

**SOUTH MIAMI DADE WATERSHED STUDY ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**Meeting Four**

January 23, 2002  
Miami Metro Zoo  
Miami, Florida  
8:00 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.

**Report of Proceedings**

**WELCOME**

The meeting was opened by Chair Roger Carlton, who thanked everyone for coming and introduced Glen Ekey, Executive Director, Zoological Society of Florida. Mr. Ekey welcomed everyone to the Zoo, spoke about its history, recovery from Hurricane Andrew and the new facilities and exhibits that are planned or already completed. He then turned the meeting over to Mr. Carlton. Mr. Carlton thanked Committee Member Craig Wheeling and his company, Brooks Tropicals, for sponsoring the refreshments for the day and Miami Metro Zoo for the use of their facilities. As there were new Committee members present, the Chair asked everyone to introduce themselves and tell whom they represented. Louise King, Redland Citizen's Association Representative, volunteered to sponsor the food for the next meeting to be held on March 7, 2002.

Members Present:

Roger Carlton, Chair  
Ivonne Alexander, Miami Dade AgriCouncil  
Daniel Apt, Florida Department of Environmental Protection  
Maribel Balbin, South Florida Water Management District  
Linda Canzanelli, Biscayne National Park  
Carlos Espinosa, Miami Dade DERM  
Jeffrey Flanagan, Chamber South  
Dick Frost, Tropical Audubon Society  
Lester Goldstein, Building Industry Representative  
April Gromnicki, National Audubon Society  
John Hall, Florida Engineering Society  
Robert Johnson, Everglades National Park  
Louise King, Redland Citizens' Association  
Thomas MacVicar, Florida Lime & Avocado Committees  
Blanca Mesa, Sierra Club  
Lee Rawlinson, Miami Dade Planning and Zoning Department  
Claudio Rosario, Florida Nurserymen and Grower's Association  
Mike Shehadeh, City of Homestead  
Charles Thibos, Tropical Everglades Visitor Association  
Dale Williams, Miami Dade Agricultural Practices Board  
Tim Williams, Homestead/Florida City Chamber of Commerce

## **AGENDA REVIEW, DISCUSSION GUIDELINES**

Ms. Fleischer reviewed the meeting Objectives and Agenda for the day. The Objectives were:

- ❖ To have a presentation on the Community Aspects of the Study by Members
- ❖ To have a presentation on the Economy and the Tourism Industry
- ❖ To make general comments on the Preliminary Draft Request for Proposals
- ❖ To discuss the pros and cons of three Alternatives for the Consultant Selection Criteria
- ❖ To tour Miami Metro Zoo

A copy of the Objectives and Agenda are attached as Exhibit A.

Ms. Fleischer reviewed the Committee's Discussion Guidelines and Consensus Rules and encouraged Members to complete their Evaluations, as they are an important resource to her in designing future Agendas for the Committee and to the Chair in keeping a pulse on the Committee. She explained the Comment Cards and Idea Parking Lot to visitors and announced that there would be a time for Public Comment immediately after lunch.

Cindy Dwyer, Miami Dade Planning and Zoning, and staff to the Committee, handed out a flyer describing the meeting details for the Watershed Tour to be held on February 8, 2002. It was decided that all attendees would pay \$10.00 for food for the day of the Tour.

## **COMMUNITY SUBGROUP PRESENTATION**

Ms. Dwyer introduced the next group of speakers. These individuals were asked by the Community Subgroup of the Committee to assist in giving the Community Presentation.

The first speaker was Amber Riviere, Miami Dade Planning and Zoning, who spoke about the Comprehensive Development Master Plan and the Urban Development Boundary. (Exhibit B).

The next speaker was Maria Crowley, Miami Dade Planning and Zoning, who discussed incorporations and annexations in the South Miami Dade area. (Exhibit C).

Lee Rawlinson, Assistant Director, Miami Dade Planning and Zoning, and Committee member, spoke on the County's Commitment to the Watershed Planning Project but reminded Members that the community is responsible for the implementation of the plan.

Mr. Rawlinson was followed by Committee member, Louise King, Redland Citizen's Association, who introduced A.C. "Charlie" McGarey, Redland Community Zoning Appeals Board member. Mr. McGarey spoke about the pros and cons of Redland Incorporation. As an exhibit to his talk, Mr. McGarey brought a few copies of a booklet entitled, "Redland, A Preservation and Tourism Plan". This can be obtained by contacting Mr. McGarey directly at the Metro Dade Community Council 14 Headquarters, 305-233-8965.

Committee Member Maribel Balbin, South Florida Water Management District, was slated to be the last speaker in this group. Ms. Balbin was to give an update on the C-111 and Modified Waters Project; however, she announced that this would be done on the February 8 Tour, not at this meeting.

Members then took a short Break.

## **DRAFT REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS- MEMBER COMMENTS**

SFRPC Staff member, John Hulsey, explained how he redrafted the RFP (Exhibit D) based upon comments from members solicited at the meeting on December 13, 2001. Members were asked to give general comments and reactions to this newly drafted document. These comments will be used to further refine the RFP and finalize it. The comments of the Committee members follow:

1. Need to articulate and clarify phasing possibilities
2. Need to consider extending the study area beyond the shoreline to the coral reefs (the Bay)
3. Need to consider what affects the watershed upstream as well as downstream
4. A big part of the plan is land use planning, we should be comfortable with where boundary is now
5. Should water quality standards be part of this project? National parks should fund this
6. Make the charge clear in the RFP and its effects (goal is not to pay for water quality)
7. We should receive input from other processes that do address water quality and how they pay for it
8. Boundary should focus on land uses in the uplands, plug in other studies
9. The scope of work addresses the needs of Biscayne Bay
10. In Economic Base Analysis section: add "Tourism, recreation and agritourism", Commercial fishing might also be missing, there are more economic activities in the area than are listed
11. The Introduction section has Tourism, might want to be more specific about what it means, i.e. ecotourism and agritourism, not Disneyland.
12. Tourism should be defined as compatible with existing resources and what we want to preserve
13. Add recreation, open space, natural resources to Quality of Life
14. In future scenarios, don't assume the agriculture will be viable.
15. Don't ignore the Motor Sports Complex, no appropriate tourism use should be precluded.
16. Tourism uses that adversely impact the study area would not be acceptable
17. Definition of Tourism should remain general to allow more inclusion of specific types
18. Be very specific about schedule for consultants; include the schedule in the RFP; be clear about schedule constraints
19. Don't close any doors, the data and science should guide the exclusion process
20. Add a cost/benefit analysis component; don't preclude some funding scenarios and protect others in the interest of protecting private property rights; seek funding sources/scenarios to protect the environment and private property rights
21. Add a new section: Ecosystem Restoration
22. Should we direct test scenarios?

## **SELECTION PROCESS ALTERNATIVES**

Following comments on the RFP, John Hulsey explained the three alternatives for selecting the consultants, which had been provided to Committee members. (Exhibit E). Each alternative has its own unique process. Members were asked to express their opinions of the pros and cons of the alternatives presented. Members' reactions were:

1. Technical items and price should not be considered together
2. The law says it is an obligation to consider qualifications first, then price in these types of contracts

3. Make sure the County Attorney's office is involved
4. The County process with points is better given that Miami Dade County is where study is
5. County's process may be the worst, not the best
6. Price is too important in the County process, prefer Alternate #3
7. Who will make up the selection committee? The entire Advisory Committee?
8. Alternate #3 forces a broader view, there needs to be a subjective point system, #3 is preferred
9. A point system helps to bring consensus
10. Rank by point system to get average; Local preference should not be limited to headquarters in South Florida
11. Don't like Alternate #2, won't work in this process
12. Lack of a point system won't work, #3 has evaluative criteria that is specific to environmental and land use planning (#1 is too general); #3 is preferred
13. #1-PRO=transparent and clearly definable process is good but CON=price is too important; we should pick 2-4 consultants we like best, then negotiate price
14. Negotiate the price after you pick the top 2-3 firms, then indicate first, second and third choices
15. We should put consultants on notice that price counts
16. Another way is to let the consultants know the budget and ask them what they can do for us for that money; focus the consultants in the same scope
17. If you attach price to RFP, you mix apples and oranges
18. Don't like #1, includes price in the ranking
19. If price is a part of the process is it a) in a separate envelope; and b) does it have potential influence on ranking?
20. Get the top 3 consultants; work with them to get all their ideas together, refine the elements and refine the SOW
21. Would like to see the consultants give presentations to the entire Committee (this could be done before or after the "narrowing" process)
22. Discuss budget with consultants at the pre-application process
  - a. If within budget, they don't have to submit price
  - b. If outside the budget, must submit price
23. Price should be a separate process after they convince us their proposal is best
24. Don't have the scope of services etched in stone, draw it more general
25. Leave price out: reason: there is a process to follow and then a public perception of the process
26. There could be a two part process with the top 3 qualifiers returning with refined proposals and prices
27. Alternates #1 and #2 provide presentations to the group
28. Take our ideas and see if they can be blended into the County process (speak to someone in procurement)
29. Leave price out of the qualifications, but include in the process

Lunch was served. During lunch, Paul Vrooman, Marketing Director, Zoological Society of Florida, who had helped with all the logistics for the day, arranged to have a cheetah come and visit the Committee. Members were offered the opportunity to take a picture with the cheetah while learning many interesting facts about these beautiful cats.

## **THE TOURISM INDUSTRY AND SOUTH MIAMI DADE ECONOMY**

After lunch, Charles Thibos, Committee member and representative for the Tropical Everglades Visitor Association, introduced William Anderson, Director of Planning and Research, Greater Miami Convention and Visitor's Bureau. Mr. Anderson spoke about tourism and the South Miami Dade economy. (Exhibit F). For more information and tourism materials, Mr. Anderson can be contacted at: [www.TropicoolMiami.com](http://www.TropicoolMiami.com).

## **INTERIM MEASURES REPORT**

Cindy Dwyer reported on the Interim Measures Report of the Biscayne National Park Buffer Development Review Committee. (Exhibit G). Ms. Dwyer pointed out that Members should look at the items suggested by the Buffer Committee for this Committee to review. Committee members were reminded that the standard is "proactive", not just to mitigate and protect.

## **ADJOURNMENT AND ZOO TOUR**

The formal portion of the meeting was adjourned and Committee members were given a tram tour of the Zoo.