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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The National Resource Network (Network) is a White House initiative designed to partner with cities across America to identify practical solutions and share real-world expertise and best practices to help cities develop the tools and strategies they need to address their most complex challenges. The city of Miami began its engagement with the Network in early 2014, starting with an assessment of the city in April 2014. From there a technical assistance engagement plan was crafted. The engagement began in January 2015 and concluded in July 2015. The focus of the work has been to provide recommendations to the city as they address the high rates of poverty, income inequality and need for affordable housing.

This report presents the Network’s findings and recommendations and provides the following:

- Overview of the Network Direct Assistance Engagement
- Network Observations
- Recommendations and Action Steps
- Attachments and Appendices

OBSERVATIONS

Key Statistics

The Network’s data analysis has surfaced the following five findings of significance:

1. Miami’s demographic and economic indicators related to poverty and housing are outliers among the 100 largest cities in the U.S. 1 of which Miami is the 42nd largest city.
2. The severe problems Miami currently faces are not new and are not trending in a positive direction.
3. There is a significant shortage of housing for people below 50 percent of Area Median Income (AMI) (under $30,000 for a family of three) and an abundance of housing for people between 50 and 80 percent of AMI (between $30,000 and $47,000 for a family of three).

---

1 Attachment A is a list of the 100 largest cities and Attachment B is an outline of the cities that share Miami’s income and housing characteristics.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

4. There is a “bar bell” income distribution with a minimal share of middle-income households.

5. Although poverty and housing cost burden are extremely high, the rate of unemployment is not – indicating a significant proportion of “working poor.”

Key Premises
The Network conducted its work with three key premises in mind:

1. Focus on need and opportunity: The most effective way to deploy limited public resources within a city’s control is to focus the resources on the intersection of need and opportunity. This is the lens through which the city should work, however, it is not currently organized to use this lens.

2. Strategic management: This involves breaking down silos to work on goals larger than the boundaries of any single department within the city. Led by the city manager’s office and with the active involvement of departmental leadership, strategic management adds a new dimension to the city’s current strengths by using data and mapping to drive the framing of larger goals. Departments then work collectively to meet those goals. The outcome from this type of strategic cross-sector work will be greater than the sum of its parts.

3. Collective impact: To solve problems as complex as poverty, income inequality and affordable housing, an internal- and external-facing approach is needed. The collective impact approach includes: dedicating resources to combat a specific issue adopted through data; practicing strategic management; engaging and getting buy-in from multiple sectors; leveraging partnerships; and measuring progress along the way.

Focusing on need and opportunity calls upon the city to conduct in-depth, cross-sector analyses of neighborhoods. Employing strategic management and moving toward a collective impact approach calls upon the city family to work together in a new way. This new way of working together requires a coordinated and collective effort that is informed by a deep analysis of data, and where decisions are based on a commitment to a common agenda and mandated and led by the highest decision making levels. In our complex society, there is no other way to solve big problems. This approach will also increase the city’s competitiveness for federal funding, based on the current national attention and preference for place-based, comprehensive, holistic and cross-sector approaches to solving problems.
The context for the recommendations is also based on the Network’s assessment of the city’s positioning to address these deeply complex issues. City staff are strong professionals, operating an array of impressive programs and dedicated to their work. The city’s Strategic Plan serves as a platform for coordination and collaboration as well as to tie metrics to. The proposal to create a Community Investment office to harness the strength of existing programs can help operationalize both the practice of strategic management and collective impact. There are two place-based frameworks in place from which to launch cross-sector data analysis: the Neighborhood Development Zones (NDZs)2 and the collaborative formed for the Promise Zone application.

Challenges facing the city are a lack of coordination and leveraging of resources, funding spread thinly resulting in diluted impact, untapped external partnerships and programs that are not operating at scale. Coupled with the extreme nature of the city’s pressing issues, having an impact on the seemingly intractable issues of poverty and affordable housing proves very difficult without incorporating a data-driven strategic management approach. This approach takes the city beyond its current level of strength to focus in on agreeing on underlying issues and goals that can be game changers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The data tells us that the key areas where the city should focus are:

• **Decreasing the number of working poor and children in poverty**
• **Addressing the housing needs of middle income households**

This is not to say that there aren’t other important issues facing the city that deserve continued attention and investment. However, to have an impact on critical challenges of this nature, a focused and targeted approach is warranted.

---

2 There are seven NDZs: Allapattah, Coconut Grove, Edison, Liberty City, Little Havana, Overtown, Wynwood
The Network recommendations for city action that can reduce the number of working poor and children in poverty (focused on their families) and provide increased housing options for middle income households are based on three core hypotheses:

A. **Strategically targeting existing resources** will increase the city’s ability to impact poverty and affordable housing by focusing on those housing types, community and economic development activities, and social services that address priority needs and that seize and leverage existing opportunities.

B. **Coordination of “self-sufficiency” activities** will increase the city’s impact on poverty through improved job training, financial education, and employment program design, coordination, and leverage, as well as by identifying service gaps that need filling and best practices that the city can replicate.

The related recommendations are primarily designed to increase income and achievement for the working poor and families in poverty through careful targeting of investment in social programs, establishing partnerships, and aligning resources with opportunities. Additionally, these outcomes will improve neighborhood economies and attract more middle-income households.

C. **Value capture and regulatory strategies** that increase resources, including direct revenue, can create housing opportunities for those in greatest need and promote workforce and mixed-income development to address middle-income residents. With Miami’s economic turn-around in full swing, the window of opportunity is now and may not last.

The related recommendations are primarily designed to bring new housing and funding for housing targeted to middle-income residents (i.e., workforce housing).

There are seven citywide recommendations and two neighborhood-based recommendations that flow from these hypotheses. The neighborhood-based strategies are focused on the intersection between need and opportunity and tie to the strategic targeting of funds and the coordination of self-sufficiency programs recommendations.
## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### A. Strategic Targeting of Funds

| A1. Create a Neighborhood Revitalization Mapping Initiative to surface the intersection of need and opportunity and establish city priorities and goals |
| A2. Develop a Housing Strategy to prioritize housing needs, set specific goals, identify funding and policy strategies, and create an implementation roadmap with metrics |
| A3. Utilize Targeted Notices of Funding Availability (NOFAs) that pool city-controlled funds |

### B. Coordination of Self-Sufficiency Programs

| B1. Define needs, evaluate programs, align programs |
| B2. Develop and fund an integrated service delivery model |

### C. Value Capture and Regulatory Policy

| C1. Strengthen the city's existing Public Benefits Program |
| C2. Adopt a value capture policy, such as a commercial linkage fee |

## Neighborhood-based Recommendations

| D1. Three-NDZ Opportunity Zone | Focused investment in the Health District/Marlins Stadium area comprised of Allapattah, Overtown and Little Havana NDZs |
| D2. Liberty Square Revitalization | Develop a coordinated and collaborative approach to ensuring successful outcomes for the revitalization of Liberty Square and the surrounding area |

The report that follows provides a description of each recommendation including the following:

- **Rationale** explaining the basis for the recommendation and data to support it
- **Who** from city staff and which partners should be engaged
- **Connections** to existing city initiatives, plans, activities
- **Best practices citation** for relevant case studies in Appendix 3
- **Anticipated outcomes** from carrying out the recommendation
- **Action steps**, ordered in short, mid and long term (as appropriate)
ACTION STEPS
Below is a three-tiered timeframe for implementing the strategies. It is important to note that a leadership mandate and proper resource allocation (both staff and specialized third party support) are essential ingredients to successfully carry out these activities. They also call upon the city to employ strategic management, all of which, over the long term will ready the city for a collective impact approach.

What should the city do first, in the short term? The following three strategies are steps the city can undertake now, that are within its control and that can yield outcomes over the course of a year. The first two recommendations will inform mid-term recommendations and in the short term serve to increase competitiveness for federal funding applications such as the next Promise Zone application, expected to be released sometime after the summer.

Recommendation A1: Implement a “Neighborhood Revitalization Mapping Initiative”
This initiative involves the development of a common framework of values, goals and guidelines that will surface the intersections of need and opportunity and inform operational, programmatic and policy decisions related to poverty alleviation and affordable housing. The Network recommends that this effort be led by the Planning Department working collaboratively with Community and Economic Development Department (CD), DREAM, Parks and Recreation, and Grants Administration. It is recommended that this be carried out in partnership with the University of Miami, thereby leveraging their expertise, data and technology.

This recommendation should be conducted utilizing the Opportunity Framework/Five Sector Analysis tool (described in report, and attached in Appendix 1), and in coordination with the self-sufficiency strategy described below, potentially as a joint process.

Key outcomes include:
• Serving as a building block for other recommendations (particularly the Housing Strategy and targeted NOFAs)
• Placing strategic management practice into action, fostering cross-department collaboration
• Readying city for more effective competition for federal funds
• Serving as the backbone for Special Area Plans and Neighborhood Plans

3 See Attachment C for recommendations for improving the city’s competitiveness for a Promise Zone application.
WHAT WILL SUCCESS LOOK LIKE?
Successful execution of these activities will find departments establishing mutually agreed upon priorities and goals, collaborating in program planning and implementation to meet these goals, giving up individual department preferences in service of achieving mutually agreed upon city goals, pooling resources and funding, and creating a single common language and branding.

- Preparing city for the next HUD Consolidated Plan and carrying out new Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing rule (published July 16, 2015)
- Provides framework for targeting city-controlled funding, for Neighborhood Planning initiatives, and for implementing Capital Improvements Programs

Recommendations B1 and B2: Coordination of Self-Sufficiency Programs
Utilize the Gateway to Self-Sufficiency initiative as a starting point to evaluate, align and coordinate city programs currently being administered and/or funded by: ACCESS Miami, the SEOPW CRA, Grants Administration, and CD with the goal of evaluating program performance (both outcomes and scale), matching outcomes to needs, identifying synergies, gaps, partnerships and funding opportunities across programs. The Opportunity Framework is proposed as a tool to guide this process, in conjunction with the neighborhood revitalization mapping work described above. Further, a logic model approach to map goals, objectives, implementation strategies and performance measures is recommended in order to create an implementable integrated service delivery model.

Key outcomes include:
- Serving as a building block for other recommendations (particularly targeted NOFAs)
- Placing strategic management practice into action, fostering cross-department collaboration
- Readying city for more effective competition for federal funds
- Identifying best practices within the city that can be replicated and screening out programs that are not performing
- Scaling programs to better match magnitude of issues

Recommendation C1: Strengthening the city’s existing Public Benefit Trust program
The report lays out six recommended improvements to the city’s existing Public Benefit Trust Program (Section 3.14 of Miami 21 code). The anticipated outcomes of this strategy are to:

- Strengthen the policies that can increase the amount of funding coming into the Affordable Housing Trust Fund
- Increase the number of affordable units being developed
- Match affordable units so that location and housing types target income levels in need of affordable housing
Over the mid term (starting at the close of 2015 and continuing into 2016), the Network recommends that the city move forward with the following recommendations, some of which are sequential to the first three.

Recommendation A2: Develop a housing strategy
A housing strategy will set forth goals, identify funding and policy strategies, create an implementation roadmap and metrics. It will identify the gaps in Miami’s affordable housing inventory and facilitate targeting funding best suited for filling those gaps, as well as establish short- and long-term unit production and preservation goals. The city should consider engaging third party expertise (such as the University of Miami, which developed a preliminary housing gap analysis tool, or consultant) to carry this out. Anticipated outcomes include:

• Creation of an implementation roadmap that spells out how to meet priority housing needs that are currently unmet and spelling out how funding programs, policies and partnership strategies will be employed
• Formulation of innovative financing solutions that city leadership can use to rally around and to attract partnerships
• Completion of a housing gap analysis tool that can be updated and used to monitor progress in filling housing gaps – both on a citywide and targeted neighborhood basis
• Identification of nonprofit partners positioned to assist in implementation of a housing strategy

Recommendation A3: Utilize targeted, unified NOFAs for city controlled funds
This strategy will be informed by the Neighborhood Revitalization Mapping Initiative and Opportunity Framework/Five Sector analysis outcomes from recommendations A1, B1 and B2. As such, while the development of targeted NOFAs can be accomplished in the mid-term, the actual issuance may not be possible until the longer term to accommodate the time needed to vet and gain necessary approvals. By developing targeted NOFAs driven by data and the city’s priorities, and coordinating more than one funding source in a NOFA, the anticipated outcomes are:

• Funding connected to city priorities and unmet housing needs
• More leveraged resources, enabling city funding to go farther
Recommendation C2: Adopt a value capture policy, such as a commercial linkage fee

This strategy will require research, stakeholder engagement and navigation of the political process, and as such, the mid-term stage entails engaging both internal and external stakeholders in exploratory work. The anticipated outcome of the strategy once completed is the adoption of a revenue generating value capture policy (the commercial linkage fee is one that is growing in use and attention across the country) to cover the cost of meeting housing needs stemming from real estate development activity in the city and address unmet needs including the lowest-income residents and middle-income households. The timing for this recommendation is based on the strength of the city’s current economic development climate, which should be seized in the near term to take full advantage of this status.

Finally, on a long-term basis (commencing in 2016, but could take longer to execute on), the city will be in a position to implement on the following strategies, once the prior strategies have been carried out or are in play:

- Issue targeted NOFAs upon City Commission approval
- Use the results of the Neighborhood Revitalization Mapping Initiative and the Opportunity Framework/Five Sector Analysis to inform how and where to target NOFAs; such NOFAs can then fund implementation of the neighborhood-based strategy targeting three NDZs (Recommendation D1)
- Use the results of the Neighborhood Revitalization Mapping Initiative and the Opportunity Framework/Five Sector Analysis to inform the design of a coordinated and collaborative approach on Liberty Square (Recommendation D2)
- Based on the exploratory work on developing a value capture policy, adopt a policy that generates revenue for affordable housing of varying types

The city is in the enviable position of hosting an impressive economic boom in its downtown and surrounding neighborhoods. The presence of strong, professional staff and department leadership are the critical fundamentals without which these strategies cannot be executed. The rates of poverty and the housing needs are in serious need of focused attention, and the city of Miami can position itself to have meaningful impact. While there are no shortcuts, and while local government does not possess all of the tools that are necessary to solve the problems on its own, there are incremental steps that can be undertaken now and built upon in the coming years. With a combination of leadership, perseverance, partnerships and the allocation of resources, intersecting need with opportunity can yield results.
OVERVIEW OF THE NATIONAL RESOURCE NEWTWORK
DIRECT ASSISTANCE ENGAGEMENT

Miami has been referred to as a “tale of two cities.” The city’s positive emergence from the Great Recession is exemplified by a real estate boom, concentrated primarily downtown and in higher income residential areas, as evidenced by 15,000 condominium units planned or in development and construction cranes dotting the downtown skyline. However, at the same time, the city of Miami faces serious and worsening poverty and income inequality. Nearly one in three Miamians lives below the poverty line. Households in the bottom 20th percentile in the city have annual income of roughly $10,400, just $11 per person per day on average for a typical sized household. Miami has the third-highest gap in the U.S. between households at the 20th percentile of the income scale and those at the 95th percentile. More than 40 percent of Miami’s low- and middle-income renters pay more than half their income just for housing, the highest of any major city in the country. A United Way study4 reveals that in addition to the 28 percent of those in poverty, there are another 35 percent of all households that fit the definition of the “working poor” – asset limited, income constrained and employed (ALICE).

With these statistics in mind, city leadership determined that support from the National Resource Network (Network) could help in addressing poverty, income inequality and the lack of affordable housing. From April 28–29, 2014, a Network assessment team visited Miami and conducted a review of baseline conditions, held on-site interviews with the mayor, senior leaders and department directors. Subsequently, the team prepared an assessment report with recommendations for direct assistance from the Network. The recommended assistance included two elements:

• Development of neighborhood-based and citywide strategies and action steps to focus on addressing poverty, income inequality and the lack of affordable housing

• Development of an asset inventory database that includes information on city-owned property

The Network engagement commenced in January 2015 with a kick-off meeting to discuss the vision for the work and garner feedback from city staff. Key activities since the kick-off have included: interviews with city staff and stakeholders;5 periodic meetings with a “core committee” comprised of representatives from the City Manager’s Office, Planning Department, Community and Economic Development and the

4 United Way ALICE Report – Florida, Fall 2014
5 Please see Attachment D for a list of interviewees
Anti-Poverty Initiative; reviews of relevant plans, ordinances and Commission actions; mapping of needs and opportunities; and site visits to several city-owned properties. This effort was conducted to inform the development of the recommended strategies. The Network also made presentations to city staff and other participants selected by the city manager’s office on March 27, 2015, and June 26, 2015.

This work entailed an in-depth assessment in addition to the initial Network assessment. It involved collecting and analyzing data on a citywide and neighborhood basis and surfacing the greatest needs, identifying assets and opportunities. The March 27 presentation provided data on demographics, income and housing characteristics, and compared Miami with the 100 largest cities in the United States, as well as with Miami-Dade County and the state of Florida. This is data that the city will need as it implements all of the recommended strategies. It involved studying and analyzing how the city operates, its current initiatives and how it partners with others in order to develop:

- Process-oriented strategies that build staff capacity to take the Network’s data and analysis and apply it to the cross-departmental development of agreed upon priorities and goals
- Action-oriented strategies that can impact poverty and increase affordable housing both citywide and at the neighborhood level

In addition, the Network created two tools: an Opportunity Framework/Five Sector Analysis tool and a Housing Gap Analysis tool. Finally, the Network is transmitting the data and mapping it has developed to the city in formats that staff can use and manipulate.

At the same time, members of the Network team created an asset inventory of properties where the city of Miami is the owner of record according to the Miami-Dade County Assessor’s Office. This work was divided into three parts: 1) data consolidation, 2) preliminary data reconciliation, and 3) creation of asset inventory management tool.

Through a series of in-person interviews and ongoing conversations with city of Miami stakeholders during the winter and spring of 2015, the Network team obtained lists of
city-owned properties from the following entities and consolidated available data pertaining to city-owned real estate into a single Excel database:

- Miami-Dade County Assessor’s Office
- City of Miami Department of Real Estate and Asset Management (DREAM)
- City Department of Risk Management
- City Department of Finance
- City Department of Community Development

From these five organizations, the Network team identified 877 records of city-owned properties, totaling 657 properties. The consolidation of data in a central database allowed the Network to upload the data seamlessly into ArcGIS and layer city-owned assets into a series of interactive GIS maps along with a host of other demographic, economic and programmatic data. The mapping of city-owned real estate assets allowed the team to evaluate these assets in target neighborhoods and identify city-owned properties that could be leveraged as part of neighborhood specific revitalization strategies.

Data from the asset inventory were linked to the GIS maps created by the Network and delivered to the city in shapefile format in August 2015. These properties were incorporated into maps that displayed neighborhood boundaries, zoning, Commission Districts, residential density overlays, land use data, affordable housing sites and other data points. These maps can be used as the launching point for the Neighborhood Revitalization Mapping Initiative recommended by the Network.

The Network delivered the asset inventory database and management tool to the city manager’s office in July 2015. In addition, two demonstrations of the database tool were provided to city staff, one in April 2015 and one in August 2015, to ensure transmission of information on the use, maintenance and application of the asset inventory tool.

A further description of this work, including data reconciliation, the asset inventory management tool and screen shots of the tool’s various functions, and recommendations is provided in Attachment E.

6 In this instance, a “record” refers to a department’s listing of specific property. For example, if two departments possessed information about the same property, there would be two records but only one property.
The Network engagement team conducted two separate analyses of relevant data for Miami. The first was part of creating the Assessment Report with top findings as follows:

- Miami’s emergence from the Great Recession was found to be driven in part by the real estate development boom and significant foreign investment.
- Miami faces serious and worsening poverty and income inequality.
- Educational attainment in Miami is lower than the county and the surrounding region.
- The city faces serious transit and infrastructure challenges, including worsening traffic congestion and the need for better mass transit.

The second analysis was conducted in March and April 2015, and surfaced the following five findings of significance:

1. **Miami’s demographic and economic indicators related to poverty and housing are outliers among the 100 largest cities in the U.S.** Perhaps the most striking finding is the extent to which Miami is an outlier among major U.S cities across a wide range of dimensions indicating a need for concerted attention. According to the 2013 American Community Survey (the most recent year available), out of the 100 largest U.S. cities, Miami is the 42nd largest and has:
   - The 6th highest share of senior residents
   - The 3rd highest share of residents who are non-white and/or Hispanic/Latino
   - The 3rd and 2nd highest shares of owners and renters respectively for whom housing is unaffordable according to federal standards
   - The 3rd lowest homeownership rate
   - The 4th lowest median household income
   - The 12th highest poverty rate, with nearly one out of every three people living in poverty and 44 percent of all children living in poverty

---

7 Attachment A is a list of the 100 cities.
In addition to being a frequent outlier when compared to other major U.S. cities, Miami is also an outlier when compared to other South Florida cities such as Hialeah, Fort Lauderdale, Pembroke Pines, Hollywood and 15 other cities.

An outline of large cities that share Miami’s income and housing characteristics is provided in Attachment B. However, from a practical perspective, Miami’s status as an outlier means that direct comparisons with other cities may be limited. Lessons learned from successful interventions in other places must be considered carefully and differing contexts accounted for prior to implementation. These potential demographic and economic differences are in addition to Miami’s own unique characteristics.

2. **The severe problems Miami currently faces are not new and are not trending in a positive direction.** The high poverty rates, problems with housing affordability, lack of retention of middle-income earners and prevalence of vulnerable populations such as seniors are not artifacts of the recession years, but rather they are longer-term trends that will require significant effort to alleviate.
3. There is a significant shortage of housing for people below 50 percent of AMI (below $30,000) and an abundance of housing for people between 50 and 80 percent of AMI ($30,000 - $47,000). Miami exhibits the general pattern that is common among major cities in the U.S., however with a more pronounced need for affordable housing at lower income levels compared to other cities. This pattern shows an abundance of housing that is affordable in the 50 to 80 percent of AMI range and a significant shortage of housing that is affordable below 50 percent of AMI. In addition, the housing that is affordable at the 50 to 80 percent of AMI range is subject to significant competition from both lower- and higher-income households, creating a gap in the availability of affordable units for households at 50 to 80 percent of AMI, even where there is no gap in the supply of units that are affordable at this income range. However, it is important to note that an oversupply in one income level could be masked by lower-income renters renting more expensive units as indicated by Miami’s high rent burden.

4. There is a “bar bell” income distribution with a minimal share of middle-income households. The income distribution shows a substantial number of high- and low-income households, but a relatively small share in the middle. Further, we find that although there are a large number of high-paying jobs in the city, most of these are held by inbound commuters who live elsewhere. Unlike cities such as San Francisco or Seattle that have been experiencing rapid rent growth in recent years, the challenge of retaining middle-class households in Miami does not seem to be a
product of housing affordability, given that there is ample affordable stock at this income range. Some interviews indicated that middle-income families cite school quality and performance as a reason for leaving the city. Additional analysis or information gathering is needed to conclusively determine the causes, but this is certainly a challenge for the city if the trend continues over time.

5. **Although poverty and housing cost burden are extremely high, the rate of unemployment is not – they are the “working poor.”** This trend confirms findings in the United Way’s ALICE (Asset Limited, Income Constrained and Employed) report, which shows that in addition to the 28 percent of those in poverty, there are another 35 percent of all households that fit the definition of ALICE and are thus struggling financially. This means that fully 63 percent of all households in the city are financially vulnerable and are viable targets for assistance in some form.
KEY PREMISES
The Network conducted its work with three key premises in mind:

1. **Focus on need and opportunity**: The most effective way to deploy limited public resources within a city's control is to focus the resources on the intersection of need and opportunity. This is the lens through which the city should work, however, it is not currently organized to use this lens.

2. **Strategic management**: This involves breaking down silos to work on goals larger than the boundaries of any single department within the city. Led by the city manager’s office and with the active involvement of departmental leadership, strategic management adds a new dimension to the city’s current strengths by using data and mapping to drive the framing of larger goals and has departments working collectively to meet those goals. The outcome from this type of strategic cross-sector work will be greater than the sum of its parts.

3. **Collective impact**: To solve problems as complex as poverty, income inequality and affordable housing, an internal and external facing approach is needed. The collective impact approach includes: dedicating resources to combat a specific issue adopted through data; practicing strategic management; engaging and getting buy-in from multiple sectors; leveraging partnerships; and measuring progress along the way.

Focusing on need and opportunity calls upon the city to conduct in-depth, cross-sector analyses of neighborhoods. Employing strategic management and moving toward a collective impact approach calls upon the city family to work together in a new way. This new way of working together requires a coordinated and collective effort that is informed by a deep analysis of data, and where decisions are based on a commitment to a common agenda and mandated and led by the highest decision making levels. In our complex society, there is no other way to solve big problems. This approach will also increase the city’s competitiveness for federal funding, based on the current national attention and preference for place-based, comprehensive, holistic and cross-sector approaches to solving problems.
The context for the recommendations is also based on the Network's assessment of the city's positioning to address these deeply complex issues:

**Positive Attributes**
- The city of Miami’s Strategic Plan serves as a platform for coordination and collaboration and as an anchor for new goals around poverty reduction and affordable housing.
- The proposal to create a Community Investment office can help operationalize strategic management and a collective impact approach.
- The Promise Zone collaboration serves as a solid launching point for a next application and should tie to the Community Investment office activities.
- The city possesses a strong, dedicated professional staff and an impressive array of programs.
- Neighborhood Development Zones provide a baseline for targeting areas with greatest needs and place-based activity.

**Challenging Conditions**
- There is a lack of coordination between departments and programs.
- There is a lack of inter-departmental leveraging of resources and information sharing.
- Funding is spread thinly, resulting in diluted impact on high priority needs.
- External partnerships are not maximized and are not regularly leveraged.
- Programs are not operating at scale, outputs are at a small scale comparative to needs and do not appear to be benchmarked against needs.
- There is a history of city management turn-over.

These challenges, coupled with the extreme nature of the city’s pressing issues, make having an impact on the seemingly intractable issues of poverty and affordable housing very difficult. However, employing a strategic management approach that moves the city beyond its current level of strength to focus in on the underlying issues would be game changing. The recommendations below have this concept threaded through them.
The data tells us that the key areas where the city should focus are:

- Decreasing the number of working poor and children in poverty
- Addressing the housing needs of middle-income households

This is not to say that there aren't many other important issues facing the city that deserve continued attention and investment. However, to have an impact on critical challenges of this nature, a focused and targeted approach is warranted.

The Network recommendations for city action that can reduce the number of working poor and children in poverty (focused on their families) and provide increased housing options for middle-income households are framed based on three core hypotheses:

1. **Strategically targeting existing resources** will increase the city’s ability to impact on poverty and affordable housing by focusing on those housing types, community and economic development activities, and social services that address priority needs and that seize and leverage existing opportunities.

   The related recommendations are primarily designed to increase the availability of affordable housing for the working poor and families in poverty in areas accessible to opportunities.

2. **Coordination of self-sufficiency activities** will increase the city’s impact on poverty through improved job training, financial literacy and employment program design coordination, and leverage, as well as by identifying service gaps that need filling and best practices that the city can replicate.

   The related recommendations are primarily designed to increase income and achievement for the working poor and families in poverty through careful targeting of investment in social programs, establishing partnerships and aligning resources with opportunities. Additionally, these outcomes will improve neighborhood economies and attract more middle-income households.

3. **Value capture and regulatory strategies** that increase resources, including direct revenue, can create housing opportunities for those in greatest need and promote workforce and mixed-income development to address middle-income residents. With Miami’s economic turn-around in full swing, the window of opportunity is now and may not last.

   The related recommendations are primarily designed to bring new housing and funding for housing targeted to middle-income residents (i.e., workforce housing).
There are seven citywide recommendations and two neighborhood-based recommendations that flow from these hypotheses. The neighborhood-based strategies are focused on the intersection between need and opportunity and tie to the strategic targeting of funds and the coordination of self-sufficiency programs recommendations.

The description of each recommendation includes the following:

- **Rationale** explaining the basis for the recommendation and data to support it
- **Who** from the city staff and partners should be engaged
- **Connections** to existing city initiatives, plans, activities
- **Best Practices Citation** for relevant case studies in Appendix 3
- **Anticipated outcomes** from carrying out the recommendation
- **Action steps**, ordered in short, mid and long term (as appropriate)

A Consolidated Action Steps Chart is provided as Attachment F, and a Strategic Plan Connections Chart reflecting how each of the strategies connects to one of the city’s Strategic Plan strategies under the Clean/Beautiful Neighborhoods, Education and Access, and Growth and Development objectives is provided as Attachment G.

### A. Strategic Targeting of Funds

| A1. Neighborhood Revitalization Mapping Initiative
| A2. Develop a Housing Strategy
| A3. Utilize targeted NOFAs

#### A1. CREATE A NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION MAPPING INITIATIVE

**Description**

This initiative would involve the development of a citywide cross-agency framework of values, goals and guidelines that will surface the intersections of need and opportunity and inform operational, programmatic and policy decisions related to poverty alleviation and affordable housing. The initiative process could begin with aspirational, high-level ideas, but would also need to be operationalized as concrete measures that can be implemented and used to benchmark and measure success. For example, we might start with a blue-sky vision that “all neighborhoods should present economic opportunities for local residents,” but then pivot to a series of more specific questions:

- What, exactly, do we mean by “economic opportunity”?
- How would we measure it?
What programs do we have that could have an impact in this area and how are they performing?

What groups are most in need?

A key feature of this framework is that it will facilitate the identification of the intersections of needs and opportunities in a given place, population or program. Opportunities refer to features that can be used or leveraged to address identified needs. For example, a transit system expansion might be an opportunity to address a need by connecting the under-/unemployed to major job centers. Having a framework in place that is mutually agreed to by city agencies will facilitate more effective coordination when opportunities arise and create a more coherent picture of the city’s programs to present to federal and other funders.

Relevant data and mapping analyses should be incorporated into the framework process, including both city-owned data and data collected by the Census, HUD, the county and other public sources.

While this framework can be structured in multiple ways, the Network proposes a five-sector approach (attached as Appendix 1) as a starting point, as follows:

- **Housing**
- **Economy/Employment**
- **Transit**
- **Education**
- **Health/Health Care**

A key feature of a successful framework is that it breaks down silos, advancing strategic management practices. Instead, the sectors can refer to underlying needs and opportunities that are inherently interrelated. For example, this initiative will generate questions such as:

- How does a need in the education system relate to a need in the economic sector?
- How might affordable and better quality housing be an opportunity to address health disparities?

By focusing on the intersection between needs and opportunities across sectors, rather than within sectors, the city can set the stage for greater operational and programmatic coordination across teams that may not think they are doing work that is related to the challenges at hand. Issues as complex as poverty call for this integrated approach.

---

**ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY MEASURES COULD INCLUDE:**

- Resident credit scores of 650+
- Jobs created, businesses expanded, income increased
- Job placements, jobs retained, income increased
- Homes purchased, foreclosures prevented
- Tax return dollars received, public benefits received
Additionally, the Network recommends building out a branding and communication strategy as part of the framework effort. For example, transit-related maps or tables could be uniformly represented with the color green or with a particular iconography or logo. Or the city could employ a common vocabulary to describe its efforts related to education. While this may exist already within an individual agency, by coordinating across agencies, the city will be speaking with a unified, consistent and powerful voice about its actions and its vision with the media and external stakeholders.

It is further recommended that this effort be conducted in coordination with the self-sufficiency strategy described below, potentially as a joint process.

**Rationale**

The lack of shared vision and coordination among city agencies and programs has been a consistent theme in our interactions with city staff – an issue raised explicitly by some staff and observed in multiple areas by the engagement team. This is true both programmatically and operationally. Programmatically, the missed opportunities for coordinated investment and partnerships to address the multifaceted challenges faced by Miami’s many communities certainly merit the city’s attention. Operationally, the lack of information sharing, shared infrastructure and coordinated communication strategies represent a significant obstacle to success, but one that the city will be able to address. In addition, improving operational coordination is likely to catalyze greater programmatic coordination, allowing the city to make better use of limited resources and to attract additional resources through competitive federal programs. The Promise Zone application indicated lack of coordination and understanding of the power of this type of collective endeavor and the value of effective mapping.

**Who**

With support from the City Manager’s Office, the Planning Department would lead a partnership with the University of Miami and with the active involvement of CD, DREAM and Parks Department.

**Connections**

Con Plan, Parks and Recreation Department mapping, Comprehensive Plan, DREAM mapping, asset inventory

**Best Practice Citation**

Strategic Management
Anticipated outcomes

- Serves as a building block for other recommendations (particularly the Housing Plan and targeted NOFAs)
- Places strategic management practice into action, fostering cross-department collaboration
- Readies city for more effective competition for federal funds
- Can serve as the backbone for Special Area Plans and Neighborhood Plans
- Prepares city for the next HUD Consolidated Plan and carrying out new Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing rule (published July 16, 2015). The city will need to collect local data to complete their Assessment of Fair Housing.
- Provides framework for targeting city-controlled funding, for Neighborhood Planning initiatives and for implementing Capital Improvements Programs
- The process will empower staff to make better informed decisions based upon an agreed upon vision and set of values, principles and guidelines
- The city as a whole will be able to make a more compelling case for its strategies and actions, both to local stakeholders and to state and federal agencies

Action Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHORT TERM</th>
<th>MID TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Form an internal working group, led by Planning Department staff</td>
<td>• Once initial data collection and mapping is completed, engage a facilitator to conduct a priority setting session to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Partner with University of Miami to support this initiative</td>
<td>o Establish priority needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bring all departments maps to the table to compare notes and identify overlaps, commonalities and differences</td>
<td>o Establish priority geographies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Utilize the Opportunity Framework/Five Sector Analysis to begin looking at needs and opportunities</td>
<td>o Identify opportunities that city-controlled funding can leverage/align with, such as transportation improvements, market rate development, capital improvement program activity, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Start the mapping with the NDZs</td>
<td>o Identify partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incorporate asset inventory into the mapping</td>
<td>• Use the session(s) to structure a proposal for the next round of Promise Zones (or other federal opportunities)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment H provides a visual and more detailed representation of the steps in carrying out the Opportunity Framework/Five Sector Analysis.
A2. DEVELOP A HOUSING STRATEGY

Description
A housing strategy will set forth goals, identify funding and policy strategies and create an implementation roadmap and metrics. It will identify the gaps in Miami’s affordable housing inventory and facilitate targeting funding best suited for filling those gaps, as well as establish short- and long-term unit production and preservation goals. Based on the Network’s analysis, the key housing need area is housing for extremely low-income residents and developing housing strategies that address the middle class. The city should consider engaging third party expertise, such as the University of Miami, which developed a preliminary housing gap analysis and tool (described below), to carry this out. The housing strategy process will help answer questions such as:

• What is our inventory of restricted affordable housing? Which income groups and populations are being served and which are not?
• What is the term of affordability and when will expiring uses leave affordable units vulnerable to conversion to market rate?
• Are our housing funds being used for the highest and best purposes? How are they complementing other sources from the county, state and federal government?
• What types of funding is needed – only capital, or also operating support and/or funding for supportive services connected to housing?
• What innovative approaches to meeting housing needs can be created, such as:
  o Increase revenues for the Affordable Housing Trust Fund and for what uses?
  o How can tools and vehicles like New Markets Tax Credits or creation of a new revenue stream best serve the city?
  o What role can corporations and philanthropy play?

The University of Miami’s Housing Gap Analysis (provided in Appendix 2) presents important baseline information, including:

• A list of all assisted housing (units that are income restricted), by address, number of units, income groups (by area median income) and populations served elderly, homeless, persons with disabilities and families). This listing is a tool that the city can use to update, analyze and monitor progress in meeting goals.
• Map of assisted properties
• Sources of funding used for assisted properties
• Information on condition of existing properties to project risk of conversion to market rate at end of term of affordability

• Analysis comparing number of units serving income groups versus households in need of those units (see inset box for results of this analysis)

This analysis is considered preliminary as there are data reconciliation issues to address and additional data that would be helpful to confirm assumptions and to conduct additional analyses. However, as other data collected bears out, there is a heavy proportion of households paying more than 30 percent and many paying more than 50 percent of their income for housing costs. There are also important variations by neighborhood that should be considered to fine-tune and inform the targeting of resources for neighborhood-based strategies.

Rationale
While the HUD required Consolidated Plan (Con Plan) compiles a tremendous amount of information about Miami’s housing programs and addresses federal funding sources, it is not designed as a template for analyzing a jurisdiction’s inventory of affordable housing compared to its needs in order to identify where the housing gaps are. As evidenced by the fact that the city does not have a full inventory of assisted units within the city boundaries, there is a need to pull that information together, along with a need to truly map out how the city will meet those needs. As noted above data indicates a mismatch of inventory to need, which leads to extremely and very low-income residents becoming housing cost burdened as they pay for the available units which are beyond their means. And, moderate-income residents have to compete with them for these units. For example, a housing strategy may tell the city that there are enough units, but there is a need to deploy a voucher-type program to increase affordability for extremely low-income residents. Similarly, it will provide the city with the data needed to design middle-income strategies which might include how to scale the current first-time homebuyer program, or design a robust single-family housing rehabilitation program for run-down homes, etc.

Who
Led by CD Department, partnering with Planning and Code Enforcement. A third party such as the University of Miami, one of the other universities, or a consultant, can serve a useful purpose in conducting analyses, investigating best practices and mapping out options and scenarios.
Connections
Consolidated Plan, Comprehensive Plan, Strategic Plan, Gateway to Self-Sufficiency Plan

Best practices citation
Housing Plans and Strategies, Housing for Extremely Low-Income Households

Anticipated outcomes
• Creation of an implementation roadmap for meeting unmet priority housing needs and spelling out how funding programs, policies and partnership strategies (with nonprofits, foundations, the county, the state) will be employed to accomplish that.
• Formulation of innovative financing solutions that city leadership can rally around and attract partnerships
• Development of a housing gap analysis tool that can be updated and used to monitor progress in filling housing gaps
• Neighborhood-specific housing strategies
• Enable the city to engage with partners and stakeholders with a clear position on housing needs and how they can be addressed. For example:
  o The Miami Coalition for the Homeless housing plan
  o The EB5 Regional Center’s Housing Summit
• Educate potential partners such as large employers and business interests about the need for new housing strategies

Action Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHORT TERM</th>
<th>MID TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• CD prepares a scope of work to prepare a housing strategy</td>
<td>• Hold stakeholder and community meetings to gather input and vet ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Partner with University of Miami, or other institution/consultant, to assist in data collection and analysis, best practice collection and scenario planning</td>
<td>• Finalize and adopt housing strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A3. ISSUE TARGETED AND UNIFIED NOFAS (NOTICE OF FUNDING AVAILABILITY)

Description
The NOFA process used to select projects and programs for funding is a powerful tool and one that can be refined to ensure that the city’s priorities are being met. Developing a targeted NOFA that is driven by data and the city’s priorities relies largely on articulating the city’s vision and goals for the funding, ensuring threshold requirements are sound, and that the point system is weighted to advantage only those projects and programs that will meet city priority needs, including specific geographies and community and economic development and public service needs.

A NOFA that brings in more than one funding source is referred to as a “unified NOFA” and can result in expediting the process for assembling funding by streamlining the process for developers, as well as leverage the city funding so that it is spread farther.

A unified NOFA should include city-controlled funds such as HOME, CDBG, ESG, HOPWA, Affordable Housing Trust Fund (from public benefits funding), CRA funds and any other city funds. The unified NOFA should also seek to coordinate timing with other funding entities such as the county, and private funders such as Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFIs) like the Florida Community Loan Fund, banks and foundations. Implementing this strategy will call for the city to reach out internally to departments administering resources to gain their buy-in to join a unified NOFA, as well as to external parties to develop strategic partnerships that align respective goals and priorities. There may not always be alignment, but it will be important to start those conversations to see where points of alignment exist.

This strategy should be carried out sequential to the work conducted on Neighborhood Revitalization Mapping Initiative, Opportunity Framework/Five Sector Analysis, and the analysis conducted for the Gateway to Self-Sufficiency Plan so that the targeting meshes with the priority needs, opportunities and target neighborhoods surfaced as a result of that efforts.

Rationale
The current NOFA process has a list of six overarching areas eligible for funding, plus a statement of “open to other facets of public services/economic development.” This provides applicants with an opportunity to present proposals and garner sufficient points for activities that do not necessarily match up with city priorities. For example, the eligible uses are not fully tied to the Strategic Plan (Education and Economic Access8), and the process awards only 8 percent of points to leveraging. The weighting of points in the NOFA process should be

---
8 Education and Economic Access Strategic Plan objective establishes the following as desired performance measures: financial empowerment, access to child care, youth employment, business incubators/micro lending, “stay in school” programs, literary, high school/college students
delivering projects that reflect the city’s anti-poverty objectives and targeting precise unmet affordable housing needs. The pooling of multiple sources of funds will also be more effective in helping projects focused on the most challenging housing issues that the market and conventional tools are not addressing.

As an example, in Los Angeles, a recent NOFA focused on equitable Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) and as a result, 84 percent of the selected projects were located near transit, a significant increase from prior years.

Who
CD

Connection
Con Plan, Strategic Plan

Best Practice citation
Targeted and Unified NOFAs

Anticipated outcomes
- Funding connected to city priorities and unmet housing needs
- More leveraged resources, enabling city funding to go farther
- Neighborhood targeting, informed by data and mapping analysis conducted in neighborhood strategy mapping initiative, is employed

Action Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHORT TERM</th>
<th>MID TERM</th>
<th>LONG TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Use information from Neighborhood Revitalization Mapping Initiative and Opportunity Framework, Housing Strategy, as well as city’s Strategic Plan, to identify priorities</td>
<td>• Convene staff responsible for funding sources to be included in a unified NOFA</td>
<td>• Seek approval from City Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify the availability of housing funding within the city’s control to include in a unified NOFA</td>
<td>• Compare what is eligible with what is in Strategic Plan, and then with what was actually funded</td>
<td>• Develop an MOA between departments contributing funding sources to NOFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Commence conversations with strategic funding partners about aligning NOFAs</td>
<td>• Issue revised NOFAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop NOFA document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B1. DEFINE NEEDS, EVALUATE PROGRAMS, ALIGN PROGRAMS

Description

The city’s recently issued Gateway to Self-Sufficiency Plan draft proposal stands as an excellent portal through which to devise and direct the income strategies that address the working poor. The draft Gateway to Self-Sufficiency Plan provides an extensive overview of the programs the city operates or is contemplating. The plan is designed to “improve the delivery of human services to economically disadvantaged families and individuals.” It is an impressive list of valuable activities categorized into approximately six components. The plan’s proposal to unify the programs under an Office of Community Investment as a means to avoid duplication of services and instill improved coordination is an important step in the right direction.

The Network’s first recommendation in this regard is to take that list and engage in a process to align and coordinate city programs currently being administered and/or funded by ACCESS Miami, the CRA, Grants Administration and CD programs. The goal is to evaluate program performance (both outcomes and scale), match outcomes to needs and identify synergies, gaps, partnerships and funding opportunities across programs (as well as matching the best suited sources to the programs). The final product of this effort would be a crosswalk of the programs with needs, proposals for aligning similar activities, proposals for prioritizing programs and possibly phasing out other programs, and identifying best practice programs in neighborhoods that can be replicated elsewhere.

This recommendation should be implemented in coordination with the Neighborhood Revitalization Mapping Initiative, as the establishment of vision, values, principles and guidelines coming from that process should interlace with and buttress the self-sufficiency programs.

Draft “Gateway to Self-Sufficiency Strategic Plan Proposal,” July 13, 2015
Rationale
The level of poverty, housing cost burden, and working poor, as well as the high rate of children in poverty, speaks to the proposed focus on income strategies such as jobs, training, financial literacy and education, as well as youth focused interventions. At the same time, the silos in which many of these activities fall within calls for a data-driven strategic approach. The proposed Office of Community Investment is a great starting point. This recommendations seeks to tap into that department and amplify its role and impact.

Who
Office of Community Investment’s Anti-poverty Initiative, Economic Initiatives’ ACCESS Miami, Grants Administration, CD, Parks and Recreation, Police, Fire, NET staff, Southeast Overtown Park West (SEOPW) Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA)

Connections
Anti-poverty Initiative, Strategic Plan, Promise Zone application, Neighborhood Plans

Best practice citation
Strategic Management

Anticipated Outcomes
• Positions the new Office of Community Investment to implement the Gateway to Self-Sufficiency Plan with a focus on how the programs will meet prioritized needs
• Serves as a building block for other recommendations (particularly the targeted NOFAs)
• Places strategic management practice into action, fostering cross-department collaboration
• Readies city for more effective competition for federal funds
• Identifies best practices within city that could be replicated
• Programs scaled to better match magnitude of issue
• The city as a whole will be able to make a more compelling case for its strategies and actions, both to local stakeholders and to state and federal agencies

Action Steps
See below, under B2.
B2. INTEGRATED SERVICE DELIVERY MODEL

Description
Upon completion of the B1 activities – the definition of need, evaluation of programs and the alignment of programs – the city will be poised to develop an integrated service delivery model that accomplishes the goal as set forth in the Gateway to Self-Sufficiency Plan. There are various ways this can be accomplished, including use of a logic model approach. The logic model, simply put, is a way to both better define a problem and goals to solve the problem and then map out the action steps and resources to reach those goals. It is used as a systematic and visual way to present and share the relationships among resources to operate programs, the activities being planned and the changes or results that are desired. Lastly, the logic model process serves as a starting point for a planning conversation and then can later serve as a “report card” when measuring success in meeting goals and objectives.10

In addition, as the sources of funding are lined up to pay for the service delivery, it is recommended that an analysis of how CDBG for public services and Section 108 for economic development programs can be best utilized to meet self-sufficiency goals. It appears that past experiences have left the city staff with concerns about these programs, but there are best practices that could be modeled to ensure these resources are maximized. A related step the city can take is to request technical assistance from HUD, through its Community Compass TA programs to provide targeted assistance on the technicalities, mechanics and best practices to ensure successful deployment of these funds to enlarge upon the impact.

Rationale
The rationale for this recommendation is the same as described above for B1.

Who
Office of Community Investment’s Anti-poverty Initiative, Economic Initiatives’ ACCESS Miami, Grants Administration, CD, Parks and Recreation, Police, Fire, NET, along with partners such as nonprofit subgrantees and program sponsors, health district facilities, school district and community foundations

Connections
Anti-poverty Initiative, Strategic Plan, Promise Zone application

---

10 The Pell Institute Evaluation Guide
Anticipated Outcomes
- Enables the Office of Community Investment to execute on the Gateway to Self-Sufficiency plan with a set of quantifiable metrics for measuring success
- Partnerships are forged and lined up, bringing new forms of leverage to program delivery
- Programs are scaled to better match magnitude of issues

Action Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHORT TERM</th>
<th>MID TERM</th>
<th>LONG TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal staff convening</td>
<td>Logic Model</td>
<td>Measure impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate with mapping initiative</td>
<td>Convene partners</td>
<td>Conduct long-term program evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>Determine outcome measurements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Value Capture and Regulatory Policy

C1. STRENGTHEN THE EXISTING PUBLIC BENEFITS PROGRAM

Description
The city’s current Public Benefits Program (Section 3.14 of Miami 21 Code) allows bonus building heights in various zones in exchange for the developer’s contribution to specified programs that provide benefit to the public. There are various ways that this provision can be strengthened to increase both the number of affordable housing units developed and to raise funding for assisting housing being developed by others.
Since this recommendation is a series of specific improvements to an existing program, the lay-out format below differs, but provides the same information as other recommendations.

1. Establish a required percentage of residential units under the Affordable Housing Criteria for the Public Benefit Trust Fund

| Problem Statement | Need to improve the definition of affordable housing in order to ensure that a minimum percentage of units are provided in a specific residential development, which are affordable at a particular income level. |
| Proposed Change | Amend the Affordable Housing Criteria within the Public Benefit Program to establish a required percentage of residential units set aside for households earning less than 80 percent AMI and a percentage of units for households earning between 80 and 120 percent AMI ($47,000 - $71,000 per year for a family of three). |
| Outcomes | Increase number of affordable units created through this program. |

2. Prioritize use of Public Benefits funds for affordable/workforce housing

| Problem Statement | Need for additional funding specifically for affordable workforce housing needed that is within city’s control to deploy. |
| Proposed Change | Change city of Miami policy to increase and ensure the allocation of Public Benefit funds for affordable housing. |
| Outcomes | Increased funding available for affordable units.11 |

---

11 Proposed that this funding be part of a unified NOFA per Recommendation A3.
3. Create a mandatory inclusionary zoning requirement for affordable workforce housing as a precondition for any Special Area Plan or upzoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Statement</th>
<th>Need to ensure affordable housing units are created.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Change</td>
<td>Amend Special Area Plan code language to require a percentage set aside of workforce housing units for households earning between 80 and 120 percent AMI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Increase number of affordable units created through this program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Create stronger incentives for rental and homeownership with NDZ areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Statement</th>
<th>Need to encourage development in the NDZ areas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Change</td>
<td>Increase Floor Lot Ratio (FLR) if the developer sets aside a predetermined percentage of units for households earning less than specific percentages of AMI. For example, the developer may be allowed an increase of FLR if the developer sets aside 5 percent of units for households earning less than 50 percent of AMI or 20 percent of units for households earning less than 80 percent. This proposal has effectively been implemented in Los Angeles. Rental units must also be affordable to those earning less than 80 percent of AMI and remain affordable for 30 years. Boston through their City Inclusionary Development Policy has addressed rentals as well as for sale units. An analysis of this incentive structure by a third party would be required to determine what the appropriate increases in FLR are required for the different NDZ areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Increase number of affordable units created through this program, targeted to particular uses depending upon city priorities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **Create stronger incentives for projects within TOD areas that provide a percentage of affordable and workforce housing in their development projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Statement</th>
<th>Need to encourage a variety of mixed-income housing near transit opportunities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Change</td>
<td>Increase FLR within a TOD designated area if the developer sets aside a predetermined percentage of units for households earning less than specific percentages of AMI. E.g., less than 80 percent, and between 80 and 120 percent of AMI. A similar program was implemented in Fairfax County, Virginia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Increase number of affordable units created through this program that are accessible to public transportation, thereby creating enhanced affordability for residents based on lower cost of commuting to work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Facilitate process for developers to build affordable housing on-site**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Statement</th>
<th>Need to encourage development of affordable workforce housing.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Change</td>
<td>Create inducements for developers to build affordable housing on-site such as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Continue to encourage parking requirement reductions for affordable housing projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support an exemption for small buildings near public transit from minimum parking requirements. This will encourage infill affordable housing development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Expedite permitting process for affordable housing projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Increase number of affordable units created through this program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rationale
In addition to the problem statements noted above, strengthening the existing program can also lead the city to devise ways to induce the development of housing serving middle-income households that would be less economically onerous for developers, as well as mixed-income housing.

Who
Planning Department, CD Department

Connections
Miami 21 Code, Con Plan

Best practice citation
Inclusionary Zoning for Affordable Housing

Action Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHORT TERM</th>
<th>MID TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Stakeholder conversations – flexibility concerns, targeting to NDZ impact on availability of land for developers, impact on neighborhoods (parking adjacent low density neighborhoods)</td>
<td>• City Commission approval on the prioritization of the use of funding for affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Analysis of incentive structures by a third party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Procedural steps include:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Ordinance Amendment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Public hearing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o City Commission approval for all except prioritizing use of funding for affordable housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C2: ADOPT A VALUE CAPTURE STRATEGY SUCH AS COMMERCIAL LINKAGE FEE

Description
The concept of value capture is that government should benefit from the value it adds from approving development and providing the infrastructure benefiting the development and ultimately increasing its value. Jurisdictions around the country are exploring how to unlock massive amounts of land value through regulation, planning and investment. Many are implementing value capture strategies and are often turning to linkage fees when the economic health is stable and moving in an upward trajectory. Likewise, like cities across the country, Miami is struggling to create funding streams to assist the development of housing for low- to moderate-income households in the face of rising housing costs and a very high rate of housing cost burden. With Miami's uptick in real estate development projects coming on line and with foreign dollars attracted to the market as well, it is opportune timing to consider the linkage fee strategy for capturing the value generated by market-rate development in support of affordable homes. Other options include tax increment financing (TIFs), other district level assessments or transit related fees outside of what is currently in place with the city's CRAs.

In order to get started, the city legal department would need to advise on the feasibility of implementing a linkage fee program in Miami. An affordable workforce housing support study would need to be prepared to justify a “rational relationship” between the proposed linkage fee and the impact on new construction of affordable housing. Questions to consider include:

• Should fees be negotiated on a project-based basis, be plan specific or citywide?
• What sorts of threshold requirement should there be based on type and size of development?
• The potential for legal challenges should be considered.
• The context for this fee being added to those already imposed on the development community need to be carefully calculated and considered.
• Establishing a clear connection and rationale demonstrating that the fees will only go toward housing.

Additionally, getting a linkage program underway will typically call for a civic engagement process to educate the purpose and value of this type of program and build support among stakeholders. If adopted, the linkage fees collected should be allocated to in the Affordable Housing Trust Fund, and possibly also under the Public Benefit Program.
**Rationale**

Value capture generally, and commercial linkage fees in particular, work best in a growing commercial development climate, and one with high housing costs. The city is encountering a healthy economic outlook with construction and synergistic development booming in the downtown. Both Standard & Poor’s and Moody’s cite a strong regional economy as one of Miami’s strengths. With a healthy market, the city should determine how, not if, a value capture strategy can be developed and implemented.

This type of policy will help fill unmet housing needs and could possibly be used to assist with middle-income housing solutions, which are very difficult to finance, as well as to promote mixed-income housing.

**Who**
Planning Department, City Manager’s Office, CD Department

**Connections**
Miami 21 Code, Strategic Plan, Con Plan

**Best practice citations**
Linkage Fees, Mixed-Income Housing Development

**Anticipated Outcomes**
- Raise funds for housing that can used in ways informed by mapping (*Recommendation A1*) and housing strategy (*Recommendation A2*)
- Funds can be incorporated into a unified NOFA per *Recommendation A3*

**Action Steps**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHORT TERM</th>
<th>MID TERM</th>
<th>LONG TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Internal staff meetings to evaluate value capture options</td>
<td>• Make a determination on a value capture strategy (linkage fee or other)</td>
<td>• Commission deliberation/adoption of a new policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify need for third party support to assist with assessment of value capture options within context of existing city fee structure</td>
<td>• Prepare study for rationale for linkage fee, if so indicated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Convene external partners – share best practices and the impact the policy will have for the city</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Neighborhood-Based Strategies

The neighborhood-based strategies are focused on areas where need and opportunity intersect and where impact appears attainable. Key principles guiding these strategies are:

- Use the Neighborhood Development Zones (NDZs) established in the Consolidated Plan as geographic targets.
- Use the NOFA process and strategic cross-agency coordination to devise and implement neighborhood level strategies.
- Prioritize needs to serve as the lens for targeting resources.
- Build on opportunities assets (since needs are great and widely dispersed throughout the city).
- Establish performance targets for funded programs.
- Select key city-owned properties that can help catalyze development in target areas.

D1. Three-NDZ Opportunity Zone

Allapattah | Overtown | Little Havana

Description

A key premise of the Network analysis is that the most effective way to deploy limited public resources within a city’s control is to focus the resources on the intersection of need and opportunity. These intersections are will occupy limited geographies that can consist of a neighborhood, a corridor or a node, and focusing on them reflects what is commonly referred to as “place-based strategy.” The Neighborhood Development Zones (NDZs) present themselves as an ideal starting point for this approach.

With regard to need, while the data reflects high rates of poverty and housing cost burden in many parts of the city, the data does reveal dense pockets of poverty, unemployment, housing cost burden, overcrowding and other indicators in the Overtown, Liberty City and...
Allapattah NDZ’s. Attachment I provides data on these three NDZs, along with all seven of the city’s NDZs. With regard to opportunities that already exist, these three NDZs and the areas contiguous to them reveal a convergence of key opportunities such as large employer opportunities:

- Health District
- MiamiWorld Center
- Marlins Stadium and the potential for ancillary business activity related to it

Additional opportunity attributes in this area include:

- The SEOPW CRA development pipeline and array of emerging programs
- Increasing private investment activity along Miami River that appears to be moving westward
- City-owned properties
- Synergy that could be established with emerging economic development activity in Wynwood

As a result, the Network is recommending a targeted planning and investment strategy in this three-NDZ area. It should be informed by the Neighborhood Revitalization Mapping Initiative and the Opportunity Framework/Five Sector Analysis as it will surface the priority needs, opportunities and partnerships that could come into play. Attachment J is a prototype map of this area that could be used for connecting this strategy to a next Promise Zone application.

The following is a list of three recommended strategies that are synergistic:

**1: Prioritize commercial connector corridors and design an investment strategy for them**

- Utilize CDBG and/or Section 108 funding to fund economic development activity along these corridors; target NOFAs for this use (per Recommendation A3)
- Employ a Main Street or similar commercial district revitalization program for key blocks
- Explore assessment district financing
- Engage corporate/philanthropic sponsors
- Engage in long-term planning to improve urban design, visual connections and increase density to support corridor revitalization
Focus planning and resources on corridors that connect the Three-NDZ Area:

- NW 29th Street – connecting Allapattah to Wynwood
- NW 20th Street – connecting Allapattah to Wynwood
- NW 17th Avenue – connecting Little Havana to Allapattah
- NE 14th Street – connecting Allapattah to Overtown
- NW 7th Street – connecting Little Havana to Overtown (proximate to Marlin’s Stadium)

2: Develop a neighborhood-based jobs program using the Gateway to Self-Sufficiency platform

- Study and select growing employment sectors
- Establish specific targets that ensure interventions are structured to meet the needs of residents in most need of jobs
- Develop a small business support strategy that includes incubators and micro-lending that integrates existing programs in place, including:
  - ACCESS Miami
  - CDBG funded programs
  - County business assistance programs
- Use the Overtown CRA food and hospitality small business incubator and training programs as a launching point for this strategy
- Forge partnerships with local employers, banks, universities and business groups to participate in this effort, particularly Miami-Dade College
- Target CDBG funding for these programs, target NOFAs for this use (per Recommendation A3)
- Coordinate with other funding partners such as the county, the state, transportation agencies, banks and foundations
3: Utilize city-owned sites (some of which are underutilized) for development of housing

For example:

- NW 17th Avenue and NW 14th Terrace *(across from VA lot in Health District)*
- NW 10th Avenue to NW 8th Ave at NW 27th Street *(near Better Way of Miami/Greater Miami Service Corps)*
- NW 8th Avenue and NW 23rd Street *(next to Miami Stadium apartments)*
- Corner of NW 13th Avenue and NW 20th Street *(near the Santa Clara Station)*
- Properties west and east of Marlins Stadium

*Attachment K* is additional information on these sites, as well as others in the Three NDZ Opportunity Zone, along with photographs.

An additional strategy used by many cities is to conduct a design competition for developers to create proposals for this three-NDZ area or a more limited geography such as one or more commercial corridors or nodes. Alternatively, the city could conduct its own neighborhood planning and design process.

The city’s CD department has a practice of deploying city-owned properties for housing development, but building on this practice by focusing on a particular area and braiding it with commercial development and job programming activities are the ingredients that can really make the difference in impacting poverty and housing affordability. For example, the development of city-owned properties near the Santa Clara station could help transform an underdeveloped section of the Health District into a mixed-use development that will help transform the NW 20th Street commercial corridor.

In addition, it will be important to ensure that this process is accompanied by clear parameters for the type of development being sought that will meet needs and priorities (i.e.: rental for extremely low-income families and/or seniors, and/or ownership housing for moderate- and middle-income families). The city should conduct its own massing studies to confirm assumptions on number and type of units viable and desired, as well as run financing scenarios to identify whether the land would need to be donated (or sold for nominal fee) to ensure optimal affordability and facilitate timely assembly of financing.
**Rationale**

With limited resources and growing needs, targeting and leverage in areas where needs and opportunities intersect is critical. In the case of Miami, the need to increase the income of the working poor through jobs, training, financial literacy and education suggests a focus on an area with significant employment centers that can be tapped into for job creation and training and where residents can travel to work using public transportation and without long commutes.

While Overtown has an abundance of resources, this becomes part of the opportunity – it has value capture potential and replicable housing development and jobs programming to build on and to scale. While housing cost burden is not as great in Overtown (62 percent of renters) as it is in Allapattah (68 percent) and Little Havana (72 percent), its poverty rate is the highest of all the NDZs. It is also now vulnerable to displacement due to the increased economic development activity, most notably the MiamiWorld Center. As an example, Wynwood, an area that has experienced positive economic activity, experiences one of the highest rates of housing cost burden (74 percent) as compared to the other NDZs.

**Who**

CD, Planning, Office of Community Investment’s Anti-poverty Initiative

**Connections**

Strategic Plan, Con Plan, Comprehensive Plan, Anti-poverty Initiative

**Best practice citation**

Using Public Assets for Housing and Community Development

**Anticipated Outcomes**

- Increase in available affordable housing and decreased housing cost-burdened households
- Increased economic activity along commercial corridors
- Increased employment opportunities that increase income for extremely low-income residents
- Benefits from market activity in Overtown accrue to the community
Action Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHORT TERM</th>
<th>MID TERM</th>
<th>LONG TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Use the Neighborhood Revitalization Mapping Initiative and Opportunity</td>
<td>• Vet priorities with partners and community</td>
<td>• Incorporate priorities for this target area into a targeted NOFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework to refine intersection of need and opportunity and identify</td>
<td>• Establish a program design for targeting this area with components</td>
<td>• Assemble and deploy funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the opportunities best suited to tapping</td>
<td>including:</td>
<td>• Conduct evaluations for job program components (per Recommendation B2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify city-owned properties to RFP for housing/mixed-use development</td>
<td>o Commercial activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop partnerships and MOAs with stakeholders representing those</td>
<td>o Job programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities</td>
<td>o Housing development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vet priorities with partners and community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establish a program design for targeting this area with components</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Issue city-owned property RFPs, select developers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incorporate priorities for this target area into a targeted NOFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assemble and deploy funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct evaluations for job program components (per Recommendation B2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D2. Liberty Square

The redevelopment of Liberty Square by the Miami-Dade Public Housing and Community Development Department represents a place-based opportunity that is underscored by a clear intersection of need and opportunity. The PHCD RFP will bring resources to this neighborhood and leverage funding from the state and other funding and financing entities. The significant portfolio of city-owned land in the neighborhood, as well as the effort underway to coordinate self-sufficiency through the new Community Investment office, represents additional opportunities. The needs in this neighborhood are borne out by the data. Notwithstanding that this will likely be a long-term endeavor, the facts at play indicate that this should be a recommendation presented for the city to consider.

*Attachment L* is a list of the city-owned properties in this area, along with photos.
Rationale
As already noted, the Liberty Square revitalization effort represents the intersection of opportunity and need, a key premise of the Network’s analyses. The city has authority over the properties to be revitalized through its powers of permitting and planning entitlements. The city has a large inventory of land in the area that would be key to a comprehensive neighborhood revitalization strategy. PHCD is contemplating a revitalization strategy beyond Liberty Square, and as such this will necessitate the city’s involvement. The ability to maximize the use of city-owned sites and leverage the programs it already funds and has in place indicates that the city can contribute to the success of this effort and thereby increase the availability of affordable housing and reduce its number of working poor and children in poverty. Additionally, the success of this effort will have ripple effects on the neighborhood’s property values and civic pride.

Who
CD, Planning, Office of Community Investment’s Anti-poverty Initiative

Connections
Strategic Plan, Con Plan, Comprehensive Plan

Best practice citation
Using Public Assets for Housing and Community Development

Anticipated Outcomes
• Revitalization efforts are comprehensive and include city-owned sites and align with city programs and goals for decreasing poverty.
• Through implementation of these strategies, city-county collaboration is advanced and used as a model for other/future such opportunities.

Action Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MID TERM</th>
<th>LONG TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Identity city-owned sites appropriate for incorporating into the Liberty Square/Liberty City revitalization effort</td>
<td>• Develop an MOA with PHCD to outline goals, opportunities for collaboration and roles and responsibilities associated with this revitalization effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify social programs that should be aligned with and could serve as leverage to this effort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Commence discussion with PHCD regarding city-owned sites that might be incorporated into comprehensive neighborhood revitalization plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENTS: A - L
### ATTACHMENT A: 100 Largest U.S. Cities (2013 American Community Survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Total Pop</th>
<th>Change in Population, 2000-2013</th>
<th>% Minority</th>
<th>% Senior</th>
<th>Median Income($)</th>
<th>Home-ownership Rate</th>
<th>% in Poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York, New York</td>
<td>8,405,837</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>52,223</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, California</td>
<td>3,884,340</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>48,466</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Illinois</td>
<td>2,718,789</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>47,099</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston, Texas</td>
<td>2,197,374</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>45,353</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1,553,165</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>36,836</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix, Arizona</td>
<td>1,513,350</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>46,601</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio, Texas</td>
<td>1,409,000</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>45,399</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, California</td>
<td>1,355,885</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>63,456</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, California</td>
<td>1,297,340</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>45,353</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose, California</td>
<td>1,197,165</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>80,977</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, Texas</td>
<td>885,415</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>56,351</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville, Florida</td>
<td>842,588</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>47,424</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis, Indiana</td>
<td>838,425</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>41,361</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, California</td>
<td>837,442</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>77,485</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, Ohio</td>
<td>822,762</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>44,426</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth, Texas</td>
<td>794,189</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>52,430</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte, North Carolina</td>
<td>792,849</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>51,034</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit, Michigan</td>
<td>688,740</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>24,820</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso, Texas</td>
<td>674,438</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>41,129</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis, Tennessee</td>
<td>653,450</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>36,722</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, Washington</td>
<td>652,429</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>70,172</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, Colorado</td>
<td>649,495</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>51,089</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, District of Columbia</td>
<td>646,449</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>67,572</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, Massachusetts</td>
<td>644,710</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>53,583</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, Maryland</td>
<td>622,104</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>42,266</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, Oregon</td>
<td>611,134</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>55,571</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City, Oklahoma</td>
<td>610,617</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>46,232</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas, Nevada</td>
<td>603,525</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>49,289</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee, Wisconsin</td>
<td>599,168</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>35,186</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque, New Mexico</td>
<td>556,489</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>48,357</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson, Arizona</td>
<td>526,141</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>35,720</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno, California</td>
<td>509,965</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>40,179</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento, California</td>
<td>479,671</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>48,034</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach, California</td>
<td>469,384</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>52,116</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, Missouri</td>
<td>467,082</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>45,551</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa, Arizona</td>
<td>457,595</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>47,561</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ATTACHMENT A: 100 Largest U.S. Cities (2013 American Community Survey) (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Total Pop</th>
<th>Change in Population, 2000-2013</th>
<th>% Minority</th>
<th>% Senior</th>
<th>Median Income($)</th>
<th>Home-ownership Rate</th>
<th>% in Poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Beach, Virginia</td>
<td>448,479</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>62,855</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, Georgia</td>
<td>447,848</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>46,485</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Springs, Colorado</td>
<td>439,858</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>53,550</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha, Nebraska</td>
<td>434,353</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>47,512</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh, North Carolina</td>
<td>431,897</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>55,170</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, Florida</td>
<td>417,670</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>31,070</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland, California</td>
<td>406,228</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>54,394</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis, Minnesota</td>
<td>400,079</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>50,563</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa, Oklahoma</td>
<td>398,724</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>41,495</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, Ohio</td>
<td>390,106</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>26,096</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita, Kansas</td>
<td>386,558</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>43,538</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington, Texas</td>
<td>379,565</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>51,400</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans, Louisiana</td>
<td>378,715</td>
<td>-22%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>36,631</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield, California</td>
<td>363,630</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>54,763</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa, Florida</td>
<td>352,981</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>42,649</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td>347,907</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>61,559</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora, Colorado</td>
<td>345,814</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>49,142</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaheim, California</td>
<td>345,015</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>57,550</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana, California</td>
<td>334,241</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>47,914</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, Missouri</td>
<td>318,416</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>34,488</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside, California</td>
<td>316,613</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>54,300</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus Christi, Texas</td>
<td>316,389</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>49,686</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>305,838</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>42,004</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage, Alaska</td>
<td>300,950</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>79,045</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton, California</td>
<td>298,115</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>42,114</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati, Ohio</td>
<td>297,498</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>34,605</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul, Minnesota</td>
<td>294,873</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>49,469</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo, Ohio</td>
<td>282,313</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>31,907</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensboro, North Carolina</td>
<td>279,651</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>41,150</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark, New Jersey</td>
<td>278,436</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>32,973</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plano, Texas</td>
<td>273,519</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>80,448</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson, Nevada</td>
<td>270,798</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>60,819</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln, Nebraska</td>
<td>268,743</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>49,419</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo, New York</td>
<td>258,945</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>32,392</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jersey City, New Jersey</td>
<td>257,345</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>54,700</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista, California</td>
<td>256,765</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>60,882</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando, Florida</td>
<td>255,479</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>41,345</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Wayne, Indiana</td>
<td>251,340</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>39,878</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Petersburg, Florida</td>
<td>249,702</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>43,894</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ATTACHMENT A: 100 Largest U.S. Cities (2013 American Community Survey) (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Total Pop</th>
<th>Change in Population, 2000-2013</th>
<th>% Minority</th>
<th>% Senior</th>
<th>Median Income($)</th>
<th>Home-ownership Rate</th>
<th>% in Poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chandler, Arizona</td>
<td>249,139</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>71,545</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laredo, Texas</td>
<td>249,085</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>40,599</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk, Virginia</td>
<td>246,139</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>44,030</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham, North Carolina</td>
<td>245,466</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>50,522</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison, Wisconsin</td>
<td>243,337</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>49,546</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubbock, Texas</td>
<td>239,544</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>45,728</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine, California</td>
<td>236,724</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>87,830</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winston-Salem, North Carolina</td>
<td>236,457</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>37,322</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garland, Texas</td>
<td>234,694</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>45,848</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale, Arizona</td>
<td>234,618</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>41,037</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hialeah, Florida</td>
<td>233,394</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>27,371</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno, Nevada</td>
<td>233,306</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>48,740</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesapeake, Virginia</td>
<td>230,571</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>67,252</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert, Arizona</td>
<td>229,989</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>81,589</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton Rouge, Louisiana</td>
<td>229,405</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>38,321</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving, Texas</td>
<td>228,652</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>51,722</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottsdale, Arizona</td>
<td>226,909</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>69,690</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Las Vegas, Nevada</td>
<td>226,872</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>50,133</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise, Nevada</td>
<td>225,861</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>45,201</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington, Virginia</td>
<td>224,906</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>102,501</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont, California</td>
<td>224,904</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>104,838</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise City, Idaho</td>
<td>214,235</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>47,847</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond, Virginia</td>
<td>214,114</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>39,193</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino, California</td>
<td>213,700</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>83.4%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>37,440</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham, Alabama</td>
<td>211,933</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>31,152</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lexington, Kentucky; Louisville, Kentucky; and Nashville, Tennessee, are excluded from this, due to an incomparable census definition.*
## ATTACHMENT B: Comparison of Miami to Other Large Cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number as compared with 100 largest cities</th>
<th>Cities higher than Miami</th>
<th>Cities just lower than Miami</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median income relative to national median</td>
<td>#4 lowest</td>
<td>Hialeah, FL</td>
<td>Birmingham, AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cleveland, OH</td>
<td>Toledo, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>Buffalo, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority population</td>
<td>#3 highest</td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>Newark, NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Laredo, TX</td>
<td>Santa Ana, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>#6 highest</td>
<td>Scottsdale, AZ</td>
<td>Miami Dade, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hialeah, FL</td>
<td>Mesa, AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Honolulu HI</td>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Henderson, NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Petersburg, FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>#11 highest</td>
<td>Milwaukee, WI</td>
<td>Toledo, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hialeah, FL</td>
<td>Baton Rouge, LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Newark, NJ</td>
<td>Memphis, TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Birmingham, AL</td>
<td>Stockton, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Laredo, TX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cincinnati, OH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Buffalo, NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fresno, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Bernadine, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cleveland, OH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of homeownership</td>
<td>#2 lowest</td>
<td>Jersey City, NJ</td>
<td>New York City, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Newark, NJ</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost-burdened (roughly the same for renters and owners)</td>
<td>#2 highest</td>
<td>Hialeah, FL</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Newark, NJ</td>
<td>Santa Ana, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT C: Improving Miami’s Competitiveness for a Promise Zone Designation

- Application process should possess collective impact attributes
- Commit a portion of CDBG funds to the Promise Zone (PZ)
- Target a geography that cohesively presents need and opportunity
- Map compelling assets
- Ensure lead stakeholders include the school district, Miami Police Dept., and the county; and that each brings relevant resources
- Prioritize activities and connect to achievable outcomes
- Identify key “allies” to the PZ, such as:
  - Foundations
  - Anchor educational, cultural and business institutions
  - Nonprofit recipients of foundation and corporate grants

According to HUD’s website, they will publish a Notice in the Federal Register in the summer of 2015 for public comment on the proposed selection process, criteria and submissions for the final round of the Promise Zone initiative.
**ATTACHMENT D: List of Network Engagement Interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lillian Blondett</td>
<td>Grants &amp; Special Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfredo Duran</td>
<td>Community &amp; Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Garcia</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaqueline Ellis</td>
<td>Planner II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Eisenburg</td>
<td>Planner I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luciana Gonzalez</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perla S. Gonzalez</td>
<td>Planner II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mensah</td>
<td>Community &amp; Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Porro</td>
<td>ACCESS Miami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Rotenberg</td>
<td>Real Estate &amp; Asset Management (DREAM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Cross Schmitt</td>
<td>Historic Preservation Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelius “Neil” Shriver</td>
<td>Southeast Overtown Park West CRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Vickers</td>
<td>Anti-Poverty Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence Woods</td>
<td>Southeast Overtown Park West CRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Edwards</td>
<td>Miami-Dade Public Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Liu</td>
<td>Miami-Dade Public Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Chavis</td>
<td>U.S. HUD, Miami Field Office, CPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Arostegui</td>
<td>Univ. of Miami Office of Community Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Bachin</td>
<td>Univ. of Miami Office of Community Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Eisenauer</td>
<td>Univ. of Miami Office of Community Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Bacon</td>
<td>Urban Philanthropies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Berman</td>
<td>Carrfour Supportive Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Bartle</td>
<td>South Florida Community Land Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Hoffmeyer</td>
<td>Florida Housing Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobbie Ibarra</td>
<td>Florida Homeless Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arden Shank</td>
<td>Neighborhood Housing Services of South Florida</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT E: Description of Asset Inventory

DATA CONSOLIDATION AND RECONCILIATION
The Network team consolidated available data pertaining to city-owned real estate into a single Excel database. Data from component units were excluded. Through a series of in-person interviews and ongoing conversations with city of Miami stakeholders during the winter and spring of 2015, the Network team obtained lists of city-owned properties from the following entities:

- Miami-Dade County Assessor’s Office
- City of Miami Department of Real Estate and Asset Management (DREAM)
- City Department of Risk Management
- City Department of Finance
- City Department of Community Development

From these five organizations, the Network team identified 877 records of city-owned properties, totaling 657 properties. The County Assessor’s Office possessed information on 536 city-owned properties, meaning that records maintained by the city of Miami contain 121 properties that are either not listed with Miami-Dade County or listed by the county as owned by another entity. A list of these 121 properties, including folio number, address and owner according to the County’s Assessor’s office, was transmitted to the city manager’s office in July 2015.

Finally, consolidating the data in a central database allowed the Network to upload the data seamlessly into ArcGIS and layer city-owned assets into a series of interactive GIS maps along with a host of other demographic, economic and programmatic data. The mapping of city-owned real estate assets allowed the team to evaluate city-owned assets in target neighborhoods and identify city-owned properties that could be leveraged as part of neighborhood specific revitalization strategies.

Data from the asset inventory were linked to the GIS maps created by the Network and delivered to the city in shapefile format. These properties were incorporated into maps that displayed neighborhood boundaries, zoning, Commission Districts, residential density overlays, land use data, affordable housing sites and other data points. These maps can be used as the launching point for the Neighborhood Strategic Mapping Initiative recommended by the Network.

Additionally, the Network performed a preliminary internal reconciliation of property data provided by city departments and identified properties that appeared on a property list maintained by the Department of Real Estate and Asset Management, but not on a list maintained by Risk Management. This information can be useful in ensuring that the city maintains appropriate levels of insurance coverage, as well as improving capital asset management. This analysis was performed independently of this report – using data contained in the asset inventory – and was transmitted to the city manager’s office in July 2015.

13 In this instance, a “record” refers to a department’s listing of specific property. For example, if two departments possessed information about the same property, there would be two records but only one property.
ATTACHMENT E: Description of Asset Inventory (continued)

Beyond the reconciliation described above, that there are cases of incomplete, outdated, and/or inconsistent data. Out of the 657 properties evaluated by the Network, only 11 properties have complete data on major property characteristics (name, use, function, department, area, data placed in service, year built and assessed values). There were missing records for 14 property characteristics listed in the asset inventory for numerous properties.

Asset Inventory Management Tool
The Asset Inventory Management Tool contains the centralized database and overlays a series of dashboards and profile views to help the user quickly evaluate the city’s real estate assets. The Network identified key data variables and sources, coordinated with the city and the county to obtain these sources, and layered the variables together to create a data-rich understanding of community assets and opportunities.

The Asset Inventory Management Tool contains three key features:

• **Dashboard:** A summary page/dashboard that gives an overview of city-owned properties (Average square footage; number of buildings; number of parks etc.)

• **Profiles:** A one-page report showing properties’ information by commission district, land use, and neighborhood

• **Query Tool:** A search tool allowing users to type in folio number and show information regarding a specific property

Dashboard
The “Dashboard” function provides a high-level overview of the city-owned properties from an enterprise perspective, by data source. Users can select which characteristics to display using the drop-down menus. The user generate summaries based on two datasets:

• City data (DREAM, Finance, Risk Management and Community Development)

• County data (County’s Assessor’s Office)

The figure below is a screenshot from the “Dashboard” tab within the asset inventory:
ATTACHMENT E: Description of Asset Inventory (continued)

The City Data Dashboard provides a high-level summary of data provided by city departments. The figure below summarizes the property characteristics contained in the City Data Dashboard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Characteristics – City Data Dashboard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Square Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Property Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Square Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Square Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Years in Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Square Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Value per Sq. Ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Value per Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Land Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Insured Properties by Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Building Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Total Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Properties Insured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Designation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The County Data Dashboard provides a high-level summary of data provided by the County Assessor’s Office, the County Planning Department and various geographic attributes. The list below shows data included in the County Data Dashboard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Characteristics – County Data Dashboard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Property Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Size Square Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Effective Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Size Square Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Value per Sq. Ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Value per Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Value per Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Land Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Properties in Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Building Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Total Value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the city and the county variables capture similar asset characteristics, there are sometimes significant discrepancies between the two sources. These discrepancies may be due to differences in data availability and data collection methodologies. The “Comparison Data” dashboard compares the number of data available and the differences in the values between city and county data to provide some insight into the differences between the two data sources.
**Profiles**

The “Profile” function in the asset inventory is designed to provide high-level summaries of city-owned properties according to three views:

- Commission District
- Land Use (e.g., Office, Vacant Land, Parking Lot, etc.)
- Neighborhood Enhancement Team (N.E.T.) Area

The profile function allows the user to quickly evaluate city-owned properties by each profile view (i.e., Commission District, Land Use or N.E.T. Area) and 17 key property characteristics. For example, using the profile function, the user can quickly determine:

- The average age of city-owned properties in Commission District 3
- The average square footage of city-owned vacant properties across the entire city
- The average distance of from a city-owned property to a bus stop in Overtown

The figure below summarizes each of the key property characteristics that are displayed in each profile view within the asset inventory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City-Owned Property Characteristics Summarized in Profile View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Land Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Building Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Total Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Years Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additionally, the profile function provides a summary of city-owned property information by flood zone and Coastal High Hazard Area. The figure to the left is a screenshot from the Commission District Profile from the “Profile” tab in the asset inventory.

Query Tool
In contrast to an enterprise-wide or departmental perspective, the “Query” function allows users to pull up information on a particular property using the folio number. Users manually enter the folio number into one cell and click “show parcel details” to extract all information related to the property contained in the asset inventory. The figure that follows is a screenshot from the “Query” tab in the asset inventory:
ATTACHMENT E: Description of Asset Inventory (continued)

The Network handed-off the tool to the city manager’s office in July 2015. In addition, two demonstrations of the database tool were provided to city staff, one in April 2015 and one in August 2015 to ensure transmission of information on the use, maintenance and application of the asset inventory tool. To better improve the management of its real estate portfolio and potentially leverage its assets for redevelopment and capital planning goals, the Network recommends the following:

• **Use the Inventory to Review All Inconsistent Property Records.** The asset inventory allows the user to determine where the city is maintaining property that it no longer owns, as well identify properties that it does own, but is not maintaining because its records do not show ownership. City staff may want to investigate whether the 121 properties noted above are still owned and/or maintained by the city, or whether county records are outdated and should be updated.

• **Use the Asset Inventory as a Bridge to Fixed Asset Management Program.** Data from the asset inventory can be uploaded into a newly procured system to create a dynamic and integrated management system used in day-to-day property management, capital planning, and aligned with community redevelopment goals.

• **Review Processes Around City Leases.** While the Network did not evaluate city leases\(^\text{14}\) (i.e., instances where the city of Miami is the lessor or lessee), leasing terms and expiration dates should be tracked centrally and shared periodically with the city manager’s office to ensure that the management of the city’s assets is aligned with redevelopment and capital planning goals.

---

\(^{14}\) The Network did not evaluate leases because the city staff expressed concerns that publicly releasing the terms of leases would potentially erode the city's bargaining position.
### ATTACHMENT F: Consolidated Action Steps Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network Strategy Recommendations</th>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Mid Term</th>
<th>Long Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Strategic Targeting of Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| A1. Create a Neighborhood Revitalization Mapping Initiative | • Form an internal working group, led by Planning Department staff  
• Partner with Univ. of Miami  
• Bring all departments’ maps to the table to compare notes and identify overlaps, etc.  
• Utilize the Opportunity Framework/Five Sector Analysis  
• Start the mapping with the NDZs  
• Incorporate asset inventory into the mapping | • Once initial data collection and mapping is completed, engage a facilitator to conduct a priority setting session to:  
   o Establish priority needs  
   o Establish priority geographies  
   o Identify opportunities  
   o Identify partners  
• Use the session(s) to structure a proposal for the next round of Promise Zones | |
| A2. Develop a Housing Strategy | • CD prepares a scope of work to prepare a housing strategy  
• Partner with University of Miami, or other institution/consultant, to assist in data collection and analysis, scenario planning, etc. | • Hold stakeholder and community meetings to gather input and vet ideas  
• Finalize and adopt housing strategy | |
| A3. Utilize Targeted Notices of Funding Availability (NOFAs) | • Use information from mapping initiative and Opportunity Framework, housing strategy, as well as city's Strategic Plan, to identify priorities  
• Identify the availability of housing funding within the city’s control to include in a Unified NOFA | • Convene staff responsible for funding sources to be included in a unified NOFA  
• Compare what is eligible with what is in Strategic Plan, and then with what was actually funded  
• Commence conversations with partners about aligning NOFAs  
• Develop NOFA document | • Seek approval from City Commission  
• Develop an MOA between departments contributing funding sources to NOFA  
• Issue revised NOFAs |
| **B. Coordination of Self-Sufficiency Programs** |            |          |           |
| B1. Define needs, evaluate programs, align programs | • Internal staff convening  
• Coordinate with mapping initiative | • Logic model  
• Convene partners  
• Data collection  
• Determine outcome measurements | • Measure impact  
• Conduct long-term program evaluation |
| B2. Develop and fund an integrated service delivery model | | | |
### Network Strategy Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C1. Strengthen the city’s existing Public Benefits Program</th>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Mid Term</th>
<th>Long Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Stakeholder conversations</td>
<td>• Analysis of incentive structures by a third party</td>
<td>City Commission approval on the prioritization of the use of funding for affordable housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Analysis of incentive structures by a third party</td>
<td>• Procedural steps include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ordinance Amendment</td>
<td>• Public hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• City Commission approval, for all except prioritizing use of funding for affordable housing</td>
<td>• City Commission approval, for all except prioritizing use of funding for affordable housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C2. Adopt a value capture policy, such as a commercial linkage fee</th>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Mid Term</th>
<th>Long Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Internal staff meetings to evaluate value capture options</td>
<td>• Make a determination on a value capture strategy – linkage fee or other strategy(ies)</td>
<td>Commission deliberation/adoption of a new policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify need for third party support to assist with assessment of value capture options within context of existing city fee structure</td>
<td>• Prepare study for rationale for linkage fee, if so indicated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify city-owned properties to RFP for housing/mixed-use development</td>
<td>• Convene external partners – share best practices and the impact the policy will have for the city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. Value Capture and Regulatory Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focused investment in Allapattah, Overtown, and Little Havana NDZs</th>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Mid Term</th>
<th>Long Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Use the Neighborhood Revitalization Mapping Initiative and Opportunity Framework to refine intersection of need and opportunity and identify the opportunities best suited to tapping</td>
<td>• Vet priorities with partners and community</td>
<td>Incorporate priorities for this target area into a targeted NOFA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify city-owned properties to RFP for housing/mixed-use development</td>
<td>• Establish a program design for targeting this area with component parts including:</td>
<td>Assemble and deploy funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop partnerships and MOAs with stakeholders representing those opportunities</td>
<td>• Commercial activity</td>
<td>Conduct evaluations for job program components (per Recommendation B2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Issue city-owned property RFPs, select developers</td>
<td>• Job programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incorporate priorities for this target area into a targeted NOFA</td>
<td>• Housing development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop an MOA with PHCD to outline goals, opportunities for collaboration and roles and responsibilities associated with this revitalization effort</td>
<td>• Issue city-owned property RFPs, select developers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ATTACHMENT G: Strategic Plan Connections Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network Strategy Recommendations</th>
<th>City Strategic Plan Objective</th>
<th>Strategic Plan Targets</th>
<th>Additional Potential Performance Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Strategic Targeting of Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1. Create a Neighborhood Revitalization Mapping Initiative</td>
<td>• Clean and Beautiful Neighborhoods/Invigorate Economically Challenged Neighborhoods</td>
<td>• Reduced percentage of vacant housing units</td>
<td>• Increased number of affordable housing units for extremely low-income households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2. Develop a Housing Strategy</td>
<td>• Growth and Development/Enhance Transportation and Mobility Options</td>
<td>• Increased average weekly city trolley ridership</td>
<td>• Reduced housing cost burden for households below 50% of AMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3. Utilize Targeted Notices of Funding Availability (NOFAs)</td>
<td>• Education and Economic Access/Increase Homeownership and Access to Affordable Housing; Align Internal and External Resources; Reduce Homelessness</td>
<td>• Increased rate of homeownership</td>
<td>• New financing tools are developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Coordination of Self-Sufficiency Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1. Define needs, evaluate programs, align programs</td>
<td>• Growth and Development/Support Business Development and Growth</td>
<td>• Number of new businesses</td>
<td>• Logic model is developed and used to measure outputs and outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2. Develop and fund an integrated service delivery model</td>
<td>• Education and Economic Access/Support Development of Quality Workforce; Support Individuals and Families in Achieving Educational Success; Educate and Empower Residents in Personal Financial Management</td>
<td>• Increased labor force</td>
<td>• X partnerships are formed to deliver services in an integrated manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of new businesses</td>
<td>• Decreased unemployment rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased labor force</td>
<td>• Educational attainment (high school &amp; college)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Decreased unemployment rate</td>
<td>• Residents served by ACCESS Miami</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Educational attainment (high school &amp; college)</td>
<td>• Decreased poverty rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Residents served by ACCESS Miami</td>
<td>• Increased median income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ATTACHMENT G: Strategic Plan Connections Chart (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network Strategy Recommendations</th>
<th>City Strategic Plan Objective</th>
<th>Strategic Plan Targets</th>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Value Capture and Regulatory Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1. Strengthen the city’s existing Public Benefits Program</td>
<td>• Education and Economic Access/Increase Homeownership and Access to Affordable Housing; Align Internal and External Resources; Reduce Homelessness</td>
<td>• Increased rate of homeownership</td>
<td>• Increased number of workforce housing units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2. Adopt a value capture policy, such as a commercial linkage fee</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduced housing cost burden</td>
<td>• Increased number of workforce units near transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduced number of homeless individuals</td>
<td>• Increased city-controlled funding for addressing housing needs (i.e.: housing development, first time homebuyer assistance, rental subsidies, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. Three-NDZ Opportunity Zone</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1. Three-NDZ Opportunity Zone</td>
<td>• Focused investment in Allapattah, Overtown, and Little Havana NDZs</td>
<td>• Clean and Beautiful Neighborhoods/Invigorate Economically Challenged Neighborhoods</td>
<td>• Reduce percentage of vacant housing units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2. Liberty Square Revitalization</td>
<td>• Develop a coordinated and collaborative approach to the revitalization of Liberty Square and the surrounding area</td>
<td>• Education and Economic Access/Increase Homeownership and Access to Affordable Housing; Align Internal and External Resources; Reduce Homelessness</td>
<td>• Increased rate of homeownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT H: Step-by-Step Approach to Carrying Out Opportunity Framework/Five Sector Analysis

**Step 1: Convene Agency Staff to Establish a Shared Vision**

The city manager convenes directors and managers from city agencies in an extensive, professionally-facilitated session to focus the agencies' attention on a particular theme or set of themes such as reducing poverty or providing economic opportunity to Miami's residents. The city manager tasks agency leaders with changing the way the city thinks about, plans for, implements, reports on and communicates about its activities. The city manager lays out the vision, process, timeline and accountabilities for those involved.

- This convening could also involve (fully or partially) representatives from potential partner institutions who might share the city's goal and support the effort in some way.
- It could include a professional training or presentation on the theme. For example, if poverty reduction is the key topic, the city could invite an expert on poverty studies or a practitioner from another city to give a talk on the subject.
- It should allow for staff to have a voice and raise concerns. The city manager must be ready to explain how different agencies' work is compatible with and vital to this vision.
- Having the mayor formalize this effort as an administration priority could help to increase visibility and importance.

**Step 2: Establish Cross-Sector Working Group and Draft Framework**

The city manager charges a group of five to 12 key agency leaders with the responsibility to work together to develop and implement a cross-sector framework. This framework will create a basis for aligning the city's programs toward the same goals, making messaging across agencies consistent and increasing competitiveness for federal funding. As discussed in the body of this report, the framework should:

1) Identify the key dimensions that are relevant to the city's desired outcomes (e.g., poverty, housing affordability).

2) Provide guidance on how an agency should identify the needs and opportunities in an area.

3) Lay out branding and communication standards so that agencies can better speak with one voice about their work.

- The cross-sector framework presented by the Network team illustrates one potential approach to the framework, but there are many viable approaches.
- The framework should be grounded in an understanding of the places the city wants to focus on and the city programs already in operation.
ATTACHMENT H: Step-by-Step Approach to Carrying Out Opportunity Framework/Five Sector Analysis (continued)

The five to 12 agency leaders and city manager divide themselves into three distinct working groups. They establish a leader for each group and a clear communication protocol between groups. The city manager provides skilled staff to each team to ensure they have the critical information they need to make decisions and to avoid the working groups placing undue burden on the participating agencies.

**Step 3: Refinement and Planning to Implement**

The first working group would focus on data and measurement, taking stock of what information the city has and what information would be helpful to support the cross-sector framework. How should the city be measuring progress toward key outcomes? What data is necessary to do this? How can this information best be presented (e.g., maps, a website, etc.)? This group could work in concert with outside institutions who could bring additional expertise or data to the table.

The second working group would focus on policy and programs to determine how the framework being created relates to current programs and activities. For example, how do areas of need and opportunity implied by the framework relate to areas where the city is focusing its resources and investments? What about investments by partners such as the CRAs? What kinds of plans and reporting do various agencies need to do? What kinds of competitive opportunities could benefit from this work? How does the new Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Rule relate to the framework?

The third working group would be led by the city manager and perhaps involve only staff from his office. This group would focus on how the city is going to use the cross-sector framework to make the strongest possible case to the City Commission for the value of coordinated city investments and policies. Part of this will include determining what kinds of internal and external reporting systems will be necessary to support a more coordinated approach. For example, if the housing department receives new funds, how will this be communicated to key people at other agencies or to the public? To what extent should efforts at different agencies be branded the same way? In addition, this group will set a timeline or schedule for major projects across the agencies – what is being asked of them over the next six months?

**Step 4: Implementing the Cross-Sector Framework**

The city manager’s office, in concert with the working group members, leads the training of staff across the city on the nature and use of the framework. The city manager also leads the coordination of activities according to the needs and opportunities identified through the framework. Each agency is charged with holding both itself and other agencies accountable to the common vision and framework. It is also attached to the budgeting process and is associated with concrete goals, not only for what each agency will accomplish individually, but for what the city as a whole will accomplish in the time frame.

- Success means the city’s decisions are informed by the cross-sector framework and the other work of the three working groups. Staff are working from the same playbook or working thematically in concert.

- As funding opportunities arise, the city reviews the opportunity and examines the proposals from successful grantees to determine how it could adapt a successful entry to its framework.
## ATTACHMENT I: NDZ Level Data

### Poverty, Incomes, Unemployment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NDZ</th>
<th>Poverty Rate</th>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
<th>Unemployment Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allapattah</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$31,829</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Havana</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$30,357</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtown</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>$27,310</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty City</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$25,762</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconut Grove</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>$50,980</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$31,923</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wynwood</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$49,972</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing Tenure and Housing Cost Burden

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NDZ</th>
<th>Homeowners</th>
<th>Cost-Burdened Homeowners</th>
<th>Renters</th>
<th>Cost-Burdened Renters</th>
<th>% Overcrowded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allapattah</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Havana</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtown</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty City</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconut Grove</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wynwood</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ATTACHMENT I: NDZ Level Data (continued)

**Housing Units by Year Built**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allapattah</td>
<td>4,590</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Havana</td>
<td>12,059</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtown</td>
<td>4,968</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty City</td>
<td>5,394</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconut Grove</td>
<td>1,419</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison</td>
<td>12,209</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wynwood</td>
<td>2,724</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Population by Educational Attainment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NDZ</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>No School</th>
<th>Some School No Degree</th>
<th>High School or Equivalent</th>
<th>Some College</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Masters or Higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allapattah</td>
<td>9,202</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Havana</td>
<td>20,412</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtown</td>
<td>6,333</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty City</td>
<td>7,049</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconut Grove</td>
<td>1,816</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison</td>
<td>20,424</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wynwood</td>
<td>3,758</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT J: Prototype Map for a Promise Zone Targeting Three-NDZ Area

Assets in the City of Miami
ATTACHMENT K: Three-NDZ Area: City-Owned Properties List With Photos

The following is a list of selected sites for further study from the property inventory. Team members selected sites based on a number of criteria including location within an NDZ, proximity to Metrorail, employment center and lot size. Team members visited and photographed the sites.

ALLAPATTAH

2615 NW 10th Avenue
Folio #: 01-3126-056-0030
Lot Size: 35,137

2735 NW 10th Avenue
Folio #: 01-3126-056-0020
Lot Size: 81,892
Note: Adjacent property is used for vehicle inspections.
This property has a parking lot attached to a youth center.

800 NW 28th Street
Folio #: 01-3126-056-0040
Lot Size: 104,263
Allapattah - Civic Center

1970 NW 13th Avenue & 1390 NW 20th Avenue
Folio #: 01-3135-000-0163
Lot Size: 413,160
Note: Currently used for city equipment, vehicles as well as machine shop.

1950 NW 12th Avenue
Folio #: 01-3135-001-0010
Lot Size: 403,801
**ATTACHMENT K: Three-NDZ Area: City-Owned Properties List With Photos (continued)**

**LITTLE HAVANA-NEAR MARLINS PARK**
Note: Lots below are used for parking and open space around Marlins Park. Key lots on major intersection.

- **1600 NW 7th Street**
  Folio #: 01-4102-005-5730
  Lot Size: 68,900

- **1610 NW 6th Street**
  Folio #: 01-4102-005-5810
  Lot Size: 45,000

- **1680 NW 5th Street**
  Folio #: 01-4102-005-6850
  Lot Size: 120,000

- **1350 NW 4th Street**
  Folio #: 01-4102-005-7160
  Lot Size: 40,000

- **1380 NW 6th Street**
  Folio #: 01-4102-005-6080
  Lot Size: 45,000

- **1390 NW 5th Street**
  Folio #: 01-4102-005-6730
  Lot Size: 30,000
ATTACHMENT K: Three-NDZ Area: City-Owned Properties List With Photos (continued)

OVERTOWN
Note: Some site may be currently under consideration in the SEOPW CRA redevelopment plans.

218 NW 8th Street
Folio #: 01-0104-060-1010
Lot Size: 66,429

402 NW 8th Street
Folio #: 01-0104-080-1010
Lot Size: 5,000

249 NW 6th Street
Folio #: 01-0105-050-1120
Lot Size: 149,856

714 NW 4th Avenue
Folio #: 01-3137-028-0040
Lot Size: 3,000

728 NW 4th Avenue
Folio #: 01-3137028-0020
Lot Size: Unavailable

734 NW 4th Avenue
Folio #: 01-3137-028-0010
Lot Size: 5,000

721 NW 5th Avenue
Folio #: 01-0104-080-2090
Lot Size: 5,000

731 NW 5th Avenue
Folio #: 01-0104-080-2080
Lot Size: 5,000

Photo Credits: Manuel Ochoa and Google Earth Street View.
ATTACHMENT L: Liberty City: City-owned Properties List With Photos

LIBERTY CITY
Note: Potential site in close proximity to proposed Liberty Square redevelopment.

6200 NW 17th Avenue
Folio #: 01-3115-005-3291
Lot Size: 13,924

6201 NW 17th Avenue
Folio #: 01-3114-005-0010
Lot Size: 29,318

1305 NW 61st Street
Folio #: 01-3114-043-0150
Lot Size: 3,710

1321 NW 61st Street
Folio #: 01-3114-043-0160
Lot Size: 10,600

1331 NW 61st Street
Folio #: 01-3114-043-0180
Lot Size: 5,300

1341 NW 61st Street
Folio #: 01-3114-043-0190
Lot Size: 5,300

1361 NW 61st Street
Folio #: 01-3314-043-0200
Lot Size: 21,200

1371 NW 61st Street
Folio #: 01-3114-043-0240
Lot Size: 5,300

6240 NW 15th Avenue
Folio #: 01-3114-027-1290
Lot Size: 2,800
ATTACHMENT L: Liberty City: City-owned Properties List With Photos (continued)

1551 NW 62nd Street
Folio #: 01-3114-027-1210
Lot Size: 3,400

1535 NW 62nd Street
Folio #: 01-3114-027-1220
Lot Size: 3,400

1525 NW 62nd Street
Folio #: 01-3114-027-1230
Lot Size: 3,400

1500 NW 62nd Street
Folio #: 01-3114-035-2030
Lot Size: 5,841

1501 NW 62nd Street
Folio #: 01-3114-027-1250
Lot Size: 11,066

1515 NW 62nd Street
Folio #: 01-3114-027-1240
Lot Size: 3,400

1520 NW 62nd Street
Folio #: 01-3114-035-2020
Lot Size: 13,818

1560 NW 62nd Street
Folio #: 01-3114-035-2000
Lot Size: 3,900

Photo credits: Manuel Ochoa and Google Earth Street View.
APPENDICES: 1 - 3
APPENDIX 1: Opportunity Framework

Housing
- What percentage of the housing stock is affordable to households at different income levels?
- Taking into account average transportation costs for a location, what percentage of stock allows residents to pay no more than 45 percent of income towards housing and transportation combined?
- What are the average utility costs in the area?

Economy

Education

Transit

Health & Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affordability</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- What share of a region’s affordable housing does a community contain relative to its overall housing supply?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Are there housing unit options for households of different sizes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How many units are affordable AND available to low-income families?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Are there homeless shelters and/or permanent supportive housing units in the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is housing in this place of a decent quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What is the typical building age and is there evidence that the buildings have/have not been kept up to standards?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Has this area experienced low/high numbers of building code violations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is this area in close proximity to environmental hazards?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Are there any known green building or healthy home efforts in this place?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 1: Opportunity Framework (continued)

### Housing

#### Affordability

Housing and Transportation Cost Burdens in the Three-NOZ area by Household Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>Individual in Poverty</th>
<th>Single Parent Family</th>
<th>Working Individual</th>
<th>Retired Couple</th>
<th>Median Income Family</th>
<th>Single Professional</th>
<th>Dual Professional Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Income</td>
<td>$11,270</td>
<td>$24,291</td>
<td>$44,291</td>
<td>$39,866</td>
<td>$43,962</td>
<td>$55,466</td>
<td>$73,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Area</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Size</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Cost Burden</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Cost Burden</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined H+T Burden</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HUD Location Affordability Index (Note: income levels not adjusted for household size)

### Economy

- What opportunities for economic development are there in the area?
- Is there access to quality low- and middle-skill jobs?
- Are resident skills mismatched with available jobs and, if so, are workforce development efforts in place?
- Are there jobs available to low-income people that provide training, benefits & livable wages?
- To what degree is there positive economic mobility in the area?
APPENDIX 1: Opportunity Framework (continued)

- Do people have access to high quality and affordable childcare/early childhood education?
- Do people have access to high quality K-12 schools?
- Do people have access to high quality college, career training, or continuing education opportunities?
- Is there access to high quality, safe, affordable youth support services during school and beyond the school day?
- Do people have access to practical transportation to school (for districts with a high number of charter or school choice options)?
APPENDIX 1: Opportunity Framework (continued)

Educational Attainment by NDZ Compared to the City as a Whole

- Bachelor’s Degree or Higher
- Some College or Associates Degree
- High School Diploma
- Some High School, No Diploma
- No School

Source: 2013-15 year ACS

Transit

- Is transportation proximate?
- Is transportation for residents frequent & reliable?
- Are there multimodal affordable transit options?
- Is transportation for residents affordable?
- Is the place walkable/bikeable?
APPENDIX 1: Opportunity Framework (continued)

- Do healthcare services in the area have an appropriate service level for the population served?
- Do people have access to affordable and nutritious food options?
- Do people have access to quality physical and mental health care?
- Do people have access to green buildings/ environments?
- Do people have access to safe parks & open space?
APPENDIX 1: Opportunity Framework (continued)
APPENDIX 2: Housing Gap Analysis

Note: The following are the results from the housing gap analysis for the city of Miami with an example for a neighborhood specific analysis for Overtown. The Excel spreadsheet, the tool from which to do the analysis, was delivered to the City Manager’s staff in August 2015. The housing gap analysis was prepared by the University of Miami’s Office of Civic and Community Engagement.

### Assisted/Public Housing Supply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Developments</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5818</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted Housing</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>14274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD Funded</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3843</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHFC Funded (state)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5885</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDC Housing Finance Authority Funded</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Dade County Funded</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5210</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Miami Funded</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2945</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3556</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHFT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHIP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 2: Housing Gap Analysis (continued)

#### Preservation Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Developments</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Rental Assistance Units (Project Based Section 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REAC Score below 80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td>916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built before 1960</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of project rent to FMR &lt; 80%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8391</td>
<td>1193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidy expiration before 2020</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1495</td>
<td>829</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- REAC is a measure of the condition of the unit based on annual inspections.
- FMR is based on the Miami NSA.
- Most Rental Assistance properties have 15-year contracts that can be renewed indefinitely.

#### Populations Served

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Elderly</th>
<th>Homeless</th>
<th>Link</th>
<th>Persons with disabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assisted Housing Developments</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted Housing Units</td>
<td>10,149</td>
<td>5,623</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>2,446</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing Developments</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing Units</td>
<td>5,622</td>
<td>1382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Populations Served (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elderly</th>
<th>Homeless</th>
<th>Link</th>
<th>Persons with disabilities</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assisted Housing Developments</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total developments</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of units</td>
<td>5,623</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>2,446</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>14274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing Developments</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total developments</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Number of units represents all units in the development even though not all units in a development will be designated for special populations.
- Link is a Florida Housing Finance Corporation program that sets aside a certain number of Extremely Low-Income units for special needs households including homeless families, survivors of domestic violence, persons with a disability, or youth aging out of foster care.
APPENDIX 2: Housing Gap Analysis (continued)

Assisted and Public Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Assisted Units</th>
<th>Public Housing Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 30% AMI (≤$15,000)</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>4,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% - 50% AMI (≤$25,000)</td>
<td>1,132</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% - 60% AMI (≤$30,000)</td>
<td>8,089</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% - 80% AMI (≤$35,000)</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
Area Median Income levels for 1-2 person households using 2011 AMI.
Estimates of number of public housing units at each affordability level based on actual public housing resident income data.

Cost-burden

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Cost-burdened Renter Households (30% or more of income)</th>
<th>Percent Cost-burdened</th>
<th>Severely Cost-burdened Renter Households (50% or more of income)</th>
<th>Percent Severely Cost-burdened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 30% AMI (≤$15,000)</td>
<td>23,558</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>21,334</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% - 50% AMI (≤$25,000)</td>
<td>14,004</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>6,779</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% - 60% AMI (≤$30,000)</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% - 80% AMI (≤$35,000)</td>
<td>5,478</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>53,295</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>30,376</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey 2013 5-year, downloaded from IPUMS.

Gap Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Renters</th>
<th>Rental Units Affordable (≥30% of income)</th>
<th>Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 30% AMI (≤$15,000)</td>
<td>73,822</td>
<td>33,204</td>
<td>15,437</td>
<td>-17,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Low-Income</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% - 50% AMI (≤$25,000)</td>
<td>59,289</td>
<td>17,780</td>
<td>13,883</td>
<td>-3,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Low-Income</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% - 60% AMI (≤$30,000)</td>
<td>28,173</td>
<td>7,520</td>
<td>15,201</td>
<td>7,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Low-Income</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% - 80% AMI (≤$35,000)</td>
<td>45,936</td>
<td>10,590</td>
<td>25,212</td>
<td>14,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Total</td>
<td>405,918</td>
<td>98,510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey 2013 5-year, downloaded from IPUMS.
APPENDIX 2: Housing Gap Analysis (continued)

### Comparison of Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Market Rate Units</th>
<th>Assisted Housing Units</th>
<th>Public Housing Units</th>
<th>Section 8 Vouchers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 30% AMI (~$15,000)</td>
<td>9,412</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>4,829</td>
<td>3,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% - 50% AMI (~$25,000)</td>
<td>11,995</td>
<td>1,132</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% - 60% AMI (~$30,000)</td>
<td>6,879</td>
<td>8,089</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% - 80% AMI (~$35,000)</td>
<td>25,044</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>519</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53,330</td>
<td>14,274</td>
<td>5,818</td>
<td>5,198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
Market Rate Units is equal to the total number of units affordable for each income level less the number of Assisted Housing Units and Public Housing Units.

### Section 8 Vouchers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract Rent</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Portion of Rent</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Percent of Rent</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Monthly Income (based on paying 30% towards rent)</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source:
Miami Dade County Public Housing and Community Development, April 2015
Overtown

- Total Households: 3,649
- Total Renter Households: 3,190 (87%)
- Median household income: $12,733
- Cost-burdened renter households: 1,785 (56%)
- Assisted Housing Units: 1,893
- Public Housing Units: 652

Source: ACS 2013 5-year, based on Census tracts 31, 34 and 36.01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Share</th>
<th>Assisted Units</th>
<th>Assisted/ Public</th>
<th>Assisted/ Public Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 30% AMI ($15,000)</td>
<td>2,042</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>163*</td>
<td>704*</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 50% AMI ($25,000)</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 60% AMI ($30,000)</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1,328</td>
<td>1,354</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 80% AMI ($40,000)</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Low-income Households</td>
<td>3,014</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>1,893</td>
<td>2,545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>3,649</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
*Assisted and Public units are categorized at 35% of AMI.
Household data is from ACS 2013 5-year.
Conclusions & Best Practice

- In Overtown, the majority of households (56%) are below 30% AMI, but the majority of assisted units available are at 60% AMI. This will likely increase in the future as the SEOPW CRA has been supporting tax credit developments that normally target above 30% AMI. Potentially, we can also expect higher incomes as more market rate units come on-line that attract Downtown workers.
- Housing Gap Analysis should be completed for the 3 NDZ Area along with other neighborhoods undergoing rapid change.
- A Housing Gap analysis can provide better information to develop more refined strategies and policies depending on whether a neighborhood needs more housing preservation to stem gentrification or revitalization strategies for distressed neighborhoods.
Challenges to be addressed

Communities with significant needs such as high rates of poverty and inadequate stock of affordable housing face a daunting task as the resources to address these issues are limited. It calls for a level of strategy beyond that required for the day-to-day operation of city functions. With many communities jockeying for limited funding, decisions are often guided by deal-making and political clout rather than greatest need or strategic best use of resources that align with opportunities in a synergistic way. Strategic management adds a new dimension to a city’s typical toolkit by drawing on data and mapping in a well-organized and disciplined operational structure to drive the framing of larger goals that departments work on collectively to meet.

Best Practice Examples

Los Angeles, California: Transit-Oriented Development Consolidated Plan
The city of Los Angeles used a strategic management approach to develop the nation’s first TOD focused Consolidated Plan (Con Plan) and develop implementation strategies. That approach included numerous elements such as:

- Leadership mandate
- Cross-agency collaboration carried out at agency leadership level, on developing clear and targeted priorities to address needs
- Development of common language around data, mapping and opportunity
- Ongoing communication through a system of working groups, regularly scheduled meetings and strategic planning sessions
- Community engagement
- Willingness to test drive new ideas

Goal: Addressing the need for housing and services for low-income residents and the increasing traffic congestion in the city

Planning Strategies:
1. Weave together housing funding and leverage new local transit funds and new federal transit funding
2. Establish a new planning approach, using the Con Plan as the platform
3. Conduct the planning effort through a mayor-created “Housing Cabinet” comprised of the leadership of multiple city departments
   a. Met bi-weekly
   b. Held two half-day planning retreats
c. The group established common goals and an agreed-upon way to translate their vision into local neighborhood-level strategies focused on the intersection of need and opportunity

4. Engage the community in the process using maps and data

5. Example of neighborhood level strategy that surfaced from this process: connect child-centered shops along a commercial corridor with a transit stop and family housing

Outcome: The outcome of this effort was that in the subsequent funding cycle, the city funded 26 of 31 TOD projects that leveraged transportation funding. In addition, the Con Plan was recognized by former Federal Reserve Chair Ben Bernanke as a plan that “presents a multifaceted approach to build healthy communities by integrating community, economic and housing development investments with transit opportunities to increase their positive impact on neighborhoods.”

Implementation Strategies:

1. Inter-agency coordination: Five different departments within the city created a coordinated approach to CDBG funding including procurement practices, grants management and performance standards for subgrantees. This group met monthly and set up multiple subcommittees and ultimately executed an MOU to memorialize their collective agreement to carry out standardized practices. This in turn helped streamline their process and enabled the city to move forward with a unified vision on the deployment of this funding source, one which would become a key element for implementing the TOD Con Plan goals.

2. Development of neighborhood-based strategies: City staff conducted internal and community participation meetings using maps and data over the course of three months to develop “neighborhood investment roadmaps,” which identify the key opportunities, partners and resources needed to carry out programs and projects that would positively impact low-income households.

3. Demonstration funding pool: In order to test drive implementation of this effort, a small pool of funding using CDBG funds called the “Neighborhood Investment Fund” was created to target the types of programs and projects identified in the Con Plan and the neighborhood investment roadmaps.

Houston, Texas: Disaster Recovery Strategic Investment

The city of Houston’s Housing and Community Development Department demonstrated strategic management as it seized the opportunity to use $150 million in disaster recovery funding as a historic opportunity to stimulate redevelopment of underserved communities.

Goal: Create stable, diverse communities, greater racial and economic diversification in neighborhoods impacted by Hurricanes Ike/Dolly.
**APPENDIX 3: Best Practice Case Studies | Strategic Management (continued)**

**Planning strategies:** Identify areas of opportunity that could leverage the disaster recovery funding and attract both public and private investment that results in catalytic revitalization.

1. **Targeted investment strategy:** The city’s deployment of its disaster recovery funding was carefully aligned with multiple types of investment including: transportation improvements, infrastructure improvements, market rate development, university development activity, and improvements to libraries, schools, and parks.

2. **Inter-departmental Coordination:** Led by the Housing and Community Development Department, and with the mayor’s strong leadership, multiple departments coordinated their resources and activities to enable the alignment of these efforts to induce revitalization of selected neighborhoods.

3. **Community engagement:** Using maps and data, and with support from consultants and community-based nonprofit partners, city staff engaged in 13 community meetings to develop selection criteria for identifying areas of opportunity and then to select those areas. Three areas were selected, based on:
   a. A needs assessment and planning study
   b. Location of competitive multifamily proposals
   c. Area is poised for revitalization
   i. Public transportation options including light rail and bus routes
   ii. Near amenities
   iii. Ability to accomplish slum and blight removal

**Outcome:** The city is successfully deploying their disaster recovery funding in a targeted manner that includes both new rental housing and single-family home repairs. In the three selected neighborhoods, the attracted public and private investment is calculated at between $350 million for the smallest area to nearly $1 billion for the largest (includes a major transit improvement).

In addition, the strategic process involved working closely with housing advocates in the state who were keenly concerned about the city’s use of these funds and desired to see it target revitalization and create areas of opportunity for low-income and minority households.
Challenges to be addressed

While the city is required to develop a Consolidated Plan (Con Plan) by HUD, it does not, in and of itself, contain all of the elements needed to craft a housing strategy. It may be possible to use the Con Plan in this way, but it is typically not. Miami has a strong Con Plan, however the knowledge of how much assisted affordable housing is available to residents and the extent of the gaps that exist is needed to truly inform a strategy that can target the greatest needs. This type of planning process will also surface innovative funding options and policy solutions as well as partnerships. It will create a single message for internal and external use when addressing the city’s approach to meeting its residents housing needs. Finally, a city-conducted Housing Plan can bring local stakeholders to the table on and begin to build support for solutions.

Best Practice Ideas

- Housing Plans will typically have the following components:
  I. Vision/Principles
  II. Statement of Need/Market Analysis
  III. Goals (examples)
     a. New production
     b. Preservation
     c. Neighborhood-based objectives and strategies
  IV. Numerical targets by:
     a. Housing tenure (rental and ownership)
     b. Income group
     c. Population
  V. Strategies
     a. Raise funds
     b. Improve use of existing funds
     c. Align with other sources
     d. Land use and zoning
     e. Lower costs
  VI. Implementation Strategies
     a. Responsible entities
     b. Timeline
     c. Reporting back

- A Housing Plan does not need to be a long document, but rather a straightforward analysis of needs, market conditions and solutions to meet needs, leverage resources and forge partnerships. It should also include a roadmap for how to implement. The town of Chapel Hill, North Carolina, created a one-page Affordable Housing Strategy document that will be followed up by a work plan to sketch out implementation steps.

- Appendix II is a Housing Gap Analysis prepared by the University of Miami, which serves as a cornerstone of what a Miami Housing Plan would include and be informed by.
• Jurisdictions will often use an advisory committee or task force to spearhead a housing planning effort. It will be made up of city officials, nonprofits, banks, developers and other industry stakeholders.

• The plans should be vetted through a thorough citizen engagement process.

• A Housing Plan can provide a community with the opportunity to establish common definitions and understanding about the housing types, tenures and needs that residents have. There are HUD and state definitions, and local governments may have their own as well. It is important to have a common understanding and agreement, particularly among elected officials, about terms such as person versus household, the different income group levels (area median income) and what the term “special needs” comprises.

• Some jurisdictions will use a Housing Plan as a tool to develop a public-facing initiative to raise awareness and resources and to establish accountability for accomplishing the goals set out in the plan. Toward this end, some plans have catchy titles, pitches and branding.

• Third party consultants are often used, including universities, to assist in convening stakeholders, bringing in best practices and designing strategies for vetting, as well as the actual writing and preparation of the plan.

Best Practice Examples

Examples of Florida Housing Plans Strategies

Davie Affordable Housing Incentive Strategy:
• Fee Waivers - such as Park and Recreation Impact fees, Design Review and Site Plan Processing Fees, Engineering Review Fees, Building Permit Fees, etc., but not Water and Sewer Impact Fees; however, nothing prohibits the use of the town’s SHIP or HOME funds to pay these impact fees in order to reduce the cost of the housing.

• Expediting Permits - the Town’s Housing and Community Development Director is assigned to guide affordable housing developers through the permitting process; and, affordable housing projects and initiatives are to be expedited to a greater degree than all other projects in Davie.

• Parking and Set-Back Requirements – provides a waiver of up to 25 percent of that which is permitted by code, for affordable housing initiatives only. This incentive will allow the development of in-fill single-family homes on vacant property not otherwise suited for development and could significantly lower the cost of housing,

• Inventory of Publicly-Owned Land – the town maintains a list of all publicly-owned land in Davie. The Advisory Committee recommended that this list be reviewed and updated using Metro Scan or other applicable data, so that current and future uses are identified, as well as any deed-related or other restrictions on the land.

Palm Bay Affordable Housing Incentives Plan Strategies:
• Expedited processing
• Reduction or waiver of fees and alternative methods of fee payment for affordable housing
• Reservation of infrastructure capacity for low- and moderate-income housing
• Density bonuses
**APPENDIX 3: Best Practice Case Studies | Housing Plans and Strategies (continued)**

- Affordable accessory units in residential zones
- Reductions on set back and park requirements
- Flexible lot configurations, including zero lot line configurations for affordable housing
- Establishment of a process by which a local government considers, before adoption, policies, procedures, ordinances, regulations, or plan revisions that increase the cost of housing
- Modification of street requirements
- Preparation of a printed inventory of locally-owned public lands suitable for affordable housing
- Support of development near transportation hubs and major employment centers and mixed-use developments

**Other Housing Plans Strategies**

What follows are some examples of fairly high profile Housing Plans and their high level goals:

- **Atlanta:** The city’s Development Authority, Invest Atlanta, developed a housing strategy to ensure that the city had a comprehensive plan that incorporated the most recent economic and demographic trends. It’s goals, by 2020, are to:
  - Attract 42,000 new residents (10% growth) and retain current ones
  - Reduce the number of housing cost burdened low- and moderate-income households by 10%
  - Reduce the number of vacant structures by 20%
  - Produce or rehabilitate 10,000 units for a range of incomes, doubling the city’s rate of production
  - Generate $100 million in new housing investment
  - Ensure that at least 10,000 new and rehabilitated units meet nationally recognized sustainability and energy efficiency criteria

- **Boston:** Called “Housing a Changing City: Boston 2030”
The goal is to ensure that growth and prosperity reaches every corner of Boston by creating 53,000 units of housing across demographics and neighborhoods. Specific goals are:
  - 44,000 units of workforce housing
  - 5,000 units of housing for senior citizens
  - 4,000 units to stabilize the market and bring rents and housing prices under control

- **Chicago:** Called “Bouncing Back, a Five Year Plan”
The goal is to invest $1.1 billion to produce or preserve 40,000 units, with 62% for extremely low-income households, and assist 265,000 households in purchasing or retaining their homes.

- **Los Angeles:** Called “Sustainable City Plan” – a cross sector approach that includes housing, but also water conservation, clean energy, waste, green jobs and transportation. The housing goals include developing 100,000 units by 2021 and increase affordability by protecting and growing the stock of affordable housing and increasing the overall housing supply.

- **New York City:** Called “Housing New York”
The goal is to build or preserve nearly 200,000 affordable units over 10 years and help both tenants and small landlords preserve the quality and affordability of their homes.
- **Seattle**: Referred to as the “Grand Bargain”

  Strategies include:

  - Require developers to build affordable homes or pay fees in exchange for relaxed zoning
  - Double the city’s housing levy (a local tax with revenue going to affordable housing)
  - Allow more housing types with multiple units in single-family zones
  - Offer tax breaks to landlords who restrict rents in existing buildings
  - Make it easier for people with criminal histories to access housing
  - Reduce parking requirements for development
Challenges to be addressed

The CDBG program is a critical resource for addressing the needs of low- and moderate-income residents, enhancing the economic fabric of a community, and increasing, preserving, and improving its housing resources. However, the federal cuts to this program over the years make it difficult to meet the needs of low- to moderate-income residents across the city. As a result, there is a need to target resources based on data, and factors such as leverage and impact. The best practice entitled “Targeted and Unified NOFAs” provides additional information on this topic.

Best Practice Ideas

- Target public service funding by NDZ and/or by service needs; tie to data analysis and the Strategic Plan categories.
- Set aside CDBG for federal funding opportunities such as Promise Zones to ensure competitiveness in seeking leveraged resources.
- Set minimum grant sizes to ensure more impact. Fewer, larger grants are also less of an administrative burden and mean more time for staff to be monitoring and assisting subgrantees to establish, measure and meet outcomes.
- Further encourage partnerships/collaborations to get groups working together.
- Evaluate the value of setting up a Citizens Advisory Committee. There are pros and cons, but we recommend including more than just representatives of each district; need to include mayoral appointees, citywide community leaders and subject matter experts.
- Evaluate the efficacy of employment and training programs to ensure performance outcomes are being met, not just outputs. Issue an RFP or RFQ to solicit best practice new approaches to best ready those most in need with marketable skills to seize new job opportunities coming into the city.
- Establish a funder collaborative with the county, corporate and foundation partners. Some United Way organizations will partner with CDBG funded programs.
- Increase low/moderate-income threshold beyond HUD required 51% to target areas with greatest need from an income standpoint.

Best Practice Examples

PLACE-BASED CDBG PROGRAM: San Jose, California

In 2012 the city of San Jose established a prioritization of CDBG funding that included the following:
- A place-based, neighborhood-focused strategy for a CDBG “Community Development Improvement” (CDI) fund targeting three neighborhoods.
A narrowly focused use of Public Service funds on adopted city priorities, some of which will also reinforce the place-based investment strategy for CDI funds. The CDI fund comprised approximately 50% of that year’s CDBG funds, with the remainder going toward public services, fair housing, program administration and Section 108 debt service. The focused Public Service funding include these programmatic uses:

- Foreclosure response
- Homelessness
- Programs targeted to the selected place-based neighborhoods for CDI
- Senior services

The decision to target funding in three neighborhoods was based on an underlying framework that the city council adopted with the intention of guiding the CDBG program. The hope is that this focus will energize neighborhoods and leverage resources, build local capacity and empower residents. Key principles of this framework are:

- Target funding with a specific focus on ensuring clean and safe neighborhoods with engaged residents
- Stabilize neighborhoods in crisis and concentrate resources in support of neighborhoods in need
- Reduce administrative costs

Selection of the neighborhoods is based on three elements:

- **Demonstrated Need:** crime, gang hot spots, code violations, foreclosures and unemployment
- **Opportunity for Change:** strength of neighborhood organizations, social capital, opportunity development sites or catalytic projects
- **Strong Partnership:** strong external partners who can sustain change beyond the city’s investment such as nonprofits, institutions such as schools and universities, and community-based organizations

**PLACE-BASED AND DATA DRIVEN PROGRAM: Richmond, Virginia**

- Begun in 1999, targets improvements in certain neighborhoods, using CDBG funds, to focus on rehabilitating housing for homeownership and rental by concentrating investment of resources in a limited impact area.
- Neighborhood eligibility is established through objective criteria that includes:
  - Number of vacant properties
  - Crime statistics
  - Poverty rate
  - Homeownership rate
  - Housing quality
- Revitalization potential is also evaluated by considering existing redevelopment plans, market trends, and strength of civic associations.
- Neighborhoods are rated independently by a group of civic leaders, housing providers and city staff.
- Program works with nonprofits to:
  - Buy and rehabilitate vacant homes for homeownership
  - Buy vacant lots and build new homes for homeownership
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- Provide down payment assistance that requires homebuyer education and counseling
- Assist homeowners with home repairs and rehabilitation

- Recipient of HUD Secretary’s Opportunity and Empowerment Award. Cited by HUD and the White House’s Office of Management & Budget as a best practice.

CDBG ADVISORY BOARDS: Burlington, Vermont

The keystone to the annual allocation of CDBG funds in the city of Burlington is the Citizen Advisory Board, which makes funding recommendations to the mayor and the city council. This citizen allocation process has been in place since the 1980’s. The Citizen Advisory Board reviews all non-city initiated funding proposals. Board members normally serve a two-year term.

Half of the members of the Citizen Advisory Board are elected by Neighborhood Planning Assemblies, other members are appointed by the mayor, one member is chosen through the Single Parent Program, and the remaining members represent stakeholders such as the State of Vermont and the United Way.

Burlington’s use of a Citizen Advisory Board to make recommendations on the best use of the city’s annual federal CDBG appropriation has received national recognition, including a local best practice award from the U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development. The Board makes difficult but community-based decisions about addressing a broad spectrum of poverty-related needs with finite resources.
APPENDIX 3: Best Practice Case Studies | Linkage Fees

Challenges to be addressed

The city of Miami, like cities across the country, is struggling to generate funding to assist with the development of housing for low- to moderate-income households in the face of rising housing costs and a very high rate of residents being housing cost-burdened. At the same time, the city is experiencing an uptick in the real estate development market, with new projects of all sorts coming on line, and with foreign dollars attracted to the market as well. A key strategy for capturing the value generated by market-rate development in support of affordable homes is the linkage fee.

About Linkage Fees

Linkage fees are designed as modest charges assessed on new non-residential, and sometimes market-rate residential development, typically on a per square foot basis, to help offset the housing impacts of that development and ensure that housing for low- and moderate-income households keeps pace with the growth of economic development and jobs in a community. The funds are placed in a trust fund used to provide for the construction and maintenance of affordable residential units. Non-residential can include office buildings, hotels, retail establishments and manufacturing facilities and are assessed on a square foot basis.

Under Florida law, there must be a rational relationship between the linkage fee imposed and the impact of new construction on the need for affordable housing. The nexus can be based on:

- The way the development creates demand for labor and the workers earning lower wages and who can’t afford housing in the local market.
- Competition created from purchase or use of land driving up property values thereby aggravating affordable housing challenges.
- Creation of a jobs-housing imbalance if commercial development is outpacing production of affordable housing in a given neighborhood or city as a whole.

The burden of proof is on local government to determine the level of housing need created by the development, creating the legal basis to establish a fund to mitigate and meet the need.

The determination is conducted through a nexus or support study, which identifies the housing need and provides statistical support for fee calculation. Linkage fees are calculated by 1) calculating the housing demand to be stimulated by a development, and 2) multiplying that demand by the amount of money it will take to make those units affordable. Typically calculated by $ per sf. The questions that the study needs to answer include:

- What types of development will pay the fee?
- Is there is minimum square footage above which the fee will be assessed (exempt smaller projects)?
- Are there exemptions to be made?
- What is the timeline for paying fee?
- What will the funds be used for?
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Best Practice Ideas

- Jurisdictions successful in adopting these types of policies have built strong community coalitions to vet and support a fee.
- Most commonly, the local government will set up an exploratory committee, task force, advisory council, or other form of stakeholder group to review best practices locally and across the country, and place options within the context of the other fees and regulations imposed on developers.
- It is critical to ensure that a new policy is compatible and complementary to existing policies and that it is not onerous to the viability of the market.
- Certain cities have viewed legal challenges as a positive as they can affirm and then cement the fee rather than leave it as the subject of ongoing debate.
- The required study must be defensible and clearly define the link between fees and impact and how the fee (its pricing and structure) directly mitigates the impacts of new development. Cities will generally hire a third party who is expert in these types of studies to conduct it.
- A linkage fee can be put on hold/moratorium during economic downturns.

For More Information


Best Practice Case Studies

Florida case studies

City of Coconut Creek
Coconut Creek adopted the first affordable housing linkage fee in the state of Florida in 2006, as follows:
- Tied to new hotel development and need for housing for future workers – opportunities for all income levels, increase homeownership and shorten commutes
- The goal for the fee is to double the number of residents living and working in the city, and to create a continuing revenue stream for affordable housing
- Steps undertaken to develop this policy:
  - Global research about what other communities are doing (included Colorado and California), conducted by Development Services Department
  - Hired a Florida-based consultant to do a study on relationship among development, growth, employment, income and demand for housing. The analysis yielded a connection between new commercial construction (offices, industrial, retail and hotels) and the need for additional affordable housing; a connection that was qualified both in terms of numbers of units and in terms of subsidy needed to make units affordable.
  - Staff developed proposed concepts and presented to the City Commission; public input was provided
The Affordable Housing Linkage Fee was approved by the City Commission
- The Development Services Department is enforcing and collecting the fee
- The fee is assessed on all new non-residential construction, non-residential construction within a mixed-use project, building additions and on the renovation of existing buildings and building space when the building permit value of the renovation of improvements exceeds 50% of the replacement cost of the building or building space at the time of construction.
- Fees are:
  - Industrial - $0.37 per sf
  - Commercial - $1.36 per sf
  - Office - $0.15 per sf
  - Hotel - $2.42 per sf
  - Limited service hotel - $0.70 per sf
- In 2012, $300,000 in linkage fees were used for a home repair program (as a small city of 55,000, this compares favorably to their HOME allocation of $74,749)

Town of Jupiter
- A linkage fee was added to the city’s existing Workforce Housing Program, which includes an inclusionary zoning requirement, in May of this year.
- The effort to create this fee was initiated with the establishment of a Workforce Housing Steering Committee.
- An underlining rationale for this fee was the fact that the town is close to build-out and there is not a lot of developable vacant land. It was anticipated that most new residential development would be mixed use or redevelopment.
- Commercial and industrial development exceeding 2,000 square feet of new gross floor area pay a fee of is $1.00 per square foot.
- Jupiter’s Workforce Housing Program also includes an inclusionary requirement, density bonuses and other incentives.

Monroe County
- Conducted a stakeholder assessment; 75 people participated in interviews and meetings and identified a range of workforce housing issues.
- Reviewed by Affordable Housing Advisory Committee – called upon to make recommendations to County Commission; staff identified gap -- a deficit of 6500 units.
- Affordable and employee fair share housing impact fee – “purpose is to provide a fair and equitable fair share fee for affordable and employee housing impacts generated by commercial, recreational, multifamily residential, institutional and industrial development...“ as well as other uses.
- Use is exclusively to offset the cost of required permitting and connection fees related to the development of new employee housing.
- Fees for nonresidential structures:
  - Under 1999 sf - $1.00 per sf
  - 2000 – 2999 sf - $2.00 per sf
  - 3000 and above - $3.00 per sf
Out-of-state case studies

Arlington County, Virginia
- The county enacted linkage fees specifically for commercial development.
- The fee is indexed to CPI and adjusted annually.
- Funds go into a housing investment fund.
- In 2013 the fee was $1.77 per square foot.
- Between 2008 and 2012 $8.8m was collected.
- Expect $13.9m between 2013 and 2016.

Somerville, Massachusetts
- Fee is $5.15 per square foot for commercial development over 30,000 sf.
- Generates approximately $500,000 per year and is used for a full array of housing programs including multifamily development and preservation and homeownership assistance.
- Can serve households up to 110% of AMI, but at least 20% must be reserved for households at 50% of AMI and below.

Example of a plan-based benefits package approach, San Francisco, California
- Fee structure based on a particular neighborhood plan (Eastern Neighborhoods)
- Includes the following:
  - Commercial linkage fee (ranges from $15 per sf to $20 per sf for varying uses)
  - Transit impact fee
  - Child care fee
  - Open space fee
  - Arts fees
  - Inclusionary requirements (onsite units, or in-lieu fee)
- Developers were granted increased height limits
- Developed based on study of development economics and real estate analysis with an eye toward “not whether, but how”
- Developed in collaboration with community groups, was a way to garner support and move residents from opposing development, to a focus on “what do we want” and “how do we get it”?
Challenges to be addressed

The city of Miami has a housing affordability mismatch - there is a surplus of housing for people at higher income levels and a serious deficit for those at extremely low income levels. The availability of housing affordable to people at lower income levels appears adequate, but there is competition for it from those who can least afford it, thereby creating high housing cost burdens. The city also has concentrations of poverty and minority populations in certain neighborhoods. Further exacerbating the situation, the market continues to build for the highest-income groups near the downtown and waterfront areas, while the number of middle-income households has been decreasing over time.

Best Practice Ideas

According to the Urban Land Institute (ULI), over the last decade, much of the most successful affordable housing, including housing for the workforce sector, has been part of mixed-income housing developments. Of its many attributes, it can:

- Leverage market forces
- Increase absorption in large developments
- Contribute to the revitalization of urban neighborhoods
- Increase housing options for lower- and moderate-income households
- Decrease concentration of poverty in publically assisted housing
- Activate smart growth principles by advancing housing for a continuum of the workforce near employment centers and public transportation nodes

Mixed-income development can be pursued on a project-based basis or as a neighborhood-based initiative.

Below are several key elements that are associated with mixed-income housing:

- Mixed-income housing is often accomplished through the provisions of mandatory inclusionary zoning, or other regulatory measures such as density bonuses, reduced parking and land assembly assistance.
- Measures to incentivize mixed-income housing can also include tax incentives, streamlined permitting, provision of city-owned land, and deployment of public resources for subsidizing extremely low- or very low-income homes and/or down payment assistance.
- Most successful mixed-income housing will target moderate-income residents to bridge the gap between extremely low- and very low-income residents and market rate; in fact, some development will focus exclusive on serving the low- to moderate-income group and utilize other mechanisms to meet housing needs of extremely low- and very low-income residents.
- Partnerships are key to successful mixed-income deals; including public partnerships with market rate developers, banks, Community Development Financial Institutions
(CDFIs) who can offer creative financing options, and community-based organizations (CBOs) with homebuyer assistance and social service programs.

- Partnerships between for-profit market rate and nonprofit developers have proven successful in creating mixed-income housing across the country, each bringing their own expertise, access to financing, and relationships to the table.
- Innovation in financing, which while time-consuming, is a component of many mixed-income properties.
- Co-location of uses is commonly coupled with mixed-income developments, in part of take advantage of innovative financing tools. New Market Tax Credits have been used in Atlanta and in Portland, Oregon, to incorporate schools (both charter and public) in with revitalized public housing, affordable housing and market rate units.
- Educating these various partners is key to a successful initiative around mixed-income housing. The ULI’s Mixed Income Housing: Fact vs. Myth publication is an effective tool in dispelling myths and providing concrete information on how to accomplish mixed-income goals.

For More Information

Urban Land Institute, Mixed Income Housing: Myth and Fact, 2003

National Initiative on Mixed-Income Communities website at the Jack, Joseph and Morton Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences | Case Western Reserve University, http://nimc.case.edu/

Best Practice Examples

**Mixed-Income Housing: Boston, Massachusetts: Tent City**
This mixed-income development consists of 269 rental apartments of which 25% are market rate, 50% are for low- to moderate-income households and 25% are for very low-income households, creating a successful graduated balance among residents’ incomes. It helped rejuvenate the city’s South End neighborhood as well as created synergy with the adjacent Copley Place commercial development. The financing including over 10 different sources and required committed partnership with the community, the nonprofit development (The Community Builders), the city and its redevelopment agency, the state, equity investors and banks. In addition, the innovative use of a HUD loan repayment stream from another project was one of the financing tools.

**Mixed-Income and Public Housing: San Francisco, California: HOPE SF**
The HOPE SF initiative will transform over 5,000 units of public housing in five developments that will also include affordable and market rate units and create thriving, mixed-income communities that provide residents with healthy, safe homes and attract new local businesses to economically challenged neighborhoods. The first development to break ground is Hunters View, which will replace the existing 267 public housing units and add over 500 new units. Total
breakdown will be 45% market rate, 35% public housing and 20% affordable (between 50% and 120% of area median income). The affordable and market rate housing will be a mix of rentals and for sale housing. Project attributes will include:

- Comprehensive programming for all residents including job training and placement, child care and a community center
- Specialized service programming for public housing residents
- Green and healthy home standards

The developer is a for-profit firm, partnering with a locally based nonprofit. The initiative has involved extensive planning and partnerships across the city family (including housing authority, and the departments of housing, public health and planning). Financing has included low-income housing tax credits, tax exempt bonds, city, state and federal funding for capital and operating costs, philanthropy and the proceeds from the market-rate homes.

**Mixed-Income and Mixed-Use: Portland, Oregon: Bookmark Apartments**

This 47 unit rental development includes a 40% affordable housing component for residents at 60% of area median income and below, as well as a county-operated library and a locally-owned café. The development is also located five blocks from a transit center. The developer (Shiels, Obletz Johnson, a small locally-based firm) was selected through an RFP process, run by the county. The key ingredients leading to the success of this development were:

- Regional approach to funding the project
- City commitment to ensuring proper zoning to support compact, mixed use development in proximity to smaller commercial and residential structures, as well as addressing permitting issues
- Utility company participation in advising on green elements

Funding sources included library bonds, tax-exempt housing bonds, city-funded low interest loans, 4% Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC), TOD property tax exemption and deferred developer fee.

Challenges included risk management related to the condominium structure including public and private sectors, maintaining consensus related to high design and construction standards, and ensuring consistency of strong partners in the development team.

**Local Initiative: Austin, Texas: S.M.A.R.T. Housing Initiative**

In 2000, the city of Austin enacted the S.M.A.R.T. (Safe, Mixed-Income, Accessible, Reasonably Priced, Transit-Oriented) Housing Initiative as a means to address housing needs of residents at 80% of area median income and below, with the goal of creating mixed income developments. Developers who agree to meet S.M.A.R.T. standards – incorporating affordable housing, building near transit and building green – qualify for these incentives:

- Waived development fees
- Expedited permitting and zoning reviews
- Reduced parking
- Support from the city’s Housing and Community Development department in the
The fee waiver and fast track reviews are tiered based on the percentage of affordable housing provided, from a 25% fee waiver for 10% affordable units, all the way up to a 100% fee waiver if 40% of the units are affordable.

In its first two years, 1,400 S.M.A.R.T. units were developed, and after eight years over 10,000 such units were developed.

A recent analysis of the program indicates that areas for the program’s ongoing improvement include: ensuring expedited review is meeting developer needs, exploring additional mechanisms for provision of resources that leverage private investment. The original program was revised in 2008 and again in 2014. The city and its stakeholders stay engaged in ensuring the program’s success and the need to revise as economic conditions change and in response to stakeholder and user input.
APPENDIX 3: Best Practice Case Studies | Inclusionary Zoning for Affordable Housing

Challenges to be addressed

Inclusionary zoning (IZ) and inclusionary housing policies have been long been used as planning tools to effectively address housing affordability challenges especially in hot real estate markets. However not all inclusionary zoning policies are equally effective. Voluntary and mandatory policies can differ in their success based on how they effectively capture real estate development for affordable housing. Building political will from the public and the real estate development community are also important factors in the success of any IZ program. Currently, Miami has several incentives for affordable housing including the Public Benefit Program. Tightening up current policies and adding additional tools could help create more affordable housing units.

Best Practice Ideas

Over the past decade, an increasing number of jurisdictions have turned to inclusionary zoning as a tool to help provide a greater number of affordable units. The best known example is Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit (MPDU) ordinance passed in Montgomery County, Maryland, in 1974. Voluntary IZ programs have been a good way to introduce inclusionary housing policies where there are political, legal or market barriers to adoption.

The most impactful inclusionary zoning or upzoning policies apply to a broad geography and development types as well as promote mixed use. However, even when broad policies are implemented on a city-wide basis, some local governments have customized standards and incentives in certain neighborhoods to create greater affordability or meet specific needs or address specific issues. Cities may opt to adopt a minimum level or floor from which they may provide additional density or bonuses in exchange for a greater number of affordable housing units.

As a starting point, the purpose and goals of the IZ program is a key consideration in the program’s perceived effectiveness. For example, on-site requirements may create greater opportunity in high demand neighborhoods but also a smaller number of units due to higher per unit costs, while off-site requirements may create a greater number of units in high-poverty neighborhoods that may be limiting access to educational and employment opportunities. Several communities have also tied Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) and housing voucher programs to inclusionary housing policies allowing developers to meet a portion of their affordable housing obligation.

It’s also important to note that some communities are prohibited from using inclusionary zoning because of state law or the courts have restricted the use of IZ. In such cases, voluntary forms of IZ and inclusionary housing have been effective ways to introduce the concept in communities. Optional inclusionary housing policies in neighborhoods proposed for upzoning may help local governments work around legal restrictions. In other cases, mandatory
inclusionary zoning policies is applied in only new areas where offering upzoning can be an incentive in neighborhoods with increased development potential.

Ad-hoc policies (project specific or plan-based) seem to have varying degrees of success in building affordability and some create public consternation over a perceived lack of transparency.

Based on several case studies and findings, the following are some of the common characteristics of the best practices for implementing inclusionary zoning or inclusionary upzoning:

1. Inclusionary zoning works best in strong real estate markets and is best implemented before the market takes off.
2. Low base zoning creates the potential for greater development by awarding height and density bonuses in exchange for affordable housing. Adding affordable housing requirements in already dense areas will not be as effective.
3. Access to additional funding or tax breaks may strengthen the appeal of the program. Examples include: property tax exemptions, access to state LIHTC credits and financial assistance for providing affordability can make the program more attractive.
4. Ensuring that the level of affordability requirements (by percent of area median income) align with financial viability for a developer is an important consideration in creating an inclusionary program.
5. Community engagement and discussions over density and what that looks like in a particular neighborhood is also an important component for success. Proposing increased density in a neighborhood that believes it will negatively affect community character can lead to neighborhood opposition.
6. A wider geographic area produces more affordable housing.
7. Voluntary zoning programs may be more effective if the requirements are tailored to the increased financial value of upzoning in a particular neighborhood.

For More Information

The report, *Inclusionary Upzoning: Tying Growth to Affordability*, is one of several in a series of research and policy briefs on Inclusionary Housing from the National Housing Conference. The report can be downloaded here: [http://www.nhc.org/Inclusionary-Upzoning.pdf](http://www.nhc.org/Inclusionary-Upzoning.pdf)

For more information on Tallahassee program described below see: [http://talgov.com/planning/planning-af-inch-af-inchouse.aspx#Program](http://talgov.com/planning/planning-af-inch-af-inchouse.aspx#Program)


Cornerstone Partnership Webinars on Inclusionary Housing: [www.affordableownership.org/event-topic/inclusionary-housing/](http://www.affordableownership.org/event-topic/inclusionary-housing/)
Best Practice Examples

Tallahassee, Florida – Combination Mandatory and Voluntary

- Florida’s state capitol is a median-sized city of approximately 186,000.
- Passed in 2005, Tallahassee’s ordinance combines voluntary and mandatory compliance features.
- Density bonuses, design flexibility and transportation compliance exemptions provided for voluntary participation in the program for developments that include up to 25% of total units as affordable.
- Some of the flexibility includes choice of housing type, alleviation of setback and lot size requirements, alleviation of screening requirements, modified development standards and expedited permitting.
- All new developments over 50 units in designated areas of the city must provide 10% of total units. Developers may comply by providing units off-site or making a payment-in-lieu of construction to the city’s affordable housing trust fund.
- City sets income limits by household size; most recently set in 2008 for eligible homebuyers. Rent limits are set by HOME program rental limits.
- Affordable units may be built for homeownership or rental. Homeownership units have resale restrictions within the first 10 years intended to allow for a new eligible homeowner to buy the home.

Lesson Learned: Tallahassee spent some time studying inclusionary zoning programs around the country and created a program tailored for their needs. A combination of mandatory and voluntary requirements is an effective way to convince the development community to support the program and build much needed affordable housing.

Fairfax County, Virginia – Voluntary Program in Specific Area

With the coming of four stations as part of the extension of the Silver Line Metro, Fairfax County adopted a 20-year comprehensive plan in 2010 to transform Tyson’s Corner from an auto-oriented suburban office and commercial center to a mixed-use, walkable downtown. Now rebranded as simply Tyson’s, the plan requires developers to include 20% low- and moderate-income housing in exchange for increased redevelopment options within a half-mile of the Metro stations. At a quarter-mile distance from the station, developers have unlimited floor area ratio (FAR) in exchange for affordable housing units while developments up to a half-mile distance can access up to 3.0 FAR depending on the mix of uses. Office, retail, and hotel developments that receive higher density bonuses must contribute to the county’s affordable housing trust fund. The bonuses in the Tyson’s area are attractive because the redevelopment options are higher than anywhere else in the county. Fairfax County already has an Affordable Dwelling Unit (ADU) program that requires 5% to 12.5% affordability for multi-family housing, however, steel-and-concrete based buildings are exempt providing a unique opportunity to
create affordable housing in a high-demand area. Fairfax County is attempting to harness the development potential in the Tyson’s area as it tries to recreate what has become this urban county’s downtown. As of 2013, over 14,600 units were approved for development of which more than 2500 units will serve household earning less than 120% of area median income (AMI), while another 1680 will serve households at less than 70% AMI. Another 20 million square feet of non-residential development has been approved which has been estimated to generate over $64.5 million to the county’s affordable housing trust fund.

Lesson Learned: Transit-oriented development can be a perfect opportunity to create affordability requirements in areas where higher density is planned. Local governments can harness development potential that cannot be found elsewhere in the jurisdiction. In neighborhoods where height is limited consider affordability requirements that provide greater height and density thereby making additional bonuses special.

**Boston, Massachusetts – Voluntary Program Whenever Developer Seeks Zoning Change**

Another option is for local governments to apply a standard inclusionary housing requirement to any upzoning or zoning changes. Mayor Thomas Menino signed an executive order in 2000 creating Boston’s Inclusionary Development Policy. The policy requires 13% affordable housing to any residential development of 10 or more units seeking a zoning change. The policy is also applicable to any development on public land or any development that receives public financial assistance. Developers have the option of building the units on-site, off-site, or pay a fee referred to as the “buy-out fee.” The revenues for the affordable housing trust fund must be spent in neighborhoods where there is less affordable housing units than the city-wide average. The program includes homeownership and rental units mostly for households earning less than 80% AMI. The new units also have affordability periods of 30 to 50 years for homeownership units and 50 years for rental units.

Since 2012, Boston has produced over 1,070 units with at least $36.3 million in buy-out fees. The majority of affordable housing currently produced comes from zoning relief. Because the city has not updated the zoning code in decades and the city is primarily built-out, developers need additional density to build up. Also, as the city upzones certain neighborhoods, city staff already includes affordability requirements into the neighborhood zoning request. For example, the new Fenway neighborhood zoning plan includes a 20% affordability requirement.

Lesson Learned: Rather than ad-hoc affordability requirements on a neighborhood by neighborhood basis, some cities set the ground rules so that all developer requests for upzoning or any zoning change will include predictable affordable housing requirements.

**Redmond, Washington - Mandatory Program in Upzoned Area**

Redmond, Washington, is a small town of 56,000 in King County, part of the Seattle metropolitan region. Redmond’s Affordable Housing Zoning program was adopted in 1994 as the city implemented neighborhood by neighborhood zoning changes. Mostly applicable to Redmond’s downtown area, each neighborhood goes through a neighborhood planning process that allows for higher densities. The policy requires that all new development with 10 or more units must provide 10% of units targeted to 80% or less of area median income (AMI). Units
include homeownership units subject to a 50 year affordability period while rental units have affordability restrictions in perpetuity. Since 2002, all six neighborhoods have gone through the neighborhood planning process with only one neighborhood deciding not to include affordability requirements. So far the city has created 308 affordable units in six downtown neighborhoods. In the past 10 years, the city has added over 3448 new households but not necessarily in downtown neighborhoods limiting the success of the program.

Lesson Learned: A mandatory program should already have significant public buy-in and significant opportunities for public input such as a neighborhood plan. A mandatory program should also be applicable throughout the entire jurisdiction to ensure its maximum reach.
Challenges to be addressed

The use of public land for housing and community development can provide a locality with strategic opportunities to spur development and change land use patterns. However, competing agency and developer goals, public expectation of community benefits, and realistic costs can create conflict between local governments and its citizens. A large number of agencies with property inventory without a lead agency makes it difficult to agree on common goals and approaches for the sale or leasing of land. Even more important is public engagement and general agreement on the purpose and general use of city-owned property.

Best Practice Ideas

Robert Hickey, co-author of Public Lands and Affordable Housing: Lessons from the Washington Region, suggests the following best practices:

1. A single agency should be empowered to lead regular, cross-agency assessments of available city-owned property.
2. Early and frequent public engagement is important to gaining acceptance of the proposed reuse of a city owned property, whether it is vacant or underutilized.
3. It is important to establish clear, transparent and objective criteria in identifying sites and in determining how they will be priced or if the land will be offered at a nominal cost.
4. Review all capital improvement project proposals for their potential to include residential development (including affordable housing).
5. Identify public land in an accessible, high-value locations. Good locations that offer transit, community and health facilities, grocery stores and other retail will provide the greatest opportunity to its residents.
6. A policy that identifies and protects suitable sites for the development of affordable housing. These policies should ensure that the property is:
   a. Clear of legal encumbrances
   b. Clean or free of any environmental contamination
   c. Adequate size and shape
   d. Set minimum affordable expectations for residential development (no. of units, income levels)
6. Frequent coordination among agencies and the selected developer. Joint meetings can help problem solve issues along the way.
7. Allow the agency handling land disposition to accept less than top-dollar bids when reviewing proposals.
8. Localities still need a local funding source or trust fund providing financial subsidy for affordable housing construction and operation.
For More Information

The report is a joint effort of the Urban Land Institute and the National Housing Conference entitled *Public Lands and Affordable Housing in the Washington, DC Region: Best Practices and Recommendations* by Robert Hickey and Lisa Sturtevant, PhD.


Best Practice Examples

**Arlington Mill - Arlington County, Virginia**

A diminishing stock of garden-style apartments and similar kinds of properties has made it more difficult to find suitable affordable housing sites in Arlington County. In 2008, a failed deal with a developer created the opportunity to create permanent, supportive housing in Arlington’s rapidly changing Columbia Pike transit corridor. The county reconsidered its first effort at a mixed-use market rate development for the county-owned property and rebid the property for affordable housing and a community facility.

The winner, the Arlington Partnership for Affordable Housing (APAH), agreed to pay $1.5 million dollars in upfront ground lease payments as part of the 75-year discounted ground lease offered by the county. In exchange, the county also agreed to an accelerated permitting process and build a parking garage on site. The mixed-use development includes 122 affordable units, community space and space for the county’s health and human services – about one-third of the building. Services include a senior center, Head Start, after school programs and a teen center that have proved to be transformative for its low-income residents.

It is important to note that although Arlington Mill filled an important community need for permanent supportive housing, the development did not come without large costs of about $300,000 per unit requiring additional subsidies using HOME and local funds. The development was mostly on time, but it required weekly meetings with lots of coordination with county staff.

Later, the county identified an additional 30 county sites in the Arlington Public Land report that created furor and rancor among the public. The report was poorly timed and did not include early public engagement. When the report was published, neighborhood groups galvanized against the plan and rallied against the proposed use of county-owned sites. By contrast, Arlington Mill came about because of community support and a large amount of public input.

Lessons Learned: Proposed developments can succeed or fail based on community support for the use of land perceived as a public resource entrusted to the local government. The local government should be willing to reassess the original proposal for the use of city-owned
property from a private development that yields a profit for the local government to subsidized-development proposals that may yield other benefits such as additional community facilities, mixed-use development in an underserved neighborhood and affordable housing.

**The Bonifant - Silver Spring, Maryland**

The Bonifant is an 11-story, 149 unit senior housing development in the heart of downtown Silver Spring, a burgeoning transit-oriented community in Montgomery County, Maryland, on the border with Washington, D.C. The county leased the property for $0 to the Montgomery Housing Partnership (MHP), a highly-regarded, nonprofit developer in the county. The site includes a connection to a long-anticipated public library. The county also supports the goal of providing affordable housing in transit-rich and accessible areas such as Silver Spring where the site is within walking distance of the Silver Spring Metro station and the proposed Purple Line station. The county provided funds for pre-development costs so there were no holding costs for MHP. The original income mix did not work due to funding and financial constraints so the county agreed to allow units above 30% Area Median Income (AMI) to include 50% and 60% AMI. The county and the development team coordinated closely on the entitlement and permitting process and also coordinated and planned connecting programmatic areas such as the library and the adjoining plaza. However, the partnership with a market-rate developer created greater scrutiny requiring additional public engagement particularly when the income targets changed.

Lessons Learned: The county’s commitment to build affordable housing in a high-cost area where there are many development pressures proved to be key in getting The Bonifant completed. Complete transparency on the deal, especially when changes were necessary, were also important factors in maintaining community support. It was also important for the county to provide additional public subsidy even when the land is donated in order to meet deeper income targets.
**APPENDIX 3: Best Practice Case Studies | Housing for Extremely Low-Income Households**

**Challenges to be addressed**

Providing housing for households with extremely low incomes (less than $18,000 a year) and those who are homeless with no incomes is a challenge facing cities, counties and states across the country. Even in the case where all of the capital costs associated with developing the housing are covered (which is difficult to manage), the fact that tenants are unable to pay a rent level that will cover all of a property owner’s operating costs necessitates a rental or operating subsidy being in place. Nearly one third of all Miamians are living at the poverty line (or below), and the deficit in housing for this income group is significant. The funding that the city has to address this is limited to HOME funding and Affordable Housing Trust Fund dollars from the Public Benefit Program and these are being spread across the city to meet a variety of housing needs, including homeownership and single-family rehabilitation.

However, there are funds available from the county, state and federal government, and there are strategies to raise funding locally to increase resources to address this severe housing need.

**Best Practice Ideas**

- Providing a competitive advantage in the funding allocation process for projects with a set-aside of units for extremely low-income households at a level of 25% or greater will increase the supply of these units.
- Coordinating a city’s capital funding for affordable housing with a public housing authority’s capacity to provide project-based Section 8 vouchers has been a very effective strategy in bringing extremely low-income housing units on line. The vouchers can provide cash flow to the owner, which will at a minimum cover operating expenses, and in some cases service debt as well.
- Public housing authorities are a key resource in meeting the housing needs of this population, and while their resources alone will be insufficient to meet the needs in most communities, a local housing department’s collaboration with their housing authority has proven very effective in designing creative strategies to meet the needs of extremely low-income residents.
- The HOPWA, HOME and ESG programs can be used to provide rental assistance; however these sources present challenges since they are subject to annual allocations of funding. They are often used in very select settings where there is a programmatic expectation of increased income for the tenants. In some cases, these programs are structured as “shallow rent subsidies,” meaning they provide a small, flat amount to stretch the resource out longer. It serves as a tool in preventing homelessness and abating the stress and hardship associated with having very little income.
- The Homeless Prevention and Rapid Rehousing Program (HPRP), funded with ARRA funds, was an effective resource, however in the absence of those funds, cities are struggling with how to replicate this program with other resources.
Numerous jurisdictions create their own funding stream or allocate existing resources precisely to fund a rental or operating subsidy program. In some communities, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and county or state funding for youth transitioning out of foster care have been used to provide operating or rental subsidies on a short term basis.

For More Information

Corporation for Supportive Housing has numerous toolkits pertaining to the development and operation of supportive housing which while a more expansive group, includes people with extremely low incomes: www.csh.org

Best Practice Examples

San Francisco, California: Local Operating Subsidy Program/Rental Subsidies for Homeless Individuals
- The city provides an operating subsidy that pays the difference between the cost of operating the housing and any other revenue coming to the project, plus the tenant’s ability to pay rent.
- Typically provided to projects that are also receiving capital funding from the city.
- The subsidy is provided pursuant to a 15-year agreement with the project developer.
- Funded by city General Funds and administered out of the city’s Department of Human Services and Department of Health.

Commonwealth of Puerto Rico: Rental Subsidies for Senior Housing (also known as Law 173)
- Provides rental subsidies for housing units serving the elderly so that tenants only pay 30% of their income for housing costs.
- Since 1996, 3,800 units have been subsidized; typical annual allocation is $5,000,000 using State General Funds however due to dire economic conditions, there is no funding in 2015.
- Administered by the Department of Housing and follows similar procedures to project based Section 8 vouchers.

Houston, Texas: The Way Home/Housing Homeless Vets
- The city, in partnership with the Houston Housing Authority and the local Veterans Medical Center, launched a program to end homelessness among veterans in 2014.
- The effort engaged 35 local agencies that worked collaboratively and attracted a $12.5 million investment from the Houston Endowment, a philanthropic foundation.
- The approach to housing included the set-aside of units within affordable developments using Section 8 vouchers and finding landlords who would rent to households with portable Section 8 vouchers.
- Eighteen months later, the city was able to declare that they had ended veteran homelessness in Houston.
APPENDIX 3: Best Practice Case Studies | Targeted and Unified Notices of Funding Availability (NOFA)

Challenges to be addressed

With limited resources and increasing needs, local and state governments are looking at ways to both target their funding and pull multiple funding sources together, as a means to ensure funds are having the greatest impact in addressing the most difficult issues. By pulling together multiple funding sources the jurisdiction is increasing the resources allocated to its highest priorities through leveraging. This can also streamline the process for developers and expedite the finance assembly timeframe for affordable housing development. The best practice entitled “CDBG Project Selection and Targeting Strategies” provides additional information on this topic.

Best Practice Ideas

- The first step is to identify the priority housing needs to be targeted. This should be drawn from the following:
  - Consolidated Plan
  - State Housing Plan (if applicable)
  - Staff data and mapping analyses
  - Civic engagement/public process

- Examples of priority housing types include:
  - At-Risk Housing (with expiring restrictions, vulnerable to conversion to market rate rents)
  - Transit-Oriented Development (TOD)
  - Housing Serving:
    - Homeless population (youth, chronically homeless)
    - People with special needs
    - Seniors
    - Families (units with 3+ bedrooms)
  - Housing Tenure: Rental or homeownership
  - Location: Revitalization zone or areas of high opportunity

- A NOFA can be structured to offer different funding sources in a single funding process which can include only locally controlled funds, or also those from other jurisdictional entities. This requires cross-departmental and cross-agency cooperation and typically includes the execution of a multi-party agreement. In the case of Los Angeles, Puerto Rico, and Washington, D.C., described below, both city/state departments as well as housing authorities, utilities and the county - all with different governance structures – are included in the NOFA.

- NOFA timing should be linked to that of other funding sources not subject to the NOFA to ensure proper sequencing that enhances competitiveness, particularly for LIHTCs which are often the largest funding source in a project’s capital stack.
Los Angeles, California: Unified NOFA Targeting Homelessness

- The city of Los Angeles uses the NOFA process to target specific housing and community development needs and to leverage funding sources – both those within their control and those of partnering agencies.
- In 2006, LA created a fund targeted to addressing homelessness through the development of permanent supportive housing and released a NOFA specifically for this type of housing.
- NOFA scoring establishes both thresholds and weighted scoring to award funding to only those projects that meet the city’s targeted criteria. In this case, the city had determined, based on data related to the homeless population, that creating permanent supportive housing with services was their top priority and targeted use for their funding.
- This NOFA included multiple funding sources:
  - Housing Department (HOME, CDBG, HOPWA, and bond funds)
  - Community Redevelopment Agency (Tax Increment)
  - Housing Authority (Project-based voucher assistance)
  - Department of Water and Power (Funding to cover utility infrastructure, electric energy efficiency and water conservation loans, water conservation and electric energy efficiency services, products and rebates)
- The four participating funding agencies executed a four-party Cooperation Agreement that spelled out their respective contributions to the fund and the purpose for the funding program.
- The NOFA is designed to fund projects that will be competing for Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) in the next available round, with the intent of enhancing their competitiveness. Toward this end, LA developed a “LIHTC Managed Pipeline Plan.”
- The NOFA process is operated pursuant to a managed pipeline approach, which means that applications with the highest scores are admitted into the pipeline and then are subject to underwriting to ensure readiness and ability to perform before funding agreements are crafted and executed.
- The NOFA aligns with the county’s funding cycles and seeks to ensure that its projects are also competitive for county funding.
- In 2014, the city released a TOD-focused NOFA to target affordable housing development near transit.

Commonwealth of Puerto Rico

- The commonwealth adopted a State Housing Plan in 2014 that identified three top priority populations:
  - Seniors
The commonwealth determined that the most effective approach to targeting the resources within their control to these housing needs would be a targeted, unified NOFA approach.

The director of Housing for the Commonwealth directed the agency leadership administering HOME, LIHTC and Section 8 to convene and develop a NOFA. The activities pursued to implement this NOFA include the following:

- Revising the LIHTC Qualified Allocation Plan (QAP)
- Amending the HOME Plan
- Amending the Public Housing Authority’s Administrative Plan
- Entering into a cross-agency MOU
- Designing unified scoring criteria
- Designing unified underwriting standards
- Designing a single application form
- Identifying the lead application intake and underwriting staff

The commonwealth is planning to release this first ever unified targeted NOFA in September of 2015.

Washington, D.C.

Washington, D.C., provides a case study in the braiding together of multiple funding sources, however, it is open to a cross-section of housing needs. The D.C. unified NOFA includes the following sources:

- CDBG and HOME funds
- Locally generated Housing Production Trust Fund program funds
- 9% Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC)
- Department of Mental Health (DMH) funds administered by the Housing Department
- District of Columbia Housing Authority’s Local Rent Supplement Program (LRSP), Housing Choice Vouchers and the Annual Contributions Contract Program
- Department of Human Services (DHS) supportive services funds for permanent supportive housing
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Challenges to be addressed

To address the major social problems of extreme poverty and lack of affordable housing, a city – or any organization looking to affect big change - will need to operate differently to move from an isolated impact approach to a collective impact approach. These problems are complex and interdependent, and thus require cross-agency and cross-sector coalitions to resolve. In the city of Miami, current programmatic initiatives being undertaken, while well-designed and thoughtful, are not meeting the scale of the problem and do not always talk to each other. The connections to external public and private parties is not coordinated. The ability to leverage the success of isolated efforts, to align activities into a robust initiative that has clear, compelling and attainable goals in mind, and to address the problem at scale requires a concerted commitment to bring multiple parties together to coalesce and implement.

Best Practice Ideas

- Collective impact is an approach that has demonstrated success in achieving outcomes and has attracted philanthropic attention as well. This approach is predicated upon:
  - A common agenda with agreed upon boundaries and strategic framework
  - Shared metrics
  - Mutually reinforcing activities across agencies
  - Consistent communication – sharing and learning
  - Staff resources to support and manage the effort

- Preconditions for collective impact are:
  - An influential champion
  - Allocation of resources to carry out
  - A sense of urgency that change is needed

- It is important to select a single lens or issue with which to address the poverty and housing issues, such as:
  - Ending or reducing childhood poverty
  - Increasing incomes/job creation for working poor

- A select group of stakeholders needs to be assembled with agreement on the goals and strategies to achieve the goal. Participation needs to come from the leadership of each participating department/agency/organization.

- To successfully carry out a collective impact initiative, staff time must be allocated, and an “infrastructure backbone” must be designated – someone who will ensure that timelines are met, that participants are up to date and on track and performance of the initiative is
continually monitored. This could be carried out by a staff person, or a third party engaged just for this purpose.

- Addressing homelessness presents a strong analogy for this type of work and has embedded in it the concepts of collective impact. It is not possible to address the issues facing chronically homeless people without taking a collaborative and cross-sector approach with clear goals.

For More Information


Best Practice Examples

Broward County, Florida: A Safety Net for Youth Aging Out of Foster Care

In 2001 Broward County faced the reality that more than 1,000 youth were aging out of foster care each year as they turned 18 years old. The data revealed that only 25% of them were actually self-sufficient at that point, and that 46% had no high school diploma, 25% were experiencing homelessness and 49% had already become parents. To address this crisis, a collective impact approach, initially funded by the Broward Community Foundation. The key steps in their process were:

- **Listening tour** to identify the issues and stakeholders and to build trust with the community.
- Creation of an informal working group with representatives from the nonprofit and government sector.
- Selection and engagement of many additional partners from varied sectors. These partners (some of whom were considered “nontraditional”) would bring fresh perspectives, resources and a level of accountability to the endeavor. These groups included faith organizations, housing organizations, cultural institutions, Legal Aid, county and state government agencies, corporations, and foundations.
- Leadership from each partner organization was at the table to ensure rapid decision making and removal of bureaucratic barriers.
- A consultant was hired to work with the coalition of partners to create an action plan.
- Continual communication was essential:
  - Small working groups met monthly and quarterly meetings were held to update the entire collective impact effort.
  - A full-time coordinator was hired with funding from the Community Foundation and the United Way to serve as the “backbone” of the effort.
- As a result of the collective impact endeavor, implementation of the action plan has created a safety net of providers who work together to support youth aging out of foster care. And, the outcomes are measurable and sustainable:
  - Homelessness among these youth has decreased from 25% to 4%
  - Foster youth becoming parents has decreased from 49% to 26%
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- There are now 186 housing units designated for this population
- A new organization, Fort Lauderdale Independence Training & Education Center (FLITE) was created to serve as the hub for connecting youth with housing and services. It is viewed as a national model and has received grants from foundations and donors.

San Francisco, California: Promise Neighborhood

In 2012, the Mission Economic Development Agency (MEDA), the mayor’s office, the John W. Gardner Center for Youth and Their Communities at Stanford University, and the United Way of the Bay Area as well as various city agencies and community-based organizations worked together to write a Promise Neighborhood Implementation Grant proposal for San Francisco’s Mission District neighborhood, a low-income community with a predominantly Latino population. During the year-long planning process, partners worked to create a continuum of services that would meet the Mission District’s needs, with a focus on low-income Latino students and families and students at Cesar Chavez Elementary, Bryant Elementary, Everett Middle School and John O’Connell High School.

The goals of the Promise Neighborhood collaboration, headed by MEDA, are straightforward:

1. Academic achievement
2. Family economic success

One of the key strategies they would employ is service integration, tapping into the rich array of services already in place in the community. A key partner is the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD), and an important point of leverage for this effort was the three-year $45 million Federal School Improvement Grant (SIG) SFUSD received to support the turnaround and transformation of student outcomes at state-identified “persistently low-performing schools.” Six of the 10 schools benefitting from the grant are located in the Mission District and are part of a newly created “Superintendent’s Zone” led by Assistant Superintendent Guadalupe Guerrero, who collaborated on the development of the Promise Neighborhood grant application.

The core components of the service integrations are:

- Literacy instruction
- Professional development for teachers
- Additional support staff at the schools
- Community schools approach
- Cradle to college to career approach that coordinates educational, health, social and community supports
- Culturally and linguistically appropriate services

In December of 2012, the U.S. Department of Education selected MEDA to receive a five-year, $30 million Promise Neighborhoods implementation grant to implement a plan to create true innovation and ensure children, youth and families in the Mission have strong schools,
opportunities to become economically successful and robust systems of family and community support that will allow them to thrive. Below is an example of the framework established, with stakeholder involvement, for this initiative:

Mission Promise Neighborhood “Wheel of Promise”

Five indicators of family economic success:

1. Credit score of 650+
2. Jobs created, businesses expanded, income increased
3. Job placements, jobs retained, income increased
4. Homes purchased, foreclosures prevented
5. Tax return dollars received, public benefits received