CALL TO ORDER
Melissa Lammers, Acting Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.

ROLL CALL
Roll call was taken, with Members Surrette, Tobias, LeFils, and Zelenski absent and Member Jamison attending virtually. All other members were present.

Acting Chair Lammers requested a motion to allow Member Jamison to participate virtually. Member Anderson moved to allow the participation of Member Jamison virtually. Member Malmborg seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Acting Chair Lammers called for any comments regarding the March minutes.

Member Anderson moved to approve the minutes as drafted. Member Gow seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION
Acting Chair Lammers requested to discuss the appointment of a new Chair at the end of the meeting.

LOW IMPACT DEVELOPMENT (LID)
Ginger Adair, Environmental Management Director, provided a brief introduction regarding the LID presentation.

Katrina Locke, Sustainability and Resilience Manager, introduced herself and the other presenters; Michelle Morrison, East Central Florida Regional Planning Council (ECFRPC), and Jerry Murphy, UF/IFAS. She also introduced Thomas Ruppert, UF/IFAS, SeaGrant. She then discussed the agenda as Project Overview, LID Regional Roundtable Discussion Highlights, Draft LID Ordinance Concepts and Recommendations, and Project Next Steps. She also provided a recap of the February LID Workshop. Moving into the presentation, she reviewed the definitions of LID and green stormwater infrastructure (GSI), how each would pertain to the development process – specifically, avoidance as LID, minimization as LID, and mitigation as GSI, the FDEO grant, its phases, and the potential LID barriers as determined by VCARD. She noted the goal was to come back to ENRAC in May to review and discuss the LID draft ordinance and guidance manual.

Ms. Morrison then moved into the LID Regional Roundtable Highlights. She provided an overview of ECFRPC, the Action Plan, which was adopted in 2018, the implementation possibilities, the February workshop purpose, the LID audit tool, and LID challenges.
Acting Chair Lammers commented on the audit tool and its application to county ordinances as demonstrated at the workshop. Staff clarified that the use of the tool was to provide a beta test, but it did not include a deep dive into the code.

Member Anderson inquired if the 2018 adopted action plan was intended to be implemented countywide or just within the unincorporated areas of the county. Ms. Locke responded it was intended to be regional for Volusia and Brevard, with a focus on unincorporated areas and input from the cities.

Acting Chair Lammers asked how many staff were devoted to the coordination with the cities. Staff responded there are two.

Member Morrissey asked if any city staff were on any technical advisory committees (TAC). Staff explained that while there is a city collaborative effort, their staff are not part of TAC.

Mr. Murphy then continued the presentation by discussing the ordinance concepts and recommendations, environmental site design, LID design process, pollutant removal as it relates to pre and post-development conditions, the pollutant removal calculation procedure, the purpose and intent to improve and protect water quality and quantity, the applicability, noting the county should set and become the standard, and other considerations.

Acting Chair Lammers requested definitions of channel protection flow and conveyance flow. Member Anderson responded conveyance as actual stormwater treatment and conveyance, and channel erosion by existing channels. Mr. Murphy confirmed the explanation.

Member Hoblick asked how big a part the hydrological and geological conditions play in flows. Mr. Murphy explained LID keeps the GIS commitment of water remaining on site until it is clean enough to discharge, while attempting to avoid bulkheads and pipes so as not to rush the water off.

Member Hoblick also inquired about the percolation effect on recharge back to the aquifer. Mr. Murphy offered the proposal would look at hydrology prior to the development plan and then develop accordingly.

Member Anderson discussed “treatment train” as being the process of treating at multiple points. She added source control as a landscape design that does not require fertilization and that leading with a goal of hydrology remaining completely on site might be unobtainable.

Acting Chair Lammers inquired about new development versus redevelopment mitigation and infill retrofitting. It was explained that LID would be at the planning phase for new development and GSI would be specific to redevelopment or infill.

Member Malmborg discussed BMP trains, which use calculations for nutrient loading. He offered treatment may be the use of wet ponds, which provide for onsite binding with the use of plants, or effective nutrient removal using dry ponds within the BMAP (affected area springs), which used
biologically active media that is dormant when dry and activate when wet but has to be harvested. He added the dry option has a service life and a management expectation that cannot be met with the newly proposed policy. He asked if there were other methods available.

Ms. Adair noted the end of the presentation and requested discussion of expectations and proposals.

Member Anderson concurred with Member Malmborg’s assessment and reiterated the need for site design without the reliance on fertilizer, which Seminole County is currently exploring.

Member Malmborg added the nutrient loading calculation science is relatively young and did not gain the attention it deserves. He suggested consideration should be given to creating incentives.

Mr. Murphy reiterated that landscape is important as it stops inputs prior to the source, which would equate to capture not removal of nutrients. He added soil composition should be tested to determine native composition.

Member Gow offered thoughts on water quality versus quantity. She then discussed the need to go through the Land Development Code to address curb and gutters, driveways, sidewalks, etc., and not create conflicting rules. She added sites should be looked at not just as individuals but in relation to the overall effects on the area. She reiterated the need for innovative ideas.

Ms. Adair agreed Code reviews need to be done. She explained the LID information will come back in a standard ordinance, which will incorporate the overall requests and recommendations. Then, staff will take pieces of the language and insert them in the most appropriate places in the Code. Staff will also search for conflicts and challenges.

Member Malmborg expounded on the creation of a capture mechanism to deal with stormwater treatment first. He explained the need for ongoing maintenance. He added alternatives to hurdles may make it more doable from the stance of engineers.

Mr. Ruppert discussed pre and post development.

Member Malmborg explained that the state target is 85% of post development load.

Mr. Ruppert agreed that maintenance cannot be underestimated as a major issue.

Member Anderson provided background of Victoria Gardens it was designed to follow principles considered LID. She added HOAs should be in charge of maintenance, noting 67% of housing units fall under and HOA or condo association.

Acting Chair Lammers offered development standards should be transferrable as part of the deed. She then noted most of the lands fall within the city jurisdictions and there should be city buy in. She also discussed the need for retrofits.
Member Gow spoke to HOAs being a powerful tool and how it becomes an issue if they have been dissolved and need to be reinstated. She then expressed concern that some developers may try to use LID to cut other corners. She explained the standard development cost is 15%, and if the cost goes above that, the development will not happen.

Member Fitzsimmons explained it’s not an either-or situation and anything towards LID is an accomplishment. He expressed concern about the regulations increasing the cost of housing. He suggested an audit first and then incremental improvements.

Ms. Adair responded both could happen in parallel to each other. Barriers were being identified, and time was scheduled with the water management district to discuss how to overcome the barriers.

Acting Chair Lammers requested areas be identified where incentives have worked. Member Malmborg also requested information on how many have failed.

Discussion ensued regarding conservation subdivisions and why this type of development had not been taken advantage of to date.

Member Anderson requested the LID webinars be distributed to all members. Staff agreed.

Discussion continued on “nature hoods” and the lack of understanding inhibiting the process.

Member Malmborg requested to see what had worked in the last five years.

Member Anderson suggested a field trip to Victoria Park.

Chris Ryan, Assistant County Attorney, cautioned the members that a field trip could be done, but it would have to be noticed and minutes would have to be taken.

Member Lites requested Member Anderson provide a presentation instead of the field trip. He also suggested the committee go through the process of showing potential sites, walking through the design process and deciding how sites could work, and talk through multiple scenarios.

Discussion ensued regarding case studies of the Cresswind development near Lake Winnemissett and Sun Bridge. The Committee could review what had been implemented in these locations and then choose pieces that may work for other sites. There was also discussion on redevelopment and thresholds for LID as well as the difference between redevelopment and infill.

At 2:51 p.m. the meeting adjourned for a break and resumed at 3:02 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jessy Wayles, IRL National Estuary Program, spoke about bipartisan infrastructure law and expected funding. She clarified the funds could not be used as a match but could be used as leverage. She offered her contact information to those wanting more information.
LID CONTINUED

Acting Chair Lammers summarized the earlier feedback as requiring LID practices or incentivizing them and relieving the difficulty of marketing LID.

Ms. Adair requested feedback for the grant team, which will be used to refine the recommendations.

Member Morrissey discussed how development regulations discourage ability to do LID, not liking the term “all new development”, and regulations imposed by other entities impeding implementation.

Vice Chair Lammers asked if local codes could be more stringent than the district. Member Malmborg replied in the affirmative. He then spoke about summarization and prioritization. He then motioned to have the staff and review team look at where in the code to allow, or benefit by GSI and minimization. He clarified reviewing for larger sites and subdivisions (20-35 acres +) and showing how incentives may be applied (tools within available resources) to focus on better water quality, without staff and professionals getting into crosshairs. He suggested it be scaled based on size.

The motion was then summarized to include: 1. Requirements for larger sites and subdivisions, 2. Review and identify Code opportunities as well as conflicts, and 3. Incentives tiered by types of development to exceed the water quality expectation.

Member Morrissey seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION

Member Anderson expressed LID is not explicit to large developments only and she did not want to constrain based on size.

Member Gow agreed with requirements and offered incentives do not have to monetary but could be used to offset the balance sheet to offer relief. She echoed the need for innovative approaches, mentioning lot depth instead of width and groundcover alternatives.

Member Fitzsimmons reiterated that infill, new development, and redevelopment are different and should be looked at incrementally.

Member Lites concurred and noted he would like to see application of the things discussed, possibly to the Amazon site as well as ¼ acre lots.

Member Anderson offered requiring versus incentivizing should become “must”, otherwise water will run out.

Member Hoblick called for the question.

Acting Chair Lammers again summarized the motion as: 1. LID for larger sites, 2. Review and identify Code opportunities and conflicts for water quality, and 3. Incentives by category for different types of development.
Member Morrissey also added GSI not for single but multiple areas.

Ms. Adair requested clarification of whether LID should be applied to commercial.

Member Malmborg responded LID should not be required but incentivized for small subdivisions and development.

Mr. Murphy reminded the Committee the grant is for an ordinance, which can allow for several approaches. He then cautioned against the term “should” or allowing for options that cannot be enforced.

After another summarization of the motion, the vote was called. The motion carried 8:1, with Member Anderson opposed.

Ms. Adair stated staff would review the motion and the scope of work for the consultant to formulate recommendations, which will come back to the Committee for review.

Discussion ensued regarding these recommendations not precluding others, development within the cities, and the need to determine the how.

Member Anderson motioned for the inclusion of commercial properties and roadway recommendations. Member Gow seconded the motion.

Member Malmborg requested the percentage of residential and commercial development within the county. Member Gow stated she will pull the information from the VCARD presentation and bring it back at the next meeting.

The motion carried unanimously.

Acting Chair Lammers discussed the link for the 1000 Friends of Florida webinar that was distributed prior to the meeting.

Member Lites requested clarification on the next steps for LID. Ms. Adair responded the grant team will draft an ordinance and a guidebook, which will include options. Staff will assist in deciding where the draft ordinance language should be placed within the Code.

Acting Chair Lammers stated using the audit tool might be helpful to better understanding. Ms. Adair responded the effort might be huge. Ms. Locke stated she would check with Eban Bean on whether it was ready.

Member Lites asked if the next meeting will be LID focused. Ms. Adair confirmed it would be a follow-up on LID, and if time allows continuation of trees.
Ms. Adair then discussed upcoming GSI workshops; April 13 for GSI design and April 14 for GSI maintenance. The workshops will be held at the Stetson Aquatic Center. She stated staff would distribute the fliers.

Mr. Ryan cautioned against conversations about the committee, if multiple members attend the workshop.

Discussion ensued regarding the intended audience for the GSI maintenance portion on the 14th and that it would include public works staff and the cities would be invited as well.

Member Morrissey noted a workshop on April 12 in Daytona Beach to discuss shorelines and climate change. She noted a mobile tour she took of the Jersey Shore post Sandy, which demonstrated the fragmented efforts for recovery and focused on coastal erosion. She then expressed concern that may be reality on our coasts.

Member Anderson expressed her hopes that the Committee would soon work on the coastal element. She then added approvers should also attend the GSI design workshop.

Member Gow supplied the location and time of the shoreline workshop. It will be held at 5:30 p.m. at Yvonne Scarlett-Golden Center in Daytona Beach. Ms. Gow then asked for the times of the GSI workshops and if they would be a structured program. Staff stated each day was scheduled from 9-3 and would be structured.

Ms. Adair then provided a recap of expected items for the next meeting and things for staff to do as: 1. LID YouTube video distribution to members, 2. Examples of how to apply LID in commercial, residential, and industrial sites 3. Explore if the audit tool is ready and if so, bring it back at the next meeting, and 4. An update from the grant team.

Member Morrissey also discussed the presentation from the League of Women Voters that is scheduled for April 22 at the Stetson Aquatic Center.

**DISCUSSION OF CHAIR APPOINTMENT**

Acting Chair Lammers requested a motion and/or discussion regarding the appointment of an ENRAC Chair.

Member Anderson motioned to appoint Melissa Lammers as Chair.

**DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION**

Member Morrissey expressed the value of Member Lammers’ input during the meetings and discussed the responsibilities of a Chair as facilitator and that the Committee would have to agree to allow Member Lammers to speak openly.

Mr. Ryan clarified the Chair’s inability to make motions or second them without passing the gavel. He also discussed Robert’s Rules of Order.
Member Malmborg asked if the discussion should be continued to the next meeting.

Member Anderson stated members need to be present and if they were not, they should understand they do not have a say.

Member Lites seconded the motion.

Member Morrissey expressed there should be an attendance policy and her support of the nomination, but with the understanding that Member Lammers would be able to freely share input on matters.

The motion carried unanimously.

Discussion ensued regarding nomination of Vice Chair.

Member Anderson moved to nominate Member Gow as Vice Chair. Member Malmborg seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.