

**Lake Jesup, Crane Strand and Long Branch BMAP
Working Group Meeting
April 12, 2007
Sylvan Lake Park
Sanford, Florida**

Attendees

Libertad Acosta-Anderson, CH2MHill	Ed Hayes, FWC
Mary Brabham, SJRWMD	Migdalia Hernandez, City of Sanford
Sherry Brandt-Williams, SJRWMD	Danielle Honour, CDM
Tiffany Busby, Wildwood Consulting	Liz Johnson, Orange County EPD
Fred Calder, FDEP	Bob Kelly, SAIC
Ni-Bin Chang, UCF	Robert King, Friends of Lake Jesup
Vanessa Cruz, City of Altamonte	Steve Lienhart, URS
Lisa Curtin, City of Orlando	Regina Lovings-Morse, SJRWMD
Amy Dalton, PBS&J	Kevin McCann, City of Orlando
Danny DeCiryran, SSWCD	Durga Nagda, City of Lake Mary
Gloria Eby, Seminole County	Kim Ornberg, Seminole County
Chris Ferraro, FDEP	Mary Paulic, FDEP
Brian Fields, City of Winter Springs	Zynka Perez, City of Winter Springs
Mark Flomerfelt, Seminole County	Marianne Pluchino, Seminole County
Vivian Garfein, FDEP	Robert Potts, E-Sciences
Jennifer Gihring, FDEP	Roland Raymundo, Seminole County
Sarah Hardy, Senator Constantine	Gary Smith, Orange County Health Department
Robin Harrel, E-Sciences	Tom Ziegler, SJRWMD

Opening Remarks

Tiffany Busby welcomed attendees on behalf of the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) and introductions were made. She thanked Seminole County for the use of their facility. She asked if there were any questions on the TMDLs that have been adopted for these basins that have come up since the last meeting. No questions were offered.

Long Branch Update

Dan Homblette stated that Long Branch is a stand-alone waterbody located entirely within Orange County. He said that the BMAP report is being drafted and will be turned in to DEP on Monday. They currently can't find the source for the high fecal coliforms counts observed but will continue to sample, monitor water flow, and continue to conduct further research in order to find sources or determine that the past observations are no longer occurring.

Other Stakeholder Activities

Sherry Brandt-Williams mentioned that the St Johns River Water Management District is writing a press release (that will be released in the next week or so) on the “Pay for Performance” approach that was selected for Lake Jesup.

Follow Up Items from February Meeting

Bob Kelly referred to the handout titled “Comparison of SJRWMD’s HSPF Model Inputs with DEP’s TMDL Model Inputs.” He prefaced this information with several caveats: 1) The HSPF model was developed on a water year basis—October 1 through September 30 and the TMDL model was developed on an annual year basis—January to December, so the numbers are not strictly comparable because they took place during different time periods; and 2) Land uses were manipulated considerably during this process and therefore, difficult to understand. He also pointed out that the HSPF model focused on tributary inputs which included base flow in the analysis (stormwater + base flow). TMDL model treated base flows only for the whole Lake Jesup waterbody. He therefore had to allocate out base flow and the concentration associated with that base flow to the same watersheds that were considered in the HSPF model. He said that he may or may not have done that correctly.

Other suggested items that still need to be evaluated are:

- St. Johns River loadings
- atmospheric deposition
- groundwater input other than springs
- springs (internal to the lake).

Another suggestion was to have a meeting with Sherry Brandt-Williams, the SJRWMD Engineering Division, Rick Hicks and Dr. Gao (FDEP), Seminole County and their contractors in either April or May to help evaluate the St. Johns River loading estimate. Tiffany Busby agreed to provide contact information to Sherry.

The question was raised as to whether or not a drawdown study based upon spring information needs to be performed. Sherry stated that the first step in this process (if done) would be to do a thermal flyover. An earlier flyover revealed no hot spots that indicate significant spring inputs to Lake Jesup. A decision was made for Bob and Sherry to begin to develop data on the springs in order to find out if there is any significance to loadings from spring inputs.

The basic consensus on the HSPF and TMDL models was that they are adequately correlated on estimates for surface water loadings so that the group can move forward.

Lake Jesup Allocation Strategy and Supporting Documentation

Tiffany Busby stated that for this agenda item, we would like to define ideas on how to approach the allocation process and to solicit input on the process of how we define who the responsible parties would be.

Jennifer Gihring pointed out that all of the materials handed out in this meeting were for educational purposes only. A handout was provided entitled “Background on Allocation Strategies.” The need for additional background information on growth, Environmental Resource Permit (ERP) program implementation, and allocations was identified.

A suggestion was made to have Cammy Dewey, SJRWMD, come again and give a more detailed presentation about how the ERPs are being implemented in areas with impaired waters.

A suggestion was made that whatever allocations are made in the future need to factor in proximity to the lake, BMPs, etc. A data need to evaluate whether “pound for pound” reductions are appropriate was mentioned. A decision was made to halt discussion on this subject for now and to discuss more about allocation approaches in the future. Fred Calder stated that we need to have an open discussion on factors for each specific area in terms of allocations and that this needs to be in written form. He also suggested that people need to relate their situations and circumstances earlier in the allocation process so that we avoid re-discussing topics that have been decided in earlier meetings.

The issue of water quality credit trading was brought up. Fred suggested that water quality credit trading should not be done on a formal basis if it can be handled through the BMAP process. More information about the water quality credit trading process was requested.

Jennifer stated that we really need to start thinking about all the information needed (additional refinements to loading tables, etc.) in order to move forward with the allocation strategy. There was consensus that the group is generally OK with the external load information and the TMDL load estimated with the exception of Site 10.

Kevin McCann and Joe Walter will share information about which BMPs were accounted for and which BMPs were not included in the TMDL itself so the City of Orlando can complete its project collection sheet appropriately.

Jennifer agreed to look up the correct link/filename for the load information from the November or February meeting and re-send it out to the group for another review of that information.

Site 10 Evaluation (Presentation by Danielle Honour)

Danielle Honour gave a presentation on the Site 10 assessment. The study was performed for the City of Sanford by CDM based on the questions and outline provided by FDEP. The report for this presentation is on DEP’s FTP site.

Robert King noted that the map of the site correctly indicates where the land area for Site 10 ends and the floating plant matter begins. He reported that the floating mass often is mistaken for uplands and its size has expanded considerably in recent years. A consensus was made to further evaluate water flow at Site 10. A suggestion was also made for the St Johns River Water Management District to evaluate possible spring flow on the site.

BMAP Project Collection

Tiffany Busby noted that the Working Group staff had been contacting the individual entities and asking about the status of the project collection sheets. As of two weeks before the meeting, only two entities had submitted their projects. The response to the telephone inquiries so far was good and the staff was getting a better sense of the issues and limitations for filling out the spreadsheet. Since the telephone calls began, a few more spreadsheets had been submitted. Tiffany encouraged everyone to work on their project list, call with questions, and to submit their sheets as soon as possible. Mark Flomerfelt noted that the spreadsheet had been edited after Jeff Herr attended a Working Group meeting and made some suggestions about providing percent reduction versus concentration. Tiffany agreed to re-send the revised version of the project collection spreadsheet to ensure that everyone was filling out of the most recent version.

Crane Strand/Crane Strand Drain

Amy Tracy spoke to the group about the infrastructure maps that she has been working on. These maps were provided to the attendees. Amy stated that key changes to the maps included septic tank coverage for Orange County, Seminole County, and Winter Park. She noted that there is a discrepancy on the right hand corner of the Crane Strand Infrastructure map. Information still needed to complete the maps includes the following:

1. Confirmation of septic parcels;
2. Identification of additional wastewater use areas beyond the two that are included already;
3. Determination of gray parcels on the map;
4. Addition of any additional lift stations and treatment plants;
5. Decision on best way to spatially display stormwater information;
6. Addition of stormwater flow directional lines;
7. Addition of scale bar on legend; and
8. Change the label from “CDM” data to identify that Seminole County was the source of the data
9. Consider amending the Seminole County stormwater infrastructure data to include only the primary systems to be consistent with the data for Orange County.
10. Consider adding the sampling stations that are water quality “hot spots” to relate the water quality issues with the infrastructure.

It was noted that Gloria Eby, Seminole County, is a good source of information to further delineate the gray-labeled parcels on the map (item #3 above). Amy identified that stormwater infrastructure data is needed from Casselberry, Longwood and Winter Springs. It was noted that some additional stormwater infrastructure data is available from CDM for Seminole County. Amy stated that she will put the revised maps for wastewater infrastructure and for Crane Strand on the FTP site when they are completed.

Jennifer agreed to set up a conference call on monitoring efforts for Crane Strand. Information from the previous Crane Strand/Seminole County study should be considered. Conference call invitees should include representatives from Seminole County, Orange County, and Casselberry.

Next Meeting Dates/Agenda Items

Preferred dates for future meeting dates under consideration are: June 13, July 11, and August 9. The next meeting date is Thursday, May 10th at Sylvan Lake Park in Sanford.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Action Items

1. Include river loadings, atmospheric deposition, and springs (internal to the lake) into the models.
2. Conduct a meeting with Sherry Brandt-Williams, the SJRWMD Engineering Division, Rick Hicks and Xueqing Gao (FDEP), Seminole County and their contractors in either April or May to help evaluate the river loading estimate for the model.
3. Cammy Dewey should be invited to come again and give a more detailed presentation on the ERP implementation in areas with impaired waters such as Lake Jesup.
4. Kevin McCann and Joe Walter will share information about which BMPs were accounted for and which BMPs were not included in the TMDL.
5. Evaluate water flow at Site 10 (FDEP, SJRWMD, and City of Sanford).
6. Jennifer agreed to look up the correct link/filename for the load information from the November or February meeting and re-send it out to the group for another review of that information.
7. Tiffany agreed to re-send the revised version of the project collection spreadsheet to ensure that everyone was filling out of the most recent version.
8. Amy identified that stormwater infrastructure data is needed from Casselberry, Longwood and Winter Springs.
9. Some additional stormwater infrastructure data is available from CDM.
10. Amy stated that she will put the revised maps for wastewater infrastructure and for Crane Strand on the FTP site when they are completed.
11. Jennifer agreed to set up a conference call on monitoring efforts for Crane Strand. Information from the previous Crane Strand/Seminole County study should be considered. Conference call invitees should include representatives from Seminole County, Orange County, and Casselberry.
12. Sherry Brandt-Williams to send groundwater study to Bob Kelly so he can begin to summarize.