

**PALM BEACH COUNTY WORKSHOP SERIES
STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS MINING IN THE EAA**

**WORKSHOP 2
February 8, 2011**

PLEASE NOTE: Today's workshop focuses on understanding review processes applicable to rock mining in the EAA, and possibly identifying ways to improve those that relate to land use. Participants are strongly encouraged to review *Permitting Process Regarding Mining Impacts within the EAA* in advance of the meeting. This report by Ken Todd of Palm Beach County staff provides a comparative overview of the topics to be covered today.

To download the report, go to <http://www.pbcgov.com/pzb/>, click on the link for *Mining Workshops* near the middle of the page. This will take you to the news release regarding this process. The link to download the report is on the first page of the news release, under *Related Links*.

AGENDA

Objectives

- Review and understand agency and county permitting and other review processes and responsibilities regarding rock-mining in the EAA
- Preliminarily identify what is working well and what might be improved in review processes
- Review, refine and consensus-test preliminary strategies from Workshop 1

9:00 Welcome and introductions, agenda and workshop discussion guidelines review

9:15 FDEP reviews and related processes – *presentation and questions for clarification*

SFWMD reviews and related processes – *presentation and questions for clarification*

10:15 Break

10:30 Palm Beach County Department of Environmental Resources – *presentation/ clarifications*

Other reviews -- *presentation and questions for clarification*

- Army Corps of Engineers
- Palm Beach County Health Department
- State Fire Marshall

11:30 Presenter and participant discussion – initial discussion in small groups

- *What parts of the review process are working well?*
- *What needs to be improved?(Overlaps?Gaps? Other issues?)*
- *What additional information is needed?*

12:00 Lunch

1:00 Presenter and participant discussion – continuation of discussion in full group

1:30 Review, refine and consensus-test preliminary list of potential strategies.

In light of today's discussions, participants will be asked to:

- *Review preliminary list of strategies from Workshop 1*
- *Add or refine strategies based on today's discussion*
- *Offer acceptability ratings and other input on the identified strategies*

2:45 Next steps

3:00 Adjourn

WORKSHOP GUIDELINES

Discussion Guidelines

- Say everything that needs to be said – concisely
- Balance participation
- Express and acknowledge differing views
- Ask questions and verify assumptions
- Seek shared understanding
- Be willing to explore solutions that address as many interests as possible
- Make sure recording is accurate
- Share in keeping to the agenda

Palm Beach County Staff Role

- Provide background information
- Serve as a resource – answer questions, provide clarification

The Facilitators' Role

- Help structure and guide discussions
- Help ensure that all perspectives have an opportunity to be heard
- Maintain an accurate record of group products
- Prepare the workshop report

Consensus or Acceptability Rating Scale

At various times in today's workshop, you may be asked to respond to ideas using the following scale.

- 4 Support. This is what I would do.
- 3 I can support or accept this, even though it might not be my first preference.
- 2 Minor reservations. I may be able to support or accept this, but I would like clarification or refinement of the idea first.
- 1 Major reservations. Not acceptable without significant changes.

WORKSHOP SERIES

The purpose of the workshop series is to explore and develop as much agreement as possible among stakeholders on whether changes are needed to Palm Beach County land use regulation addressing rock mining in the Everglades Agricultural Area, and if so, what those changes should be.

Workshop 1 (January 5, 2011)

- Review current Palm Beach County mining regulations, including applicable zoning requirements
- Identify considerations that should be taken into account when making decisions
- Identify potential new zoning strategies to address mining in the EAA

Workshop 2 (TODAY – February 8, 2011)

- Review discuss and understand review processes and information used for rock mining applications in the EAA
- Review, refine and add to strategies suggested at Workshop 1
- Consensus-test identified strategies
- Refine most promising strategies

Note: Activities anticipated at Workshops 3 & 4 may change, depending on results of Workshop 2

Workshop 3 (March 11, 2011)

- Review draft strategies developed by staff based on Workshops 1 & 2
- Consensus-test draft strategies
- Discuss and suggest refinements to draft strategies
- Consensus-test suggested refinements

Update to Board of County Commissioners (April 12, 2011)

Workshop 4 (Date TBD, if needed)

- Review draft recommendations or ULDC language developed by staff based on Workshops 1 -3
- Consensus-test proposed draft
- Discuss and suggest refinements to proposed draft
- Consensus-test suggested refinements
- Revise proposed draft, if needed

WORKSHEET 1

POTENTIAL LAND USE REGULATION STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS MINING IN EAA

The following strategies were drafted by the facilitator based on Workshop 1 discussions. Although they are based on participant comments as recorded in the Workshop 1 Meeting Summary, they have not been reviewed by participants in their current form. They are not mutually exclusive, and are not in any particular order. They focus on County-level, land-use-related processes and are intended as a starting point for further discussion and strategy identification by workshop participants.

- A. Identify areas of the EAA that are most likely to be within the footprint of Everglades restoration projects, and defer decisions on mining in those areas for a limited, specified period of time. This strategy allows additional time for the further detailing of restoration project plans, and defers final decisions on mining in the identified areas until more information is available.

4 – Support. This is what I would do	3—Can support. May not be my first preference.	2 – Minor reservations. Needs clarification or refinement.	1—Major reservations. Not acceptable w/o major changes.

Reservations and Comments: _____

- B. Reduce duplication between the County land-use decision-making process and other agency reviews required of rock-mining applications.

4 – Support. This is what I would do	3—Can support. May not be my first preference.	2 – Minor reservations. Needs clarification or refinement.	1—Major reservations. Not acceptable w/o major changes.

Reservations and Comments: _____

- C. Establish better up-front siting and suitability criteria, and agree to allow mining in areas that are suitable.

4 – Support. This is what I would do	3—Can support. May not be my first preference.	2 – Minor reservations. Needs clarification or refinement.	1—Major reservations. Not acceptable w/o major changes.

Reservations and Comments: _____

D. Create an advisory board composed of mining experts to develop criteria to be used in the review process.

4 – Support. This is what I would do	3—Can support. May not be my first preference.	2 – Minor reservations. Needs clarification or refinement.	1—Major reservations. Not acceptable w/o major changes.

Reservations and Comments: _____

F. Create an advisory board composed of mining experts to evaluate permit applications.

4 – Support. This is what I would do	3—Can support. May not be my first preference.	2 – Minor reservations. Needs clarification or refinement.	1—Major reservations. Not acceptable w/o major changes.

Reservations and Comments: _____

G. Develop more rigorous design and performance standards, and require bonding.

4 – Support. This is what I would do	3—Can support. May not be my first preference.	2 – Minor reservations. Needs clarification or refinement.	1—Major reservations. Not acceptable w/o major changes.

Reservations and Comments: _____

H. Develop and disseminate informational materials to inform stakeholders and members of the interested public about existing review processes and procedures.

4 – Support. This is what I would do	3—Can support. May not be my first preference.	2 – Minor reservations. Needs clarification or refinement.	1—Major reservations. Not acceptable w/o major changes.

Reservations and Comments: _____

I. Other: _____

4 – Support. This is what I would do	3—Can support. May not be my first preference.	2 – Minor reservations. Needs clarification or refinement.	1—Major reservations. Not acceptable w/o major changes.

Reservations and Comments: _____

WORKSHOP 2

February 8, 2011

MEETING EVALUATION

Average rating using a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 means totally disagree and 10 means totally agree.

1. Please assess the overall meeting

- _____ The agenda packet was very useful.
- _____ The background information and presentations were very useful.
- _____ The objectives for the meeting were stated at the outset.
- _____ Overall, the objectives of the meeting were fully achieved.

2. Do you agree that each of the following meeting objectives was achieved?

- _____ Review and understand agency and County permitting and other review processes and responsibilities regarding rock-mining in the EAA
- _____ Preliminarily identify what is working well and what might be improved in those review processes
- _____ Review, refine and consensus-test, as appropriate, preliminary list of potential strategies from Workshop 1

3. Please tell us how well the facilitators helped the participants engage in the meeting.

- _____ The facilitators made sure the concerns of all members were heard.
- _____ The facilitators helped us arrange our time well.
- _____ The members followed the direction of the facilitators.

4. Please tell us your level of satisfaction with the meeting?

- _____ Overall, I am very satisfied with the meeting.
- _____ I was very satisfied with the services provided by the Facilitators.
- _____ I am satisfied with the outcome of the meeting.

5. Please tell us how well the next steps were explained?

- _____ I know what the next steps following this meeting will be.
- _____ I know who is responsible for the next steps.

6. What did you like best about the meeting?

7. How could the meeting have been improved?

8. Do you have any other comments that you would like to add (Please use back of form if needed)?