

# **SOUTH MIAMI DADE WATERSHED STUDY ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**March 23, 2006 Meeting #43  
John D. Campbell Agricultural Center  
Homestead, Florida**

## **REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS**

### **WELCOME/CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The meeting was held at the John D. Campbell Agricultural Center in Homestead, Florida.

Roger Carlton, Chair, welcomed everyone. Mr. Carlton has accepted a position with the County as Assistant County Manager and had made a commitment to the Committee that he would give them his decision on whether or not he would stay on as Chair of the South Miami Dade Watershed Study Advisory Committee. In announcing his decision to stay as Chair, Mr. Carlton explained that he had sought the opinion of the County Attorney and Robert Meyers, Esq., Executive Director of the Miami-Dade County Commission on Ethics and the Public Trust. Both advised him that there was no conflict of interest in his continuing to serve as Chair. Additionally, the County Manager, George Burgess, expressed his desire for Mr. Carlton to continue as Chair to keep a sense of continuity and stability to a process that has lasted for five years and is now coming to a close. However, Mr. Burgess left the final decision to Mr. Carlton. In making his decision to stay as Chair, Mr. Carlton, considered not only the legal, ethical and County Manager's opinions, but also the perception of a conflict if he remained in the role of Chair. In deciding to stay, Mr. Carlton announced that, although he would continue to participate in deliberations, he would no longer take part in consensus rankings or voting; rather, he would be a Chair that assists in moving the process along and assisting in assuring its continued and final success. He asked if anyone had any objections; none were forthcoming. One member requested that a Vice Chair be appointed to serve in Mr. Carlton's absence if he is unable to attend a meeting. This decision will be considered and an announcement regarding a vice-chair will be made within the next couple of meetings.

Members present:

Roger Carlton, Chair  
Humberto Alonso, South Florida Water Management District\*  
Subrata Basu, Miami Dade Planning and Zoning\*  
Guillermina Damas, At-Large Member  
Carlos Espinosa, Miami-Dade DERM\*  
Jeffrey Flanagan, Chamber South  
John Fredrick, Dade County Farm Bureau  
Jamie Furgang, National Audubon Society (prospective member)  
Robert Johnson, Everglades National Park  
Louise King, Redland Citizen's Association  
Mark Lewis, Biscayne National Park  
William Losner, Greater Homestead/Florida City Chamber of Commerce  
Bennie Lovett, Florida City  
Reed Olszack, Miami-Dade Agricultural Practices Board  
Mark Oncavage, Sierra Club

\*\*\*\*\*

Lawrence Percival, Kendall Federation of Homeowner Associations  
Armando Perez, Florida Engineering Society  
Bonnie Roddenberry, Sunny South Acres Homeowner's Association  
Jorge Rodriguez, Miami Dade Water Department\*  
Mike Shehadeh, City of Homestead  
Jane Spurling, Florida Nurserymen, Grower's and Landscape Association  
Charles Thibos, Tropical Everglades Visitor Association  
Julia Trevarthen, South Florida Regional Planning Council

\*Non-voting member

There were 22 Observers.

## **AGENDA REVIEW/GUIDELINES**

Janice Fleischer, Facilitator, reviewed the Agenda for the day (Exhibit A).

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

## **PROJECT MANAGER'S REPORT**

Bob Daniels, SFRPC, delivered his Project Manager's Report. (Exhibit B)

## **"RESPONSE TO COMMENTS" PRESENTATION**

Eric Silva, Keith and Schnars, gave a presentation on how Committee member questions and concerns were addressed since the last meeting. (Exhibit C and full Responses Exhibit D).

Following the presentation, Committee members made the following comments (areas indicated in red represent answers to questions asked):

- 1) Explain surface water flow variations
- 2) Are the 3 scenarios consistent with Park Master Plan
  - a. Same amount of park acreage in all three scenarios
  - b. Consultant going further out in time than Master Plan
- 3) South Dade Corridor Transit improvements are due for approval before we have a chance to discuss
  - a. The Chair will get our information to the MPO
- 4) Concerns on Florida City comments
  - a. 70% of land Florida City wants to annex is farmland
  - b. high density development in these areas is contrary to tourism access
- 5) When we analyze Parks we need to use National Parks as part of percentages considered in parks.
- 6) Krome needs to be included as a transit corridor.
  - a. Krome not included because traffic modeling is not done
- 7) We need to plan now for Krome as an North/South corridor
  - a. This may come up in implementation strategies
- 8) We agreed to designate Krome as a transportation corridor not a transit corridor-are we doing that?

\*\*\*\*\*

- a. Krome may be used if needed when results are in
  - b. This group needs to have benefit of analysis before deciding
  - c. **WE NEED TO FINALIZE KROME ISSUE**
  - d. Facilitator's note: As used by this committee for this discussion, a transportation corridor is a road that is maintained/improved to allow a free flow of traffic; a transit corridor would include additional mass transportation services (i.e., buses or trains) and increased development along the corridor (commercial, residential, industrial, etc.)
- 9) There are two separate issues here on Krome – do you want higher densities or just improvements to the road itself?
    - a. **Asking that Krome is an improved roadway not that there are increased densities**
  - 10) If we want to remain Agriculture – putting higher densities along Krome is contrary to that
  - 11) It is important to discuss Krome; whether we want densities there as the western most major corridor
  - 12) 136<sup>th</sup> Street and up is the Northern part of Krome and is what has been discussed regarding development; South of 136<sup>th</sup>, you should just improve the road
  - 13) Think of Krome as a Route not a corridor for development; it needs to be 4 laned
  - 14) Krome needs to be widened for safety
  - 15) Implementation strategies should include Krome recommendations
  - 16) During the implementation strategies phase we need to look at the difference in roads for trucks and small traffic
  - 17) Implementation strategies are part and parcel of the Final Plan – not optional
  - 18) #97, P19-Consultant answer not satisfactory
    - a. Compensation is necessary if a 'de facto' line is being created and land taken
    - b. question is: Do we as a Committee go back to one house on 1.25 acres or stay @ 1 house in 5 acres
  - 19) **There are many questions – they must be answered as a package not separate**
  - 20) It is important where wetlands are located
    - a. Must be specific and agreed to by Committee
  - 21) In the final plan there will be more specificity regarding concerns in implementation strategies
  - 22) The discussion at this point only assumes “willing sellers”
  - 23) Flooding effects – we need to talk about where there are areas that are subject to flooding that are not near canals. Flooding is dependent on topography
  - 24) The zoning you have at the time you purchase property is your inherent right, you are not guaranteed a change in zoning.
  - 25) Can we discuss the Florida City DRI?
    - a. **it was decided over 2 years ago not to take a position on the Florida City DRI**
  - 26) Property rights need to be discussed now – no need to wait until modeling is finished
    - a. **Property Rights has 2 arms: Legal and policy**
  - 27) By virtue of just doing the modeling, we must recognize that land values can change
    - a. this issue must be addressed
    - b. Recognition of impacts of modeling
    - c. Compensation
    - d. Satisfaction
  - 28) We must also discuss value increase and value decrease
    - a. property rights
    - b. saltwater intrusion
    - c. **The map will be able to be revised after modeling comes back**

\*\*\*\*\*

## PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment was invited at 11:30 am (This was an additional public comment time added in order to provide more time for input on the many matters being discussed by the Committee).

Four individuals spoke:

- Katie Edwards, Dade County Farm Bureau
- Ed Swakon, Consultant
- Charles Shinn, Dade County Farm Bureau
- Pat Wade

The Committee then broke for lunch. Upon returning from lunch, public comment was invited once again. Four individuals spoke:

- Robbie Bishop, Farmer, Dade County Farm Bureau
- Steve Sapp
- Pat Wade
- Joseph Goldstein, Esq.

Members of the public are strongly encouraged to submit their comments in writing on the comment cards provided at each meeting or email the Facilitator; Janice Fleischer ([janice@flashresolutions.com](mailto:janice@flashresolutions.com)) within the first week following the meeting and those comments will be included in the Report.

## CONSULTANT PRESENTATION: "WHERE WE HAVE BEEN AND WHERE WE ARE GOING."

Michael Davis, V.P., Keith and Schnars, delivered a presentation on the project timeline and where the Committee is in the process (**Exhibit E**). Mr. Davis emphasized that the Plan is the map PLUS implementation strategies; neither one can be separated from the other. Mr. Davis said, "The map is not the plan." He stated that the biggest impact on the watershed area is where and how we live while accommodating 1.6 million new residents in the area over the next 44 years.

Committee member comments:

- 1) How is Agriculture Economic Study used in this study
- 2) Where has quality, quantity, timing and distribution (QOTD) been done?
  - a. Stormwater quality, groundwater supply, and surface water flows are the parameters used to assess these factors
- 3) Economic viability of Agriculture-would ask Agriculture community to help with implementation strategies suggestions
- 4) Agriculture wants to continue but farmers also need to face the economic realities and consider future alternatives
- 5) We need to set policy without worrying about available funds.
- 6) Michael Davis-a consensus group recommendation will have great weight with funders
- 7) Discussion of techniques to reduce discharges off all types of properties
- 8) Permeability of properties needs to be discussed, possible zone of no septic tanks; these are water seepage issues

During this discussion, the following question was posed to the Committee for consensus due to the fact that one member informed the Committee that this issue would be decided upon by the MPO at their April meeting. The member was concerned that if the WSAC did

\*\*\*\*\*

not act at this meeting the MPO would make their decision without the input of the Committee.

*It is consistent with the work of this Committee that an extension of metro rail (elevated above grade) from Dadeland South to Southland Mall completely constructed and fully operational before the year 2025; from Southland Mall to Florida City a bus way at grade with possible elevations at major intersections; then after 2025 a complete elevated system to Florida City.*

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

**This issue failed.**

## **MEMBER FORUM**

Member announcements were received. No items were recorded.

## **EVALUATIONS/ADJOURN**

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

## **MEMBER COMMENTS SUBMITTED SUBSEQUENT TO THE MEETING**

None was received.

## **OBSERVER COMMENT CARDS RECEIVED AT THE MEETING**

*"The terminology of "rural" and "agriculture" are being used interchangeably. They are not. Sprawl that takes place as rural expansion does have the potential to impact agriculture. Due to conflicts that may exist between agricultural practices and rural residents that do not understand the significance of those practices. (in the same manner though) Farmers survive only if they have the ability to borrow on the value of their farmland for annual expenses. Any action that lowers these values have the potential to limit the ability to borrow and thus the ability to farm. If open space in the form of farmland is valuable to this country, the best way to make sure the land remains in agriculture is to come up with innovative ways to keep property values up."*

*Charles Shinn, Asst Director, Government and Community Affairs  
Florida Farm Bureau Federation, cshinn@flgs.net*

\*\*\*\*\*

## PUBLIC COMMENT SUBMITTED SUBSEQUENT TO THE MEETING

*Thank you, my name is Ed Swakon, a registered lobbyist for Atlantic Civil, The majority of my comments today are related to the document distributed to the committee with their concerns and the responses of the consultants. Many of the consultant responses deal with concerns expressed about the proposed UDB expansion north and northeast of the Homestead Air Reserve Base.*

- 1. This area contains wetland – whether the consultant’s database shows them or not! Check with DERM. Ask if the tree farmer there could fill there property without a permit? I represent property owners in the area and much of this area will be claimed by one or more agency. The area contains wetlands!*
- 2. The area is clearly in a CERP footprint for the Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands project. Look at the maps(see attached). Why is it shown for development if this is a constraint?*
- 3. The fact that it is (was) an Urban Expansion Area (UEA) on the county current landuse map should have no bearing on the decision to show development here.*
- 4. This area may have all of the same “problems” the consultant felt compelled to express about the Florida City annex area or the Florida City Commons (aka Atlantic Civil) project, but no application has been submitted.*
- 5. At least FCC is actively addressing these issues. We are being penalized now because of that effort. The consultant only presented one side of the discussion by only providing agency issues, without providing our responses to the agencies. I urge you to go to [www.FloridaCityCommons.com](http://www.FloridaCityCommons.com) for copies of our responses to the agencies. Expect further correspondence on this issue. The committee should urge the consultants to include the ACI project area as an area to relive development pressure from elsewhere in the study area.*

*These next comments are not meant to single out anyone committee member, but I fail to see how the science or the results of the test scenarios are being used to draft this map. Each member is simply asking for their own “pet” modification. For example:*

- 1. Why is there no development in horse county? Are horses good for Biscayne Bay? Wouldn’t the Bay be better off if that area were to be developed? What science was used to make this decision?*
- 2. Why stay out of the Redlands along US1, or anywhere for that matter. What water quality, economic or traffic model suggests that is the best for Biscayne Bay?*

*What science is being used to make these decisions? I suggest none. The consultants are making changes to secure votes! (3 or more fingers).*

*Finally, I can not understand how this committee can allow the consultant to “run” the models (which are admittedly expensive and difficult to run) on some scenario you as a group have not agreed upon. I suggest you will not get any additional models run.*

*Ed Swakon  
EAS Engineering, Inc.  
55 Almeria Ave.  
Coral Gables, FL 33134-6118  
305-445-5553  
305-444-2112 Fax  
eswakon@eas-eng.com  
www.eas-eng.com*

\*\*\*\*\*