MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL AND
NATURAL RESOURCES ADVISORY COMMITTEE
May 3, 2023

CALL TO ORDER
Melissa Lammers, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL
Roll call was taken, with Member Jamison attending virtually. All other members present.

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

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

Member Fitzimmons moved to approve the minutes as drafted. Member Malmborg seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION
Chair Lammers stated that there would be a very big presentation and we should spend quality time with our visitors and get started.

LOW IMPACT DEVELOPMENT UPDATE
Ginger Adair, Environmental Management Director, provided a brief introduction to the day’s presentation and information requested by the committee at the last meeting. Presentation order was changed with Eban Bean, now presenting following Mr. Murphy.

Katrina Locke, Sustainability and Resilience Manager, was introduced and reviewed the presentation guests presenting to the committee. Michelle Morrison, ECFRPC, will present LID implementation examples and incentives and additional information. Jerry Murphy, UF/IFAS, will be discussing some ordinance recommendations. Eban Bean, UF/IFAS, will then present the audit tool at the end of the presentation.

Katrina reviewed the Grant Phases calendar reviewing that the project was presented to all in April and have worked on the appendix and the LID Implementation Guidebook. Today we are back with you to review some additional information, and then there are a couple more steps to go through with the grant expiration date June 3, 2023.

Michelle Morrison introduced and presented examples of LID GSI Implementation for Grove Roots Brewing Company in Winter Haven, Florida. The information was pulled from the Winter Haven from Gray to Green Enhanced Stormwater Permit Design Manual. The project utilized an integrated system of roof gutters/downspouts, infiltration basins, parking areas graded to flow into grassed
swales, and open areas, and trees. Mechanical reworking of the compacted soil was also performed. The city refers to their stormwater as a resource and not a nuisance to be quickly disposed of through pipes and ditches.

Another example presented was of a True Value Hardware store in Philadelphia, PA, redeveloped a store, two vacant buildings, asphalt parking, gravel, and lawn, with approx. 26,000 sq. ft. of impervious area. A rain garden and two subsurface infiltration basins were installed. The use of staged construction prevented the compaction of the native soils in areas where infiltration was proposed.

Another example of smaller office complexes was shown that utilized pervious pavers, bioretention, pea gravel/infiltration, bioretention islands including a bioretention area. These projects were done in Nashville, TN, and can be found utilizing an interactive map that shows the location of similar LID projects in the area, and have a campaign called “Depave Nashville” that utilizes many volunteer groups and grants to replant areas for LID.

A Whole Foods in Raleigh, NC, was shown that has a rain chain, cistern in front of store that uses the water for irrigation and toilets. Again, a subsurface infiltration system with bioswales, bioretention, and underground detention chamber was also installed.

A residential multi-family example located in Winter Haven, FL, was shown that incorporated under-building parking which reduced impervious area by 50%; infiltration of almost 100% of stormwater on-site and utilization of roof gutter/downspouts, infiltration basins/ponds, grassed bioswales and open areas with trees. These examples are easy to maintain and routinely done so. A residential area that had been prone to flooding was also presented that utilized amended soils, bioretention, gravel pathway & storage areas, while utilizing native vegetation.

Sunbridge Weslyn Park, in Oseola County, FL, was presented as an example of the utilization of Florida-Friendly landscaping. The homeowners in this area must abide by landscaping standards and provide documentation guides to assist them. The Villages, in Sumter County, FL, also utilize the same principles. Discussion of the use of Bahia and soil amendments assists residents to stay away from the use of fertilizers and irrigation.

Escambia County Office Complex in Pensacola, FL, boasts the largest green roof at 33,000 sq. ft and utilizes biofiltration, native vegetation, and provides energy savings. Another public space that was changed from a brownfield site, prone to runoff, erosion, and flash flooding issues, was turned into Cascades Park in Tallahassee, FL, a 25-acre public park with wildlife, ponds, interconnected multi-use trail system, and amphitheater, by utilizing biofiltration, bioretention, rain garden and wetlands.

In Volusia County, the Sandra Stetson Aquatic Center in DeLand, is a GSI demonstration project incorporating biofiltration, rain garden, floating wetland Beemat system, and native vegetation.

Slides were presented which shared the core goals of the SJRWMD and included water quality, water supply, flood protection, and utilization of natural systems. An example of the cost-share funded Ocala Wetlands Recharge Park project which originated as a golf course. Discussion ensued to the
fact that the SJRWMD meeting was recorded and available on their website. WMD allows permits by state law, but local jurisdictions can impose stricter requirements and are then responsible for their enforcement. Ms. Morrison shared how the WMD can assist with technical issues and to expedite LID projects, as well as assist in cost-share funding roles.

Elements pertaining to LID/GSI in the Volusia County Comprehensive Plan were shared covering drainage, groundwater aquifer recharge, coastal water quality, conservation, future land use, including conservation subdivisions. The Ormond Beach Comprehensive Plan was shared which included LID/GSI elements related to utilities, future land use, and conservation, which included a goal of low impact development. Ormond Beach in 2013 created their Low Impact Development Design Manual and began offering incentives toward LID, which includes waived fees and expedited processes.

Discussion ensued on project utilization of LID elements, and Member Gow stated that all projects include in some form LID pieces in them, but it is harder to find one standout project that pulls together at once, all the elements.

Member Malmborg shared that due to the SJRWMD regulations, most of Ormond Beach projects were already in compliance. Clay Ervin, Director of Volusia County Growth and Resource Management, shared a Zev Cohen project in Ormond Beach that utilized an under-parking lot vault for stormwater storage. Discussion ensued with the failure and collapse of the parking lot due to product failure by the manufacturer, which was quickly repaired with no loss of life. It was confirmed that no signage at the site lists the project as a low impact development.

Apopka, Orlando, Titusville, St. Petersburg, Sebastian, Tallahassee, Tampa, Doral, Orange County, and Alachua County, have all included incentivized LID credits and promotions. Some incentives are geared towards single family residences. LID parking requirement examples being done in Apopka, Groveland, Winter Haven, and Doral, were also shared.

Member Malmborg commented on the Doral slide which illustrated structural and non-structural LID components and inquired about the meaning of the term. Ms. Morrisson shared that she took this to mean utilization of natural land topography and hydrology of the site but would verify.

Member Surrette posed questions on whether the incentives being offered were adequate for enticing LID, and if cities were receiving incentives for providing the incentives? What were the reasons that drew the cities toward implementing LID requirements?

Member Anderson stated that often cities were drawn to LID as a response to crisis due to flooding issues that arose. The crisis then resulted in the need to do things differently to protect against future events. LID is also a standard in the industry, and the goal is to match the code to the standards.

Discussion ensued on whether current incentives being offered were enticing enough to developers to incorporate LID principles into their projects. Chair Lammers requested discussion to continue following the presentations.
Member Anderson commented on disconnecting the impervious surface to different areas where recharge and infiltration can occur and multiple areas of water treatment as water moves along a site.

Jerry Murphy, JD, AICP, DBM, was introduced to speak on ordinance recommendations, incentives, and whether incentives would then be turned into requirements. Information to be presented would illustrate how to proceed with LID in both unincorporated and incorporated areas.

Virtually presented ordinance information at the previous month’s meeting regarding purpose and intent, environmental site design, or process of utilizing the site as it exists to incorporate existing topography was discussed. Ordinance goals included designing the project for the site as it exists instead of scraping the site which has long since been the practice. Waivers for when the situation does not fit within the requirements were also discussed. (This slide was not included in the presentation.)

Channel protection and conveyance flow were reviewed, with conveyance flow explained to mean the maintaining of post-development peak runoff rate as the same or less than the pre-development peak rate. High density residential and non-residential redevelopment projects were projected as being where these ordinances would be most needed.

Discussion ensued on what was meant by high density in the presented slide which was explained to mean a subdivision, or a multi-family development. The terminology used was explained as the utilization of green field development terms and natural hydrology.

Industrial land uses with high pollutant loads and the high pollutant loads associated with the use of reclaimed water. Implementation and integration of GSI and LID strategies are key to establishing criteria that can be followed. Incentivization of retrofits could be an option in making existing developments utilize GSI and LID methods. Often it would be necessary to try and bring the land topography back to what it was before the site was flattened, by utilizing various options.

Volusia County Land Development Code (LDC), Chapter 72, was reviewed to show that modifications in the four divisions: definitions and interpretation; zoning; land development regulations, and overlay zones, would be necessary. Land Development Regulations, section III, would be where the most amount of change would be necessary and the audit tool to be presented by Eban Bean, later in the presentation, could prove very beneficial.

Recommendations to the board would be to go forward with the new LID requirements, due to there being too many people, not enough land, and surrounding water shortage. Questions were posed on if LID was made a requirement, where would it be or not be required, as well as if it is to be incentivized. Discussion on an important place to start was with road design, driveway layouts, and lot design.

Member Hoblick asked if the number of units to be developed, and type of development to build, were not already in the comprehensive land use plan. Mr. Murphy replied that this is being done at a very high level, but not at a per-site stormwater level.
Member Malmborg inquired if density discussed was density of impervious coverage and not so much of density of units per acre. Mr. Murphy stated that it was the density of development, and shared an example of a ten-acre parcel that was completely paved, which would mean that that was a dense occupation of that site, versus a ten-acre parcel where a quarter was used for a high-rise and three-quarters used for site design.

Member Hoblick asked for additional clarification on the comprehensive land use plan that already states the number of parcels and number of units per acre and inquired if that wasn’t the basis of where the committee should begin. A suggestion to consider reviewing those densities as they currently exist, versus creating more densities with special exceptions.

Chair Lammers commented that this was a good question and that we need to understand and learn more as the commission progresses. Discussion ensued on maximum lot coverage and a developer’s perspective of density of units per acre versus current discussion of lot surface percentage being made impervious, or rather “impacted.”

Chair Lammers identified this distinction as being very important to embrace throughout the discussions.

The suggestion was made to perhaps begin with zoning, as future land uses are already in place which designate a maximum density and coverage per acre. It was shared that approximately 40% of the property would be left undisturbed and that would mean how much of the property was left with its original contours or scraped down to increase the maximum density allowable. The main issue is what would be done with the amount of property remaining, and the use of native landscaping to diminish the need for irrigation.

Mr. Murphy shared a clearer label for density should have included impacts, and we want to put the fewest number of impacts on the natural hydrology of the property. The suggestion is that planning should begin during the subdivision site design stage. The goal is to use the existing topography and incorporate that into the design of the development.

Discussion ensued over cluster development and placing more land into conservation. Design aspects were discussed on the location of cluster developments and allowing the water to flow naturally, which is a design with nature approach, and engineering with nature. Water in needs to be less than or equal to water out, without the means of traditional stormwater treatment with pumps. Discussion ensued on traditional methods for handling stormwater and LID principles which are non-traditional to being exercised and conservation areas.

Chair Lammers stated that the committee had been tasked with identifying those ordinances that are contrary to LID principles. Conservation of property was clarified as not necessarily putting property into conservation but working with nature. Clarification was given to work with nature to be able to help nature work with the development to build the number of units desired.
Member Malmborg shared the challenges faced by engineers of the inability to advocate for every new emerging technology or technique, and the resulting unintended consequences.

Mr. Murphy shared how utilization of the audit tool can be used to identify existing land development regulations and where they don’t work with this kind of LID program. Volusia County has a large amount of undeveloped land and wetlands where utilizing LID and GSI and the new stormwater rule being rolled out, can be used to design a little differently in those suburban areas.

Member Gow shared the land development regulations are where LID requirements can be seen, and then discussed the new state law on collection and redistribution of water. Ms. Gow also shared that the goal should be to create a code, that at its core, does not take extra process and staff can administer with clear standards. Suggestion was made that regulations should apply to baseline zoning districts.

Discussion ensued with the level of incentives and if they are substantial enough to entice developers to follow LID guidelines. The example brought up was a previous slide discussing Titusville and curiosity of the various types of incentives they found had worked and didn’t work. Mr. Murphy emphasized that Tittusville, due to the fact they are a coastal area and built out, and already under constraints.

Ginger Adair stated that the matrix utilized by Tittusville is on their website. Mr. Murphy stated that Titusville and other coastal and barrier island areas in Florida offer many incentives, and due to their land constraints, have made those incentives work on their behalf.

Mr. Murphy reviewed the ten-step process for reviewing incentives. (Slide not presented.)

1. Determine objectives.
2. Different incentives for different developments and businesses.
3. Fact finding and including the audience in this step.
4. Create rules, structure, and develop a budget.
5. Select the rewards.
6. Communicate the program.
7. Identification of the unintended consequences.
8. Fulfill the rewards and issue the rewards as soon as possible.
9. Evaluate and measure whether the goals are being accomplished.
10. Celebrate success if the goals are being accomplished.

Member Gow asked about the barriers encountered regarding buffer changes and elements discussed without being accused of changing and implementing new rules. Mr. Murphy suggested reviewing the land development code and identifying where LID is not being supported. Taking the CAST, and the template ordinance being developed, and seeing where it can and cannot be utilized. Property developers will take the tool kit, look at the property and if they cannot do what they want, they will move on to another property.

Member Zelenski asked how adopting an ordinance utilizing GSI and LID fits into the CRS program, and how the entire County benefits from the insurance discounts. Mr. Murphy explained that points
assigned to implementing LID regarding stormwater management will assign points, and the increase in number of points reduces the cost of flood insurance by 5% per category level achieved.

Member Zelenski asked if the model ordinances written for this grant were compliant with the CRS manual of the National Flood Insurance Program policies. Mr. Murphy replied that it was compliant with the CRS manual and would result in 25 points, but the ordinance would require LID and not merely offering incentives.

Clay Ervin stated that changes in the new rate program set up determination is not solely based on flood plains, and the added categories will require more people to have flood insurance.

At 1:22 p.m. the meeting adjourned for a break and resumed at 1:32 p.m. Member Jamison left the meeting for the day at this time.

Chair Lammers stated that the audit tool was discussed at the LID workshop in February as something that might assist our effectiveness. Katrina Locke introduced Eban Bean, Assistant Professor with the University of Florida, who developed this tool and introduced the scoping exercise at the workshop. The presentation will be shown to explain the tool.

The presentation showed the code audit tool entitled Enabling Low Impact Development (LID) and Green Stormwater Infrastructure (GSI) for Florida counties and municipalities. The tool helps to identify codes that either explicitly or inadvertently restrict or prohibit low impact development and green water infrastructure. The intent to take an objective assessment of a code and what those barriers might be.

The tool is a spreadsheet tool with approximately 140 questions, by categories, including definitions, a log of what is being reviewed, and applying a scoring system to evaluate the code. The four major categories included administration; local government planning and policy; protecting nature; stormwater and water quality, and the “built environment.”

There are two major parts of the audit tool which include the scoping exercise and the code audit, which follow the initial groundwork layout of establishing a core team and establishing a plan.

The audit tool helps to identify strategies for updating and auditing the codes to enable the implementation of GSI and LID, and the exercise encompasses five different parts, with the presentation example that was performed at the Marine Resources Council last fall. The five parts of the scoping exercise include LID/GSI implementation in your community; community acceptance of LID/GSI; natural infrastructure in the community; stormwater and water quality; and revising codes and policies. The exercise showed that LID and GSI codes were found in comp plans, but not in land development codes, and was also not a requirement.

In this exercise it was noted that the code section that could be improved upon to support LID/GSI was zoning; site plan; storm water; street; parking; erosion and sediment; and water quality. The main topics that could be improved were stormwater and site planning.
Scoping was then followed by conducting the audit which included adapting the CAST (Code Audit Spreadsheet Tool); performing the audit; and summarizing the results. Scoring examples were shared. The post audit will include the adoption of strategy; identification of hurdles beyond codes; and follow through. The tool is for identifying gaps or weaknesses and not a tool for offering solutions. There is a second part of this tool that will help to identify solutions that other entities have utilized.

Pilot audits were performed in Alachua County and Cocoa Beach, FL, with current discussions with another county. The presentation included a QR code to access the audit tool.

Chair Lammers summarized the process and commented that there wasn’t an opportunity for artificial intelligence (AI) to be used to find where the specific code items reside, and then evaluate them. Dr. Bean responded that the tool did not include that type of automation but instead would help to start the process of how to approach the topic. The audit tool provides a map on how to navigate through the codes and pose important and relevant questions on how to change it.

Chair Lammers shared that no criticism of the tool was implied, and identified it as evaluative, diagnostic, and prescriptive.

Member Morrissey noted that this tool didn’t appear to be a product of the grant, and asked if the committee was going to utilize the tool and do audits.

Ms. Locke clarified that it was not our intention to have the committee utilize the audit tool, but whether the committee recommended grant funds be allotted for staff to work through the process. Dr. Bean’s presentation of the audit process illustrated how other counties had utilized the audit tool and the staff investment and additional costs that are associated with the completion of an audit.

Dr. Bean stated that staff time and associated costs were determined by the size of the organization, number of codes reviewed, and extensiveness of the audit. Alachua county is comparable in size to Volusia and completed an extensive audit in approximately four to six months. A partnership with the Urban and Regional Planning program at UF will utilize students in the internship program, who are working for a government, to use the audit tool on their organization. The approximate cost to the intern would be $10,000, again, depending upon the size of the audit.

Ms. Adair commented that the reason that we don’t see this as a product of the grant work being done is because when the grant was applied for this audit tool was not available. Now that the tool is available, the question is how do we best use it, or do we wait to present recommendations to council on after we use the audit tool? We’ve received recommendations from the grant team, but need to know if we should wait until after we utilize the tool.

Chair Lammers stated that there were two questions to address prior to the continuation of this discussion.
Member Malmborg shared that most of the barriers that he has encountered concerned FDP and SJRWMD requirements. The suggestion was made to read The Applicants Handbook: Best Management Practices, which shows techniques from the 1980’s and is not new. The question arose on whether the state codes had been reviewed using the audit tool and if a set of recommendations been proposed and developed and where the barriers of implementation are located.

Dr. Bean stated that neither the Applicant’s Handbook nor the state regulations have been audited. LID is usually guided and influenced by the local governments.

Discussion ensued on the ERP and DEP and the water management districts with Member Malmborg asking how to deal with creating green stormwater infrastructure challenges.

Dr. Bean explained that the role of local government is not meant to change the rules of the state or water management districts. The tool was designed to change only at the scope of what is adjustable and changeable at the local government level. Flood control and stormwater discussion and practices were further discussed including local current projects.

Chair Lammers suggested that our task is to recommend what is right and good for Volusia County present and future residents. Some of those issues may or may not encounter issues and move forward and be mindful of whether other restrictions need to be taken into consideration or staff guidance from staff, rather than not talk about the work that we are supposed to do. Let’s get as much done and then address the exceptions.

Member Malmborg stated that the exceptions have not been identified and did not want to be the responsible party for identifying the potential conflicts in proposing different techniques while other codes are being changed and their compatibility issues.

Chair Lammers shared that this will always be a moving target and mentioned the current changes occurring from the legislature. Further debate with Member Malmborg ensued.

Dr. Bean stated that Eric Livingstone, who has been running state stormwater and developing manuals for years. This audit tool does not suggest anything and is used to evaluate and point out what code does regarding certain practices.

Ms. Adair shared that currently we have two issues going on, one being the tool for evaluation, and Member Malmborg discussing recommendations which are more a part of the Regional Planning Council team that is developing guidelines and recommendations.

Discussion ensued and clarification was provided by Ginger Adair of Dr. Bean’s discussion of there being two separate issues; LID that is mostly about the local code and how you design your site and then there is the GSI is where the compatibility with ERP permitting, etc. There are things that we have more and less control over which need to be kept in mind.
Member Gow asked if we worked with organizations could we offer them the use of the audit tool for evaluation of their own guideline review. Dr. Bean stated that the tool is freely available to all and by providing an email address the number of people utilizing the tool can be tracked, and updates sent out as they occur.

Member Anderson discussed compatibility and credit provided by the state so that these tools are cost effective and saving. It was shared that the committee can develop higher standards than what is required by the state. Discussion ensued on the formation of subcommittees to work more closely with staff with the audit tool.

Chair Lammers shared that the committee learned it was better for staff to make a brief presentation on the ordinances than the committee trying to decipher it. There is a shelf-life for this committee and requirement that everything is looked at and necessary changes provided, and the audit tool can take from four to six months. Dr. Bean shared that the items focused on during the LID workshop exercises were for Volusia County and came out of the scoping exercise performed by Volusia County.

Ginger Adair shared that the scoping was performed by the attendees of the workshop and if it was to be more focused other staff members from the county should have been included.

Chair Lammers stated that we cannot wait for an entire audit to be performed was asked by Member Lites on whether we should continue to move forward even if there will be conflicts with regulatory authorities beyond Volusia County.

Clay Ervin shared that in Volusia County we have the city of Ormond Beach, and they have their existing standards which are not mandated but are available to the development community to utilize, which indicates that they have experienced some type of vetting process. Although it is understood that we do not want to go through this process to create something that cannot be implemented but we cannot afford to get caught up in analysis paralysis in trying to create the perfect mousetrap. Mr. Ervin recommended that the committee should continue with this process as we have a real grant to help to get the work done. Secondly, the vetting process can be continued by ENRAC, and ultimately the PLDRC and County Council. The conflicting message of the acceptance of LID and GSI principles by DEP and SJRWMD, as shown on their websites, without credits being given to developers was recognized. There appears to be a default mode where developers know that they can follow X, Y, and Z, and get their job done, as opposed to fighting with SJRWMD for 9 – 12 months to be able do this other project.

It was suggested to continue with providing good, sound recommendations, and ground truth what we are doing with our state agencies.

Member Malmborg shared challenges encountered with a current project.
Member Fitzsimmons shared that all costs incurred because of regulations are passed along to the consumer, and the cause of most Volusia County residents not being able to afford the average house. It was also mentioned that Habitat for Humanity is now the 25th largest home builder in the country.

Chair Lammers shared that having worked for almost 40 years in the for-profit industry, profit margins are always monitored. The affordability of housing was noted, and the committee was formed at the request of the Council to review LID and the code of ordinances. The committee is to bring out affordability and environmental issues and come to consensus on recommendations to the PLDRC and eventually the County Council. Chair Lammers that you have been heard and will continue to be heard, but that the committee has a job to do in a specific amount of time, and that something is done. The committee was asked if they wanted to continue to go to the County Council and voice to them that the committee is stuck?

Member Gow saw that it appeared that the trees were being looked at when the forest needed to be addressed. The presentations were merely introductions to the LID topic, and that the tree ordinance would be revisited. Agreement was voiced with Member Anderson’s comment that it may be time to put together a small group to review the audit tool or ask organizations that we are involved with to look and provide recommendations, because we may get caught up in rhetoric and we need to provide a product.

Member Anderson agreed with the discussion of profit margins and affordable housing and would like to add that the size of future storms will need the additional infrastructure and storm mitigation and need to be in front of the State regulations that are probably still lagging.

Chair Lammers asked for a move to create a committee to address stormwater issues.

Member Gow asked for staff recommendations on whether to table this until the committee has some draft recommendations and organization input has been received.

Ginger Adair stated that both she and Clay Ervin will not be able to attend the next meeting as they are both attending separate conferences. Katrina Locke and Keith Abrahamson will both be in attendance and since Katrina is the expert in LID, the discussion can continue. If the tree ordinance or something different is to be discussed Ginger would prefer to be in attendance. She shared that the group is more than capable of proposing that LID and GSI are, or are not, things that Volusia County should pursue, and that it is not necessary to know where in the code these changes should occur and/or incentives provided.

The Council goal setting workshop was also mentioned as occurring on May 10th and should be relevant to what the committee is working on. The final product of the grant team will not be ready by the next meeting and if you would prefer to have that first, then that would not be until July. Tree ordinance discussion could continue at the June meeting.

Clay Ervin addressed Member Gow’s comments on the formation of a subcommittee and how it could extend the timelines even further. If the committee is interested in doing a deep dive into the land
development regulation code, then that level of detail should be brought to the full body. There is a larger issue and that is if you agree with what the University of Florida and East Central Regional Planning Council brings back to us, and at face value agree that everything that they say is going to be done, but understand that there could be implementation problems, it is still okay to send those to the County Council with those concerns. The County Council will then determine what they want to see as policy. What we can do is once we have the blessings from this group, we can work with our colleagues at SJRWMD and at DEP that this is coming to our Council and ask questions on developers that may come to them. This is what the Council asked of the group originally.

Member Gow discussed and reviewed what had been done and suggested waiting until the stormwater element is reviewed because it is very much tied together with LID.

Member Hoblick asked what the purpose was of reviewing LID.

Ginger Adair reviewed that ENRAC was reestablished to advise Council of recommended changes to the environmental minimal standards and land development code. LID was added because members of Council wanted it added for water quality and flood protection. The staff perspective is that Council convened these diverse backgrounds to convey what the community wants as representatives of these Council members. The presentation brought to the Council will be the recommendations of the committee.

Member Hoblick inquired that this would be a way to dig into the ordinance language so that we can evaluate the ordinance itself.

Ginger Adair stated that this has been reviewed for the last five years and with this audit tool we can identify those issues that are insurmountable and those issues that we can change. In concept is this what we want to do, and Council gives the ultimate direction, but if it is something we want to do, identify the barriers and through our own work make changes.

Member Hoblick asked if staff were looking for a recommendation on the audit tool. Ms. Adair replied that ultimately staff were seeking a recommendation on LID to bring to Council. A recommendation can be presented to Council, but staff were seeking an answer on whether the audit tool needed to be used or not for that recommendation to be completed.

Member Lites asked that we wait for recommendations to come back before going further, and that the audit tool was just presented as another tool that could be used. It was surmised that recommendations would come back in two months.

Chair Lammer stated that she thought the audit tool could be used immediately to identify related topics to be more efficient and effective. Currently we are looking at LID and deciding on whether to continue with it and make it a separate topic for ENRAC. The method that would best work is having staff bring back the issues and suggested ordinance changes that are not working and have the committee work from there. Second, there is the decision to proceed with LID, and go to Council with either specific suggested changes or general changes. Then the audit tool is something to be
decided to be used. The fourth item to be decided is whether to have or cancel the June meeting. The committee was asked if they would like to have staff continue to bring back the proposed changes, apart from LID, and why they are asking for those changes.

Member Morrissey stated that the committee got off track with the audit tool, and that Mr. Murphy’s presentation made some very specific questions to the group that would possibly influence some of the recommendations to staff and Council in the final product. Discussion ensued on examples of LID and proposed questions that could have been answered during the meeting; the need for discussion on DEP and SJRWMD is essential to LID moving forward. Incentivization by Ormond Beach since 2013 has not worked and may need to be made more monetarily advantageous.

Member Lites made a motion to review the recommendations for the grant at the next meeting.

Member Malmborg shared thoughts on incentives, waivers and penalties and means of generating funds.

Member Gow asked if the current motion is to keep the June meeting and focus on the questions that Ms. Morrissey raised and focus on the big picture items with Katrina Locke. The communities have not said they do not want LID and that should be the guiding principle on how to proceed.

Member Lites amended the motion to include review of LID big picture items. Member Gow seconded the motion.

Member Zelenski shared that for Volusia County to receive the discount for flood insurance the LID changes is required by CRS.

Member Surrette added that a discussion point was that at the next meeting Mr. Ervin and Ginger are both in attendance, so if necessary that the meeting date should be changed.

Discussion ensued on whether to change the meeting date with the result being that Katrina Locke would lead the next meeting as planned.

After another summarization of the motion, the vote was called. The motion carried 12:0, with Member Jamison absent.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:01 p.m.