

SOUTH MIAMI DADE WATERSHED STUDY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting Thirty- Seven

December 8, 2005
12:30 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.

Report of Proceedings

WELCOME/CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS

The meeting was held at the John D. Campbell Agricultural Center in Homestead, Florida.

Roger Carlton, Chair, welcomed everyone. Mr. Carlton spoke to the Committee regarding the impact of the 9 applications to the County Commission for projects requiring the movement of the Urban Development Boundary (UDB). Most of these applications were sent on to the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) without a decision or recommendation from the Commission. He encouraged the Committee to continue to work diligently in order to complete this study by March, 2006, so it is done prior to the DCA response to these applications to the County Commission.

Mr. Carlton made the following comments and announcements:

- ✓ He congratulated member, Richard Alger for being selected as *Citizen of the Year* by the Homestead Chamber of Commerce.
- ✓ There will be a joint meeting of the Farm Bureau and the Florida Nurseryman and Grower's Association with the Project Management Team on Friday, December 9, 2005.
 - He encouraged all NEW committee members to go since we have not been able to have a "new members" orientation due to the hurricanes and their impact.
- ✓ The Organizational Committee wants to begin having 2 meetings a month as of this month, through about March, 2006 in order to ensure completion of the project.
 - He asked that members please mark their calendars for the 2nd and 4th Thursdays of each of the months mentioned.
 - He indicated that the Facilitator will be checking for a quorum for each meeting but if members mark their calendars now, it is more likely that we will be able to get a quorum.

Members made the following comments regarding two meetings a month:

- Try to avoid the times that the County Commission might be meeting.
- Two meetings a month really doubles the work load for members.
- As Committee members, we need to dig in our heels to ensure producing something of value and primary importance.

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

Members present:

Roger Carlton, Chair
Ivonne Alexander, Miami Dade AgriCouncil
Richard Alger, South Florida Potato Growers Exchange
Subrata Basu, Miami Dade County Planning and Zoning*
Gerald Case, Florida Avocado Committee
Guillermina Damas, At Large member
Carlos Espinosa, Miami-Dade DERM*
Jeffrey Flanagan, Chamber South
John Fredrick, Dade County Farm Bureau

Dick Frost, Tropical Audubon Society
Louise King, Redland Citizen's Association
William Losner, Greater Homestead/Florida City Chamber of Commerce
Bennie Lovett, Florida City
Carter McDowell, Building Industry Representative
Reed Olszack, Miami-Dade Agricultural Practices Board
Mark Oncavage, Sierra Club
Armando Perez, Florida Engineering Society
Bonnie Roddenberry, Sunny South Acres Homeowner's Association
Jorge Rodriguez, Miami Dade Water Department*
Jane Spurling, Florida Nurserymen, Grower's and Landscape Association
Charles Thibos, Tropical Everglades Visitor Association
Julia Trevarthen, South Florida Regional Planning Council

*Non-voting member

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.

PROJECT MANAGER'S REPORT

Bob Daniels, Project Manager, referred the Committee to his Project Manager's Report in the meeting packet (Exhibit B).

FOLLOW UP PRESENTATION SUBTASK 3.4: WATER RESOURCES ASSESSMENT

Michael Davis, V.P. and Project Manager, Keith and Schnars, gave a follow up presentation of certain aspects of subtask 3.4, Water Resources Assessment which had received inquiries from Committee members (Exhibit C).

Subsequent to Mr. Davis' presentation, members made the following comments:

Facilitator's note: items noted with red font indicate answers to the questions asked.

- 1) What impact does groundwater flow have on water quality? We are trying to understand SWMM model better.
 - a) This model is designed to capture run-off that infiltrates into the groundwater and from there into the canals, but does not integrate groundwater flowing through the Biscayne Aquifer underneath the canals
- 2) p. 30 chemicals listed as only as abbreviations; we need full name and definitions.
- 3) There are only 3 paragraphs on saltwater intrusion; we need more reference to this problem; it has been brought up many times. We need an actual study of this topic.
- 4) There is some concern about the percentage of accuracy of the SWMM model; the model does not have 100% accuracy and this needs to be explained in final report.

- a) We never intended to only rely on what is modeled – some issues and items are known by members but are not results of models; we should speak to those items.
- 5) Does the model predict regarding agriculture’s future impact on water quality compared to urbanization; does the model differentiate between the different impacts of pollutants from agriculture versus urbanization.
- 6) Under current regulations, there is a requirement to retain water on site; why is there a flooding increase showing on the model; does it reflect the type of building being done? (residential, commercial, industrial?)
- 7) Is statement “most’ canals were not designed for flood control but for agriculture” correct? Where did this come from?
 - a) Canals in S. Dade have not been improved for a long time and canals were meant to take the capacity of the land that was there at the time the canal was created (only agriculture at the time)
 - b) This sentence needs reversing/changing to more accurately reflect what is meant
- 8) Could you improve the canals by dredging more & can we recommend that?
 - a) In addition to dredging, there are several methods for increasing canal capacity.
- 9) What is a ‘French drain’? Typical drainage design in Dade County
- 10) For areas on wells, would like to have higher criteria than a French drain provides.
- 11) Issue of ground water volume flowing into estuarine areas of Biscayne Bay.
- 12) We need to see a narrative analysis of the different scenarios of ground water flow into the Bay. (and future surface water flow).
- 13) How much of study area is modeled & how much isn’t? Want study to show acreage affected/modeled.

Members took a short break.

PRESENTATION OF SUBTASK 3.6: ASSESSMENT AND BUILDING THE PREFERRED SCENARIO: AN INITIAL DISCUSSION

Mr. Davis reviewed the Consultant evaluations of the assessments from each of the three test scenarios (Exhibit D). Members were then asked to comment on the presentation and make suggestions for how the Committee transitions to building the preferred scenario. The following are the comments of the Members:

With regard to the presentation:

- 1) Change the word ‘Homes’ to ‘dwelling units’.
- 2) Parameter ‘Ground water supply’ should be changed to ‘Potable water’ supply.
- 3) ‘Limited influence’ parameters do not mean that they limit the recommendations that can be made.
- 4) Counter intuitive why the three scenarios had minimal differences in surface water and ground water. It seems like it should be greater.
- 5) Volume of water may not be as valuable a measure as the cost of water.
- 6) Water supply will not be a limiting factor in terms of development; the cost is what will change.

With regard to the transition from test scenarios to preferred scenario:

- 1. We need to have an open discussion for accomplishing the goal of “Honor Private Property Rights”
- 2. Small breakout groups to discuss items necessary to get to preferred scenario
- 3. Show us how the consultant would apply the knowledge from the models to build the preferred scenario and allow us to react; float a straw man preferred scenario
- 4. What do we do with goals/objectives that a member cannot support at all?
- 5. Specific request – show us what has happened in approval process REALLY over the last 3-5 years. i.e. get the actual facts; remember: this scenario needs to be doable politically

6. Some evaluation needs to be done before we try to build the preferred scenario; maybe we work on a smaller basis and choose just one basin
7. Today's presentation was very helpful – use more of this evaluation/percentages to show us the impacts
8. Some of the existing language in the original goals and objectives is not practical and may not express what is meant; they are too broad
9. We first need to decide if we can accommodate the population growth in 2025 or 2050, then create a preferred scenario to make that happen
10. We need to have discussions with community councils.
11. We need a summary by consultants of each scenario for each objective then let us discuss and rank them
12. We should develop a process for developing a straw man alternative
13. Our preferred scenario needs to include policies & practices – taking a smaller area to work with may help – maybe by basin.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment was invited. Four (4) 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.

ADJOURN

The meeting was then adjourned.

OBSERVER COMMENT CARDS

“A presentation on basin and watershed management should be made to the committee. It would be beneficial to have the DEP and the Florida office of Agricultural Water Policy facilitate this soon.

With respect to comment regarding Subtask 3.4: questions have been raised for pollutants and agricultural best management practices (BMPs). BMPs are statewide. No BMPs have been adopted for Miami-Dade agriculture or its industries. A vegetable and nursery BMP program are in the drafting stages. Nothing has been formally adopted.

The sources for answers to specific questions should be referenced and cited in the minutes.”

-Katie Edwards, Dade County Farm Bureau, 305-246-5514

IDEA PARKING LOT

No comments received.