

SOUTH MIAMI DADE WATERSHED STUDY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**June 15, 2006 Meeting #47
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 observations and announcements:

1. We have essentially completed the study part of the Watershed Study and Plan
 - a. We have recently shifted gears to begin working on the plan.
2. In order to ensure that our five years of work on this project leads to success, we might need to modify the procedures that were established to achieve consensus on the building blocks of the plan.
3. From here on in we must focus on helping with production of the plan and implementation strategies, and we have two working meetings scheduled after today to accomplish that:
 - a. July 27th and September 7
4. Our final meeting on September 25 will be largely ceremonial, since the Committee's work will be done
5. The draft plan will be sent out to the Committee in early August, and the Committee's last working meeting on September 7 will give members an opportunity to comment on the draft plan. We need to follow this schedule in order to submit the watershed plan recommendations in time for the October 06 Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP) amendment cycle.

At the conclusion of Mr. Carlton's announcements, members had the following comments:

1. Concern that we have been meeting for a year discussing how we get to the end result and now the real decisions are being compressed into just a few meetings; I think the time frame is disturbing and too compressed.
2. Labeling of documents/3 items mislabeled
 - a. "design guide"
 - b. 2025 map is labeled inaccurately; this committee never agreed to a 2025 preferred scenario map; we saw it for the first time at the last meeting; also label on 2050 map, no consensus on maps
3. Areas inside and outside the boundary lines being indicated that could really cause trouble
4. This committee has not discussed when UDB line should be moved
5. I think that during our map consideration; we talked about where the units would go rather than when any boundary would be moved
6. UDB tied to analysis; many unknowns
7. Should we have a debate on when/whether the UDB should be moved?
8. Roger: INLUC committee is asking for this report and finalization of this study
9. Maybe we should go back to them and tell them we are not done

10. Roger: we have a schedule we must meet; we will have the max input possible; we must meet the comp plan cycle
11. On several occasions when some members were not present, we did discuss the UDB and how it relates to growth, etc. (future units)
12. I find it troubling that we are rushing the process of our deliberations just so we can meet a deadline; the adequate time we need is what would make this a successful plan as we try to get to consensus; communicate this to the folks you (chair) talk to and make them aware we need more time; you (chair) need to represent us
13. Roger: I share your concern about the time frame as well
14. Some of the items that were agreed to in the map are not reflected in the 2025 map
15. These maps should not be published as a "draft preferred scenario" on the 2025 and 2050 maps; give them no name
16. Subrata: this is not an artificial deadline; the deadline was always the CDMP schedule

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

Members present:

Roger Carlton, Chair *
 Ivonne Alexander, Miami Dade AgriCouncil
 Humberto P. Alonso, Jr., 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*
 Dick Frost, Tropical Audubon Society
 Jamie Furgang, Audubon of Florida
 Robert Johnson, Everglades National Park
 Louise King, Redland Citizen's Association
 Mark Lewis, Biscayne National Park
 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
 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
 Julia Trevarthen, South Florida Regional Planning Council*

*Non-voting member

There were 14 Observers.

AGENDA REVIEW/GUIDELINES

Janice Fleischer, Facilitator, reviewed the Agenda for the day (Exhibit A) and the Public Comment Guidelines.

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 B**). Mr. Daniels noted that there was only one week between meetings so not much has changed. He announced that the Ad Hoc Committee was trying to commit to a date for a second meeting. He told the Committee that at today's meeting, they would be receiving a copy of the draft Report that will be presented to the INLUC committee.

PROGRESS REPORT

Michael Davis, Keith and Schnars, gave an overview of the Report to be delivered to the Board of County Commissioner's Infrastructure and Land Use Committee (INLUC) by Committee Chair, Roger Carlton. www.southmiamidadewatershed.com

Mr. Davis commented that the Report captures all the good work done by this Committee in the past. The data is described in a "user friendly" manner; the document is approximately 40 pages long. The purpose of the Report is to give the INLUC committee a sense of where this Committee is going. This is only a draft document and the last chapter talks about a draft watershed plan.

He mentioned the following errors in the Report:

Page 23 has a mislabeled table: yellow should be the "best"; orange should be the "worst"

Page 20: maps labeled "scenario assessment maps" do not reflect any recommended land use plan

This is the document that will go to the INLUC committee; Mr. Davis asked for suggestions on how to improve it for the final report.

Mr. Carlton added that this is a summary of five years of work; it is not a final document. We will tell the INLUC that this Committee will be meeting over the summer to fine tune more. We should also be getting reactions from the INLUC Committee; anyone who wants to come should do so.

The Committee was encouraged to read this document and send comments, questions, etc. to Bob Daniels at bobd@sfrpc.com.

Member comments:

1. Are our comments only substantive or can we suggest how to present the document?
 - a. **Both; the quality of this document is lower than final will be**
2. Implementation strategies are still being worked on; you need to make sure that the INLUC committee knows we are not done with the implementation strategies
3. Does the commission itself understand the process and context; I would hope they know how hard we have worked and take our recommendations seriously
4. Page 35: Homestead's suggestions are not reflected on the map. Suggestions re: moving UDB in industrial area near the air force base
 - a. **To be shown as was previously discussed and agreed upon by the Committee**
5. Beginning on approx. Page 23, (aside: map labeling is better here); in green are conclusions based on the analysis being done and we have not seen that yet; we had

- questions about results and their accuracy; it concerns me that this is a public document and those questions should be answered first before it appears in this document
6. We keep raising issues and concerns, but the process keeps rolling along without a reflection of our concerns
 - a. Clarifications were included, numbers did not change
 - b. Take it home and read it; talk to your constituency and send comments to Bob
 7. Page 27, agriculture land in green reflects only a small part of overall agricultural land and doesn't include agricultural lands lying outside the study area
 - a. Please let us know if this is correct; we should change this as a note or clarification
 8. National Parks: did (re: commercial center in homestead area) (page 20) park make any comments on commercial development coming close to the Bay?
 - a. Park is a little concerned with this; personally less concerned about this than other portions of the map that are closer to the shore line
 9. When you meet with the Air Force base you should also meet with Park (Biscayne National Park)
 10. Page 35 regarding area that Homestead is planning as commercial ; we discussed the fact the Homestead commercial area not continue to grow and expand to a size that could negatively affect the Park
 11. We have expressed our concern several times about stuff going to the County even if marked "draft" ; once a document is published it gets relied upon; whether we like it or not that can happen; just putting the word "draft" on it is dangerous
 12. Back inside cover: thanks many folks; maybe thanking the committee should be more prominent
 - a. It was noted that the Committee was thanked early on in the document, not at the end
 13. Page 25 and 29:
 - a. Page 25: much of the land shown as wetlands is actually farmed; they are tree farms and not depicted as farms; only depicted as wetlands; if there are different colors they are not prominent enough; you need a base map for agriculture
 - i. Consultant said it could be put in
 - b. Page 29: on bottom economic base: only 0.9% of employment is shown; agriculture community wants Dr. Degner's study; it is not reflected; why isn't this showing? Many more farm workers than is showing in this chart
 - i. Some employment may be showing under "commercial" instead of "ag"; we need to follow up and correct if necessary
 14. Roger: if this document needs an addendum or errata sheet we will do that;
 - a. Comments need to be in by Wednesday, June 21
 15. Page 35: design guide maps, fear that including Urban Expansion Area (UEA) boundaries could be seen as this Advisory Committee endorsing that
 16. Page 20: yellow increases greatly in 2050, if we increase densities out west in 2050 we are encouraging urban sprawl; this should not be encouraged and this should be changed
 - a. Find areas around Tamiami corridor
 - b. Town and Country Mall is already being redesigned and will stimulate more growth and we are not planning for that
 17. These are assessment maps only; not recommendations (Consultant and Roger)
 18. You should encourage more medium densities along Kendall drive.
 19. If we reach consensus today on any matters will they be reflected in this document?
 - a. Any substantive changes will be incorporated into this document
 20. The northern portion of the UEA located west of Krome Avenue was eliminated, but the lines do not show that

21. Final map should show adjustments to UEA; label UEA on maps will be revised to show the word "existing" so there is no confusion
22. Paula Church, M-D P & Z: Committee needs to understand that the UEA line is now the 2025 line; things have changed since the Committee began its work
23. The final report needs to include every baseline map to show existing conditions; every existing condition needs to show

COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT MASTER PLAN (CDMP) AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES PRESENTATION

Paula Church, Miami-Dade Planning & Zoning, delivered this presentation. (Exhibit C)

Ms. Church explained that the work of the Committee will lead to revisions of the CDMP but not immediately, due to the time required for the amendment process. The document that was handed out (Exhibit C) shows the CDMP policies by subject, and can be referenced to see what existing policies cover some of the implementation strategies that this Committee began to outline at the last meeting.

Ms. Church encouraged the Committee to look at these policies and review what needs changing, revising, etc. She asked them to think outside the box.

Member comments;

1. Summary of Final Actions- does it incorporate the private occupations that were submitted as part of the April 2005 amendment cycle?
2. Subrata Basu: This document includes land use changes from 1997 to date and the EAR based amendments from October 2004
3. Is County considering changing the zoning to help effectuate the policies that the Committee and others have suggested? Is the Department prepared to not only change maps but current policies as well?
 - a. Yes, for example, as Charrettes are done County begins to reconsider existing zoning and what changes are needed

GROWTH MANAGEMENT LAW PRESENTATION

Mr. Daniels gave a brief update on the Growth Management laws. (Exhibits D1 and D2).

Following his presentation, Mr. Daniels was asked the following question:

1. With regard to Developments of Regional Impact (DRIs), what is meant by "substantial deviation"?
 - a. The DRI process allows for changes in market, local development, if you want to change the DRI, you must request (Notification of Proposed Change) if it is a "substantial deviation" from original DRI than you must go back to original process; the new legislation has raised the threshold for the trigger of the "substantial deviation"

The Committee took a short break.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Upon reconvening, public comment was invited, one individual spoke.

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.

SMALL GROUP INSTRUCTIONS RE: IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES AND POLICIES

The Facilitator introduced the next exercise. The Committee would deliberate in three small groups as they had at the last meeting. The purpose of the exercise was for each small group to refine the policies and implementation strategies related to the six topic areas they worked on last time and propose specific statements to the full group for approval by consensus upon our reconvening. Members were asked to stay in the same groups they were in at the June 8 meeting. The Facilitator instructed each small group to keep in mind that these recommendations must first be acceptable to all members of the small group with the intention that they would also be acceptable to the full Committee.

The Committee worked in small groups for the remainder of the morning and through lunch.
Transportation and Smart Growth;
Private Property Rights and Economics;
Water Resources and Open Space

PUBLIC COMMENT

Upon reconvening, public comment was invited, no one spoke.

SMALL GROUP REPORTS AND DISCUSSION

Each group reported on the work they had done and the full Committee discussed the recommendations and findings and, where possible, ranked items for consensus. What follows are the results of the group work and discussion by the Committee.

TRANSPORTATION

1. The success of the plan will be dependent upon sufficient, timely funding and the ability to create an expanded transit network sooner than is currently planned.
 - a. The County must expand the existing dedicated transportation funding source and implement policies from existing CDMP (MT-3a)

5	4	3	2	1
18	0	2	0	0

Adopted by consensus

With regard to No.1 above, keep this language for future consideration:

From some or all of the following sources:

- i. Full penny transportation sales tax (through voting process)

- ii. Special transportation benefit districts (ex: Kendall)
- iii. Special assessment or tax increment districts
- iv. Gas taxes should be increased and possibly based on percentage of cost
- v. Impact fees should be prioritized to transit not roadways
- vi. Gas guzzler tax
- vii. Other increases in registration or other fees

2. Expedite the planning and development of premium transit (i.e. dedicated right of way, enhanced bus, rail) along all of the transit corridors in Zone B (US1, Kendall Drive, 137th Avenue, Turnpike) in order to encourage the intensification of development along those corridors. Do not wait for development.

5	4	3	2	1
18	0	0	1	0

Further discussion needed to hear concerns of the #2.

Including new underlined language:

Expedite the planning and development of premium transit (i.e. dedicated right of way, enhanced bus, rail) along all of the transit corridors in Zone B (US1, Kendall Drive, 137th Avenue north of Biscayne Drive, Turnpike, including Coral Reef Drive) in order to encourage the intensification of development along those corridors. Do not wait for development.

5	4	3	2	1
15	1	3	0	1

This item went to a vote.

Vote: to accept language as above: Yes: 14 No: 1 **passed**

The following policies were drafted by this small group but did not come up during the meeting for discussion:

3. Explore privatization as a means to expedite the production of transit service. Examine the use of private operators.
4. All transportation corridors including but not limited to the Turnpike, SR826, SR874, should be evaluated for joint use by transit or park and ride.
5. Create disincentives to multiple cars.
6. Encourage people to use transit
 - a. Make it more user friendly
 - b. Circulate buses
 - c. Incentives for eliminating cars
 - d. Pedestrian friendly environment
 - i. Shelters
 - ii. Schedules
 - iii. Park and ride facilities at Tamiami, Zoo, Miami Dade College and Homestead Kendall and Homestead campuses and other areas

- iv. Car pool facilities
 - v. Funding incentives
 - vi. Fees to drivers that car pool
7. Right of way acquisition and protection: Within 2 years, undertake a County wide reevaluation of zoned ROWs to ensure timely acquisition and reservation of ROW.
 - a. Dedications happen at time of development
 - b. Reservations at time of development
 - c. Krome Avenue to protect this ROW, maybe should be widened now as evacuation route
 - d. Kendall
 - e. US1
 - f. 137th
 - g. Turnpike
 - h. 157th Ave widening from 184 St. to 152 Street
 8. Widening of roads does not need to lead to increased densities along those ROW; i.e. land use change does not have to be done along widening of roads
 9. Buy or reserve CSX route ROW now; don't miss this opportunity
 10. Transportation system must be looked at for evacuation

SMART GROWTH

The following policies were drafted by the small group but did not come up during the meeting for discussion:

1. Future development should be concentrated along major transportation/transit corridors to relieve pressure on the western and eastern areas
2. Transit improvements must be emphasized and expedited; we cannot rely on or build enough roads to support the desired growth pattern
3. County must establish minimum densities on these corridors
4. Require mixed use developments along transit corridors
5. Examine reduced parking requirements or maximum parking allowances
6. Convince community to get out of their car and use the transit system

WATER RESOURCES AND OPEN LANDS

1. Miami Dade County, guided by appropriate analysis, must protect the values relating to Biscayne National Park in Land Use Element 3E by protecting the agricultural and undeveloped lands across and under which fresh water flows toward and into Biscayne Bay and Biscayne National Park. The County must protect current agricultural lands, and restore and enhance open lands and wetlands for the benefit of Biscayne Bay and Biscayne National Park. (Excluding the current-2006-corporate city limits of the City of Homestead)*
 - a. Geographic areas to be protected are:

- i. The area east of 107th avenue and south of 248th Street.
- ii. The area west of 107th avenue to 132nd Avenue and south of 296th Street.
- iii. The area west of 132nd Avenue and south of SW 352 Street
- iv. Coastal wetlands north of 248th Street up to C-100 Canal (173rd Street)

*Intent is to make sure Homestead is not limited in its development of its current boundaries.

Not enough agreement on the above to try to go to consensus

The following policies were drafted by the small group but did not come up during the meeting for discussion:

- 2. To the extent possible, the areas designated for protection in item #1, must be used to improve the Quality, Quantity, Timing and Distribution of fresh water flows into Biscayne Bay
- 3. Miami Dade County should coordinate with Everglades Restoration activities to keep flood protection levels of service from being degraded using a baseline date of December 11, 2000 as defined in WRDA 2000.

I am missing the remainder of the water resource notes, have requested from the group, will add when received

PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS

- 1. All land protection, conservation and preservation programs related to the South Miami Dade Watershed Plan (acquisition, easements, etc.) shall require written proof of a landowner's willingness to participate.

5	4	3	2	1
15	3	0	0	0

Adopted by consensus

- 2. The County shall create an outreach program and a funding source to serve as local/state/federal match of incentives for private landowners to engage in restoration/preservation activities on their lands.

5	4	3	2	1
18	1	0	0	0

Adopted by consensus

- 3. Prior to participation in a protection, conservation or preservation program, properties identified through the South Miami Dade Watershed Plan for protection (resources, historical, etc.) shall not be re-designated to a more restrictive land use category without the owners consent.

5	4	3	2	1
19	0	1	0	0

Adopted by consensus

The following policies were drafted by the small group but did not come up during the meeting for discussion:

4. The County shall explore with the Federal Government a Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT) program so as to recapture a percentage of lost ad valorem tax revenues due to Federal ownership of lands, and dedicate those revenues to implementation of the Watershed Plan's recommendations.
5. The County shall initiate a study to be completed within the next three years to identify certain land uses (conservation, historic, agricultural) and their corresponding [contingent values*]. *contingent values=the valuation of a property's attributes other than its developability, i.e. recharge areas, wetlands, historic buildings.
6. Identify the local funding match gaps to attract state and federal funds for implementation of the Watershed Plan's recommendations.

ECONOMICS

1. The County and allied business organizations shall develop a South Miami Dade industry recruitment program, such as biotechnology [Scripps], hire a coordinator to facilitate the program and develop educational partnerships with local universities and high schools to create a skilled workforce.
 - a. Beacon Council
 - b. Chamber South
 - c. Homestead Chamber
2. The County should redistribute 50% of its Tourist Development Tax collected within the Watershed Study Area to allow more local control of marketing efforts for specifically promoting this unique area and its attractions. Tropical Everglades Visitors Association was originally established for this purpose, and could serve as the receiver organization.
3. The Agricultural Practices Board shall provide a comprehensive review of the County Code and make comprehensive, specific recommendations for code changes to assist the economic viability of agriculture.
4. Allow the processing and sale of locally produced agriculture products in the agricultural areas.
5. Change current zoning regulations in the to-be-designated areas to allow the operation of small area and breakfast accommodations.
6. Establish buffers for only compatible development around existing tourist attractions to minimize/discourage encroaching incompatible development that would interfere with future operations. (i.e. housing adjacent to Homestead Race Track).
7. The County should accelerate funding for and implementation of the Biscayne Everglades Greenway.
8. The County and Tourist community shall work together to create the "Redland Tropical Trail", and establish a directional signage system highlighting participating attractions.
9. The Greater Miami Visitors and Convention Bureau should be directed to promote the Watershed Area as a destination for visiting Everglades National Park and Biscayne National Park.

10. A bona fide representative from the South Miami-Dade Watershed Area should be appointed to the County's Tourist Development Council. This person should meet the qualifications as outlined in FS 125.0104(4)(e) and should be a member of the Tourism Industry.

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

"[My] position with NOAA is to enhance the communication links between researchers at NOAA and the University of Florida, and the South Florida Ecosystem Restoration. Thank you!"
Pamela Fletcher, Florida Sea Grant/NOAA
Pamela.fletcher@noaa.gov
305-361-4553

"The Consultants, Project Managers, etc. need to ensure that all handouts to the Committee are also made available to the public. This is a perpetual problem and it is extremely disrespectful to the public!"
