

Lake Okeechobee Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP)

Technical Meeting Summary

Tuesday, August 6, 2013

9:30 AM – 11:30 AM

Okeechobee Service Center

3800 NW 16th Boulevard, Suite A, Okeechobee, FL 34972

Attendees

Beth Alvi, FDEP	Catherine Johnson, Orange County
David Austin, UF-IFAS Highlands	Daniel Kallin, Southern Gardens
Rick Baird, Osceola County	Peter Kalogridis, Isleworth
Lesley Bertolotti, SFWMD	Greg Kennedy, FDEP
Karen Bickford, Lee County	Kimberly Lawrence, Osceola County
Tiffany Busby, Wildwood Consulting	Charles Lee, Audubon Florida
Kevin Carter, SFWMD	Kim Love, Citizen
Dennis Corrick, Dean Mead	Susan Martin, SFWMD
Linda Crane, FDACS	Linda McCarthy, Lykes Brothers Inc.
Savannah Davy, SFWMD	Barbara Miedena, Sugar Cane Growers Coop
Rebecca Elliott, FDACS	Frank Nearhoof, Federico, Lamb & Associates
Clell Ford, Highlands County	Jennifer Nelson, FDEP
Tom Frick, FDEP	Julie Neurohr, FDEP
Stan Ganthier, FDEP	Steffany Olson, SFWMD
Brian Gentry, Palm Beach County	Fernando Pleitez, E Sciences
Pattie Gertenbach, E Sciences	Marcy Policastro, Wildwood Consulting
Eddie Gibson, Palm Beach County	Luke Polk, Florida Farm Bureau
Eric Gonzales, SFWMD	Irene Quincey, Pavese Law Firm
Randy Gornto, UF-IFAS Highlands	Terry Riordan, FDEP
Paul Gray, Audubon Florida	Dan Rutland, E Sciences
Susan Gray, SFWMD	Brent Setchell, FDOT District 1
Kirby Green, AquaFiber	Clay Shrum, Spring Lake Improvement District
Noah Handley, Lykes Brothers Inc.	Jason Storrs, FDEP
John Hayford, Okeechobee Utility Authority	Jeff Sumner, SFWMD
Janet Hearn, ATM	Hilary Swain, Archbold Biological Station
Tom Hill, Florida Farm Bureau	Bridgett Tolley, Osceola County
Clegg Hooks, FDACS	Moises Villapando, FRWA
Bob Howard, The Carol Group	Garrett Wallace, Alico Inc.
Dianne Hughes, Martin County	Bonnie Wolff Pelaez, FDACS
Laurie Hurner, UF-IFAS Highlands	

Welcome and Opening Remarks

Tiffany Busby welcomed everyone to the Lake Okeechobee Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP) meeting. The participants introduced themselves and the entity they represent. Beth Alvi noted that there was a tentative item on the agenda to review data from the Fisheating Creek and Lake Istokpoga sub-watersheds. The Florida Department of Environmental Protection has been evaluating the data from these sub-watersheds to determine the total phosphorus (TP) concentrations and how the sub-watersheds drain. The Department had some questions about the data, so the evaluations for these sub-watersheds will be presented at the next meeting.

Lake Okeechobee Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP)

Identify Stakeholders

Beth stated that this is the third BMAP technical meeting. There has been slow but steady progress being made on the BMAP; however, it is now time to ramp up the effort. The project collection process is important to start to identify what projects have been completed and which are planned in the watershed.

Beth noted that one of the steps in BMAP development is to ensure that everyone who needs to be involved is informed of the process. Since the kickoff meeting in February, the Department has been working to determine the appropriate stakeholders that should be at the table. At this time, the Department has a fairly comprehensive list of local governments and entities that need to be part of the BMAP process; however, contact information for some of those entities is missing. Beth stated that the Department would like the stakeholders' help in obtaining contacts in the local governments and other entities. The distribution list will be posted to the FTP site for the stakeholders to review and to provide any missing contacts.

Within the Lake Okeechobee watershed, there are multiple local governments including ten counties, 24 municipalities, and 34 special districts. Beth stated that as a first step, the Department would be reaching out to the counties for contacts at the municipalities within their jurisdiction. If there are other entities within the county that are also implementing projects to reduce total phosphorus (TP), this information should be provided to the Department.

In addition, there are several state agencies involved in the BMAP process. The Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (FDACS) has been doing a lot of work in the watershed to enroll agricultural producers in best management practices (BMPs). The Florida Department of Environmental Protection is represented by the Southeast, South, and Central District Offices. Beth noted that the districts are good contacts for the stakeholders if they cannot reach Department staff in Tallahassee. The Florida Department of Health (FDOH) is also involved, as well as the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT). FDOT's Districts 1, 4, and 5 are represented in the watershed, and the Department recently met with FDOT District 1 staff about project opportunities in the area. The Florida Turnpike Enterprise is also within the watershed. The Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD), St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD), and South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) are also involved, and SFWMD has a long history of work in this watershed.

Beth stated that there are other interested stakeholders who provide valuable input for the BMAP process. There are conservation associations, such as the Nature Conservancy, Audubon Society, and Wildlife Federation; growers; agricultural producers; and the Seminole Tribe. Beth stated that the Department had a meeting with the Seminole Tribe to discuss the projects they implement on their reservation.

Charles Lee stated that the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP) is missing from the list and they have spent about \$160 million on easements in this watershed. Beth responded that NRCS should be included on the list of stakeholders. Charles stated that NRCS has a new leader in

Lake Okeechobee Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP)

Florida so now is a good time to talk with them. Garrett Wallace noted that he just sent an email to Beth with the NRCS contact's information.

Beth stated that she would post the distribution list to the FTP site at the end of this week or early next week. Tiffany requested that the stakeholders review this list by the end of next week (August 16th) and provide any additional contacts to Beth.

Discuss TP Reductions for the First BMAP Phase

Beth noted that this presentation will provide a quick overview of the Department's short-term plans for the BMAP. The Department would prefer not to assign allocations in this watershed, and instead they want to focus on TP reductions at the sub-watershed level. Over the last few months, the Department conducted a basic evaluation of the flow and TP data to learn about how each sub-watershed drains and which have high TP concentrations. This information will help identify which projects would work best in each sub-watershed and where projects should be located.

Beth stated that she sent an email about two weeks ago asking the stakeholders to compile a list of projects that were recently completed in which the reductions are now being seen and projects that are planned during the first five-year BMAP iteration (through December 31, 2019). This information will set the stage for the BMAP in each sub-watershed so that the Department can work with the stakeholders to formulate a plan for which sub-watersheds need more reductions. The Department will then start calculating targets for each sub-watershed, and use the Watershed Assessment Model (WAM) to optimize where and what types of projects are best suited to each sub-watershed. Once the stakeholders submit their projects, there can be discussions about what other projects are needed to meet the sub-watershed targets for the first BMAP iteration. There will also be discussions about funding for the additional projects because it is important to ensure there will be adequate funding for the efforts listed in the BMAP. Beth requested that the stakeholders think about their sub-watershed and provide ideas to the Department about what is needed in that sub-watershed. Beth stated that she would like feedback now on the short-term goals for the path forward.

Charles stated that it seems as if there are two pieces of the process that need to be working at once. One piece is identifying projects that are already underway and additional work that needs to be done. The other piece is that all sub-watersheds are not created equal in terms of loading contribution and potential opportunities to gain ground through the pursuit of funding for projects. Without having some rudimentary baseline information that could be posted for the stakeholders to see what part of the problem is associated with their sub-watershed, the stakeholders may be vague about what they are and could be doing. This information is already known through the Del Bottcher report, and it could be summarized into a map of the sub-watersheds and relative contribution of loading to the lake. Beth responded that this a good point and SFWMD has done a lot of this work already, so it can be added to maps and placed on the FTP site. Lesley Bertolotti noted that SFWMD already has this information in a table and draft maps that could be finalized and provided to the stakeholders.

Hilary Swain stated that when she gives presentations to the public and elected officials, most seem to be unaware that they are located in the Northern Everglades. It would be helpful to have

Lake Okeechobee Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP)

a simple dashboard to make people aware of which watershed they are located in and to provide summary information about that watershed. Beth responded that public education can be included in the BMAP because the projects that will be listed can be structural or nonstructural. The Department can coordinate with the local governments about implementing this idea as a BMAP project. Hilary noted that this information could be conveyed with the tax bill to each property owner in the watershed. Clell Ford stated that he agrees with Hilary's idea. The ridge is mostly located within the SWFWMD and yet it drains into the Everglades, so this link needs to be made. However, SWFWMD is not as involved in this process as SFWMD. Beth responded that she has been in contact with SWFWMD and she needs to continue her efforts to involve them.

Dan Rutland stated that FDEP has historically provided a date range for project collection, and he asked if one would be provided for this BMAP. Beth responded that right now the Department is not providing a set date for the start of project collection; it will be up to the stakeholders to determine what timeframe to use for their recently completed projects. In BMAPs with allocations, there is a reduction amount that each stakeholder has to achieve, but that is not the case here. Before the BMAP is adopted, the Department would like to go back further in time, possibly to the end of the total maximum daily load (TMDL) period, to account for what has been done in the watershed. Kimberly Lawrence asked if the calculations for the projects would include attenuation or would a pound of TP be the same no matter where it is coming from in the watershed. Beth responded that the Department has not figured this out yet; however, the targets will have to factor in how much of the loading from each sub-watershed goes to the lake.

Paul Gray stated that the Lake Okeechobee Protection Program has a goal for meeting the TMDL in 2015. Since this will not be achieved, the legislature will likely provide a new date. Paul asked if the BMAP will provide a timeline to meet the TMDL or if the process will putter along. Beth responded that the Department's goal is to complete the BMAP in less than two years. The BMAP process was kicked off in February and the Department hopes to complete it before the end of 2014, which is why the process is ramping up. Paul noted that completing the BMAP is not the same as meeting the TMDL. Beth responded that the BMAP process is phased and describes efforts for five years at a time. Towards the end of the first iteration, the Department will review the numbers and determine what else needs to be done in the next BMAP phase.

Karen Bickford asked if a single method of estimating load reductions from projects will be used to ensure the results are comparable. Using different methods results in different answers, so it is important to have consistency. Beth responded that the Department will develop a loading spreadsheet that includes land uses, soils, event mean concentrations (EMCs), and rainfall to calculate loads associated with an area treated by a project. The associated efficiency for that type of best management practice (BMP) would then be applied to calculate credit. The same model will be used across the watershed.

Kirby Green stated that in other BMAPs, he has seen a focus on reductions and how each entity is making those reductions. What he has not seen in the BMAP process is the expected outcome of those reductions on the waterbody. Kirby encouraged the Department to look at how the

Lake Okeechobee Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP)

reductions would affect the lake to establish an interim goal for this BMAP iteration. Beth responded that this is a good idea and she can talk with other Department staff about how to accomplish this.

Project Collection Process and Path Forward

Beth stated that the BMAP process is moving into the project collection phase. The types of projects include structural BMPs, such as ponds, swales, and cost-share agricultural BMPs; restoration and water quality improvement activities, and basic stormwater management program implementation. There are other activities that could count for credit including education and outreach programs, ordinances, and street sweeping. The Florida Stormwater Association recently developed a tool to calculate reductions from street sweeping. Operations and maintenance (O&M) is important and any O&M over and above the basic requirements to keep the BMP working could result in additional nutrient reductions. There are also agricultural BMPs that are implemented in the watershed, and these may be discussed in more detail at the next meeting. Beth noted that the next meeting would be held in the Kissimmee or Orlando area. In addition, public service announcements, brochures, and other outreach activities that help to change behaviors should result in a TP reduction. Hilary stated that the suite of restoration activities, such as easements and payment for environmental services (PES), is missing from the list. Garrett suggested that the Department include Federal lands that are already in conservation.

Charles stated that he is confused because he thinks of BMPs as part of a structured regulatory program, such as FDACS or Works of the District BMPs. However, the slide in the presentation has a generic statement about BMPs that makes it sound like everything is a BMP. It would help to clarify what are the different BMPs. This slide seems to blend them all together and makes it difficult to identify which ones fall under each of the funding streams and regulatory responsibilities. Beth responded that this slide in the presentation was meant to be generic and more details about the BMPs are provided later in the presentation. Beth noted that she did not think about conservation easements as an option, but one of the slides later will discuss buying lands and putting them into conservation.

Beth stated that the current status of the project collection process is that the Department asked the local governments to provide information about recently implemented projects and those planned within the first BMAP iteration. This project information is due by September 16th. An email was sent to the distribution list but it was not comprehensive, which is why the Department would like help identifying additional contacts. Dianne Hughes asked if the Department also wants the Geographic Information Systems (GIS) shapefiles for the project areas by September 16th. Dianne noted that it took Martin County six months to put that information together for the St. Lucie BMAP. Beth responded that the Department understands that the local governments have limited resources. If the county can provide what information they can by September 16th, they can then submit the rest of the information later. There may be some local governments that do not have the resources to create GIS files, so they can submit hard copy maps.

Hilary asked if the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) is involved in the BMAP discussions, especially about the regulation schedules north of the lake. Beth responded that the Corps has not been engaged in the BMAP process yet but she would work on getting them involved.

Lake Okeechobee Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP)

Kimberly asked if the Department has been involved in the Corps' Kissimmee Basin Modeling and Operation Study (KB MOS). It would be good for the Department to be involved from a water quality perspective. Beth responded that the Department has been involved and the TMDL group has been reviewing the modeling information. This is an important process and the Department needs to provide input on the four alternatives that have been developed.

Kim Love stated that coordination in this watershed is a concern for people. There are several processes occurring including the BMAP, Central Florida water issues in the upper part of watershed, update of the Lake Okeechobee Protection Plan, water reservations, minimum flows and levels, and the Senate select committee meeting on August 22nd to specifically focus on this watershed and the Lake Okeechobee discharges. Kim asked who, if anyone, is coordinating all these efforts. Kim noted that while she appreciates the effort of going through the BMAP process, she is not sure how all these activities are integrated and how the right people are working together. She is frustrated that after 20 years of meetings, the same conversations are occurring and another plan is being implemented. What is needed is additional storage north of the lake.

Beth responded that Kim made some important points. While the BMAP is called a "plan," the projects and activities included will be implemented according to the schedule in the BMAP. If a stakeholder is no longer planning to implement a project listed in the BMAP, they must replace it with another project that has equal TP load reductions. The Department tries to coordinate with other agencies on the BMAP process, and they have been working very closely with SFWMD and FDACS and have been reaching out to the local governments. The Department does hope to involve some of the bigger players, such as the Corps, in the process.

Kim asked when Beth says that projects in the BMAP will get done, to which projects she is referring. When the Kissimmee River was channelized, it not only affected the river but its capacity for storage. The storage now needs to be on land, which is privately owned, and building this storage requires funding. However, project funding is dependent on what the legislature deems appropriate. Beth responded that this is why the Department wants to determine where projects are needed and what types so that the funding needs can be identified. Karen noted that in Lee County, having the Caloosahatchee BMAP gives staff leverage with the Board of County Commissioners to implement projects. In terms of funding, the county is engaging the legislature through the Community Budget Issue Request (CBIR) process and is also trying to work on public/private partnerships. For Lee County, the BMAP has provided a detailed document that gives support for projects when the county goes to the legislature for funding. The BMAP should also help with Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) funding to build storage in the upper part of the watershed.

Beth stated the Department's goals for the project collection process are to be as transparent as possible with the calculations and to utilize realistic estimates of what the projects accomplish for nutrient reductions. The process for project collection involves the stakeholders providing projects to the Department and then the Department will compile all the information at the sub-watershed level. The Department will ensure all the necessary information was provided for the credit calculations and will then calculate the initial estimate of reductions. The Department will

Lake Okeechobee Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP)

bring this information to a public meeting for review, and there may be a need to hold smaller meetings to discuss the projects at the sub-watershed level.

Beth stated that at the last meeting, an overview of the different types of projects was provided. The standard stormwater BMPs include retention, detention, and treatment trains. For treatment trains, information about the components should be provided so that credit can be evaluated as it moves through the treatment train. Septic tank phase out is another BMP option. The septic tank model developed for the Department by Florida State University only evaluates total nitrogen (TN) but the Department is developing a method for calculating TP load reductions. Charles noted that from the BMP handout, a lot of the efficiencies are derived from work by Harvey Harper. Some of his more recent work has included his growing concern about reclaimed water and its potential to redistribute loading throughout a watershed. Charles noted that he personally has argued in the past about the need for phasing out septic tanks. However, considering that this wastewater would then go to a treatment facility where the effluent would be used for reclaimed water and sludge would be produced, it could be that the nutrients will be dispersed throughout the watershed again like they would if the septic tanks were still there. Reclaimed water is a good thing, but it has the potential for causing damage depending on where it is applied. The Department should review Harvey Harper's studies on reclaimed water.

Beth stated that there are also provisional BMPs eligible for BMAP credit. These BMPs are provisional because information is not available to determine the exact reductions but there are benefits to implementing the BMPs. Public education and outreach brings about a change in behavior that results in a decrease in loading. Beth noted that she had sent an education efforts form to the stakeholders that she will review later in the meeting. Floating islands/managed aquatic plant systems (MAPS) are another type of provisional BMP. There has been some success with floating islands but there are also areas where these did not provide a reduction. Monitoring information will be needed in order to assess the benefit of this project type for the BMAP.

Beth noted that in each BMAP, the Department learns about new projects. In some of the recently adopted BMAPs, there were special districts that implemented actions to help manage their canals to reduce nutrients. These activities include muck removal/dredging, aquatic plant removal, and upgrades to water control structures. The Department worked with these districts to determine approaches to calculate credit for these types of activities, but the Department is continuing to evaluate these project options. If the stakeholders are aware of other types of projects that would be helpful to reduce TP loading, they should let the Department know about those projects.

If a project was built to meet a permit requirement, this project would not be eligible for BMAP credit. However, if the project provides treatment above and beyond permit requirements, the additional treatment would count for project credit. All projects must reduce TP to be included in the BMAP. Beth noted that some projects will also reduce TN, and the Department will keep a tally of the TN reductions since both the Caloosahatchee and St. Lucie Estuaries have TN TMDLs. All projects must be located within the watershed, and the watershed boundaries are posted on the FTP site.

Lake Okeechobee Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP)

Beth noted that a table of BMP efficiencies was provided both by email and as a meeting handout. The credit for retention BMPs is based on the inches of water retained by the project. Credit for wet detention ponds are based on how long the water is retained in days. Dry detention and baffle box projects have set efficiencies that are used. Stormwater reuse is also eligible for credit. Beth stated that if the stakeholders have data to support higher efficiencies for their projects, to provide these data with the project collection information.

Beth reviewed the education efforts form. She noted that participation in the Florida Yards and Neighborhoods (FYN) Program is granted a 3% reduction from an entity's total urban loads. Rick Baird stated that the Green Industries BMP Program has set parameters that are provided to people, but the FYN Program is more flexible so that the counties can adapt the program to their area. He asked how this program needs to be used to obtain BMAP credit. Beth stated that she could follow up with Osceola County to discuss their program. Kimberly noted that Osceola County has customized their program, so not everything goes through FYN. Catherine Johnson stated that in Orange County, the FYN Program is being used to target BMAP areas, especially for home fertilizer use. The county currently does not implement the FYN Program in the Lake Okeechobee watershed.

Randy Gornto stated that FYN/Florida Friendly Landscaping (FFL) is not as stringent as the Green Industries Program because it is not a training program but a concept that is taught to determine how the nine principles should be applied. The Green Industries BMP Program is teaching specific ideas that need to be implemented, so it is a different program from FYN. Marcy Policastro noted that in other BMAPs, the Department has given credit for the FYN Program as long as it is implemented in some form within the BMAP watershed. Charles stated he believes that FYN/FFL could yield a lot of results; however, he is skeptical about adopting a set percentage for credit. Typically, when the FYN program is implemented, it is done through suggestions and informational pieces to homeowners, so there is no specificity on what will actually happen on residential lawns and to what extent. It does not seem that 3% is a real world reduction number without minimum requirements in place.

Paul stated that the major disconnect is how to deal with TP, which is why we have been working on Lake Okeechobee issues for decades. The recommended TP application rate for urban turf is 10 pounds/acre. To meet the TMDL, only 0.1 pounds/acre of TP would be allowed, so this recommendation for urban turf is 100 times greater than the TMDL. There are also 190,000 metric tons (MT) of legacy loads, which could provide high loading to the lake for decades. This does not account for the fact that TP is still being applied in the watershed. Paul noted that he is not hearing that the Department will stem the flow of new TP inputs. Charles added that in areas that use reclaimed water, they should not be adding fertilizer to lawns and shrubbery. Beth responded that this is a good point that the Department needs to consider. However, if the Department does not provide incentives for some of these activities, such as the FYN Program, they will not happen. These activities help to change behaviors, which is why the Department gives credit for these efforts. Paul stated that these activities should be incentivized. However, there is a problem if properties are allowed to continue to saturate the soils with TP.

Beth stated that a project spreadsheet was sent to the stakeholders. The stakeholders should provide information on each project, as completely as possible. If a project is part of a treatment

Lake Okeechobee Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP)

train, this should be noted. For permitted projects, the permit number must be provided so that the Department can determine what part of the project is above and beyond permit requirements. Beth noted that it is also important to know where the project is located and what area drains to it. Therefore, map files should be provided in GIS or AutoCAD. If stakeholders do not have access to these programs, they should let the Department know. When a project is entered onto the spreadsheet, it should be assigned a number and project name. This same number and project name should be included on the supporting information provided for that project. Beth stated that she would post the project collection information to the FTP site, and the stakeholders should contact her if they have any questions.

Beth noted that another project option is conservation land purchase programs. Several counties have programs to purchase lands that were agricultural or urban development and to change them into conservation lands. Credit in the BMAP is assigned for going from a higher loading land use to a lower loading land use. If the land is already in conservation and it stays in conservation, that is great but it is not providing a nutrient reduction benefit from the existing loading.

Kirby stated that a bill was passed this year that moved the water quality credit trading program from only in the Lower St. Johns River (LSJR) Basin to a statewide application. He asked how the Department plans to implement this new program. Tom Frick responded that the Department currently has a rule that allows trading specific to the LSJR Basin. There are a number of provisions in this rule that may not be applicable statewide, based on the legislature's intent. Before any formalized trading program can be developed in the BMAPs, the Department will have to update the current rule to expand it for statewide application and address a number of issues that were specific to the LSJR Basin. One of the big issues for the Lake Okeechobee watershed is agriculture and nonpoint source credits and how they could be generated and traded. Tom noted that he is not sure when the Department would go forward with rulemaking for trading.

Tiffany added that the lack of a formal trading program does not preclude the stakeholders from participating in cooperative projects. Garrett asked if the Department still needs to know the credit amount for these cooperative projects for the BMAP. Tom responded that almost all BMAPs have project sharing where entities receive credit based on how they are participating in a project. For trading, location factors would need to be established to ensure the credits are purchased appropriately across the watershed because it may not be 1:1 based on attenuation. There are still opportunities for stakeholders to partner on projects and receive credit in the BMAP, and this is highly encouraged to achieve restoration.

Garrett stated that in the last few years, there has been tens of thousands of acres in this watershed that have gone into perpetual easements or large scale projects. In order to have a true picture of what is occurring in the watershed, the benefits of these projects need to be determined. Hilary added that many of those easements receive water, which leaves the easement at a better quality, so they do provide a benefit. A lot of money has been invested in this program so it should be included in the BMAP. Beth responded that in each BMAP, there is a new situation and it was not the case in other BMAPs where easements were providing this benefit. The Department can look into this as a project option. Hilary added that the Department

Lake Okeechobee Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP)

should also consider how worse the conditions would be if these lands were not in conservation. This is an important benefit to show the public. Charles stated that there are modifications that could be made to some of the conservation lands to increase storage since many of the lands have been impacted by canals and other alterations. The Department could go through the conservation lands existing database to identify opportunities for improvements. Beth responded that the Department is going through this evaluation, starting with Florida Forever lands.

Beth stated that the information on the area that drains to a BMP is needed so that it could be superimposed onto a map of the land use coverage to determine the total loading coming from the area. The BMP efficiency would then be applied to the total loading to determine the load reduction credit. Charles stated that he is confused about the phrase “acreage draining to a BMP.” Beth responded that this is the area that drains to a BMP, such as a wet pond. Tiffany added that the pond could be two acres in size but it is treating a contributing area of 20 acres. This contributing area is what Beth is referring to. Kimberly asked what land use year the Department will use in the BMAP. Beth responded that the most current coverage, which is 2008/2009, would be used. Paul noted that it would be good to determine a strategy for addressing legacy loads and how this strategy fits into the long-term plan.

Beth stated that the next meeting will likely be in November in the Kissimmee/Orlando area; however, the Department will be engaging the stakeholders in the meantime on project collection. A notice will be sent to the distribution list once a date and location have been set.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 11:31 AM.

Action Items

- Beth Alvi will post the distribution list to the FTP site. The stakeholders should review this list and provide any additional contacts to Beth by Friday, August 16th.
- Beth will contact NRCS about the BMAP process and how their projects can be incorporated.
- The stakeholders should provide feedback to Beth on what is needed for their sub-watershed to meet water quality targets.
- Beth will work with SFWMD to create maps that summarize the contribution of loading from each sub-watershed to Lake Okeechobee to help with project collection.
- Beth will continue to engage SWFWMD in the BMAP process.
- Beth will talk with the Department about how to address attenuation in determining loads and project credits.
- Beth will talk with Department staff about the best way to determine the changes in Lake Okeechobee water quality from the expected project reductions in the first BMAP phase.
- Beth will work towards the Department continuing to provide input to the Corps' KBMOS and on the four alternatives that have been developed.
- Beth will work on engaging the Corps in the BMAP process.
- The Department will review Harvey Harper's studies on reclaimed water use and its potential impacts on nutrient loading.
- Beth will follow up with Osceola County about their FYN Program.
- Beth will post the project collection information to the FTP site.

Lake Okeechobee Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP)

- The Department will evaluate the load reduction benefit of the easements in the watershed.
- The Department should consider legacy loading and how addressing this load fits into the long-term plan.
- Beth will send a notice to the distribution list once a date and location for the next BMAP meeting have been determined.