop strategies to assist in developing inclusionary housing requirements for hospitality and commercial sector to build workforce housing.</i>
<b>9:35</b>	<b>Briefing on Inclusionary Housing</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>D. Islamorada Inclusionary Housing program- Hospitality &amp; Commercial- development, implementation and lessons learned – Cheryl Cioffari</li> <li>E. Review of Previous Inclusionary Housing Proposals- 2007-08 Task Force - staff</li> <li>F. Review County Residential Inclusionary Housing 30% requirement implementation- staff</li> <li>G. Developer Perspective on a Project meeting the Residential Inclusionary Housing requirement-Jim Saunders</li> </ul> Committee Q & A
<b>10:30</b>	<i>Break</i>
<b>10:45</b>	<i>Public Comment</i>
<b>10:50</b>	<b>Inclusionary Housing Strategies for Workforce Housing- Discussion</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committee Identification and Discussion of Ideas, Strategies and Options</li> </ul>
<b>11:45</b>	<b>Workforce Housing Costs-Different Housing Types/Income Levels</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentation of Examples of Workforce Housing Costs- Hana Eskra &amp; Ed Swift/Debbie Batty</li> <li>• Discussion of the implications of housing costs as the AHAC addresses its tasks</li> </ul>
<b>12:15</b>	<i>Public Comment</i>
<b>12:30</b>	<b>Review of February AHAC Roundtable with Municipal Representatives</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Invitation/participation of municipal representatives, invitation of other public and private organizations.</li> <li>• Review Draft Roundtable objectives, format and design</li> </ul>
<b>12:50</b>	<b>Next Steps and Assignments</b>
<b>1:00 PM</b>	<b>ADJOURN</b>

## Appendix #2- AHAC Committee and Staff

<b>AFFORDABLE HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP</b>	
<b>MEMBER, ORGANIZATION</b>	<b>REPRESENTATION –Based on Statutory/Regulation Categories &amp; Districts</b>
Jim Cameron	Advocate for low income affordable housing, Dist. 2
Capt. Ed Davidson, Monroe County School Board	Citizen recommended by the Monroe County School Board
Hana Eskra, Florida Market President, Gorman & Co. Inc.	Real estate professional in connection with affordable housing, Dist. 4
Bill Hunter	Citizen with no financial interest in the development of affordable
Warren Leamard. Owner, Chef, Destination Catering & Events	Not for profit provider of affordable housing, Dist. 3
Kurt Lewin	
Ken Naylor, Atlantic Pacific Communities	For profit provider of affordable housing, Dist. 3
Tim Root, Mingo Co Construction	Residential affordable housing building industry, Dist. 1
Jim Saunders, Bayview Land Development & Permitting	Citizen, representing employers in Monroe County, Dist. 5
Stephanie Scuderi, Senior VP, Centennial Bank.	Citizen, representing essential services personnel related to AH, Dist. 5
Ed Swift III, President, Historic Tours of America	Citizen, residing in Monroe County, Dist. 4
Randy Wall, Blue Fin Inc.	Labor, home building related to affordable housing, District 2
Jodi Weinhofer, President, Lodging Association of the Florida Keys	Citizen recommended by the Monroe County lodging industry
William Wiatt, Sunset Villas	Member, Local Planning agency, Dist. 4
<b>BOCC LIAISON- EX OFFICIO MEMBERS</b>	
Heather Carruthers	Mayor Pro Tem, Monroe County BOCC
Sylvia Murphy	Commissioner, Monroe County BOCC
<b>MONROE COUNTY STAFF</b>	
Peter Morris / Steve Williams	County Attorney's Office
Mayte Santamaria	Senior Director of Planning and Environmental Resources, <a href="mailto:Santamaria-Mayte@MonroeCounty-FL.Gov">Santamaria-Mayte@MonroeCounty-FL.Gov</a> (305) 289-2500
Emily Schemper	Comprehensive Plan Manager (305)289-2500 <a href="mailto:Schemper-Emily@MonroeCounty-FL.Gov">Schemper-Emily@MonroeCounty-FL.Gov</a>
Tiffany Stankiewicz	Development Administrator
Carol Schreck	Committee Administrator <a href="mailto:Schreck-Carol@MonroeCounty-FL.Gov">Schreck-Carol@MonroeCounty-FL.Gov</a>
<b>AHAC FACILITATOR</b>	
Bob Jones	FCRC Consensus Center, FSU, <a href="mailto:rmjones@fsu.edu">rmjones@fsu.edu</a>

Appendix #3- Meeting Evaluation Summary

MONROE COUNTY AFFORDABLE HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING EVALUATION FORM

MEETING IV—FRIDAY, JANUARY 22, 2016—9:00 A.M.-1:00 P.M.

MARATHON GOVERNMENT CENTER

*Average rank using a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 means totally disagree and 10 means totally agree.*

**1. Please assess the overall meeting.**

10.0 The agenda packet was very useful.

10.0 The objectives for the meeting were stated at the outset.

9.5 Overall, the objectives of the meeting were fully achieved.

**2. Do you agree that each of the following session objectives was achieved?**

10.0 The background information was very useful.

10.0 To review and Approve Regular Procedural Topics (Agenda, AHAC December 2015 Summary/Minutes)

9.6 To review the Committee's Draft Work Plan

9.8 To receive presentations on inclusionary housing requirements for workforce housing and discuss initial options in response to Task #10

10.0 To receive presentations on the cost of developing and constructing workforce housing and discuss implications for AHAC's remaining Tasks.

10.0 Review the Objectives and Format for the February AHAC Workshop with Municipalities

9.7 To Identify Next Steps, Assignments

10.0 To Hear and Consider Public Comment

**3. Please tell us how well the facilitator helped members engage in the meeting.**

10.0 The facilitator made sure the concerns of members were heard.

9.8 The facilitator helped to arrange our time well.

**4. Please indicate your level of satisfaction with the organizational meeting?**

10.0 Overall, I am very satisfied with the meeting.

10.0 I am satisfied with the outcomes of the meeting.

10.0 I know what the next steps following this meeting will be.

**5. What did you like best about the listening session?**

- Very informative on cost of construction issues.

**6. How could the session have been improved?**

- Some members get off topic with personal agenda.

**7. Do you have any other comments that you would like to add?**

- We are accumulating a lot of items to firm up into recommendations.
- Add "current events and discussion of how we can be effective" to each agenda.

## Appendix #4 – AHAC Charge

### THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE CHARGE

#### **AHAC Tasks Assigned by the Monroe County Board of County Commissioners (BOCC)**

**The Monroe County Affordable Housing Committee (Committee) will seek consensus on guidance and recommendations to the Monroe County Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) addressing the issues set forth in the Committee’s charge.**

#### **By October 2015:**

- 1 Propose a definition for “Workforce” and the need within and where (geographically in unincorporated Monroe County) for providing housing for various income levels (very low, low, median and moderate).
- 2 Evaluate and define the workforce housing need in unincorporated Monroe County.
- 3 Evaluate and propose additional mechanism to qualify and monitor the occupants of deed restricted affordable housing to ensure the units are preserved and maintained as affordable.

#### **Within 1 year from the effective date of this resolution:**

4. Develop solutions for rental housing.
5. Develop incentives for development of workforce housing on Tier III properties.
6. Develop strategies for increasing density to encourage workforce housing development, such as micro housing and dormitories.
7. Develop strategies to increase the Monroe County Housing Authority’s role in workforce housing, specifically as a management entity for rental workforce housing;
8. Explore and propose expanding local funding sources (local government, private/public partnerships, community/charitable organizations) to help expand workforce housing in Monroe County.
9. Review and consider recommendations to the BOCC for amendments to statutes to address:
  - a Sadowski Trust Fund donor inequity,
  - b Allow Land Authority funds to be used for extending deed restrictions or buying back expired deed restrictions to preserve affordable housing,
  - c Amend Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program to require on-site management longer than 15 years,
  - d Amend or increase 1 cent Tourist Impact Tax to provide dedicated funding for the provision of workforce housing specifically for the hospitality industry; and
10. Develop strategies to assist in developing inclusionary housing requirements for hospitality and commercial sector to build workforce housing.

## Appendix #5: AHAC Workplan

COMMITTEE DRAFT WORK PLAN/MEETING SCHEDULE			
2015			
#	DATE	TIME	LOCATION
<b>Initial Review and Development of AHAC Recommendations for Tasks #1-3</b>			
I.	Friday, August 21, 2015	9am-12 pm	Marathon Govt. Ctr.
Organizational Meeting #1: Review Charge, Procedures, Success, Work plan and BOCC Charge tasks due in October 2015: workforce definition, workforce housing need and deed restricted affordable housing			
II.	Friday, September 18, 2015	9am-1pm	Marathon Govt. Ctr.
2 <sup>nd</sup> Meeting: Refine and Adopt Work Plan, Presentation and discussion on qualifying and monitoring employee housing and potential role of the Monroe County Housing Authority (Task #3); review 2 <sup>nd</sup> draft statement on “workforce” definition (#1); receive information from staff on workforce housing need and review draft statements (#2).			
III.	Friday, October 16, 2015	9am-3pm	Marathon Govt. Ctr.
3 <sup>rd</sup> Meeting: Refine and Update Work Plan, review, refine and adopt draft consensus recommendations on workforce definition (#1), workforce housing need (#2) and deed restricted affordable housing (#3). Review & discussion of Local Housing Assistance Plan, Sec. 2-701. - Duties of the affordable housing advisory committee.			
<b>Initial Review of AHAC Ideas and Options on Tasks # 4-10, November 2015 –March 2016</b>			
IV.	Friday, November 20, 2015	9am-1 pm	Marathon Govt. Ctr.
4 <sup>th</sup> Meeting: Review Work plan; Discuss, review, discuss and adopt the Report to the BOCC on the Local Housing Assistance Plan and surplus land inventory; Presentation and information on AHAC Tasks #5 Incentive for development of Tier III workforce housing properties and discussion and identification of initial options.			
V.	Friday, December 18, 2015	9am-1 pm	Marathon Govt. Ctr.
5 <sup>th</sup> Meeting: Refine and update Work Plan, Presentations, briefings and information on AHAC Tasks: Local funding sources (#8), state and local funding (#9a,b,c,d) discussion of initial options for recommendations.			
2016			
VI.	Friday, January 22, 2016	9am-1 pm	Marathon Govt. Ctr.
6 <sup>th</sup> Meeting: Refine and update Work Plan, Presentations, briefings and information on AHAC Tasks: Possible topics: Task #10 Inclusionary Housing.			
VII.	Friday, February 19, 2016	9am-3 pm	Marathon Govt. Ctr.
7 <sup>th</sup> Meeting: AHAC Roundtable with Municipal Representatives			
VIII.	Friday, March 18, 2016	9am-1 pm	Marathon Govt. Ctr.
8 <sup>th</sup> Meeting: Refine and update Work Plan, Additional presentations, briefings and information on AHAC Tasks; Overview of initial draft of AHAC draft workforce housing report; Rating, refining and building consensus on background and recommendations.			
IX.	Friday, April 22, 2016	9am-1 pm	Marathon Govt. Ctr.
9 <sup>th</sup> Meeting: Refine and update Work Plan, Presentations, briefings and information on AHAC Tasks: Task #6 Increase Density (micro housing, dormitories, etc.) to encourage workforce housing development; Review of AHAC draft workforce housing report outline. Rating, refining and building consensus on draft background and recommendations.			
<b>Consensus Building on AHAC Recommendations for Tasks 4-10, April 2016- July 2016</b>			
X.	Friday, May 20, 2016	9am-3pm	Marathon Govt. Ctr.
10 <sup>th</sup> Meeting: Review of 2 <sup>nd</sup> draft of AHAC draft workforce housing report and rating, refining and building consensus on background and recommendations.			
XI.	Friday, June 17, 2016	9am-1 pm	Marathon Govt. Ctr.
11 <sup>th</sup> Meeting: Review and adopt final draft of AHAC draft workforce housing report			
XII.	Friday, July 22 2016	9am-1 pm	Marathon Govt. Ctr.
12 <sup>th</sup> Meeting: Finalize and adopt AHAC report to the BOCC			

## Appendix #6

# INCLUSIONARY HOUSING DEFINED

“Inclusionary housing refers to a range of local policies that tap the economic gains from rising real estate values to create affordable housing—tying the creation of homes for low- or moderate-income households to the construction of market-rate residential or commercial development. In its simplest form, an inclusionary housing program might require developers to sell or rent 10 to 30 percent of new residential units to lower-income residents... Roughly 500 communities in the United States have developed inclusionary housing policies, which require developers of new market-rate real estate to provide affordable housing. For cities struggling to maintain economic integration, inclusionary housing is one of the most promising strategies to ensure that the benefits of development are shared widely.

- [Inclusionary Housing: Creating and Maintaining Equitable Communities](https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/3583_Inclusionary-Housing), Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, 2015 [https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/3583\\_Inclusionary-Housing](https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/3583_Inclusionary-Housing)

Inclusionary housing ordinances vary substantially among local governments. These variables can include:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Mandatory or voluntary ordinance.</b> While many cities require inclusionary housing, many more offer zoning bonuses, expedited permits, reduced fees, cash subsidies, or other incentives for developers who voluntarily build affordable housing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Percentage of units to be dedicated as inclusionary housing.</b> This varies quite substantially among jurisdictions, but appears to range from 10-30%.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Minimum size of development</b> that the ordinance applies to. Most jurisdictions exempt smaller developments, but some require that even developments incurring only a fraction of an inclusionary housing unit pay a fee (see below).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Whether inclusionary housing must be built on site.</b> Some programs allow housing to be built nearby, in cases of hardship.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Income level or price defined as "affordable," and buyer qualification methods.</b> Most ordinances seem to target inclusionary units to low- or moderate-income households which earn approximately the regional median income or somewhat below. Inclusionary housing typically does not create housing for those with very low incomes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Whether fees can be paid in lieu of building inclusionary housing.</b> Fees-in-lieu allow a developer to "buy out" of an inclusionary housing obligation. This may seem to defeat the purpose of inclusionary zoning, but in some cases the cost of building one affordable unit on-site could purchase several affordable units off-site.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Appearance and integration of inclusionary housing units.</b> Many jurisdictions require that inclusionary housing units be indistinguishable from market-rate units, but this can increase costs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Which types of housing construction the ordinance applies to.</b> For example, high-rise housing costs more to build per square foot (thus raising compliance costs, perhaps prohibitively), so some ordinances exempt it from compliance.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Longevity of price restrictions attached to inclusionary housing units, and allowable appreciation.</b> Ordinances that allow the "discount" to expire essentially grant a windfall profit to the inclusionary housing buyer, preventing that subsidy from being recycled to other needy households. On the other hand, preventing price appreciation removes a key incentive for home ownership. Many programs restrict annual price appreciation (by, for instance, enrolling inclusionary housing in community <a href="#">land trusts</a>), often tying it to <a href="#">inflation</a> plus market value of home improvements, striving to balance the community's interest in long-term affordability with the homeowner's interest in accruing equity over time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Whether housing rehabilitation counts as "construction,"</b> either of market-rate or affordable units. Some cities, like New York City, allow developers to count rehabilitation of off-site housing as an inclusionary contribution.</li> </ul>

**Appendix #7**

**OVERVIEW OF PREVIOUS MONROE COUNTY AFFORDABLE HOUSING TASK FORCE INCLUSIONARY HOUSING PROPOSAL**

**Overview of Previous Inclusionary Housing Proposals- 2008**

*Summary from Lisa Tennyson:*

There were two nexus studies that provided analysis and specific numbers related to the need for workforce housing created by both residential and non-residential development. The studies calculated the employees and workforce housing units needed based on 1,000 square feet of non-residential development for each land use. (The nexus studies were done for Islamorada and Marathon, but because both studies used data that was county-wide, the County relied upon it as well.)

NEED FOR WORKFORCE HOUSING CREATED BY NON-RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, MONROE COUNTY		
Land Use	Number of Employees Generated	Workforce Housing Units Needed For Employees
Per 1,000 Sq. Ft.		
Government	.953	.601
Industrial	1.327	.837
Institutional	1.301	.821
Office	1.778	1.121
Retail	1.460	.921
Tourist	1.509	.952

So, for example every 1,000 sq. ft. of office development generates the need for 1.778 workers and the need for 1.12 housing units. So, 16,000 sq. ft. of new commercial office space generates the need for 28 workers and 17 housing units (using an assumed household size of 1.56).

The previous Affordable Housing Task Force then used this data/analysis to develop an inclusionary ordinance for transient use (hotel/motel) and commercial development. We basically calculated how many housing units a new or re-development would generate the need for, and then required that the new development mitigate 30% of that. i.e. if a new development generated the need for 14 new housing units, then they would have to provide 4 units of worker housing.

## Appendix # 8

### OVERVIEW OF MONROE COUNTY RESIDENTIAL INCLUSIONARY HOUSING REQUIREMENTS AND PROGRAM

Adopted County Code provides for an inclusionary housing requirement for *residential* development and redevelopment projects.

Monroe County Code Section 130-161 requires residential developments that result in the development or redevelopment of three (3) or more dwelling units [or ten or more mobile homes] to develop or redevelop at least 30 percent of the units as affordable housing units (fractional requirements equal to or greater than 0.5 shall be rounded up to the nearest whole number) to implement Goal 601 of the Monroe County Comprehensive Plan and to ensure that the need for affordable housing is not exacerbated by new residential development and redevelopment of existing affordable housing stock.

#### **Excerpt of Section 130-161(b)(2) of the Land Development Code:**

- a. Residential developments, other than mobile home or mobile home spaces covered by subsection (b)(2)b. of this section, that result in the development or redevelopment of three or more dwelling units on a parcel or contiguous parcels shall be required to develop or redevelop at least 30 percent of the residential units as affordable housing units. Residential development or redevelopment of three units on a parcel or contiguous parcels shall require that one developed or redeveloped unit be an affordable housing unit. For the purpose of this section, and notwithstanding subsection (b)(2)b. of this section, any dwelling unit exceeding the number of lawfully established dwelling units on site, which are created by either a TRE or ROGO allocation award, shall be considered developed units.
- b. The removal and replacement with other types of dwelling units of ten or more mobile homes that are located on a parcel or contiguous parcels and/or the conversion of mobile home spaces located on a parcel or contiguous parcels into a use other than mobile homes shall be required to include in the development or redevelopment a number of affordable housing units equal to at least 30 percent of the number of existing units being removed and replaced or converted from mobile home use or, in the event the new use is nonresidential, to develop affordable housing units at least equal in number to 30 percent of the number of mobile homes or mobile home spaces being converted to other than mobile home use. Removal and replacement or conversion to a different use of ten mobile homes or mobile home spaces on a parcel or contiguous parcels shall require that three units be replaced or converted to deed-restricted affordable housing.
- c. In calculating the number of affordable housing units required for a particular project, or phase of a project, all dwelling units proposed for development or redevelopment or mobile homes or mobile home spaces to be converted from mobile home use since the effective date of the ordinance from which this section is derived shall be counted. In phased projects, the affordable housing requirements shall be proportionally allocated among the phases. If a subsequent development or redevelopment is proposed following a prior development approved on the same property as it existed as of the effective date of the ordinance from which this section is derived, which prior development did not meet the compliance thresholds set forth in subsection (b)(2)a. or (b)(2)b. of this section, the requirements of subsection (b)(2)a. or (b)(2)b. of this section shall be met as part of the subsequent development for all units proposed for development or redevelopment after the effective date of the ordinance from which this section is derived.

## Appendix #9

### NET AFFORDABLE HOUSING IMPACTS- TWO PROJECTS- BILL HUNTER

At Friday's AHAC meeting I presented an overview of my analysis of the net affordable housing impact of two current development projects. I spoke quickly so I offer you this summary of what I said as an aid when you create the meeting minutes. The number of units involved below has changed several times over the months and is as accurate as my research allowed.

#### ROGOs - Mobile Home Incentive Program:

At last count, Oceanside Investors has acquired ownership of 79 mobile homes and 17 RV spaces which had been supplying affordable housing in the Lower Keys. Oceanside Investors requested 79 affordable ROGOs to deed restrict the mobile home sites. (NOTE: Since deed restriction requires the dwelling unit to meet code, many (all) units are demolished and replaced with modular housing).

Rather than the split among income categories that MC 130-161.1, (2)(c)(i)(4) recommends- 25% very low/25% low/25% median/25% moderate, the BOCC approved 0% very low, 25% low, 25% median, and 50% moderate. The result is no gain in workforce housing but existing affordable housing is preserved albeit at a significant increase in cost to occupants. The transferred ROGO exemptions are then used to build 79 residences that will be gated and used as vacation rentals – in essence hotel suites. There is no requirement for affordable housing with this gated community vacation rental development agreement. The 17 RV spaces will be used to create a new 17 room hotel, again with no workforce housing requirements.

#### Transient Rental License – Change in use:

RV spaces, hotel rooms and motel rooms are all considered transient uses. However, RV space occupants bring their own accommodations. They cook their own meals, do their own laundry, clean their own rooms and repair their living accommodations. On the other hand, hotel and motel occupants depend on the local workforce for all of these tasks. Changing the transient use from RV space to hotel room can be done rather simply, but doing so creates the need for new employees that require workforce housing.

Longstock LLC purchased Sea Horse RV Park and Campground that had, over the years, become permanent affordable housing for the workforce on Big Pine Key. There were 125 transient units and 5 permanent dwellings. The occupants of this park were evicted and 100 of the transient units will be moved to a 100 room hotel project. The current plan for Sea Horse is to donate the land to the County who will lease it to Habitat for Humanity to build 24 affordable ownership homes and retain 6 RV spaces for their volunteer workforce. This plan is admirable in that it improves the condition of the dwelling units at Sea Horse. However the net effect is an increase in cost for the 24 units of workforce housing that will be built and a loss of 100 workforce dwelling units. Not requiring workforce housing at the new hotel adds significantly to this workforce housing deficit.

#### Summary:

In the first case, workforce housing is preserved but the cost of occupancy increases significantly. The allocation of affordable ROGOs does not create any new housing but instead frees up transferable ROGO exemptions that enable de facto hotel suites for which no workforce housing is required. The net effect is depletion of the pool of affordable ROGOs while increasing the deficit of workforce housing.

In the second case, RV Parks that are providing workforce housing are closed in order to shift the transient units to new hotel rooms. Existing workforce housing is lost (with no replacement) and the need for new workforce is created at the hotel with no requirement to provide any housing.

All of the above is being done legally today within our existing Land Development Code. Requiring inclusionary workforce housing for all new tourist accommodations and addressing the loss of permanent residential dwelling units by gating communities for vacation rental, are two recommendations the committee can make. Requiring workforce housing to be addressed at both the sender and receiver side of a change in transient use is another recommendation the committee can make.

I hope this summary helps with the meeting minutes,  
Bill Hunter

## Appendix # 10 Committee LHAP Recommendations & AHAC Survey Results

### November 2015 AHAC Recommendation LHAP

#### Other County Incentive Strategies to Encourage or Facilitate Affordable Housing

##### **Inclusionary Housing**

*Staff Recommendation:* Monroe County shall maintain land development regulations on inclusionary housing and shall evaluate expanding the inclusionary housing requirements to include or address nonresidential and transient development and redevelopment based on specific data and analysis.

See, AHAC TASK # 10. Develop strategies to assist in developing inclusionary housing requirements for hospitality and commercial sector to build workforce housing
--

##### *Committee comments and questions*

- Inclusionary Housing is a functioning program right now and has been applied.
- The Committee should evaluate the current regulations and determine what the net effect of the regulations is on either increasing or losing affordable housing.
- It says non-residential, does that include Commercial? *A: Yes*

### August 2015 AHAC Member Survey Results- Task 10 Inclusionary Housing

**Task 10 “Develop strategies to assist in developing inclusionary housing requirements for hospitality and commercial sector to build workforce housing.”** (*Average 4.3 of 5, Very Critical*)

#### ***Define the related issue(s) as you see them in the form of key questions the Committee should explore:***

- Providing housing for predictable staff should always have simply been the cost of doing business in the Florida Keys, and making huge real estate profits on property turn over. Local taxpayers are now going to have to subsidize such staffing for profitable operations that should have paid their own impact costs, and paid a more livable wage
- It seems we are mostly built out in much of Monroe County and there are already requirements.
- Why is commercial development not required to provide affordable housing for the work force anticipated?
- Would think the hoteliers would be better-suited to develop these strategies and work with the county using their insights.
- For over twenty years we were making progress. Before the recession, all commercial construction or demolition and re-building were to provide housing on or off site (affordably) for 30% of its statistically verified workforce.
- This would be a primary source of helping fund new housing which is where our focus should be.

#### ***Identify any potential strategies to consider:***

- Leave incentives in place but introduce a requirement for commercial development. Examine a special requirement for tourist lodging.
- Pool sources of inclusionary housing fees to help subsidize those who can build rental housing projects.

***What key information do you think the Committee needs to make educated recommendations to address issue(s)?***

- Is there a plan that would expand the current requirements for new construction? What is the possible gain of housing that could be generated by this effort?
- How many employees does a single hotel room require? (a 100 room hotel requires xxx employees). How much housing is required for a shopping center where the anchor store will require 300 employees and the satellite stores require another 200 employees?
- What do current zoning regulations allow? Are projects financially feasible with inclusionary zoning regulations and no additional subsidy?
- None, pass it.
- Current inclusionary housing requirements.

**April 2015 Monroe County Workforce Housing Assessment Report- Excerpt**

**Inclusionary housing fee.**

“The County should set a fee for inclusionary housing such as the \$40,000 per inclusionary housing credit that Marathon is proposing. This fee would be paid to the Monroe County Housing Authority in an affordable housing trust fund to be distributed to those who actually build affordable housing. This would create a subsidy paid from new market rate or transient (hotel) projects to be distributed to those who actually build the affordable housing. To assure the housing is built and completed, the subsidy would not be funded until the certificates of occupancy for the affordable housing are issued. This type of commitment would incentivize those who are willing to build affordable housing, and the funds would come from those building the projects that require inclusionary housing without the market rate developer having to use some of his/her market rate allocations on affordable housing.

“All transient unit development and re-development to be inclusionary housing ordinance, or impact fee assessment.”

## **Appendix #11 Costs of Construction**

Debbie Batty presented an estimate and breakdown of the costs for one modular home which can be found at:

<http://www.monroecounty-fl.gov/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/2585>

Hana Eskra presented a hypothetical example of a Project and Feasibility as a summary of the costs involved in construction affordable housing in the Keys which can be found at:

<http://www.monroecounty-fl.gov/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/2586>

## Appendix #12 Intergovernmental Workforce Housing Roundtable

### INTERGOVERNMENTAL WORKFORCE HOUSING ROUNDTABLE , FEBRUARY 19, 2016

City of Key West Resolution  
Monroe County Resolution

Roundtable Draft Objectives

- ✓ To offer an opportunity for informal information sharing of workforce housing activities and initiatives in the municipalities & County.
- ✓ To identify strategies for enhancing workforce housing throughout the Florida Keys
- ✓ To hear from stakeholders and consider public comment
- ✓ To identify next steps and assignments

Invitation and Participation

- Invitation sent to each Municipality and the County to participate by sending a representative official or staff to directly participate.
- Share the Committee's Charge and 10 Tasks, Committee Success Statement and the October consensus recommendations to the BOCC.
- Each jurisdiction will be asked to develop the following information for sharing:
  - Number of total available affordable allocations (ten year allocation from the State of Florida)
  - Number of unused or pooled affordable housing allocations
  - Number of affordable allocations awarded in 2015 (ROGO or BPAS year of July to July)
  - Current length of deed restrictions
  - Existing number of existing affordable housing units, by income category, within the municipality
  - Current tenancy of affordable units (rental vs. owner-occupied)
  - Current income categories (definitions/\_\_\_% of median income)
  - Summary of existing incentives for affordable housing (brief bullet list)
  - Funding budgeted toward affordable housing development or land acquisition for affordable housing

Format

- An informal facilitated roundtable discussion with AHAC members, municipal and county representatives.
- Active participation of the public and opportunity for public comment including “comment forms”
- Length 9:00 a.m.- 2:00 pm.

**MONROE COUNTY AFFORDABLE HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**INTERGOVERNMENTAL WORKFORCE HOUSING ROUNDTABLE**  
**FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 2016—9:00 A.M. - 2:00 P.M.**  
**MARATHON GOVERNMENT CENTER**

***INTERGOVERNMENTAL WORKFORCE HOUSING ROUNDTABLE OBJECTIVES***

- ✓ To offer an opportunity for informal information sharing of workforce housing activities and initiatives in the municipalities & County.
- ✓ To identify strategies for enhancing workforce housing throughout the Florida Keys
- ✓ To hear from stakeholders and consider public comment
- ✓ To identify next steps and assignments

***INTERGOVERNMENTAL WORKFORCE HOUSING ROUNDTABLE AGENDA***  
***—FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 2016***

*All Agenda Times—including Public Comment & Adjournment—are Approximate and Subject to Change*

<b>9:00 AM</b>	<b>Welcome, Introductions and Expectations for Success and Review of the Workshop Agenda, Guidelines and Roles</b>
<b>9:20</b>	<b>Review of Monroe County BOCC and City of Key West Resolutions</b>
<b>9:25</b>	<b>Information Sharing on Workforce Housing Activities and Initiatives – Municipalities &amp; Monroe County</b>
<b>10:15</b>	<b>Key Colony Beach- Information Sharing</b>
<b>10:30</b>	<b>Layton- Information Sharing</b>
<b>9:30</b>	<b>City of Key West- Information Sharing</b>
<b>9:45</b>	<b>City of Marathon- Information Sharing</b>
<b>10:00</b>	<b>Village of Islamorada- Information Sharing</b>
<b>10:45</b>	<b>Monroe County – Information Sharing</b>
<b>11:00</b>	<b>Break</b>
<b>11:15</b>	<b>Q&amp;A and Public Comment</b>
<b>11:30</b>	<b>Roundtable Discussion- Strategies for Enhancing Workforce Housing throughout the Florida Keys</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there a common view on the workforce housing challenge in the Keys?</li> <li>• What are ideas for better coordination of policy and data collection?</li> <li>• What are ideas for enhancing city-county collaborations? Joint financing and projects? Pool allocations? Set asides? Others?</li> </ul>
<b>12:40</b>	<b>Break</b>
<b>1:00</b>	<b>Roundtable Discussion of Strategies and Options to enhance Intergovernmental Coordination and Collaboration on Workforce Housing</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What can the AHAC do to enhance coordination and collaboration among local governments on workforce housing in the Keys?</li> </ul>
<b>1:45</b>	<b>Public Comment</b>
<b>1:55</b>	<b>Summary and Next Steps</b>
<b>2:00 PM</b>	<b>ADJOURN</b>