

From: Gefvert, Cynthia [mailto:cgefvert@sfwmd.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 04, 2016
Cc: Elsner, Mark; Sweazy, Chris
Subject: RE: CFWI Reg Team Uniform demand calculations (for Public Supply)

Hey Krystal,

Nice job on trying to incorporate all of the comments and thoughts - it can be a rather thankless job.

Mark and I talked (at length) and I have tried to keep the comments in order of the document. Chris was busy on other CFWI stuff so I hope we covered his thoughts.

1. Might be nice to have a short introduction with the purpose and main issues. And then a few introductory sentences at the beginning of A and B. Could include where we want to end up with BEBR Statewide Small Area Populations (utility service areas although I guess if they do it by parcels, we can sort it out by service areas) by 20XX.
2. The title is Uniform Demand Calculation by Use Class (Utility) – but it doesn't specify utilities that produce more than 100,000 gallons per day. And under B, there is a discussion about the smaller utilities so it could confuse folks. We just need to be clear. May want to include this in the introduction. I think the methodology for the larger utilities may work fine for the smaller.
3. A1a – the formula gives you finished water (since it takes out the treatment loss and exported water). I think the bold should say 'Existing Finished Demand'. Because this is for permitting, don't we really need the gross/raw water demand (withdrawals + imports)? Additionally, the alternate calculation is just finished water and we really need the gross.
4. A1 & A1a – When referring to existing demand, should refer to it as "Existing Raw Water Demand" or "Existing Finished Water Demand" so there is no confusion.
5. A1b – On the existing population, there is no way to tie population for each utility in a county to medium BEBR for the county.
6. A1b – alternative 2 is listed as a method to make corrections. Do we actually need a correction for existing populations? Consider rewording to state "...based on demonstration of appropriate circumstances to warrant an alternative method..."
7. A1c – can we attach a copy of the guidance memo so everyone has the whole package? We have an electronic copy (scanned, I think) that we could provide. Seems more like for future. May want to include mention of the 2008 Memo in introduction.
8. A1d – We're not sure the purpose of having the Uniform Residential Per Capita in here. What would it be used for?
9. A2a – These options will work for some utilities. However, there will be utilities, especially the very small ones, that will not be growing so use of countywide growth (BEBR) or past 5 years may not be appropriate. Additionally, there may be some utilities where new projects are coming in and the growth may be significantly higher. All parts of a county do not grow at the same rate. Should we add wording that corrections can also be based on current TAZ data or approved projects (terminology would need work) or???
10. DSS – don't think that should be included in here. There is no permitting for DSS and so it seem inappropriate.

I'm sure we will have more as we keep working on this but we are moving in the right direction.

Cheers – Cynthia and Mark

From: Azzarella, Krystal [mailto:KrystalAzzarella@polk-county.net]

Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2016 5:37 PM

To: 'kfelblinger@stcloud.org' <kfelblinger@stcloud.org>; 'cayce.salvino@stcloud.org' <cayce.salvino@stcloud.org>; 'QNEWELL@tohowater.com' <QNEWELL@tohowater.com>; 'BWheeler@tohowater.com' <BWheeler@tohowater.com>; 'msweeney@tohowater.com' <msweeney@tohowater.com>; 'karen.allen@ocfl.net' <karen.allen@ocfl.net>; 'Teresa.Remudo-Fries@ocfl.net' <Teresa.Remudo-Fries@ocfl.net>; 'rob@lsgfl.com' <rob@lsgfl.com>;