

## IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY APPROACH OPTIONS

There are various options available to be included in development of an implementation strategy as identified below. The options consist of Planning Tools and Regional Options. The Planning Tools are designed to assist the Districts and water users in developing conservation plans and in achieving conservation savings. The Regional Options are actions that can be implemented to achieve conservation savings.

### Planning Tools

**Guidepost** – This component provides guideposts to assist in the development of conservation plans by class of user. These guideposts will be developed to ensure that all users, in the aggregate, will achieve, the CFWI Estimated Conservation Savings Goal of 37+ mgd.

Guideposts are not goals and are not intended to be applied to an individual permit. Rather, they demonstrate the percent reduction that a class of users, in the aggregate, would need to reach to achieve the CFWI Estimated Conservation Savings Goal of 37+ mgd. Applicants' conservation plans would continue to receive an application-specific evaluation, but would take into consideration the aggregate reduction needed in that class of user.

#### PROS

- Flexibility to choose savings programs/BMPs
- Consistent with 4.1% savings estimate used for the PWS 27.9 mgd estimate in 2035
- Focus on application-specific evaluation of Applicant's conservation plans
- Allows maximum flexibility in selection of BMPs and programs
- Consistent with permittee's CUP conservation plan

#### CONS

- Uncertainty over how much savings each individual user is responsible for
- Doesn't ensure savings goal will be met
- Focuses on 37 MGD, not achieving more than 37 MGD
- Doesn't provide guidance or specificity for specific users

**Designated Projects** – This component will include a list of water conservation projects that could be implemented by permittees to meet the CFWI Estimated Conservation Savings Goal of 37+ mgd goal within the CFWI region. This list would be similar to the list of water supply development projects in a regional water supply plan in that it functions as a list of options that could be selected by a permittee for implementation or inclusion in their water conservation plan. The list would include projects proposed by permittees and/or by the Conservation Team for possible implementation in the future. These projects may be regional, permittee-specific, or generic. A generic project is a project currently without a designating managing entity.

#### PROS

- Provides direction on projects seen as most beneficial/cost effective that could be selected for implementation
- Shows future path to meet goal
- Can use cost-share applications and estimated water savings values
- May help with funding
- Actual savings could be more easily determined

#### CONS

- May be difficult to forecast projects over long term
- Regional projects not typical for conservation
- Doesn't ensure savings goal will be met
- Doesn't independently mandate completion of all projects listed
- May not be consistent with permittee's current CUP conservation plan

**Clearinghouse** (*part of scope of work*) – This component develops options to redevelop and support a statewide clearinghouse as a repository for agricultural and utility conservation data, publications, and goal based planning tools to optimize future conservation programs and promote consistency. The mission/objectives of the clearinghouse will be tightly focused to avoid a large library of data that is not being used effectively.

PROS

- Could help create a more uniform approach for planning and evaluating savings
- Seems a necessary part of conservation planning, key to developing best practices, understanding relevant issues, and guiding implementation
- Promotes sharing of data
- Helps users with conservation approach and optimizing programs and BMP selection
- Moves away from pilot projects and towards implementable projects
- Meets statutory requirement 373.227(2)(f), F.S.
- Allows calculation of conservation potential of the region using the same methodology in the 2015 RWSP

CONS

- Expensive; funding uncertain
- Will take a long time to develop conservation data; not much data available to date
- Doesn't ensure savings goal will be met
- Labor intensive, on-going effort
- Old version wasn't used
- Possibly proprietary

**Regional Options**

**Funding Opportunities** – This component identifies ongoing funding programs that support additional BMP implementation, and options for increasing the effectiveness of the existing programs. ~~Barriers and challenges, as well as solutions, would be identified to increase water provider participation in cost share programs and other funding programs.~~ A funding website for the CFWI region would be developed listing: District, state, and federal funding opportunities; website links; approximate funding amounts; and deadlines for application. This website would be updated over time as information changes and opportunities develop. (See [grants.gov](http://grants.gov) for example.) ~~Active outreach by WMD staff to water users for cooperative funding would be promoted.~~ Barriers and challenges, as well as solutions, would be identified to increase water provider participation in existing cost-share programs. Active outreach by WMD staff to water users for cooperative funding would be promoted. Increased funding opportunities would be explored, such as increasing state appropriations for regional projects and priority consideration for funding to identified projects. Note: Increased funding to WMD cost-share programs could also result in additional conservation efforts. This would be an issue for individual Governing Boards to consider.

PROS

- Helps rural and smaller governments enact worthwhile projects
- Makes it as easy as possible for funding/grant opportunities for conservation to be utilized
- Districts are seeing increased funding applications when reaching out to utilities directly

CONS

- Need buy-in from DEP and Districts to secure more funding
- Doesn't ensure that savings goal will be met
- Actual available funding may still be limited

- Will most likely increase user participation in funding opportunities
- Public/private partnerships may help with funding
- Inexpensive to just provide information

**Regional Education and Outreach** – This component includes coordinating with the Districts and stakeholders on consistent public service announcements, e.g., billboards, commercials, mailings, and social media accounts. Methods will be explored to evaluate estimated conservation savings based on regional education and outreach. Mechanisms to fund regional education and outreach would be explored. Barriers and challenges, as well as solutions, of utility development and implementation of conservation programs and in increasing the public’s participation in conservation would be identified. Barriers and challenges, as well as solutions, of increasing agriculture producers’ participation in conservation would be identified. Note: Per the Conservation Team’s scope of work, the Team will coordinate with the Communications Team on a water conservation education and outreach initiative.

PROS

- Proper messaging can help garner public support for all other conservation work being done
- Education can be effective in achieving water savings
- All water use types can benefit
- Directly and indirectly necessary to achieve more conservation
- May be very effective in terms of both costs and savings

CONS

- Water savings and cost effectiveness from education and outreach are difficult to measure
- Funding uncertain; can be very expensive
- Doesn’t ensure that savings goal will be met
- Relies on voluntary end-user behavior modification