

FINAL DRAFT
Meeting Summary
Southwest Florida Water Management District
Regional Reclaimed Water Partnership Initiative
Regulatory/Recharge Steering Committee

Tampa Service Office
September 10, 2008 – 9:00 AM

Attendees:

Bruce Wirth, SWFWMD	Mario Cabana, Hillsborough County
Ken Weber, SWFWMD	Luke Mulford, Hillsborough County
Mark Barcelo, SWFWMD	Paula Dye, Tampa Bay Water
Sandie Will, SWFWMD	Sandra Anderson, City of Tampa
Gary Ross, City of Lakeland	Jan McLean, City of Tampa
Gregg Jones, Entrix Water Solutions/CF Industries	Joe Robinson, NW Hillsborough Basin Board
Gene Heath, Polk County	Alba Mas, Tampa Regulation, SWFWMD
Robert Beltran, Polk County	Karen Lloyd, Legal Department, SWFWMD
Mark Hammond, SWFWMD	David Tarbox, HSA Engineering Scientists
John Dumeyer, Schroeder Inc.	Duke Clem, Polk County
Carl Asprinio, HSA Engineers	
Jeff Greenwell, FDEP	Notes – Carol Lynch, SWFWMD

The meeting convened at 9:00 a.m.

1. Welcome/Introduction

Bruce Wirth welcomed the group; those present introduced themselves. The purpose of this meeting is to finalize Work Order 1 and distribute a copy of Work Order 2, which addresses the indirect aspect and concerns from Polk County.

2. Status of Request for Qualifications (RFQ)

Mark Barcelo introduced Sandie Will, who will be the District's project manager for the resultant contract. There were 10 respondents to the RFQ; the top-ranked team was MWH Americas, Inc. Their team includes: June Mirecki (noted geochemist), ASR US (Mark McNeal, regulatory work), Liquid Solutions (expertise in indirect recharge), John Schearer (coordination with FDEP), and others. There will be a meeting this afternoon with the firm to go over the Scope of Work and contract language. It is anticipated to have a signed contract and to have work begin on October 1, 2008.

3. Work Order 1 – Direct Recharge

- o Draft Scope of Work
- o Timeline

Mark Barcelo distributed copies of the Work Order (WO) 1 Scope of Work (SOW) dated August 13, 2008. This version incorporated all comments received; no comments have been received since this version was emailed to the group. Most comments received were questions, rather than comments. This effort will answer the question "can this be done".

To ensure those questions had been answered, District staff reviewed a graphic (WO 1 Attachment 2) the injection zones that will be considered for this project. These zones may change after working with the consultants. The main regional constraint to groundwater withdrawals in this area is the minimum aquifer level over the Most Impacted Area (MIA). The question is how to increase water levels, and, if there is an increase to water levels over the MIA, how much additional groundwater supply can occur. To that end, staff identified four injection zones: the coastal area, the central portion, and the eastern edge of the MIA; and the Hillsborough/Polk County line.

District staff was asked to define "benefit" as used in the Scope of Work. Benefit would be defined for this effort as how to increase groundwater levels in a sustainable way over the MIA. Once a benefit has been created, the next question would be how much groundwater development can be achieved in that area and still maintain at least 10 percent of that benefit for the resource. This relates to the net benefit concept that was discussed as part of the Southern Water Use Caution Area (SWUCA) Recovery Strategy.

It was expressed that water supply development is the concern of those utilities represented in this group versus the District's concern for water resource development and protection. Discussion ensued regarding WO 1, Page 1, Item No. 3, language regarding "cost-benefit analyses of various recharge/ withdrawal scenarios", versus the language provided on Page 7 in Section 4.0 Economic Analyses, which references only the injection (recharge) system. The group agreed if WO 1 was addressing only the first step, injection of reclaimed water, then the language in WO 1 should not reference a full cost-benefit analysis. Staff will address the language to clarify those sections. Factors that would be considered for a full cost-benefit analysis include: Will this be a water supply development study or a resource development study? Would water be injected and withdrawn from the same wells? Where would water be injected versus where water would be withdrawn? What additional treatment of the reclaimed water would be required? Are you modeling regionally or modeling locally? There are regional, as well as localized, benefits that need to be understood. Is there existing infrastructure? The Steering Committee consultant members would be able to help with that kind of cost-benefit analysis.

Mark Barcelo summarized the comments: Can we use reclaimed water to increase water levels over the MIA in a sustainable fashion and create a net benefit (recharge)? If a net benefit can be created, how much of that net benefit would be available for potential additional groundwater supply (withdrawal)? Once those questions are answered, then more specific locations could be ascertained. During this afternoon's meeting with the consultants, staff will discuss how the consultants might interact with the Steering Committee through this process. It is anticipated that about mid-November, a Technical Memorandum from the consultant to address water quality would be available, and a meeting could be held to present the results of that water quality evaluation and bring in preliminary, regional-type modeling scenarios, and then decide if the consultants need to look at some more specific things. Mark Hammond added that stakeholders would have enough information to decide if this was a viable direction in which to go.

Joseph Robinson, Vice Chair of the Northwest Hillsborough Basin Board, expressed concern that if this study did not provide for modeling of injection and withdrawal, a further study would be necessary, and indicated he would like to see the study include consideration of withdrawal costs. Mr. Robinson expressed concern that we may not be able to get all those answers in this 6-month project, and asked how existing and future projects could be tied into this study. Mark Barcelo responded that the first question that needs to be answered is: is it technically and financially feasible to recharge the Upper Floridan aquifer with reclaimed water? If water is injected in different locations within the project area, which area is most optimal and provides the most benefit? Water quality will also be a major question. Then, depending on where the optimal benefit is, where is the opportunity to withdraw? Once those locations are determined, there will be an opportunity to look at more specific questions. It is anticipated that by mid-November, the Steering Committee should be able to look at more injection and withdrawal questions that may be of more interest to the community – regional and then very specific water supplier questions.

Bruce Wirth indicated that, if everything (quality, cost, availability of water) looks to be a "go", then the District can begin to partner with others for more specific projects. Further discussion ensued on infrastructure and costs. Comment was that the current SOW leads one to believe the withdrawal cost is in there as well, and at the 20-year projection. Bruce requested staff to look at the SOW to see if there is a point at which an optimal resource scenario could be connected to optimal withdrawal needs and have the consultants, within given parameters, look at that, and bring that information back to this group to assess. Comment was to just make sure Page 1, Item 3, and Section 4 does

not use the term "cost-benefit study". Staff responded they would clarify language for Page 1, Item 3, and Section 4.

Concern was expressed if the injection could increase water levels in a sustainable way in the SWUCA, it might not provide opportunities for withdrawals in some locations due to different limiting factors (i.e., impacts at the surface). Staff indicated that WO 2 would consider the localized, Lakeland-type scenarios.

Mr. Robinson asked if the water quality issues would take into consideration the arsenic and pharmaceutical issues regarding reclaimed water. Bruce Wirth indicated that FDEP and EPA rules would have to be met and would address these issues. Jeff Greenwell stated that these would be covered under a narrative standard in the Department's rules. Bruce Wirth indicated that another piece will be public acceptance; this project is primarily a scientific start.

The question was asked if it was assumed that the withdrawal would be of the reclaimed water for potable purposes. Staff responded no, that this would not be assumed. It was then asked if this particular question was part of what needs to be decided regarding regulatory issues and letting people know that they are in a particular area and may have trouble getting a permit. Mark Barcelo responded that it is the sustainable idea – where can the injection occur to get an increase in water level. If the water level is to be raised one foot, where would the injection site be? Is it a sustained increase? If a one foot rise in water level is sustained, it may be possible to allow 9/10th of a foot to be taken.

The question was asked why not give consideration to the water balance issue and possible credits that could result from an injection project. Bruce Wirth responded that the rule allows for a net benefit. However, this will not be addressed in this report. WO 2 will address concerns raised by Polk County and others. A brief discussion ensued regarding questions on injection zones chosen for the study. Staff responded that step one is how do we optimize the benefit to the environment. Step two is how optimization might be adjusted to balance the benefit between the environment and the suppliers.

Other questions asked were: Are we choosing the right regional questions, the right site-specific examples, and the right model? Staff responded that the minimum aquifer level over the Most Impact Area (MIA) represents a very major regional constraint to groundwater development in that area, and it has to be looked at more regionally. Moving away from the MIA, and if the withdrawal is not projected to impact the MIA, it is a more localized effect. We need to look at different scenarios and determine which are the most optimal. The first step is to look at different scenarios and figure out which one is the most optimal. Another question raised was could a range of credits be available? Staff responded that the only way to determine credits is to do these scenarios.

The question was asked if the consultant would be using the District-Wide Regulation Model (DWRM) or some other model. Staff responded that it will likely be the southern District model.

Bruce Wirth cautioned consultants present regarding a point of protocol. Steering Committee members are representatives of stakeholders and any consultant that is representing a stakeholder. Others are welcome to observe the meeting, and are welcome to remain after the meeting to meet with staff and get answers to any questions they may have.

Mark Barcelo summarized the timeline for Work Order 1:

- There will be a meeting with the top-ranked firm this afternoon to discuss how to frame the regional issue, get input on the scenarios, and how to move forward and interact with the Steering Committee.
- Another meeting with the Steering Committee regarding preliminary information should occur in the mid-November or early December timeframe.

- If anyone has any further comments on WO 1, they must be received by Carol Lynch or Mark Barcelo by this Friday (September 12, 2008).

4. Work Order 2 – Indirect Recharge

- Purpose
- General Approach

A copy of the draft Work Order 2 was distributed. This Work Order was designed to address the issues raised by representatives of Lakeland and Polk County. A brief discussion on WO 2 ensued. Mark Barcelo requested comments be sent to himself or Carol Lynch within one week (9/17/08). The group requested Mark Barcelo send out an electronic copy of the Work Order with a reminder of the deadline for comments.

Gene Heath thanked the District for putting this Work Order together to address indirect recharge issues because that completes the whole package. Once all these issues are addressed, then it can be determined what has merit; it's a good step.

A brief discussion ensued regarding geography and rapid infiltration basins, and the area that would be covered under Work Order 2. Tampa Bay Water had conceptual information they could provide; Bruce Wirth requested the group send him their ideas.

Mark Barcelo summarized the WO 1 and WO 2 timelines:

- Comments for WO 1 are due no later than Friday (09/12/08).
- Comments on WO 2 are due in one week, Friday 9/19/08.
- Based on comments today and the meeting with the consultants this afternoon, a revised WO 1 Scope of Work will be sent out.
- A contract will be in place by October 1, and work will begin on WO 1.
- Preliminary information should be available for a meeting in the late November/early December timeframe.

5. Other Items/Open Discussion

A brief discussion ensued between Mr. Robinson and Mr. Wirth regarding CCNA requirements and Section 278.55, Florida Statutes. Mr. Robinson then requested that staff confirm the consultant's commitment to the District's diversity guidelines. Mr. Wirth responded that, although not part of the Procurement process, these guidelines are standard language in the resultant agreements.

Mr. Robinson complimented District staff on their efforts with this initiative and members of the group for their participation and working together with District staff on this initiative.

Mark Barcelo requested input from the group on the idea of public awareness. Mark then asked if this group had any suggestions on how to approach decision-makers and how to get information to them before the preliminary study information becomes available. Discussion ensued on terminology that would best describe the study. Comment was that the term indirect reuse might be a more accurate description.

Jeff Greenwell, FDEP representative, stated that this would be direct recharge under the DEP's rule and briefly discussed direct and indirect recharge scenarios. Mr. Greenwell commented that there are different rules, depending on what terminology (project description) is used, which would result in very large differences in project costs. Mr. Greenwell indicated that if he was not available to sit in on this afternoon's meeting with the consultant, another FDEP representative would be available to discuss those nuances. Discussion ensued regarding differences in testing done in Orange County (FL), Miami-Dade County (Florida), and California.

Mr. Robinson asked if there was an educational component of this study; Mr. Wirth indicated that there currently was not. Discussion ensued on how best to handle public education for this type of study and resultant project(s). Mr. Wirth responded that the educational component would be something that the Steering Committee would need to discuss in addition to the study findings; this would be a major need that would have to be addressed very soon.

Mark Barcelo thanked the group for attending the meeting and summarized the actions items.

Action Items:

- Work Order 1 – Comments due by Friday, 09/12/2008; staff to send copy of final WO 1
- Work Order 2 – Staff to send electronic copy; comments due by 09/19/2008
- The final version of Work Order 1 will be sent to the Steering Committee.
- The contract start date and for work to begin is anticipated to be October 1.
- There likely will be another Steering Committee meeting in the mid-November/early December timeframe to review preliminary information from WO 1.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:50 a.m.