

Lake Jesup, Crane Strand and Long Branch BMAP
Agency Discussion
May 10, 2007
Sylvan Lake Park
Sanford, Florida

Attendees

Sherry Brandt-Williams, SJRWMD Tiffany Busby, Wildwood Consulting Fred Calder, FDEP Amy Dalton, PBS&J Jennifer Gihring, FDEP Ed Hayes, FWC Robert King, Friends of Lake Jesup Regina Lovings-Morse, SJRWMD Erich Marzolf, SJRWMD Mary Paulic, FDEP

Opening Remarks

Tiffany Busby welcomed attendees on behalf of the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) and introductions were made. She began by stating that the primary focus of this meeting was to discuss the Interagency Action Plan (IAP) and issues/concerns voiced during April's meeting. Two primary issues were emphasized: 1) regional projects to reduce nutrient concentrations in Lake Jesup and 2) internal loads in the Lake.

Meeting

Jennifer Gihring mentioned that we have the conceptual IAP now but that a detailed IAP needs to be developed within the next four months. In order to move forward with this, members need to come to a consensus on the issues. Most members are in agreement about the external loadings, however concerns regarding internal loadings still need to be addressed. The possibility of adding to information provided by Seminole County's existing study on sediment flux with additional research over time was introduced. The current thought regarding this seemed to be that the understanding/consensus on external loadings may be sufficient to move forward with the IAP and BMAP given the understanding that other uncertainties will be addressed in the future as this TMDL process moves along and additional five-year cycles provide the opportunity to further refine the loads and sources. **Sherry Brandt-Williams** stated that their study involving a review of the measurement techniques used for quantifying sediment flux will be finished by the end of July 2008.

The question was raised as to whether or not the original TMDL would need to be revisited in order to include allocations for loads that might be addressed in the BMAP that are not in the existing TMDL. [For example, the existing TMDL addresses external loads and not internal loads. If internal loads are to be included in the allocation process,

then they should have been included in the original TMDL numbers.] There was concern that delaying the TMDL process until the quantification of internal loads could be done to everyone's satisfaction would delay the reductions of external loads. And since the internal loads are directly affected by external loads, it seemed practical to being the process of reducing external loads no matter what the internal load results will be.

A suggestion was made for the Game and Fish Commission to continue to push for acquisition of Site 10. This site would be used for placement of spoil material from future dredging operations.

Robert King stated that the "Friends of Lake Jesup" group seemed to buy into the IAP because they see it as a promise for the future. They are anxious for something to actually be done about the lake for the long term rather than people simply talking about it.

A question was raised whether the stakeholders were completing and submitting the project collection sheets. The answer is that they are being assembled very slowly and that the local governments can document what they have done thus far but they may be having trouble determining what their responsibilities are from here on out until they know the total load reduction for which they are responsible. A point was made that the entities need to "own up to" their load reduction percentages in order for the group to move forward with the allocation process. A suggestion was made that a better approach may be to meet with the local entities individually in order to get their input as to how we can move forward with the project identification process.

The general consensus is that everyone's comfort level needs to be such that the process can move forward with the information available now (current TMDL) with the understanding that the internal loading question will be addressed later in the process. This may prompt a need to meet with each entity on a "one on one" basis. An idea was brought up that local governments may need to be given certain protections in the BMAP process if they are willing to move forward now. It should be made clear that the local governments were essential in the BMAP inception and will be an essential part of the end result.

Action Items

- 1) Meet with those entities with significant concerns about the current TMDL and determine what steps are needed in order to move forward (**Erich, Sherry, Jennifer, Tiffany, Mark, Kim, Gloria, Kevin, Dan**).