

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

October 28, 2004  
9:00 a.m. – 3:15 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, thanked the facility for their continued generosity in sponsoring the meetings every other month. He then made several announcements:

1. Evan Skornick, Senior Planner, South Florida Water Management District has joined the Watershed Staff as the SFWMD project manager, Mr. Skornick is taking the place of former SFWMD project manager, Liz Abbott. Ms. Abbott has a new role and will be working exclusively in Broward County for the SFWMD. Ms. Abbott was in attendance at the meeting and Mr. Carlton thanked her for all her hard work and excellent effort working with all parties and the Consultant team. Mr. Skornick can be reached at [eskornic@sfwmd.gov](mailto:eskornic@sfwmd.gov), phone: 305-377-7274 x7290.
2. Subrata Basu, Miami Dade County Planning and Zoning Assistant Director and Committee representative, had appeared before the County Commission once again to attempt to obtain the Waiver of Conflict of Interest for the Committee. The Commissioners have taken the position that all such waivers need to be reviewed and no further waivers will be issued until this review of all existing Committees that have been granted the waiver are evaluated. It is the opinion of the Commission that blanket waivers are overbroad and waivers should only be issued for specific sections of the Ordinance. Mr. Carlton and Mr. Basu will keep the Committee informed as they continue to seek the appropriate waiver for the Committee.
3. In the meanwhile, Mr. Carlton reminded members that Robert Meyers, Esq., Executive Director, Miami Dade County Commission on Ethics and Public Trust, had made a presentation to them at the previous month's meeting regarding Conflicts of Interest and ethics. Mr. Meyers had said that, as long as members disclose any direct conflicts as soon as they become aware of them, they (members) can take part in all deliberations but should recuse themselves from voting on those specific issues.
4. Janice Fleischer, the Committee's facilitator has opened her own firm, Flash Resolutions. She will continue to facilitate the meetings of the Committee and can be reached at [jfleischer@mediate.com](mailto:jfleischer@mediate.com).

Mr. Carlton then turned the meeting over to the facilitator.

Members Present:

Roger M. Carlton, Chair  
Ivonne Alexander, Miami-Dade AgriCouncil  
Richard Alger, South Florida Potato Growers Exchange  
Humberto P. Alonso, Jr, South Florida Water Mgmt District  
Subrata Basu, Miami Dade Planning and Zoning  
Gerald Case, Florida Lime & Avocado Committee  
Amy Condon, At Large  
Guillermina Damas, At Large  
Carlos Espinosa, Miami-Dade DERM  
Jeffrey Flanagan, Chamber South  
John Fredrick, Dade County Farm Bureau  
Dick Frost, Tropical Audubon Society  
April H. Gromnicki, Esq., National Audubon Society  
John Hall, Florida Engineering Society  
Robert Johnson, Everglades National Park  
William Losner, Greater Homestead/Florida City Chamber  
Bennie Lovett, Florida City  
Carter McDowell, Esq., Building Industry Representative  
Reed Olszack, Miami-Dade Agricultural Practices Board  
Lawrence Percival, Kendall Federation of Homeowner  
Jorge Rodriguez, Miami-Dade Water & Sewer Authority  
Jane Spurling, Florida Nurserymen and Growers  
Charles Thibos, Tropical Everglades Visitor Association  
Julia Trevarthen, South Florida Regional Planning Council

In this and all future Reports, the number of Observers present will be noted. At this meeting, there were 13 Observers.

**AGENDA REVIEW/ GUIDELINES**

Ms. Fleischer reviewed the day's Agenda (**Exhibit A**), and reminded everyone to turn off cellphones and beepers and keep side conversations to a minimum. She directed members to their meeting packets which contained updated information for their notebooks on contact information for Mr. Skornick and herself as Staff to the Committee. This information will also be updated on the Committee website.

Ms. Fleischer then announced that former FDEP representative, Daniel Apt, will tentatively be replaced by Steve Dale. Mr. Apt had resigned from the Committee several months earlier to pursue other opportunities out of state.

She then announced that there was a possibility that the meeting would be ending early, so if any observers wished to comment, they should do so during the morning public comment time. If the meeting did follow the times on the agenda, the public would be invited to comment again.

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).

**PROJECT MANAGER'S REPORT**

John Hulsey, Project Manager, delivered the Project Manager's Report. (**Exhibits B and C**)

Mr. Hulsey made a powerpoint presentation to explain how the test scenarios fit in with the big picture of the Watershed Study. The main emphasis of the presentation was to remind members that these test scenarios were developed, in part, from information given by them during commentary on previous tasks, and that these scenarios are “tests” which will determine what is used for the final plan. The final plan will not be chosen from among the test scenarios. Rather, the results of the impact assessments of the three test scenarios, and the comments about them from the Committee, the Technical Review Committee and the public would inform the “preferred” scenario, which would be the basis for the final plan.

During Mr. Hulsey’s report, a member commented that Gables by the Sea and Gables Estates are not included in this Plan. The member stated that they should be included because they cause pollution in the Watershed area. Mr. Carlton responded by asking that this item be placed on the agenda for the next Organizational Committee meeting.

It was additionally noted that the map brought to every meeting by Miami Dade County project manager, Cindy Dwyer, has different boundaries for the study area than the maps brought for review at this meeting by the Consultant, Keith and Schnars. Mr. Hulsey explained that the original boundaries of the study area excluded portions of two drainage basins that contribute to freshwater inflows to Biscayne Bay, and that Keith and Schnars had agreed to expand the study area to include these basins in their entirety. Mr. Carlton requested that Ms. Dwyer alter the boundaries on her map for the next meeting.

### **TESTING THE HYPOTHESES: PRESENTATIONS ON SCENARIOS I AND III**

Prior to beginning this section of the meeting, Ms. Fleischer asked all members to hold their questions until after the full presentation and the Committee’s review of the maps which were brought for their review and information. Copies of the maps were in each member’s packet for their use when viewing the larger maps exhibited. (Exhibit D and E-powerpoint and maps)

Michael Davis, V.P., Keith and Schnars, delivered the presentation on test scenarios I and III. Test scenario II will be developed after the assessment results from scenarios I and III are reviewed.

### **TEST MAP REVIEW**

Immediately following the presentation, members and observers were invited to review poster-size maps for scenarios I and III, which depicted each of the two scenarios in the years 2025 and 2050. Members were given 11x17” copies of the maps to write and make notes on as they reviewed the larger maps.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

When the Committee reconvened after reviewing the maps, public comment was invited. Five members of the public made comment.

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 ([jfleischer@mediate.com](mailto:jfleischer@mediate.com)) within the first week following the meeting.

### **QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS: PLENARY SESSION**

During the period following the presentation and review of maps, members had the following 31 comments, observations and questions:

1. Please provide an overlay for maps so we can easily understand where CERP is located.
2. Important to know storage facilities on CERP- adds to understanding to distinguish between CERP footprint and study boundary.
3. Now CERP shows as a much larger area than eventually will be used.
4. Page 51, Sub 2.1-Opportunities and Constraints shows CERP constraints.
5. We would like an update on accelerated projects on CERP
  - o Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands Project
  - o C-111 Spreader Canal
6. CERP footprint should be a constraint but not an absolute prohibition.
7. Need to look also at what is politically viable.
8. Consultant should be keeping track of changing variables (CERP is one)
9. Committee needs to be kept informed of land use changes from the Base which is 2003.  
In 2003 some areas that were vacant are now being built or changed.
10. Consultant will keep track and inform members – process will be developed that is realistic and feasible.
11. In a 50 year cycle real estate cycles can change.
12. Is there a time frame by Miami-Dade Planning & Zoning when the Final Plan should be done?  
Goes through Commission approval process, ~October 2005 (but this may be unrealistic)  
From study to amendments is ~3 months.
13. We are here not just to predict future process, but to guide and somewhat control what happens; we need to get political leadership to make this work.
14. Remember the implementation, it is the most important part of study and we need to help.
15. Area south of Air Force Base and North of racetrack: Why isn't showing as developed?  
Over-fly area should be light industry designation.
16. Homestead Air Force Base – designate as a regional park
17. Agricultural land outside study are not included on maps (i.e. Ag land loss may not be as great as showing on maps)
18. Scenario III raises many policy issues – may show density needed.
19. Density overlay – designation may be incorrect re: single-family medium – need to change label – list actual category (p. 11, Table 10); Correct on all density overlays
20. This committee needs to understand what the densities are in Scenario III – provide in some format the land use assumptions that are going into developing the maps.
21. “All non-residential” grouped together is confusing – too many subs groups in this; need to break out and divide more
22. What “smart growth” principles are being used? – generally accepted
23. Does Regional Economic Models, Inc (REMI) really capture the economic analysis for the area?  
(Note: Regional Economic Models, Inc. is a company that produces a series of state-of-the-art economic impact models.)
24. We need more familiarity with EPA “smart growth” principles.
25. Can we show which areas are being affected more (undeveloped areas) by each scenario?
26. SW Wellfield – should be included in constraints (Kendall Drive & 127<sup>th</sup> Avenue).
27. What tools will committee have to look at impacts of higher and lower densities?
28. Consultants will provide many maps in Scenario 4 so it is very clear regarding impacts.
29. Need tools for committee to show impact on all parameters – try to make it interactive.
30. Just designating land “agriculture” does not mean agriculture can/will survive – many factors are affecting farming – inventories of land use need to factor in these other forces – Agriculture Study Economic Report very important.
31. Please create overlays that show major roads and orient us to N, S, E, W.

## MEMBER FORUM

The next meeting of the Committee will be on December 9, 2004 to accommodate the Thanksgiving holiday. Members should be meeting with their constituencies to keep them informed and to gain their input.

## ADJOURN

The meeting was then adjourned.

## MEMBER COMMENT CARDS:

None received.

## OBSERVER COMMENT CARDS

*"With respect to the maps available to Committee members and the public:*

- 1) There needs to be some sort of identification of (a few) main streets-it is almost impossible to locate a specific area.*
- 2) How good is the data being provided to the Committee? There is a sizeable body of water on the map at about SW 300 St. and 200 Ave. In reality, there is a dry field and hammocks in that location."*

*-Barbara Hampson-Keller*

*"On the (color) maps, the category "Vacant" includes Remnant Natural Forests (RNF). These RNF's were created by Miami-Dade ordinance (Chapter 27) in 1989. A clear reading of the ordinance provides that only one acre per 5 A could be used without mitigation, and an additional ½ acre with mitigation for pineland natural forest communities (NFC's). As a result of the NFC designation, the RNF's are not available as agricultural land because it is economically unfeasible to farm 1 to 1½ in a 5 A parcel in Dade County. The Watershed Study has not taken the defacto existing loss of agricultural land into account, and is therefore proceeding on faulty data.*

*When Everglades Park was created in the early 50's, the eastern boundary lines were set far enough east to provide a buffer for the park proper. It was understood at that time, by both the creators of the Park and the other residents of Dade County, that the public could build up to the boundaries of the Park. The existing development plan, created by Miami-Dade planners, allows future development to abut the Park. If the Park wants a buffer zone, let the Park purchase the property at fair market value, rather than unfairly targeting existing private property owners whose properties abut the Park.*

*This study should have properly been assigned to the County Planning Department."*

*-Barbara Hampson-Keller*

*"Growth projections not representative of actual (Homestead) need to work with cities to obtain more accurate planning & zoning information. TAZ growth projections do not reflect city projections. The boundary lines south of Air Force Base should move East also shows residential within the restricted (flight path) to Air Force Base"*

*-Julio Brea, City of Homestead Public Works Director*

*"It does make sense to hold CERP footprints as a constraint. These footprints need protection until it is definitively determined that land is not needed for restoration/preservation/conservation activities. Any potential land use plan can be modified to accommodate some types of development AFTER it is clear which lands will be needed to ensure full implementation of CERP."*

*-Cynthia Guerra, Tropical Audubon Society*

*“In considering the reduction of agricultural land under different hypothetical scenarios and under the finally developed scenario, consideration ought to be given to the ongoing reduction of agricultural lands by the conversion of agricultural land to residential 5-acre single family estates. The reduction – from this process – of farmland is very significant. And I have not seen where this has been considered in formulating projections... without consideration of this phenomenon the estimated remaining agricultural acreage at the years 2015 & 2050 will be highly overestimated, damaging the credibility of ALL the underlying assumptions on which the study recommendations are predicated, and thereby the final recommendations themselves.”*

*-Matthew Kaskel*

*“Agriculture has a bright future in Miami-Dade County, but it will change and needs to change with the markets. Organic Ag is growing by 25% a year yet very little of it is growing in Miami-Dade Co. When you purchase products at local markets it all comes from California State future can be bright!”*

*-Roderick Jude*

*“It is improper to remove all lands outside the urban development boundary that are within CERP study areas! These are study areas! Make the maps available on the website as PDF’s.”*

*-Ed Swakon*

## **IDEA PARKING LOT**

No comments