

**CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
SUSTAINABILITY ADVISORY BOARD
CITY HALL CITY COMMISSION CHAMBERS – 1ST FLOOR
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA
MARCH 26, 2012 – 6:30 P.M.**

| Members | Attendance | Cumulative Attendance 1/2012 through 12/2012 | |
|------------------------------|-------------------|---|---------------|
| | | Present | Absent |
| Jon Albee, Chair | A | 2 | 1 |
| Alena Alberani, Vice Chair | P | 3 | 0 |
| Valerie Amor [arrived 6:39] | P | 3 | 0 |
| Steven Cook | P | 1 | 0 |
| Cathy Curry | P | 2 | 1 |
| Vicki Eckels | P | 2 | 1 |
| William Goetz [arrived 6:39] | P | 3 | 0 |
| Dana Pollitt | P | 3 | 0 |
| Rebecca J. Walter | P | 3 | 0 |
| Robert Walters | A | 1 | 1 |

Also Present

Todd Hiteshew, Staff Liaison
 Heather Steyn, WaterWorks 2011
 D'Wayne Spence, Assistant City Attorney
 Anthony Fajardo, Zoning Administrator
 Randall Robinson, Planner II, Department of Sustainable Development
 Diana Alarcon, Transportation and Mobility Director
 Loretta Cronk, Recycling Program Manager
 Brigitte Chiappetta, Recording Secretary, Prototype Inc.

Communications to the City Commission

Motion made by Ms. Eckels, seconded by Ms. Walter to state: the Board feels the Urban Agriculture Ordinance, as currently written, does not accomplish what they thought it needed to from a sustainability standpoint and that it would be counterproductive to send the ordinance to the Planning and Zoning Board now. The Board was requesting that they hold a workshop with the Planning and Zoning Board to craft an ordinance that both boards could approve, for ultimate review by the Commission. In a roll call vote, motion passed unanimously.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Vice Chair Alberani.

2. Roll call – Introductions

Roll was called and it was determined a quorum was present.

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes – February 2012

Motion made by Ms. Curry, seconded by Ms. Walter, to approve the minutes. In a voice vote, Board unanimously approved.

4. Staff Liaison Report

- EECBG

Mr. Hiteshew said they had cancelled the revolving loan fund due to lack of demand. The rebate program was still running and was very successful. The Home Energy Savings Workshops were also ongoing. They were still working on the Demonstration Center, and would ask DOE for an extension of time. Mr. Hiteshew stated the funds left from the revolving loans would be put into the demonstration center. He explained they would install a solar roof on the Holiday Park Social Center. They would also install LED lights, energy efficient windows and doors.

Mr. Cook asked if the SAB members could be advised of future projects going out to bid. Mr. Hiteshew stated all City bids went through BidSync, but he would try to remember to report this activity to the Board.

Mr. Goetz and Ms. Amor arrived at 6:39.

- Moving April 2012 meeting
See Walkability Study section below.

May Meeting

The Board's May meeting date fell on Memorial Day so they discussed an alternate meeting date or cancelling the meeting. They agreed to wait until April to decide.

- Minutes

Mr. Hiteshew announced that Prototype would no longer be attending meetings and writing minutes for the Board. City staff would attend meetings and create the minutes. He explained that the minutes may no longer have the level of detail the Board is accustomed to, but will be done according to the Better Meetings Academy Handbook. They will still be recorded as usual.

5. New Business

- EECBG Initiatives – Bill Goetz

[This item was heard out of order]

Dr. Goetz said a research report by the National Academy of Sciences indicated that over their entire life cycles, electric vehicles and hybrids caused 30% more damage to humans and the environment than gas-powered vehicles. He said some municipalities

had determined that the vehicles were not as cost effective as gas vehicles. Dr. Goetz said the bottom line was that it was counterproductive environmentally and financially to invest in hybrid and electric vehicles.

Ms. Eckels wished to see other studies on this subject. Ms. Amor said she was trying to find out more and she suggested they discuss this again.

Dr. Goetz said he had recently learned about rebound: with an increase in efficiency, people tended to buy other things that counteracted the energy savings they had realized. He had never seen this in any SAP plan, but it seemed to be recognized in the research community.

Ms. Eckels suggested they request a meeting with whoever was prioritizing the SAP recommendations and request they perform additional research. Dr. Goetz stated the responsible people were Ms. Torriente and Mr. Carbon, and this was why they should insist that they attend the SAB meetings.

Dr. Goetz said the City had a list of Green initiatives that included some items the SAB had no knowledge of. Mr. Hiteshew stated this list was circulated back in 2010 when the Board was a Committee and they were working on their report to Commission, It was specifically created for Mr. John Lacz who at the time was working on the Education/Outreach chapter. Staff is currently updating the list. He said they needed to be able to ask questions and provide input. Dr. Goetz had asked Ms. Torriente and others to comment on topics and received no response; this was another reason he wished her to attend the SAB meetings. Ms. Eckels wished to invite Ms. Torriente and Mr. Carbon to attend an SAB meeting to discuss the SAP and the Regional Climate Change Action Plan.

In order to assist staff, Mr. Hiteshew wanted the Board to establish evidence-based benchmarking and prioritization.

- Downtown Walkability Study – Diana Alarcon

Ms. Alarcon asked if the Board would consider a special meeting on April 16. Jeff Speck, an Urban Design Planner, would be in Town to perform a walkability study for the City and she felt the Board would be able to provide some input. The study would cover the downtown core area. Ms. Alarcon said Mr. Speck would bring samples of his work and ask the Board for input regarding their concerns and issues. She said he was most known for work he had done in Oklahoma City a few years ago. Ms. Alarcon said this tied into the City's Complete Streets Program. Dr. Goetz requested to see the Scope of Work to which Mr. Speck had responded and Ms. Alarcon agreed to provide it. Ms. Alarcon also agreed to provide materials related to work Mr. Speck had done.

Motion made by Dr. Goetz, seconded by Ms. Eckels, to hold the Board's April meeting on April 16 at Ms. Alarcon's office at 290 NE 3 Street.

- Single Stream Recycling – Loretta Cronk

Ms. Cronk gave a Power Point presentation on single-stream recycling, a copy of which is attached to these minutes for the public record.

Board members asked which plastics could be collected and Ms. Cronk stated they accepted all #1, #2 and some #5 plastics. The easiest way to remember was that any plastic "with a neck" was accepted.

Ms. Cronk stated only multi-family units that had City of Fort Lauderdale refuse collection accounts would be part of the program. The initial rollout was approximately 37,550 households: 100% of single-family homes, duplexes and triplexes. Ms. Cronk explained that the City was not responsible for the collection from commercial establishments and this would continue. Phase I of the project was the conversion to carts for the residential collection and Phase II was expansion of public space recycling. Phase III would be expansion of multi-family building recycling.

Ms. Amor noted that plastic lids were not accepted, and she asked that information be provided on what could be done with such items (note: follow-up from Loretta Cronk, Recycling Program Coordinator - after plastic and glass containers are emptied and rinsed, caps can be put back on the bottles and jars before they are emptied into the bins. Caps go through the same process as the other materials at the MRF. Because of their size, some fall through the screens and end up as residue. Those that make it through the assembly line are baled and recycled as mixed plastic.)

Ms. Cronk stated this could be part of the larger education program.

Dr. Goetz thought the education component was targeted to HOAs, but Ms. Cronk stated the carts would all have hangers explaining the program and they would run ads on cable TV and on Channel 78. Ms. Eckels said Green Your Routine volunteers would work to increase participation.

Ms. Eckels reminded Ms. Cronk that 60% of the City's population lived in multi-family units and she wanted multi-family recycling to be a priority. She pointed out that including this would significantly increase their revenue.

Ms. Cronk informed Mr. Cook that there was an ordinance in place requiring multi-family establishments to provide recycling for their tenants. Ms. Curry noted that most multi-family buildings did not have recycling carts. Ms. Cronk stated this was why they were making this a dedicated initiative and an independent project.

Mr. Cook asked how the State addressed the issue of multi-family recycling, since the State had a goal of 75% by 2020. He asked if this was an enforcement issue. Ms.

Cronk remarked that the State goal was “aspirational.” She said there was also discussion about how much of the 75% goal would be met by waste-to-energy.

Regarding multi-family recycling, Ms. Cronk stated these dwellings were serviced by private haulers and generally speaking, if it made economic sense to implement recycling, many establishments had done so. She said the rate was low in buildings with trash chutes that could not accommodate recycling. There was also an issue of providing enclosed spaces on every floor to house the carts. Ms. Alarcon said for smaller buildings, it was not cost effective to implement.

Ms. Amor asked if the next step would be to reduce garbage collection to once per week, and asked if people would be penalized for carts that were not full. Ms. Cronk stated once the carts were distributed, the infrastructure was in place to consider other options.

6. Old Business

- Urban Agriculture Ordinance

Mr. Hiteshew reminded the Board that the special workshop had been held in March. The next step for the ordinance was to be heard by the Planning and Zoning Board.

Mr. Fajardo recalled there had been discussion with the Board about using the State’s definition of agriculture and he asked if the Board wished this. He said the State definition of agriculture dealt with land; it did not define agriculture in an urban context. Anthony Olivieri had provided some information that could be included in the draft ordinance. Mr. Robinson distributed copies of the definition of urban agriculture from the APA Handbook on Urban Agriculture.

Mr. Robinson remarked there was no agriculture-zoned land in the City, so applying the State statute would require re-zoning. He said they were trying to simplify the process and go forward without re-zoning.

Ms. Eckels suggested that without re-zoning the City could allow urban agriculture in every zone. She had heard complaints that the City was restricting the zones in which urban farms could operate and this defeated the purpose. Mr. Fajardo said the Board could recommend that it be permitted in every zoning district. Ms. Eckels wanted to be very liberal with where farming was allowed; if someone had land, farming should be permitted on it if the land was adaptable to that use.

Regarding the definition Mr. Robinson had distributed, Mr. Fajardo said the ordinance defined a “small area” specific to lot sizes in a zoning district for community gardens. For urban farms, the size affected site plan reviews.

Ms. Amor asked how the Commission would make a decision after the Planning and Zoning Board meeting. Mr. Fajardo stated the Planning and Zoning Board would make

a recommendation to the City Commission. He said the ordinance was a change to the City's ULDR and therefore must be presented to the Planning and Zoning Board. Ms. Amor did not feel there would be any grey area with the Planning and Zoning Board, and this would not work well.

Ms. Eckels wanted the Board to inform the City Commission that the ordinance that was being developed did not begin to address what they had wanted to accomplish. She would prefer the Commission defer to the SAB to draft an ordinance that would be presented to the Planning and Zoning Board.

Mr. Spence explained that the City's current zoning system did not permit the use. The Commission had asked staff to develop an ordinance to permit the use. Staff had drafted an amendment to the ULDR that would permit this use. The City Commission had requested input from the SAB. Mr. Spence said there was a difference between looking at what the ordinance was intended to do: regulate the use of land, and what the SAB understood to be necessary for this to be a successful use. The considerations for the Planning and Zoning Board and Planning staff to consider were the character of the neighborhood in which the farms would be located: neighborhood compatibility and health, safety and welfare of the community. The ordinance was drafted to keep out noxious uses someone could "sneak in" based on a very broad ordinance.

Ms. Amor suggested one more workshop between the SAB and the Planning and Zoning Board, after which the SAB could craft language to address any concerns from the Planning and Zoning Board. She said their goal was to craft an ordinance that was effective and usable but they were hearing so many contrary comments she did not feel the ordinance was ready. Ms. Eckels said they needed to know the fears of the people who ultimately needed to sign off on this prior to presenting this to the City Commission so they could be addressed.

Mr. Spence asked for the Board's objections to the ordinance as written. Ms. Amor reiterated her suggestion for a workshop with the SAB and Planning and Zoning. Mr. Fajardo asked if the Board wanted to meet with the Planning and Zoning Board or Planning and Zoning staff and Ms. Amor said staff should participate in the discussion as well.

Mr. Spence said the Commission had asked for recommendations from the SAB and from the Planning and Zoning Board.

Mr. Fajardo stated the Planning and Zoning Board would need to vote to hold a workshop and this would slow the process down. He said if the Boards' recommendations disagreed, the City Commission would make a determination about which recommendations were better. Mr. Fajardo said when staff had discussed this with the Commission, the Commission had indicated they wanted to ensure the uses were compatible with the neighborhoods in which they were located.

Mr. Fajardo remarked that the ordinance was not really restrictive. He said their greatest concern had been about the types of equipment; they did not want to see any equipment used in a residential area that would not be used at a residence. Mr. Fajardo said the one sticking point that he kept hearing was community garden versus urban farm.

Ms. Amor stated if the Commission went forward with the ordinance that the SAB did not support, people in the community opposed to it might attend the Commission meeting when it was discussed and the Commission could need to postpone their discussion again.

Mr. Fajardo said staff had discussed the vacant land question and he felt it would be possible to put a community garden or urban farm on land that was already developed, provided it complied with code requirements.

Mr. Hiteshew suggested the Board send a communication to the City Commission to request a meeting with the Planning and Zoning Board and to state their comments on the ordinance. He also suggested they appoint a representative to attend the April Planning and Zoning Board meeting. Ms. Walter stated any Board member could attend the Planning and Zoning Board meeting as a private citizen.

Mr. Spence informed the Board that the City Commission really wanted their input on the ordinance. Their comments and the Planning and Zoning Board comments would then be presented to the Commission. He stated they could also communicate their concerns via a communication to the City Commission. Mr. Spence felt the City Commission would need to recommend a workshop between the SAB and the Planning and Zoning Board.

Motion made by Ms. Eckels, seconded by Ms. Walter to state: the Board feels the Urban Agriculture Ordinance, as currently written, does not accomplish what they thought it needed to from a sustainability standpoint and that it would be counterproductive to send the ordinance to the Planning and Zoning Board now. The Board was requesting that they hold a workshop with the Planning and Zoning Board to craft an ordinance that both boards could approve, for ultimate review by the Commission. In a roll call vote, motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Walter suggested that if they could not schedule a workshop, SAB members should attend the Planning and Zoning Board meeting to request they defer the item.

- MOU – Bill Goetz

This was discussed with the following item.

- City Staff Attendance – Bill Goetz

Dr. Goetz said they must improve communication between City administration and the Board. In order to accomplish this, he said Ms. Torriente and Mr. Carbon should attend all of their meetings and they should also create a Memo of Understanding [MOU] between the City and Board. Ms. Eckels asked if an MOU would make staff more responsive to requests for information and Dr. Goetz felt it would. He distributed a draft MOU he had based on the Budget Advisory Board's MOU.

Ms. Alberani suggested Board members read the MOU and they could continue to discuss it at their April meeting.

7. Communications to the City Commission

Discussed earlier:

Motion made by Ms. Eckels, seconded by Ms. Walter to state: the Board feels the Urban Agriculture Ordinance, as currently written, does not accomplish what they thought it needed to from a sustainability standpoint and that it would be counterproductive to send the ordinance to the Planning and Zoning Board now. The Board was requesting that they hold a workshop with the Planning and Zoning Board to craft an ordinance that both boards could approve, for ultimate review by the Commission. In a roll call vote, motion passed unanimously.

Other discussion items

Mr. Cook advised the Board that a judge had determined public comments must be taken regarding PACE and today was the last day. He stated the website for public comments was: www.regulations.gov, RIN 2590-AA59.

Mr. Cook announced that Progresso Point in Flagler Village was the first high-rise in Florida to receive the Florida Green Building Coalition's Green High-Rise Residential designation.

Next meeting: April 16

Next Planning and Zoning Board meeting: April 18.

Mr. Hiteshew announced Earth Day was April 21 and invited Board members to help the City at the event in Birch State Park.

Ms. Amor distributed a flyer for the opening April 1 of a community garden she had designed on Sistrunk Boulevard.

8. Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 9:01 p.m.

Sustainability Advisory Board
March 26, 2012
Page 9

Attachments:
Minutes – February 2012

[Minutes prepared by J. Opperlee, Prototype, Inc.]