# INITIAL RECOMMENDATIONS

# OCTOBER 2012 CYCLE EAR-BASED APPLICATIONS TO AMEND THE COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT MASTER PLAN

FOR MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA



April 2013

# Carlos A. Gimenez

Mayor

#### MIAMI-DADE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Rebeca Sosa Chair

#### Audrey M. Edmonson Vice Chairman

Barbara J. Jordan District 1 Jean Monestime District 2 Audrey M. Edmonson District 3 Sally A. Heyman District 4 Bruno A. Barreiro District 5 Rebeca Sosa District 6 Xavier L. Suarez District 7 R. A. Cuevas, Jr. County Attorney

Lynda G. Bell District 8 Dennis C. Moss District 9 Sen. Javier D. Souto District 10 Juan C. Zapata District 11 Jose "Pepe" Diaz District 12 Esteban Bovo, Jr. District 13

Harvey Ruvin Clerk of Courts

#### MIAMI-DADE COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY BOARD

Wayne Rinehart Chair

#### William Riley Vice-Chair

Carla Ascencio-Savola Aida G. Bao-Garciga Jose Bared Peter DiPace Horacio Carlos Huembes Joseph James Serafin Leal Raymond Marin Robert Meador Javier Munoz Kimberly Ogren Georgina Santiago Jesus Vasquez Paul Wilson

Ivan Rodriguez, School Board Representative, *Non-Voting Member* Larry Ventura, Homestead Air Reserve Base Representative, *Non-Voting Member* 

#### Jack Osterholt, Deputy Mayor/Director

Executive Secretary

Miami-Dade County provides equal access and equal opportunity in employment and services and does not discriminate on the basis of disability. "It is the policy of Miami-Dade County to comply with all of the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act".

#### INTRODUCTION

This report presents the Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources' (Department) initial recommendations addressing the EAR-based Applications to amend the Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP), which were filed by staff for consideration during the October 2012 Plan amendment review cycle. Eleven CDMP element-based applications (from Land Use Element to Economic Element), were filed by the Department to implement the recommendations of the Adopted 2010 Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR). The report also contains necessary background information and analyses on which the recommendations are based.

Chapter 1 of the report contains the summary and recommendations on each application, including the LUP map parcel applications associated with the Land Use Element, the principal reasons for the recommendations, and analysis of the proposed land use changes. The Appendix series contains four Appendixes A through D. Appendix A provides information regarding the adopted municipal land use changes; Appendix B provides information addressing the countywide conditions and the general planning considerations on which the recommendations are based; Appendix C contains the listing of CDMP policies and provisions utilized in the required review of each application's consistency with CDMP policies; and Appendix D contains an evaluation of fiscal impacts of the applications from the agencies responsible for supplying and maintaining infrastructure services addressed in the CDMP.

#### Application Review Process and Schedule of Activities

Following is a summary of the Plan review, amendment activities and schedule that will be followed by this cycle to comply with CDMP procedural requirements contained in Section 2-116.1, Code of Miami-Dade County, and with State law. The Schedule of Activities on page iii lists the principal activities that will occur during this CDMP amendment process and indicates the timeframes for those activities in accord with the State requirements and County Code.

The CDMP amendment process involves two phases. The first phase occurs between the time applications are filed and the time the Board of County Commissioners (Board) conducts its first public hearing and takes action to transmit the applications to the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity (DOE), the State Land Planning Agency (SLPA), and associated agencies for their review and comments. During this first phase, the affected community council(s) and the Planning Advisory Board (PAB), acting as the Local Planning Agency, conduct their required public hearings to formulate their recommendations on the applications to the Board of County Commissioners.

The Planning Advisory Board (PAB) held a public workshop on March 27, 2013 and is scheduled to hold its public hearing on April 15, 2013. The purpose of this PAB public hearing is to receive comments and recommendations on the proposed amendments and to formulate its recommendations to the BCC regarding transmittal and final action on the adoption of the proposed amendments. The BCC is currently scheduled to hold a public hearing on May 22, 2013 to consider transmittal of all the requested amendments to the Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO) and reviewing agencies. Transmittal of a proposed amendment to the reviewing agencies does not constitute adoption of the requested amendment.

A second phase of the amendment process begins after transmittal of the applications to the DEO and reviewing agencies. Section 2-116.1 of the County Code provides for the County to

request the SLPA to review and comment on all transmitted amendment proposals. The SLPA and/or the other reviewing agencies are expected to return comments addressing all transmitted amendment proposals by July or August 2013, approximately 45 days after the transmittal date pursuant to section 163.3184(3), Florida Statutes. Within 45 days of receiving comments from the state and regional reviewing agencies, or other time period determined by the Director of the Department, the BCC will conduct a public hearing and take final action on the transmitted applications. During the review period by the reviewing agencies, the Department will also review comments received at the transmittal hearings and any additional submitted material and may issue a "Revised Recommendations" report reflecting any new information prior to the final public hearings. Final action by the Commission will be to adopt, adopt with change or not adopt any of the transmitted applications.

#### **Additional Information**

Anyone having questions regarding any aspect of the CDMP review and amendment process should visit or call the Metropolitan Planning Section of the Miami-Dade County Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources at 111 NW 1st Street, Suite 1220; Miami, Florida 33128-1972; telephone (305) 375-2835.

# Table 1 Schedule of Activities October 2012-2013 CDMP Amendment Cycle (2010 EAR-Based Amendments)

Application Filing Period	October 1 to October 31, 2012	
Notification Letter sent to the State Land Planning Agency (SLPA) Regarding Evaluation and Appraisal Based Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan	November 21, 2012*	
Staff Applications Report Published	March 27, 2013	
Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources Initial Recommendations Report Published	April 2013	
Country Club of Miami Community Council (5) Public Hearing addressing Land Use Plan map change to Parcel 296 identified in Part C of Application No. 1	April 11, 2013	
Planning Advisory Board (PAB), acting as Local Planning Agency (LPA), Public Hearing to formulate Recommendations Regarding Adoption and Transmittal of Amendment Applications to the SLPA	April 15, 2013 County Commission Chamber 111 NW 1 <sup>st</sup> Street Miami, Florida 33128	
Board of County Commissioners (Commission) Public Hearing and Action on Transmittal of Standard Amendment Applications to SLPA	May 22, 2013** County Commission Chamber 111 NW 1 <sup>st</sup> Street Miami, Florida 33128; and April 22, 2013, if needed.	
Transmittal of Applications to SLPA and other state and regional reviewing agencies	June 2013** (Approximately 10 days after Commission transmittal hearing)	
Deadline for Filing Supplementary Reports by the Public	Forty-five (45) days after Commission transmittal hearing	
Receipt of Objections, Recommendations and Comments (ORC) Report from SLPA and Comments from other reviewing agencies	July/August 2013** (Approximately 60 Days After Transmittal Hearing)	
Board of County Commissioners Public Hearing and Final Action on Applications	October 2, 2013** (Within 180 days after receipt of ORC) County Commission Chamber 111 NW 1 <sup>st</sup> Street Miami, Florida 33128	

\*Notification due to SLPA by December 1, 2012 \*\*Estimated Date

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	
SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES	
LIST OF FIGURES	
LIST OF TABLES	
Chapter 1: RECOMMENDATIONS AND ANALYSIS	
Types of Recommendations	
Types of Recommendations	
Staff Applications 10 Implement Adopted 2010 Evaluation and Appraisal	
Application No. 1	
Application No. 1	
Application No. 2	
Transportation Flomont	
Application No. 2	
Application No. 5 Housing Element	
Application No. 4	
Conservation Aquifer Recharge and Drainage Element	
Application No. 5	
Water, Sewer, and Solid Waste Flement	
Application No. 6	
Recreation and Open Space Element	
Application No. 7	
Coastal Management Element	
Application No. 8	
Intergovernmental Coordination Element	
Application No. 9	
Capital Improvements Element	
Application No. 10	
Educational Element	
Application No. 11	
Economic Element	
Summary of Application No. 1, Part C, Land Use Plan Map Changes	
Analysis and Reasons for the Proposed Land Use Plan Map Changes	
Parcel Nos. 292 through 295	
Principal Reasons for Recommendation	
Parcel No. 296	
Principal Reasons for Recommendation	
Staff Analysis	
Adjacent Land Use and Zoning	
Supply and Demand Analysis	
Environmental Conditions	
Water and Sewer	
Solid Waste	
Parks	
Fire and Rescue Service	
Aviation	
Roadways	
Transit	

Appendix A - Summary of Application No. 1, Part C, Land Use Plan Map	A-1
Changes	
Appendix B - Planning Considerations	B-1
Appendix C - Consistency Review Applications with CDMP Policies	C-1
Appendix D - Fiscal Impacts	D-1

### LIST OF FIGURES

## Page

	. age
Proposed Land Use Plan Map Changes	
Parcel No. 292 Map	1-8
Parcel No. 292 Aerial Photo	1-9
Parcel No. 293 Map	1-10
Parcel No. 293 Aerial Photo	1-11
Parcel No. 294 Map	1-12
Parcel No. 294 Aerial Photo	1-13
Parcel No. 295 Map	1-14
Parcel No. 295 Aerial Photo	1-15
Parcel No. 296 Aerial Photo	1-17
Parcel No. 296 Zoning	1-18
Parcel No. 296 CDMP Land Use	1-19
Parcel No. 296 Existing Land Use	1-20

### LIST OF TABLES

Schedule of Activities	111
Projected Absorption of Land for Industrial Uses	1-22
Existing Traffic Conditions	1-27
Estimated PM Peak Hour Trip Generation by Current and Requested CDMP Land Use Designations	1-29
Traffic Impact Analysis on Roadways Serving Application Site	1-31
2035 Volume to Capacity (V/C) Ratios	1-34
Metrobus Route Service Summary	1-36
Metrobus Recommended Service Improvements	1-36

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

#### Chapter 1

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

The Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP) is Miami-Dade County's policy guide for countywide growth management. The Plan contains components such as goals, objectives and policies, which are countywide in scope, and components including the Land Use Plan map and schedules of capital improvements which express policy for localized areas. First and foremost, the CDMP is a metropolitan-scale plan for long-range countywide development. The October 2012 Cycle applications that were filed based on the Adopted 2010 Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR), seek to update eleven of the twelve adopted CDMP elements to reflect changes in state law and County policy.

#### Types of Recommendations

This chapter contains the initial recommendations of the Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources (Department) addressing the EAR-Based applications filed for review during the October 2012 CDMP amendment cycle and presented on page 1-2. The following outlines the two types of recommendations that are issued:

- <u>TRANSMITTAL TO THE REVIEWING AGENCIES</u>. Transmittal to the State Land Planning Agency and other state and regional agencies (the reviewing agencies) is a required action, taken by the Board of County Commissioners, to continue the eligibility of any standard CDMP amendment application, such as the EAR-Based applications. Therefore, recommendations on the EAR-Based applications will address whether or not each application should be transmitted (Transmit or Do Not Transmit). Failure to transmit a standard application, including any of the EAR-Based Applications, to the reviewing agencies effectively denies the application from further consideration during the cycle. Therefore, the Department recommends transmittal to the reviewing agencies of all EAR-Based amendment applications.
- <u>FINAL DISPOSITION</u>. Recommendations issued addressing final disposition or final action to be taken by the Board of County Commissioners on each individual application may be to Adopt, Adopt with Changes, or Deny. Accordingly, the Department for all staff EAR-Based applications in the October 2012 CDMP amendment cycle will recommend a disposition for Adopt or Adopt with Changes. In some instances an application may be withdrawn from consideration.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS ON STAFF APPLICATIONS TO IMPLEMENT ADOPTED 2010 EVALUATION AND APPRAISAL REPORT

#### **APPLICATION NO. 1 (Land Use Element)**

<u>Requested Amendments:</u> Numerous changes to the CDMP Preface and Future Land Use Element are proposed as presented in the "Staff Applications October 2012 Cycle EAR-Based Applications to Amend the Comprehensive Development Master Plan" report dated March 27, 2013. This Application is organized as follows:

- Part A: CDMP Preface;
- Part B: Future Land Use Element Goals, Objectives, Policies and Text; and
- Part C: Future Land Use Plan Map

<u>Recommendations:</u> Transmit and Adopt (All Parts)

<u>Principal Reasons for Recommendations and/or Changes:</u> The reasons for the proposals in this application are presented in Section 4 of the above-mentioned Staff Applications report.

#### **APPLICATION NO. 2 (Transportation Element)**

<u>Requested Amendments:</u> Numerous changes to the Transportation Element, which includes the Traffic Circulation Subelement; Mass Transit Subelement; Aviation Subelement; Port of Miami River Subelement; and PortMiami Master Plan Subelement, are proposed as presented in the "Staff Applications October 2012 Cycle EAR-Based Amendments Applications to Amend the Comprehensive Development Master Plan" report dated March 27, 2013. This Application is organized as follows:

- Part A Transportation Element;
- Part B Traffic Circulation Subelement;
- Part C Mass Transit Subelement;
- Part D Aviation Subelement;
- Part E Port of Miami River Subelement; and
- Part F PortMiami Subelement

<u>Recommendations:</u> Transmit and Adopt (All Parts)

<u>Principal Reasons for Recommendations and/or Changes:</u> The reasons for the proposals in this application are presented in Section 4 of the of the above-mentioned Staff Applications report.

#### APPLICATION NO. 3 (Housing Element)

<u>Requested Amendments:</u> Several changes to the Housing Element are proposed as presented in Section 4 of the "Staff Applications October 2012 Cycle EAR-Based Applications to Amend the Comprehensive Development Master Plan" report dated March 27, 2013.

Recommendations: Transmit and Adopt

<u>Principal Reasons for Recommendations and/or Changes:</u> The reasons for the proposals in this application are presented in Section 4 of the above-mentioned Staff Applications report.

#### APPLICATION NO. 4 (Conservation, Aquifer Recharge and Drainage Element)

<u>Requested Amendments:</u> Numerous changes to the Conservation, Aquifer Recharge and Drainage Element are proposed as presented in the "Staff Applications October 2012 Cycle EAR-Based Applications to Amend the Comprehensive Development Master Plan" report dated March 27, 2013.

Recommendations: Transmit and Adopt

<u>Principal Reasons for Recommendations and/or Changes:</u> The reasons for the proposals in this application are presented in Section 4 of the above-mentioned Staff Applications report.

#### APPLICATION NO. 5 (Water, Sewer, and Solid Waste Element)

<u>Requested Amendments:</u> Numerous changes to the Water, Sewer, and Solid Waste Element are proposed as presented in the "Staff Applications October 2012 Cycle EAR-Based Applications to Amend the Comprehensive Development Master Plan" report dated March 27, 2013.

Recommendations: Transmit and Adopt

<u>Principal Reasons for Recommendations and/or Changes:</u> The reasons for the proposals in this application are presented in Section 4 of the above-mentioned Staff Applications report.

#### APPLICATION NO. 6 (Recreation and Open Space Element)

<u>Requested Amendments:</u> Numerous changes to the Recreation and Open Space Element are proposed as presented in the "Staff Applications October 2012 Cycle EAR-Based Applications to Amend the Comprehensive Development Master Plan" report dated March 27, 2013.

Recommendations: Transmit and Adopt

<u>Principal Reasons for Recommendations and/or Changes:</u> The reasons for the proposals in this application are presented in Section 4 of the above-mentioned Staff Applications report.

#### APPLICATION NO. 7 (Coastal Management Element)

<u>Requested Amendments:</u> Numerous changes to the Coastal Management Element are proposed as presented in the "Staff Applications October 2012 Cycle EAR-Based Applications to Amend the Comprehensive Development Master Plan" report dated March 27, 2013.

Recommendations: Transmit and Adopt

<u>Principal Reasons for Recommendations and/or Changes:</u> The reasons for the proposals in this application are presented in Section 4 of the above-mentioned Staff Applications report.

#### APPLICATION NO. 8 (Intergovernmental Coordination Element)

<u>Requested Amendments:</u> Numerous changes to the Intergovernmental Coordination Element are proposed as presented in the "Staff Applications October 2012 Cycle EAR-Based Applications to Amend the Comprehensive Development Master Plan" report dated March 27, 2013.

#### Recommendations: Transmit and Adopt

<u>Principal Reasons for Recommendations and/or Changes:</u> The reasons for the proposals in this application are presented in Section 4 of the above-mentioned Staff Applications report.

#### **APPLICATION NO. 9 (Capital Improvements Element)**

<u>Requested Amendments:</u> Numerous changes to the Capital Improvements Element are proposed as presented in the "Staff Applications October 2012 Cycle EAR-Based Applications to Amend the Comprehensive Development Master Plan" report dated March 27, 2013.

Recommendations: Transmit and Adopt

<u>Principal Reasons for Recommendations and/or Changes:</u> The reasons for the proposals in this application are presented in Section 4 of the above-mentioned Staff Applications report.

#### APPLICATION NO. 10 (Educational Element)

<u>Requested Amendments:</u> Numerous changes to the Educational Element are proposed as presented in the "Staff Applications October 2012 Cycle EAR-Based Applications to Amend the Comprehensive Development Master Plan" report dated March 27, 2013.

#### Recommendations: Transmit and Adopt

<u>Principal Reasons for Recommendations and/or Changes:</u> The reasons for the proposals in this application are presented in Section 4 of the above-mentioned Staff Applications report.

#### APPLICATION NO. 11 (Economic Element)

<u>Requested Amendments:</u> Several changes to the Economic Element are proposed as presented in the "Staff Applications October 2012 Cycle EAR-Based Applications to Amend the Comprehensive Development Master Plan" report dated March 27, 2013.

Recommendations: Transmit and Adopt

<u>Principal Reasons for Recommendations and/or Changes:</u> The reasons for the proposals in this application are presented in Section 4 of the above-mentioned Staff Applications report.

#### APPLICATION NO. 1, PART C ANALYSIS AND REASONS FOR THE PROPOSED LAND USE PLAN MAP CHANGES

#### Summary of Application No. 1, Part C, Land Use Plan Map Changes

For convenience of the reader, the List of Proposed Land Use Plan Map Changes (Parcel Nos. 1-6, 8-19, 21-121, 123-156, 158-164, 167-236, 238-252, and 255-296) in Table A-1 in Appendix A of this report summarizes essential facts about the requested parcel amendments. Table A-1 and the aerial maps that follow the table revises and provides more details to Part C of Application No. 1 contained in the "Staff Applications October 2012 EAR-Based Applications to Amend the Comprehensive Development Master Plan" (Application No.1 Page 136). It should be noted that Parcel Nos. 7, 20 and 165 are withdrawn and Parcel Nos. 122, 157, 166, 237, 253, and 254 were not filed in the original application and are not included in the Table A-1.

Presented below are staff's recommendations on the proposals in Part C of Application No. 1 addressing the CDMP Land Use Element, the principal reasons for the recommendations on the proposed Land Use Plan map changes and an analysis of the Land Use Plan map changes proposed for Parcel 296.

#### New Urban Center and Roadway Network Updates

Staff recommends to **Transmit and Adopt** the proposed changes to add a new urban center the Palmetto Expressway and Bird Road and to update the roadway network on the Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP) Adopted 2015-2025 Land Use Plan (LUP) map for the following reason:

#### Principal Reason for Recommendation:

- Beginning in September 2008, the County conducted a study of the Bird Road Corridor which culminated in the publication of the Bird Road Corridor Study report in January 2010. The report was accepted by the Board of County Commissioners on April 6, 2010 by Resolution R-356-10. The Bird Road Corridor Study report recommended, among others, that a Community Urban Center be designated on the Land Use Plan map at the intersection of the Palmetto Expressway/SR-826 and Bird Road. The proposed urban center fulfills the recommendation of the Bird Road Corridor Study.
- 2. The proposed changes to the Expressways, Major and Minor Roadway network portrayed on the LUP map are to reflect the most recently adopted Miami-Dade County Long Range Transportation Plan to the year 2035. The changes are depicted on Figure T and described in Table 2 of the "Staff Applications October 2012 EAR-Based Applications to Amend the Comprehensive Development Master Plan" (Application No.1 Pages 163-165) and are pursuant to Revision No. 10 to the adopted 2015 and 2025 Land Use Plan (LUP) map, page 4-11 in Chapter 4: Conclusions and Proposed Revisions.

#### Parcel Nos. 1-6, 8-19, 21-121, 123-156, 158-164, 167-236, 238-252, and 255-291

Staff recommends to **Transmit and Adopt** the proposed changes to redesignate the Parcel Nos. 1-6, 8-19, 21-121, 123-156, 158-164, 167-236, 238-252, and 255-291 on the Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP) Adopted 2015-2025 Land Use Plan (LUP) map to various to various designations, as detailed in Table A-1 of Appendix A, for the following reason:

#### Principal Reason for Recommendation:

 Parcel Nos. 1-6, 8-19, 21-121, 123-156, 158-164, 167-236, 238-252, and 255-291 are located in municipal areas. Redesignation of these parcels are based on the recommendation in the Adopted 2010 Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR), Revision No. 4 to the adopted 2015 and 2025 Land Use Plan (LUP) map, page 4-10 in Chapter 4: Conclusions and Proposed Revisions. Revision No. 4 requires the County to incorporate into the LUP map, changes that are based on the land use designations in adopted municipal comprehensive plans that were either new or have been revised since 2003. The individual parcel designation changes are presented in Table 1 above and the LUP map designation assigned to each parcel by the County is the designation that best represents the respective municipal designations.

Miami-Dade County does not attempt to replicate the detail contained in the local plans of the 34 municipalities in the County. The range or residential densities, the range of uses permitted within the various land use plan categories, and the level of detail portrayed in the plans differ among the various adopted plans, and the County's plan is, appropriately, more general due to the extent of area covered with respect to municipal limits. The adopted municipal plans and subsequent amendments were previously reviewed by Miami-Dade County, the State Land Planning Agency, and other state and regional reviewing agencies pursuant to state law. The subject proposed changes to the LUP map are proposed to make the CDMP more informative to the reader of the Plan, but, will not affect the County's development capacity as the proposed designations seek to better depict the designations of the adopted municipal plans, which are already reflected in the County's calculations of development capacity within municipalities.

#### Parcel Nos. 292 through 295

Staff recommends to **Transmit and Adopt** the proposed changes to adjust the existing Urban Expansion Area (UEA) boundaries to exclude Parcel Nos. 292 through 295 from within the UEA's as depicted on the Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP) Adopted 2015-2025 Land Use Plan (LUP) map for the following reasons:

#### Principal Reason for Recommendation:

1. Parcel Nos. 292 through 295 are located in unincorporated Miami-Dade County within the areas designated on the LUP map as Urban Expansion Areas (UEAs) and are proposed to be excluded from within the respective UEAs through the recommended UEA boundary modifications. Recommendation No. 4 of the 'UDB Capacity and Urban Expansion' major issue addressed in the Adopted 2010 EAR (page 4-2) identified that portions of each UEA are constrained by the existence of wetlands, wellfields protection areas and EEL properties within the UEAs, among other factors such as the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Project (CERP), which are areas that shall either not be considered for urban expansion or should be avoided, pursuant to Land Use Element Policy LU-8G. In addition, the accident potential zones of the Homestead Air Reserve Base were identified as a constraint to urban development for one of the UEAs. The 2010 EAR Recommendation No. 4 provides that each UEA should be modified to appropriately address the provisions of Policy LU-8G and other factors that constrain future urban development within the UEAs, and to ensure that land identified for future urban expansion in each UEA is free of these constraints. The proposed modifications to the UEAs would also enhance the internal consistency of the CDMP.

The LUP map currently depicts the 2015 Urban Development Boundary (UDB) and four (4) UEAs. The 2015 UDB is included on the Land Use Plan map to distinguish areas where

urban development may occur from areas where it should not occur. The UEAs comprise those areas between the 2015 UDB and the UEA boundaries where urban development beyond the 2015 UDB is likely to be warranted some time in the future. Each UEA and their respective constraints are presented below.

**Parcel 292:** This UEA area contains ±3,000 acres located generally between SW 232 and SW 284 Streets and between SW 122 and SW 187 Avenues. Approximately 1,489 acres are proposed to be removed from within the UEA based on the factors outlined below and represented on the map 292 on page 1-8.

- Future Wetlands and Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Project (CERP) Water Management Areas; *identified in Policy LU-8G(ii)(a) as areas that shall be avoided when considering lands to add to the UDB*
- Coastal High Hazard Areas; which are proposed to replace the Category 1 Hurricane Evacuation Areas identified in Policy LU-8G(ii)(c) as areas that shall be avoided when considering lands to add to the UDB
- The CERP project footprints; *identified in Policy LU-8G(ii)(d)* as areas that shall be avoided when considering lands to add to the UDB
- The Accident Potential Zones (APZ) of the Homestead Air Reserve Base (consistent with the proposed amendment to Policy LU-8G to address compatibility with the Homestead Air Reserve Base)

**Parcel 293:** This UEA area contains ±595 acres located generally between SW 312 and SW 352 Streets and between SW 127 and SW 142 Avenues. The entire UEA proposed to be deleted based on the factors outlined below and represented on the map on page 1-10.

- Future Wetlands and CERP Water Management Areas; Policy LU-8G(ii)(a) as above
- The CERP Project footprints; *Policy LU-8G(ii)(d) as above*
- The Accident Potential Zones (APZ) of the Homestead Air Reserve Base; as above

**Parcel 294:** This UEA area contains  $\pm 2,816$  acres located generally between SW 42 and SW 112 Streets and between SW 162 and SW 177 Avenues. Approximately 1,525 acres are proposed to be removed from within the UEA based on the factors outlined below and represented on the map on page 1-12.

- The West Wellfield Protection Area west of SW 157 Avenue between SW 8 Street and SW 42 Street; *identified in Policy LU-8G(i)(a) as areas that shall not be considered for urban expansion*
- The Everglades Buffer Areas by the South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD); *identified in Policy LU-8G(i)(b)* as areas that *shall not be considered for urban expansion*
- The CERP Project footprints LU-8G(ii)(d)

**Parcel 295:** This UEA area contains  $\pm$ 873 acres located generally between NW 12 and SW 8 Streets and between SW 137 and SW 147 Avenues. Approximately  $\pm$ 575 acres are proposed to be removed from within the UEA based on the factors outlined below and represented on the map on page 1-14.

• Everglades Buffer Areas designated by the SFWMD; Policy LU-8G(i)(b) as above

















#### Parcel No. 296

Staff recommends to **Transmit and Adopt** the proposed change to expand the Urban Development Boundary to include the ±521 gross acre property and to redesignate the property from "Open Land" to "Restricted Industrial and Office" on the Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP) Adopted 2015-2025 Land Use Plan (LUP) map for the following reasons:

#### Principal Reasons for Recommendation:

 The ±521-acre subject site, identified as Parcel No. 296 in the Staff Applications, is located outside the 2015 Urban Development Boundary (UDB) and is proposed to be brought inside the UDB through expansion of the boundary and to be redesignated on the Land Use Plan (LUP) map from "Open Land" to "Restricted Industrial and Office". This proposed LUP map change is a recommendation of the adopted 2010 Evaluation and Appraisal Report (Recommendation No. 6 of the major issue 'UDB Capacity and Expansion'; page 4-3). The proposed change seeks to correct an anomaly on the LUP map, whereby land that is surrounded by urban development cannot itself be developed for urban uses because it is located outside the UDB.

This situation was created in 2002 when areas to the north and west of the subject property were brought inside the UDB through approval of a CDMP amendment related to the Beacon Lakes Development of Regional Impact and the April 2001 Cycle of CDMP amendment Application No. 6 (Shoppyland).

- 2. Recommendation No. 6 of the major issue 'UDB Capacity and Expansion', mentioned above, recommended that if public services and environmental issues can be addressed and it is financially feasible, then the area should be urbanized. If the proposed Land Use Plan map change for Parcel 296 is approved, the impacts that would be generated by the maximum allowable industrial type development on the property would not cause a violation in level of service standards for public services and facilities, except for roadways. It is recognized that this overall application area will be developed incrementally over the next 20-30 years and level of service standards will have to be met as individual parcels apply for development approvals. At that time development of the individual properties may be restricted to less than the maximum allowable under the proposed "Restricted Industrial and Office" category through the zoning and site planning review process to ensure that all public facility level of service standards, particularly for roadways, are not violated.
- 3. The application area is strategically located at the intersection of two major expressways, the Dolphin Expressway Extension and the Homestead Extension of Florida's Turnpike (HEFT). The Dolphin Expressway, a major east-west corridor, provides connectivity to the Miami International Airport and PortMiami, the County's major economic engines; and the HEFT provides connectivity to the northern and southern areas of the County and to the region. Moreover, the area is adjacent to existing industrial type of development to the west and north, is ideal for industrial development, and the proposed "Restricted Industrial and Office" designation is appropriate for the site.









#### Staff Analysis: Parcel 296

#### Location and Existing Land Use

The ±521-acre subject site is located at the northwest corner of the Dolphin Expressway/SR-836 and the Homestead Extension of the Florida Turnpike/SR-821. See Figure 141, Parcel 296 - Aerial Photo on page 1-163. The site is primarily vacant with two large lakes approximately 223.54 acres in size and is comprised of several individual properties. A fat rendering plant, built in the early 1970's, is on ±8 acres within subject property and a [see existing land use] is on ±7 acres.

#### Land Use Plan Map Designation

The subject site is currently designated "Open Land" on the CDMP Adopted 2015 and 2025 Land Use Plan (LUP) map, (see Figure 143, Parcel 296 - CDMP Land Use map on page 1-165). The "Open Land" land use category allows agriculture, limestone extraction or other resource-based activity such as development of potable water supplies; rural residential development, compatible utility and public facilities, and environmental conservation.

The proposed "Restricted Industrial and Office" land use category allows manufacturing operations, maintenance and repair facilities, warehouses, mini-warehouses, office buildings, wholesale showrooms and distribution centers and other similar uses, including telecommunication facilities, utility plants, hospitals and medical buildings, hotels, motels and very limited commercial uses dispersed as small business districts in the industrial areas to serve the firms and workers.

#### Zoning

The subject site is currently zoned GU (Interim District). Uses within the GU zoning district depend on the character of the neighborhood, otherwise EU-2 standards apply. EU-2 standards allow 1 single family home per five gross acres. (See Figure 142 Parcel 296 - Zoning Map on page 1-164.)

#### Zoning History

Miami-Dade County zoning districts and zoning code regulations were first created in 1938. At that time the subject property was zoned GU (Interim), which remains the zoning designation on the property today.

#### Adjacent Land Use and Zoning

#### Existing Land Uses and Zoning

To the east of the site beyond the Florida Turnpike/SR-821 are industrial and commercial uses including the Dolphin Mall zoned IU-1, IU-2, BU-2 and BU-3. To the south are single and multifamily residences, zoned RU-4L, RU-1, RU-1Z and RU-1MA. To the west are vacant land and warehouse development zoned BU-3 and IU-1, and to the north are warehouses and vacant land zoned IU-1 and BU-1A. Further north beyond NW 25 Street is a rock mining area zoned GU. (See Zoning Map on page 1-20.)

#### Land Use Plan Map Designations

Properties adjacent to the site are designated "Industrial and Office" and "Business and Office" to the east beyond the Turnpike, "Low Density Residential" and "Low-Medium Density Residential" to the south beyond the Dolphin Expressway, "Restricted Industrial and Office" to the north and west, and open Land further north beyond BW 25 Street. (See CDMP Land Use Map on page 1-21).

October 2012 Cycle

#### **Supply and Demand Analysis**

#### Industrial Land

The Analysis Area for the subject Parcel 296 is Minor Statistical Area 3.2 (MSA 3.2), which contained 5,565.60 acres of in-use industrial uses in 2013 and an additional 1,320.90 acres of vacant land zoned or designated for industrial uses. The annual average absorption rate for the 2013-2030 period is 97.71 acres per year. At the projected rate of absorption, reflecting the past absorption rates of industrial uses, the study area will deplete its supply of industrially zoned land in the year 2027 (See Table below). Additionally, the countywide industrial land supply is projected to be depleted beyond the year 2030. The application would add over  $2\frac{1}{2}$  years worth of supply industrial land supply.

Projected Absorption of Land for Industrial Uses Indicated Year of Depletion and Related Data					
Analysis Area	Vacant Industrial Land 2013 (Acres)	Industrial Acres in Use 2013	Annual Absorption Rate 2013-2030 (Acres)	Projected Year of Depletion	
MSA 3.2	1,320.90	5,565.60	97.71	2027	
Countywide	3,591.50	12,161.20	163.03	2035	

Source: Miami-Dade County, Regulatory and Economic Resources Department, Planning Division, Research Section, March 2013.

#### **Environmental Conditions**

The following information pertains to the environmental conditions of the Application site. All YES entries are further described below.

Flood Protection	
Federal Flood Zone	AH-8
Stormwater Management Permit	Surface Water Management General Permit
County Flood Criteria, National	+7.50 feet
Geodetic Vertical Datum (NGVD)	
Biological Conditions	
Wetlands Permit Required	Yes
Native Wetland Communities	Yes
Specimen Trees	May contain
Endangered Species Habitat	Yes
Natural Forest Community	No
Other Considerations	
Within Wellfield Protection Area	Yes (Northwest Wellfield)
Hazardous Waste	No
Dreinage, Fleed Dretestion and Stermwate	r Managamant

#### Drainage, Flood Protection and Stormwater Management

The subject area is located within the North Trail Basin, where flood protection and resource conservation is enforced by special storm water management set-asides as set forth in Section 24-48.2(I)(B)(1)(g) of the Code.

A Class II permit for any drainage outfall into any existing retention lake, Class VI for any installation of drainage systems in contaminated sites, and/or a Surface Water Management Standard General Permit (SWMSGP) may be required. A Fill Encroachment review and approval by the Water Control Section of DERM must also be obtained for the Cut and Fill requirements of the Code.

#### <u>Stormwater</u>

The subject area is located in the special Basin B, where encroachment and management criteria (cut and fill criteria) should be implemented. The proposed industrial use of the site will increase the Directly Connected Impervious Area (DCIA) from 31.12% to 45% and/or 55% (Total Impervious Area (TIA) will increase from 65% to 75% and/or 80%) depending of the type of industrial district developed. Based on the C-4 Basin XP-SWMM model, the flood zone will not change as a result of the proposed development. The water table may increase as a result of the proposed development.

#### Coastal and Wetland Resources Section

The subject area lies within the Transitional Northeast Everglades Wetlands Basin and contains jurisdictional wetlands as defined by Section 24-5 of the Code. A Class IV Wetland Permit will be required before any work can be performed in wetlands on the subject properties. Please be advised that some parcels within this area have been permitted for work in wetlands and therefore have obtained a Class IV Wetland Permit; however, other parcels will require a Class IV Wetland Permit prior to any work on the site.

#### Threatened and Endangered Species

Wetlands in and adjacent to the area proposed for re-designation are located within the Core Foraging Area for one or more of four rookeries, located along Tamiami Trail and the eastern portion of Water Conservation Area 3B. These rookeries are occupied by woodstorks, a federally-listed endangered species, as well as other wading bird species listed by the State of Florida as Threatened or Endangered. There may be other listed plant or animal species occurring in and/or utilizing these wetlands as well. The Miami-Dade County Comprehensive Development Master Plan affords a high standard of protection to wetlands that provide habitat for threatened or endangered species. If wetlands will be impacted by development that becomes allowable under the proposed re-designation, detailed information on Threatened or Endangered species occurrence and/or utilization may be required to determine consistency with Miami-Dade County's CDMP Policy CON-7A, which states, in part, that "...Habitats critical to endangered or threatened species shall not be destroyed." In addition, Policy CON-9B states that "...nesting, roosting and feeding habitats used by federal or State designated endangered or threatened species, shall be protected and buffered from surrounding development or activities."

#### Specimen Trees

The subject properties may contain specimen-sized trees (trunk diameter 18 inches or greater). Section 24-49.2 of the Miami-Dade County Code provides for the preservation and protection of tree resources; therefore, the applicant is required to obtain a Miami-Dade County Tree Removal Permit prior to the removal or relocation of any identified specimen-sized trees. The subject properties are not designated Natural Forest Communities (NFC) by Miami-Dade County and there are no designated NFCs nearby.

#### Wellfield Protection and Aquifer Recharge

The site is located within the Northwest Wellfield protection area. The Board of County Commissioners approved a wellfield protection ordinance for this wellfield. This ordinance

provides for stringent wellfield protection measures that restrict activities within the wellfield protection area. Consequently, some of the corresponding industrial and office classifications allowed within Restricted Industrial and Office land use are prohibited in the Northwest Wellfield protection area. Such land uses would require a variance form the Environmental Quality Control Board. Additionally, no hazardous material or hazardous wastes can be used, generated, handled, disposed of, discharge or stored within the Northwest Wellfield protection area.

#### Pollution Remediation

There are two (2) records of current contamination assessment/remediation issues within the subject boundary:

- Name: Doral West Commerce Park/Valido/Busot/De La Vega DERM Tracking file: SW-1172 File-12832 Location: NW 118<sup>th</sup> Avenue & NW 17<sup>th</sup> Street and proximity Comments: Solid waste contaminated site. Site Assessment is past due.
- Name: Lowell Dunn/MDX DERM Tracking File: SW-1468 File-7970 Location:12400 NW 12th Street Comments: Industrial waste contaminated site. Currently in a Monitoring Only Plan and a sampling report is past due.

#### Water and Sewer

The Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department (MDWASD) indicates that water and sewer services are available adjacent to the subject site and can be extended onto the property subject to MDWASD rules and regulations.

#### Water Supply

The application site is located within the Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department (MDWASD) franchised water service area. The Hialeah/Preston Water Treatment Plant is the water supply source for this area. At the present time there is adequate treatment and water supply capacity for this application; however, a Water Supply Certification will be required at the time of development to determine water supply availability.

#### Wastewater Facilities

The wastewater flows for the  $\pm$ 521-acre site will be transmitted to the South District Wastewater Treatment Plant (SDWWTP) for treatment and disposal. The SDWWTP has adequate wastewater treatment capacity to serve the application area. However, a capacity modeling evaluation will be required at the time of development.

#### Solid Waste

The change proposed for the subject site would not impact the Public Works and Waste Management Department (PWWM) waste collection services. The PWWM does not actively compete for non-residential waste collection and the collection service will most likely be done by a private waste hauler.

CDMP Policy SW-2A establishes the adopted Level of Service (LOS) standard for the County's Solid Waste Management System. This CDMP policy requires the County to maintain sufficient

October 2012 Cycle

waste disposal capacity to accommodate waste flows committed to the System through longterm contracts or interlocal agreements with municipalities and private waste haulers, and anticipated uncommitted waste flows, for a period of five years. The PWWM assesses the solid waste capacity on system-wide basis since it is not practical or necessary to make determination concerning the adequacy of solid waste disposal capacity relative to a specific property. As of FY 2012-2013, the PWWM is in compliance with the adopted LOS standard.

#### Parks

The Land Use Plan Map change proposed for the subject Parcel 296 does not include residential development. Therefore, there would be no impacts to parks.

#### Fire and Rescue Service

The following Miami-Dade County Fire Rescue stations are within the vicinity of the application site and would respond to a fire alarm:

STATION	ADDRESS	EQUIPMENT	STAFF
58	12700 SW 6 Street	Rescue, Engine	7
61	15155 SW 10 Street	Rescue, Brush Fire Truck	5
29	351 SW 107 Avenue	Rescue, Aerial	7
48	8825 NW 18 Terrace	Rescue, Engine, Technical Rescue	9
45	9710 NW 58 Street	Rescue, Engine	7

Source: Miami-Dade Rescue and Fire Department, April 2013.

The Miami-Dade County Fire Rescue Department (MDFR) has indicated that the average travel time to incidents in the vicinity of the application site is approximately 8 minutes and 18 seconds. Performance objectives of national industry standards require the assembly of 15-17 firefighters on-scene within 8-minutes at 90% of all incidents. Travel time to incidents in the vicinity of the application site complies with the performance objective of national industry standards.

#### Level of Service Standard for Minimum Fire Flow and Application Impacts

CDMP Policy WS-2A establishes the County's minimum Level of Service standard for potable water. This CDMP policy requires the County to deliver water at a pressure no less than 20 pounds per square inch (psi) and no greater than 100 psi, unless otherwise approved by the Miami-Dade Fire Rescue Department. A minimum fire flow of 3,000 gallons per minute (gpm) is required for business and industrial uses, and 750 gpm for single family and duplexes.

The current CDMP land use designation of "Open Land" will allow a potential development on the application site that is anticipated to generate approximately 30 annual alarms. The proposed CDMP land use designation of "Restricted Industrial and Office" will allow a potential development that is anticipated to generate 500 annual alarms which will result in a severe impact to existing fire rescue services. However, the MDFR has planned for new fire Station No. 68 to be located in the vicinity of NW 112 Avenue and NW 17 Street and Fire Station No. 75 (through developer agreement) to be located within the subject site (Parcel 296) in the vicinity of NW 127 Avenue and NW 17 Street. The MDFR projects that the planned fire stations would have adequate capacity to serve the subject site and the adjacent areas.

The required fire flow for the proposed CDMP land use designation of "Restricted Industrial and Office" shall be 3,000 gpm. Fire hydrants shall be spaced a minimum of 300 feet from each other and shall deliver not less than 1,000 gpm. Presently, there are no fire flow deficiencies in the vicinity of the application site.

#### Public Schools

The Land Use Plan Map change proposed for the subject Parcel 296 does not include residential development. Therefore, there would be no impacts to schools.

#### Aviation

There would be no impacts to the County's airport operations provided that development on the property complies with all applicable local, state and federal aviation regulations including Airport Zoning, Chapter 33, of the Code of Miami-Dade County. Therefore, the Miami-Dade County Aviation Department has not objection to the proposed CDMP Land Use Plan map change,

#### Roadways

Application No. 1, Part C (Parcel 296) of the "Staff Applications October 2012 Cycle EAR-Based Applications To Amend the Comprehensive Development Master Plan" seeks to amend the Adopted 2015 and 2025 Land Use Plan map to re-designate approximately 521 acres of land from "Open Land" to "Restricted Industrial and Office" and inclusion within the Urban Development Boundary.

The 521-acre application is located approximately between NW 25 Street and north of NW 12 Street and between SR 821/Homestead Extension of Florida's Turnpike (HEFT) and NW 132 Avenue in unincorporated Miami-Dade County. Access to this area is provided by the HEFT, NW 25 Street, NW 12 Street, SR 836/Dolphin Expressway, NW 137 Avenue, and NW 127 Avenue. The Dolphin Expressway provides connectivity to SR 826/Palmetto Expressway, Miami International Airport, I-95, PortMiami, and other areas of the County. SR 821/HEFT provides access to I-75, SR 91/Florida's Turnpike, and to Broward County.

East-west arterials and expressways within the study area include: NW 58 Street, NW 41/36 Street, NW 25 Street, NW 12 Street, SR 836/Dolphin Expressway, SR 986/Flagler Street, SR 90/SW 8 Street, SW 24/26 Street, and SW 40/42 Street. North-south arterials and expressways include: SW 157 Avenue, SW 147 Avenue, NW/SW 137 Avenue, NW/SW 132 Avenue, NW/SW 127 Avenue, NW/SW 122 Avenue, SR 821/HEFT, SW 117 Avenue, NW/SW 107 Avenue, NW/SW 97 Avenue, and NW/SW 87 Avenue.

The Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources in cooperation with the Department of Public Works and Waste Management and the Metropolitan Planning Organization performed a short-term (concurrency) and a long-term (Year 2035) traffic impact analyses, respectively, to assess the impact that the application would have on the roadways adjacent to the application area and on the surrounding roadway network.

#### Study Area

A three-mile radius study area (area of influence) was selected to determine the application's traffic impact on the roadway network within the study area. The study area is bound by NW 58

Street on the north, NW/SW 87 Avenue on the east, SW 24/22 Avenue on the south, and SW 157 Avenue on the west.

Traffic conditions are evaluated by the level of service (LOS), which is represented by one of the letters "A" through "F," with "A" generally representing the most favorable driving conditions and "F" representing the least favorable.

#### **Existing Conditions**

The "Existing Traffic Conditions Roadway Lanes and Peak Period Level of Service (LOS)" table below shows the current operating condition of the roadways within the study area which are currently monitored. The roadway segment of SW 137 Avenue between SW 8 Street and SW 26 Street is currently operating at E+3% (E+20% is the adopted LOS standard); the segment of SW 42 Street between SW 147 Avenue to SW 137 Avenue is operating at LOS E (D is the adopted LOS standard); the segments of NW 87 Avenue from NW 58 Street to NW 25 Street and between SR 836 and Flagler Street are operating at LOS F (D and E, respectively, are the adopted LOS standards); the rest of the roadways analyzed are operating at their adopted LOS standard or better.

Roadway Lanes and Peak Period Level of Service (LOS)				
Roadway	Location/Link	Lanes	LOS Std.	LOS
SW 147 Avenue	SW 56 Street to SW 72 Street	4 DV	D	D (2012)
SW 137 Avenue	NW 6 Street to SW 8 Street	6 DV	D	C (2012)
	SW 8 Street to SW 26 Street	4 DV	E+20%	E+3%(2012)
	SW 26 Street to SW 42 Street	6 DV	D	C (2012)
SW 132 Avenue	NW 6 Street to SW 8 Street	2 UD	D	D (2012)
	SW 8 Street to SW 26 Street	4 DV	D	D (2012)
	SW 26 Street to SW 42 Street	4 DV	D	D (2012)
SW 127 Avenue	NW 6 Street to SW 7 Street	4 DV	D	D (2012)
	SW 8 Street to SW 26 Street	4 DV	D	D (2012)
	SW 26 Street to SW 42 Street	2 UD	D	D (2012)
NW/SW 122 Avenue	NW 6 Street to SW 8 Street	4 DV	D	D (2012)
	SW 8 Street to SW 24 Street	4 DV	E+20%	E (2012)
SR 821/HEFT	Okeechobee Road to SR 836	6 LA	D	B (2012)
	SR 836 to SW 8 Street	6 LA	D	C (2012)
	SW 8 Street to SW 40 Street	6 LA	D	B (2012)
SW 117 Avenue	SW 8 Street to SW 24 Street	2 DV	D	C (2012)
NW/SW 107 Ave.	NW 58 Street to NW 41 Street	4 DV	D	C (2012)
	NW 41 Street to NW 25 Street	4 DV	D	C (2012)
	NW 25 Street to NW 12 Street	6 DV	D	C (2012)
SR 985/NW/SW 107 Ave	SR 836 to Flagler Street Flagler Street to SW 8 Street SW 8 Street to SW 24 Street	6 DV 4 DV 6 DV	E E E	D (2012) E (2012) E (2012) E (2012)
NW/SW 97 Avenue	NW 41 Street to NW 25 Street	4 DV	D	C (2012)
	NW 25 Street to NW 12 Street	4 DV	D	A (2012)

Existing Traffic Conditions	
adway Lanes and Peak Period Level of Service (LOS	21

			,	
Roadway	Location/Link	Lanes	LOS Std.	LOS
	SW 8 Street to SW 24 Street	2 DV	D	D (2012)
NW 87 Avenue	NW 58 Street to NW 36 Street	4 DV	D	F (2012)
	NW 36 Street to NW 25 Street	6 DV	D	F (2012)
	NW 25 Street to NW 12 Street	6 DV	D	D (2012)
SR 973/NW 87 Avenue	SR 836 to Flagler Street	6 DV	F	F (2012)
	Flagler Street to SW 8 Street	4 DV	F	C(2012)
	SW 8 Street to SW 24 Street		E	D (2012)
		400	L	D (2012)
NIM ES Street	NNA/ 117 Ave to NNA/ 107 Ave		П	D (2012)
NW 56 Street		4 DV	D	D (2012)
	NVV TUZ AVE. IO NVV 97 Avenue	4 DV	D	C (2012)
	NVV 97 AVE. to NVV 87 AVE.	4 DV	D	B (2012)
NIM 41/26 Street			р	C (2012)
NW 41/30 Street			D	C(2012)
	NW 107 AVE. to NW 97 AVE.	6 D V	D	D (2012)
NIM 25 Street			П	B (2012)
NW 25 Street				D(2012)
	NVV 107 AVE. LO NVV 97 AVE.	4 DV	D	C(2012)
	NVV 97 AVE. to NVV 87 AVE.	4 DV	D	B (2012)
NW 12 Street	NW 127 Ave to NW 117 Ave	4 DV	П	Δ (2012)
	NW/127 Ave. to $NW/112$ Ave.			P (2012)
	NVV 117 AVE. LO NVV 112 AVE.		D F	D (2012)
	NVV 107 AVE. 10 NVV 87 AVE.	4 D V	E	C (2012)
Dolphin Expwy (SR 836)	HEET to NW 107 Avenue	6 I A	D	B (2012)
	NW 107 Ave to NW 87 Ave	614	D	$C_{1}(2012)$
		0 L/ (	D	0 (2012)
Flagler Street	SW 118 Ave. to W 114 Ave.	6 DV	E+20%	D (2012)
- 3	W 114 Ave. to W 107 Ave.	6 DV	E+20%	C (2012)
	W 107 Ave to W 97 Ave	6 DV	E+20%	D (2012)
		6 DV	E+20%	E (2012)
	W 97 AVE. W 07 AVE.	000	L12070	L (2012)
SW 8 Street	SW 147 Ave. to SW 137 Ave.	6 DV	D	D (2012)
	SW 137 Ave to SW 127 Ave	6 DV	D	D (2012)
	SW 127 Ave to HEFT	6 DV	F	D (2012)
	HEFT to SW/ 107 Avenue	6 DV	E+20%	D (2012)
		000	L12070	D (2012)
SW 24/26 Street	SW 147 Ave. to SW 137 Ave.	4 DV	E+20%	E (2012)
	SW 137 Ave to SW 127 Ave	4 DV	E+20%	D (2012)
	SW 127 Ave to SW 117 Ave	4 DV	E+20%	E (2012)
	SW 117 Ave to SW 107 Ave		E+20%	D (2012)
	SW 107 Ave. to SW 107 Ave.		E+20/0	D (2012)
				D(2012)
Source: Miami Dade County Da	SVV 9/ AVE. 10 SVV 8/ AVE.			

#### **Existing Traffic Conditions** Roadway Lanes and Peak Period Level of Service (LOS)

Source: Miami-Dade County Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources, Miami-Dade Public Works and Waste Management Department; and Florida Department of Transportation, March 2013.

() in LOS column identifies year traffic count was taken or LOS updated Note:

DV= Divided Roadway, UD= Undivided Roadway, LA= Limited Access LOS Std. means the adopted minimum acceptable peak period Level of Service standard for all State and County roadways.

E+20% means 120% of roadway capacity (LOS E) on roadways serviced with transit with 20 or less minutes peak- period headway.
## Trip Generation for the Amendment

The "Estimated PM Peak-Hour Trip Generation" Table, below, identifies the number of PM peak-hour trips estimated to be generated by the proposed amendment. Trip generation was estimated using the rates and equations from the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) Trip Generation, 7<sup>th</sup> Edition. Two potential development scenarios were analyzed for traffic impacts for the current "Open Land" and requested "Restricted Industrial and Office" CDMP land use designations. Scenario 1 assumes the lakes filled and the application area developed with single-family detached houses at a density of one dwelling unit per five acres (1 DU/5 acres) under the current "Open Land" designation, and with warehouses under the requested "Restricted Industrial and Office" land use designation. Scenario 2 assumes one lake partially filled (35 acres out of the 184.34 acre-lake have been already approved for fill) and the application area developed with single-family houses at a density of one single-family house per five acres (1 DU/5 acres) under the current "Open Land" designation and with warehouses under the requested "Restricted Industrial and Office" land use designation. Scenario 1 shows that if the application area is developed with warehouses under the requested "Restricted Industrial and Office" land use designation, it would generate 3,522 more PM peak hour vehicle trips than the potential development that may occur under the current "Open Land" CDMP land use designation. On the other hand, Scenario 2 shows that if the application area is also developed with warehouses under the requested "Restricted Industrial and Office" land use designation, it would generate 2,082 more PM peak hour vehicle trips than the potential development that may occur under the current "Open Land" CDMP land use designation.

	•	0	
Application Number	Assumed Use for Current CDMP Designations/ Development Program <sup>1</sup> / Estimated No. Of Trips	Assumed Use For Requested CDMP Designation/ Development Program/ <sup>2</sup> Estimated No. Of Trips	Estimated Trip Difference Between Current and Requested CDMP Land Use Designation
1 (Scenario 1: 521 Acres)	"Open Land (1 DU/5 acre)" 104 Single-family Units	"Restricted Industrial and Office" 11,347,380 sq. ft. of warehousing	
521 Acres)	109 PM Peak Hour Trips	3,631 PM Peak Hour Trips	+3,522
1 (Scenario 2: 308 Acres)	"Open Land" Residential (1 DU/5 acre)" 61 Single-family Units	"Restricted Industrial and Office" 6,708,240 sq. ft. of warehousing	
	65 PM Peak Hour Trips	2.147 PM Peak Hour Trips	+2.082

#### Estimated PM Peak Hour Trip Generation By Current and Requested CDMP Land Use Designations

Source: Institute of Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation, 7th Edition, 2003; Miami-Dade County Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources and Miami-Dade County Public Works and Waste Management Department, March 2013.

Notes: <sup>1</sup> Scenario 1 assumes the lakes filled and the application site developed with single-family detached houses at a density of one dwelling unit per five acres (1 DU/5 acres) under the current "Open Land" land use designation. Under the requested "Restricted Industrial and Office" land use designation, the application area is assumed to be developed with warehouses.

<sup>2</sup> Scenario 2 assumes one lake partially filled (35 acres out of the 184.34 acre-lake have been already approved for filling) and the application area developed with single-family houses at a density of one single-family house per five acres (1 DU/5 acres) under the current "Open Land" designation. Under the requested "Restricted Industrial and Office" land use designation, the application area is assumed to be developed with warehouses.

# Short-term Traffic Impact Analysis

An evaluation of peak-period traffic concurrency conditions was performed by Miami-Dade County Public Works and Waste Management Department. The traffic impact analysis, which considers reserved trips from approved development not yet constructed, programmed roadway capacity improvements, and the additional trips that would be generated by the application, does not project any substantial changes in the operating conditions of the roadways analyzed, with the exception of the segment of NW 127 Avenue from NW 12 Street to SW 8 Street. Under Scenario 1, NW 127 Avenue between NW 12 Street and NW 8 Street is projected to deteriorate from LOS D to LOS E; however, under Scenario 2 the same roadway segment is projected to continue to operate at LOS D –D is the adopted LOS standard applicable to this roadway segment. See "Short-term Traffic Impact Analysis" table below.

# **Future Conditions**

The MPO's adopted 2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) lists the following roadway capacity improvement projects for construction in fiscal years 2013-2017 in the vicinity of the application area (see table below).

	Fiscal Years 2012/2013-2016/2017							
Roadway	From	То	Type of Improvement	Year				
NW 25 Street Viaduct	NW 82 Avenue	SR 826	New road construction	2012/2013				
SR 826/SR 836 interchange	SW 8 Street NW 87 Avenue	SW 25 Street NW 57 Avenue	Interchange – add lanes	2012/2013- 2016/2017				
SW 107 Avenue	W Flagler Street	SW 5 Street	Add lanes	2015/2016- 2016-2017				
SW 107 Avenue	SW 4 Street	SW 12 Street	Add lanes	2013/2014- 2015/2016				
SR 821/HEFT	SW 40 Street	SR 836	Add lanes	2016/2017				
SR 826/SR 836 interchange	NW 82 Avenue	SR 826/SR 836	Interchange improvement	2012/2013- 2016-2017				
SW 147 Avenue	SW 18 Street SW 10 Street	SW 22 Terrace SW 18 Street	New 2 lanes Widening to 4 lanes	2013/2013				

## Programmed Roadway Capacity Improvements Fiscal Years 2012/2013-2016/2017

Source: 2013 Transportation Improvement Program, Miami-Dade County Metropolitan Planning Organization, May 2012.

The Metropolitan Planning Organization's adopted 2035 long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), Cost Feasible Plan, lists the following roadway capacity improvement projects for construction through the year 2035. See "Planned Roadway Capacity Improvements" table.

## Short-term Traffic Impact Analysis on Roadways Serving the Application Area Roadway Lanes, Existing and Concurrency Peak Period Operating Level of Service

		•	-				-	•				
Sta. Num.	.Roadway	Location/Link	Num. Lanes	Adopted LOS Std.*	Peak Hour	Peak Hour	Existing LOS	Approved D.O's	Conc. LOS w/o	Amendment Peak Hour	Total Trips With	Conc. LOS with
					Cap.	V0I.		Thps	Amenu.	Thps	Amena.	Amenu.
"Restri	"Restricted Industrial and Office" – Scenario 1: 11,347,380 sq. ft. of warehousing											
F-2272	HEFT	Okeechobee Rd to SR 836.	6 LA	D	10150	3238	В	383	В	703	4324	В
F-2250	HEFT	SR 836 to SW 8 Street	6 LA	D	10150	7197	Ċ	907	Ċ	515	8619	D
9408	NW 25 Street	NW 117 Ave to NW 107 Ave	4 DV	D	3040	1241	В	628	В	351	2220	С
9365	NW 12 Street	NW 127 Ave to NW 117 Ave	4 DV	D	5040	1793	В	1197	В	337	3327	В
9160	W Flagler Street	NW 118 Ave to NW 114 Ave	6 DV	E+20%	3156	1699	D	264	D	276	2239	D
9770	NW 127 Avenue	NW 12 St. to SW 8 Street	4 DV	D	2540	1877	D	374	D	200	2451	E
9798	NW 137 Avenue	NW 12 St. to SW 8 Street	6 DV	D	4520	3456	С	437	С	910	4803	С
F-90	SW 8 Street	HEFT to SW 107 Avenue	6 DV	E+20%	6180	3984	D	0	D	53	4037	D
F-88	SW 8 Street	SW 137 Ave. to SW 127 Ave.	6 DV	D	4880	3868	D	178	D	286	4332	D
"Restri	cted Industrial an	d Office" – Scenario 2: 6,708,	,240 sq.	ft. of wareh	ousing							
F-2272	HEFT	Okeechobee Rd to SR 836.	6 LA	D	10150	3238	В	383	В	417	4038	В
F-2250	HEFT	SR 836 to SW 8 Street	6 LA	D	10150	7197	С	907	С	305	8409	D
9408	NW 25 Street	NW 117 Ave to NW 107 Ave	4 DV	D	3040	1241	В	628	В	207	2076	В
9365	NW 12 Street	NW 127 Ave to NW 117 Ave	4 DV	D	5040	1793	В	1197	В	200	3190	В
9160	W Flagler Street	NW 118 Ave to NW 114 Ave	6 DV	E+20%	3156	1699	D	264	D	162	2125	D
9770	NW 127 Avenue	NW 12 St. to SW 8 Street	4 DV	D	2540	1877	D	374	D	100	2351	D
9798	NW 137 Avenue	NW 12 St. to SW 8 Street	6 DV	D	4520	3456	С	437	С	538	4431	С
F-90	SW 8 Street	HEFT to SW 107 Avenue	6 DV	E+20%	6180	3984	D	0	D	49	4033	D
F-88	SW 8 Street	SW 137 Ave. to SW 127 Ave.	6 DV	D	4880	3868	D	178	D	169	4215	D

Source: Compiled by Miami-Dade County Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources; Miami-Dade County Public Works and Waste Management Department and Florida Department of Transportation, March 2013.

Notes: DV= Divided Roadway; LA = Limited access roadway.

\*County adopted roadway level of service standard applicable to the roadway segment: E+20% (120% capacity) for roadways serviced with transit service having 20 minutes headways; D (90% of service capacity volume).

Scenario 1 assumes the lakes filled and the application area developed with warehouses under the requested "Restricted Industrial and Office" land use designation.

Scenario 2 considers that 35 acres of one of the lakes have already been approved for filling and assumes application area developed with warehouses under the requested "Business and Office" land use designation

Roadway	From	To	Type of Improvement	Priority
SR 826/SR 836 interchange	NW 57 Avenue	NW 87 Avenue	Interchange modification	I
SR 826/Palmetto Expressway	SW 32 Street	SW 72 Street	Interchange modification	I
SR 836/Dolphin Expressway	NW 137 Avenue	I-95	Toll system conversion to open road tolling	I
SR 874/SR 826 interchange	North of SR 874/SR 826 interchange	South of SR 874/SR 826 interchange	Interchange improvements	I
SR 874/Don Shula Expressway	SW 88 Street	SR 826	Modification of SR 874 mainline roadway	I
SW 147 Avenue	SW 10 Street	SW 22 Terrace	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	Ι
NW 25 Street	NW 89 Court	SR 826	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	П
NW 25 Street Viaduct	SR 826	NW 87 Court	Construction of viaduct	II
NW 87 Avenue	NW 36 Street	NW 58 Street	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	П
NW 107 Avenue	NW 25 Street	NW 41 Street	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	П
SW 137 Avenue	SW 8 Street	SW 24 Street	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	П
SR 826	SR 836	NW 87 Avenue	Special use lanes	II, III
SW 107 Avenue	Flagler Street	SW 8 Street	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	IV
SW 72 Street	SW 117 Avenue	SW 157 Avenue	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	IV

#### Planned Roadway Capacity Improvements Fiscal Years 2013/2014 through 2034/2035

Source: Miami-Dade 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan, Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Miami Urbanized Area, October 2009.

Notes: Priority I – Project improvements to be funded by 2014; Priority II – Project improvements planned to be funded between 2015 and 2020; Priority III – Project improvements planned to be funded between 2021 and 2025; and Priority IV – Project improvements planned to be funded between 2026 and 2035.

A future (2035) traffic analysis was performed to evaluate the conditions of the major roadways adjacent to the application site and within the study area (impact area) to determine the adequacy of the roadway network to handle the application's traffic demand and to meet the adopted LOS standards applicable to the roadways through the year 2035.

The volume to capacity (v/c) ratio is a representation of the roadway volumes proportionate to the roadway capacity and is an expression of the roadway level of service. The correlation between roadway LOS and the v/c ratio is as follows:

- v/c ratio less than or equal to 0.70 is equivalent to LOS B or better;
- v/c ratio between 0.71 and 0.80 is equivalent to LOS C;
- v/c ratio between 0.81 and 0.90 is equivalent to LOS D;
- v/c ratio between 0.91 and 1.00 is equivalent to LOS E;
- v/c ratio of more than 1.00 is equivalent to LOS F.

The same development scenarios analyzed in the short-term traffic analysis (concurrency analysis) were also analyzed in the future (2035) traffic condition analysis. Scenario 1 assumes

the application site developed with 11,347,380 sq. ft. of warehouses. And Scenario 2 assumes the applications site developed with 6,708,240 sq. ft. of warehouses.

The future traffic conditions analysis shows that numerous roadway segments adjacent to the application area and throughout the study area are projected to operate either at their adopted LOS standards or in violation of the LOS standards without the application's traffic impact. The trips that will be generated by the application will impact all roadways. It should be pointed out that the proposed CDMP amendment application would not significantly impact all the roadways projected to fail their adopted LOS standards because the application's traffic impact is less than 5% of the adopted maximum service volumes. However, five roadway segments —NW 12 Street from NW 132 Avenue to the HEFT, SW 8 Street from NW 142 Avenue to NW 137 Avenue, NW 107 Avenue from NW 25 Street to NW 12 Street, NW/SW 127 Avenue from NW 12 Street to SW 8 Street, and NW/SW 137 Avenue from NW 12 Street to SW 8 Street, and NW/SW 137 Avenue from NW 12 Street to SW 8 Street. which are projected to operate in violation of their adopted LOS standards will be further impacted by the application's impacts. See the "2035 Volume to Capacity (V/C) Ratios" table below.

However, it should be recognized that this overall application area will be developed incrementally over the next 20-30 years and the level of service standards will have to be met as individual parcels apply for development approvals.

### Application Impact

The "Estimated PM Peak Hour Trip Generation By Current and Requested CDMP Land Use Designations" table above identifies the estimated number of PM peak hour trips to be generated by the two development scenarios analyzed. Under the requested "Restricted Industrial and Office", the application area is assumed to be developed with 11,347,380 sq. ft. of warehouses (Scenario 1) if all lakes are approved for filling, Scenario 2 under the requested CDMP land use designation assumes the application area developed with 6,708,230 sq. ft. of warehouses –35 acres of larger lake has already been approved for filling.

The short-term traffic impact analysis indicates that if the application area were developed with 11,347,380 sq. ft. of warehouses (Scenario 1) under the requested "Restricted Industrial and Office" use, this scenario would generate approximately 3,522 more PM peak hour trips than the 109 single-family houses that may be developed under the current "Open Land" land use designation. On the other hand if the application area is developed with 6,708,240 sq. ft. of warehoused (Scenario 2), under the requested "Restricted Industrial and Office" use, this scenario would generate approximately 2,082 more PM peak hour trips than the 65 single-family houses that may be developed under the current "Open Land" land use designation.

On the other hand, the future (year 2035) traffic impact analysis shows that if the proposed Land Use Plan map change for Parcel 296 is approved, the impacts that would be generated by the maximum allowable industrial type development on the property would further deteriorate the operating levels of service of some of the roadway analyzed. However, it is recognized that this overall application area will be developed incrementally over the next 20-30 years and the level of service standards will have to be met as individual parcels apply for development approvals. At that time of development the individual properties may be restricted to less than the maximum allowable under the proposed "Restricted Industrial and Office" category through the zoning and site planning review process to ensure that all public facility level of service standards, particularly for roadways, are not violated.

2035 Volume to Capacity (V/C) Ratios								
Roadway Segments	Adopted	No. of	Base Sc Without Ap	enario oplication	Scen Warehouse (1 ft	ario 1 1,347,380 sq. .)	Scena Warehouse (6 ft.	ario 2 5,708,240 sq. )
	LUS 510	Lanes	V/C Ratios <sup>2</sup>	Projected LOS	V/C Ratios <sup>2</sup>	Projected LOS	V/C Ratios <sup>2</sup>	Projected LOS
NW 58 Street								
HEFT to NW 107 Ave.	D	4 DV	0.39-0.84	B/D	0.38-0.84	B/D	0.38-0.85	B/D
NW 107 Ave. to NW 97 Ave.	D	4 DV	0.98-1.09	E/F	0.96-1.07	E/F	0.97-1.07	E/F
NW 97 Ave. to NW 87 Ave.	D	4 DV	1.19-1.31	F	1.19-1.30	F	1.18-1.30	F
NW 36/41 Street								
NW 127 Ave. to HEFT	D	2 DV	1.23-1.61	F	1.22-1.59	F	1.23-1.59	F
HEFT to NW 107 Ave.	D	6 DV	0.76-0.93	C/E	0.76-0.92	C/E	0.76-0.93	C/E
NW 107 Ave. to NW 97 Ave.	D	6 DV	0.65-0.80	B/C	0.65-0.80	B/C	0.65-0.76	B/C
NW 97 Ave. to NW 87 Ave.	D	6 DV	0.84-1.21	D/F	0.84-1.24	D/F	0.84-1.24	D/F
NW 25 Street	_			_		_		_
NW 127 Ave. to HEFT	D	4 DV	1.14-1.32	F	1.16-1.31	F	1.20-1.29	F
HEFT to NW 102 Ave.	D	4 DV	1.02-1.47	F	1.00-1.40	F	1.01-1.05	F
NVV 102 Ave. to NVV 97 Ave.	D	4 DV	0.995	В	0.99	E	0.99	E
NW 97 Ave. to NW 87 Ave.	D	4 DV	0.89-1.28	D/F	0.84-1.24	D/F	0.89-1.28	D/F
NW 12 Street	P		0 00 1 61		0 01 1 70		1 11 1 64	F
NVV 132 AVE. TO HEFT	D		0.89-1.01		0.91-1.70	E/F	1.11-1.04	F
	D		1.00-1.12	F	1.10-1.11	F F	1.07-1.11	F
NW 107 Ave. to NW 97 Ave.		4 DV	1.13-1.39	F	1.14-1.39	F	1.15-1.41	F
NVV 97 AVE. 10 NVV 67 AVE.	E	4 DV	1.00-1.41	Г	1.41	Г	1.20-1.41	Г
SW 8 Street/Tamiami Trail								
SW 142 Ave. to SW 137 Ave.	D	6 DV	0.98-1.01	E/F	0.97-1.10	E/F	0.99-1.11	E/F
SW 137 Ave. to SW 127 Ave.	D	6 DV	0.86-1.02	D/F	0.85-1.01	D/F	0.85-1.01	D/F
SW 127 Ave. to HEFT	E	6 DV	1.01-1.02	F	1.02-1.03	F	1.01-1.02	F
HEFT to SW 107 Ave.	E+20%	6 DV	0.59-1.02	B/E+2%	0.58-1.02	B/E+2%	0.58-1.01	B/E+1%
SW 107 Ave. to SW 97 Ave.	E+20%	8 DV	0.65-0.84	B/D	0.65-0.84	B/D	0.66-0.84	B/D
SW 97 Ave. to SW 87 Ave.	E+20%	8 DV	0.82-0.86	D	0.83-0.85	D	0.83-0.85	D
Flagler Street								
NW/SW 118 Ave. to NW/SW	F+20%	6 DV	0 60-0 99	B/F	0 63-1 03	B/E+3%	0 62-1 01	B/E+1%
107 Ave.	2.2070	0.51	0.00 0.00	0,2	0.00 1.00	D/L · O/I	0.02 1.01	B/2 · 1/0
NW/SW 107 Ave. to NW/SW 97 Ave.	E+20%	6 DV	0.54-0.91	B/E	0.54-0.92	B/E	0.54-0.92	B/E
NW/SW 97 Ave. to NW/SW	E+20%	6 DV	0.87-1.09	D/E+9%	0.88-1.10	D/E+10%	0.89-1.09	D/E+9%
87 Ave.								
SW 26/24 Street Coral Way								
SW 147 Ave. to SW 137 Ave.	E+20%	4 DV	0.63-1.01	B/E+1%	0.60-1.01	B/E+1%	0.59-0.99	B/E
SW 137 Ave. to SW 127 Ave.	E+20%	4 DV	0.82-1.08	D/E+8%	0.82-1.08	D/E+8%	0.82-1.07	D/E+7%
SW 127 Ave. to SW 117 Ave.	E+20%	4 DV	0.92-1.54	E/E+54%	0.90-1.56	D/E+56%	0.91-1.54	D/E+54%
SW 117 Ave. to SW 107 Ave.	E+20%	4 DV	0.74-0.93	C/E	0.74-0.94	C/E	0.73-0.99	C/E
SW 107 Ave. to SW 97 Ave.	E+20%	4 DV	0.71-0.78	С	0.71-0.77	С	0.70-0.77	С
SW 97 Ave. to SW 87 Ave.	E+20%	4 DV	0.89-0.97	D/E	0.88-0.96	D/E	0.88-0.96	D/E
NW/SW 87 Avenue	_	0						
NW 54 St. to NW 36 St.	D	6 DV	0.79-0.94	C/E	0.80-0.93	C/E	0.80-0.94	C/E
NW 36 St. to NW 25 St.	D	6 DV	0.96-1.06	E/F	0.96-1.05	E/F	0.96-1.05	E/F
NW 25 St. to NW 12 St.	D	6 DV	1.08-1.45	F	1.09-1.44	F	1.09-1.45	F
NW 12 St. to Flagler St.	E	6 DV	0.63-1.19	B/F	0.62-1.15	B/F	0.63-1.18	B/F
Flagler St. to SW 8 St.	E	4 DV	1.16-1.31	F	1.15-1.30	F	1.15-1.30	F
SW 8 St. to SW 24 St.	E	4 DV	0.93-1.02	E/F	0.92-0.96	E	0.93-1.03	E/F
NW/SW 97 Avenue	-							
NW 54 St. to NW 41 St.	D	4 DV	0.96-1.20	E/F	0.96-1.21	E/F	0.96-1.18	E/F
NW 41 St. to NW 25 St.	D	4 DV	1.09-1.22	F	1.06-1.21	F	1.06-1.22	F
NW 25 St. to NW 12 St.	D	4 DV	1.25-1.29	F	1.25-1.30	F	1.25-1.30	F F
NVV 12 St. to Flagler St.	D	4 DV	0.99-1.73	E/F	0.98-1.73	E/F	0.98-1.73	E/F
Figger St. to SW 8 St.	D	4 DV	0.94-1.00	E F	0.94-1.00	E	0.93-1.00	
5VV 8 St. to SVV 24 St.	D	2 DV	1.01-1.08	F	1.01-1.08	F	0.98-1.05	E/F

2035 Volume to Capacity (V/C) Ratios								
Roadway Segments	Adopted No		Base Sc Without Ap	Base Scenario Without Application		ario 1 1,347,380 sq. .)	Scena Warehouse (6 ft.	ario 2 5,708,240 sq. )
	LUS Sta	Lanes	V/C Ratios <sup>2</sup>	Projected LOS	V/C Ratios <sup>2</sup>	Projected LOS	V/C Ratios <sup>2</sup>	Projected LOS
NW/SW 107 Avenue								
NW 54 St to NW 41 St	D	4 DV	0 98-1 22	F/F	0 96-1 21	F/F	0 95-1 20	F/F
NW 41 St. to NW 25 St.	D	4 DV	0.80-1.18	C/F	0.80-1.18	C/F	0.80-1.17	C/F
NW 25 St. to NW 12 St.	D	6 DV	1.00-1.17	F	1.00-1.19	F	0.98-1.21	E/F
NW 12 St. to Flagler	E	6 DV	0.95-1.42	E/F	0.95-1.41	E/F	1.24-1.41	F
Flagler St. to SW 8 St.	E	4 DV	0.99-1.00	E/F	1.00-1.01	F	0.95-1.00	E/F
SW 8 St. to SW 24 St.	E	6 DV	0.90-1.08	D/F	0.91-1.08	E/F	0.91-1.08	E/F
HEFT								
Okeechobee Rd. to NW 41 St.	D	6 LA	0.66-0.75	B/C	0.66-0.73	B/C	0.66-0.74	B/C
NW 41 St. to SR 836	D	6 LA	0.46-0.83	B/D	0.70-0.81	B/D	0.70-0.82	B/D
SR 836 to SW 8 St.	D	6 LA	0.80	С	0.81	D	0.73-0.86	C/D
SW 8 St. to SW 88 St.	D	6 LA	0.91-0.97	E	0.89-0.97	D/E	0.91-0.97	E
	5		4 45	-		-	1 10	-
NVV 41 St. to NVV 25 St.	D	2 00	1.15	F	1.11	F	1.12	F
NW/SW 127 Avenue								
NW/ 25 St to NW/ 12 St	П	4 DV	0 87-1 01	D/F	1 03-1 05	F	0 89-1 03	D/F
NW 12 St. to SW 8 St			1 11_1 18	F	1.03-1.03	F	1 05-1 24	F
SW 8 St to SW 24 St	D	4 DV	0 78-1 10	C/F	0 79-1 09	C/F	0.67-1.09	B/F
011 0 011 10 011 24 01.	D	400	0.70-1.10	0/1	0.75-1.05	0/1	0.07-1.00	Dil
NW/SW 132 Avenue								
NW 12 St. to SW 8 St.	D	2 UD	1.25-1.59	F	1.16-1.50	F	1.20-1.47	F
SW 8 St. to SW 24 St.	D	4 DV	0.98-1.24	E/F	0.96-1.20	E/F	1.00-1.23	E/F
NW/SW 137 Avenue	_			_		_		_
NW 12 St. to SW 8 St.	_ D	6 DV	1.04-1.40	F	1.08-1.44	F	1.08-1.42	F
SW 8 St. to SW 24 St.	E+20%	4 DV	0.81-0.94	D/E	0.82-0.95	D/E	0.76-0.94	C/E
SW 147 Avenue								
SW 8 St to SW 24 St	D	4 DV	0 82-0 83	D	0 85-0 86	D	0 87-0 89	D
011 0 011 10 011 24 01.	D	700	0.02 0.00	D	5.00 0.00	D	5.67 0.00	D
SW 157 Avenue								
SW 8 St. to SW 24 St.	D	2 DV	0.95	E	0.95	E	0.95	E

Source: Compiled by the Regulatory and Economic Resources Department and the Metropolitan Planning Organization, April 2013.

Notes: <sup>1</sup> Minimum Peak-period operating Level of Service (LOS) standard for State and County roadways. <sup>2</sup> Volume-to-Capacity (v/c) ratio, which is the ratio of the number of vehicles using the road to the road capacity. The V/C model output is expressed using daily volumes.

## Transit

The subject application area is currently located outside the Urban Development Boundary. As such the subject area is not served by transit. The closest transit service to the subject area is provided by Metrobus Routes 7, 36, 71, 137 (West Dade Connection), and 238 (East-West Connection/Weekend Express). These Routes converge at Dolphin Mall which is approximately 2 miles from the subject area. The table below indicates the service frequency for these routes.

Metrobus Route Service Summary								
		Serv	Proximity to	Turne of				
Route(s)	Peak (AM/PM)	Off-Peak (Midday)	Evenings (After 8pm)	Overnight	Saturday	Sunday	Bus Route (miles)	Service
7	30	40	60	n/a	40	40	0.56	L
36	60	60	40	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.56	L
71	30	60	45	n/a	60	60	0.56	L
137 (West Dade connection)	30	45	60	n/a	40	45	0.56	L
238 (East-west connection)	45	60	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.56	L
238 (Weekend express)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	60	60	0.56	E/F

Source: 2012 Transit Development Plan, Miami-Dade Transit (November 2012 Line Up)

Notes: 'L' means Metrobus local route service

'F' means Metrobus feeder service to Metrorail

'E' means Express or Limited-Stop Metrobus service

#### Future Conditions

The 2023 Recommended Service Plan within the draft 2013 Transit Development Plan identifies improvements to the existing Metrobus service which are being planned for the next ten years.

			<b>\</b>
Route(s)	Improvement Description	Implementation Year	Operational Cost
7	No planned improvements	N/A	\$0
36	No planned improvements	N/A	\$0
71	Extend route to Palmetto Metrorail Station via NW 74 Street.	2025	\$500,000
137 (West Dade Connection)	No planned improvements	N/A	\$0
238 (East-West Connection)	Extend route westward to Beacon Lakes	2015	\$250,000

# Metrobus Recommended Service Improvements October 2012 EAR-based CDMP Amendment Application #1 (Part C)

Source: Draft 2013 Transit Development Plan, Miami-Dade Transit, April 2013.

Based on the CDMP threshold for traffic and/or transit service objectives within a <sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> mile distance; the estimated operating or capital costs of maintaining the existing bus service and implementing the new service is not associated with this application.

It should be noted that in November 2012, MDT issued notice-to-proceed to a consultant to begin work on the Transit Service Evaluation Study – Phase 2. The purpose of this project is to evaluate the current bus system of Miami-Dade Transit, identify service deficiencies and design a more direct, grid oriented route network and service plan that maximizes the efficiency and effectiveness of the system. The final product will be a schedule-ready detailed plan which

includes estimated impact on ridership, resources, and operating cost. The study is on-going at this time. As such, it should be noted that the Recommended Service Plan as presented above is subject to change once results from the study are determined.

#### Major Transit Projects:

There are no future major transit projects within the vicinity of this area.

#### Application Impacts in the Traffic Analysis Zone:

There is no transit service to the affected zone (TAZ #832). As such, the mode share in the study area is 0% and there is no impact on transit ridership system wide.

# THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

# **APPENDIX A**

## Summary of Application No. 1, Part C, Land Use Plan Map Changes

For convenience of the reader, the List of Proposed Land Use Plan Map Changes (Parcel Nos. 1-6, 8-19, 21-121, 123-156, 158-164, 167-236, 238-252, and 255-296) in Table A-1 below summarizes essential facts about the requested parcel amendments. Table A-1 and the aerial maps that follow the table revises and provides more details to Part C of Application No. 1 contained in the "Staff Applications October 2012 EAR-Based Applications to Amend the Comprehensive Development Master Plan" (Application No.1 Page 136). It should be noted that Parcel Nos. 7, 20 and 165 are withdrawn (consequently Figure 4 is not included herein) and Parcel Nos. 122, 157, 166, 237, 253, and 254 were not filed in the original application and are not included in the table below. For each of the parcels presented, the parcel size and general location including an identification of the applicable municipality and the requested LUP map designation change is listed.

# Table A-1 LIST OF PROPOSED LAND USE PLAN MAP CHANGES OCTOBER 2012 EAR-BASED APPLICATIONS TO AMEND THE COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT MASTER PLAN

Parcel		Municipality	Requested Category Change(s)			
No.	Parcel General Location	manioipanty	From	То	Acres ±	
1	East of NE 37 Court along East Country Club Drive	Aventura	Parks and Recreation	Medium-High Density Residential	8	
2	Southeast corner of East Dixie Highway and NE 215 Street	Aventura	Low-Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	44	
3	Northeast corner of NE 30 Avenue and NE 207 Street	Aventura	Medium Density Residential	Medium High Density Residential	14	
4	Northwest corner of NE 34 Avenue and NE 207 Street	Aventura	Medium-High Density Residential	Parks and Recreation	20	
5	Between Lehman Causeway and NE 185 Street; between Atlantic Blvd and Collins Avenue	Sunny Isles Beach	Low Density Residential	Low-Medium Density Residential	9	
6	Between North Bay Road and Collins Avenue; between NE 185 and NE 183 Streets	Sunny Isles Beach	Low Density Residential	Business and Office	4	
8	Between Atlantic Avenue and NE 163 Street; between NE 34 Avenue and Collins Avenue	Sunny Isles Beach	Medium Density Residential	Parks and Recreation	2	
9	Between Biscayne Boulevard and NE 26 Avenue along NE 163 Street	North Miami	Environmentally Protected Parks	Parks and Recreation	3	
10	East and west side of 19 Avenue between NE 173 and 171 Streets	North Miami Beach	Low and Medium Density Residential	Office/Residential	7	

Parcel		Municipality	Requested Category Change(s)			
No.	Parcel General Location		From	То	Acres ±	
11	Northeast corner of NE 169 Street and NE 20 Avenue	North Miami Beach	Medium Density Residential	Office/Residential	2	
12	Between NE 169 Street and North Glades Drive along NE 19 Avenue	North Miami Beach	Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	10	
13	Southwest corner of NE 14 Avenue and NE 162 Street	North Miami Beach	Low Density Residential	Office/Residential	5	
14	Southwest corner of NE 16 Avenue and NE 162 Street	North Miami Beach	Low Density Residential	Office/Residential	3	
15	Southwest corner of NE 22 Avenue and NE 159 Street	North Miami Beach	Low Density Residential and Industrial and Office	Business and Office	15	
16	Northeast corner of Biscayne BLVD and NE 151 Street	North Miami	Parks and Recreation & Business and Office	Institutions, Utilities and Communications	51	
17	Between Bay Vista BLVD and Biscayne BLVD along NE 151 Street	North Miami	Parks and Recreation	Business and Office	32	
18	Between Bay Vista BLVD and FIU Stadium Drive along NE 151 Street Biscayne BLVD along NE 151 Street	North Miami	Environmentally Protected Parks	Institutions, Utilities and Communications	5	
19	Southwest corner of Bay Vista BLVD and NE 151 Street	North Miami	Environmentally Protected Parks	Institutions, Utilities and Communications	9	
21	East side of Biscayne BLVD between NE 137 and 151 Streets	North Miami	Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	178	
22	Northwest corner of Bay Vista BLVD and NE 135 Street	North Miami	Institutions, Utilities and Communications	Environmentally Protected Parks	3	
23	Southwest corner of Bay Vista BLVD and NE 135 Street	North Miami	Institutions, Utilities and Communications	Parks and Recreation	8	
24	Between theoretical NE 143 Street and NE 136 Street along Biscayne BLVD	North Miami Beach	Medium Density Residential and Business and Office	Business and Office	26	
25	East of Biscayne BLVD between theoretical NE 149 Street and theoretical NE 143 Street	North Miami Beach	Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	35	
26	South of NE 123 Street between NE 19 Avenue and North Bayshore Drive	North Miami	Office/Residential and Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	10	
27	Between NE 8 and NE 14 Avenues; between NE 129 and NE 125 Streets	North Miami	Low and Low-Medium Density Residential	Medium Density Residential	71	
28	Between NE 8 and Griffin BLVD; between NE 121 and NE 123 Streets	North Miami	Medium Density Residential	Medium-High Density Residential	42	

Parcel		Municipality	Requested Category Change(s)			
No.	Parcel General Location		From	То	Acres ±	
29	Northeast corner of NE 6 Avenue and NE 131 Street	North Miami	Low Density Residential	Medium-High Density Residential	14	
30	Northeast corner of NE 6 Avenue and NE 135 Street	North Miami	Low-Medium Density Residential	Medium-High Density Residential	93	
31	East and west side of NE 3 Court between NE 139 and 135 Streets	North Miami	Low-Medium Density Residential	Medium-High Density Residential	18	
32	East side of NE 6 Avenue between NE 172 Street and theoretical NE 168 Street	North Miami Beach	Low Density Residential	Office/Residential	4	
33	North side of NE 168 Street between NE 2 Avenue and NE 1 Avenue	North Miami Beach	Low Density Residential and Institutions, Utilities and Communications	Office/Residential	7	
34	Northwest corner of NW Miami Court and NW 171 Street	North Miami Beach	Institutions, Utilities and Communications	Low Density Residential	3	
35	Southwest corner of NE 2 Avenue and NE 169 Street	North Miami Beach	Low Density Residential and Institutions, Utilities and Communications	Medium Density Residential	13	
36	West of NW 7 Avenue between NW 175 Street and SR 826 Extension	Miami Gardens	Institutions, Utilities and Communications	Business and Office	19	
37	East side of NW 2 Court between NW 183 Street and NW 187 Street	Miami Gardens	Low Density Residential	Business and Office	8	
38	Southwest corner of NW 7 Avenue and NW 207 Street	Miami Gardens	Parks and Recreation	Medium-High Density Residential	70	
39	East and west side of Atlantic Way between 77 Street and 79 Street	Miami Beach	Parks and Recreation	Low Density Residential	7	
40	Southwest corner of NW 5 Avenue and NW 115 Street	Miami Shores	Low-Medium Density Residential	Institutions, Utilities and Communications	11	
41	Between Florida Turnpike and NW 22 Place; between theoretical NW 210 Terrace and NW 207 Street	Miami Gardens	Low-Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	64	
42	Northwest corner of NW 25 Avenue and 207 Street	Miami Gardens	Low-Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	9	
43	Southeast corner of NW 215 Street and NW 29 Avenue	Miami Gardens	Office/Residential and Low Density Residential	Business and Office	8	
44	Southeast corner of NW 215 Street and NW 47 Avenue	Miami Gardens	Industrial and Office	Business and Office	101	
45	South of NW 183 Street between NW 17 Avenue and NW 23 Avenue	Miami Gardens	Office/Residential	Business and Office	22	

Parcel		Municipality	Requested Category Change(s)			
No.	Parcel General Location		From	То	Acres ±	
46	East of NW 27 Avenue between theoretical NW 185 Street and NW 191 Street	Miami Gardens	Low-Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	35	
47	Northwest corner of NW 25 Avenue and NW 175 Street	Miami Gardens	Low Density Residential	Business and Office	5	
48	North of SR 826 and east of NW 27 Avenue	Miami Gardens	Low Density Residential	Business and Office	14	
49	East of NW 17 Avenue between theoretical NW 137 Street and NW 147 Street	Opa-Locka	Low Density Residential	Medium-High Density Residential	20	
50	Southeast corner of NW 139 Street and NW 22 Avenue	Opa-Locka	Medium Density Residential	Medium-High Density Residential	10	
51	North of NW 136 Street between NW 22 Place and theoretical NW 26 Avenue	Opa-Locka	Low-Medium Density Residential	Medium-High Density Residential	26	
52	North of NW 135 Street between NW 22 place and theoretical NW 26 Avenue	Opa-Locka	Low-Medium Density Residential	Medium-High Density Residential	8	
53	Northwest corner of NW 27 Avenue and NW 127 Street	Opa-Locka	Medium Density Residential	Medium-High Density Residential	5	
54	Southwest corner of NW 26 Court and NW 135 Street	Opa-Locka	Medium Density Residential	Medium-High Density Residential	63	
55	Southwest corner of NW 32 Court and NW 135 Street	Opa-Locka	Office/Residential	Medium-High Density Residential	29	
56	East side of NW 37 Avenue between NW 145 Street and theoretical NW 137 Street	Opa-Locka	Medium Density Residential	Medium-High Density Residential	63	
57	West of Miami Lakeway between Turnberry Drive and NW 154 Street	Miami Lakes	Medium Density Residential	Parks and Recreation	8	
58	East of SR 826 Extension between W 62 Street and W 53 Street	Hialeah	Medium Density Residential	Medium-High Density Residential	179	
59	Between W 20 Avenue and W 22 Avenue; between W 76 Street and theoretical W 74 Street	Hialeah	Industrial and Office	Medium-High Density Residential	13	
60	Northwest corner of W 24 Avenue and W 76 Street	Hialeah	Industrial and Office	Medium Density Residential	10	
61	Between W 67 Place and W 62 Street; between W 20 Avenue and W 28 Avenue	Hialeah	Medium Density Residential	Medium-High Density Residential	441	
62	Between NW 80 Court and NW 81 Avenue; between theoretical W 46 Street and W 52 Street	Hialeah Gardens	Industrial and Office	Medium Density Residential	12	

Parcel	M	Municipality	Requested Category Change(s)		
No.	Parcel General Location		From	То	Acres ±
63	Between W Okeechobee Road and NW 77 Avenue; between W 46 Street and theoretical W 38 Street	Hialeah Gardens	Industrial and Office and Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	76
64	East of W Okeechobee Road between NW 98 Street and NW 99 Street	Hialeah Gardens	Industrial and Office	Medium Density Residential	4
65	Northeast corner of NW 154 Street and NW 87 Avenue	Miami Lakes	Environmentally Protected Parks	Parks and Recreation	16
66	Northwest corner of W 28 Avenue and W 76 Street	Hialeah	Medium Density Residential	Medium-High Density Residential	67
67	Between W 31 Avenue and W 32 Avenue; between W 77 Place and W 74 Street	Hialeah	Low-Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	15
68	Southeast corner of W 80 Street and NW 92 Avenue	Hialeah	Low-Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	14
69	Northeast corner of W 76 Street and W 36 Avenue	Hialeah	Business and Office and Low-Medium Density Residential	Medium Density Residential	30
70	East of W Okeechobee Road between NW 122 street and NW 110 Lane	Hialeah Gardens	Low-Medium Density Residential	Medium Density Residential	133
71	East of W Okeechobee Road between W 68 street and NW 116 Way	Hialeah Gardens	Industrial and Office	Business and Office	37
72	West side of NW 104 Avenue between NW 134 Street and NW 130 Street	Hialeah Gardens	Estate Density Residential	Low Density Residential	20
73	East side of Biscayne Boulevard between NE 91 Street and NE 88 Street	Miami Shores	Low-Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	10
74	Between NE 87 Street and NE 79 Street; between North Bayshore Drive and NE 7 Avenue	Miami	Low Density Residential	Low-Medium Density Residential	161
75	East of NE 6 Avenue between NE 77 Terrace and Palm Bay Lane	Miami	Low Density Residential	Low-Medium Density Residential	145
76	West of NE 6 Avenue between NE 69 Street and NE 63 Street	Miami	Low-Medium Density Residential	Office/Residential	5
77	Southwest corner of North Miami Avenue and NW 75 Street	Miami	Medium-High Density Residential	Business and Office	12
78	Southwest corner of NW 2 Avenue and NW 71 Street	Miami	Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	8

Parcel		Municipality	Requested Cate	gory Change(s)	
No.	Parcel General Location		From	То	Acres ±
79	East and West side of NW 2 Avenue between NW 70 Street and theoretical NW 63 Street	Miami	Medium Density Residential and Medium-High Density Residential	Business and Office	15
80	North and south side of NE 62 Street between NW 2 Plane and NE Miami Place	Miami	Medium and Medium- High Density Residential	Business and Office	13
81	West of 7 Avenue between NW 62 Street and NW 54 Street	Miami	Low-Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	11
82	East of Biscayne Boulevard between NE 60 Street and theoretical NE 41 Street	Miami	Low Density Residential	Low-Medium Density Residential	229
83	West of Biscayne Boulevard between theoretical NE 50 Terrace and NE 43 Street	Miami	Low Density Residential	Low-Medium Density Residential	31
84	West of North Miami Avenue between NW 42 Street and NW 38 Street	Miami	Low-Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	5
85	Between NW 2 Avenue and I- 95; between NW 49 Street and NW 38 Street	Miami	Low Density Residential	Low-Medium Density Residential	122
86	Between NW 50 Street and I- 95; between NW 12 Avenue and NW 7 Avenue	Miami	Low Density Residential	Low-Medium Density Residential	171
87	Northwest corner of Pine Tree Drive and W 47 Street	Miami Beach	Low Density Residential	High Density Residential	7
88	Northwest corner of Alton Road and W 41 Street	Miami Beach	Business and Office	Low Density Residential	6
89	Northeast corner of North Bay Road and W 41 Street	Miami Beach	Business and Office	Parks and Recreation	9
90	East of Ocean Drive between theoretical Espanola Way and 12 Street	Miami Beach	Business and Office	Parks and Recreation	12
91	East of Ocean Drive between 5 Street and 3 Street	Miami Beach	Parks and Recreation	Business and Office	3
92	East of Ocean Drive between 3 Street and 2 Street	Miami Beach	Business and Office	Parks and Recreation	3
93	East of Ocean Drive between 2 Street and Inlet Boulevard	Miami Beach	Parks and Recreation	Business and Office	8
94	Southwest corner of Collins Avenue and Biscayne Street	Miami Beach	Parks and Recreation	Business and Office	8
95	North of Fisher Island Drive and south of Inlet Boulevard	Miami Beach	Low-Medium Density Residential	Medium-High Density Residential	16
96	Northeast corner of North Biscayne Boulevard and NE 6	Miami	Transportation Terminals	Parks and Recreation	52

Parcel	Parcel General Location Municipality	Municipality	Requested Category Change(s)		
No.			From	То	Acres ±
	Street				
97	Southwest corner of NE 11 Street and NE 2 Avenue	Miami	Medium-High Density Residential	Business and Office	120
98	Northwest corner of NE 12 Street and NE 2 Avenue	Miami	Industrial and Office	Business and Office	91
99	East of I-95 between NW 14 Street and NW 6 Street	Miami	Medium-High Density Residential	Business and Office	74
100	Between I-95 and NW 7 Avenue on the north and south sides of NW 6 Street	Miami	Medium-High Density Residential	Business and Office	43
101	Between South River Drive and NW 11 Street; between NW 12 Avenue and theoretical NW 7 Court	Miami	Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	14
102	Southwest corner of NW 7 Avenue and NW 14 Street	Miami	Medium-High Density Residential	Business and Office	32
103	Southeast corner of NW 20 Street and NW 7 Avenue	Miami	Industrial and Office	Institutions, Utilities and Communications	19
104	Southeast corner of NW 28 Street and NW 10 Avenue	Miami	Industrial and Office	Low-Medium Density Residential	21
105	Southwest corner of NE 2 Avenue and NE 36 Street	Miami	Industrial and Office	Business and Office	130
106	Between NE 28 Street and NE 25 Street; between NW 2 Avenue and North Miami Avenue	Miami	Industrial and Office	Low-Medium Density Residential	19
107	Northwest corner of SW 7 Street and SW 1 Avenue	Miami	Industrial and Office	Business and Office	4
108	Northeast corner of SW 7 Street and SW 1 Avenue	Miami	Industrial and Office	Business and Office	5
109	Southwest corner of NW 62 Street and NW 12 Avenue	Miami	Medium-High Density Residential	Business and Office	8
110	Southwest corner of E 9 Street and E 4 Avenue	Hialeah	Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	87
111	Southwest corner of W 9 Street and Palm Avenue		Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	34
112	East side of W 4 Avenue between W 21 Street and W 17 street	Hialeah	Low-Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	35
113	East side of W 4 Avenue between W 37 Street and W 29 Street	Hialeah	Low Density Residential	Office/Residential	10

Parcel		Municipality	Requested Cate	gory Change(s)	
No.	Parcel General Location		From	То	Acres ±
114	North and south side of NW 29 Street between 12 Avenue and 14 Avenue	Miami	Medium Density Residential	Industrial and Office	10
115	Northwest corner of NW 12 Avenue and NW 35 Street	Miami	Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	10
116	Southwest corner of NW 30 Street and NW 22 Avenue	Miami	Medium and Medium- High Density Residential	Business and Office	10
117	South side of South River Drive between NW 28 Street and SW 42 Avenue	Miami Springs	Industrial and Office	Business and Office	16
118	Southwest corner of NW 14 Avenue and NW 20 Street	Miami	Medium and Medium- High Density Residential	Business and Office	43
119	Northeast corner of NW 15 Street and NW 14 Avenue	Miami	Office/Residential	Institutions, Utilities and Communications	8
120	Southwest corner of NW 20 Street and NW 17 Avenue	Miami	Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	43
121	Southeast corner of NW 22 Avenue and NW 17 Street	Miami	Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	30
123	Northeast corner of SW 17 Avenue and SW 7 Street	Miami	Medium-High Density Residential	Business and Office	109
124	Northeast corner of West Flagler Street and NW 32 Avenue	Miami	Low Density Residential	Low-Medium Density Residential	120
125	West of NW 27 Avenue between NW 17 Street and SR 836 Expressway	Miami	Low-Medium Density Residential	Medium Density Residential	121
126	Northeast corner of NW 37 Avenue and NW 14 Street	Miami	Low Density Residential	Low-Medium Density Residential	219
127	Northeast corner of NW 42 Avenue and NW 7 Street	Miami	Low Density Residential	Low-Medium Density Residential	99
128	Southeast corner of NW 42 Avenue and NW 7 Street	Miami	Low Density Residential	Low-Medium Density Residential	95
129	West of SW 37 Avenue between SW 2 Street and SW 8 Street	Miami	Low-Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	9
130	Northeast corner of Calabria Avenue and Galliano Street	Coral Gables	Medium-High Density Residential	Business and Office	5
131	Southwest corner of SW 37 Avenue and SW 1 Street	Miami	Low Density Residential	Low-Medium Density Residential	63
132	Southeast corner of NW 7 Street and NW 47 Avenue	Miami	Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	28
133	Southwest corner of SW 42 Avenue and West Flagler Street	Miami	Low Density Residential	Low-Medium Density Residential	731

Parcel		Municipality	Requested Cate	gory Change(s)	
No.	Parcel General Location		From	То	Acres ±
134	South of SW 9 Street between SW 62 Avenue and SW 57 Avenue	West Miami	Low Density Residential	Low-Medium Density Residential	19
135	Southwest corner of NW 7 Street and NW 57 Avenue	Miami	Low Density Residential	Low-Medium Density Residential	260
136	Southwest corner of NW 90 Street and NW 97 Avenue	Doral	Office/Residential	Low-Medium Density Residential	76
137	Southeast corner of NW 90 Street and NW 107 Avenue	Doral	Business and Office	Industrial and Office	1
138	Northeast corner of NW 112 Avenue and NW 74 Street	Doral	Low Density Residential	Environmentally Protected Parks	48
139	Northwest corner of NW 107 Avenue and NW 74 Street	Doral	Business and Office	Low Density Residential with One Density Increase	10
140	BetweenNW112AvenueandFloridaTurnpikeExtension;betweentheoreticalNW78StreetNW74Street	Doral	Office/Residential	Low Density Residential with One Density Increase	39
141	Between theoretical NW 75 Lane and NW 74 Street; between NW 114 Avenue and Florida Turnpike Extension	Doral	Business and Office	Low Density Residential with One Density Increase	17
142	Northwest corner of NW 69 Terrace and NW 114 Avenue	Doral	Industrial and Office	Medium Density Residential	32
143	West side of NW 102 Avenue between NW 74 Street and NW 66 Street	Doral	Industrial and Office and Low-Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	12
144	East side of NW 107 Avenue between NW 74 Street and NW 66 Street	Doral	Industrial and Office and Low-Medium Density Residential	Low-Medium Density Residential	108
145	Northeast corner of NW 107 Avenue and NW 58 Street	Doral	Industrial and Office	Low-Medium Density Residential	106
146	North of NW 58 Street between NW 107 Avenue and NW 102 Avenue	Doral	Industrial and Office	Office/Residential	17
147	East and west side of NW 122 Avenue along NW 58 Street	Doral	Industrial and Office	Business and Office	7
148	Southwest corner of NW 58 Street and NW 107 Avenue	Doral	Low-Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	5
149	Southeast corner of NW 58 Street and NW 109 Avenue	Doral	Business and Office	Low-Medium Density Residential	4
150	Southeast corner of NW 58 Street and NW 97 Avenue	Doral	Industrial and Office	Business and Office	40
151	Southwest corner of NW 58 Street and NW 87 Avenue	Doral	Industrial and Office	Low-Medium Density Residential	27

Parcel		Municipality	Requested Cate	gory Change(s)	
No.	Parcel General Location		From	То	Acres ±
152	Southeast corner of NW 54 Street and NW 87 Avenue	Doral	Office/Residential	Business and Office	120
153	North of NW 41 Street between NW 87 Avenue and NW 79 Avenue	Doral	Medium Density Residential and Industrial and Office	Parks and Recreation	122
154	Southwest corner of NW 36 Street and NW 79 Avenue	Doral	Industrial and Office	Business and Office	5
155	Northeast corner of NW 82 Avenue and NW 25 Street	Doral	Industrial and Office	Business and Office	196
156	East of NW 79 Avenue between NW 25 Street and NW 29 Street	Doral	Industrial and Office	Business and Office	6
158	Northwest corner of NW 82 Avenue and NW 33 Street	Doral	Industrial and Office and Office/Residential	Business and Office	51
159	Northeast corner of NW 87 Avenue and theoretical NW 41 Street	Doral	Business and Office and Industrial and Office	Medium-High Density Residential	14
160	Southeast corner of theoretical NW 94 avenue and NW 41 Street	Doral	Office/Residential	Business and Office	6
161	Northeast corner of theoretical NW 94 avenue and NW 36 Street	Doral	Office/Residential	Parks and Recreation	26
162	South of NW 36 Street between theoretical NW 94 Avenue and NW 91 Avenue	Doral	Office/Residential	Institutions, Utilities and Communications	21
163	Northeast corner of NW 25 Street and NW 97 Avenue	Doral	Industrial and Office	Institutions, Utilities and Communications	230
164	Southeast corner of NW 104 Avenue and NW 33 Street	Doral	Industrial and Office	Low-Medium Density Residential	18
167	Northwest corner of NW 41 Street and NW 97 Avenue	Doral	Office/Residential	Medium Density Residential	43
168	Southwest corner of West Flagler Street and SW 103 Court	Sweetwater	Low Density Residential	Business and Office	4
169	East side of 107 Avenue between SW 4 Street and SW 7 Terrace	Sweetwater	Low Density Residential	Office/Residential	4
170	West side of 107 Avenue between SW 1 Street and SW 7 Terrace	Sweetwater	Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	22
171	West side of SW 109 Avenue between SW 1 Street and SW 7 Terrace	Sweetwater	Low-Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	17
172	North of Flagler Street between NW 114 Avenue and NW 109 Avenue		Low-Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	9

Parcel		Municipality	Requested Category Change(s)		
No.	Parcel General Location		From	То	Acres ±
173	East of Rickenbacker causeway and south of theoretical Port Boulevard	Miami	Parks and Recreation	Environmentally Protected Parks	8
174	North of Sewage Plant Road	Miami	Parks and Recreation	Environmentally Protected Parks	8
175	North of Sewage Plant Road	Miami	Parks and Recreation and Environmentally Protected Parks	Institutions, Utilities and Communications	12
176	Northeast of Arthur Lamb Jr. Road and east of Sewage Plant Road	Miami	Environmentally Protected Parks	Parks and Recreation	54
177	North of Arthur Lamb Jr. Road and east of Sewage Plant Road	Miami	Institutional, Utilities and Communications	Parks and Recreation	17
178	North of Arthur Lamb Jr. Road and south of Sewage Plant Road	Miami	Environmentally Protected Parks	Parks and Recreation	61
179	South of Arthur Lamb Jr. Road and northeast of Rickenbacker causeway	Miami	Institutions, Utilities and Communications	Parks and Recreation	33
180	North of Arthur Lamb Jr. Road and northeast of Rickenbacker causeway	Miami	Institutions, Utilities and Communications	Environmentally Protected Parks	15
181	North of Brickell Avenue between SE 15 Road and SW 26 Road	Miami	Low-Medium Density Residential	Medium-High Density Residential	24
182	North of South Miami Avenue between SE 15 Road and SW 26 Road	Miami	Low Density Residential	Low-Medium Density Residential	38
183	South of SW 15 Road between SW 3 Avenue and SW 1 Avenue	Miami	Office/Residential	Business and Office	17
184	North of SW 1 Avenue between SW 28 Road and theoretical SW 18 Road	Miami	Low Density Residential	Low-Medium Density Residential	73
185	Between SW 32 Road and SW 17 Road along SW 3 Avenue	Miami	Office/Residential	Business and Office	49
186	Between SW 18 Terrace and SW 27 Avenue; between SW 11 Street and SW 21 Street	Miami	Low Density Residential	Low-Medium Density Residential	780
187	Northwest corner of SW 27 Avenue and SW 32 Avenue	Miami	Low Density Residential	Low-Medium Density Residential	80
188	Northwest corner of SW 21 Street and SW 32 Avenue	Miami	Low Density Residential	Low-Medium Density Residential	110
189	Southeast corner of SW 22 Terrace and SW 27 Avenue	Miami	Low Density Residential	Low-Medium Density Residential	244

Parcel		Municipality	Requested Cate	ory Change(s)	
No.	Parcel General Location		From	То	Acres ±
190	Southwest corner of SW 22 Terrace and SW 27 Avenue	Miami	Low-Medium Density Residential	Medium Density Residential	454
191	Southwest corner of McDonald Street and Bird Avenue	Miami	Low-Medium Density Residential	Medium Density Residential	82
192	Northwest corner of Salzedo Street and Majorca Avenue	Coral Gables	Low-Medium Density Residential	Medium-High Density Residential	6
193	Northeast corner of SW 42 Avenue and Valencia Avenue	Coral Gables	High Density Residential	Business and Office	15
194	Northwest corner of SW 65 avenue and SW 22 Street	West Miami	Low Density Residential	Medium Density Residential	8
195	Between SW 23 Street and SW 24 Street; between SW 67 Avenue and SW 64 Avenue	West Miami	Low Density Residential	Office/Residential	4
196	West of Galliano Street between Sevilla Avenue and Malaga Avenue	Coral Gables	Low Density Residential	Business and Office	6
197	East of SW 37 Avenue between SW 26 Street and SW 29 Street	Miami	Low and Low-Medium Density Residential	Medium Density Residential	33
198	East of SW 37 Avenue between SW 29 Street and SW 40 Street	Miami	Industrial and Office	Medium Density Residential	13
199	Southeast corner of SW 40 Street and SW 42 Avenue	Coral Gables	Industrial and Office	Business and Office	15
200	East of SW 37 Avenue between Orange Street and theoretical Velarde Avenue	Miami	Medium-High Density Residential	Business and Office	20
201	North of Ponce de Leon Boulevard between SW 57 Avenue and San Antonio Drive	Coral Gables	Institutions, Utilities and Communications	Business and Office	5
202	North of South Dixie Highway between SW 59 Place and SW 63 Avenue	South Miami	Office/Residential and Institutions, Utilities and Communications	Business and Office	47
203	North of Edgewater Drive between Ingraham Highway and Sunrise Place	Coral Gables	Low Density Residential	Medium-High Density Residential	5
204	South of Marin Street	Coral Gables	Estate Density Residential	Environmentally Protected Parks	21
205	Northwest corner of Old Cutler Road and SW 120 Street	Coral Gables	Estate Density Residential	Low Density Residential	63
206	Northwest corner of Virtudes Street and Cartagena Avenue	Coral Gables	Estate Density Residential	Institutions, Utilities and Communications	32

Parcel		Municipality	Requested Cate	gory Change(s)	
No.	Parcel General Location		From	То	Acres ±
207	East of Old Cutler Road between Cartagena Avenue and Bella Vista Avenue	Coral Gables	Estate Density Residential	Low Density Residential	161
208	South of SW 136 Street and east of SW Guadalajara Street	Coral Gables	Parks and Recreation	Environmentally Protected Parks	64
209	Northwest corner of SW 120 Street and SW 77 Avenue	Pinecrest	Low Density Residential	Estate Density Residential	111
210	East of SW 60 Avenue and north of Paradize Point Drive	Coral Gables	Environmentally Protected Parks	Parks and Recreation	3
211	East of SW 67 Avenue between SW 144 Street and theoretical SW 152 Street	Coral Gables	Estate Density Residential	Parks and Recreation	58
212	North of Paradise Point Drive	Coral Gables	Estate Density Residential	Low Density Residential	8
213	East of Permit Drive	Coral Gables	Estate Density Residential	Low-Medium Density Residential	4
214	East of Permit Drive and northwest of SW 60 Avenue	Coral Gables	Estate Density Residential	Medium-High Density Residential	16
215	Southeast corner of SW 144 Street and SW 67 Avenue	Coral Gables	Estate Density Residential	Low Density Residential	67
216	North of Paradise Point Drive and east of Dolphin Drive	Coral Gables	Estate Density Residential	Environmentally Protected Parks	9
217	End point of Paradise Point Drive	Palmetto Bay	Environmental Protection	Low Density Residential	1
218	South of Paradise Point Drive and East of Polar Street	Palmetto Bay	Low Density Residential	Low-Medium Density Residential	12
219	South of Paradise Point Drive and northeast of Bayshore Boulevard	Palmetto Bay	Environmental Protection	Environmentally Protected Parks	12
220	South of Paradise Point Drive and east of Polar Drive	Palmetto Bay	Low Density Residential	Environmentally Protected Parks	1
221	South of Bayshore Boulevard and southeast of Royal Palm Drive	Palmetto Bay	Environmental Protection	Environmentally Protected Parks	10
222	North of SW 152 Street between SW 71 Court and SW 69 Court	Palmetto Bay	Estate Density Residential	Environmentally Protected Parks	5
223	Northeast corner of SW 168 Street and SW 72 Avenue	Palmetto Bay	Parks and Recreation	Environmentally Protected Parks	37
224	West of Old Cutler Road between theoretical SW 160 terrace and SW 157 Terrace	Palmetto Bay	Estate Density Residential	Environmentally Protected Parks	10
225	Southeast corner of Old Cutler Road and SW 164 Terrace	Palmetto Bay	Estate Density Residential	Low Density Residential	10

Parcel		Municipality	Requested Cate	gory Change(s)	
No.	Parcel General Location		From	То	Acres ±
226	East of Old Cutler Road between SW 174 Street and theoretical SW 176 Street	Palmetto Bay	Environmentally Protected Parks	Estate Density Residential	8
227	East of Old Cutler Road between SW 184 Street and SW 176 Street	Palmetto Bay	Estate Density Residential and Office/Residential	Parks and Recreation	29
228	Northeast f SW 184 Street and east of Old Cutler Road	Palmetto Bay	Office/Residential	Environmentally Protected Parks	10
229	Southeast corner of Old Cutler Road and SW 184 street	Cutler Bay	Estate and Low Density Residential	Environmentally Protected Parks	91
230	West of Old Cutler Road and south of SW 184 Street	Cutler Bay	Estate and Low Density Residential	Environmentally Protected Parks	5
231	Northwest corner of SW 94 Avenue and SW 174 Street	Palmetto Bay	Low Density Residential and Business and Office	Medium Density Residential	10
232	West of SW 87 Avenue between SW 232 Street and theoretical SW 198 Street	Cutler Bay	Estate, Low and Low- Medium Density Residential	Environmental Protection	671
233	Northeast and northwest corners of SW 87 Avenue and Old Cutler Road	Cutler Bay	Low Density Residential	Business and Office	73
234	South of Old Cutler Road between SW 92 Avenue and SW 97 Court	Cutler Bay	Low Density Residential	Business and Office	57
235	North of SW 232 Street between the Florida Turnpike and SW 87 Avenue	Cutler Bay	Estate, Low, and Low- Medium Density Residential	Environmental Protection	94
236	Northwest corner of SW 87 Avenue and SW 232 Street	Cutler Bay	Estate, Low, and Low- Medium Density Residential	Environmental Protection	11
238	West of SW 137 Avenue between theoretical 290 Terrace and theoretical 291 Street	Homestead	Low-Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	17
239	West side of SW 137 avenue between theoretical SW 304 Street and SW 312 Street	Homestead	Low Density Residential	Business and Office	5
240	Northwest corner of SW 137 Avenue and Waterstone Boulevard	Homestead	Low Density Residential	Business and Office	5
241	Northwest corner of SW 137 Avenue and SW 312 Street	Homestead	Industrial and Office	Low Density Residential	7
242	Southeast of the Florida Turnpike between NE 36 Avenue and NE 32 Avenue	Homestead	Low Density Residential	Medium Density Residential	84
243	South of SW 312 Street between theoretical NE 26 Terrace and theoretical NE	Homestead	Low-Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	22

Parcel		Municipality	Requested Categ	gory Change(s)	
No.	Parcel General Location		From	То	Acres ±
	30 Avenue				
244	Southeast of the Florida Turnpike between SE 18 Avenue and SE 21 Terrace	Homestead	Low Density Residential	Business and Office	27
245	Northwest corner of SW 162 avenue and SW 328 Street	Homestead	Low Density Residential	Business and Office	11
246	North of SW 328 Street between SE 14 Place and theoretical SE 16 Avenue	Homestead	Low Density Residential	Medium Density Residential	11
247	Southwest corner of NE 18 Avenue and SW 320 Street	Homestead	Low Density Residential	Business and Office	10
248	South of NE 8 Street between NE 20 Avenue and theoretical NE 16 Terrace	Homestead	Low, Low-Medium Density Residential and Office/Residential	Business and Office	20
249	Southeast corner of NE 8 Street and theoretical SW 163 Avenue	Homestead	Low-Medium Density Residential and Office/Residential	Business and Office	5
250	South of 304 Street between NE 12 avenue and NE 15 Avenue	Homestead	Low-Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	9
251	South of SW 312 Street between NE 12 avenue and NE 18 Avenue	Homestead	Low-Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	2
252	South of SW 312 Street between NE 18 Avenue and SE 5 Avenue	Homestead	Low and Low-Medium Density Residential	Medium Density Residential	296
255	North of NE 8 Street between SW 170 Avenue and N Krome Avenue	Homestead	Low-Medium Density Residential	Medium Density Residential	123
256	South of NE 16 Street between N Krome Avenue and NE 1 Street	Homestead	Low and Low-Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	8
257	Northwest corner of NE 19 Avenue and N Krome Avenue	Homestead	Estate Density Residential	Business and Office	3
258	Southeast corner of NW 1 Avenue and NW 18 Street	Homestead	Low and Low-Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	20
259	Southeast corner of NW 2 Avenue and NW 15 Street	Homestead	Low Density Residential	Office/Residential	57
260	West of N Krome Avenue between NW 10 Street and NW 8 Street	Homestead	Low-Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	4
261	Southeast corner of NW 1 Avenue and NW 8 Street	Homestead	Low-Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	2
262	South of SW 304 Street between NW 14 Avenue and NW 6 Avenue	Homestead	Low Density Residential	Medium Density Residential	112
263	Southwest corner of NW 6 Street and NW 2 Avenue	Homestead	Low-Medium Density Residential	Medium Density Residential	56

Parcel		Municipality	Requested Cate	gory Change(s)	
No.	Parcel General Location		From	То	Acres ±
264	West of Krome Avenue between NW 6 Street and W Mowry Drive	Homestead	Low-Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	35
265	Northwest corner of SW Krome Terrace and SW 8 Street	Homestead	Low-Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	28
266	Northeast corner of SW 4 Avenue and SW 8 Street	Homestead	Low-Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	7
267	North of SW 4 Street between SW 14 Avenue and South Flagler Avenue	Homestead	Industrial and Office	Low-Medium Density Residential	46
268	South of SW 4 Street between SW 2 Avenue and SW 10 Avenue	Homestead	Low-Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	17
269	Southeast corner of SW 4 Street and SW 14 Avenue	Homestead	Low-Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	7
270	West of NW 14 Avenue between NW 8 Street and SW 8 Street	Homestead	Low and Low-Medium Density Residential	Medium Density Residential	65
271	Southwest corner of SW 320 Street and SW 187 Avenue	Homestead	Low Density Residential	Business and Office	8
272	Southwest corner of SW 328 Street and SW 187 Avenue	Florida City	Low-Medium Density Residential	Low Density Residential	40
273	Southeast corner of SW 328 Street and SW 192 Avenue	Homestead	Low-Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	41
274	East of SW 192 Avenue between SW 344 Street and SW 328 Street	Florida City	Low Density Residential	Low-Medium Density Residential	232
275	Northeast corner of SW 344 Street and SW 192 Avenue	Florida City	Low Density Residential	Business and Office	21
276	Northwest corner of SW 187 Avenue and SW 344 Street	Florida City	Low Density Residential	Business and Office	11
277	Northwest corner of SW 344 Street and SW 182 Avenue	Florida City	Low Density Residential	Low-Medium Density Residential	16
278	West of SW 182 Avenue between SW 344 Street and SW 328 Street	Florida City	Low Density Residential	Low-Medium Density Residential	21
279	South of SW 344 Street between SW 182 Avenue and SW 184 Avenue	Florida City	Environmentally Protected Parks	Business and Office	3
280	East of SW 187 Avenue between SW 344 Street and SW 352 Street	Florida City	Low Density Residential	Low-Medium Density Residential	20
281	Southwest corner of Krome Avenue and SW 344 Street	Florida City	Low Density Residential	Low-Medium Density Residential	27
282	Northwest corner of Krome Avenue and theoretical SW 352 Street	Florida City	Industrial and Office	Low-Medium Density Residential	6

Parcel No.	Parcel General Location	Municipality	Requested Category Change(s)		
			From	То	Acres ±
283	Southwest corner of SW 172 Avenue and SW 344 Street	Florida City	Industrial and Office	Business and Office	52
284	East of SW 172 Avenue between East Palm Drive and theoretical SW 352 Street	Florida City	Industrial and Office and Low Density Residential	Environmentally Protected Parks	75
285	Southeast corner of South Dixie Highway and theoretical SW 352 Street	Florida City	Agriculture	Environmentally Protected Parks	31
286	Southwest corner of East Palm Drive and SW 167 Avenue	Florida City	Low Density Residential	Low-Medium Density Residential	74
287	Northwest corner of East Palm Drive and SW 167 Avenue	Homestead	Low and Low-Medium Density Residential	Business and Office	42
288	South of SW 344 Street between SW 152 Avenue and SW 142 Avenue	Homestead	Low Density Residential and Parks and Recreation	Environmentally Protected Parks	173
289	Southwest corner of SW 344 Street and SW 142 Avenue	Homestead	Environmentally Protected Parks, Low Density Residential and Business and Office	Parks and Recreation	112
290	Southeast corner of SW 344 Street and SW 142 Avenue	Homestead	Environmentally Protected Parks	Parks and Recreation	58
291	Northeast corner of Alex Muxo Boulevard and SW 142 Avenue	Homestead	Business and Office	Industrial and Office	19
292	East of SW 112 Avenue between SW 232 and SW 284 Streets	unincorporated	Inside the 2025 Urban Expansion Area (UEA); Open Land; Institutions, Utilities and Communications; Agriculture	Outside the 2025 UEA; Open Land; Institutions, Utilities and Communications; Agriculture	1,489
293	East of SW 142 Avenue between SW 312 and SW 352 Streets	Homestead and unincorporated	Inside the 2025 UEA; Agriculture; Open Land	Outside the 2025 UEA; Agriculture; Open Land	595
294	Between SW 177 and SW 176 Avenues and between SW 42 and SW 72 Streets	unincorporated	Inside the 2025 UEA; Open Land; Institutions, Utilities and Communications; Agriculture	Outside the 2025 UEA; Open Land; Institutions, Utilities and Communications; Agriculture	1,525
295	West of NW/SW 137 Avenue and between NW 12 and SW 8 Streets	unincorporated	Inside the 2025 UEA; Open Land	Outside the 2025 UEA; Open Land	575
296	Northwest corner of Florida Turnpike and Dolphin Expressway interchange	unincorporated	Open Land; Outside the 2015 UDB	Restricted Industrial and Office; Inside the 2015 UDB	521







# THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK













































































































































































































































































# THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

### APPENDIX B

### PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

This Chapter outlines the factors that are considered in evaluating applications to amend the Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP). It contains descriptions of the methods of analysis typically used by the Planning staff of the Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources (RER) in evaluating CDMP amendment applications. The chapter contains an overview followed by a discussion of countywide planning factors, and the factors that typically evaluated for the geographic study areas around the application areas, and for the applications sites. These factors include: environmental conditions; land use patterns; population and housing projections; supply and demand for residential, commercial, industrial and agricultural lands; and urban services which relate most directly to land development (roadways, mass transit, water and sewer, solid waste, fire rescue, park and recreation and schools). Also included are descriptions of the analysis methods typically used by the Planning staff in evaluating CDMP amendment applications.

### **Growth Management**

Miami-Dade County's Comprehensive Development Master Plan is a metropolitan guide for growth management. The Plan is countywide in scale and comprehensive in scope. It establishes the County's policy framework within which specific development decisions are made. Among its key growth management objectives, the CDMP seeks to ensure that physical expansion of the urbanized area is managed so as to occur: 1) at a rate commensurate with projected population and economic growth; 2) in a contiguous pattern centered around a network of high-intensity activity centers well-connected by multimodal intra-urban transportation facilities; and 3) in locations which optimize efficiency in public service delivery and conservation of valuable natural resources. The forgoing objectives are also encouraged by the State's planning laws and the South Florida Regional Planning Council's (SFRPC) Strategic Regional Policy Plan (SRPP). Chapter 163, Part II, Florida Statutes, (F.S.) establishes planning direction for all local governments. The SFRPC's Strategic Regional Policy Plan establishes policy direction by way of regional goal and policy statements that are derived from state laws but relate more specifically to South Florida's conditions and circumstances.

Various State agencies (i.e. Department of Economic Opportunity, Department of Environmental Protection, Department of State, Department of Transportation, Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, and Department of Education) review proposed and adopted local comprehensive plans for impacts on important state resources and facilities. The DOE, the State Land Planning Agency, shall limit its comments on important state resources and facilities outside the jurisdiction of other commenting State agencies. The South Florida Water Management District shall provide comments to flood protection and floodplain management, wetlands and other surface waters, and regional water supply.

For State Coordinated Review process, the State Land Planning Agency may make objections, recommendations and comments in its report regarding whether the proposed plan or plan amendment is in compliance and whether the plan or plan amendment will adversely impact important state resources and facilities. Following local adoption, the DEO will issue a notice of intent to find the plan or plan amendment in compliance or non-compliance. Any affected person or the State Land Planning Agency may file a petition with the Division of Administrative

Hearings to request a formal hearing to challenge whether the plan or plan amendment is in compliance as defined in section 163.3184(1)(b), Florida Statutes.

# Plan Implementation

Chapter 163, F.S., provides that after a local government plan has been adopted, all development and development orders by governmental agencies shall be consistent with the plan (s. 163.3194(1)(a), F.S.). In addition, Chapter 163 requires that each local government must adopt and enforce land development regulations that are consistent with and implement its adopted comprehensive plan (s. 163.3202, F.S.). At a minimum, all local governments must enforce regulations which regulate the subdivision of land; regulate the use of land and water and ensure the compatibility of adjacent uses and provide for open space; provide for the protection of potable water wellfields; regulate areas subject to seasonal and periodic flooding and provide for drainage and stormwater management; ensure the protection of environmentally sensitive lands; regulate signage; ensure that public facilities and services meet or exceed the adopted level of service standards established in the comprehensive plan and are available when needed for the development, or that development orders and permits are conditioned on the availability of these public facilities and services; and ensure safe and convenient onsite traffic flow, considering needed vehicle parking.

The DEO is authorized to review a local government's development regulations to determine its compliance with these requirements. Chapter 163, F.S., also provides that affected parties may challenge actions of local governments that are not consistent with the locally adopted plan or development regulations.

# Areas of Analysis

To facilitate the evaluation of applications requesting amendments to the Adopted 2015 and 2025 Land Use Plan (LUP) map, Study Areas are established, encompassing an application or group of applications. The basic geographic unit used in many analyses conducted by the Department is the Minor Statistical Area (MSA); these areas are depicted in Figure 1 below. The MSA boundaries are based on census tracts, which are a component of the United States Census geography. An MSA may contain one large census tract or an aggregation of census tracts. The Department established MSAs as planning areas to facilitate small-area analyses and to standardize areas for the development of statistical data and projections.

In order to provide a broader picture than the MSA, larger planning areas called Tiers were established as standard analysis areas in the CDMP Land Use Element (see Figure 2 below). These two planning areas – MSAs and Tiers – provide continuity in the analyses.





October 2012 Cycle

**EAR-Based** Applications

# **ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS AND CONSIDERATIONS**

General environmental conditions are usually described for each parcel in unincorporated Miami-Dade County. A description of general environmental conditions is included within each respective Application review. Environmental conditions addressed include the following: natural ground elevations, soils, drainage characteristics, County and federal flood criteria, stormwater management, County wellfield protection criteria, hurricane evacuation areas, wetlands, upland forests, endangered species and habitats, exotic pest plant and animal species, historical and archaeological resources, and other relevant issues or concerns.

Several sources of information have been used in evaluating CDMP amendment Applications. These include: CDMP Conservation and Coastal Management Elements; Soil Survey of Dade County Area (1996), U.S.D.A. Natural Resources Conservation Service; Miami-Dade County Public Works Department Topographical Maps (revised 1954-56); Miami-Dade County Flood Criteria Maps (2009); National Flood Insurance Program Flood Insurance Rate Maps for Dade County, Florida (2008); Federal Emergency Management Agency; Wellfield Protection Areas (2006); Hurricane Evacuation Map (2012), Miami-Dade County Office of Emergency Management; and support data provided by the Division of Environmental Resources Management (DERM) of the Miami-Dade County Department of Regulatory Economic Resources (DRER). DERM assists in the evaluation of site conditions relative to County Code and other governmental requirements.

# Drainage and Flood Protection

DERM reviews the proposed CDMP amendment applications for consistency with flood protection requirements contained in Chapter 11C, Chapter 24 and Chapter 28 of the Code of Miami-Dade County. For each application site, information on the natural ground elevation, flood criteria and the type of drainage required is presented in tabular form and further explained in narrative form if necessary.

Types of soil and drainage characteristics are no longer listed for each site. Standard practices in Miami-Dade County require soils that are unsuitable to support construction to be removed prior to filling to meet County flood criteria; however, these conditions are addressed at the time of development. Soils range from those that drain well, such as Dade sand, to those that drain very poorly, such as muck and marls. Since Miami-Dade County has been developing for decades, much of the urban area consists of previously filled wetlands, and upland areas that have been scarified to break up the natural bedrock outcroppings into moderately well-drained gravelly loam. Soils primarily consisting of fill are referenced as udorthents if the fill is identifiable or Urban Land if structures obscure the soil type and have moderate drainage characteristics.

CDMP Policy CON-5A of the Conservation, Aquifer Recharge, and Drainage Element establishes the stormwater management level of service standards for Miami-Dade County, which contains both a flood protection and water quality component. The minimum acceptable flood protection level of service standard is the protection from the degree of flooding that would result from duration of one day from a ten-year storm, with exceptions in previously developed canal basins, where additional development to this base standard would pose a risk to existing development. Further, the lowest habitable floor of all structures must be elevated above the federal flood criteria described below based on existing topography, roadway or County Flood Criteria that provides the highest protection level of service.

In areas having drainage limitations where site conditions prevent on-site retention of the applicable design storm and are adjacent to canals or surface waters, a minimum of one inch of runoff of total area, or 2.5 inches times the percentage of the site's impervious area must be retained in either a dry retention or exfiltration trench before discharge into surface waters. In addition, stormwater conveyance structures (e.g. catch basins) located in paved parking areas must be fitted with oil and grease interceptors prior to entering an exfiltration or infiltration system. Other environmental requirements that may limit development of particular sites are outlined in the following paragraphs.

The water quality component of the stormwater management level of service standard is met when the annual average for each of the twelve priority pollutants do not exceed the target criteria for each of the pollutants within a canal basin or sub-basin, as determined in accordance with procedures established by DERM. This criterion is monitored through the County's Stormwater Monitoring Program, which was designed to meet the requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), as approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the State of Florida, for the control of water pollution. (For a list of the referenced pollutants, see pg. IV-9 in the CDMP Conservation, Aquifer Recharge and Drainage Element.)

### Drainage Basins

There are two types of hydrologic basins indicated in the environmental conditions summary tables. These are canal drainage basins, such as C-2 (Snapper Creek Canal), and wetland basins such as the Bird Drive Basin. Based upon information provided by the South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD), the primary canal system generally drains the following three areas of the County: east of the Turnpike and north of Kendall Drive; east of levee L-31N between Kendall and Eureka Drives; and south of Eureka Drive between L-31N and the Turnpike. The remaining portions of the County receive little or no flood protection from the primary canal system.

Areas generally north of Kendall Drive and west of the Florida Turnpike have drainage limitations and frequent flooding problems. Therefore, the SFWMD and the County have established special fill criteria for certain basins in this region, such as the Western C-9 Basin, the Bird Drive Basin, the North Trail Basin and Basin "B." These basins serve to conserve water, recharge the aquifer and mitigate impacts of floodwater loading on the canal systems.

The 2009 Federal Flood Criteria, which established 100-year base flood elevations for structures in Miami-Dade County, have been used to evaluate each application site. These criteria are based on assumed land use patterns in the various basins that could be altered by CDMP amendments. Federal flood criteria are used primarily for development and insurance purposes to protect property in flood-prone areas. Special Flood Hazard Areas (zone series A and V) are those inundated by a 100-year flood. The Federal Flood AE or AH Zone designations indicate areas where base flood elevation has been determined. Inundation to flood elevation can be expected in a 100-year flood in the AE designated areas, and one to three feet of ponding can be expected in AH zones. The V Zone indicates Coastal High Hazard Areas subject to high-velocity wave action. Areas designated as X Zone are outside the 100-year flood zone but may be within the 500-year flood area. Chapter 11C of the County Code regulates development within Special Flood Hazard Areas, and provides stricter regulations in Coastal High Hazard Areas.



### Wellfield Protection Areas

The location of all existing public water supply wellfields in Miami-Dade County and the protection zones around the wellfields are depicted in Figure 4 below. All wellfields include a protection zone based on the theoretical 210-day groundwater travel distance from the wellheads. Larger capacity wellfields have had additional protection zones adopted over time that extend beyond their respective 210-day zones. Land use restrictions are increasingly more stringent the closer a proposed development is to a wellfield.

Wellfields that have additional protection zones are those that supply the regional drinking water treatment plants: Alexander Orr (Alexander Orr, Snapper Creek, and Southwest and West Wellfields) and the interconnected Preston and Hialeah Treatment Plants (Northwest, Hialeah, Preston, and Lower Miami Springs Wellfields). The outermost protection zones for these wellfields were established either directly or indirectly through technical and policy advisory committees that deliberated on a wide range of factors that included development patterns and projected water demands on each wellfield system. Consequently the resulting outer protection zones vary in terms of the underlying assumptions used in the respective hydrologic model that generated each of the mapped protection zones:

- The Northwest Wellfield Protection outer protection zone west of the Florida Turnpike Extension was established in 1985 and delineated by the "0.25-foot drawdown contour." A safety buffer was established east of the Turnpike at the same time to ensure protection of Northwest Wellfield groundwater during drought periods. The safety buffer was amended in 1993 to its current extent and based on a "3-year groundwater travel distance" east from the turnpike.
- 2. The oldest wellfield groups (Hialeah, Preston, and Lower Miami Springs Wellfields, and Alexander Orr Plant, Snapper Creek, Southwest Wellfields) have two outer protection zones that were based on their respective "average" and "maximum" permitted pumping rates. Each of these protection zones were delineated by a "1.0-foot drawdown contour. A drawdown is defined as the difference between the water table elevation that occurs without the wellfield pumping, contrasted with the water table elevation with the wellfield pumping.
- 3. The current West Wellfield Interim outer protection zone is also shown on Figure 4 below. That protection area boundary is delineated by the 0.1-foot drawdown contour.
- 4. South Miami Heights Wellfield has an outer protection zone that was based on theoretical 1,500-day groundwater travel distance from the wellheads.

Table 1 below summarizes the land use restrictions and regulations that apply within all urban wellfield protection areas except the Northwest and the West Wellfield Interim Protection Areas, which are subject to special protection regulations governing land use activities as outlined in Table 2 below.

### Wetlands and Upland Forests

Wetlands are delineated based on vegetation, soils, and hydrology, consistent with a statewide methodology described in Chapter 62-340, F.A.C. If there are wetlands present on site, permits may be required pursuant to Chapter 24-48 of the Code of Miami-Dade County and mitigation criteria may also apply. Miami-Dade County has established policies in the CDMP to protect, October 2012 Cycle B-8 EAR-Based Applications



Table 1	
Urban Wellfields Land Use Restrictions and	ł
Prohibitions for New Construction	

	PROTECTION ZONES								
ACTIVITY	100'	10 Day	30 Day	100 Day	210 Day	Avg. Day	Outer/Max		
			-				Day		
RESIDENTIAL USES	Р	2.4	4.6	NR	NR	NR	NR		
SERVED BY SEWERS		Units/Acre	Units/Acre						
STRINGENT SEWER	Req.	Req.	Reg.	Req.	Reg.	Req.	Reg.		
CONSTRUCTION		- 1	- 1	- 1		- 1			
CRITERIA									
STORMWATER	Р	Infiltration Only	Only Infiltration Infiltration.		NR	NR			
DISPOSAL		,	& seepage	seepage or over					
			only	flow outfa	flow outfall				
ROCKMINING	Р	Р	Р	40 ft. max	40 ft max depth or		NR		
	-	-	-	30 day travel time					
				buffer. lar	nd				
				dedication	n. securitv				
				required					
RESIDENTIAL LAND	Р	R	R	R	R	NR	NR		
USES SERVED BY									
SEPTIC TANKS									
NON-RESIDENTIAL USES	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	R	NR		
HANDLING HAZARDOUS									
MATERIALS									
EXISTING USES	Req.	Req.	Req.	Req.	Req.	NR	NR		
HANDLING HAZ. MAT.	-	-			-				
MUST REDUCE RISK									
UPON EXPANSION									
NON-RESIDENTIAL USES	Р	R	R	R	R	NR	NR		
SERVED BY SEPTIC									
TANKS									
NON-RESIDENTIAL USES	Р	R	R	NR	NR	NR	NR		
SERVED BY SEWERS									
UNDERGROUND	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	R	R		
STORAGE TANKS FOR									
HAZARDOUS									
MATERIALS									
PIPELINES	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р		
TRANSPORTING									
HAZARDOUS									
MATERIALS									
LIQUID WASTE	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	NR		
STORAGE, TREATMENT									
OR DISPOSAL METHODS									
OTHER THAN SEPTIC									
TANKS & PUBLIC									
SANITARY SEWERS									
RESOURCE RECOVERY	P	P	P	Р	Р	Р	Р		
AND MANAGEMENT									
FACILITIES									
P=Prohibited NR=Not Restricted Reg.=Required R=Restricted									

Table 2Northwest and West Wellfields Protection AreaLand Use Restrictions and Prohibitions for New Construction

ACTIVITY	PROTECTION ZONES							
	100'	10 Day	30 Day	100 Day	210 Day	Outer Zone		
RESIDENTIAL USES SERVED BY SEPTIC TANKS	Р	R	R	R	R	NR		
RESIDENTIAL AND NON- RESIDENTIAL USES SERVED BY SEWERS	Р	2.4/Acre	4.6/Acre	NR	NR	NR		
STRINGENT SEWER CONSTRUCTION CRITERIA	R eq.	Req.	Req.	Req.	Req.	Req.		
STORMWATER DISPOSAL	Р	Infiltration	Infiltration & Seepage	Infiltration, seepage or NF overflow outfall				
ROCKMINING	Р	Р	Р	40 ft. ma day trave land c securi	NR			
NON-RESIDENTIAL USES HANDLING HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	Р	Ρ	Р	Р	Р	Р		
EXISTING USES HANDLING HAZ. MAT. MUST REDUCE RISK UPON EXPANSION	Req.	Req.	Req.	Req.	Req.	Req.		
BU-3 AND IU ZONING	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р		
NON-RESIDENTIAL USES SERVED BY SEPTIC TANKS	Р	Р	P P P P P Excluding Rockmining & Ancillary Uses					
UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS FOR HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р		
PIPELINES TRANSPORTING HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р		
LIQUID WASTE STORAGE, TREATMENT OR DISPOSAL METHODS OTHER THAN SEPTIC TANKS & PUBLIC SANITARY SEWERS	Ρ	Ρ	Ρ	Ρ	Ρ	Ρ		
RESOURCE RECOVERY AND MANAGEMENT FACILITIES P=Prohibited_NR=Not Restr	P	P Required R	P =Restricted	Р	Р	Р		

restore, and enhance wetlands. An environmental summary in each application review by DERM indicates if the site is subject to wetland permit requirements. Additionally, sites may be subject to State and Federal permitting requirements as well. It is the responsibility of the applicant to contact those agencies to determine applicability.

DERM also reviews each application site for the presence of environmentally sensitive areas, protected specimen trees and/or Natural Forest Communities (NFC). Habitats for threatened or endangered species are protected by the CDMP through objectives and policies in the Conservation, Aquifer Recharge and Drainage Element and the Coastal Management Element. The Board of County Commissioners (BCC), per Resolution R-1764-84 and Ordinance 84-34, designated approximately 230 environmentally sensitive pinelands and hammocks totaling 3,645 acres in Miami-Dade County as NFC. Of the total 3,645 acres of designated NFC's, 1,976 acres have been purchased through the Environmentally Endangered Lands (EEL) Program. The EEL program was established in 1991 to acquire and preserve environmentally endangered lands in Miami-Dade County.

In an attempt to preserve remaining NFC in private ownership, and to provide property owners with an economic incentive to preserve forestland, the Miami-Dade County Commission adopted the Environmentally Endangered Lands Tax Covenant Ordinance in December 1979. The ordinance established significantly lower property tax assessments for sites that qualify. Additionally, the Miami-Dade County Tree and Forest Resources Protection Code regulates development and provides preservation standards for these forests during development. A permit is required prior to the removal or relocation of any trees or understory vegetation in an NFC. In addition, Chapter 25-B of the Code provides for the execution of a covenant to preserve and maintain privately owned parcels of NFC's in their natural state in exchange for preferential tax treatment. The Code also provides protection standards for Specimen Trees (trees which are 18 inches or greater in diameter) during development. Regardless of whether a site contains an NFC or sensitive tree resources, a permit review by DERM is required prior to the removal or relocation of trees on any site. Potential and controlled exotic pest plants are addressed through permitting, enforcement and public outreach programs administered by the DERM and Building Division of the Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources.

On December 5, 1995, the BCC adopted a revised Landscape Ordinance (No. 95-215) as Chapter 18A of the County Code and on February 6, 1996 adopted a Landscape Manual, per Resolution R-90-96. An amendment to the Landscape Ordinance (No. 09-36), revising Chapter 18A and creating Chapter 18B, was adopted on May 5, 2009. The Landscape Ordinance applies countywide to both unincorporated areas and municipalities. All new development must meet the standards of this code. The purpose of the Landscape Manual is to illustrate the standards adopted in the Ordinance and provide recommendations for landscaping, including xeriscaping with native species to conserve water and reduce the potential for invasive exotic plants to threaten natural areas. Prohibited and controlled exotic pest plants are addressed through the permitting process by the Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources.

### Historic and Archaeological Sites

Miami-Dade County contains a significant number of historic sites, historic districts and archaeological sites and zones under both municipal and County jurisdiction. These sites, districts and zones are identified for their significance and preserved because they represent distinctive elements of the County's cultural, social, economic, political, scientific, religious and architectural history and prehistory. Properties possessing exceptional historical and
archaeological elements, which meet the criteria for designation, are selected by the County's Historic Preservation Board for their unique attributes. Once designated, County Ordinance No. 81-13 (Chapter 16A), the Historic Preservation Ordinance, requires a Certificate to Dig and Certificate of Appropriateness prior to conducting any site work. Designated properties may also be eligible for certain local, state, or federal tax incentives for restoration, renovation or rehabilitation work.

# EXISTING AND PLANNED LAND USE PATTERNS

Among the considerations used in evaluating individual applications to amend the LUP map of the CDMP, are the relationships of the requested use to the immediate surroundings in which the application site is located, and to the broader area of the County. The relative merit of the requested use is also evaluated in comparison to the currently planned use.

Each application analysis contains appendices with additional information related to each site. The appendices include a series of existing and future land use maps, aerial and zoning maps, the CDMP amendment application filed, the Miami-Dade County Public Schools analysis, and the fiscal impact of the site. Additional information may include any proposed declaration of restrictions submitted by the applicant, photos of the application site, or other information requested or supplied by the applicant, such as a traffic study.

#### Population Projections

Population projections are fundamental to the land needs analysis, both for the entire County and for the Minor Statistical Areas (MSA). The population projections used in this analysis utilizes the 2010 Decennial Census Count as a base. For the MSAs, the excess of vacant units above the levels of the past was factored into these subarea population projections. The population projections were used to project housing demand.

#### Housing Projections

The population projections were converted into housing demand projections by applying Census 2010 vacancy rates and household size figures to the projected population. The projections show a sustained demand for housing through 2030.

# **Residential Land**

The total residential capacity of the County is the sum of existing units in 2012 and an estimate of new units that can be built on vacant, residentially zoned, or CDMP designated land and redevelopment capacity. The procedure to estimate redevelopment capacity is restricted only to residential parcels (excluding single-family type parcels) and parking lots without a structure. In addition, only those parcels inside the Urban Infill Area were analyzed. In addition, a set of criteria relating to building to land value, age of structure and the ratio of allowable to existing density was used.

The available capacity is the estimate of the number of new housing units that can be built on vacant developable land and redevelopment capacity within the Urban Development Boundary (UDB). The available capacity figures are based on a data set from the Department's land use file as of February 2013. Net available residential capacity within the Urban Development Boundary was 143,050 housing units.

#### Countywide Supply and Demand

Table 2-3 below compares the projected demand and supply of land for urban residential development countywide. This is an aggregation of analyses done in the 32 Minor Statistical Areas (MSAs) across the County. Gross capacity was reduced by 3 percent to reflect the fact that even in mature urban residential areas in Miami-Dade County, approximately 3 percent of the land base typically remains undeveloped.

It is important to note that the residential development capacity of vacant land within the UDB is not fixed. It is established and re-established by the planning and zoning decisions of the County and municipal governments.

As noted above, the countywide capacity in February 2013 was 143,050 housing units. The projected demand for housing units is 7,940 units per year in the 2010 through 2015 period and 11,676 units per year in the 2025-2030 period. These figures reflect the projected net increase in units required.

In the year 2026, the remaining residential capacity of vacant land within the current Urban Development Boundary is projected to be depleted. The single-family supply is projected to be exhausted in 2020; the multi-family in 2033. The single-family capacity is substantially smaller than the multi-family, while the projected demand for single-family units is somewhat higher than that for multi-family.

	-		
Analysis Done Separately For Each Type,			
i.e. No Shifting of Demand Between Single			
& Multi-Family Type		Structure Type	
	Single-Family	Multifamily	Both Types
Capacity in 2012	41,001	102,049	143,050
Demand 2010-2015	4,013	3,927	7,940
Capacity in 2015	28,962	90,268	119,230
Demand 2015-2020	4,957	4,590	9,547
Capacity in 2020	4,177	57,318	71,495
Demand 2020-2025	5,353	4,920	10,273
Capacity in 2025	0	42,718	20,130
Demand 2025-2030	6,041	5,635	11,676
Capacity in 2030	0	14,543	0
Depletion Year	2020	2033	2026

# Table 3 Residential Land Supply/Demand Analysis, Countywide, 2012 to 2030

Note: Residential capacity is expressed in terms of housing units.

Housing demand is an annual average figure based on population projections.

Source: Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources, Research Section, March 2013.

#### Supply and Demand within Tiers of the County

Tables 4, 5, 6 and 7 present supply and demand data for four tiers and for the eastern and western portions of these areas. These four areas are called "Planning Analysis Tiers" and are the North, North-Central, South-Central, and South Tiers

In general, the undeveloped residential land supply patterns are similar to those seen in previous years. It is important to note that for the purpose of the tier-specific supply/demand

analyses, each tier is treated independently. Thus, if the supply of a housing type is exhausted in a particular tier, it is not assumed that the demand will shift to another tier in the County. It is not possible to project where housing demand might surge if the supply of land in a single tier is exhausted. That is why it would appear that the remaining capacity for the sum of the individual tiers in the year 2030 is higher than the countywide figure.

Analysis Done Separately	Subs										
for Each Type, i.e. No	E	Eastern P	art	Wes	tern M	SA 3.1	No	rth Miami-	Dade		
Shifting of Demand between	Single	Multi-	Both	Single	Multi-	Both	Single	Multi-	Both		
Single & Multi-family Type	Family	Family	Types	Family	Family	Types	Family	Family	Types		
Capacity in 2012	2,876	9,850	12,726	3,594	792	4,386	6,470	10,642	17,112		
Demand 2010-2015	329	435	764	178	135	313	507	570	1,077		
Capacity in 2015	1,889	8,545	10,434	3,060	387	3,447	4,949	8,932	13,881		
Demand 2015-2020	438	652	1,090	271	205	476	709	857	1,566		
Capacity in 2020	0	5,285	4,984	1,705	0	1,067	1,404	4,647	6,051		
Demand 2020-2025	424	607	1,031	274	207	481	698	814	1,512		
Capacity in 2025	0	2,250	0	335	0	0	0	577	0		
Demand 2025-2030	510	732	1,242	285	216	501	795	948	1,743		
Capacity in 2030	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Depletion Year	2019	2028	2024	2026	2016	2022	2022	2025	2024		

Table 4
Residential Land Supply/Demand Analysis
North Tier, 2012 to 2030

Note: Housing demand is an annual average figure based on population projections.

Source: Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources, Research Section, March 2013.

Table 4 above shows that the North Tier has sufficient capacity to accommodate projected demand through the year 2024. The single-family supply is projected to be exhausted during 2022, whereas the multi-family supply is projected to be depleted during 2025. The projected overall demand for housing is higher in the eastern half than in the western half of the North Tier; capacity is also higher. The residential capacity in the eastern half is projected to be depleted by 2024, while in the western half the projected depletion year is 2022.

Table 5 below shows that the North Central Tier has sufficient capacity to accommodate projected demand until 2028. The single-family supply is projected to be exhausted by 2016, whereas the multi-family supply will be depleted in 2033. The projected demand for housing is higher in the eastern half than in the western half of the North Central Tier. Capacity in the eastern half is also higher, and residential land supply is projected to be depleted in 2029. In the western half, the projected depletion year is 2026.

Table 6 below shows that the South Central Tier has sufficient capacity to accommodate projected demand through the year 2024. The single-family supply is projected to be exhausted by 2017, whereas the multi-family supply is projected to be depleted in 2034. The projected demand for housing, as well as capacity is higher in the eastern half than in the western half. Capacity in the western half is projected to be depleted by 2020. In the eastern half, the projected depletion year is 2026.

		North Ce	entral Tier,	2012 to 2	030								
Analysis Dona Sanarataly	_	Subs											
for Each Type i.e. No		Eastern Pa	rt	Weste	ern MSA	3.2	Nort	h Central	Total				
Shifting of Demand between	Single	Multi-	Both	Single	Multi-	Both	Single	Multi-	Both				
Single & Multifamily Type	Family	Family	Types	Family	Family	Types	Family	Family	Types				
Capacity in 2012	2,651	44,862	47,513	2,554	9,765	12,319	5,205	54,627	59,832				
Demand 2010-2015	734	1,960	2,694	314	299	613	1,048	2,259	3,307				
Capacity in 2015	449	38,982	39,431	1,612	8,868	10,480	2,061	47,850	49,911				
Demand 2015-2020	684	1,954	2,638	443	422	865	1,127	2,376	3,503				
Capacity in 2020	0	29,212	26,241	0	6,758	6,155	0	35,970	32,396				
Demand 2020-2025	730	2,146	2,876	488	465	953	1,218	2,611	3,829				
Capacity in 2025	0	18,482	11,861	0	4,433	1,390	0	22,915	13,251				
Demand 2025-2030	842	2,486	3,328	540	514	1,054	1,382	3,000	4,382				
Capacity in 2030	0	6,052	0	0	1,863	0	0	7,915	0				
Depletion Year	2015	2033	2029	2018	2034	2026	2016	2033	2028				

# Table 5 Residential Land Supply/Demand Analysis North Central Tier, 2012 to 2030

Note: Housing demand is an annual average figure based on population projections.

Source: Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources, Research Section, March 2013.

Table 6
Residential Land Supply/Demand Analysis
South Central Tier, 2012 to 2030

Analysia Dana Canarataly	Subs										
for Each Type i.e. No.	Ea	East of Turnpike			st of Turn	oike	Sout	South Central Total			
Shifting of Demand between	Single	Multi-	Both	Single	Multi-	Both	Single	Multi-	Both		
Single & Multifamily Type	Family	Family	Types	Family	Family	Types	Family	Family	Types		
Capacity in 2012	1,684	13,736	15,420	4,045	2,106	6,151	5,729	15,842	21,571		
Demand 2010-2015	459	417	876	426	115	541	885	532	1,417		
Capacity in 2015	307	12,485	12,792	2,767	1,761	4,528	3,074	14,246	17,320		
Demand 2015-2020	540	499	1,039	643	174	817	1,183	673	1,856		
Capacity in 2020	0	9,990	7,597	0	891	443	0	10,881	8,040		
Demand 2020-2025	600	553	1,153	649	175	824	1,249	728	1,977		
Capacity in 2025	0	7,225	1,832	0	16	0	0	7,241	0		
Demand 2025-2030	689	634	1,323	674	181	855	1,363	815	2,178		
Capacity in 2030	0	4,055	0	0	0	0	0	3,166	0		
Depletion Year	2015	2038	2026	2019	2025	2020	2017	2034	2024		

Note: Housing demand is an annual average figure based on population projections.

Source: Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources, Research Section, March 2013.

Table 7 below shows that the South Tier has sufficient capacity to accommodate projected housing demand to the year 2028. The capacity for single-family units is projected to be depleted in 2024, and multi-family capacity extends to 2042. Both housing demand and capacity is higher in the eastern half than in the western half.

			-							
Analysis Dona Sanaratoly					Subs					
for Each Type, i.e. No	E	ast of US	-1	١	Nest of US	S-1	Sou	South Miami Total		
Shifting of Demand between	Single	Multi-	Both	Single	Multi-	Both	Single	Multi-	Both	
Single & Multifamily Type	Family	Family	Types	Family	Family	Types	Family	Family	Types	
Capacity in 2012	16,423	14,697	31,120	7,177	6,241	13,418	21,600	20,938	44,538	
Demand 2010-2015	1,087	366	1,453	522	164	686	1,609	530	2,139	
Capacity in 2015	13,162	13,599	26,761	5,611	5,749	11,360	18773	19,348	38,121	
Demand 2015-2020	1,397	476	1,873	575	174	749	1,972	650	2,622	
Capacity in 2020	6,177	11,219	17,396	2,736	4,879	7,615	8,913	16,098	25,011	
Demand 2020-2025	1,571	536	2,107	655	193	848	2,226	729	2,955	
Capacity in 2025	0	8,539	6,861	0	3,914	3,375	0	12,453	10,236	
Demand 2025-2030	1,772	602	2,374	773	226	999	2,545	828	3,373	
Capacity in 2030	0	5,529	0	0	2,784	0	0	8,313	0	
Depletion Year	2023	2040	2028	2024	2045	2028	2024	2042	2028	

# Table 7 Residential Land Supply/Demand Analysis South Tier, 2012 to 2030

Note: Housing demand is an annual average figure based on population projections.

Source: Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources, Research Section, March 2013.

# **Commercial, Office and Industrial Land**

The Department's most recent assessment of commercial and industrial land availability is presented below. This will provide the reader with a picture of the existing land use character and development rates throughout the County for these types of uses.

The adequacy of the Plan's existing capacities to accommodate projected commercial and office development is evaluated both on a countywide basis, and for smaller areas of the County, namely the Planning Analysis Tiers and MSAs. Absorption tables are presented for Commercial and Office, and Industrial land.

### Projected Commercial and Industrial Land Supply and Demand

An inventory (2012) of the supply, and assessed the use of land for industrial and commercial development in Miami-Dade County to determine whether it can sustain projected commercial and industrial demand through the years 2020 and 2030. Following are projections of commercial and industrial absorption in Miami-Dade County.

#### Commercial Land

The first step in deriving countywide control totals was to obtain existing commercial acreage, commercial employment, and total population for the years 1994, 1998, 2000, 2001, and each year from 2003 to 2012. Secondly, a linear regression was run with commercial acres being the dependent variable and commercial employment and population as the independent variable. The regression coefficients were then applied to the independently projected population and commercial employment to arrive at projected demand for commercial land.

The next step consisted in the allocation of projected countywide demand for commercial land to each MSA. To obtain the MSA's share of the countywide demand for commercial land, the

October 2012 Cycle

EAR-Based Applications

following procedures were followed: The annual change in "in-use" commercial land was calculated for the periods 1994-1998, 1998-2000, 2000-2001, 2001-2003, 2003-2004, and for two year intervals thereafter through 2011-2012 periods was calculated. Then the average of these periods, by MSA, was computed. If the average was negative, the MSA's share was put at zero. Next, the growth in population from 2010 to 2030, based on population projections for each MSA, was used. The final step involved averaging the annual growth in commercial land and the population growth for each MSA. This was done to better take into account the historical demand for commercial land and the projected growth in population by MSA. Lastly, the countywide demand was distributed proportionately to the MSA's share of the total average growth (average of historical growth of "in-use" commercial land and projected population growth) for all MSAs. The end result is an annual absorption rate for the 2012-2030 period.

Table 8 below presents countywide projections of commercial land absorption. For purposes of this analysis, the only vacant land included in commercial supply is land that is specifically zoned for business, professional office, office park, or designated "Business and Office" on the LUP map of the CDMP. While vacant industrially zoned or designated land may be and often is used for commercial use (in particular for office development, but including retail uses such as hotels and restaurants), for purposes of this analysis none was included in the commercial land supply.

The first four columns of Table 8 summarize the result of applying the method described. Countywide, the 2,421.2 acres of vacant commercially designated land available in 2012 would be depleted in the year 2032, at the average annual absorption rate of 120.18 acres. However, the projected depletion year varies from Tier to Tier. Only in the South-Central Tier will supply be depleted before 2025. However, individual MSAs reveal more variability. In MSAs 1.1-1.3, 4.7, 5.1, 5.2, 5.4-5.6, 5.8, 6.1, and 7.6 the supply of commercial land will be depleted before 2020. It should be noted that MSA 7.6 lies almost wholly outside the UDB. At this point, it is necessary to point out that the projected year of depletion provides only one indication of the areas within the County where additional land for commercial use may be warranted. However, it cannot be concluded that land for commercial use should automatically be added in the specific MSAs where the numbers indicate depletion of supply before the year 2020. Because of the dual purposes of commercial land use category, the land allocation process and planning for future land availability are more complex than for the case of residential or industrial land use.

One important consideration related to the absorption of commercial land in the future is the land cost factor. As the supply of vacant developable land keeps decreasing and land becomes more expensive, commercial developments will tend to be built and sized more efficiently by utilizing a higher ratio of building square footage to land acreage. As a result, the average annual absorption rate for commercial uses may be lower in the future than it has been in the past.

It is worth noting that by redeveloping or adding additional uses to existing sites, the existing supply could accommodate significant growth. A second consideration is that some commercial uses are "population serving" and should be distributed throughout the community with consideration for convenience to the residential population, while some commercial uses can be categorized as "export" uses which may be better located in areas having good transportation access, and where other similar or complementary uses can agglomerate into commercial or employment centers. In this regard, "export" oriented commercial centers - like regional centers, industrial centers, and transportation facilities - can help give structure to the urban pattern and comprehensive planning should foster this.

In an effort to gauge what is an appropriate allocation of commercial land to "population serving" commercial uses, the ratio of commercial acres per 1,000 persons by MSA, Tier, and countywide was analyzed. The final two columns of Table 8 indicate commercial acres per 1,000 persons for each MSA, Tier and the countywide average. The countywide ratio for 2020 is projected to be 5.5 acres per 1,000 persons declining to 4.9 per 1,000 persons by the year 2030. This assumes that no industrial land is used for commercial purposes and no further supply is added. While 4.9 acres of commercial land per 1,000 persons is the County average, this includes commercial uses that are characterized as "export" uses such as regional centers, and other such commercial uses. If a local area registers a commercial land/population ratio below average, it does not necessarily indicate an undesirable condition. However, those MSAs or Tiers showing ratios significantly below the Tier or countywide ratio should warrant closer review to determine whether the commercial needs of the area's population would be adequately met.

Where both measures – projected commercial land depletion year and the commercial acres per 1,000 population ratio – indicate a possible future need for additional commercial land, it is probable that this need will become apparent during the projection period, unless additional land is designated on the LUP map for Commercial or Office use. Thus, both the amount of vacant land and the adequacy of the commercial land to population ratio need to be considered when determining locations where additional commercial land should or need not be added.

Another factor that must be considered is the existence of vacant industrial land. There has been a continuing pattern in which there is much crossover in the use of industrial land for commercial purposes.

In addition to the traditional depletion analysis, a new procedure was added to analyze the adequacy of small-scale applications for commercial uses. The procedure is what is commonly known as a Trade Area analysis. It consists of drawing a radius (the size of the radius depends on the project's size) around the proposed project and computing "in-use" commercial acreage, and the vacant commercially zoned land inside its radius.

		Tab	le 8			
	PROJ	ECTED ABSORPT				
	IV	IIAMI-DADE COUN	IY, FLORIDA 2012 -	- 2030		
	Vecent	Commercial Land		Droipatad	Common	ام مع
Tior and Minor	Vacani		Avg Annual	Voor of	Commerc	al Lanu
Statistical Area		2012	2012 2020	Doplation	2020	2020
Statistical Alea		2012 (Acros)	2012-2030	Depletion	2020	2030
	(Acies)	(Acres)	(Acres)		(Acie	5)
North Tior						
	1.2	54 5	0.86	2013	2.2	1 0
2.1	71.0	1 052 2	0.00	2013	6.2	5.9
2.1	71.9	1,002.2	2.01	2030+	0.2	5.0
2.2	21.0	240.0	0.91	2030+	4.7	4.4
2.3	44.3	300.3	0.75	2030+	5.9	5.7
2.4	30.0	404.0	0.73	2030+	5.9	5.7
J.I Totol	<u>340.0</u>	929.8	<u>17.18</u>	2030+	<u>5.4</u>	<u>5.1</u>
Iotal	515.0	3,049.4	23.38	2030+	5.3	5.0
North Central Tier						
1.3	97	216.5	1 89	2017	19	18
32	377.1	1 470 5	11.00	2030+	11.0	9.4
4.1	44.8	349.8	1 28	2030+	4.3	4 1
4.2	52.9	396.7	1.20	2030+	5.3	5.0
4.3	13.6	686.5	0.33	2030+	6.0	5.9
4.0	3.2	67.8	0.08	2000+	4.3	4.2
4.5	29.6	208.8	1 18	2030+		7.2
4.6	19.7	200.0	1.10	20001	5.7	5.2
4.0	34.0	200.0	5.86	2027	4.0	2.0
5.1	7.9	474.2	2.01	2010	4.0	2.3
Total	<u>7.0</u> 503.3	474.2	2.01	2010	<u>5.4</u>	<u> </u>
Total	000.0		21.22	2030+	5.0	0.0
South-Central Tier						
1.2	0.0	77.5	0.06	2012	61	6.0
5.2	0.0	226.1	0.00	2012	2.0	0.0
53		582.2	1 31	2014	2.5	2.0
5.0	6.8	564.0	1.01	20304	4.0	5.5
5.4	0.0	504.0	2.40	2019	5.0	5.5
5.5	4.4	090.7	0.29	2013	7.3	7.0
5.0	2.0	220.0	0.20	2019	7.0	0.7
5.7	0.7	200.0	1.30	2030+	10.4	10.2
0.8	15.0	50.9 522.6	1.23	2025	2.7	2.0
0.1	44.3	533.0	12.52	2016	3.0	2.8
0.2	240.5	<u>239.1</u>	<u>15.11</u> 27.52	2028	4.9	4.5
TOLAI	354.0	3,094.9	37.53	2021	4.7	4.4
South Tier						
71	92.2	304.3	3 24	2030+	54	44
7.2	53.3	209.3	6 44	20001	4 2	32
7.3	199.2	195.4	1.52	2020	9.0	7 8
74	270 8	378 5	16.60	20001	6.4	47
7.5	210.0	105.0	3 55	2020	13.2	۰. <del>۲</del> ۵ ک
7.5	043.4	195.0	0.71	2030+	13.2	9.3 0 F
Total	<u>958.9</u>	1.287.2	32.05	2012	6.8	5.3
		.,201.2	02.00	20001	0.0	0.0
Grand Total	2,421.2	12,445.8	120.18	2032	5.5	4.9
Insignificant populat	tion.					
Source: Miami-Dade	County, Regulatory	and Economic Reso	ources Department,	Planning Division,		
Research Section, Au	igust 2012.					

#### Industrial Land

Table 9 presents countywide projections of industrial land absorption. The first step in projecting Miami-Dade County's future industrial land use was to develop control totals for countywide use of industrial land in each projection year. Historical land use data for 1994, 1998, and annually thereafter through 2012 was divided by relevant employment data to obtain acre per employee ratios for each year. The average ratio was applied to industrial employment projections to obtain projected demand for industrial land.

Before drawing conclusions from Table 9, it is important to consider the assumptions and methods used in developing the information presented, the high potential for cross-over among the land uses which may occur on industrially designated land, and the spatial distribution of uses and sites in an area. A significant amount of cross-over can occur among business, office, and industrial uses, with commercial uses occurring in industrially designated land.

It is inappropriate to draw conclusions regarding the adequacy or inadequacy of supply in any individual MSA solely from the information provided in Table 9, as well as the projected supply and demand in a single MSA; it is also necessary to consider land in adjoining MSAs.

In projecting future demand for industrial land, historical consumption data available for such land countywide and in each MSA were used. On this basis, average consumption of industrial land for the years 1994, 1998, 2000, 2001, 2003 and for each year thereafter through 2011-2012 was used to project the annual absorption rate. In MSAs where definitional or data compatibility issues are encountered, appropriate adjustments have been made. The demand for industrial land conversion through 2030 was calculated reflecting the 2012 to 2030 time period.

Table 9 provides the results of the analysis of the supply and demand for industrial land. In the North Tier, MSA 1.1 has no industrial land available, but it is not considered an industrial area. The MSAs in the South-Central Tier mostly have small or no amounts of industrial land, and correspondingly low or no absorption rates. In particular, MSA 1.2, 5.2, 5.5, 5.7, 5.8 and 6.1 have essentially no vacant industrial land available, they also exhibit very low absorption rates. Thus, only MSAs 5.5 and 6.2 indicate a possible need for increasing the current supply. The large supply in MSA 6.2 can meet the overall needs in this Tier. Similarly, no MSA in the South Tier shows deficient industrial land supply. However, as mentioned in the section on commercial land, there is significant conversion of vacant industrially zoned land for other uses. If this conversion continues to increase, the depletion of industrial land will take place earlier than projected.

		Table 9		
	PROJECTED A	SORPTION OF IN	DUSTRIAL LAND	
	MIAMI- DAD	E COUNTY, FLOR	IDA 2012 - 2030	
		,		
	Vacant	Industrial Land	Ava Annual	Projected
Tier and Minor	Industrial	in Use	Absorption Rate	Year of
Statistical Area	Land 2012	2012	2012-2030	Depletion
Clausical/fied	(Acres)	(Acres)	(Acres)	Depletion
	(Acles)	(ACIES)	(Acles)	
North Tior				
	0.0	0.0	0.00	
1.1	0.0	0.0	0.00	
2.1	0.0	320.9	0.00	
2.2	10.2	149.3	0.00	
2.3	99.2	41.6	0.00	
2.4	51.4	1,538.6	12.10	2016
3.1	<u>1,382.3</u>	<u>917.7</u>	<u>12.87</u>	2030+
Total	1,543.1	2,968.1	24.97	2030+
North Central Tier				
1.3	0.4	9.2	0.08	2017
3.2	1,262.8	5,585.5	93.55	2025
4.1	3.9	161.9	0.05	2030+
4.2	15.0	756.1	2.65	2018
4.3	3.7	509.6	0.00	
4.4	0.0	4.8	0.03	2012
4.5	30.2	106.1	0.00	
4.6	19.9	309.6	2.68	2019
4.7	13.4	155.4	0.00	
5.1	4.5	48.7	0.00	
Total	1.353.8	7.646.9	99.04	2026
		,		
South-Central Tier				
12	0.0	0.0	0.00	
52	0.0	5.2	0.00	
53	17.7	62.5	0.00	
5.0	0.9	159.9	0.00	
5.5	0.0	88.0	1 33	2012
5.5	0.0	12.2	0.09	2012
5.0	0.0	13.3	0.09	2019
5.7	0.0	2.1	0.10	2012
5.6	0.0	14.9	0.00	2012
6.1	0.0	12.2	0.42	2012
	192.0	023.7	21.20	2021
Total	211.8	983.8	23.29	2021
South Her		00.4	0.00	
7.1	0.0	22.4	0.00	
7.2	37.4	262.2	3.52	2023
7.3	32.6	152.9	3.20	2022
7.4	0.0	27.1	0.00	
7.5	302.5	89.1	0.46	2030+
7.6	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	0.00	
Total	372.5	553.7	7.17	2030+
Grand Total	3,481.2	12,152.5	154.47	2035
Insignificant Dem	and			
Source: Miami-Dade	County, Regulatory	and Economic Res	ources Department,	
Planning Divis	sion, Research Secti	on, August 2012.		
		_		

### INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES

The public services addressed in this section of the report are roadways, transit, water and sewer, solid waste, fire and rescue, parks and schools. Drainage is addressed in the Environmental Conditions and Considerations section of this report. Each of the public services is evaluated for current and future conditions, taking into account the impact of filed CDMP amendment applications. The time horizons for the assessment of future conditions vary somewhat among the different services because of the variability in planning time frames used by the service agencies in their functional planning and programming of capital improvements. Each CDMP amendment application is evaluated for the possible impact on the various services as compared with the impact of the currently planned use of the site, or the adequacy of existing and future service levels in meeting the demand generated by the application.

In accordance with state requirements, the CDMP includes level of service standards for roadways, transit, parks, water facilities, sewer facilities, solid waste, and stormwater drainage. New level of service standards for schools was adopted in 2009. These standards are used proactively by service and facility agencies as objectives to be met by their facility planning and service delivery programs. The County, in its administration of the state-mandated service "concurrency" management program also uses them reactively. The concurrency program mandates that development orders not be issued unless the necessary services are in place, or will be in place and operating at or above all adopted level of service standards, around the time the development will begin occupancy. In the evaluation of the merits or drawbacks of proposed CDMP amendments to the Land Use Plan Map, each of the noted services is evaluated in terms of the adopted level of service standards using the most current information available.

Miami-Dade County's concurrency management program procedures took effect in July 1989. The affected County service agencies have developed methods for determining level of service conditions. The Planning Division of the Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources (Department) coordinates the administration and implementation of those methods. The methods used by the Department are parallel to those developed for concurrency regulatory determinations but are not identical in all cases. In some cases, concurrency review agencies are using relatively short-term time horizons for concurrency determinations because they are responding to immediate development permit requests and are interested in immediate conditions, or because a full update of a complex data base is not yet complete. Geographic sub-areas used for concurrency may not be identical to those used in this report for long-range countywide planning. Consequently, the evaluations of level of service made are not a substitute for official concurrency determinations. In keeping with the function of long-range comprehensive planning, this report endeavors to address anticipated long-range conditions.

The level of service conditions for stormwater drainage is discussed in conjunction with flood protection in the "Environmental Conditions and Considerations" section of this report. The level of service conditions pertaining to each of the other services, and the methods that were used in developing the analysis for each Application, are described below.

A final note on services is that the CDMP is a body of broad policies adopted as a legislative, not regulatory, act of the Board of County Commissioners. The array of Plan elements and policies reflect consideration of a host of social and physical responsibilities of County government, including housing, economic growth, environmental resource management, as well as service delivery policies and their fiscal implications. Accordingly, broad service implications may be considered when evaluating proposals to amend the CDMP, in addition to whether or not a proposed Land Use Plan map amendment would meet level of service standards.

October 2012 Cycle

EAR-Based Applications

### Roadways

Estimates of traffic conditions for each application site are developed using standard professional transportation analysis methods. For each application site, an analysis is performed to determine:

- 1. Current traffic conditions in roadways adjacent to the application site or within a study area (i.e. existing number of lanes and operating level of service);
- 2. Projected roadway concurrency conditions (i.e. level of service considering reserved trips from approved developments not yet constructed and programmed roadway capacity improvements) with and without the impacts from the CDMP amendment applications; and
- 3. Estimated impacts generated by each CDMP amendment application, if approved, in terms of the number of potential peak-period trips projected for both the current CDMP land use designation (and/or existing use) and the proposed CDMP land use designation, and the difference.

Key sources of information used in conducting these analyses include the Transportation Element of the Adopted Components of the Comprehensive Development Master Plan (October 2006 Edition, as amended through October 19, 2011); the Miami-Dade County Transportation Improvement Program, 2013 (May 17, 2012); the Miami-Dade Long Range Transportation Plan to the Year 2035, Cost Feasible Plan (October 2009); the most recent available traffic count data published monthly by the Miami-Dade County Public Works and Waste Management (PWWM) Department; The Generalized Peak Hour Two-way Volumes Tables for Florida's Urbanized Areas published by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT); and the most recent traffic counts data for state roadways published by FDOT.

#### Level of Service

The level of service concept is applied nationwide as a qualitative assessment of the road user's perception of the quality of traffic flow and, therefore, the degree of traffic congestion. The level of service is represented by one of the letters "A" through "F," with "A" generally representing the most favorable driving conditions and "F" representing the least favorable. The level of service reflects the quality of flow as measured by a scale of driver satisfaction. The definitions and measures of level of service reflect a national consensus of driver quality of flow. Measures of effectiveness such as vehicle delay, average travel speed and volume to capacity ratio have been developed to quantitatively approximate these qualitative representations. The measures used by Miami-Dade County are described below.

The roadway level of service standard adopted by the County requires that level of service conditions be measured during the "peak-period." Peak period is defined in the Traffic Circulation Subelement of the Transportation Element of the CDMP as the average of the two highest consecutive hours of traffic volume during a weekday (footnote on pg. II-11 of the CDMP). Current peak-period level of service conditions for county roadways are measured using FDOT's level of service software (LOSPLAN), which is designed to replicate the procedures of the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual Update prepared by the Federal Highway Administration; the updated 2012 Generalized Peak Hour Two-way Volumes for Florida's Urbanized Areas, Table 4-4 of the 2009 Quality/Level of Service Handbook; and the most recent traffic count data for state roadways published by FDOT. Many different roadway and traffic characteristics are taken into consideration when using the LOSPLAN software in order to produce roadway segment specific measures of level of service. A summary of the adopted

level of service standard for roadways in Miami-Dade County (CDMP Traffic Circulation Subelement, Policy TC-1B) is shown in Table 10 below.

	Non-FIHS Roadways								
	Transit Availability								
Location	No Tran	sit Serv	rice	20 Min. Headway Transit Service Within 1/2 Mile		Extraordinary Transit Service (Commuter Rail or Express Bus)			
Outside UDB	LOS D-S LOS C-C	OS D-State Minor Arterials							
Between UIA and UDB	LC (90% of LOS E ( (100%	DS D Capaci or on SUM Capacit	ity) As ty)	LOS E (100% Capacity)	% of	of 120% of Capacity			
Inside UIA	LC (100% o	DS E f Capac	120% of Capacit		acity	150% of Capacity			
	FIHS Roadways								
				Lo	catio	n			
FIHS Facility	Outside UDB	Inside UDB	Tra	Roadways Parallel to Exclusive ansit Facilities	Insic Mai	de Transportation Concurrency nagement Areas	Constrained or Backlogged Roadways		
Limited Access Facilities	В	D [E]		D [E]		D [E]	Manage		
Controlled Access Facilities (two lanes)	С	D	E		E E		Manage		
Controlled Access Facilities (four or more lanes)	В	D		E		E	Manage		
	NOTE: Lo through lar	OS insidenes exist.	e of	[brackets] applies	s to g	general use lanes or	nly when exclusive		

# Table 10 Traffic Circulation Peak-Period LOS Standard

Source: Miami-Dade County Comprehensive Development Master Plan, October 2006 Edition As amended through October 19, 2011.

Notes: Constrained FIHS facilities are roadways that FDOT has determined will not be expanded by the addition of two or more through lanes because of physical, environmental or policy constraints.

Backlogged FIHS facilities are roadways operating below the minimum LOS standards, not constrained and not programmed for additional lanes in the first three years of FDOT's adopted work program or five year Capital Improvements Element.

FIHS: Florida Intrastate Highway System

UIA: Urban Infill Area –Area east of, and including NW/SW 77 Avenue and SR 826 (Palmetto Expressway), excluding the City of Islandia, and excluding the area north of SR 826 and west of I-95. UDB: Urban Development Boundary

SUMA: State Urban Minor Arterial

\*Peak-period means the average of the two highest consecutive hours of traffic volume during a weekday.

Projected levels of service for the year 2035 or the estimated buildout year were determined using the Southeast Florida Regional Planning Model (SERPM), a transportation planning computer model, and are expressed as a volume-to-capacity ratio (v/c ratio), which is the ratio of the number of vehicles using the road to the road capacity. The 2035 v/c ratio model output is expressed using daily volumes. Roadways for the 2035, or buildout year, highway network are rated as follows:

V/C Ratio	Level of Service
0.70 or less	LOS B or better
0.71 to 0.80	LOS C
0.81 to 0.90	LOS D
0.91 to 1.0	LOS E
1.0 or greater	LOS F

### Analysis Method and Assumptions

The Miami-Dade County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) adopted the Miami-Dade County Year 2035 Transportation Plan, Cost Feasible Plan, in October 2009. The 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) was developed to guide federal, state, and local transportation expenditures through the 25-year period. Improvements and extensions to the transportation system throughout the County are governed by this Plan. Significant transit improvement projects listed in the 2035 Cost Feasible Plan include: enhanced bus service for the North (NW 27 Avenue), Kendall (SW 88 Street), Northeast (Biscayne Boulevard) corridors, etc. One heavy rail extension was recently completed in July 2012, the AirportLink Connection from Earlington Heights Metrorail Station to the Miami Intermodal Center (MIC). Non-motorized facilities (on-road bicycle lanes, off-road greenways and trails, and sidewalks) are also included in the Cost Feasible Plan.

It is important to note that the SERPM, which is used the project the year 2035 or buildout year traffic impacts of the CDMP Land Use Plan map amendment applications, is the best available tool for conducting these long-term traffic impact assessments. However, the model was designed for large-area analyses; it uses traffic analysis zones (TAZ) as the smallest geographic unit; and it uses a schematic roadway network. Therefore, because of its schematic characteristics, it will not yield the same results as it would a site or area-specific traffic model or impact analysis when evaluating specific development proposals.

The analysis also includes the estimated total PM peak-hour trip generation impacts of each CDMP amendment application. The land use designation requested for each application site is the basis for estimating the number of PM peak-hour trips that would be generated by the application. This trip generation is then compared to the number of PM peak-hour trips generated or projected to be generated for an existing use and/or a potential use consistent with the current CDMP land use designation of the subject property. The potential development used is based on the most recent use of the property, or if it is vacant, the most intense use allowed under the existing or requested land use designation, or the most likely use given the current development trend in the area. Trips generated by the proposed amendment applications are estimated using trip generation rates or equations published in the Institute of Transportation Engineers' Trip Generation, 8<sup>th</sup> Edition (2008).

A near-term trip distribution and short-term (concurrency) traffic impact analysis is also performed for each application with the assistance of the Public Works Division of the Public Works and Waste Management Department. The analysis reveals any potential impacts the

applications may have on short-term traffic conditions in the vicinity of the application sites, accounting for current traffic conditions, programmed roadway capacity improvements, and the calculated impacts of other approved developments not yet built in the vicinity of the application site for which development orders have been issued. In some instances, an anticipated short-term concurrency problem, which may be solved by Long Range Transportation Plan improvements, would be reported as well as satisfactory short-term conditions projected to deteriorate without the impact of the requested CDMP amendment.

# Transit Service

Transit service analyses are conducted for each CDMP Application with assistance from Miami-Dade Transit (MDT). The current transit service characteristics of each route that travels along the vicinity of each application site are described. Transit service is measured in terms of service headways and distance from the application site. Projected transit service improvements for the year 2014 are based on:

- 1. Characteristics of each CDMP amendment application;
- 2. Miami-Dade Transit's Service Standards for transit vehicle loading;
- 3. Planned improvements included in MDT's 2012 Ten-Year Transit Development Program (TDP); and
- 4. Adopted CDMP level of service standard for transit (CDMP Mass Transit Subelement, Policy MT-1A).

The adopted CDMP level of service standard for transit states that the minimum peak-hour mass transit level of service for areas within the Urban Development Boundary, which have a combined resident and work force population of more than 10,000 persons per square mile shall be provided with public transit service having 30-minute headways and an average route spacing of one mile provided that:

- 1. The average combined population and employment density along the corridor between the existing transit network and the area of expansion exceeds 4,000 per square mile, and the corridor is 0.5 miles on either side of any necessary new routes or route extensions to the area of expansion;
- 2. It is estimated that there is sufficient demand to warrant the service;
- 3. The service is economically feasible; and
- 4. The expansion of transit service into new areas is not provided at the detriment of existing or planned services in higher density areas with greater need.

Relevant transit related characteristics of CDMP Land Use Plan map amendment applications are reported, such as proximity of each Application site to existing or anticipated routes, and connections of said routes with Metrorail. Regarding the CDMP-adopted level of service standard and criteria outlined above, if the future impact of each application is found to result in a combined population and employment of less than 10,000 persons per square mile, or the area already has transit service with minimum headways of 30 minutes and is projected to continue to have such service, no new transit service would be required to meet the transit level of service standard.

MDT annually updates its Ten-Year TDP. This document analyzes existing transit network conditions and identifies short-term future transit needs. The currently adopted 2012 TDP addresses the 2013-2022 time frame. A Recommended Service Plan (RSP) for 2022 has been

developed to provide a guideline for replacement, expansion and improvement of the County's transit system. The 2022 RSP improvements are prioritized and assigned cost estimates for implementation.

Each Application is reviewed for planned transit improvements identified for implementation in the TDP based on projected needs. Descriptions of such improvements, as relevant to each Application, are provided along with cost estimates for implementation.

### Water and Sewer

Either a municipal utility or the Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department (WASD) provide water and sewer services throughout Miami-Dade County. Under long-standing County policy, water and sewer service is provided to developed areas within the Adopted 2015 Urban Development Boundary (UDB) and is discouraged outside the UDB. WASD operates regional water supply and wastewater disposal systems, which serve both incorporated and unincorporated areas. WASD's water treatment plants produce 87 percent of the County's public potable water supply. The regional wastewater plants treat and dispose of over 98 percent of the wastewater treated by public utilities in the County. Programmed improvements to the WASD systems are ongoing in accordance with the Miami-Dade County Water Facilities Master Plan (2010), Wastewater Facilities Master Plan (2007), sanitary sewer Settlement Agreement with the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP), a First Partial Consent Decree and a Second Partial Final Consent Decree with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), a Consent Order with the FDEP, the 2006 Water Use Efficiency 5 Year Plan, subsequently extended to 20 years, and the 2008 County Water Supply Facilities Work Plan. Evaluation of sewer system capacity is based on criteria established in the First Partial Consent Decree and capacity of the plants for average flow will be required, depending on the compliance status of the EPA Second and Partial Final Consent Decree.

In addition to WASD's regional system, sixteen municipalities are franchised to operate water distribution systems, and twelve municipalities are franchised to operate sewage collection systems, within specified service areas. Within a franchised service area, the designated utility has the responsibility of providing service that meets the adopted level of service within the time frame of the CDMP.

The cities of North Miami, North Miami Beach, Homestead, and Florida City own and operate water treatment facilities to provide water service within their respective service areas. On December 27, 2007, the City of Hialeah and WASD entered into a Joint Participation Agreement to build, own and operate the Hialeah Reverse Osmosis (RO) Plant with a total capacity of 17.5 gallons per day (mgd) by 2026. The Plant will provide water for WASD's service area and a portion of Hialeah's Service Area. Also, the City of North Miami purchases water from WASD to provide water service to a portion of their service area. On April 20, 2010, the BCC approved a 20-year contract for WASD to provide 3 mgd of water on a wholesale basis to the City of Homestead to meet the demands of its retail water customers.

The City of Homestead owns and operates a sanitary sewer treatment facility to provide sewer services within their service area, and they are a volume sewer customer with WASD on an emergency basis. On June 19, 2012, WASD and the City entered into a 20-year wholesale agreement to treat all future flows in excess of the City's permitted Wastewater Treatment Plant capacity.

#### Water Resource Management

Allocation of water resources among environmental, agricultural, and urban interests is a serious issue in South Florida. New use of the Biscayne Aquifer as a water supply source is generally no longer allowed under new rules by the SFWMD, unless off-setting water is returned to the aquifer in an appropriate place and quantity as determined by the SFWMD. These rules were established as a major step towards the restoration of South Florida's natural environment including the Everglades and the Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands.

In 2006, Miami-Dade County adopted the *Water Use Efficiency 5-Year Plan*, and initiated several programs aimed at water conservation and at evaluating alternative water resource technologies. WASD has implemented a water conservation program aimed at reducing water demand by over 19 million mgd in the next 20 years. This plan includes public education, the use of new water-conserving devices in all new developments, restrictions on landscape irrigation, and an inclined block rate structure. Additionally, WASD has established an aggressive program to reduce water loss within its own systems, which may save as much as 14.25 mgd by 2030.

On November 15, 2007, the County obtained a 20-year Water Use Permit (WUP) which included a series of alternative water supply and wastewater reuse projects designed to offset the water needs of anticipated growth in the WASD service area through 2030. As water demands continue to decline as a result of the successful implementation of the County's Water Conservation Program, water restrictions, and economic conditions, the WUP was revised to reasses the projects accordingly. On July 16, 2012, a second revision to the WUP was issued that included 34.95 mgd of water supply from the Floridan Aquifer, and a total of 265.51 mgd of reuse projects.

# Potable Water Level of Service

The County's Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP) adopted level of service standards for potable water facilities (CDMP Policy SW-2A(1)) requires that all federal, state, and county primary water quality standards for potable water be met; that countywide storage capacity for finished water shall be no less than 15 percent of the countywide average daily demand; that the regional system shall operate with a rated maximum daily capacity no less than two percent above the maximum daily flow for the preceding year and an average daily capacity 2 percent above the average daily system demand for the preceding 5 years. In addition, the level of service standard mandates that water be delivered to users at a pressure no less than 20 pounds per square inch (psi) and no greater than 100 psi. Unless otherwise approved by the Miami-Dade Fire Department, minimum fire flows must be maintained for specified land uses as shown in Table 2-12 below. All public water systems are currently meeting the adopted level of service standards for potable water.

Water Treatment Plant (WTP)	Maximum Permitted Raw Water Withdrawal (mgd)	Permitted Treatment Capacity (mgd)	Average Plant Production (Finished) (mgd) (1)	Max. Day Plant Production (Finished) (mgd) (1)	Max. Day Treatment Capacity Available (Finished) (mgd)	Max. Day Treatment Capacity Percentage Available Finished (2)
COUNTY (WASD)						
REGIONAL SYSTEM TOTAL (3)						
	341.70	439.74	300.8	341.4	98.34	22.36%
Hialeah/Preston*	155.40	225.00	139	163.8	61.2	27.20%
Alexander Orr*	186.30 7.8	214.74 14.19	161.9 7.30	177.6 8.74	37.14 5.49	17.30% 38.69%
SO. DADE SYSTEM TOTAL*		6 48	2 51			
Newton		2.01	2.03			
Narania		1.38	0.06			
Elevated Tank		1.44	1.68			
Everglades LC		2.88	1.01			
WASD TOTAL*	349.50	453.93	308.09	350.1	103.83	22.87%
Future Hialeah RO(**)(***)						
Phase I	13.30	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a n/a
Future So. Miami Heights****						n/a
Reverse Osmosis**	23.27	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Biscayne Aquifer*	3.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
MUNICIPAL						
Florida City	3.60	3.00	4.37	4.59 <del>6</del>	-1.37	-45.67%
Homestead	15.20	14.11	12.81	12.85	1.26	8.9 %
North Miami TOTAL	9.30	18.10	13.25			
Winson Plant		9.00	9.24	9.28	-0.28	-3.1%
WASD Delivery (4)		9.10	4.01			
North Miami Beach TOTAL	17.70	54.3	22.98			
Norwood-Oeffler		32	22.90	26.46	5.54	17.3%
WASD Delivery (4)		22.30	0.08			
MUNICIPAL TOTAL (5)	45.80	89.5	49.32	53.18		

# Table 2-11 Capacity of Miami-Dade County And Municipal Water Treatment Plants, 2011

Source: Water Treatment Plant's Finished Water Flows as reported to Florida Department of Health, May 2012.

(1) Production based on raw water for a 12-month period, ending May, 2012.

(2) Percent Capacity Available is calculated as Treatment Capacity Available/Permitted Treatment Capacity.

(3) Maximum day flow determined by calculating the average highest day flow from the 5 highest day flows for the preceding 12 months.

(4) Treated potable water is purchased wholesale from WASD and combined with water produced by the municipal plants.

(5) Includes treatment plants and interconnections

\*Maximum permitted withdrawal capacity from the Biscayne Aquifer through 2021.

\*\*Maximum permitted withdrawal capacity from the Floridan Aquifer through 2021 based on Water Use Permit issued on July 16, 2012.

\*\*\*Hialeah RO WTP, Phase 1 to be online by end of 2012.

\*\*\*\*South Miami Heights WTP to be online by end of 2015.

On January 11, 2011, in an effort to better manage water supplies to ensure that the level of service is maintained, WASD implemented a Water Supply Certification (WSC) Program to track the water demands from platted and permitted development. The WSC Program was implemented to assure adequate water supply is available to all water users of the Miami-Dade WASD as required by Policies CIE-5D and WS-2C of the CDMP, and in accordance with the permitted withdrawal capacity in the County's 20-year Water Use Permit. This system corresponds to the allocation system currently being used by DERM for wastewater treatment facilities, and requires all development proposals to obtain a water supply certification letter from WASD stating that adequate water supply capacity is available for the proposed project. Through July 31, 2012, a total of 13.68 mgd of water supply was allocated for future development within WASD's service area including wholesale customers. A total water supply capacity of 51.80 mgd is available for allocation through 2021.

Water Distribution Level of Service Standard For Minimum Fire Flows							
Land Use	Fire Flow Delivered at 20 PSI (gallops per minute)						
Business and Industry	3,000						
Hospitals, Schools	2,000						
Multi-family Residential; Semiprofessional Offices	1,500						
Single Family and Duplex; Residential on minimum lots of 7,500 square feet	750						
Single Family Residential; Estate Density	500						

Table 2-12

Source: Water, Sewer, and Solid Waste Element of the CDMP (2006 Edition)

#### Potable Water Status

WASD's regional network of water mains currently runs from the Miami-Dade/Broward County line on the north to approximately SW 272 Street on the south. The Hialeah-Preston Water Treatment Plant serves the area north of Flagler Street and the Alexander Orr Water Treatment Plant serves the area south of Flagler Street. The network connects the regional plants to all of the municipal water treatment plants between these boundaries. The unincorporated area south of SW 272 Street is served by the South Miami-Dade Water System, which consists of several small plants formerly operated by Rex Utilities.

At the current time, all water treatment plants are operating within the adopted level of service standard. WASD completed an upgrade to the Everglades Labor Camp Water Treatment Plant and distribution system to provide additional flow capacity to the South Dade service area. The permitted capacity for the Everglades Labor Camp Water Treatment Plant was increased from 0.96 mgd to 2.88 mgd. Additionally, On December 27, 2007, the City of Hialeah and WASD entered into a Joint Participation Agreement to build, own and operate the Hialeah Reverse Osmosis (RO) Plant with a total capacity of 17.5 mgd by 2026. The Plant will provide water for WASD's service area and a portion of Hialeah's service area. The new South Miami Heights Water Treatment Plant is programmed to serve this service area. The new water treatment plant is anticipated to come online at the end of 2015.

### Wastewater

WASD operates three regional wastewater treatment plants (WWTP); the North, Central and South Districts. Because the system is interconnected, the service districts, shown in Figure 5 below, have flexible boundaries, and some flows from one district can be diverted to other plants in the system. During 2011-2012, the total WASD regional system capacity is 375.59 mgd, and the annual average daily flow treated at the three plants totaled 301.55 mgd (twelve month period ending May 2012), or 80 percent of the design capacity of the regional system (see Table 2-13 below). There has been a significant reduction in average flow into the regional system as the result of extensive infiltration and inflow prevention work.

As the result of enforcement actions brought against Miami-Dade County by the State of Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Miami-Dade County agreed to construct more than \$1.169 billion worth of improvements to its wastewater treatment plants, transmission mains and sewage lines. Major improvements included construction of a new Biscayne Bay sewer line, a force main interceptor at Flagler Street, a South Miami-Dade transmission main and new mains in North Miami-Dade. Construction of the Biscayne Bay sewer line was completed in August 1994.

On July 1, 2008, the Florida Legislature passed Senate Bill 1302, which requires Miami-Dade County to:

- Submit an implementation plan to FDEP by July 1, 2013;
- Implement advanced wastewater treatment for the North and Central Districts' wastewater discharges, or equivalent nutrient load reduction by December 31, 2018; and
- Implement 60% reuse, and stop discharging out the outfall, except as "backup discharge" to the functioning reuse system, by December 31, 2025.

WASD is currently planning how to address and implement these requirements to ensure timely compliance.

	County and Municipal Wastewater Treatment Plant Capacity									
Waste Water Treatment Plant	Average Flow Design Capacity (mgd)	12 Month Average* (mgd)	Flow as Percent of Design Capacity	Long-Term Programmed Capacity** (mgd)	Effluent Disposal					
WASD										
Central District WWTP	143.00	110.92	77.57	143.00	Ocean Outfall					
North District WWTP	120.09	86.01	71.61	120.00	Ocean Outfall & Deep Well Injection					
South District WWTP	112.50	104.67	93.04	112.5	Deep Well Injection					
Future West District WWTP				50.00						
Regional System Total	375.59	301.55	80.30	425.50						
Municipal Plants										
Homestead	6.00	6.13	102.17%	6.00	Ponds & Trenches					
Source: Miami-I	Source: Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department, 2012									

Table 2-13

October 2012 Cycle

\* Twelve month period ending May 2012

\*\* Based on 2007 wastewater Facilities Master Plan to be revised by the Ocean Outfall Implementation Plan.

### Wastewater Facility Level of Service

The County's adopted level of service standard for wastewater treatment and disposal requires that the regional wastewater treatment and disposal system maintain the capacity to collect and dispose of 102 percent of average daily sewage demand for the preceding five years and at a physical capacity of no less than the annual average daily sewer flow (CDMP Policy WS-2A(2)). The wastewater effluent must also meet all applicable federal, state, and county standards and all treatment plants must maintain the capacity to treat peak flows without overflow.

### Wastewater Facility Status

Currently, all of WASD's wastewater treatment plants have capacity to treat and dispose of wastewater flow demands. However, some of the collection/transmission facilities in the County do not have adequate capacity, as defined in the EPA's First and Second Partial Consent Decrees. Consequently, approval of each development order which will generate additional wastewater flow is evaluated for available capacity by the Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources Division of Environmental Resources Management (DERM). Approvals are only granted if the application for any proposed development order is certified by DERM to comply with the provisions of the EPA's Consent Decrees. Furthermore, in basins which have been determined not to have adequate capacity, no new sewer service connections can be permitted until adequate capacity becomes available. Consequently, in these areas, final development orders may not be granted unless adequate capacity in the sanitary sewer collection/transmission and treatment systems is available at the point in time when the project will be contributing sewage to the system, or if approval for alternative means of sewage disposal can be obtained. Use of an alternative means of sewage disposal shall be an interim measure, with connection to the public sanitary sewer system required upon availability of adequate collection/transmission and treatment capacity.

As of August 2, 2012, a total 105 pumping station basins have been identified as requiring remedial action in order to achieve compliance with the Consent Decrees between the County and the EPA. An additional 14 stations cannot receive additional flow due to lack of capacity at downstream pump stations. Depending on the station, this remedial action may include work on the pump station, the collection basin for the station, or the force main the station is pumping into. The remedial actions to return all of the basins to compliance are scheduled to be completed by December 31, 2019.

Miami-Dade County is now in negotiations with the EPA, the U.S. Department of Justice and the FDEP to enter into a new Consent Decree, which will supersede the existing Consent Decrees. This action is expected to include some minor changes to the definition of adequate capacity for parts of the collection/transmission system, which may impact which basins are found to have adequate capacity for additional flow. Further specific information on these changes is expected to become available in 2013.

#### Evaluation of Application Impacts on Water and Sewer

Although specific requirements under Chapter 24 of the Code of Miami-Dade County vary with land use, most new development in Miami-Dade County is required by Chapter 24 and CDMP policy to connect to the public water or sewer systems, or to both. The timing of new development is heavily dependent on the availability of service connections. Where water and sewer lines do not exist and are not programmed, the necessary service connections may be provided by the developer. When construction is completed, the facilities are donated to the utility.



October 2012 Cycle

**EAR-Based** Applications

The proximity of an application site to existing or programmed water and sewer lines is an important asset or constraint, which can influence the feasibility of a site's development. For this reason, the location of the nearest adequate water and sewer main connections is identified for each Application. Additionally, the adequacy of available water and sewer system capacity has been evaluated by the Department and WASD for each Application.

In evaluating proposals to amend the Land Use Plan map, expected changes in water demand and wastewater generation that would result from the different land uses are estimated. This can be done only in a general way because each of the CDMP Land Use Plan map categories allows a variety of land uses to be approved. For example, the "Industrial and Office" land use category allows warehousing, which creates little demand for water; and also allows office buildings, restaurants and manufactures, which could create a large demand for water. For purposes of estimating water demand or sewage generation, typical land uses for each land use classification are assumed.

### Solid Waste Management

The Miami-Dade County Public Works and Waste Management Department (PWWM) Solid Waste Functions oversees the proper collection and disposal of solid waste generated in the County through direct operations, contractual arrangements, and regulations. In addition, the PWWM directs the countywide effort to comply with state regulations concerning recycling, household chemical waste management and the closure and maintenance of solid waste sites no longer in use.

#### Collection Services

The PWWM provides collection services to residential units within the Waste Collection Service Area (WCSA), which consists of all residents of the Unincorporated Municipal Service Area (UMSA) and residents of eight municipalities. The PWWM provides waste collection services to the municipalities of Aventura, Cutler Bay, Doral, Miami Gardens, Miami Lakes, Palmetto Bay, Pinecrest and Sunny Isles Beach.

The PWWM also operates 13 Neighborhood Trash and Recycling Centers (TRC) for residents of the WCSA to drop-off yard trash, bulky items, waste tires, end-of-life electronics, used oil, and white goods and two Home Chemical Collection Centers. Permitted landscapers can drop-off clean yard trash at the TRCs for a fee.

The PWWM offers collection services to residential units, while permitted haulers are hired by most commercial and multi-family establishments throughout the County. Private haulers purchase permits and vehicle decals to be allowed to haul solid waste on County roads. Municipalities outside of the WCSA either have their own solid waste collection departments or contract with permitted private haulers for residential waste collection service.

#### Disposal System

The County maintains three major disposal sites including the Resources Recovery Facility located at 6990 NW 97 Avenue, the South Dade Landfill located at 24000 SW 97 Avenue and the North Dade Landfill located at 21500 NW 47 Avenue. The County also contracts for landfill space with Waste Management Inc. of Florida for disposal of a portion of the County's waste. One of the two contracted landfills is located in the Town of Medley and the other in the City of Pompano Beach, in Broward County. The County also maintains three regional transfer stations including the Northeast Transfer Station located at 18701 NE 6 Avenue, the Central Transfer Station located at 1150 NW 20 Street and the West Transfer Station located at 2900 SW 72 October 2012 Cycle B-36 EAR-Based Applications

Avenue. Solid waste is received at the three disposal facilities and three transfer stations from County collection operations, municipal collection operations, and permitted private haulers. The waste received at the transfer stations is loaded into transfer trailers and transported to the County's major disposal sites or contracted disposal sites. The primary uses of the transfer stations are to reduce hauling time and distance between collection sites and disposal sites and to enable the PWWM to manage its waste deliveries to fulfill contract obligations at the Resources Recovery Facility (RRF) and the contracted disposal site in the Town of Medley. In FY 2011-12, PWWM disposal operations are projected to receive 1.5 million tons of solid waste. The RRF has the capability to process 1.306 million tons of waste each year. The RRF accepts and processes two distinct municipal solid waste fractions (garbage and trash) in two separate processing areas. During garbage processing, metals (ferrous and non-ferrous) are removed for recycling and the remaining garbage is shredded to produce refuse derived fuel (RDF). Garbage processing also produces a grit-like process residue referred to as "unders." This material is disposed of at the South Dade Landfill, where it can be used as a daily cover for unprocessed waste. During trash processing, metals are removed for recycling and the remaining trash is shredded to produce biomass fuel, a portion of which is used to supplement the RDF used to generate electricity on-site. The bulk of the biomass fuel is sold to cogeneration facilities in Central Florida. Trash processing also produces process residues in the form of "fines" and "recyclable trash rejects." Fines can be used as daily cover for unprocessed waste at both the North Dade and South Dade Landfills. Recyclable Trash Rejects are landfilled. The total amount of waste material recycled annually at the RRF is approximately 128,000 tons, including metals, biomass fuel, and fines.

The RDF and biomass fuel generated by garbage and trash processing are combusted in a furnace to generate steam from four boilers that power two turbines, which generate approximately 72 megawatts of electricity for on-site consumption and export. The ash product that results from the combustion process is approximately 10 percent by volume of the original waste material and is placed in the ash monofill adjacent to the RRF. Based on data reported to the PWWM for FY 2011-12, the ash monofill was estimated to have a remaining capacity of approximately 87,000 tons. This capacity estimate does not include the development of the final permitted Cell 20, which once constructed, will permit the RRF to receive waste at a disposal rate of 166,000 tons per year until 2020, at a reported compaction ratio of 1.25 tons per cubic yard. The RRF also has a sophisticated air quality control system to remove acid gases and particulate matter from the flue gas prior to emission to the atmosphere.

The South Dade Landfill is a 300-acre site located in the south end of the County and is the only Class I waste disposal facility in the PWWM System. The South Dade Landfill is permitted to receive municipal solid waste, construction and demolition debris, contaminated soil, pathological waste, sterile medical waste, asbestos, off road tires, and dewatered wastewater sludge. Based on data reported to the PWWM for FY 2011-12, the South Dade Landfill was estimated to have a remaining capacity of 6.31 million tons, which equates to twelve years of capacity considering a disposal rate of approximately 486,000 tons per year and a reported compaction ratio of 0.55 tons per cubic yard.

The North Dade Landfill is a 269-acre site located in the north end of the County and is permitted to receive Class III waste, which is defined by the FDEP as "yard trash, construction and demolition debris, processed tires, carpet, cardboard, paper, glass, plastic, furniture and other appliances, or other materials approved by the PWWM that are not expected to produce leachate that poses a threat to public health or environment." Based on data reported to the PWWM for FY 2011-12, the North Dade Landfill was estimated to have a remaining capacity of 1.72 million tons, which equates to approximately ten years of capacity considering a disposal October 2012 Cycle B-37 EAR-Based Applications

rate of 161,000 tons per year and a reported compaction ratio of 0.5 tons per cubic yard. There are no additional permitted landfill cells available at this facility.

In addition to the County's three waste disposal facilities, the County maintains a disposal service contract with Waste Management, Inc. of Florida (up to 500,000 tons per year for 20 years, ending September 30, 2015, with two five-year options to renew). This arrangement allows for flexibility in the amount delivered, permitting the County to maintain adequate capacity and meet concurrency requirements, subject to a minimum annual waste delivery guarantee of 100,000 tons.

#### Recycling

Curbside recycling for single-family residences in unincorporated Miami-Dade County transitioned from a dual-stream (two-bin) program implemented in FY 1990-91 to a single-stream program that became fully operational in FY 2008-09. The PWWM delivered 65-gallon wheeled carts to more than 345,000 homes. Single-stream allows residents to place all of their recyclable materials into one cart including magazines, catalogs, junk mail, office paper and paperboard such as cereal type boxes newspapers, aseptic containers, aluminum and steel cans, narrow neck plastic bottles regardless of the resin identification code (the number on the bottom of the container) and clear, brown and green glass bottles and jars.

The program uses two contractors to collect recyclable materials. World Waste Recycling Services of Florida Inc. is the collector in the north and central areas of the County. Waste Services of Florida Inc. is the collector in the southern portion of the County (south of Kendall Drive). Waste Management Inc. of Florida has the contract to process the materials. The County receives revenue based on a per ton fee negotiated at the start of the contract, which increases annually with the Consumer Price Index.

The PWWM provides recycling services to the WCSA, which includes the municipalities of Aventura, Cutler Bay, Doral, Miami Gardens, Miami Lakes, Palmetto Bay, Pinecrest and Sunny Isles Beach. Twelve other municipalities participate in the single-stream curbside recycling program with the County through interlocal agreements. These municipalities are: El Portal, Florida City, Medley, Miami Beach, Miami Springs, North Bay Village, Opa-locka, South Miami, Surfside, Virginia Gardens, West Miami, and North Miami Beach. The remaining municipalities in Miami-Dade County offer recycling services to their residents either by curbside municipal service or through contracts with permitted private haulers.

Commercial and multi-family establishments are required by Chapter 15 of the County Code to provide for a recycling program. The PWWM is proactively enforcing these laws primarily through educational and outreach efforts.

#### Level of Service Standard

The adopted level of service standard for the County Public Works and Waste Management System is as follows: to maintain sufficient waste disposal capacity to accommodate waste flows committed to the system through long term contracts or interlocal agreements with municipalities and private waste haulers, and anticipated uncommitted waste flows, for a period of five years (CDMP Policy SW-2A). As of FY 2011-12, the PWWM is in compliance with this standard, meaning that there is adequate disposal capacity to meet projected growth in demand.



#### Fire Rescue

The Miami-Dade Fire Rescue Department (MDFR) provides 24-hour emergency response service to over 1.9 million residents, businesses and visitors within a 1,905 square mile territory through 119 rescue, suppression, and specialty units strategically located in 65 fire rescue stations within Unincorporated Miami-Dade County and 30 municipalities.

MDFR provides emergency response and transport services, which encompass fire suppression, Advanced Life Support (ALS) and Basic Life Support (BLS) emergency medical services, hazardous materials mitigation, disaster management, and other specialty services. MDFR also provides aero-medical transport services within Miami-Dade County to state approved trauma centers and other medical facilities.

During Fiscal Year 2010-11, MDFR responded to 237,062 emergencies, more than 80 percent of which were medical in nature. MDFR's air rescue helicopters flew almost 1,500 missions during the same Fiscal Year, increasing the survivability of patients in critical emergencies. Since Fiscal Year 1999-2000, MDFR has opened seventeen (17) new stations, rebuilt/relocated seven (7) stations, converted one peak-time rescue unit to full-time suppression, and upgraded eighteen (18) units from BLS to Advance Life Support (ALS).

### Service Level Factors

One of the most critical factors in any emergency incident is response time, which is measured from the time an alarm is received by 911 to the time the first unit arrives. Major variables affecting response time are station alarm activity, travel time from the station, and the location of the incident. The busier a local station, the less likely those units will be available to respond, increasing the probability that a unit from a surrounding station will be dispatched. In that case, travel time to the incident would likely be increased. The distance from a station, as well as poor, congested or discontinuous roads between the station and the incident location, will increase travel time. These factors adversely impact the travel time of the first arriving unit, as well as those of other units responding on multiple-unit assignments, such as structure fire alarms. In areas of intense land use, the location of stations should facilitate several units working in tandem. Furthermore, MDFR's vast territory, with over 60% of its service area outside of the Urban Development Boundary (UDB), tends to exacerbate response time. The use of traffic calming devices such as barricades, speed bumps and lane narrowing obstructions also increases response time.

To address the service level factors, MDFR uses key comparative data for future decision making in planning the direction and growth of the department in terms of additional units and services. Trends and historical information serve as the foundation for future implementation. In Fiscal Year 2005-06, MDFR began using the DECCAN Modeling System, a fire station location analysis computer software program that allows for retrieval of alternate deployment scenarios, identification of color-coded workload and response performance trends. The software allows for the establishments of parameters against defined target goals for service delivery as recommended by National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) standard 1710 and adopted by MDFR. The DECCAN software was used to compile a five-year service plan and analyze long-term service delivery gaps based on projected residential population growth and call volumes in planning for future units and services. Additionally, recent enhancements to the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) system allow for more automated dispatching of fire-rescue calls to the nearest available unit using Automated Vehicle Location (AVL) capabilities, which will minimize service delivery gaps and thus reduce the response time of first units arriving to an emergency scene.

### Fiscal Year 2007-08

MDFR opened three (3) new stations, rebuilt/relocated one (1) station, placed one (1) new frontline response unit and nine (9) BLS transport units (Squads) in service, and upgraded one (1) unit from suppression BLS to ALS.

- Highland Oaks 63 On November 9, 2007, Phase I of Station 63 was completed at 1773 NE 205 Street to accommodate a one-bay station. Haz Mat ALS Engine 63 located at Station 8, was relocated to Station 63.
- East Homestead Station 65 On November 27, 2007, Station 65 was opened at 1350 SE 24 Street. Rescue 65, located at Station 16, was relocated to Station 65.
- 3. East Kendall Station 13 Station 13 located at 6000 SW 87 Avenue with ALS Aerial 13, Squad 8, and an Air Truck was opened March 24, 2008.
- 4. South Miami 14 Engine 14 was upgraded to an ALS unit to augment paramedic services.
- 5. Interama 22 Squad 3 was placed in service on November 26, 2007.
- 6. Bunche Park 54 Squad 4 was placed in service on November 26, 2007.
- 7. West Little River 7 Squad 5 was placed in service on October 29, 2007.
- 8. East Kendall 13/Suniland 23 Squad 8 was placed in service on March 24, 2008.
- 9. Turnpike South 53 Squad 7 was placed in service on November 26, 2007.
- 10. Cutler Ridge 34 Squad 9 was placed in service on March 24, 2008.
- 11. Village of Homestead 66 Squad 10 was placed in service on October 29, 2007.
- 12. Sweetwater 29 Squad 12 was placed in service on October 29, 2007.
- 13. Miami Lakes 1/Model Cities 2 Squad 14 was placed in service on November 26, 2007.
- 14. Pinecrest Station 49 Station 49 was relocated to 10850 SW 57 Avenue.

# Fiscal Year 2008-09

MDFR placed two (2) BLS transport units (Squads) in service and upgraded two (2) units from suppression BLS to ALS.

- 1. Coral Reef 4 Engine 4 was upgraded to an ALS unit to augment paramedic services.
- 2. Miami Springs 35 Engine 35 was upgraded to an ALS unit to augment paramedic services.
- 3. Opa-Locka 26 Squad 2 was placed in service on June 19, 2009.
- 4. West Kendall 57 Squad 13 was placed in service on June 19, 2009.

# Fiscal Year 2009-10

MDFR opened one (1) new station, placed one (1) BLS transport unit (Squad) in service and upgraded one (1) unit from suppression BLS to ALS.

- 1. Tamiami Airport 24 On October 1, 2009, the Motorcycle Emergency Response Team (MERT) was removed from service due to budget constraints.
- North Miami Beach Station 78 On November 1, 2009, Station 78 opened at 16435 NE 35 Avenue with Squad 1 placed in service.
- 3. Medley Station 46 On May 31, 2010, Aerial 46 was upgraded to an ALS unit to augment paramedic services.

# Fiscal Year 2010-11

MDFR opened one (1) new station, placed one (1) new front-line response unit in service, and removed three (3) BLS transport (Squads) units from service

- 1. Haulover 21 Fireboat 2 was placed in service on January 24, 2011.
- 2. Opa-locka 26 Squad 2 was removed from service on January 24, 2011 to fund Fireboat 2.
- 3. Turnpike South 53 Squad 7 was removed from service on January 24, 2011 to fund Fireboat 2.
- Miami Lakes 1 Squad 14 was removed from service on January 24, 2011 to fund Fireboat 2.
- 5. Fireboat Station 73 On April 20, 2011, Station 73 was opened at 975 North America Way.

# Fiscal Year 2011-12

MDFR re-built/opened one (1) station, placed two (2) new front-line response units in service and removed two (2) front-line response units and nine (9) BLS transport (Squads) units from service.

- 1. Haulover 21 Fireboat 2 was removed from service on October 17, 2011.
- 2. Interama 22 Squad 3 was removed from service on October 24, 2011.
- 3. Village of Homestead 66 Squad 10 was removed from service on October 24, 2011.
- 4. West Kendall 57 Squad 13 was removed from service on October 24, 2011.
- 5. Sunny Isles Station 10 On November 23, 2011, Station 10 re-opened at 172-175 Streets with Ladder 10 and Rescue 10.
- 6. Bay Harbor 76 Rescue/Fireboat 76 was placed in service at Haulover Station 21 on November 28, 2011.
- 7. Eastern Shores 78 On November 28, 2011, Squad 1/Rescue 78 were taken out of service and Rescue 63 was relocated to Station 78.
- 8. Fireboat 73 Fireboat 1 was taken out of service on November 28, 2011.
- 9. Bunche Park 54 Squad 4 was removed from service on December 5, 2011.
- 10. West Little River 7 Squad 5 was removed from service on December 5, 2011.
- 11. East Kendall 13 Squad 8 was removed from service on December 5, 2011.
- 12. Cutler Ridge 34 Squad 9 was removed from service on December 5, 2011.
- 13. Sweetwater 29 Squad 12 was removed from service on December 5, 2011.
- 14. Homestead/Florida City 16 –Rescue 72 was placed into service at Station 16 on April 2, 2012.
- 15. East Homestead 65 –Ladder 16 was relocated to Station 65 On April 2, 2012.

# Major Programs, Initiatives, and Accomplishments/Milestones - Fiscal Year 2011-2012

- Completion of the new Model Cities Fire-Rescue Station 2, which replaces an existing station at 6460 NW 27 Avenue.
- Completion of the new Homestead Fire-Rescue Station 16, which replaces an existing station at 325 SW 2 Street.
- Completion of the new Bay Harbour Fire-Rescue Station 76 located at 9665 Bay Harbor Terrace. Rescue 76, which was placed in service on November 28, 2011 and temporarily housed at Station 21, will be relocated to Station 76 upon completion.
- Completion of the new Doral North Fire-Rescue Station 69 located at 11151 NW 74 Street. Rescue 69, currently housed at Station 45, will be relocated to Station 69 upon completion.

- Completion of the expansion to West Miami Fire-Rescue Station 40 at 975 SW 62 Avenue allowing permanent residency for Engine 40.
- Completion of land acquisition for land to construct Palmetto Bay Fire-Rescue Station 62 in the vicinity of Old Cutler Road and SW 176 Street. Upon completion, Engine 62 currently housed at Station 50 will be relocated to Station 62.

# Major Programs, Initiatives, and Accomplishments/Milestones - Fiscal Year 2011-2012

- Completion of the new Model Cities Fire-Rescue Station 2, which replaces an existing station at 6460 NW 27 Avenue.
- Completion of the new Homestead Fire-Rescue Station 16, which replaces an existing station at 325 SW 2 Street.
- Completion of the new Bay Harbour Fire-Rescue Station 76 located at 9665 Bay Harbor Terrace. Rescue 76, which was placed in service on November 28, 2011 and temporarily housed at Station 21, will be relocated to Station 76 upon completion.
- Completion of the new Doral North Fire-Rescue Station 69 located at 11151 NW 74 Street. Rescue 69, currently housed at Station 45, will be relocated to Station 69 upon completion.
- Completion of the expansion to West Miami Fire-Rescue Station 40 at 975 SW 62 Avenue allowing permanent residency for Engine 40.
- Completion of land acquisition for land to construct Palmetto Bay Fire-Rescue Station 62 in the vicinity of Old Cutler Road and SW 176 Street. Upon completion, Engine 62 currently housed at Station 50 will be relocated to Station 62.

# Major Programs, Initiatives, and Accomplishments/Milestones - Fiscal Year 2012-2013

- Coconut Palm Fire-Rescue Station 70 will be located in the vicinity of SW 248 Street and 114 Ave. Construction of Station 70 will allow Rescue 70, currently housed at Station 34, to be relocated to Station 70. Station 70 will be constructed on land owned by the County.
- Miami Lakes West Fire-Rescue Station 64 will be located in the vicinity of NW 154 Street and NW 77 Court in the Town of Miami Lakes. Upon completion of Station 64, temporary service located at 8205 Commerce Way will be relocated to Station 64.

# Park and Recreation

Miami-Dade County residents benefit from a variety of parks offered by many different providers. Each provides a type of recreation and parkland, facilities, and services that are consistent with each provider's policies and service population needs. Within Miami-Dade County, recreation and open spaces include federal parks and preserves, state parks, water conservation areas, and County and municipal parks. As of July 2012, there are a total of 828 recreational facilities and open space areas countywide, of which 22 are under state and federal jurisdiction, 260 parks are under County jurisdiction and 546 parks are under municipal jurisdiction. Total park acreage in Miami-Dade County is 1,486,200 acres (see Table 14 below).

Jurisdiction	Miami-Dade County		Municipal		State	e/ Federal	Total	
	Sites	Acres	Sites	Acres	Sites	Acres	Sites	Acres
TOTAL	260	12,825	546	4,385	22	1,468,990	828	1,486,200

Table 14
Countywide Recreation & Open Space Areas

Source: Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces Department Parks Property Management Information System, 07/2012

The Miami-Dade County Park, Recreation and Open Space Department (PROS) provides parkland, recreational facilities and services to Miami-Dade County in two primary ways. First, the PROS provides local recreation open space for Unincorporated Municipal Service Area (UMSA) residents. Second, the County provides countywide recreation open space for both UMSA residents and residents of the 34 municipal areas. Typically, the PROS does not provide local park services to municipal residents unless an intergovernmental agreement exists, and then such services would be limited.

PROS countywide parks are large and diverse and include such areas as beaches, natural area preserves, historic sites, and unique places such as Zoo Miami. Local parks are commonly much smaller and in the form of neighborhood, community and district properties. At present, the PROS offers 82 countywide parks and 177 local parks. Additional local recreation open spaces available for public use also include recreation facilities within public schools, colleges, universities, as well as privately owned local recreation open spaces within homeowner association areas.

The inventory of PROS recreation open space sites and acreage varies annually according to incorporations, land acquisitions, and transfer of maintenance responsibility to other County departments or government entities.

PROS operates and maintains a system of 12,825 acres of parkland that includes the two categories of countywide and local parks, as well as County-owned Environmentally Endangered Lands (EEL) that are adjacent or contiguous to PROS properties and managed as County parks. Of the 12,825 acres mentioned above, 2,800 acres are part of the EEL program. Countywide parks serve all residents and tourists, while local parks serve UMSA residents. Within these two general categories, County parks are further classified based on their primary function, size, and degree of facility/program development. The characteristics of the various classes of parks are summarized in Table 15 below.

# Countywide Parks

Countywide parks support the recreational needs of incorporated and unincorporated area residents and tourists that can only be accommodated within larger, resource-based parks. They serve large populations and draw users from great distances. Countywide parks provided by the County include Metropolitan Parks, Natural Area Preserves, Special Activity Areas, District and/or Greenways.

		Count	ywide			Local				
Criteria	Metropolitan	Natural Area Preserves	Greenway	Special Activity	District	Single- purpose	Community	Neighbor- hood	Mini Park	
Primary Orientation	Resource	Resource	Resource	Resource	User	User	User	User	User	
Staff	Yes	Varies	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	
Available	Varies	Varies	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	
Programs										
Acres	Varies	Varies	Varies	Varies	200 +	Varies	20-100	1-10	1⁄2	
Service	County-	County-	County-	County-	5	3 miles	3.5 miles	1 mile	0.5	
Area	wide	wide	wide	wide	miles				mile	

Table 15 Recreation & Open Space Classifications

Source: (1) Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces Department, July 2009

(2) Miami-Dade Park and Recreation Areas- Summary of Park Classification, July 2006

Metropolitan Parks are large resource-oriented parks. Generally, these parks preserve valuable natural and historical resources while providing a broad mix of resource-dependent recreation opportunities. They typically include prominent water features. For example, Crandon Park provides numerous compatible recreational activities to park users, while at the same time preserving 343 acres of coastal wetland and 48 acres of coastal hammock as natural areas.

Natural Area Preserves are ecologically unique, resource-based parks that are often minimally improved with interpretive facilities and trails. Examples include Castellow Hammock Preserve, Nixon Smiley Pineland Preserve, and the R. Hardy Matheson Preserve.

Special Activity Areas vary greatly, but they typically are large and provide a unique recreational opportunity centered on a single theme. Miami-Metrozoo and Redland Fruit and Spice Park illustrate the diverse nature of Special Activity Areas.

District Parks are large-sized user-oriented parks that provide extensive recreational facilities and staffed recreational programs to UMSA residents living within many different communities. They also provide recreational facilities and programming to municipal residents. For example, Tropical Park is a District Park that offers swimming, picnicking, athletic fields, game courts, and supervised recreational programs to the residents living in the west-central portion of the County.

Greenways are linear open spaces that provide a select range of recreation and conservation activities. Greenway parks include horse trails, bike paths, canoe trails and conservation corridors that often link parks and other public facilities. Greenways are specialized recreational facilities that often include linear modes of transportation or a natural feature such as a trail, canal, or stream.

Countywide recreational open space in Miami-Dade County also includes state and federal recreation areas including the Everglades National Park, Biscayne National Park, the Big Cypress National Preserve, State Conservation Areas, State Parks and other state owned recreation areas.

### Local Parks

Local parks are the County's functional equivalent of municipal parks and are designed to fulfill the specific recreational needs of unincorporated area residents. There are 177 local County parks totaling 1,468 acres that include Single Purpose, Community, Neighborhood and Mini-Parks. There are an additional 442 local parks totaling 2,359 acres of parkland in municipalities. Local parks have smaller service populations than countywide parks, drawing users principally from surrounding residential neighborhoods and communities.

Table 16 below summarizes local parkland by park class, and differentiates between the total number of County-owned park acres and acres for other government agencies.

Park Class	Miami- Dade County Sites	Miami- Dade County Acres	Other Govt. Sites	Other Govt. Acres	Total Sites	Total Acres
Single	13	163	31	280	44	443
Purpose						
Community	50	819	141	1,624	191	2443
Neighborhood	79	459	89	369	168	828
Mini-Parks	35	27	181	86	216	113
TOTAL	177	1,468	442	2,359	619	3,827

Table 16 Local Park Land Inventory Summary

Source: Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces Department, July 2012 Parks Property Management Information System Database

Single-Purpose Parks are smaller sized parks and user-oriented that provide single themed recreational facilities that meet the specific recreational needs of local residential communities. Tennis, boxing, and youth athletics are examples of the recreational opportunities provided at these parks. Unlike most County parks, single-purpose parks are often operated by non-profit service organizations.

Community Parks are medium-sized user-oriented parks that provide recreational facilities and staff programming to residents living within nearby communities. These parks focus on an aggregate of neighborhoods within a three and one-half mile radius of the park. Typically, community parks include a combination of active and passive areas, tot-lots, lighted athletic fields and game courts, and a staffed recreation building.

Neighborhood Parks are small-sized user-oriented parks that meet the recreational needs of individual neighborhoods, usually within one and one-half miles of the park. Most neighborhood parks are passive, un-staffed areas that typically include tot lots, multi-purpose courts, open playfields, and a picnic shelter. These facilities are generally open only during daylight hours since the facilities have no lighting.

Mini-parks are among the smallest parks, typically less than one-half acre, that provide a passive recreational setting for residents in various neighborhoods. The vast majority of mini-parks include tot-lots, walking and sitting areas, and open space. These facilities are unlit, walk-to type parks, and include a number of special taxing districts and common open spaces that are maintained by the PROS.

### Level of Service Standards

The County has adopted a level of service standard of 2.75 acres of local recreation open space per 1,000 unincorporated area residents (CDMP Policy ROS-2A). Local recreation open space includes:

- County provided mini-, neighborhood, community, and single-purpose parks;
- Portions of County-provided countywide parks that function and are designated as local parks in the implementation of the Miami-Dade Service Concurrency Management Program;
- Portions of public school and public college playfields; and
- 50% of the recreation open space provided at private developments in the unincorporated area.

As of June 2012, there are 3,096.84 acres of local recreation open space, 752.74 acres of public school and public college playfields, and 829 acres of privately provided open space (see Table 17 below).

As required by Chapter 163, F.S. and the Miami-Dade Service Concurrency Management Program, the PROS calculates the level of service that is provided in each of the County's three Park Benefit Districts (PBD). The Park Benefit Districts are identified in Figure 8 below.

Park Benefit District	Unincorporated Population (1) Plus Permitted Development	Standard @ 2.75 Acres Per 1000 Residents	Public Park Acres (2)	School Acres (3)	Private Open Space Acres (4)	Total Recreation Open Space Acreage	Surplus (Deficit) Acres	Percent of Standard (%)
1	370,546	1,019.00	763.09	299.82	267	1,329.91	310.91	131%
2	600,714	1,651.96	1,317.61	356.30	473	2,146.91	494.95	130%
3	154,867	425.88	448.99	96.62	89	634.61	208.73	149%
TOTAL	1,126,127	3,096.84	2,529.69	752.74	829	4,111.43	1,014.59	133%

Table 17Local Recreation Open Space Level of Service, 2012

Source: (1) Regulatory and Economic Resources Department, Planning Division, June 2012

(2) Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces Department, Planning and Research Division, June 2012

(3) Miami-Dade County School Board, Site Planning Department 11/28/08

(4) Private Open Space is one-half of total private acres.

The PROS also estimates the Year 2017 level of service. This estimate relies on acreage projections of: (1) local parks expected to be purchased through impact fees; (2) pending donations, covenants and long-term lease agreements; (3) acquisitions funded by Safe Neighborhood Park and Quality Neighborhood Initiative Bond Programs; and (4) school playfield acquisitions. Table 18 below summarizes projected local recreation open space additions between the years 2012 and 2017.

Park Benefit District	Impact Fee Acquisitions (1) (acres)	Covenanted Dedications (2) (acres)	Bond Acquisition (acres)	School Playfields (3) (acres)	Projected Total Additions (acres)
1	10.29	47.6	0.00	8	65.89
2	13.51	6.02	0.00	3	22.53
3	13.73	4.89	0.00	4	22.62
TOTAL	37.53	58.51	0.00	15	111.04

### Table 18 Projected Local Recreation Open Space Additions Between 2012-2017

Source: Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces Department, Planning and Research Division, July 2012 Miami-Dade County School Board, Site Planning Department, 2006

Notes: (1) Based on approved and projected residential development.

(2) Computed in accordance with the Park Impact Fee Ordinance No. 90-95

(3) Previously approved developer dedications. Based on School Board's -2012 new construction plans, and State Department of Education for 1999-2001

Table 19 below summarizes Years 2012-2017 levels of service for local recreation open space. The estimates in the "Year 2017 Surplus/Deficit Acres" column shows that the County will be able to accommodate the Year 2017 projected population for all three Park Benefit Districts.

Park Benefit District	Projected 2017 Unincorporated Population (1) Plus Permitted Development	2012 Total Public Park Recreation Open Space Acreage (2)	2012-2017 Public Park Land Acres Addition (2)	2012-2017 School Playfield Acres Addition (3)	2017 Total Recreation Open Space Acres	Standard @2.75 Acres Per 1,000 Population in Acres	Year 2017 Surplus (Deficit) Acres	2017 Percent of Standard
1	390,399	1,329.91	57.89	8	1,395.80	1,073.60	322.20	130%
2	632,579	2,146.91	19.53	3	2,169.44	1,739.60	429.84	125%
3	185,225	634.61	18.62	4	657.23	509.37	147.86	129%
TOTAL	1,208,203	4,111.43	136.04	15	4,222.47	3,322.57	899.90	127%

Table 19Projected 2012-2017 Local Recreation Open Space Level of Service

Sources: (1) Regulatory and Economic Resources Department, Planning Division, Research Section, July 2012

(2) Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces Department, Planning and Research Division, June 2012

Park Ordinance (90-59), previously approved developer donations, and General Obligation Bond

Acquisition: Safe Neighborhood Park Act of 1996.

(3) Miami-Dade County School Board, Site Planning Department, 2006.

#### Constraints

There are a number of constraints to the PROS's ability to adequately acquire, maintain and operate existing and proposed parks. These constraints include: 1) budget reductions that reduce staff's ability to manage and operate existing parks, much less new parks; 2) inadequate funding from bond and impact fees for the acquisition of neighborhood and community parks; and 3) the uncertainty of maintaining county-owned parks within areas considering incorporation.
#### Public Schools

Public schools are evaluated for existing and projected conditions after the completion of projects programmed under the Miami-Dade County Public Schools System's 5-Year Facilities Work Program.

#### Analysis Method

The adequacy of existing public schools is evaluated based on the adopted School Concurrency Management System. This new system tracks available capacity by considering student enrollment based upon the month of October membership of each public school, and school capacity based on the Florida Inventory of School Houses (FISH) that includes permanent and relocatable (portable) student stations (capacity also includes seats planned to be under construction within the next three years). Previously reserved capacity for residential developments is deducted from the overall available capacity.

The Interlocal Agreement for Public School Facility Planning (Interlocal Agreement) adopted by Miami-Dade County, the municipalities within Miami-Dade County and the Miami-Dade County School Board requires the review of development orders based on the adopted level of service standard for all Miami-Dade County public school facilities, which is 100% FISH capacity (permanent and relocatable student stations) (CDMP Policy EDU-2A). This level of service standard is applicable in each concurrency service area (CSA), which is defined as the public school facility concurrency level of service standards, a plat application, site plan approval or the functionally equivalent of a development order is required. School concurrency capacity is then reserved with the development order.

If there is a capacity deficit in the impacted CSA, the impact is then shifted to one or more contiguous CSAs, within the same Geographic Area, if there is capacity available. The County is divided into four Geographic Areas (Northeast, Northwest, Southeast and Southwest), which are depicted in Figure 9 below. CDMP applications are reviewed and analyzed based on this new public school concurrency level of service standard. However, only a preliminary analysis is conducted for purposes of determining the current capacity and the potential impacts on the public schools being impacted from the proposed development.

On July 17, 2009, the County's Educational Plan Amendment and Interlocal Agreement adopting the level of service standard for public school facilities in Miami-Dade County was found in compliance by the former state planning agency, the Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA), currently the Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO). When sufficient capacity is not available at the impacted CSA, the Public School Concurrency System allows the level of service standard to be satisfied if: 1) construction of additional capacity is programmed to relieve the impacted school within 3 years; 2) capacity is available at a public school facility in a contiguous CSA within the same Geographic Area; 3) development is phased to meet existing capacity; or, 4) if the proportionate share mitigation option is used. It is the goal of Miami-Dade County Public Schools and Miami-Dade County to achieve 100% utilization of Permanent FISH for all public schools facilities (no relocatable classrooms) by January 1, 2018.

Figure 9



#### Existing Conditions Countywide

In October 2012, there were 302,301 students attending Miami-Dade County's Public Schools (this includes magnet schools but not charter schools). The County's public schools system operates 216 elementary schools (including 42 K-8 centers), 57 middle schools, 50 senior high schools, and 5 other (alternative/specialized schools). There is a total FISH design capacity of 358,155, which represents a total FISH utilization rate of 84%.

In the Northeast Geographic Area, there are 47 elementary schools (including 10 K-8 centers), 12 middle schools, 7 senior high schools and 1 other. This Area has a FISH design capacity (including portables) of 67,099 with a total enrollment of 57,081 students, which represents a FISH utilization rate of 85% in the referenced geographic area.

In the Northwest Geographic Area, there are 52 elementary schools (including 10 K-8 centers), 15 middle schools, 12 senior high schools and 2 other. This Area has a FISH design capacity (including portables) of 91,713 with a total enrollment of 76,956 students, which represents a FISH utilization rate of 84% in the referenced geographic area.

In the Southeast Geographic Area, there are 79 elementary schools (including 13 K-8 centers), 18 middle schools, 22 senior high schools and 1 other. This Area has a FISH design capacity (including portables) of 121,333 with a total enrollment of 101,196 students, which represents a FISH utilization rate of 83% in the referenced geographic area.

In the Southwest Geographic Area, there are 38 elementary schools (including 9 K-8 centers), 12 middle schools, 9 senior high schools and 1 other. This Area has a FISH design capacity (including portables) of 78,010 with a total enrollment of 67,068 students, which represents a FISH utilization rate of 86% in the referenced geographic area.

Student enrollment system-wide for the 2012-13 school year totaled 302,301 students; FISH capacity totaled 358,155, which represents a total utilization rate of 84% for the 328 schools, including elementary, middle, senior high and other specialty schools in the Miami-Dade County Public School System.

The FISH design capacity percentage rate includes both permanent and portable student stations. The optimal situation is for the number of students enrolled in a particular facility not to exceed the number of permanent student stations.

Geographic Area	School Type	Number of Schools in Area	October 2012 Enrollment	Perm Capacity	% Util Perm	Reloc Capacity	Total FISH Design Capacity	FISH Percent Utilization Rate
Northeast	Elementary + K-8 Center	47	32,191	34,688	93%	2,386	37,074	87%
	Middle	12	9,722	12,544	78%	752	13,296	73%
	Senior + Other	8	15,168	16,516	92%	214	16,730	91%
Total		67	57,081	63,748	90%	3,352	67,099	85%
					•			
Northwest	Elementary + K-8 Center	52	40,855	44,605	92%	2,643	47,247	86%
	Middle	15	12,789	16,269	79%	673	16,942	75%
	Senior + Other	14	23,312	27,267	85%	256	27,523	85%
Total		81	76,956	88,141	87%	3,572	91,713	84%
Southeast	Elementary + K-8 Center	79	51,089	59,297	86%	2,164	61,461	83%
	Middle	18	16,945	21,367	79%	356	21,723	78%
	Senior + Other	23	33,162	37,336	89%	812	38,148	87%
Total		120	101,196	118,001	86%	3,332	121,333	83%
Southwest	Elementary + K-8 Center	38	31,490	35,376	89%	1,556	36,932	85%
	Middle	12	12,780	14,274	90%	1,247	15,521	82%
	Senior + Other	10	22,798	24, 804	92%	753	25,556	89%
Total		60	67,068	74,454	90%	3,556	78,010	86%
		•	•				•	•
Grand Total		328	302,301	344,343	88%	13,812	358,155	84%
Courses Miero		0.1		•			•	

# Table 20 Miami-Dade County School District Existing Conditions 2011-2012

Source: Miami-Dade County Public Schools, October 2012 FTE

## CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ELEMENT SCHEDULE MODIFICATIONS

Some or all of the CDMP's schedules of capital improvements may be proposed for revision for a variety of reasons during each CDMP amendment cycle. Typically all schedules are revised during the April Cycle. This section briefly outlines the functional capital facility programs amended during the April 2010 Cycle, and explains the more significant amendments approved in 2011.

The Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 Capital Improvements Element (CIE) adopted in November 2010 contained 455 active projects with a total cost of \$17.902 billion. The largest expenditures are for Water and Sewer facilities with 38.3 percent of the total, followed by Aviation with 36.6 percent. Transit-related projects make up another 11.2 percent, Highways and roads 4.1 percent, Seaport close to 3.6 percent, and Park and Recreation just over 2.7 percent of total programmed expenditures. Aviation, water and sewer, and traffic projects have long been the dominant components of the CIE. Due to the injection of funding from the ½ cent transit surtax, as well as funding from the voter approved General Obligation Bond (GOB) program, the mass transit and park and recreation areas have increased their proportion in recent years.

The Schedule of Improvements for FY 2011-12 CIE has cost totals much lower to the values of the previous program, as are the six-year expenditures. There are 358 active projects with a total cost of \$17.464 billion and six-year programmed expenditures of \$5.297 billion. Also included are 39 new projects costing \$2.006 billion with \$561.730 million planned expenditures over the six FY 2011/12 – 2016/17 periods. The largest share (38.8 percent of cost) of this new CIE is held by Water/Sewer facilities followed by Aviation (34.5 percent) and Mass Transit (12.7 percent).

## Aviation

The aviation component has consistently been one of the largest in dollar terms since the inception of the CIE process in 1988. The Miami-Dade Aviation Department (MDAD) is responsible for planning and carrying out the renovation and upgrading of existing facilities and the construction of new facilities to meet current and forecasted commercial passenger, cargo and general aviation demand at Miami International Airport (MIA); plus four other active general aviation airports and one training facility.

The currently adopted CIE (April 2010 Cycle) contains nine aviation projects at a total cost of \$6.556 billion. About 10.5 percent is proposed for expenditure over the six-year program period; a percentage below the previous year, with absolute expenditures of about \$655.854 million lower than the previous program cycle. During the FY 2010-11 budget and multi-year capital plan, \$689.406 million was programmed and many projects were carried out in the following areas: terminals, concourses, support facilities, cargo facilities, landside improvements, and airside improvements. The bulk of the program (54.6 percent) is to be found in the first category, a total of about \$376.422 million. Projects completed and in use at MIA include the new North Terminal, expansion of the South Terminal, as well as new concessions for passenger comfort and convenience.

For the 2010-11 budget year, this capital programming was continued; i.e. terminal, concourse, and gate expansion at MIA along with increases in cargo handling capacity; necessary airside and landside improvements (roads and parking) and a variety of support projects, including about \$71.34 million for various improvements in the general aviation airports. For the 2010/11–2015/16 period, programmed funding decreased substantially from the previous six-year period. October 2012 Cycle B-53 EAR-Based Applications

Overall, the April 2011 Cycle Aviation Schedule of Improvements planned expenditures of \$317.889 million is well below the previous program cycle. Similarly, the total cost of the program (\$6.021 billion) is \$534.711 million below the previous program cycle. Almost all is funded from a combination of state and federal grants, revenue bond funds, current capital outlay and passenger facility charges. The program contains seven active projects. Project Nos. 4 and 9 are anticipated to be completed during FY 2010. There are no new proposed projects.

This new schedule of improvements embodies the strategy of emphasizing capabilities changes of MIA to handle existing and future demand levels for passengers and cargo operations in an efficient manner. MDAD is finalizing a \$6.568 billion capital improvement program to make the airport a more desirable and efficient transportation center. Aeronautical activities at MIA are being enhanced by the new North Terminal and expansion of the South Terminal. During FY 2011-12, in addition to a new North Terminal, key elements of the capital program include improvements to the Central Terminal, construction of an elevated automated people mover system known as the "MIA Mover," roadway and facilities improvements, major security modifications, and replacement of business systems.

## **Coastal Management**

The Environmental Resources Management Division (ERM) of the Department of Regulatory and Economic Enhancement administers the coastal management program as reflected in Table 3 of the Schedule of Improvements. Its primary aim is beach restoration and preservation. The program focuses on initiating and coordinating federal and/or state projects essential to the protection and recreational viability of the County's ocean shoreline.

The adopted (April 2010 Cycle) Coastal Management Schedule of Improvements includes two projects at a cost of \$63.137 million, with planned expenditures at \$32.531 million. Both the total cost and the six-year expenditures are lower than the previous year's capital program. During FY 2010-11, only one beach re-nourishment project is to be completed with programmed expenditure at the \$7.401 million level.

The currently recommended Coastal Schedule of Improvements contains two active projects with a six-year expenditure program of \$28.834 million, somewhat lower than the previous year, while total cost of the program at \$61.482 million is down by about 2.6 percent. There are no newly proposed projects. During FY 2011-12 there is one beach re-nourishment project with \$9.224 million planned expenditures.

## Conservation

The Conservation Element of the CDMP provides direction for the protection and conservation of Miami-Dade County's natural resources. Projects with this purpose are included in the Conservation Schedule of Improvements of the CIE, which has emphasized protection of natural water bodies and unique endangered lands. Since the advent of the Stormwater Utility program, the focus has been heavily on major and local drainage improvements. However, as a result of changes in the Proposed Resource Allocation Plan during the previous four fiscal years, the bulk of these activities are now devoted mostly to the administrative function of the program. The presently adopted program for FY 2010-11 contains nine projects at a total cost of \$267.287 million, with expenditures programmed at \$45.031 million. The total cost for FY 2010-11 is \$7.833 million below the previous year and so are the six-year expenditures at about \$7.379 million lower from the previous program cycle.

Major activity during FY 2010-11 includes continued acquisitions of environmentally endangered lands, as ERM offers to purchase close to 100 acres of such lands and provides for active restoration and preservation of wetlands and environmentally valuable uplands. As a result of limited debt service millage capacity during FY 2010-11, the number of acquired acres is much lower than the previous year. About \$5.461 million was programmed for this purpose. Over the fiscal year, a small number of local drainage projects have been carried out. Of the \$45.031 million to be expended during the 2010/11 - 2015/16 programming period, \$3.755 million were devoted to a variety of drainage improvements for the Community Rating System (CRS) program. In addition, several individual drainage projects were completed.

The April 2011 Cycle recommended program for Conservation continues these efforts at about the same scale as the last year from the number of ongoing projects perspective. This is due to the transfer of drainage related activities to PWWM. The current program will cost \$271.985 million, which is an increase from the previous year, with only \$61.025 million planned to be expended over the six-year period. There are nine active projects with no proposed additions.

## Drainage

The Miami-Dade County Department of Public Works and Waste Management (PWWM) has been responsible for eliminating or controlling localized stormwater drainage problems, and has an ongoing program directed to that purpose. As a result of the recommendations made during the summer of 2006, all drainage, design, and construction activities formerly housed in ERM were transferred to PWWM. This includes secondary canal maintenance, street swiping, and drain cleaning funded by the Stormwater Utility program.

The currently adopted (April 2010 Cycle) Drainage Schedule of Improvements contains 39 projects costing a total of \$88.990 million, with six-year programmed expenditures at the \$29.025 million level. With the abovementioned transfer of drainage improvements activities from ERM to PWWM, the April 2011 recommended capital program for Drainage has total cost slightly lower to the levels of last year (\$87.109 million), but the expenditure level is very much higher. Over the six-year program, \$47.114 million exclusively for roadway drainage improvements will be expended. There are 33 ongoing projects with two newly proposed ones. Six projects are being deleted; Project Nos. 4, 5, 32, and 38 due to completion. Funding sources for project numbers 6 and 39 have been assigned to other higher priority projects; as a result, the projects are being cancelled.

## Park and Recreation

The Miami-Dade County Department of Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces (PROS) acquires, constructs, maintains, and operates or manages an extensive and diversified system of parks, and other recreational and cultural facilities along with open spaces, to serve the people of Miami-Dade County. PROS's facilities range from small neighborhood parks to large regional parks, and include golf courses, marinas, beaches, and the Miami-Dade Zoological Park and Gardens (Zoo Miami) that serve the entire County. Overall, PROS manages 263 parks encompassing over 12,848 acres, and is also responsible for historic sites and nature preserves.

Historically faced with huge unfunded capital needs, in the last fifteen years this situation has been somewhat relieved. This is due to the approval, late in 1996, of the Safe Neighborhood Parks (SNP) bond program and the Mayor's FY 1998-99 Quality Neighborhoods Improvement Program (QNIP). The former is exclusively for parks, while the latter also funds other local October 2012 Cycle B-55 EAR-Based Applications capital projects such as sidewalks and street resurfacing. Aside from these sources, the Building Better Community (BBC) Bond Program has also provided additional funding to meet PROS's capital needs.

However, even with the utilization of these and a wide assortment of other funding sources, PROS is proceeding with a capital program that is less ambitious than previously anticipated. Because the GOB program funding remains low as a result of limited debt service millage capacity, the currently adopted FY 2010-11 Capital Budget and Multi-Year Plan shows programmed expenditures at \$114.464 million with a total cost of \$485.929 million, which is a drop from the previous year. During the first year (2010-11), PROS was budgeted to make improvements at several projects, the largest being the Areawide and Local Parks – Park Improvements, as well as QNIP Bond Phase II – Local Park Improvements at combined expenditures of \$5.905 million.

In light of the changes in current economic conditions and related needs, the presently recommended Park and Recreation schedule lists 87 active projects including two new additions, at a total cost of \$451.075 million and programmed outlays of \$153.918 million. These projects are covering a wide range of activities, most relatively small expenditures on local parks. But there are also significant improvements being made at the larger parks, including large expenditures at the Tropical Park, Amelia Earhart Park, Ives Estates District Park, and Westchester Arts Center. Fourteen projects are being deleted. Project Nos. 8, 9, 12, 15, 17, 21, 44, 62, 93, 95, and 97 have been completed. Project Nos. 82 and 83 are privately funded projects and are being deleted since these projects do not need to be included in the CIE schedule. Funding for project number 85 was reprogrammed to Project No. 73. Project number 98 was shifted to Park and Recreation from the Traffic Circulation schedule.

The FY 2011-12 capital budget and multi-year plan is 83.4 percent funded by the voterapproved GOB program, about 7.9 percent from park impact fees, 1.1 percent from QNIP II Bond, QNIP V Bond, and Safe Neighborhood Parks (SNP) Proceeds, as well as Capital Outlay Reserve (COR) combined. The remaining 7.6 percent comes primarily from State and Federal grants and financing proceeds. Of the total ongoing program, about 37.5 percent is devoted to Metropolitan Parks – Renovation. About 5.9 percent of the expenditures are allocated to Zoo Miami improvements. As a result of the economic downturn, during FY 2011-12, PROS plans to implement a smaller number of park projects than the projects implemented in the previous year funded by a combination of Impact Fees, QNIP, and SNP dollars.

## Seaport

The Miami-Dade County Seaport Department manages and operates the Port of Miami, which is the busiest passenger cruise home port in the world and the 11th ranked busiest containerized cargo port in the United States. As part of the Transportation and Economic Development strategic areas, the Port of Miami is responsible for meeting the infrastructure needs of the cruise and cargo industries, ensuring that the Port is managed efficiently and effectively while maintaining, renovating and expanding the Port's facilities to meet industry growth for both cargo and cruise operations. The Port of Miami promotes cruise and cargo growth through infrastructure enhancements and through capacity improvements combined with an aggressive foreign and domestic marketing program.

The presently adopted (FY 2010-11) Capital Improvements Element contains a Seaport component listing a six-year expenditure program of \$464,182 million and a total cost of \$645,794 million. There are a total of 24 projects. The program is somewhat evenly loaded with October 2012 Cycle B-56 EAR-Based Applications

61.4 percent of the total expenditures being planned for the first three years. The single largest project in the FY 2010-11 capital program is the dredging the southern part of Lummus Island - Phase III with a total cost of 165,584 million. Other major projects are for the Seaport Tunnel and the Dredge III Bulkhead Strengthening with outlays of \$155,000 million and \$62,500 million, respectively. Together these three projects account for 59.3 percent of the total cost of the program. If capital costs for the Container Yard Improvements – Seaboard were added, just these four projects constitute about two thirds of the FY 20109-11 capital investments.

In this (April 2011 Cycle) recommended Schedule of Improvements, there are 24 ongoing projects with four new projects being proposed, while eleven are being deleted; Project Nos. 2, 3, 14, 16, 17, and 19 are listed as deletions from the program due to completion. Project No. 10 is expected to be completed in FY 2011. Project No. 1 is simply expanded and included in new Project No. 28. Project No. 11 is being downsized and put in Project No. 7. Project Nos. 21 and 22 are deleted and now included in project numbers 23 and 26, respectively.

This 2011-12 capital program embodies continued investment in new and improved berthing, cruise terminal facilities, security, and traffic circulation enhancement and throughput projects. Both the cost and the six-year expenditure figures are higher than those from the previous year.

A number of security installation and upgrades will be done on the Port. A wide variety of infrastructure improvements have expenditures of \$38.281 million. Likewise, passenger area facilities will be expanded including Cruise Terminals B and C improvements, Cruise Terminals D and E upgrades for future growth demands, as well as Terminals F and G upgrades at a combined cost of \$46.732 million. The largest project in terms of cost is for the Dredging Project (Phase III) for the southern part of Lummus Island (\$166.883 million) followed by the Port of Miami Tunnel (\$155.00 million). Other general port improvements and channel deepening will also be accomplished.

For the entire six-year programming period, the Seaport identifies 17 projects with expenditures of \$524.030 million, mostly funded by Seaport revenue bonds. The total cost of these projects is \$717.758 million.

## Sewer Facilities

The Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department (WASD) is the largest water and sewer utility in the Southeastern U.S. WASD has a major capital program to build and maintain wastewater collection and treatment infrastructure. About 99 percent of the wastewater generated in Miami-Dade County is collected and treated by WASD, utilizing three regional wastewater treatment plants with a total treatment capacity of 368 million gallons per day. WASD serves approximately 338,368 wastewater retail customers as of September 2010 and provides wholesale sewer service to 12 municipalities within Miami-Dade County.

The currently adopted capital schedule (April 2010 Cycle) contains expenditures of \$3,393.873 million for the period 2010/11-2015/16, with a total cost of \$5,026.740 million for 45 projects. The 2010-11 program reflected continuation of the major, expedited capital program to meet the requirements and deadlines of two settlement agreements with the Florida State Department of Environmental Protection and two consent decrees with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Almost all of the required improvements have been put in place, except for consent decree projects addressing the collection system, such as pump station improvements and peak flow requirements. During FY 2010-11, the program expenditure total is \$394.514 million. The largest expenditures include \$119.675 million for the South District Wastewater Treatment Plant October 2012 Cycle B-57 EAR-Based Applications

high level disinfection; \$24.453 million for peak flow management facilities; \$23.980 million for Central District wastewater transmission mains and pump station improvements; and \$23.877 million for Central District upgrades. These four projects constitute 48.7 percent of the program's first year expenditures.

For the period FY 2011/12 – 2016/17, recommended expenditures total close to \$1,209.740 million with the total cost at \$4,891.817 million for 33 active projects and twelve proposed deletions; Project Nos. 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35 are being deleted and are now shown as one project (Project No. 47). There are two proposed additions, of which only one is truly new (Project No. 46); the other new project (Project No. 47) is as a result of the previously mentioned deletions. Both the cost and, especially, the expenditure levels are lower than the previous year.

Over the course of the 2011-2016 six-year program period, WASD will continue to pursue a capital strategy aimed at overcoming the deficiencies specified in the Consent Decrees through a series of improvements to the wastewater collection, transmission, treatment and disposal systems. A total of 173.139 million is programmed for FY 2011-12. Many upgrades go beyond merely correcting the deficiencies identified by the State and federal governments. This is especially true at the Central and South Wastewater Treatment Plants, systemwide peak flow pumping capacity, infiltration reduction, wastewater reuse, corrosion control program, and several sewer line extensions. Primary funding for the overall program is from wastewater revenue bonds and connection charges.

## Solid Waste Disposal

The Department of Public Works and Waste Management (PWWM) collects garbage and trash in the Waste Collection Service Area (WCSA), performs a series of waste disposal tasks countywide, and enforces County ordinances as appropriate countywide. As part of the Neighborhood and Infrastructure strategic area, PWWM provides a variety of services for residents, including garbage and trash collection and curbside collection of recyclable materials. In addition, PWWM operates 13 Trash and Recycling (T&R) Centers in the WCSA and provides waste transfer and disposal services countywide to municipalities and private haulers. A large fleet of trucks and other equipment is maintained in order to carry out these and other activities. PWWM is also responsible for the operation and management of three regional transfer stations and associated fleet, two operating landfills, and the Resources Recovery Facility (one of the largest waste-to-energy facilities in the world) and a co-located ashfill. Additionally, PWWM has countywide responsibility for the regulation of waste collection, transportation of waste, and recycling activities. PWWM coordinates with federal and state regulators, other County departments, and municipalities for the implementation of disposal site mitigation.

The existing adopted capital program lists 31 projects costing \$197,003 million, with \$109,641 million to be expended over the 2010/11-2015/16 period. The cost of the program is \$27,843 million above the previous year, with planned expenditures about \$6,530 million higher than the previous program cycle. The Solid Waste Management capital program, guided by the 1995 Strategic Plan and the 1996 Master Plan, contains projects directed at the broad areas of Environmental Projects, Waste Collection, and Waste Disposal.

The recommended Solid Waste Management Schedule of Improvements for FY 2011/12–20016/17 has cost values lower than the previous year, as are the six-year expenditures. There are 26 active projects with no new projects being proposed. While total cost is now \$182.384

million, planned expenditures are \$102.333 million. There are five proposed deletions: Project Nos. 1, 6, 12, 13 and 28 are or will be completed within the fiscal year.

During the first three years of the Capital Program, about 69.6 percent of the program expenditures are devoted to waste disposal environmental projects. These include on-going miscellaneous capital projects, cell closures (at the Resources Recovery facility, North Dade and South Dade landfills), plus other remediation projects. About 19.1 percent of the six-year program is concerned with waste disposal. There are a number of small projects covering the full range of disposal activities. At the Resources Recovery facility, a new cell (#20) is planned to be constructed at a cost of \$14.915 million. One other cell (#5) is under construction at the South Miami-Dade facility at a cost of \$14.915 million. Waste collection projects constitute only about 2.8 percent of the program. Major emphasis is being placed on improvements at existing T&R Centers and the construction of a new T&R Center in West/Southwest Miami-Dade, where more than two thirds of the funding is programmed in the first three years of the six-year plan. Major funding comes from Future Solid Waste Disp. Notes/Bonds, followed by Solid Waste System Revenue Bonds, and Waste Disposal Operating revenues.

#### **Traffic Circulation**

The Department of Public Works and Waste Management is also responsible for constructing and maintaining the County's roadway and bridge infrastructure system, which totals 662 arterial and 2,692 local centerline road miles, as well as 171 bridges on arterial roads and 33 bridges on local roads. Basically, this includes many of the section-line and most half-section line roads, all collector roads and most of the various bridges in the County. In addition, all local roads in unincorporated Miami-Dade are maintained. Capacity improvements typically consist of widening and/or reconstructing roadways, replacement of bridges and reconfiguring intersections. Countywide street and roadway signage (2,750 traffic signal controllers, 21,500 streetlights, and 450,000 street and traffic signs, as of FY 2010-11) are also PWWM responsibility.

The presently adopted (FY 2010-11) Traffic Circulation component of the CIE contained 134 projects totaling \$737.054 million in cost. Expenditures of \$457.544 million were heavily programmed during the first three years of the 2010/11-2015/16 period, with 85.5 percent of the outlay found there. The largest category of expenditures was for projects funded by the People's Transportation Plan (PTP) bond program at \$238.665 million, which is 52.1 percent of the total for all projects. The Public Works Division is responsible for carrying out the building of several new roads, widening many others, resurfacing, new operational improvements and new curbs and gutters as set forth in the PTP. The second largest category was for projects funded by the Secondary Gas Tax at \$82.899 million, or about 18.1 percent of the total. The third largest category was for projects funded by FDOT funds at \$37.937 million, or about 8.3 percent of the total expenditures. The projects include unspecified infrastructure improvements in each Commission District, several bike path projects, and a few bridge expenditures. The majority of the other projects was funded by road impact fees and causeway toll revenue, and was applied to the usual array of road and bridge projects.

As recommended, the new 2011/12 – 2016/17 program is below the prior year's program and will have a total cost of \$681.179 million for 93 ongoing projects and 21 newly proposed ones. The six-year expenditure plan is for \$410.874 million, which is also below the prior year's program. Forty one projects are listed as deletions from the program; Project Nos. 3, 33, 41, 75, 85, 96, 127, 128, and 133 being completed. Project Nos. 112, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, and 126 to be completed in FY 2010-11. Project Nos. 129, 130 and 132 were listed twice in October 2012 Cycle B-59 EAR-Based Applications

last year's schedule. Project Nos. 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 91, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, and 107 are being deleted. All are privately funded projects and, as of the Community Planning Act of 2011, need not be included on the CIE schedule. Of the 21 proposed additions, only eight are truly new projects: Project Nos. 136, 137, 138, 139, 143, 151, 154 and 155. The remaining Project Nos. 135, 140, 141, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 152 and 153 were not included in last year's schedule. Project No. 142 was shifted from the Mass Transit schedule. The new projects have a total cost of \$15.518 million and planned expenditures of \$11.446 million.

This 2011/12 – 2016/17 multi-year Public Works Capital plan is somewhat similar to previous plan versions with the inclusion of projects both countywide and in unincorporated Miami-Dade. As it did last year, following its new Business Plan, PWWM has segmented the capital program into two parts: Neighborhood and Unincorporated Area Municipal Services, and Transportation. The latter is the largest component, \$655.233 million in cost versus \$178.834 million, while six-year expenditures are \$408.417 versus \$98.560 million. The transportation part includes causeway improvements, major road improvements, traffic control systems, infrastructure improvements and ADA accessibility improvements. The Neighborhood and Unincorporated Area Municipal Services part includes drainage improvements, infrastructure improvements, mosquito control (not addressed herein) and local road improvements. In transportation, the expenditures decrease in the second through fifth year and then increase for the last year of the six-year period, much less so in the Neighborhood/UMSA program, where the expenditure levels vary throughout the six-year programming period.

## Mass Transit

Miami-Dade Transit (MDT) is the 14<sup>th</sup> largest public transit system in the country (based on passenger trips) and the largest transit agency in Florida. A large capital program is necessary for the purpose of constructing and maintaining facilities and acquiring equipment necessary to provide transportation services to the public. The transit system has four major components; Metrobus, Metrorail, Metromover, and Special Transportation Services (STS) which is a demand-response door-to-door service. MDT provides 29.2 million miles of Metrobus revenue service along 93 routes with a fleet of 772 full-sized buses, 25 articulated buses, and 75 minibuses, 2 contracted routes, a 24.6 mile elevated Metrorail system, a 20-mile Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) line that is the largest in the United States, and a 4.4-mile elevated people mover system. MDT also provides Special Transportation Services (STS) to eligible participants. The passage by County voters of the one-half cent sales tax in 2002 to be used primarily for transportation provides a dedicated funding source for transportation improvements and is expected to generate more than \$150 million annually, which has opened the door to applying for federal and state matching funds. Thus, despite the recent termination of the joint Participation Agreement by FDOT reflecting no funding for the North Corridor Metrorail Extension project, a potentially viable transit system can be planned and put into place. The various elements were compiled prior to the vote in a document entitled The Peoples Transportation Plan (PTP). MDT works closely with several federal, state and local agencies and other transportation stakeholders. MDT is working with the Citizens Independent Transportation Trust (CITT) and is in the process of implementing the PTP.

The capital program for FY 2010-11 has total costs of \$1.998 billion and expenditures of \$1.481 billion through the year 2015. The single largest component was for Capitalization of Preventive Maintenance. The next highest expenditure was for Rail Vehicle Replacement, then the Earlington Heights/MIC Connector, Bus Acquisition, and the Infrastructure Renewal Plan (IRP). Together, these five projects account for 84.4 percent of the budgeted six-year expenditures. October 2012 Cycle B-60 EAR-Based Applications

Approximately \$25.969 million was budgeted for the Rail Vehicle Replacement project for FY 2009-10. The remaining funds in this capital program were used to construct and modify park and ride facilities and for planning, administration, and contingency. Funding comes from federal grants, FDOT funds, County bonds, and the new surtax supported bonds.

Expenditures for Metrorail include vehicle replacement, repair and maintenance of Metrorail and Metromover facilities, as well as Metromover vehicle replacement. The largest outlay for the bus system is the acquisition of new buses (\$93.908 million). Equipment purchases include a variety of items ranging from the Upgrade and/or Replace Bus Tracker and Automatic Vehicle Locating System, tools and equipment for repair, to bus security and surveillance monitoring devices.

The FY 2011-12 capital program consists of 31 active projects, six new ones, and two deletions. A significant amount of reprogramming has occurred resulting in cost changes with values well above the prior year program. The cost at \$2,235.165 million is almost 11.9 percent higher than the previous year. The six-year expenditure level at \$1,459.004 million is somewhat lower by 1.5 percent. Of the six newly proposed projects, only five are truly new projects as Project No. 38 was an omission from last year's schedule. Two projects are marked as deletions from the program; Project No. 9 is no longer feasible and Project No. 43 has been completed. Project No. 56 is a privately funded project and is being deleted as need not be included on the CIE schedule. The funding breakdown for the six-year expenditures is as follows: People's Transportation Bond Program \$549.638 million; Federal grants \$472.862 million; and State of Florida-FDOT \$68.899 million. These three sources comprise 74.1 percent of total expenditures. MDT expenditures decrease during the first three years then increase over the next two years and decrease again over the last year.

#### Water Facilities

The Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department (WASD) provides portable water to most residents and businesses within Miami-Dade County. Approximately 420,367 water retail customers are served and 15 municipalities purchase water wholesale. This is accomplished by the operation of three regional and five smaller water treatment plants, with water supply coming from 95 water supply wells (grouped into 14 wellfields) in the Biscayne Aquifer. The capital program necessary to accomplish this includes wellfield development, the expansion and upgrade of water treatment facilities, pumping capacity and related infrastructure. WASD implements water conservation measures, provides high quality drinking water, and plans for future growth. In providing these water services, WASD interacts with and is regulated by various federal and state agencies, the Miami-Dade County Health Department, the South Florida Water Management District, as well as Environmental Resources Management.

The April 2010 Cycle adopted program has 20 active projects costing \$1,836.564 million with \$1,329.73 million to be spent by FY 2015-16. Both the total cost figure and the six-year expenditures are much higher than the prior year's program. Several revenue sources were used to fund a variety of water supply and quality projects. Just six projects, excluding Project No. 19 and its components, account for about 75.3 percent of the six-year expenditures. These are: Safe Drinking Water Act Modifications, South Miami Heights Water Treatment Plant and Wellfield, Water Distribution System Extension Enhancements, Water System Maintenance and Upgrades, Water Treatment Plant – Alexander Orr, Jr. Expansion, and Water Treatment Plant – Hialeah/Preston Improvements. All of these projects are ongoing with various subcomponents completed each year.

The Schedule of Improvements shows a higher total cost than the previous year at \$1,882.951 million, but the expenditures level is lower at \$1,000.480 million for all the 28 active projects. The capital outlay predominately accounted for by the Safe Drinking Water Act Modification – Surface Water Treatment (SWT) and Disinfectant/Disinfection by Product (D-DBP) regulations. There are two proposed additions, of which only one is truly new project, number 32; the other, Project No. 33, is a result of the deletion of Project No. 19 and its components (A, B, C, D, E, and F) to form that project. Also, there are two additional deletions, Project No. 31, due to completion and Project No. 29 is no longer needed.

Like the capital programs before it, this six-year schedule of improvements is aimed at meeting current and future needs for water pumping, treatment, transmission, and distribution capacity. Water quality is given high priority also, as dictated by various federal and state regulations and guidelines.

# APPENDIX C

## CONSISTENCY OF AMENDMENT APPLICATIONS WITH ADOPTED CDMP POLICIES

All CDMP amendment applications are evaluated for consistency with the Adopted Components of the CDMP. Each element of the CDMP is recommended for changes in the "*Staff Applications - October 2012 Cycle EAR-Based Applications to Amend the Comprehensive Development Master Plan*" (Applications Report). These applications were initiated to reflect changes in state law, to address the major issues as identified in the "*Adopted 2010 Evaluation and Appraisal Report*" (EAR), and to improve the effectiveness of the CDMP to manage growth. Numerous changes to policies are recommended, with reasons noted by staff in the Applications Report. Some of the existing CDMP policies are now obsolete, or the work described in the policy has been completed. Many more policies are recommended to improve implementation of preexisting CDMP objectives. Additionally, changes to the CDMP Adopted 2015 and 2025 Land Use Plan (LUP) map to redesignate parcels, as identified in Part C of Application No. 1, were also evaluated for consistency with the provisions of the CDMP.

To facilitate the reviews of the requested CDMP LUP) map amendments, the parcels were arranged in three groups according to the reasons for the proposed change, as discussed in detail in Chapter 1 of this report and in Application No. 1 of the Applications Report. The three groupings of reasons for proposed changes are summarized below:

- Group 1 Changes to redesignate parcels located within municipalities to a corresponding designation on the LUP map.
- Group 2 Changes to move the Urban Expansion Area (UEA) to exclude properties that have constraints to urban development.
- Group 3 Changes to increase expand the Urban Development Boundary to include property and redesignate the property on the LUP map for urban development.

Following the discussion of reasons, each group was evaluated for consistency of changes with selected objectives and policies of the Comprehensive Development Master Plan. As these changes have been fully discussed and recommended in the *"Adopted 2010 Evaluation and Appraisal Report"*, only the most significant supporting CDMP objectives and policies related to each grouping are presented herein. The applicable objectives and policies are listed in abbreviated form at the end of each group. The full texts of these objectives and policies are presented in Appendix A under the heading "Text of CDMP Objectives and Policies Cited in Reasons for Amendments", following the policy consistency review of the three groupings.

## Group 1

Parcel Nos. 1-6, 8-19, 21-121, 123-156, 158-164, 167-236, 238-252, and 255-291 are located in municipal areas. Redesignation of these parcels are based on the 2010 EAR recommended Revision No. 4 to the Land Use Plan Map (See Page 4-10 of the Adopted 2010 EAR), which is to incorporate changes in the CDMP Land Use Plan (LUP) map that are based on the land use designations in adopted municipal comprehensive plans that are either new or been revised since 2003. The proposed redesignations for the parcels reflect the plans of the adopted comprehensive plan land use designations for the municipalities identified in the table below:

	Municipality	Total No.	Parcel Nos.
		of Parcels	
1	City of Aventura	4	1,2,3,4
3	City of Coral Gables	19	130,192,193,196,199,201,203-208,210-216
4	Town of Cutler Bay	7	229, 230, 232-236
5	City of Doral	29	136-157,158-164,167
6	City of Florida City	14	272,274-286
7	City of Hialeah	12	58-61,66-69,110-113
8	City of Hialeah Gardens	6	62-64, 70-72
9	City of Homestead	38	238-252,255-271,273, 287-291
10	City of Miami	67	74-86,96-109,114-116,118-121,123-129
			131,132,133,135,173-191,197,198,200
11	City of Miami Beach	10	39,88-95
12	City of Miami Gardens	11	36-38,41-48
13	Town of Miami Lakes	2	57,65
14	Village of Miami Shores	2	40,73
15	City of Miami Springs	1	117
15	City of North Miami	14	9,16-19,21-23,26-31
17	City of North Miami	12	10-15,24,25,32-35
	Beach		
18	City of Opa-locka	8	49-56
19	Village of Palmetto Bay	13	217-228,231
20	Village of Pinecrest	1	209
21	City of South Miami	1	202
22	City of Sunny Isles	3	5,6,8
	Beach		
23	City of Sweetwater	5	168-172
24	City of West Miami	3	134,194,195
	Total	282	

#### Summary of Municipal Parcels Subject to Proposed CDMP LUP Map Changes

<u>Consistency Review:</u> These proposed redesignations are supported by the following excerpt from the CDMP Statement of Legislative Intent (CDMP Page 4):

The right of all municipalities in Miami-Dade County to enact and administer comprehensive planning and land development regulations to govern development-related activities solely within their respective incorporated jurisdictional boundaries as provided by Chapter 163, Part 2, Florida Statutes, is generally reserved and preserved to the municipalities. The CDMP shall not supersede authority of incorporated municipalities to exercise all powers relating solely to their local affairs as provided by the Metropolitan-Dade County Charter, provided that the following fundamental growth management components of the CDMP that are necessary to carry on a central metropolitan government in Miami-Dade County shall serve as minimum standards for zoning, service, and regulation to be implemented through all municipal comprehensive plans and land development regulations:

1. The Urban Development Boundary (UDB), Urban Expansion Area (UEA) Boundaries, and the CDMP provisions which prescribe allowable land uses and public services and facilities outside the UDB;

- 2. The Policies for Development of Urban Centers contained in the text of the Land Use Element;
- 3. The Population Estimates and Distributions as mapped in the Land Use Element;
- 4. Policies which provide that the County shall maintain and utilize its authority provided by the Metro-Dade County Charter to maintain, site, construct and operate public facilities in incorporated and unincorporated areas of the County.

## Group 2

Parcel Nos. 292, 293, 294 and 295 are recommended to be removed from within the Urban Expansion Area (UEA) based on Recommendation No. 4 of the 'UDB Capacity and Urban Expansion' major issue in the Adopted 2010 EAR (page 4-2).

<u>Consistency Review:</u> This proposed redesignation is supported by the following CDMP objectives and policies.

- LU-3 Upon the adoption of the CDMP, the location, design and management practices of development and redevelopment in Miami-Dade County shall ensure the protection of natural resources and systems by recognizing, and sensitively responding to constraints posed by soil conditions, topography, water table level, vegetation type, wildlife habitat, and hurricane and other flood hazards, and by reflecting the management policies contained in resource planning and management plans prepared pursuant to Chapter 380, Florida Statutes, and approved by the Governor and Cabinet, or included in the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan approved by Congress through the Water Resources Development Act of 2000.
- LU-3B. All significant natural resources and systems shall be protected from incompatible land use including Biscayne Bay, future coastal and inland wetlands, future potable water-supply wellfield areas identified in the Land Use Element or in adopted wellfield protection plans, and forested portions of Environmentally Sensitive Natural Forest Communities as identified in the Natural Forest Inventory, as may be amended from time to time.
- LU-8G. When considering land areas to add to the UDB, after demonstrating that a need exists, in accordance with foregoing Policy LU-8F:
  - i) The following areas shall not be considered:
    - a) The Northwest Wellfield Protection Area located west of the Turnpike Extension between Okeechobee Road and NW 25 Street and the West Wellfield Protection Area west of SW 157 Avenue between SW 8 Street and SW 42 Street;
    - b) Water Conservation Areas, Biscayne Aquifer Recharge Areas, and Everglades Buffer Areas designated by the South Florida Water Management District;
    - c) The Redland area south of Eureka Drive; and
  - ii) The following areas shall be avoided:
    - a) Future Wetlands delineated in the Conservation and Land Use Element;

- b) Land designated Agriculture on the Land Use Plan map;
- c) Category 1 hurricane evacuation areas east of the Atlantic Coastal Ridge;
- d) Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan project footprints delineated in Tentatively Selected Plans and/or Project Implementation Reports; and

## Group 3

The proposed expansion of the Urban Development Boundary to include Parcel 296 and to change the Land Use Plan map designation of the site from "Open Land" to Restricted "Industrial and Office" is supported by the following CDMP objectives and policies

<u>Consistency Review:</u> This proposed UDB expansion and redesignation of the site is supported by the following CDMP objectives and policies.

- LU-1G. Business developments shall preferably be placed in clusters or nodes in the vicinity of major roadway intersections, and not in continuous strips or as isolated spots, with the exception of small neighborhood nodes. Business developments shall be designed to relate to adjacent development, and large uses should be planned and designed to serve as an anchor for adjoining smaller businesses or the adjacent business district. Granting of commercial or other non-residential zoning by the County is not necessarily warranted on a given property by virtue of nearby or adjacent roadway construction or expansion, or by its location at the intersection of two roadways.
- LU-10. Miami-Dade County shall seek to prevent discontinuous, scattered development at the urban fringe particularly in the Agriculture Areas, through its CDMP amendment process, regulatory and capital improvements programs and intergovernmental coordination activities.
- LU-4A. When evaluating compatibility among proximate land uses, the County shall consider such factors as noise, lighting, shadows, glare, vibration, odor, runoff, access, traffic, parking, height, bulk, scale of architectural elements, landscaping, hours of operation, buffering, and safety, as applicable.
- LU-4B. Uses designated on the LUP map and interpretive text, which generate or cause to generate significant noise, dust, odor, vibration, or truck or rail traffic shall be protected from damaging encroachment by future approval of new incompatible uses such as residential uses.

## APPENDIX D

#### FISCAL IMPACTS ON INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES

On October 23, 2001, the Board of County Commissioners adopted Ordinance 01-163 requiring the review procedures for amendments to the Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP) to include a written evaluation of fiscal impacts for any proposed land use change. The evaluation estimates the incremental and cumulative impact of the costs for the required infrastructure and service, and the extent to which the costs will be borne by the property owners or will require general taxpayer supports and includes an estimate of the amount of support. This evaluation reviews the impacts to County departments and agencies responsible for supplying and maintaining infrastructure and services relevant to the CDMP.

The infrastructure and services and associated agencies responsible for planning, providing and maintaining those services are the following:

Solid Waste	Miami-Dade Public Works and Waste Management
	Department
Water and Sewer	Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department
Park and Recreation	Miami-Dade Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces
	Department
Mass Transit	Miami-Dade Transit Agency
Fire and Rescue Service	Miami-Dade Fire Rescue Department
Roadways	Miami-Dade Public Works and Waste Management
-	Department
Flood Protection	Miami-Dade Division of Environmental Resources
	Management
Public Schools	Miami-Dade County Public Schools

The Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources (Department) has submitted, as part of the application for the Land Use Element, 284 parcels to be redesignated on the adopted Land Use Plan (LUP) map and four changes to the Urban Expansion Areas to implement findings and recommendations contained in the adopted 2010 Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR). No private applications to redesignate lands on the LUP map are being considered at this time. These EAR-based land use changes as proposed by the Department are categorized into three general types of redesignations, including those that: reflect the current land use designations on adopted comprehensive municipal plans; removal of land designated "Agriculture" from the 2025 Urban Expansion Area; and the redesignation of approximately 521 acres from "Open Land" to "Restricted Industrial and Office" land use category and inclusion in the Adopted 2015 Urban Development Boundary.

As discussed below, the modifications to the Urban Expansion Areas and municipal plan changes representations on the CDMP Land Use Plan map by their very nature do not ordinarily generate any additional fiscal impacts to urban services provided by County departments and agencies.

- 1. The redesignations to address municipal plan changes are already permitted to occur in municipal areas, thus, no additional fiscal impacts are being generated;
- 2. The changes to the LUP map that would modify the 2025 Urban Expansion Area (UEA) boundaries by removing land from the 2025 UEA will not generate demand for urban services; and
- 3. The redesignation of Parcel 296 from "Open Land" to "Restricted Industrial and Office" land use category and its inclusion in the 2015 Urban Development Boundary will result in a higher overall fiscal impact to urban services. However, any future development of this land will have to be done by the developers at their own expenses and according to County Rules, Regulations and Specification Standards.

Parcel No. 296 is requested to be redesignated from "Open Land" to "Restricted Industrial and Office" land use category and to be included in the Urban Development Boundary. The proposed change is estimated to have higher water and sewer demand and water and sewer costs than the existing designation of "Open Land". The application area is not currently served by water and sewer infrastructure and therefore water main and sanitary sewer extensions will be required. Any future development in the application area will have to be done by the developers at their own expenses and according to County Rules, Regulations and Specification Standards. Additionally, since there is no residential development involved, this proposed redesignation would not fiscally impact such services as parks and schools.

Additionally, Parcel 296 will fiscally impact transportation services. However, it is recognized that this overall application area will be developed incrementally over the next 20-30 years and the construction of new roadways to provide access to the parcels will have to be done by the developers at their own expenses and according to County Regulations and Design Standards. Moreover, at the time of development the individual properties may be restricted to less than the maximum allowable uses under the requested "Restricted Industrial and Office" category through the zoning and site planning review process to ensure that all public facility level of service standards, particularly for roadways, are not violated.

The following is a fiscal evaluation of Parcel 296 Application from County departments and agencies responsible for supplying and maintaining infrastructure and services relevant to the CDMP. The evaluation estimates the incremental and cumulative costs of the required infrastructure and services, and to the extent to which the costs will be borne by the property owners or will require general taxpayer support and includes an estimate of that support.

The agencies use various methodologies for their calculations. The agencies on a variety of sources for revenue, such as property taxes, impact fees, connection fees, user fees, gas taxes, taxing districts, general fund contribution, federal and state grants, federal funds, etc. Certain variables, such as property use and location were considered by the service agencies in developing their cost estimates.

## Solid Waste Services

Since the Public Works and Waste Management Department (PWWM) assesses solid waste disposal capacity on a system-wide basis, in part, on existing waste delivery

commitments from both the private and public sectors, it is not possible or necessary to make determinations concerning the adequacy of solid waste disposal facilities relative to the application. Instead, the PWWM issues a periodic assessment of the County's status in terms of 'concurrency'; that is, the ability to maintain a minimum of five (5) years of waste disposal capacity system-wide. The County is committed to maintaining this level in compliance with Chapter 163, Part II F.S. and currently exceeds this standard as of FY 2012-2013.

Currently, the household waste collection fee is \$439 per residential unit, which also covers costs for waste disposal, bulky waste pick up, illegal dumping clean-up, trash and recycling center operations, curbside recycling, home chemical collection centers, and code enforcement. As of September 30, 2012, the average residential unit generated 2.15 tons of waste, which includes garbage, trash and recycled waste.

The cost of providing disposal capacity for Waste Collection Service Area (WCSA) customers, municipalities and private haulers is paid for by system users. For FY 2012-2013, the PWWM charges at a contract disposal rate of \$63.65 per ton to PWWM Collections and to those private haulers and municipalities with long-term disposal agreements. The short-term disposal rate is \$83.92 per ton in FY 2012-2013. These rates adjust annually with the Consumer Price Index, South Region. In addition, the PWWM charges a Disposal Facility Fee to private haulers equal to 15 percent of their annual gross receipts, which is used to ensure availability of disposal capacity in the system. Landfill closure is funded by a portion of the Utility Service Fee charged to all retail customers of the County's Water and Sewer Department.

## Water and Sewer

The Miami-Dade County Water and Sewer Department (WASD) provides for the majority of water and sewer service needs throughout the county. The cost estimates provided herein are preliminary and final project costs will vary from these estimates. The final costs for the project and resulting feasibility will depend on the actual labor and materials costs, competitive market conditions, final project scope implementation schedule, continuity of personnel and other variable factors. The water impact fee was calculated at a rate of \$1.39 per gallon per day (gpd), and the sewer impact fee was calculated at a rate of \$5.60 per gpd. The annual operations and maintenance cost was based on \$1.3957 per 1,000 gallons for water and \$1.8572 per 1,000 gallons for sewer.

The applicant requests a change to the CDMP Land Use Plan map to redesignate a 521 gross acre application area from Open Land to Restricted Industrial and Office, which would allow a maximum of 11,347,380 square feet of warehouse development. If the application site is developed with the maximum allowable square footage, water connection charges/impact fees would be \$157,729 and water service line and meter connection fees would cost \$1,300. Sewer connection charges/impact fees for the land use would be \$635,453 and the annual operating and maintenance costs would total \$134,728.

# Flood Protection

The Miami-Dade County Division of Environmental and Resources Management (DERM) is responsible for the enforcement of current stormwater management and

disposal regulations. These regulations require that all new development provide full onsite retention of the stormwater runoff generated by the development. The drainage systems serving new developments are not allowed to impact existing or proposed public stormwater disposal systems, or to impact adjacent properties. The County is not responsible for providing flood protection to private properties, although it is the County's responsibility to ensure and verify that said protection has been incorporated in the plans for each proposed development. The above noted determinations are predicated upon the provisions of Chapter 46, Section 4611.1 of the South Florida Building Code; Section 24-58.3(G) of the Code of Miami-Dade County, Florida; Chapter 40E-40 Florida Administrative Code, Basis of Review South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD); and Section D4 Part 2 of the Public Works Manual of Miami-Dade County. All these legal provisions emphasize the requirement for full on-site retention of stormwater as a post development condition for all proposed commercial, industrial, and residential subdivisions.

Additionally, DERM staff notes that new development, within the urbanized area of the County, is assessed a stormwater utility fee. This fee commensurate with the percentage of impervious area of each parcel of land, and is assessed pursuant to the requirements of Section 24-61, Article IV, of the Code of Miami-Dade County. Finally, according to the same Code Section, the proceedings may only be utilized for the maintenance and improvement of public storm drainage systems.

Based upon the above noted considerations, it is the opinion of DERM that Ordinance No. 01-163 will not change, reverse, or affect these factual requirements.

## Public Schools

The proposed land use change would not result in residential development and therefore will have no impact on public schools.

## Fire Rescue

The Miami-Dade County Fire and Rescue Department indicates that fire and rescue service in the vicinity of the application site is inadequate. However, MDFR is constructing two new stations, and is working with a private developer who agreed to dedicate a 2-acre parcel of land to MDFR for station construction, and it is anticipated that the stations will provide adequate fire and rescue coverage in the vicinity of the application site.