

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

September 22, 2005  
9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

**Report of Proceedings**

**WELCOME/CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The meeting was held at the South Dade Government Center in Cutler Ridge, Florida.

Roger Carlton, Chair, welcomed everyone and thanked member, William Losner, for continuing to sponsor breakfast.

Mr. Carlton made the following comments and announcements:

- ✓ New members, Mark Lewis and Armando Perez have been approved by the Infrastructure and Land Use Committee; their applications will now go before the County Commission for final approval.
- ✓ The Committee has a new prospective member, Jamie Furgang, who will replace former member April Gromnicki of National Audubon. Ms. Gromnicki has taken a new position and has moved to Washington, D.C.
- ✓ Mr. Carlton acknowledged that the September 1, 2005 meeting was a difficult one. The combination of highly technical subject matter, the after effects of Hurricane Katrina and his having to leave the meeting early all contributed to a meeting at which valuable comments, observations and suggestions were made, but little consensus was accomplished.

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

Members present:

Roger Carlton, Chair  
Ivonne Alexander, Miami-Dade AgriCouncil  
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  
Jeffrey Flanagan, Chamber South  
John Fredrick, Dade County Farm Bureau  
Jamie Furgang, National Audubon Society (prospective member)  
Robert Johnson, Everglades National Park  
Louise King, Redland Citizens' Association  
William Losner, Greater Homestead/Florida City Chamber of Commerce  
Bennie Lovett, City of 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 (prospective member)

Bonnie Roddenberry, Sunny South Acres Homeowner's Association  
Jorge Rodriguez, Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Authority  
Jane Spurling, Florida Nurserymen and Grower's Association  
Charles Thibos, Tropical Everglades Visitor Association  
Julia Trevarthen, South Florida Regional Planning Council

There were 17 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](http://www.sfrpc.com/institute/watershed.htm).

## **PROJECT MANAGER'S REPORT**

John Hulsey, Project Manager delivered his Project Manager's Report. (Exhibit B) At the conclusion of his report, Mr. Hulsey announced that he will be leaving south Florida and moving to Massachusetts. He expressed his pleasure at having had the opportunity to work with the Committee and encouraged everyone to continue their collaborative and positive work. He advised Committee members not to allow fear to restrict or inhibit their ability to make valuable recommendations and finalize this important Study.

This will be Mr. Hulsey's last meeting with the Committee.

Comment by member: There is a tradeoff in Monroe County: potable water vs. affordable housing

## **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](mailto:janice@flashresolutions.com)) within the first week following the meeting.

## **CONSENSUS PROCESS: SUB-TASK 3.1 ASSESSMENT OF LAND USE AND ECONOMICS**

Committee Procedure: the Committee is asked to accept the selected section by consensus (See Consensus Rules on the Institute website: [www.sfrpc.com/institute/watershed.htm](http://www.sfrpc.com/institute/watershed.htm)). If consensus is not reached in the first ranking, discussion follows to attempt to get all concerns addressed and resolved. A second ranking is then taken. If consensus is still not reached, the Committee goes to vote according to Committee procedures. Once tasks are accepted, the Committee does not go back again to review those tasks.

Eric Silva, Keith and Schnars, delivered a presentation on Sub-Task 3.1 to answer those issues raised at the last meeting (Exhibit C):

1. There will be an opportunity to look at expanding the economic definition and parameters in the preferred scenario

2. Parameters need to be more predictive-the current predictive value is less than we hoped
3. This study will be used for other purposes- we must be cognizant of that
4. Can't this group make recommendations to include Biscayne National Park in the preferred scenario?
5. We want regional/local parks to be in our area; we don't want to reduce the amount of parks by using national parks as part of the park requirement
6. Since 1/2 or more of agricultural land is outside of the study area; will the same standards be used on ag lands outside the study area?
  - a. No way to know that
  - b. Can we have a statement in our report that makes it clear that the recommendations for land inside the study area is not necessarily a statement for land outside the study area
7. Can we have a statement that the 1 unit in 10 acres is not used as a regulatory standard but was used in the analysis of community character; want NO misconception in the future about what exists today and what could be used in the future
  - a. The current base line in the ag area is 1 unit in 5 acres
  - b. **Language accepted drafted by John Frederick:**
    - i. "Agricultural land use designation in CDMP permits 1 dwelling unit per 5 acres, the 1 in 10 rural description used in the land inventory of the study is an arbitrary attribute and is not to be used or construed to suggest the down zoning of land in the rural areas (ag land and open space) or deviate from the CDMP 2003 baseline for open space or agricultural designation."
8. People should read the statement that the 1 unit in 5 acres is the current standard first, before the language regarding the 1 in 10.
9. Say that this is an arbitrary classification.
10. You need more recreational space as you create more multi-family – this should come up under the preferred scenario
11. Costs of construction, which are already high, are about to get even higher in wake of Hurricanes Katrina & Rita
12. Parks need to be within walking distance as we design building of multi-family
13. **The entire length of Florida's Turnpike will be considered as a transit corridor in the preferred scenario.**
14. If UDB moved to Krome, then Krome MUST become a major transit corridor – including public transportation
15. Need to acknowledge fact that Krome is already a transit corridor – it is currently used by hurricane evacuation in Keys
16. There is justification for widening Krome Avenue
  - a. **The Florida Department of Transportation is currently conducting a Project Development and Environmental Study (PD & E) for Krome Avenue south (from SW 296<sup>th</sup> Street to SW 136<sup>th</sup> Street). The PD & E Study was initiated in 2003 and is expected to be completed in 2007.**

3.1 Acceptance - 1 <sup>st</sup> Ranking					
	5	4	3	2	1
	2	7	11	4	0

All changes indicated above will be codified.

Comments of members who ranked "2"'s on 1<sup>st</sup> ranking of 3.1:

1. We need language that we intend to look at economic development values addressing economic provisions
2. We want to be sure when we see changes they are in document itself; we need to see the final document in order to agree to approve this issue
  - o **Yes, you will see the final document, give consultant chance to make changes**

3. The economy of the study area is not a mirror of county as a whole
  - o Language from Carter adopted:
    - “After reviewing the results of the analysis of the economic parameters, the Committee finds that they are not helpful in evaluating the various scenarios. The Committee intends to further evaluate the economic development impacts during the review of the preferred scenario as that scenario is produced and evaluated.”
4. An errata sheet will be created and sent out to members to insure comfort level of members
5. Still want no reference to 1unit in 10 acres

3.1 Acceptance - 2 <sup>nd</sup> Ranking					
Ranking	5	4	3	2	1
	1	9	15	0	0

3.1 Accepted by consensus with changes to be made as indicated in red in notes above.

### CONSENSUS PROCESS: SUB-TASK 3.2: ASSESSMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE FACILITIES

The Consultants delivered a presentation on Sub Task 3.2 (Exhibit C)

The 3.2 Sub-Task Presentation by Consultants produced the following comments and suggestions:

1. School busing was not included in analysis – some statement needs to reflect this – that school busing was not included
2. The disclaimer that this assumes there is sufficient water available is not necessarily true and the things that impact that (water to Keys, alternative supplies) and where there is no infrastructure for folks on wells, there is impact (see # 5 below)
3. Is desalination being considered?
4. Is there enough water for today?
  - a. Water department is now looking into this; reclamation of wastewater and alternative aquifers
  - b. Really depends on what folks are willing to pay
  - c. “Custom” (i.e. desalinated, bottled, etc. ) water will be much more expensive – there is enough water, it is just the treatment of it
5. In the study we need to acknowledge costs of folks on wells hooking up to infrastructure
  - b. Language from Jamie Furgang adopted:
    - i. “Availability of water for the projected demand is not calculated into this analysis. The methods to meet further demands will be addressed in the consumptive use permitting process, lower east coast water supply plan and the implementation of SB 444.
6. No projection that ag will be paying for the right to pump water in the future
7. During the drought, ag was more impacted than residential guidelines; ag consumptive use permits are currently very costly- ag doesn’t get water as it is needed without great cost
8. Recommendations about ag and water should be in the preferred scenario

3.2 Acceptance - 1 <sup>st</sup> Ranking					
Ranking	5	4	3	2	1
	2	9	12	2	0

Folks who ranked “2”s on 1<sup>st</sup> ranking of 3.2:

1. The transportation analysis was based on moving vehicles not moving people; we need to move people; cost differential is not great but increase in congestion is great between scenarios
2. Schools: cost difference between scenarios shows addition to existing schools rather than adding schools
3. Footnote: Those existing entities that rely on Biscayne Aquifer for water supply, the costs of infrastructure are not included.
  - a. Language from Bonnie Roddenberry adopted:
    - i. "The cost to provide potable water to residential and other users of potable water who do not currently (2005) have access to public water supplies are not included in the study"

3.2 Acceptance - 2nd Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
2	7	15	0	0

Sub-task 3.2 adopted by consensus with changes as indicated in above notes.

### CONSENSUS PROCESS: SUB-TASK 3.3: ASSESSMENT OF NATURAL COMMUNITIES

The Consultants delivered a presentation on Sub Task 3.2 (Exhibit C)

Sub-Task 3.3 member comments:

1. Discussion regarding wetlands mitigation and use as a constraint
2. Why are Remnant Natural Forests (RNF) shown as a loss - it is my understanding that you can't build on them
3. RNF includes more than just forest land, it also includes pine rockland and hammocks
4. Is there any assessment of land needed to provide buffers around RNF?
5. In preferred scenario we could recommend to retain RNFs and have the county purchase the land

3.3 Acceptance - 1st Ranking					
Ranking	5	4	3	2	1
	1	11	12	0	0

Sub-task 3.3 accepted by consensus.

### PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS PRESENTATION

Michael Davis, Keith and Schnars, delivered a presentation on private property rights. (Exhibit C)

Comments by members following the presentation:

1. Bert Harris Act is prospective
2. The Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP) defines uses - if CDMP is being changed, citizens can challenge changes
3. Want a presentation on the ways and means property rights will be protected (will come up in preferred scenario)
4. There are several means of protecting private property rights (tools); this committee can make recommendations on these tools in preferred scenario
5. Ultimately, we will need to see CDMP maps that show specifically what we are changing
6. Need a presentation on tool box to be used with regard to private property rights

7. At some point the need for higher density along transit corridors may outweigh the committee's desires to keep densities lower and buildings at lower heights

## MEMBER FORUM

This group needs to think about how the preferred scenario and recommendations could be communicated and how the public is involved, etc.

## ADJOURN

The meeting was then adjourned.

## MEMBER COMMENT CARDS

*"Observer Comment Cards: Continually we receive "anonymous" comments that are published; in my opinion this is wrong; name, signature should be required for publication; permitting "anonymous" could result in opinions that may be detrimental to Committee progress. It's a coward or a shallow person who is afraid to "stand" for his or her opinion."*

*Gerald Case*

*Comment submitted on behalf of Homestead with the approval of Mike Shehadeh:*

*"The following comments are submitted based on review of project documents addressing the test scenarios and land use/economic impacts considered by the Watershed Advisory Committee on 9-6-05.*

- 1. The test scenario and land use assessment maps should label and show the boundaries of the cities in the Study Area and the proposed new urban communities. These urban centers are critical to the future of the Study Area because they are a primary organizing community feature of this area and central to the concept of Smart Growth for South Miami-Dade County.*
- 2. A scenario variation should be prepared permitting more mixed use and density in expanded ½ and 1 mile radius areas around the existing and new urban centers. The project model now uses a ¼ mile radius which corresponds to the recommended maximum walk distance to transit access points, but is too limiting.*
- 3. The existing 2005/2015 UDB lines constrain the future growth of existing cities, such as Homestead, as well as, proposed urban center Naranja/Princeton, to the west and north. The UDB lines were drawn many years ago and need serious review based on current demographics and population growth trends. The UDB expansion areas in Test Scenarios 1 and 2 should include new areas around Homestead and Naranja/Princeton to make more balanced and complete urban centers. The UDB expansion areas used in the land use and economic model so far don't address these constraints on existing and proposed urban areas. These UDB options should also be considered in the County's planned UDB study.*
- 4. The Homestead General Aviation Airport has not been addressed in this Study. It is located outside of the project boundary, but it should still be included as a significant transportation facility. In fact, all airports should be shown on project maps and their future growth impacts assessed.*
- 5. Homestead Motor Speedway does not appear to be mentioned in the reports reviewed or shown on maps. It is a major tourist/recreation facility and a major component of existing future economic growth and area marketing.*
- 6. The role of Homestead Air Force Base and its redevelopment must be addressed. Analysis of this critical facility was not found in the reports reviewed and the Airbase is not shown on project maps.*
- 7. In the Assessment of Land Use and Economics Report, the LU-3 Proximity of Housing/Jobs to Transit parameter is too narrow and given too much weight. According to the MPO model, transit trips*

represent about 2.5% of all vehicle trips in Miami-Dade County and probably less in the Study Area given the relatively sparse transit system and low/moderate density development. Since relatively modest transit improvements are proposed for the study area thru 2050, it appears transit will remain relatively insignificant in the overall scheme of travel patterns. This parameter should be expanded to include proximity to primary transportation facilities which would encompass expressways, major highways (including some section line roads) and bikeways. Smart Growth doesn't prohibit consideration of other important transportation facilities, in addition to transit.

8. It is unclear why the provision of future parks is considered as a variable at all in scenario evaluation. It is not a variable. Park lands and facilities can be provided at any LOS under any scenario if planned properly and funded. By having this as a parameter in scenario evaluation, it lessens the importance of other more critical parameters. We probably can all agree that the Study Area should have an abundance of parks.

9. Two (2) new parameters should be added to the Land Use and Economic Assessment Report: 1.) Number of jobs created; and 2.) Growth in property values. These are more important to the economic health of growing communities than the 3 economic parameters now included in the report.

10. There is a real concern that this Study/Plan is being prepared in a vacuum. The input/output assumptions at the Study Area boundary do not appear to have been expressed in the reports. What assumptions have been made about growth in the Keys? There are key areas and facilities, such as MIA and Homestead Airbase which are integrally connected to Study Area, and whose future growth does not appear to have been considered.

11. What is the impact of the Test Scenarios on the "... economic and community values of Biscayne National Park?" This is 1 of 4 overall project objectives and an assessment of it could not be found in the subject reports.

12. What is the impact of the Test Scenarios on the tourist economy of the region? This is part of the project objectives and an assessment of it was not evident in the project reports reviewed.

13. Is technology considered in the project's future vision? The City of Homestead has an underground fiber optic ring and a Technology Mixed Use land use category in place in the City to promote high technology development. Has this future trend been considered in other urban centers specified in the project? How does this variable impact future growth trends and future public investment?

14. The extensive amount of lands in the Study Area zoned for 1 unit per 5 acres (AU or GU) does not appear to have been accurately represented in the project models. The reports state that the lowest land use / zoning category into which project lands are grouped for modeling purposes is 1 unit per 1 acre. This is 400% higher than the actual zoning of 1 unit per 5 acres which applies to a significant portion of the Study Area. What impact does this apparent discrepancy have on the model results?

15. The models assume densities as high as 60 units per acre in downtown Homestead and other urban centers. This is 200% higher than currently permitted anywhere in the City of Homestead. What analysis has been done to support the feasibility of these very high density areas?

*-written by Henry Iler, Consultant"*

## **OBSERVER COMMENT CARDS**

*From Ed Swakon:*

1.) *Many thanks to John Hulsey. John has been a great agency person to work with and his departure is a loss to the region. Best of luck in all future endeavourer.*

- 2.) *Handout material must be made available at the time of discussion for members of the public.*
- 3.) *The process is moving entirely too fast and with reckless abandon. As an example:*
  - a. *Section 3.1 was distributed about 6 weeks ago*
  - b. *An attempt was made at consensus adoption Sept 1 but was not possible. The group generated a number of concerns*
  - c. *The consultants come back at the Sept 22 with a PowerPoint presentation and rewrite of the section (passed out only at the meeting and not available to the public observers)*
  - d. *The consultant also provide detail housing construction cost document (it is unclear where in the section this information is to be inserted. The page numbers indicates p21-24)*
    - i. *There is NO opportunity for members of the committee to get back to their representative groups on either document*
  - e. *During the Discussion many (6-10) additional wording clarifications and/or footnotes are drafted and written to the easel.*
  - f. *The group is pressured to vote now- Without seeing the final wording.*
    - i. *An addendum sheet is to be distributed to Members with a "time to respond"*
    - ii. *The Organizational committee will decide what to do with the comments.*
- 4.) *How can statements about the air quality parameters be made indicating "no violation of Standard" when the most important item that needs to come from this entire Watershed process is "will various development patterns have any impact on Biscayne Nation Park" and the consultants can't (because the modeling tools being used are not capable) make any statements about whether water quality will meet standards.*
  - a. *The suggestion made at previous meetings that any increase in a WQ parameter is presumed to be bad because the ultimate discharge is and Outstanding Florida Water (OFW) is absolutely incorrect. Project throughout the watershed study area are required to meet the water quality design criteria of the SFWMD. In all but a very few cases the OFW criteria would NOT apply.*
  - b. *There is also considerable concern about the WQ methodology (xp-SWMM). This model is a depositional model that assumes constant pollutant loading over time. It is based on WQ data collected from older developments. Today's new projects are required to do much more to address WQ prior to any discharge.*
  - c. *Many areas where new development has occurred or may occur in the future are in areas where NO discharge from the development is allowed. No discharge –NO WQ impact.*
  - d. *The assumptions applied to new expansions need to be completely documented and consistent with today's design standards to assume new development is inappropriately assigned a WQ loading.*
- 5.) *It is not clear to me how existing environmental permitting wetland mitigation requirements are accounted for in the 3.3 section. If a project has wetland that project is required to mitigate for that loss.*
- 6.) *Given the broader definitions used by all regulatory agencies for wetland delineation, our experience tells us the FLUC codes will greatly underestimate wetland loss.*
- 7.) *Private property rights ARE affected by planning. To suggest or think it doesn't just shows how far out of touch the consultants are. This entire section needs lots of work. This work, in my opinion is NOT finding justification for the government to take property rights away without JUST compensation thru some "toolbox" of regulations.*

*Finally two non technical comments:*

- 1.) *Roger's comments critical of any organization's newsletter or groups non-supportive characterization of the Watershed process was inappropriate and an attempt at intimidation. Not everyone believes in the goals or motives of the process at this point. I certainly don't. The public's ability to be heard is non-existent, the pace at which the process is being pushed is non-building and support, the fact that you can't "go back" and revise anything are only some of the concerns that exist. Last time I checked people had a first amendment right and membership on the committee didn't require a pledge of allegiance.*
- 2.) *The suggestion was made that the group needs a public relation firm or lobbyist to "push" the plan should be dismissed now. This group is not a PAC. You all serve at the will of County Commission. "*



\*\*\*\*

*Comments made by Truly Burton, on behalf of the Builders Association of South Florida at South Miami Dade Watershed Meeting held on Thursday, September 22, 2005.*

1. *First, I want to correct something the consultant said. Mr. Davis indicated that the preparation of these scenarios have no legal impact on land use. I respectfully submit to you all that this is not true. Planning processes have a direct impact on property rights, even if no ordinance is ever adopted. There is something called “zoning in progress”, which officially alerts land owners that they better get all approvals quickly, because the local government is in the process of changing either land use or zoning categories which will directly affect the value of their property. The next level in this “non- legal effect” is insipient agency policy. Regulators sense a shift in their elected officials’ desires, and favorably recommend only those plans or projects which meet those criteria, even though the requirements are not adopted by code or are perhaps not even in a draft document. Finally, as discussion of land development regulations occur, these conversations have a similar effect on the market. While there is no “legal effect” there surely is a market effect that is very real. Do not be deceived by the words “legal effect”.*
2. *Second, I have a concern with how quickly this portion of the consensus process has occurred. For the past 3 years, the consulting team has been gathering data. Now, given the deadline is only a few months away, suddenly, amendments are being written on the fly, errata sheets abound and members are being asked to vote immediately – on consensus basis – about recommendations that will affect the lives of over one half a million people This wrong and should stop.. Instead, this is the time to slow down to make sure everyone understands the multiple effects of these subtasks on this area.*
3. *Further, this “process” is antithetical to the procedures of the committee, which thus far have been relatively fair: each representative of a constituent group has been given a month to review the material with their group, obtain comments and present them at the next month’s meeting. Given how quickly some of these amendments have been presented, this is clearly not happening. Public involvement looks better on paper than in reality at this stage of the study.*
4. *Third, one of the proposed scenarios could include density increases or bonuses. The County has an adopted severable use rights ordinance (SURS) in place for at least 20 years. Thus far, the program has been unsuccessful, due almost exclusively to NIMBYism. Those landowners that were given SURs as compensation for down-zoning cannot sell their rights, because builders really cannot use them: city councils or local zoning boards will reject higher-density projects which SURs were meant to provide. Until the County can resolve this issue, this is not a “regulatory tool”, but more of a regulatory “taking” in disguise.*
5. *Builders are now developing projects using smart growth principles but when the project is presented to a city council or local zoning board, the higher density project is denied. The denials sometimes may not be for higher density, but they are for “lack of infrastructure”. Whatever the reason, the answer is always no. If the future “preferred scenario” includes density bonuses, and SURS, we will not be snookered into a benefit that cannot be enforceable.*
6. *Another suggestion from a task force member was to get CDMP maps from key cities that could be density recipients. I will remind you all about what Mr. McDowell just said: the County Commission has not yet had the political will to enforce density increases on cities. I doubt this will happen now. So, please be aware when this idea comes up, that this is also a non-starter of a suggestion.*
7. *Similarly, transit-oriented development throughout various cities could also meet the same fate: the law is on the books, but never implemented due to political pressure.*
8. *Please do not be pushed into adopting portions of a study and figure “preferred scenarios without seriously considering how they will impact the entire future of so many residents, land owners and homeowners in Miami-Dade County.*
9. *I am concerned that these so-called “tools” are simply a sham to take away people’s land and give them no real value for it.*
10. *Thank you for considering the Association’s views.*

\*\*\*\*

*"At some point, Miami-Dade County will no longer have easily consumable land for development. This planning process provides an opportunity to be proactive to that scenario. As the team moves towards designing the preferred alternative and final recommendations they should be considering how to achieve urban and suburban densification in a fashion that protects the environment and our quality of life. This will reduce the pressure to develop open and agricultural land."*

*-Cynthia Guerra, Tropical Audubon Society*

\*\*\*\*

*"Which scenario would be best for water conservation? Jorge Rodriguez brought up some sobering information about the future of our water supply. He stated that the Biscayne Aquifer would not meet our needs in the future. As this is a watershed committee-how important is each scenario to helping conserve water? The alternative water supply costs should be added into the models; after all, desalinization and reuse \* are very expensive processes. If you build on all available land- there will be little areas for our aquifer to be replenished and then the cost of water will be higher because there will be less of it... rain water will just run off. \*to drinking water standards without endocrine disruption present and EPOC's. They don't even have technology yet to get all that out."*

*-Anonymous*

\*\*\*\*

*"I concur-now-with the inclusion of housing data in the body of this report. Originally staff had wanted to include the data in an appendix. It is a clear indication of bias against including housing development data in the body of the report. That has been rectified but the issue should never have been handled this way."*

*Process at this point is going too quickly; amended items are presented to the Committee with no opportunity to get constituent group comments back to their representatives. Its being pushed down the task force's throat. While I appreciate the Chair's need to move the process along, this is the most important part of the study."*

*-Truly Burton*

\*\*\*\*\*

*"I would not like to see Krome Avenue considered a transit corridor. Transportation hubs and corridors should be in densely populated areas not on the edge. Krome Avenue could be affected by flooding, lightening fires, and road kill hazards. We should keep transportation hubs east- in populated areas not on the edge of environmentally sensitive lands."*

*-Nancy Lee*

\*\*\*\*\*

*"The negative comments about the Dade County Farm Bureau's September newsletter about the study undermine the right of constituent groups to communicate their concerns to their members. The opinions of all constituent groups should be respected."*

*The land use designations and descriptions should be expanded to include rural residential definition of 1 house on 5 acres. Land in the study area may be deemed ag, but rural residential "zoning" allows for 1 house with some type of ag activity, be it in groves or horticulture."*

*-Katie Edwards, E.D. Dade County Farm Bureau*

## **IDEA PARKING LOT**

No comments received.