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Meeting Summary

I. Welcome and introductions

Chairman Richard T. Crotty, Orange County, welcomed the participants and provided opening comments. Crotty noted this was the second meeting discussing the water supply situation in East-Central Florida. Last month, elected officials and other stakeholders from Brevard, Orange, Osceola, Volusia, Seminole, Lake and Polk counties came together. At that session, several background water supply presentations were offered and five local government representatives participated in a panel discussion. Crotty said that in addition to those elected officials, elected officials from Flagler, Marion and Sumter counties were invited to this second session because the impacts of existing and proposed withdrawals from the Floridan aquifer in the heart of the area extend into these counties.

Emphasizing that water supply is a critical issue in this area, Chairman Crotty said it needs priority attention from elected officials, key decision makers and other stakeholders. Crotty said, “We are all in this together” and urged local governments and stakeholders to work together to find solutions that will provide the water the region needs for the future. Crotty noted that the executive directors of the three water management districts that cover the area – the St. Johns River Water Management District, the South Florida Water Management District, and the Southwest Florida Water Management District – have agreed to assist in fostering and facilitating discussions among local governments and others. Crotty announced the districts have retained the Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium to help move forward toward the goal of developing an East-Central Florida Water Supply Agenda by November 2002. This schedule would allow for the preparation of any legislative requests for funding and identification of other appropriate actions if such requests appear necessary.

II. Regional water supply initiatives: “Lessons Learned”

Sonny Vergara, executive director, Southwest Florida Water Management District, presented information on water supply conflicts and lessons learned in Tampa Bay over the past decade. He addressed a series of questions, including:

- What was wrong?
- What was at risk?
- What brought about change?
- What is changing?
- What were the lessons learned?
What was wrong? The Tampa Bay area has historically relied upon groundwater as its primary source of water. There are a series of 11 interconnected regional wellfields that serve the approximately 2 million people within the three-county area—Hillsborough, Pasco and Pinellas counties. Over time, it became evident that these wellfields were causing unacceptable environmental impacts in terms of lowered lake levels, and the drying up and destruction of wetlands. The District had, for over a decade, attempted to address these environmental problems by forcing, through its regulatory powers, reductions in wellfield withdrawals. This resulted in litigation between the District and the regional water authority and its member governments. Tens of millions of dollars were being spent by public organizations and nothing was being accomplished.

Meanwhile, like much of Florida, the area was experiencing significant population and economic growth. With this new growth was coming the need for new water supplies. Yet, no significant new water sources were developed in the region for over a decade.

What was at risk? Most significantly, the environment was at risk. The very reason so many people find the area an attractive place to live or visit—the natural resources associated with abundant water resources—was at risk. So too was the growth upon which so much of the local economy depends. The Tampa Bay region is characterized, similar to the East-Central Florida region, with many advantages that offer economic prosperity: a world class airport and seaport, an advanced university system, the I-4 technological corridor, a favorable climate, internationally known beaches, and international trade opportunities with South America. With the potential that an essential service, water, could not be provided to meet growing demands, the Tampa Bay region could easily miss the economic opportunities that lie ahead.

What brought about change? A number of factors contributed to the change: public awareness of the problems and dissatisfaction with the current state of affairs, including all the unproductive litigation and the continued environmental destruction; political pressure was also applied from the state Legislature—essentially, a message that the local communities needed to resolve the problems or the Legislature would; significant changes in local political leadership; participation by the business community; and a shift in policy at the water management district—to move away from relying on its regulatory powers and to look for cooperative approaches to solving the water problems.

What is changing? The most significant change in the region is that the District has entered into a cooperative agreement with the region’s wholesale water supplier (Tampa Bay Water) and its member governments to resolve these problems in a cooperative fashion. Referred to as the “Partnership Agreement,” it calls for the development of sustainable, alternative water supplies (alternative to the stressed groundwater resources), reductions in the existing wellfield withdrawals to provide for environmental restoration, and significant financial assistance from the District. One characteristic unique to the Southwest District is its eight basin boards, which share the taxing authority with the Governing Board. The other Districts do not have these basin boards, which, in large part, allowed the District to provide this financial assistance.
The resolution specifically includes:

- A reduction in permitted pumping capacity from a total of 192 million gallons per day (mgd) to 90 mgd by the end of 2007.
- Development of alternative supplies, including:
  - Seawater desalination
  - Regional surface water withdrawals and a regional reservoir
  - Regional transmission lines
  - Reuse of reclaimed wastewater
- District funding assistance, including:
  - $183 million for capital project costs
  - $90 million for conservation and reuse
  - $26 million for land acquisition associated with new projects

Significant water supply development projects are currently under construction, not only to meet growing demands, but also to allow for environmental restoration in areas impacted by wellfields. Additional alternative sources are being explored. The District is looking at ways by which the available, still unused, quantities of treated wastewater, suitable for reuse, can be developed on a regional basis. Over the next 20 years, there exists the potential for over 100 mgd of traditional water supply needs to be offset by reclaimed water in the Tampa Bay region.

**What were the lessons learned?** A number of lessons can be learned from the experience in Tampa Bay.

- Everyone needs to win some and everyone needs to give some. It cannot be a winner takes all type of approach.
- Litigation is a costly, ineffectual approach for solving these types of public policy issues.
- You must have an appropriate institutional vehicle to undertake regional solutions, particularly when problems transcend local jurisdictions, such as in the case in water supply in the Tampa Bay region.
- The costs and benefits must be equitably distributed among all participants.
- Progress in addressing these regional problems will only come about through courageous leaders with a vision, strong political will, and public knowledge and understanding of the situation.

Finally, for an issue such as water supply, so critical to our quality of life and economic future, failure is not an option.

Jake Varn, partner, Fowler, White, Boggs, Banker law firm, followed with remarks on the lessons learned and offered advice for those concerned about water supply issues in East-Central Florida. Based on his experiences and his study of water supply initiatives in other areas, Varn made the following points:
1. Other areas in Florida and in the United States have dealt with these same water supply issues, so there are lessons to be learned from these experiences.

2. Planning should concentrate on providing new sources of water supply to meet the demands of all water users rather than developing a process to allocate a limited amount of water.

3. Limiting supplies of water will result in the following: (A) conflicts and competition for the limited supply, (B) lengthy and expensive litigation, and (C) unpopular decisions.

4. While there is a limit as to the amount of sustainable groundwater for water supply, the East-Central Florida area has adequate time to plan and avoid a water crisis.

5. With adequate planning, problems should be avoided, such as, the lowering of lake levels, disappearing wetlands, saltwater intrusion, reduced flows from springs, and building moratoria.

6. Local governments have all the tools necessary to work together cooperatively to address their long-term water supply needs; however, long-term solutions will require cooperation on a multi-jurisdictional basis.

7. There are four key elements to solving long-term water supply issues: (A) trust and cooperation among the affected local governments; (B) funding to assist in developing new and alternative water supplies; C) having leadership and the right people involved, including persons who are prepared to forego their short-term interests in favor of long-term interests that will benefit the region; and (D) having patience and a willingness to listen to all interested parties.

III. Key questions in designing a consensus process

Bob Jones, director, Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium, discussed the key questions that must be answered in order to design a consensus process. Jones also outlined the questions that would be part of the personal interview assessment step in the consensus-building process, which would involve interests throughout the region and would begin following this session. Answers to these questions will emerge from the personal interviews and a convening meeting following the assessment. The key questions presented included:

1) What geographic area should the planning initiative address?
2) What should be the goal of the initiative?
3) Who should participate in the planning initiative?
4) How should it be organized?

Jones encouraged all attendees to participate in break out groups to identify and discuss key water supply questions.
IV. Summary of break out groups discussion and participant input

A. Composition of the break out groups

Seventy-eight participants broke into five randomly assigned groups to discuss key questions. Each of the five groups had local elected officials participating. Below is a summary of the interests participating in the five group discussions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Users</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local elected</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• County</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• City</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local government staff</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Government utilities staff</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Private utilities/consultant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self supply</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulators/Planning agency</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WMD</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DEP</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Stakeholder Interests</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Citizen Groups</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Key water supply questions

1. Do you believe there is a limitation on future groundwater withdrawals in the East-Central Florida area that needs to be addressed?

Members of the five break out groups provided a ranking on a five-point scale. Following the ranking, participants offered comments. Participants agreed, the overall average score (4.8) suggested strong support for continuing to explore how best to build consensus in the region on water supply issues.

Overall Results: 4.8

Yes(5) Probably(4) Not Sure(3) Probably Not(2) No(1) = 4.8 average

45 10 1 0 0
Comments:

- Geographically dependent growth management link to water supply
- WMD and users work together
- Consideration
- Issue of timing — "yes" vs. "probably" — when the problem will occur
- Limitation of question — better stewardship may reduce problem
- How serious is problem? Answer depends on definition of scope and alternatives
- Some impacts on local level, but larger on regional scale
- Have an immediate problem that will force them to go outside their jurisdiction
- Current topic of debate
- Plenty of water, but effects of withdrawals are problematic
- Need to study fast flow of H2O from region
- Not sure — want to see documentation
- Probably not — what geographical area being discussed

2. What are the advantages and disadvantages of local governments dealing with long-term water supply individually?

Advantages of dealing with long-term water supply individually:

Total control; local control; chart own course; bonding/funding localized; control of final water money; growth/development control politically easier; protect/control our environment; limited options leads to simplified analysis; fewer choices; potential revenue/sell to other areas; manage to your own requirements; set rates; solutions are site specific; flexibility and efficiency; independence from others; unique needs/requirements are addressed easier; ensure water quality; local government can do extensive planning to protect its water supplies-this is a political advantage because it is the local sources first concept, which protects local water supplies; self sufficiency; best understanding of local interests/needs; direct conduit to water users; familiarity with service and context; closest to the problem.; familiar with local history and nearby problems; know customer needs and characteristics best; can deliver services and conservation practices the best due to direct relationship with customers; users pay in the end so they are closer to the problem at the local level; can get things done faster than a consortium; timeliness of solutions; integrated financially with other government services and departments; have taxing and bonding authority to pay for projects; politicians like to think they control growth with utilities; can control supply as it relates to growth; can curtail overuse by use of land use/zoning; ownership of facilities is clear; ease of decisions; reuse from sewer systems; planning your supply to the needs of your community; local government knows best the immediate and long term needs of its citizens; infrastructure for supply (in most cases) it reuse owned local level; reuse; immediate response to citizens under their jurisdiction and resource planning; local water availability, local control of development, local government of capital projects; control your own future, based on affordability; local consumer pays for infrastructure; utility revenue source; competition leads to more innovative solutions; most to gain, most to lose; inventiveness; control of their revenue; none, ground water has no political boundaries; equity guaranteed; local government can
follow the directives of their local constituents thus satisfying the local voters and staying in office to work through a long team situation; keeps it out of the hands of “higher authorities” who know little and care little about local facts, figures and problems. DCA is a good example; don’t pay for others’ growth or water mismanagement (assumes that environmental costs are not included); local government has the best ability to gauge and deal with growth; increased public awareness; need for cooperation; control of financial impact on customers; control of individual needs and financial impact; ability to implement options and solutions as needed; you may need to slow down growth or control to a specific area; like the basin theory you can be very specific to local area; big government can only blanket the problem by restriction. Local can actually address and fix the problem; can be more responsive to changes in needs; local government is closer to the people and the problem; if all levels work cooperatively together reasonable solutions can be achieve; the problem is smaller than dealing with numerous entities.

Disadvantages of dealing with long-term water supply individually:

Does not promote regional planning of our resources (groundwater is a regional resource); relinquish control to regulator; conflicting interests, overlapping or redundant work efforts; funding limitations; refusal to deal with significant problem; voter revolt (fear of); limits alternatives to solving problems; litigation increases; local ability to pump controlled by influences outside the local jurisdiction; the effects of water use on the aquifers are regional. For example-the amount of pumpage in Orange County will affect the aquifers in Lake County. So, it would be an advantage for counties to work together on a regional basis; limited supply, no synergy from groups experiencing same issues, expenses regarding maintenance/infrastructure; expenses-too costly to go alone; does not allow for funding opportunities (everyone pools money) as in Basin Boards in the SWFWMD; precludes regional funding; takes time/effort/money; risk of capital outlay; parallel/duplicative efforts; layer projects more cost effective; cost of standing alone; competition is costly; if your local personalities in power don’t see a problem, nothing will be accomplished; not in my back yard mentality; limited funding; local government has limited funds and limited education/understanding regarding problem; inadequate resources to fund solutions; fail to get the “economies of scale”; costs are sensitive issues; single county may not be able to fund a big regional project; may miss out on more cost-effective alternatives i.e. regional supply and treatment; small communities lack necessary resources, sophistication and knowledge; the aquifer is regional and local government won’t be able to effectively solve a regional problem; water does not respect political boundaries; causes and effects of water supply manifest themselves regionally; only solutions are regional; lack of a design to integrate at the regional level; the volume of local government and other entities to coordinate regional “multi-county” coordination and action may be difficult for a regional resource; local water availability; increase in costs for infrastructure development; backup opportunity; economy of scale; parochial interest may be too narrow a focus; does not provide for opportunity to have say in neighbor plans that might effect your utility; may cost more than working together on a larger facility; does not consider cumulative impacts; it may not provide the most cost-effective and environmentally beneficial solution; the future water sources are not where the highest demand is — the water has to
cross many political boundaries. If the entire area is looked at as a whole, without boundaries and the best overall solution was determined, it would be a different solution than what 30 governments would come up with on their own; site specific only, doesn’t take with account major growth areas; competition; an expensive facility would have more impact with fewer customers; only one vision and solution of wider spread problem — more minds can be better; no one entity could afford cost; cumulative and overlapping effect; it is a regional issues water knows no boundaries, limited resources expenses and dollars; lose opportunity for collateral funding opportunity; difficulty with dealing with large governmental agencies; litigation which paralyzes; effort spent could be totally wasted if neighboring city's actions are contrary to yours; limited resources on local level; limited sphere of influences; items not controlled by local government; tendency of treatment plants and inter regional transmission lines i.e. other sources; competition for limited supply; competition breeds wastefulness, escalates problem; water resume does not know where the boundary lay and each effects the other; options are not limited by geography if desalination; water supply is not limited to local area; isolation; no regional neighbors; competition for water; geography limits use of many alternative water sources; water does not follow municipal lines; local government teamed together creates more access to funds and to knowledge; county comes and puts in well field at edge of city; the water supply is associated with multiple jurisdictions so there is no effective way to regulate the resource; groundwater supply crosses political jurisdictional boundaries; can’t leverage as much funding; can’t take advantage of expertise throughout a general area to use many disciplines to resolve complicated problems; a local government may not fully comprehend or care about the issue of its neighboring governments; Parochialism beyond reasonableness; accusing Orange County of stealing another county’s water while many in Orange see other jurisdictions as raiding Orlando’s treasury throughout the metropolitan and ECRPC e.g.; local government has to face the monetary and political consequences — users who pay for increased water costs are voters; we need to address the issue as a whole; by big government setting up guidelines, locals can step in with their ideas; less likely to have small picture of regional needs; territorial/ self interest; lack of available technical expertise; the biggest governmental agency could have greater resources (and manpower) to override smaller agencies; ability to cooperate; assistance financially from a large body of participants to attempt big projects beyond the capability of small communities; solution may negatively impact another neighboring local government; there would be fewer potential resources to tap; there would be fewer options; could produce a conflicting “solution” with neighboring jurisdiction; takes out of hands of the local community; bigger is never better or closest to the people; impact on others may not be taken into consideration; may be affected by the power of resources of others; opportunity for inequities in the distribution of water available, customer rates and financial investments; extensive financial investment (may not be able to afford cost of long-term solutions); competition between utilities and local governments; share costs will raise cost for those who have smaller needs; water supply is regional – even if one government controls withdrawals others that do not will have impact on all
3. What are the advantages and disadvantages of dealing with long-term water supply in partnership with other local governments or regional entities?

Advantages of dealing with long-term water supply in partnership with other local governments or regional entities:

- Protects long term availability of water supply for growth; better distribution of resources, money, water; shared risks, shared benefits could reduce and/or eliminate negative impacts to individual groups; more influence when representing unified front; rate control; continued economic growth and prosperity; ability to interconnect systems; need to share tech and hydro info; cost sharing; more alternatives; minimizes competitive interests; win/win; economy of scale; distribution of impacts to resources; share needed technical information; incentive means more planning, solutions, water projects; strength in numbers; enhanced creativity; more stakeholders included; water supply is a regional issue - best to have it addressed by locals at the regional level; can better match the boundaries of the water supply problems with the political boundaries; solutions will be longer-term and organization will be in place to continue managing; increase the area of available options; expands the range of alternative solutions that can be considered; increase solution set; help utilize water resources more effectively; sharing of costs/ shared costs/benefits; increase funding sources; more cost effective; curry regulatory favor; build influence and backing for funding because of the numbers and dollars at stake; take advantage of economies of scale; back up system for different local governments would be stronger in a regional concept; better and clearer communications among water officials and stakeholders; better coordination of planning efforts and funding; increased efficiencies and specialists on a particular problem; better access to expertise; may lead to other partnerships on regional issues; spread costs out to larger customers bases; stronger voice with others; regional management of resource; environmental protection; address parochialism; all entities be aware of the big picture; increases potential solutions; more resources at the table; improve for state and federal funding changes; reduce changes for legal contracts; better sense of community (all in it together); smaller impact on environment; eliminates economic competition; emergency backup water supply availability; since problem is regional, solution must be regional; variety of resources available to region; bigger group lends itself to better media coverage and thus better public education; strength is greater when dealing with higher levels of government; better/wider acceptance; minimize/avoid litigation; long-term water supply is almost certainly needful of a regional solution; no competition; economical, better planning; more resources are available; save on capital investments dollars; will reuse system; water at a low cost; create a series of regional solutions to benefit all users of the common resource; larger knowledge pool; protect environment agreements that limit withdrawals; builds relationships between governments; shared cost and expertise; sharing resources such as interconnection of reuse facilities and distribution systems; sharing of experts that maybe available on staff or within community; common problems could result in solutions that would reduce redundancies; equity of cost and resources; financial resources are much greater; leveraged funding (sharing costs); access to state and federal funds; avoids competition and legal battles; a single combined solution is more cost effective than individual, multiple solutions; equity in customer rates; takes burden from elected officials; recharge banks similar to wetland banks; take advantage of sharing the
wealth of a larger community i.e. greater funding, larger resource pool for natural resources and greater brain trust to deal with difficult situations; profit from trials and errors of others, i.e. build on previous experiences; more comprehensive, sustainable solutions are possible; regional consensus can be obtained; water supply options increase; water knows no boundaries; approach must be cooperative or inequitable water use will result; water can be evenly distributed; potential for cost savings by not duplicating efforts; more likely to develop plan that conserves resource; a united front is easier to sell to the public.

*Disadvantages of dealing with long-term water supply in partnership with other local governments and regional entities:*

Tough getting everyone to agree; need compromise; increases bureaucracy; time necessary to develop agreements between entities; relinquish individual control; costs may go up; fear of greater competition for water; power struggles and personality conflicts slow or prevent resolution; win-win will be difficult concept for local officials to buy into with other local governments; need to overcome competition; requires a strong degree of trust that isn’t there right now; some jurisdictions down play and work well with others; disputes over who gets what and who pays; concept tied to an institution that may be bigger and more restrictive than you want; unwieldy organization that does not exist might come with this concept; timing of supplying infrastructure may not be compatible with local needs; time to implement the regional approach will be slow; timeframes for solutions may be too long; group decisions will always make someone unhappy; difficult to build and maintain consensus with many interests; disagreements over the best course of action leading to compromises that aren’t good for the water supply in the region; benefits vary according to progress of water issues at local level utilities; less local level benefit yielding to regional needs; environmental benefits to a region are not easily explained at the local level, or in one’s own backyard; different governments have had various levels of commitment to water stewardship — both historically and currently; could be more costly than staying local; a few may actually pay more than if they had gone it alone; different groups fighting for control; more difficult decision; different problems for different areas; fear of loses; increased bureaucracy; key interests have territorial concerns, shared control viewed as loss of control; smaller utilities may not be well represented; may not be as cost-effective for a particular entity; lack of price control; loss of control a major issue; political dominance; avoids legal conflicts; obtaining agreement and consensus; lacks of respect big local governments have for small governments; very long process; difficulty in gaining consensus, severity of issue, determination of cost v benefit; difficulty in reaching consensus; possible loss economy of scale; competing interests (parochialism); time required for bringing partners together; distrust among various governmental entities involved because of egos, past histories, local pride or lack of cooperation on other matters; run the risk of never developing a workable plan due to selfish interests; more difficult to equitably allocate cost of solutions; bureaucracy slow to act; the more governments are involved, the greater the probability of politics and “turf” control problems will arise; requires much more consensus building to be successful; unless a formal organization is established and a strong leader elected or appointed, chaos will result; local jurisdictions may not wish to follow someone else’s leadership; smaller entities can be overpowered; small counties feel
overwhelmed by big counties or cities; urban v. rural; restrictions; can lead to lawsuits; increase costs; agreeing on how to structure the “partnership;” challenges in building consensus among leaders of various jurisdictions; distrust; complicated by the large number of individuals that can’t reach consensus on anything; shared costs could unfairly shift burden; equity of supply use/ costs; time consuming negotiations; need to keep the process about managing supply for region rather than political power; longer and more drawn out process; different needs and incentives; suspicions of interests of others clouding the individual needs; political battles to overcome; relinquishing a certain level of control.

4. What are the appropriate roles of the water management districts in this process?

Participants ranked several roles in terms of their importance in building consensus on water supply in East-Central Florida. There were 58 respondents with the following rankings in order of the highest average in terms of importance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Most Important</th>
<th>Less Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AVG</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Technical Asst.</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Funding</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Facilitation</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Planning</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Regulation</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Do you wish to be contacted during the planning initiative assessment/interview process?

Forty-six participants indicated an interest in being contacted during the assessment process.

6. What information on water supply do you need to help you better participate in the planning initiative?

Below are the responses:

Local government and water management districts need to work together and plan development based on availability of water.
Protect important recharge areas.
Reclaimed water grants should be given to local governments.
Districts’ opinion of what they think their role is and how they are going to be part of solution.
What are the concerns of municipal agencies?
How to solve all our problems?
Total water budget – precipitation, runoff, recharge
What other governments are doing that might affect each other’s supplies
Common denominator of single family residence (gallon/day)
Rates for every utility in central Florida, published and complied with numbers of customers
Probable economic impacts if problem is not addressed (for pro-development local leaders)
How do the utilities compare and rate in their usage of water (per capita usage goods) and what efforts are being made to lower the rate
How water supply authorities work and how to rent one
More specific info on water conservation alternatives and emphasis on "demand management" rather than new supplies
Specifics on overall impact on all areas as it relates to the region — particularly how growth impacts management of existing resources — and vice versa
Sources of water
How to be a better partner
Water flow model for aquifer. How/where does pumping/recharge in one location effect region?
Technical information regarding overall expected need and demand
South Florida Executive 2020 Summary (CAPS Reports)
Water 2020 reports
Data on long-range rainfall, data on long-range levels of the aquifers, data on comparison of agriculture uses vs. development
Clear refutation of "Chicken Little" syndrome

V. Next steps in the process

Bob Jones introduced the neutral facilitation/assessment team. The team includes Linda Shelley and Rafael Montalvo, assisted by Jake Varn. Jones reviewed the next steps in organizing the consensus process, including the following kinds of questions that would be explored with stakeholders in the assessment interviews:

- What key interests need to be represented in this process?
- What is your willingness to participate? What level of participation are you willing and able to give?
- What do you believe is the appropriate geographic area to focus this initiative on?
- What are the central water supply issues the region should address in this process?
- What are the data and information needs to adequately address the region’s water supply needs?
- How should the process be organized?

Jones solicited questions and suggestions from the participants for how to proceed with the interviews around the region and asked for their assistance in helping this interview/assessment process be as complete as possible.
# MEETING EVALUATION SUMMARY

**Were the meeting objectives met?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>AVG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To receive a briefing on lessons learned from other regional water supply initiatives</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To present key conceptual questions in designing a consensus process</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To identify perspectives on whether there is a limitation on future groundwater withdrawals in East-Central Florida that needs to be addressed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To identify in small groups the advantages and disadvantages of local governments in the region dealing with water supply issues individually and/or in partnership with other local governments in the region</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To present a proposal for a stakeholder interview/assessment process as a next step in exploring the development of a consensus building process on water supply in East-Central Florida</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Meeting organization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>AVG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agenda packet was helpful</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plenary presentation was effective</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitators guided participant efforts effectively in small groups</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plenary small group reports were effective</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What did you like best about the meeting?**

- Frank discussions of the issue
- Sonny's presentation
- Jack Varn’s presentation
- First two speakers

**What could be improved?**

- Inclusion of a wider variety of parties of interest in this issue i.e. agriculture, development, industry, environmental, and regulatory environmental responsibility
- Getting all stakeholders involved
- Discuss specifics
- I was not asked to pick-up the slide packages at sign-in
- Questions seemed to contract people in the small groups

**Other comments**

- How does the SLOOP Group fit into this process?
- Broad educational effort to reach the general public with the issues so they will be more receptive to regional solutions
- Accomplished a lot in a short time