North Indian River Lagoon
Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP)

Technical Meeting Summary
Friday, February 12, 2010
9:30 AM – 12:00 PM
Brevard County Agricultural Center
3695 Lake Drive, Cocoa, Florida 32926

Attendees

Holly Abeels, Brevard County Extension	Mary Lawrence, FDEP
Carolina Alvarez, Brevard County	Cindy Lieberman, Brevard County
Natalie Ayala, FDEP	John Matthews, NASA
Virginia Barker, Brevard County	Mike McBee, Brevard County
Nidia Bullard, MACTEC Engineering	Peter McClure, Evans Properties Inc.
Tiffany Busby, Wildwood Consulting	Elizabeth Melvia, Brevard County
Robert Day, SJRWMD IRL NEP	Steve Peene, ATM
Douglas Durham, NASA	Marcy Policastro, Wildwood Consulting
Roger Dykes, Cocoa	Ken Poole, Rockledge
Richard Earp, E-Sciences	Robert Potts, E-Sciences
Rebecca Elliot, FDACS	Thomas Price, NASA
Gordon England, Stormwater Solutions	Troy Rice, SJRWMD IRL NEP
Chris Ferraro, FDEP	HM Ridgely, Evans Properties
John Gamble, Volusia County	John Royal, Brevard County
Lou Giacoma, Indian Harbour Beach	Dave Sinton, Melbourne Village
Scott Glaubitz, BSE/Indialantic	Jim Smith, Oak Hill Consultant
Whit Green, SJRWMD	Suzie Stempel, Brevard County
Lorraine Guise, Titusville	Dani Straub, Melbourne
David Hamstra, Pegasus Engineering	Steve Szabo, Jones Edmunds & Associates
Carol Johnson, FDACS	Amy Tracy, FDEP
Bob Kelly, SAIC	Kalina Warren, FDEP
Ken Kniel, DRMP	Ed Wegerif, Cocoa
Carl Larrabee, Cocoa	Kelly Young, Volusia County

Welcome and Opening Remarks

Tiffany Busby welcomed everyone to the North Indian River Lagoon (IRL) Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP) meeting. Tiffany thanked the Brevard County Agricultural Center for hosting the meeting and the participants introduced themselves and the entity they represent.

Allocation Approach

Amy Tracy stated that she is not prepared to give each entity their BMAP responsibility at this time. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss the overall approach to calculate the BMAP reductions for each entity. The IRL Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) includes the existing loading estimate for 2000, which does not include atmospheric deposition, for each waterbody identification number (WBID) in the North IRL. The TMDL also includes target loads for total nitrogen (TN) and total phosphorus (TP) by WBID. Amy presented the list of stakeholders in basin including the wastewater facilities (WWTFs), municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s), and non-MS4s.

The North IRL basin will be divided into "project zones." Amy noted that through discussions with the St. Johns River Water Management District (SRJWMD) it was determined that the North IRL functions differently throughout the basin based on the residence time. The project zone approach ensures that projects are located correctly so that they benefit the lagoon. This approach allows the entities some flexibility to partner with other stakeholders in their zone to achieve nutrient reductions. The SJRWMD

model provided the boundaries for the two zones in the North IRL basin. The North A project zone extends from Turnbull Creek to the NASA Causeway (State Road 405), and includes Titusville. The North B project zone extends from the NASA Causeway to the Melbourne Causeway (US 192). The project zone boundaries are based on the Pollutant Load Screening Model (PLSM) output.

The method for the allocation calculations will be Geographic Information System (GIS) based using the PLSM output file that includes 2000 land uses, runoff (RO) coefficients, event mean concentrations (EMCs), and average rainfall. Peter McClure asked if a glossary of acronyms could be provided for future meetings. Amy responded that she will create a handout and post it on the FTP site.

Tiffany asked if there were any questions on the project zone approach. Mike McBee asked if the shaded areas on the map represented those entities in the project zones that would be responsible for reducing pollutants to meet the TMDL. Tiffany responded that this is correct and that the project zones will be correlated to the WBIDs in the TMDL to determine the required reductions. The entities can implement projects anywhere in the project zone they are located in to meet their allocation, which provides more flexibility than implementing projects on a WBID scale. The project zones also ensure that the reductions are hydrologically meaningful.

Carol Johnson asked if the IRL tributaries will be brought into this BMAP. Amy responded that they will be and Dr. Xueqing Gao (FDEP) is working on the model for the tributaries. The draft tributaries TMDLs will not be available until the spring and the allocations cannot be calculated until these TMDLs are ready. Carol asked if the basin maps will change when the tributaries are added. Amy responded that she will not know the basin area until the TMDLs are available.

John Gamble stated that the basin boundary goes quite a way into Volusia County and he asked who determined this area. Amy responded that the basin boundary was determined based on the areas that drain into North IRL. The Volusia County area drains into Turnbull Creek, which drains to IRL. Whit Green added that SJRWMD used five-foot topographic contours to determine the drainage areas with some field inspections for areas where they were uncertain how it drained. John noted that in 2007 Volusia County had one-foot contours done, which are much more accurate. Amy responded that since the TMDL is adopted, FDEP must move forward with the information from that point in time to implement the BMAP. Bob Kelly responded that since the BMAP will be implemented in three, five-year periods, there is the option in the future to look at new data. For this first period, the TMDL data will be used.

Jim Smith noted that when looking at Oak Hill, the breakpoint in the elevation is along the US 1 corridor and he asked if only projects west of US 1 would have an impact on the lagoon. Amy responded that the entire Oak Hill jurisdiction is not included in the basin based on the PLSM output. The model seems to have accurately captured how water flows in the basin (whether or not the flow goes to IRL). Whit added that there will eventually be TMDLs for Mosquito Lagoon and the majority of Oak Hill is located in that basin.

Ed Wegerif asked what if there are several hundred acres outside the basin boundary that contribute to IRL but are not shown in on the map. Amy responded that this area may be included in the tributaries TMDLs since the map is currently based on the PLSM output for only the IRL main stem. In addition, after the model was completed in 2000, SJRWMD expanded the basin boundaries and this expansion is not included in the BMAP. Ed asked if a closed pipe is considered a creek. Amy responded that she would talk with him after the meeting about the area in question.

Gordon England asked why the conservation areas are highlighted. Amy responded that she was checking to see if any have any agricultural uses and those that do seem to match the land use coverage in the model. Virginia Barker asked if the basin boundaries would be expanded to include all creeks that flow the lagoon, whether or not they are impaired. Amy responded that only the impaired tributaries will be included since they will have TMDLs. The total acreage that will be included with the tributaries is not known yet since the TMDLs have not been completed. Virginia stated that she agrees with Ed that any area that drains to the lagoon should be included, whether or not it is impaired, because any improvements in those areas would benefit the lagoon. Amy responded that the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) only has authority for TMDLs when there are impaired waters. Once the tributaries TMDLs are complete and those areas are added to the PLSM output, then the group can discuss if there are any other areas that should be included. Bob added that if an entity can provide information on what areas should be included that drain to the IRL, then FDEP can determine if it is reasonable to include those areas.

Gordon noted that the cities and counties were asked to provide information for the PLSM and SJRWMD did not receive much feedback. Then, the stakeholders were asked during the TMDL period to provide information and there was still little input. It is too late to include this information now but there is the possibility to include it in future iterations of the BMAP. Amy added that this is the reason why technical meetings are held. The information in the TMDL is only as good as the information that was provided; therefore, FDEP likes to obtain additional feedback as they go through the BMAP process. Bob Day noted that if any entity has GIS coverages for the basin they should provide this information to Amy so it is on file for future revisions.

Amy reviewed the GIS processing steps that will be used to calculate the allocations. The first step is to take the PLSM output shapefile and clip (or "cookie cut") the North A and North B project zones. This then creates the base map for each project zone and includes the land uses and associated information. Then, all Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) infrastructure will be identified using the FDOT shapefile that shows their roads, right-of-ways, and stormwater ponds. The FDOT areas will be removed from the base map to create its own file with total acreages that shows what FDOT is responsible for in each zone. The FDOT area is no longer in the base map and is assigned to FDOT. The next step will be to identify all the EMCs with a zero value and remove those areas from the base file. This will take those acres out of the calculations since they have no loading. Then, the agricultural areas will be identified using the 2000 land use land cover and these areas will be removed from the base map to create a separate file with the agricultural responsibility. Therefore, agriculture will not be assigned to the municipalities and counties.

Carl Larrabee asked what the white areas in the presentation maps represent. Amy responded that these areas either have no loading or belong to another stakeholder. For instance, the marsh land around the lagoon and lagoon proper are shown in white because they were removed since they do not have any loading. Any land uses shown in color belong to agriculture, a municipality, or a county.

Amy noted that once the agricultural areas have been removed from the base map, each of the municipalities will be clipped from the base map based on their jurisdictional boundaries. Each municipality will have its own shapefile for its responsible area and the remaining areas in the base map will be assigned to the counties. Once the shapefiles for each entity have been created, then these areas will be further divided into MS4 and non-MS4 areas, where appropriate. The MS4 areas will be assigned a wasteload allocation (WLA) and the non-MS4 areas will be assigned a load allocation (LA). The allocation table could be complicated because some entities are located in both project zones and may also have MS4 and non-MS4 areas.

John noted that the mosquito impoundments along the lagoon are managed by the Merritt Island National Wildlife Refuge and he asked if there are data to show that these impoundments do not contribute nutrients. The impoundments are managed for ducks and are sometimes closed for long periods of time. Whit responded that there are no specific studies on those impoundments but there a lot of studies on wetlands. These studies have shown that while at times wetlands release nutrients, they are usually nutrient sinks, which is why there were shown as zero loading in the model. John noted that the impoundments are a great opportunity for a project but if the refuge is not included in the BMAP then they may not allow projects there. Whit responded that the impoundments are already opened to allow lagoon water to flow through for treatment.

John Royal asked how the non-MS4 area will be determined. Amy responded that the entities will need to provide their MS4 coverage to determine the split. Tiffany added that if an entity does not have their MS4 coverage, they can request that their full jurisdiction be used or just the urbanized area. The most refined way to determine the MS4 area would be to use a map of the system. Virginia asked if the entity would still be responsible for the non-MS4 area. Amy responded that they would be responsible. Virginia noted that there are many areas where the stormwater systems were permitted by SJRWMD based on assumptions of performance and now those ponds are not performing at that level. She asked if the jurisdictions will be responsible for these ponds. Amy responded that the homeowner's association ponds will be discussed later in the meeting.

Jim asked if agricultural lands will be removed from the jurisdictions' responsibilities. Tiffany responded that they would be based on the 2000 land use in the model. Whit asked what occurs if the agricultural land has been developed since 2000. Amy responded that she is working with the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (FDACS) on this. Agriculture will receive credit since this land is no longer in agricultural uses. During the next iteration of the BMAP, the load reductions from these lands will be assigned to the appropriate local government where the development occurred.

Troy Rice asked why the distinction is being made between MS4 and non-MS4 areas. Amy responded that MS4 permits have an implementation clause for adopted TMDLs and BMAPs as an enforcement mechanism. Areas outside of the MS4 are enforceable through the BMAP itself. The distinction is made for enforcement purposes. Steve Peene asked if an entity is achieving more of a load reduction in the non-MS4 area and not enough in the MS4 area how this would be handled. Tiffany responded that any load reductions in the project zone would count and as long as the entity meets their total load reduction then they are good for the BMAP. There is also the option to trade out projects in the annual report as long as the reductions and schedule are met. Bob Kelly added that it does not matter whether the projects are located in the MS4 area as long enough reductions have been made to achieve the BMAP allocation.

Steve Szabo asked if there is any flexibility in where the line is drawn for the project zones. For instance, only a very small portion of Titusville is located in North B. Amy responded that FDEP will look at the information on a case-by-case basis with SJRWMD to make sure any changes make sense with the hydrology of the area.

Amy reviewed an example calculation to determine the required reduction. The PLSM output provides the loading for each of the land uses in the basin and this information will be used to determine the starting point load. Bob Kelly will then calculate the allowable load from the TMDL for the project zone. This load will be in terms of pounds per acre. This allowable loading multiplied by the acres in jurisdiction will give the total allowable load for that entity. The entity's starting point load minus the allowable load will yield the required reduction. The entities will provide projects that have been completed since 2000 and that are planned in order to meet this required reduction. The discussion on the

projects for BMAP credit will occur at a future meeting. Each entity will have to accomplish one-third of their required reduction in the first five-year BMAP period.

Amy noted that in order to complete the allocation calculations, each entity will need to provide their jurisdictional and MS4 boundaries. The entity should provide their latest boundary, which includes any annexations or other changes since the 2000 boundaries used in the TMDL. FDEP will also calculate a *de minimus* load, in which an entity must meet both the TN and TP values to be exempt from this first BMAP. The first step to calculate the *de minimus* values will be to calculate the starting points load to determine a reasonable value. Any entity that falls under the *de minimus* values will be notified by FDEP. Jim asked what the timeframe for this calculation is. Amy responded that the tributaries TMDLs information is needed for the allocation calculations, which will be available in the spring. Jim asked if an entity thinks they fall under the *de minimus* calculation if they can wait until spring to see if they should be involved. Tiffany responded that since FDEP does not know who will be exempt, the entities should be involved until they know for sure that they are considered *de minimus*.

Carl stated that early in the presentation there was a slide showing the TN and TP target loads from the TMDL and he asked if these were the loading numbers that would be fitted the project zones. Carl stated that he was also curious if the actual allowable loading would be close to the example in the presentation. Bob Kelly responded that the target loads from the TMDL for each WBID will be fitted to the project zone areas to determine allowable loads. Whit added that the model calculated the total load based on a load per acre value for each type of land use. Carl asked if once these targets are met if the IRL will be healthy. Amy responded that the TMDL target is a depth-limit target for seagrass, which is based on the best available information. These reductions in TN and TP, and associated reductions in total suspended solids (TSS), should lead to an improvement in seagrass. It is unknown whether once the target is achieved if everything will be perfect. This is the reason for breaking the reductions into three parts so that new information can be factored in throughout the process.

Peter asked how well does the TMDL match up with the numeric nutrient criteria. Amy responded that FDEP is in the process of going through the U.S Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) proposed criteria to understand what the criteria mean for FDEP's programs. Once FDEP finishes reviewing the criteria, they will determine how to proceed. Whit added that the TMDL and numeric nutrient criteria are related but separate ideas. The TMDL is currently in place and is what we are working on now. The numeric criteria will be used in the future. The estuary criteria are currently under development and the TMDLs will be considered in this process. Bob noted that the TMDL is based on the narrative criteria to maintain a balanced aquatic ecosystem and seagrass is an indicator of this balance. Whit stated that this is a good point and that resources will figure into setting the criteria. The draft estuaries criteria are due next year and, currently, the process is underway to determine what protective levels are needed.

Steve Peene noted that there already is a set load for the IRL, which should be the criteria in this area. Steve stated that Russ Frydenborg (FDEP) is going around the state to meet with those experts who have developed models and other work for freshwater systems. The goal is to collect information to supersede the SPARROW model being used by EPA to set the criteria. Steve stated that he hopes the experts who were part of the IRL TMDL work are involved in this effort. Whit added that he does not think the numeric criteria process is being dismissive of TMDLs because they have been involving those who have done work in these freshwater systems. HM Ridgely stated that he recently attended a joint water management district and Water Resources Advisory Commission (WRAC) meeting where they discussed the numeric criteria. As part of the discussion there was concern that each waterbody will be held to the highest standards, likely the numeric criteria, and that FDEP will have to redo their TMDLs to match the new criteria. Amy noted that it will be an interesting process and FDEP is determining how to move forward.

Provisional Credit for Nonstructural Activities

Tiffany noted that since the purpose of the meeting was to discuss how load reduction responsibility would be assigned, FDEP thought it would be helpful to share some information on what activities will receive credit. In other basins, FDEP wanted to give credit for some types of nonstructural projects. There is adequate information for many stormwater structural projects to assign credit but there are also other activities that help reduce nutrients. The nonstructural credits are considered provisional because they are based on the best knowledge and studies available, and there are efforts underway to refine these numbers with Florida specific information. In the next five-year cycle, the amount of credit for these projects could change based on new information.

There is a substantial amount of credit available for education and outreach if certain activities are in place. FDEP wanted to explain the education credit now because ordinances are included and it takes time to develop and adopt these ordinances. Up to a 6% credit off the starting load for both TN and TP can be achieved with the education efforts. A total of 3% credit is assigned for Florida Yards and Neighborhoods (FYN) Program. It does not matter when this program was implemented because the 2000 start date for project credit does not apply to education activities. FDEP does not want to penalize early adopters of these efforts. An additional 2% credit can be assigned for having all four local ordinances: (1) irrigation, (2) landscape, (3) fertilizer, and (4) pet waste management. The remaining 1% credit is for other items that are likely MS4 activities such as an illicit discharge program, website, and pamphlets. The education efforts information will be collected during the project collection process.

John Gamble asked if an entity purchased land that was agriculture and changed it to conservation, if that would be considered for nonstructural credit. Tiffany responded that it would be a credit that would be considered but there will need to be some legal mechanism in place to show that it will stay in conservation. In other basins, credit was allowed for the first five-year period and then it will be reevaluated in the next iteration.

Peter asked if there is credit available for agricultural best management practices (BMPs). Amy responded that there was some discussion about this at the Central IRL meeting and FDEP is discussing this option internally. Tiffany added that the BMPs are part of the adopted manuals that will be required for the producers to implement for the BMAP. Carol noted that agriculture will be given a load reduction and credit will be assigned based on the number of growers signed up for BMPs. BMPs alone will probably not be enough to meet the agriculture allocation so regional treatment will be needed. However, once the growers have implemented BMPs, they have met their BMAP obligation. Tiffany noted that FDEP is determining if there are public education activities that agriculture and water control districts can do to receive credit. Amy added that she would like to talk with Peter after the meeting to get him involved in these discussions.

Tiffany stated that provisional credit is also provided for street sweeping. The Florida Stormwater Association (FSA) has a study underway to provide Florida specific street sweeping numbers. FDEP hopes this information will be available for use in the IRL BMAP. The handout provides an example of how street sweeping credit was provided for another basin. Whit asked if both sweeping and vacuuming were included in the study. Tiffany responded that the study did include the removal of material from the roadway. The example in the handout only provides TP reductions, which was the focus of the BMAP in that basin. Credit will also be assigned for TN in the IRL. The example calculation is based on total miles of roadway swept for the entire road, not curb miles. Gordon asked if the miles swept need to be provided for the entire jurisdiction or just the WBID. Tiffany responded that the information will be needed by project zone. This was just provided as an example and it is not known how the FSA study will compute credit. Other studies have used a catchment area or the weight of materials collected.

Gordon noted that some cities have long term records from street sweeping and he asked if they can provide this information to assign credits. Amy responded that FDEP would like to use the FSA information. If it is not available in time for use in the IRL then FDEP can discuss other options with the stakeholders and upper management.

Inspection and Maintenance of Neighborhood Stormwater Ponds

Tiffany stated that in past meetings there have been questions about private ponds that are not owned by the jurisdictions and why the jurisdictions are being held responsible. A handout was provided that outlines this issue and how maintenance of these ponds will be handled. For those ponds that have an Environmental Resource Permit (ERP), there is an enforcement mechanism through the water management district. For any ponds that were in place pre-ERP (before 1982), enforcement can be taken through the MS4 permit if the pond discharges to MS4 conveyances. In addition, although SJRWMD does not have an enforcement mechanism, the local field office is willing to meet with the homeowner's association (HOA) to provide guidance on maintenance.

While not having control over the maintenance of these ponds is an issue, the TMDL model does acknowledge where there is existing stormwater treatment, which provides some credit. Areas with treatment have a lesser load reduction than those areas without treatment; therefore, there is some benefit to the jurisdiction even if they have to make efforts to ensure the ponds are maintained. The question was asked if the model includes pre-2000 development. Tiffany responded that the model includes 2000 land uses so development before that time would be included.

Tiffany noted that several local governments throughout the state, including Indian River County, have created ordinances for inspection and maintenance of the HOA ponds. If a jurisdiction sees that there are a lot of ponds that are not being maintained and this is causing an issue, the entity can create an ordinance to add another enforcement mechanism. FDEP feels that the local governments are in the best position to report problems and/or to work with HOAs to get the most treatment out of the existing systems.

Virginia asked if the nutrient removal efficiencies assumed in model are the same as those in the permits. Whit responded that the efficiency is based on the average removal rate from several studies, include some local studies. This average load reduction was then applied to developed areas with stormwater treatment. Tiffany added that the allocation approach is based on trying to equitably assign load reductions. Areas without treatment will have a higher loading from model than those areas with treatment; therefore, there is more responsibility for reductions in areas with no treatment. Virginia stated that while she appreciates the concept of trying to level the playing field, in the more developed cities where there is little available land, it may be more cost effective to improve or enhance existing ponds. Amy responded that FDEP does not mandate how each entity should meet their reductions. It is up to each entity to determine what makes sense to them as long as the project is occurring in the correct project zone.

Dave Sinton asked what ponds are considered older. Tiffany responded that the stormwater rule went into effect in 1982. Whit added that for the model, SJRWMD had 1989 aerials that showed developed areas. This date was the closest to the time of the stormwater rule. Any development after that time was considered to have stormwater treatment. Dave asked if adjustments for credit could be made if an entity provides information on treatment prior to 1989. Bob responded that it would be difficult at this stage to include that information because it would be a lot of work to verify the treatment.

The question was asked if an entity could provide a list of those systems that have treatment based on an ERP search because there is one project before 1989. Tiffany responded that the estimates in the model were not based on ERP but on development at a point in time. The difference in the loading estimates

would probably be very small. Any retrofits to the system can receive credit. This information will be provided as part of the project collection process after the allocations have been calculated.

Dani Straub asked if an entity wants to monitor a stormwater pond, what testing is needed to show the project accomplishments. Bob responded that, in general, it will not be a requirement to monitor the reductions from a project because it takes a lot of data. Instead, information on the project design will be requested to estimate load reductions. Amy added that Eric Livingston (FDEP) has funded studies for many years to determine removal efficiencies for different projects throughout the state. Information will be provided during project collection on what is needed to estimate project reductions. Whit added that there is a list of standard monitoring procedures on the FDEP website that provide guidance on monitoring. Dani stated that she asked the question to determine what monitoring is needed for budgeting. Tiffany responded that the BMAP will include a monitoring plan for the basin but it will not include a requirement to monitor the effectiveness of each project.

Virginia stated that a lot of information will be incorporated in future iterations and she asked what assurances the stakeholders have that FDEP will have the funding and staff to capture these changes. Amy responded that there are limited resources and the FDEP basin coordinators go through a process to determine what resources are needed for their basins. Once the consent decree TMDLs are completed, there should be more staff time available and she is anticipating having the support to refine the model for the next iteration. All questions will not be able to be addressed so the stakeholders will need to focus on the main issues.

Gordon stated that he has a client who asked if septic tank removal will receive BMAP credit. Amy responded that FDEP has been discussing this internally and she anticipates giving some credit for removing septic tanks. There will be caveats, such as the tanks must be within a certain distance from surface waters, and there are several studies underway to provide more information to help determine project credit. Amy stated that she also spoke with FDEP wastewater staff about credit for upgrading sewer infrastructure and there may be the potential for credit near surface waters.

Gordon asked if there was any idea what time of day the Basin Working Group (BWG) will meet. He was asked by a council member who is interested in participating. Amy responded that she will coordinate with the BWG members before the first meeting to determine what time works best for them. The meeting date will likely remain on the second Friday of the month. Gordon asked what the deadline is for BWG nominations. Amy responded that the deadline has technically passed but the tributaries TMDLs will be needed before the BWG can meet so the first meeting is still months away.

Steve asked how much flexibility there is for stakeholders to receive credit for projects that cross project zones. Amy responded that there is probably little flexibility but FDEP and SJRWMD can review the information on a case-by-case basis. Credit trading is not an option in this basin so the entity will need to work within their project zone.

Next Meeting

Tiffany stated that the next North IRL meeting is scheduled for Friday, May 14, 2010, at the Brevard County Agricultural Center. Amy noted that it was brought to her attention that SJRWMD is holding water supply meetings at the same time as the IRL BMAP meetings. There are several smaller stakeholders that do not have adequate staff to send representatives to both meetings. Amy contacted SJRWMD and they will work to avoid this conflict in the future. Amy stated that before selecting the second Friday of the month for the IRL meetings, she checked to make sure that other existing meetings were not scheduled for that date. However, the SJRWMD water supply meetings started after FDEP selected the date for the IRL meetings.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 11:43 AM.

Actions

1. Amy Tracy will create a list of acronyms for the BMAP process and post it the FTP site.
2. Amy will follow up with Ed Wegerif on the area near Cocoa that he believes should be included in the BMAP area.
3. Amy will coordinate with Peter McClure about credit for agricultural and water control district education activities.
4. All entities should provide their best information about their jurisdictional boundaries and MS4 area to Amy Tracy as soon as possible.
5. FDEP staff should continue to refine the BMAP credits available for structural projects as well as septic tank removals and wastewater collection system upgrades and to define the distance from surface waters where these projects would count.
6. Staff should review information about non-impaired tributaries and whether they should be included in the project zones.