

# Central Florida Water Initiative

TOHO Water Authority  
951 Martin Luther King Blvd.  
Kissimmee, Florida 34741

Friday, May 18, 2012  
10:00 AM to 12:30 PM

## Meeting Minutes:

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

### 1. Introductions

- a. Brian Wheeler chaired the meeting
- b. Self introductions of Steering Committee (SC)
- c. Call in number provided for interested parties to listen to discussion

### 2. Consent Items

- a. Approval of the Jan. 27, 2012 Meeting Minutes
- b. Approval of revisions to the Guidance Document (05152012 version posted to [cfwiwater.com](http://cfwiwater.com))

### 3. HAT Update

- a. Model Assumptions and Input; briefing by David MacIntyre
  - Protection of non-MFL Wetlands/Surface Waters
    - Treat all wetlands equally in analysis.
    - Deviations from this are policy rather than technical decisions
  - Approaches for Modeling of Groundwater Allocations
    - Scale withdrawals to estimated monthly demands consistent with the authorized uses. Model only the portion of full allocation that is most likely to be used under the conditions of each simulation scenario.
    - For actual demands, use a consistent demand basis, to be developed by the Hydrologic Assessment Team (HAT) with FDACS & WMDs. Demand basis will relate demand to crop type and crop area.
    - Model the full allocation / acreage as an upper bound assessment for comparison with the End of Permit (EOP) Scenario.
  - Approaches for Modeling of Groundwater Allocations (Permitted Allocation)
    - As far as practicable for the EOP simulation, respect constraints of the existing CUP/WUP allocation basis.

- For actual demands, use a consistent demand basis, to be developed by HAT with FDACS & WMDs.
  - Brian Wheeler noted that the use of permits issued using 1 in 10 or 2 in 10 drought introduces inconsistency that CFWI was supposed to address. David explained that the EOP run represents permitted allocations which were issued under different WMD rules. The simulation reflects what is in effect.
  - Greg Munson asked about the time to update model scenario if revised permit allocations need to be considered; Akin Owosina responded that an update in this case would have a “minor impact” on overall schedule
  - Protection of Rivers
    - The WMDs have other, more constraining Evaluation Measures to ensure protection of the river systems.
    - Flow in spring-dominated rivers will be protected through constraints on modeled spring discharges.
- b. Model Deliverables and Schedule; briefing by Akin Owosina
- Products Delivered:
    - Workshop USGS Groundwater model (March 21 and 22, 2012).
    - Workshop USGS ANN Decision support tool (April 18, 2012).
    - Four initial scenarios for which water use data was prepared by the HAT.
    - Access to draft Report of ECFT Model for HAT review
  - Status of Model Delivery:
    - Model Release delayed an additional month pending completion of USGS internal review. Revised release date May 31, 2012 or shortly thereafter.
    - Bob Ranken, USGS Manager, explained the USGS review process and said they will do all that they can to maintain the schedule.
  - New subtask undertaken for 2035 agriculture water use projections- requested by DACS.

#### 4. Action Item

- a. Standards for MFL Peer Review; discussion led by Doug Leeper
- For each Peer Review Component, options were identified and cost /risk assessed
  - MFL/Reservations Team has identified six major components of the peer-review process; three involve two or more options for the Steering Committee to consider and provide guidance.
    - For Voluntary vs. Requested Peer Review Options:

- i. Option A involves voluntary review of all MFLs/Reservations – High costs and low risk of challenge.
  - ii. Option B involves voluntary review of selected MFLs/Reservations based on standard application of previously reviewed methods – moderate cost, increases risk of challenge.
  - iii. Option C corresponds to conducting peer review when requested by a substantially affected party per Florida Statute. .
  - iv. SC provided guidance for implementing a modified Option C (peer review when requested by a substantially affected party; voluntary peer review when high likelihood of challenge; peer review new methodologies). FDEP to provide written guidance for consistency when Peer Reviews would be undertaken by WMD initiated action
- Options for Reviewer Selection (The two options for reviewer selection differ based on whether reviewers are selected by the Districts with stakeholder input (A) or solely by the Districts (B))
  - i. Costs associated with Option A are expected to be moderate if the input process becomes involved or contentious; otherwise Option A costs would be only slightly higher than Option B costs.
  - ii. Note that if peer-review is not undertaken voluntarily, Florida Statutes dictate a reviewer selection process that can involve stakeholder input or review selection by the Districts or the Department of Environmental Protection.
  - iii. SC selected Option A
- Option for Public Involvement; SC approved as presented
  - i. Cost reductions are incorporated into this consensus option for public involvement.
  - ii. The option identifies need for teleconferences or workshops at beginning and end of the review process.
  - iii. The recommended option involves use of teleconferencing to save money.
  - iv. The option requires at least one public meeting in a physical location.

- Option for Scope of Work; SC approved as presented
  - i. Standard scope of work for this consensus option is focused on technical concerns.
  - ii. The approach has been successfully used by all three Districts.
- Options for Reviewer Independence and Reporting Requirements
  - i. Difference between Options A and B regarding reviewer independence and reporting requirements involves use of separate field trips for each panelist (Option A) or a use of a single, publicly noticed trip for all reviewers (Option B).
  - ii. Option C involves less collaboration/interaction among reviewers – Panelists develop separate reports that are compiled by a panel chair.
  - iii. SC Selected Option B with flexibility for the WMD to address logistical challenges
- Option for Governing Board Presentations; SC approved as presented
  - i. The consensus option calls for two Governing Board presentations; one addressing approval for the initiation of peer review and the other including presentation of peer review findings.

## 5. Other Issues

- a. Groundwater Availability Team (GAT); briefing led by Mark Hammond
  - i. Progress and schedule
    - Completed Process Flowcharts
    - Reviewed products from HAT, EMT, MFLT
    - Preliminary assessment by June 15
    - Provide results to Regional Water Supply Plan (RWSP) by August
  - ii. Interpreting results
    - Conceptual graphics to depict groundwater availability results were reviewed
  - iii. Critical path elements
    - Preliminary groundwater assessment by June 15
    - SC to consider meeting in June after preliminary results are known
    - GAT directed to work with closely MOC mad TOC

- Present draft results to SC in August for extensive discussion
  - SC needs to provide draft results to RWSP by August 31 in order to be able to complete the draft RWSP by December 31, 2012
- b. Regional Water Supply Plan; briefing led by Tom Bartol
- i. Water demand projections
    - Completed population distribution- controlled to BEBR 2010, per capita updated (2006-2010 average), updated public supply areas in CFWI
    - Completed and distributed Public Supply, DSS, CII , Power Generation, and Recreational categories
    - Coordinating agricultural demand distribution with HAT Drafting methodology text for RWSP
  - ii. Public Involvement Plan
    - i. Finalize Public Information Plan (6/1/2012)
    - ii. Kickoff meeting (6/30/2012)
    - iii. Periodic Public Update meeting(s) (10/15/2012)
    - iv. Technical Methods Workshop (11/15/2012)
    - v. Workshop on Draft Regional Water Supply Plan (12/15/2012)
    - vi. Ad-hoc Meeting(s) (4/30/2013). DEP suggested utilizing an information session format, where appropriate

## 6. Open Discussion

- No additional comments from SC

## 7. Public Comments

- No comments from audience members
- Letter from Edward MacDonald (Auburndale resident) was sent to Dean Powell (SFWMD); letter was provided to SC members and issue raised were highlighted by Dean Powell; SC accepted comments; letter attached to the Minutes

## 8. Next meeting

10:00 AM, Friday, June 29, 2012  
TOHO Water Authority

## 9. Meeting adjourned at 12:18 PM

Comments for the May 18, 2012 public meeting of the Central Florida Water Initiative steering committee.

My name is Edward McDonald. I live in Polk County within the boundary of the Southwest Florida Water Management District. I have been studying water related issues within Central Florida for several years now and feel that I have a better than average understanding of the water supply problems that are being addressed in the Central Florida Water Initiative. The work being done by these committees is very important and critical to the future of the region under review. The work is very complex and comprehensive in its scope and its conclusions and recommendations will be very contentious and controversial. That is the nature of work that involves property rights, large expenditures of tax payer dollars and the interpretation of broadly defined state laws.

Because of the comprehensive nature of the work being done by the CFWI, I find commenting effectively is very difficult. To aid in my arguments, I will use real world examples to demonstrate points that I am attempting to convey. I will do my best to follow the Central Florida Water Initiative Guiding Document when making my comments.

Starting with the Preface, I agree that it is absolutely essential that a comprehensive plan be developed to address the water issues of Central Florida. The plan needs to be supported and followed by all agencies of the federal, state, and local governments. The Florida Statutes will need to be revised to incorporate the plan and its recommendations. Most importantly it needs to be done now. Water use permits are being reviewed right now without the guidance the plan will provide. Public utilities are being required to design and construct expensive so-called "alternative water" projects based on criteria that has little, if any, scientific support.

The Central Florida Water Initiative Guiding Document discusses a "New Direction". I fully support this concept. Every policy that water management districts have followed in the past should be reviewed and evaluated against a single, guiding principle. That guiding principle is protection of the resource. The measure of success is sustainability.

Below is a list of areas that I think are in need of change:

1. The concept of "Reasonable and Beneficial" means little in a time when water resources are being rationed. Who decides if a given industrial demand is more beneficial than an agricultural demand? Is an agricultural demand that grows ornamental sod grass more beneficial than an agricultural demand that grows a food crop? Who decides what's in the "public interest". One thing I know for sure is that it's not the public making these decisions.
2. The way that water management districts are funded needs to be changed to reflect the water resources consumed by the various users. In other words, water consumers should pay in proportion to the benefit received. As an example,

- within Polk County agriculture consumes approximately 30 percent of the total water demand yet only contributes approximately 3 per cent of the taxes collected by the water management districts.
3. Florida Statutes require that water management districts meet all future water demands. How does a statement like this make it into Florida law? It's clear that all a water management district can do is to identify the maximum, sustainable water supply quantity. It's not possible for a water management district to guarantee that this quantity will be sufficient to meet all future demands.
  4. Water management districts should not be using tax payer money to pay for water supply projects. I understand that in the case of remediation or a recovery strategy it may be necessary to use public funds to "fix" damage that has already been done. When the SWFWMD required a large reduction in groundwater withdrawals to slow down the rate of salt water intrusion, one could argue that using public funds to subsidize the construction of a surface water storage reservoir and a desalination plant was in the public interest. That same argument cannot be made for subsidizing the proposed Polk County Southeast Wellfield water supply project. That project is not in the public interest as it will result in high water rates for existing citizens and only benefits future, unidentified residents.

With regards to "Guiding Principles" I have the following comments:

1. The committee should identify the maximum, sustainable quantities from all available water sources. Why limit it to just traditional groundwater sources? The Floridan Aquifer is an interconnected system and can only be accurately modeled as a system. Before long term, rational demand side solutions can be identified the full extent of the problem must be known. The obvious 800 pound gorilla is how do you define harm? We all know that the consumption of any limited resource results in change. The real problem is getting universal agreement as to what extent is change acceptable. In my opinion, this consensus can only be reached when there is a statewide comprehensive land use master plan. It doesn't do any good for a county government to establish a wetlands protection plan, only to be superseded by a state law that allows mitigation to occur anywhere within a given watershed. Why have endangered species protection laws, if their only suitable habitat is flooded by a storm/surface water control project needed to insure that MFL limits are met? Restoring historical wetlands should also be a priority. It's an accepted fact that the loss of wetlands as had an adverse impact on Florida weather and has reduced yearly rainfall totals.
2. Once all sustainable sources of water have been identified, those groups that want to consume water can decide on which source best meets their needs. Logic would suggest that this choice will be based on economic factors. Clearly there will need to be a review of the policy of local sources first and a policy established that defines a way of prioritizing how this limited water will be rationed. I see the main business of water management districts as protecting the resource but, I have no problem with water management districts taking the lead on identifying methods to use water more efficiently and to minimize waste. I don't agree in

using tax payer money to subsidize future growth by funding water supply projects.

3. I agree completely that all water management districts should be consistent and uniformly apply the results of the Central Florida Water Initiative.

With regards to the six “Goals” stated for the Central Florida Water Initiative, I agree that these are important goals, as long as the primary goal is to protect the resource. I also understand that each water management district will have unique circumstances that may be difficult to adequately address in a document written to establish a uniform approach to water management.

I agree that this effort is very difficult and the implications of its results will be far reaching. I understand that this work cannot be rushed to the point where recommendations are based on incomplete data. I also understand the importance of the work and the need to give this effort the highest priority. What are the restraints (critical resources) that are limiting this effort? Is it a money problem? Is a manpower problem? Are the committee members required to find time to do the CFWI work as well as their regular jobs? In the long run, completing this work will streamline and simplify day to day water management tasks such as water use permitting, preparation of regional water supply plans, establishing MFL’s, monitoring and managing surface water projects and so much more. You will have a guiding document that is based on science. You will have a comprehensive, analytical model that everyone accepts.

As I have indicated in previous correspondence, I have a concern over the ability of the public to have a meaningful contribution to the development of the CFWI directives. I understand that the various committees cannot hold their meetings with public participation. What I have not seen spelled out in the Central Florida Water Initiative Guiding Document is a process where the public will have an opportunity to review and comment on the findings and recommendation of the six sub-committees. I am sure that engineering firms will want to comment on the hydraulic model assumptions and methods, environmental groups will want to comment on how wetlands are identified and the definition of harm, and I know that I want to be able to review all of the input from the various sub-committees and all public comments. How is the steering committee going to make this happen?

I have looked at the CFWI website and found the link to past CFWI public meetings. Looking at the minutes and presentation links I can review summaries of what the reporting sub-committees are doing, but there is not sufficient detail for commenting. I noted that during the January 27, 2012 meeting that a presentation was made by a group led by myregion.com wanting, just like me, to have input into the final CFWI rules and policies. Again, like me, they have their priorities. My priority is to protect the resource. I don’t want to see a repeat of the past, where a lack of understanding of man’s impact on the natural environment has resulted in the expenditure of billions of public dollars in an attempt to “undo” and “reverse” these past mistakes. My interpretation of the presentation given by this group is that their priority is to insure that water will be available to support future economic development and population growth. As I have

stated earlier in this document, it's my opinion that "insuring future water supply" is not water management district's primary function nor is it technically feasible. The area where this group and I do share common ground is the importance of water conservation. I do agree that water management districts, local governments, public supply utilities and groups like the one led by myregion.org can play a part in reducing water waste.

The following are some of my comments on water conservation:

### CONSERVATION

I define conservation as the efficient use of water that eliminates or at least minimizes waste. From my studies, conservation is recognized as the most cost effective way of addressing our future water needs. It emphasizes reducing demand rather than increasing supply. Conservation can be applied to all users of water. The industrial/commercial, agricultural and public supply utilities all have equal responsibility to insure that water is used efficiently. The measure of how successful we are at conserving water should not be based on how much water we are using now when compared to the past, but on much water we are using compared to theoretical minimums.

Obviously the larger users of water have the most potential for savings through conservation. Water management districts know the "who" with regards to large water users, but do they know the "why" or the "how" the water is used. Do they know if alternative methods could be employed to increase the efficient use of water or eliminate its use altogether? Do they know if a lower quality of water could be used just as effectively? Do they know if waste waters are minimized or reused efficiently?

Florida Statutes, Chapter 373 addresses conservation and states that conservation is an important consideration when determining if a water use meets the "reasonable-beneficial" test. When discussing "public supply" conservation objectives, it states that they should be goal-based, accountable and measurable. Are water management districts following these guidelines? The SFWMD recently approved a water use permit for the Cypress Lakes Wellfield for a total 37.5 MGD of new groundwater. In the SFWMD staff report it's stated that the applicant has approved conservation plans that meet the requirements of section 2.6.1 of the Basis of Review. Section 2.6.1 contains the following nine requirements (for brevity I have summarized them):

- a. Limit the hours and days when outdoor irrigation is permitted.
- b. If beneficial adopt an ordinance requiring Xeriscape.
- c. Adopt an ordinance requiring ultra-low flow plumbing fixtures on new construction.
- d. Adopt conservation-based rate structures.
- e. If unaccounted water losses are greater than 10% adopt a leak detection program.
- f. Adopt an ordinance requiring rain detection systems on automatic sprinkler systems.
- g. Implement a conservation education program.
- h. Analyze the feasibility of making reclaimed water available.

- i. Procedure and schedule for implementing the plan shall be included.

This is all that's required. Where are the goals? What is measured and who is doing the measuring? Who's accountable and for what are they accountable? Apparently there are no conservation goals required for the Cypress Lakes Wellfield permit. Table 3.a-1 titled "Revised Projected Population and Water Demands", which is part of the documentation submitted to support the permit application, shows no reduction in per person gross potable water demand over the entire 30 year permit duration.

How is this acceptable? How does this meet the letter or even the spirit of Chapter 373?

Clearly this is one area where the Central Florida Water Initiative can show leadership and guidance. It's time to take water conservation seriously. It's the responsibility of all consumers of water to use it efficiently. Now that we are rationing water, it's time to reevaluate what's meant by "reasonable and beneficial".

Thank you for taking the time to read my thoughts on water issues in Central Florida and I look forward to submitting more detailed comments as the sub-committees complete their work.

Edward McDonald  
Auburndale  
863-967-0483