

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

November 9, 2005
8:30 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Report of Proceedings

WELCOME/CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS

The meeting was held at the Keys Gate Golf and Country Club in Homestead, Florida.

Roger Carlton, Chair, welcomed everyone. He expressed his hope that everyone was recovering well from the recent Hurricane Wilma and recognized the hardship caused to many stakeholders with representatives on the Committee.

Mr. Carlton made the following comments and announcements:

- ✓ Biscayne National Park Superintendent Mark Lewis and Armando Perez were confirmed as members of the Committee by the Board of County Commissioners.
- ✓ The confirmation is still pending for National Audubon's representative, Jamie Furgang.
- ✓ Introduction of Bob Daniels, Senior Planner for the Regional Planning Council, who is the Committee's new Project Manager, replacing John Hulse who is moving to Massachusetts.
- ✓ He will continue to monitor the progress of the UDB study discussions which are being led by County Commissioner Dennis Moss.
- ✓ Miami Dade County Project Manager Cindy Dwyer reported on the project management team's (PMT) meeting with the Homestead -Florida City Chamber of Commerce and announced that the PMT will be meeting jointly with the Florida Nurserymen and Grower's Association and the Farm Bureau.
- ✓ With regard to the amendment sheet that was sent to members concerning subtask 3.1, the language in the final document will track the language that was approved and adopted by the Committee at the last meeting. The document that was sent out included clarifying changes and additions to the adopted language; those changes will be eliminated.
- ✓ Anyone who is being paid for lobbying efforts must follow the law regarding registering as a lobbyist if applicable.
 - The Committee will adopt a new procedure: anyone who speaks during public comment as a paid lobbyist must disclose this information and the identity of their client.
 - If someone speaks during public comment or submits comments on behalf of a member of the Committee, they must first get specific approval from that member, which must be either verbally confirmed at the meeting or in writing in the case of written comments

A member of the Committee noted that the next meeting date of December 8, 2005 may present a problem in gaining a quorum as there is another important conference on that date. The facilitator, Ms. Fleischer indicated she would send out an email to confirm a quorum for December 8 and a possible second meeting on December 22, 2005.

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

Members present:

Roger Carlton, Chair
Ivonne Alexander,
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
Jamie Furgang, National Audubon Society**
Robert Johnson, Everglades National Park
Mark Lewis, Biscayne National Park
William Losner, Greater Homestead/Florida City Chamber of Commerce
Mark Oncavage, Sierra Club (prospective member)
Lawrence Percival, Kendall Federation of Homeowner Associations
Armando Perez, Florida Engineering Society (prospective member)
Bonnie Roddenberry
Jorge Rodriguez, Miami Dade Water Department*
Jane Spurling, Florida Nurserymen and Grower's Association
Charles Thibos, Tropical Everglades Visitor Association
Julia Trevarthen, South Florida Regional Planning Council

*Non-voting member

**Unconfirmed member

There were 8 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, presented his Project Manager's Report (Exhibit B). Mr. Daniels said he was honored to be the new Project Manager and was looking forward to working with the Committee.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment was invited. One (1) member 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.

PRESENTATION SUBTASK 3.4: WATER RESOURCES ASSESSMENT

Michael Davis, V.P. and Project Manager, Keith and Schnars, presented the findings of subtask 3.4, Water Resources Assessment. Discussion followed this presentation. Members took breaks and had lunch during the time of this discussion.

As Mr. Davis presented the results, members made the following comments:

Introduction section:

1. Concern with the short term frame for notice of meetings & materials.
2. Get notices out in more media so general public is notified.
3. Need enough time with documents so representatives' experts can review the documents and get opinion back.
4. Committee members need a copy of the work product before they are asked to react and comment.
5. Need to define the difference between a consultant and a lobbyist.
6. Survey given out by Consultant lists agriculture last in place of ranking- need to rearrange the order.
 - a. This survey appeared in Sept. 2003. (*It's also on the website and the public can complete it at any time*)
 - b. The survey will be revised to list ranking items alphabetically.

Comments regarding Subtask 3.4:

1. Why aren't petroleum-based pollutants reflected in the list of pollutants modeled?
 - a. It gets measured as part of other pollutants
 - b. The pollutants chosen are representative of all possible pollutants.
2. How do we know what is an acceptable baseline?
 - a. The baseline represents land use in the year 2003
3. Does agriculture's Best Management Practices (BMP) show a decrease in pollutants by agriculture?
 - a. Yes
4. Data in model is taken countywide, not just in watershed area.
5. Who has the responsibility (agencies) to mitigate the effects of the pollutants regardless of which preferred scenario is accepted?
6. Models also include storm events/rainfall.
7. Should the pollutants be prioritized in relation to which ones are more negative to the Bay than others?
8. Certain metals in the soil are 'tied to' the soil so that the soil keeps these metals from passing into the water.
9. The model assumes development will include water and sewer infrastructure.
10. Did the scenario that includes 'smart growth' include using more permeable surfaces?
11. Urban areas typically have more run off than agricultural areas
12. The Model assumes that when you change land use there is retention of water on site.
13. Each land use has a percent of runoff defined for the model.
14. We should look at opportunities to improve water quality in the C3 Basin outside of this study.
15. Different basins have different levels of service for flood protection.
16. The projections for increased hurricane events may change the actual results per basin.
17. There are three different levels of storm events and they were applied based on appropriateness according to Basin.

At the end of the presentation, members were told that their comments regarding this subtask must be received by NOVEMBER 30, 2005 and should meet the following criteria:

- a. in writing
- b. give the technical basis for comment
- c. give supporting studies and research if available

PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment was invited. Two (2) 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.

MEMBER FORUM

1. William Losner handed out a copy of an ordinance dated January 23, 1997, which created the Biscayne National Park Buffer Review Committee. Miami Dade County Project Manager and Miami Dade County Representative Subrata Basu indicated that the sunset date in this document was subsequently revised by the Commission.
2. Information on subtasks needs to be given to members faster.
3. Charts today were very hard to see and the booklet was too small. We need more information on the chemicals and how they are used.
4. We need to designate what pollutant baselines are good and which are bad.
5. The Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) has designated which water bodies are degraded.
6. What does non-gradation mean? What is "significant" degradation?
7. Biscayne Bay is on the 2006 list for minimum flows and levels (MFLs) by the Water Management District.
8. The lands not included in the modeling to the south were constrained because of CERP.

ADJOURN

The meeting was then adjourned.

MEMBER COMMENT CARDS:

Bill Losner formally submitted the comments made by Ed Swakon as a committee member.

1. *The presentation of water quality differences from the 3 test scenarios provides very little insight in to how to proceed with the preferred alternative. There needs to be a way for committee members to "see" the impact a change in landuse has from each other for each parameter. It is suggested that the consultant be required to present a matrix of change for a "standard" area (say 100 Ac). This approach should not be limited to the water quality parameters only, but where applicable to as many of the other "evaluation" parameters as appropriate. An example is shown below:*

BOD Changes between landuses

Landuse	LandUse				
	AG	Single Family	Multi-Family	Commercial	Open Space
AG	0	10%	12%	15%	-10%
Single Family	-10%	0	2%	5%	-20%
Multi-Family	-12%	-2%	0	3%	-22%
Commercial	-15%	-5%	-3%	0	-25%
Open Space	10%	20%	22%	25%	0

a. In the above example a change in landuse from Single Family to Commercial would result in a 5% increase in BOD loading.

- BMP's for ALL landuses must be specifically defined and there effects must be quantified for the "standard" area as above. Below is an example of a easy way to present the effects of the BMPs on each landuse.

BOD Changes By BMP application

Landuse	LandUse				
	Existing Conditions Without BMP (Base)	BMP1	BMP2	BMP3	Combine
AG	0	-10%	-2%	-15%	-18%
Single Family	0	0	-12%	15%	-20%
Multi-Family	0	-5%	-5%	-3%	-13%
Commercial	0	-5%	-3%	-10	-25%
Open Space	0	-3%	-2%	-5%	-4

- In the above example the existing conditions for the Commercial landuse would produce 5% less load with BMP1 applied.
 - Please note at this time you have NO idea what the BMPs are or how many are being applied – a critical flaw in the data presentation.
- The statement "that residential BMPs don't seem to be working" is completely inappropriate. What is K&S using as BMPs?
 - The statement that "the Ag BMP's must be working", because as landuse change away from Ag the WQ numbers go up is equally inappropriate. The existing conditions are just that, existing conditions. If some alteration (BMP) is being applied to the current conditions then this needs to be addressed.
 - All of the new development within the Bird Drive Basin (C-2) have been required to retain onsite all stormwater from the 100 year storm for at least the last 10 years. The high number of failing nodes in this basin doesn't make sense. The Bird Drive Canal does NOT have a 100 year design criteria. The consultants are confusing the requirements of new development design (current BMP) with the canal design capacity.
 - As confirmed by the consultants they DO NOT HAVE the ability to apply the water quality of flooding model South of SW 344 Street. The primary objective that led up to this study was the potential impact on water quality to Biscayne National Park (BNP). If an area CANNOT be modeled it MUST BE removed from the study area boundaries. The Atlantic Civil Property has been adversely impacted by this planning process. **We reiterate our demand that the ACI property be removed from the study area and at a minimum ALL documents clearly indicate the limitations in the work being performed.**

OBSERVER COMMENT CARDS

Comments To November 9th meeting of the SMDWSAC; By Edward Swakon, P.E. President EAS Engineering, Inc; A registered lobbyist for Atlantic Civil, Inc.: See the comments under Member Comments above from Bill Losner.

IDEA PARKING LOT

No comments received.