Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council

Council Minutes

September 11, 2006
10:00 a.m.

REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT

Chair, Mr. Robert Kersteen, Gubernatorial Appointee, Pinellas County
Vice Chair, Ms. Jill Collins, Gubernatorial Appointee, Hillsborough County
Mr. Richard Albrecht, Gubernatorial Appointee, Pasco County
Councilwoman Mary Alvarez, City of Tampa
Commissioner Gigi Arntzen, City of Largo
Mayor Larry Bustle, City of Palmetto
Councilor John Counts, City of Seminole
Commissioner Bill Dodson, City of Plant City
Mayor Ward Friszolowski, City of St. Pete Beach
Mr. Housh Ghovaee, Gubernatorial Appointee, Pinellas County
Reverend James T. Golden, City of Bradenton
Mr. Kenneth Hoyt, Hillsborough County Gubernatorial Appointee
Ms. Angeleah Kinsler, Hillsborough County Gubernatorial Appointee
Commissioner Deborah Kynes, City of Dunedin
Mayor Mary Maloof, City of Treasure Island
Councilperson Carlen Petersen, City of Clearwater
Ms. Barbara Sheen Todd, Gubernatorial Appointee, Pinellas County
Mr. Philip Waller, Gubernatorial Appointee, Hillsborough County
Councilman Earnest Williams, City of St. Petersburg
Mr. Kent Fast, alternate for Mr. Bob Clifford, Florida Department of Transportation
Mr. Todd Pressman, SWFWMD

REPRESENTATIVES ABSENT

Secretary/Treasurer, Commissioner Scott Black, City of Dade City
Past Chair, Commissioner Jane von Hahmann, Manatee County
Vice Mayor Larry Crowley, City of South Pasadena
Mr. Julian Garcia, Jr., Gubernatorial Appointee, Hillsborough County
Dr. Lois Gerber, Gubernatorial Appointee, Manatee County
Mr. Michael Guju, Gubernatorial Appointee, Pinellas County
Commissioner Ken Halloway, City of Temple Terrace
Deputy Mayor Matthew McCaffery, City of New Port Richey
Commissioner James McCormick, City of Safety Harbor
Vice Mayor Janice Miller, City of Oldsmar
Vice Mayor John Phillips, City of Gulfport
Commissioner Robin Saenger, City of Tarpon Springs
Commissioner Mark Sharpe, Hillsborough County
Commissioner Steve Simon, Pasco County
Vice Mayor Ed Taylor, City of Pinellas Park
Commissioner Kenneth Welch, Pinellas County
Ms. Kathleen Wolf, Gubernatorial Appointee, Pasco County
Ms. Michelle Miller, Enterprise Florida
Ms. Deborah Getzoff, DEP

OTHERS PRESENT
Trisha Neasman, Planner, SWFWMD
Shawn College, Exec. Planner, Hillsborough Planning Commission
Rick MacAuly, Senior Planner, City of St. Pete
Joanne McClellan, Planner, SWFWMD
Clayton Bricklemyer, BBB
Paula Dye, Planner, Tampa Bay Water
Richard Owen, Planning Director, SWFWMD
Rick Solomon, Engineer, Sarasota Manatee Airport Authority

STAFF PRESENT
Mr. Manny Pumariega, Executive Director
Mr. Roger Tucker, Legal Counsel
Mr. Avera Wynne, Planning Director
Ms. Suzanne Cooper, Principal Planner
Ms. Lori Denman, Administrative Assistant
Mr. John Jacobsen, Accounting Manager
Ms. Wren Krahl, Manager of Admin./Public Information
Mr. Bill Lofgren, Principal Planner
Mr. John Meyer, Principal Planner
Mr. Patrick O'Neil, Senior Planner
Ms. Jessica White, Senior Planner
Ms. Kim Williams, Communications/Graphics Coordinator

Call to Order - Chairman Kersteen
The regular meeting of the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council was called to order by Chairman Kersteen on September 11, 2006 at 10:02 a.m.

The Invocation was given by Chairman Kersteen, followed by the pledge of allegiance.

Roll Call - Recording Secretary
A quorum was present. One voting conflict was filed.

Announcements:
Chairman Kersteen pointed out that the Council folders contained a publication from 1000 Friends of Florida entitled: *Community Stewardship II: A Citizen's Guide to the Nuts and Bolts of Florida's Growth Management Process*. Community Stewardship I was distributed at the August meeting.

Mayor Mary Maloof was recognized. She had been unable to attend the past two Council meetings due to her recovery from an auto accident.

1. **Approval of Minutes** - Vice Chair Collins
   The minutes from the August 14, 2006 meeting were approved. (Hoyt/Albrecht)

2. **Budget Committee** -Vice Chair Collins
   A. The Financial Report for the period ending 07/31/06 was approved. (Hoyt/Kynes)
   B. FY 2005/2006 Final Budget Amendment

The Budget Committee met this morning and was presented with the 2005/2006 Final Budget Amendment. The overall budget decreased $61,000 primarily due to the following:

- Printing & Graphics decreased slightly more than $11,000 based on projecting out year to date expenditures.
- Contract Services decreased almost $34,000 due to revised projections & timing between fiscal years.
- Legal decreased approximately $21,000 reflecting a reduction in legal services.

The Budget Committee unanimously approved the proposed 2005/2006 Final Budget Amendment.

The FY 2005-06 Final Budget Amendment was approved. (Petersen/Bustle)

3. **Consent Agenda** - Chairman Kersteen
Mr. Todd Pressman, Ex-officio, SWFWMD, filed a voting conflict report on Consent Agenda Item #3.H.4. Local Government Comprehensive Plan Proposed Amendment Report DCA #07-1, City of St. Petersburg, and refrained from voting.

The Consent Agenda was approved. (Collins/Alvarez)

4. **Item(s) Removed from Consent Agenda and Addendum Item(s)** – None

5. **Review Item(s) or Any Other Item(s) for Discussion** – None

6. **A. Ms. Trisha Neasman, Planner, Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD)**
Mr. Todd Pressman, Ex-officio, SWFWMD, introduced Ms. Neasman and stated she will introduce the Regional Water Supply Plan update, which is the roadmap to meet water needs in the 11 county area of SWFWMD for future demand. Staff will also solicit feedback from Council, and answer any questions you may have.

Ms. Neasman provided a Power Point presentation of the Draft 2006 Regional Water Supply Plan (RWSP). The purpose of the RWSP is to demonstrate that enough water will be available to meet water supply and environmental recovery needs in the planning region for the 2000-2025 planning period. They are in the public input phase for this plan and Ms. Neasman encouraged Council to ask questions and provide feedback. It was suggested that questions of a more detailed nature be submitted in writing.

The RWSP includes an emphasis on the development of alternative water supplies such as reclaimed, surface water, and places an emphasis on recovery strategies for the establishment of minimum flows and levels (MFL). It also places an emphasis on working with local governments and other users to plan for water supply development and source optimization.

The RWSP is required by statute and is a five year update.. The area where it is necessary to do a RWSP must be reassessed every year. The governing board approved this area in the year 2004 and this is the same area that is in the current RWSP.

The RWSP covers a 10-county area from Pasco to Polk county, south. Ms. Neasman displayed a conceptual map showing areas of resource concern. In northern Tampa Bay the resource concerns are lake and wetland impacts due to groundwater withdrawals associated with the regional well-field system. This is a constraint for growing demand. In the southern water use

caution area the concern is saltwater intrusion near the coast, advancing inland, low lake levels on the ridge, and reduced flows in the upper Keys. These impacts are caused by groundwater withdrawals.

The northern part of the district doesn't show the same resource impact so it was thought that water would be ample on a regional basis in this area. Planning is being done in the northern part of the district and some of the significant activities that are ongoing are: Marion County water supply planning out to the year 2050, Withlacoochee River Water Supply Authority water supply study, Northern District model, minimum flows and levels, reclaimed water and conservation projects funding.

One part of the RWSP is demand and the other part is sources. Demand projections are based on average rainfall conditions and the methodology was coordinated with other WMDs that had to prepare a Regional Water Supply Plan. The following chart shows the Demand Projections Planning Region 2000-2025 Million Gallons per Day (mgd):

Category	**2000**	**2025**	**Change**
Agriculture	491.6	496.1	4.5
Public Supply	485.4	680.4	195.0
IC/MD/PG	118.5	133.1	14.6
Recreation	55.2	85.5	30.3
Environmental Restoration		132.0	132.0
Total	**1,150.7**	**1,527.1**	**376.4**

One of the major differences between this plan and the current plan is in the Agriculture water sector. The current plan shows a large increase in demand for agriculture. For this plan we coordinated with industry groups and also worked with the University system and decided that this is not increasing on a regional basis. They are going to be decreasing so there would be a decrease in water use. The bulk of the demand is from public supply. The next category, Industrial/Commercial-Mining/Dewatering/Power Generation is expected to have a small increase. Recreation is largely golf courses, and also includes cemeteries. We expect a slight increase in demand associated with population growth. The total demand is 376.4 mgd and since we are already in the year of 2006 we have already experienced some of this demand.

Source Categories are: conservation, reclaimed water, surface water/storm water, seawater, brackish groundwater, fresh groundwater. A major difference between this plan and the current plan is that in the current plan it was assumed, for planning purposes, that additional groundwater quantities would not be available for a growing population. A change of philosophy in this plan took place. It is assumed that additional groundwater quantities would be available for growing demand.

Ms. Neasman showed a chart of the Water Sources Quantified-Planning Region 2000-2025 (mgd) and reviewed each item.

Category	SWUCA	NTB	Total
UFAS Fresh G.W. (Unused permitted)	32	11	43
IAS Fresh G.W.	34	1	35
Brackish G.W.	9	14	23
Surface Water	134	63	197
Reclaimed Water	36	90	126
Seawater	50	50	100
Conservation	119	61	180
Total	**414**	**290**	**704**
Land Use Changes	84		

The first category is the Upper Florida Aquifer System. We assumed public supply utilities experiencing growth and those utilities would grow into their permitted but unused quantities. The Intermediate Aquifer System, another groundwater system, is anticipated to have 335 mgds available from that source. Surface water/Reclaimed water are the two workhorses. Surface water involves capturing flows during high periods, storing that flow, and using it at a later date. Reclaimed water would be used for non-potable demand. The information for Seawater is based on previous studies for the RWSP. We anticipate the development of 3 new facilities and expansion of the existing facility. For purposes of demand, increases in conservation were not included so we could show this on the *source* table as a potential water supply. The total sources would be over 700 mgd. On top of that you have land use changes. What is being done is recognizing that in the southern water use caution area some forms of development or some forms of activity on groundwater now - and an example of that would be agriculture - would go away and we would have another form of development. When that other form of development comes on line we hope to place it on *alternative water supplies*. We anticipate 84 mgds from that source.

This plan is not the District's first attempt at water supply planning. In this effort we are building on the planning efforts of Tampa Bay Water, the Water Planning Alliance (Peace River/Manasota Water Supply Authority), and the Heartland Water Alliance (a collaboration of Polk, Hardy, Highland and Desoto counties). Some of the projects that have been identified are: Surface water harvesting, Off-stream reservoirs, ASR, Reclaimed water, Conservation, Seawater desalination, Brackish ground-water desalination, and Fresh groundwater.

The RWSP provides planning level information on configurations, suitable locations, cost, potential yield, and permitting issues, etc. These options or some alternative configuration of these options can be selected for development by local governments, utilities, regional water supply authorities and private entities.

Demand vs. Sources 2000-2025 (mgd)

Area	Demand	Sources	Surplus
SWUCA	196	414	218
NTB	181	290	108
Total	**377**	**704**	**327**

Land-Use Transitions	**84 mgd**

The total demand is 377 mgd and we anticipate sources over 704 mgd, plus on top of that you have the Land-use transitions - 84 mgd. There are some problem areas that exist in the interior part of the planning region where traditional sources are limited. They don't have a lot of experience with regional approaches and they don't have a lot of experience with the use of alternative water sources. We recognize the problem is there and are ready and willing to assist in that area.

SWFWMD does not pay for everything at the District, but to a certain extent we take on that responsibility, especially when we are trying to get the locality to use regional approaches or to develop alternative water supplies. Ms. Neasman showed a chart of funding sources and explained that the longest funding source available at the District is the Basin Board Cooperative Funding Program. The $374 million is from FY 2007-2025 and this is if they continue to stay the course. This is a 50/50 program. The New Water Sources Initiative includes funding from the governing board and the 50% match from the cooperator. The Water Supply Resource Development funding reserve was created with ad valorem taxes that exceeded our budgeted amounts and the governing board decided to put that in a reserve for alternative water supplies and return it to the communities where it originated from. The Water Sustainability Trust Fund (2007-2015) was created over a year and a half ago by the state and it requires a match. 50% of The Florida Forever Trust Fund is due to terminate in the year 2010. We expect a total of $1.8 billion to be available up to the year 2025.

Legislation in recent years has placed more requirements on local governments in terms of water supply planning. They are now required to prepare a 10-year water supply facilities work plan, or if they have one it has to be updated within 18 months of the approval of the RWSP. We anticipate approval at the end of this year. They are also required to consider our projections in the plan and identify sources to address that demand. District technical assistance is available.

In conclusion, the water supply/environmental restoration demand for the 2000-2025 planning period is 377 mgd. Sources of water within the Planning Region are sufficient to meet the 2025 demand (704 mgd of sources vs. 377 mgd of demand). Existing state, water management district, and local funding sources appear to be sufficient to cover the cost of meeting the 2025 demand, assuming that funding programs are maintained at current funding levels.

Please send comments by September 22nd to: Planning@WaterMatters.org or call Ms. Trisha Neasman at 1-800-423-1476 ext. 4407. The Plan will be submitted to DEP in December.

B. Ms. Paula Dye, Planner, Tampa Bay Water (TBW)

Ms. Dye stated when SWFWMD created their RWSP in 2001 TBW followed along with their Long Range Plan, and Master Water Plan, and evaluated every idea they had. TBW will be doing that again once their Plan is completed. Ms. Dye said she hopes to be back before this Council in another 6 months to get your input on Tampa Bay Water's Update to the Long Range Plan, which funnels into the Master Water Plan. TBW's planning process is at a decision point and this is a very good opportunity for you to provide input to us.

Tampa Bay Water and our Future Water Needs and Choices is the subject of the presentation. One of the first things we look at, and we look at this constantly, is how much water supply will be needed in the future. Tampa Bay Water updates demand projections on an annual basis, and every five years looks at the Regional Water Supply Plan demand projections for comparison, consistency, and compatibility. Tampa Bay Water is the wholesale drinking water supplier to the counties of Pinellas, Pasco and Hillsborough and the cities of St. Petersburg, Tampa and New Port Richey. We look at the public supply component. The Water Management District has a much bigger job than Tampa Bay Water. They have to look across a 16 county area and they have to look at meeting the water supply needs of many-use sectors. Tampa Bay Water focuses in on our 3 county area. We were created by our member governments. Over our 20 year planning we are going to need another 45 million gallons a day. The next increment of supply that we need to bring on-line, a choice that we need to make soon, is how will we meet that next increment of supply so that we can have supplies on-line in 2012. We will need another 12 mgps by then and it takes at least 6 years to do the final permitting and construction on a water supply project.

The TBW Board of Directors was created to make sure that the environment was protected and that we could afford our future water supplies, and the engineers keep telling me that they have to be technically feasible as well. You can't develop icebergs. You have to do something locally that will work.

TBW was created by our member governments in 1998 and at that point the majority of water supplies were groundwater. Because we needed to use groundwater more than it should be used at that point we were seeing some environmental damage. We were created to fix that problem and to move forward by making sure that what was developed in the future would be environmentally sound as well as affordable. In 1988 we entered into a partnership agreement with SWFWMD and the goal of that was to cut back on those groundwater supplies so they could be operated at an environmentally sustainable level and also, to develop alternative supplies. Out of that came our Master Water Plan which we use as our blueprint to look at long-term drinking water supply needs and to reduce that groundwater reliance and protect the environment.

We are now seeing environmental recovery and have developed many of the alternative water supplies from that first Master Water Plan. We have developed a surface water treatment plant and the C.W. Bill Young Regional Reservoir came on line last year and was successful in helping us through the drought that we experience every dry season. We have things on-line that are working for us as alternative supplies. The desalination plant, which we are finishing up by the end of this year, will also be an important future component of our alternative water

supply program and will provide approximately 10% or 25 mgd to that mix.

We also want to make sure that we don't have future problems. We know that alternative water supplies in the tri-county area are limited because we have picked the low fruit with the current alternative water supplies that have come on line. We have gotten up on a ladder and picked the high fruit with the reservoir and things like the desal plant. Now we have ugly fruit left, but that doesn't mean that we aren't capable of making fruit salad out of it.

300 ideas were reviewed, many which came out of the RWSP, against being environmentally sound, economical and technically feasible. In 2001 the TBRPC staff facilitated 18 public meetings for Tampa Bay Water. The ideas funneled down to where TBW is today. Right now, we have been looking in-depth at four projects for the last couple of years. You cannot take the resources and look at 300 ideas in-depth. You can't even really look in-depth at 39. You keep peeling the onion away. The four projects which we have been evaluating for that next increment of supply in 2012 are:

- Downstream Enhancements Project (Phases A & B)
- Downstream Augmentation Project
- Mid-Pinellas Brackish
- Crystals International

The Mid-Pinellas Brackish and the Crystals International are not large enough to meet that next increment of demand of at least 12 mgd. They might be developed as a supplement, but the two choices that the board is going to consider in October will be the Downstream Enhancements Project and the Downstream Augmentation Project.

The Downstream Enhancements Project is a surface water supply off the Hillsborough River and Tampa Bypass Canal, in its first phases. It will have the option in longer term phases, in another 10 or 15 years, to look at additional higher flows off the Alafia, and also adding the second idea, Downstream Augmentation. It is compatible with the City of Tampa's use of those resources. We do not take any supply off the Hillsborough River and the Tampa Bypass Canal right now, until there is at least 100 cubic feet per second (cfs) going over the dam, and that is after the City of Tampa's primary use as a supply source. What we have looked at doing is, could we take at those higher flow periods a little bit of extra water off of these systems? The idea originated with input from one of your groups - the Agency On Bay Management and also the Tampa Bay National Estuary Program. Both recommended that we take a look at this idea and it is a series of projects that we could develop in phases to match the growth of the region.

The analysis for Downstream Enhancements are just about finished. We would modify our current permits for the higher flows on the Hillsborough River and Tampa Bypass Canal and target mid-range higher flow periods making sure we continue to protect those low and high flows, which the scientific community tells us are the important flows to protect environmentally. We will be compiling a water use permit application which will be presented to the Tampa Bay Water Board of Directors for their consideration at their October 2006 meeting.

Downstream Enhancements benefits would increase drinking water supply through 2025, protect high and low stream flows, and protect environment by reducing nitrogen loading to Tampa Bay (by withdrawals at higher flow levels).

The first phases include modifying water use permits to use mid-range (higher flows),

increasing pump station capacity and the water treatment plant expansion. This concept takes advantage of existing infrastructure on existing owned property and expanding it. The potential impact on the public for new construction is practically nothing. A second phase would extend that water treatment plant more.

After 2017 we can look at Downstream Augmentation (if not chosen by the Tampa Bay Water Board this fall) and/or the 3rd major river system which we currently have water supply from, the Alafia River. Right now, the existing C. W. Bill Young Regional Reservoir is large enough for the first phases. Should we look at future phases we would also be looking at the potential for a second reservoir. That isn't something that needs to be done immediately.

The cost of the first phases are $186 million for 25 mgd. It is an alternative water supply project and it is in the current draft of the RWSP, which will make it eligible for SWFWMD co-funding, and also potentially for state and federal co-funding. We view this as environmentally sound, cost effective and comprehensive.

Another project that has been looked at in great depth is the Downstream Augmentation project. One of the great benefits of that project is that it is a part of the larger regional reclaimed water plan that's called "The Tampa Bay Regional Reclaimed Water and Downstream Augmentation Project." Regional project partners are the City of Tampa, Hillsborough County, SWFWMD, Pasco County and Tampa Bay Water. The City of Tampa is instrumental because the Howard F. Curren Wastewater/Reclaimed Water Plant is the City of Tampa's and we have an agreement with them to use the reclaimed water should this project move forward. We also have the opportunity to share infrastructure with Pasco & Hillsborough counties, Tampa, and SWFWMD because the reclaimed water that is produced at Howard F. Curren is very high quality and it has been a major goal of the City of Tampa, the Water Management District and other regional entities such as the Tampa Bay Estuary Program to see how we can use that reclaimed water in a beneficial way. One of the benefits is that by sharing infrastructure it becomes a more cost effective project for everybody.

The idea is to put a gallon of reclaimed water downstream of the structure on the Hillsborough River, the Tampa Dam, or downstream of the last structure on the Tampa Bypass Canal and that way we maintain the fresh water flow, and we would not be drinking the reclaimed water. The idea of treating it again and drinking was something the City of Tampa and several entities looked at back in the 1990s and our Board of Directors chose not to move forward back in 1997 with that idea because people just didn't want to drink reclaimed water. We have been looking at other alternatives to use it effectively because it is a great resource.

Extensive environmental reviews have been conducted of moving that reclaimed discharge point. One of the things of interest to the general public are what we call personal care products and pharmaceuticals and we have been monitoring all of the extensive studies that have taken place. The Howard F. Curren takes almost all of those out during the treatment process.

The benefits are that it maximizes reclaimed water use, it could meet the region's drinking water needs through 2017, it increased yield of the surface water system and reservoir, and is part of a larger regional reclaimed water plan. The estimated cost is $186 million for 13 mgd. SWFWMD has said they will fund 50% of the project and we have received Congressional EPA funding and also state funding for the Planning Phases that have been conducted over the last couple of years.

The Tampa Bay Water Board will select the next water supply configuration in October 2006. We need to meet projected water demand of 12 mgd by 2012. They have to be environmentally sound, economical and technically feasible, and the long term need of 45 mgd by 2025 should be considered.

Tampa Bay Water is now in the process of taking input at public meetings and individual briefings. The public input and technical review will be presented to the Tampa Bay Water Board in October at which time the Board will consider which project to pursue.

Questions & Comments:

Councilman Williams: You talked about the project of putting reclaimed water back into Hillsborough River. We have had some difficulty when we deep water inject reclaimed water to bring it back for use of our customers, because of the high salinity. What about the chemistry of putting that back in the river? How is that offering water quality?

Ms. Dye: The Downstream Augmentation Project is looking at moving that point of discharge with the reclaimed water. It is not exactly the same as the surface water with which it would be replacing. Because of that we have been going through a very extensive permitting process with FDEP. It has been very, very hard. Quite frankly, one of the reasons that we are looking at the alternative to that is because the permitting to that is taking much longer than we had hoped it would, and we have not completed it within the time frame that was our goal so that we would know whether or not it was a permittable project. It's a very simple concept to move the reclaimed water from one point to the next and so you would think it would be a simple thing to permit, but it is actually the opposite of that. It's one of the most complex permitting endeavors I've ever worked on and we have a really great team which is headed up by Mr. Waller, from MWH to look at that. The questions that you are raising are the things that they are looking at and I think we will have to do a lot more work documenting all of that for the permitting agency before we will know if we can get a permit or not. That is a major difficulty with choosing that project, at this point.

Councilman Williams: How far away are we with the brackish plans?

Ms. Dye: The points that we would be discharging in are what you would consider brackish points.

Councilman Williams: You indicated that there were 3 additional desal - where are you talking about?

Ms. Neasman: I don't know the particular locations.

Mr. Owen (Planning Director): This is just planning information - they looked at the Anclote site (25 mgd) and two other sites for new sites, one in Manatee County and one in Charlotte County. Both associated with areas that are already

impacted by port facilities and so the new impacts associated with a desal plant might be minimized at those locations. Both of those would be at 25 mgd). And an expansion of the existing Big Ben plant. Again, those are just planning numbers. Keep in mind that even if you took out the quantities associated with sea water desalination from our study you still have ample other sources to meet the growing demand. It is not a necessity at this point in time.

Ms. Todd: The technology has presented some challenges for our water supply. I'm wondering if that has been resolved, and also, with the cost of energy increasing like it is, how are we going to deal with that when you anticipate new desal projects - is the technology issue resolved and how about the energy cost....is it going to be a cost effective, efficient way to deal with providing additional water?

Ms. Dye: Those are excellent questions. We have been remediating the current Tampa Bay desalination plant. We were in a public/private partnership with the developer and they did not build it to the design and it could not meet the performance criteria and we would not accept it. We were not going to let the public not get what they paid for and so we took it back. We have a company now that is remediating it and we expect it to be finished and up and running as a Christmas present. The date that is our goal is December 22nd.

Energy costs are always something to consider as you look at future water supply sources. Even other alternative water supply need energy. The Surface Water Treatment Plant needs energy to clean the surface water supplies which need more treatment than groundwater. From an operations and maintenance perspective desalination is the most expensive of the water supply sources. Whenever the Board of Directors looks at future water supplies that is one of the major things they look at. You don't see a second desal plant as one of the options for our 2012 needs and one of the reasons for that is we want the first one up and running and have that operational history, see what the energy costs are, and understand all of that. It will be 10% of meeting the region's needs. When you fold that into the mix of water supplies I think we can still have an affordable mix of water supplies.

Ms. Todd: The other question I have has to deal with your reclaimed water. I know in Pinellas County, Pinellas County and its citizens paid for an entire reclaimed water system. It was very carefully planned. I'm wondering why this isn't happening in the other areas. It seems to me that it is sort of like what Benjamin Franklin said, "a penny saved is a penny earned" and if these areas that are considering utilizing their reclaimed water, and putting it into the Hillsborough River at the expense of the region, were to be considered by each of these areas, and with the regional vision, and used for other purposes other than for drinking, like for lawn irrigation and other kinds of things, would this not be as effective or more effective than just supplementing? Why isn't that happening?

Ms. Dye: The regional project, of which Downstream Augmentation is a piece, that's the very goal. The very goal of that is to take 55 mgd, which is now produced at the Howard F. Curren Reclaimed Plant, and be able to use almost all of that. To build the pipelines that leave that plant, and after we have used a piece of it for augmentation purposes, for it to be used for watering, irrigation purposes for Hillsborough, the City of Tampa, and Pasco County. The piece we would use for augmentation, because we do that at a higher flow period, is actually the piece that can't be used for traditional irrigation purposes because you have to build your reclaimed system to meet that maximum reclaimed use which is when it is dry. When it is wet people aren't watering their lawns as much - they don't need to, and there is more reclaimed water. We would be using that piece of it. The goal of that larger plan is to use that supply source. The City of Tampa is currently building their reclaimed system for the Southern Tampa Area Reuse System (STAR). The whole region is looking at that. In fact, Ms. Neasman or Mr. Owen may want to talk to you about the funding for reclaimed water projects in the Regional Water Supply Plan.

Ms. Todd: I think what you are doing is amazing. I'm very proud that our region has taken the leadership it has. We found that there is never enough reclaimed water if you use it for traditional domestic and commercial uses. Is that a realistic thing?

Ms. Dye: The reason there isn't enough is because it's that dichotomy between dry weather and wet weather and when it is dry your demands in your reclaim system are the greatest. With a system like that you can only build it to your maximum day demand because you have to provide when that happens. You can run out of reclaimed water and not serve everyone as a result. The piece in the regional project that the Downstream Augmentation Project would use would be that next wet period piece. We did two years of modeling, looking at the Howard F. Curren system and all of the partner's use of reclaimed water to see how we would fit with that curve and to make sure that we could fit into it, and then what would that mean to us. We found that it actually works really well, that you can more fully use that because when you are doing downstream augmentation the demands are low for the traditional uses. You are not only able to share that resource effectively, you can also share the same pipes because when the folks are watering their lawns need that, that isn't when you would be doing the augmentation.

Mr. Hoyt: I have so many thoughts and comments and questions anticipating this presentation and you have answered a few of them and provided some useful information. Let's just start, right now in 3 counties we have watering restrictions. We are unable to match our supplies and our demand as we stand. It is wetter right now than we would like to have it, but overall, as I look at your chart and how close the line is between your capacity and your demand it seems to me you are playing with fire

all the way out as far as you can see in not having an adequate buffer between what your supply and demand is so that we can accommodate the years when we don't have much rain. There is also no real certainty to the demand, the demand may actually be greater. It looks to me that your buffers or your safety margins are much less than I know to be the case with electric utilities providing power. You shouldn't go into a decade still working on the water you are going to need for that decade. Seems to me you need to go into a decade with all the resources you are going to need for that decade. I wonder if there is a surplus in the Northern District through the year 2050 and what plans are being made to utilize that surplus throughout the rest of the Southwest Water Management District.

This brings up the question of the price of water. At the moment, what the consumer sees when he gets his water bill is the cost of lifting the water up out of the ground, storing it, processing it, chlorinating it, transmitting it and distributing it through the pipes and paying for all of the planning and effort and the capital construction has to go for that. But the water as it comes out of the tap, the price of that water is actually zero. I don't see, when I look at the reports, what is the value of the water that sits underneath the ground and in the reservoirs. It does have a value. When it first comes down from the sky its price is zero because we just inherited it. It seems to me that someplace between now and 2050 all water will have a price associated with it. Hillsborough County and the City of Tampa charges a high volume water user a higher price per gallon than we do a lower water user. So that water actually does have a price to it. The consumer that uses water at the lower level pays nothing for what's in the jar. We haven't had enough conversation about that. We haven't had enough conversation about out of area sources of water to the north of us and whether or not they do have a surplus that could be piped down. Flat roofs could be reinforced to collect water and feed it into a system the way other countries do in the Mediterranean.

Mr. Hoyt stated he will submit his thoughts and concerns on paper and provide them to Ms. Dye.

Chairman Kersteen: It is cheaper to build it now. Does Tampa Bay Water have the land necessary to build a second reservoir?

Mr. Dye: You make a good point that construction costs do go up. It's one of the things that we need to consider as we look at when we should bring on supply sources. We know that we don't need a second reservoir for the first phases of supply development. One of the things that Mr. Waller's firm is doing for TBW is laying out a plan on when we need to look at those sorts of questions because of your point. When would be the time to look at doing those things. The existing reservoir sits on 1200 acres. The WMD and TBW bought 5400 acres around that so a second location might follow but it might be right next to the existing one. There are other alternatives as well. One of the things that I would expect we would do is another siting evaluation to make sure that we

were siting it at the most optimal location should we need it. You have to waive the difference between when you know when you need something, how much the construction costs are to bond it and not use it, versus are you positive it is that next solution you want to build. I will probably be back in another year or so with those sorts of discussions.

Chairman Kersteen: One of the aims of my question is, do you put all of your eggs in one basket?

Ms. Dye: Those are the very types of things a siting analysis would have to look at and because reservoirs are inevitably federally funded you would also have to do an alternatives evaluation to qualify for outside funding. Mr. Waller will be helping lay out a plan to take a look at when to ask those questions to make sure you meet the timeliness.

Water planning needs to look at increments of time as well as increments of supply. We took our last Long Term Planning projections out that 50 years to take a look. Going out 100 years is very difficult because you end up with an awful lot of unknowns such as how many people really will be living in the region 100 years from now and what will their demand profile be like? 100 years ago I don't think you could have foreseen what it was going to be like here today. You also don't want to bring on a $200 million supply project and not use it for 10 years. You will have a cost to the residents that today would not be acceptable. From a planning process we always have different supply sources in different levels of development.

Chairman Kersteen: The military has battleships that have treatment plants. We should get one for free and back it up where ever we want to, near a water line, a transmission line, and use it. Or dismantle the battleship and take the water supply and use that.

Ms. Dye: I think that's something we need to look at when we go back into the planning process.

Chairman Kersteen: A carrier has 5,000 people on it so they have to make millions of gallons.

Reverend Golden: The augmentation project has already received a commitment of 50% of the financing from SWFWMD.

Ms. Dye: It has for the planning phase. The planning phase of that has been funded 50% by SWFWMD, by an actual federal grant from the EPA and also some state funding. Because the enhancements is a later idea they have not funded 50% of the planning for that, to date. We expect that they will.

Councilman Williams: Two questions: Are there plans for underground storage? When we have the additional rainfall we could use underground storage rather

than the surface water which is subject to evaporation.

Ms. Dye: The City of Tampa is doing that. They have aquifer storage and recovery (ASR) right now. They are using it right now. ASR is a promising alternative to above ground storage. When you need a huge amount of supply though - we did look at ASR instead of the regional reservoir and it was much more expensive because of the quantities that we were looking at. ASR is something in the Regional Water Supply Plan and is being used successfully by some folks right now and I think you will see more of it in the future.

Councilman Williams: I think that is a part of the solution. I have been to the big reservoir and you have a lot of evaporation. Another process is that major corporations simply can use a water recovery system within, for example, this building. Have you looked at those kinds of systems to recommend and assist with?

Ms. Dye: Conservation is a very important part of both the RWSP and TBW's plan. We provide a lot of technical assistance, un-researched such as that idea and other ideas. Our region has been able to save over 17 million gallons a day in the last 10 years, and the goal is to save 30 million gallons a day by 2010. From a conservation perspective research on conservation ideas and their ultimate implementation is a big goal of everyone and is something that we work very hard on through our member governments and the WMD. We have one of the lowest per capita water uses in the state and in the nation using under 120 gallons per person, per day. Some of our member governments use under 100 gallons per person per day and that is in great part due to ideas that you are talking about.

Mr. Pressman said, in summary, that the bottom line is that a number of years ago we just put a straw in the ground and pulled water out. It was just as simple as that. I can't speak well enough about the staff that I work with, not on a daily basis but probably on a weekly basis. The work they do is outstanding. As Ms. Todd said, this has been a huge success and I do want you to know that we are leading the state by far with these types of projects and providing alternative water. It's a pleasure to go to the statewide conference, which was this past week, and see that people are coming to our region and looking at ideas and putting implementation into what we have done already. I am proud to be a part of it.

7. **Council Members' Comments** - Chairman Kersteen - None

8. **Program Reports**

A. Agency on Bay Management (ABM) - Chair, Mayor Mary Maloof

The full Agency on Bay Management will meet on Thursday, September 14th. Items on the agenda include: the archaeological study underway in Tampa Bay; an update of Tampa Bay Water's Downstream Enhancement/Augmentation Project; and a report on the 2006 shorebird nesting season at the Egmont Key National Wildlife Refuge.

B. Clearinghouse Review Committee (CRC) - Chair, Ms. Jill Collins - No Report

C. Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC) - No Report

D. Emergency Management - No Report

E. Legislative Committee - Chair, Commissioner Deborah Kynes

The next meeting will be held on October 9th at 9:00 a.m., prior to the Council meeting.

F. Regional Planning Advisory Committee (RPAC) - No Report

G. Telework Tampa Bay - No Report

H. Economic Development - No Report

I. Regional Domestic Security Task Force (RDSTF) - No Report

9. **Other Council Reports** - None

10. **Executive/Budget Committee Report** - Chairman Kersteen – No Report

The Executive/Budget Committee met this morning and discussed the following:

- The FY 2005/2006 Final Budget Amendment, which was approved.
- The Pay and Classification Plan. There have been problems hiring new staff and retaining staff. As a result, the committee approved a 2% across the board increase for the Pay and Classification Plan.
- The Council Member/Staff Visioning session was discussed. Chairman Kersteen thanked Kim Williams for her leadership and graphics. The flyer provides an overview of the subjects to be covered at the Visioning session.
- Executive Director's Evaluation:

  Mr. Pumariega received an excellent evaluation from the Committee members. He had a number of accomplishments over the past year which include the following:

  - The Tampa Bay Region's Hurricane Forum and subsequent report.
  - The Workforce Housing Think Tank and the Employer Assisted Housing Legislative Initiative. Thus far, the Council conducted three workshops with the Westshore Alliance, Pinellas County and the North Pinellas Chamber of Commerce.
  - Mr. Pumariega continues to maintain a leadership role within the Florida Regional Councils Association. He was a key figure in increasing the funding level for all of Florida's 11 RPCs. It was through his continued diligence and the support of our members that we were able to see this increase.
  - Statewide leadership im implementing the Fiscal Impact Analysis Model (FIAM).

- Key partnerships have been formed due to the Executive Director's continued dedication to establishing those partnerships within the region as well as on a statewide level. An example is our role in the Reality Check Visioning event which will be taking place in 2007.
- And, the Regional Domestic Security Task Force training tabletop exercise and Continuity of Operations Plans. The Council provided over 300 days of training to first responders.

11. **Chairman's Report -** Chairman Kersteen

The Chairman received an email from Carol Bracy, Chief of Staff for Lt. Governor Jennings, thanking Council for our letter and suggestions regarding the state's insurance crisis.

Councilman Williams: I have some concerns about this letter. Under the recommendations:

1. *The Legislature must deal with major insurance companies setting up subsidiaries. Require parent companies to issue policies instead of less solvent subsidiary.* One of the key issues that any insurance company faces is where is the liability exposure? Florida is a subsidized state. We lost $3.7 billion with Hurricane Andrew. We have lost every dime we ever made in the last 23 years. We had to get $1 billion from our parent company. Companies are saying, why should we subsidize states like Florida when we don't make the premiums for it. I'm really concerned about that.
2. *Eliminate the wind maps....*Well part of the problem we also have is that we subsidize barrier islands. The only place that you require a separate wind policy is in a wind pool area and those are the barrier islands. Everybody has been subsidizing them for years. We have to make some decisions. I'm concerned about this one.
3. ...*Cap premiums* but you aren't capping exposures. So I make $10 million and I have $100 million exposure. It doesn't make sense. It's a contradiction with deregulation. Again, when you are capping something you are regulating it.

We need to let people know how the industry works and people seem to have the idea that we are making lots of money when we aren't. We are spending lots of money and we are subsidizing all these places, especially the barrier islands.

Mr. Hoyt: How could we avoid this type of thing in the future. Obviously, did we talk to insurance people before we wrote the letter?

Mr. Pumariega: Some of these items came from input from Council members and a few individuals from the insurance industry.

Mr. Hoyt: I know it wasn't our intention, but maybe if we had taken a little more input we might have heard some of the comments Councilman Williams provided.

Reverend Golden: I don't think that the intent was designed to help the insurance industry. In fact, it was just the opposite. I can appreciate Councilman Williams feelings, but as a Council we were charged with gathering input from across the region as to

ideas that might be used to help the people. I would suggest that the insurance industry be given an opportunity to respond, and they will I suspect with the Select Committee of Insurance Reform made up of mostly insurers. The problem we have is that there is no voice for the people.

Mr. Hoyt: Reverend, you and I agree on many many things, but on this particular case we have to agree to disagree because it's my opinion that the Council, in retrospect, might have done a little more to ensure that what we said was balanced and at least recognize that there is a different point of view out there.

Councilman Williams: It's interesting that you said the voice of the people aren't heard. We have an elected Insurance Commissioner. Insurance is the most highly regulated industry outside of the utilities. So to say the people's voices aren't heard, that's not true. It never has been true. That's part of the problem. People don't understand the industry. No one contacted me about this letter. I surely would have contacted somebody in the industry and ask them about this.

Chairman Kersteen: I'm sure there will be a balance of information given or presented to that Commission. Their next meeting is the 21st of this month. I'm sure the insurance industry will have representation.

Councilman Williams: Part of the problem is that we are so regulated, that's why the system was created. If there was so much money that we were making why aren't they coming in here hand over foot? That's what they want to do, make money and that's not the case. We have these ideas about how the insurance companies are killing everybody.

Chairman Kersteen: Over regulation is part of the problem.

12. **Executive Director's Report** - Manny Pumariega **-** No Report

Mr. Pumariega thanked the staff for the excellent job they have done over the past 12 months. He also thanked the board members for their support and their involvement with some of the TBRPC programs. That translates into the evaluation.

Adjournment 11:29 a.m.

Next Meeting - October 9, 2006 at 10:00 a.m.

Events Calendar located in Council folders.

_____

Lori Denman, Recording Secretary

_____

Robert A. "Bob" Kersteen, Chairman