

SOUTH MIAMI DADE WATERSHED STUDY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

September 13, 2006 Meeting #49
John D. Campbell Agricultural Center
Homestead, Florida

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. He then made the following announcements:

- Condolences to Mark Lewis on the death of his father and Michael Davis on the death of his sister
- Included in today's packet are the Minutes of the April 2, 1974 meeting of the BOCC. At this meeting the Board of County Commissioners down zoned agriculturally designated lands. (Exhibit A).
- CDs of the April 2005 Hazen & Sawyer Biscayne Bay Economic Study have been made for each member and are available today. Thanks to Charles Thibos and Amy Condon for alerting us to this study.
- There is a good chance that the UNLUC Committee meeting set for October 3 at the Agricultural Center will be cancelled due to conflicts with two other meetings that have now been set. The Committee will receive an email with an update on this.
- Bill Losner was thanked for continuing to provide breakfast for each meeting.

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

Members present:

Roger Carlton, Chair *
Ivonne Alexander, Miami AgriCouncil
Gerald Case, Florida Avocado Committee
Amy Condon, At Large Member
Guillermina Damas, At Large Member
Carlos Espinosa, Miami-Dade DERM*
Jeff Flanagan, Chamber South
John Fredrick, Dade County Farm Bureau
Dick Frost, Tropical Audubon Society
Robert Johnson, Everglades National Park
Louise King, Redland Citizen's Association
Mark Lewis, Biscayne National Park
Bill Losner, Greater Homestead/Florida City Chamber of Commerce
Bennie Lovett, Florida City
Carter McDowell, South Florida Builders Association
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 and Sewer Department
Mike Shehadeh, City of Homestead
Jane Spurling, Florida Nursery, Growers and Landscape Association
Charles Thibos, Tropical Everglades Visitor Association

*Non-voting member

There were 11 observers.

Members opening comments:

1. When are we going back to see the comparative analysis of the test scenarios and the preferred scenario - requested several times now (ex. school impact fees)?
2. Chair asked Carter McDowell for specific questions with regard to this analysis which will be answered by staff
3. Specifically water supply which bears on all other issues – assumptions made and no discussion
4. Let's see the analysis presentation again
5. We need a presentation from WASD on water supply issues
6. We are doing implementation strategies before we discuss this analysis – this is not being done in the right order
7. Consultant should be coming up with solutions to the 200+ questions this committee posed – some were answered, but not all – specifically property rights and valuations
8. Concern about water resources and how it is handled – the preferred scenario is inadequate to deal with mitigation of detrimental impacts
9. Strategies become comprehensive plan amendments for BCC to consider
10. Capital improvements will be recommended to mitigate the impacts of growth without damage to environment, economy, etc.
11. Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands needs to be accelerated – we must hurry up on water resources discussion

AGENDA REVIEW/GUIDELINES

Janice Fleischer, Facilitator, reviewed the Agenda for the day (**Exhibit B**) and the Public Comment Guidelines. She explained the procedure for the day with regard to the consensus process would be to pick up where the group left off last time so the Committee gets through the current document in full before revisiting any sections.

Ms. Fleischer asked all members to update their email addresses as some members have not been receiving their notices.

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

PROJECT MANAGER'S REPORT

Bob Daniels, SFRPC, delivered his Project Manager's Report (**Exhibit C**)

He explained that staff and consultants had met with County department heads and received input from them on the implementation strategies. Input has also been received from the public

and from Committee members. He also noted that there would be a presentation on water resources at this meeting.

PRESENTATION: WATER RESOURCES

Maribel Balbin, Water Conservation Manager, Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department, gave a presentation on the Department's Water Conservation Program. (Exhibit D) This is a five year plan. Some of the standards adopted by the Department exceed the EPA requirements. Additionally, all Best Management Practices (BMPs) must be economically feasible to be accepted.

Member comments/questions:

- 1 What about folks on wells? – no capacity/infrastructure – these numbers not included in the program
- 2 We need to address this
- 3 What percentage of water reduction should result if this is implemented?
 - a. 25% ultimately is hoped
- 4 2 recommendations:
 - a. Tiered rate structure for basics vs. extras (pools, etc.)
 - b. Mandatory retrofit for older industrial/commercial users (this is 2nd year of plan)
- 5 Rate consultant is being hired – most (75%) of WASD customers are retail, the more they use, the more they will have to pay
- 6 What about all the water we are sending to the Keys? – Dade County does not own the water – equity of the issue is the real focus
- 7 P. 11 – Why are Hialeah numbers going down? – very little irrigation there
- 8 Water heaters are not located near bathrooms – means you use a lot of water to get hot water to the bathroom
- 9 Agriculture needs water before 9am and there should be no restriction
 - restrictions only on residential, not on agriculture (send these comments to Maribel)
- 10 Looking at better (automated) meter reading

PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment was invited, two individuals spoke.

Pat Wade
Truly Burton

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 PROCESS: IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

Implementation strategies had been drafted using input from Committee members, the Consultants and outside sources. These were incorporated into a single document to be used to test the consensus of the group on each of the strategies. The strategies were divided into eleven topic areas:

- General Implementation Principles
- Property Rights
- Transportation

- Housing
- Economics
- Smart Growth Incentives
- Water Resources
- Agriculture
- Natural Communities/Open Space
- Infrastructure
- Smart Growth Audit

This consensus process continued from where it left off at the last meeting. The group began with Property Rights PR 4 (see document Exhibit E for wording) and then moved to Water Resources and worked on this for the remainder of the day.

FACILITATOR’S NOTE: ALL COMMENTS WERE INCLUDED AS PART OF THE CONSENSUS RANKING OF EACH SECTION.

PLEASE NOTE: FOR EACH SECTION, THE “MEAN” NUMBER IS GIVEN IN RED ABOVE THE RANKING TABLE. BY CONSENSUS RULES OF THE COMMITTEE, A “3” INDICATES ACCEPTANCE BY A MEMBER. THE “MEAN” NUMBERS ARE BEING DISPLAYED TO SHOW THE COMMITTEE HOW CLOSE THEY ARE TO CONSENSUS ON THE ITEMS RANKED.

PROPERTY RIGHTS

PR4 Mean: 2.59

PR4	5	4	3	2	1
Count	0	3	9	8	2

- 1 Economic impact of national parks to local economy – we need a better understanding so there are no unintended consequences
- 2 How much has gone off tax roll? “County shall cause federal government to pay in taxes lost revenue to make up loss due to federal land ownership”
- 3 Needs to add: “for compensation to land owners for loss of value of land”
- 4 “and dedicate those revenues...” – this language may keep us from getting consensus
- 5 If National Park Service is using funds to make this study happen, doesn’t that accomplish the same thing?
- 6 National Park Service in Miami-Dade County provides millions of dollars to the County from revenues, money doesn’t come from Park Service, but from taxpayers
- 7 Parks are burden on local tax payers – money comes from outside visitors

PR5 Mean: 1.81

PR5	5	4	3	2	1
Count	0	0	0	17	4

- 1 Relegated outside UDB, not inside, not area-wide, only outside UDB
- 2 Sunset provision – concern that time will be extended ad infinitum
- 3 This should be “shall” – need a fair method of valuation that takes in all aspects – not very clear, need to be better articulated
- 4 Fascinating concept and very interesting but need to see possible consequences and avoid unintended consequences
- 5 In PR8, you need to tie urgency of valuation (1 year) with PR8 (3-5 years) – tie together

PR6

Mean: 1.91

PR6	5	4	3	2	1
Count	0	0	4	12	6

- 1 Last phrase not understandable, needs to be more clear - eliminate PR6 - covered in PR7
- 2 If basis of valuation is 1/acre does that become the de facto zoning? - we should value on basis of what you are trying to preserve (new value created)
- 3 PR6 addresses if UDB is frozen, land owners compensated; PR7 addresses lands slated for conservation/protection
- 4 PR6 would be a return to a previous zoning
- 5 If UDB not moved, it should change to 1/1
- 6 Intent in PR6 is not to build 1 house on 1 acre, but to use it for valuation only
- 7 This may not be an acceptable recommendation to BCC since it would be more expensive for County
- 8 Don't want to make land more expensive for County

PR7

Mean: 2.16

PR7	5	4	3	2	1
Count	1	2	4	4	8

- 1 Language unclear "and subject to protection" - is that needed?
- 2 "Protection" intended to add lands subject to acquisition - wording need more clarification - only valuation not zoning
- 3 This is not about building, only about valuation
- 4 Larger parcels bring less per acre
- 5 If I purchased land that was only good for agriculture - full or part time - should I be able to set a higher value upon acquisition in this study
- 6 Won't all this lead to land speculation?
- 7 We need a compromise that fairly compensates while preserving ability to implement the purpose of this study
- 8 Flooding by itself during a rain is not necessarily an indication of wetlands
- 9 Too broad language - leave it to courts if not a willing seller - if willing seller, no problem; if no willing seller, leave it to case law
- 10 If we are trying to get more equity based, these recommendations 6/7 do not do that - don't create an artificial construction - need more specificity re: "lands subject to preservation" - What does it mean?
- 11 Income approach not used to value farm land here

PR8

Mean: 2.19

PR8	5	4	3	2	1
Count	1	1	6	6	7

- 1 Phrase "lands subject..." too broad - time bomb approach not acceptable - find a different way to deal with it
- 2 Don't like time limit - creates cloud on land
- 3 Land owners in limbo for years, valuation reduced because of this - consultant did not address this - some time limits are needed - land owners need to be told if land is needed
- 4 We need to try to come up with a deadline of some sort, can't keep everything in limbo - this and valuation are heart of issue (subcommittee for language?)
- 5 Timeframes are necessary, but need to be tied to funding sources - lead times are very long - maybe a set of priorities with timeframes

*priorities for land? Or timeframe for funding – maybe 2 timeframes: 1) identify;
2) funding

- Maybe we refer to map for priorities/look at language and map

PR9

Mean: 2.48

PR9	5	4	3	2	1
Count	1	3	6	6	5

- Don't understand this – how does this work? – this needs more work

WATER RESOURCES

Mark Lewis, Superintendent of Biscayne National Park, disclosed that in 2002/2005, the Park contracted with The Trust for Public Land to help the Park create a GIS-based mapping tool for the Park's use. He acknowledged that Amy Condon, current member of the Committee, provided local support to TPL's national GIS Development Team which is located in Santa Fe, New Mexico. Mr. Lewis presented maps and an explanation. The maps will be provided and placed on the web.

WR1

Mean: 3.73

WR1	5	4	3	2	1
Count	8	3	9	1	1

- Question of fairness, current homeowners may not be able to afford to hook up/new developments are getting priority
- Be consistent in two paragraphs: only inside the UDB or the entire region?
- New development infrastructure paid for by developer
- Septic tanks need to meet state regulations
- WASD supported by fees
- Why is this in here if all new development must put in water and sewer?

WR2

Mean: 3.05

WR2	5	4	3	2	1
Count	2	3	14	0	3

- Don't refer to plans in place now – we are using this report for BCC and the public. Too confusing for public.
- Not sure if 18 months reasonable and what is water supply plan
- Insert “non-Ag” in front of “more stringent...”
- This is not clear – put column “don't understand”
- If statutes, rules, etc. are referred to – give links, copies, appendices (synopsis as well)

WR3

Mean: 3.23

WR3	5	4	3	2	1
Count	2	5	12	1	3

- Want more than just a “study of feasibility” – all entities east of US1 should be hooked up to water and sewer – this should be a priority
- Science to show that septic tanks are not acceptable

WR4

Mean: 3.45

WR4	5	4	3	2	1
Count	4	6	9	2	1

- Last line replace “interface” with “intrusion”

- 2 Saltwater intrusion is hugely important problem, affect agricultural crops; add "saltwater intrusion has negative impact..." (get language from Bonnie)
- 3 Optimization mean wells used that are further away/rotation of wells
- 4 Bond issue - some municipalities have gotten money to help with infrastructure for sewer and water
- 5 Best guess from WASD to hook all existing homes up to water and sewer - tens of millions of dollars
- 6 Homestead - ~\$15 million/square mile

WR5

Mean: 3.24

WR5	5	4	3	2	1
Count	4	2	11	3	1

- 1 Not clear relationship with watershed study
- 2 Better define "alternative water supplies"
- 3 Ag needs to be careful here - policy should be that agriculture gets alternative water supply first

WR6

Mean: 3.00

WR6	5	4	3	2	1
Count	0	2	17	3	1

- 1 Is "facilities" the appropriate word; would change to "services" for connections
- 2 Take out "smart growth"
- 3 Take out "seek to" and say "County should"
- 4 Replace "facilities" with "connections"

WR7

Mean: 2.57

WR7	5	4	3	2	1
Count	0	1	12	9	1

All comments stay in/examples come out

- 1 A feasibility study should not have numbers associated with it - does not like the word "aggressive"
- 2 How can we "aggressively" apply a study if not completed yet?
- 3 Water reuse program very different from water conservation - need more info before we agree
- 4 % numbers - are they based on anything and are they correct? - WMD has not come up with numbers yet
- 5 What does this mean? What can you re-use water for? Grey water for crops for consumption?
- 6 So many issues - 25% target would not be considered aggressive
- 7 Sewerage treatment facilities can produce water good enough to drink
- 8 City of Homestead has 100% reuse - much more difficult to retrofit

WR8

Mean: 3.39

WR8	5	4	3	2	1
Count	4	5	10	4	0

- 1 Last sentence - implies water conservation above all others - not appropriate - comply with code and that is all
- 2 Last sentence "an important factor" not a "critical" factor - "a con... policies - it is a comment not a statement

- 3 No references to specific programs
 - * need a glossary
 - * generic paragraph – where specific programs are mentioned – language re: amendment
- 4 Some recommendations already exist on CDMP but are not fully implemented – in those instances we should suggest how they could be better implemented
 - ex. Shoreline develop guidelines

WR9

Mean: 3.91

WR9	5	4	3	2	1
Count	7	9	5	2	0

- 1 Last sentence should be listed as a comment

WR10

Mean: 3.17

WR10	5	4	3	2	1
Count	3	4	10	6	0

- 1 Do not understand it – too loose words “buzz” words – be more specific
- 2 Be careful with words that sound like “orders”
- 3 **Need a glossary for the entire document**
- 4 Ag and BMPs – Ag should be exempted from this item since already being done on state level
- 5 Take out “appropriate”
- 6 Cut and fill means digging or dredge & filling; interpretation is all important

WR11

Mean: 2.81

WR11	5	4	3	2	1
Count	2	3	6	9	1

- 1 Add sentence to end of comment: “A low water table will facilitate saltwater intrusion...” (Bonnie)
- 2 Not “minimize” impact – should be minimize “negative” impact – this needs wordsmithing – in some areas you may want to raise water level
- 3 No relationship between comment and policy – show relationship; seepage management is different from water table management
- 4 This item is critical to Ag – some talk about creating wetlands within the study area – comments should be part of paragraph
- 5 Do we really need more wetlands? Don’t we have enough?
- 6 Merge the comment into the policy – and change the language as follows (re: Bob Johnson):

For areas recommended for wetland creation or usage as stormwater detention and/or treatment areas, the County should evaluate and implement a variety of seepage management techniques to minimize flooding impacts to surrounding ~~groundwater elevation levels~~ urban and agricultural areas.

The above language makes the comment unnecessary:

~~Comment: The County should recognize that water table management is the key to reducing flood damage to residential areas and agricultural crops in South Dade. A high water table will reduce drainage capacity and harm many crops, even when there is no flooding on the surface.~~

- 7 Fingerglades - DERM map
don't want these to fill up
- 8 "retention" and "detention" need to be differentiated - be more careful

WR12

Mean: 3.27

WR12	5	4	3	2	1
Count	4	4	8	6	0

- 1 Date baseline is a saving clause for CERP so they should all coincide or not if not a CERP project/take out the CERP project with its date
- 2 This statement is too simple for this complex concept

The Water Resources Sections below have their consensus rankings; however, they did not get discussed at this meeting for lack of time. At the next meeting of the Committee, discussion will begin with WR13.

WR13

WR13	5	4	3	2	1
Count	9	9	2	2	1

WR14

WR14	5	4	3	2	1
Count	6	1	9	5	0

WR15

WR15	5	4	3	2	1
Count	7	6	6	2	1

WR16

WR16	5	4	3	2	1
Count	7	8	2	5	0

WR17

WR17	5	4	3	2	1
Count	1	9	11	2	0

WR18

WR18	5	4	3	2	1
Count	3	5	8	4	0

WR19

WR19	5	4	3	2	1
Count	4	1	8	7	0

WR20

WR20	5	4	3	2	1
Count	0	0	5	11	4

WR21

WR21	5	4	3	2	1
Count	0	5	6	8	2

WR22

WR22	5	4	3	2	1
Count	3	4	8	6	0

WR23

WR23	5	4	3	2	1
Count	4	6	5	4	2

PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment was invited, three individuals spoke.

- Katie Edwards
- Ed Swakon
- James Humble

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.

EVALUATIONS/ADJOURN

Members were reminded to fill in their evaluations and the meeting was adjourned.

MEMBER COMMENTS SUBMITTED SUBSEQUENT TO THE MEETING

None was received.

OBSERVER COMMENT CARDS RECEIVED AT THE MEETING

“In smart growth chapter of the Draft Implementation Strategies, the text is too general, and not specific enough about how the strategies will be implemented. Unless the strategies are mandatory, they are meaningless. Many issues BASF representative and others have raised have been “addressed” but never resolved. This is a source of great frustration and has resulted in industry’s likely inability to support the final study.”

Truly Burton, Builders Association of South Florida

DOCUMENTS DELIVERED BY MEMBERS AT THE MEETING

John Fredrick: Farm Bureau Responses to the “Preliminary Draft, August 23”: **Exhibit F**

Bill Losner: MOU and Scope of Services establishing Study: please see: <http://www.sfrpc.com/institute/watershed.htm>.
