

**SOUTH MIAMI DADE WATERSHED STUDY ADVISORY
COMMITTEE
Meeting Thirty-four**

September 1, 2005
8:00 a.m. - 3:00 p.m.

Report of Proceedings

WELCOME/CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS

The meeting was held at the Miami-Dade Cooperative Extension Service Agricultural Center in Homestead, Florida.

Roger Carlton, Chair, welcomed everyone and thanked the facility for their continued generosity in sponsoring the meetings every other month and thanked member, William Losner, for continuing to sponsor breakfast. He expressed his hope that everyone was recovering well from the recent Hurricane Katrina.

Mr. Carlton made the following comments and announcements:

- ✓ The Committee has two new prospective members: Biscayne National Park Superintendent Mark Lewis has been nominated to replace Rick Clark, and Armando Perez, nominated to replace Florida Engineering Society representative John Hall.
- ✓ Due to the storm, there was no Organizational Meeting in preparation for this meeting; however, the issues which are up for consensus today reflect the results of testing based on information formerly agreed upon by the Committee.

Mr. Carlton turned the meeting over to the facilitator, Janice Fleischer.

Members present:

Roger Carlton, Chair
Richard Alger, South Florida Potato Growers Exchange
Subrata Basu, Miami Dade County Planning and Zoning
Gerald Case, Florida Lime and Avocado Committees
Amy Condon, At Large member
Guillermina Damas, At Large member
Carlos Espinosa, Miami-Dade DERM
John Fredrick, Dade County Farm Bureau
Dick Frost, Tropical Audubon Society
April Gromnicki, National Audubon Society
Robert Johnson, Everglades National Park
Louise King, Redland Citizens' Association
Mark Lewis, Biscayne National Park (prospective member)
William Losner, Greater Homestead/Florida City Chamber of Commerce
Carter McDowell, Building Industry Representative
Reed Olszack, Miami-Dade Agricultural Practices Board
Mark Oncavage, Sierra Club (prospective member)
Lawrence Percival, Kendall Federation of Homeowner Associations
Armando Perez, Florida Engineering Society (prospective member)
Jane Spurling, Florida Nurserymen and Grower's Association

There were 13 Observers.

AGENDA REVIEW/GUIDELINES

Janice Fleischer, Facilitator, reviewed the Agenda for the day (Exhibit A).

All Reports of Proceedings of the Committee, Discussion Guidelines and Committee related information, can be found on the SFRPC website at www.sfrpc.com/institute/watershed.htm.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment was invited. Three (3) members of the audience addressed the Committee.

Note: Public comment is not recorded. If anyone from the public desires to have his/her comments appear in the Report of Proceedings, they can submit their comments in writing on the comment cards provided at each meeting or email the Facilitator, Janice Fleischer (janice@flashresolutions.com) within the first week following the meeting.

CONSENSUS PROCESS: SUB-TASK 3.1 ASSESSMENT OF LAND USE AND ECONOMICS

Committee Procedure: the Committee is asked to accept the selected section by consensus (See Consensus Rules on the Institute website: www.sfrpc.com/institute/watershed.htm). If consensus is not reached in the first ranking, discussion follows to attempt to get all concerns addressed and resolved. A second ranking is then taken. If consensus is still not reached, the Committee goes to vote according to Committee procedures. Once tasks are accepted, the Committee does not go back again to review those tasks.

1st Ranking: Sub-Task 3.1: Assessment of Land Use and Economics

5	4	3	2	1
0	2	9	6	4

Comments by member's who ranked this section "1" or "2":

1. If 1 house in 10 acres stays I cannot move up
 - a. *1 in 10 not a recommendation, but just a description*
2. This reference could become a precedent.
3. This could be seen as a guideline which could be used for down-zoning
 - a. *This was specifically part of Sub task 1.8 and was adopted*
Project manager recommendation: Add a footnote that explains the 1 in 10 units per acre is not a recommendation, but just a descriptor.
4. P. 4 table is what is under discussion
5. Development patterns 2003 Baseline - there are 2 "white" areas that are now included and will be applied to all scenarios
6. White areas to east, west and south should be included in the inventory - remember that this area only takes ½ of all existing agricultural land into study
7. **Recommended:** East, west and south areas in white should be included in inventory of study with respect to total lands and percentages

8. Problem is that the above statement should have been incorporated in replacement pages so members could have seen this
9. We need to see the changes made prior to a final vote
 - a. *What our procedure has been is that consensus (with changes) is done before changes are made*
10. Get changes made and reflected and send to members after this meeting but before we continue to the next step
11. When changes are made and agreed to during the consensus process, members need to see the changes (comfort level that changes made)
12. Discomfort with inclusion of white areas without then seeing how that changes percentages and numbers across all scenarios – hypothetically the percentages and numbers could drastically change and members would then not have an opportunity to comment/change
13. Although we agreed we would not go back, many changes have happened in the last 3 years – so should we be allowed to go back?
14. If white areas are incorporated and changes occur, what action would occur on part of committee?
15. Some items (like the Horse Country issue) are being presented and the committee has not had a chance to discuss this
16. Horse Country should be preserved and should be a constraint (Lawrence Percival)
17. 2 Scenarios are affected with Horse Country issue (3A and 3B)
18. Tourism is in Vision Statement but not addressed in economic analysis – should be recognized in study
 - a. *This is something that needs to be addressed*
19. Agriculture is the #1 economic producer in the area, loss of agricultural land will have significant economic effect – Tourism is the #1 economic generator in county
20. Tourism must be included as a parameter
21. Analysis of housing and production costs – differential between cost of building residential and commercial-high rise and single family is not considered
 - o Not appropriately or correctly analyzed,
 - o You must take into account the differential and costs of the different types of construction
 - a. *Chuck will look at during the break*
22. Transit corridor is too narrow; need to expand it east and west (the entire length of the Turnpike should be used as a transit corridor)
 - a. *This should be considered in preferred scenario*
23. Why do we designate parks? Parks will be mandated; so don't need designations
 - a. *the designation is based on current formula*
24. New parameters in economic portion
 - number of quality jobs created
 - growth and land value created
25. Adding to the already existing economic parameter would not be changing the parameter but rather broadening scope of what is included in economics

As the discussion was not resulting in areas of consensus, it was decided to outline what issues were in conflict at this juncture:

Outstanding Issues

1. 1/10 acres
2. Horse Country
3. Tourism
4. Parks
5. White areas (east, west and south)
6. Differential in construction costs
7. Transit corridors

Before continuing the discussion, the group took a short break.

Upon returning from their break, the following discussion ensued:

The first item to be discussed was Issue #3-Tourism

DISCUSSION OF ISSUE #3: TOURISM

Suggestion: look at the number of tourists coming in and look at the number of jobs related to tourism

- a. remind the Consultant that in the preferred scenario tourism is reflected as something we are trying to achieve

Suggestion by member: Tourism and broader economic impacts need to be included in the preferred scenario as fundamental element and tourism focus at future meeting workshop: workshop needs to put existing numbers in plain language so the committee can understand and approve.

1. need an acknowledgement of cost/benefit analysis of tourism
2. how does this affect land use
3. direct and indirect impact of economics
4. need to get additional data on scope of economics
5. let's have a special workshop to discuss economic issues
6. ag has been getting short shrift
7. current analysis does not show any differentiation in any of the scenarios; maybe we picked an inadequate parameter; current analysis isn't revealing useful information
8. how many dollars are coming into the county (ag and tourism) versus how many dollars are just exchanging hands within the county

2ND Ranking of Sub-Task 3.1

5	4	3	2	1
3	1	12	3	1

Consensus was not reached. It was decided to continue discussing each issue.

DISCUSSION OF ISSUE #1: 1 in 10 acre definition

1. I want rural defined as 1 dwelling unit in 5 acres; no reference to 1 dwelling unit in 10; see previous concerns

VOTE: Leave numbers as they are, but with a footnote to explain why this is used

Vote is 80% of voting members present with minimum of 50% of entire voting membership needed to pass an item.

80% of voting members present = 80% of 16 = 13 (number of "yes" votes required to pass)

50% of entire voting membership = 50% of 22 = 11 (number of voting members required for a vote)

- | | |
|---------------------------|-----|
| 1. Richard Alger..... | NO |
| 2. Gerald Case..... | NO |
| 3. Amy Condon..... | NO |
| 4. Guillermina Damas..... | NO |
| 5. John Fredrick..... | NO |
| 6. Dick Frost..... | YES |
| 7. April Gromnicki..... | NO |
| 8. Robert Johnson..... | NO |
| 9. Louise King..... | YES |
| 10. Bill Losner..... | NO |
| 11. Carter McDowell..... | NO |

- 12. Reed Olszack..... NO
- 13. Mark Oncavage..... YES
- 14. Lawrence Percival..... NO
- 15. Jane Spurling..... NO
- 16. Charles Thibos NO

RESULT: Vote failed

DISCUSSION OF ISSUE #2: HORSE COUNTRY

- Lawrence Percival: There are 2 scenarios with Horse Country being included for development; Horse Country should have been excluded and identified as a constraint and we missed it. (this is an area of 2 square miles)

Ranking: Leaving the scenarios as they are; deal with this in preferred scenario

5	4	3	2	1
0	0	12	6	1

VOTE: Leave designations as they are currently

*Vote is 80% of voting members present with minimum of 50% of entire voting membership needed to pass an item..
 80% of voting members present = 80% of 16 = 13 (number of "yes" votes required to pass)
 50% of entire voting membership = 50% of 22 = 11 (number of voting members required for passage of a vote)*

VOTE:

- Richard Alger NO
- Gerald Case..... NO
- Amy Condon YES
- Guillermina Damas YES
- John Fredrick NO
- Dick Frost..... YES
- April Gromnicki YES
- Robert Johnson YES
- Louise King..... YES
- Bill Losner NO
- Carter McDowell..... YES
- Reed Olszack NO
- Mark Oncavage YES
- Lawrence Percival NO
- Jane Spurling NO
- Charles Thibos..... YES

RESULT: Vote failed

The Chair had been called away just before the break for lunch and before the discussion with regard to the issue of Horse Country. As discussions were not productive and the Chair was absent, the Facilitator made the decision to eliminate the consensus and voting process, but take comments from all members on all the remaining issues with regard to Sub-Task 3.1 in an effort to obtain information that the Consultants and Project Management team could use to work with Committee members in resolving these issues.

DISCUSSION OF ISSUE #4: PARKS

1. Biscayne National Park and Everglades National Park are not included as parks; wetlands not used as "parks"; land south of Palm Drive; open land not included in numbers for parks
2. Parks should be ¼ mile from homes, is this needed?
3. Level of service: 2.75 acres per 1000 residents is Dade County standard
4. If you are going to count Biscayne National Park as a "park" for use in the study, then use only the parts of Biscayne National Park that is publicly accessible Large part of BNP is not in the study area
5. Developers are required to provide neighborhood parks; this is where that ¼ mile comes in; "walking neighborhoods"
6. Parks contribute to health and economic vitality of the community
7. You can use parks for multiple purposes (below grade, etc.)
8. 2.75 value is low and preferred scenario should raise it

DISCUSSION OF ISSUE #5: WHITE AREAS ON MAP

1. Revised maps and tables need to be brought back before the committee is asked to come to consensus
2. This study only represents ½ of the full ag land-ag land not included in this study should be included in presentations so there is not a misinterpretation that the study represents ALL available ag land

DISCUSSION OF ISSUE #7 :TRANSIT CORRIDORS

1. Include the turnpike and area on either side of the turnpike as a transit corridor
2. Kendall corridor (west kendall) needs mass transit; public transportation; Require moving up to a 15 year time frame
3. How were premium transit corridors determined?
4. Need adequate/safe parking garages to hook to bus/rail
5. Didn't put enough emphasis on infrastructure in the area

CONSULTANT PRESENTATION: SUB-TASK 3.4 ASSESSMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

Comments received following presentations:

1. All basins studied empty into Biscayne Bay
2. Assumption is that increase in pollutants will have a negative impact on Biscayne Bay
3. 14 pollutants were used on 5 basins
4. SWMM model uses 1 in 5 as its lowest density; what happens to areas that are actually less than 1 in 5 (like 1 in 10)?
5. The Model is based on current design and permitting standards
6. What is the baseline based on surface water runoff
 - a. *No samplings are done, the model is used*
 - b. *Model is a comparative analysis, not absolute*
7. Model covers only the 5 basins and will reveal what areas are not covered

PROJECT MANAGER'S REPORT

There was no Project Manager's Report at this meeting.

MEMBER FORUM

Amy Condon submitted a document on Summary of Park Classifications. (Exhibit B)

Carter McDowell submitted a document on Trends in Land and Building Material Costs in Miami-Dade County. (Exhibit C)

ADJOURN

The meeting was then adjourned.

MEMBER COMMENT CARDS:

None received.

OBSERVER COMMENT CARDS

"The open house was not properly described in the email as to its intent. The public was not included; I appeared at the Open House and the Consultant would not give the presentation. The idea that public comment time can not be shared is outrageous! Henry Iler's comments were relevant and should have been allowed to continue!

It is completely inappropriate to have a presented "summary" information. From the so-called "open house" meetings! Going backwards! You were OK with adding the turnpike as a new transit corridor, but nothing else."

Ed Swakon

"I would hate to think that team members can't maintain their commitment to consensus and seeing this process through..."

Anonymous

"The builders representatives are introducing information relative to the cost of constructing different types of housing? Does the analysis factor in cost of land and the profit that is generated by different types of housing? i.e. What is the net revenue result of construction of different housing types?"

Anonymous

IDEA PARKING LOT

No comments received.