

SOUTH FLORIDA WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT WATER CONSERVATION PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Stakeholder Meeting #4, March 28, 2008
District Headquarters, West Palm Beach, Florida

Report of Proceedings

Meeting Objectives:

- To receive presentations on the Year Round Landscaping Irrigation Rule
- To complete input ranking and discussion on Iteration Three
- To begin the process of developing deliverables and milestones
- To determine need for future stakeholder meetings and their purpose

STAKEHOLDERS IN ATTENDANCE

Water Conservation Stakeholder	Alternate	Attendance March 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	Doug Meurer	YES Alternate
Charles Shinn, Assistant Director, Government & Community Affairs, Florida Farm Bureau		NO
Tom MacVicar, MacVicar, Federico & Lamb		YES
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	John Renfrow	Yes
John Stunson, City of Oakland Park, City Manager	Susan Smith	YES Alternate
Susan Watts , Bonita Bay Group	Dennis Church	YES

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 Cavaioli , American Society of Landscape Architects, Florida Irrigation Society	Jay Bridge	YES Alternate
Sheila Wilkinson, Florida Power & Light	Andy Flajole	YES Alternate
Rick Hawkins, The Breakers		YES
Armando Rodriguez, Director of Environmental Affairs		YES
Anne Murray, P.G., County Hydrogeologist, Martin County Utilities		NO

WELCOME/AGENDA REVIEW/GUIDELINES/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Janice M. Fleischer, J.D., Facilitator, opened the meeting. 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.

PRESENTATION: YEAR ROUND LANDSCAPE IRRIGATION RULE

Chip Merriam, SFWMD Deputy Executive Director, delivered a presentation on the District's Draft Year Round Landscape Irrigation Rule (**Exhibit B**). Mr. Merriam explained that:

Report of Proceedings
Meeting #4, Water Conservation Stakeholder Group
March 28, 2008

- This rule focuses only on landscape irrigation
- This does not apply to nurseries or agriculture
- The rule is consistent among all the other water management districts.
- Local governments can be more restrictive

Drinking water needs to be restricted from being used for irrigation. Reclaimed water can be utilized for irrigation, however, there still time restrictions.

Stakeholder comments:

1. This is a great effort; is there still an opportunity to refine the language?
 - a. Yes, public rule development workshops will be held.
 - b. Nursery owners have provided input as well on how it is working during normal weather and in extreme drought conditions.
2. In the spirit of conservation as a full time concept, you should insert “up to 2 times a week AS NEEDED”.
3. Disney: large areas with no address, they have to follow St. Johns rules as well as SFWMD. Disney would like to have flexibility on “non-address” areas; 2x week with reclaimed water, we may not have enough water to do our large areas 2x a week including Fridays.
 - a. We will work with that and discuss this.
 - b. The rule does address areas where there is no address.

OVERVIEW OF THIRD ITERATION AND FUTURE PROCESS

Deena Reppen, SFWMD Deputy Executive Director of Government and Public Affairs, and Mark Elsner, SFWMD Water Supply Implementation Division Director, explained the process that was used to create the current iteration of the Water Conservation Program.

Some items that were previously action steps were redrafted into deliverables. After this meeting, the SFWMD staff will take today’s input to the Water Resources Advisory Council (WRAC), and then on to the SFWMD Governing Board for direction on policy issues, strategies, actions, scheduling, implementation and defining success. The iteration brought to the Governing Board will not be presented as a final, but rather as a draft.

Ms. Reppen reminded stakeholders as they go through the information during this meeting; they need to think about what will be done next. The 4th draft will be brought back to this group and discussed at an additional meeting if that is what the group prefers. SFWMD hopes to finalize the plan in May.

The Introductory piece of the document is still being worked on, including information regarding Everglades restoration. That portion of the document should be sent out to the stakeholders next week (week of March 31, 2008).

April will be declared Water Conservation Month by the Governing Board.

As a last comment, Ms. Reppen reminded the stakeholders of the need to consider funding/finances for implementation in light of the current state of a tight budget.

Following Ms. Reppens presentation, Mr. Elsner went over changes to the document.

Stakeholder comments/questions:

1. Page 6, water saving? Compared to what? Will there be a “base line” to compare it to?
 - a. There will be a series of steps, etc.
 - b. Permit would probably be laid out as a cumulative.
2. Will there be credit given to steps taken before the rule?
 - a. No, April 1, 2006 became the base case, we are looking at what happened since then.
 - b. We are also looking at longer term permits, there will be 5 year review periods, in order to develop trust you must show progress.
3. “Goal based” isn’t a straight percentage, it is based on the size and age of the utility; tailored to the specific utility.
4. Is this an aspirational goal, with no penalties or a real “goal”-mandate- based?
5. You may want to look at changing the term “goal” based, it doesn’t imply a hard limit
 - a. Goals are not coming from WMD, but rather from the utilities themselves.
6. Even if you comply with all the goals, if the business is expanded then the goals will be eaten up.
7. Capture discussions on the expansion capabilities, flexible, can be resubmitted regularly.
8. WMD may even ask that you re-review your goals to see if they are realistic.
9. Since this is a reality based plan, the work “goal” is where you go off base, I think the WMD is looking for a “plan” from the utilities that allows some flexibility; there should be a demonstration that you are meeting your plan.
10. Goal based means you show specifics, previously you just gave a general idea of what you would do.
11. Line 189: “conservation rate”: show difference in “conservation” and “drought” rate.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment was invited, no one spoke.

RANKING OF THIRD ITERATION OF PROGRAM

At this point in the meeting, the Facilitator explained that the group would be ranking all new or changed sections of the document prior to initiating discussions. In this way, the sections which gained consensus could be skipped to allow more time for discussion on those sections that did not attain consensus. The tables below reflect the results of that ranking (see Exhibit C –the Third Iteration for comments taken on each section)

Table 1: Regulatory Section: Strategy IA Public Water Supply:1

5	4	3	2	1
0	5	7	4 Jackie, Randy, Paul, Armando	0

Table 2: Regulatory Section: Strategy I-B Agricultural Irrigation: 2

5	4	3	2	1
0	7	9	0	0

Table 3: Regulatory Section: Strategy I-C Landscape Irrigation 3-5

5	4	3	2	1
0	12	1	3 Tom, Paul,	0

			Randy	
--	--	--	-------	--

Table 4: Regulatory Section:Strategy I-D :ICI Uses 6

5	4	3	2	1
0	4	10	2 Kristin, Randy	0

Table 5: Regulatory Section:Strategy I-E Golf Courses 7-9

5	4	3	2	1
0	10	5	1 Kristin	0

Table 6: Voluntary and Incentive Based Section: II-A Leading by Example 1-2

5	4	3	2	1
0	4	11	1 Randy	0

Table 7: Voluntary and Incentive Based Section: II-B Public Water Supply 3-7

5	4	3	2	1
0	4	8	4 Kristin, Andy, Paul, Randy	0

Table 8: Voluntary and Incentive Based Section: II-C Agricultural Irrigation 8

5	4	3	2	1
0	4	11	1 Tom	0

Table 9: Voluntary and Incentive Based Section: II-E Financial Incentives 11

5	4	3	2	1
0	6	9	1 Randy	0

Table 10: Voluntary and Incentive Based Section: II-F Golf Courses 12-13

5	4	3	2	1
0	10	4	2 Kristin, Randy	0

Table 11: Voluntary and Incentive Based Section: II-G Landscape Irrigation 14-19

5	4	3	2	1
1	6	7	2 Kristin, Jackie	0

Table 12: Voluntary and Incentive Based Section: II-H New Development 20-21

5	4	3	2	1
3	8	4	1 Tom	0

Table 13: Voluntary and Incentive Based Section: II-J ICI Uses 24-28

5	4	3	2	1
0	7	7	2 Andy, Kristin	0

BREAK

Following the ranking, stakeholders took a short break.

PRESENTATION: CONSERVE FLORIDA

Following the break, Maribel Balbin, member of the stakeholder group and representative for Miami-Dade County Water and Sewer Department, spoke to the stakeholders about the *Conserve Florida Program*. (Exhibit D).

Following Ms. Balbin's presentation, one of the stakeholders stated that this is a really great tool. Further, as savings can be demonstrated entities should be able to use that for credit.

DISCUSSION BASED ON RANKINGS

See Exhibit C for all discussion comment notes. This discussion continued for the remainder of the day. Exhibit C incorporates the results of the strategy rankings, the comments from those who ranked each section lower than a "3" and the ranking which was done in place of the group working on Deliverables and Milestones (see explanation below).

DELIVERABLES AND MILESTONES: EDUCATION AND MARKETING

The next task for the stakeholders was to begin drafting Deliverables and Milestones for all the strategies in each Initiative of the Document. Deena Reppen introduced the next exercise by demonstrating the format the SFWMD would like to have the group use when formulating the Deliverables and Milestones for all three Initiative Sections.

At the conclusion of Ms. Reppen's explanation, the stakeholders made the following comments:

1. We should be prioritizing based on funding.
2. Maybe we should take the dates out and just prioritize based on process flow.
3. Let's pick out the low hanging fruit in the interim while there is no money.
4. This is a shared program for water; the District is not going to pay for it all; they will be looking for a sharing with local governments.
5. Cuts in Tallahassee do not have an effect on the utilities; they are on a rate structure but the District will be hit by the budget cuts.
6. Shifting burdens: how does it get done? We the stakeholders need to know who has the financial burden before we can prioritize.

GROUP WORK: DELIVERABLES AND MILESTONES

As a result of the comments above concerning budget cuts, it was decided that the stakeholders would or could not develop deliverables or milestones without an assurance regarding who (the SFWMD or the individual stakeholders) would be responsible for payment of the deliverables and what consequences not meeting the milestones would bring. In place of the scheduled exercise, it was decided that each Action Step would be ranked, on a scale of "1 to 3" for Ease of Implementation (1 being the easiest), Cost of Implementation (1 being the least cost) and , in some cases, the amount of water conservation the action would bring (1 being the most conservation). What the table show inside each box is the ranking number (1, 2, or 3) followed by the number of members voting for that ranking level (Example: 1/7= 7 people ranked this item a "1").

PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment was invited, no one spoke.

EVALUATIONS/ADJOURN

Before adjourning for the day, stakeholders were asked to complete their process Evaluations.
