

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

February 26, 2004
9:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.

Report of Proceedings

WELCOME/CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS

The meeting was held at the Miami-Dade Water & Sewer Department Douglas Road facility in Miami. Member organization, Audubon of Florida, through member April Gromnicki, and Member John Hall, through his private firm, Ludovici & Orange Consulting Engineers, sponsored breakfast and lunch.

Members Present:

Roger Carlton, Chair
Richard Alger, South Florida Potato Growers Exchange
Daniel Apt, Florida Department of Environmental Protection
Linda Canzanelli, Biscayne National Park
Amy Condon, Trust for Public Lands (prospective member)
Carlos Espinosa, Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management (DERM)
Jeffrey Flanagan, Chamber South
Dick Frost, Tropical Audubon Society
April Gromnicki, National Audubon Society
John Hall, Florida Engineering Society
Robert Johnson, Everglades National Park
Louise King, Redland Citizens' Association
William Losner, Greater Homestead/Florida City Chamber of Commerce
Bennie Lovett, Florida City
Blanca Mesa, Sierra Club
Howard Nelson, Building Industry Representative (prospective member)
Reed Olszack, Miami-Dade Agricultural Practices Board
Lawrence Percival, Kendall Federation of Homeowner Associations
Bonnie Roddenberry, Sunny South Homeowner's Association
Jorge Rodriguez, Miami-Dade County Water & Sewer Department (prospective member)
Charles Thibos, Tropical Everglades Visitor Association
Julia Trevarthen, South Florida Regional Planning Council

Roger Carlton, Chair, welcomed everyone. Mr. Carlton had several announcements:

1. The Trust for Public Land has accepted the invitation to be an "at large" member of the group. The South Florida office director, Amy Condon, will serve as Committee representative.
2. We are still awaiting word from either the Urban Land Institute or the Nature Conservancy for the remaining "at large" position. Neither group has submitted a nomination as of this date.
3. To clarify our process, as each work product of the Consultant is finalized, the final work product will be brought to the Committee for acceptance.

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.

PROJECT MANAGER'S REPORT

Project Manager, John Hulsey, presented his monthly report. (Exhibit B) Mr. Hulsey added that copies of the 1995 document, "South Dade Watershed Project" prepared by the University of Miami and the South Florida Water Management District are available to Committee members upon request. Additionally, he provided a draft handout of Project Milestones as requested by a Committee member at the previous meeting. Mr Hulsey requested that member comments on the Milestones be sent to him. He will then prepare a final version that Committee members can duplicate and distribute to their constituencies.

TASK 1.8-PARAMETERS AND THRESHOLDS-PROJECT MANAGER OVERVIEW

Mr. Hulsey followed his monthly report with a PowerPoint presentation that provided the Committee with an overview of the actions to be accomplished in Task 1.8 (Parameters and Thresholds) for each category to be studied: Infrastructure, Natural Communities, Employment and Economics, Land Use/Community Character and Water Resources. (Exhibit C).

Following the presentation, Members made the following observations:

1. "Essential municipal services" should be included in all 3 scenarios
2. Scenario 1 – how does it comport with the Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP) – may be a discrepancy in number listed on presentation (4.5 DU/acre)
3. In all scenarios, water quality must not be degraded (quality, quantity, saltwater intrusion)
4. What is the correlation between scenarios and Committees' Vision?
5. Task 4– Development of Preferred Scenario – will tie the group's Vision in with the decision of which scenario is developed
6. Biscayne National Park and Biscayne Bay should be the stated objective – not just Biscayne National Park
7. It seems that alternative #2 is being presumed to be the preferred scenario – this is a cause for concern - #3 is too sketchy – needs to reflect spectrum better and not be extreme
8. Many things that can be done that reflect a more moderate view than #1 or #3 and still freeze Urban Development Boundary (UDB)
9. What has happened in Kendall could happen in South Dade, too much development – look at what is the proper build out of Krome Avenue before decisions about it are made
10. Currently CDMP allows movement of UDB based on population – based on this current philosophy, never moving UDB is a fringe position
11. Increasing density near transit brings out "Not In My Back Yard" (NIMBY)
12. Need to step back from UDB and look at areas inside UDB instead
13. Learn from past (i.e. invasion of wellfields, protect resources)
14. All scenarios will be reviewed again in Task 4

PARAMETERS REFINED

At the conclusion of Mr. Hulsey's presentation and the discussion that followed, Committee members were asked to consider each category separately in refining the parameters they had suggested at the January meeting. Subsequent to the January meeting, the Consultant had reviewed all items generated by the Committee during the "brainstorm" activity and had assigned them to one of several uses. Each item was designated as a parameter, a policy, an opportunity or constraint, or as "not within the scope". (See Exhibit D). Considering one category at a time, Members were asked to comment on the parameter lists presented. What follow are the results of that discussion. Member comments will be considered by the Consultants when drafting their Final Report.

- **Infrastructure**

Presented as parameters to the group:

1. *Solid Waste*
2. *Transportation (which was further defined as meaning roadway capacity)*
3. *Air Quality*
4. *Educational Standards (which was later deleted as not being measurable as a parameter)*
5. *Potable water*
6. *Sewers*
7. *Mass Transportation and Transit (originally listed separately, but then combined under the heading of Transit)*
8. *Schools*
9. *Flood protection*

Members' comments regarding the above list:

- Where hospitals are located should be a parameter
- Why is "schools" in infrastructure and not in Land Use
- Schools do not belong in Infrastructure
- Sewers and Flood Protection – make sure you do not only look at flooding, but at storm water recharge
- Parks are integral to infrastructure – you can have non-traditional uses so they can be used to capture water and serve two purposes
- Wells are being developed in Parks - so you have both uses
- "Transportation" means roadway capacity; "Transit" and "Mass Transportation" are the same and are combined
- Not sure how one uses educational standard and schools as parameters – they may actually be an opportunity/constraint, not a parameter
- Educational standard is a term of art – usually used to mean educational quality, not capacity (*Note: this item was ultimately removed from the parameters list*)
- Why don't we see power supply as parameter

- **Natural Communities**

Presented as parameters to the group:

1. *Buffer & protect natural systems from impacts of adjacent land uses*
2. *Threatened & endangered species habitat*
3. *Fish & wildlife habitat*
4. *Spatial extent of ecologically intact communities*
5. *Connectivity of natural communities*
6. *Acres of protected natural communities*
7. *Acres protected from development*

8. *Acres of habitat for native species*
9. *Habitat area*
10. *Upland habitat*
11. *Habitat function*
12. *Acres of protected wetland*
13. *Spatial extent of wetlands*
14. *Healthy coastal wetlands adjacent to the bay*
15. *Sea grass*
16. *Species diversity*
17. *Restoration projects (e.g. cerp)*
18. *Healthy fish nursery (using mangrove environment)*

Members' comments regarding the above list:

- Everglades National Park and Biscayne National Park should be considered when one is measuring how much park area is in a region, they should not be treated separately but used in the overall (analysis?)
- National parks are treated somewhat differently – they serve a different clientele
- Populations of species listed as outside scope – why isn't it a parameter
- Population of species may be an opportunity or a constraint and still will be used, just not as a parameter
- Consultant is urged to keep some aspect of habitat function as a parameter
- Amount of flow ways east-west – is it a parameter or threshold? (possibly opportunity or constraint)

At this point in the meeting, Members took a short break.

Upon returning from the break and before resuming the parameters exercise, the following comments were made by Members to the Consultant and the Project Managers:

1. Will there be data analysis on Krome expansion issues?
2. Water levels need to be considered.
3. Don't just accept water level assumptions of the Corps and the District.

Members then returned to considering the parameters:

- **Employment & Economics**

Presented as parameters to the group:

1. *Employment Mix*
2. *Role of Agriculture in Study Area Economy*
3. *Wages*
4. *Location of Housing*
5. *Housing Affordability*
6. *Diversity of jobs to allow countercycle stability*
7. *Agricultural acreage*
8. *Mix of housing, affordable to high-priced*
9. *Housing costs*
10. *Ecotourism opportunities*

Members' comments regarding the above list:

- There is nothing that measures the health of economy indicated
Suggested indicators: employment levels, unemployment levels, earning levels (wage), number of acres in cultivation, tourism - number of visitors or tourists in area, per capita spending per tourist

PUBLIC COMMENT

At this point in the meeting, it was approaching time to break for lunch. Mr. Carlton called on members of the public who addressed the Committee and then he announced the lunch break.

After lunch, the Tropical Audubon Society presented their follow up position with regard to the Scope of Services. Their presentation is summarized later in this Report in order provide continuity for the discussion on parameters.

- **Land Use/Community Character**

Presented as parameters to the group:

1. *Parks & Recreation*
2. *Urban Centers*
3. *Rural Community Character*
4. *Historic Preservation*
5. *Open space*
6. *Parks – open space*
7. *Densities (east of US 1; between US 1 and Turnpike; west of Turnpike)*
8. *Protect Biscayne Bay*
9. *Agricultural acreage*
10. *Riding and Bike trails*
11. *Walking trails (to main community destinations)*
12. *More traditional neighborhood development (TND)*

Members' comments regarding the above list:

- Multi-use facilities should be a parameter – institutional and community serving facilities are a parameter
- Population should be a parameter – population density, growth, distribution
- Impervious surface area should be parameter – goes to flood control, recharge, protecting Biscayne Bay
- Hotels, hospitals, manufacturing and industrial facilities, schools, dog parks, community centers, well field protection, libraries, power supply facilities, restaurants, bowling centers, theaters, department stores, strip malls, health clubs, banks- all should be considered
- Water supply plants – need well field capacity – include as parameter – land use description needs to include well fields
- Agricultural acreage – two considerations: seasonal vs. year-round agricultural

Water Resources

Presented as parameters to the group:

1. Groundwater Supply
2. Freshwater Flows & Distribution
3. Flood Protection Level of Service (FPLOS) – Development
4. Water Quality: Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD)
5. Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD)
6. Total Suspended Solids (TSS)
7. Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)
8. Nitrogen Species (TN, NO₂, NO₃, TKN and NH₃)
9. Phosphorous Species (Total & Orthophosphate)
10. Metals (Cadmium, Copper, Lead & Zinc)
11. Water supply to meet goals and objectives
12. Surface water supply to meet goals and objectives
13. Water supply to meet goals and objectives – supply Everglades, rain, ocean, aquifer (existing)
14. Water quantity
15. Groundwater quality
16. Healthy reef ecosystem (not impaired by lack of fresh water flow or land-based pollution)
17. Groundwater flow to Biscayne National Park
18. Surface water flow to Biscayne National Park
19. Sufficient water for a healthy estuarine Bay
20. No flooding
21. Water table should not be held too high so flood protection can be maintained

Members' comments regarding the above list:

- No surface water quality as a parameter – needs to be included
- Add to water quality list, which is not all inclusive: hydrocarbons and others on page 4 of Consultant's spread sheet (Exhibit D) that are listed as outside the study
- Impaired list of water bodies exists and could help consultants
- This is a planning list – not confirmed data yet
- Saltwater intrusion should be a parameter
- Last two items really are subsumed under the previous heading of “flood protection”
- Agricultural use is a pervious water flow and ends up in the aquifer – is this a parameter?

SCOPE OF WORK SUGGESTION: TROPICAL AUDUBON

Committee member, Dick Frost, Tropical Audubon Society representative, made a short presentation regarding the Consultant's Scope of Work. Mr. Frost re-iterated his comments from the previous meeting that neither the Committee Vision Statement nor the goals and objectives say anything about accommodating the projected population, and that he believed it would be more useful if there were to be a scenario model that assumed a healthy ecosystem and agricultural economy with constrained population growth. Mr. Richard Grosso, Esq., at the request of Mr. Frost, spoke briefly about the need to assess the minimum needs of the ecosystem before trying to accommodate the population, and that Scenario III in the Scope of Services was close. He stated that the basic premise of the study should not be accommodating the projected population growth but how much could the population be accommodated after meeting the ecosystem's needs. A general discussion among the Committee members followed in which some members expressed the need for a paradigm shift in the current philosophy away from

accepting population growth as a given and instead making sure the ecosystem works effectively first and planning around that. Others remarked that the conversation indicated a shift away from balance in the objectives, that the Scope of Services should be left as is, and that a lack of information exists to determine what the needs of Biscayne Bay are now. It was stated that the heart of the question was: should we wait until the information is back from measuring the three scenarios before considering carrying capacity, or should we look at carrying capacity at the same time? Mr. Carlton asked for project staff, the Consultants, and the organizational group to develop language for the Scope of Services that ensures we will consider carrying capacity as part of an ongoing process, including cost and time estimates, for next month's WSAC meeting.

THRESHOLD DEVELOPMENT: RURAL COMMUNITY CHARACTER

The Committee participated in an exercise to list threshold items for the measurement or indications of "rural community character". The following are the results of that exercise:

1. Streets roll up at night
2. Pickup trucks are the predominant cars in area
3. No buildings taller than 2 stories
4. Amount of light pollution (i.e. how dark it is)
5. No pollution in the wells
6. Pine trees from the turnpike to Everglades National Park, closest neighbor is a mile away
7. Historic looking homes – coral rock/wood frame
8. Septic vs. sewer, wells vs. city water, 2 lane primary roads vs. unpaved roads, unplanned development, ratio of services to population
9. Significant greenery, architectural design standards that speak to rural look, themed entertainment, themed retail
10. Percentage of land in agriculture
11. Little main streets, little gathering places, town centers, livestock, architecture to scale/respect type of architecture
12. 2 lane Krome, farmers/local markets
13. No red lights on every corner; takes no longer than 15 seconds to cross road
14. Percentage of open space, number of wagon wheels
15. Horse riding /trails, fruit stands
16. No curbs, no sidewalks
17. Wildlife in view

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Carlton called for public comment; there was none.

MEMBER OPEN FORUM

Members had the following requests for discussion at the next meeting:

- Status report on building permits issued
- Annexations and incorporations
- How much land has been sold in last 2 years

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:

“Streamline!! Can the Project Manager’s report be distributed prior to the meeting for review and then we can confine comments. Use lunch time for housekeeping items. Use a kitchen timer and give members 2-3 minutes to speak. If someone can’t express their point in that time they need to practice more. Do not allow people to repeat themselves or others comments.”

Anonymous

“Why are we going over all of this (parameters) when the consultant has already prepared a revision/work product and we should be reviewing all of this together since the Consultants’ work product may have incorporated some of our comments and concerns. If we’re going to review their revisions, it doesn’t seem efficient to do it twice.” Jeff Flanagan

“We still need a presentation on salt water intrusion issues because it is a constraint on all the policies.”

Anonymous

OBSERVER COMMENTS (CARDS) RECEIVED:

“Future well field study area to be included in the land use category of the parameter exercise.”

Maria Valdes, Miami Dade Water and Sewer Department, Planning Section