

Watershed Study Advisory Committee Comments and Responses
March 17, 2006

PRELIMINARY PREFERRED SCENARIO MAP

1. On the map we need to know where the charrettes exist

Charrettes are mapped. The location of the charrettes were first mapped for the Sub-task 2.1 report (Figure 4) which was presented to the WSAC on June 3, 2004 and accepted on August 24, 2004.

2. Keep wetlands away from Mt. Trashmore

The specific location of wetland restoration areas will be determined by the reviewing agencies. Wetlands already exist near Mt. Trashmore. There is an existing 54-acre stormwater retention/wetland restoration area located immediately east of the South Dade Landfill (aka "Mt. Trashmore"), which is designed to retain all stormwater generated from the entire 210 acre site.

3. Put well-field study areas back on map (these are not a well-field *protection* area)

The wellfield study area was mapped in the Sub-task 2.2 (Opportunities and Constraints) report (Figure 13). As the preferred scenario is developed wellfield protection areas will be considered. All land uses must be consistent with the County's wellfield protection ordinance.

4. Map will coincide in Watershed boundaries with CERP map boundaries

It is our intent to leave these areas open for the CERP projects.

5. A better delineation of lands required by CERP should be included on the base map.
 - a. The Yellow Book should NOT be used. The work on the CERP projects affecting the watershed study area has changed significantly.

Information on CERP project boundaries was presented by the SFWMD at the February 9, 2006 WSAC meeting. Until CERP staff determines a more detailed project area for each project, it is our intent to leave these areas open for the CERP projects.

6. Ensure that the expanded UDB does not encroach on Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands Project footprint or other CERP project footprints (leaving open future options once we know the final dimensions of projects)

It is our intent to leave these areas open for the CERP projects.

7. The Watershed Committee must discourage any encroaching urban development from coming closer to the Bay, encourage implementation of the Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands Project Phases 1 & 2, encourage a northern alignment for the C-111 Spreader Canal, and encourage implementation of the South Miami-Dade Water Reuse Project.

As discussed in Sub-task 2.1, it is our intent to leave these areas open for the CERP projects.

8. It was stated by study consultants that no new units were assigned in CERP areas yet the area northwest of the Homestead Air Reserve Base (HARB) is within the footprint of the Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands (BBCW) study area. This area has not been examined by agencies to determine if those lands, which are currently shown on your maps with a red proposed UEA area are needed.

The area north of HARB shown as a potential urban expansion area does not contain wetlands. It is also an adopted urban expansion area.

9. Base Reuse BRAC (Base Realignment and Closure) – this is an opportunity to go back and have HAFB as a joint use facility

The land uses described in the HARB ULI study have been incorporated into the SMDWSP. The development plans for the site were described in the Sub-task 1.7 report.

10. Move red dotted development area presently located outside UDB on the map to between the 2 transportation corridors (Redland area)-put population between the two N/S running corridors

The red dotted area has been made smaller in the Redlands.

11. The actual siting of wetlands to west will not be done in this study-just a designation of approximate acres needed

Agreed, the actual siting will require detailed engineering and surveying work.

12. On current map: Red area SW of AFB should be commercial/industrial only – protect the green corridor in there

Agreed, the area is currently shown as only commercial and industrial. The land immediately adjacent to SW 328th Street should be landscaped to create a trail.

13. We should not be referring to this as the “preferred” scenario

Comment noted.

14. Existing pattern along transportation corridors is mostly residential –how do we add proposed higher densities and still be compatible with existing development?

The purpose of Zone B is to provide a transition zone from high density residential and commercial development to the surrounding neighborhoods.

15. We still have not considered 2025 first as I have asked in the last meetings.

Potential areas for urban development through 2025 are shown on the map.

16. We need to do a 2025 map first before a 2050 map—2025 is a more reasonable time to make predictions

The 2050 map was created first to show the end state for the WSAC. Potential areas for urban development through 2025 are shown on the map. We are following the same methodology as the test scenarios, the 2050 plan and the 2025 are not independent of each other. They will be consistent with each other. No one ever suggested there would be two completely different land use plans. For the actual allocation of land uses 2025 will be created first and built upon to create 2050.

17. The timing of these units needs to be understood. Provisions must be made in the development of the map for development of property and densities lower than those anticipated 45 years from today. It is unrealistic to expect two completely different land use plans for the years 2025 and year 2050.

The 2050 map was created first to show the end state for the WSAC. Potential areas for urban development through 2025 are shown on the map. We are following the same methodology as the test scenarios, the 2050 plan and the 2025 are not independent of each other. They will be consistent with each other. No one ever suggested there would be two completely different land use plans. For the actual allocation of land uses 2025 will be created first and built upon to create 2050.

18. Next we need to actually build land use plans based upon background information and knowledge. That does not mean just drawing lines on a map and asking small groups of us where we think the lines should be drawn. We have done a lot of work and studies, but I do not see how it is being used to build the scenarios and plans. Perhaps most importantly, I do not remember the Taskforce deciding that we would look only a 2050. It makes no logical sense to suddenly be looking at only 2050 when we have consistently used 2025 and then 2050 for all of the test scenarios. We can make some reasonable assumptions and predictions about 2025, but 2050 are almost pure guess work. It is only useful to establish major transportation corridors, infrastructure and policy issues. Who knows how or what we will be driving or commuting in 2050? I am certainly not prepared to suggest I can reasonably predict 2050, but 2025 is rational. So my next major issue is to stop talking about 2050 and focus solely on 2025 until we

actually feel fully comfortable that we can address that time frame. If we want to then make some policy recommendations about 2050 or even a map fine.

The 2050 map was created first to show the end state for the WSAC. Potential areas for urban development through 2025 are shown on the map. We are following the same methodology as the test scenarios, the 2050 plan and the 2025 are not independent of each other. They will be consistent with each other. No one ever suggested there would be two completely different land use plans. For the actual allocation of land uses 2025 will be created first and built upon to create 2050.

19. The study does not address whether 2050 plan builds on a 2025 plan, or whether they are independent of each other.

The 2050 map was created first to show the end state for the WSAC. Potential areas for urban development through 2025 are shown on the map. We are following the same methodology as the test scenarios, the 2050 plan and the 2025 are not independent of each other. They will be consistent with each other. No one ever suggested there would be two completely different land use plans. For the actual allocation of land uses 2025 will be created first and built upon to create 2050.

20. The timing of delivery of these units needs to be understood. Provisions must be made in the development of the map for development of property and densities lower than those anticipated 45 years from today. It is unrealistic to expect two completely different land use plans for the years 2025 and year 2050 without fully understanding how they relate to each other.

The 2050 map was created first to show the end state for the WSAC. Potential areas for urban development through 2025 are shown on the map. We are following the same methodology as the test scenarios, the 2050 plan and the 2025 are not independent of each other. They will be consistent with each other. No one ever suggested there would be two completely different land use plans. For the actual allocation of land uses 2025 will be created first and built upon to create 2050.

21. What has happened to the 2025 (or as the contract calls for the 2015) development scenario? We submit that the true reality check as to the ability to implement this study will be to determine what needs to be accomplished during this more reasonably established time horizon.

The 2050 map was created first to show the end state for the WSAC. Potential areas for urban development through 2025 are shown on the map. We are following the same methodology as the test scenarios, the 2050 plan and the 2025 are not independent of each other. They will be consistent with each other. No one ever suggested there would be two completely different land use plans. For the actual allocation of land uses 2025 will be created first and built upon to create 2050.

22. What does the yellow line with red dashes mean?

The yellow lines represent urban expansion in 2025.

23. Why do we say potential area for use 2025? Why not immediately?

There is sufficient land inside the UDB to meet current demands.

24. The concern is if we go ahead with this map and it passes all models, then we have effectively adopted this scenario-there are too many issues still open to allow that to happen

The WSAC is not being asked to accept this map as the final preferred scenario. It is a draft to move forward with more detailed analysis. It may change. Acceptance of the final preferred scenario map will occur once we know the impacts. All of the information contained in the Sub-task 3.6 report was already presented to the committee in great detail at previous meetings.

25. Area next to racetrack, let City of Homestead decide what goes there (fly zone limits its use anyway)

Only non-residential uses are allowed in this area.

26. Eastern/South area of UEA on map limits what could be done with UEA as of now

The square expansion area south of HARB is planned to be available immediately for non-residential uses. This area provides a large tract of land for attracting a major employer.

27. Existing development along US1 is now primary residential—may not be compatible with densities on newest version of the map

The purpose of Zone B is to provide a transition zone from high density residential and commercial development to the surrounding neighborhoods.

28. Don't increase densities in West Kendall

The West Kendall urban development area has been decreased. However, if the Kendall Drive corridor becomes a light rail transit corridor as planned, it makes sense to increase densities in the western portion of Kendall Drive to support such premium transit. Additionally, extensions of SW 120th and SW 152nd Streets are planned or already underway and bridges are designed to cross over the C-1 canal at those locations.

29. This is a conceptual vision and these lines on the map are conceptual only

Conceptual for guiding the assessments.

30. Support limiting densities east of 147th Ave to UDB; this area has a strong sense of community

Map has been changed to decrease the size of this UEA, thus providing for higher density on the east than on the west of the line.

31. Remove all increased densities east of 147th Avenue to UDB. This agricultural area is an historical agricultural community that our vision statement says we want to protect. Put extra density up in existing UEA at end of Kendall and Krome (177th Ave). There are no residents there, and has been in existence at least since the 1990's.

The urban expansion area has been moved further east.

32. Change wording on the map to "Stormwater Treatment and Retention Study area to be considered in basins C-1, C-102, and C-103.

Comment noted.

33. Move blue line (21 du/acre) in Florida City so that it is west of transit corridor (FEC), this will provide the minimum density (15 du/acre) that is needed to support this type of transportation.

Zone A has been expanded in this area.

34. 97th Avenue west should not now be shown as wetlands; if it is needed as wetlands later it can be added

The map does not identify any existing wetlands. Wetlands information is contained in a separate data layer.

35. Bird Road Basin needs to be shown as a wetland and it isn't showing now

The map does not identify any existing wetlands. Wetlands information is contained in a separate data layer.

36. Area near HAFB that is showing as commercial/industrial was suggested to be water retention and recreation area and now that is not what is reflected

Several groups asked that this boundary be extended to 132nd Avenue. Also, HARB will most likely oppose any natural marsh-like areas in close proximity to the base as that increases the likelihood of BASH (Bird Air Strike Hazards).

37. The “#7” shaped area (employment) contains the zoo and the largest Remnant Natural Forest

As identified in the Sub-task 1.7 report, the Parks and Recreation Department Metro Zoo Master Plan envisions a major attraction center on the property. This plan was carefully crafted to avoid impacts to nearby pine rockland habitat. Pine rockland habitat has been removed from this employment center.

38. Park would be concerned about using HAFB as joint use

The land uses described in the HARB ULI study have been incorporated into the SMDWSP.

39. Move the UDB in the South along the red lines on current map and would like a separate modeling done

Land uses were contained inside the UDB in Test Scenario 3.

40. Motorsports facility area—they are looking forward to more parking space –not being considered for industrial/commercial because parking is needed

Comment noted.

41. Text on map needs to reflect what zones actually are

Average densities for each zone are included on the map. Density ranges will be added to the map.

42. Take out the word “preferred” from any references in the map

Comment noted. It will be called assessment map until the assessments are complete.

43. Clear guidelines must be given to the committee as to what constraints if any are to be applied during the development of the preferred alternative.
a. It is my understanding that the constraints were NOT a limitation on where new development could be assigned.

Consistent with the Sub-task 2.1 report constraints will be a limitation to the placement of new land uses.

44. It should not be a given that densities of 20 to 50 units per acre shall apply to the inner zone of the entire US-1 transportation corridor.
a. These densities are much higher than currently exist.
b. If lower densities are allocated in this zone then more units will need to be distributed elsewhere.

- c. Without an approved acceptance at the municipality level, this proposal is flawed before any analysis begins.
- d. The analysis must demonstrate that the timeline for approval of these densities will occur within a timeline that will not adversely disrupt the development market, e.g., the implementation of these densities, if possible, must also be made in a timeframe which is certain. Unless there is a guarantee, then the entire analysis cannot move forward as waiting x number of years for this density to mature to accommodate growth only to find that it will not work x years down the road is devastating to the economy and belies the ideological no growth predisposition of the study.
- e. What is the simple cost benefit analysis of inside the udb versus outside the UDB? Consider the question with cost of housing factored in?

Other than Florida City and Homestead the other municipalities have been allocated very few units. In the other municipalities and unincorporated areas it is assumed that vacant, agricultural land and 10% of developed areas will be redeveloped. These figures are very conservative and allocate a minimal amount of housing in these cities similar to the allocations presented to the WSAC for the test scenarios.

- 45. The selection of employment centers seems random at best.
 - a. To include the entire Tamiami Airport as a potential employment center is unrealistic. This area will remain largely open space as an airport. The area to the south and possibly west of Tamiami Airport are the better options for employment centers.
 - b. Homestead air reserve base should be identified as a potential employment center.
 - c. Metrozoo should be eliminated as an employment center

The area surrounding the airport is part of the employment center. HARB is designated as an employment center. As identified in the Sub-task 1.7 report, the Parks and Recreation Department Metro Zoo Master Plan envisions a major attraction center on the property. This plan was carefully crafted to avoid impacts to nearby pine rockland habitat. Also, the area around the Tamiami Airport is becoming an employment center. Coulter has a facility there and a new shopping plaza is in the works for the corner of SW 120th Street and SW 137th Avenue.

- 46. Current urban expansion area boundaries should be removed during the development of the preferred alternative and they should NOT be given any priority in developing the preferred alternative. If not, explain the logic behind their priority???

Current urban expansion areas are not shown on the map. It should be noted that the criteria for siting new development is similar to the criteria used for creating the urban expansion areas.

- 47. Areas currently within the UDB, but encumbered with conservation easements

should be removed (i.e. the boundary should be moved to exclude them) and the equivalent area added outside the UDB in the preferred alternative.

- a. The 500 acres mitigation area within the City of Homestead for the race tract, overflow parking area and City Lake is the best example.

Conservation lands are not included in the land supply analysis. Staff has confirmed that the City of Homestead does not wish to move the UDB in these areas.

48. The placement of hard lines all on the proposed alternative map for areas of proposed urban expansion should be replaced with areas of shading where development is preferred at certain densities. The scale of the modeling does not lend itself to drawing hard lines.

Zones at specific densities have been added to the map.

49. Many of the western wetland restoration areas are unrealistic because of the existing high elevation.

Specific boundaries for these areas have been removed. It is not unrealistic to assume that such western STAs could be included as a future condition. Regardless of elevation, they could be built and engineered to operate to specific standards, much like the District's Emergency Detention Basin in the western portion of the C-4 Basin.

50. The first relates to the slough, which was mentioned at the last Advisory Committee meeting: Long Glades Slough. I am in agreement that this is a natural area and should be protected. A suggestion has been made that it could be made into a park and this could be really helpful to the tourist industry if done correctly.

The vast majority of overnight tourists staying in the Southern Watershed Area lodge in the hotels within a mile of this area, and there is very little for them to do outside the hotels. A natural area with trails and an outdoor experience would fit well with the environmental theme that attracts visitors to this area.

Long Glades Slough has been removed.

51. Protect *Long Slough*, which is just west of U.S. 1 at the intersection of Card Sound Road.

Long Slough will be protected.

52. The area known as the "Florida City Slough" should likely not be shown for new development and should be removed from Zones A & B.

Long Glades/Florida City Slough has been deleted from Zone B.

53. Secondly I am still concerned with the main access to Biscayne National Park passing through a highly concentrated commercial or industrial area which is proposed Southwest of the Homestead Air Force Reserve Base. I very much believe that this commercial area is needed but there should be some way to make it non-intrusive to the park. Perhaps moving the area west of 137th Ave would make the Park officials more comfortable with keeping this area. Also isolating 328th St to retain the greenway and future bike path would be very appealing to visitors to the Park.

The land immediately adjacent to SW 328th Street should be landscaped to create a trail.

54. Remove the Metrozoo complex from the industrial/employment center, which includes protected pine rockland, putting the southern boundary of that zone at 152 St.

The pine rockland habitat has been removed from the employment center.

55. Expand the two parallel North-South Zone Bs (along SW 137 Ave and SW 147 Ave) to take in the space between them (leaving out the Metrozoo complex)

This area has been added to Zone B.

56. Use the added Zone B area created above and add density as needed in Zone A areas to absorb all projected population growth without expanding into agricultural land outside current UDB.

The strip of Zone B between 117th Avenue and 137th Avenue is not large enough for the new units projected outside the UDB. Some movement of the UDB is still required.

57. Eliminate the extension of the West Kendall transit corridor outside the UDB

The West Kendall urban development area has been decreased. However, if we assume that the Kendall Drive corridor is going to be a light rail transit corridor, it makes sense to increase densities in the western portion of Kendall Drive to support such premium transit. Additionally, extensions of SW 120th and SW 152nd Streets are planned or already underway and bridges are designed to cross over the C-1 canal at those locations.

58. Change the industrial/commercial rectangle SW of Homestead ARB and north of the Speedway to a regional park. This recommendation was made by Group 2 at the beginning of this mapping exercise. This would not be intended however to prevent the existing employment center west of the Speedway from developing in its present location.

Several groups asked that this boundary be extended to 132nd Avenue. Also, HARB will most likely oppose any natural marsh-like areas in close proximity to the base as that increases the likelihood of BASH (Bird Air Strike Hazards).

59. The first comment is related to the expansion of the UDB as marked on the proposed map next to the race track (SW 137 Ave.), I stated that the date shown on the map (2006-2050) should be changed since a part of that area is projected to be expanded by 2015 as it is the county's map now, and the area east of it could be for the proposed time frame.

The square expansion area south of HARB is envisioned to be available immediately for non-residential uses. This area provides a large tract of land for attracting a major employer. Industrial and commercial use of this property will require amendments to the City of Homestead Comprehensive Plan and the Miami-Dade County Comprehensive Development Master Plan.

60. The second is also related to the above area, the proposed map shows it as commercial/industrial, I asked that it should be changed to show commercial/Industrial under the ACIUZ, but leave the rest of it to be zoned by the City based on proper land uses in the area.

Only non-residential uses are allowed here because of the crash zone and noise impacts. What other uses are you asking for?

61. I also requested that the UDB be moved west from SW 157 Ave. to SW 162 Ave. between SW 152 St. and 184 St. for two reasons, to have a straight line UDB and the proposed area to be included was grandfathered in for smaller lots and has many single family dwelling on 1.4 lots.

Comment noted. We will further analyze this area.

62. The preferred scenario and project models assume densities as high as 60 units per acre in downtown Florida City and other urban centers. This is a shocking 300% higher than is currently permitted anywhere in the City. We would like to review whatever analysis has been done to support the feasibility or local desirability of such extremely high density. The City does not believe those densities will ever be reached and those units should be projected elsewhere with our close input.

It has never been suggested that Florida City intensify development to 60 dwelling units per acre. Current zoning in the City allows for 15 dwelling units per acre. The suggested density range for Zone A is 15 du/acre and greater and Zone B 6-20 du/acre.

63. The existing 2005/2015 UDB lines were the only UDB options considered in this study. Those lines were drawn many years ago, are out-dated and constrain the future growth of existing cities, such as Florida City. UDB options accounted for to date in

this study were far too limited. UDB intrusion into the natural future growth patterns of existing cities should have been addressed. The preferred scenarios should allow for modest UDB expansion west and southwest of Florida City, possibly out to SW 212th Avenue and south to SW 368th Street. This would relieve the pressure for the above mentioned 50-60 units per acre densities the study is proposing in Florida City's center.

There is no pressure to relieve. It has never been suggested that Florida City intensify development to 60 dwelling units per acre.

64. There is concern that property recently annexed into Florida City and lying outside the UDB was not included in the preferred scenario for development, whereas, an area north of Homestead Air Force Base also lying outside the UDB is projected for development.

We compared the two sites to determine whether there is a defensible reason as to why one site was included and not the other. Our analysis revealed the following:

- (a) The HAFB property is within the CERP area but no determination has been made as to whether it is needed for CERP. The SFWMD and the Army Corps. Have already determined that the annexed Florida City land is not needed.
- (b) The annexed Florida City land is within one mile of all four transportation corridors. The HAFB is only within one mile of the turnpike. The HAFB site is seven miles from Krome and three miles from US1 and the Busway.
- (c) There will be no wetland loss in the development of the annexed area. On the other hand, the proposed HAFB site is a wetland area. Development here will result in approximately 500 acres of wetlands being destroyed. Based on the above, we in Florida City are frankly bewildered by whatever methodology was used to include HAFB site and not the recently annexed area.

The recently annexed property is the proposed Florida City Commons DRI, which was found to be insufficient in several areas by the South Florida Regional Planning Council, Miami-Dade County and 11 other reviewing agencies. The first round of sufficiency review revealed over 200 questions/unresolved issues related to the DRI application for development approval (ADA). These issues include water supply and wastewater treatment, stormwater treatment, transit, impact of roadway improvements to environmentally sensitive areas, impact of habitat fragmentation on endangered species, and hurricane evacuation. The DRI comments specifically mentions CERP, transportation issues, and wetlands. The agencies reviewing the proposed Florida City Commons DRI identified these same issues as potential problem areas with the proposed DRI. Specifically, the agencies have indicated that insufficient information has been provided to determine how the Florida City Commons stormwater management system may impact the achievement of CERP

project goals. The ADA includes very limited information on stormwater treatment, including planned structures and facilities. The agencies are also concerned that additional water withdrawals may adversely impact CERP projects, further lower the water table, and increase saltwater intrusion and adversely impact wetlands in the area.

Finally, the description of how transit service would be provided to and from the site has been deemed inadequate; documentation and maps to support mixed-use development concepts, transit reduction and internalization of project trips is lacking; and the proposed roadways may impact environmentally sensitive areas. The proposed Florida City Commons DRI is the subject of an ongoing review process, and until this process is completed it will be difficult to determine the potential impacts with any degree of certainty. Additionally, the Florida City Commons property includes and is adjacent to Save Our Rivers parcels, Environmentally Endangered Lands, DERM Environmental Mitigation Areas and CERP project area.

65. This area is a wetland area. In order to develop this property, a net increase of wetland loss is required. Accordingly, our property will not increase wetland loss, yet it is deemed not a development area. So destroying hundreds of acres of wetlands as opposed to an area that will not destroy wetlands was not a criteria. Otherwise we would be included in the development footprint.

The area north of HARB shown as a potential urban expansion area does not contain wetlands. Conversely, an exhaustive review conducted by several agencies as part of the Florida City Commons DRI process indicated potential impacts on wetlands, as described in detail in #54 above.

66. This property is within a CERP footprint and has not as of yet been determined to be needed for CERP. Our property has already been determined by CERP at both the Corps and SFWMD level to be “NOT” needed for CERP. What if the study area is deemed to be needed for CERP? How valuable was the study when it knowingly put development in a CERP needed area when it could have put it in an area certain to not be necessary for CERP?

The constraints map will be overlaid on the draft “preferred scenario” map before it is finalized in order to ensure that no CERP footprints are included in zones proposed for urban development. It has been a consistent project goal to avoid proposed CERP areas so as not to foreclose opportunities for ecosystem restoration. At this time, no definitive guidance has been received indicating that the footprints for the Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands and the C-111 Spreader Canal projects of CERP, as shown in the “Yellow Book”, have been changed, or are inappropriate as a guide for restricting land uses. While it is true that some work has been completed on the Acceler8 portions of these two projects, the fact remains that the respective Project Delivery Teams for each project have not completed their project planning. Furthermore, the evidence (letters from the USACE and the SFWMD)

presented by a consultant representing the owner of the aforementioned property does not support the claim that “the property is not needed for CERP.” In any event, beyond considerations for the CERP projects, there are a variety of reasons why the location would seem to be inappropriate for development beyond current allowable density (i.e. 1 unit per five acres), including issues related to endangered species habitat impacts, availability of water supplies, evacuation routes and times, and the status of surrounding areas being listed as of critical state concern or as environmentally protected lands. Additionally, the Florida City Commons property includes and is adjacent to Save Our Rivers parcels, Environmentally Endangered Lands, DERM Environmental Mitigation Areas and CERP project area.

67. This property is approximately between ½ to 1 mile from Biscayne Bay. Our property is 8 miles away. Apparently proximity to the Bay is not a factor.

The above referenced property is over two miles from the Bay. Neither property drains directly into the Bay.

68. This property, using current water quality standards, will have some measure of pollutant load. Our project will be designed to have zero runoff at the 100 year storm. We will therefore have no pollutant load discharge. Zero. Apparently a site with some pollutant loading discharge into Biscayne Bay is preferred over one that does not.

Drainage and site plan designs for residential development have not been approved for the Florida City Commons site. Therefore, there is no way to confirm the above statement.

69. The last seeming reason that this area was approved for “development” was its close proximity to the turnpike, about 1 mile away. Yet it is 3 miles from US 1, 3 miles from the Busway, and 7 miles from Krome Avenue. Our project is 1 mile from all four transportation corridors. So apparently transportation isn’t a driving factor either.

Zone B is a half mile away from Florida’s Turnpike. Transportation issues have been raised by agencies reviewing the proposed Florida City Commons DRI, as described in detail in #54 above.

70. We need go back and really look at the central US 1 corridor in detail starting at the north and working south or visa-versa or even starting with the Charrette areas and building outward from there. One of the primary goals for the study is to create compatible land uses and preserve the community character of South Dade. That does not mean simply protecting the rural character of the Redlands, or agricultural lands or Horse country it means all of south Dade. Yes, there are going to be significant changes because there are going to be a lot more people, but if the study is to be meaningful and not just another document gathering dust on the shelf, we have responsibility to understand the implications of what we are proposing.

We need to know where and at what real intensity the areas are currently developed and how we are recommending that be developed. What will that mean for the existing residents? What is the current Land Use Designation and what is the current zoning? Is it realistic to assume that single family and commercial areas will be redeveloped and at what intensity? What will that mean for the surrounding areas? Even if it is possible, should we recommend that type of change ? Should we be recommending that we protect the life style of a small number of people, while we recommend wholesale changes to large areas occupied by the largest number of people (voters) ? Can these recommendations be implemented politically and economically ? What type of density change is necessary to fund the cost of land assembly ? Are we as a community willing to accept those types of density changes in order to redevelop these Transportation corridors ? These are important policy questions that we have not even been discussed--they have been assumed away as the maps are drawn.

Once we have looked at the US 1 corridor we need to do the same thing for the other transportation corridors. Even though they are being shown as lower density than the US 1 corridor, the changes are dramatic. I promise you that the people in the Hammocks and Country Walk and other developments have strong opinions about what should happen in those corridors, but we have not even looked at these corridors or sought the opinions of those communities. Once we have done all of that we can get to the western fringe and decide what ought to happen there, but until that time all of the focus on the UDB is counter productive to the real purpose of this study.

Most of the US1 corridor has been subject to community involvement processes that ended up recommending increased densities. The community has been involved through a charrette process or a community redevelopment area process and sometimes both. Those areas not covered by one of these processes have been allocated very few units. Although further study and community involvement may be required to implement the other corridors, the recommended density in these areas is 6 – 20 dwelling units which is consistent with most of the development along Kendall Drive right now. A significant analysis of existing densities was provided as part of the Sub-task 2.2 report.

71. There already is too much sprawl development in South M-D County. Wealthy buyers will always have the opportunity to build their homes on 5 acres parcels; therefore no provision for additional high-end housing is needed. Workforce housing (minimum wage earner) and affordable housing (young professionals) are the only housing categories that should be included in the Watershed plan.

Higher density residential development has always been a part of the preferred scenario.

72. The plan should recommend precise housing densities. Each zone should have a narrowly focused maximum and minimum density allowed per acre.

Agreed. Zone A has a minimum of 15 du/acre. Zone B has a minimum of 6 du/acre and a maximum of 20 du/acre. Inside the Charratte areas the densities approved as part of the charrette plans and implementing ordinances will be used.

73. Vague guidance on density allows developers to choose the most profitable option, which is usually not the most beneficial density for M-D County. Also, sprawl defeats infill housing and high density housing along transportation corridors. Sprawl diminishes the quality of life for everyone.

Comment noted. See above.

74. Higher densities will attract rapid transit infrastructure, whereas sprawl leaves most communities without any rapid transit opportunities. Smart growth policies should be promoted. Good housing with available rapid transit in a quality of life issue.

Comment noted. See above.

75. Looming price escalations for gasoline makes sprawl communities less and less attractive unless public transportation is established. Without public transportation, sprawl communities may be abandoned.

Comment noted. See above.

76. Unless a valid tipping point on farm economy sustainability can be established, there should be no loss of farmland.

Recent trends and several studies including the University of Florida Agricultural Study predict a decrease in farm land.

77. Agriculture provides about 25,000 jobs. An *agriculture district* consisting of all land outside the UDB needs to be formed. Otherwise, encroaching non-agriculture businesses will crowd out the agriculture economy. Public transportation and infrastructure are detrimental to the sustainability of an agriculture economy. Establishing wellfields and water retention marshes in the agriculture district is also detrimental.

Comment noted. This concept may help preserve these areas as agricultural land.

78. Open natural spaces are important as quality of life issues, preservation of wildlife, water recharge, flood control, a buffer area for parks, and places that give people a sense of well-being.

Park space and wetland restoration areas are a part of the preferred scenario.

79. Open space is win/win for everyone and people say they want it. Open space is valuable.

Park space and wetland restoration areas are apart of the preferred scenario.

80. On the Draft Preferred Scenario, the red dashed line north of Homestead Reserve Air Base needs to be removed and the Urban Development Boundary restored to its original location.

Higher density development adjacent to the Turnpike provides easy access for new residents.

81. On the Draft Preferred Scenario, the red shaded area west of Biscayne National Park Headquarters needs to be removed and the Urban Development Boundary restored to its original location.

At the request of several WSAC members this area was designated for commercial and industrial use.

82. On the Draft Preferred Scenario, the red dashed line and the solid yellow line, west of U.S. 1, starting at 264th Street and going north to 184th Street need to be removed and the Urban Development Boundary restored to its original location.

Land in this area is very close to the transit corridor and provides the densities necessary to make transit viable.

83. On the Draft Preferred Scenario, the red shaded area west of Tamiami Airport needs to be removed and the Urban Development Boundary restored to its original location.

At the request of several WSAC members this area was designated for commercial and industrial use.

84. The area located between the Turnpike transportation corridor and the 137th Avenue transportation corridor should be designated as a Zone B area, except for the pine flatwoods forest and the 500' buffer area located just south of 152nd Street.

This area has been added to Zone B.

85. Move the development lines south of 312 Street to the racetrack and east to 112 Avenue.

The majority of the WSAC has agreed that this area should be set aside for wetland restoration. It is anticipated that some of this land will be acquired for restoration and stormwater treatment.

86. Move the wetlands restoration green line to 97 Avenue from approximately 220 Street South.

Moving the line in this area may adversely impact the Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands Project Phase 1 which is a constraint to development.

87. Move the employment area circle to include Homestead Air Reserve Base. We should suggest that Dade County ask the Air Force for joint use of the facility.

The land uses described in the HARB ULI study have been incorporated into the SMDWSP. The development plans for the site were described in the Sub-task 1.7 report.

88. What happened to moving the development line on the east and west side of 137 Avenue?

Some movement of the UDB in this area will be required.

89. Why did you make the area smaller for moving the development lines north of Homestead Air Reserve Base?

The boundary for Zone B is this area is ½ mile from Florida's Turnpike. The extent of future development outside Zone B has not yet been determined.

90. What happened to moving the development lines West of Tamiami Airport between 120 Street and approximately 64 Street?

The UDB has been moved west of Tamiami airport.

91. Why is Mount Trashmore and Black Point Marina in a wetlands restoration area?

The specific location of wetland restoration areas will be determined by the reviewing agencies. Wetlands already exist near Mt. Trashmore.

92. Why is what appears to be developed land along the coast north of 200 Street considered for wetlands restoration?

The areas shown on the map are potential areas for future wetland restoration. The map does not show existing wetlands.

93. Why is the Bird road basin not shown for wetlands restoration?

The areas shown on the map are potential areas for future wetland restoration. The map does not show existing wetlands.

94. What does charrette 2050 have to do with our current study?

Charrettes are mapped. The location of the charrettes were first mapped for the Sub-task 2.1 report which was presented to the WSAC on June 3, 2004 and accepted on August 24, 2004.

95. The map indicates storm water treatment and retention areas to be located in basins C-1, C-102 and C-103. Locations should be designated and owners of land should be notified immediately.

Basins with more severe water quality problems and specific areas with flood problems were identified as part of Sub-task 3.4. Additionally, the actual location of the proposed Stormwater Treatment Areas will most likely be subject to implementation strategies and land availability. Exact location is not as important because various engineering solutions can be used at a later date to fit the project needs.

96. Why does our map not show the western boundary of watershed study area?

The western boundary will be shown on future maps.

97. The Urban Development Boundary should not be frozen in perpetuity. If no further movement of the line is granted as the market dictates, then the zoning is restricted to 1 house on 1.25 acres or compensation given via public funding on this basis.

Allocating units at 1 du per 1.25 acres would equate to 70,000 du spread out all over agricultural land. This idea is contrary to everything we have worked towards since the beginning of the study. It would create more water quality problems, wipe out the agricultural industry, create a transportation nightmare and drastically increase improvement costs for infrastructure. The results would be worse than Scenario 1 which was the worst of all the test scenarios.

98. We believe that markets dictate the location of urban and commerce centers.

Market forces are only part of the equation to building successful communities. Community involvement, access to affordable housing, adequate park space, easy access to transit and major transportation routes and other factors are important for determining the location of urban centers and commerce centers.

99. Wetlands should not be designated for creation in agricultural production areas.

Basins with more severe water quality problems and specific areas with flood problems were identified as part of Sub-task 3.4. Additionally, the actual location of the proposed Stormwater Treatment Areas will most likely be subject to implementation strategies and land availability. Exact location is not as important because various engineering solutions can be used at a later date to fit the project needs.

100. High-density housing along the US 1 corridor is unrealistic because of political atmosphere and voting trends of community councils.

This statement is not accurate. High density housing has been approved by community councils through the charratte process and the implementing zoning ordinances.

101. Identify lands outside the National Park boundaries necessary for buffers.

Basins with more severe water quality problems and specific areas with flood problems were identified as part of Sub-task 3.4. Additionally, the actual location of the proposed Stormwater Treatment Areas will most likely be subject to implementation strategies and land availability. Exact location is not as important because various engineering solutions can be used at a later date to fit the project needs.

102. There is no evidence that the study has considered the land area requirements for important infrastructure such as schools and parks - particularly in the higher density and/or in-fill transit corridors where land for new development for such uses is limited.

As described in the Sub-task 2.2 report support land uses such as schools, government offices, religious facilities, hospitals and parks were built into the test scenarios and will be included in the preferred land use scenario.

103. The Watershed boundary fails to include the western portions of Florida City or, apparently, all of the land within the existing UDB.

The boundary of the Watershed is based on drainage basins not the UDB. The drainage basin in this area does not extend out to the western portions of Florida City.

104. Properties within the study area are classified incorrectly and such things as existing permits and ongoing development appears to be missing.

All construction through 2005 is included in the supply calculations.

105. Inclusion of the entire Tamiami Airport as a potential employment center is somewhat unrealistic. This area will remain largely open space as an airport. The areas to the south and possibly west of Tamiami Airport are better options for employment centers. However, much of that area is already being developed. The HARB should also be identified as a potential employment center.

The area west of Tamiami Airport has been designated for commercial and industrial use. If it is being developed as these uses it is consistent with our plan. The land uses described in the HARB ULI study have been incorporated into the

SMDWSP. The development plans for the site were described in the Sub-task 1.7 report.

106. The current draft suggests wetland restoration areas which are unrealistic because of their existing high elevations, which would likely be economically unfeasible to restore.

Basins with more severe water quality problems and specific areas with flood problems were identified as part of Sub-task 3.4. Additionally, the actual location of the proposed Stormwater Treatment Areas will most likely be subject to implementation strategies and land availability. Exact location is not as important because various engineering solutions can be used at a later date to fit the project needs.

107. The draft "preferred" plan does not effectively recognize the issues, benefits and inefficiencies surrounding future development of lands outside the existing UDB at a density of 5 units/ac.

A detailed report on issues, benefits and inefficiencies surrounding development at a specific category of density is outside the scope of this project. We have discussed the issues, benefits and inefficiencies of various densities in the Sub-task 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 and 3.6 reports.

108. The Study does not appropriately take into account the fact that development approvals, even when granted, are at significantly lower densities than originally requested.

Test Scenario 1 was based on the assumption that development approvals are typically lower than maximums allowed by zoning. As described previously, Zone A, Zone B and the charrattes have minimum and maximum densities which would be adopted by Miami-Dade County.

109. There does not appear to have been much use of the test scenario information to determine where the anticipated additional development units will actually be located. The consultant appears to have not provided any guidance to the committee on how to locate development taking into consideration the results of the test scenario information. Rather, the suggested draft appears to draw lines without significant regard to the ability to implement the plan. Notably, the use of fifty year time-frame, rather than analyzing the 2015 (or 2025) interim phase, appears to merely presume that implementation will happen rather than analyzing what it will take to ensure that those units can actually be constructed during any reasonable time horizon.

The link between the test scenario assessments and the preferred scenario is explained in the Sub-task 3.6 report. What it will take to implement both timeframes has been researched. Higher density development will require

minimums and maximum densities similar to the implementing ordinances for the charrettes.

110. The consultant has overestimated the densities allocated next to the busway (zones A & B), and has not taken into consideration the near term development that will occur making the available land in zones A & B less than today, thereby jumping 45 years ahead to an end result.

If near term development is expected to occur in the busway then preferred scenario is consistent with current approvals and development plans. The approved but not built development referenced in this comment will help supply residential and other uses through 2025.

111. Using the consultant's estimate (which appears low because the allocated densities within zones A & B are so high) that 44,000 residential units need to be allocated outside the existing UDB, then the proposed UEA areas are not large enough. Assuming that the southernmost proposed UEA (the one SW of the HARB) is for commercial uses only, because it is under the AICUZ (the flight path into HARB), then it appears that approximately 8 sections (5120 acres) of land are shown within the proposed UEA areas. If ALL of this area were to be developed at 5 du/ac, that would only provide only 25,600 units. This is 18,400 units short.

Inaccurate figures were used to draw the conclusion that the calculations are 18,400 short. All of the units outside the UDB are not anticipated to be developed at 5 du/acre. In addition to Zones A and B development needs to be allocated to vacant and agricultural land inside the UDB and the charrette areas.

112. The western wetland creation areas may be unrealistic.

Basins with more severe water quality problems and specific areas with flood problems were identified as part of Sub-task 3.4. Additionally, the actual location of the proposed Stormwater Treatment Areas will most likely be subject to implementation strategies and land availability. Exact location is not as important because various engineering solutions can be used at a later date to fit the project needs.

113. Current urban expansion area boundaries should be removed during the development of the preferred alternative and they should NOT be given any priority in developing the preferred alternative.

This comment is in conflict with previous comments from other WSAC members. It should be noted that the criteria for siting new development is similar to the criteria used for creating the urban expansion areas.

114. Areas currently within the UDB, but encumbered with conservation easements should be removed (i.e. the boundary should be moved to exclude them) and the equivalent area added outside the UDB in the preferred alternative: for example, the 500 acre mitigation area within the City of Homestead adjacent to the race track, overflow parking area and City Lake are reasonable examples to consider removing.

Staff has confirmed that the City of Homestead does not wish to move the UDB in these areas.

115. The placement of hard lines all on the proposed alternative map for areas of proposed urban expansion should be replaced with areas of shading where development is preferred at certain densities. The scale of the modeling does not lend itself to drawing hard lines. Moreover, such lines could be misinterpreted.

Comment noted. The addition of shading and densities may better illustrate the location of future development.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

116. The level of landscaping of new development needs to be discussed as part of implementation strategies.

Landscaping and building design criteria are important components of implementing the preferred scenario and thus should be part of the implementation strategies.

117. We have not addressed water supply-we should identify places where de-salinization plants would go.

Miami-Dade County and its consultants are working on this analysis.

118. We need to interface this study with our work.

Keith and Schnars staff met with the water supply consultants on February 15, 2006.

119. This new study should be interfaced with our work: “Re-use Feasibility and Alternative Water Supply Plan Study” very preliminary study

- a. after this preliminary study a consultant will be hired to prepare a detailed study in the next 6-9 months
- b. This study will be appropriate

The study is being prepared by Ecology and Environment and Milian, Swain & Associates, Inc.

120. M-D County needs a viable alternative to ASR wells.

A water supply study is being prepared by Ecology and Environment and Milian, Swain & Associates, Inc.

121. Conservation, efficiency, and reuse of water will be needed. Even with these measures water shortages are likely. A building moratorium may be an acceptable temporary solution.

A study addressing these issues is being prepared by Ecology and Environment and Milian, Swain & Associates, Inc.

122. All efforts need to be made to insure the integrity and stability of M-D’s drinking water supplies. Future supply is in doubt.

Flood protection is a parameter. A study addressing this issue is being prepared by Ecology and Environment and Milian, Swain & Associates, Inc.

123. The most recent ORC report from the DCA to M-D County states, “According to the District’s report (SFWMD), the County has applied for a consolidated 20-year consumptive use permit for all of its wellfields, which is currently being processed by the District; however, data available to the District indicate that traditional water supply sources will not (be) adequate to meet the County’s future water supply needs.”

A study addressing this issue is being prepared by Ecology and Environment and Milian, Swain & Associates, Inc. Water reuse is part of the study being prepared by Ecology and Environment and Milian, Swain & Associates, Inc.

124. M-D County is relying on ASR wells in the Upper Florida Aquifer as a future drinking water source. This is an experimental technology with serious problems. Significant amounts of water injected into the aquifer may not be retrievable, contamination by pathogens may be occurring, and contamination by toxic substances may be occurring. Florida Power & Light will soon be withdrawing 14,000,000 gallons a day from the Upper Florida Aquifer for its new power station at Turkey Point, opening in 2007.

A study addressing this issue is being prepared by Ecology and Environment and Milian, Swain & Associates, Inc.

125. Agriculture relies on open space and economics, open space is not enough to preserve agriculture.

Agriculture remains an option only if land is available. In Test Scenario 1 land was not available and agriculture in the area was not an option.

126. We have not yet addressed the vast array of implementation strategies available—we need to hear about them and what were their keys to success; this is a process issue; we are being asked to go forward before we have all the information

We are only going forward with the assessments. This map does not represent the final preferred scenario. Implementation strategies cannot be developed until we know the impacts of the draft preferred scenario.

127. My largest comment is that we seem to have lost focus on the original reason for the study-- to protect Biscayne Bay and Biscayne National Park. I feel as if we have suddenly become a study of whether or not to move the UDB and that was not and is not the purpose of the study, although it could ultimately be part of one of the recommendations of the study. I believe we need to refocus on the original purpose and address those issues first. If there are lands that need to be acquired or preserved or modified to protect Biscayne Bay we should try the best we can to identify them and to discuss how we protect the property rights of those parties affected by those actions.

Similarly, if there are lands that are not needed to protect Biscayne Bay they should be "released" from those regulatory burdens. As noted there are many potential ways to achieve those goals and we have not really even explored most of them.

As discussed in Sub-task 2.1, the SMDWSP will be consistent with the CERP projects which include the Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands Project. Additionally, the water resources data resulting from the test scenario assessments provides clear guidance on which type of development patterns are better for Biscayne Bay.

128. Graphical examples of the type of product required to satisfy the densities proposed should be provided for each category.

- b. These examples should include number of stories, typical square footage of each unit, whether structured or surface parking is required, etc.

These images have been presented on several occasions at an appropriate level of detail for this study.

129. Locally owned organic agriculture needs to be developed. Best management practices and earth-friendly practices need to be promoted.

Comment noted. Organic products may provide an additional market for farmers. Best management practices are one tool for protecting Biscayne Bay and the environment.

130. There needs to be a balance between the agriculture economy and farmland. If farmland area dwindles, supply houses, packing houses, equipment outlets, and labor may be forced to leave the area. This would no longer make farming viable.

Agricultural support uses are critical to ensuring a viable industry.

131. South M-D County is the only sub-tropical growing region in the continental U.S. Winter vegetables, tropical plants, ethnic fruits and vegetables grow here. Agri-tourism needs to be promoted.

Comment noted. Agri-tourism may provide an additional market for farmers.

132. The Watershed Committee is ideally positioned to create a successful future community. Necessary ingredients are affordable housing, workforce housing, rapid transit, smart growth, high density housing adjacent to rapid transit corridors, abundant parks, open space, eco-tourism, viable agriculture, and non-polluting industries. Developers will attempt to dissuade government leaders from implementing such a plan with reasons like cheap land, sprawl developments, no transportation plan, little open space, and polluting industries. Government needs to be firm and make the right things happen.

It is anticipated that affordable housing, workforce housing, rapid transit, smart growth, high density housing adjacent to rapid transit corridors, abundant parks, open space, eco-tourism, viable agriculture, and non-polluting industries will be part of the final plan.

133. When the development plan for 2050 is finalized, it would be a grievous mistake to build out the full extent of the plan in just a few years. Implementation needs to be slow and methodical and carefully coordinated to the population growth of the area.

Agreed. The timing of new development outside the UDB will still be required to meet the requirement of Land Use policy 8G of the Miami-Dade County Comprehensive Development Master Plan. Land Use Policy 8G describes the land use supply and demand analysis.

134. Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands Phases 1 & 2 are supposed to be flooded. The Model Lands tract is supposed to be flooded. C-1, C-100, C-110, C-111 Spreader Canal, and the South Miami-Dade Water Reuse Project are to provide fresh water for the flooding.

As discussed in Sub-task 2.1, the SMDWSP will be consistent with the CERP projects.

135. CERP project footprints and affected lands are needed to recharge Biscayne Bay, Card Sound, Little Card Sound, Manatee Bay and Barnes Sound. CERP project footprints and affected lands need to be fully protected to keep urban areas and agricultural lands from flooding.

As discussed in Sub-task 2.1, the SMDWSP will be consistent with the CERP projects.

136. School mitigation is a losing proposition for the schools.

Comment noted.

137. M-D County will need to spend huge amounts of money on drinking water facilities if ASR well technology fails.

Comment noted.

138. Solid waste needs to be reduced. The County's landfill dominates the skyline in Biscayne National Park. The landfill generates odors and releases toxic leachates. Solid waste needs to be reduced, recycled and reused. This is a quality of life issue.

Comment noted.

139. Affordable housing for farm workers should be allowed in agricultural areas. The Everglades Village is a prime example of high-quality, planned labor housing in close proximity to agribusiness.

Comment noted.

140. We believe that a Transfer of Development Rights program is largely unattainable because the overwhelming majority of landowners do not want their land downzoned and their rights restricted. There is simply not a demand for such a program, nor is there sufficient funding to purchase rights at fair market value. Also, the cost of purchasing development rights in today's market will not work economically.

Miami-Dade County staff is working on revisions to the TDR program. Funding is a critical piece of a successful program.

141. Adopt the Interim Structural Operating Plan's 2001 benchmark criteria for maintaining canal water levels as endorsed by the South Florida Water Management District.

Canal levels in Miami-Dade County, and throughout the District, are controlled and maintained based upon a schedule that has been developed through interagency agreement among various Federal and State agencies. The water levels within the canals can vary from month to month or even day to day depending upon a variety of factors. The schedule that controls the water levels, through utilization of structures in the canals, is based upon the following needs: providing for flood protection; limiting saltwater intrusion into groundwater; protecting underground water supplies/the Biscayne Aquifer, and providing for the hydrological needs of the environment. The term "Interim" implies that the Structural Operating Plan is not finalized, but short term only. The intent is that there will be a final Structural Operating Plan, and it is not known if the same criteria will be used for completion of this final plan. In any case, the issues related to the IOP and CSOP are highly complex, and fall outside the scope of the Watershed Study. In terms of the South Miami-Dade Watershed Study and Plan, our intent is to mitigate for the impacts of future growth within the Study area, including flooding. It is our belief that adding storage capacity and improving conveyance capacity in the western portions of the drainage basins will be one of many implementation strategies to be considered for the final plan.

142. Well fields should not be located in areas of active farming, but, if so, the restrictions for agriculture on crop chemical inputs must be adequately addressed.

The SMDWSP will not be siting wellfields.

143. Groundwater levels should be maintained for agricultural production areas that give a level of protection that will not jeopardize the economic sustainability for

agriculture and will follow the standards established to accomplish flood protection by maintaining groundwater levels that prevent or mitigate damage to crops.

As required by CERP groundwater levels will be maintained at the level they were at when CERP was adopted.

144. The use of the CSX rail line and other creative transit solutions should be encouraged as additional transportation corridors.

Although the CSX rail may someday be an attractive option for transit, funding should be focused on the US1 corridor which is already an urban area and listed as a future improvement in the Miami-Dade Transportation Plan.

145. Graphic examples of the type of product required to satisfy the densities proposed should be provided for each category. These examples should include number of stories, typical square footage of each unit, whether structured or surface parking is required, etc.

Examples of these products are already built within the Dadeland and Narnaja Charrettes.

146. Most notably, it is unclear how this plan can be implemented in terms of zoning, land assembly, etc.

As described previously, Zone A, Zone B and the charrettes have minimum and maximum densities which would be adopted by Miami-Dade County.

147. In terms of implementation, it is unclear how the committee suggests that the County assert both planning and zoning jurisdiction upon affected municipalities, if at all. The County Charter does not appear to grant such broad authority. Moreover, the Board of County Commissioners and municipal zoning authorities has historically not asserted the political will to assert such jurisdiction in these matters. Therefore, it should not be a given that densities of 20 to 50 units per acre shall apply to the inner zone of the entire US-1 transportation corridor. These densities are much higher than currently exist. If lower densities are allocated in this zone then more units will need to be distributed elsewhere. Without an approved acceptance of these densities at the municipal level, this proposal is flawed before any analysis begins. The analysis must demonstrate that the time-line for approval of these densities will occur within a timeline that will not adversely disrupt the development market, e.g., the implementation of these densities, if possible, must also be made in a timeframe which is certain. Unless there is a guarantee, then the entire analysis should not move forward as waiting an undefined number of years for this density to mature to accommodate growth only to find that it will not work so many years down the road could be devastating to the economy and belies the apparent ideological "smart" growth predisposition of the study

Other than Florida City and Homestead the other municipalities have been allocated very few units. Florida City and Homestead officials serve on the WSAC and have welcomed the additional development. In the other municipalities it is assumed that vacant, agricultural land and 10% of developed areas will be redeveloped. These figures are very conservative and place minimal burden on these cities to house new residents. Other than the charrettes (which already have approved densities), the maximum density used for calculating land supply in Zone A was 21 du/acre. No one ever suggested densities as high as 50 du per acre in Florida City or Homestead.

148. Agribusiness is affected by many factors outside of local land use planning policy, such as NAFTA. Should economic pressures cause further contraction of the agricultural sector, is it the intent of this study to place an effective conservation easement upon the land and have the land remain fallow?

Comment noted. Agri-tourism may provide an additional market for farmers.

149. Issues surrounding population growth remain, particularly in light of political instability in South and Central America. Should the County's population grow faster than the County has predicted due to increased in-migration and/or decreased out-migration to Broward, the current draft does not appear to provide appropriate flexibility. We suggest that a sensitivity analysis be preformed.

As of the Sub-task 1.2 report five different methods of projected population were used.

150. We have been advised that Florida City staff does not believe that the densities proposed within Zones A & B will be achieved within their jurisdiction, and should therefore be reduced.

It has never been suggested that Florida City intensify development to 60 dwelling units per acre. Current zoning in the City allows for 15 dwelling units per acre. The suggested density range for Zone A is 15 du/acre and greater and Zone B 6-20 du/acre.

151. Presenting a map without fully addressing the significant land-use and zoning changes that are needed to make it all happen is inappropriate for purposes of truly understanding what it will take to implement this study.

As described previously, Zone A, Zone B and the charrattes have minimum and maximum densities which would be adopted by Miami-Dade County.

152. The proposed draft “preferred” alternative does not appear to take into consideration any of the “results” from the test scenario (section 3.6).

The information contained in the Sub-task 3.6 report was used to create the initial preliminary preferred scenario map, subsequent draft and will be used to finalize the preferred scenario. Under each parameter assessment is a section title “Scenario Development Actions to be applied to the Preferred Scenario”.

153. Since this will affect the market value of farmland, we will need policy solutions to ensure that farmers do not lose their ability to finance farm operations.

From a land use perspective leaving the land open for agricultural will preserve the option to farm in the future but other (i.e., foreign trade policies) issues must be considered to make agricultural viable.

154. Policy initiatives will be needed for Zone A to build support for and reduce resistance to the gradual 50-year transition to higher densities

Policy changes and strategies will be recommended as part of the SMDWSP.

TRANSPORTATION

155. Slow moving buses in transportation corridors are not acceptable. Rapid light rail and rapid heavy rail such as Metrorail are required.

Rail service is critical to implementing the preferred scenario.

156. Slow moving buses as perpendicular feeders to rapid transit corridors are acceptable.

A bus feeder system may be useful for residents away from the corridor to access transit.

157. Rapid light rail on Kendall, from SW 137 Ave. to US 1 is acceptable, even if it means giving up a lane in both directions.

Rail service is critical to implementing the preferred scenario.

158. Rapid light rail on the Turnpike corridor from US 1 to the East-West rail (SR 836) is acceptable.

Rail service is critical to implementing the preferred scenario.

159. Rapid light rail on US 1 from Homestead to the Metrorail Dadeland terminal is acceptable.

Rail service is critical to implementing the preferred scenario.

160. Rapid transit can help reduce traffic gridlock, foreign oil dependency, and air pollution.

Rail transit and higher density development along transit corridors is a critical component of the preferred scenario.

161. Rapid transit concurrency is essential. Build rapid transit first. No rapid transit, no development.

Rail transit and higher density development along transit corridors is a critical component of the preferred scenario.

162. The President and the oil companies are warning that our society is addicted to oil and the amount of oil being consumed does not keep up with new oil discoveries.

To reduce our reliance on oil, rail transit and higher density development along transit corridors is a critical component of the preferred scenario.

163. As the global demand for oil increases and oil supply fails to keep up, it can be expected that gasoline prices will be rising dramatically. It is in the best interest of the community to recommend housing and economic development areas that are not automobile dependent.

To reduce our reliance on oil, rail transit and higher density development along transit corridors is a critical component of the preferred scenario.

164. A number of U.S. congressmen headed by Rep. Bartlett (R-MD) organized an ad hoc congressional committee to study the impacts of oil production peaking and declining.

To reduce our reliance on oil, rail transit and higher density development along transit corridors is a critical component of the preferred scenario.

165. The Hirsch report, funded by DOE, shows that under normal conditions it takes 10–15 years to replace *half the automobiles in the U.S.* This means that new conservation and efficiency efforts to reduce gasoline consumption can produce no short-term benefits.

To reduce our reliance on oil, rail transit and higher density development along transit corridors is a critical component of the preferred scenario.

166. All new affordable housing and workforce housing must be concentrated within walking distance of rapid transit corridors if it is to be sustainable.

Locating affordable and workforce housing near transit is an important component of the getting workers to their jobs. Residents living in affordable and workforce housing are most likely to use transit.

167. The most recent ORC Report from the DCA tells M-D County to, “Address the needs for new facilities and expansions of alternative transportation modes to provide a safe and efficient transportation network and enhance mobility.”

Rail transit and higher density development along transit corridors is a critical component of the preferred scenario.

168. Krome Ave should be a major transit corridor—it is not showing as such on map

The area near Krome Avenue does not have sufficient residential densities to support premium transit service. It should be noted that the term transit refers to public transportation (i.e., buses and trains).

169. Four-lane Quail Roost Drive, Eureka Drive, Hainlin & Silver Palm

We have not yet conducted the traffic analysis for the preferred scenario making it impossible to recommend roadway improvements. If the reasoning for this suggestion is the current traffic situation, your comments should be sent to the Miami-Dade County Metropolitan Planning Organization.

170. Four-lane Krome

We have not yet conducted the traffic analysis for the preferred scenario making it impossible to recommend roadway improvements. If the reasoning for this suggestion is the current traffic situation, your comments should be sent to the Miami-Dade County Metropolitan Planning Organization.

171. Six-lane US1

We have not yet conducted the traffic analysis for the preferred scenario making it impossible to recommend roadway improvements. If the reasoning for this suggestion is the current traffic situation, your comments should be sent to the Miami-Dade County Metropolitan Planning Organization.

172. Complete four-laning of 137 Avenue

We have not yet conducted the traffic analysis for the preferred scenario making it impossible to recommend roadway improvements. If the reasoning for this suggestion is the current traffic situation, your comments should be sent to the Miami-Dade County Metropolitan Planning Organization.

173. Four-lane 147 Avenue

We have not yet conducted the traffic analysis for the preferred scenario making it impossible to recommend roadway improvements. If the reasoning for this suggestion is the current traffic situation, your comments should be sent to the Miami-Dade County Metropolitan Planning Organization.

174. Four-lane Biscayne Drive

We have not yet conducted the traffic analysis for the preferred scenario making it impossible to recommend roadway improvements. If the reasoning for this suggestion is the current traffic situation, your comments should be sent to the Miami-Dade County Metropolitan Planning Organization.

175. Pave all unpaved section line roads and half section roads in the agricultural area.

We have not yet conducted the traffic analysis for the preferred scenario making it impossible to recommend roadway improvements. If the reasoning for this suggestion is the current traffic situation, your comments should be sent to the Miami-Dade County Metropolitan Planning Organization.

SCENARIO ASSESSMENTS

176. Wetlands need to be established where it has been shown they will be effective for water quality and flooding.

Basins with more severe water quality problems and specific areas with flood problems were identified as part of Sub-task 3.4. Additionally, the actual location of the proposed Stormwater Treatment Areas will most likely be subject to implementation strategies and land availability. Exact location is not as important because various engineering solutions can be used at a later date to fit the project needs.

177. Current development practices are killing Biscayne Bay (a recent study shows it's failing)

Current development practices were analyzed in Test Scenario 1 which produced the most pollutants.

178. East of US1 and East of Turnpike—concern that uses should be moved further from Biscayne Bay---We should be improving Bay water quality not only maintaining it

After modeling the preferred scenario we will have more information on pollution generation

179. Groundwater levels and water supply must be considered in this study

Groundwater modeling is not a part of this project. As noted above water supply is not a problem, the issues is cost and type of supply. While water supply is just at the cusp of becoming a problem for the near term, it is an issue of great concern. It is of great importance that everyone understands that the issues related to water supplies in the future are based upon where the County will get the water (alternative sources) and how much it will cost to develop these sources and to provide potable water.

180. It is interesting Scenario 1 is best for water supply while scenario 3 is worst on water supply

Test Scenario 3 has a greater impact on water supply because there is more agricultural land. Agricultural land uses more water.

181. Primary focus is supposed to be how to protect BNP? We are still not addressing that

BNP is being protected by limiting the amount of pollutants entering the Bay.

182. It is not the Park's job to come up with how to protect the Park, it is the job of this study to do that

Comment noted.

183. Two (2) additional parameters should be specifically assessed as impacts of the preferred scenario: 1.) Number of jobs created; and 2.) Growth in property values. These are more important to the economic health of growing communities than the three (3) economic parameters now included in the report.

The number of jobs is already a parameter. Projections related to Growth in property values would require site and use specific analysis which is not a part of this project. Under any land use plan there is no guarantee that property values will increase.

184. The impact of the preferred scenario on the tourist economy of the region must be addressed in detail.

An analysis similar to the one performed for the test scenarios will be conducted for the preferred scenario (Sub-task 3.1 report).

185. Utilizing the effective mean concentration EMC table from section 3.4, how is it possible to determine if low, medium, or high density residential is preferable. All three densities result in the same pollutant loading.

All three densities create different amounts of impervious surface and require different amounts of land.

186. See the attached Table. All land uses within each grouping use essentially the same loadings.

All three densities create different amounts of impervious surface and require different amounts of land.

187. Only 8 different land use loadings are being used, not 23 as the table would suggest.

In addition to the differences in EMCs, the amount of land needed in each scenario for residential development creates variations in pollutant loads. Additionally, the EMC's are a part of the accepted model program. DERM has done exhaustive study in assigning these values and they have been reviewed and accepted by the USEPA and FDEP for TMDL and NPDES purposes.

188. The modeling does not tell if the loading is concentrated at the canal mouths leading to the Bay. If the loading is spread over a large enough area the concentration may not be any higher from one scenario to another. With no information about concentration and downstream loading I am not sure ANY conclusions can be drawn from the modeling

Total loads to the Bay and loads by basins are included in the Sub-task 3.4 report.

189. County staff should be advised that if a specific section and page is required to be referenced in the county memos of the existing CDMP applications the information that is contained in section 3.4 cannot be used because of the way this section was adopted by the committee.

County staff is well aware of the directive from the Board of County Commissioners to provide specific references to the Watershed Plan if used in CDMP application reports. The December 22, 2006 report of proceedings clearly states that the WSAC accepted this document and the work product (i.e. modeling) as a comparative tool. This would not preclude the County staff from referring to various tables, graphs, etc. by section and page #.

190. M-D County needs to partner with SFWMD, ACOE, and ENP to find solutions to water supply problems. ENP will be raising the groundwater levels as part of CSOP and CERP to save the ecosystem. Addition flood protection will be given for West Kendall urban areas and the South M-D agricultural areas. Seepage management techniques such as curtain wall or slurry wall will likely *reduce* the supply of water coming into M-D wellfields from the west. The first wellfield to be impacted will likely be the new West Wellfield.

Agreed, Miami-Dade County needs to partner with SFWMD, ACOE, and ENP to find solutions to water supply problems. This could be incorporated into the SMDWSP's recommendations.

191. With lowered groundwater levels, likely winners will be West Kendall homeowners and South M-D agriculture. Likely losers will be WASD not having enough water, well users near the saltwater intrusion line, and Biscayne Bay getting a reduced amount of fresh water.

Similar to the analysis for the test scenario analysis, the amount of canal water flowing into the Bay will assessed for the preferred scenario.

192. The National Parks Conservation Association rates the condition of Biscayne National Park as *poor*. Reasons for this degraded condition are destruction of coastal wetlands, declines in important fish populations, mounting development pressures, limited supply of freshwater recharge, and excessive pollution. The Bay remains critically important to South Florida for many reasons.

Similar to the analysis for the test scenario analysis, the amount of pollutants flowing into the Bay will be assessed for the preferred scenario.

193. Urban areas and agricultural lands are not supposed to be flooded.

Similar to the analysis for the test scenario analysis, flooding will be assessed for the preferred scenario.

194. Housing outside the developed area puts the school system in a difficult situation. The highest costs of providing a public school education occur when new schools are built. Student population increase for infill areas often can be accommodated by sending students to the various school locations where vacancies are located or by expanding existing sites. With new housing developments beyond the traditional urban area, no such reasonable options exist.

Residential developments outside the UDB would have to include new schools.

195. The excessive costs of building new schools often means that traditional schools do not receive the maintenance and improvements that older facilities need. As with schools, transportation, and other services, the older neighborhoods are cannibalized to provide infrastructure and services to the newest neighborhoods. The older neighborhoods are often the poorest neighborhoods.

As redevelopment occurs school improvements should also occur.

196. M-D County is harming its future water supply by allowing effluent from UIC wells in South M-D to leak into the Upper Floridian Aquifer.

Comment noted.

197. The fiscal analysis does not appear to properly take into account the contributions of developers to schools, parks, etc, or the costs and dislocations associated with improving infrastructure like water and sewer in in-fill areas.

Impact fees are included in the fiscal impact analysis. Costs to improve infrastructure in urban areas were based on the *Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department Needs Assessment*.

198. The analysis does not consider the appropriateness of the housing types and prices that the higher densities would produce. It presumes that any unit can serve any owner whether an "empty nester" or a family with children without regard to individual needs.

The final plan will include a mix of unit types appropriate for a range of household sizes.

199. The study does not address the benefits and detriments of agriculture upon the watershed.

Although a specific analysis listing the positive and negative attributes of agriculture is not a part of this project, certain factors were revealed through the parameter assessments (i.e., water quality, loss of agricultural land and employment).

200. The study does not provide the ability to actually assess impacts to Biscayne Bay. Increases in a pollutant loading do not mean there will be a problem in Biscayne Bay, *per se*.

The adverse impacts of pollution on marine life have been documented on numerous occasions. A summary of these impacts is provided in the Sub-task 3.4 report.

201. The modeling does not indicate if the loading is concentrated at the canal mouths leading to the Bay. If the loading is spread over a large enough area the concentration may not be any higher from one scenario to another. With no information about concentration and downstream loading, it is not clear that any conclusions can be drawn from the modeling.

The Sub-task 3.4 report described pollutant loading for each basin and totals entering the Bay.

PROCESS

202. The “Preferred Scenario” map, which is to be voted upon on February 23, 2006 is based on a report that is not being voted on until March 2006 and logic dictates that the report be reviewed and voted upon prior to voting on the map; which is the result of the report.

The WSAC is not being asked to accept this map as the final preferred scenario. It is a draft to move forward with more detailed analysis. It may change. Acceptance of the final preferred scenario map will occur once we know the impacts. All of the information contained in the Sub-task 3.6 report was already presented to the committee in great detail at previous meetings.

203. Don’t stop this process because we don’t know what will happen in the future

Stopping the process will lead to Test Scenario 1.

204. Groups like this make lines on a map meaningful

Comment noted.

205. It is clear that the public input and response process has not been followed throughout the past several years. Even your current changes do not address the requirements of the scope of services. The following is an excerpt from the Scope of Service:

Public Comment Response Process

Public comments regarding the South Miami-Dade Watershed Study and Plan will be formally received in three different ways: 1) through public comment at General Public meetings and Watershed Advisory Committee meetings; 2) through e-mail messages to the CONSULTANT and South Florida Regional Planning Council Watershed web pages; and 3) through U.S. Mail or other courier service received by the CONSULTANT or the South Florida Regional Planning Council (SFRPC). Public comments received at meetings open to the public will be recorded on flip charts, and transcribed to the official record of the proceedings of such meetings. Public comments received by the CONSULTANT through e-mail or post will be transmitted to the Project Manager at the SFRPC. The CONSULTANT will be responsible for transmission within seven (7) days of its receipt. Public comments received by the SFRPC will be copied to the Project Manager at the SFRPC. Upon request of the Project Manager, the CONSULTANT will participate in drafting a response to the public comment.

The Project Manager will transmit process-oriented public comment regarding Watershed Advisory Committee meetings to the Facilitator at the Institute for Community

Collaboration for further response. Likewise, the Project Manager will transmit process-oriented public comment regarding General Public meetings to the CONSULTANT for further response. All other public comment will receive a response posted on the SFRPC Watershed web page no later than thirty (30) days after its receipt. The Project Manager will transmit responses to the CONSULTANT for posting on its Watershed web page as well. Comments received from elected officials will, if not answered satisfactorily in a meeting with the official, be answered in formal correspondence on SFRPC letterhead, drafted by the Project Manager. Please note the Scope requires a response to public comments. This has not happened. All public comments are to be transcribed to the official record of the proceedings. Responses have not been provided within 30 days as required. Voting on items has occurred at almost every meeting without regard or timely input or response from Public input.

The SFRPC and Keith and Schnars are satisfied that the requirements of the public comment response process are being met.

206. What is the status of sections 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6? How can you proceed without seeing the results of section 3.6?

Sub-task 3.6 was presented to the WSAC in December 2005 and submitted in February 2006. Sub-task 3.5 will be submitted as part of the assessments for the preferred scenario. Sub-task 3.4 was approved as a comparative analysis by the WSAC in December 2005.

207. Where is the Economic Study being used in the preferred scenario?

Of the three economic parameters studied housing costs provided the most guidance for creating the preferred scenario. Unit types and the costs for each unit are important to providing affordable and workforce housing in the future.

208. Who changed the name as directed by the commission from the South Dade Land Use and Water Management Plan to the South Dade Watershed Plan?

The Watershed Plan is initially referred to as an "integrated land use and water management plan for southeastern Miami-Dade County" in Land Use Policy 3E, and is thenceforth referred to as either the "South Dade Watershed Plan" or simply "the Plan." This revision and several other revisions to Land Use Policy 3E were adopted by the Board of County Commissioners as part of the October 2004 CDMP Amendment Cycle on December 12, 2005.

209. There is no adequate indication of whether the "preferred" plan represents an optimal plan, or what it represents.

Agreed, we will not know what the optimal plan is until we complete the assessment and implementation phases of the project.

210. It is inappropriate to publish the "preferred" scenario map in advance of the entire report. After almost a decade from its inception, the speed with which the group is now being pushed to get this draft "preferred" alternative to the County Commission is inappropriate.

Initial input on the preferred scenario was taken at the open house events in August 2005 and the first draft map was presented on January 12, 2006. The WSAC has been reviewing this map for over two months.

211. Apparent incorrect representations were made at the February 21, 2006 public meeting. Section 3.4 (Water Quality) was in fact not adopted by consensus, and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) has not formally approved any aspect of the Study, and has only provided comments. Indeed, TAC members have expressed dissatisfaction with the consultant's responses to their comments at recent TAC meetings.

Sub-task 3.4 was approved as a comparative analysis by the WSAC in December 2005. The only dissatisfaction expressed by the Technical Review Committee was the lack of analysis done on water resources modeling in Biscayne Bay. Water resources modeling in Biscayne Bay is not apart of this project.

212. Because of the speed between meetings, there was inadequate time for comments provided by the public to be circulated to members of the Committee – and thus the members of the Committee have no ability to incorporate those comments into their own decision-making, effectively rendering the provision of comments by the public moot. This reinforces the fact that the meetings have been proceeding too quickly, and suggests that public input has been and continues to be given little credence.

Initial input on the preferred scenario was taken at the open house events in August 2005 and the first draft map was presented on January 12, 2006. The WSAC has been reviewing this map for over two months.

213. We urge this committee to recognize that they are being asked to forward this draft to the County Commission prior to the March PAB hearings and April County Commission hearing scheduled for the current CDMP applications to be used as a tool to guide their decisions in this CDMP amendment cycle. We suggest that the release of this preliminary draft will be treated as the final decision of the committee, which is inappropriate given the status of the overall study.

Although the preferred scenario has not yet been approved by the WSAC, 14 other reports have been approved by consensus.

214. What has happened to Section 3.6? This document was to analyze the test scenarios. Other than a very brief power point presentation no written report has been provided, and is not available on the web site.

Sub-task 3.6 was presented to the WSAC in December 2005 and submitted in February 2006.

215. The current release of a preliminary "preferred" scenario is much different than what was originally contemplated and contracted for in the Scope of Work for this project.

The preliminary preferred scenario is not the final plan. The final plan will include a map, assessment of the map and implementation strategies.

216. As of this date, the meeting summaries from the Technical Advisory Committee for the last two meetings (January and July 2005) have not been posted on the web site. There is no link from either the SFRPC or "official" Watershed web sites to the location of the TAC meeting minutes. It is difficult for the public to locate the information about this project which is not posted in a timely manner and is posted on three (3) different web sites with no links between them.

All meeting summaries are posted on the website.

217. The public input and response process has not been as aggressively followed throughout the past several years as had been hoped. First, the amount of time given to speakers from the public is extremely limited. Even your current changes do not address the requirements of the Scope of Work, which, among other things requires a response to public comments within 30 days and all public comments are to be transcribed to the official record of the proceedings. Voting on items has occurred at almost every meeting without regard or timely input or response from Public input.

The SFRPC and Keith and Schnars are satisfied that the requirements of the public comment response process are being met.

218. It seems inappropriate to release a draft plan without completing section 3.6 in particular.

Sub-task 3.6 was presented to the WSAC in December 2005 and submitted in February 2006.

219. County staff should be advised that if a specific section and page is required to be referenced in the County memos of the existing CDMP applications, the information that is contained in section 3.4 cannot be used because of the way this section was adopted by the committee.

Sub-task 3.4 was approved as a comparative analysis by the WSAC in December 2005.

220. It has been suggested that the committee should first allocate the units and then determine what is left over for environmental protection. We disagree with this

approach and remind the committee that the original and primary objective of this study was to identify those lands needed to protect Biscayne Bay.

Staff is not aware of that suggestion or approach. The preferred scenario is being developed in accordance with adopted development constraints and environmental issues described in Sub-task 1.4 and 3.3. As discussed in Sub-task 2.1, the SMDWSP will be consistent with the CERP projects which include the Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands Project. Additionally, the water resources data resulting from the test scenario assessments provides clear guidance on which type of development patterns are better for Biscayne Bay.

221. Numerous requests have been made to update the land analysis to recognize lands no longer needed by CERP be included in the preferred alternative. The database should be adjusted so that the conclusions of the committee will not be obsolete at the outset. Specifically, a better delineation of lands required by CERP should be included on the base map. The Yellow Book should NOT be used. The work on the CERP projects affecting the watershed study area has changed significantly.

As discussed in Sub-task 2.1, the SMDWSP will be consistent with the CERP projects. CERP staff has not identified any more specific project boundaries than those described in the Yellow Book.

222. The CDMP provides an Urban Development Boundary, which is intended to plan for 10 years of growth and a suggested Urban Expansion Area, which contemplates expansions at the end of the existing planning horizon. Efforts to define UEA areas for a fifty year time frame seems a bit overreaching, particularly given the detail of all of the various models being used. We suggest that the scale and sensitivity of the models being used simply cannot provide information of sufficient detail to draw the lines as they have been.

At this point we do not know if the lines shown on the preliminary preferred map are in the optimal location. The final areas for urban expansion will not be determined until the assessments and stakeholder input process have been completed.

223. Discussions about a map – draft or otherwise – is premature, and there is no quicker way to derail a planning process than by drawing lines on a landscape. The map should come at the end of the process - not in the middle - and should not direct the modeling. The draft map should be the end result of the modeling processes.

With that said, we need to move forward with modeling. However, we should be going back right now to our parameters and criteria and giving rank and weight to each of these to facilitate the modeling.

What we need to know – above all else - is which are the most important lands to the health of the watershed – no map needs to be approved for this information to be modeled –this information can be derived from the data we already have and should be based entirely on non-arbitrary data sets of hydrology, landscape features and resource integrity. By modeling these data sets, we will be provided with a layer that shows the most critical lands for the health of the watershed.

Then, we should overlay this base map with the CERP footprints for the Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands, the C-111 Spreader Canal and the Bird Drive Retention Area. By doing this activity, we will be provided with the absolute HIGHEST priority lands for conservation. However, this information does not mean that all of this land will be saved nor does it mean these lands will be diminished with a “cloud” over their values (see discussion of conservation tools below). What we can do from there is set a goal that X percentage of these lands must be conserved so as to ensure the health of the South Dade Watershed, the effective restoration of Everglades and the resource integrity of Biscayne Bay to support not only the park, but the economic engines of agricultural, tourism, fishing, etc.

Once we come to agreement on the critical lands, then we can take the areas of MEDIUM and LOW conservation priority to address the other issues of development, density, economics and transportation.

We intend to move forward with the assessments and revisit the map after completing the assessments.

224. It is never too early for this team to begin discussions on implementation strategies, and we should be receiving as much information as possible about alternatives and tools available so that we can make the best and fully integrated recommendations as possible. If we could achieve early consensus on some of these tools, it will remove some of the fear that we come to the table with at each meeting.

From the different issues raised around the table, we need to discuss – in depth – implementation strategies for the following:

- Economics

I remain strongly disappointed in the economic analysis performed as a part of this study. Let’s just say I am TIRED of the same old outdated modes of economic analysis that have failed our communities time and again by promising certain growth without deeper understanding of local economies and landscapes. What do we mean by industry and commercial when we discuss job growth, wages, employment? Have we even identified the emerging economies – such as information technology, biotechnology, ecotourism that are non-consumptive types of industries that pay higher wages. What industries are needed to really support agriculture – marketing and public relations, processing, restaurants, markets? We need a real discussion and

analysis about the direct and indirect economic benefits and impacts of leisure, nature-based recreation and parks – which includes the race track, the national parks, fishing, etc.

- Agriculture

We must get beyond the discussion of those policies directly out of our control – NAFTA, CAFTA – and discuss what are local policies that we could recommend for implementation that will support a healthy agriculture in South Miami-Dade, and we must recognize some of the national trends that are proving successful all across the country – from farmers cooperatives, federal marketing orders, agritourism – to determine their adaptiveness to the local environment.

TDRs/PDRs are but one tool, and by no means the only tool, for preserving farmland, and we need to look at a number of initiatives to support farming, including the potential of creating a non-profit, community-based conservancy that can hold and maintain conservation easements, purchase and sell development rights, retain the opportunity to purchase farm land at fair market prices and keep it in production.

- Conservation

An entire toolbox exists to conserve lands while respecting private property rights and without diminishing values. We need a full-on discussion of these tools, processes and programs, existing public/private and future funding sources, and how they can be applied in this area. We also need to discuss – in non-emotional terms – how past processes have hampered local landowners and explore ways that we can address these concerns in future recommendations.

We also need to incorporate a discussion about local parks, classifications and distribution and the partnering of these parks with larger goals of greenways and connectors, water flow and retention, decompression zones between protected areas and development.

- Development

We need a real discussion about the residential and commercial development market – not just as it exists today and its focus on single-family development – but as we would like to shape the market in this area over the next 50 years. Across America there exists a paradigm shift, especially among empty-nesters and young professionals, that the single-family home is NOT representative of the American Dream, and this process should recognize that shift and offer incentives for other types of development. We also need to discuss the emergence of more “green” development – materials, design, industries – that we can recommend in these areas to address some of the concerns raised about development and its proximity to protected areas.

Implementation strategies will be the main topic of discussion at the April 2006 meeting.

225. For this plan to have any hope of passage at the Board of County Commissioners level, the public outreach process must be completely revisited.

On a broader level of advocacy, public information and participation, we need to go to where people already are by getting on the agendas of existing and regular group meetings. We must recognize that different audiences receive information differently based upon cultural variances as well as their associations. What I've learned from running public finance campaigns, if you want to reach African-Americans, you go to the churches. For Hispanics of Mexican descent, you go to the social service agencies and community fairs. For Hispanics of Central, South and Caribbean origin, you go to the radio stations and the community newspapers and the community events. Homeowners Associations, Optimist Clubs, agricultural organizations, professional and civic groups all have monthly meetings – we should be going to them not asking them to come to us. We need to equip every member of this Advisory Committee with the capacity to speak on behalf of this Plan to each group and gather the public's input.

Agreed, the members of the WSAC are critical for informing the public.

OTHER

226. Land Use Element 3E specifically charges the Watershed Committee “To identify and protect lands, including their uses and functions that are essential for preserving the environmental, economic, and community values of Biscayne National Park.”

As discussed in Sub-task 2.1, the SMDWSP will be consistent with the CERP projects which include the Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands Project. Additionally, the water resources data resulting from the test scenario assessments provides clear guidance on which type of development patterns are better for Biscayne Bay.

227. These values, related to Biscayne National Park, are deteriorating. The Watershed Committee must not promote any plans to allow new urban areas closer to the Park’s boundary that will decrease the beneficial effects of wetlands, increase contamination loads, or restrict freshwater flows to the Park.

As discussed in Sub-task 2.1, the SMDWSP will be consistent with the CERP projects which include the Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands Project. Additionally, the water resources data resulting from the test scenario assessments provides clear guidance on which type of development patterns are better for Biscayne Bay.

228. 3E also charges the Watershed Committee to analyze “Ways to integrate the Plan into the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan.”

As discussed in Sub-task 2.1, the SMDWSP will be consistent with the CERP projects. Additionally, the water resources data resulting from the test scenario assessments provides clear guidance on which type of development patterns are better for Biscayne Bay.

229. Integrating the Plan into CERP means that all CERP footprints *and affected lands* need to be protected from urban encroachment. These projects include Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands (Phases 1 & 2), C-111 Spreader Canal, C-4 Structure, Everglades National Park Seepage Management, L-30 Seepage Management Pilot, Restoration of Pineland & Tropical Hardwood Hammocks in C-111 Basin, South Miami-Dade Water Reuse, Wastewater Reuse Technology Pilot, and West Miami-Dade water Reuse.

As discussed in Sub-task 2.1, the SMDWSP will be consistent with the CERP projects. Additionally, the water resources data resulting from the test scenario assessments provides clear guidance on which type of development patterns are better for Biscayne Bay.

230. Essential parts of 3E that are missing are issues of quality of life and sustainability. Many former residents have moved out of M-D County complaining of a diminished quality of life. Sustainability is even more critical. M-D County needs to commit to a serious study of sustainability.

This may be a policy recommendation of the WSAC.

231. Land Use Element 3E specifically charges the Watershed Committee, “To support a viable, balanced economy including agriculture, recreation, tourism, and urban development in the Plan area.”

Comment noted.

232. Watershed Committee recommendations have no legal impact on property rights. “The argument that conducting a planning study, and considering a range of planning or regulatory changes is a taking of private property simply has no support in the law.” (Comments by Environmental & Land Use Law Center, Inc. submitted to the Watershed Committee 12/22/05.)

Similar finding were discussed in the Sub-task 3.5 Interim Work Product and presented to the WSAC on two separate occasions.

233. “Property rights protect landowners from government action that takes away so much of their existing uses and value that it is unfair. They do not guarantee profit, subjective expectations, or protect speculative business decisions.” (Ibid.)

Similar finding were discussed in the Sub-task 3.5 Interim Work Product and presented to the WSAC on two separate occasions.

234. The Watershed Committee should not become a property value enhancement board. Land speculation, like the stock market, comes with no guarantees of increased values.

Similar finding were discussed in the Sub-task 3.5 Interim Work Product and presented to the WSAC on two separate occasions.

235. Eminent domain must not be used to obtain property for private economic development or personal gain.

No one has suggested that eminent domain be used to obtain property for private economic development.

236. Everglades National Park, alone among U.S. national parks, holds three international designations: International Biosphere Reserve, Wetland of International Importance, and World Heritage Site. Its viability is a top priority

Comment noted.

237. The Everglades are inextricably linked to water supply and flooding in M-D County. Everglades National Park only receives 50% of the fresh water it needs. This lack of fresh water affects the Park, endangered species, and all of Florida Bay. To supply the proper amount of water to the Park, M-D wellfields and Biscayne Bay will likely receive less water than they need. Also, to supply the proper amount of water to the Park, It is likely that flooding in the western area will be exacerbated. It is critically important for the Everglades, water supply, and flood protection that all CERP footprints and affected lands be protected for necessary CERP restoration projects.

As discussed in Sub-task 2.1, the SMDWSP will be consistent with the CERP projects.

238. With little doubt, the population of South Miami-Dade will increase by 600,000 residents. South Miami-Dade is a unique and desirable place. Safety, climate, accessibility, business, opportunity, and recreation will attract future residents from northern states, Canada, Europe, the Caribbean Basin, and South America. There is no need to advertise for more residents, they will come.

Comment noted.

239. 2050 is not the final chapter for M-D County.

Comment noted.

240. The Brookings Institution analyzed data from the 2000 Census and concluded that of the 100 largest cities, M-D County had the lowest household median income of all the large cities in the United States. County government has been enthralled with sprawl development, but it comes with a heavy price. County government admits to being \$10 billion in arrears on its own infrastructure investments. M-D County needs to get its house in order and provide its residents basic services such as excellent schools, reliable public transportation, safe streets, functional parks, child care centers, and medical facilities. The M-D community needs to fight poverty with high quality schools and local empowerment. Sprawl development consumes infrastructure money that's needed elsewhere.

These concepts can be incorporated into the preferred scenario and implementation strategies.

241. The Brookings study states that in 2000, 41% of black families in M-D County had no access to a car. As good planners, the Watershed Committee needs to recommend growth for the right places. All residents should benefit from transportation investments and other infrastructure investments, not just the residents of newly created neighborhoods.

Transit improvements are planned for existing neighborhoods.

242. We need a clear definition of what is 'rural'

Rural land is agricultural or open land.

243. The Committee needs charrette background documentation

As mentioned above the charrette plans were previously discussed in June and August of 2004. They were also discussed at the WSAC open house events held on August 10 and 11, 2005. Miami-Dade County Urban Design Center staff made a presentation to the WSAC all of the charrattes at the January 12, 2006 meeting.

244. Committee will be provided a list of charrette areas and a map of where they are

This information has already been provided on several occasions. See comments 3 and 4.

245. Short report to this Committee is needed on what happened with agriculture study meeting with County Manager

A report on the Agricultural Study was provided at the February 23, 2006 WSAC meeting.

246. We have an obligation to respond to public's comments and address their concerns

All public comment is considered by the Organizational Committee.

247. Building Industry/Planning Dept. will be having a panel discussion sometime in 1st or 2nd weeks in March to discuss how calculations are done and give reactions on how this process is done

The FIU Metropolitan Center held a "Panel on Land Capacity in Miami-Dade County" on March 7. A follow-up meeting is scheduled for March 24, and a report on the accepted methodology for determining land capacity is scheduled for release on March 30.

248. Attached are my comments/questions that I prepared for yesterday's meeting. I still don't understand why Gables Estates and Gables by the Sea were not included in the study area as was mandated by the regional committee that requested the study. There were comments made by the representative of Audubon about the quality of water in Biscayne Bay. What studies have been done pertaining to Mount Trashmore polluting the Bay? Why is it automatically assumed that the farmland developed south

of Homestead Air Reserve Base and east is going to pollute the Bay? There is no scientific evidence. The comments made by John Fredrick were very apropos.

The boundaries of the Watershed Study Area are based on major drainage basins that outfall to Biscayne Bay. No land use changes are proposed in this area which is a builtout waterfront community. Therefore there will be no changes to the baseline condition. No one has made any assumptions about pollutants going into Biscayne Bay. All pollution calculations are based on water quality modeling using the XP-SWMM.

249. Also, I know there is much discussion about how this draft map must achieve consensus - but I really think we're missing the boat on procedure and getting unfocused by focusing only on a map. The consultants don't really need our consensus to model - it's the results of the modeling itself and the weights of the criteria underlying the modeling that really need our attention. We need to look at the results of the modeling to frame discussion. Also, every issue being brought up by members is related to implementing strategies - unless we can take the fire out of some of the more inflaming rhetoric and have common sense discussions about strategies and about alternatives that respect private property rights, we will not move forward.

Also, with DCA's basically denying all requests to move the UDB until water issues are resolved, there really is no April "deadline" now looming over our heads. We can breath at the moment and consider how a thoughtful process from here on out can inform the County's future decisions.

We've lost sight that this is NOT a land use plan, but a watershed plan which should ultimately set a goal that X percentage of land within this watershed must be conserved to protect water resources. The road we're headed down right now is not getting us there.

We intend to move forward with the assessments and revisit the map after completing the assessments.

250. I'm concerned about the group getting deadlocked. Perhaps we should have some more breakout sessions to try to fine-tune/adjust the "preliminary preferred scenario" map and/or other related issues (e.g., property rights), so that everyone feels more comfortable to then go ahead and allow the consultant to proceed to the modeling? Alternatively, perhaps the consultant could do some (limited) modeling, or at least a qualitative assessment of impacts, of some alternative marginal options (e.g., localized extensions of the UDB line outward) to the "preliminary preferred scenario"? Just something to think about. My sense is that some weeks ago, when the committee members rolled up their sleeves and got focused in a problem solving mode (rather than individual issues), we made a lot of progress, and that some more of this type of activity may be needed before the scenario (with associated issues such as property rights) is ready for formal modeling evaluation.

We intend to move forward with the assessments and revisit the map after completing the assessments. Breakout groups will be used on March 23, 2006 to work through some of the conflicting comments.