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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Dale Jenkins, Suwannee River Water Management District along with Al Canepa, St. Johns River Water Management District, welcomed all of the SAC members as well as the public to the Committee’s 19th meeting and introduced the FCRC Consensus Center facilitation team of Jeff Blair and Bob Jones. The facilitators reviewed with the Committee the proposed meeting objectives and agenda. Al Canepa announced that Mary Lou Hildreth has stepped down from her role on the SAC in light of the recent election results and SJRWMD will be appointing a local government representative to replace her. The Committee reviewed and unanimously adopted the proposed Committee agenda as well as the Committee’s February 24, 2014 meeting summary that was sent to members in advance of the meeting.

The facilitator reviewed with the SAC the changes to the Workplan consisting of changes in dates for presentation based on updated schedule information on products from the North Florida Regional Water Supply Partnership. Following the review, the Board moved to unanimously adopt the SAC Workplan as revised. Following the review, the Board moved to unanimously adopt the SAC Workplan as revised and the 2014 Meeting Schedule.

The facilitator noted that when the SAC discusses possible requests for presentations, it does so in light of its charter, the feasibility, time and resources required to develop requested presentation. Mr. Canepa noted that the SRWMD and SJRWMD staff want to be fully supportive of the SAC, but there are limits on staff time. The SAC discussion that followed touched on the following issues: Increasing Water Supply; and Scorecard to Map RWSP Progress.

Jennifer Gihring with the SJRWMD provided a presentation on the water supply plan assessment on behalf of both Districts, noting that Dale Jenkins worked closely with her in preparing this for the SAC. She noted that in February 2014 the SAC received a presentation from Tammy Bader, SJRWMD, on the Water Demand Projection Methods being used for developing the NFRWSP Water Supply Plan. She noted that are three parts for the water supply plan assessment: water supply demand; water resources; what would happen if fresh groundwater were used to meet projected demands and what projects would be needed to avoid exceeding water resource constraints.

The water resource assessment quantifies the volume of fresh groundwater available for water supply, constrained by the potential for unacceptable water resource impacts. It informs magnitude of alternative water supply projects and management actions needed to meet future demands and avoid unacceptable impacts. The components of water resource assessment include: Minimum flows and levels (adopted and proposed) for lakes, springs and flowing systems which represent the
“lion’s share” of quantity; water bodies without MFLs; wetland vegetation; groundwater quality; and water reservation. The deliverables for the RWSP Water Resource Assessment includes: a Wetland Potential Harm Map; a Groundwater Quality Areas of Concern Map; and a list of non-MFL springs with potential significant decrease in flow. The assessment is used to calculate the estimated volume of water available from traditional sources for comparison against demands.

Ms. Gihring outlined the assessment inputs as: wetland vegetation maps; soil maps; groundwater level/level under baseline and projected water use demands throughout model domain (Upper Floridan & surficial aquifers), output from groundwater model (intend to use NFSEG); and surface water models calibrated to the baseline year. She noted several assumptions guiding their work and covered technical unknowns, water quality, springs and other water bodies without MFLs, and water reservations.

The SAC members posed questions and offered comments on the following topics: water number totals; treatment of water bodies without MFLs; assumptions about future water supply; the yardstick for available water; GIS and satellite measurements; accounting for water and different water users; accounting for types of surfaces and soils; QA/QC; evapotranspiration and water use projections for 2035; parcel analysis; evaluating the drying up of wetlands; and the array of piezometers and periodic monitoring.

Al Canepa SJRWMD updated the SAC on the groundwater flow model development. He noted the SAC have received previous presentations: October 2012 – introductory brief; April 2013 – calibration methodology; May 2013 – conceptual model; June 2013 – water use data set; and September 2013 – continued water use data. Mr. Canepa noted that the surface water model element work, which wasn’t in the original scope of work but will better incorporate recharge and evapotranspiration.

In terms of the groundwater model accomplishments, the model data is nearly complete including: aquifer elevations; aquifer properties; water use data; water level observations, etc. They have developed the GIS data series for technical team review. The next steps include: Finalizing groundwater model input files (Estimate completion date - March 31st); Refinement of agricultural irrigation estimates (Estimated completion date – May 1st); Update of HSPF calibration (Estimated completion date – June 15th); Initial groundwater model calibration (Estimated completion date – July 31st); Peer Review of initial HSPF and MODFLOW model calibrations (Estimated completion date October 1st); Automated calibration of MODFLOW model (Estimated completion date December 1st); and development of water supply plan model scenarios.

The SAC members posed questions and offered comments on the following topics: using this in the RWSP; small delay in schedule for the RWSP; peer review; agriculture irrigation demand data; involvement of SWFWMD in the RWSP; how was the methodology for surface water determined;

Al Canepa, SJRWMD, provided a presentation update on the Clay/Putnam MFLs rule development for Grandin, Cowpen, Brooklyn and Geneva Lakes. He noted the technical issues being addressed, including: peer review comments on Lakes Geneva and Brooklyn; stakeholder concerns on Lakes Geneva and Brooklyn; and water use data has been further refined and needs to be analyzed. In terms of addressing these concerns, much analysis required and staff resources are limited and the District is seeking specialized outside expertise.
He noted that conventional frequency analysis assumes independence of extreme events from one year to another. While this assumption is generally true, it may not entirely represent water level fluctuation in some sand hill lakes with significant aquifer connections as these systems are heavily influenced by phenomena such as the AMO (cycles 60 or more years long). The refinement of water use data might impact the projections and the District is looking for some specialized expertise on this issue. They are examining frequency analysis methods to better address long term extreme events that present fluctuations over a period of time. This might allow for consideration of linkages between events in the systems and the influence of systems on long cycles. (e.g. AMO)

The remaining milestones on this project include: Peer review comment resolution document; Revise Hydrology report; Revise MFLs report. The estimated completion date is August 2014

The SAC members posed questions and offered comments on the following topics: the AMO 60 year cycle and expected changes and cycles; impacts of actions outside the region; reevaluation of MFLs after RWSP model is running; merging oscillations with physical changes; auto correlation technique and “stationarity.”

Dale Jenkins, SRWMD noted that the Suwanee River Water Management District Governing Board accepted the Lower Santa Fe Basin recovery strategy document at their March meeting. He noted that DEP published the proposed rule for the Lower Santa Fe MFL Recovery Strategy, and the Statement of Estimated Regulatory Costs (SERC) on March 7. The public comment period will continue until March 28. The SAC members posed questions and offered comments on the following topics: the Lower Santa Fe MFL SERC findings and legislative review; and cost share funding.

The Facilitator noted that this agenda item provides an opportunity for members to offer any general comment. The SAC members posed questions and offered comments on the following topics: conservation and water savings and user group strategies; FDACS estimates of future conservation; irrigation efficiency and conservation; the interrelationship between the upper and lower Suwannee River; Motivating public utilities to look for alternative sources other than groundwater; the Partnership schedule and clear score card on progress on milestones; presentation on the potentiometric surface water issues; how land use will be treated in the RWSP;

Paul Still, Administrator, Bradford Soil and Water Conservation District and Vivian Katz, Save Our Lakes, provided public comment.

The members discussed and the facilitator summarized the suggested items for the next SAC meetings including:

- Consider skipping the April SAC meeting and convening in May. The District Staff indicated they would consider this and let members and others know of their decision in early April.
- Review the timing for briefings on Workplan issues and have a discussion of the Workplan at the May 2014 SAC meeting.

Members completed a meeting evaluation (See, Appendix #3 for a summary)

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.
MEETING SUMMARY

SAC Members in attendance: Ray Avery, James Cornett, Thomas Harper, Kerry Kates J. Michael O’Berry, Bud Para, Jason Sparks (alternate for Steve Roberts), Terry Baker, Jacqui Sulek & Patrick Welsh

SAC Members unable to attend: Gene Higginbotham, Steve Roberts

Staff: Dale Jenkins, SRWMD, Al Canepa SJRWMD

Facilitators: Jeff Blair & Bob Jones

I. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW OF WORKPLAN

A. Welcome and Agenda Review

Dale Jenkins, Suwannee River Water Management District along with Al Canepa, St. Johns River Water Management District, welcomed all of the SAC members as well as the public to the Committee’s 19th meeting and introduced the FCRC Consensus Center facilitation team of Jeff Blair and Bob Jones. Al Canepa announced that Mary Lou Hildreth has stepped down from her role on the SAC in light of the recent election results and SJRWMD will be appointing a local government representative to replace her. The facilitators reviewed with the Committee the proposed meeting objectives and agenda. The Committee reviewed and unanimously adopted the proposed Committee agenda as well as the Committee’s February 24, 2014 meeting summary that was sent to members in advance of the meeting.

B. SAC Workplan Review

The facilitator reviewed with the SAC the changes to the Workplan on page 10 (RWSP Objective-Task 3, Develop and Assimilate Population and Water Demand Projections) consisting of changes in dates for presentation based on updated schedule information on products from the North Florida Regional Water Supply Partnership. (See Appendix 10). The facilitator reviewed the proposed meeting schedule below for the balance of 2014:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROVED MEETING SCHEDULE—2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XIX.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following the review, the Board moved to unanimously adopt the SAC Workplan as revised and the 2014 Meeting Schedule.

- Review and approval of updated Workplan and Meeting Schedule; and Key Topics for SAC evaluation;
- Requests for presentations relevant to Regional Water Supply Tasks;
- Potentiometric- May or June- meeting with USGS this week (Linda Clements).

The facilitator noted that when the SAC discusses possible requests for presentations, it does so in light of its charter, the feasibility, time and resources required to develop requested presentation.

Mr. Canepa noted that the SRWMD and SJRWMD staff wants to be fully supportive of the SAC but there are limits on staff time.

**SAC Discussion and Questions**

- **Increasing Water Supply.** We’ve spent time talking about permitting and where the water is going. What are we doing to increase water supply? Would like a briefing what both Districts are doing to increase recharge into the Floridan aquifer. Enlarge the water supply and not just about permitting and working against the water supply. A: There are several projects ongoing and this is part of the Regional Water Supply planning process in terms of alternative water supply projects or alternative water development projects. We will be break into that into the Summer/Fall of 2014. We try to document water resource shortfalls and what are the solutions to get at water resource problems. The SAC would take this up later on in the process.
- Dr. Welsh indicated he didn’t like the sequence presented. We’ve spent a lot of time talking about consumption. We need to talk about water resources in terms of increasing supply. Would like to see the big picture before tackling the water supply plan items separately and waiting to the end to be rushing to put together. Show us the things on table we are working on. Potential yield even though they will be rough estimates.
- SJR could pull together information for both water supply and water resource development projects drawing from the SJR draft Water Supply Plan in the coming months.
- Dr. Welsh indicated that this was what he was looking for-- a big picture 20 minute briefing.
- For SR there won’t be lots of meat on bones at this stage with concept level projects.
- **Scorecard to Map Progress.** What about developing a scorecard (stop light) depiction of the RWSP list of all activities and their stage in the process as a status report to the SAC. This could help with the flow of things.
- We are asking for where you are on things and this is important.
- The staff can put things together without a great deal of additional work at a fairly high level, including some projects on the drawing board for future implementation.
II. NORTH FLORIDA REGIONAL WATER SUPPLY PLAN RESOURCE PROTECTION CRITERIA (RWSP Task #4)

A. Presentation

Jennifer Gihring with the SJRWMD provided a presentation on behalf of both Districts noting that Dale Jenkins worked closely with her in preparing this for the SAC. She noted in February the SAC received a presentation from Tammy Bader, SJRWMD, on the Water Demand Projection Methods being used for developing the NFRWSP Water Supply Plan. She noted that are three parts for the water supply plan assessment: water supply demand; water resources; what would happen if fresh groundwater were used to meet projected demands and what projects would be needed to avoid exceeding water resource constraints.

The water resource assessment quantifies volume of fresh groundwater available for water supply, constrained by the potential for unacceptable water resource impacts. It informs the magnitude of alternative water supply projects and management actions needed to meet future demands and avoid unacceptable impacts. The components of water resource assessment include: Minimum Flows and Levels (adopted and proposed) for lakes, springs and flowing systems which represent the “lion’s share” of quantity; water bodies without MFLs; wetland vegetation; groundwater quality; and water reservation. The deliverables for the RWSP Water Resource Assessment include a: Wetland Potential Harm Map; Groundwater Quality Areas of Concern Map; and list of non-MFL springs with potential significant decrease in flow. In sum, the assessment is used to calculate the estimated volume of water available from traditional sources for comparison against demands.

Ms. Gihring outlined the assessment inputs as: wetland vegetation maps; soil maps; groundwater level/head under baseline and projected demands throughout model domain (Upper Floridan & surficial aquifers), output from groundwater model (intend to use NFSEG); and surface water models calibrated to baseline year. She noted this is a work in progress and “not a polished apple” yet. She reviewed the following basic water resource assessment assumptions:

- Water bodies with negative freeboard in 2035 = water bodies that present a water resource constraint
- For water bodies with negative freeboard in 2035, determine if water body is in prevention/recovery status
- 2035 freeboard feeds the assessment of groundwater availability
- For simulation purposes, staff assumed that projected 2035 demands would be met with source water options similar to current uses (i.e. primarily fresh groundwater)
- Uses a steady-state model (in order to complete plan by 2015)
- Water resources vary in their susceptibility to aquifer drawdown
- Methodology does not discriminate between different use types when defining constraints

She noted that the assessment will include MFLs within the model domain, many of which are outside the planning area and that the water body list remains to be determined. The technical unknowns that will need resolution through the MFL assessment are:
• Confirmation of MFLs to use in assessment including incorporation of MFLs in the model domain but outside the planning area (e.g. Silver Springs), extent of water bodies connectivity to the aquifer
• The final method for calculating “freeboard” associated with LSF & priority springs
• Integration of MFLs expressed in different ways
• Incorporation of different water use types and spatial considerations; and
• Bring together MFLs that differ in their expression

In terms of water quality, she noted the use of existing wells and related water quality data to identify areas where groundwater quality may impact use of the surficial/Floridan aquifer (e.g. chloride concentration trends). In terms of wetland impacts, the likelihood of vegetative harm throughout the planning area will be looked at and areas at moderate to high risk of vegetative harm under future water use conditions will be identified. The Districts team will analyze through a GIS based categorization matrix analysis the land cover data, soils data and projected 2035 groundwater levels. In terms of water bodies with MFLs, water resource constraints using period-of-record spring flow data & spring flow estimated from groundwater model simulations (2010 & 2035) & other sources will be identified.

In terms of springs without MFLs they will assess data availability and identify non-MFLs springs to use in assessment. They plan to use the groundwater model to calculate spring flow under baseline and 2035 conditions and use a statistical comparison to identify springs which are projected to have a decrease in flow that exceeds threshold value (TBD). Springs without MFLs are not a constraint for regional water supply availability. They are acknowledged but not brought into groundwater availability assessment.

Water reservations apply only to the SJRWMD and include Prairie Creek and Camps Canal (adopted by SJRWMD in 1994; 40C-2.302, F.A.C). The reservation establishes minimum diversion to Prairie Creek and Camps Canal Paynes Prairie (avg. 23 mgd; ~45% of historic flow) with remainder flowing into Orange Lake. This reservation constrains local surface water permitting, but does not represent regional constraint for RWSP.
B. SAC Questions and Comments

- What are the water number totals over planning period? A: Calculating the base year out to the planning period end date 2035.
- How are water bodies without MFLs handled? A: The analysis uses a 10% decrease from 1995-2030. In last SRWMD WSP they used a 5% decrease. The base year of 2010 is used to consider what the % should be.
- Is the assumption that we are using more water than we have in the past? A: Likely to be. SJR’s draft Water Supply Plan identified the need throughout SJR district which represents a greater demand than what is available for fresh water groundwater.
- Are the 2 Districts working together on this lockstep? A: Absolutely. To extent possible we are using the same methodologies. Even if use different methods, we are working together to address this.
• What is the yardstick of available water? A: water resource constraints is the floor that becomes “sustainable yield” in perpetuity. MFLs will be reevaluated.

• Subtle problem is that in some GIS data sets, a parameter is inferred from satellite measurements. Who is double checking the data. A: Wetland and soils assessment - comes from vegetative data and satellite data. There is a team checking the data. They plan on using a 2011 land cover land data set because it will be ready to go.

• Is there an issue of connecting where water is vs. counting from different sources, i.e. people, plants, animals, surface, ground. Needs or availability side of equation. Couldn’t find water in plants (back to land use). Who is checking these changes. Trends regarding Agriculture and raising animals is business going down 18%. Cow 1100 pounds. Who is accounting for that piece? Who is looking at where all water is to check if we have missed anything? E.g. Vegetation. Pines vs. acre of grass water supply. A: In terms of vegetation the model will have a robust surface water runoff component as part of the model scenarios. In terms of projections from a water use perspective the will bring in DACS/USDA information in the Summer 2014. Also will be projecting changes in Agricultural uses, e.g. going from cows to sod, etc.

• What about acres of concrete vs. permeable soil? A: Will go into the model.

• Note also the Quality Assurance/Quality Control will be used to insure a safe and sustainable yield. In SJR Water Supply Plan, that is where the QA/QC process to get at assumptions and other issues to answer, “Does this make sense?”

• In Florida evapotranspiration is a tough parameter to work with. How will the Districts scientifically verify the model in terms of this issue? There is a danger of getting into a closed loop. This is important to verify given water use projections to 2035 and funds to be invested in major projects. A: We calibrate the basin model and it matches our observations in the basin. You have to conclude you have a close approximation of ET in the basin. We will raise this question with our modelers and report back to the SAC their response.

• Is there satellite verification of models? A: There is verification of the inputs. Land use/land cover information. Lots of analysis goes into verification. We can talk with the modelers on this question was well and report back.

• Are you looking at more than wetlands? A: Yes, we look at every parcel and determine within the parcel the relative amounts of concrete, pavement, trees, grass, corn, etc. The modelers (GIS staff at SJR and contractor) utilize a lot of land use categories. They? GIS staff at SJR work with contractor.

• What about drying up of wetlands? Is this evaluated by groundwater model along with drawdown of surficial aquifer? A: We use satellite imagery and convert it into a grid. We review categories each grid cell to see if the grid is sensitive to draw down or not. Leads to parameter out of groundwater model. E.g. wetland next to well or in a forest. Not a risk of harm for future drawdowns. Looking at the regional scale.

• Is the Mallory swamp/Suwannee River in the model? A: The wetlands assessment covers that. District Staff and consultants from both Districts are putting this analysis together.

• Is the array of piezometers that measure the piezometric head of groundwater at a specific point read periodically? A: Will go back and look at that and report back. There is a monitor well network. Wells in surficial, intermediate, upper and lower. Many are chosen as calibration points for the model and the observed changes analyzed.
III. RWSP REGIONAL GROUNDWATER FLOW MODEL DEVELOPMENT STATUS UPDATE (RWSP Task #6)

A. Presentation

Al Canepa SJRWMD, reported on the update on the groundwater flow model development. He noted the SAC have received previous presentations:

- October 2012 – Introductory brief
- April 2013 – Calibration methodology
- May 2013 – Conceptual model
- June 2013 – Water use data set
- Sept 2013 – Continued water use data

Mr. Canepa noted that the Surface Water Model Element work, which wasn’t in the original scope of work but will better incorporate recharge and evapotranspiration, had advanced and included the following accomplishments:

- Created 54 HSPF surface water models for each basin in the domain that provide to the groundwater model: recharge; base flow; evapotranspiration estimates; and initial calibration of the HSPF models; and
- Estimated initial agricultural and landscape irrigation volumes for inclusion in HSPF models

He noted they are calibrating observation points using USGS and spring data points. The dots represent calibration points. The model construction is complete with a GIS data base that is available. We will put in the pumping stressors and see which affect potentiometric surface and other layers. Our technical team will be supplemented by peer review of the calibration of the HSPF and MODFLOW models by the end of October 2014. He noted there has been some delay
in getting this model done and that they are not on schedule in terms of the original plan but they are on track to get this done and use it in the RWSP. The Districts are trying to expedite other parts of their work and provide a more robust approach to other elements.

In terms of the ground water model element accomplishments, the model data is near complete including: aquifer elevation; aquifer properties; water use data; water level observations, etc. They have developed the GIS data series for technical team review. The next steps include:

1. Finalizing groundwater model input files (Estimated completion date - March 31st)
2. Refinement of agricultural irrigation estimates (Estimated completion date – May 1st)
3. Update of HSPF calibration (Estimated completion date – June 15th)
4. Initial groundwater model calibration (Estimated completion date – July 31st)
5. Peer Review of initial HSPF and MODFLOW model calibrations (Estimated completion date October 1st)
6. Automated calibration of MODFLOW model (Estimated completion date December 1st)
7. Development of water supply plan model scenarios

---

**B. SAC Member Questions & Comments**

- Will this be done in time to be used in the RWSP? A: Agree we should do this done and view that it may be necessary to slide RWSP completion date to incorporate this.
- Are we talking about a year’s delay? A: We are not talking about a big delay. Things will generally keep on schedule.
- Who will be doing the peer review? A: We haven’t determined this yet. Possibly the USGS or some independent contractor.
• You are looking at having agriculture irrigation demand data by May 2014. What if you get later agriculture alternative measures? A: As long as the data is delivered in a standard format we can incorporate it into the model. FDACS has the lead in assuring best estimates and the Districts won’t second guess FDACS estimates.

• The boundaries of model include a large portion of SWFWMD. How involved have they been? A: SWFWMD staff are providing input on Technical Team. They were involved in the chartering of Partnership.

• Is this model more robust? A: The model includes population distribution methodology. Tammy Bader, SJRWMD, noted that when you get the data into a spatial model we will have a model to get to the parcel level. The percentage approach gets you close but is less robust. With the change in schedule, we have chance to catch up and use the data in the spatial model.

• In terms of the methodology for surface water, how was this decision made? A: The short answer is that at the end of day this is model for two districts as owners of the model. The longer answer is the Steering team is providing input to Technical team. The Technical team comes with a suggestion and the Steering Committee doesn’t second-guess the technical committee. We haven’t heard suggestions that blow the RWSP schedule.

IV. SAC REQUESTED BRIEFINGS AND UPDATES

A. Update Presentation on Clay/Putnam MFLs rule development

Al Canepa, SJRWMD, provided a presentation update on the Clay/Putnam MFLs rule development for Grandin, Cowpen, Brooklyn and Geneva Lakes. He noted the technical issues being addressed including: Peer review comments on Lakes Geneva and Brooklyn; Stakeholder concerns on Lakes Geneva and Brooklyn; and water use data has been further refined and needs to be analyzed. In terms of addressing these concerns, much analysis is required and staff resources are limited and the District is seeking specialized outside expertise.

• Refinement of water use data might impact projections. Working on those now. Looking for some specialized expertise.

• Another methodology for lakes with extreme fluctuations over a period of time. Linkages between events in the systems. Influence of systems on long cycles. (e.g. AMO)

• Exploring other ways of look at this. Frequency analysis methods.
He noted that conventional frequency analysis assumes independence of extreme events from one year to another. While this assumption is generally true, it may not entirely represent water level fluctuation in some sand hill lakes with significant aquifer connections as these systems are heavily influenced by phenomena such as the AMO (cycles 60 or more years long). The refinement of water use data might impact the projections and the District is looking for some specialized expertise on this issue. They are examining frequency analysis methods to better address long-term extreme events that present fluctuations over a period of time. This might allow for consideration of linkages between events in the systems and the influence of systems on long cycles. (e.g. AMO)

The remaining milestones on this project include:

1. Peer review comment resolution document
2. Revise Hydrology report
3. Revise MFLs report
4. Estimated completion date - August 2014

SAC Member Comments and Questions

- Are the Technical Team meetings open to the public? A: Yes and they are noticed on the Partnership website.
- If we are looking at AMO 60 year cycle it has been broken due to the last 60 years of development, construction and man made changes including major flow changes and berming to the chain of lakes. We know that the next 60 years won't look like the last 60. We also know more about recurring cycles of El Nino and La Nina (6-7 year cycles). Should shorter cycles be considered? A: You may be correct and statistical experts will look at this issue before launch.
- Are we looking at the interdependence of things outside the region that may be affecting the MFLs in region? A: No pure statistical analysis will provide answers to extra jurisdictional actions. But will be looking at land use changes to try and capture these.
• Based on our Lower Santa Fe River discussions, once we get model up and running we anticipate we will find interrelationships will cause us to reevaluate existing MFLs and related corrective actions. A: Yes once model is ready, we will evaluate.

• Why can’t oscillations be merged with other physical changes? A: Our hope is that they can be merged. We will compare what changes on ground correlate with statistics in terms of this surface water basin.

• Challenge the basic assumption that you can use the auto correlation technique. Clear non-“stationarity” in the time series within the time frame may suggest you shouldn’t use this method. A: We will ask whether we have a long enough period of record and a stationarity in the early phase.

B. Update on SRWMD Governing Board Action on Lower Santa Fe River MFL

Dale Jenkins, SRWMD noted that the Suwanee River Water Management District Governing Board accepted the Lower Santa Fe Basin recovery strategy document at their March meeting. He noted that DEP published the proposed rule for the Lower Santa Fe MFL and the Statement of Estimated Regulatory Costs (SERC) impacts on March 7. The public comment period will continue until March 28.

SAC Member Comments
• Did the SERC trip the impact level needing legislative review? Yes. The regulatory costs were estimated at over $1 million over 5 years (over $200,000 annually).
• Has legislature been asked to waive the approval? Don't have ability now but there is a bill that has been filed.
• Is this ready for legislative ratification? A: The Rule Adoption Hearings will take place on April 3, 2014 in Live Oak.
• The District determined some potential direct or indirect costs. It didn’t look deeply into cost share and making funds available.

V. SAC MEMBER COMMENTS AND ISSUES

The Facilitator noted that this agenda item provides an opportunity for members to offer any general comment. The following member comments were offered:

• We haven’t been talking of conservation and potential for water savings in recent meetings. Any updates on that? A: SRWMD has a conservation person who was just appointed and the SAC will return to the Conservation element of the RWSP in the Fall of 2014.
• The Districts plan to use basic tool that SJRWMD is using in its draft SJR plan. Staff will send a copy of the draft SJRWMD water supply plan to SAC members.
• In terms of FDACS’s reasonable estimates of future conservation it is possible it may be different in the future.
• Irrigation efficiency and conservation— from a business standpoint, this increases of efficiency but may not produce an equal amount of reduction in use. Typically assumed 5% reduction. 5% increase in efficiency.

• We need a presentation on the interrelationship between upper and lower Suwannee River. A: We will provide a briefing in the future on that.

• How can we motivate public utilities to look for alternative sources other than groundwater?

• Update on Partnership schedule and clear score card on milestones progress.

• A presentation on the potentiometric surface water issues will be organized for June.

• Do we need an April meeting? A: Probably not. Will check and let SAC know soon.

• There is an open issue on land use. Addressed somewhat today with the model presentation. 2nd element to it. Model is projecting land uses to feed into the analysis. Beyond that, there needs to be discussion on where land use is going as influenced by the various user groups and the amount of water stored in various places. We need to address strategies for land use. A: We do have land use projections by user category.

• Our end product will be recommendations made on regional goals and water levels and will end up driving land use decisions at local level.

• We should look at encouraging water conservation strategies by user group.

• We should look at how land use change could serve as a water resource development concept while we are respectful of role local governments in land use.

• In terms of the water supply component, user groups need to take a higher view in determining how to contribute to the solution.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

Paul Still, Administrator, Bradford Soil and Water Conservation District and Vivian Katz, Save Our Lakes, provided public comment. A summary of their comments as well as comments submitted by email to the SAC are included in Appendix #4.

VII. NEXT STEPS

The members discussed and the facilitator summarized the suggested items for the next SAC meetings including:

• Consider skipping the April SAC meeting and convening in May. The District Staff indicated they would consider this and let members and others know of their decision in early April.

• Review the timing for briefings on Workplan issues and have a discussion of the Workplan at the May 2014 SAC meeting.

Members completed a meeting evaluation (See, Appendix #3 for a summary)

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.
### COMMITTEE MEETING OBJECTIVES

- To Approve Procedural Topics (Agenda, Report, SAC Workplan and Meeting Schedule, and Matrix of SAC Information Briefings)
- To Receive Briefings/Updates on RWSP Tasks: Resource Protection Criteria in RWSP; Groundwater Flow Model Development
- To Review Briefings/Updates on SAC Requested Issues: Clay-Putnam MFLs Status; and Lower Santa Fe River Basin MFLs Update
- To Provide Opportunity for Member Issues, Comments and Discussion
- To Identify Needed Next Steps, Assignments, and Work Plan Agenda Items for Next Meeting

### MEETING AGENDA—MONDAY, MARCH 17, 2014

**All Agenda Times—Including Public Comment & Adjournment—Are Approximate & Subject to Change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:00 PM</td>
<td>WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS • Member roll call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:05 PM</td>
<td>REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA (March 17, 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10 PM</td>
<td>APPROVAL OF FACILITATOR’S MEETING SUMMARY REPORT (Feb. 24, 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 PM</td>
<td>REVIEW &amp; APPROVAL OF UPDATED COMMITTEE WORKPLAN AND MEETING SCHEDULE; AND REVIEW LIST OF SAC INFORMATION AND BRIEFINGS • Review and approval of updated Workplan and Meeting Schedule; and Key Topics for SAC evaluation • Requests for presentations relevant to Regional Water Supply Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45 PM</td>
<td>RESOURCE PROTECTION CRITERIA USED FOR RWSP BRIEFING (RWSP TASK #4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~2:30 PM</td>
<td>BREAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 PM</td>
<td>C. NFSEG REGIONAL GROUNDWATER FLOW MODEL DEVELOPMENT STATUS UPDATE (RWSP TASK #6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td>SAC REQUESTED BRIEFINGS AND UPDATES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td>D. Update on Clay/Putnam MFLs rule development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45 PM</td>
<td>E. Update on SRWMD Governing Board action on Lower Santa Fe River MFL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td>MEMBERS’ COMMENTS AND ISSUES • Opportunity for members to offer any general comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 PM</td>
<td>NEXT STEPS AND AGENDA ITEMS FOR THE NEXT MEETING (April 21, 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 PM</td>
<td>• Review Work Plan action items and assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify agenda items any needed information for next meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45 PM</td>
<td>PUBLIC COMMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 PM</td>
<td>ADJOURN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix #2—Committee Members, Staff and Facilitation Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Membership</th>
<th>REPRESENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Water Supplier</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray O. Avery</td>
<td>Clay County Utility Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Roberts <em>(Jason Sparks, Alternate)</em></td>
<td>Lake City Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial/Power Generation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bud Para</td>
<td>JEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Cornett</td>
<td>Cornett’s Spirit of the Suwannee Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industrial/Minning</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Michael O’Berry</td>
<td>Vulcan Materials Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Baker</td>
<td>PCS Phosphate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agriculture</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry Kates</td>
<td>Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Harper</td>
<td>Harper Farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Patrick T. Welsh</td>
<td>University of North Florida and Save Our Lakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqui Sulek</td>
<td>Audubon Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Government</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Higginbotham</td>
<td>Commissioner, Dixie County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Management Districts Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Fitzgerald</td>
<td>St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Canepa</td>
<td>St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Herd</td>
<td>Suwannee River Water Management District (SRWMD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Jenkins</td>
<td>Suwannee River Water Management District (SRWMD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Agencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Department of Environmental Protections (DEP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FDACS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other State Agencies as Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitation Team</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Jones &amp; Jeff Blair</td>
<td>FCRC Consensus Center, FSU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE: Members used a 0 to 10 Rating Scale Where a 0 Meant Totally Disagree and a 10 Meant Totally Agree.

1. Please assess the overall meeting.
   - 8.0 The background information was very useful.
   - 7.4 The agenda packet was very useful.
   - 9.4 The objectives for the meeting were stated at the outset.
   - 8.9 Overall, the objectives of the meeting were fully achieved.

2. Do you agree that each of the following meeting objectives was achieved?
   - 9.1 Updated SAC Workplan review and approval.
   - 8.3 Resource Protection Criteria in RWSP presentation.
   - 8.7 Groundwater Flow Model development update.
   - 7.5 Clay-Putnam MFLs and P&R Strategies status update.
   - 7.6 Lower Santa Fe River Basin MFLs status update.
   - 8.3 Member comments and issues.
   - 7.9 Review of next steps and agenda items for next meeting.
   - 8.4 Public Comment.

3. Please tell us how well the Facilitator helped the participants engage in the meeting.
   - 9.6 The members followed the direction of the Facilitator.
   - 9.4 The Facilitator made sure the concerns of all members were heard.
   - 9.1 The Facilitator helped us arrange our time well.
   - 8.9 Participant input was documented accurately in Facilitator’s Summary Report (last meeting).

4. Please tell us your level of satisfaction with the meeting?
   - 7.7 Overall, I am very satisfied with the meeting.
   - 8.4 I was very satisfied with the services provided by the Facilitator.
   - 7.6 I am satisfied with the outcome of the meeting.

5. Please tell us how well the next steps were communicated?
   - 7.1 I know what the next steps following this meeting will be.
   - 7.9 I know who is responsible for the next steps.

6. What did you like best about the meeting?
   - Updates.
• The update presentations.
• The general discussions about next steps.
• Water supply tasks briefing. Very well done, but not what was scheduled.
• Great venue thanks to the college.
• Discussion. Methodology presentation.

7. **How could the meeting have been improved?**

• Facilitator and meeting heads pay constant attention to SAC member comments.
• Two briefings today were a waste of the committee's time.
• We need Carlos Herd and Dr. Shortell.
• We ended early.

8. **Do you have any other comments?**

• Please provide PowerPoint presentations.
• [I know what the next steps following this meeting will be.] An April meeting. May not be April meeting.
• Resource Protection Criteria in RWSP presentation.] Not what was presented.
• [Clay-Putnam MFLs and P&R Strategies status update.] Not what was presented.
  If there are several more non-productive days like this, I will resign. It takes 6 hours of my time to be here. (Unpaid)
  [Public Comment] Need more participation.
• Complete agenda packet received after arriving at the meeting. No Partnership schedule update.
• [The Facilitator made sure the concerns of all members were heard.] But not always paying attention or engaged with others.
• Jennifer Gerhing and Dale Jenkins offered nice input/presentations.
• Low energy day. Must be the aquifer recharge!
# Appendix # 4—Public Sign-in Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>E-mail &amp; Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Addae-Mensah</td>
<td>DEO</td>
<td>josephaddae@deogov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Will</td>
<td>BSU (US)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pat.will@bsu.edu">pat.will@bsu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Apple</td>
<td>Corps of Engineers - Jacksonville</td>
<td><a href="mailto:david.a.apple@usace.gov">david.a.apple@usace.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Apple</td>
<td>Corps of Engineers - Jacksonville</td>
<td><a href="mailto:david.a.apple@usace.gov">david.a.apple@usace.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Bopp</td>
<td>NCFPRC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Ted.Bopp@ncfprc.org">Ted.Bopp@ncfprc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cori Hamlet</td>
<td>FDACS GADEP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Cori.hamlet@fda.gov">Cori.hamlet@fda.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudy Fernandez</td>
<td>Thomas Pimentellof</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rudyf.fernandez@phx.gov">rudyf.fernandez@phx.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Joseph Addae-Mensah | DEO | josephaddae@deogov |
2. Pat Will | BSU (US) | pat.will@bsu.edu |
3. David Apple | Corps of Engineers - Jacksonville | david.a.apple@usace.gov |
4. David Apple | Corps of Engineers - Jacksonville | david.a.apple@usace.gov |
5. Ted Bopp | NCFPRC | Ted.Bopp@ncfprc.org |
6. Cori Hamlet | FDACS GADEP | Cori.hamlet@fda.gov |
7. Rudy Fernandez | Thomas Pimentellof | rudyf.fernandez@phx.gov |
APPENDIX #5—PUBLIC INPUT- COMMENT FORMS, COMMENTS AND EMAIL COMMENTS

NORTH FLORIDA REGIONAL WATER SUPPLY PARTNERSHIP
STAKEHOLDER ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING XI
MARCH 17, 2014—LAKE CITY, FLORIDA

Members of the public were encouraged to provide input and submit written comments with the understanding that all comments would be included in the Meeting Summary Report. All written comments submitted by email after the previous SAC meeting in advance of the next meeting are included in the Meeting Summary.

PUBLIC COMMENT SPEAKERS- SUMMARY

Name: Paul Still
Organization/Affiliation/Location: Administrator, Bradford Soil and Water Conservation District

Paul Still

- People confusing land use vs. use of the land. That is important because ag can choose how they use the land.
- SERC- interesting document. Tells how the rule is going to impact water users. Less than 60 Ag permits. No other users?
- SERC rule allows individuals to propose lower costs alternative to the rule. Will be submitting to dep.
- SERC can be challenged through Admin hearing. Method will be challenge.
- Rule development process. Asking for administrative hearing review of that as well.
- Key issue is quality of data going into the rule. Rule itself won’t do anything for 5 years.
- Read and understand what came from the process the SAC
- Other element- hearing scheduled on April 3- SRWMD 10 a.m.

Name: Vivian Katz
Organization/Affiliation/Location: Keystone Heights.

- Concern about use of land. SAC concerned about water supply and demand. Look at the list of the users.
- What about property owners who cant use property they bought it for? Because of lakes of the region.
- Not hearing the human element. Seems to be how much more water can we get. Getting WMD to move forward. Connecting a piece of string to the Titanic. SJR moving but not keeping informed.
- Look at the human factor of land we own.
- Questions on modeling. Rep 600 members. Get the right model not a schedule.
- If we get model will reevaluate.
- If you postpone- table MFLs. Assume SAC is to guide the 2 water districts.
PUBLIC COMMENT-- EMAIL COMMENTS (submitted by email between the February 24, 2013 and March 17, 2014 SAC meetings)

From: Paul Still, Administrator, Bradford Soil and Water Conservation District StillPE@aol.com
To: SAC Members
Sent: 2/28/2014

To: SAC Members
From: StillPE@aol.com > <StillPE@aol.com>
Subject To: SAC Recovery Strategy Plan Motion
Date: February 28, 2014 1:04:21 AM EST

The attached press release does not seem reflect what I thought the motion was regarding the Draft Recovery Strategy document. I thought the motion was changed to reflect Ray Avery’s concern about his need to get input from the groups he represented. A concern I think all the SAC members should have had.

The Draft Recovery Strategy Plan is dated 2/21/14 the SAC met on 2/24/14. It is hard to believe that the SAC or the groups members of the SAC represent had an opportunity to fully evaluate the Draft particularly the Section 6 changes that will become part of the MFL rule.

It looks to me as thought SRWMD staff and the facilitator are manipulating the SAC to meet SRWMD needs rather than working to have the SAC operate as open and independent effort to obtain public input into the water supply planning process.

If the SAC is to be the SRWMD’s effort to involved the public in the water supply planning, the SAC policy of not allowing public comment before SAC votes and limiting public comment to 5 minutes after all the decisions have been made needs to be addressed.

Thanks,
Paul Still

To: SAC Members
From: Robert Jones <rmjones@fsu.edu>
Subject: Update on the SAC February 24 Meeting Outcome- Joint SRWMD & SJRWMD Press Release
Date: February 28, 2014 2:20:21 PM EST

Yesterday, the SRWMD & SJRWMD issued a joint press release on the SAC February 24, 2014 recommendation. It is attached to this email and states, in pertinent part that, “The North Florida Regional Water Supply Partnership Stakeholder Advisory Committee on Feb. 24 unanimously supported the updated Draft Recovery Strategy for the Lower Santa Fe and Ichetucknee Rivers and Priority Springs Minimum Flows and Levels (MFLs).” This is an accurate statement reflecting the unanimous vote on the motion (see below) of the stakeholders present who have been appointed by both the Suwannee River Water Management District and the St. Johns River Water
Management District.

Late last night you received an email from Paul Still expressing concerns regarding the SAC process, especially as it relates to the motion to support the revised Draft Recovery Strategy at our meeting on February 24 and the opportunity for public comment. He referenced an attached “SRWMD press release” on the SAC motion at our February 24, 2014 meeting. However the attachment was a press release on another topic announcing, "SRWMD Assists 13 area farmers to reduce groundwater withdrawals."

We are in the process of drafting the SAC Meeting report which captures the SAC motion, discussion and outcome. To clarify our process below is the draft section on the process, discussion and motion for your information. This will be incorporated into the Draft Meeting Summary that will be sent for your review in advance of the March 17 SAC meeting. It reads:

"Following an original proposed motion was to support the Draft Recovery Strategy as responding to the SAC’s January 2014 consensus recommendations. Ray Avery expressed reservations indicating he would prefer more time to review with his water utility colleagues. The facilitator stated if the SAC wanted to defer action to next meeting that was their prerogative. SAC members expressed a desire to make a recommendation at its February meeting so their recommendation could be considered by the Districts Governing Boards who would be meeting prior to the next SAC meeting in March 2014. The facilitator suggested if members were more comfortable, they could support only the recovery strategy portion of the document. However members expressed that they would prefer to register their support for the entire recovery strategy document, and that the changes made that reflected their consensus recommendations. After extensive discussion the following motion offered by Jacqui Sulek was to support the recovery strategy document implementing SAC consensus recommendation and Tom Harper asked to include a statement pertaining to the 4th point of his agricultural recommendation:

**Lower Santa Fe River Basin MFLs and Recovery Strategy.** February 24, 2014. The SAC unanimously voted (by a vote of 11 – 0 in favor) to support the revised Draft Recovery Strategy Lower Santa Fe River Basin—Lower Santa Fe and Ichetucknee Rivers and Priority Springs Minimum Flows and Levels (dated February 21, 2014) incorporating the SAC’s consensus recommendations pertaining to the document. Staff agreed to work with Tom Harper to incorporate item #4 of the SAC’s recommendation for “Agricultural Water Use Approach” for inclusion in “Section 5.2 Water Conservation Component.”

In voting to support the Draft Recovery Strategy, the SAC noted that it reflected what the SAC discussed along with the public at the December 2013 meeting and the consensus recommendations it approved at its January 2014 meeting, following public comment. Since there were no new issues on the table, the SAC vote was taken during the agenda item and prior to public comment. This was consistent with the SAC adopted Policies and Procedures which provide:

“If a decision is to be made over the course of multiple meetings (i.e., discussed at one meeting and voted on at another meeting) the public will be allowed an opportunity to speak on the issue during the regularly scheduled Public Comment opportunity. If a decision is to be made at the same meeting where the issue is first discussed the public will be provided an opportunity to speak after SAC discussion and before a vote is taken.”

This issue was not first discussed at this February SAC meeting but had been a topic of discussion and public comment over several previous SAC meetings. However, following public comment, the facilitator twice asked if any SAC member wished to offer a motion to reconsider based on public comment. No such motion was offered."
We appreciate your hard work and continuing efforts to seek, where possible, consensus recommendations to provide to the Districts and FDEP and look forward to our SAC meeting on March 17.

Bob Jones & Jeff Blair, SAC Facilitation Team
COMMITTEE CHARGE AND PURPOSE
(Charged By the SRWMD, the SJRWMD, and DEP)

The purpose of the Committee shall be to provide guidance and advisory recommendations to the Suwannee River Water Management District (SRWMD), St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD), and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (Department) on development of the regional groundwater model, data needs, minimum flows and levels (MFLs), MFL prevention and recovery strategies and implementations, and ultimately a regional water supply plan. Committee members are appointed by the Districts to represent the concerns of specific affected groups as well as to communicate information about the North Florida water supply process to other members of their represented group.

COMMITTEE MISSION STATEMENT

The North Florida Regional Water Supply Partnership Stakeholder Advisory Committee, representing stakeholders in both districts, seeks to build consensus on advice and recommendations for the development of a North Florida regional water supply plan and related Partnership activities. The Committee’s efforts will be informed by sound science, and focused on supporting joint actions on water supply and resource issues.

COMMITTEE GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1. The Committee will adhere to their charge and purpose as provided by the SJRWMD and the SRWMD.

2. The Committee will strive to achieve consensus on the evaluation and development of substantive advisory recommendations submitted to the SRWMD, SJRWMD and DEP.

3. The Committee will operate under adopted policies and procedures that are clear and concise, and consistently and equitably applied.

4. Committee members will serve as liaisons between the stakeholder groups they have been appointed to represent and the NFRWSP Stakeholder Advisory Committee, and should strive to both inform and seek input on issues the Committee is addressing from those they represent.

The Committee’s complete package of adopted Committee Organizational Policies and Procedures are available at the Committee webpage at the following URL: http://northfloridawater.com/
NFRWSP Stakeholder Advisory Committee Presentations:
http://northfloridawater.com/committee.html

Northeast Florida Southeast Georgia Regional Groundwater Model Documents:
http://northfloridawater.com/groundwaterflowmodel.html

Minimum Flows and Levels (MFL) SJRWMD:
http://floridaswater.com/minimumflowsandlevels/prevention-recovery.html

Minimum Flows and Levels (MFL) SRWMD:

Aquifer Replenishment Pilot Project (Keystone Heights):

Consumptive Use Permit Process SJRWMD:
http://floridaswater.com/permitting/

Consumptive Use Permit Process SRWMD:
http://www.srwmd.state.fl.us/index.aspx?NID=368

Consumptive Use Permit Process Consistency (CUPcon) DEP:
http://www.dep.state.fl.us/water/waterpolicy/cupcon.htm

DEP CUPcon Workgroup:
http://www.dep.state.fl.us/water/waterpolicy/cc-issue-wg.htm#workgroups

DEP CUPcon Rulemaking:
http://www.dep.state.fl.us/water/waterpolicy/rule.htm

WMD Policy Documents (DEP):
http://www.dep.state.fl.us/secretary/watman/

Agricultural Water Supply BMPs (FDACS):
http://www.floridaagwaterpolicy.com/BMP.html
APPENDIX #8—COMMITTEE WORKPLAN

The Committee Workplan is set forth in the February 24, 2014 SAC Agenda Packet posted at:

http://northfloridawater.com/documents.html

APPENDIX #9—COMMITTEE CONSENSUS DECISIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS- AUGUST 2012- MARCH 2014

CONSENSUS NFRWSP SAC RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations were unanimously adopted by the SAC and submitted to the St. Johns River Water Management District, Suwannee River Water Management District and FDEP:


Committee Organizational Policies and Procedures. The SAC unanimously adopted Organizational Policies and Procedures for the Committee to utilize to operate and develop consensus recommendations to the SRWMD, SJRWMD and DEP. The Policies include: consensus-building decision-making procedures, meeting process procedures, roles and participation procedures, alternate member policy and absentee member policy. Additional policies may be developed as needed. The policies and procedures are consistent with the Districts’ goals regarding developing a regional water supply plan under the Partnership agreement.

August 28, 2012

SAC Mission Statement: The SAC unanimously adopted the following Mission Statement:

The North Florida Regional Water Supply Partnership Stakeholder Advisory Committee, representing stakeholders in both districts, seeks to build consensus on advice and recommendations for the development of a North Florida regional water supply plan and related Partnership activities. The Committee’s efforts will be informed by sound science, and focused on supporting joint actions on water supply and resource issues.

August 28, 2012

SAC Guiding Principles: The SAC unanimously adopted the following Guiding Principles:

5. The Committee will adhere to their charge and purpose as provided by the SJRWMD and the SRWMD.
6. The Committee will strive to achieve consensus on the evaluation and development of substantive advisory recommendations submitted to the SRWMD, SJRWMD and DEP.
7. The Committee will operate under adopted policies and procedures that are clear and concise, and consistently and equitably applied.
8. Committee members will serve as liaisons between the stakeholder groups they have been appointed to represent and the NFRWSP Stakeholder Advisory Committee, and should strive to both inform and seek input on issues the Committee is addressing from those they represent.

January 23, 2013

Regional Water Supply Plan Boundary Area: The North Florida Regional Water Supply Partnership Stakeholder Advisory Committee (NFRWSP SAC) has reviewed and discussed the proposed boundary for the Regional Water Supply Plan that is based on science and the Partnership technical team and steering committee’s recommendations. The SAC understands:

1. That the boundary for the groundwater modeling that will be utilized in the water supply plan is much broader than the Regional Water Supply Plan boundary.
2. That each District will engage simultaneously in developing their water supply plans for District areas that are not part of this Regional Water Supply Plan and that the Regional Water Supply Plan will be a chapter in each District’s overall water supply plan.
3. That including complete county areas in the plan boundary area makes sense since splitting up counties would produce expensive challenges for data collection and segregation.

4. That if the Regional Water Supply Plan boundary presents unexpected problems during the course of the Regional Water Supply Plan development, the Districts can adjust it consistent with the supporting science and modeling results.

Therefore, the SAC recommends to the Districts that the proposed planning boundary be utilized for the Regional Water Supply Plan.

April 22, 2013
**N.E. Florida S.E. Georgia Regional Groundwater Model:** The North Florida Regional Water Supply Partnership Stakeholder Advisory Committee supports the Districts’ methodology and assumptions including using the selected two-year water use data sets (2001 & 2009) for calibration of the N.E. Florida S.E. Georgia Regional Groundwater Model. In addition, the SAC recommends the following considerations:

1. Where ever possible and available, the Districts should utilize actual water use data; and,
2. The Districts should identify any data gaps and address how these will be handled to ensure calibration of the regional ground water model is based on the best available science and data.

July 15, 2013
**Public Opportunity To Be Heard Policy:** The unanimously SAC adopted an expanded public opportunity to be heard policy.

September 23, 2013
**Motion to Continue Committee’s Support Structure:** The SAC recommends that the Governing Boards of the Suwannee River Water Management District and the St. Johns River Water Management District continue with the Committee’s current support structure including the facilitators and the Districts’ technical and logistical support team.

September 23, 2013
**Process for SAC to Provide Formal Feedback to DEP and the Districts Pertaining to Proposed MFLs and Recovery Strategy for the Lower Santa Fe River Basin.** The SAC will participate as a Committee using the following participation strategy: The SAC members will identify and rate a series of strategies/options and provide a rating on each Prevention and Recovery (P&R) Strategy. Strategies and/or options with 75% or greater level of support will be considered consensus recommendations to the Districts and DEP (This is a formal rating of individual strategies/options). The SAC may decide to make recommendations regarding the setting of the MFLs in conformance with their adopted consensus-building procedures. Any SAC member may provide a minority report pursuant to the procedures adopted by the SAC.

January 28, 2014
**Lower Santa Fe River Basin MFLs and Recovery Strategy.** The SAC unanimously adopted a package of 11 Recommendation Statements (each of which achieved a 75% or higher level of support on separate acceptability rankings) were unanimously adopted (by a vote of 12 – 0 in favor) for submittal to FDEP and the Water Management Districts as the SAC’s formal recommendations pertaining to the proposed MFLs and Recovery Strategy for the Lower Santa Fe River Basin.

February 24, 2014
**Lower Santa Fe River Basin MFLs and Recovery Strategy.** The SAC unanimously voted (by a vote of 11 – 0 in favor) to support the revised Draft Recovery Strategy Lower Santa Fe River Basin—Lower Santa Fe and Ichetucknee Rivers and Priority Springs Minimum Flows and Levels (dated February 21, 2014) incorporating the SAC’s consensus recommendations pertaining to the document. Staff agreed to work with Tom Harper to incorporate item #4 of the SAC’s recommendation for “Agricultural Water Use Approach” for inclusion in “Section 5.2 Water Conservation Component.”