

**SOUTH MIAMI DADE WATERSHED STUDY ADVISORY
COMMITTEE
Meeting Twenty**

April 22, 2004
9:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.

Report of Proceedings

WELCOME/CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS

The meeting was held at the Miami-Dade County Cooperative Extension Service, Agricultural Center in Homestead, Florida. Roger Carlton, Chair, could not attend this meeting. Members Louise King representative of the Redland Citizen's Association, and Roger Carlton sponsored breakfast and lunch.

Janice Fleischer, Facilitator, made a few announcements on behalf of the Chair. In response to a request to have legislative intent language included with work product posted on the Committee website, Mr. Carlton is speaking with the Miami Dade County Attorney's office and will report back to the Committee next month. However, all documents that are still in draft form will be marked as such on the web so that no one can download a document and represent it as a final product.

The Lime and Avocado Grower's Association has been asked to submit a replacement for Tom MacVicar who resigned from the Committee last month. They have indicated they will have two potential candidates and will select one at their next meeting. Cindy Dwyer, Project Manager, Miami Dade County Planning and Zoning, reported that five Committee appointments (John Fredrick, Subrata Basu, Jane Spurling, Amy Condon and Jorge Rodriguez) were recently approved by the Government Operations and Environment Committee, and scheduled for final approval by the Board of County Commissioners on May 11, 2004. The League of Cities decided not to appoint anyone for the Committee due to the time commitment, but agreed to provide input on issues relating to municipalities on an as needed basis. Additionally, Ms. Dwyer announced that a waiver of the Miami-Dade County residency requirement for Builder's Association nominee Howard Nelson, was not approved.

For the benefit of the several new members who have joined the Committee, Ms. Fleischer reminded members of the policy regarding contact with the media. If a member is approached by the media to give an interview or comment from the point of view of their constituency, they may make comments. Any requests for the position or opinion on behalf of the Committee must be referred to the Chair, Roger Carlton.

Members Present:

Ivonne Alexander, Miami Dade Agricouncil
Richard Alger, South Florida Potato Growers Exchange
Daniel Apt, Florida Department of Environmental Protection
Subrata Basu, Miami-Dade DP&Z (prospective member)
Linda Canzanelli, Biscayne National Park
Carlos Espinosa, Miami Dade DERM
John Fredrick, Dade County Farm Bureau (prospective member)
Dick Frost, Tropical Audubon Society
April Gromnicki, National Audubon Society

John Hall, Florida Engineering Society
Louise King, Redland Citizens' Association
William Losner, Greater Homestead/Florida City Chamber of Commerce
Bennie Lovett, Florida City
Blanca Mesa, Sierra Club
Reed Olszack, Miami Dade Agricultural Practices Board
Lawrence Percival, Kendall Federation of Homeowner Associations
Bonnie Roddenberry, Sunny South Homeowner's Association
Jorge Rodriquez, Miami Dade Water and Sewer Department (prospective member)
Mike Shehadeh, City of Homestead
Jane Spurling, Florida Nurserymen and Grower's Association (prospective member)
Charles Thibos, Tropical Everglades Visitor Association
Julia Trevarthen, South Florida Regional Planning Council

AGENDA REVIEW/GUIDELINES

Janice Fleischer, reviewed the day's Agenda (Exhibit A) and reminded members and observers to place any materials they wish to hand out to the Committee on the Registration table.

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.

PROJECT MANAGER'S REPORT

John Hulsey, Project Manager, reported that the third meeting of the Technical Review Committee took place on April 14, 2004. Those members who were unable to attend will provide their comments through conference calls.

Mr. Hulsey reminded the Committee that a question had been asked about the recent Supreme Court decision on the S-9 Pump in Broward County and how that might affect this Study. He reported that the Supreme Court has remanded the case back to a lower court on a procedural matter, and that the lower court must consider evidence not previously considered and render a new decision.

He then called the Committee members' attention to a graphic showing the project schedule with a red colored bar describing position of the Study in that schedule. This will be a permanent feature of future Project Manager reports.

As a final item, Mr. Hulsey presented two fact sheets, one for each of the two Developments of Regional Impact (DRI) that are being proposed in the Study Area. These developments are within the Study area but outside the Urban Development Boundary. He explained how the DRI process works, and informed the members of other processes the developers must go through to get approval. The members will be informed of any upcoming public hearings on a regular basis.

The Project Manager's Report is included as **Exhibit B**.

At the conclusion of the PM Report, a discussion ensued regarding the two DRIs and their impact on the area. Committee members expressed varying opinions regarding the continued growth and development of the Watershed area while the Study is in progress?. One suggestion was that the Committee issue a resolution or some other indication of the Committee's opinion with regard to continued growth and its management until the Study is completed. The following comments were recorded:

1. City of Homestead as a neighboring municipality has been invited to comment on the Florida City DRI; it is important to copy all appropriate staff with the notifications of meetings at which comment can be made
2. Developers are getting approvals on 9.9 acres to stay under the 10-acre trigger for full-scale CDMP amendments.
3. By the time the study is done, many permits will already be issued which negatively impacts the ability to have the study succeed
4. Land use element 3E was a solution to looking at urban sprawl re: Urban Development Boundary (UDB). There were 2 controls for what would happen during the time the study was taking place: a legally binding deadline for completion of the study that has since been postponed, and creation of the Buffer Review Committee This Committee should consider expressing its opinion on its position re: development to any municipality in the watershed considering permitting growth
5. The Study process has taken much longer than originally anticipated.
6. Saltwater intrusion should be a specific item on DRI consideration
7. Resolution by Committee suggested by member April Gromnicki of National Audubon
8. Does this discussion lead to a moratorium? This would have a huge impact.
9. Florida City DRI – Miami-Dade Water & Sewer Department will be turning down the application
10. Buffer Committee has jurisdiction outside UDB and east of US Highway 1
11. There are three reasons not to discuss the resolution now:
 - o It is not within the scope of the study,
 - o It is not specifically on today’s agenda,
 - o The property owners are not here
12. We need to check with our constituents before looking at any resolution.
13. It is germane for this body to make its feelings known – to make a policy recommendation
14. This is a policy and perception issue – these are extraordinary applications – we should consider the resolution today.

At this point in the discussion, the Facilitator called for a break. Upon the Committee’s return, the Facilitator observed that there was a high level of opposition to deciding upon issuing a resolution before members would have an opportunity to speak to their constituents. It was decided to table the resolution issue until the next meeting. The Facilitator indicated her desire to get an initial ranking on how the members felt about the Committee taking a position on this issue. The following rankings were the result of the Facilitator asking how members felt about the Committee considering taking a stand on the issue of growth:

- Ranking (whether we consider any resolution at all) Mean: 3.38

5	4	3	2	1
11	0	1	4	5

Note: 5 is the highest in support

CONSULTANT UPDATE ON STUDY PROCESS AND OVERVIEW OF SCENARIOS

The Consultant, Keith and Schnars, gave a presentation on the timeline of the study process and an overview of the three scenarios. (Exhibit C).

Members made the following comments subsequent to the Consultant presentation:

1. Wellfield protection must be a constraint – additionally show possible future wellfields
2. Either protect from saltwater intrusion or put well-dependent residents on city water
3. Exclude wetlands in study area from build out – there are lands that have been determined to be wetlands but may still be privately owned

4. Are the policies of the municipalities in the area being considered? Some want growth and others don't.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Just before breaking for lunch, public comment was invited.

OPPORTUNITIES AND CONSTRAINTS

At previous meetings, Committee members had been asked to travel in the watershed area and list the opportunities and constraints to development. This assignment was due to be turned in by this meeting. In an effort to determine if any opportunities and constraints were more favored than others, Committee members were asked to list two of their top opportunities and constraints. While no particular favorites were noted, the following is a list of suggestions by the Committee:

OPPORTUNITIES:

1. Mt. Trashmore
2. Homestead Air Force Base
3. Water supply development plant
4. Mass transit corridors on U.S. 1
5. De-salinization plant
6. Wetlands and canals for use with storage (timing and delivery)
7. Redevelopment adjacent to community centers
8. Universal hook up of water and sewer for water conservation
9. Public transportation to Miami Airport
10. Location of Homestead
 - a. Gateway to the Keys
 - b. Near national parks
11. Use of open space for storm water treatment
12. Underperforming shopping centers
13. Land use change to include water treatment/remove impairment of potential impaired basin
14. Railway corridor
15. Elevation relative to agriculture and water table stability
16. Move development line north and south of Homestead Air Force Base
17. Resort and entertainment complex at Metro Zoo

CONSTRAINTS

1. Pineland preserves
2. Perception that reclaimed water is contaminated
3. Agriculture water quality standards
4. Privately owned tourist attractions
5. Public reluctance to use of mass transit
 - a. Lack of mass transit
 - b. Distance from mass transit
 - c. Densities
6. More roads
7. Open land adjacent to Biscayne Bay for coastal wetland restoration
8. Wells for potable water
 - a. Saltwater intrusion and infrastructure cost: treat this as well field protection
9. Contaminated landfill

10. Two lane Krome Avenue
11. Property rights in the agricultural area
12. Continued regulations by national parks restricting use by the public
13. Wellfield protection area and future wellfield study areas
14. Homestead Air Force Base
15. U.S. 1 and Old Cutler inadequate for existing traffic/access to downtown
16. Lack of capacity
17. Urban development boundary

At the conclusion of this exercise, several members, who had not yet completed their Opportunities and Constraints assignment due to a lack of understanding of the subject matter, reported that this exercise explained the assignment clearly and they requested additional time for completion. PM, John Hulsey, extended the time for receiving this exercise to May 6, 2004.

PRESENTATION: REGIONAL CANAL SYSTEM OPERATION

This presentation was postponed due to the illness of the presenter preventing him from attending the meeting.

MEMBER FORUM

1. Education Facilities Benefit District: school situation serious; demand not up to resource
2. Farm Bureau & Cooperative Extension is sponsoring an Ag Economic Short Course relative to the economics of agribusiness sometime in the Fall. Details to follow. Course is open to Committee and staff.
3. This area is subject to many studies, important that resident public is involved (input, observation, comment).
4. How will the Agriculture Plan be considered
5. Review Committees Goals & Objectives – was there a consensus process on this? (next meeting)
6. Map of public lands of 1993 (or more current) should be referenced in study
7. Request a map of the areas not serviced by the Water and Sewer Department

PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment was invited.

The next meeting of the Committee may need to be rescheduled due to several member conflicts. A new date will be determined and members will be notified.

ADJOURN

The meeting was then adjourned.

MEMBER COMMENTS (CARDS) RECEIVED:

“Subtask 1.8: Land inventories and Economic Base Industries (?) Ref #EE1 does not consider land designated for tourism even though land use policy 3-E goal is to support viable balanced economy including... Tourism. There is a low use of land in the watershed area currently but for planning purposes it should be shown separately because of its importance and potential to the economic future of the area. Its importance should be emphasized because of the importance assigned it by the Advisory Committee.”

-Charles Thibos

IDEA PARKING LOT COMMENTS:

“In the Report of Proceedings, you indicate public comment was made and received by the Committee, but you did not report what the comments were. The Report of Proceedings should indicate the nature of comments made....”

Facilitator note: The Report of Proceedings is not “minutes” of a meeting, it is an outline of the techniques used to gain information from the Committee and then transcribing the information received. Members of the public who wish to have their comments appear in the Report of Proceedings need to fill in a “Comment Card” with their comments and suggestions. With regard to the time allotted to public comment, it is the policy to simply state that public comment was invited and whether or not any was made, not to try to capture the subject of each comment.

“Save a tree, use double sided handouts”