

# Central Florida Water Initiative

TOHO Water Authority  
Friday, September 26, 2014

## Meeting Summary

(All presentations made to the Steering Committee have been posted on [cfwiwater.com](http://cfwiwater.com).)

### Introductions

- a. Steering Committee members present: Drew Bartlett (FDEP), Paul Senft (SWFWMD, alternate for Michael Babb), Brian Wheeler (TOHO Water), Rich Budell (DACS), Dan O'Keefe (SFWMMD), John Miklos (SJRWMD)
- b. Members of the audience introduced themselves and the sign in sheet for those in attendance has been posted to the website.

### 2. Consent Items

- a. The August 29, 2014 Meeting Summary was approved.

### 3. Kissimmee River Reservation

- a. Len Lindahl reviewed the process and schedule the SFWMMD is following to adopt the reservation. Key milestone dates are:
  - Draft rule language by the end of June 2015
  - Final draft rule by September 2015
  - Rule adoption by December 2015
- b. Three additional public workshops will be held at key dates during the rule development and adoption process.
- c. Schedule is shown in the presentation associated with this agenda item on the website.

### 4. Conservation

- a. Public water supply
  - Mike Sweeney (TOHO Water) presented the conservation efforts of the public water suppliers in Central Florida. He said the data was from the seven largest utilities (Orlando Utilities Commission, Orange County, TOHO Water, Seminole County, Polk County, Reedy Creek Improvement District and City of St. Cloud). He felt the data was representative of the other utilities efforts. These seven utilities represent approximately 57% of the 2010 total public water use in the CFWI.
  - Mike Sweeney explained that residential potable per capita water use has decreased from approximately 165 gpcd in 1995 to 100 gpcd in 2010. He stated the public suppliers are committed to conservation and they will continue to manage demand and implement additional conservation to offset growth demands. Public utilities face several challenges to further reduce water consumption- among them:
    - Rate balancing – lower water sales needs to be offset by rate adjustments to cover fixed costs

- Higher water rates will drive some customers to private wells
  - Sustaining water conservation requires permanent change in customer behavior
  - There is a strong economic incentive to pursue water conservation due to the high cost of alternate water supplies (AWS). At some point the cost of water conservation will greatly exceed the cost of AWS but a great amount of water conservation can be achieved before that point
- Drew Bartlett said he was impressed with the success of conservation but asked how to better document and present the efforts for each utility to better understand the extent of implementation.
  - Brian Wheeler reinforced the point made during the presentation that water reuse had a significant impact on reducing demand.
  - Brian Wheeler also stated that estimating the effectiveness of conservation is difficult and that the UF Clearing House is helpful in doing so.
  - Dan O'Keefe noted the graph and data showing progress only goes to 2010 and requested that it be updated to reflect the latest data available.
  - Paul Senft expressed concern about the current consumptive use rules that have thresholds for regulation that are greater than 2" and how best to evaluate and understand the impact on overall water use in the CFWI. The Steering Committee requested this issue be explored further and be brought back for further understanding and discussion.
- b. Agriculture water supply
- Ray Scott (FDACS) summarized agriculture within the CFWI and associated water use. He indicated that of the 1,096,550 acres being farmed only about 12% (134,873 acres) were irrigated. The irrigated acreage by crop type is as follows:

Irrigated Agriculture Acreage within the CFWI (acres)							
Citrus	Field Crops	Greenhouse/Nursery	Misc.	Other Fruits & Nuts	Pasture	Sod	Vegetables/Melons/Berries
100,472	4,236	5,250	214	145	6,011	9,019	9,527
75%	3%	4%	<1%	1%	4%	7%	7%

- Ray indicated that citrus being the largest water user is also the most efficient user of water. Over the past 20 years most groves have been converted to micro-jet or drip irrigation.
- Rich Budell (FDACS) explained it is the priority of FDACS to develop more real time data through additional weather stations closer to the actual farms using water and expand the use of automatic soil moisture monitors. He indicated that FDACS felt there was significant opportunities to improve agricultural water conservation statewide

(perhaps 50 MGD) but he felt that within the CFWI most of the water conservation potential has already been achieved.

- Drew Bartlett requested more documentation be developed for existing agricultural water conservation accomplishments. The documentation should quantify actual water use and conservation.
- John Miklos said the data showing conservation efficiencies by irrigation system type were confusing and needs to be better explained.

c. Regional Water Supply Plan (DRAFT)

- Joanne Chamberlain (SJRWMD) explained the water conservation element within the RWSP and presented the following summary:

<b>Water Demand Category</b>	<b>Projected 2035 Demand (mgd)</b>	<b>Projected 2035 Conservation (mgd)</b>	<b>Net Projected 2035 Demand with Conservation (mgd)</b>
Public Supply	653.27	26.78	626.49
Agriculture	214.84	10.90	203.94
Domestic Self-Supply	24.42	1.19	23.23
Landscape/Recreation /Aesthetic	72.18	2.02	70.16
Commercial/Industrial/ Institutional	95.85	1.15	94.70
Power Generation	22.41	0.27	22.14
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,082.97</b>	<b>42.32</b>	<b>1,040.65</b>

- Joanne explained the water conservation estimates were based on the EZ Guide for PWS and the MIL estimates for agriculture.

d. Conservation Sub Team

- Robert Beltran (SWFWMD) reviewed progress on achieving the water conservation targets within the draft RWSP and opportunities to increase the targets as requested by the Steering Committee.
- With respect to public water supply
  - Approximately 1 mgd of additional conservation savings was identified through solutions process for a total of 27.7 mgd for PWS at an estimated cost of \$122M.
  - High efficiency clothes washers and dishwasher aren't shown because they did not meet the \$3 /kgal threshold
  - The savings estimates are predicated on a participation rate derived from the continued level of effort (education and outreach) and funding as currently exist. Increased levels of funding or effort will likely result in more savings.
  - 100% PWS participation is virtually impossible. However, participation greater than what was used in the estimates is possible.

- Robert explained the savings estimates provided are based on the water conservation measures which can currently be quantified. Savings attributable to other unquantified measures are not included in the estimate. Therefore, 42MGD should not be considered the maximum possible savings for the region.
- With respect to agriculture water use
  - Robert explained the sub team is evaluating through the FAARM Model and existing SWFWMD FARMS Program how Ag will go about achieving the 10.9 mgd target. He said there is some concern within the sub team that without Ag BMP cost-share programs the 10.9 mgd target cannot be achieved.
- Ongoing water conservation sub team discussions

### **Quantifiable vs Unquantifiable**

- Beyond what has been quantified there are many projects, programs, BMPs, and measure that we collectively feel are important and effective. These will be written into the narrative.

### **Education and Outreach**

- Education needs to be considered in this process. It will be further analyzed in the narrative but doesn't fit the mold of the 11 questions.

### **Regulatory Options**

- Reviewing various regulatory options which have the potential to have significant impacts on water conservation- such as Implementation of statewide landscape and irrigation regulations for all new construction

### **Other Self Supply**

- Utilization of the same set of BMPs as PWS
- Due to lack of available information we focused on developing projects based on these two main sectors PWS & AG. (4.6 MGD of 42 is in this group and includes DSS, Rec/Aes, CII, & PG)
- Potential for future model runs using parcels not served by PWS utilities

### **Chapter Development**

- The chapter is undergoing sub-team review and currently consist of 50+ pages including a comprehensive list of terms/definitions
- In additions to BMPs the chapter discusses the impact of education, regulation, and other water management strategies in achieving water use efficiency

## Implementation

- Programmatic Approach is being utilized per earlier Steering Committee guidance.
  
- e. Public comment
  - Bob Stamps (Audubon Florida) appreciated the water conservation efforts made by PWS and Ag users. He indicated that much of the gains in conservation were a result of the adoption of International Plumbing Codes. However, he expressed concern that not much progress has been made since 2001. He felt maintaining the status quo was not acceptable. He thought the participation rates were too low and understood that improving them significantly would be costly and may require legislative funding.
  - David Gore (Davenport) felt that landscape and agricultural irrigation were his biggest concerns and these concerns can be addressed by requirements to use native plants in landscaping. Extensive irrigation lowered the water table and needed to be addressed.

## 5. Solutions Planning Team (SPT)

- a. Robert Beltran said the Team has identified approximately 340 MGD of potential new water supply at an estimated cost of \$2.7B. He said this number will be refined and more detail provided at future SC meetings.
- b. Robert reviewed the SPT schedule and critical path dates. The SC modified and approved the following dates for the CFWI Plan and RWSP completion:
  - Sept 26 – SC - Conservation presentation
  - Oct 24 – SC – Draft regional projects (Reclaimed Water, Stormwater, Groundwater)
  - Nov 14 – SC – Draft regional projects (Surface Water, Environmental Sub-team report)
  - Nov 21 - Central Florida Regional Leadership Forum
  - Dec 1 – All Draft CFWI Plan chapters due to Production Team
  - Dec 2 – SPT – Review final draft regional projects and overall CFWI planning effort
  - Jan 7 – Production Team distributes Internal Draft CFWI Plan
  - Jan 22 – SPT – Discuss Internal Draft CFWI Plan
  - Jan 30 – SC – Overview of the Internal Draft CFWI Plan
  - Feb 13 – All CFWI Internal Draft Plan comments due to Production Team
  - Feb 19 – SPT – Overview of updated Internal Draft CFWI Plan
  - Feb – SC – Presentation on updated Internal Draft CFWI Plan

- March – SC – Approve External Draft CFWI Plan
- April/May 2015 – Public review period
- June/July – SC – Approve Final Draft CFWI Plan and Final Draft RWSP
- July/Aug – Gov Bd – Approve Final Draft CFWI Plan and Final Draft RWSP

## 6. Regulatory Team (RT)

- a. Len Lindahl, Team Leader, reported on the ongoing process to follow the December 13 FDEP Guidance memo.
  - WMD coordination on pending applications
  - Review of permit duration
  - Water conservation criteria
  - Reporting consumptive use data
    - Updated list of pending consumptive use permit applications, separated by District
    - Requested permit duration
    - Identifies requests for new quantities by source
    - Available on [www.cfwiwater.com](http://www.cfwiwater.com)
- b. Outstanding RT Topics (to be addressed)
  - Water use per capita
    - Additional request form Steering Committee
    - Data collection across District programs
  - Water shortage criteria comparison
  - Caution area example review
  - Public interest (3rd prong test interpretation)
    - Statutory and rule review
  - Conjunctive Use
- c. New Topics:
  - Regulatory review of RSWP Projects
    - FDEP March 2012 Guidance on Improved Linkage between Plans and Permits
      - “...project has undergone initial screening for feasibility and has a likelihood of being permissible.”
    - Drafting Regulatory Review Template
    - Principles
      - Sub team created in conjunction with the Solutions Planning Team to discuss high-level policy issues
      - Long term success plan
      - Identify options for principles and programs
- d. **Upcoming**
  - Continued progress on priority topics
  - Coordination with Solutions Planning Team
  - Regulatory Review of RWSP Projects

- Draft content for Strategies Document

## 7. Regional Consensus Building

- a. Steve Seibert (triSects Inc.) participated via phone and provided the following summary :
- b. Upcoming Workshops
  - Tri-County League of Cities
    - Date: October 16<sup>th</sup>
    - Time: 1 to 3pm
    - Place: Town of Oakland
  - Second Workshop
    - Date: October 29<sup>th</sup>
    - Place: Haines City
- c. Central Florida Regional Leadership Forum
  - Working Together to Advance a Regional Water Strategy
    - Date: Friday, November 21st
    - Time: 8:00 am - 11:30 am
    - Place: Hyatt Regency Orlando International Airport

## 8. 2015 Funding

- a. As a follow up from Brian Wheeler's request at the August 29<sup>th</sup> SC meeting to develop a unified approach to coordinate 2015 legislative funding requests for the CFWI, Robert Beltran offered the following:
  - The Solutions Planning Team is looking at 28 projects that would develop 340 MGD at a cost of \$2.7B. The number of projects may increase as the work of the team continues.
  - Robert explained that most of these projects are multi-phase, multi-year endeavors. He felt they the SPT would be developing an implementation scenario that segments these projects into 1, 2, 5, 10- and 20 year time frames similar to the FDOT Transportation project scenarios.
  - Robert said he felt that initial funding next year could set the stage for CFWI implementation and that conservation, stormwater projects and data collection would be good candidates for consideration. He also mentioned some preliminary engineering studies would be appropriate for 2015 funding.
- b. Brian Wheeler said he would support going forward to explore funding priorities and felt the recommendations from the Data Management and Implementation Team (DMIT) should be given the highest priority.
- c. Paul Senft has been speaking with some legislators and they expressed a lack of understanding as to what the CFWI has been developing. He thought we needed a better mechanism to inform the legislature.
- d. Drew Bartlett explained the Governor's Office and the FDEP will be requesting water funding and the CFWI will be given some priority.

- e. Dan O'Keefe thought the timing was very good. This is expected to be the year of water and he thought the next two years would focus on water projects.
- f. Robert Beltran said he would work with the Management Oversight Committee (MOC) and develop options for an approach at the next SC meeting.

**9. Open Discussion NONE**

**10. Public Comments**

- a. Hans Tanzler (SJRWMD) commended the conservation efforts of the CFWI utilities and hoped their successes could be an inspiration to other utilities in the state. He said Mike Sweeney did an exceptional job explaining the efforts of the utilities and the challenges they still face in implementing more water conservation practices.
- b. David Gore (Haines City) said he has reviewed the draft RWSP and felt it is challenging for citizens to read and understand. He felt that additional measures other than just water conservation and alternate water supply development are needed. He felt all water use causes some impact. He feels that the CFWI is too focused on the Floridan Aquifer and the surficial aquifer should be more of a concern. The CFWI should focus on managing and protecting the water table aquifer.

**11. Next SC meetings**

- a. Oct 24
- b. Nov 14
- c. Dec 19

**12. Adjourn 11:45 AM**