

**From:** Edward Mc Donald [<mailto:emcdotomb@yahoo.com>]

**Sent:** Thursday, July 16, 2015 1:41 PM

**To:** Memberg, Steven

**Cc:** John Shearer

**Subject:** CFWI Water Conservation

Mr. Memberg,

I have watched a video of the presentation that you gave this past June 29th in conservation. I am a big believer in the efficient use of water and it's clear to me that you have played a major role in the reduction in water usage that we have seen over the years. Now receiving so much attention, it would be my opinion that this trend in water conservation will continue for the foreseeable future.

Water management districts in partnering with local government growth management plans have achieved water use efficiencies that, up until now, has occurred with little organized guidance. Most water use efficiency improvements have occurred on a pretty much voluntary basis, with some requirements for mandatory reductions in water use. Outdoor watering restrictions have been implemented that are designed to reduce overall water consumption. Again, at the local level, the most part non-existent.

Looking at comments that have been made to the overall CWFI effort is it very important to be the primary focus of any water supply plan. I for one, will be looking at the future with the expectation of seeing a much greater emphasis on demand side management and that's what we need to see happen.

Agricultural water use is still a major component of our water demand. Because agricultural water use consists of a relatively small number permitted water users, there is a real potential to improve water efficiency in this sector of water use. I disagree with a statement that implied that the cost of pumping water will automatically encourage agricultural water use efficiencies. I don't know the numbers that you use to determine the cost to pump water, but my estimates are in the range of \$0.08 to \$0.16 per thousand gallons per acre-foot. The cost difference between diesel and electric power.

I have attached the commercial and industrial water rates for the City of Lakeland. As you can see they have a consistent rate of \$2.15 or \$2.90 per 1000 gallons. Based on that that agricultural users are getting essentially free water. The incentive to improve water use is not so much to benefit the actual agricultural users, but to free up that water so that it can be used to offset the need to build expensive, alternative water projects.

Thanks for time.

Edward McDonald

Jacksonville. Your main topic was water efficiency improvements that have taken place in the past decade or so. The fact that water use efficiency is improving will

regulatory agencies can enhance the trend in water use efficiency. In other words, water efficiency improvements are the closest thing that has been done. Equal enforcement of these restrictions is for

clear that water efficiency improvements is the next iteration of the CFWI RWSP with equal enforcement. That's what the public has demanded

of this fact and the fact that agricultural water users have the potential for a concentrated effort to improve water efficiency that you made during your presentation to agricultural water users to maximize their water efficiency. Agricultural users per thousand gallons of water pumped. The large range is due to the

and's Department of Water Utilities. As you can see from my numbers, it would be my opinion that the efficient use of agricultural irrigation will reduce the quantity of traditional groundwater soaks.



**WATER RATES**

**RATES EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1, 2013**

**FOR COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL, AND FRANCHISED ACCOUNTS:**

<u>METER SIZE</u>	<u>FIXED METER CHARGE</u>		<u>CHARGE PER 1,000 GALLONS</u>	
	<u>INSIDE CITY LIMITS</u>	<u>OUTSIDE CITY LIMITS</u>	<u>INSIDE CITY LIMITS</u>	<u>OUTSIDE CITY LIMITS</u>
5/8" - 3/4"	\$ 7.99	\$ 10.79	\$ 2.15	\$ 2.90
1"	\$ 21.54	\$ 29.08	\$ 2.15	\$ 2.90
1 1/2"	\$ 38.92	\$ 52.54	\$ 2.15	\$ 2.90
2"	\$ 67.26	\$ 90.80	\$ 2.15	\$ 2.90
3"	\$ 146.22	\$ 197.40	\$ 2.15	\$ 2.90
4"	\$ 283.18	\$ 382.29	\$ 2.15	\$ 2.90
6"	\$ 597.14	\$ 806.14	\$ 2.15	\$ 2.90
8"	\$ 1,011.12	\$ 1,365.01	\$ 2.15	\$ 2.90