

SOUTH MIAMI DADE WATERSHED STUDY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting Twenty-eight

January 26, 2005
9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Report of Proceedings

WELCOME/CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS

The meeting was held at the Miami Dade Water and Sewer Department Douglas Road Facility, Miami, 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 introduced a special guest to the meeting: Thaddeus Cohen, Secretary of the Department of Community Affairs (DCA), State of Florida. Members were asked to introduce themselves to the Secretary and to state the constituency they represent on the Committee. Secretary Cohen spoke to the Committee about his desire to have this process expand, at an appropriate time, into reviewing land and water use issues with the DCA, the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and Monroe County. His desire is that there be a broader conversation with all neighbors. The Secretary has asked his staff, in this 20th Anniversary year of the Growth Management Act, to concentrate on Infrastructure and Hurricane interests in the south Florida area. Secretary Cohen explained that we need to talk about “Why Florida is the greatest place to live and work” He stated that he would like to see growth “planning” not growth “management”.

Mr. Carlton thanked Secretary Cohen for visiting the Committee and invited him to remain for as long as his schedule would allow.

Members present:

Roger Carlton, Chair
Ivonne Alexander, Miami Dade AgriCouncil
Humberto Alonso, Jr., South Florida Water Management District
Subrata Basu, Miami-Dade Planning and Zoning
Linda Canzanelli, Biscayne National Park
Gerald Case, Florida Lime & Avocado Committee
Amy Condon, Member at Large
Guillermina Damas, Member At Large
Carlos Espinosa, Miami Dade DERM
Jeffrey Flanagan, Chamber South
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
Lawrence Percival, Kendall Federation of Homeowner Associations
Jorge Rodriguez, Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Authority
Mike Shehadeh, City of Homestead
Jane Spurling, Florida Nurserymen and Grower's Association
Charles Thibos, Tropical Everglades Visitor Association
Julia Trevarthen, South Florida Regional Planning Council

There were 11 Observers who signed the register.

Mr. Carlton announced that Miami Dade County Commissioner Dennis Moss had asked for a workshop on the Watershed Study which was held on January 20, 2005. The purpose of the workshop was to understand the Watershed Study process and to consider a new study that reviewed the urban development boundary (UDB) countywide. Commissioner Moss has now requested an additional workshop to be held regarding the UDB and how this additional study would be implemented. This workshop is to be held January 31, 2005 in Commission chambers at 10:00 am. All Committee members were encouraged to attend.

In response to Mr. Carlton's explanation of the workshop, members asked the following questions and made the following comments:

1. What is the relationship between the workshop discussion and what this Committee does?
2. Concerns come up more as we get closer to the end of this study.
3. Our study is more comprehensive but more limited geographically.
 - a. our study could impact other areas
4. The Commission wants an analysis of expanding the UDB outside of areas in our study area (full UDB study) – Commissioner Moss wants to make a decision based on all information.
5. We should not view full UDB study as in conflict with our study – our study is producing information that can be used in other areas.
6. Revisiting transportation infrastructure should be a part of any other study – Kendall Corridor in particular (it is in our study area)
7. The proper approach for this Committee is to work with the Commission and their interest in expanding UDB study.
8. January 31st workshop will better define exactly what the Commission wants – how the two studies are interconnected.
9. There will be more involvement on DCA level with the County as it performs a full UDB study.
10. The Building Industry wanted a separate independent study.

AGENDA REVIEW/GUIDELINES

Janice Fleischer, Facilitator, reviewed the Agenda for the day (**Exhibit A**) and reviewed the Committee's Meeting and Observer Guidelines. She explained that members were now receiving notices of the Technical Review Committee's meetings and it was causing some confusion. Members were responding to those notices as if they were for the Committee meetings. She asked that everyone read their emails very carefully so they know which meeting is being announced.

Ms. Fleischer reminded members that the Agricultural Economics presentation would be held at the next meeting which will be on February 24, 2005 at the Agricultural Center in Homestead, Florida.

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, delivered the Project Manager's Report. (Exhibit B) Mr. Hulsey reminded the Watershed Advisory members that the Technical Review Committee Meeting will be held on January 31, 2005 at the Agriculture Center in Homestead.

Mr. Hulsey explained further that member John Hall was once again unable to attend the meeting due to his concerns over a conflict of interest and the fact that a blanket waiver had not been granted. Mr. Carlton asked that this issue be placed on the agenda for the next Organizational Committee to discuss. The resolution of the conflict of interest issue has become more pressing. The following member comments were recorded:

1. We need a direct opinion from Ethics Committee.
2. We need to revisit the issue again (Org. Committee)
3. We need this issue resolved – everyone on the Committee has potential conflicts of interest.

At the conclusion of Mr. Hulsey's Report, Cindy Dwyer, Project Manager, Miami Dade Planning and Zoning, distributed a revised version of the Sunset Report that had previously been provided to Committee members and briefly reviewed the revisions that were suggested by the Chair. The Sunset Report is required by the Code of Miami Dade County, and must be approved by a formal vote of the membership. Following a brief discussion, a motion to approve the Report as amended (Exhibit C) was made by Mike Shehadeh, seconded by April Gromnicki, and approved unanimously by all voting members present at the meeting.

CONSULTANT PRESENTATION: TEST SCENARIOS 1 & 3: IMPACT ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Michael Davis and Eric Silva, Keith and Schnars, presented the results of the impact assessments on Test Scenarios 1 & 3. Each scenario was presented in the five subject areas: water resources, natural communities, land use/community character, economic conditions and infrastructure. After seeing the results in each area, members were given the opportunity to comment. In addition, members were provided with a worksheet (Exhibit D) upon which they could record any comments which they did not have time to express during the meeting. These comments could be turned in at the end of the meeting or emailed to Project Manager, John Hulsey, subsequent to the meeting.

Mr. Carlton noted that action on the impact assessments will be taken during the March, 2005 meeting. It is important that members bring this information to their constituencies for comment before then.

What follows are the comments received at the meeting in each subject area, whether orally or in writing:

WATER RESOURCES:

1. Other projects are now taking place that can affect this area and these parameters
2. Affects on groundwater of growth needs to be acknowledged
3. There are the issues of timing, distribution, quality and quantity (TDQQ) and when water flows to the Bay will there be enough water.
4. Concern re: amount of freshwater flowing into the Bay (minimum flows and levels) – link between fisheries decline and change in freshwater flow
5. Provide a mapping of where the points are that are being measured (by XPSWMM)
6. Do you consider any stormwater and water treatment?
 - a. Not at this time

7. Is there anything showing in your results that indicates any problems with the model?
 - a. No
8. They are using Miami-Dade's Urban Expansion Area
9. I am very confused: why does biological oxygen demand (BOD) reduce so much in Scenario 3A compared to 1A when I would imagine sewage levels and consumption levels per person would not change by virtue of living in a more compact situation (3A) vs. a more open space living (1A). For those of us that are not scientific, an explanation of each water quality parameter would be helpful.

NATURAL COMMUNITIES:

1. You are assuming that government will allow Remnant Natural Forests (RNF) to be destroyed
2. When you speak of "park space lost" do you mean existing park space?
 - a. No – this is for new park space not reducing the existing park space
 - b. It is not a loss, just less of increase
3. Are natural forests the same as pineland preserves?
4. Why do you use RNFs instead of Ag land?
 - a. Because at that point all Ag land is gone
5. The buffer section around RNFs that were studied is only on paper now; it is just for purposes of understanding choices
6. This buffer could potentially diminish the value of the land used as a buffer if it must stay Ag and not be residential
7. Serious concern with open space next to RNFs – exotics, maintenance, etc.
8. How were allocations made?
 - a. We tried to stay out of wetlands as much as possible
9. How did you decide how much to apportion?
 - a. We followed policy direction of scenarios
10. Is there a priority to how you use land?
 - a. The order is: vacant land, ag lands inside the UDB, any unconstrained land outside
11. The bond that was just passed gives a good tool for mitigating growth impacts and innovative smart growth studies.
12. There is a distinction between regulated parks vs. acquired parks
13. There are opportunities for combining uses on land

At this point, the question was asked: When will the Agriculture Economic Study be considered/how does it fit into our Study?

- It is part of the analysis being done now
- It has been in the analysis from the beginning

LAND USE & COMMUNITY CHARACTER:

1. We need a map that shows where density changes are being made
2. What is the average suburban density today vs. what average would be in each scenario
3. Consultant will produce an overlay showing new density projections
4. When you consider parks you should evaluate the habitat function
5. Make sure what we are suggesting can really happen in the real world. There should be a rational nexus; remember these are long term visions (50 years)
6. Preferred scenario is feasibility phase
7. This work now is looking at the extremes and a snapshot; we need to understand the margins to come to a consensus.
8. Lands that are west of the study area are not being considered; that may skew the results
9. The study is based on water flows
10. There should be some mention of lands outside the area and how they could impact the results

11. Metrorail was supposed to have more intense urban corridor around it
 - a. There are increased densities being placed along the entire corridor
12. What is a “premium” transit corridor? Where is that defined?
 - a. Premium corridors are:
 - i. South Dixie Highway
 - ii. North Kendall Drive (SW 88th Street)
 - iii. Le Jeune Road, and
 - iv. SW 72nd Avenue
 - b. Other corridors are being developed now
13. We need to identify areas that are appropriate for higher densities

As lunch was late in arriving, the Committee continued its deliberations after taking a short break.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS:

There are no statistics ready at this time. This will come before the Committee in March.

One member noted that impact fees should be considered in this subject area.

INFRASTRUCTURE:

1. With regard to schools, talk with the School Board about new innovative ways to get schools built
2. Need to look at schools in areas; some are overcapacity according to the Florida Inventory of School Houses (FISH) greater than 40%
3. Show the number of overcrowded schools
 - a. remember this is a 50 year plan, we are not sure if current overcrowding is relevant or how it is incorporated
4. Current Overcrowded Schools Committee is considering reducing the current FISH to less than 115%
5. Student population is related to unit/family type
6. You need to consider power supply in infrastructure
7. Are there any recommendations for waste water, treatment processes, etc?
8. Possible recommendation to accommodate students by allowing students to go wherever they want
9. There are no projections for technical schools or colleges, you need that

The Consultants stated that the next public meeting will be held in approximately April; this will be after the preferred scenario is considered by the Committee.

The Committee asked that future maps provided to them have streets and avenues clearly marked to assist in member’s ability to read the map accurately.

PUBLIC COMMENT

At this point in the meeting, public comment was invited. One member 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) within the first week following the meeting.

TRANSIT ISSUE DISCUSSION

This was an addition to the original agenda. There was a request that the Committee take a formal position relative to the Kendall Corridor no longer being considered a priority corridor. Members made the following comments:

1. I would want more information before deciding whether to take a position
2. This is not a part of our study
3. Timing is off, tomorrow (January 27, 2005) is too soon for us to take a position
4. As we get toward the "preferred scenario" we need a presentation on transit and corridors (and schools)

The Committee was then asked to rank the following question:

"Does the Committee want to discuss taking a position on the Kendall Corridor for tomorrow?"

5	4	3	2	1
1	0	0	12	8

It was clear from this ranking that this issue would not be taken up by the Committee at this time.

MEMBER FORUM

At the February meeting (February 24, 2005) lunch and the second half of the day will be sponsored by the Dade County Farm Bureau and the Miami Dade County Cooperative Extension Service. A presentation on agriculture and economics will be given to the Committee in the afternoon.

PUBLIC COMMENT

At this point in the meeting, public comment was invited. One member 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) within the first week following the meeting.

ADJOURN

The meeting was then adjourned.

MEMBER COMMENT CARDS:

None were received.

OBSERVER COMMENT CARDS

*"I need more time to analyze and understand Scenario 2. This is going too quickly. Please slow it."
- Truly Burton*

"An an observer at the last several meetings, it has been hard to hear the members of the committee speak and the presenters as well. Microphones should be set up for the committee in order to better follow the discussion."

-Truly Burton

“Scientific data seems voluminous and complex. Getting interest group input seems bewildering at best. I'm pretty good at what I do, but I don't think our group can provide thorough and thoughtful comments on the data... I'll keep trying. Give us more time than 2 months to digest the final report due in March.”
-Truly Burton

“Too much emphasis on preservation of forest communities with 500 foot buffer. Why 500 feet? Why not 50 feet? Why not apply the same buffer concept to wetlands? I believe your existing wetland maps must be flawed. To suggest only less than 500 acres of wetland impact with entire basin is absurd. Most existing farmland will be determined to be wetland.” - Ed Swakon

“What input does or will the Committee have on how scenario 2 will be developed? What is the definition of coastal wetland being used?” How is wetland mitigation taken into consideration? -Ed Swakon

“A copy of the Committee handouts (powerpoint) must be provided to audience while presentations are being made”- Anonymous

“I reiterate: the constraints are flawed! Property in South Dade permitted for 980 acres of fill with existing conservation easements in place for 1800 acres are excluded from urban expansion. All of the projected wetland and forest impacts from 1B and 3B could be accommodated in this area!” - Ed Swakon

“Please consider rearranging the room to allow the public to hear better. Roger should face the public. Janice could have her back to the public consider [other room set ups]. You may need microphones!” - Ed Swakon

IDEA PARKING LOT

No comments