

## AD HOC CHARTER REVIEW BOARD

### Members:

Stephen Zack, Esq., Chair  
Jonathan Beloff, Vice-Chair  
Richard Alhadeff  
Sherry Kaplan Roberts  
Rick Kendle  
Sarah Johnston  
(Vacant)

### Appointed by:

Mayor Philip Levine  
Commissioner Joy Malakoff  
Commissioner Micky Steinberg  
Commissioner Michael Grieco  
Commissioner Edward L. Tobin  
Commissioner Deede Weithorn  
Commissioner Jonah Wolfson

### Staff:

Jose Smith, City Attorney  
Donald Papy, Chief Deputy City Attorney  
Debora Turner, First Assistant City Attorney  
Gary M. Held, First Assistant City Attorney  
Rafael E. Granado, City Clerk  
Liliam Hatfield, OAV, City Clerk's Office

### Meeting Agenda

Monday, March 24, 2014 at 4:00 p.m.  
City Manager's Large Conference Room, Fourth Floor, City Hall  
Email: [CharterReview@miamibeachfl.gov](mailto:CharterReview@miamibeachfl.gov)

*Special Note: In order to ensure adequate consideration, if necessary, the members of the Charter Review & Revision Board may move any agenda item to another meeting date. In addition, the members of the Charter Review & Revision Board may, at their discretion, adjourn the Charter Review & Revision Board meeting without reaching all agenda items.*

- 1. APPROVE THE MARCH 17, 2014 CRB MINUTES.**
- 2. REPORT ON COMMISSIONER MALAKOFF'S MEMORANDUM REGARDING THE LEGAL OPINION THAT HOLDS THAT COMMISSIONER MALAKOFF'S PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT TO THE PROVISIONS GOVERNING THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD SET FORTH IN CITY CODE CHAPTER 118 DO NOT REDUCE THE POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE CITY'S HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD OR CREATE LESS STRINGENT HISTORIC PRESERVATION STANDARDS AND REGULATIONS, AND THUS DO NOT TRIGGER THE REFERENDUM REQUIREMENT OF CHARTER SECTION 1.06.**  
*No Action Needed.*
- 3. TRAFFIC - CITIZENS OF MIAMI BEACH HAVE THE RIGHT TO REASONABLE ACCESS TO THEIR ROADS** - Proponent Chair Zack
- 4. PROTECT U.S. COAST GUARD FROM ENCROACHMENTS** – Proponent Rick Kendle.
- 5. DISCUSS WHETHER CHARTER QUESTIONS SHOULD BE PLACED ON PRIMARY ELECTION BALLOT OF AUGUST 26, 2014 OR GENERAL ELECTION BALLOT OF NOVEMBER 4, 2014.**

6. **DISCUSS CRB REPORT TO CITY COMMISSION FOR APRIL 23, 2014 CITY COMMISSION MEETING (CRB SUNSETS MAY 2, 2014; CITY COMMISSION TO CONSIDER CRB REPORT AT APRIL 23, 2014 MEETING AS RESOLUTIONS PLACING CHARTER QUESTIONS ON THE AUGUST 26, 2014 BALLOT MUST BE PLACED ON THE MAY 21, 2014 CITY COMMISSION AGENDA.)**

7. **ESTABLISH FUTURE MEETING DATES AND TIMES.**

**THE FOLLOWING MEETING IS CURRENTLY SET:**

Thursday, April 10, 2014 – 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

**TIME PERMITTING, THE FOLLOWING ITEMS MAY BE DISCUSSED OR ALTERNATIVELY, CARRIED OVER TO THE NEXT MEETING:**

- a. **INSPECTOR GENERAL WITH SUBPOENA POWER** – Discussion lead by Board member Kendle. (Invite Joe Jimenez, Assistant City Manager, and Alek Boksner, First Assistant City Attorney)
- b. **ADDITIONAL FUNCTIONS OF THE CRB – EXTENSION OF JURISDICTION/TIME**
- c. **MIAMI BEACH UNITED’S (MBU) FIVE PRINCIPLES FOR RESIDENT CHARTER RIGHTS AND COMPANION LEGISLATION** (Time Certain to be determined.)
- d. **SECTION 2.02 COMPENSATION – STIPEND AND TAX REPORTS FOR MAYOR AND COMMISSIONERS** (Invite Finance Department)
- e. **SECTION 2.07 – VACANCIES IN THE CITY COMMISSION** – Item tabled at the 2/21/14 CRB meeting.
- f. **CASINO GAMBLING ON MIAMI BEACH** – Proponent Rick Kendle deferred the item until State Legislature takes action.

**TIMEFRAME:**

- **April 23, 2014** – Last Regular City Commission meeting before CRB sunsets; CRB recommendation to be presented.
- **May 2, 2014** – CRB Sunsets.
- **May 21, 2014** – Last Regular City Commission meeting to consider resolutions calling for Special Election on **August 26, 2014** for ballot questions. (Commission meeting no later than June 6, 2014 for passage of Resolution(s) calling for an August 26, 2014 Special Election); and
- **July 23, 2014** – Last Regular City Commission meeting to consider resolutions calling for Special Election on **November 4, 2014** for ballot questions. (Commission meeting no later than August 5, 2014 for passage of Resolution(s) calling for a November 4, 2014 Special Election.)

# MIAMI BEACH

## AD HOC CHARTER REVIEW BOARD MEETING NOTICE

**NOTICE IS HEREBY** given that the Miami Beach Ad Hoc Charter Review Board will meet on the following dates:

DATES	TIMES	LOCATION
March 24, 2014	4:00 PM	City Hall/City Manager's Large Conference Room
April 10, 2014	4:00 PM	City Hall/City Manager's Large Conference Room

City Hall is located at 1700 Convention Center Drive, Miami Beach, Florida, 33139.

Pursuant to Section 8.01 of the Miami Beach City Charter, review of the Charter shall occur every ten years. The Miami Beach Ad Hoc Charter Review Board (CRB) has been formed for the purpose of reviewing the City Charter, seeking public input thereon, and eventually presenting its recommendation to the Miami Beach City Commission.

Please visit the Miami Beach Ad Hoc Charter Review Board's website for the latest meeting information and agendas: <http://www.miamibeachfl.gov/scroll.aspx?id=72572>

**INTERESTED PARTIES** are invited to appear at this meeting, or be represented by an agent, or to express their views in writing addressed to [CharterReview@miamibeachfl.gov](mailto:CharterReview@miamibeachfl.gov), or by mail to Miami Beach Ad Hoc Charter Review Board, c/o the City Clerk, 1700 Convention Center Drive, 1st Floor, City Hall, Miami Beach, Florida 33139. Inquiries may also be directed to the City Clerk at 305.673.7411.

One or more members of the Miami Beach City Commission may be in attendance and participate in discussions.

Rafael E. Granado, Esq., City Clerk

Pursuant to Section 286.0105, Fla. Stat., the City hereby advises the public that: If a person decides to appeal any decision made by this Board with respect to any matter considered at this meeting or hearing, such person must ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based. This notice does not constitute consent by the City for the introduction or admission of otherwise inadmissible or irrelevant evidence, nor does it authorize challenges or appeals not otherwise allowed by law.

To request this material in accessible format, sign language interpreters, information on access for persons with disabilities and/or any accommodation to review any document or participate in any City-sponsored proceeding, please contact us five days in advance at 305.673.7411 (voice) or TTY users may also call the Florida Relay Service at 711.

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

**ITEM 1**  
**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**  
**March 17 2014**

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

# MIAMIBEACH

## AD HOC CHARTER REVIEW BOARD

### Members:

Stephen Zack, Esq., Chair  
Jonathan Beloff, Vice-Chair  
Richard Alhadeff  
Sherry Kaplan Roberts  
Rick Kendle  
Sarah Johnston  
(Vacant)

### Appointed by:

Mayor Philip Levine  
Commissioner Joy Malakoff  
Commissioner Micky Steinberg  
Commissioner Michael Grieco  
Commissioner Edward L. Tobin  
Commissioner Deede Weithorn  
Commissioner Jonah Wolfson

### Staff:

Jose Smith, City Attorney  
Donald Papy, Chief Deputy City Attorney  
Debora Turner, First Assistant City Attorney  
Gary M. Held, First Assistant City Attorney  
Jean Olin, CAO Outside Legal Counsel

Rafael E. Granado, City Clerk  
Liliam Hatfield, OAV, City Clerk's Office

### Also present:

City Commissioner Joy Malakoff  
Guest Presenter Victor M. Diaz

### Meeting Minutes

Monday, March 17, 2014 at 4:30 p.m.  
City Manager's Large Conference Room, Fourth Floor, City Hall  
Email: [CharterReview@miamibeachfl.gov](mailto:CharterReview@miamibeachfl.gov)

*Special Note: In order to ensure adequate consideration, if necessary, the members of the Ad Hoc Charter Review Board may move any agenda item to another meeting date. In addition, the members of the Charter Review & Revision Board may, at their discretion, adjourn the Charter Review & Revision Board meeting without reaching all agenda items.*

Meeting called to order at 4:40 p.m. by Chair Zack.

Roll call taken. All Board members are present.

#### 1. APPROVE THE MARCH 10, 2014 CRB MINUTES.

**ACTION:** Motion made by Vice-Chair Beloff; seconded by Member Kaplan Roberts to approve the minutes; Voice-vote: 6-0.

#### 2. VOTER REFORM

**ACTION:** Chair Zack asked Commissioner Malakoff, as a courtesy, if she wished to discuss Item No. 3, but she was agreeable to begin the discussion with Item 2.

Chair Zack introduced Victor Diaz, attorney, former City Commissioner, and former member of the 2003 City Charter Review Board, and former Chair of the County's Charter Review Board, who will be discussing voter reform.

### **PRESENTATION BY VICTOR DIAZ**

Victor Diaz gave a brief summary of his background and the voter reform issues that he has been advocating for over 20 years in Miami Beach, and what has legally transpired in the City, which led to the creation of the Mayor's Blue Ribbon Committees on diversity issues. He stated that there is no ideal system for voting. They all have advantages and disadvantages but there are ways to promote better government. He commended the group for taking up this difficult issue for discussion. He explained preferential voting, elimination of groups system and a strong mayor form of government.

The issue of voter reform has been discussed primarily due to the factors of diversity in the community; diverse socioeconomic, religious, sexual and geographical diversities. This has led to different reform movements with much discussion and advocacy for districts. He is in support of preferential voting.

He discussed the differences between preferential voting and pure preferential voting:

**PREFERENTIAL VOTING** is considered by most academics to be a most progressive system for ensuring representation in diverse communities. This is where a voter is asked to rank candidates in order of preference (proportional voting).

**PURE PREFERENCE VOTING** is a system in which votes are cast for as many seats as are available, and this can be combined with the instant runoff election. He explained that rather than running against a person, the candidate runs for office; candidates can be ranked in order of preference, and depending on the system that is adopted, you can have a requirement that the candidate needs to have a 50% voter approval or a lower quota to be elected to the first seat. Votes are recounted and the cycle continues for the No. 2 preference. This system ensures that the elected representatives have majority support. The one constitutional issue that needs to be studied is whether you can force someone to vote for No. 1, 2 and 3. In the absence of ranking candidate, voters could target their votes for one candidate and that could change the dynamic of the election. That does not happen when you have a 50% quota, only when you lower the quota to less than 50%. This is one of the disadvantages identified using this system. Most people are familiar with this voting in condominium elections. There are pros and cons to this system as well. Additionally the main advantage of this system is that it diminishes the power of incumbency. Candidates run for office, not against a candidate in general.

Discussion held regarding name recognition and election groups versus incumbents. The City should focus on the alarming trend in the country, the City and State, of the cost of elections. He continued discussing districting at the request of Board Member Alhadeff and explained that in Miami Beach there are very distinct personalities to the North Beach, Middle Beach and South Beach communities, and when districts have been proposed, they have been proposed along those lines. He also explained the concept of a combination of districts and at large candidates (a "hybrid" system).

He does not support districts, but suggested looking at the preferential voting with a quota and the Instant Runoff. The preferential voting system eliminates runoffs and diminishes the

powers of special interests. The disadvantage is to diminish the power of incumbency by requiring all incumbents to run all the time. Most people that have studied the issue, indicate some form of preferential voting is the best option, keeping in mind its disadvantages; it eliminates runoff, diminishes powers of incumbency, but has constitutional issues that Legal will address, In summary, people understand this type of voting, it does not lead to voting confusion. There are things that can be done to improve the way City Commission is elected, but proceed with caution because everything that is done may have unforeseeable consequences.

Discussion continued regarding elections by groups and what Commissioner Malakoff and Board Member Kaplan Roberts experienced during the recent 2013 General Election. Ms. Kaplan Roberts is in support of doing away with the groups and in favor of districts. Discussion continued.

Chair Zack stated that Miami Beach is only seven miles long and three miles wide, and he believes districts are not a good idea for the City. Intellectually, preferential voting is the way to go, but his concern is that the CRB ends their task in May. To tackle the voter reform issue, if the City Commission decides that the CRB should discuss, will take time and may not be practical. He suggested that once the CRB finds out if jurisdiction extension has been approved, then they can discuss voter reform.

Member Kaplan Roberts stated that this is critical and they should deal with it. This constitutes how the City is governed and how people are elected to make and enforce the laws. It is long overdue for a change.

Discussion held.

**MOTION:**

Motion by Member Alhadeff; seconded by Member Kendle, to table the voter reform item until a date certain as directed by the City Commission; Voice vote: 5-1; Opposed: Member Kaplan Roberts.

Reference Materials: Center for Voting and Democracy website accessible online at the following link [http://ballotpedia.org/Center for Voting and Democracy](http://ballotpedia.org/Center_for_Voting_and_Democracy).

- 3. LAND USE BOARDS – SIMPLE MAJORITY WHEN ONLY FIVE MEMBERS PRESENT OR APPOINTMENT OF ALTERNATES TO THE LAND USE BOARDS.** Gary Held, First Assistant City Attorney to present.

Commissioner Malakoff introduced the item.

**See Supplemental Material**

Jean Olin, City Attorney's Office Outside Legal Counsel, explained that the proposal submitted by Commissioner Malakoff is somewhat different than the one presented at the last CRB meeting. The proposal at that time was done in recognition of the concern that when only five members of the Board of Adjustment (BOA) show up, the possibility exists that action will not be viable in light of the existing Related Special Acts requirement that BOA action occur upon 5/7<sup>th</sup> affirmative vote of the Board. The language proposed at the last CRB meeting considered that during those limited instances in which only 5 BOA members are present that the vote of the Board of Adjustment be 4/7ths rather than 5/7ths. However, on

the Supplemental Agenda today there is a different suggestion from last week's proposal, this suggestion is to amend the Related Special Acts to provide for an absolute reduction in BOA vote from 5/7 to 4/7 vote--under this proposal there is no issue of 5/7 vote in some circumstances, this proposal provides for a 4/7 BOA vote requirement for all BOA actions. Attorney Olin explained her reasoning that imposing a different vote requirement for identical BOA actions would present potential legal challenges to the City that should be avoided, and the proposal in the Supplemental Agenda, which does not provide for different votes, is recommended. Discussion held regarding disgruntled applicants and the potential for misuse in the event the change presented at last week's CRB meeting was adopted.

Ms. Olin added that the Charter Review Board has historically considered any special act of the legislation affecting the City of Miami Beach, which acts are set forth within the City's Charter and the Related Special Acts (RSA). The City's laws regarding land use boards other than the BOA do not require public referendum, but any change to the City's Related Special Acts language governing BOA can only be amended by public vote because the Municipal Home Rule Powers Act requires that any matter that is contained in a special act of the State Legislature dealing with appointed boards of the City (such as BOA) can only be amended by vote of the public. Therefore, any change to the RSA BOA language must go out for voter approval. Commissioner Malakoff's proposed changes to the BOA language is twofold: 1) changing BOA vote from 5/7ths to 4/7ths; and 2) limiting BOA's power to grant variances to those not otherwise within jurisdiction of the City's Historic Preservation Board or the City's Design Review Board, with further explanation of this proposed amendment by Ms. Olin.

Commissioner Malakoff further explained that her proposal is that the DRB and HPB be granted the powers to grant variances stemming from variance requests specified in development applications pending before those Boards. Her recommendation is that the HPB have the right to grant a variance, instead of having the same project go to the HPB and then go to BOA, which requires an applicant to make the same presentation twice. Under this proposal, the HPB will have the power to simultaneously consider the HP development application and also vote on the specified variance request. Same is true of those buildings which receive DRB approval but need a variance. She would propose the DRB have the ability to grant the variance without having developers go through a second meeting to a BOA.

Chair Zack recommended that the issues be bifurcated for purposes of CRB vote.

**MOTION 1:**

Motion made by Vice-Chair Beloff; seconded by Member Kaplan Roberts to accept Commissioner Malakoff's proposal in the Supplemental Agenda as discussed, to amend the City's Related Special Acts, Article I, Section 2, to change the required affirmative vote for Board of Adjustment action from 5/7 to 4/7; Voice vote: 6-0.

Further discussion held regarding Commissioner Malakoff's proposed change to BOA's variance powers, with additional explanation of the process by Ms. Olin.

Gary Held, First Assistant City Attorney, stated that City staff needs to identify what variances appear on the plans. Discussion continued. There are two standards for variances in the Related Special Acts. The BOA has been functioning as more of a compatibility board rather than a hardship board. One out of 100 variances may be approved under the strict hardship standard. The standard as applied is what impact this will generate in neighborhoods and the

objective is taking the practical difficulty standard and adding criteria to it and codifying to provide an alternative. DRB and HPB would be able to use either standard in looking at the variances.

Discussion continued regarding code amendments and variances.

**MOTION 2:**

Motion made by Vice-Chair Beloff; seconded by Member Kendle to accept Commissioner Malakoff's proposal in the Supplemental Agenda as discussed, to amend the City's Related Special Acts, Article I, Section 2 dealing with the Board of Adjustment, to except from the BOA's jurisdiction those variances requests specified in development applications subject to the jurisdiction of the HPB or DRB. Voice vote: 6-0.

Discussion ensued regarding Commissioner Malakoff's other proposal set forth in the Supplemental Agenda pertaining to amendment of City Code section 2-459. Ms. Olin explained that this is a proposed Code not Charter amendment that must go out to the public vote because of Charter Section 1.05, which was enacted eight years ago. The section reads that if there is an amendment to an existing section in Chapter 2, Article VII, dealing with the City's Code of Conduct for Elected Officials and Employees, which will make the Code of Conduct less strict, then that amendment may only occur if approved by voters.

**Amendment to Section 2-459**

City Code section 2-459 as enacted in 1993 exceeds the existing ethics restrictions that are contained in State and County law, by stating that appointed board members in the City of Miami Beach are absolutely prohibited from lobbying, directly or indirectly, any City personnel. Part of Commissioner Malakoff's goal in streamlining the development review process in the City encompasses recruiting design professionals to the land use boards, particularly architects and urban planners, and one way to accomplish this is to amend 2-459 so that they may lobby City personnel, except their Boards and related City staff. This amendment will allow these design professionals to effectively do business in the City, which will at the same time attract these professionals to serve on the City's Boards.

Discussion held regarding lobbyists prohibitions.

Attorney Olin further explained Commissioner Malakoff's concern is that the City has been unable to attract qualified architects and landscape architects on DRB and HPB. This proposed amendment may make the City's Standard of Conduct less strict, hence it may require approval by voters, by providing an additional limited exception from the lobbying proscription for HPB and DRB members who are architects or landscape architects; these members will still be prohibited from lobbying their own board, as well as related City staff. Even if this exception is approved by the voters, the language that will be adopted will include a carryover of existing County Ethics Code restrictions, which basically states that even though an architect or landscape architect serving on HPB or DRB is prohibited from lobbying the board they sit on they still are permitted to submit an application to their board, with the requirement that if that matter goes before their board then they must comply with all disclosure and abstention requirements under applicable ethics laws and may not participate at all on the subject application.

**MOTION:**

Motion by Member Kaplan Roberts; seconded by Member Johnston to accept Commissioner Malakoff's proposal in the Supplemental Agenda as discussed, to amend Section 2-459 to provide additional limited exception for HPB and DRB members who are architects and/or landscape architects, whereby they may lobby City personnel and Agencies other than the board on which they serve and related City staff, regarding applications for development approval. Voice vote: 6-0.

Additional discussion was held regarding Commissioner Malakoff's related future proposals including amending City Code Chapter 118 in order to change vote requirements of Planning Board and Historic Preservation Board. Ms. Olin explained that Charter Section 1.06 provides that any lessening of the stringency of any provision dealing with HPB's powers and duties or reduction in stringency of HP standards must be approved by voters. If and when the Office of the City Attorney determines that these related Chapter 118 amendments require voter approval per Charter section 1.06, those matters may be represented to CRB for review, and if the Office of the City Attorney determines that the referendum requirement in Charter section 1.06 is not triggered then said amendments will be presented to the City Commission, not to CRB.

Discussion continued. CRB agreed that only in the event the Office of the City Attorney determines that these related Chapter 118 amendments require public vote will such matter be presented to CRB at its March 24, 2014 meeting. **Item to be placed on the March 24, 2014 CRB Agenda in the event Legal determines matters require public vote--matters will not be heard by CRB should Legal determine that public vote is not required.**

Vice-Chair Beloff suggested including 4/7 vote requirement language across the board for all of the City's land use boards. **Gary Held to handle.**

**New Item: Sunshine Law Refresher**

Debora Turner, First Assistant City Attorney, reminded members that any discussions held with any other members of this board with regard to anything that is before the board or that will foreseeably come before the board regarding Charter amendments must be done in the Sunshine during publicly noticed meetings. Members should not interact via emails, messages, or any other means of communication about any other matter that is before the board or may come before the board.

4. **CASINO GAMBLING ON MIAMI BEACH** – Proponent Rick Kendle deferred the item until State Legislature takes action.
5. **REVIEW REVISIONS TO CITIZENS' BILL OF RIGHTS/DECLARATION OF RIGHTS AS SUGGESTED BY PROPONENT R. ALHADEFF.** Proponent Richard Alhadeff.  
**ACTION: Item withdrawn.**

Rafael E. Granado, City Clerk, announced that the City Clerk's Office received an email from Member Alhadeff withdrawing this item.

6. **TRAFFIC PLAN CONCERNS** – Proponent Chair Zack  
**ACTION: Not reached.**

7. **PROTECT U.S. COAST GUARD FROM ENCROACHMENTS** – Proponent Rick Kendle.  
**ACTION:** To be placed on the March 24, 2014 CRB Agenda. **Rafael E. Granado to handle.**

8. **ESTABLISH FUTURE MEETING DATES AND TIMES.**  
**ACTION:** The CRB will meet from 4:00 to 7:00 p.m. on April 10, 2014.

Meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Handouts or Reference Materials:

1. Supplemental Agenda to Item 3.
2. Option 1 – U.S. Coast Guard Base Miami Beach language – proponent Member Kendle.
3. Option 2 – U.S. Coast Guard Base Miami Beach Language Re: Zoning Ordinance – proponent Member Kendle
4. Amendments to Allow 4/7 Vote to approve an item normally requiring 5/7 where only five members are present.

M:\\$CMB\CITYCLERK\_0000 CHARTER 2013\MINUTES\2014\03172014\Charter Review Minutes March 17 2014 REG OLIN TURNER CHANGES.docx

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

## **ITEM 2**

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**



TO: City of Miami Beach Charter Review Board  
FROM: Joy V. W. Malakoff, Commissioner  
DATE: March 19, 2014  
SUBJECT: Your March 24, 2014 agenda

Please note that the City Attorney's Office has opined that my proposed amendments to provisions governing the Historic Preservation Board set forth in City Code Chapter 118 do not "...reduce the powers and duties of the City's Historic Preservation Board, or create less stringent historic preservation standards or regulations...", and thus do not trigger the referendum requirement of Charter section 1.06.

Accordingly, inasmuch as discussion held at last week's CRB meeting required placement on today's agenda of my proposed Code amendments to HPB in the event said amendments were subject to public vote, in light of the above legal opinion, said matters will now proceed to placement on a future City Commission agenda for its consideration.

I again thank the Board for its thoughtful consideration and approval of my proposed amendments to the City's Special Related Acts and to City Code section 2-459 presented at last Monday's meeting.

JVWM

ITEM 2

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

**ITEM 3**  
**TRAFFIC CONCERNS**

**Jose Gonzalez,**  
**Transportation Manager**  
**to present**

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

**ITEM 4**  
**U.S. COAST GUARD**  
**FROM ENCROACHMENTS**

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

The City recognizes U.S. Coast Guard Base Miami Beach as an area of critical economic, safety and military concern to the City. Changes to zoning, for any property within a 1400 ft radius of the base, must not adversely impact the mission and readiness of the U.S. Coast Guard.

option 1

Zoning ordinances shall be for the general purpose of promoting the health, safety or general welfare of the public. To these ends, such ordinances shall be designed to give reasonable consideration to each of the following purposes, where applicable: (i) to provide for adequate light, air, convenience of access, and safety from fire, flood, hurricanes, crime and other dangers; (ii) to reduce or prevent congestion in the public streets; (iii) to facilitate the creation of a convenient, attractive and harmonious community; (iv) to facilitate the provision of adequate police and fire protection, disaster evacuation, civil defense, transportation, water, sewerage, flood and hurricane protection, schools, parks, playgrounds, recreational facilities, and other public requirements; (v) to protect against destruction of or encroachment upon historic areas; (vi) to protect against one or more of the following: overcrowding of land, undue density of population in relation to the community facilities existing or available, obstruction of light and air, danger and congestion in travel and transportation, or loss of life, health, or property from fire, flood, hurricane, panic or other dangers; (vii) to encourage economic development activities that provide desirable employment and enlarge the tax base; (viii) to provide for the preservation of lands of significance for the protection of the natural environment; (ix) to provide for a pedestrian friendly city; (x) to promote the creation and preservation of affordable housing suitable for meeting the current and future needs of the locality as well as a reasonable proportion of the current and future needs of Miami Beach; and (xi) to provide reasonable protection against encroachment upon the United States Coast Guard military base, and its adjacent safety areas.

option 2