

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

March 25, 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. Chair, Roger Carlton, introduced Don Pybas, director of the Center who welcomed everyone to the facility. Members Lawrence Percival (and his business DCA, Inc.) and William Losner sponsored breakfast and lunch.

Roger Carlton, Chair, welcomed everyone and made several announcements. Member Claudio Rosario, representative for the Florida Nurserymen and Grower's Association and Tom MacVicar, representative for the Florida Lime and Avocado Committees have resigned the Committee. Jane Spurling has replaced Mr. Rosario. No one has been designated to replace Mr. MacVicar at this time.

Mr. Carlton recommended a process for gaining the Committee's consensus on each Consultant task as it is finalized. When a task is finished, the results will be brought to the Committee (and posted on the project website) and the Committee will be asked to accept the work product in order to provide closure on that task. If everyone expresses (using the Consensus Ranking Procedure of the Committee) acceptance of that task, the Committee will move on. If there is not consensus, the concerns will be discussed for a reasonable time and a second ranking will be taken. If consensus still is not reached, a vote will be taken as per the procedures adopted by the Committee. The Committee accepted this procedure by consensus. It is hoped that Sub-tasks 1.1-1.7 will come before the Committee at the May, 2004 meeting.

Member William Losner, requested that the Statement of Legislative Intent language provided by him to the Project Manager regarding the South Miami Dade Watershed Advisory Committee be placed on the website so that visitors to the website know that the materials contained there are still only drafts. Mr. Carlton responded that the Organizational Committee would consider this request and Mr. Losner would be informed of their decision.

Mr. Carlton asked everyone to give a moment of silence in memory of committee member Lester Goldstein, who passed away recently.

Members Present:

Roger Carlton, Chair  
Ivonne Alexander, Miami Dade Agricouncil  
Humberto Alonso, SFWMD  
Daniel Apt, Florida Department of Environmental Protection  
Subrata Basu, Miami-Dade DP&Z (prospective member)  
Linda Canzanelli, Biscayne National Park

Amy Condon, Trust for Public Land (prospective member)  
Carlos Espinosa, Miami Dade DERM  
Jeffrey Flanagan, Chamber South  
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  
Blanca Mesa, Sierra Club  
Reed Olzack, Miami Dade Agricultural Practices Board  
Lawrence Percival, Kendall Federation of Homeowner Associations  
Bonnie Roddenberry, Sunny South Homeowner's Association  
Jane Spurling, Florida Nurserymen and Grower's Association (prospective member)

## **AGENDA REVIEW/GUIDELINES**

Janice Fleischer, Facilitator, reviewed the day's Agenda (Exhibit A) and the contents of the meeting packets.

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).

## **PARAMETERS AND THRESHOLDS-CONSULTANT DRAFT**

This portion of the meeting was designed to gain Committee input on the drafted final Parameters and Thresholds prepared by the Consultant. This is Sub-task 1.8 of their assignment. The Parameters and Threshold draft document had been sent to all members two weeks prior to this meeting to ease this discussion (Exhibit B). Members will be given an additional four weeks after this meeting to consider the draft document in detail and gather comments from their respective organizations.

The Parameters are divided into five categories: Water Resources, Natural Communities, Land Use and Community Character, Employment and Economy, and Infrastructure. Each category was considered separately. Representatives from the Consultant team presented the draft parameters and their thresholds to the Committee along with the explanation for each category (Exhibit C). Committee members were given an opportunity to ask for clarifying questions and make general comments.

What follows are the results of each discussion. The Consultant representative who delivered the overview is listed first, then member comments are listed.

### **CATEGORY: WATER RESOURCES (WR) presented by Juan Carrizo**

#### **PARAMETERS:**

##### **WR1: Stormwater Discharge Quality**

Member comments:

1. Identify the state water quality criteria/standards
2. Provide web links in final report to other relevant sites
3. Include references in parameters and thresholds document to Task 1.5 pages
4. Groundwater quality should be a parameter in addition to stormwater
5. Saltwater Intrusion should be a parameter

6. Existing polluted/contaminated sites need to be considered in baseline; are we going to take into account existing toxic sites in the area plus sites that may be creating pollutants, including Mt. Trashmore. It is the cumulative effect on the contamination loading that is relevant.
7. It is important to know that science is valid to be able to support the conclusions. North Bay vs. South Bay, impact of North Bay on South Bay.

**WR2: Groundwater Supply**

Member Comments:

1. Does this measure flow or just drinking water supply? - groundwater flow is important
2. We need something that will deal with groundwater flow reliably
3. Water supply is driven more by what is happening in the Everglades than by water supply issues
4. Biscayne Aquifer water withdrawals need to be considered – they have an impact
5. Impervious surfaces will be a big factor
6. Consider properties that do not have access to city/county water; they are at risk and should be factored into the study

**WR3: Freshwater Flows and Distribution**

Member Comments:

1. Wording needs to be changed re: CERP
2. We want to increase flows to the Bay, not just have no net decrease
3. Distribution component is needed in this analysis
4. This includes surface water flows (i.e. what goes into the canals) it is not all freshwater flows

**WR-4: Flood Protection**

Member comments:

1. Add groundwater quality and saltwater intrusion
2. L-31 and C-111 canals outside study area, but impact the study area - need to be considered; include these in the study, in the thresholds list of canals

\*\*

**CATEGORY: NATURAL COMMUNITIES (NC) presented by Marie Ecton**

PARAMETERS:

**NC1: Coastal Wetlands:** no comments

**NC2: Freshwater Wetlands** no comments

**NC3: Connectivity and Buffers of Natural Communities**

Member comments:

1. Seasonal wetlands – should be viewed as wetlands

**NC4: Threatened and Endangered Species Habitat-** no comments

**NC5: Air Quality-** no comments

\*\*

**CATEGORY: LAND USE/COMMUNITY CHARACTER (LU) presented by Mark La-Ferrier**

PARAMETERS:

**LU1: Development Densities**

Member comments:

1. "Ex-urban" means: between rural and suburban
2. Inject design into this parameter; not just "density"
3. Auto dependence is an issue, not density alone
4. Why wasn't open space being considered in this?
5. What is the definition of "open space"
6. Look at capacity of roadway systems
7. Comparative analysis of population densities should be a parameter – potential impact on population densities
8. Factor in property values as they already exist; can't change some of the existing properties from one use to another; Carson Bytes did a study on urban buildout for the rural and ag study that we can look at

**LU2: Rural Land-**

Member comments:

1. East of the urban development boundary needs to be considered

**LU3: Proximity of Housing and Employment to Transit-** no comments

\*\*

**CATEGORY: EMPLOYMENT/ECONOMY (EE) presented by Eric Silva**

PARAMETERS:

**EE1: Economic Base** (Distribution of Employment by Industry and Acreage)

Member comments:

1. Is it looking at how the interface with what's outside the study area (jobs, housing for workers) within the study area?
2. Is it going to look at growth industries and industry outside the study area?
3. Is it going to look at impact of different industries on water quality, natural areas, etc?

**EE2: Sustainable Agricultural Industry**

Member comments:

1. Do you look at historic types of employment and growth industries?
2. Concern that economics should not be the only measure of value for agriculture – look at the other values of agriculture
3. Consider the total value of agriculture
4. Don't know how many farms can give up land; agriculture is driven by economics only
5. Agriculture is about public policy too; could be supplemented by subsidies, loans, etc. if we think ag is important.
6. What is sustainable ag going to look like?
7. Need to look at how we keep agriculture going when farmers can get more money by walking away from it.

### **EE3: Housing Affordability**

Member comments:

1. Need to tie the housing cost issue into the low end of the housing affordability range
2. Look at patterns of home ownership; rental vs. ownership– permanent residents affect resources of an area; stewardship of an area is stronger with ownership

### **EE4: Mix of wages-**

Member comments:

1. Incorporations of areas causing tax increases; pushing folks out of their homes because they cannot afford the taxes. Tie wages and incorporation.

\*\*

## **CATEGORY: INFRASTRUCTURE (IS) presented by Eric Silva**

PARAMETERS:

### **IS1: Roadways**

Member comments:

1. Why should roadways be primary parameter and not schools, sewer, water, etc.?
2. Need to address how we encourage less auto dependability; look at roadways in context of other modes
3. Don't call it just "Roadways", include more options, such as "transit"
4. Transit needs to be more than just mitigation, but a solution that's factored in now. Needs to be more visible. If the area is going to be a bedroom community of Miami, we need to bring industry, roadways will be challenged
5. Building roadways encourages development, be careful about recommending building more roads or expanding existing roads

### **IS2: Schools**

Member comments:

1. This needs to be a primary parameter
2. Analyze schools, parks, neighborhood community centers, libraries and open space together – co-location
3. Change of policy on schools is needed re: co-location with parks because it is left up to each individual principal to decide whether school grounds will be available for recreational uses
4. Putting schools and parks together can be a negative – schools should have their own recreational space and not be allowed to cannibalize parks

### **IS3: Potable Water**

Member comments:

1. Potable water and wastewater must be primary – these are limiting factors on population growth
2. Take care of current problem before you start expanding - also look at costs of water
3. Consider where population is in order to meet demands (location); Where you put the development could decrease the available water resources as well.
4. Agricultural water needs to be considered

### **IS4: Wastewater- see comments for IS3**

### **IS5: Parks, Recreation and Open Space**

Member comments:

1. Be very clear how we define open space – parks and recreation do not all need to be publicly owned – agricultural lands can be open space; protect view sheds and other recreational opportunities
2. Differentiate between active parks and passive parks
3. Agriculture can't be considered open space because if agriculture is not viable then the owner may not want to keep the land as open space but may want to sell it to developers or develop it him/herself
4. Dog parks affect water

#### **General Comments on Parameters and Thresholds**

1. Police and fire, public safety, solid waste (Why not on list of thresholds?)
2. Add wastewater discharge to water resources category
3. What consideration or factoring in of evacuation in event of hurricanes, etc.?

Having clarified the intent of the task and their progress thus far, the Consultants will utilize comments from the Technical Review Committee to be obtained on April 14, and the comments from the WSAC and their constituent groups that are due no later than April 22 to refine their report before delivering a final work product to the Project Manager.

This discussion took the majority of the day to complete. The Committee took breaks, had lunch and provided an opportunity for public comment. Once the Parameters and Thresholds discussion was concluded, the Committee continued with as much of the original agenda as possible in the time left.

#### **PROJECT MANAGER'S REPORT**

Mr. Hulsey reported to the members that no resolution had yet been made regarding the County's *Agriculture and Rural Land Study* (Ag Study) recommendations. However, the Ag Study report from the Consultants as well as the Ag Study Advisory Committee's Minority and Majority reports would be made available on Keith and Schnars' Watershed Study website ([www.southmiamidadewatershed.com](http://www.southmiamidadewatershed.com)) for those who wished to see them.

Mr. Hulsey presented the members with a fact sheet regarding the Florida City Development of Regional Impact (DRI). He briefly discussed the DRI process, emphasizing that it would be months before a public hearing would take place. He also emphasized that this is a pre-application process and many other processes exist before the project could be approved, and that the members would be apprised of public hearing dates as they become available.

Cindy Dwyer, Principal Planner and Project Manager for Miami-Dade County Planning and Zoning, reported on her progress of determining the number of building permits recently issued in the Study Area. Ms. Dwyer informed the members that the only information that is available free of charge is a summary report of building permits by Commission District. A more refined computer analysis of building permits is available only for a fee. The Building Department provided a sample of the monthly permit report, which the Chair briefly summarized. The Chair then asked that building permit reports for those Commission Districts falling within the Watershed Plan area be obtained and a summary provided at the next meeting.

The Project Manager's Report is included as Exhibit D.

## **CONSULTANT RESPONSE TO LAND USE SCENARIO/POPULATION PROJECTIONS**

Committee members took a few minutes to review the Consultant's response to the request for an additional scenario that would include population limitations (Exhibit E). Committee member Dick Frost continued to express concern regarding this issue. As time was very short, this discussion was postponed until the next meeting.

### **MEMBER FORUM**

Committee needs to discuss possibility of restrained growth

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr. Carlton called on those individuals who had expressed a desire to address the Committee. Two members of the public commented to the Committee.

Ms. Fleischer thanked members for their participation and asked them to turn in their Evaluation Forms.

### **ADJOURN**

The meeting was then adjourned.

### **MEMBER COMMENTS (CARDS) RECEIVED:**

None

### **OBSERVER COMMENTS (CARDS) RECEIVED:**

"Even though the consultants ask for input from the Committee, it appears they do not intend to incorporate any of the concerns or comments into their threshold analysis. What is the point of giving input? This process has become very frustrating!"

*-Anonymous*

### **IDEA PARKING LOT COMMENTS:**

- PLEASE DUPLICATE MATERIALS
- Transit frequency needs to be considered in Land Use; Proximity of transit, it will determine if someone uses the transit
- Do not relive the Ag Study Committee process
- Revisit the ground rules-too much repeating