

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

## **Meeting Twenty-nine**

February 24, 2005  
8:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.

### **Report of Proceedings**

#### **WELCOME/CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The meeting was held at the Miami-Dade Cooperative Extension Service Agricultural Center in Homestead, Florida.

Roger Carlton, Chair, welcomed everyone and thanked the facility for their continued generosity in sponsoring the meetings every other month and thanked member, William Losner, for continuing to sponsor breakfast.

Mr. Carlton introduced a new prospective member to the Committee, Mark Oncavage, who has been nominated to replace Blanca Mesa as the representative for the Sierra Club. Ms. Mesa recently had a baby girl, Leah. Mr. Oncavage is on the Executive Committee for the Miami Group of the Sierra Club and is also their Conservation Chair. Additionally, he is on the Executive Committee for the Florida Chapter of the Sierra Club and serves on their Everglades, Energy and Toxics Issue Committees. All members of the Committee present introduced themselves to Mr. Oncavage.

In response to items mentioned by Committee members at the last meeting, Mr. Carlton:

1. Assured the Committee that all issues raised by the Technical Review Committee are addressed by the Consultants;
2. Noted that the Conflict of Interest issue has been placed on the agenda of the Infrastructure and Land Use Committee for March 8, 2005 and expressed his hope that this will resolve this issue for the Watershed Committee and make it possible for deliberations to continue without the cloud of concern affecting the members; and
3. Expressed his pleasure at the visit paid by DCA Secretary Thaddeus Cohen at the last meeting. Mr. Carlton indicated that Secretary Cohen's comments regarding the future focus of the Committee would be considered and that the Committee would explore how to serve the Secretary in pursuing his concerns.

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

Members present:

Roger Carlton, Chair  
Ivonne Alexander, Miami Dade AgriCouncil  
Richard Alger, South Florida Potato Growers Exchange  
Subrata Basu, Miami-Dade Planning and Zoning  
Linda Canzanelli, Biscayne National Park  
Gerald Case, Florida Lime & Avocado Committee  
Amy Condon, Member at Large  
Carlos Espinosa, Miami Dade DERM  
Dick Frost, Tropical Audubon Society

April Gromnicki, National Audubon Society  
Louise King, Redland Citizens' Association  
William Losner, Greater Homestead/Florida City Chamber of Commerce  
Bennie Lovett, Florida City  
Carter McDowell, Building Industry Representative  
Reed Olszack, Miami-Dade Agricultural Practices Board  
Mark Oncavage, Sierra Club (prospective member)  
Lawrence Percival, Kendall Federation of Homeowner Associations  
Bonnie Roddenberry, Sunny South Acres Homeowner's Association  
Mike Shehadeh, City of Homestead  
Jane Spurling, Florida Nurserymen and Grower's Association  
Charles Thibos, Tropical Everglades Visitor Association  
Julia Trevarthen, South Florida Regional Planning Council

There were 19 Observers who signed the register.

## **AGENDA REVIEW/GUIDELINES**

Janice Fleischer, Facilitator, reviewed the Agenda for the day (**Exhibit A**) and reviewed the Committee's Meeting and Observer Guidelines. She reminded members that the Agricultural Economics presentation was being sponsored by the Dade County Farm Bureau who would be providing lunch in addition to the presentation. Observers were invited to have lunch and remain for the presentation as well.

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

## **PROJECT MANAGER'S REPORT**

John Hulsey, Project Manager, delivered the Project Manager's Report. (**Exhibit B**). As part of his Report, Mr. Hulsey announced that the current courtesy to members of allowing them to submit articles and announcements of interest to the facilitator for review, approval and distribution to the full Committee by email may need to be modified. The procedure has become burdensome and is causing concern among the Committee membership on articles sent. Until the March meeting, the procedure will remain the same, but a new policy will be discussed at the Org Meeting and announced at the March meeting. Until that time, anything relevant to the work of the Committee that a member wants distributed electronically should be submitted to the facilitator who will forward it to the Project Manager for approval at which point Ms. Fleischer will send it out by email to members.

At this point in the meeting, Mr. Carlton asked to break the Agenda schedule so he could announce that member Linda Canzanelli, Superintendent of Biscayne National Park, would be leaving the Committee as she has been promoted and will be moving to Pennsylvania. On behalf of the Committee, Mr. Carlton formally thanked Ms. Canzanelli for her hard work and assistance as a member for the last 3.5 years. Ms. Canzanelli thanked everyone and announced that Rick Clark, Director of Resources Management, Biscayne National Park, will be taking her place on the Committee.

## **CONSULTANT PRESENTATION: TEST SCENARIO 2**

Prior to the Consultants beginning their presentation, Committee members made the following general comments regarding consultant materials provided to them for review (note: when an answer or response to a question is recorded, it is reflected in an indented paragraph below the question) :

1. The maps still need more clarity; you can't tell what designations are on the maps

2. The County should notify land owners of the designations that their land has on the maps
  - a. The Committee was reminded that these maps showed possible outcomes from the test scenarios and are not final. Designations may change between this draft and the final preferred scenario.
3. The Org Committee will address the issue of how we get and where we put larger size maps (i.e. libraries, public buildings, etc.)
4. Zoning and other designations are different from the designations on the consultant maps; landowners are responsible for knowing what their land is zoned currently; this Committee's responsibility is only to let the landowners know if changes to their zoning will be recommended in the final study.
5. Posting larger maps in public places is a good alternative.
6. We need to show landowners which lands we are saying are constrained.
7. No constraints have been placed on property by this Committee, the constraints only exist for the purpose of test scenarios.

Eric Silva, Director of Planning for Keith and Schnars, delivered a presentation that included a project update, purpose and overview of the three test scenarios, and a description of how they are being formulated. **(Exhibit C)** Test scenario II is based on policies in the Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP) that are not being permitted as current practice. Test scenario II is re-allocated housing that had been located on natural habitat areas (primarily wetlands) in test scenarios I and III. It increased densities allocated outside the Urban Development Boundary (UDB) as compared to test scenario I. The maps provided at this meeting are draft maps and members' comments will be considered as the maps are revised.

## **TEST MAP REVIEW**

Immediately following the presentation, members and observers were invited to review poster-size maps for test Scenario II, which depicted the scenario results for the years 2025 and 2050. Members were given copies of the maps to write and make notes on as they reviewed the larger maps.

Following the presentation and review of the maps, members asked the following:

1. With density suggestions does it include where parking will occur?
2. We need to see the breakdown of likely unit mix (ex: townhouse, high-rise, etc.) for each scenario to give us the feel for the changing development pattern. Market impact may not support what you are suggesting.
3. We need overlays for each scenario so we can really see the changes at each scenario; include environmental overlays.
4. Maybe we should suggest helicopter shuttle service from west Kendall.
5. Scenarios 1, 2 and 3 are only test scenarios; they are not recommendations.
6. The Org Committee will discuss maps, their sizes and overlays to be provided to the Committee.
7. We need a presentation which consolidates all three scenarios so we can see the differences in each scenario. This would help with comprehension and anxiety.
8. Don't build Scenario 2 from Scenario 3; there is an inherent bias in this since Scenario 3 is not the existing condition. You need to build Scenario 2 from Scenario 1 which is the existing condition.
9. Scenario 2 should stand by itself.
10. There is a concern that this study is leading to a complete change in current policies of higher densities, etc. The worry is that the decision makers (County Commission) are not prepared to do this.
11. Scenario 2 is being developed out of both Scenario 1 and 3.
12. Take into consideration that some areas are already urban, not vacant land; you must consider what development already exists.
  - a. The consultant is looking at what exists in areas currently

13. The impacts of saltwater intrusion and water supply need to be included in each scenario.
14. Mixed use and commercial designations are not accurate
  - a. That is a correct observation, the Consultant does not have the information but is obtaining it and will make the necessary changes
15. 2003 Land Use- some designations are not correct in Homestead; parks, vacant land are not for example
  - a. the Consultant is groundtruthing the actual designations; members should notify the consultants if they see discrepancies
16. We did not have enough time today to look at the maps; the maps are showing no movement of the UDB in 2050 for Scenario II, I don't think this is viable or realistic; I want to see acreages and what moves and changes.

## **CONSULTANT PRESENTATION: TEST SCENARIOS 1 & 3: IMPACT ASSESSMENT RESULTS (CONTINUED)**

Michael Davis, Vice President, Keith and Schnars, explained that a glitch with certain applications of the stormwater model had been discovered, requiring that the assessments be re-run on the computer. Mr. Davis stated that, rather than present data that had not been reviewed by the quality control team, he preferred to wait until the second round of assessment results had been finalized and verified for accuracy before presenting them to the Committee. He then highlighted preliminary results for flood protection showing changes in water elevation from the baseline condition for the years 2025 and 2050. Dr. Robert Cruz with Global Economic Associates, who is working as a sub consultant to Keith and Schnars on the Employment and Economy assessment, then gave a presentation on comparative economic conditions in the study area in the baseline year of 2003, 2025, and 2050. Eric Silva followed Dr. Cruz's presentation and presented preliminary results for potable water supply and demand, which are being evaluated under the infrastructure category of parameters.

Following each presentation, members were given the opportunity to comment. Additional comments not made during the meeting can be turned in at the end of the meeting or emailed to Project Manager, John Hulsey, subsequent to the meeting.

What follows are the comments received at the meeting in each subject area, whether orally or in writing:

### **WATER RESOURCES:**

1. Clarify what 100 year/24 hour storm event is; make it easily understandable.
2. Concern with the data on contaminant levels.
3. Will you designate where lakes should be located?
  - a. Yes, we show on-site retention and the preferred scenario will look to place parks, etc. in strategic locations
4. As you develop the preferred scenario, use or consider Homestead's Stormwater Master Plan.
5. If any members go to outside consultants for their opinion, they need to verify they are a credible source.

### **ECONOMIC CONDITIONS:**

1. Will the analysis show which are growth industries? (ex: ecotourism)
  - a. Some of the analyses show which industries are growing
2. Some land uses suggested could hurt certain industries.
3. Aren't there more parameters than salary and wages, you need to add intangibles
  - a. Medium and average incomes are included

4. You need to consider quality of life, the aging population and their impacts.
5. It is counter intuitive that manufacturing has the highest average annual wage.
  - a. The future of manufacturing is in a different skill level; this reflects the change in the industry mix
6. Is there any cost/benefit analysis of infrastructure re: re-development vs. new development?
  - a. Yes
7. Is a retiree component included? Also in industrial/commercial development?
  - a. Yes, in all levels that component is included.
8. I would like to hear more about the methodology being used to determine the cost of housing. Property appraiser's records are not necessarily accurate.
9. The cost of construction is an important factor.
10. Do you consider the part of the retiree population that is only here seasonally?
  - a. Yes, that is taken into consideration
11. How is the tourism industry being addressed?
  - a. Mainly through industries related to tourism (hotels, etc.)
12. Park service employees are contained in the institutional portion.
13. Is the change of Metro Zoo and the University of Miami Village being taken into consideration?
  - a. As this is a 50 year study, we are considering things at the macro level, not at individual projects and their impacts.
14. However, individual projects impact all the other areas.
15. How is affordable housing issue being addressed? We need a definition of affordable housing and then show the changes from the current to 2025 and 2050; do both purchase price and rental rates.
  - a. Using the standard methodology, housing affordability is calculated relative to median income for the County.
16. Look at affordability across all types of housing.
17. Consider the growth of the aviation industry; Tamiami Airport as an executive airport is being proposed.

#### INFRASTRUCTURE:

There were no questions.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

At this point in the meeting, public comment was invited. Three (3) members of the audience addressed the Committee.

Note: Public comment is not recorded. If anyone from the public desires to have his/her comments appear in the Report of Proceedings, they can submit their comments in writing on the comment cards provided at each meeting or email the Facilitator, Janice Fleischer ([janice@flashresolutions.com](mailto:janice@flashresolutions.com)) within the first week following the meeting.

#### **LUNCH AND FARM BUREAU AGRICULTURE ECONOMICS WORKSHOP**

The Committee then broke for lunch and the presentation by the Dade County Farm Bureau on Agricultural Economics. For more information on this and to obtain handouts, contact Dade County Farm Bureau Executive Director, Katie Edwards, at [dcfb2@bellsouth.net](mailto:dcfb2@bellsouth.net) or visit their website at: [www.dade-agriculture.org](http://www.dade-agriculture.org).

An agriculture economics presentation and overview was made by Dr. Bob Degner, Professor of Food and Resource Economics and Director of the Florida Agricultural Market Research Center at the University of Florida. This was followed by a panel of three working farmers, Teena Borek of Steven Borek Farms, Inc., Marc Ellenby, LNB Farms, and Bobby Lee, Superior Foliage, moderated by Ms. Edwards.

At the end of the program, the Chair of the Committee, Roger Carlton, thanked the presenters for an excellent workshop.

**MEMBER FORUM**

Members were invited to make announcements or bring up topics to be discussed at future meetings. This is a regular part of the Committee’s meetings.

Member William Losner asked that the Committee take a position on the widening of Krome Avenue and have that position forwarded to the County Commission before their meeting the following week. Mr. Carlton asked the facilitator to take a ranking on whether the Committee desired to discuss taking a position at this meeting.

Ranking results:

5	4	3	2	1
2	0	2	6	4

Upon seeing the results of the ranking, Mr. Losner withdrew his request.

Members asked that we consider having another round of stakeholder presentations like was done in the early months of the Committee formation. Mr. Carlton indicated that the Org Committee would address this request.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

At this point in the meeting, public comment was invited. No comments were made.

Note: Public comment is not recorded. If anyone from the public desires to have his/her comments appear in the Report of Proceedings, they can submit their comments in writing on the comment cards provided at each meeting or email the Facilitator, Janice Fleischer ([janice@flashresolutions.com](mailto:janice@flashresolutions.com)) within the first week following the meeting.

**ADJOURN**

The meeting was then adjourned.

**MEMBER COMMENT CARDS:**

None were received.

**OBSERVER COMMENT CARDS**

*“Cities will be developed to allow higher densities to allow for economic gains and improvements in quality of life. This fact is made obvious by community redevelopment authorities. You just need to look to Hollywood, Florida or Oakland Park, Florida. Oakland Park just rezoned their downtown from one story commercial industrial to 3-6 story mixed use. Redevlopments of South Miami Dade cities will happen as*

our population increases. Thee efforts do result in loss of some single family homes, other businesses, etc. However, they are validated by the benefits.”

-Anonymous

“Re: Economic Analysis: The amount of land dedicated to agriculture in the study area (~7,800 acres) seems inconsistent with the total agricultural acreage in the County~90,000 acres according to 2002 Agriculture census.”

-Mike Richardson, Vision Council, 305-247-7082

“Scenario 2 is nearly the same as Scenario 3 with massive—and unfortunately unrealistic assumptions of higher densities. Higher densities are not only being consistently rejected by CZAB’s (Community Zoning Appeals Boards) and cities alike, but communities are being approved at 40% lower density than the current Comprehensive Development Master Plan is approved for”

-Truly Burton, Builders Association of South Florida

“The “smart growth” designations on Scenarios 2 & 3 are not new; they have been incorporated over the duration of the study. Opportunities and constraints have been vetted by the Committee and agreed upon. Higher density development is currently occurring in Miami Dade County. Downtown Miami, the Miami River Corridor and Downtown Dadeland are all examples of increasing densities within the existing communities.”

-Anonymous

“Please show on the water demand projections table the total population used for urban demand and agriculture self supply demand.”

-Maria Valdes, Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department

“Dick Frost’s comment that the constraints don’t effect anyone’s land; it is only a constraint for planning purposes maybe true but when the plan is completed and presented to Commission if someone’s land is not shown for future development the commission isn’t going to look back at the underlying constraints. They need to be correct from the start! They aren’t now.

Additionally,

- 1) Why is Scenario 3 now being labeled with as “smart growth” This shows bias toward no movement of the UDB.
- 2) Consultants are working w/ DERM on BMPs for water quality monitoring. It was stated that the committee already approved evaluation methodology yet how the models are used is even more important. How does modeling take into consideration how some areas are required to retain onsite 100% of runoff from 100 year storm? How are “improved” (stricter) water quality criteria that may be or already have been adopted taken into consideration? Committee/Public must understand & approve.
- 3) Constraints remain a problem ! (See comment card)
- 4) Ag land acreage 3’s don’t make sense (?)
- 5) How are government plans to acquire land for CERP projects being accounted for?
- 6) Current development practices in Miami-Dade has NOT been to allow for ANY movement of UDB (No movement at all for Residential in at least 10 years! Why then does Scenario #1 entitled “Current Practice” show and assume expansion well beyond current UDB? Yet Scenario #3 assumes no UDB movement This is closer to current practice & I don’t think that’s smart growth (see comment #1)
- 7) A suggestion for the maps to show changes between scenarios would be white-out any areas that don’t change & only show changes”

-Ed Swakon

## **IDEA PARKING LOT**

No comments