

SOUTH MIAMI DADE WATERSHED STUDY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

July 27, 2006 Meeting #48
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. He then made the following announcements:

1. Recommended changes to Comprehensive Development Master Plan policies made at the Committee meetings are expressions of the intent of the Committee members. These recommendations will be analyzed in greater detail and against other policies to avoid duplications and or contradictory policies and to make sure that they are consistent with other policies. (This was the "official" language of the P&Z Department, Mr. Carlton paraphrased at the meeting.)
2. The INLUC Committee has provided a clearer definition of our schedule with regard to time; we are not going to try to meet the current CDMP schedule but we still need to move along and get done before the end of the year.
3. There is an October 3, 2006 meeting with INLUC Committee at Agricultural Center.
4. On August 2, 2006, there will be a meeting with Roger and the Agricultural Board.
5. Committee members must remember that financial disclosures must be completed or updated.
6. With regard to the need to tape record the meetings: Florida Statutes DO NOT require that verbatim transcripts of meetings be kept. The term "minutes" in the Sunshine Statute refers to a brief summary reflecting the events of the meeting. Furthermore, the County Attorney's office has confirmed that meetings of the South Miami Dade Watershed Study Advisory Committee DO NOT need to be tape recorded.
7. Humberto Alonso is leaving the Water Management District and moving to a private consulting firm. Everyone congratulated him and he was presented with a Certificate of Appreciation for all his time and effort on behalf of the Committee.

Member comments after opening announcements:

1. Biscayne National Park (BNP) still has not identified lands that are needed; this study was initiated because of BNP; I think it is very unfair to not have the lands yet identified
2. Minutes: disappointed on decision not to record; need to find out what the intent was
3. Are we going to continue to push the agenda; should we have two meetings a month; at least keep the option open
4. We need help for those who need hard copies; some don't have ability to download
 - a. we will do that
5. Meetings should not go after 3pm; we don't concentrate well
6. Amy Condon will send Jane Spurling a color copy
7. Are we still taking comments on the draft study booklet;
 - a. After we finalize the implementation strategies; we don't know if we will use the same document

8. We need to focus on the health of Biscayne Bay not just the Park; take it to a higher level of thought
9. With regard to a final product; we should hire someone to take the data and have them make a document that appeals on many levels; independent source; user friendly and action oriented; does not need to follow the public document format for this purpose; the final document is so important as to how it communicates to the public
10. Farm Bureau passed out implementation strategies re: flood protection and property rights for use during discussions today and in the future (Exhibit A)
11. Employment figures for agriculture that differ from consultants numbers have been brought to this meeting for review (Exhibit B)
12. Water use permits- unclear for future; agricultural community has lost confidence due to a letter received from the South Florida Water Management District
 - a. John Fredrick will provide a copy of the letter to Evan (I think that's right).
13. Agriculture wants to provide as much assurance as it can as to the sustainability of agriculture; if the land can't be agricultural, that community wants to know that their land won't be taken without just compensation
14. We need to go back to section of study that was the analysis; we never talked about going back to that analysis, its conclusions, etc. we need to go back and have a discussion with regard to that document; specifically the impact on water supply in that document (Task 4.3)
15. While our time has now been extended somewhat; recommendations primary basis is intensification of building around the US 1 corridor; maybe as a committee we should put forward minimum densities within a ½ mile (underlying presumption) and put that forward to Board of County Commissioners (BCC) now (Org comm. item)
 - a. Come to INLUC committee meeting here at Agricultural Center to bring up what you feel is important
16. Let's be very careful not to use personal attacks or adjectives when describing any of our constituent communities
17. Letter cited by John Fredrick on water should be included as an exhibit. (Exhibit C)
18. Homestead AFB should be a joint facility; Miami Dade County needs a second airport; this would be a likely spot; in the Report we should say this

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

Members present:

Roger Carlton, Chair *
 Richard Alger, South Florida Potato Growers Exchange
 Humberto P. Alonso, Jr., South Florida Water Management District*
 Gerald Case, Florida Avocado Committee
 Amy Condon, At Large Member
 Guillermina Damas, At Large Member
 Carlos Espinosa, Miami-Dade DERM*
 John Fredrick, Dade County Farm Bureau
 Jamie Furgang, Audubon of Florida
 Robert Johnson, Everglades National Park
 Louise King, Redland Citizen's Association
 Bill Losner, Greater Homestead/Florida City Chamber of Commerce
 Bennie Lovett, Florida City
 Carter McDowell, South Florida Builders Association
 Mark Oncavage, Sierra Club
 Lawrence Percival, Kendall Federation of Homeowner Associations
 Armando Perez, Florida Engineering Society
 Mike Shehadeh, City of Homestead

Jane Spurling, Florida Nursery, Growers and Landscape Association
Charles Thibos, Tropical Everglades Visitor Association
Julia Trevarthen, South Florida Regional Planning Council*

*Non-voting member

There were 11 observers.

AGENDA REVIEW/GUIDELINES

Janice Fleischer, Facilitator, reviewed the Agenda for the day (Exhibit D) and the Public Comment Guidelines. She explained the procedure for the day in attempting to gain as much consensus around the implementation strategies as possible.

She announced that the next meeting of the WSAC would be on August 31, 2006. More details as to place and agenda would be sent by email.

All Reports of Proceedings of the Committee, Discussion and Public Guidelines and Committee related information, can be found either on the Study website or at the SFRPC website at 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 E) Mr. Daniels welcomed attendees to meeting number 48 and reported on staff participation in the Ad Hoc Sub Committee meeting of June 20, 2006 and the Homestead Air Reserve Base Joint Land Use Committee meeting of July 24, 2006. He also reported that South Florida Regional Planning Council staff had met with Katie Edwards of the Dade County Farm Bureau to discuss concerns of the agricultural community. Mr. Daniels added his well wishes to Humberto Alonso.

AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYMENT FIGURES UPDATE

At previous meetings, several members questioned the data presented by Keith & Schnars with regard to employment figures for agriculture. In response to member request for data to be updated and to use other sources, sub consultant Dr. Robert Cruz of Global Economics Advisors delivered a presentation explaining the methodology utilized to derive the agricultural employment figures. (Exhibit F)

In response to this presentation, a discussion began which led to the following member comments:

1. Are these numbers only based on loss of agricultural land and not other factors that could have an effect
2. Are these full time or seasonal numbers?
 - a. The calculation is on year round workers plus seasonal/monthly
3. While it may be that the numbers decline in each scenario; the agriculture community still thinks the original numbers are not accurate
4. The numbers are important because the economic aspect of this study is flawed; the economic impact of agriculture is not being considered and was not appropriately measured
5. We need an economic impact study on degradation of Biscayne National Park
6. The number of employees is not the real issue, the Degner Study showed that the amount of agricultural land would be reduced, not due to development, but because agriculture

would no longer be viable; the REMY model is showing only that agriculture employment numbers go down only due to the loss of land uses

- a. Not really- REMI model looks at macro economics
7. May want more information on economics; recommend other studies to help with economic analysis that is more accurate; in the Watershed Study we should acknowledge that there is a disagreement regarding the numbers in the Report (show that the Degner Study is accepted and put in as an appendix)
8. The Degner Study is based on the 1997 Census of Agriculture; showed greater than 15 thousand employees for the whole county; South Dade numbers were based on full and part time workers
9. You can not simply predict employees based on acreage; some small acreage uses a high concentration of employees (small parcels often have higher intensity of employees)
10. The reality is that with a change in the type of agriculture being practiced (nurseries vs. row crop) you may have more employees not less; agriculture needs to have confidence in the data being used

In response to this discussion, it was decided that John Fredrick, Amy Condon and Katie Edwards (and anyone who wanted to join the group) would draft language during the lunch break to suggest for consensus.

The language that was brought back by this drafting group was:

Agricultural Employment:

- a. *Predictability of agricultural employment is difficult due to uncertainty in immigration reform, changes in mechanical harvesting practices and labor intensity differentials among the industry segments. (nurseries are more labor intensive on a per acre basis than row crops)*
- b. *Notwithstanding the need for accurate data/numbers of agricultural employment, we believe that a decline or gain in agricultural employment and or agricultural land use should not necessarily be used as a basis for determining the failure or success of a given scenario.*
- c. *University of Florida component (re: Degner Study) of the Miami Dade County Agricultural and Rural land use study should be an appendices to the watershed study to be used as a deeper analysis for future considerations. (This language should be referenced in the economic section.)*

PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment was invited, five individuals spoke.

Mike Richardson

Ed Swakon

Colleen Boggs

Cherry Pane, Everglades National Park

Cynthia Guerra, Tropical Audubon (A link to the Biscayne Bay Economic Study, April, 2005 will be sent to all members and interested parties by Project Manager, Bob Daniels)

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) within the first week following the meeting and those comments will be included in the Report.

CONSENSUS PROCESS: IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

Implementation strategies had been drafted using input from Committee members, the Consultants and outside sources. These were incorporated into a single document to be used to test the consensus of the group on each of the strategies. The strategies were divided into eleven topic areas:

- General Implementation Principles
- Property Rights
- Transportation
- Housing
- Economics
- Smart Growth Incentives
- Water Resources
- Agriculture
- Natural Communities/Open Space
- Infrastructure
- Smart Growth Audit

This consensus process continued for the remainder of the day. See Attached Implementation Strategies Document for consensus results and language changes where applicable.

General Member comments during consensus process

1. Priority for zones
2. Don't ignore Krome Avenue
3. We still need the County's presentation on water resources
4. Will our plan influence the water study that is being done by WASA
5. we will be better prepared to do the water resources section if we work in small groups and presentations
6. Next iteration of the IS will consider those paragraphs that were left out of this consensus process

PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment was invited, one individual spoke.

Robert Moehling, "Robert is Here" Fruit Stand

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) within the first week following the meeting and those comments will be included in the Report.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION/TEXT NEEDED IN NEXT ITERATION

The consensus process was discontinued at the end of the Economic Section. The Chair then asked members for their ideas on what additional information or text is needed in the next iteration of the Implementation Strategies. The following suggestions/comments were made:

- 1 Smart Growth Section- need to add something about preserving Horse Country
- 2 See John Fredrick's handout and add this to the next iteration (Exhibit)
- 3 Several items to be added on Katie's submission
- 4 Identify buffer lands needed for Parks

- 5 Suggestion: Basis of compensation for lands outside the UDB shall be on the value basis of one house on one acre, if the UDB is not moved until 2025 and /or 2050
- 6 Sunset provision that unless the compensation methodology was determined within 3 years, the UDB could be moved and development could continue
 - a. Do the lands have to be acquired?
 - b. No just the methodology for valuation
- 7 It may not be possible to preserve Horse Country; it may be all of Kendall; and it may look like favoritism
- 8 Expansion of development should be tied to growth; we should not be building unless it is needed; no building just for the sake of building
- 9 Economy: something in E12 or E13, link hotels on Miami Beach/airport to bring people down to South Dade
- 10 Natural Communities: NC4 needs to identify the problems with implementation and state how to resolve/solutions for Purchase of Development Rights (PDRs) and Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs)
- 11 There should be 0% runoff in Homestead AF Base on all new development on east side of current UDB
- 12 Protect lands in the Everglades Restoration Plan Project; specifically: degraded wetlands
- 13 Funding mechanism to match federal and state land acquisition; Funds for everglades restoration
- 14 Don't carve "favorite" areas out
- 15 Krome Avenue widening should be back on table for discussion
- 16 Rail system expansion, problem with passing existing roads; consider extending system through Don Shula Expressway and south
- 17 We need an economic impact analysis of Biscayne Bay that isn't just recreation based, deals with hazard mitigation piece
- 18 Without a healthy habitat hurricane and storm damage is worse
 - a. This is just an implementing strategy
- 19 Identify sustainable and green building practices within the Watershed Area
- 20 Fund food studies program that takes into account farming, culinary, land stewardship
- 21 Krome Ave: expedite funding for 4 laning Krome from Okeechobee Road south
- 22 Homestead Air Force Base (HAFB): if future need, joint use airport, military and civilian
- 23 Have someone take out lands around the HAFB that are not needed for CERP, footprints are now more final so lands not needed should be identified
- 24 If UDB is not going to move until 2025, then we should go back to 1 house/1 acre zoning on land outside the UDB
- 25 We will provide the transcript from the 1974 down zoning that amended the code, all minutes and public comments were found (hard copy will be included in agenda packet for next meeting)
- 26 No recognition that Biscayne Bay is an outstanding water body and target is not to add loading above current levels, this needs to be in the Plan
- 27 Flooding; we need to see if we are putting people in harms way in areas of known flooding
- 28 Developers should seek to attain green development certification and be encouraged to adhere to standards set by the Florida Green Building Coalition
- 29 Establish a policy to adhere to the 2025/2050 guidelines
- 30 Everglades National Park (ENP): please provide a report (bullets) that shows
 - a. the investment of the federal government in the local area, including restoration, water resources, etc. and,
 - b. the direct/indirect economic impact of the parks on the local economy (e.g. Cherry Pane's report) to address the issue of the two national parks (PILOT) program
- 31 We should discuss how agriculture could change from one type of growth to another (row crops to nurseries, etc.)

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.

PUBLIC COMMENT RECEIVED AND INCLUDED AT THE REQUEST OF COMMITTEE MEMBER

“Good morning. My name is Cherry Payne. I work at Everglades National Park as Chief of interpretation and Visitor Services. However, I come before you today representing the two national parks found within Miami-Dade County: Biscayne and Everglades. I’d like to talk to you about the synergies these two parks bring to the community through tourism. But first, you might be interested to know that Miami-Dade is unique: it is the only county in the US with two national parks. Further, the two parks share the gateway communities of Homestead and Florida City.

The parks protect threatened and endangered species, part of the world’s 3rd largest coral reef system, and the largest wilderness area east of the Rocky Mountains. Everglades is an International Biosphere Reserve and a World Heritage Site. Biscayne has three listings in the National Register of Historic Places, including the Offshore Reefs Archaeological District. It is the largest marine park in the park system. Both parks are Outstanding Florida Waters. And while all these superlatives are impressive, they mean little if people do not know about them and care about them. In 2005, almost 1.8 million people visited and learned about the two parks.

The park service uses a model to measure economic impacts of national parks in local communities. The last run was for 2003, a year in which 1.5 million people visited. That year, the parks directly generated \$57 million in sales \$22 million in wages and salaries and almost 1200 jobs. Most spending was in tourism-related industries such as hotels and food service. This year, visitation to both parks has dropped 20 to 30 percent, probably due to hurricane publicity and the loss of infrastructure at Flamingo from Katrina and Wilma. While Biscayne is prohibited from collecting entrance fees, Everglades is not – and we keep 80% of the gate. The money is used to repair buildings, improve infrastructure, and to provide visitor services. The National parks have been interwoven with tourism from the earliest days of the Service. The lure of parks as magnets for tourism and related economic activity has been understood and capitalized on by many interests for over 90 years. Early NPS leaders felt the public needed to be enticed to the parks to experience them first hand to understand and support their values and importance. Ironically, the parks are prohibited from using federal dollars for marketing. Therefore, we must depend upon local communities to do that for us. While marketing and promotion may be our desire - it is also our weakness. We need the county to help us to promote and support sustainable and informed tourism to our area--for bringing tourism to the parks helps not only the parks themselves, but the whole community. Thank you.”

*Cherry Payne
Chief of Interpretation and Visitor Services
Everglades and Dry Tortugas National Parks
40001 SR 9336
Homestead, FL 33034
305.242.7750
305.242.7757 fax*

OBSERVER COMMENT CARDS RECEIVED AT THE MEETING

“Funding to help South Dade promote Agritourism through TEVA (Tropical Everglades Visitors Association)”

"The South Miami-Dade Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan projects (Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands and C-111) have now chosen Tentatively Selected Plans (TSPs) but the TSPs still need to undergo the full EIS process and the projects may be modified as the process moves forward. It is too early to say definitely which lands will or will not be used and what effect the projects may have on lands outside their footprint.

Re: Bill Losner's comments on the "economic value" of Biscayne Bay: In 2005 the SFWMD published a Biscayne Bay Economic Study. The Study provided data on the economic contribution of the Bay to Dade County, the Southeast region of Florida and Florida as a whole. The data focused on direct, indirect and induced sales, income, employment and tax revenues generated by uses of the Bay. The uses studied were primarily focused on recreational uses. Other contributions of the Bay were not analyzed but were noted: effects on real estate values, hazard mitigation, quality of life, etc. The Study found that in 2004, the Bay contributed \$12.7 billion in output, \$6.3 billion in income, 137,600 jobs and \$627 million in tax revenue. When the other values of the Bay are analyzed, these numbers will increase."

Cynthia Guerra, Tropical Audubon Society
