TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

September, 1985

URBAN WATER DEMAND ESTIMATES FOR MARTIN COUNTY: 1983 EXISTING AND COMMITTED, AND BUILDOUT

۰.

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM URBAN WATER DEMAND ESTIMATES FOR MARTIN COUNTY: 1983 EXISTING AND COMMITTED, AND BUILDOUT

SEPTEMBER, 1985

By Stephen Opalat Water Use Planning & Management Division Resource Planning Department

This publication was produced at an annual cost of \$243.75 or \$.75 per copy to inform the public. 500 990 Produced on recycled paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

list of Tables	ii
	iii
List of Figures	1
Introduction	-
Overview of Water Use in Martin County Water Demand Water Supply	3 4 7
Martin County Planning Framework	9
Water Use and Source Factors Water Use Factors Residential Potable Water Demand Non-residential Potable Water Demand Residential Non-potable Water Demand Non-residential Non-potable Water Demand	11 11 12 15 21
Water Sources Potable Water Use Non-potable Water Use	22 23 24
Model Validation Stuart Utility Service Area Hydratech, Intracoastal, Hobe Sound, and Miles Grant Service Areas	24 24 28
Summary, Conclusions, and Suggestions for Future Research	31
Appendix A Population, Housing Unit, and Non-residential Acreage Data	34
Appendix B Estimated Water Demand 1983 Existing and Committed and Buildout	39
Appendix C Estimated Utility Demand 1983 Existing and Committed and Buildout	46
Appendix D Wastewater Reclamation	51

LIST OF TABLES

Table	1	Large Utility Pumpage Data	5
Table	2	Per Capita Water Consumption - 1980	6
Table	3	Percentage of Total Annual Pumpage by Source 1980	8
Table	4	Non-residential Development Characteristics	13
Table	5	Non-residential Potable Demand Factors	14
Table	6	Residential Irrigation Area Factors	19
Table	7	Units with Automatic Irrigation Systems	20
Table	8	Estimated Residential Water Demand Stuart Service Area 1980	26
Table	9	Estimated Non-residential Water Demand Stuart Service Area 1980	27
Table	10	Estimated Residential Water Demand Hydratech, Intracoastal, etc. Service Area 1980	29
Table	11	Estimated Non-residential Water Demand Hydratech, Intracoastal, etc. Service Area 1980	30
Table	A.1	Estimated Housing Unit Distribution 1983 Existing and Committed	35
Table	A.2	Estimated Housing Unit Distribution Buildout	36
Table	A.3	Developed Non-residential Acres 1983 Existing and Committed	37
Table	A.4	Developed Non-residential Acres Buildout	38
Table	B.1	Estimated Residential Water Demand 1983 Existing and Committed	40
Table	B.2	Estimated Non-residential Potable Water Demand 1983 Existing and Committed	41
Table	B.3	Estimated Non-residential Non-potable Water Demand 1983 Existing and Committed	42

	where the standard liston Domand Buildout	43
Table B.4	Estimated Residential water Demand Bulldout	
Table B.5	Estimated Non-residential Potable Water Demand Buildout	44
Table B.6	Estimated Non-residential Non-potable Water Demand Buildout	45
Table C.1	Estimated Residential Utility Demand 1983 Existing and Committed	47
Table C.2	Estimated Non-residential Utility Demand 1983 Existing and Committed	48
Table C.3	Estimated Residential Utility Demand Buildout	49
Table C.4	Estimated Non-residential Utility Demand Buildout	50
Table D.1	Estimated Existing and Future (Buildout) Demands for Irrigation of Green Areas in Martin County with Reclaimed Wastewater, Based on Three Levels of Use (25%, 50%, 100%) of the Available Supply	55

List of Figures

Figure 1 Martin County Study Area

I. INTRODUCTION

This report presents a model which projects urban water demand using population and land use data for the area in Martin County shown in Figure 1. The model was developed with a rather unique structure compared to most water demand models which simply apply an estimated per capita consumption rate to a set of population data. The model described within this report makes use of land use acreage by type, and population projections, in order to develop water demand projections by land use type. By incorporating land use data, the model becomes sensitive to changes in the Comprehensive Plan of Martin County. Having a model which is directly tied to the Comprehensive Plan of a particular region makes it possible to use the model to assist in growth management decisions.

The model uses as its inputs land use acreage by type and population projections, both of which have been provided by the Martin County Planning Department for the traffic analysis zones (TAZs) in the study area. Water use factors are applied to these data in order to estimate urban water demand by land use type by TAZ. The results of this model are being used by the Hydrogeology Division in a model which evaluates various scenarios regarding the location of wellfields and their impacts on water levels.

Following this Introduction the second section contains an overview of the current water use characteristics of Martin County. This is followed by a section which presents the planning framework of the data used as input to the model. The fourth section contains the methodology used to develop water use and source factors which are applied to the data presented in section three in order to develop projections of urban water demand. The fifth section evaluates the performance of the model by comparing ex post estimates with actual data for some of the larger utility service areas. Finally, in



section six the results of the model are summarized and some suggestions for further research are discussed.

II. OVERVIEW OF PAST WATER USE IN MARTIN COUNTY

The model presented in this report was designed to estimate future urban water demand for Martin County. The first step in constructing such a model was to review historic water use characteristics for the study area. Before specifically discussing Martin County, however, it is helpful to review the general types of water use as well as the data restrictions that arise when conducting such an analysis.

Water use can best be discussed by first identifying the different types Basically water use can be placed into five user of use that exist. residential, commercial, industrial, and institutional, categories: Along with these user classifications one can make the agricultural. distinction between potable (indoor) and non-potable (outdoor) use. When water use is examined following this disaggregated structure it becomes clear that data availability plays a limiting role in the analysis. The largest void in real data exists in the area of non-potable water use, because the majority of non-potable water is self supplied and pumpage records are not maintained for the majority of private wells being used for irrigation. Typically the only real data that are available are the pumpage figures for the larger utilities (i.e., those which pump 100,000 gallons per day or more). Due to these data limitations the review of historic water use must concentrate on pumpage figures for the larger utilities, using these figures as a measure of demand. Water use must also be viewed from the supply side by examining the sources from which the water is being supplied.

Water Demand

Before developing a model for estimating water demand for a particular region it is helpful to review historic demand for that region. Table 1 shows historic demand in the form of annual pumpage for the major utilities of Martin County from 1980 through 1984. The pumpage data in Table 1 are positively correlated to time, which is reasonable since population is also positively correlated to time and water demand is directly tied to population. It is useful to adjust for population by putting the data into per capita Table 2 presents the per capita figures for each of the counties in terms. the South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) for 1980. These data indicate that on a per capita basis Martin County is one of the more water consumptive counties in the District. The population used to calculate the per capita figures in Table 2 was permanent resident population which is often significantly smaller than peak seasonal population. Using the permanent resident population figure causes the per capita figure to be higher, and since Martin County is strongly affected by seasonal population swings, one should be cautious when using these per capita figures. Under the framework developed by the Martin County Planning Department for this study, it is assumed that all units will be occupied year-round, thus eliminating the impact of seasonal fluctuations in population. This assumption and others will be discussed further in the following section.

Although it is helpful to review historic demand in order to project future demand it should be mentioned that in the case of Martin County, caution must be used when comparing past and future conditions. Visual inspection of new development in Martin County makes apparent the changing appearance between "old" and "new" Martin County. Normally a model is

TABLE 1

Large Utility Pumpage Data (million gallons per year)

Utility	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>	1982	<u>1983</u>	<u>1984</u>
Indiantown	171.8	166.6	165.0	148.0	168.9
Indian River	15.6	18.0	18.4	21.0	29.8
Intracoastal	82.5	169.2	173.1	211.8	239.6
Hobe Sound	361.2	326.8	348.7	467.1	628.7
Beacon 21 ⁵	38.6	50.6	52.5	49.2	49.7
Hydratech	84.2	121.9	141.7	133.7	167.3
Sailfish	n/a	3.6	8.4	15.0	16.7
Joe's Point	1.6	3.1	7.5	13.8	16.2
Pine Lake Village	69.1	62.0	73.1	89.3	91.1
Piper's Landing	n/a	1.1^{1}	8.5	9.5	12.6
Southern States	49.9	57.5	52.0	57.6	62.2
River Club	4.0	6.9	7.9	7.7	4.9 ⁴
Ocean Breeze	14.8	16.2	15.1	16.8	19.5
Utilities Inc. ⁶	15.8	12.6	13.1	13.2	18.6
Stuart ²	887.7	909.8	944.0	947.9	1042.8
Martin County ³	301.8	315.4	316.6	385.1	425.8

¹Includes only 10/81 - 12/81
²Does not include water sold to Southern Gulf
³Includes Southern Gulf pumpage
⁴excluded 7/84 - 9/84, 12/84
⁵Previously Miles Grant Utility
⁶Previously Oz Utility

TABLE 2

Per Capita Water Consumption (1980)

County	<u> Per Capita Rate (gpcd)</u>
Collier	287
Palm Beach	231
Dade	195
Martin	193
Broward	187
Lee	172
*Orange	169
St. Lucie	168
*Osceola	164
*Polk	162
*Charlotte	158
Monroe	157
*Highlands	156
Hendry	153
*0keechobee	146
Glades	140

*These per capita figures apply only to the portion of the county located within the District.

Source: Technical Memorandum "A Potable Water Use Data Base for South Florida 1980"

constructed for a particular region based on historical data using the premise that the "structure" of the area being modeled is relatively stable. In Martin County this does not appear to be the case; therefore, the emphasis placed on historical demands was significantly reduced. In the fourth section there is further discussion about old and new development in Martin County and how it affects water demand.

Water Supply

The structure of the groundwater flow model, for which the results of this model are inputs, is such that demands need to be classified as either utility demand or self supplied demand. In the past the District has worked with three categories of suppliers: large utilities, small utilities (less than 100,000 gpd), and self supplied, and procedures were developed for allocating demand to each of these potential suppliers.

Historically Martin County has been about 40% self supplied, 10% small systems, and 50% large utilities. Table 3 compares Martin County's nonutility pumpage to other counties in SFWMD. The figures show that in the past, Martin County has had a relatively large percentage of non-utility demand. Caution is again emphasized when using this information for future considerations about the composition of Martin County water demand. In actuality the future of Martin County, as seen by the Martin County Planning Department, is one which will be dominated by the large utility. It is assumed that by buildout the majority of private potable wells will be given up for connections to major utilities. Small utilities are projected to disappear, as they will be absorbed by the more efficient larger utility

TABLE 3 Percentage of Total Annual Pumpage by Source (1980)

County	Self Supplied/Small System (%)
*Charlotte	100.0
*Highlands	87.0
Glades	75.7
*Polk	68.4
Martin	48.6
*0keechobee	45.1
*Osceola	39.7
St. Lucie	34.1
Hendry	29.7
Orange	29.3
Lee	15.6
Monroe	13.0
Palm Beach	6.6
Dade	3.5
Collier	2.8
Broward	2.8

*These percentages refer only to the portion of the county located within the District.

Source: Technical Memorandum "A Potable Water Use Data Base for South Florida 1980" systems. The effect of this on the water demand estimation process is discussed in section four.

Before proceeding to the next section it should be emphasized once again that data on past water use does provide some useful information about water demand and supply. However, since the future development in Martin County is proposed to be quite different than past development, one should hesitate to place emphasis on these characteristics of the past.

III. MARTIN COUNTY PLANNING FRAMEWORK

The water demand model developed for Martin County was based upon data provided by the Martin County Planning Department. The model uses these data to estimate urban water demand for two distinct development phases: 1983 existing and committed, and buildout. The term "existing and committed" refers to development that actually exists or has received preliminary approval from the County Commission, and "buildout" refers to the maximum amount of development expected under the current Comprehensive Plan.

Two sets of data were provided for each of the two development phases mentioned above. The first set of data consisted of land acreage for 14 land use types (i.e., rural ranchette, rural, estate, low, medium, mobile, and high residential uses; general, limited, commercial office residential, and waterfront commercial uses; industrial; institutional; and agricultural) by TAZ. These acreage figures were further classified as vacant, wetland, or developed. The land was considered "developed" if actual development existed or if there was committed development which had been approved by the County Commission. It should be mentioned that at buildout there will be zero acres of land in the "vacant" category for all land use types. Also note that

agricultural acreage was not incorporated into the model because water use for this category is handled directly in the Hydrogeology model.

The second set of data consisted of housing unit projections by type (i.e., single-family, multi-family) by TAZ. From these data population projections were constructed by applying a persons per unit rate to the housing unit data. A factor of 2.9 persons per unit was used for single-family units and a factor of 2.0 was used for multi-family units, both of which were provided by the Martin County Planning Department. In formulating population estimates the Planning Department assumed 100% occupancy. Historically the occupancy rate for Martin County was 76% (1980 census).

Given the structure of the model it was necessary to combine the housing unit data and the land use data so that the housing units could be distributed by land use type for each TAZ. For those units not yet committed to development this distribution process was quite straightforward given the assumption that single-family units were to be allocated to areas with a density less than 5 units per acre (upa) and multi-family units were to be allocated to areas with a density equal to or greater than 5 upa. This assumption about housing units, combined with the information contained in the Martin County Comprehensive Plan regarding density transfer and maximum density, laid the framework for the allocation of new housing units projected to exist by buildout.

The units in the category of "existing and committed" had to be distributed in a slightly more complicated fashion. The first step in distributing these units was to calculate the maximum number of units which could exist in each TAZ given the land use acreage data and the maximum upa for each land use category, the latter being in accordance with the

Comprehensive Plan. Existing and committed units were then distributed in proportion to the potential maximum number of units for each land use type by TAZ. The results of this distribution process are presented in Appendix A for both development phases. Appendix A also contains the acreage data for the non-residential land use categories.

IV. WATER USE AND SOURCE FACTORS

In the previous section the general framework of the data was described. This section presents the methodology used to develop water use factors by land use type which are applied to the data set in section three in order to generate estimates of urban water demand. Also discussed in this section is the issue of what sources will supply the future water needs of Martin County.

Water Use Factors

There were four types of demand for which water use factors had to be constructed: residential potable and non-potable, and non-residential potable and non-potable. The methodology used to develop such factors for Martin County was further concerned with relating these factors to each particular land use type.

Residential Potable Water Demand

Residential potable water demand was determined to be independent of land use type, thus a factor of 100 gallons per capita day (gpcd) was applied to the population projections for the county in order to generate residential potable water demand estimates. The factor of 100 gpcd is the standard used by the Department of Environmental Regulation and is provided by the Water Pollution Control Federation in their document, "The Manual of Practice for Design and Construction of Sanitary and Storm Sewers."

Residential potable water demand estimated for Martin County are shown in Tables B.1 (1983 Existing and Committed) and B.4 (Buildout) of Appendix B. Non-residential Potable Water Demand

Unlike residential potable water demand, it was determined that nonresidential potable water demand across the different land use types. The main reason for this is the wide variation in types of development associated with the various land use types. Table 4 gives a brief description of the development characteristics of the six non-residential land use categories as described in the Comprehensive Plan of Martin County. The information in Table 4 was used along with material from Technical Information Memorandum 6.2.1 of the Department of Environmental Regulation in order to develop the water use factors for non-residential potable water demand shown in Table 5.

The next step in calculating non-residential potable water demand was to take non-residential land use acreage by type and calculate the expected square footage of building space which would exist under the Proposed Land Development Code for Martin County, taking into account such things as open space requirements and maximum building cover. For the purposes of this model it was assumed that the developer would take full advantage of planning guidelines by maintaining the minimum amount of open space and the maximum building cover. Given this assumption, the acreage data was converted to building space and the factors in Table 5 were applied in order to estimate non-residential potable water demand.

It should be noted it was necessary to make some minor adjustments to the acreage data before calculating water demand. First of all, fifty percent of total vacant acreage (e.g. for future development) of waterfront commercial and commercial office residential land uses were treated as residential with

TABLE 4

Non-residential Development Characteristics

Land Use	Description
General Commercial	Retail sales and services, trade and warehouse facilities, hotels and motels
Limited Commercial	Retail shops with small floor area, small parking lot requirements, and limited inventory
Comm. Office Res.	Business offices and financial institutions, used as a buffer between intensive comm. & res.
Waterfront Comm.	Marine related services, some restaurants & shops as approved by the Planning and Zoning Board
Industrial	Accessible to rail facilities and major arterials, includes salvage yards
Institutional	Schools, government buildings, hospitals, parks and recreational areas, and public open space

Source: Martin County Comprehensive Plan (1982)

TABLE 5

Non-residential Potable Demand Factors (gallons/1000 sq. ft.)

Land Use	<u>Factor</u>
General Commercial	150
Limited Commercial	125
Comm. Office Res.	100
Waterfront Comm.	250
Industrial	100
*Institutional	175

*applied to 1/2 of the developed acres assuming the remainder to be public open space

Source: Various literature releases including memorandum 6.2.1 from the Department of Environmental Regulation

development occurring at a density of 10 upa. Also, based on information provided by the Martin County Planning Department, the majority of land considered "institutional" was treated as open space, therefore no potable demands were calculated for these institutional areas.

Non-residential potable water demand estimates for Martin County are shown in Tables B.2 (1983 Existing and Committed) and B.5 (Buildout) of Appendix B.

Residential Non-Potable Water Demand

The structure of this water demand model, which involved linking water use with land use, played a major role in the development of residential nonpotable (irrigation) water use factors. Each residential land use category was expected to have unique characteristics regarding maximum and actual density, type of irrigation system, and other relevant factors that influence irrigation practices, and which needed to be examined in great detail in order to develop water use factors by land use type. The basic methodology followed was to develop figures reflecting average irrigation area per unit by land use type and use this information along with the housing unit data provided in Appendix A to estimate total irrigation area by land use type. These data could then be used along with irrigation rate and frequency factors to provide non-potable water demand estimates.

A primary consideration influencing the development of residential water use factors had to do with the maximum density allowed for each land use category according to the Comprehensive Plan. It was assumed by Martin county that all new development would occur at these maximum densities, which are shown below.

Land Use Type	<u> Maximum Density (upa)</u>
Rural Ranchette	.2 .5
Estate	2.0
Low	8.0
Mobile	8.0 15.0
High #Waterfront	10.0
*Comm. Office Res.	10.0

*This figure applies to 50% of total vacant acreage These density figures were important because they aided in determining average lot sizes for the various land use categories and lot size was the key input in calculating irrigation area per unit by land use type.

There are two other inputs which were taken into consideration when irrigation area was calculated, both of which are based on provisions of the Comprehensive Plan of Martin County. These two provisions, open space requirements and density transfer, are of importance because they both directly affect the amount of irrigation area per unit.

Open space, as defined by the Comprehensive Plan, is comprised of permeable open surfaces, excluding principle structures and impermeable surfaces (i.e. parking lots). According to the Plan, all residential development must maintain a minimum of fifty percent of the gross land area as open space. Golf courses and wetlands can be used in calculating open space as long as the percentage of each does not exceed ten percent, thus ensuring a minimum of thirty percent of the development's upland area to be comprised of open space. In this model it was assumed that this open space would be irrigated. This provision does not apply to construction of a single-family house on a lot of record, which is a lot that was platted before April 1, 1982.

Density transfer is the other provision contained in the Comprehensive Plan which had to be incorporated into irrigation area calculations. This provision allows property owners to transfer density to the upland area of any site which contains functional wetland properties. This provision applies only to those developments submitted for review as a planned unit development and is subject to the following constraints:

- a) The gross residential density of the upland property is equal to or less than two times the gross residential density of the entire parcel, and
- b) The residential density of the upland property is less than 15 upa, and
- c) The total number of units allowed in any development using this transfer formula shall be equal to or less than the maximum allowed on the parcel determined by the density shown on the Land Use Map, and
- d) Density transferred is less than or equal to (wetland acreage x gross density).

If the above criteria are fulfilled, and a property owner takes advantage of the density transfer, then the actual lot size for each unit in that particular parcel would be smaller than one would expect since the development (upland) density would be greater than the established land use density. It was assumed in this model that property owners would, for the most part, take full advantage of this density transfer privilege and it was therefore included in the process of estimating average irrigation area per unit by land use type.

Table 6 contains the average per unit area of irrigation figures by land use type. There are two sets of numbers shown, one set for existing units, another set for committed and future units. This time distinction was made in order to reflect the changing character of development in Martin County when comparing old development with new development. For example, the land use categories of low, medium, and high are generally associated with community developments, and in the future these developments will be taking advantage of the density transfer provision described above. The use of density transfer leads to a smaller lot size per unit, therefore a smaller area per unit will require irrigation. Actual on-site inspection of both old and new housing units in each land use category verified the figures shown in Table 6.

After developing the factors of irrigated area per unit it was necessary to examine irrigation system design characteristics. The main issue of concern was what percentage of units in each land use type would have automatic irrigation systems. This was an important distinction because data indicate that those units with systems irrigate at a greater frequency than those without. The percentages shown in Table 7 were based upon a sample of units observed throughout the study area as well as information provided by the Florida Irrigation Society. The distinction between "old" and "new" refers to those systems installed before or after 1980. It was necessary to develop these two sets of figures in order to reflect the changing irrigation requirements of new development compared to old development. The percentages are higher for the newer development because the newer development is more elaborately landscaped and the turfgrass being used for lawns (St. Augustine grass) requires more irrigation than the turfgrass used by much of the older development (Bahia grass).

TABLE 6

Residential Irrigation Area Factors (square feet/dwelling unit)

Land Use	Existing	Future
Rural Ranchette	23,500	23,500
Rural	20,000	20,000
Estate	13,500	13,500
Low	7,000	5,400
Medium	4,800	3,600
High	1,300	800
Mobile	800	1,500
Comm. Off. Res.	1,300	1,500
Waterfront Comm.	1,300	1,500

TABLE 7

Units with Automatic Irrigation Systems (percentage)

Land Use	Existing Development (1980)	New Development (post 1980)
Rural Ranchette	25%	50%
Rural	25%	50%
Estate	75%	100%
Low	25%	90%
Medium	50%	100%
High	50%	100%
Mobile	50%	50%
Comm. Office Res.	50%	100%
Waterfront	50%	100%

The final step before estimating residential non-potable water demand involved developing assumptions about irrigation application rates and application frequency; both the Florida Irrigation Society and IFAS helped in formulating these assumptions. Sprinkler systems installed before 1980 were assumed to apply 1/2" per acre per application, and systems installed after 1980 were assumed to apply 3/8" per acre per application. This reduction in the application rate reflects the change from a jet head to a mist head. Those that irrigate by other means (i.e., garden hose) were assumed to apply 1/4" per acre per application. The application frequency for those units with systems was assumed to average out to three times a week which is 155 applications a year. Those that irrigate by other means were assumed to concentrate their efforts during the dry season leading to a yearly figure of

60 applications.

With all the assumptions described above one could then proceed with the estimation of residential non-potable water demand. Because the various assumptions have a time element built into them it was necessary to separate the housing unit data into three categories: units developed through 1980, units developed after 1980 through 1983, and projected units not yet developed. After placing the housing units in these various categories it was simply a matter of applying the factors developed above to the housing units distributed by TAZ by land use type.

Residential non-potable water demand estimates for Martin County are shown in Tables B.1 and B.4 of Appendix B.

Non-residential Non-potable Water Demand

The procedure for estimating non-residential non-potable water demand was somewhat restricted by the data available, that being acreage figures for 1983

existing and committed, and buildout. The leading factor used to develop demands from these data was the open space requirement, similar to that which was used for residential demand estimation. General commercial, waterfront commercial, and industrial land uses are subject to a twenty percent open space requirement. Commercial office residential, and institutional development must maintain forty percent open space. Finally, limited commercial development must have thirty percent open space.

Non-potable water demands were estimated by applying the open space requirement for each land use to the acreage data thus giving an estimate of irrigated area. This area information was then used along with the application rate and frequency factors previously discussed in order to estimate nonresidential non-potable water demands by land use type by TAZ.

Non-residential non-potable water demands for Martin County are shown in Tables B.3 and B.6 of Appendix B.

Water Sources

The water demand estimates in the previous section were formulated so that they could be used in the Hydrogeology Division's groundwater flow model. The structure of the groundwater flow model is such that it specifically inputs only utility supplied water from central wellfields. Self supplied water is handled differently because much of it is used for irrigation and the amount withdrawn far exceeds the amount actually consumed. To adjust for this, the model specifically inputs utility demand only and incorporates an evapotranspiration factor to account for the consumption associated with nonpotable water use.

In section two information was provided about the various sources that have existed in the past in Martin County, those being private wells, small

systems, and large utilities. This section is concerned with future sources in Martin County and addresses this issue for both potable and non-potable water use.

Potable Water Use

Potable water sources in the past fell into all three categories, including private wells, small systems, and large utilities. The future, however, is projected to be quite different. The planning assumption developed by Martin County for this study is that small systems will eventually be disbanded with customers hooking up to larger utilities. It is also projected by Martin County that the majority of private wells will disappear. Only developments in the lower density categories of rural ranchette and rural are assumed to remain on private wells through buildout. Exceptions to this assumption are the estate density developments in TAZ's 38 and 100 which are assumed to remain self supplied because they are outside the urban service area.

This information was incorporated into the water demand estimates in two stages. First of all, for the 1983 existing and committed estimates, adjustments were made to potable demand by subtracting out the demand attributed to private wells and small systems. The buildout estimates were also adjusted but only for those units which would still be self supplied (i.e., rural ranchette, rural, and some estate). With these assumptions the estimates presented in Appendix B were adjusted so that they represented utility demands. It should be noted that due to data limitations it was necessary to assume that all non-residential potable water was utility supplied.

Non-potable Water Use

The basic assumption made about non-potable water use was that the majority of it would be self supplied, with people taking advantage of the cost savings associated with using a private well or available surface water for irrigation. It was assumed 100% of non-potable use attributed to rural ranchette and rural would be self supplied, 95% for estate, 85% for low, medium, high, and commercial office residential, 75% for mobile, and 0% for waterfront. Non-residential non-potable water demand was assumed to be 85% self supplied.

After developing these assumptions about water sources, it was then possible to take the water demand estimates shown in Appendix B and adjust them so that they reflected utility demand.

The utility demand figures for both potable and non-potable uses are shown in Appendix C.

V. MODEL VALIDATION

In this section the water demand model described herein is used to generate water demand estimates for 1980 for two sub-areas so that these estimates can be compared to actual pumpage for 1980. The two sub-areas were chosen so that their boundaries followed those of major utility service areas. The two areas used for this analysis were the Stuart utility service area, and the service area which includes Hydratech, Intracoastal, Hobe Sound, and Miles Grant utilities.

Stuart Utility Service Area

The first step in the validation process was to take the 1983 existing and committed housing units by land use type and adjust them to the 1980

level. After completing this task it was simply a matter of applying the water use factors presented in Section IV in order to estimate water demand. These estimates were then adjusted to utility demands, taking into account both potable and non-potable self supplied. A summary of the residential water demands is shown in Table 8.

The non-residential water demands were calculated by first adjusting the 1983 existing and committed acreage to 1980 acreage. To make this adjustment it was assumed that the 1980 non-residential level of development would be the same percentage of 1983 existing and committed as was residential (i.e. 84.7%). This assumption was made because the 1980 housing unit data was based on census data and there was no real data for 1980 non-residential acres. Potable and non-potable water use factors from Section IV were applied to the 1980 acreage figures in order to estimate non-residential water demand. These demands were then adjusted to utility demands. Non-residential water demands are summarized in Table 9.

The final step was to add residential and non-residential utility demands and compare that total with the actual pumpage figure for the Stuart utility for 1980 (i.e., 887.7 million gallons). The model estimates utility pumpage to be 1324.4 million gallons and at first it appears that the validity of the model is questionable. This discrepancy actually points out the effect of some of the planning assumptions regarding occupancy rate and persons per unit.

According to the 1980 census the occupancy rate for the city of Stuart was 80.5% and the average persons per unit was 1.8. If these factors were used with the housing unit data, utility potable water demand would decrease from 696.5 million gallons (mg) to 445.9 mg, which would reduce estimated pumpage for 1980 to 1073.8 mg.

TABLE 8

Estimated Residential Water Demand Stuart Service Area 1980 (million gallons)

Land Use	<u>Units</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>Potable (mg)</u>	<u>Non-potable (mg)</u>
Estate	127	368	13.5	66.1
Low	2,588	7,502	274.6	345.8
Medium	488	1,357	49.7	67.5
Mobile	447	894	32.7	10.3
High	4,617	10,281	376.3	173.1
Comm. Off. Res.	99	198	7.3	3.7
Waterfront	38	76	2.8	1.4
Totals	8,404	20,676	756.9	667.9
Adjusted Potable: Adjusted non-potab	756.9 - 60 le:).4 ¹ = 696.5 mg = 89.9 mg		
Residential Utility	y Demand:	= 786.4 mg		

¹private wells demand

TABLE 9

Estimated Non-residential Water Demand Stuart Service Area 1980 (million gallons)

Land Use	Acres	Potable Demand	Non-potable <u>Demand</u>
General	333.7	238.8	210.7
Limited	6.6	3.9	3.1
Comm. Off. Res.	54.2	25.9	34.2
Waterfront	7.3	8.7	2.3
Institutional	268.1	132.5	87.6
Industrial	148.7	70.9	46.9
Totals	818.6	480.7	381.8

Non-residential Potable Demand	=	480.7	mg
Adjusted Non-potable Demand		57.3	mg
Non-residential Utility Demand	=	538.0	mg

Another source of error involved using information contained in the Martin County Comprehensive Plan regarding open space requirements and maximum building cover for non-residential development. This was a problem because the majority of the development that existed in 1980 was developed without such a plan and most likely would not conform to the present planning guidelines. Because there was very little real data about 1980 nonresidential water use, it was difficult to adjust the non-residential water demand estimates for 1980.

The problem is that the model is designed to estimate future water demands for Martin County, which will be dominated by "new" development constructed under the guidelines of the Comprehensive Plan, making it difficult to adjust the model for the non-residential development for 1980. The second sub-area chosen had less non-residential acres and should therefore be a better area to use for validation purposes.

Hydratech, Intracoastal, Hobe Sound, and Miles Grant Service Area

The same procedure used for Stuart was used for this area, beginning with the residential demands which are summarized in Table 10. A minor difference in this area is that the residential potable demands were adjusted for small systems as well as private wells. The Stuart area did not contain any small systems.

Non-residential water demands were calculated using the same procedure as described previously. It was determined from the residential data that this area was 70% developed in regards to 1983 existing and committed development, therefore 70% of the 1983 existing and committed non-residential acres were assumed to be developed in 1980. A summary of the non-residential water demands is shown in Table 11.

TABLE 10

Estimated Residential Water Demand Hydratech, Intracoastal, etc. Service Area (million gallons)

Land Use	Units	Population	<u>Potable (mg)</u>	<u>Non-potable (mg)</u>
Rural	360	1,044	38,2	173.5
Estate	1,153	3,344	122.4	600.4
Low	3,749	10,300	377.0	501.0
Medium	1,610	4,141	151.6	222.8
Mobile	1,244	2,488	91.1	28.7
High	264	528	19.3	9.9
Comm. Off. Res.	7	14	.5	.3
Waterfront	9	18	.7	.3
Totals	8,396	21,877	800.8	1500.9
Adjusted potable: Adjusted non-potable	800.8 - :	399.5 ¹ - 88.4 ²	= 312.9 mg = 110.4 mg	
Residential Utility	Demand:		= 423.3 mg	
¹ private wells deman	d			

²small systems demand

TABLE 11

Estimated Non-residential Water Demand Hydratech, Intracoastal, etc. Service area (million gallons)

Land Use	Acres	Potable <u>Demand</u>	Non-Potable <u>Demand</u>
General	122.2	87.4	77.1
Limited	25.8	15.4	12.2
Comm. Off. Res.	8.4	6.3	5.3
Waterfront	16.6	12.5	10.5
Institutional	136.6	57.0	76.0
Industrial	240.8	114.9	43.1
Totals	550.4	293.5	224.2
Non-residential Potabl Adjusted Non-potable D	e Demand emand	= 293.5 mg = 33.6 mg	
Non-residential Utilit	y Demand	= 327.1 mg	

Residential and non-residential utility demands were then added together and compared to the annual pumpage figure for the combined service areas for 1980 (i.e., 600.5 mg). The estimated pumpage for the area for 1980 was 750.4 mg. Once again the estimated value is larger than the actual pumpage, but this can partially be attributed to historical deviations from the planning assumptions about occupancy rate and persons per household.

According to the 1980 census the occupancy rate for Martin County was 76% and the persons per unit was 2.03. Incorporating these factors into the residential demand estimates leads to a decrease in utility potable water demand from 312.9 mg to 173.3 mg, which would reduce estimated pumpage for 1980 to 610.8 mg.

This validation process has made apparent that the model cannot be used as is for ex post forecasting. The main reason for this relates to the assumptions made by the Martin County Planning Department regarding occupancy rate and persons per unit. These assumptions lead to a maximum estimate of population, which for future considerations may be a safe approach, but using these assumptions for historic projections introduces an upward bias, making it difficult to evaluate the accuracy of the model.

VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The water demand model presented in this report was developed to estimate water demand for Martin County for 1983 existing and committed, and buildout. The model uses population, housing unit, and land use data provided by the Martin County Planning Department to generate estimates of residential potable and non-potable water demand, and non-residential potable and non-potable water demand.

Prior to designing the model it was necessary to review historic water use characteristics of Martin County. It was found that in the past Martin County has had a relatively large percentage of users which were self supplied (40%) or connected to small systems (10%), leaving only 50% of the water users connected to large utility systems. The Planning Department expects this supply structure to change, with the trend leading toward the majority of users connecting to a large utility system. This was an important consideration because the demand estimates were adjusted to represent utility demand and then used as input to the Hydrogeology Division's groundwater flow model which evaluates the impact of withdrawals from central wellfields on water levels.

As it turned out, the review of historical development patterns for Martin County made it apparent that past and future development in the area are expected to be quite different, thus making it difficult to relate future water use to historic water use. With this, it was necessary to make extensive use of the various provisions in the County's Comprehensive Plan which establish guidelines for present and future development.

The data provided by the Planning Department suggest that Martin County will experience considerable growth. The present population of Martin County is 77,519 (estimated as of April 1, 1984) and is projected to grow more than 325% reaching almost 330,000 by buildout. Population projections for the County were based upon housing unit data and persons per unit factors of 2.9 and 2.0 for single-family and multi-family housing units respectively. The Martin County Planning Department assumed 100% occupancy, thus making the population projections a maximum estimate of population based on the housing unit data.

Water demands were estimated using the aforementioned population projections, as well as housing unit and land use data. The projected utility urban water demand for 1983 existing and committed was 20.9 million gallons per day (mgd) and 55.9 mgd for buildout. It should be emphasized that, due to the planning assumptions made about persons per household and occupancy rate, these demands represent maximum demands. It may be useful to use more historically based assumptions, especially regarding occupancy rate, and evaluate the impact this has on the demand estimates.

A final topic of interest which would affect water availability in Martin County is wastewater reuse. At this time Martin County has yet to format a structured policy regarding the future of wastewater reuse in the area. Due to this limiting factor it was only possible to consider potential wastewater reuse in a general fashion, looking mainly at the relationship between potential supply and demand. This analysis is presented in Appendix D.

APPENDIX A

POPULATION, HOUSING UNIT, AND NON-RESIDENTIAL ACREAGE DATA

TOTALS	28888888884848888888888888888888888888	
55	หน พระ พระ พระ	
1153	เห สูง คือ คือ คือ คือ คือ คือ คือ คือ คือ คือ	
7359	STATESTAL STATESTATESTAL STATESTATESTATESTATESTATESTATESTATESTAT	
21521	20000000000000000000000000000000000000	ň
7388	ื่อ เป็น พ.ศ. พ.ศ. พ.ศ. พ.ศ. พ.ศ. พ.ศ. พ.ศ. พ.ศ	EXISTING F
4885	асти 1904 11 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	IND COMMIT
9477	H B B B B C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	TTED (1983
517		U
226	่ศี พิวออัต‡ออออต์ออออดดอออดีออ⊣อีออออดออออออออออออออออด มี	
27687		n 2017
24694		24 s - 1
129680	Population and a second	
	Ž	

ω G

TROLE A. 1

TOTI	N L	
л Ц	๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛๛	
1610	R R R R R R R R R R R R R R R R R R R	
7613	ля ля лайоооооооооооооооооооооооооооооооооооо	
24054	N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N	
62231	00000000000000000000000000000000000000	ESTI
16676		MATED HOU
72 44	ан 1 с вена 1 с вена	SING UNIT
12946		DISTRIBUT
3078	000000708008700880080700847770800045050707078888888888	ION
617	มี สุดอธุรรรรรรรรรรรรรรรรรรรรรรรรรรรรรรรรรรร	
63841		SINGLE
72228	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	MULTI
329595	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	

- - -

TABLE A.3 DEVELOPED NON-RESIDENTIAL ACRES EXISTING AND COMMITTED (1983)

.

TAZ	GENERAL	LIMITED	COR	WATER	INDUST.	INSTIT.	TOTAL.
1	101	0	0	O	0	O	101
2	42.3	0	\bigcirc	0	Ö	· O	42.3
3	34.9	54.2	1.9	5.9	9.2	Ó	106.1
4	12.9	22.5	1	2.8	0	47.1	86.3
5	23.2	17	36.3	19.3	0	86.1	181.9
6	23.9	Ö	3.4	0	0	17.9	45.2
7	41	Ó	13.5	0	27,5	0.2	82.2
8	34.9	0	. 9.7	0	0	8.3	52.9
9	15	O	15.2	0	17.5	0	47.7
10	15.9	8.8	13.7	11.9	9.1	0	59.4
11	0	Ò	27.7	Õ	0	22.4	50.1
12	2.8	0	0.7	0	0	3.2	6.7
13	3.5	O	37.8	0	0	0	41.3
14	9.8	Q	0	0	O O	12.2	. 22
15	0	Ŏ	Q	0	• • •	10.5	10.5
1.62	17	0	6.5	2.1	6	O	31.6
17	0	O	• • • •	0	0	83.8	83.8
19	0	Ó	21.2	0	13.7	111.7	146.6
17	185.2	· Q	0	0	56.3	17.4	258.9
2021	. 77.2	<u></u>	18.1	0	0	6.4	101.7
	18.8	7.8	1.1	15.1	0	62.4	105.2
23	75.6	0	O .	O.	82.5	27.5	185.6
24	27.9	O I	0	0	4.6	71.6	104.1
25	17.9	O U	1.6	21.7	0	16.5	57.7
26	0	0	0	25.7	0	2	27.7
27	25	11.4	5.7	0	7.5.4	28.5	142
28	9.9	. O	Q A com	0	201.0	0	201°2
29	/.8	· ()	18.0	0	0		કેલ્ટન પ્ર દાવ /
30 	15.5	i a it.	4./	Q Q	U O	27.0	10 E
<u> </u>	7.4	0	0		(En n	0	12.U ED D
చెంద - హాహ		. 0	0	0	പിക്കക് ന	0 10 7	JZ = 2 40 7
	U 	0	· · · ·	0	0	AQ.S	40.J
·4 기미	9 87 7	. U	· ·	ب برج د	0	. n	01 O
20 77		· · · · ·	1. 1949 ES	1		. 177 m.	21.7 74 5
20	 	а 0	لد ه که که ()	0	7.0	ш и н н./ (1)	/ .
ം ഗ ഷന	ů. Č	v Ö	· ·	0 0	О	.~* 1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
 	О	\	1 7	Ó	0	, n	77
	77 Q	ů O	1.4. "7	ŏ	147	Ő.	54. 0
	ana an Ch	0	1 (./ a / 5)	Ŏ	1.7#7 Ö	õ	
A 12	ŏ	ŏ	o o	Ő	· 0	65 Ž	45.2
A 7	58 A	с 4 8	1 8	. č	. Ö	1.3	48.5
40	46.4		 0	0 O	- Ō	10_1	20.2
AS		0	0	, n	° O	Ō	ů.
-40 &A	õ	ů O	Ŏ	ŏ	Ő	õ	. Õ
4.7	2.A	18.6	Ō	õ	õ	ö	21
ae		1010 0	õ	ŏ	ž	Ő	z.
40	ů n	ů.	TA A	4.1	Õ	Ő	38.7
50	ñ	õ	O r. O		ň	õ	Ó.
QA -		Ő	õ	ő	ŏ	41.8	79.9
97	60.1 67 R	i n	ň	24. Ř	329.7	29.2	446.5
90	1	Ő	ő	л н. с. П	41.3	0	41.3
0,0 QQ	ň	ŏ	ŏ	ň	 Ö	ŏ	
100	1.8	õ	0 0	38.5	ŏ	ŏ	40. <u>3</u>
TOTALS	1071.1	161.2	314.4	190.6	999.6	2605.7	5342.6

TABLE A.4 DEVELOPED NON-RESIDENTIAL ACRES BUILDOUT

8

TAZ	GENERAL	LIMITED	COR	WATER	INDUST.	INSTIT.	TOTAL
1	123	0	7.3	O	, O	16.5	146.8
2	58.8	Q	0	0	Ō	66.1	124.9
3	34.9	54.2	1.9	11.9	9.2	71.8	183.9
4	26.7	22.5	1	11.1	0	107.3	168.6
5	25.2	17	39.9	19.3	0	86.1	187.5
6	31.3	0	33.2	0	0	17.9	82.4
7	101.8	Ö	43.4	· 0	134	3	282.2
. 8	38.6	Ö	22.9	Ó	Ö	8.3	69.8
6	7 ET ET	Õ	23.3	Ō	28.1	0	126.9
10	20.3	8.8	29.7	11.9	11.1	O	81.8
11		Ŭ.	27.7	Ó	Ŏ	22.4	50.1
12	2.8	ò	0.7	Ö	0	2.2	6.7
13	3. Fi	õ	42.8	0	Ó	0	46.3
14	9.8	Ő	0	ö	Ó	12.2	22
15	Ő	0.7	Ö	õ	Ō	19.4	20.1
14	20.9	Ŏ	6.5	2.1	6	0	35.5
17	0	. Ö	0	ō	ō	83.8	83.8
10	ŏ	ō	21.2	õ	13.7	111.7	146.6
16	208 Z	ő	0	Ō	64.6	23.2	297.5
2021	77 7	ŏ	18.1	6	0	6.4	107.7
2021	$A \leq A$	7.8	1.1	15.1	õ	62.4	130
 77	94 7	0	25.8	0	97.3	84	303.8
 	70,7 TL	Ó	0	ò	4. 6	71.6	112.2
2.** 25	10		τ. Φ	21.7	0	19	63.6
 	<u>، ،</u>	. Õ	2.1	26.7	ō	16.7	45.5
2.80) (*)***	55 7	15 4	51 9	()	97.3	28.5	248.2
27	 00	101.7	00	ŏ	406.3	Ő	416.2
20 00	7.7 AT O	0	125 7	о О		ŏ	169.6
27 70		0 A	10 7	Ó	i õ	72.8	162.1
-252 18 4		7 • - 1 Ö	- /ነፉ ግር (17 7	ů. G	, <u></u> 0	67.9
ະວ ພະ		. 0		0	105.7	38. Å	244.1
ು ಸ ಶಾಶ		0		0	1.c.u.r A	40 K	40 Z
	· ·	0	0	Ó	ŏ	0	
् भ ्	V 87 77	0		15 4	0	$\forall a$	ет <u>л</u>
000 1914	 ସେଲ ପ	() / E	40 7 1	10.0	14 55	- 70 A	177
20 77	37.D	a.J A	**±=-> /**//////////////////////////////////	0	10.0		20017
->/ ***	. 17.7	0	24.4	О	0 0	50.7 50 A	
ුස අප	د ح م	07 (20 D	Ő	0	ം യിക്കിന് ന്	88.7
	2.0	ತೆ. ಕಲ್ಲಿ ಜಿ. (3)	04.0 AA i	ŏ	14 7	0	eo a
40	4 4 77	с 0	տեւմ։։ Դ	0	1.7** <i>7</i> Å	ň	14 7
41 47	14.7	0	0	o o	ó	1178	113 8
· 42	0 04 4	70 O	77 KU (D	0	ő		144 5
9-0 	70.0		20.U	0	. v	a.∎ "≷ 1	47 5
44	1.7.1	0 0	0.4	Č Č	ő	0	-r/ ແ
40	0	0	~ ~	0	· ·	Ő	0
40			04 O	0	~ ^	ů N	47 G
47		പ്തം പ് ന	7 e L 22 71	0	100 0	00 1	
48	0	0	1.,) "7" 4.	10.1	. LO.S. 6 A	702 # 1	AL 1
47	0	0 ^		LV-1	1.) (~	0 0	~rCr+1 /^
50	0 • • • • •			<u> </u>		и о	145 0
70	104.1	U A	0 ~	0 0/ 0	1504 4	41.0	しかしょう インフィーマ
97	125.9	0	U	∠4• . 0	1074.4	ali 7 • ali 14	1774.0
98	o	U O	0	U A	634.7	~v. ~v. 4 /	ుచంగ సికి
99	0	() ()		ب ب	U ~	/1.0	71«ሮን ተልታ 4
100	18.4	43.5	∠, , <i>t</i> -}	//ul	Ω.	Ų	⊥ «∳-⊃ « «∳
TOTALS	1755.7	288	899.9	267.1	3459.2	1632.9	8302.8

APPENDIX B

ESTIMATED WATER DEMAND 1983 EXISTING AND COMMITTED AND BUILDOUT

TOTALS		
26.094	94900+0+0000000000000000000000000000000	
480, 573	NA 000000000000000000000000000000000000	
3735.381	1222 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	
3447.942	0000672260088008555555555555555555555555555555	
1045.954	00005550000000000000000000000000000000	
120, 964	№ №	
345.261	сососисствосососососососососисство нализира с с с с с с с с с с с с с с с с с с с	i •
12.609		1
9.510		
9224.087	10000000000000000000000000000000000000	
129680	266 137711 113665233 80112 57748322 885122122418212555511 72 5788322 26 4522 57852 57852 57855555 11 575555 11 575555 11 575555 11 5755555 11 5755555 11 5755555 11 57555555 11 575555 452 565 565 565 565 565 565 565 565 565 5	\$ } }
4733.331		
13957.418	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	

40

 $\begin{array}{c} {\sf TRBLE 8.1} \\ {\sf ESTIMATED RESIDENTIAL WATER DEMAND 1983 EXISTING AND COMMITTED (MGY)} \end{array}$

,

ţ

TABLE B.2 ESTIMATED NON-RESIDENTIAL POTABLE WATER DEMAND EXISTING AND COMMITTED-1983 (MGY)

4

TAZ	GENERAL	LIMITED	COR	WATER	INDUST.	INSTIT.	TOTAL
1	72.263	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	72.263
2	30.265	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	30.265
	24.970	32.316	0.906	7.035	4.388	ดดุดด	69.616
ā	G 770	1 X A 1 K	171 1.777	7 770	0 000	10 450	2A 118
ez;	11 800	105 1724	177 774 27	CT 010	0) (7(7)(7)	with the second	107 000
	177 1010	1925 1920 (* 1767)	1 2023	22.02 1 62 1.11 62.62.63	CD CD CD CD		
C.;	1 / a 1 (040	KU 4 KUKUKU Marina Marina	ನಿ ನಿಲ್ಲೇಷ್ ೧೫೭೮		0.000	/ 4 ⁴ */ 3.	al C> + 1, 7 al -
1	27.004	10.000 17.000	6.437	0.000	10.11/	- M. WBS	48.7/4
년 1	24.970	0.000	9.627	N N N N N	N" NNN	5.464	33.061
9	10.732	$\square . \square \square \square$	7.250	\emptyset . \emptyset \emptyset \emptyset	8.347	Ø.ØØØ	26.329
iØ	11.376	5.247	6.535	14.190	4.341	0.000	41.688
11	0.000	Ø.000	13.212	0.000	0.000	9.349	22.561
12	2.003	0.000	0.334	0.000	0.000	1.336	3.673
13	2.504	0.000	18.030	0.000	0.000	0.000	20.534
14	7.012	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	5.092	12.103
15	Ø. ØØØ	0,000	0.000	0.000	Ø.000	4,382	4.382
16	12.163	0.000	3.100	2.504	2.842	0.000	20.429
1 7	17 67 67 67	(7) (7)(7)(7)	ലെ വാമമ	ത തത	0 000	34 075	X4 075
10	0,000 (3 (30)0)	(2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2)	103 1173	0.000	2 arra	76 610	678 7764 678 7766
10		CA CACACA	8. 4. 1 8. 1 8. 1 4. CA CACACA	¥2): KAKAKA CA ERENIKA	0 a	-+O-017	4// / 55
1.77	s daz y dava dava stren interna	123 - 123 (23 (2) (7) - (7) (2) (7)	0.000	21.2000 Co (2002)	20.004	7 • × 0 ×	100.022
	33.234	0.000	8.804	0.000		2.0/1	66.0-7
	13,451	4,651	VI. 525	18.006	0.000	26.043	62.675
23	54.090	0.000	0.000	0.000	39.351	11.477	104.918
24	19.962	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.194	29.883	52.039
25	12.807	0.000	0.763	25.876	0.000	6.986	46.333
- 26	Ø.ØØØ	0.000	0.000	30.646	0.000	0.835	31.481
27	17.887	6.797	1.765	0.000	35.010	11.895	73.354
28	7.083	0.000	0.000	0.000	119.866	0.000	126.949
29	5.50i	0.000	8.729	0.000	0.000	0.000	14.309
30	11.090	1.252	2.242	0.000	0.000	12.229	26,812
31	6.725	0.000	0.000	3.697	M. 709	0.000	101.422
30 30	C1 C1 C1 C1 C1	01 000 01 01010	0 202	21 20 20 20	24 898	0 000	DA COC
15 TE 16 TE	(), (),(),(), (),(),(),(),(),(),(),(),(),(),(),(),(),((3, 6)(3)(3) (3, 6)(3)(3)	40 n (0) 40 (0) (7) (7) (7) (7)	CT CT (TT (TT (TT (TT (TT (TT (TT (TT (T	0 000	12 COD	17.0000
	23 n 33 23 23 (A (A(A(A))	0:000 0:000	0.838383 0.08030	43 4 43 43 43 (3) (3) (3) (3)	(2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2)		101020
nd) Arth Mar Mar		 10.0000 0.0000 	V3 , V3V3V3 V2 , 47777	0.000	9.000 9.000	- U, UUS	
-20	. 3.792	Ki . Ki Ki Ki	V. 477	16.04/2	0.000	0.000	
్ చి	14.755	S.5//	10.752	0.000		7.304	40.192
37	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0,000	0.000
38	0.000	0.000	\emptyset . 000	0.000	0.000	Ø.417	0.417
39	0.000	3.577	0.811	0.000	0.000	0.000	4.388
40	16.313	0.000	7.966	0.000	7.012	0.000	31.290
41	Ø. Ø00	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
42	0.000	\emptyset . \emptyset \emptyset \emptyset	0. DØØ	0.000	0.000	27.212	27.212
43	41.927	4.054	0.859	0.000	0.000	0.543	47.382
44	7.226	0.000	Ø ØØØ	Ø.000	0.000	4.215	11,442
45	0.000	0.000	0.000	01. (21(2)(2)	0.000	0.000	0.000
л љ.		0.000 01 (342) (3	J 000	0 000	0 000	0.000	0 000
-+ O /3 "7	4 "71"7	11 000	0.000 0 0.000	0,000 0 000	0.000 0.000	0.000 0.0000	10 000
** / a.co	iefi/ (ACXPREA	1.1.a VU 7 VU (23. 73 (74.63)	V2 ≤ V2 V2 V2) (2) C2 (2) (2)	(3 CACACA	KJ ≥ KJ KJ KJ 1 – ZI™Z A	0.0000	1.12.5 COV// 4. 0.12.4
46		43 - 434343 	ເມີນ ແນຍ ເມື່ອງ ເປັນ ເປັນ ເປັນ ເປັນ ເປັນ ເປັນ ເປັນ ເປັນ	4 000	1.4.1	0.000	La Artabili Anna annana
44 ⁻ 7	0.000 0.000	0.000	10.004	4.887			21. a 37-3
្រុក	0.000	0.000	N. NON	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
96	27.260	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	17.446	44.705
97	44.932	Ø.ØØC	0.000	29.573	157.261	12.187	243.952
78	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	19.699	0.000	19.699
99	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
102	1.288	0.000	0.000	45.910	0.000	0.000	47.197
TOTALS	766.343	96.112	149.963	227.282	476.791	363.687	2080.178

TABLE B.3

ESTIMATED NON-RESIDENTIAL NON-POTABLE WATER DEMAND EXISTING AND COMMITTED-1983 (MGY)

1

TAZ	GENERAL	LIMITED	COR	WATER	INDUST.	INSTIT.	TOTAL
1	63.764	0,000	0.200	0.000	0.000	0.000	63.764
2	26.705	ល. លោល	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	26.705
	77 AZZ	25 6.4A	1 200	1 040	ດ ວຸດາ/	0,000	57 447
	G 1/1/1	174 657	エッエンジン (7) とです	1.00% (A 00%	12 1 7 10 M	11 010	75 101
	50 - 1.595 50 - 2.4177	10.00	0.001 00 0.7	Ø.004		14.000	
9	14,047	8.047 * *	dada 717	6.W72	0.000	a‰ / n .k. / ™	/8.885
Ć:	15.089	0.000	2.14/	6 " NAR	0.000	5.650	22.886
7	25.885	0.000	8.523	Ø,Ø00	8.681	0.063	43.151
8	22.033	0.000	6.124	0.000	0.000	2.620	30.777
Þ	9.470	0.000	9.596	\emptyset . $\emptyset\emptyset\emptyset$	5.524	0.000	24.590
103	10.038	4.167	8.449	3.756	2.873.	0.000	29.483
11	0.000	0,000	17.488	0.000	0.000	7.071	24.559
12	1.768	0.000	(A. 442	Ø.000	0.000	1.010	3.220
1 🗙	2 210	0 000	PT GAA	0 000	12 ភ្នេសាស្ត	0 000	26 017A
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	26 1 63 72	(2) (2)(2)(2)	CA CACACA	CA CACACA	0.0000 01.0000	7 CHR 1	100 031700
1 57		V.) v V.)V.)V.) Ch. Ch.Ch.Ch.Ch				പ്പെട്ടും. ന്നാനം മ	102.03-00
10	9.900 	0.000	0.080	<u> </u>	0.000	2.24 	S. 314
1 to	10.753	0.000	4.104	12.663	1,894	0.000	17.393
17	0.000	@. @@@	Ø.000	0.000	0.000	26.453	26.453
18	0.000	0.000	13,384	0.000	4.325	35.260	52.969
19	116.923	\varnothing . $@$	0.000	0.000	17.772	5.493	140.187
2021	48,739	0.000	11.427	0.000	0.000	2.020	62.286
22	11 869	5.693	Ø. A94	4.767	M . MMM	19.698	40.721
22.52	£7 70¢	<u>ភ</u> ខាពាគ	07 07 07 07	0 2000	24 042	Q 491	82 450
 	177 A 174	43 a 45 45 46 (5) (5) (5) (5)	30 a 30 70 700 Ch 50 70 70 70	0:000 0:000	4 /18/0	01001 010 6000	14 LLO
.c. 14 (m.c.7	1. Z = \$3-1. ** 4 - Z = TT Z = Z	0.020	VI. (242)(2)	< 2040 CB	ఎంగా చెడు ఈ రాజాలు	alian (DVI). Di tan	41.000
20		0.000	1.018	6.850		3.208	24,367
20	V.VVV	10,101212	0.000	8.113	0.000	0.631	8.744
27	15.783	5.398	2.336	0.000	23.170	8.996	55.483
28	6.250	\emptyset . \emptyset \emptyset \emptyset	0.000	0.000	79.327	0.000	85.577
29	4.924	0,000	11.553	0.000	0.000	0.000	16.478
30	9,786	0,994	2.967	0.000	0.000	9.249	22.996
[12] 1	en 0.1385	(21 (21 (21 (21 (21 (21 (21 (21 (21 (21	0 000	0 979	0 2020	0 00	6 913
12.02	01,000 01,000	01000 67 (30)(2)	CA (24)26	0 0000	14 470	01010	14 479
ماه ایت این این	63 - 63 63 63 63 - 63 63 63	60 (040) (04 (040)	63 5 63 63 63 63 53 53 53 53	60 - 60 60 63 60 - 60 60 60		4	10.70
sin di Tanàn		(23 a (23)(23)(23) (23 a (23)(23)(23)	21.222323 Ch. Ch.C.C.C.C.	U. UUUU	0.2000 0.000	LaCa / LL Chi ChiChiChi	ide / dit mi mamma
 	<u>0.000</u>	N. NNN	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
35	3.346	0.000	0.631	4,924	0.000	0.000	8,902
36	13.195	2.841	14.205	Ø.ØØØ	2.399	5.524	38.164
37	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
38	Q.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.316	0.316
39	Ø.ØØØ	2.841	1.073	0.000	0,000	0.000	3.914
40	14.394	0.000	10.543	0.000	4.640	0.000	29.578
41	0.000	0.000	0. DB0	01. (MMM)	0.000	0. 000	0.000
4.7	0 000	61 (192)	0 000	0 2020	0 000	201 581	201 581
л. А. Т.	74 004	2 220	3.77.6	0,000	0.000	(A 0.1 (A	A1 747
	1990) a 7 7 800 7 1997-1972	പം ചെല്ല തെ താരതം	1. 6 3. 5. FUI CA CACACA	0.000	62 (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2)	VI - 71 4 10 77 - 4 10 10	mis/O2
(† 14 11 m	C.376 C.376	U.2000 0.000	0.000		0.000 0.000	J.166	7.000
4)	V. 81212		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
46	0.000	\varnothing . $@\emptyset$	C.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
47	1.515	8.807	0.000	0.000	Ø. ØØ9	0.000	10.322
48	arnothing . $arnothing$	\emptyset . 000	0.000	0.000	0,947	0.000	Ø.947
49	0.000	0.000	21.844	1.294	0.000	0.000	23.138
59	0.000	0.000	Ø.ØØØ	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
φ <i>L</i> ,	24.05a	0.000	ต. ตดต	0.000	M. MAM	13,195	37. 240
07	70 AAO	() (2)(2)(2)	(A) (A)(A)(A)	7 070	1014 1775	0 017	1401 740
00	67 CECENCO CA CREACE	60 - 60 - 60 - 60 - 60 - 60 - 60 - 60 -	ess vovsed Da caraca	7 . C7.4.63 (% 737373	ער אנייינע איייעע גע איייעיארארי	/ a 25.1.7 (16 - 63.63.43	100 / 000 17 01 01 01 01
78		0.000		VI. 21VIVI	10.007	0.000	10.007
44 44 1	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
100	1.136	0.000	0.000	12.153	0.000	0.000	13.289
TOTALS	676.219	76.328	198.4 90	60.166	315,539	275. 0 71	1601.812

ESTIMATED
RESIDENTIAL
8.4 DEMAND-BUILDOUT
(NGY)

TOTALS	S&&4%83\$
858.968	и 14000140400000000000000000000000000000
3425.300	
11901.573	172200000000000000000000000000000000000
10822.152	8257 0.00000000000000000000000000000000000
2257.481	0.000000000000000000000000000000000000
201.618	² 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
445.827	00000000000000000000000000000000000000
162.669	00000000000000000000000000000000000000
30.561	Тоорноороороороороороороороороороороороор
50106.148	10000000000000000000000000000000000000
329595	1072 1072
12030.214	%20.0%8%9%2%0%2%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
42156.361	1257 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10

3

ł

TABLE B.5

ESTIMATED NON-RESIDENTIAL POTABLE WATER DEMAND BUILDOUT (MGY)

TAZ	BENUSE	LIMUSE	CORUSE	WATUSE	INDUSE	INSTUSE	TOTAL
-1	88.003	0.000	3.482	0.000	0.000	6.886	98.372
2	42.070	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	27.587	69.657
13	24.970	32.316	0.906	14.190	4.388	29.966	106.737
- 4	19.103	13.415	0.477	13.236	0.000	44.783	91.014
122	18.030	10.136	19.032	23.014	0.000	35.935	106.146
	22 XQ4	ด.อดด	15.836	Ø. 000	0.000	7,471	45.7Øi
7	70 834	71 010303	20.701	0.000	63.916	1.252	158.704
á	27 417	0 000	10.923	0.000	0.000	3.464	42,004
0	SA GIQ	0,000 0,000	11.114	0.000	13.403	0.000	78.535
7 1 (2)	4 A 52A	5,200 5 747	14.166	14.190	5.295	0.000	53.422
3. W./	2018-02-01 02-03(73(73	0.217	17 212	0.000	Ø. 000	9,349	22.561
4 A 1 CD	0,003	0.000 0 000	47 TT4	0.000	0.000	1.336	3.673
ــند . ۲۳۲۲ ا	2 SONA 2 SONA	0.000	202.415	0.000	0.000	0.000	22.919
4) -4. /1	120 K CONSERVE 1177 - 173 1 173	0.000 0 000	CA (A(A)(7)	0.000	ด.ดดด	5.092	12.103
1.5	7 a %3 4 44 75 (21 (21(21	0.0000	(2) (2)(2)(2)	0 000	0.000	8.097	8,514
ند بند با هن	4.7 CMCM3	63 636767	T 10403	2 504	2.862	0.000	23.420
4.07	3.9657333 03 03 030	103 010303	0.200 0.000	0.000	0.000	34.975	34.975
17	0.000 CS C2C2C2	(7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7)	172 1110	6 6 6 6 C	6.535	46.619	63.266
10	ACER ACTACIAN A CETAN ANTER	03:0000 D CACACA	1. 12. 13. 13. 13. 13. (2) (2) (2) (2) (2)	ខា ខាភាភា	701 813	9.683	190.530
1.77 (n/a/13)	100.000	0.000	0.000 0.274	7 155	04.010 12 12/2/2	2.671	73.694
12021	യയം ഹയം? തർ ർണ്ജ	V3 6 V2 V2 V2 21 - A V2 1	0.00T 0 505	10 004	0.000	26.043	80.419
31. <u>21.</u> 21. 21.	31.a 1.770 7 m - a m7	പ്പ തല്ലില് സം ബാസാസം	20° പ്പപ്പ നേ 2004	10,000 0 0000	8.000 84 A10	75 058	162.961
star internet	07.100	20. 2070120 Car Carlana	1. al. e - LINGICO CR. CACACA	0.000 13 (30) 24		70 007	57 SIA
24. 11. 500	20.707				C0 C0 C0 C0 C0	2000 77 (D177(7)	49 240
25	13.378			20.070 T: ÅTO	0.000	1 07D	7,2,2012
26	0.000	8.000 0.000)1.807 m. m.m.m.	V) = V,HOV) AZ A 4 74		471 LOO
27	39.494	9.182	24.7483		403 700	11.075	1012007 7006 001
28	7.083	0.000	U.000	0.000	170.770	(2) = (2)(2)(2) (2) (2)(2)(2)	200.001 01 342
29	51.409	0.000	39,937	0.000		70,000	71,000 00 574
3Ø	43.429	5,605	9.158	0.000	0.000	<u>30.384</u> 0.000	00.J/0 40 178
31	17.958	0.000	13.880	16.337	0.000		40.170
32	26.329	0.000	20.510	0.000	59.957	10.110	122.700
	0.000	0.000	0,000	0.000	0.000	16.820	18.824
34	\emptyset . $\emptyset\emptyset\emptyset$	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
35	3.792	0,000	1.192	18.602	0.000	14.190	-5/ - / / /
36	28.476	3.875	20.176	0.000	7,870	12.7/1	/3.169
37	14,095	ର " ପରସ	11.638	0.000	0.200	14.983	40.716
38	2.146	$\emptyset, 000$	0.000	0.000	0.000	21.870	24.015
39	2,003	13.773	29.954	0.000	0.000	0.000	45.731
4Ø	18,602	4.77Ø	21.035	0.000	7.012	0.000	51.417
41	10.517	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	10.51/
42	Ø.ØØØ	0.000	\emptyset .000	Ø.ØØØ	0.000	47.496	47.496
43	69.115	18.364	17.076	0.000	0.000	0.543	105.097
44	7,226	\emptyset . \emptyset \emptyset \emptyset	3.053	0.000	0.000	12,938	23.217
45	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
46	0.000	0.000	0.300	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
4.7	1.717	22.836	10.446	Ø.000	0.000	0.000	34.999
48	0.000	0.000	\emptyset , $\emptyset\emptyset\emptyset$	Ø,000	87.192	40,943	128.135
49	Ø.ØØØ	0.000	17.171	12.044	0.000	0.000	29.215
50	0.000	0,000	0.000	0.000	Ø.000	\emptyset . 000	0.000
96	74.481	0.000	0.000	0.000	Ø.00 0	17.446	91.926
97	90.078	0.000	0.000	29.573	760.500	12.187	972.338
98	0000.0	0.000	0.000	0.000	311.422	0.000	311.422
99	0,0 0 0	0.000	0.000	Ø.000	Ø.Ø00	29.883	29.883
100	13,165	27.128	1.145	91.938	0.000	0.000	133.376
TOTALS	1256.156	171.714	429.236	318.505	1649,976	681.506	4507.093

ł

TABLE B.6

4

_____ ____

ESTIMATED NON-RESIDENTIAL NON-POTABLE WATER DEMAND BUILDOUT (MGY)

TAZ	GENUSE	LIMUSE	CORUSE	WATUSE	INDUSE	INSTUSE	TOTAL
1	77.654	0.000	4,609	0.000	0.000	5.208	87.471
2	37.122	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	20.845	57.988
3	22,033	25.664	1.200	3.754	2.904	22.665	78.222
4	16.857	10.654	0.631	3.504	0.000	33.871	65.516
1.0	15.910	8.049	25.190	6.092	0.000	27.179	82.420
6	10 741	0 000	20 940	ด.ดดด	0.000	5.650	46.371
7	4.4 ~4.9	0.000	27 400	0,000 0 0,000	<u>47 799</u>	0,000	174 015
á	04.207 04 760	0,000	1A A57	0.000 0.000	(7) (7)(7)(7)	2 620	A1 AA"7
	алтанды / Л 17 к. с. Ш	60.0000 Ch (h(7)(2)	1, -+ 1, -+ C) / 1 /1 - 7 3 /A	03.00/0303 01.00/0303	0.070 0.070	0 0100 0 0100	71 244
1 (2)	47.000	A 14.77	10 751		X 504	6.000	AD 00A
	13 (AGAGA	-r. 107 03 030303	17 400	a aaa	0.000 0.000	"7 (7)"7 (74.077 74 ESC
1.1. 	4 740	(3, (3)(3)(2) (3) (3)(3)(2)	してい ^っ ていい (ひつれれご)	21.21 (7) (7)(7)(7)	0.000	77 3 (2) 3 (2)	Network and the second s
4 J. 4 J.	1.700 0.7040)	20, 202020 23 (32323	123 - 14 - 1422 123 - 123 - 123 - 123 - 123 - 123 - 123 - 123 - 123 - 123 - 123 - 123 - 123 - 123 - 123 - 123 - 123 - 123 - 123	0.0000 0.000	$\frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2} $	1.º01.00 12 12 10 10	
के करें। संदर्भ	4000 4000	0.000	27 - XI21 CA (20202)	0.000	20°2020 100 10020	2051 2000	403 037C
1.4	G. 107 G. 0000	(A) = (A) (A) (A) (A) = (A) (A) (A)	3. 20 XU XU Câ Câ Câ Câ	103 (23 (23 (23 (23 (23 (23 (23 (23 (23 (2	CA (31/21/2)	ಮಾಗಿಕವೆ ಎರಡಿ. ೭ ಕ⊄್ರಿ/1	1. %Ja %J-a∿ad ∠ /)82,50
10	12 10200 12 105	0.JJI 0.DDI	21 - XIVIVI		1 000	C: 12.47 C: C2C2 C2	0.** 10.088
10	10.170	0.020	44 J. V.244 CA (24/24/24	0.000	1, 2, 03 77 41 03, 03 03 03		17.000
17	0.000	123 a 123423123 - 778 - 778778778	17 704	V) - V)V)V) Ch - Ch(Ch(Ch	0.000 1 700	20,400 76 0(0	20.4JJ 57 0/0
18	0.000	<u>0.000</u>	13.384	V. 2022	4.020 no ron	30.260 - 707	02.767
17	132.390	0.000	0.000		20.392	/.3 <i>%</i> 3	184.108
2021	48.737	0.000	11.42/	1.574	0.000	2.020	64.080
22	27.526	3.693	0.694	4.767	0.000	19,698	56.3/8
aline design	61.050	0.000	16.288	0.000	30.714	26.516	134.568
24	22.728	0.000	0.000	0.000	1,452	22.602	46.782
25	11.995	0.000	2.462	6.850	0.000	5.998	27.305
26	0.000	0.000	1.326	8.428	0.000	5.272	15.026
27	34.849	7.292	32.703	0.000	30.714	8.996	114.555
28	6.250	0.000	0.000	0.000	128,255	0.000	134.505
29	27.715	0.000	79.358	0.000	0.000	0.000	107.074
3Ø	-30,322	4,451	12.122	0.000	0.000	22.9 80	77.875
31	15.846	0.000	18.372	4.325	0.000	0.000	38.543
32	23.233	\emptyset . $\emptyset\emptyset\emptyset$	27.147	0.000	39.679	12.185	102.244
33	0.000	0.000	ଷ . ଏସସ	0.000	0.000	12.721	12.721
34	\emptyset . $\emptyset \emptyset \emptyset$	0.000	Ø. 000	0.000	0.000	Ø. Ø00	0.000
35	3.346	0.000	1.578	4.924	0.000	10.733	20.581
36	25.127	3.078	26.705	0.000	5.208	9.659	69.778
37	12.437	0.000	15.404	0,000	0.000	11,332	39.174
38	1.894	0.000	0.000	0.000	Ø.ØØØ	16.541	18,435
39	i.768	10,938	39.648	0.000	0.000	0.000	52.353
40	16.415	3,788	27.842	0.000	4.640	0.000	52.685
41	9.281	0.000	0.000	0,000	0.000	0,000	9.281
42	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	35.923	35,923
43	60.987	14.584	22.602	Ø. 000	0.000	0.410	98.582
44	6.376	0.700	4.041	0.000	0.000	9,786	20,203
45	0.000	0.00A	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
4.4	0 000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	07.0700
1. /2.*7	ೆ ಜ್ಞಾನೆಗಳು	18.135	13.826	0.000	0.000	<u>ต</u> . ตดต	33.476
ae	6 000	0.000	0.000	Ø. ØØØ	57.704	30.967	88.670
40	0:000 0:000	0 000	22 72B	X 199	0 0 0 0 0 0	0.000	25.916
	្លុះស្រុះស ភាគាគា	(A)	673 173 67 67 173 173 173 173	27 CACACA	0.000 0.000	0.000 0.000	0.000
aw az	ം പായവ പെട്ടുനാന	(2) = (C) (C) (C) (2) = (C) (C) (C)	(A (A(A))	678 (24 (24 (24 (24 (24 (24 (24 (24 (24 (24	0.000 0.000	17 10E	70 014
70	ಬಾರ್ಷ/ಹನ್ ಇಲ ೨೮೫	63 - 636363 63 - 636363	യം ഗവംയ മ മിമിമ്	7 Q70	SCAL DOM	4 - 4 - 4 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 -	SOC 2017
77 80	/7.400 01 0000	01 - 01010 01 - 01010	യം യയയ സംസായയ			(7) (7)(7)(7) (7)	
78		KI, KIKIKI KA CACAKA	(2), (2)(2)(2) (2), (2)(2)(2)	0.000 0.0000	ata kati ta kat Internet kati ta	10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 -	వాణు, అగారు అని ఓణిం
4 13-13		U.UUU.U Og sag	4 57 4 50 KU	0,000 00 770	0.000	22.002 0 000	KARONA Konsa
1.121421	11.010	21.J44	L. G. A. Q.	ವಾಗ್ ಎಂಬರ್ಮಿ	127 - 127 (2112)	0.000	07.014
т∩тане	11002 100	1 34 347	SAC 175	BA NIA	1001 040	515 450	3504 443
2 (a) 1 8 1 tan 53	,s at way to y is ""Theorem CD	أراسية "سية السيامين بش	فيعهم كمعه جلي الاختما كمنية كميه	sarra a subat ""	أسطلا فالعاد فتستخبر	Teach de Sand Mar I Teach Sand	فيركا فبسواها مستوني

APPENDIX C

ESTIMATED UTILITY DEMAND 1983 EXISTING AND COMMITTED AND BUILDOUT

ESTIMATED
RESIDENTIAL
UTILITY
TABLE C.1 DEMAND-1983
EXISTING
Đ
COMMITTED
(MGY)

OTALS	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
0.000	
0.000	
196.957	8000117600000000000000000000000000000000
1015.590	
234.186	00004200000000000000000000000000000000
25.411 47	M0000000000000000000000000000000000000
81.742	нососи сосодо с
3.105	
9.310	NOCHOCOCOCOCOCOCOCOCOCOCOCOCOCOCOCOCOCOC
1566.301	Napole 12277 02000 15244120 12275 12200 1220 1220 1220 1220 1220 1220 12
3177.403	8490040084002228574044450222285740244502222857402445022228574024450222285740245222857402452228574024522285740245222857402452228574052285740522857405228574052285740522857405228
4743.703	73900140000000000000000000000000000000000

<u>منہ</u>

TABLE C.2 ESTIMATED NON-RESIDENTIAL UTILITY WATER DEMAND EXISTING AND COMMITTED-1983 (MGY)

÷

Ĵ.

TAZ	GENERAL	LIMITED	COR	WATER	INDUST.	INSTIT.	TOTAL
1	81.827	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	81.827
	34.270	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.200	0.000	34.270
3	28.275	36.165	1,086	7.315	4,824	Ø.000	77.665
4	10.451	15.013	0.572	3.471	0.000	21.888	51.375
5	18.796	11.343	20.752	23.928	0.000	4Ø.Øi1	114.831
6	19. 3A3	0.000	1,944	0.000	0.000	8.318	29.625
	33.217	12.000	7,718	0.000	14.419	0.093	55.447
, S	28.275	0.000	5.545	0.000	0.000	3.857	37.677
0	19 1억국	0.000 0.000	8.690	ต. ดดด	9.174	0.000	30.018
1 (2)	12,882	5.872	7.832	14.754	4.771	0.000	46.111
1 1	(2) (2) (2) (2)	0.000	15.836	ด ภุลุณ	0.000	12.429	26.245
12	2 248	0.000	10.000 M.4MM	0.000	0.000	1.487	4.156
4	7.8%	0.000	21.619	0.000	0.000	0.000	24,445
1 A	7 940	0.000	<u>ต</u> . ตดต	ด. ดดด	0.000	5.669	13.609
1. ~~ 4.425,	0, 0,0,0	01 (2)(2)(2) (2) (2)(2)(2)	0.000	21. (A(A)74	0.000 0.000	4.879	4.979
1	13 773	0.000	3 716	2.604	3.146	ด. ดดด	23,238
1 ") 1 ")	10,770 (3 0000	0,000	0,710 0 000		0 000	38,943	TR. 943
10	0.000	0,000 0 000	12 120	(3 (2)(2)(2)	7 183	51.908	71.211
1.0	4 CE (2) (2) 4 CE (2)	<u>6</u> .000	(2) (2)(2)(2)	07 (71(71(7)	20 520	8 086	187 450
17 1000 1	100.044	0.2000 01 0000	101 249	2.000 7 (2010)	12 (A1A)	2.974	75.882
10 % Later & 19 19	టూను నాహెళ్లూ 1531 ోహెచ్క	5.0000 5.000	140,0-10 M 470	10,000	0 000	70 000	A8 784
	1.002.01	 D1 (2)(2)(2)	0.027 0.000	10.721	AZ 257	12 780	117 284
्राज्य के स्वर्थ स्वर्थ	01::207 200 A074	0,000 0,000	(A) (A) (A)	90 a 90,90,90 98 - 98,97,09		22072 770 77	
.2 M	22°004 11 EQU	63 - 63 63 63 (75 - 63 63 63	$O \cap O \in \mathbb{C}$	0.000 02 000	A 000		10 000 10 000
20	ter and the second s	0.000	(), 71, J (), 71, J	20270T	0.0000 0.0000	A 000	77,700 707 707
.20 20	UN OF A	121 - 123123123 117 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7	0.000	01.0000 00.0000	VO AGL	¥⊒,7307 177 040	C31 77634
2/ 00	20.204	7.607	2.5 LIU 73 (3737)	CLUCKO CACACA	30.400 171 775	1.022.414	4 TO 708
- 28	13. VI.CI	0.000	4 C2 4 4 4 5 5	(D = 2D C S C)	1015700 0 0000	23 - 23 KG KG C2 - C2 C2 C2	4.2.757.000
27	6.017 10 557		110.402	- <u>V) - V)V</u> VV) CA CACAEA	0.0000	· V) · V) / I /	10.791
212 21	12.008	1.4101	2.057 0.050	0.000 7 047	0.000	15,010	-046-202 11 7180
-25 d. 	7.010	0.000		0,040 0 000	40 . 40 20 40 50 - 7 57 57 57 57	K) - K) K) K) CA CACACA	1, 1, 5 ° 6, 17 10 17 17 17
-1-1-1 	0,000	0.000	0.000	. 0.000 a aaa	.∠7.s.3743 rs rsmos	10,000	107 k - 27 W 102 m - 27 W
44 	V. MMØ	0.000	8.888 9.999	. 10. 1000		10.720	103./A.C. 03.036363
34	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
52	4.294	0.000	SNG . D	17.541	. <u>N</u> .NNN		14 × 16 / 1 × × × × × ×
36	16.933	4.004	12.863	0.000	3.780	6.152	40.715
37	0.000	0.000	0.000	10.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
38	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	13.465	0.465
39	0.020	4.004	0.972	0.000	0.000	0.000	4. 975
49	18.472	0.000	9.547	0.000	7.708	0.000	
41	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
42	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	30.297	30,299
4.3	47.476	4.537	1.029	0.000 ·	0.000	0.604	53.647
44	8.183	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	4,694	12.876
45	Ø.ØØØ	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
46	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
47	1,944	12.411	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	14.355
48	0.000	$\emptyset.000$	0.000	0.000	1.573	0.000	1.573
4.9	$\emptyset.000$	\emptyset , \emptyset \emptyset \emptyset	19.780	5,083	0.000	0.000	24.863
50	0.000	\emptyset . $\emptyset\emptyset\emptyset$	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
96	30.868	0.000	0,000	0.000	Ø.000	19.425	50.292
97	50.879	0.000	0.000	30.747	172.872	13.570	268.068
98	2.202	0.000	0.000	ଷ . ଏପଡ	21.655	0.000	21.655
99	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
100	1.458	0.000	0.000	47.732	0.000	0.000	49.191
TOTALS	867.775	107.561	179.737	236.307	524.122	404.948	2320.465

1ATED
RESIDENTIAL
UTILITY
3 DEMAND-BUILDOUT
(MGY)

Ť

١.

TOTALS	очымчаястарынаровойонойоройоного собласти и польки польки польки польки польки польки польки польки польки поль	TA2 1	
0.000		0,000 0,000	
0,000		0.000 0.000	
605,267	60000000000000000000000000000000000000	ESTATE 2.181 36.680	
2275.910	00004498000100054428611625886811746017740011709427867997	49 LOW	ESTIMATED
415.915	000140000004050000000000000000000000000	MEDIUM 12.547 27.378	RESIDENT
56.323	60000000000000000000000000000000000000	0,000	IAL UTILI
96.827		0.000 HIGH	TY DEMAN
25.614		0,269	D-BUILDOUT
30.561	1 Nooroorooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooo	0.000	r (MGK)
3506.417	800540800000000000000000000000000000000	NONPOT. 71.860	
10305.84		POTABL	
4 13812.261		241.199	

TABLE C.4

ESTIMATED NON-RESIDENTIAL UTILITY WATER DEMAND BUILDOUT (MGY)

.

Y

TAZ	GENUSE	LIMUSE	CORUSE	WATUSE	INDUSE	INSTUSE	TOTAL
1	99.651	0.000	4,173	0.000	0.000	7,668	111.492
2	47.638	0,000	മംഗരമ	0,000	0.000	30.717	78.355
3	28.275	36.165	1,086	14.754	4.824	33.366	118.470
2 1 -	21.632	15.013	0.572	13.762	0.000	49,863	100.842
3	20.416	11.343	22.810	23.928	0.000	40.011	118.509
6	25.358	0.000	18.980	0.000	0.000	8.318	52.657
7	82.476	0,000	24.811	0.000	70.260	1.394	178.941
8	31.273	0.000	13.092	0.000	0.000	3.857	48.221
9	61.168	Ø.000	13,320	0.000	14.734	0.000	89.222
iØ	16.447	5.872	16.979	14.754	5.820	0.000	59.871
11	0.000	Ø.000	15.836	Ø.ØØØ	0.000	10.409	26.245
12	2,268	\emptyset . $\emptyset \emptyset \emptyset$	0.400	0.000	0.000	1.487	4.156
13	2,836	0.000	24.468	Ø.Ø00	Ø.ØØØ	0.000	27.304
14	7.940	0.000	0.020	0.000	0.000	5.669	13.609
15	0.000	Ø.467	Ø.00 0	0.000	0.000	9.015	9.482
16	16.933	0.000	3.716	2.6Ø4	3.146	0.000	26,398
17	0.000	0.000	Ø.ØØØ	0.000	0.000	38.943	38.943
18	0.000	0.000	12.120	0.000	7,183	51.908	71.211
19	169.893	0.000	Ø. ØØØ	0.000	33.872	10.781	214.546
2021	62.545	0.000	10.348	7.439	0.030	2.974	83.306
.22	35.324	5.205	0.629	18.721	0.000	28.998	88.876
23	78.344	0.000	14.749	0.000	51.017	39.036	183.146
24	29.166	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.412	33.273	64,851
25	15.393	0.000	2.230	26,904	0,000	8.829	53.356
26	0.000	0,000	1.201	33.103	Ø. ØØØ	7.761	42.064
27	44.722	10.276	29.613	0.000	51.017	13.244	148.872
28	8.021	0.000	0,000	0.000	213,236	0.000	221,057
29	35,567	Ø.000	71,860	0.000	0.000	0.000	107.427
30	49.177	6.272	10,976	0.000	0.000	33,831	100.257
31	20.335	0.000	16.636	16.985	UDN. W		53.957
32	29.814	0.000	24.582	0.000	65.909	17.938	138.243
33	0.000	12.000	0.000	0.000	0.000 0.000	18.728	18.728
34	6.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000		
35	4.294	0.000	1.429	19.341		15.800	40.864
చద	32.245	4.337	24.182	0.000	8.601	\$ 44 x 12 .2 (U)	83.636
31 	15.960	0.000	15.949	4,000	0.000	10.000	40.07.4
3H	2.431		0.000	0.000	0.000	24.301	20.781 ez ega
-37	2.268	15.414	- 35.902			0.000	
40	21.064	3.338 a aca	20.211	5.000 5.000	7 . 7 12 C3 C3 CACACA	0.000	07.0ZI 11 010
41	tt. 718	0.000 0.000	CA CACACA		V aca	с. <u>И.</u> ИИИ С. ООЛ	11471W 50 004
4 A.	20,000 20,000		100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0.000 0 000	0,000 D 0000	UZ,004 0 404	110 002
**) 0 /	/0.200 0.407	21-10 m 11-1-1-1-1- 125 - 125-125-125	120°400 7 150	(3) (2) (2) (2) (3) (2) (2) (2)	(3) (2) (2) (2)	47 7716	24 74 20 T
4 1-4- л та	0.100	0.000 0.000	0.007 0.000	0.000 0.000	(2) - (2) (2) (2) (2) - (2) (2) (2)	14.4QC	201247 68 01/863
***.) 21 /	93 - 9272973 Ca Carata	(2) _ (2) (2) (2) (2) _ (2) (2) (2)	0.000	$C_{1} = C_{1} = C_{1$	0,000 0 0000	. 0.0000 0.0000	63 a 63 63 63 63 63 63 63 63 63
-1+ C) /1 **7	0.000 (044	25 2000 The second	10 KORA 10 KORA	0.000 0 000	(A (A(A)))	0.000 0 0000	403 01203
** / // C3	2 . 7 44	20.000 0.000	12.JZU 07 0000	0.000	05 040	4= =00	141 474
40 40	20 - 2020-2020 671 - 671 - 671 - 671 - 671 - 671 - 671 - 671 - 671 - 671 - 671 - 671 - 671 - 671 - 671 - 671 - 671 - 671 - 671	12), 10,12,123 12) (7) (7) (7)	062500 06 501	10 moo	70°040 0 0000	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	100年まれ。 文内1 文文
94-7 ST(7)	0.000 0 000	63 64640 63 646404	2014 - 2015 274 - 271577427	പംഗംപംപം ത്രാനി	ະ (7) ຕາເກີດາ	2.000 M MMM	
ටහ රැ	0.0000 QA 770	മ മമമ മ	ຍະສະນະບອ (7) (7)(7)(7)	6.400 6.400	60 - 60 60 60 17 - 60 60 60	్.లలల ≮౪ దారా≖	£950000 104℃ 7ん4
70 07	01111007 1020 02024	63 (ADADA (ADADA	(7) (7)(7)(7)	₩	aze goe	13 570	997 X17
	ಾರ್ಯವಾ ಭಾಭಾಷ ಬೇ ಬೇಬೇಬೇ	67 CADACA (7 CADACA	() () () () () () () () () () () () () () ((7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7)	SAC SSA	() (20) () (20) ()	TAD. TTA
70	0,000 (A (A(A)A	ର ରହନ ମାନ	(7) (2) (7) (7)	വം ഗഗം മറാർമ	01.010300	an a	and and a second se
77 1000	4 <u>A</u> . (2)/A ⁻⁷	26000 261 740	い。*JND4D 1 マブウ	05 500 05 500	0 000	232272 (7) (2)(2)(2)	142 220
1. 4343	1761707	ALKER ALADIKA	ելը հանքենպ	2 ዓ.ም. በ የሚዲስ /	the a the best for	0.000	ತಿ. 1 ಕೆ ಜಿ. ಮೂಲಕ್ಕೆ ಹಿನ
TOTALS	1422.420	192.169	514,457	331.152	1813.768	758.824	5032.790

APPENDIX D

WASTEWATER RECLAMATION

WASTEWATER RECLAMATION

Consideration of wastewater reclamation in the Martin County Water Supply Study is important because of the potential for efficient use of the water resource coupled with appropriate and beneficial disposal of wastewater effluent. Wastewater reclamation will benefit Martin County in several major ways:

- By providing a quality, reliable source of irrigation water for large scale landscape demands.
- By improving the level of treatment of wastewater and by providing an approved beneficial means of disposal.
- By creating an additional source of groundwater recharge in many areas of the county.
- By reducing the demand on the groundwater resource by large scale landscape irrigators.

In other areas of South Florida, wastewater has become an important priority source of irrigation water. Elaborate systems have been designed for the Naples area golf courses, while wastewater has been available for large and small scale irrigators in St. Petersburg for several years.

In Palm Beach County, a number of golf courses are being scheduled to receive wastewater effluent from the Loxahatchee River Environmental Control District (ENCON). The use of reclaimed wastewater in most new systems including ENCON, Naples, and St. Petersburg is backed up by the use of deep injection wells. These wells are used during periods of wet weather when irrigation demands are extremely low and during events when the quality of effluent treatment cannot be assured (eg. physical or chemical/biological treatment plant breakdowns).

As water conservation continues to make more sense for local governments,

wastewater reclamation serves as an important tool in water supply demand planning. The inclusion of wastewater reclamation potential in this study reflects a position of responsibility towards efficient management of the water resources in and by Martin County.

The values presented in this section provide projections of levels of implementation of wastewater reclamation efforts in Martin County. Because the county has not completed the Wastewater Master Plan and information is not available as to location and capacity of specific "future-build" treatment plants and service areas, this study only delineates supply-demand scenarios for localized potential systems. These scenarios are based upon existing and buildout supply calculations and have alternative levels of implementation for potential reuse systems. The intent then, of this effort, will be to assess the regional potentials for wastewater reclamation in the urban areas of Martin County.

In the implementation of any wastewater reclamation system, many factors must be taken into consideration. Factors such as soils, topography, physical location, user profiles, public reaction and sentiment, and present source (potential source), among others, all affect potential users. Factors such as treatment process, present or potential disposal, service area, transportation routes, bonded indebtedness, treatment plant age and condition, service area characteristics and collection systems, and influent characteristics among others all affect the potential supplies.

This study will draw conclusions as to the most evident of the variables in a supply-demand network for wastewater reclamation potential. Geographic location and physical proximity factors will be the basis for apparent conclusions regarding the most and least feasible networks pairing users and suppliers within geographic areas.

Methodology

In developing wastewater reclamation scenarios the first step was to identify regional areas within Martin County which might be served by integrated supply networks. The County's planning areas were investigated, but in many cases these areas were too farflung or crossed geographic barriers such as the St. Lucie Canal. Thus there was a need to modify these geographic areas to divisions that would be more suitable for the physical implementation of wastewater reclamation networks.

The county was divided into 10 reclamation (reuse) planning areas. These areas are built upon aggregations of whole Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZs). In the tables the areas and their TAZs are listed by footnote.

Populations were derived from the population figures supplied by Martin County for this study. Table D.1 (Part A) represents populations derived from existing and committed figures, as well as area populations at buildout (Part B) based upon county projections.

In both Parts A and B of Table D.1, the "Green Acres" columns provide projections of the number of potential wastewater irrigated acres on golf courses and other major irrigated landscape tracts such as parks and recreation areas, and sports playing fields. Acreages in Part "A" are based upon information supplied by the County's Planning Department and by review of planning documents such as "Applications for Development Approval" for Developments of Regional Impact. Acreage in Part "B" is derived by adding Part "A" totals and totals for "future" acres next described.

In Part "B", acreage beyond existing and committed is based upon a calculation using the ratio of golf course acreage to population. For Martin County the present ratio is approximately 17 acres per 1000 population. A figure of 20 acres per 1000 population was used to adjust the present ratio

]	7
⁷ Existin	IUTWOUD>	Reus	∽−⊥ດຠຠຉດ∞⊳	Reus	able
ie Plannin Buildout b	se 9612 21608 9612 23765 23765 23765 23765 23765 23765 23765 23765 23765 2842 18727 18727 3047 2844 19327 12783 3047 2844 49327 12783 30768 47572 89109 12572 89109 12572 18757 18757 12783 30768 47576 12783 12775 12783 12775 12775 12783 12775 12775 12775 12783 127755 127755 127755 1277555 1277555 12775555555555555555555555			Pop.2	D.1
9 Area 1,2,3,5 9,14,15 9,14,15 24,15 24,1524,15 24,1524,15 24,15 24,1524,15 24,15 24,1524,15 24,15 24,1524,15 24	770 301 301 301 1025 716 716 716 296 296	Green Acres ³	216 223 429 339 340 119 135	Green Acres ³	estin Greei Threi
omprised of cc 6,7,8,10 2,13,16,17,18, 2,27,28,29,30 34,35,36 34,35,36 34,41,42,43,44 48,49,50 stimates prov	3081544 1205688 1564200 2868576 2206827 52266824 6990544 2217304 1182016	Potential Demand ⁴ (gallons)	864000 952000 1004000 21996000 1236000 1356000 1764000 1764000 1764000	Potential Demand ⁴ (gallons)	N AREAS
ounty Traffic Ar 19,20,21,22,23 ,31 ,45 ,45 a from Martin (ded by Martin)	6786439 1584140 5150624 6578487 3250953 3250953 805682 7657817 1826053 6365283 577913	Wastewater Flow ⁵ (gallons)	1997587 1079165 3854711 2172024 1803894 107403 1534883 446737 1130741 130741 277188	A. f Wastewater Flow ⁵ (gallons)	N MAR
aiysis Zones (T County Plannir County.	1696610 396035 1287656 1644622 812738 2014220 1914452 19144513 1591321 144478	TARGET Supply Available ⁶ (gallons)	499397 269791 963678 4509791 26851 26851 111684 282685 282685 69297	Existing TARGET F Supply Available ⁶ (gallons)	AND FUT TIN COU (25%, 50
AZ's) 19 Dept.	28.38 27.39 28.38 29.13 27.39 18.78 54.55 54.55	B. B ₁ REUSE % Green Demand Met ⁷	57.80 28.34 95.98 27.20 20.17 1.98 28.21 5.33 5.9.39 5.9.39	and C REUSE 2 % Green Demand Met ²	rure (INTY))% an
3Green an and Cour Com ACalculati ACalculati Poprocenta Percenta Percenta BExcess g.	0000000000	Jildou 25% Excess ⁸ (gallons)		ommi 25% Excess ⁸ (gallons)	MITH F
eas include go ecreational ar ty Planning D nitted land us id as the numb of 1" per wee on potable (in 5 factored by 1 ge of large sca ored) supply llions available	3393219 792070 2575312 32854243 16254243 16254247 4028417 402847 3828909 913026 3182642 288956	t TARGE Supply Available ⁶ (gallons)	998793 539583 1927356 1086012 901947 53701 767442 223369 565370 138594	ted Land TARGET Supply Available ⁶ (gallons)	NOUT) D RECLAIN %) OF T
olf course areas. Exis Dept. and se data pli se data pli ber of gre ek). r(Target % r(Target % cale irrigat cale irrigat	110.11 65.69 164.64 80.26 56.76 56.76 18.25 54.77 37.55 109.10 24.45	「 REUS % Green Demand Met ⁷	115.60 56.68 191.97 54.41 40.34 3.96 56.43 56.43 118.78 118.78	d Uses REUSE % Green Demand Met ⁷	HE AV
r, and other i ting <u>and Con</u> DRI's. <u>Buildc</u> en acres x 40 availability ed acres der ed acres der	311675 311675 1011112 0 0 0 265338 0 265338 0 265338 0 265338 0 0 265338 0 0 265338 0 0 265338 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	E 50% Excess ⁸ (gallons)	134793 0 923356 0 0 0 0 89370 89370	50% Excess ⁸ (gallons)	NDS FO VASTEV AILAB
large irrigat <u>mmitted</u> bas <u>ted</u> 20 acres 000 gai/day/ led by utility / mand met b mand met b	6786439 1584140 5150624 6578487 3250958 805682 7657817 1826053 6365283 577913	TARGE Supply Available ⁶ (galions)	1997587 1079165 3854711 12172024 1803894 107403 1534883 446737 1130741 277188	TARGET Supply Available ⁶ (gallons)	R IRRIG NATER, LE SUPI
ed tracts si sed on dat; n existing a per additi acre (aver; acre (aver; systems y available n reuse are	220.23 131.39 329.28 160.53 113.53 113.53 36.51 109.55 75.10 218.19 48.89	F REUSI % Green Demand Met ⁷	231.20 1113.36 383.94 108.82 80.68 7.92 112.86 112.86 237.55 237.55 237.55 237.55	REUSE % Green Demand Met ⁷	BASE
uch as parks a from Martin onal thousanc age irrigation age a. Pa.	3704894 378452 3586423 2480478 387377 387377 667273 3447979 0 3447979 0	E 100% Excess ⁸ (gations)	1133587 127165 2850711 176024 0 176823 0 174883 654741 0	100% Excess ⁸ (gallons)	
<u>ц</u> –					

for trends observed in and outside of the county (such as in Palm Beach County) and the additional acreage resulting from projected public access areas such as parks and recreational areas.

The columns headed "Potential Demand" result from calculations made by multiplying the "Green Acreage" by a factor of 1 inch irrigation per week. An application rate of 1 inch per week is an established preferred rate of effluent irrigation on golf courses in south Florida.

This 1 inch of irrigation per week translates to 4,000 gallons per acre per day (average). This resultant figure is expressed as the potential irrigation demand on identified large landscape irrigation parcels within each reuse area.

The wastewater flow (potential supply) was calculated as being equal to the indoor water demand supplied by utility systems.

The target reuse scenarios are meant to demonstrate the amounts of reuse that would be achieved under alternative levels of implementation and to specify how much of that could come from traditional use patterns, such as application to golf courses. These levels of effluent use are set at 25%, 50%, and 100% of listed treatment plant output to correspond with low, medium, and high levels of implementation efforts.

Because the wastewater treatment and disposal planning process is just getting underway in Martin County as was explained in the introduction, and because the potential users could only be specified in general, it was not possible to give detailed policies and costs which would achieve the alternative levels of implementation. The most common constraint to full implementation will be cost. Under two of these scenarios, 25% and 50%, some effluent supply will be unavailable. The resulting two columns represent the percentage of demands met on identified "green acres" and the additional

supply (in gallons) available for other methods of wastewater disposal in the specific reuse area. All of the water in these columns is considered to be available for gross disposal which, when netted out, will provide some recharge to local surficial aquifers.

Summary

Upon review of Parts "A" and "B" of Table D.1, it is evident that under both existing and committed and buildout conditions reclamation at the low implementation level (25%) would come close to meeting green area demand only in the Stuart area (Reuse Area C).

In an effort to both optimize groundwater recharge and to develop alternative water sources for existing and projected "green acreage" demands, reclamation efforts utilizing between 50% and 75% of available effluent should be targeted. The quantities available (see Table D.1) at these target levels represent the most promising mechanisms for recharging the groundwater system. Large scale irrigation users combined with low cost percolation pond systems will make reclamation efforts feasible in most reuse areas.

Considering the logistical problems with disposing of supplies not being used on large scale landscaping, 50-75% target programs aimed at "Green Acreage" users probably should not be designed for reuse areas E, F, H, and J. These low demand areas present reclamation opportunities only if on site reuse is practiced on large scale PUDs and similar developments.

5		
TALS		
858.968	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
3425.300		
11901.573	L 22 23 24 24 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25	
10822.152	821 4022 402 40	
2257.481	12000000000000000000000000000000000000	1
201.618	^N Noordooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooo	
445.827		
162.669)))
30.561		5
50106.148		10000
329595	108 622 622 622 622 622 622 622 622 622 62	0
12030-214	31 22 53 53 54 53 54<	
42136.361	186 826 826 826 826 826 826 826 826 826 8	TOTA

Å

TABLE 8.4 ESTIMATED RESIDENTIAL WATER DEMAND-BUILDOUT (MGY)

Ŧ

٠,