

MINUTES

BROWARD COUNTY PLANNING COUNCIL

FEBRUARY 28, 2019

MEMBERS Mayor Daniel J. Stermer, Chair

PRESENT: Brion Blackwelder
Commissioner Richard Blattner
Commissioner Felicia Brunson
Commissioner Angelo Castillo
Mayor Bill Ganz
Mayor Michelle J. Gomez
Mary D. Graham
Richard Grosso
Mayor Rex Hardin
Jackie Railey
Commissioner Nan H. Rich
David Rosenof

MEMBERS Thomas H. DiGiorgio, Jr., Vice Chair

ABSENT: School Board Member Patricia Good, Secretary
Robert Breslau
Mayor Michael J. Ryan
Commissioner Beverly Williams

Also Barbara Boy, Executive Director

Present: Andy Maurodis, Legal Counsel
Lenny Vialpando, Broward County Environmental Protection and Growth
Management Department
Nancy Cavender, The Laws Group

A meeting of the Broward County Planning Council, Broward County, Florida, was held in Room 422 of the Government Center, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, at 10:00 a.m., Thursday, February 28, 2019.

(The following is a near-verbatim transcript of the meeting.)

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Daniel Stermer called the meeting to order.

CHAIR STERMER: Good morning, everybody. I'd like to call to order the Thursday, February 28th, 2019 meeting of the Broward County Planning Council.

ROLL CALL:

CHAIR STERMER: Ms. Cavender, can you please call the roll?

PLANNING COUNCIL
FEBRUARY 28, 2019
dh/NC

THE REPORTER: Yes, sir. Mr. Brion Blackwelder.

MR. BLACKWELDER: Here.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Richard Blattner.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Robert Breslau. Commissioner Felicia Brunson.

COMMISSIONER BRUNSON: Here.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Angelo Castillo.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Thomas H. DiGiorgio Jr. Mayor Bill Ganz.

MAYOR GANZ: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Michelle J. Gomez.

MAYOR GOMEZ: Good morning.

THE REPORTER: School Board Member Patricia Good. Ms. Mary D. Graham. Mr. Richard Grosso.

MR. GROSSO: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Rex Hardin.

MAYOR HARDIN: Here.

THE REPORTER: Ms. Jackie Railey.

MS. RAILEY: Here.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Nan H. Rich. Mr. David Rosenof.

MR. ROSENOF: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Michael J. Ryan. Commissioner Beverly Williams. Mayor Daniel J. Stermer, Chair.

CHAIR STERMER: Here. And let the record reflect Ms. Graham has joined us as well.

PLANNING COUNCIL
FEBRUARY 28, 2019
dh/NC

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

CHAIR STERMER: Good morning, everybody. If everyone could please rise for the Pledge, we will be led this morning by our newest member, Ms. Jackie Railey.

(THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE WAS LED BY JACKIE RAILEY.)

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you. Please be seated.

OATH OF OFFICE:

CHAIR STERMER: Ms. Railey, if you can join me. We're going to swear in Ms. Railey this morning. She's our newest member.

(Applause.)

CHAIR STERMER: Mayor Bogen has appointed Ms. Railey. Ms. Railey is replacing Mr. Rosenzweig. We thank -- I want to publicly thank Mr. Rosenzweig. We're sending him a letter thanking him. But Ms. Railey is here on behalf of the Mayor and the northeast corner of the County. Please raise your right hand and repeat after me. I do solemnly swear --

MS. RAILEY: I do solemnly swear --

CHAIR STERMER: -- that I will support --

MS. RAILEY: -- that I will support --

CHAIR STERMER: -- protect and defend --

MS. RAILEY: -- protect and defend --

CHAIR STERMER: -- the Constitution and government --

MS. RAILEY: -- the Constitution and government --

CHAIR STERMER: -- of the United States --

MS. RAILEY: -- of the United States --

CHAIR STERMER: -- and of the State of Florida --

MS. RAILEY: -- and of the State of Florida --

CHAIR STERMER: -- that I am duly qualified --

MS. RAILEY: -- that I am duly qualified --

CHAIR STERMER: -- to hold office --

MS. RAILEY: -- to hold office --

CHAIR STERMER: -- under the Constitution --

MS. RAILEY: -- under the Constitution --

CHAIR STERMER: -- of the state --

MS. RAILEY: -- of the state --

CHAIR STERMER: -- and the Charter of Broward County --

MS. RAILEY: -- and the Charter of Broward County --

CHAIR STERMER: -- and that I will well --

MS. RAILEY: -- and that I will well --

CHAIR STERMER: -- and faithfully perform --

MS. RAILEY: -- and faithfully perform --

CHAIR STERMER: -- the duties of a member --

MS. RAILEY: -- the duties of a member --

CHAIR STERMER: -- of the Broward County Planning Council --

MS. RAILEY: -- of the member of Broward County Planning Council --

CHAIR STERMER: -- on which I am now about to enter --

MS. RAILEY: -- of which I am now about to enter --

CHAIR STERMER: -- so help me God.

MS. RAILEY: -- so help me God.

CHAIR STERMER: Congratulations.

(Applause.)

CHAIR STERMER: Ms. Railey, if you will come down, we'll take your picture.

(Picture taken.)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR STERMER: And, Ms. Cavender, let the record reflect that Commissioner Rich has joined us.

CONSENT AGENDA:

AGENDA ITEM C-1 - APPROVAL OF FINAL AGENDA FOR FEBRUARY 28, 2019
AGENDA ITEM C-2 - FEBRUARY 2019 PLAT REVIEWS FOR TRAFFICWAYS PLAN COMPLIANCE

AGENDA ITEM C-3

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JANUARY 24, 2019

AGENDA ITEM C-4 - EXCUSED ABSENCE REQUESTS

CHAIR STERMER: Can I get a -- is there any items to be pulled from the Consent Agenda? There have been excused absence requests from Vice Chair DiGiorgio, Secretary Good, Commissioner Beverly Williams, Bob Breslau, and Mayor Ryan. He's caught in court this morning. That would be moved as part of the Consent Agenda. Is there a motion with regard to the Consent Agenda?

COMMISSIONER RICH: Move.

MAYOR HARDIN: **Move** approval.

CHAIR STERMER: Moved by Commissioner Rich, seconded by Mayor Hardin. All those in favor, signify by saying aye. All those opposed? The Consent Agenda passes unanimously.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

REGULAR AGENDA:

CHAIR STERMER: Madam Executive Director.

MS. BOY: Thank you, Mayor. I would just like -- I think we had talked about perhaps moving the Public Hearing --

CHAIR STERMER: We did.

MS. BOY: -- items.

CHAIR STERMER: We're going to move the Public Hearings to the front. That way --

AGENDA ITEM R-2 - COUNSEL'S REPORT

MS. BOY: Okay. So I will go through -- so Mr. Maurodis does not have a report this month. I'm reporting for him because he's ill. No report this month.

AGENDA ITEM R-3 - EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

MS. BOY: And then just for my report, first, if we can cancel the March 28th meeting because the County Commission has rescheduled their March meeting for Thursday, March 28th, at 10:00 a.m. --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: So, **moved**.

MS. BOY: -- in this room.

MAYOR GOMEZ: Second.

CHAIR STERMER: Moved by Commissioner Castillo. Seconded by Mayor Gomez. Any opposition to canceling our March meeting? All those in favor, signify by saying aye. All those opposed? Motion carries unanimously.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

MS. BOY: Thank you.

PUBLIC HEARING:

MS. BOY: So then Items PH-1 through PH-4. PH-1 is a quasi-judicial recertification of the City of Tamarac plan. The city has waived their -- the quasi-judicial proceeding. There are no speakers on Items 1, 2, 3, or 4, except for questions only. The Land Use/Trafficways Committee met immediately preceding the meeting.

PH-3, they recommended approval of staff's recommendation, as well as it coming back for a second Public Hearing. And then that's related to permitting affordable housing by right in the commerce category along transportation corridors that meet a certain transportation threshold.

And Item PH-4, they supported withdrawing the item for further staff review to bring back perhaps in a different form regarding mixed use village to accommodate mixed use -- sorry -- mixed use along transportation corridors.

CHAIR STERMER: So staff has withdrawn PH-4; right?

MS. BOY: Yeah. Well, we -- actually, we recommended deferral, but Andy advised that

withdrawal was better, because then we can bring back with a different number and form.

QUASI-JUDICIAL PUBLIC HEARING:

AGENDA ITEM PH-1 RECERTIFICATION PCR 19-2

END OF QUASI-JUDICIAL PUBLIC HEARING

AGENDA ITEM PH-2 - AMENDMENT PCT 19-1

AGENDA ITEM PH-3 - AMENDMENT PCT 19-2

CHAIR STERMER: That leaves us PH-1, PH-2, and PH-3. No speakers have signed up for anything other than to answer questions. How does the board wish to proceed with PH-1, PH-2, PH-3 this morning?

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: **Motion** to approve.

CHAIR STERMER: Moved by --

MAYOR GOMEZ: Second.

MAYOR HARDIN: Second.

CHAIR STERMER: -- Commissioner Blattner, seconded by Mayor Gomez. All those in favor of approving PH-1, PH-2, and PH-3, signify by saying aye. All those opposed? Those carry unanimously. We are done with PH-1, 2, and 3.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

REGULAR AGENDA:

AGENDA ITEM R-1 - WATER RECHARGE - PRESENTATION BY THE BROWARD COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND GROTH MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING AND COMMUNITY RESLIENCE DIVISION

CHAIR STERMER: We are now up to --

MS. BOY: Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: -- the presentation.

MS. BOY: The water recharge presentation, Mr. Lenny Vialpando, the Deputy Director of the Broward County Environmental Protection and Growth Management Department, is here to give you an overview. You may recall that this is a follow up presentation to -- we had a presentation by Dr. Sam Danchuk in August, related to sea level rise and the policies and things that the County's doing to mitigate those impacts, and this is the

follow up presentation. Mr. Vialpando, here you go.

MR. VIALPANDO: Oh, excellent. Thank you. All right. So, in that presentation, one of the last slides was how they do water recharge -- water recharge calculations when a Land Use Plan amendment comes before you, and they're classified as either minor, moderate, or major. And the purpose of the presentation today is kind of like to let you know if you were to approve a Land Use Plan amendment that has a major impact or even a minor one, what would happen next? What would we do in permitting.

So, we talk about that, you know, so what is recharge, right? It's basically we're allowing the water that falls out of the sky from rain to go down into the groundwater and replenish our groundwater aquifer. And this can be done either naturally or artificially. Now, in the natural system, if you have a site that's very green, let's use like a golf course or something like that as an example, then, obviously, the soil would allow the water to percolate down, and that's a significant contributor to recharge. The way that would work is, like, we use what we call design storm events. So the typical one for stormwater calculations is called the 25-year three-day design storm event, which means that there's a one in 25-year chance of it occurring, or a four percent chance of it occurring in any given year. That rainstorm produces about 15 inches of rain. If you were to have a really nice, 100 percent green site with a four-foot depth to the water table, which is a good as it gets around here, you could discharge about 6.75 inches of that into the ground. The remaining nine inches or so would become runoff and would be technically lost to tide. So we're really talking about that six inches or so that we would lose if we just paved that site.

Now, however, we don't necessarily lose all the remainder to tide because we have a very robust canal system in Broward County. And the purpose for those canals is, A, to protect us from flooding and bring that water to tide, but also, B, a lot of those control structures are operated such that they don't open or allow water to pass through until they really have to, and that causes groundwater recharge to occur in that canal system. And that's an example of an artificial way that we create recharge.

Now, when we do permit the site and we are paving it, our goal is there on the left. We want to limit the disruption of natural hydrology. And how do we do this? We require people to prove that they have adequate water management works, which are man-made drainage facilities. The way that these are typically designed, we'll either call them detention, which means that they hold onto the rain for some period of time, or retention, meaning they hold onto the rain and it only can go through percolation. There's no outfall. And, basically, if we do these techniques, they're -- usually they look like grass bathtubs or lakes. And in many cases, you can't see them because they're underground exfiltration trenches, which are like four to eight foot wide, four to eight foot deep, filled with three-quarter washed rock trenches with pipes in them, and they use head or pressure to force the water through the pipe, through the rock, and down into the aquifer. All those are examples of retention and detention.

Now, when we have them design these, many sites use detention, meaning they have

an outfall. However, every site is required to retain. It means they cannot discharge the first flush, which for us is a water quality event, which is one inch, or for a hundred percent impervious site, it's two and a half inches. So, if we go back to the hundred percent green site, which was about 6.75 inches, on most of these sites, we're getting anywhere from one to two inches of retention just off the top.

Then after that, we also look at water quantity, which is we're not going to flood anyone; right? We want to make sure that we hold the volume of water and the rate, which is how quickly it discharges, to the pre-development condition in the 25-year three day. Which means that, for most of these sites, they will provide a hundred percent on-site retention to the 25-year three day, which means that even after they're developed, they're required to hold onto -- that's where you see all these big lakes -- the entire 15 inches. And that means it will be infiltrated through the ground. If they don't hold onto the entire amount, then they have to let that -- that amount go slowly so that it does not disrupt the downstream flow.

Put another way, if you want to look at LEED and the way that they look at stormwater design and consider something green, and I see this -- this slide's a little hard to read, so hopefully you can see it up there. But for water quantity, in order to be eligible for LEED credit for SSc 6.1, which is the quantity control credit under LEED, what they recommend is that if a site -- and I'm using the less than 50 percent impervious, because we're, let's say, talking about a golf course -- they would -- they would say that you need to retain the one- and two-year 24-hour design storm. You want to basically limit the quantity there.

So what does that mean in Broward County? So, if you look at a typical site -- this is on aggregate, because some sites retain more, some sites retain less, but, on aggregate, most sites will retain at least 3.2 inches of stormwater runoff. And in order for a storm to generate enough runoff to hold onto 3.2 inches, it needs to be a rainfall of four inches or more.

That basically is a 24-hour 2-year storm in Broward County. So for most sites, the LEED criteria are met because we retain that much water. Now, when you look at water quality, what LEED would like to see is that you treat, infiltrate 90 percent of the average annual rainfall. That means for 90 percent of storm events, you're retaining and treating that runoff.

Now, in Broward County, 3.28 inches of retention represents 98 percent of all rainfall events. And 95 percent of all average annual rainfall is treated and retained for permits that we issue, and, therefore, that exceeds the LEED target of 90 percent and the LEED criteria are met. So if you have any questions, I'm here to answer them.

CHAIR STERMER: Mr. Grosso.

MR. GROSSO: Thank you.

(Laughter.)

MR. GROSSO: I would hope we'd all be fascinated by and interested in this.

CHAIR STERMER: Okay. Show of hands. Who's awake?

(Laughter.)

MR. VIALPANDO: I tried to make it as interesting as possible.

MR. GROSSO: If I can -- I do have a --

CHAIR STERMER: We're going to have a vocabulary quiz after.

(Laughter.)

MR. GROSSO: I took notes. Thank you. I have a few questions. The first -- the first slide --

MR. VIALPANDO: Sure.

MR. GROSSO: -- chart that characterizes impervious surface loss or recharge function loss --

MR. VIALPANDO: Yes.

MR. GROSSO: -- there seems like you can have a lot of impact and we still call it insignificant. That struck me about that. Can you explain that to us?

MR. VIALPANDO: So basically, this is just an indicator; right? This is basically a guideline for you as part of the planning process to tell you what the anticipated amount of imperviousness that will cause, you know, less storm water to be infiltrated. And when we permit, we mitigate that; right? And so technically, I mean, I would say even if it were moderate or major, the permitting that we do on the back end would actually mitigate for these impacts. So I'm not sure exactly what the Planning Council uses this criteria for. I'm not really a part of that process. But I will just say that I think it was designed to be an indicator to you of how much we needed to require a big drainage system; right?

A lot of times when people do planning, when they -- when they want to design a site, they do what's called front loaded -- or end loaded design, rather than front loaded design, right? Which means that they hire someone, and they look at land use and zoning and the parking and they say, gosh, you know, what's the maximum amount of building that we can stuff on this site, and, you know, parking. And then they leave almost no room for the poor engineer to come and do drainage later. And the reality is when it comes to you in that form, it may be a major impact. It may not be a major impact.

When it gets to us with permitting, we often have to scale that back and say, hey, wait a minute, you need to create a large drainage system, or you need to spend a bunch of money putting in an underground drainage system that causes this infiltration. So again, a lot of these are very, very preliminary, and by the time they work their way through the process and get to us and we actually permit them, they actually do provide the retention as, you know, per LEED requirements and, you know, they actually do minimize those impacts. But when they get to you, they may be major. Does that make sense? I hope that answers your question.

MR. GROSSO: Yeah, but typically, when they get to us, our line item always calls the recharge function loss insignificant. What's the -- yeah.

MR. VIALPANDO: Yes.

MR. GROSSO: And yet it seems like we've got a lot of recharge loss that we call insignificant. We rarely call them major because of these numbers. Where did they come up with their formula?

MR. VIALPANDO: Right. So my understanding is is that they make a lot of assumptions when they calculate this; right? Which is that when you look at a site and you say, well, if you're calling it residential, you know, what's the density of that residential? They have to make assumptions about, you know, what does industrial look like, like how much building will it have, how much paving will it have. And so, it's a very rough calculation.

And, like I said, most of them are minor. In fact, if you really look at what we end up doing in permitting, they actually will retain more in the post-development condition than they are in the pre-development condition in many cases, even if they're heavy industrial development, because we require them, in many cases, to retain the 25-year three day storm, or, in all cases, at least the water quality plus limiting to pre- versus post-.

So the more heavily developed it already is, the less of an impact it will be, even if it's, let's say, a golf course or something, because it may be allowed to create a bunch of imperviousness that didn't already get built, and then they're changing that to something that also has a lot of impervious but, in relative terms, is not a huge increase based on what was allowed before. Which is why you'll often see minor, as well.

MR. GROSSO: When our criteria are tied now to like the 25 three --

MR. VIALPANDO: Uh-huh.

MR. GROSSO: -- when was the last time we recalculated those. Aren't those storms, the 25-year, the hundred-year, aren't they happening as a matter of reality now much more frequently than they used to do? Have we recalibrated how often the 25-year

storm event happens?

MR. VIALPANDO: So there's a couple of things that happen with that is one is that's based off of the water table, right? Which is that's the baseline of where you consider how much storage you have and how much runoff is produced. And so Broward County has come up with what we call the Future Conditions Map Series, which is designed to incorporate sea level rise into the calculations that are made for these sites. And as part of that process, and I -- and Dr. Moran could come and -- and give you a presentation on that if you'd like -- but when we built those maps, we basically projected what the water table would be in 2060, and we now require new development to use those water tables, even if it's much higher than their current water table.

So in one respect, we've underestimated, in some cases significantly, the amount of storage that the site will provide in a constructed condition. So, for example -- I don't have the table completely memorized, but if you were to look to that four-foot of depth to the water table for a green area, and I told you it would produce about 6.75 inches of retention, if you reduced that to two feet of depth to the water table, it goes down to like two inches of retention.

So, you've lost like five inches of credit just from that change in the water table, even though you're really providing it. But because we're making you pretend like sea level has already risen, because over the lifespan of your project, it will rise, and your storage will be reduced at some point in the future. So that's the first step. The second step is we are in the process right now of redoing the hundred-year map, which is the one that basically sets finished floors and establishes, you know, the basin-wide storage.

And, actually, I didn't get into that here because there's so much -- so many things that happen during a hundred-year event, but, currently, a hundred-years about 18 inches. And we're actually looking at a projection of that rainfall amount as well as incorporating the water table change and the developed condition of the County and coming up with new hundred-year numbers.

Those will probably be preliminarily released in June of this year. We hope to see if the Board will adopt them by the end of the year. And those would be used, and that's just setting the stage for a series of future conditions maps that will continue to be developed. And, you know, it used to be -- I mean, our old hundred-year map was 30 years that we were able to go without updating it. I anticipate our new hundred-year map will need to be redone every five to ten years. And we're ready to do that. And we basically do this iterative process and bring things back before the Board.

MR. GROSSO: I think I have just one more question --

MR. VIALPANDO: Yes.

MR. GROSSO: -- if I may. Are you telling us that the development stormwater standards right now result in zero loss of recharge on any parcel of land that develops?

MR. VIALPANDO: No. What I'm saying is that on the aggregate, that we retain about 98 percent of all rainfall events in the post-condition. We infiltrate as much as we would without development for 98 percent of events. There are a percentage of events for certain sites where they may recharge less. There are also many sites where they will recharge more. But this is on the aggregate.

MR. GROSSO: Oh. That created another question. Is part of that, then, retention that you say we have, the fact that it's sitting in canals and it may not get discharged from those canals?

MR. VIALPANDO: A lot of it is retention even on the sites, too, because --

MR. GROSSO: Yeah.

MR. VIALPANDO: -- they put in the lake and the control structure is designed to retain a certain amount, and then detain another amount. Or, in many cases, they don't discharge at all, and so they retain the whole amount.

MR. GROSSO: But that component of it that you're calling retention because it's now sitting in the canals, the assumption there is that that water isn't getting wasted for tide - - to tide because it's sitting in the canals; right?

MR. VIALPANDO: That -- well, that's not part of this calculation. It's just like gravy, if you will, on top of that. The canals are managed to provide more recharge to the extent that the water management districts and independent districts can do that. That's not included when we do our analysis for that particular site. That site must stand on its own, and if it can discharge, it's limited to its pre-development rate and volume.

MR. GROSSO: But increasingly, those canals are being --

MR. VIALPANDO: They are, and that's --

MR. GROSSO: -- allowed to discharge because of flooding problems with increased rainfall.

MR. VIALPANDO: -- and -- right. And that's taken into account with our Future Conditions Map Series, because it would basically change the discharge characteristics based on the future projected conditions.

MR. GROSSO: Thanks.

MR. VIALPANDO: You're welcome.

MR. GROSSO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR STERMER: Commissioner Castillo.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: I've been hearing this for a long time. And, fundamentally, we have a plumbing problem. Once upon a time, people showed up here, and there was too much water. So they dug canals and sent it away. And that worked, because the rainwater was just enough to offset the hydraulics, and you could build your houses and your stores and your towns and everything else.

Then as time went on, so much concrete went down that they didn't have that recharge. And the canals that they had dug so many years before were actually sending too much water out. And so now you started having saltwater intrusion into the -- because those voids needed to be filled. And so, they sucked in water from the sea. Now, I'm not -- I'm not licensed in your discipline. Is that just about right?

MR. VIALPANDO: It -- it -- yeah. It's a --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Okay.

MR. VIALPANDO: -- good summary.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: So then -- so now here we are, so many years later, with 2,000,000 people, and we're talking about redevelopment and everything else. And the answer is not to fix the plumbing problem, which lies at the state, but to go to individuals who want to put up a medical office building or whatever, and say you now have to -- you now have to do this other thing. Which, to me, I don't have a problem with it, but it's almost like you're -- you have a leak in a pipe and you take a piece of gauze and you wrap it around like this (indicating), real tight, and you hope that the leak doesn't happen. But it'll continue to leak. It's not enough. We have a plumbing problem. Now, once I was told -- and you tell me if this number's still true -- that we were sending something in the order of 500,000,000 gallons a day to tide.

MR. VIALPANDO: I don't know the number, off-the-top-of-my-head.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Okay. But that's what I was told. If we need to retain some of that water so that it can percolate back in, instead of sending it out to tide, which, after all, rises to the top because it's -- because it's fresh water and then it evaporates, we're not destroying water. We're just displacing it. It's going somewhere else. The same amount of water we've always had is what we have now. It's just in different places. So if we want to keep it, seems to me we have to stop sending it to tide. Doesn't that make sense?

MR. VIALPANDO: The elevation is probably the only difficulty with that. It's --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Right.

MR. VIALPANDO: -- just -- it's just basically having enough --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Reservoirs.

MR. VIALPANDO: -- free board to basically allow us to retain water and still provide that 18 -- because we got a foot and a half of rain we've got to deal with, in most cases.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Right.

MR. VIALPANDO: And so, you know, if you look at a lake, it -- you know, it might be 15 percent of the size of the site. And so, if you imagine, you know, 18 inches falling over the whole site, and we've got to put 18 inches times an acre in 15 percent of an acre.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: It's tough.

MR. VIALPANDO: Yeah. Which is why we end up with an elevation issue, which is why we end up having to discharge.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: So many years ago -- no, not so many. Maybe about eight years ago, they came to my city in Pembroke Pines and they said, look, you have to start -- you have to start injecting water. You have to treat your runoff and your stormwater, and you have to start injecting it into the aquifer. And the cost of that for the City of Pembroke Pines then was \$164,000,000.

MR. VIALPANDO: Wow.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: And that was a lot of money then. It's still -- it's a huge amount for us now. Now, that would -- that would be -- let me put that in context. That would be the single greatest expenditure in the city's history.

MR. VIALPANDO: Wow.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Now, if that's what Pembroke Pines has to pay, imagine what Hollywood and all the other surrounding cities -- we have to find a way to fix the plumbing problem so that folks can come and have -- I'm not say -- I'm not saying the developers should be off the hook. I'm never going to say that. I'm saying that the hook can't be entirely on them. We have to find a different way around this.

And what I sense is that there's been a certain move, pretty consistently, from Tallahassee to force this onto locals, to force this locally, because they want to avoid the problem. And I don't think that that's going to develop a many good answer. So I don't know if that's a question or a comment or an observation, but I --

MR. VIALPANDO: Sure.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: -- I've been listening to this for like almost 20 years now --

MR. VIALPANDO: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: -- and I -- we're still not quite there.

MR. VIALPANDO: So there is a multi-pronged approach; right? So here today I'm just talking about the approach that we take with new development. But we do have regional -- regional studies and models and approaches for the global problem that you're talking about. And, you know, we'd love to come and chat with you about it if you guys want us to give -- us to give other presentations about some of our other efforts. And so, we'll come back.

MR. GROSSO: Can I have a quick -- couple of quick follow ups on that?

MR. VIALPANDO: Sure. Uh-huh.

CHAIR STERMER: And then I was going to go to Commissioner Blattner.

MR. GROSSO: Oh, no, go ahead. Didn't realize.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: No, go. Go ahead Rich.

MR. GROSSO: Are we -- to address Commissioner Castillo's potential concern, are we requiring developers to retain more than their fair share of the runoff that would be created from their own development?

MR. VIALPANDO: No. They're just required to meet pre- versus post-.

MR. GROSSO: Okay. And on the macro levels, then, that you ended with, isn't CERP, the big sort of picture or fix of that if we can actually get it funded and fully implemented, the retention of water on the interior of the land as opposed to sending it out to tide.

MR. VIALPANDO: So -- so --

MR. GROSSO: By CERP, I mean Comprehensive Everglades Restoration.

MR. VIALPANDO: -- yeah, that would be a big part of it, because, obviously, that water can hopefully stay over there and not come through Broward County and be wasted to tide. And then, of course, we have our own, you know developed area generated runoff that we also have to deal with, but, yes.

MR. GROSSO: So would our County Commission and our local Commissioners do what they can politically to make sure the state continues accelerated progress on CERP? Would that be part of the big picture answer to this?

MR. VIALPANDO: So that's a policy question, but, yeah, probably.

CHAIR STERMER: Well, correct me if I'm wrong. Part of that flows from the federal dollars from WRDA, because, as part of the impoundment area, my city has deeded over to the district and to the Corps the land necessary to build an impoundment area.

MR. GROSSO: Yeah.

MR. VIALPANDO: Right.

CHAIR STERMER: We -- without a question, we immediately deeded to them, compared to leasing them the land, we said here you go. We signed the deeds. And until the federal monies become available in the WRDA bill, they have a proved theory. They haven't approved the dollars. So it's not only the state we have to look to, part of it is looking to the feds, as well.

MR. GROSSO: 50/50 cost share make sense.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: And we created wetland banks.

CHAIR STERMER: Right. So I'm saying we're doing -- we are trying hard as a community to do our part. But I also want to remind you that we did have the first project, if I recall correctly, from Wilton Manors last year which was based on the new maps and water retention issues. That was the first one based on the new sea level rise and the numbers dealing with it, dealing with the extra retention on site based on the new formulas. It was last year?

MS. BOY: 2017.

CHAIR STERMER: 2017. So --

MS. BOY: (Inaudible)

MR. GROSSO: There's definitely a necessary effort to get the federal government to accelerate its --

CHAIR STERMER: Yes.

MR. GROSSO: -- funding and its share of the work to do it, absolutely.

CHAIR STERMER: And my belief, based upon -- I could be wrong, but based upon some of the new -- I'll use this word politely -- personalities who were put on the South Florida Water Management District board, one of them who resides in my city, who is none too quiet about the Everglades, we may get a little attention. And I have a feeling it may be coming. Commissioner Blattner.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Yeah. This is simple. Your reference to LEED, are you

implying, or is it possible for a golf course to be LEED certified?

MR. VIALPANDO: Uh-huh. So if -- there's a lot of things that go into the LEED certification process.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Uh-huh.

MR. VIALPANDO: So if -- there's a lot of things that go into the LEED certification process, but you can get the stormwater LEED points through this permitting process. So there are many other things you need to do to be LEED certified Gold, Silver, all that, and there's a whole formula they have for that. So this is just specific to the stormwater points that are available under LEED.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Thank you.

MR. VIALPANDO: You're welcome.

CHAIR STERMER: And I just want to come back to say one thing. Let's remember -- and part of it was specifically said, and it's to, I think, Mr. Grosso's point -- remember, we're doing land use. What happens once that's approved and gets through site plan, permitting, and those things, remember, we're -- that's why there are times where we're happy to see pictures of what something may look like and sometimes not.

In some respects, the picture's unimportant to us. It's the overall category we're changing to, not the specifics, which is really what happens when they go through the process. And I know you know. I just want to make sure we focus on we don't look at the pretty pictures. We look at the land use category and whether that's an acceptable use of that category to change to.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Just for information. Golf courses in Florida are going out of business because the land is too valuable. Golf courses in California are going out of business because water's too expensive. And I visited a golf course in California in anticipation of them possibly doing something here. Where they used to spend between 500,000 and a million dollars a year on water, now they spend less than a hundred thousand dollars a year, because they're retaining everything.

So it's a lesson if you're doing a golf course, just don't plant different stuff. You've got to really address the whole drainage issue, because so much of our land -- we have 300 and some acres on Orange Brook, alone, as a golf course that doesn't retain much water. It's a real challenge and an opportunity for us.

CHAIR STERMER: Mr. Rosenof.

MR. ROSENOF: First of all, thank you for bringing back memories from my LEED test. I hated that.

(Laughter.)

MR. ROSENOF: Second of all, you didn't mention anything about reuse. And I know that was always a promising technology. I've visited Pompano's plant before. Especially when it comes to saltwater intrusion, I think that's a great technology. And why has it not been emphasized? It seems to have gone away.

MR. VIALPANDO: So it is used. It's primarily used as an irrigation strategy --

MR. ROSENOF: Right.

MR. VIALPANDO: -- simply because rapid rate land application, which would be the one that would allow you to super load the ground surface in order to create a freshwater barrier between, you know, the saltwater intrusion causes the ground surface to be wet, causes the retention to be reduced. And, in many cases, we just don't have a lot of extra volume to use for that purpose, so it doesn't get a lot of use for that reason.

MR. ROSENOF: But I've seen plume maps of Pompano where it shows that a lot of that saltwater intrusion has been -- has been pushed off.

MR. VIALPANDO: It -- it --

MR. ROSENOF: I'm assuming it's because of the reuse.

MR. VIALPANDO: Oh, a lot of that --

MR. ROSENOF: Is that not true?

MR. VIALPANDO: -- is Pompano fortunately has a very large golf course that they're able to do that on --

MR. ROSENOF: Okay.

MR. VIALPANDO: -- and they use the big water bodies that are in there.

MR. ROSENOF: So they're not injecting it into the aquifer. They're watering grass, and that's enough to keep the plume at bay?

MR. VIALPANDO: Well, they're putting it -- yeah, they're -- they are putting it in the water bodies, and so that's causing them to be -- you know, kind of --

MR. ROSENOF: Okay.

MR. VIALPANDO: -- like what I was talking about with the canals, where you sort of create more head, right, by --

MR. ROSENOF: Uh-huh.

MR. VIALPANDO: -- by putting more water in there, and that allows you to force more recharge in.

MR. ROSENOF: Uh-huh.

MR. VIALPANDO: And, you know, we have seen, you know, around the Copans and US-1 area --

MR. ROSENOF: Right.

MR. VIALPANDO: -- where we've seen some push back of the --

MR. ROSENOF: Uh-huh.

MR. VIALPANDO: -- saltwater intrusion layer. And I think they have been very successful with that. Like I said, the problem with that is that that's on the coastal ridge, so they have a huge advantage of having --

MR. ROSENOF: Uh-huh.

MR. VIALPANDO: -- some elevation that a lot of other places don't have, and just, you know, space, lakes and things to put it in. A lot of cities don't have that kind of space or, if they do, they don't have the elevation.

MR. ROSENOF: Okay.

CHAIR STERMER: Anybody else? I also just want to -- oh, Mayor Hardin.

MAYOR HARDIN: Yeah, I -- just to talk about that briefly. It's my understanding also part of -- part of the -- the reason that the plume has been pushed back is because of the reduction in freshwater we've been able to accomplish through the use of our reuse. So we are not drawing as much from the aquifer in that area from our freshwater wells. Consequently, we have less inward pressure from the salt. So it's --

MR. VIALPANDO: Right.

MAYOR HARDIN: -- it's a two-step process. One, we're putting more on the ground from the reuse, but then we are drawing less from underground, which it -- both works.

MR. VIALPANDO: That's absolutely right.

MAYOR HARDIN: Thank you. Just wanted to point that out. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Commissioner Blattner, a number of years ago when the City of

Plantation actually redid their -- when they bought their golf course and redid it, they made it very environmentally friendly with the types of plantings and the types of grass -
-

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Absolutely.

CHAIR STERMER: -- that they did there. And that was one of the ones early on where, particularly municipality and built it up and put in different types of materials to use the -- be more adaptable to sometimes lack of water and things of that nature.

MR. GROSSO: And if I may, that's one of the things -- I think it's a great comment and a great observation, and it's one of the reasons why I always talk about why we shouldn't have stricter requirements for native landscaping for new development and retention of existing native landscaping, because it really does get to this we don't use as much water anymore. I think that's got to be a strong place that we -- we really begin to emphasize. Plus there's the aesthetic and the economic values of more natural planting, native plants.

We shouldn't be afraid to require that more, strict requirements for on-site retention of natives and planting of natives as opposed to exotics that have to be watered during the winter. That's a really important point of emphasis, from my perspective.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: The ZeroScape plan.

MR. GROSSO: ZeroScape.

CHAIR STERMER: Ms. Blake Boy?

MS. BOY: Hi. Sorry to interrupt. Mr. Vialpando has to go to another meeting, so he's --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Bye.

MS. BOY: -- telling me he needs to leave.

MR. GROSSO: Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

OTHER BUSINESS:

CHAIR STERMER: Anybody have anything else before the Council this morning? With that, we stand adjourned. Remember, we are not meeting in March. And lastly, if you have not made a contribution to the bagel fund recently, that is self-funded by the members. So if you can --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Please give to the bagel fund.

CHAIR STERMER: -- buy an expensive bagel, you can do so in the back.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, everybody. Have a good morning.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR STERMER: Oh, Mayor Ganz.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR STERMER: Sir. Folks, one second, please.

MAYOR GANZ: Sorry --

CHAIR STERMER: Mayor Ganz.

MAYOR GANZ: -- about that. There was one thing I wanted to share with everyone, because we talk about it quite often with the Bert J. Harris Act. The City of Deerfield Beach was successful in their Bert J. Harris case -- that we fought. It helps to have a really good attorney to be able to do that for you.

(Laughter.)

MAYOR GANZ: But it just shows that municipalities can stand up against that type of challenge. It not always works out in our favor, but with a good attorney, it will at times. So I know we talk about it a lot, but we were successful in our battle with that.

MR. GROSSO: Good for you.

MAYOR GANZ: I just wanted to share that.

CHAIR STERMER: Please make sure you forward that opinion to Mr. Grosso.

(Laughter.)

MAYOR GANZ: Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you. Congratulations. With that, we are adjourned.

(The meeting concluded at 10:30 a.m.)