

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

April 28, 2005
8:00 a.m. - 1:00 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:

- ✓ Members requests for distribution of materials will continue as has been past practice. However, Mr. Carlton asked that members send the information in the spirit of cooperation, not be divisive in their choice of articles/information. Materials must be in electronic form and easily legible; the source of the information and the author must accompany the information.
- ✓ The limited Conflict of Interest waiver was approved by the County Commission.
- ✓ In May or June, the Committee will have a legislative update presentation.

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

Members present:

Roger Carlton, Chair
Humberto Alonso, Jr., South Florida Water Management District
Subrata Basu, Miami Dade Planning and Zoning
Gerald Case, Florida Lime & Avocado Committee
Rick Clark, Biscayne National Park (prospective member)
Amy Condon, At Large member
Guillermina Damas, At Large member
John Fredrick, Dade County Farm Bureau
Dick Frost, Tropical Audubon Society
April Gromnicki, National Audubon Society
Louise King, Redland Citizens' Association
William Losner, Greater Homestead/Florida City Chamber of Commerce
Bennie Lovett, Florida City
Carter McDowell, Building Industry Representative
Mark Oncavage, Sierra Club (prospective member)
Lawrence Percival, Kendall Federation of Homeowner Associations
Bonnie Roddenberry, Sunny South Acres Homeowner's Association
Jane Spurling, Florida Nurserymen and Grower's Association
Charles Thibos, Tropical Everglades Visitor Association

There were 11 Observers who signed the register.

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.

PROJECT MANAGER'S REPORT

John Hulsey, Project Manager, delivered the Project Manager's Report. (**Exhibit B**). Mr. Hulsey reported that requests for data would not be responded to until the consultant's Quality Assurance and Control process had been implemented. The consultants would prefer not to release data until they are sure it is correct. Additionally, due to concerns raised by members at the March meeting regarding how the Test Scenarios were being described, particularly the use of the phrase "smart growth," they will be referred to by the descriptions in the Scope of Services: 1) "Current Development Practices;" 2) Full Implementation of Policies in the CDMP;" and 3) "No Movement of the Urban Development Boundary."

CONSULTANT PRESENTATION: ACCEPTANCE OF FINAL WORK PRODUCT: SUB-TASK 2.2: FORMULATION OF TEST SCENARIOS

In preparation for the consensus discussion process, Michael Davis, VP, Keith and Schnars, and Project Manager for the Study gave a presentation on the methodology for formulating test scenarios 1, 2 and 3. (**Exhibit C**)

PUBLIC COMMENT

Following Mr, Davis' presentation, public comment was invited. Two (2) 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) 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

Prior to the meeting, Committee members were sent the final version of Sub-Task 2.2-Formulation of Test Scenarios (see www.southmiamidadewatershed.com to view maps associated with this subtask) Following Committee procedure for acceptance, the Committee was asked to accept this sub-task, taking one section at a time.

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). 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.

At this point, the Facilitator began to lead the Committee through the acceptance process. The first sections to be considered were 1.0-2.3 (Introduction and Methodologies).

1.0-2.3 - Initial Consensus Ranking:

5	4	3	2	1
0	2	10	2	2

Concerns of those members ranking a “1” or “2” were discussed:

1. There is a concern with the energy situation; people cannot afford gasoline, etc. with the current price of gasoline; we need to consider gas prices rising as a parameter
 - a. Add a new section to say where housing goes if gas prices rise
 - i. **It was determined that this is outside the scope of work**
2. This group should recommend that gas prices and housing affects be addressed in future plans and discussions.
3. Very hard to determine what will happen; cheaper energy could be available in future years that has not yet been developed.
4. We need to look at the impact of increasing gas prices
 - a. This would be in Scenario III
5. It is not possible/practical/realistic to know what will happen as gas prices go up exponentially
6. Market prices will determine; it is late to be bringing this up
7. Scenario I and II names: what is the distinction?
 - a. Difference is the word “practices” and policies
8. Municipalities won’t buy into higher densities
9. Immigration considerations in how folks will live; the cultural affects and impacts
10. Renaming of scenarios doesn’t reflect what they are; Scenario II should be something like “Development at full intensity according to current Master Plan”
11. Dade County does not control a significant portion of the land in the Watershed area; cities may not implement the Master Plan (i.e. Pinecrest, Coral Gables, South Miami)
12. We know Scenario II ignores political reality
13. We are here and we need to acknowledge that the land use changes will be hard; that is not the reason to stop or not deliberate or study the area
14. If communities are already fighting over existing rules/changes how can we expect them to implement a newer set of rules, etc.?
15. Concerns about municipal jurisdiction responses may be valid but we can’t go back now to address this
16. See the handout with “future development sites”; three areas shown are already developed
 - a. **This was addressed; if errors are showing they will be corrected**
17. Redevelopment will not happen in areas developed in 2005 again in 2025; therefore assumptions are erroneous that redevelopment would occur in certain spots
18. Apartment dwellers have different amounts of people living in the units than single family residences
19. There appears to be an inconsistency in the tables showing commercial acreage.
20. If assumptions are inaccurate than result will be inaccurate; we should do this but we must do it right
21. The study is using 2003 data, not 2001 data
22. Don’t push for time

23. Meet with members with concerns; have an extra “special” meeting to allow enough time to gain consensus on these issues rather than push for a decision today.

At this point in the meeting, the Chair made a change in the procedure. It was decided that, rather than attempt to gain consensus at this meeting, all comments would be heard and recorded and an additional meeting would be scheduled to continue the consensus process. Mr. Carlton asked that members who provided substantial verbal comments during the meeting submit their comments in writing within one week.

Although no further rankings were taken, each section was discussed separately. What follows are the comments that were made with regard to each of sections 2.4, 2.5 and 2.6.

SECTION 2.4- Formulation of Test Scenarios 1A and 1B (Pages 10-17)

1. Label it “No limitation on the urban development boundary movement”

SECTION 2.5-Formulation of Test Scenarios 2A and 2B (Pages 18-26)

1. Bottom of page 19-generic numbers, then look at page 25; physical and political reality must be considered
2. Condo conversions change the ability to redevelop; rental may be able to redevelop but not condos
3. Municipalities will not follow the results of this study and municipalities control a significant portion of the land in the study area
4. Should we ask the consultants to re-evaluate Scenario I?
 - a. **Consultant: We should consider all political/physical realities in the preferred scenario; not in the test scenarios**
5. We need to look at what the possibilities are, not only what the political realities are today; decisions are made for 7 generations from now
6. Older parcels/communities could be redeveloped; agree that those developments occurring in 2003 will probably not be open to redevelopment
7. Without proper transit, any redevelopment will be difficult
8. Political reality is not the same as physical reality; some very real physical restraints to achieving this scenario
9. Need a high level of confidence in information and data presented in the reports
10. As we go to communities, we need to include a presentation on density to get it more realistic for them; what it looks like; need to try to take emotion out of it
11. Need to make very sure that the numbers and data are correct
12. Current proposed development will have an impact on area of study; land inventory is being reduced even as we deliberate
13. These scenarios do not need to be perfect; they are for our use in creating the preferred scenario
14. We are not working on developing a plan but rather the preferred scenario will be a set of guiding principles for the County Commission to use in the future

SECTION 2.6- Formulation of Test Scenarios 3A and 3B (Pages 26-35)

1. Concern that Scenario 1 and 3 are very different; while Scenarios 2 and 3 are not; this is a red flag for me
2. Remember that choice in housing stock is important

CONSULTANT PRESENTATION: SUB-TASK 3.1-3.4: TEST SCENARIOS 1 & 3

At the conclusion of the discussion regarding Sub-Task 2.2, Michael Davis and Eric Silva presented information on Sub-Task 3.1-3.4 with regard to Test Scenarios 1 and 3. Included were 3.1: Quantifying the Effects of Population growth; 3.2: Infrastructure Assessment; 3.3: Natural Resources Assessment; and 3.4: Water Resources Analysis and Modeling. (Exhibit C)

Following the presentation, members made the following comments:

1. On maps showing "native" dominated wetlands you need to indicate that more clearly so as to distinguish from "exotic" dominated wetlands (Note: native means indigenous to Florida; exotic refers to species introduced by human inhabitants)
2. The Level of Service (LOS) standard acceptable in Miami Dade County with regard to traffic is "D" (higher traffic allowed than in other areas) maps on transit infrastructure should be changed to indicate that. (Note by Project Manager Cindy Dwyer: Level of Service is a way of expressing the degree of roadway congestion, using a scale of A [representing most favorable driving conditions] to F [representing least favorable driving conditions]. The Level of Service is calculated by dividing traffic volume by road capacity).
3. LOS "D" and "E" are currently lumped together; do we want to separate them out to show more detail?
 - a. **Consultant: The transportation maps show more detail than simply failing roads. The maps show the following levels of service: C and better; D; E; and three levels of F**
4. Need to be careful with LOS; the stricter the standard the more sprawl you will promote
5. On the charts in potable water you should show that wells are included in "other uses"
6. Maps should show pollutant levels time dated (BMP's (best management practices) are now being enforced- this will make a difference)

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.

ADJOURN

The meeting was then adjourned.

MEMBER COMMENT CARDS:

None received

OBSERVER COMMENT CARDS

"If the assessment is above 344 Street, why is ACI's (Atlantic Civil) property included in the study area? Why isn't ACI's property removed from the conclusion?"

-Steve Torcise, Jr.,

"According to the Urban Density Workshops (conducted countywide) people do not object to intensification- they object to the problems intensification brings: school overcrowding; road congestion, etc. If these problems were solved, people would be more accepting (yes, even in cities) of intensification. Schools and roads are the reasons most cited by neighbors at Broward County Commission and Miami Dade County Commission meetings for not increasing density. Solve the roads and schools problems and the objections may go away."

-anonymous

"At some point, for whatever reasons present themselves in the future, the County will run out of undeveloped land to convert to development. This team and this study are uniquely positioned to confront that future condition and deal with it proactively. I ask the team members to remember that this study presents them with an opportunity to define a future condition that adequately and appropriately protects the important environmental resources of Biscayne Bay and its watershed."

-Cynthia Guerra, Tropical Audubon

"In a letter to me from the SFRPC, it was stated that "the XP-SWMM model being used to evaluate the impacts" can not be used in the area where the ACI property is located. Will this modeling limitation prevent this land from being considered in the preferred alternative?"

-Ed Swakon

"Test Scenario II: not in place- County Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP) suggests densification within transit corridor yet no county or municipality zoning policies exist to allow for implementation.

Test Scenario III: It is not looking at impact from existing development beyond UDB. Hobby farms, rural mansions, etc. Those practices are impacting agriculture preservation, etc."

-Ed Swakon

"It is clear that this study is not recognizing existing development rights on existing property. The ACI property has had permits in place from local, state and federal government regulating agencies to fill 980 acres since April, 2001. Yet the ACI property is not being considered for development. Exceptions to the CERP study areas were made for other properties which did not have any existing regulatory permits."

-Ed Swakon

"How are the redevelopment costs for the transit units being accounted for? Our estimation is a project of this scale is the largest urban redevelopment project in the country- and it is un-funded!"

-Ed Swakon

"Scenario I should not be called "no limitation on UDB movement". The project team made it clear that the underlying assumption of Test Scenario I is that the UDB can and will be moved to maintain current development practices. Therefore, the name "current practices" is the most accurate name of all that have been proposed."

-Cynthia Guerra, Tropical Audubon

"The baseline data needs to be correct before the study can proceed. The County 2003 baseline data for this study used 2001 data and only added units and did not account for ? based on the data provide to us."

-Ed Swakon

"Humberto's comments are completely wrong- If the maps about which properties get developed don't matter get rid of them! People and the community leaders will use the maps!"

-Ed Swakon

"The water quality impact to Biscayne Bay from development does not recognize the urban development boundary (UDB). The water quality is a function of the pollution standards that are in place. If those standards need to be reviewed, then that is the simplest solution to increasing water quality, not reorganizing density and destroying property rights which has not direct link to location of density within the study area."

-Ed Swakon

"Please let me know the dates of all community council presentations."

-Ed Swakon

"Understanding the difficulties that currently exist to increasing densities, I urge the team members to not view those difficulties as insurmountable obstacles. This team and the study represents a huge opportunity to overcome the obstacles and move the current paradigm in the right direction."

-Cynthia Guerra, Tropical Audubon

"Why shouldn't ACI property be accepted and shown as included in the preferred scenario as it already has been permitted under current water quality standards?"

-Steve Torcise, Jr., President, ACI

"Speakers/committee members need to use the microphones you got for them! Some didn't and it was a waste of money and I was still straining to hear!"

-Truly Burton

IDEA PARKING LOT

"Concerns need to be followed by specific recommendations to resolve them".

-anonymous