

# SOUTH FLORIDA WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT WATER CONSERVATION PROGRAM-PLAN DEVELOPMENT

Stakeholder Meeting #5, May 2, 2008  
District Headquarters, West Palm Beach, Florida

## REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

Meeting Objectives:

- To review and take final comments on the fourth iteration of the Program
- To receive an update on the Year Round Landscape Irrigation Rule

### STAKEHOLDERS IN ATTENDANCE

Water Conservation Stakeholder	Alternate	Attendance May 2, 2008
Mark Hull Village of Golf, Manager		NO
Commissioner Kristin Jacobs Broward County Commission	Jennifer Jurado, Ph.D.	NO
Commissioner Tammy Hall Lee County Commission	Doug Meurer	NO
Charles Shinn, Assistant Director, Government & Community Affairs, Florida Farm Bureau		YES
Tom MacVicar, MacVicar, Federico & Lamb		NO
Dave Self, Florida Nursery Growers & Landscapers Association, President	Jim Spratt (FNGLA staff)	YES
Paul Mattausch, Director, Collier County Public Utilities	Roy Anderson	YES
Randy Brown, Director, City of Pompano Beach Utilities	Mr. Bevin Beaudet	YES
Maribel Balbin, Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Dept	Mr. John Renfrow	Yes
John Stunson, City of Oakland Park, City Manager	Susan Smith	YES Alternate
Susan Watts , Bonita Bay Group	Dennis Church	NO

\*\*\*\*

Andrew Lester , Regional President, Broward County, The Continental Group	Ron Capitena	NO
Jacqueline Weisblum, Everglades Team Leader, Audubon of Florida	Dr. Paul Gray, Audubon	YES
Peg McPherson, Vice President, The Everglades Foundation		YES
Eric Call, Asst. Director Palm Beach County Parks	Gary Monnett	NO
Joel Jackson, CGCS, Executive Director, Florida Golf Course Superintendents Association	Steve Pearson, CGCS	YES
Kevin Cavaioli , American Society of Landscape Architects, Florida Irrigation Society		YES
Sheila Wilkinson, Florida Power & Light	Andy Flajole	YES Alternate
Rick Hawkins, The Breakers		YES
Armando Rodriguez, Director of Environmental Affairs		NO
Anne Murray, P.G., County Hydrogeologist, Martin County Utilities		YES

## **WELCOME/AGENDA REVIEW/GUIDELINES/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Janice M. Fleischer, J.D., Facilitator, opened the meeting by reminding all that this was an additional meeting that was scheduled by the SFWMD in order to gain further input on the Water Conservation Program. It has been the goal of the SFWMD during this process to ensure maximum input from the stakeholder group while acknowledging that not all stakeholder desires nor concerns can be met. The SFWMD has modified the Program several times to reflect the suggestions and recommendations of the stakeholder group wherever possible. This meeting will be the final “face to face” meeting of the stakeholder group; however, there will be yet another iteration of the Program which will be distributed to them for final comments prior to the Plan becoming Final.

As there were several new faces at the table, Ms. Fleischer asked all members of the stakeholder group to introduce themselves. She reviewed the Agenda for the day (**Exhibit A**), the Meeting Guidelines and the Public Comment Guidelines.

\*\*\*\*

All Reports of Proceedings with exhibits, Meeting Guidelines and Public Comment Guidelines can be found on the SFWMD website at:

[https://my.sfwmd.gov/portal/page?\\_pageid=3034,20240111,3034\\_20194643&\\_dad=portal&\\_schema=PORTAL](https://my.sfwmd.gov/portal/page?_pageid=3034,20240111,3034_20194643&_dad=portal&_schema=PORTAL).

Part of the agenda for the day will be an overview of the current draft of the Year Round Landscape Irrigation Rule. Ms. Fleischer explained that this stakeholder meeting is not a workshop to discuss the year round irrigation rule. While developing and implementing a year round irrigation rule is one of the program strategies, the plan does not dictate specific requirements of the year round irrigation rule. SFWMD Deputy Executive Director Chip Merriam will provide a brief update on the development of the irrigation rule at this meeting, and there will be a very brief opportunity for discussion. However, if stakeholders wish to ensure their feedback on the year round irrigation rule is recorded and noticed, they were encouraged to attend the scheduled public workshops:

- May 19, 2008, 2:00 PM -SFWMD Lower West Coast Regional Service Center, Fort Myers
- May 22, 2008, 2:00 PM -SFWMD B-1 Auditorium, West Palm Beach

The SFWMD will ensure the entire stakeholder group is emailed on the specifics of the workshops.

## **OVERVIEW OF FOURTH ITERATION AND FINAL PROCESS**

Prior to discussing the Year Round Landscape Irrigation Rule development mentioned above, Deena Reppen, SFWMD Deputy Executive Director of Government and Public Affairs, made several comments regarding the current (Fourth Iteration- **Exhibit B**) of the Water Conservation Program.

She went over some of the changes from the third draft:

- Elimination of some duplicative language and action steps
  - Action steps that were already required/implemented
  - Actions steps repeated in other areas of plan
- Ranking of action steps into “immediate”, “short-term”, “mid-term” and “long-term” goals
  - Immediate: next year
  - Short: 2009-2010
  - Mid: 2011-2112
  - Long: 2013-2018
- Grouping of recognition programs under the “Leading by Example” strategy
- Introduction/ Background section – is a work in progress, SFWMD still seeking this group’s input

Ms. Reppen reported the Program was well received at the SFWMD Governing Board Workshop.

The following criteria were used to evaluate the program strategies: cost effectiveness, water savings, and ease of implementation.

- The evaluations were developed from compiled rankings based on input from this group and information gathered by staff.
- Further input on evaluations will be solicited from you at this meeting.
- These rankings will be used as a tool when the District considers recommended budget and implementation schedules.

\*\*\*\*

Ms. Reppen explained the implementation portion of the Program will be budget driven. It is seen as a Program for full implementation by the year 2020 and has been divided into Immediate, Short-Term, Mid-Term, and Long-Term action steps.

Following this meeting, the goal is to send a final draft to members of this stakeholder group in a couple of weeks. The SFWMD will provide an opportunity for stakeholders to review and submit additional final comments. It is the hope of the SFWMD staff to submit the final draft to the Water Resources Advisory Council (WRAC) and the SFWMD Governing Board in June for approval.

## **UPDATE ON YEAR ROUND LANDSCAPE IRRIGATION RULE DEVELOPMENT**

Chip Merriam, SFWMD Water Resources Deputy Executive Director, provided an update on the Year Round Landscape Irrigation Rule development (**Exhibit C**). He explained all water management districts are trying to be consistent where possible throughout the state. The Rule is not focused on all water uses, just landscape irrigation. Whatever input is received today will not be considered part of the public workshop process as required by law; therefore; he asked members to please attend the official public workshops in order to have their opinions or concerns included in the official public record.

One immediate change resulting from feedback on the rule was a shift on reuse from 3 to 6 days a week. Further, the SFWMD is still willing to look at what else can be done with reuse water.

Stakeholder comments following Mr. Merriam's information:

1. If irrigation is limited to two days a week, what happens to the phases?
  - a. We want to stave off having to do multi million dollar improvement projects by implementing this rule.

## **OVERVIEW AND DISCUSSION: PRELIMINARY BACKGROUND SECTION**

Deena Reppen began the discussion of the Fourth Iteration of the Program with the Background section which is contained on pages 1-10 of the document. She explained this is a work in progress and the SFWMD is seeking members' input on suggested additional language. Additionally, she requested suggestions for examples/case studies of successful water conservation projects.

In response to Ms. Reppen's request, members made the following comments:

- 1) Stratification where water supply comes from: different water bodies; using potable water should be more restricted than reuse for example
  - a. Page 8, line: 331 brought this to mind
- 2) Page 3, line 111: add detail about individual Everglades restoration projects
- 3) Page 4, line 131, in middle of bar chart, we are not in a 21 year drought, need to change the date, typo on graphic
- 4) How often will we be getting updates on iterations so we can see the changes and comment?
  - a. We don't know, but at least twice
  - b. Possibly once a week updates until it goes to the WRAC
- 5) Page 2, line 75-76: made the lake smaller
- 6) Page 3, line 90-91: unintended consequences and impact
- 7) Page 3, line 95-96: need to make clear that lost water is needed is for the environment
- 8) Page 3 line 109, look forward to change in this language
- 9) Page 3, line 114: insert "natural" prior to environment
- 10) Add language about "strengthening" Everglades Restoration

\*\*\*\*

- 11) Add some graphics to give a visual, wetlands, salt water intrusion lines, economic impact tables, facilities
- 12) Do we need more of a call to action in the document; what are consequences if we don't?
- 13) Page 9: elaborate on per capita consumption numbers, what is the basis of the numbers that are being used by municipalities, counties?
- 14) Maybe add the new intention to keep Lake O lower re: Herbert Hoover Dike to show the impacts
- 15) Plans for reservoirs, storage, water treatment all with regard to the Everglades Restoration; how do we deal with "demand management"
  - a. May need to add discussion on ocean outfall legislation
  - b. A main goal may be to look at a longer term plan re: demand management
- 16) How are the details of CERP going to affect this Plan? Need to address that in the Introduction, this is a living document.
  - a. How will this living plan go forward in light of all this?
  - b. We want to make sure we don't imply once things are restored and the dike repaired, we don't stop water conservation
- 17) We need to be clear things are going to change
  - a. We anticipate updating the document on a regular basis to reflect the current situation
- 18) While not etched in stone, we do want to make sure it has solid foundation
- 19) Page 8, line 293 average rainfall number, where does it come from?

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Public comment was invited.

One (1) member of the public addressed the Council:

Patrick Hayes, Executive Director, Loxahatchee River Coalition

Members of the public are strongly encouraged to submit their comments in writing on the comment cards provided at each meeting or email the Facilitator; Janice Fleischer ([janice@flashresolutions.com](mailto:janice@flashresolutions.com)) within the first week following the meeting and those comments will be included in the Report.

For Public Comment Guidelines copies of all Reports and exhibits and other important documents/exhibits, see the SFWMD website at:

[https://my.sfwmd.gov/portal/page?\\_pageid=3034,20240111,3034\\_20194619&\\_dad=portal&\\_schema=PORTAL](https://my.sfwmd.gov/portal/page?_pageid=3034,20240111,3034_20194619&_dad=portal&_schema=PORTAL)

## **BREAK**

The group took a short break.

## **OVERVIEW AND DISCUSSION: STRATEGIES & ACTION STEPS**

Mark Elsner, SFWMD Director of the Implementation Division, spoke to the group delivering an overview of comments received and responses beginning with page 16 of the document (**Exhibit C**).

### **OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED BY SUBJECT MATTER:**

\*\*\*\*

Report of Proceedings  
 Meeting #5, Water Conservation Stakeholder Group  
 May 2, 2008

- Conservation cheaper than retrofitting, etc.
- Conserve Florida is just one tool to be used in the “goal based” approach.
- Approach of the program is to allow flexibility in how it is implemented/enforced to allow for the real world.
- AMR=Automatic Meter Reading
  - We think we will remove this section for now.
  - Educational pieces are associated with this.
  - Member comments:
    - However, this is only in the voluntary incentive section so there really should be no need to remove it, not a mandate.
    - No statement why “instantaneous readings” are needed and what would be done with this knowledge, would you immediately shut the water off?
    - Remove the reference to instantaneous AMR, but maybe require utilities that they meter, there is no current requirement in the plan for all utilities to meter.
    - Page 21: Line 779-780: why not use meter technology to make estimates (agriculture, etc.).
    - The real heartburn is what use this instantaneous reading would accomplish.
    - If this is only a recommendation and has been the subject of many articles covering this subject:
      - You do it only when/if you can so it should stay in.
      - Available and useful.
      - DO NOT mandate this.
    - Move instantaneous to long term section and change wording to remove the words “real time” and “instantaneous”.
    - This instantaneous read is extremely expensive.
    - You should REQUIRE metering; some utilities are not metered at all as well as agriculture.
    - A potential future tool? How could this be used in the future for enforcement?
    - We shouldn’t be estimating for some and requiring details for others.
- Page 21, line 779: addresses Agriculture
  - Meters don’t often work well with Ag, no pipes in some areas, just surface flow.
  - There are flow accounting water use systems that can measure.
  - AG community will tell you flow accounting is expensive but they are looking into it.
  - Permits are only issued for the most efficient use of water.
  - Section I-B: add this in there.

Wholesale water purchases:

- 1) If the small municipality saves water they should get reduced rates.
- 2) Maybe add looking at opportunities to conserve water.
- 3) Page 20, II-B: Same section: more emphasis on future sources of water and the new technologies of future sources of water; human population growth is not changing so we need to address the future potential options.
  - a. No matter how much conservation is done, it will peak and we should anticipate that and mention it. Maybe in the Introduction.
  - b. There will be a need for growth in water supply in future. This is a good point.

\*\*\*\*

- 4) All new water sources will require treatment, then more electricity needed, then impact on the environment; complicated issue.
- 5) Encourage the growth of technology to the point where it becomes more economical.
- 6) At the last WRAC meeting, they talked about how you package the entire concept (efficiencies).

Water Conservation Officer: Page 20, Line 740

- 1) This is under “encourage” not mandated.
- 2) It is not an unfunded mandate.
- 3) The Working Group language will be changed too, not an established working group, just periodic dialogues to talk about conservation.
- 4) Page 21, line 749.

Education and Marketing:

- 1) Public information on reclaiming water will be added.
- 2) Informative billing: line 982, Page 26: this is voluntary, we want to identify informative billing to show how it works and how it is done.
- 3) In Europe, in some hotels you can’t leave the room without turning off the lights they way the keys are designed. We should look at this too in education.
- 4) Page 15, line 532: “based on financial and stakeholder support”
  - a. One comment said we should not assume stakeholder support

The group then went through the document Initiative by Initiative:

I: Regulatory Section comments/suggestions:

- 1) How are these implemented? Renewals?
  - a. We are not necessarily opening permits, but maybe in the 5 year reviews. Want to create a conservation ethic.
  - b. The Plan will not be self implementing; it will go by Rule making, which allows public comment/input.
- 2) Landscape irrigation: Page 17, line 622: any suggested rules for basis of review?
  - a. Through WRAC and the public process.
  - b. Make sure stakeholders are apprised.
- 3) Any other tools used in addition to Conserve Florida, shouldn’t they have the same standard as Conserve Florida (default value).
  - a. Very good point and a detail that needs to be considered.
- 4) Page 17, line 591: should we mention AWWA/AWI?
  - a. Re: Conserve Florida: there is still some concern if Conserve Florida should be used as the standard; it is ok if it is one tool among others.
- 5) Line 633, Page 18, e-permitting: later in the document you talk about monitoring government sites: if so where would this fall? All public entities should show how resources are used and the information should be readily accessible. (i.e. public should know how much water/conservation is being used public entities).
- 6) Specifically stated SFWMD will recommend which tools are the best to use.
  - a. SFWMD doesn’t tell utilities how to spend their money, we work with the utility to explore their alternatives when reviewing their Consumptive Use Permits (CUPs) (this was done with Miami-Dade County).
  - b. Partnership is: is it feasible, do you have the money, technology, etc.
- 7) When people upgrade or renew landscaping they should be required to do water conservation planning and use Florida Friendly plants.

\*\*\*\*

- 8) The more you can include within the purview of the utilities the better, the more spread out you get, the harder it is to ensure compliance.
- 9) Page 17, line 596: suggest this becomes "a", first define it, "c" should become "b", "a" becomes "c", what will be the standard? How it is set, utility by utility, "d" should become "e" and "e" should be "d".
- 10) Talk about what it is we are going to retrofit; define what retrofit means.
- 11) Too broad a stroke with the term "water use" (temporary with no negative impacts) add the definition of "water consumption" (long term and may have negative impacts).
- 12) Use the best science available and with regard to 2-3 day, if there is sandy soil you may need to rethink this.

## II: Voluntary

- 1) Line 804: needs to be included in new development/construction.
- 2) Line 726: looking at assisting municipalities, etc. steps b and c, we should implement this for those using reclaimed water, special consideration for those who use reclaimed (reclaimed water should be a considered an alternative water supply).
- 3) Page 20, line 712: will there be a fiscal impact statement.
  - a. There will be budget numbers presented to the Governing Board.
- 4) Page 20, line 718: add "revise" and expand the SIP criteria to make it easier and more accessible.
- 5) Page 19, use of recognition programs; make sure you evaluate programs before you adopt or embrace them (specifically ST. Johns and LEEDS).
- 6) Line 791, Page 20: "urban" labs are not funded the same as agricultural, so they may need to be tracked differently, use different criteria.

## III: Marketing

- 1) Concern: where do we go with education local governments and general public on Florida Friendly plants, etc? We need to promote this to the local governments and the general public.
  - a. We want to bring in the professional organizations to begin this dialogue and develop together an approach to sharing information and developing materials.

## LUNCH

The group broke for a short lunch.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment was invited.

Two members of the public addressed the Stakeholder Group

Patrick Hayes, Executive Director, Loxahatchee River Coalition

Lisa Wilson-Davis, City of Boca Raton

Members of the public are strongly encouraged to submit their comments in writing on the comment cards provided at each meeting or email the Facilitator; Janice Fleischer ([janice@flashresolutions.com](mailto:janice@flashresolutions.com)) within the first week following the meeting and those comments will be included in the Report.

For Public Comment Guidelines copies of all Reports and exhibits and other important documents/exhibits, see the SFWMD website at:

\*\*\*\*

Report of Proceedings

Meeting #5, Water Conservation Stakeholder Group

May 2, 2008

## REVIEW OF STRATEGY EVALUATIONS

Ms. Reppen reiterated the criteria used for evaluating strategies: cost effectiveness, water savings, and ease of implementation. She explained the SFWMD was seeking input from this group on these evaluations. These rankings will be used as a tool when the District considers recommended budget and implementation schedules.

Stakeholder members entered into a facilitated discussion regarding the evaluation of the strategies, initially making some general comments then moving into the Initiatives.

### General comments:

- The designations of “high”, “medium” and “low”, what does that mean in terms of water saved?
  - In some areas it could not be quantified.
- How are cost savings defined as to high, medium and low?
  - Ease of implementation compared to cost of implemented.
- What is the goal for the use of this table, in what context will this table be used?
- What were the criteria for high, medium and low?
- If they are relative to one another, it is very telling that there is no one that is all high or all low, is this because of diversity of stakeholders, is this an arbitrary decision making process?

### I: Regulatory:

#### I-A

1. Define “hardware programs” (Page 17, line 591)
  - a. Retrofit programs, line flushing devices
    - i. Make sure you define “retrofit”
    - ii. Maybe we should use “retrofit” instead of “hardware”
2. Evaluation document should reflect the action steps directly, make the evaluation be the basis for priorities.
3. Environmental groups do not implement, so they want to hear the reactions of the utilities.
4. Under IA: “require” utilities, over and over, whereas the colored document says “work with” utilities rather than “require”.
5. Small utilities have very little funds and ability to implement on a large scale, using the term “work with” helps with the comfort level.
6. Utilities give their governments money, is there any ceiling on the amount that has to be given?
  - a. No
7. Section II-G, several are specific to cooling systems, encourage the power companies and regulatory agencies when working with AWWA.
8. #13, page 22, line 811- this talks about cooling towers and relates to #6 above.
  - a. We were thinking about air conditioning systems.
  - b. This needs clearing up because a cooling tower is very different.

### Prioritization discussion:

1. Track everyone, not just one or two industries.
2. All focus on educating the public.
3. Public education and marketing should be a priority/ school education.

\*\*\*\*

4. Public and marketing tools.
5. Get kids on board, kids take the message home.
6. Unrestricted reuse and development of AWS (alternative water supply).
7. Funding mobile irrigation labs.
8. Lead by example and being responsible, we all need to be on the same page, District, Ag, and Local governments re: Florida friendly plants, BMPs must be a part of this.
9. Financial incentives, strengthen the SIP programs and the volunteer activities.
10. The message of conservation needs to include water and energy conservation together under the umbrella of climate change; give kids 10 ways to conserve and water items are part of that.
11. Educate what reclaimed water really is; use of reclaimed water cannot be an excuse to waste water.
12. Interested in getting the results of the exercise on rating the evaluation document.
13. Interested in the Landscape Irrigation Rule.
14. Conservation water is new water, the best for the natural system, the utility and the rate payer.
15. Encourage staff to continue to work with the stakeholder groups, focus more on performance based standard rather than prescriptive.

## **FINAL STEPS AND COMMENTS**

SFWMD Executive Director, Carol Wehle, was present to thank everyone for taking their valuable time and being a part of this change in policy. She told the stakeholders how much their input was appreciated and renewed the SFWMD commitment to using as much of the input as possible in developing the final Program.

## **ADJOURN**

The meeting was then adjourned.

\*\*\*\*