

SOUTH FLORIDA WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT (SFWND)
WATER RESOURCES ADVISORY COMMISSION (WRAC)
Upper East Coast Water Supply Plan Regional Workshop
SFWMD Martin/St. Lucie Service Center
780 SE Indian Street
Stuart, Florida
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2010, 1:30 PM
MEETING SUMMARY

- Item 1. Welcome and Opening Remarks – Kevin Powers, Governing Board Member**
- Item 2. Introductions Update, and Today’s Topics - Mark Elsner, Director Water Supply Development**
- Item 3. May 5, 2010 Meeting Follow-up – Linda Hoppes, Lead Planner, Water Supply Planning Section**
- Item 4. Review of Draft 2011 Upper East Coast Water Supply Plan Update, Linda Hoppes and Mark Elsner**
- Questions and answers in this plan overview were:
- Q. What is discussed in the water supply plan regarding the impact of the Nutrient Standards on reclaimed water and all water within the District? *The focus of water supply plans is the quantity of water available. There is District staff that is dealing with this issue and when the rules are finalized, if there are impacts to water supply planning, they will be addressed at that time. According to the EPA the rule is not intended to reduce the use of reclaimed water and that compliance, if any, will not be taken at the end of the reuse distribution pipe; that said there will likely be issues to address. It was also explained that the standards apply based on use and location (nearness to an impaired waterbody).*
- Q. The population projections, particularly for 2025 and 2030 seem high. One local government indicated they have reduced their projections over the past year. *The projections were developed over a year ago, in concert with the utilities and local governments. The projections used in the local government Comprehensive Plans and the Facility Work Plans were used as a data source as these were reviewed and approved by the Department of Community Affairs. It should be remembered that these are a snapshot in time and the projections will be developed again for the 2016 Plan Update using best available information.*
- Q. Why did the acreage in the Recreation and Landscape category increase by such a large amount? *Some of the increase is based on the population projection increase; the acres for landscape were increased at the same rate as the population growth. Additionally, since the most recent plan update, a number of large HOAs received permits for irrigation of landscaping of the entire development and this added a number of acres.*
- Q. Doug Bournique of the Indian River Citrus League was asked his opinion of the new projections for agricultural acreage. *Mr. Bournique indicated the numbers*

seem reasonable based on the information they are getting regarding the progress on disease resistant rootstock and revised thinking on the productive lifespan of citrus trees. Some growers are starting to replant west of I-95. Mr. Bournique also commented on the extensive research work being done at the USDA facility in Fort Pierce.

Comment: With the delay in projects such as the Ten Mile Creek Reservoir and IRL-South, should the rule or prevention strategy be changed to eliminate these projects? *Responsibility for Ten Mile Creek Reservoir is under the auspices of the Corps of Engineers. The USACE has placed the facility in a passive operating state while funding authorization is obtained to complete a Post Authorization Change (PAC) report to identify remediation options and to fund maintenance and upkeep of the facility until 2013. Upon completion of the PAC in FY 2013, the USACE will request Congressional Authority and appropriations for design/construction contracts to start in future fiscal years. and the IRL-south project is still proposed. Significant progress is being made on the C-44 Reservoir. Currently the MFL is not being exceeded.*

Comment: *The dispersed water management program can be a good way to store some of the needed water and is a good use of the currently limited funds. Additionally, the use of cisterns should be expanded. District staff explained that cistern usage is included in the year-round irrigation rule.*

Q. Wastewater flows are projected to increase more than potable water projections – is there a reason for this? *In some areas, homes served by PWS for drinking water still utilize septic tanks. Utilities are planning on providing regional wastewater collection to several of these areas. These flows would then go to regional water reclamation facilities . District staff is in the process of reviewing and verifying this information with the utilities and to better understand the differences.*

Comment: Some HOAs are resistant to reuse and conversion to reuse doesn't go well.

Comment: Could reuse be an issue if someone takes reclaimed use water, stores it in pond for future distribution and then a major rain creates runoff? If water quality sampling was done the next day, the water could exceed standards: could the person(s) trying to do the right thing by utilizing reclaimed water be fined for an exceedance?

Comment: Good planning is the key to successful reuse.

Q. What is the definition of brackish water? *Brackish water has a minimum TDS of 1000 mg/L.*

Q. For what period of time will the online utility annual progress report portal be available and are there reasons for the decrease in per capita water use and how is this calculated? *The system will be available to January 15th. There are a number of reasons that affect per capita usage; newer construction uses more efficient equipment, a number of single family homes irrigate with a well or from a surface water source that is not counted, and it is likely a conservation ethic is beginning to emerge. The per capita rate in the plan is based on finished water as reported by each utility to the FDEP divided by the permanent population. When using the*

term per capita, it is important to look at the determination to get a good understanding of what is meant; each calculation is used for a different reason.

Q. Will the C-25 study be included in the plan? The study is captured in the Plan. While the Governing Board supports the findings of the study, it is not currently a District priority for funding. The District would support a third party taking steps forward.

Q. The plan indicates we have sufficient water to meet 2030 needs; is that true without the CERP projects? CERP projects are focused primarily on meeting the needs of the environment. The Plan analysis and evaluation did not incorporate CERP and concluded there is sufficient water to meet projected demands. Additional water supply for human purposes as a result of CERP would enhance the future water supply picture, but is not being planned for. Utilities have sufficient planned projects to actually exceed their needs.

Q. Are there any test ASR wells planned for the region? One utility is moving forward to obtain a permit but has no funds for actually constructing an ASR well. Arsenic migration is still an issue; FDEP has studies within the state but needs concurrence from the EPA. Various technologies are still being evaluated.

Q. Does the East Coast Floridan model 'work' with the CFCA model? Are we looking at how the water use in each region impacts each other over the 30 years? In one of the previous planning processes, it was explained that it would be the timeframe of geologic time to see impacts in the UEC region as a result of Floridan use in the other regions.

Q. Agriculture should look at other crops east of I-95. Mr. Bournique responded that many crops have been looked at and only one, sunflower seed comes close but does not allow the growers a profit. Due to the conditions such as soil and location, citrus is the only profitable crop in this area at this time.

Item 5. Wrap Up/Next Steps – Linda Hoppes and Mark Elsner
There were no additional questions or comments.

Item 6. Adjourn: 3:30

INTERESTED PARTIES – SIGN IN SHEET

Upper East Coast Regional Water Supply Plan - WRAC Issues Workshop
Wednesday, December 15, 2010

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

NAME	ADDRESS & PHONE	E-MAIL ADDRESS
C		
Kristin Fecko	NSLRWCD/AECOM	kristin.fecko@aecom.com
PETER MERRITT	TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL	pmerritt@tcrpc.org
RON HIX	FPL	ron.hix@fpl.com
TERRY CLARK	CARDNO ENTRIX	TERRY.CLARK@CARDNO.COM
KERRY KATES	FFVA	KERRY.KATES@FFVA.COM
Valerie Schulte	FPUA	schulte@fpu.com
Rebecca Elliott	FPAES/ OAC P	relliotte@fund.gov
Samantha Horowitz	Martin Growth Mgt	shorowitz@martin.fl.us
May Kindel	City of Stuart	
William Thiel	FDEP	
Ann Mung	Marbion Co.	
Rick Melchior	Becker Group	Rmelchior@BeckerGroup.com

INTERESTED PARTIES – SIGN IN SHEET

Upper East Coast Regional Water Supply Plan - WRAC Issues Workshop
Wednesday, December 15, 2010

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

NAME	ADDRESS & PHONE	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Elizabeth Thomas	975 Keller Rd Altamonte Spg 32714	ethomas@sjrwmd.com
Jason Bessy		
UMESH ASRANI	PORT. ST. LUCIE UTILITY SYSTEMS DEPT.	UASRANI@CITYOFFPSL.COM
Kathleen Greenwood	2600 Blair Stone MS 46 Tallahassee 32399	Kathleen.greewood@ Dep. State, FL.us
Shelley Yawn	111	Shelley.yawn@dep.state. fl.us
Brad March	Port St. Lucie Utility 900 SE Oyden Lane, PSL 34986	Bmarch@cityofpsl.com
Tom Lindsey	Becker Holding	tlindsey@beckerholding.com
CHARLES SHANN	PO Box 090342 VERO Beach 32909	CHARLES.SHANN@ FFBK.org
Ray Murankus	2300 Virginia Ave (772) Fort Pierce, FL 34982 462-5221	murankusr@ stlucieco.org

