

**SOUTH FLORIDA WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT  
WATER CONSERVATION PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT**

Stakeholder Meeting #3, February 28, 2008  
District Headquarters, West Palm Beach, Florida

**Report of Proceedings**

**Meeting Objectives:**

- Receive an update on rule development for year-round landscape irrigation measures
- Receive a presentation from UF/IFAS
- Reveal results of input ranking and comments by stakeholders of Iteration #2
- Continued development of input on Plan in preparation for Iteration #3

**STAKEHOLDERS IN ATTENDANCE**

Water Conservation Stakeholder	Alternate	Attendance February 28
Mark Hull Village of Golf, Manager		NO
Commissioner Kristin Jacobs Broward County Commission	Jennifer Jurado, Ph.D.	YES
Commissioner Tammy Hall Lee County Commission		YES
Charles Shinn, Assistant Director, Government & Community Affairs, Florida Farm Bureau		NO
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
Mr. John Renfrow , Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Dept	Maribel Balbin	Yes Alternate in attendance
John Stunson, City of Oakland Park, City Manager	Susan Smith	YES
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	Yes Alternate in attendance
Joel Jackson, CGCS, Executive Director, Florida Golf Course Superintendents Association	Steve Pearson, CGCS	YES
Kevin Cavaoli , American Society of Landscape Architects, Florida Irrigation Society		YES
Bryan Fennell, General Manager II - Environmental, Water, Lab, Florida Power & Light	Matt Raffenberg	NO
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. She 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).

\*\*\*\*

## UPDATE ON RULE DEVELOPMENT FOR YEAR-ROUND LANDSCAPE IRRIGATION MEASURES

Marjorie Craig, Director of Water Supply Department, delivered a presentation on the rule-development process for year-round landscape irrigation measures. (Exhibit B)

The District's Water Supply Division has recently hired two new people: Jesus Rodriguez, Lead Conservation Officer, and Robert Wanvestraut, Senior Water Conservation Officer.

Ms. Craig explained the rule for year-round landscape irrigation measures is only one tool in the regulatory toolbox. There is an existing rule in Lee, Collier and Charlotte counties where irrigation is limited to three days a week. Some communities in these counties have further reduced irrigation to two days a week.

Following the presentation Ms. Craig asked for input from stakeholders.

### Participant comments:

1. Water Bill from either New Mexico or Arizona; has baseline for each user on their bill and in plain English.
2. Most of the problem is users not really understanding how much water is used.
3. We could use assistance from SFWMD (District) in getting the software to add this information to existing water bills.
4. Uses of reclaimed water has unknown downstream affects; unintended consequences.
5. We should use water responsibly; two days a week should be for all water, reclaimed or not.
6. No standardization of landscape rules: have a model landscape code; ratio formula of sod to open space, etc.
7. Street scapes need to be thoughtful in how they are planted.
8. We need to think about how we put trees in parking lots, wider planting beds to achieve the goal that was desired.
9. Landscaping is a huge part of cooling down buildings.
10. Broward uses the term "nature scape" instead of "xeriscape".
11. Wholesale and retail customer interface; must have equitable sharing of the costs.
12. Municipalities that buy water don't have control so they need to have "equitable sharing" of water conservation costs.
13. Provide wholesalers with suggested criteria.
14. Don't allow more days just because they are using reclaimed water.
15. Customer billing is tied to other software systems; not easy to change, would require envelope billing.
16. Reuse should not be limited; it is a selling point to get utilities up and running.
17. Problem with mandatory district wide regulations; one size does not fit all; we need to be careful about how regulations are developed; use science based research.
18. Keep regulations out of emotional need.
19. Rate of evaporation very important.
20. Not only are there different water management districts; there are differences within the region.
21. Use of surface water also affects the Everglades; some communities' runoff affects the Everglades; others do not (closer to the coast).
22. Agriculture: (will come in under irrigation) you need to break up Agriculture into different types of water use; we need to be more detailed in how we look at Agriculture: traditional vs smaller urban.
23. You can't paint all utilities with the same broad brush; you must differentiate how water is being used and why.

\*\*\*\*

24. NOAA research is showing that a large amount of pollutants are coming from urban environment runoff (in a presentation to Broward County).

## **GOLF COURSE AND WATER CONSERVATION PRESENTATION**

Member of the Stakeholder group, Joel Jackson, gave a presentation on golf courses and water conservation (**Exhibit C**).

Mr. Jackson told the group:

1. 70% of golf courses are open to the public.
2. Golf courses have impacts on community as an asset; they bring visitors.
3. Golf only uses about 2.3% of water in Florida; in Disney 90% of courses use effluent/reclaimed water.
4. Statewide about 33% of all golf courses use reclaimed water.
5. Horizontal wells are also used.
6. Golf course designs have changed over time; include native areas, un-irrigated areas in the rough; minimize turf areas.
7. They have switched to single head irrigation controls so that only areas that need it get watered.
8. Most golf courses in the state are in the southern half of the state.

Participant Comments:

1. Golf industry based on allocation and when restrictions needed it is by a percentage; we need more science-based decisions regarding water limitations.
  - a. we have trouble with the unregulated exempt users; that is a real challenge
  - b. single family homeowners are more difficult
  - c. maybe have online system if putting information on bills is too expensive
2. This presentation is very helpful when reviewing this 2<sup>nd</sup> iteration of our Plan.
3. Informative billing, what additional information would you want?
  - a. last month to this month
  - b. last year to this year
  - c. other information
4. Water irrigation: enforcement is a major issue; municipalities do not have the resources to enforce.
5. Encourage use of reuse.
6. The school district is a huge water user; maintenance people need to have training on how to conserve water; Broward did training and saved millions of gallons a year.
7. Local governments are having very difficult budget restrictions and having to make very hard decisions.
8. Surficial and reclaimed water should be looked at in an auditing system.
9. Consumptive Use Permits (CUPs); what is being done and what is planned to be done?
10. Utilities are funded by rates; and while no one wants increased rates that may be one way to add additional funds.

## **PRESENTATION: UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA/ INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE (UF/IFAS)**

Terril Nell, Chair, Environmental Horticulture Department, UF/IFAS made a presentation on the work of IFAS regarding landscaping. (**Exhibit D**)

\*\*\*\*

Ms. Nell explained that IFAS promotes a multi disciplinary approach to landscaping. They teach managing urban and rural landscapes to promote environmental sustainability under the umbrella of "Florida friendly landscaping". With regard to science based actions; all the state agencies are telling UF/IFAS that whatever is done must be supportable; i.e. science based. They want one team/one message/one voice. The new effort of IFAS is the Water Conservation Campaign. IFAS has a communications team and, in addition, they are using information from the University of Georgia.

Comments from participants:

1. Does your work include partnerships with Counties?
  - a) Yes, but without adding credits at the end of each commercial "spot".
- 2) Broward county's concerns, they have already been doing what IFAS is doing for the last 4 years:
  - a) Broward has commercial spots but do it in 30 second spots
  - b) Curriculum in the schools
  - c) Schools will have certified nature scape sites
  - d) Tree giveaways, making sure trees are in the right spot
  - e) We should not be re-inventing the wheel; if IFAS goes statewide Broward would not want to replace what it already has running
  - f) Another concern is funds/resources
  - g) Bird migration "fly ways" campaign, put into in-flight magazines
- 3) If you are talking a state plan going forward, please sit down with Broward County first; ultimately the goal is a change in culture.
- 4) Agriculture Extension Center in Miami-Dade implements the irrigation program.
- 5) Education must be partnered with a change in infrastructure updates too.
- 6) UF/IFAS will not pre-empt existing programs but they do have a statewide mandate.
- 7) School gardening contest in conjunction with Disney (IFAS).

## INPUT RANKING RESULTS AND GENERAL COMMENTS ON 2<sup>ND</sup> ITERATION OF WATER CONSERVATION PROGRAM

In preparation for this meeting, the second iteration of the Water Conservation Program was sent to all stakeholders for their input ranking. The results of the input and some initial comments from stakeholders are reflected below.

### 13 responses received\*

**\*A response was received from member, Anne Murray but not calculated in the "mean" score.. Her email was sent to the Facilitator's "spam" mail folder and was not discovered until subsequent to all calculations being finalized, her rankings are indicated in purple "X".**

#### Eric Call:

I have previously provided comments regarding the absence of any narrative on **athletic/recreational areas** within the Comprehensive Conservation Plan document. On January 15, 2008, the District imposed Modified Phase III water Restrictions and athletic/recreational areas were separately identified in the order along with agriculture, nursery, golf courses, water utilities and landscape irrigation. All of these areas have been identified separately in the proposed conservation plan with the exception of athletic/recreational areas.

\*\*\*\*

There are thousands of acres of sports turf within the District represented by Schools, Park and Recreation agencies, Colleges/Universities and private clubs. Sports turf has a unique set of characteristics not covered by the other categories listed in the conservation plan. Will athletic/recreational areas and/or sports turf be included in the document as it is in the Modified Phase III Rules?

**Jacque Weisblum:**

Please note that my responses, except table #2, on the table are based on my understanding that the next draft will include strong support for Everglades restoration and the importance of keeping fresh water in the environment to benefit the ecosystems of South Florida. The practice of dumping/wasting precious fresh water to tide is not acceptable and Everglades restoration will achieve the ability to keep the water moving through the Everglades natural system appropriately.

**Table 1 Overall document Mean: 3.91**

5	4	3	2	1
0	8 X	3	1	0

**Table 2 Vision and Values Mean: 4.08**

5	4	3	2	1
5	4 X	2	1	0

**Table 3 Initiatives Introduction Mean: 3.75**

5	4	3	2	1
2	7 X	2	0	1

**Charles Shinn:**

‘Built on a set of core values, the plan’s goals and implementation strategies are designed to establish a proactive water conservation program that ensures, in conjunction with other District initiatives, an adequate and reliable supply of water to both protect the health of the ecosystem and satisfy current and future public water demands.’

The second paragraph above must address all three water use groups (environment, public water, and agriculture). It fails to address agriculture.

**Table 4 Regulatory Initiatives Intro Mean: 3.25**

5	4	3	2	1
1	5	3 X	2	1

**Table 5 Goal for Regulatory Initiatives Mean: 3.33**

5	4	3	2	1
2	5	2	1 X	2

**Table 6 Public water supply strategies Mean: 3.25**

5	4	3	2	1

\*\*\*\*

0	6	4	1 X	1
---	---	---	-----	---

**Kevin Cavaoli:**

I need information on AWWA rate manual to see if it reflects or unique climate or if it needs to be modified. With weak economy and already high utility rates I am concerned with cost to implement this section.

**Table 7 Landscape irrigation strategies Mean: 3.92**

5	4	3	2	1
1	4	4 X	1	2

**Kevin Cavaoli :**

Need to allow landscape industry professionals the flexibility to use science and technology based methods to optimally manage allocated water rather than use arbitrary 1, 2 or 3 day watering and limited hours. Same water conservation result can be achieved with a healthier landscape at lower cost to implement.

**Table 8 Industrial, Commercial and Institutional strategies Mean: 3.25**

5	4	3	2	1
1	5	3 X	2	1

**Table 9 Golf course strategies Mean: 3.16**

5	4	3	2	1
2	2	4 X	4	0

**Tom MacVicar:**

Concerned that requiring new landscape principles in all 'replacement planting' may not be practical. Defer to Golf course interests on the committee.

**Table 10 Voluntary and Incentive Based Initiatives Intro Mean: 4.0**

5	4	3	2	1
1	10	1 X	0	0

**Table 11 Voluntary Initiatives Goal Mean: 4.16**

5	4	3	2	1
2	10 X	0	0	0

**Table 12 Leading by Example strategies Mean: 3.75**

5	4	3	2	1
3	4 X	4	1	0

**Tom MacVicar:**

Leading by example for the District should not mean checking your plumbing fixtures. It should mean making changes to your core business (Water Management) to conserve water. The District can do things that have very large impact. The temporary pumps at S-155A are a great example of something visible, that saves a lot of water, and that only the District can do.

\*\*\*\*

The general impression is that the District sends way to much water to tide and not enough of the smaller projects, like S-155A pumps, are being done.

**Table 13 Public water supply (voluntary) strategies Mean: 3.33**

5	4	3	2	1
1	5	4 X	1	1

**Tom MacVicar:**

Real time identification of high water users through automated meter reading does not seem to be justified based on the cost benefit, and when the District says they want to ‘encourage utilities’ they usually mean it will be a condition in their next permit. Sub-paragraph ‘a’ could be deleted. It puts the District too far into the utilities business. Paragraph b, providing financial and technical assistance is more appropriate.

**Table 14 Agricultural irrigation strategies Mean: 3.58**

5	4	3	2	1
1	5 X	6	0	0

**Charles Shinn:**

Improve methods for measuring water use and estimating agricultural water demands.\*  
 In open systems such as canals and ditches, water use measurements are extremely difficult to determine. In addition, agricultural water demands vary greatly and science is elementary in this area.

**Table 15 Alternative water sources strategies Mean: 3.25**

5	4	3	2	1
2	5	1 X	2	2

**Tom MacVicar:**

Paragraph c seems to be a disincentive to going to alternative sources and also seems to be counter to paragraph b. ‘c’ could be deleted.

**Table 16 Financial incentives strategies Mean: 3.16**

5	4	3	2	1
2	4 X	2	2	2

**Charles Shinn:**

Recognize an support existing programs resulting in water savings to reduce financial redundancy.  
 Second word ‘and’, not ‘an’.

**Tom MacVicar:** What is ‘financial redundancy’’. Paragraph 14 needs help

**Table 17 Golf courses (voluntary) strategies Mean: 3.5**

5	4	3	2	1
3	2 X	5	2	0

**Table 18 Landscape irrigation strategies Mean: 3.33**

\*\*\*\*



5	4	3	2	1
0	6 X	4	2	0

**Charles Shinn:**

Utilize UF/IFAS in their marketing programs so that a consistent message is sent across all five Water Management Districts.

**Kevin Cavaoli:**

Whole hearted support for number 25 but concerned with cost of government sponsored MILs. Probably more cost effective to partner with and train landscape and irrigation industry groups and retailers to reach more people cost effectively.

**Table 19 New development strategies Mean: 2.91**

5	4	3	2	1
1	2 X	4	5	0

**Tom MacVicar:**

Paragraph 29 [note: I think he meant "19" not "29"] sounds like the District is going to be providing the technology. I don't think that is what is meant. Re-check the wording.

**Kevin Cavaoli:**

LEEDs standards need to be regionalized based on local climate and other factors before it could be adopted. The SFWMD cannot control the LEED standards so adoption could be risky and desired results not achieved. The cost to certify a project at certain levels is very high.

**Table 20 Hospitality strategies Mean: 3.58**

5	4	3	2	1
2	4 X	5	1	0

**Table 21 Industrial, commercial, etc. strategies Mean: 3.33**

5	4	3	2	1
1	4 X	5	2	0

**Table 22 Education and Marketing Intro Mean: 4.0**

5	4	3	2	1
3	7 X	1	1	0

**Tom MacVicar:** The 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence beginning on line 491 should be deleted. Too subjective and not scientific.

**Table 23 Education and Marketing goal Mean: 3.75**

5	4	3	2	1
2	6 X	3	1	0

**Tom MacVicar:**

Delete everything between the word 'about' on line 502 and the word 'water' on line 503. We are trying to conserve water, not save the world.

**Table 24 School based education strategies Mean: 3.75**

\*\*\*\*

5	4	3	2	1
2	6 X	3	1	0

**Table 25 Public information strategies Mean: 3.5**

5	4	3	2	1
0	7 X	4	1	0

**Table 26 Professional development strategies Mean: 3.58**

5	4	3	2	1
1	6 X	4	1	0

**Table 27 Social marketing strategies Mean: 3.58**

5	4	3	2	1
2	5	3 X	2	0

**Tom MacVicar** : This does not sound like something the District should be doing

**Table 28 Volunteer activities strategies Mean: 3.58**

5	4	3	2	1
0	7 X	5	0	0

## PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment was invited, no one spoke.

## BREAK

The group took a short break.

## REFINING ACTIONS STEPS, DELIVERABLES AND MILESTONES

Initially, the stakeholders made comments on the Second Iteration. Following this exercise, stakeholders broke for lunch. Upon their return from lunch, the stakeholders broke into two small groups to discuss the draft in more detail, specifically: 1. recommending action steps, 2. listing concerns on this draft, 3. listing any questions, and 4. a list of any other items they felt was important and not covered. The results of the initial discussion and small group work are reflected in [Exhibit E](#).

## PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment was invited in the afternoon; no one spoke.

## EVALUATIONS/ADJOURN

The stakeholders were reminded to complete their evaluations and the meeting was adjourned.

\*\*\*\*