

December 23, 2003

Mr. David L. Moore, Executive Director
Southwest Florida Water Management District
2379 West Broad Street
Brooksville, Florida 34609-6899

Re: Water Resource Development Work Program

Dear Mr. Moore:

Thank you for your Five-Year Water Resource Development Work Program. Your document was prepared pursuant to the requirements of Section 373.536 (6)(1)4, F.S. The Department's review of the work program must include an evaluation of:

- *the work program's consistency with the furtherance of the district's approved regional water supply plans, and*
- *the adequacy of the proposed expenditures.*

Your work program is consistent with the District's Regional Water Supply Plan and the expenditures generally appear to be adequate.

The work program is much more understandable now that it includes clear linkages to your regional water supply plan. We note that two new projects have been added to the water resource development "projects" section of the program: the effect of karst development on Peace River Flow and the evaluation of water resource development projects in the Upper Peace basin. It also appears that you have combined two reclaimed water projects into a new greatly expanded reclaimed water project for the Hillsborough River Watershed. These projects seem to be an important addition to your water resource development strategy.

The information describing the status and future actions of your water resource development projects provides a helpful synopsis of your progress toward implementing these projects. As you prepare next year's report, we ask that you provide a similar synopsis for the following projects: hydrologic data collection, regional observation monitoring program, quality of water improvement program, flood control projects, and hydrologic investigations. Also, we request that, as you delete projects from this portion of your work program, you provide a brief explanation of the reason for deleting the project. It is important that the District provide clear descriptions of what has been accomplished each year to show progress toward implementing these sections of the regional water supply plan.

Mr. David Moore
December 23, 2003
Page 2

We also suggest including a brief introductory description of how water supply development assistance projects are different from the water resource development projects described earlier in the work program. We also think it would be helpful to include, for each category of water supply development assistance, the funding history of projects on the list for more than one year, a brief summary of the new projects added, and a summary of the ones removed.

Please consider the above comments as you prepare next year's work program. In the meantime, we have also have attached some specific questions or comments related to specific projects and ask that you provide a response to those. Your work program has significantly improved from previous submissions and we appreciate your efforts to address our concerns.

Sincerely,

Janet G. Llewellyn
Deputy Director
Division of Water Resource Management

JGL/kpg
Attachment

cc: Deborah Getzoff, DEP, SWD
Cece McKiernan, DEP, SWD
Jon Iglehart, DEP, SFD
Richard Owen, SWFWMD
Gregg Jones, SWFWMD
Tom Swihart, DEP
Kathleen Greenwood, DEP
Mellini Sloan, DEP
Lenny Zeiler, EOG

SWFWMD Water Resource Development Work Program
Specific Comments

1. Last year's water resource development projects included the Falkner/Flatford Swamp surface water withdrawal project. This year's report did not include this project. Please provide an explanation of why this project is no longer included in the program.
2. pp. 11-16 - Table 2. Total Project Cost. Column 2, "Prior Year Funding District Cost", is confusing. It is not clear if this column only includes the funding for the prior year or the total from several years. When compared to last year's program it appears to be the sum of several years except for the following projects: the Hines Energy Complex recharge-recovery project and the natural treatment of wastewater/stormwater project. For these projects the prior funding reported in this year's report is significantly lower than what was reported for these projects in last year's report. Please explain or correct this apparent discrepancy.
3. p. 11 and 16 - Fate of Microorganisms in the Floridan Aquifer. This project was described as being put on hold since last year, yet when the prior year funding provided in Table 2 is compared with last year's report, it appears that \$175,000 was spent. Please explain.
4. p. 16 - Fate of Microorganisms in the Floridan Aquifer. The schedule provided for this project indicated that a study was to be completed in September 2003. Please indicate if this was completed or if there is a new schedule.
5. p. 21 – Section 21 Wellfield Rehydration Pilot Project. This description indicated that a contract amendment to the project scope was going to be presented to the Tampa Bay Water Board in March 2003. Was this amendment approved by Tampa Bay Water Board?