

SOUTH MIAMI DADE WATERSHED STUDY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

February 9, 2006 Meeting #41
John D. Campbell Agricultural Center
8:30 am to 3:00 pm

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 made the following comments and announcements:

1. An acknowledgement that the Committee is entering the final phase of its work which has and will continue to involve more intense negotiations and difficult decision making than in the past. This is just a reminder that if there is any real or perceived conflict of interest with regard to property you own or have a vested interest in, it is incumbent on the members to disclose that fact.
2. The next round of public meetings by the Consultant will take place on February 21 and 22, 2006 at the FIU Engineering Center (in Sweetwater) and Miami Dade College Homestead Campus respectively. Notices will be sent to all Committee members who are strongly urged to attend at least one of the meetings.
3. An Economic Development Strategies Workshop, organized by member Charles Thibos, took place on January 31, 2006 and was attended by several Committee members. Notes from the meeting are attached as **Exhibit A**.
4. Chuck Blowers, Miami Dade County Planning and Zoning is retiring. Mr. Blowers has been a great asset and regular attendee to these meetings. You are all invited to attend his send off party on Feb 16, 2006. A flyer will be sent out by the Facilitator, Janice Fleischer.
5. On a personal note:
 - a. We would like to thank Bill Losner for his continued and generous donation of breakfast for the Committee at every meeting.
 - b. We would like to offer our condolences to member, Bill Losner, whose Mother passed away recently.
 - c. We welcome back member, Jerry Case, who recently had knee surgery and wish him a speedy recovery.
 - d. We congratulate member, Carlos Espinosa, on his recent appointment as Director of Miami Dade Department of Resource Management (DERM)

Members present:

Roger Carlton, Chair
Ivonne Alexander, Miami Dade AgriCouncil
Richard Alger, South Florida Potato Growers Exchange
Humberto Alonso, South Florida Water Management District
Subrata Basu, Miami Dade Planning and Zoning*

Gerald Case, Florida Lime & Avocado Committees
Amy Condon, At-Large Member
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
Jamie Furgang, National Audubon Society (prospective member)
Louise King, Redland Citizen's Association
Mark Lewis, Biscayne National Park
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
Lawrence Percival, Kendall Federation of Homeowner Associations
Armando Perez, Florida Engineering Society
Bonnie Roddenberry, Sunny South Acres Homeowner's Association
Jorge Rodriguez, Miami Dade Water Department*
Mike Shehadeh, City of Homestead
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

Before the meeting formally began, there was a general discussion initiated by questions from committee members regarding the meeting with the County Manager, George Burgess and the Agricultural Study Committee which was scheduled to follow this meeting. It was noted and confirmed that meeting had nothing to do with this Committee meeting and was called by the County Manager, George Burgess, in an effort to put that Committee to rest with regard to its work.

Comments by Committee members:

1. Ag meeting after this meeting was called by the City Manager will be attended by Roger and there will be a short presentation about it at the next meeting.
2. Agriculture Economic Study was approved by this group in the past.
3. The Agriculture Economic Study that was done in conjunction with the Ag Study (separate project) was adopted by the WSAC but has not used or considered by the consultants when forming maps and other considerations for this study.

AGENDA REVIEW/GUIDELINES

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

All Reports of Proceedings of the Committee, Discussion Guidelines and Committee related information, can be found either on the Study website at SFRPC website at www.southmiamidadewatershedstudy.com or at <http://www.sfrpc.com/institute/watershed.htm>.

PROJECT MANAGER'S REPORT

Bob Daniels, Project Manager, presented his Project Manager's Report. He indicated that the most recent SFRPC staff report, including an update on Developments of Regional Impact has been included for the Committee members' information (Exhibit C).

CERP FOOTPRINT PRESENTATION

Three separate presentations were made by staff from the South Florida Water Management District related to the planning of CERP projects in Miami-Dade County (Exhibits D1, D2, and D3):

- 1) Everglades National Park Seepage Management – Maura Merkal, Lead Project Manager, CERP Planning Department, SFWMD
- 2) Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands/ Acceler8 Phase I Basis of Design Report – Jorge Jaramillo, Project Manager, Acceler8, SFWMD
- 3) C-111 Spreader Canal – John Shaffer, Project Manager, CERP Planning Department, SFWMD

These professionals were accompanied by Dewey Worth, Division Director, CERP Project Management, SFWMD, who assisted in answering questions from the committee.

Following the CERP Footprint presentations, Committee members engaged in comment and discussion. The Facilitator recorded the following:

1. Because projects are just getting started, the cannot give exact boundary lines
2. We should go back to our conceptual boundaries.
3. Any decision on what private property you need? The three we know about are:
 - Lowes Property
 - Bradshaw
 - Gibraltar Property
4. Lands more south are only conceptual at this time. Private property owners have not yet been approached.
5. These CERP plans are adaptable to this Committee's work
6. Want to know ASAP whether CERP needs the Atlantic Civil property.
7. Remember this study is over 45 year time frame-many areas will not be affected for many years.
8. How does our map relate to the CERP maps presented today? It is impossible to inter relate the two.
 - Deering area may have no conflict
 - Areas south have more potential conflict
9. This entire thing is a moving target. It is important that we have an opportunity to modify as we go along. Recommend in our study an ongoing review process.
10. CERP has finite restrictive objectives to protect all of Miami Dade County.
11. What about impact of development centers next to the parks, wetland areas. Are these two compatible without any boundary?
 - Transitional zones will be created
 - Canals, parks, etc.
 - Always best to have some sort of buffer
12. We need policies of making development be compatible with restoration/environmental needs surrounding them.

13. It looks like the current preliminary alternative may negatively impact the Homestead Race Track—can something be done to cure this?
14. Move further east in the south instead of NW (Kendall)
15. What happens with a high water event
 - They will mitigate to accommodate

OVERVIEW ON NEWEST VERSION OF CONSULTANT MAP

Michael Davis, Vice President, Keith & Schnars, Consultant, gave a powerpoint presentation on how the next iteration of the scenario map was developed using each small group's input from the previous Committee meeting on January 26, 2006. (Exhibit E)

CONSENSUS DISCUSSION REGARDING CONSULTANT MAP

The Facilitator asked the group to consider the question: "This map is approved as a preliminary preferred scenario for the purposes of running the assessments pursuant to Subtask 1.8 to see how the scenario performs." She indicated that Committee members would be asked to rank their consensus level on the above question. However, prior to taking a first ranking, public comment and Committee discussion were invited.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Members of the public who spoke:

Richard Grosso
Ed Swakon
Cynthia Guerra
Jeff Wander

Members of the public are strongly encouraged to 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 and those comments will be included in the Report.

CONSENSUS DISCUSSION REGARDING CONSULTANT MAP VERSION 3

Prior to taking a first ranking on the newest version of map, the following comments were recorded during the discussion of the Committee members:

1. Richard Alger stated he owns land near the Motorsports Complex.
2. We need to see where potential de-salinization plants may be located.
3. If we identify employment areas the concern would be that they would change to residential at a later time; we need to make sure that zoning recommendations are made.
4. Property rights issue has still not adequately been discussed.
5. There was a commitment by Roger that compensation for properties identified for governmental use will be addressed in the implementation strategies section of the Report.
6. There are still policy issues and recommendations that still need to be made by this group-they will follow the modeling of the map.
 - a. Map is good enough to go on from here
7. If we reach consensus how do we come back and change it?

8. Get more specifics of Louise King's proposal.
 - a. Expansion of the south end of the US 1 transit corridor to go further west
 - b. To make adjustments to the expansion along 147th avenue
9. How do we avoid putting development or recommending development in areas adjacent to lands needed for CERP—is it really possible to have development that does not have a negative impact on CERP lands.
10. We need to agree on 2025 first before we decide on 2050.
11. Wellfield in West area—on map not accurately shown
12. How far does backwater flooding extend from C-111 project?
13. We need to actually identify the lands that are necessary for Biscayne National Park (BNP) (which ones they think will be detrimental to park if there is development)
 - a. Gables Estates on the north
 - b. US 1 on the west
 - c. Biscayne Bay on the east
 - d. Florida City canal on the south
14. There are three areas of wetlands' reservations in Redlands that need to be removed from the map. (US1 and south of 184th Street)
15. First presentation on CERP this morning was very vague. Want to know what/where/how/why/who.
16. On the map, South Dade looks only like a water container; what are effects of economics of all this on South Dade?
17. Area to the far South within light blue line and along Krome; make this into major corridor (get specific recommendations from Jane Spurling)
18. Zoning should not be frozen
19. Recharge areas in map have been inserted without our approval.
20. Map showing too much loss of agricultural lands. Agriculture needs to be sustainable.
21. Long term possibility of losing car dependent communities; need more planned rapid transit.
22. Homestead wants an employment center and it is not currently showing on the map.
23. Mike Shehadeh and the consultant need to clarify areas outside the expansion area.
24. UDB 162nd Avenue (between 152 and 184) line should be straight.
25. Encourage giving maps to members prior to meetings.
26. Discuss ways in which expansion areas can really be right up against parks/wetland areas
27. Concerns about expanding Urban Expansion Area (UEA) around Kendall because it drives development East.
28. Mt. Trashmore—how do we protect water supply from this?
29. Reconsider CSX transit corridor issues
30. West well field—WASD owns property—move the circle down ½ mile—shown incorrectly on map
31. Future well field study area shown on the map is not a well field protection area; moved to South Miami Heights (211 St. and 107 Avenue) to east needs to be shown on the map
32. West Kendall—not feasible to place 20,000 units in that area (in and outside UDB)
33. Comparison of existing densities along US 1 to proposed densities

Due to the intensity of this discussion and the desire of the members to have time to bring this new version of the map to their constituencies, it was decided not to attempt to rank the map for acceptance at this meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment was once again invited. Two members of the public chose to speak:

Walter Vick: Manages Vick Farms
Colleen Boggs

Members of the public are strongly encouraged to 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 and those comments will be included in the Report.

WATER SUPPLY PRESENTATION

Jim Jackson, Water Supply Department, South Florida Water Management District, presented "Status of Regional Water Supply Plan Updates". (Exhibit F)

MEMBER FORUM

At every meeting, prior to adjournment, members are invited to make comments, give announcements or inform their fellow committee members of events and news.

Member forum comments:

1. MDX District- get more information (overlay)
2. February 17, 2006 – FPL donating 49 acres to Biscayne National Park and over 240 acres to SFWMD; 12pm (an email with an invitation will be sent by email)
3. Wholly compensate owners of land taken (for recharge or other reasons)
4. When looking to take property from owners and compensate them, look at what is land adjacent selling for.
5. Feb 11·2006, Loxahatchee Wildlife Reserve: Everglades Day
6. Tropic Audubon Feb 18/19, 2006 Annual Plant Sale
7. Let's not try to completely change map again; something is going to be in everyone's backyard.
8. Consider agricultural concerns seriously – it is not up to agriculture to subsidize everyone else.

EVALUATIONS/ADJOURN

The meeting was then adjourned.

OBSERVER COMMENT CARDS RECEIVED AT THE MEETING

"Knowing that the Everglades Restoration Project seeks to restore natural areas for the benefit of our parks and support our quality-of-life and our economy, the Watershed team and plan should make every effort to preserve restoration project footprints by directing development away from those areas."

-Cynthia Green, Tropical Audubon Society

1. *The timing of the preparation and distribution of the proceeding from the previous meeting is not acceptable. The public's only input is though the very limited 3 minute public comment period. I spent considerable time preparing comments on the proposed plan. ⁽¹⁾ Those comments were provided electronically more than a week before today's (2-9-2006) meeting. If those comments are not available to committee members to consider at today's meeting, while final adjustments are being considered – What is the purpose of providing those comments? If the meeting proceedings can not be made available prior to the next meeting – then maybe you're going too fast! It simply furthers my belief that public input has been and continues to be given little credence.*
2. *It was stated by Mike Davis that no new units were assigned in CERP areas. Than is simply not true. The area northwest of the Homestead Air Reserve Base (HARB) is within the footprint of the Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands (BBCW) study area. This area has not been examined by agencies to determine if those lands shown on your maps today with a red proposed UEA area are needed. It should be noted again, that the area being filled on ACI property has been determined by both the SFWMD and the COE that this area will not interfere with either the BBCW or the C111 projects, yet no units are allocated on the ACI property.*
3. *This committee should give specific direction to your Chairman on what he is authorized to say about the status of this process and the information that will be provided.*
4. *This committee should also understand what exactly the Chairman and consultants are proposing to give the County Commission prior to the March PAB hearings and April County Commission hearing scheduled for the current CDMP applications.*
5. *Finally, it is my recommendation that any preferred plan not show any proposed UEA areas. The scale and sensitivity of the models being used simply can not provide information of sufficient detail to draw the lines as they have been. This group, in my opinion, should focus on how best to allocate units within the UDB. Any units not allocated within the UDB should be noted as needing to be accommodated outside the existing UDB. Market forces should then be allowed to dictate where and when movement outside the UDB should occur.*
6. *Additional observer comments will be prepared and submitted later.*

-Ed Swakon

MEMBER COMMENTS SUBMITTED SUBSEQUENT TO THE MEETING

1. *We are moving too fast.*
2. *We don't get information timely enough to review it.*

3. Wetland restoration as shown on the map in the area of Redland is totally unacceptable. Those areas as shown were never wetlands. They only became wetlands after Everglades National Park started experimenting with water use in the park. There are avocado groves that were planted in 1914 on high ground that never flooded before we were afforded flood protection. Since Everglades National Park has experimented with water, those avocado groves are now flooding.

-Bill Losner

PUBLIC COMMENT SUBMITTED SUBSEQUENT TO THE MEETING

"The following are my observer comments from the February 9th meeting. Ed Swakon

- (1) *Using the consultant's estimate (which I believe to be extremely low because the allocated densities within zones A & B are much too high) that 44,000 residential units need to be allocated outside the existing UDB, then the proposed UEA areas are not large enough. Assuming that the southern most proposed UEA (the one SW of the HARB) is for commercial uses only, because it is under the ACCUS of the flight path into HARB then my estimate is that approximately 8 sections (5120 acres) of land are shown within the proposed UEA areas. If ALL of this area were to be developed at 5 du/ac, that would only provide only 25,600 units. This is 18,400 units short.*
- (2) *The western wetland creation areas are unrealistically located.*
- (3) *There is NO need for the wellfield protection park south of SW 184 Street as shown.*
- (4) *What has happened to the 2025 (or as the contract calls for the 2015) development scenario?*
- (5) *The consultant has not used or provided any guidance to the committee on how to locate development taking into consideration the results of the test scenario information.*
- (6) *What has happened to Section 3.6? This document was to analyze the test scenarios. Other than a very brief power point presentation no written report has been provided, and is not available on the web site.*
- (7) *The committee is urged to review the Scope of Work for this project. What you are doing is far from what was contracted for.*
- (8) *The meeting summaries from the Technical Review Committee (TRC) for the last two meetings (Jan and July 2005) have not been posted to the web site. There is no link from either the SFRPC or "official" Watershed web sites to the location of the TRC meeting minutes. It is nearly impossible for the public to locate the information about this project which is not posted in a timely manner and is posted on three (3) different web sites with no links between them."*

Observer Comments of Ed Swakon from January 26, 2006, inadvertently omitted from January 26, 2006 Report of Proceedings

1. *It is clear that the public input and response process has not been followed throughout the past several years. Even your current changes do not address the requirements of the scope of services. The following is an excerpt from the Scope of Service:*

Public Comment Response Process

Public comments regarding the South Miami-Dade Watershed Study and Plan will be formally received in three different ways: 1) through public comment at General Public

meetings and Watershed Advisory Committee meetings; 2) through e-mail messages to the CONSULTANT and South Florida Regional Planning Council Watershed web pages; and 3) through U.S. Mail or other courier service received by the CONSULTANT or the South Florida Regional Planning Council (SFRPC). Public comments received at meetings open to the public will be recorded on flip charts, and transcribed to the official record of the proceedings of such meetings. Public comments received by the CONSULTANT through e-mail or post will be transmitted to the Project Manager at the SFRPC. The CONSULTANT will be responsible for transmission within seven (7) days of its receipt. Public comments received by the SFRPC will be copied to the Project Manager at the SFRPC. Upon request of the Project Manager, the CONSULTANT will participate in drafting a response to the public comment.

The Project Manager will transmit process-oriented public comment regarding Watershed Advisory Committee meetings to the Facilitator at the Institute for Community Collaboration for further response. Likewise, the Project Manager will transmit process-oriented public comment regarding General Public meetings to the CONSULTANT for further response. All other public comment will receive a response posted on the SFRPC Watershed web page no later than thirty (30) days after its receipt. The Project Manager will transmit responses to the CONSULTANT for posting on its Watershed web page as well. Comments received from elected officials will, if not answered satisfactorily in a meeting with the official, be answered in formal correspondence on SFRPC letterhead, drafted by the Project Manager.

- a. Please note the Scope requires a response to public comments. This has not happened.
 - b. All public comments are to be transcribed to the official record of the proceedings.
 - c. Responses have not been provided within 30 days as required.
 - d. Voting on items has occurred at almost every meeting without regard or timely input or response from Public input.
2. Clear guidelines must be given to the committee as to what constraints if any are to be applied during the development of the preferred alternative.
 - a. It is my understanding that the constraints were NOT a limitation on where new development could be assigned.
 3. A better delineation of lands required by CERP should be included on the base map.
 - a. The Yellow Book should NOT be used. The work on the CERP projects affecting the watershed study area has changed significantly.
 4. It should not be a given that densities of 20 to 50 units per acre shall apply to the inner zone of the entire US-1 transportation corridor.
 - a. These densities are much higher than currently exist.
 - b. If lower densities are allocated in this zone then more units will need to be distributed elsewhere.
 - c. Without an approved acceptance at the municipality level, this proposal is flawed before any analysis begins.
 - d. The analysis must demonstrate that the timeline for approval of these densities will occur within a timeline that will not adversely disrupt the development market, e.g., the implementation of these densities, if possible, must also be made in a timeframe which is certain. Unless there is a guarantee, then the entire analysis cannot move forward as waiting x number of years for this density to mature to accommodate growth only to find that it will not work x years down the road is devastating to the economy and belies the ideological no growth predisposition of the study.
 - e. What is the simple cost benefit analysis of inside the udb versus outside the UDB? Consider the question with cost of housing factored in?
 5. The timing of these units needs to be understood. Provisions must be made in the development of the map for development of property and densities lower than those anticipated 45 years from today. It is unrealistic to expect two completely different land use plans for the years 2025 and

- year 2050.
6. Graphical examples of the type of product required to satisfy the densities proposed should be provided for each category.
 - a. These examples should include number of stories, typical square footage of each unit, whether structured or surface parking is required, etc.
 7. The selection of employment centers seems random at best.
 - a. To include the entire Tamiami Airport as a potential employment center is unrealistic. This area will remain largely open space as an airport. The area to the south and possibly west of Tamiami Airport are the better options for employment centers.
 - b. Homestead air reserve base should be identified as a potential employment center.
 - c. Metrozoo should be eliminated as an employment center
 8. Current urban expansion area boundaries should be removed during the development of the preferred alternative and they should NOT be given any priority in developing the preferred alternative. If not, explain the logic behind their priority???
 9. Areas currently within the UDB, but encumbered with conservation easements should be removed (i.e. the boundary should be moved to exclude them) and the equivalent area added outside the UDB in the preferred alternative.
 - a. The 500 acres mitigation area within the City of Homestead for the race tract, overflow parking area and City Lake is the best example.
 10. Utilizing the effective mean concentration EMC table from section 3.4, how is it possible to determine if low, medium, or high density residential is preferable. All three densities result in the same pollutant loading.
 - a. See the attached Table (Swakon Exhibit 1). All land uses within each grouping use essentially the same loadings.
 - b. Only 8 different land use loadings are being used, not 23 as the table would suggest.
 11. The modeling does not tell if the loading is concentrated at the canal mouths leading to the Bay. If the loading is spread over a large enough area the concentration may not be any higher from one scenario to another. With no information about concentration and downstream loading I am not sure ANY conclusions can be drawn from the modeling
 12. The placement of hard lines all on the proposed alternative map for areas of proposed urban expansion should be replaced with areas of shading where development is preferred at certain densities. The scale of the modeling does not lend itself to drawing hard lines.
 13. County staff should be advised that if a specific section and page is required to be referenced in the county memos of the existing CDMP applications the information that is contained in section 3.4 cannot be used because of the way this section was adopted by the committee.
 14. Many of the western wetland restoration areas are unrealistic because of the existing high elevation.
 15. What is the status of sections 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6? How can you proceed without seeing the results of section 3.6?
 16. All of my public comments are incorporated by reference.
