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

ROLL CALL
Roll call was taken, with Members Tobias and LeFils absent. Member Fitzsimmons had to leave and was excused.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Minutes will be brought to the July meeting.

DISCUSSION
Chair Lammers provided an overview of the meeting as a continuation of discussion on Low Impact Development (LID), with the committee providing recommendations to be taken to County Council for consideration.

CONTINUE DISCUSSION ON LOW IMPACT DEVELOPMENT
Katrina Locke, Sustainability and Resilience Manager, presented the grant project wrap up PowerPoint, including all participating teams’ recommendations and big picture discussion, with details to be provided at the end of the presentation.

The LID options were presented as all voluntary, hybrid, or all mandatory, and using the LID hierarchy of avoidance (LID), minimization (LID), or mitigation (GSI). Examples were shared for each element. Ms. Locke asked the committee for their model preference, and if they would rather staff summarize and come back to the committee or move forward to council for further direction.

Member Lites asked if the grant included draft ordinance language and if the audit tool would be utilized. Ms. Locke responded there was some language had been drafted, but dependent on direction, additional changes may be necessary. The audit tool would be utilized to get into the next phases.

Member Anderson moved to discuss the hybrid model first. Vice Chair Gow seconded the motion.

Member Surrette requested an explanation of the difference between development or redevelopment, as opposed to infill development.

Keith Abrahamson, Environmental Permitting Manager, responded new development is a treed site, and redevelopment would be on a previously built site.
Vice Chair Gow discussed how to treat nonconformities, even if a project was not a complete tear-down and rebuild, to bring it up to the LID code.

Member Surrette questioned how the incentives would be granted and to what extent, and if they were linear.

Ms. Locke referenced the Doral model, which provides a list of “musts” and then allows applicants to pick two other categories.

Chair Lammers suggested a sliding scale for consideration. Member Anderson expressed her agreement and then asked questions of Member Malmborg regarding stormwater and if it could be scaled based on outcomes.

Member Malmborg responded by discussing the treatment of quality of stormwater is not aimed at storm events, but typical, daily inputs. He added that may be used as a measure of effectiveness. He continued with maintaining existing hydrology and explained his understanding of redevelopment as being vacant for greater than six months and requires re-permitting for parking and pedestrian access. He noted consideration should be given to the value or site required to substantially redeveloped. He then asked how to determine the limits and appropriate assignment of value for detention and retention. He referenced examples as provided by the City of Ormond Beach staff.

Member Zelenski discussed the hybrid model and how it may relate to the Community Rating System (CRS) program, which includes the language that LID must be required to gain additional points. He then explained how voluntary participation can yield a discount in flood insurance premiums. Premium discounts are based on a point system and participation helps save everyone by millions of dollars annually.

Ms. Locke introduced Carol McFarlane, Planning and Development Services Director to further explain the CRS program.

Chair Lammers noted a current lawsuit by insurance companies that would make flood insurance mandatory, regardless of whether properties are located within a floodplain or not.

Ms. McFarlane explained the County ranking is currently a five, nearing a four rating. She discussed the many factors that go into the score and that the County floodplain residents currently receive a 25% reduction in premiums.

Member Anderson referenced affordable housing as only the cost of the house, but the cost to insure it. The cost of participating in the LID programs is passed along to the consumer, as is not participating in the program, which leads to higher insurance costs when repairs are necessary.

Vice Chair Gow expressed her agreement with the hybrid approach and recommended requiring at least two of these items. She cautioned against incentives and suggested consideration be given to if a certain number of items are done, an incentive could be to allow the stormwater in the buffer, or to have exemptions based on size and/or location.
Member Lites asked for the Avoidance Required slide to be shown. He stated that the terms avoid, minimize and mitigate often lead to a project being stopped. He expressed he would like to know more details.

Chair Lammers asked about current requirements.

Ms. Locke and Mr. Abrahamson spoke on the LID principles already being utilized or in the code, such as tree preservation and wetland avoidance and protection.

Member Malmborg expressed agreement that more detail was necessary prior to a vote and added he leaned toward the hybrid model as it allows for more flexibility. He noted while the aim should be to decrease flood insurance premiums, the goal should be for no flooding to occur at all.

Member Zelenski reminded the committee that modifying the language beyond the requirement thresholds could sacrifice the value of the grant and that it is okay to require things for additional CRS values.

Vice Chair Gow discussed avoidance to the extent practical and determining that threshold.

Ms. Locke read from the Doral example, which states, “avoidance to the maximum extent possible”.

Member Morrissey stated that today's code is the minimum and if two elements were required to raise the standard, it would be worthwhile.

Member Anderson expressed agreement with having staff proceed with definitions and expressed a moral requirement to address flooding.

Member Malmborg stated there should be an increased capacity of canals in flood-prone areas but that the runoff should not be polluted. To ensure this, water had to be dealt with at the source and should include better treatment.

Ms. Locke explained that it would be beneficial to know the preference of the three LID options and to determine the “Next steps” on how to proceed. She asked the committee to provide staff direction on what to take to council, and then offered that staff will bring back the “pieces” to the committee, based on council directive.

Chair Lammers stated that there was a current motion on the table to vote for the hybrid model as it was presented. The motion was made by Member Anderson and seconded by Vice Chair Gow. She asked if the motion should be amended or have a different motion made. Member Anderson then restated her original motion.

Member Surrette asked if these LID items were already in the code, why was there discussion. He then asked what could be added based on LID in terms of avoidance.
Mr. Abrahamson responded that wetland avoidance and minimization was currently in the code as was 15% tree preservation. He offered that LID could require more and could also define redevelopment.

Member Lites questioned additional to avoidance if it is already in the code.

Ms. Locke read from the Titusville example, explaining staff would draft their work based on Titusville as a guide.

Discussion ensued regarding hydrology and additions to the code.

Chair Lammers summarized that committee ideas presented to staff would be brought to council for direction and then would come back to the committee for consideration.

Member Jamison expressed concern that there was not a true understanding of a hybrid model.

Member Anderson explained that if council were to provide direction to utilize the audit tool, staff would then use it and bring back the suggested changes to committee consideration. She discussed trees and wetlands, and suggested staff proceed with hybrid exploration.

Member Zelenski suggested each member state their preference on LID options; all voluntary, hybrid or all mandatory.

Chair Lammers reminded everyone there was already a motion on the table for using the hybrid model.

Discussion continued on utilization of the tool, existing language and not requiring mandates.

At 2:10 p.m. Chair Lammers called for a break. The meeting came back to order at 2:20 p.m.

Member Hoblick requested an explanation of the grant.

Ms. Locke explained the grant was to create a guidebook, research of local ordinances in relation to LID, and provide language recommendations that could be used regionally. It was also to identify the challenges and barriers to LID and GSI.

Member Hoblick stated that everything was theoretical regarding LID restraints on how to grow the County responsibly. He suggested going back to the motion as it seemed that it was necessary to go to the hybrid as the others were not feasible at this time.

Ms. Locke added the guidebook was being finalized this week and a technical manual would then be formulated.

Member Malmborg expressed agreement with the hybrid model. He then referenced the LEED approach, using a points system, with extra points as incentives and noted green stormwater could potentially provide the biggest benefit.
Member Lites questioned the timing of the guidebook and the manual.

Ms. Locke responded that the guidebook would come first, which would lead into a staff draft of the technical manual to accompany the ordinance. She added staff would be meeting with St Johns River Water Management District the following week to begin the conversation.

Member Lites ~ then staff will put together the . . .

Katrina Locke ~ staff will put together for VC.

Chair Lammers ~ staff will not take the language from the grant, but the audit tool will identify.

Member Anderson amended the motion to state, “ENRAC recommends that the County Council direct staff to employ the LID Audit Tool to evaluate our Land Development Code for existing ordinances that employ LID tools, barriers or conflicts to LID, and opportunities to enhance use of LID and GSI. This is with the goal of revising the LDC to facilitate a hybrid use of LID and GSI across the county to mitigate flooding and nutrient pollution”.

Member Gow seconded the amended motion.

Discussion ensued on the motion.

Motion carried with all members in favor, with Member Lites opposed.

Chair Lammers explained this would be Ms. Locke’s last meeting and expressed her appreciation for all the work she has done. She then noted upcoming staff vacations and asked if the next meeting should be canceled or rescheduled to July 18 or 19.

Discussion ensued on the potential dates and whether or not the meeting should be canceled until there was direction from council.

Mr. Abrahamson suggested the next meeting include review of the code for gopher tortoises, wetlands, trees, etc.

Vice Chair Gow suggested the habitat discussion as well.

Member Malmborg expressed his agreement that it may be beneficial to review habitat and wetland information.

Chair Lammers summarized that staff would provide a presentation on the ordinances and provide information on NRMA, wildlife corridor, wetlands, etc.

Chris Ryan, Assistant County Attorney reminded the committee that there was no requirement to meet monthly and that if the meeting was moved, a quorum would be necessary.
Vice Chair Gow made a motion to move the meeting to July 19 and to discuss wetland and habitat. Member Surrette seconded the motion. Members Jamison and Hoblick stated they would not be able to be in attendance that day. It was determined that 8 members would be present and would allow for a quorum. Motion passed unanimously. Member Anderson inquired when a new member would be appointed. Jeff Brower, Volusia County Council Chair expressed his appreciation to the committee for doing the heavy lifting and the good work being done. He recognized the diversity of the group. Member Hoblick asked if council consensus was to keep ENRAC. Mr. Brower stated it was his desire to continue it, but there had been no official direction. Chair Lammers stated direction would be received when staff moves forward to council. She thanked everyone. **ADJOURNMENT** The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.