

Watershed Advisory Committee: Resolution Subcommittee

Meeting #2

6/20/2006

Attendees: Bill Losner, Carter McDowell, Truly Burton, John Fredrick, Amy Condon, Jane Spurling, Ivonne Alexander, Charles LaPradd , Katie Edwards, Ed Swakon, Evan Skornick, Cindy Dwyer, Bob Daniels

Recommendations:

- While respecting that the Chairman of the Watershed Advisory Committee (WSAC) must provide interim, monthly and verbal updates to the INLUC Committee, it is not the wishes of this Resolution Subcommittee that the Draft Final Progress Report, as presented, go to the INLUC Committee at its July 11 meeting. Apart from the request to provide comments by Wednesday, June 21st, the overall WSAC did not have an opportunity to offer consensus on the Draft Final Progress Report, nor did the Committee agree that making the October deadline for the County's recommended CDMP amendments was the appropriate goal, if it meant moving forward with the Draft Final Progress Report as is.
- The Subcommittee requests a better understanding of when and how Miami-Dade County submits Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP) amendments, and if a spring cycle could incorporate the recommendations of the Watershed Advisory Committee.
- Prior to 1975, lands were permitted to be developed at 1 unit per acre. Therefore, all lands subject to protection, conservation and preservation programs related to the South Miami Dade Watershed Plan shall be valued based upon a presumed development capability of 1 dwelling unit/acre.
- Lands that are to be subject to protection, conservation, preservation per the South Miami Dade Watershed Plan should only be subject to such protection for ____ years unless they have been acquired or otherwise protected. After that time, the land use restrictions shall sunset and the landowners shall be permitted to develop their property in the normal course.
- Set a specific time frame to establish a program that duly compensates people for their lands, identifies willing sellers and calculates seller property values. If this is not done within the allotted timeframe, then the subject properties become developable.
- Prevent the flooding of agricultural lands and embrace the conclusions of the Degner Study

Minutes

Carter – What should be recorded on private property rights?

Amy – Contingency evaluation –further research needed. County staff should research what has been done in the past.

John F. – Line was established to prevent leapfrog development. Growers agreed to downzone from 1 dwelling unit/acre to 1 dwelling unit/5 acres. County established build-out date at which UDB would be moved; now the study map shows no movement.

John F. – Land owners now left in limbo. Specifically identified “buffer” lands have not been discussed.

Amy – Recommendations from this group could be that those landowners be properly compensated?

Carter – Could we evaluate land at 1 dwelling unit/acre?

John F. – His letter asked for 1 dwelling unit/ 1.25 acres

Ivonne – Go back to 1 dwelling unit/acre

- 1) That’s what the farmer’s originally gave up
 - 2) It’s consistent with current County zoning
- Appraise land fairly based on value of other 1 dwelling unit/acre lands

Amy- Evaluation of land needs to be based on fair value.

Carter – 3 issues affect the value of land:

- 1) Future land use
- 2) Implementation by zoning
- 3) To the extent that lands are going to be designated for conservation or protection, the land should be valued on a presumed value of 1 dwelling unit/acre. (cited the Proof of Willingness consensus statement)

Bill – That puts a cloud on the property; maybe we should recommend 1 dwelling unit per acre for lands outside the UDB to the west.

Carter – Leave that to be decided through future proceedings of the Board of County Commissioners. Smart Growth group recommended that low density be discouraged in the watershed study area.

John F. – National Parks should say what they need. As lands within the UDB develop, an imaginary UDB could be moved in the direction of the trend.

Carter – (Cites #5 Consensus issue) Study to establish contingent values – intent was to put a time limit on valuation

Amy – All of these assume willing buyer/willing seller

John F. – 1) Establish that the right exists
2) Basis for calculating the value

Carter – (cites Consensus Item #5) Establish a specific time frame to establish that people should be duly compensated for their lands, identify willing sellers and calculate seller property values. If this is not done within the allotted timeframe, then the property would become developable

Truly - BASF perspective

- 1) If densities are being reduced in one area they need to be allowed by right in other areas and the infrastructure to support higher densities should be included.
- 2) Cost-benefit analysis is needed on impact of cost of housing

Carter – Lands that are to be subject to protection, conservation, preservation per watershed plan should only be subject to such protection for ____ years unless they have been acquired or otherwise protected.

Amy – How can we protect the economics of agriculture?

Carter – CDMP has restrictions to seasonal agriculture

John F. – Prevent flooding

Amy – Degner Study needs to be readdressed and included in the study.

It was expressed by more than one participant at this meeting that the full Watershed Advisory Committee (WSAC) needs to fully discuss the timeline for completion of the Watershed Plan, and make recommendations as to how the Plan should roll out. Concern was expressed that too much good work had been accomplished by the small discussion groups formed as part of the advisory process and that all of that progress could be diminished or disregarded by forcing a deadline that does not allow for resolution of outstanding issues. It was expressed that angst over the final report could sink the Watershed Advisory Committee's hard work.

Considerable discussion ensued regarding the presentation of the Draft Final Progress Report but the consensus seemed to be that the report, as written, was unsupported by the larger WSAC and that a number of changes, that would be expressed in the WSAC's comments to the consultants, would only scratch the surface of the Committee's concerns because of the tight timeframe given for comments.

It was emphasized that the WSAC needs to receive documents in a reasonable amount of time, especially documents as important as the Draft Final Progress Report, in order to consult member constituencies and return with thoughtful input.