

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

June 24, 2004  
8:30 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

**Report of Proceedings**

**WELCOME/CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The meeting was held at John D. Campbell Agricultural Center in Homestead, Florida. Roger Carlton, Chair, welcomed everyone and announced the addition of new prospective member Gerald Case, the replacement representative for the Florida Avocado Committee (formerly the Florida Lime and Avocado Committee).

Mr. Carlton made the announcement that Miami Dade County Planning and Zoning will be seeking a blanket waiver from the conflict of interest requirements for the Committee. Committee members will still be expected to disclose any conflicts of which they are aware, but they will not be required to recuse themselves from deliberations and voting.

Members Present:

Roger Carlton, Chair  
Ivonne Alexander, Miami Dade Agricouncil  
Linda Canzanelli, Biscayne National Park  
Gerald Case, Florida Avocado Committee (unconfirmed)  
Amy Condon, Trust for Public Land  
Carlos Espinosa, Miami Dade DERM  
John Fredrick, Dade County Farm Bureau  
Dick Frost, Tropical Audubon Society  
April Gromnicki, National Audubon Society  
John Hall, Florida Engineering Society  
Bennie Lovett, Florida City  
Blanca Mesa, Sierra Club  
Carter McDowell, Esq., Building Industry  
Lawrence Percival, Kendall Federation of Homeowner Associations  
Bonnie Roddenberry, Sunny South Acres Homeowner's Association  
Jorge Rodriquez, Miami Dade Water and Sewer Department  
Jane Spurling, Florida Nurserymen and Grower's Association  
Charles Thibos, Tropical Everglades Visitor Association  
Julia Trevarthen, South Florida Regional Planning Council

**AGENDA REVIEW/GUIDELINES**

Janice Fleischer, Facilitator, reviewed the day's Agenda (**Exhibit A**), and announced that the schedule would be rearranged. Committee acceptance of Final Work Products for Sub-Tasks 1.2, 1.3, 1.5 and 1.7 would be moved to the first item and the other items on the Agenda would follow.

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).

### **SUB-TASKs 1.2, 1.3, 1.5 AND 1.7: COMMITTEE ACCEPTANCE**

Prior to the meeting, Committee members had been sent the final version of Sub-Tasks 1.2, 1.3, 1.5 and 1.7 (see Study website at: [www.southmiamidadewatershed.com](http://www.southmiamidadewatershed.com) ) As was done at the last meeting, the Committee was asked to accept the sub-tasks, first by consensus and if consensus could not be reached, then by vote according to Committee procedures (see Institute website for consensus procedures). Once tasks are accepted, the Committee does not go back again to review those tasks.

At this point, the Facilitator led the Committee through the acceptance process.

#### **Sub-Task 1.2 – Population**

Ranking:

5	4	3	2	1
0	7	10	0	0

Sub-Task 1.2 was accepted by consensus of the Committee.

The following suggestion was made:

- Make sure to get the latest Census data.

#### **Sub-Task 1.3 –Development Features**

Ranking:

5	4	3	2	1
4	5	7	0	0

Sub-Task 1.3 was accepted by consensus of the Committee

#### **Sub-Task 1.5 – Water Resources**

Initial Ranking:

5	4	3	2	1
2	7	7	0	1

Discussion of the member who gave this task a ranking of 1:

- Does not reflect places where there is no infrastructure (issue of saltwater intrusion).
- Identify where infrastructure exists and doesn't.
  - Project Manager suggested – capture in Opportunities & Constraints.
  - Consultant suggested– maybe add in Sub-Task 1.3?
- Valid point that should be addressed in the report.
- Funding is an issue – cost of extending trunk lines and who pays.
- Believe it is political – need monitoring, especially during dry season.

*Resolution of issue:*

- Consultant will get data from County and include in Sub-Task 1.3

2<sup>nd</sup> Ranking of Sub-Task 1.5 after resolution suggested:

5	4	3	2	1
2	5	11	0	0

Sub-Task 1.5 was accepted by consensus of the Committee

### Sub-Task 1.7 – Land Inventory

Initial Ranking:

5	4	3	2	1
0	5	10	3	0

Discussion of the members who gave this task a ranking of 2:

- Mislabeled exhibit (pg. 39).
- *Resolution:* Call the exhibit “Future Land Use” Developed for XPSWMM Model
- CERP plans either not identified or, if identified, not in the right place.  
*Resolution:* References to CERP will be updated
- Would like team to look at “significant areas” scenarios prior to completing scenarios finalization
- Pg. 23 – What about “pending” projects? Are they included?  
Only those that have permits are included. Large projects are tracked and updated.
- Should land that should be preserved be reflected? Add a balance.
  - *Resolution:* Page i, Task 1.7 – add “or preservation” to that sentence.
- USDA area to be added

2<sup>nd</sup> Ranking of Sub-Task 1.7 after resolutions suggested:

5	4	3	2	1
0	7	11	0	0

Sub-Task 1.7 was accepted by consensus of the Committee.

### PROJECT MANAGER’S REPORT

John Hulsey, Project Manager, reported that the Study is in Month 13 out of 26. The project is approximately 30% complete. Sub-task 2.2 is running behind, but, Keith and Schnars has received new data from the County (which is five years more current), and work on that sub-task will now resume. In order to get back on track, the Project Management Team would like to schedule the September WSAC meeting early in the month (possibly the 9<sup>th</sup>). This will insure that Committee comments on Subtask 2.2 are received in a timely manner. Mr. Hulsey also reminded the members to turn in their Financial Disclosure Forms.

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

### BUILDING THE LAND USE SCENARIOS: CONSULTANT PRESENTATION

Marc LaFerrier and Eric Silva of Keith and Schnars gave a PowerPoint presentation on the building of the land use scenarios. **Exhibit C** Subsequent to the presentation, Committee members were asked if they had any clarifying questions that would assist them in reviewing the materials that will be sent to them in the coming weeks.

Committee members made the comments and asked the questions which follow:

1. Where do environmental concerns get addressed in the scenario task?
2. Show where environmental concerns currently exist as well as the potential for them
3. Principles of Smart Growth – Can Team see what principles you are using?
4. The Committee would like to be assured that they will be able to weigh in on the land use classifications that are considered by the consultants
5. Make sure that at any public meetings all documentation is clearly marked “DRAFT”
6. Look at the impact of pervious/impervious surfaces on scenarios in analysis
7. Look at lot coverage rules
8. Don’t forget tourism in land use classifications
9. Ensure as much attendance at public meeting as possible
  - o Send out notices to members ASAP so they can get information to constituencies
  - o Make it as transparent as possible
  - o Get members copies of flyers or other materials
10. Will private properties be identified if they could be used as buffers or other natural resource protection?
11. Would it help if the Trust for Public Land (TPL) provides strategies for obtaining private property if needed? (answer was an unqualified “yes”)
12. Tourism includes more than stadiums, etc. – you need smaller tourist attractions, water, fishing, environmental areas

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Public comment was invited. Several comments were made.

## **MEMBER FORUM**

1. Schedule public comment time at these meetings prior to the committee making final decisions.
2. TPL will do a presentation on property rights
3. There is currently a bond issue for land acquisition; should we have some presentation on it? – it was suggested to wait until it is finalized
4. Any consideration in scenarios regarding impact of hurricanes? – see how 2-3 story buildings do in hurricanes (constraint)
5. Will team be working with Consultant on costs, etc. for infrastructure – wells?
6. Hurricane Andrew data will not be as meaningful now because code has been changed substantially.

## **ADJOURN**

The meeting was then adjourned.

## **IDEA PARKING LOT**

*Keith and Schnars, please create double-sided documents to save paper.*

## **OBSERVER COMMENT CARDS**

*“Ensure that you preserve all places that need preservation; accommodate only that population growth which can be accommodated while preserving those areas. To allow reasonable population growth, increase densities in appropriate places, but not across the board. The law does not require accommodation of all projected population; respect private property rights through transfer of development rights (TDRs) and other mechanisms”*

*Richard Grosso, 954-262-6140, Environmental and Land Use Law Center*

*“County code zoning re-write allows accessory buildings to 70-75% lot coverage. ( This is) way too much lot coverage! Applies to lots as small as zoning codes RU-1 (MA) and RU-1 (MB)”*

*Pat Wade*

*“To accommodate population growth in study area, Builders Association of South Florida (BASF) recommends an across the board density increase in all zoning categories throughout the Comprehensive Development Master Plan to reduce pressure on environmentally sensitive lands, and to implement smart growth criteria in all projects.*

*As an observer, I like the tables available to sit, take notes, etc. If possible, please provide them at all future meetings. I want to receive email notices of all Reports as they are posted to the website:*

*[trulyburton@basfonline.org](mailto:trulyburton@basfonline.org)”*

*Truly Burton*