

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

June 23, 2005  
8:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.

**Report of Proceedings**

**WELCOME/CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The meeting was held at the Miami-Dade Cooperative Extension Service Agricultural Center in Homestead, Florida.

Roger Carlton, Chair, welcomed everyone and thanked the facility for their continued generosity in sponsoring the meetings every other month and thanked member, William Losner, for continuing to sponsor breakfast.

Mr. Carlton made the following comments and announcements:

- ✓ The Committee has two prospective new members: Richard Curry has been nominated to replace Rick Clark, representing Biscayne National Park; and Armando Perez has been nominated to replace John Hall, representing the Florida Engineering Society.
- ✓ Member April Gromnicki, representing National Audubon Society, is moving to Washington, D.C. to begin a new position with National Audubon. Ms. Gromnicki is an original member of the Committee and National Audubon would like her to remain as their representative. Her organization will be making a formal request to the BCC for a waiver of the residency requirements so that she can remain on the Committee.
- ✓ It is hoped that the information presented at this meeting will satisfactorily respond to all the comments and questions raised at the last meeting and that consensus can be reached on Task 2.

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

Members present:

Roger Carlton, Chair  
Gerald Case, Florida Lime & Avocado Committee  
Richard Alger, South Florida Potato Growers Exchange  
Gerald Case, Florida Lime and Avocado Committees  
Amy Condon, At Large member  
Richard Curry, Biscayne National Park (prospective member)  
Guillermina Damas, At Large member  
Carlos Espinosa, Miami-Dade DERM  
John Fredrick, Dade County Farm Bureau  
Dick Frost, Tropical Audubon Society  
April Gromnicki, National Audubon Society  
Robert Johnson, Everglades National Park  
Louise King, Redland Citizens' Association  
William Losner, Greater Homestead/Florida City Chamber of Commerce  
Bennie Lovett, Florida City  
Carter McDowell, Building Industry Representative

Reed Olszack, Miami-Dade Agricultural Practices Board  
Mark Oncavage, Sierra Club (prospective member)  
Lawrence Percival, Kendall Federation of Homeowner Associations  
Bonnie Roddenberry, Sunny South Acres Homeowner's Association  
Jorge Rodriguez, Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Authority  
Mike Shehadeh, City of Homestead  
Jane Spurling, Florida Nurserymen and Grower's Association  
Julia Trevarthen, South Florida Regional Planning Council

There were 17 Observers.

## **AGENDA REVIEW/GUIDELINES**

Janice Fleischer, Facilitator, reviewed the Agenda for the day (Exhibit A).

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).

## **"BACK TO THE FUTURE"**

Cindy Dwyer, Project Manager, Miami-Dade Planning and Zoning, gave a presentation that contained "refresher" information including , Committee accomplishments and goals and an overview member responsibilities. (Exhibit B)

## **PROJECT MANAGER'S REPORT**

John Hulsey, Project Manager, then delivered the Project Manager's Report. (Exhibit C).

## **CONSULTANTS' RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED AT THE APRIL 28, 2005 MEETING**

At the April 28, 2005 meeting, several issues were raised that were of concern to members of the Committee. As a result, it was decided at that meeting to allow members to articulate their concerns fully and postpone the consensus process with regard to Subtask 2.2: Formulation of the Test Scenarios. In response to those concerns and the comments recorded at the April 28 meeting, meetings with the Project Management Team (PMT) and the Consultants were held to clarify issues of concern. The meetings resulted in additional research being conducted by the Consultant in an effort to fully address outstanding issues, and a response was provided to the full Committee in the form of a letter (Exhibit D) and a presentation (Exhibit E)

Following the presentation, the Committee members made the following comments:

1. We need a more detailed description of where 4700 units along transit corridor will be
  - a. **None in City of Miami**
2. The County could require new cities to be in compliance with the Watershed Plan
3. Densities east and west of US1 in Kendall need to be more balanced
4. Will we be looking at new projects approved or built since the study started before the Preferred Scenario is developed?
  - a. **What has happened since study began will be re-evaluated.**

5. Encourage consultants to look at population striations again before doing Preferred Scenario (DU/ACRE)
6. Recommend this committee does not sunset after study is done; for approval and oversight purposes during implementation
7. If there are items that were not included in consultant SOW, these left out items could affect the real results of Preferred Scenarios
8. Success will depend on transportation (movement of people)
9. New cities need to pay mitigation fees which creates a resentment on the part of new cities since established cities do not need to do mitigation

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Following the Consultant presentation, public comment was invited. Four (4) members of the audience addressed the Committee.

Note: Public comment is not recorded. If anyone from the public desires to have his/her comments appear in the Report of Proceedings, they can submit their comments in writing on the comment cards provided at each meeting or email the Facilitator, Janice Fleischer ([janice@flashresolutions.com](mailto:janice@flashresolutions.com)) within the first week following the meeting.

The members took a short break.

**CONSENSUS PROCESS: ACCEPTANCE OF FINAL WORK PRODUCT: SUB-TASK 2.2: FORMULATION OF TEST SCENARIOS**

Upon returning from break, the Facilitator led the Committee through the consensus process for each part of Sub-Task 2.2. The results of this process are shown below.

Committee Procedure: the Committee is asked to accept the selected section by consensus (See Consensus Rules on the Institute website: [www.sfrpc.com/institute/watershed.htm](http://www.sfrpc.com/institute/watershed.htm)). If consensus is not reached in the first ranking, discussion follows to attempt to get all concerns addressed and resolved. A second ranking is then taken. If consensus is still not reached, the Committee goes to vote according to Committee procedures. Once tasks are accepted, the Committee does not go back again to review those tasks.

Note: All sections below will incorporate those items contained in Exhibit D (above- a formal response letter written to member, Carter McDowell, the Building Industry representative).

1<sup>st</sup> Ranking: 1.0-2.3 Intro and General Methodology

| 5 | 4  | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|---|----|---|---|---|
| 2 | 11 | 8 | 0 | 0 |

No further discussion necessary; accepted by consensus.

1<sup>st</sup> Ranking: 2.4 -Test Scenarios 1A and 1B

| 5 | 4 | 3  | 2 | 1 |
|---|---|----|---|---|
| 1 | 9 | 12 | 0 | 0 |

No further discussion necessary; accepted by consensus.

1<sup>st</sup> Ranking: 2.5- Test Scenarios 2A and 2B

| 5 | 4 | 3  | 2 | 1 |
|---|---|----|---|---|
| 0 | 9 | 13 | 0 | 0 |

No further discussion necessary; accepted by consensus.

1<sup>st</sup> Ranking: 2.6-Test Scenarios 3A and 3B

| 5 | 4  | 3  | 2 | 1 |
|---|----|----|---|---|
| 1 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 |

No further discussion necessary; accepted by consensus.

1<sup>st</sup> Ranking: 2.7 Comparison of Land Uses

| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 |

No further discussion necessary; accepted by consensus.

All sections were accepted by consensus upon first ranking. The meeting was running ahead of schedule so the Agenda was modified to allow members to adjourn just before lunch was served.

**CONSULTANT PRESENTATION: SUB-TASK 3: UPDATE**

Michael Davis, Project Manager and V.P., Keith and Schnars, presented an update on the next sub-task to be considered by the Committee: Sub-Task 3. [\(Exhibit F\)](#)

Following the presentation, members made the following comments:

1. Salt water intrusion issue needs to be addressed
  - a. salt water intrusion is part of methodology
2. Farmers experience this all the time- during decreased rainfall you have salt water intrusion, during increased rainfall you have no salt water intrusion
3. You might be able to lessen the effect through alternative water supply means

**MEMBER FORUM**

Members were invited to make announcements or bring up topics to be discussed at future meetings. This is a regular part of the Committee’s meetings.

1. Recommend “endofsuburbia.com” tape
2. Palmetto Bay voted to hold the line on the Urban Development Boundary
3. Concerns on groundwater flow to Bay- pay attention on Sub Task 3
4. Agriculture area has a transportation problem moving crews and equipment on crowded roads
  - economic
  - public safety
5. Agriculture relies heavily on groundwater level-ecological parameters affected especially in tree crop
  - need a clear indication as to how levels will be kept
  - legal “taking” issue (if groundwater levels not maintained and crops are lost)

6. Agriculture close to residences poses challenges and liabilities (spray, heavy equipment, transportation)
7. Roger attended and visited:
  - Homestead Speedway
  - Met with new SFWMD-Executive Director
  - Met with Environmental Leaders Group (Richard Pettigrew group)
8. Mayor of Dade County will be at the meeting on July 11 with Kendall Home Owner Association
  - Transportation issues in West Kendall Transit Summit- Aug 1

## ADJOURN

The meeting was then adjourned.

## MEMBER COMMENT CARDS:

None received

## OBSERVER COMMENT CARDS

*"It is important for committee members to know about the community council ordinance being put forth by BCC commissioner Dennis Moss to make it impossible for any community council member to go before any board or meeting to discuss any planning issues. This means that your community council member could not speak to this Watershed Committee, nor speak to any other board, including the BBC, about this Watershed study."*

*- Jamie Furgang, Audubon of Florida*

*"There is an enormous volume of technical materials being provided that volunteer groups have little time or resources to evaluate. The Consultants provide no relief from extremely rushed and increasingly compressed timeframe deadlines."*

*-Truly Burton*

*"Issue: Report to the County Commission on the annual declining balance of residentially- zoned land that is available for future development. The Commission needs to know, every year, how many units could be built for people in which to live."*

*-Truly Burton*

*"Good morning. My name is Katie Edwards, and I am the Executive Director of the Dade County Farm Bureau in Homestead. I represent Miami-Dade County's oldest and largest general agriculture organization with over 3,500 members, 820 of whom are grower members.*

*Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to provide public input.*

*Many of you were present at the February meeting when three of our commercial growers participated in a panel discussion, addressing questions from the Watershed committee. At the request of committee members John Fredrick and Reed Olszack, I would like to again emphasize commercial agriculture and the role it plays in the South Miami-Dade Watershed area.*

*We know that farmland provides a natural recharge area for the aquifer. We know that farmers are the preferred neighbors of Everglades National Park and Biscayne National Park. We know that growers are leading the way in stewardship by implementing best management practices which decrease water, pesticide and fertilizer usage.*

*But do we know how the watershed study and plan will support economically viable and diverse agriculture while protecting private property rights? Farm Bureau believes that this will be a critical*

*component to determining the success of the Watershed Study and Plan.*

*Miami-Dade County has allocated \$30 million in the General Obligation Bond for purchasing development rights from agricultural lands. While we believe that this is a good start to giving more growers options about the future use of their land, we believe that growers must be compensated at fair market value for any rights they give up in order to allow for down-zoning and loss of development rights.*

*I enjoy driving out to the Redland to visit growers, and I enjoy seeing the sunset just as much as everyone else who says they want to keep it rural. But I read the USDA reports each week that tell me how much growers are receiving for their crops. I also know how much it costs those growers to harvest it. The Watershed committee can't reverse trade agreements or stop imports and invasive pests and diseases. If the local community is going to provide for an economically viable agriculture to exist, then we must provide for economic incentives for growers to keep land in agriculture. Green space provided by our growers is not a private subsidy for the public's benefit.*

*A recent survey of the Dade County Farm Bureau's 820 grower members yielded the following results:*

*Over half of the respondents believe that there should be some adjustments made to the UDB now or at some point in the future.*

*I respectfully ask that you please take this into consideration when deciding upon a preferred scenario for the Watershed Study and Plan. And remember, you can only save farmland if you save farmers first.*

*Thank you for your time.*

*-Katie A. Edwards, Executive Director, Dade County Farm Bureau*

## **IDEA PARKING LOT**

No comments received.