

Indian River Lagoon Basin Management Action Plans

Meeting Summary

Wednesday, May 18, 2016

9:30 AM – 11:40 AM

Brevard County Agricultural Center

3695 Lake Drive, Cocoa, FL 32926

Attendees

Holly Abeels, UF/IFAS Brevard County	Robert Kline, NASA
Carolina Alvarez, Brevard County	Jenni Lamb, City of Melbourne
Liz Alward, District 2 County Commissioner's Office	John LaSalle
Eric Anderson, Resident/IRL Task Force	Pam LaSalle
Chuck Baird, Citizen	Kathy LaMartina, SFWMD
Ann Benedetti, SJRWMD	Lance Lumbard, Amec Foster Wheeler
Robert Berish, Morton Salt	David King, Quentin L. Hampton
Alex Bernard, City of Rockledge	Robert Kline, NASA
Randy Burden, EcoSense International	Shannon Lewis, City of Melbourne
Tiffany Busby, Wildwood Consulting	Lance Lumbard, Amec Foster Wheeler
Erik Charest, Indian River County	Darren May, Cape Canaveral AFS
Jim Clark, Titusville hunter/fisher	Debbie Mayfield, State of Florida
Kevin Coyne, FDEP	Mike McCabe, Melbourne-Tillman WCD
Robert Day, Citizen	Bach McClure, Brevard County
Rich Dunkel, ETS, Inc.	Keith McCully, Indian River County
Douglas Durham, NASA	Mike McGarry, Brevard County
John Durkee	Keith Mills, City of West Melbourne
George Dussich, EcoSense International	Matthew Mitts, City of Vero Beach
Rebecca Elliott, FDACS	Craig Mott
Yesenia Escribano, FDEP	Terry Mott
John Fergus, City of Satellite Beach	Keegan O'Brien, 3E Consultants
Chris Ferraro, FDEP	Judy Orcutt, Citizen
Catherine Foerster, Wildwood Consulting	Marion Parsons, City of Palm Bay EGIS
Jake Fojtik, FDACS	Steve Peene, ATM
Hector Franco, City of Palm Bay	Bo Platt, Brevard IRL Coalition
Rachel Gerena, City of Palm Bay	Ken Poole, City of Rockledge
Patricia Gertenbach, E-Sciences, Inc.	Thomas Price, IHA/Kennedy Space Center
Clyde Giesenschlag, Citizen	Laura Rankin, City of Cocoa
Peggy Giesenschlag, Citizen	Jeff Ratliff, City of Cape Canaveral
Alex Gorichky, Jr.	Joanie Regan, City of Cocoa Beach
Alex Gorichky, III	Sandra Reller, City of Titusville
Jeremy Grimes, Brevard Resident	HM Ridgely, Evans Properties
Anthony Guarino, Orlando Kayak Fishing	Gary Ritter, Florida Farm Bureau
Anthony Gubler	Mark Ryan, Indian Harbour Beach
Lorraine Guise, Brevard County	Katherine Schmidt, NSLRWCD FPFWCD
Judy Grim, Volusia County	Ray Scott, FDACS
Lauren Hall, SJRWMD	Mel Shubert
Katie Hallas, FDACS	George Simons, Carter Associates, Inc.
	Jeff Smith, ECT

Indian River Lagoon Basin Management Action Plans

David Henderson, City of Rockledge Dave Herbster, FDEP Tom Hill, Florida Farm Bureau Dale Hodge, City of Palm Bay Erlyn Hupfer, ISC Environmental Assurance Chuck Jacoby, SJRWMD George Jones, ORCA Victor Karycki, City of Rockledge Kerry Kates, Florida Fruit and Vegetable Assn.	Marty Smithson, Sebastian Inlet District Dani Straub, Melbourne John Tarantine, NASA Laurel Webb, BF Consultants Everett Wegerif, City of Cocoa Kaylene Wheeler, City of Palm Bay Kim Wroble Heather York, Wildwood Consulting Kelly Young, Volusia County
--	--

Welcome and Opening Remarks

Tiffany Busby welcomed everyone to the Indian River Lagoon (IRL) Basin Management Action Plans (BMAPs) meeting, and noted that the meeting covered all three IRL BMAPs. She thanked Brevard County for the use of the facility. The participants introduced themselves. Tiffany introduced Yesenia Escribano as the basin coordinator for the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP). Yesenia's contact information was listed on the meeting agenda.

Review of BMAP Annual Progress Reports

Yesenia thanked stakeholders for providing project updates and provided an overview of the agenda items for the meeting. She stated that many of the stakeholders participated in project verification meetings or teleconferences in the last few months. She stated that Banana River Lagoon (BRL) project one B and the North IRL project zones were assigned 15% reductions in total nitrogen (TN) and total phosphorus (TP) for the first five year iteration of the BMAP. All reductions are to be met within 15 years of BMAP adoption. Yesenia stated that project reductions in the third annual report tables could change based on updates received from stakeholders. She stated that new projects are listed in the tables designated with 2016 in the column titled, "year added."

Yesenia stated that in the BRL the City of Cape Canaveral completed a two and a half million gallon reclaimed water tank. In addition, the City of Cape Canaveral, City of Cocoa, City of Indian Harbour Beach, and Patrick Air Force Base (AFB) identified 35 new projects for inclusion in the BMAP.

Yesenia stated that in the Central IRL, the following entities completed projects: Brevard County, City of Fellsmere, Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), Indian River County, and St. Lucie County completed projects. Fifteen new projects were identified by the following entities: Fellsmere Water Control District (WCD), Indian River County, Melbourne Tillman WCD, St. Lucie County, and Town of Indialantic.

Yesenia stated that in the North IRL Brevard County and the City of Melbourne completed projects during the reporting year. In addition, 24 new projects were identified by Brevard County, City of Cocoa, City of Melbourne, and City of Rockledge.

Indian River Lagoon Basin Management Action Plans

Yesenia stated that in the BRL project zone B 25% of the total necessary TN reductions have been achieved and 26% of the total TP reductions have been achieved. She showed a table of TN and TP allocations by entity in BRL project zone B and the reductions achieved by each entity. Kevin stated that these tables are included in the progress reports as well as this presentation.

Yesenia then displayed a table displaying the total number of projects by entity and the status of each project within the Central IRL. She stated that there have been many projects completed in this subbasin even though there are no required reductions at this time.

Yesenia presented a graph of progress toward the TN and TP load reductions within the North IRL project zone A. She stated that 30% of the total necessary TN reductions and 53% of the total necessary TP reductions have been achieved. Yesenia presented a table showing TN and TP allocations by entity in NIRL project zone A and the reductions achieved by each entity. Yesenia presented a graph of progress toward the TN and TP load reductions within the North IRL project zone B. She stated that 48% of the total necessary TN reductions and 59% of the total necessary TP reductions have been achieved. Yesenia presented a table showing TN and TP allocations by entity in NIRL project zone B and the reductions achieved by each entity. She stated that even though the targets for the first five years has been achieved in each project zone with allocation, there is still work to be done.

Yesenia stated that there has been an increase in agricultural best management practice (BMP) enrollment. In the BRL, enrollment is not reported since agriculture is *de minimus* in this subbasin. The five year enrollment goal has been achieved in the CIRL. She stated that the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (FDACS) has hired additional staff to assist with enrollment in the IRL basin.

Seagrass Compliance Update

Yesenia stated that the goal of the IRL total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) is to recover the deep edge of the seagrass habitat. The restoration target for seagrass is based on the depth limit from mapping years ranging from the dates 1943 through 1999. The TMDL targets were set to restore 90% of the union depth from those years.

Yesenia stated that compliance with the seagrass targets for the TMDLs is measured in two steps. In the first step, a cumulative frequency distribution analysis is performed. Compliance is achieved when at least 50% or more of the assessment years' frequency distribution curve, including its fiftieth percentile value, lies on or to the right of the TMDL cumulative frequency distribution curve. In the second step, the median seagrass depth for each of most recent four years of data is compared to the median depth from the TMDL data years. At least three of the four assessment years must meet or exceed the TMDL median in order to be compliant. Both steps must be compliant to be considered compliant with the TMDL.

Indian River Lagoon Basin Management Action Plans

Yesenia stated that the depth limits are tracked by project zone using four years of data. These four years were 2009, 2011, 2013 and 2015 growing season data. She displayed an overview slide of step one and step two compliance for each BMAP. She stated that step one compliance is relatively the same as last year and the project zones are not quite step two compliant. She added that the evaluation was based on compliance prior to the bloom in 2016.

Yesenia displayed a graph of step one compliance and bar chart for step two compliance for each project zone. BRL project zone A showed a loss in deep edge but was step one compliant. Although there was an increase in median seagrass depth, BRL project zone A was not step two compliant. She stated that BRL project zone B saw a gain in deep edge and median seagrass depth but was step one and step two noncompliant. Central IRL project zone A was step one compliant. The median seagrass depth is increasing but the project zone is not step two compliant. Central IRL project zone SEB saw a loss in deep edge but remained step one compliant. Yesenia stated the project zone was not step two compliant. Central IRL project zone B saw a slight loss in deep edge but was step one compliant. The project zone was not step two compliant even though there was an increase in median depth. Yesenia stated that North IRL project zones A and B were both step one and step two noncompliant. Based on the two-step process in each zone, none of the project zones were compliant for the 2015 assessment.

Yesenia displayed a slide containing the names of entities conducting monitoring efforts in the IRL basin. The network includes 77 stations. She stated that there is a monitoring plan in the adopted BMAPs. The monitoring network helps DEP determine trends in the IRL.

Water Quality Monitoring Update

Yesenia introduced Lance Lumbard with Amec Foster Wheeler to discuss water quality data received from multiple entities. Lance stated that it was great to see an interest in watershed data. He was assigned to look at trends in station data. He stated that he was looking at trends in concentration and not pounds. He stated that the trends were only trends in statistics and could be the result of environmental conditions at the time. He stated that some of the stations have a longer term of records where the trends would be more valid.

Lance displayed a map and graphs for Volusia County IRLTBC station. The data are from 1999 to 2015. He stated that he could see an increasing trend in TN and TP concentration. He stated that a typical ratio of TN to TP is 10:1 for this area. This trend could be due to data from 2010 to 2011 where there could have been an unusual occurrence.

Mel Shubert asked if those data could have been driven by weather. Lance responded that he performed a cursory analysis of the data and not a detailed analysis that included a review of other variables such as weather. Kevin stated that this was a first cut at the data. He stated that it would be good to look at potential variables in the data as a next step. Kelly Young stated that the data follows the algae blooms and tracks with the chlorophyll-a data. Mel agreed and stated that there could be a weather event that could derail the monitoring data for the year. Lance agreed that everyone should keep in mind that it is

Indian River Lagoon Basin Management Action Plans

difficult to tease out the variables at this time but that additional analyses might be something to consider moving forward.

Lance displayed data for Volusia County stations TC2 and ODIK. He had two years of data for TC2 which seem to be on track with other data. He stated that there was a similar trend for ODIK but with a longer data set. He pointed out the outliers.

For Station IRFWCD Lance stated that there were only three stations with lots of variability and no real trend. There is about 15 years of data for these points. At Fort Pierce Farms WCD there are five stations with about five years of data. Lance did not find a significant trend line but stated the concentrations are similar to the other stations. He pointed out that for Canal 3 it appears that the TP concentrations are probably at the minimum detection level, which is interesting. Lance did not find a significant trend at Canal 5 or Minton stations, but these did follow the 10:1 ratio.

Mel asked if Lance had any turbidity data to look for a correlation with the TN and TP concentrations. Lance stated he did not have turbidity data but agreed it would be interesting to run the correlation.

Lance stated that there is one station with the North St. Lucie WCD with a limited timeline. He stated that the data were variable and he could not find a significant trend in the data. Lance also reviewed data for the South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) station C25S50. He stated that the data were really scattered, but he saw a gradual decrease in TN and TP concentrations with some seasonality also being observable. He stated it would be interesting to look at the peaks in TP in greater detail.

John Windsor asked if the TN and TP were processed in the laboratory as total nitrogen and total phosphorus. Lance stated the data reviewed were for total nitrogen and total phosphorus. John stated that some of the results could be due to organic particles present in the samples. He asked Lance for the take-home message. Lance responded that at this time the DEP is trying to introduce water quality results. He stated there is lots of variability in the data that will need to be teased out. John stated that the SJRWMD has lots of data and hopes DEP is working with them. Kevin stated that the stakeholders asked DEP to look at data farther up in the watershed. He stated that the DEP is looking at some new locations and that we have raw data that has not been previously interpreted. He asked the stakeholders to provide input on the best analyses to perform on these data. Dave Herbster asked if there were any flow data at the sites so that loads could be calculated. Kevin stated that flow data are not often collected. Chris Ferraro stated that the data presented by Lance comes from up in the watershed. Chuck Jacoby will present SJRWMD IRL data. She added that the information presented by Lance helps us understand what is coming off the land.

Yesenia introduced Chuck Jacoby with SJRWMD to provide a water quality monitoring update based on the District's data. Chuck stated that he would begin his presentation with a discussion of the brown tide. He has been working with Landsat imagery over the last few decades. He has been looking to see where the blooms have occurred in the past. The satellite imagery comes in as different wavelengths of

Indian River Lagoon Basin Management Action Plans

light. Then the data are processed to generate an image, as shown in his slides. He stated that the orange and red colors in the images are high levels of chlorophyll-a. One slide displayed the difference in imagery during the bloom on January 7, 2016 and May 7, 2016. Chlorophyll-a levels now have returned to normal levels.

Chuck stated that the fish kill in the BRL was the largest recorded and one potential cause was a drop in solar radiation. He stated that during this cloudy period, the brown tide was not photosynthesizing which usually releases oxygen. He displayed an image of three monitoring stations showing a decline in dissolved oxygen in the days leading up to the fish kill. He stated that chlorophyll-a levels were less than 1 microgram per liter ($\mu\text{g/L}$) for more than eight hours which led to the fish kill.

Chuck displayed a map of other sites and asked participants to focus on those highlighted by red boxes. He then displayed graphs of chlorophyll-a concentrations at each station. The peaks correspond with the dates of the brown tide. He then displayed graphs of nitrogen concentrations for the same stations. He stated that the peaks indicate an increase in ammonia as seen in the BRL. He stated that algae is not good at using nitrate. Algae use ammonia as a food source. He then displayed graphs of phosphorus concentrations for the same time period and same stations. He stated that the phosphorus levels are higher than in the past. Chuck then displayed graphs of chlorophyll-a at these same stations. He stated that the peaks are the superbloom in 2011. He stated that the brown tide was in Mosquito Lagoon and then the other brown tide event was more recent. In another slide displaying nitrogen concentrations, Chuck pointed out the peaks in ammonia and nitrate. He indicated that TN seems to be increasing in the North IRL. He then presented a slide of phosphorus concentrations and stated that TP concentrations were higher around the bloom and have persisted. He stated that the southernmost station shows more variability than the other stations.

Chuck stated that the SJRWMD did not look at toxins during the fish kill and did not know the species that caused the bloom. He added that the SJRWMD is working with Harbor Branch and using money from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to look at seagrass. He stated that researchers were out in the BRL yesterday tracking the brown algae that is still present.

Chuck stated that there is still seagrass in the lagoon. He stated that the 2015 analysis conducted by DEP with assistance from the SJRWMD overestimates seagrass; there has been a decrease in seagrass since the 2016 brown tide event.

Mel asked what the trigger might be that caused ammonia to increase. Chuck stated that the SJRWMD was still looking into the causes. He stated that the brown tide struggles to use nitrate. He added that the trigger for the superbloom was not typical and seemed to be internal to the lagoon. He stated that the SJRWMD is looking at a more in-depth nutrient budget. He stated that brown tides are known to follow other blooms.

Indian River Lagoon Basin Management Action Plans

John Durden stated that the causeway monitor was installed in 2014 and asked if there was a live feed of the data. Chuck responded that there is a live feed. He stated that samples are taken monthly but there are continuous monitors that collect data every two hours. John asked if Chuck has seen a change in water temperature prior to the drop in oxygen levels. He recalled that there was no wind at the time either. Chuck stated that he does not recall an increase in water temperature and did not think it was temperature-driven. John stated that there was an increase in TP prior to the bloom. He asked Chuck thought that could have been the cause. Chuck stated that he is looking at the variables and added that it could be internal cycling rather than an external trigger.

Joanie Reagan asked how long he saw the peak in ammonia. Chuck responded that the samples were monthly. Marty Smithson asked if there were any spikes in nutrients from the recent fish kill. Chuck stated that he did not have much of that data processed yet.

Randy stated that ammonia is usually from decomposition of organic material. He asked if that could be the cause. Chuck responded that it was possible and stated that the SJRWMD would also look at sediment flux.

Debbie Mayfield asked Chuck if there are enough monitoring devices and what type are used. Chuck stated that the SJRWMD has more monitoring devices than in the past. He stated that the SJRWMD is starting to use more real-time monitoring devices rather than collecting grab samples. He added that these provide a good temporal signal but limited placement. He stated that we have good representation of the IRL now, but will be continually discussing how to improve the network. He said it is good to use all of the data. He added that it is critical to inter-calibrate monitoring efforts because sensors can be different. Kevin stated that this will be a program-wide effort. He stated that the DEP is planning to have a monitoring-focused meeting and would like to host one here as part of a technical discussion. He added that this has not been planned yet.

Mel stated that more data in the right places helps. Kevin agreed, but added that DEP is also interested in getting up in the watershed to see what is coming off the landscape.

Yesenia displayed a slide summarizing the Watershed Information Network (WIN). Yesenia stated that a monitoring plan was designed when the BMAPs were adopted but she would like to update the network. She stated that it would be good to have a technical meeting for projects and efficiencies. She stated that WIN is a replacement for the Florida Storage and Retrieval (STORET) database. She stated that the STORET coordinators will be available to assist people with uploads to WIN.

Brevard County Muck Flux (Mike McGarry, Brevard County)

Yesenia introduced Mike McGarry with Brevard County to discuss muck flux. Mike stated that he works for Brevard County's Natural Resources Office. He stated that the muck data was not his research nor his area of expertise. A few years ago people wanted to know how much of the nutrients in the lagoon were from muck in context with other nutrient loads.

Indian River Lagoon Basin Management Action Plans

Mike displayed pie charts representing TN and TP contributions from Brevard County. He stated that the term flux is used to describe how much nutrients are leaving the system and lost to the lagoon. The county did actual measurements of nutrient levels from muck removal projects when developing this model. Information from the TMDL assessment also was used in the model. He stated that the real story is that the muck portion of the contributing load is significant. Even if the estimates are off by plus or minus 10%, the muck portion of the pie is still significant. The county was able to secure funding from the legislature for muck removal and for research.

Mike stated that the muck contribution varies seasonally. The county is looking at the influence comparing the surface area of muck on the bottom to runoff onto the surface of the lagoon. The muck surface area in Central IRL is lower than runoff from stormwater input, but 25% is still significant and needs to be addressed. The muck flux is also significant in the North IRL.

Mike stated that the county and legislature are taking on muck removal projects in Turkey Creek, Cocoa Beach, Mims, Sykes Creek, Grant Canal, and Eau Gallie. He added that the legislature required science in conjunction with the projects to determine the effects of muck on the system. The county is looking at the efficiency of muck removal too. The county does not want to remove natural, healthy sediment. He added that the inputs are significant.

Mel asked where the muck goes. Mike responded that it varies by project. The county uses hydraulic dredging and the muck goes to an upland site. The water is returned to the lagoon after the muck settles out. The Florida Institute of Technology (FIT) is studying the quality of the water. He stated that muck dries out and is hauled to mix with other material to be used for agriculture or mixed with sand for residential development. He stated that it is not cost effective to send the material to the landfill.

A gentleman at the back asked why the county is not penetrating further than the train trestles. He stated that they are only removing muck in the coves closest to the lagoon. Mike stated that this may have been due to funding and proximity to the lagoon. Dani Straub added that the county is dredging the Eau Gallie all the way to the dam. She added that they cannot get too close to the bridge footers for safety reasons. She added that the SJRWMD is also looking for funding for removing muck upstream of the dam.

Pattie Gertenbach asked if there has been an analysis of the composition of the muck to determine its source. Mike stated that he believes the source is anthropogenic, but is not sure if it is agriculture or residential, but probably a combination due to poorly regulated runoff. George Jones stated that Harbor Branch will have an excellent presentation posted on their website by Jon Trefry, a researcher at FIT. Tiffany stated that Yesenia can post this presentation with the meeting materials, once it is available for download.

Mel asked how phosphorus levels are measured in the water sent back to the river following hydraulic muck removal. Mike stated that the environmental permits did not mandate a specific phosphorus

Indian River Lagoon Basin Management Action Plans

concentration, but the county did. The county worked with a contractor to use a proprietary product to reduce phosphorus levels to less than 100 parts per billion (ppb) for release. He added that the contractor has met that goal so far.

Ann Benedetti stated that the SJRWMD scheduled a public meeting for the Eau Gallie muck removal project on June 7, 2016 at 6:00 PM.

Next Steps (Yesenia Escribano)

Yesenia stated that the DEP must meet new requirements for existing and new BMAPs based on revisions to Florida Statutes 403.067. She stated that the DEP has the necessary information for most of the projects included in the IRL BMAPs but some information is missing. She would like to gather all of the information for the second, five-year phase of the BMAP.

Yesenia stated that the report contains a new compliance section. It includes counts of projects committed to in the BMAP by entity and indicates project completion status.

Yesenia stated that she began an effort this year to verify project information with stakeholders. She has conducted meetings, teleconferences, and a few site visits. She added that these have been very helpful. She stated that DEP may be changing models used for allocations and it will be helpful to have accurate information. She also requested funding details for these projects. She stated that complete project information and costs can help us with funding requests to the legislature.

Yesenia stated that the DEP also conducted a project solicitation effort that included the IRL in addition to Lake Okeechobee, St. Lucie Estuary, and others. Four of the submitted projects were in the IRL basin. She stated that upper management is reviewing the projects now.

Yesenia stated that action items included the following:

1. Stakeholders should provide comments on the draft annual reports by Friday, June 3, 2016.
2. Florida STORET database uploads completed by all monitoring entities.
3. Next annual meeting planned for spring 2017.
4. Development of the Phase II BMAPs in spring 2018.
5. Continue project information collection.

Pattie Gertenbach asked about plans for the model. Tiffany stated that the DEP has the existing model. She stated that there is a local effort to develop a new model. She added that the locals and DEP are meeting with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to review the proposed revisions to the targets. Kevin stated that he was hoping Virginia Barker (Brevard County) could attend the meeting to address this question. He added that an interim meeting could be scheduled to discuss the model and details of the model prior to the next annual meeting. Yesenia stated that it is critical to go ahead and review project information. Kevin stated that the DEP is now required to report project information and

Indian River Lagoon Basin Management Action Plans

project updates to the legislature. Pattie stated that she is looking at the tables for future projects without funding and how that will be incorporated with projects committed to by stakeholders. Kevin stated that the DEP is trying to separate those projects because they are not BMAP commitments. He stated that the DEP will need to prepare 5-, 10-, and 15-year plans. Kevin requested feedback from the stakeholders on how the planned projects are presented.

Matthew Mitts agreed flexibility is needed. He is aware that the next phase of the BMAP will be complete in 2018. He stated that Vero Beach is not in compliance with the seagrass compliance test step two. He is aware that there will be reductions and asked what the process and timeline will be for DEP. Tiffany stated that BRL project zone B and the Central IRL are in that position of needing reductions. She stated that DEP wanted to move forward quickly, but now the new model may be available soon, so it is good to wait. She encouraged him to begin reviewing his project information so the city will be prepared when a model decision is made. She added that there is no firm timeline, but that DEP will not surprise the stakeholders with assignments and a deadline.

Yesenia stated that she has begun to look at a draft allocation method involving the counties and WCDs. She stated that the process will be as transparent as possible.

Sandra Reller stated that unfunded projects are included in two places in the report. Kevin encouraged her to send comments regarding the report to Yesenia.

Public Comments and Wrap Up (Tiffany Busby)

Tiffany asked if there were any announcements. Eric Anderson stated that there is a meeting of the Space Coast Progressive Alliance coming up and John Trefry will be the speaker.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 11:40 AM.

Action Items

Tiffany stated the following action items from the meeting:

1. Everyone can send water quality analysis comments to Yesenia.
2. Yesenia will finish reviewing the monitoring network.
3. Everyone should send any comments on the draft annual reports to Yesenia by June 3, 2016.
4. Yesenia will post the link to the video from Harbor Branch with the meeting materials, when the presentation is posted and the link is available.
5. Water quality entities should upload data to STORET and prepare for the transition WIN.
6. Yesenia will plan future meetings using email and the Florida Administrative Record.
7. Yesenia will post the reports and presentation on the public website.