

Tidal Caloosahatchee
Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP)
Technical Meeting
Thursday, September 24, 2009
9:00 a.m. – 12:00 noon.
South Florida Water Management District
2301 McGregor Blvd,
Fort Myers, FL 33901

Agenda

Welcome and Opening Remarks

- Attendee Introductions

Information for Basin Group Formation

- Working Group Responsibilities
- Members to Date

Approaching Allocations

- Allocation vs. Required Reductions vs. Sufficiency of Effort
- Allocation Calculations - Process
- Identifying Required Reductions and Phased Implementation
- Other Consideration

Projects

- Watershed Protection Plan
- Types of Projects for BMAP Credit and Required Project Information

Next Steps

- What Has Been Completed
- To Be Done
 - o Data Needs
 - o Identify Stakeholders
 - o GIS needs

Next Meeting – October 28, 2009 (Tentative)

Adjourn

Please note the FTP site for documents pertaining to the Technical meetings:

<ftp://ftp.dep.state.fl.us/pub/water/BMAP/Caloosahatchee/>

For more information, contact Beth Alvi, 850-245-8559, Elizabeth.Alvi@dep.state.fl.us



Tidal Caloosahatchee BMAP Technical Meeting

Attendee List

September 24, 2009

✓	Name	Organization
✓	John Abendroth	FDEP
✓	Mike Acosla	Kitson R. Partners
✓	Beth Alvi	FDEP
✓	Wes Anderson	CFM
✓	Pinar Balci	SFWMD
✓	Lisa Beever	CHNEP
✓	Jim Beever	SWFRPC
✓	Karen Bickford	Lee Co. Natural Resources
✓	Kevin Carter	SFWMD
✓	John Cassani	SWFL Watershed Council
✓	Miao-Li Chang	SFWMD
✓	Teresa Coley	SFWMD
✓	Kim Cressman	Cape Coral
✓	Clyde Dabbs	SFWMD
✓	Julianna daFrota	SFWMD
✓	Tim Denison	Johnson Engineering
✓	Rebecca Elliott	FDACS / OAWP
✓	James Evans	City of Sanibel
✓	John Fumero	Fumero Law Group
✓	Pat Fricano	SFWMD
✓	Phil Gillogly	Hendry County
✓	Melanie Grigsby	City of Ft. Myers
✓	Ron Hamel	Gulf Citrus Growers
✓	Ed Hanlon	UF - IFAS
✓	Tricia Hobson	Entrix
✓	Bob Howard	Gulf
✓	Connie Jarvis	Cape Coral
✓	Keith Laakkonen	Ft. Myers Beach
✓	Scott Legg	SFWMD
✓	Steve Lienhart	CDM



Tidal Caloosahatchee BMAP Technical Meeting

Attendee List

September 24, 2009

✓	Name	Organization
✓	Ai Ning Loh	Florida Gulf Coast University
✓	Scott McClelland	CDM
✓	Megan Mills	FDEP
✓	Dana Moller	FDEP
✓	Carla Palmer	Palmer & Assoc.
✓	Arielle Parlos	FDEP
✓	Shayne Paynter	PBSJ
✓	Pete Quasius	Audubon/Collier
✓	Jesse Reade	FDEP
✓	Steve Sentes	SFWMD
✓	Brent Setchell	FDOT
✓	Charles Shinn	Florida Farm Bureau Federation
✓	Geordie Smith	LCHD
✓	Ryan Snyder	FDEP
✓	Carlton Spirio	FDOT D1
✓	Steve Swann	ATM
✓	Jennifer Thera	FDEP
✓	Rae Ann Wessel	SCCF
✓	Jim Wilt	FDOT
✓	Chester Young	Friends of Billys Creek



Tidal Caloosahatchee BMAP Technical Meeting Summary September 24, 2009

MEETING SUMMARY

This is a summary of the first Technical Meeting for the Tidal Caloosahatchee Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP). The meeting agenda and attendee list are attached. Provided below are significant discussions and comments from the meeting.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Scott McClelland (CDM) called the meeting to order at approximately 9:00 a.m. He introduced Mr. John Abendroth as the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) Watershed Planning and Coordination Administrator and Ms. Beth Alvi as the FDEP Basin Coordinator. The participants introduced themselves and the entity they represent.

Basin Group Formation

Materials: PowerPoint Presentation, Nomination Form

Mr. McClelland discussed the types of meetings conducted during BMAP development, the role of the Basin Working Group (BWG) and the characteristics of the ideal BWG representative.

Highlights:

A BWG representative needs to:

- Understand the objectives and big picture of the TMDL/BMAP program.
- Have a senior/management role in their organization and have the ability to make key decisions for their organization.
- Have the time to serve on this group.

The BWG provides recommendations to the FDEP.

The BWG will vote on the allocation approach, project reductions, the BMAP document itself and any other issues as needed.

Each entity that has an allocation will have a seat on the BWG.

Technical Meetings are fact finding. They are conducted to identify and address technical issues.



Approaching Allocations

Materials: PowerPoint Presentation

Highlights:

We need clear goals, sound scientific analysis, transparency and stakeholder involvement.

We need to refine sources, address appropriateness of type of allocation calculations.

Identify knowns and unknowns upfront in the process and determine what is absolutely necessary to move forward

Principal steps include: calculation of loads by entity, establishing required reductions, making project commitments and calculating credits to meet required reductions.

Identify sources of funding, implement monitoring plans and coordinate with other local efforts

Allocation Calculations

Allocation: Your fair share

Required Reduction: Your implementation obligation. Not always the same as your assigned allocation. Phasing of implementations is an option e.g. three – five year phases.

Sufficiency of Effort: If insufficient scientific basis to make detailed allocation calculations then define implementation obligations for entities and determine if this is sufficient to meet goals. Often implemented for Fecal TMDLs.

Stakeholders should provide project information in a specified format to FDEP.

Only reductions of TN above permitted requirements will be eligible for credit.

Records need to be maintained for both continuing and new projects.

Adaptive management in BMAP implementation provides flexibility.

Modeling

HSPF model utilized 102 hydrologic units which were sub-divided amongst 15 sub-basins based on precipitation zones (NEXRAD).



Currently modifying HSPF model to determine loads from contributing watershed areas based on land-use.

Goal is to calculate quantitative detailed allocations for all of the contributing jurisdictions within the Tidal Caloosahatchee Basin.

The Tidal Caloosahatchee Basin contributes 17.5% of the total TN load to the estuary, which is about 2,063,723 lbs/yr.

Projects

Location and type of BMPs should be targeted to maximize benefit and cost-effectiveness.

Caloosahatchee River Watershed Protection Plan includes:

- Construction Projects
- Pollutant control programs
- Research and water quality monitoring programs

Need additional information regarding viability as well as location of these projects.

Next steps

Identify missing stakeholders

Identify special districts, their viability, their responsibility, their boundaries, MS4 boundaries.

BMP project details

Discussion:

A stakeholder asked if we were allocating loads from upstream. Ms. Alvi replied we need to work on the tidal area first and we also need to wait for the completion of upstream TMDLs.

A stakeholder asked if it was fair to say that the downstream stakeholders represent about 16% of the load to the Estuary. Mr. McClelland said the number is within range, but we might update this number based on some of the modeling refinements that are ongoing.

A stakeholder asked if the loads from the Waste Water Treatment Plants discharging upstream of S79 were included in the watershed NPS number. Ms. Alvi responded that it was likely, but would check on that.



A stakeholder asked for clarification on the load removed from Lake Okeechobee. Ms. Alvi explained that the current total load from Lake O is about 7,004,379 lbs/yr. The TN load to be removed from Lake O when it meets its TMDL is 782,224 lbs/yr (6.6% of the total load). When Lake O meets its TMDL the estimated TN load from Lake O will be 6,222,155 lbs/yr which is 52.7% of the total load to the estuary.

A stakeholder asked what land use and rainfall numbers were used in the TMDL. Mr. McClelland replied that 2004 land use numbers were utilized and rainfall data between the years 1997-2005.

A stakeholder asked if we would concentrate on the loads between S78 and S79. Ms. Alvi replied that it would be addressed after the upstream TMDL development process.

A stakeholder asked how upstream TP TMDLs would be accounted for, since this BMAP was not addressing upstream loads. The stakeholder observed that at the Stormwater Rule meeting they mentioned not regulating TN as much as TP and stated that the BMAP process needs to help drive the stormwater rule into regulating both. Mr. McClelland responded that, even though the TMDL was focusing on TN, in general treatment systems that remove TN also remove TP and so we expect to get some ancillary TP removal as the Estuary TMDL gets accomplished.

A stakeholder asked if it was reasonable to simply allocate a 23 percent reduction to each stakeholder. Mr. McClelland stated that in its simplest form, this is one way to allocate – each stakeholder has to remove 23 percent of their existing TN loading. However, there are a lot more factors that have to go into this allocation and it is by the BMAP process that all of these factors are considered. A stakeholder asked how the BMAP was being tied in with the River Watershed Protection Plan (RWPP). Ms. Alvi replied that we are currently working with the South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) to identify projects from the RWPP with TN reductions.

A stakeholder noted that both concentrations as well as loads need to be considered during this process.

A stakeholder asked if the BMAP would take into consideration the new verified impaired list. Mr. Abendroth replied that for this BMAP we are looking at the entire Tidal Caloosahatchee watershed not at individual WBIDs. If additional TMDLs are developed in these WBIDs, FDEP advises stakeholder to do projects where they feel it would be the most efficient.

A stakeholder asked about the cut-off date for project credits. Ms. Alvi replied that it was after June 2005 but that FDEP would consider other projects on a case by case basis.

The SFWMD stated that the C-43 Water Quality Treatment Area is a test project to change N from the bioavailable form to the non bioavailable form. It will not change



the load or amount present in the waterbody however it will make N unavailable for biological activity. The C-43 Reservoir is in the design phase and still needs funding.

A stakeholder asked about the monitoring programs in a BMAP and stated that five years was a long time to wait to see the effects of the projects. Ms. Alvi replied that an extensive monitoring plan would be developed as part of the BMAP and stated that annual reporting was a requirement.

A stakeholder asked how we would address additional loads based on new loads or developments since they did not believe the stormwater rule would effectively address this. Ms. Alvi replied that FDEP encourages Low Impact Design (LID) and also stated that it was a possibility to allocate to new/ future growth. Mr. Abendroth stated that the Margin of Safety that was built into the TMDL reductions would also deal with these additional loads.

A stakeholder asked who would be responsible for the monitoring. Mr. Abendroth replied that it was the responsibility of the stakeholders.

Responsible Party	Item	Deadline
Stakeholders	Jurisdictional boundaries, special district information	ASAP
Stakeholders	Identify BWG Members	By December
Beth Alvi	Post Presentation	ASAP (ftp://ftp.dep.state.fl.us/pub/water/BMAP/EWC)
SFWMD	Priority Project Information	ASAP

Note: Caloosahatchee meeting materials can be downloaded from the following site:
<ftp://ftp.dep.state.fl.us/pub/water/BMAP/Caloosahatchee/>