St. Lucie River and Estuary Basin Management Action Plan

Technical Meeting Summary
Wednesday, January 16, 2013
9:30 AM – 12:00 PM
Martin County Building Department Conference Room
900 SE Ruhnke Street, Stuart, FL 34994

Attendees

Sam Amerson, Stuart	Janet Hearn, ATM
Jim Angstadt, Port St. Lucie	Dianne Hughes, Martin County
Jason Bessey, St. Lucie County	Kerry Kates, Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association
Tiffany Busby, Wildwood Consulting	Kathy LaMartina, SFWMD
Lorrie Bush, St. Lucie West Service District	Milton Leggett, Stuart
Joe Capra, Captec Engineering	Chris Lestrange, St. Lucie County
Kevin Carter, SFWMD	Dale Majewski, Port St. Lucie
Deb Drum, Martin County	Stefan Matthes, Culpepper & Terpening
Amy Eason, AECOM	Tom McGowan, AECOM
Rebecca Elliott, FDACS	Greg Nolte, Martin County
Gordon England, Stormwater Solutions	Mary Oakley, UF
Rachel Espinosa, E-Sciences	Ximena Pernett, SFWMD
Stan Ganthier, FDEP	Mark Perry, Florida Oceanographic Society
Glen Gareau, SFWMD	Marcy Policastro, Wildwood Consulting
Charlie Gauthier, FDEP	Jennifer Purdy, FDEP-SED
Bill Griffin, Stuart	H.M. Ridgely, Evans Properties
Katie Hallas, FDEP	Brian Sharpe, FDEP Aquatic Preserves
Jodie Hansing, SFWMD	Eric Shea, FPL
Bill Hayden, St. Lucie West Service District	Don West, St. Lucie County

Welcome and Opening Remarks

Tiffany Busby welcomed everyone to the St. Lucie River and Estuary Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP) meeting. The participants introduced themselves and the entity they represent.

Allocation Process Steps

Katie Hallas stated that she sent an email last Wednesday with links to the FTP site that have the project calculation spreadsheets, allocation model, and Geographic Information Systems (GIS) shapefiles used in the allocations. The allocations were calculated using the GIS base map, which is posted to the FTP site, to clip areas associated with each entity in the watershed. The base map includes information on the land uses, soils, event mean concentrations (EMCs), runoff coefficients (ROCs), and rainfall. The base map was updated with the 2004 land use coverage, as discussed at the November and December meetings. The 2004 land use coverage is the same coverage used by the South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) for the St. Lucie River Watershed Protection Plan (SLRWPP) and the 2012 SLRWPP Update. Each entity's area was clipped and erased from the base map sequentially: (1) natural lands, associated with land use codes 3000 (not including 3300, which is rangelands and part of agriculture), 4000 (upland forests), 5000 (water), and 6000 (wetlands); (2) water control districts (WCDs) and other special districts; (3) agriculture; (4) roads; (5) community development districts (CDDs); (6) municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s); (7) Florida Power & Light (FPL) pond; (8) non-MS4s;

and (9) remaining area assigned to each county based on their boundaries. Katie noted that a handout was provided with the allocation process details, and the handout and presentation will be posted to the FTP site tomorrow. All individual shapefiles that resulted from the clipping are posted to the FTP site under the "GIS" main folder under the "January 2013 Allocation Layers" subfolder.

Mark Perry asked what defined natural lands for the clipping. Katie responded that the natural lands were identified based on the land use codes in the 2004 land use coverage.

Updated Allocations and Required Reductions

Katie stated that the allocation model includes multiple tabs, some of which are new and were added to help make the model easier to understand. A new "Table of Contents" tab was added to list what is included in each tab. The "Conformance" tab is the same as in the previous version of the model, and it lists the EMC land use definition and ROC land use definition to the land use type. The "EMCs" tab is the same as before and lists the EMCs. The "ROCs" tab is the same as before and lists the ROCs. The "Summary" tab is also unchanged, and it summarizes the area and loading by sub-watershed to calculate total nitrogen (TN) and total phosphorus (TP) target loads per acre and compares this information with the SLRWPP model. The "Target Loads per Acre" tab is new, and it calculates the TN and TP target loads per acre. The "Calcs Juris" tab is the same as before except it was updated with the information from the new allocations clipping, and this tab calculates the starting loads for each entity. The "Juris N Red" and "Juris P Red" tabs are the same as before, and these tabs calculate the starting load, allocation, and required reduction by entity for TN and TP, respectively. The "Starting Loads" tab is new and shows the starting loads, which are also included in the "Juris N Red" and "Juris P Red" tabs. Katie noted that this tab was added to make it easier to follow the calculations while not changing the original format of the model. The "De Minimus" tab is also new and includes the calculation of the *de minimus* entities as discussed in the November and December meetings. The "Allocations" tab is new and includes the allocations and options for reductions in the first BMAP iteration. This information is also in the "Juris N Red" and "Juris P Red" tabs. Dianne Hughes asked where the model is posted on the FTP site. Katie responded that it is included in the "Model" subfolder on the FTP site and is the January 2013 version.

Katie stated that the first step in the allocations was to calculate the starting loads. The model factors for each land use type and sub-watershed were used to calculate the loading for each entity. The starting loads are shown in both pounds (lbs) and metric tons (MT), as requested at the last meeting. Amy Eason noted that the starting loads in the handout and presentation are different. Marcy Policastro responded that the presentation includes the starting loads for the natural lands and FPL pond, and the handout does not show these loads. Katie added that the natural land and FPL pond loads were removed from the handout because these loadings were not included in the allocations. As discussed in previous meetings, the managed lands had been included in the allocation calculations, and they are now being set aside because reductions are not expected from the natural lands. H.M. Ridgely asked what the subbasin boundaries are based on. Katie responded that the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) received information from the SFWMD about the SLRWPP subbasins. Mark noted that the natural lands were previously called conservation lands, and these areas had a large loading. Katie responded that a lot of work was done before to identify conservation lands; however, many of these lands

had cattle on them. The natural lands in these allocations only include areas that are actually natural. If conservation lands have cattle on them, they are included in the agricultural allocations because best management practices (BMPs) will be required. The natural lands are not quite the same as the previous conservation lands coverage.

Katie reiterated that the stakeholders are not expected to make reductions on natural lands, so the loading and acres associated with these areas were removed from the allocations. The acreage and loading from the FPL pond were also set aside because additional reductions from the pond are not required. The next step in the allocations was to identify the *de minimus* stakeholders. The starting loads were sorted from highest to lowest for TN and TP to identify entities with low enough loads that reductions from those areas would not have a significant impact. During previous meetings, there was a discussion about the *de minimus* threshold being less than 0.5% of both the TN and TP loading and that all *de minimus* loading together would be about 1% of the total loading. Based on these criteria, Pal Mar WCD, Tradition CDD, Turnpike, Okeechobee County, Sewall's Point, Verano CDD, and Copper Creek CDD are *de minimus*. Katie noted that Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) District 4 is 0.5% of the TN and TP starting load, and FDEP would like feedback from the stakeholders about whether FDOT District 4 should also be *de minimus*. The current *de minimus* entities equal 1.1% of the TN load and 1.0% of the TP load. If FDOT is included, the total will be 1.6% of the TN load and 1.5% of the TP load. The *de minimus* entities are not assigned an allocation in the first BMAP iteration. However, as the model is refined and new data are incorporated, the *de minimus* entities may receive allocations in the future. The loads associated with the *de minimus* entities are not reallocated to other stakeholders.

Tom McGowan asked if the total loading for all *de minimus* entities has to be 1% of the loading. Katie responded that the proposed threshold is about 1% of the total loading. Tiffany noted that the benefit of designating *de minimus* entities is that these entities typically have a small area in the basin, so it is difficult to implement projects in that area. Okeechobee County is a good example of this situation. On the other hand, if an entity is *de minimus*, it means they are not working towards reductions. Sam Amerson asked if there would be a consideration for pollutant trading if FDOT would contribute funding to a project to help meet reductions. Tiffany responded that this would not be a trade but if more than one entity funds a project, they can share the credits. Janet Hearn noted that FDOT is talking with other stakeholders to implement projects around the state. Rachel Espinosa stated that she would need to go back to talk with FDOT about the *de minimus* designation, but Tiffany stated that this decision should be made by all the stakeholder rather than just FDOT. Marcy noted that FDOT has implemented projects and these credits would be included in the BMAP whether or not FDOT is *de minimus*. Brian Sharpe stated that there has to be a cut off at some point so that the threshold does not keep increasing.

Glen Gareau stated that Verano CDD and Tradition CDD are conceptual plans for future growth. Other places, such as the City of Stuart, are built out, and it will be difficult to achieve additional reductions. The CDDs that are not built have plenty of opportunity for reduction as they change in the future. Katie responded that this is why FDEP uses a phased approach for the BMAPs. If any of the CDDs or other entities have development during the first five years of the BMAP, this will be accounted for in the next BMAP iteration. This is why *de minimus* stakeholders may

receive allocations in the future. Currently, FDEP does not have the ability to factor in the potential future growth in the CDDs into the allocations, which is why the BMAP is phased. Glen noted that the allocations are based on current, not future land uses. Tiffany responded that the allocations are based on current land uses as of 2004.

Sam noted that his question about FDOT was more about opportunities for entities to cooperate on projects. Katie responded that FDEP does want to foster partnerships among the entities, which is the only way to make a real difference in the waterbodies. Dianne stated that Martin County has already offered to meet with FDOT about a project. FDOT's project table also has several of projects without acres, and they are having discussions with Martin County and St. Lucie County about project credit sharing on these projects. Katie noted that FDOT has been working on the shapefiles for some of their projects, which is why the spreadsheet does not currently have credits for those projects. Mark asked if the *de minimus* entities are obliged to achieve some sort of load reduction. Katie responded that most of these entities have been doing something to achieve reductions. The WCDs and some CDDs have agricultural credits, which are not shown in the handout yet, as the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (FDACS) in Tallahassee is working diligently to complete these calculations. FDEP does want these entities at the table and is only saying they are not significant contributors, so additional reductions are not required at this time. If they are no longer *de minimus* in the future, they will receive an allocation. Mark noted that Okeechobee County is ranked highest for loads to the estuary. Tiffany responded that the allocation to Okeechobee County is only for the urban portion of the county within the basin; the agricultural portion receives a separate allocation.

Tom asked if FDOT is exactly 0.5% of the load. Marcy responded that FDOT is slightly greater than 0.5% of the TN load and slightly less than 0.5% of the TP load. Katie stated that it sounds like FDOT should be left in the allocations since the threshold needs to be drawn somewhere. FDOT has done a lot of work, and they have achieved the reductions for the first BMAP iteration.

Katie stated that the allocations to each entity were assigned using a target load per acre for TN and TP. The targets were calculated by determining the percent reduction needed in each sub-watershed to achieve the target concentration. This percent reduction was multiplied by the anthropogenic load in each watershed. The current anthropogenic load per acre minus the needed reduction resulted in the target load per acre for each sub-watershed. Jason Bessey asked if FDEP has looked at the concentrations. The current TN concentrations look good, but the TP concentration for the C-23 subbasin seems high. Marcy responded that the estimated current concentration is based on model information. Amy asked if the model estimated concentration is similar to what is measured in this subbasin. Kevin Carter responded that he could check the data for this area. Jason stated that he wants to make sure decisions on building expensive projects are not based on modeled information. Katie responded that this is part of the reason why FDEP is only asking that a portion of the reductions be achieved in this BMAP iteration. Kevin noted that the consideration for measured data could be discussed at the monitoring meeting next month. Katie added that one of the monitoring plan's goals is to determine if the waterbodies are achieving targets. There is also the option to make another goal to collect real world data for the model.

H.M. stated that most of the basin is in agriculture, and there are data to show that the water in the C-23 and C-24 canals is dirtier than the water put into those canals from agriculture. If agriculture went out of business and stopped putting water into the canals, there would be a huge reduction in nutrient loading that would not show up in the canal water quality samples because of legacy loading in the basin. The river is not going to be restored by stopping the existing loads; the damage was done 80-100 years ago. If agriculture had to implement projects to achieve all these reductions, they would go out of business. Katie responded that this is a great comment and will be considered during the monitoring discussion next month. The stakeholders will review the existing monitoring, which is mainly conducted by SFWMD, and other entities may need to participate in the monitoring plan to refine the model. The model currently does not have a way to show the legacy loads and the impacts but this can be added as a BMAP consideration.

Amy stated that any model should be calibrated with real world data, and the estimated concentrations in the model should be calibrated to measured concentrations. Tom stated that the issue is that there are many land uses that are being lumped into 16 categories. This approach does not allow for adjustments for different types of agriculture based on when it was put into production and whether it includes treatment. Tiffany stated that as part of the monitoring discussion, the stakeholders can identify which items in the model have enough value that they should be refined in the next iteration. Tom noted that agriculture is the largest load contributor in the basin because it has the most acreage. The least amount of information is available on agricultural loading, which can skew the numbers if not added to the model correctly. In the Indian River Lagoon BMAP model, there were adjustments for urban areas with treatment and something similar is needed for agricultural areas. Rebecca Elliott stated that she thinks the legacy loads in the basin will make it difficult to achieve the reductions. Katie responded that this could be part of the monitoring discussion at the next meeting. Additional monitoring may be needed, so FDEP and the stakeholders will need to discuss how to obtain additional resources and what information will best support model refinements.

Katie stated that the allocations were calculated by multiplying the TN and TP target loads per acre by each entity's acreage in each sub-watershed. The sum the allocations in each sub-watershed is the total allocation for each entity. The required reductions are the difference between the total starting load and allocation for each entity. Dianne noted that the totals for the TN reductions by sub-watershed do not look correct. Marcy responded that the sums in the TN reductions table are not correct, although the reductions for each entity are correct. Katie noted that she would post the corrected presentation and model to the FTP site and asked that the stakeholders let her know if they find any other issues.

Katie stated that the required reductions would be phased over a 15-year period, with three, five-year iterations. The required reductions will likely change in future iterations based on new information. This approach allows reductions to occur while an adaptive management approach is used to refine the model and evaluate progress towards the TMDLs. FDEP compared the total required reductions to the project credit calculated to date. The project credit spreadsheets are posted to the FTP site in the "Project Credit Calculations" folder for the January meeting. The stakeholders should review this information and provide any corrections or BMP-specific information. FDACS is in the process of calculating the agricultural reductions for the

agriculture and special districts allocations. This information will be presented at the February meeting. FDEP is proposing that the stakeholders achieve 30% of the required reductions in the first BMAP iteration. Sam asked for entities that achieved greater than 30% of the reductions in the first five years, if the balance of the reductions would be reduced in future iterations. Marcy responded that any additional credit beyond the 30% would count towards future BMAP iterations, so there is a benefit to continuing to implement projects.

Mark noted that Martin County has achieved more than 30% of their reductions, so they are done for this iteration of the BMAP. Tiffany responded that this allows Martin County more time to plan for reductions in future BMAP iterations. Unless an entity is really close to achieving 100% of their reductions, they should continue to plan for projects because it takes time to design and obtain funding for the projects. Janet asked if projects implemented during the next five years could be included in the annual BMAP reports. Tiffany responded that projects could be added to the annual reports. Dianne noted that Troup-Indiantown WCD received credit for the C-44 project, and she asked what this credit was based on. Marcy responded that the WCD received credit for the change in land use from citrus to undeveloped. This credit is not for the C-44 project itself.

Rebecca suggesting changing the percent reduction achieved for agriculture to "to be determined" on the handout and presentation. Mark stated that some of the project credits are for the Florida Yards and Neighborhoods (FYN) program and ordinances. He asked how credit for these efforts is determined. Marcy responded that education efforts are assigned up to a 6% credit off the starting loads as a provisional credit. These efforts are thought to help reduce nutrient loads, but information is not available to quantify the associated reductions, which is why the credit is provisional. Education efforts eligible for credit include participation in FYN; ordinances for landscaping, fertilizer, irrigation, and pet wastes management; pamphlets; presentations; website; and an illicit discharge program and call in number.

Dianne asked when comments on the project calculations are due and when Martin County will receive their septic tank phase out credit. Katie responded that comments on the project credits are due by January 31st. This allows FDEP time to revise the credit before the February meeting. Katie stated that FDEP is finalizing the contract with Florida State University (FSU) for the septic tank modeling. Once the contract is finalized, provisional credit can be provided quickly. Marcy added that any missing project information and project-specific data should also be provided by January 31st. Katie noted that once the agricultural credit calculations are completed, the agriculture and special district credits would be updated to show progress towards the 30% reductions for the first BMAP iteration. Tom asked what reductions would be required in the second BMAP iteration. Tiffany responded that FDEP and the stakeholders would discuss what is practical for the next iteration.

Katie stated that in previous meetings, FDEP asked the stakeholders about changing the land use in the model to the 2004 coverage. The stakeholders provided feedback that they wanted to update the land use coverage to 2004; therefore, the allocations presented during the meeting are based on the 2004 land uses. FDEP and SFWMD have been working to align the BMAP and SLRWPP; however, when 2004 land uses were added to the BMAP model, the difference between the models for the C-44 subbasin is no longer within 20%, as it was before. FDEP

hopes to refine the model in the next five years but Katie noted that they wanted to make sure the stakeholders were aware of the differences between the two models now. The allocations can be recalculated with 1999 land uses, if the stakeholders want to see this. Tom asked which model is showing greater loads. Katie responded that the BMAP model is showing greater loads than the SLRWPP model, but FDEP and SFWMD will continue to work together to refine the model.

Tom asked how the C-44 project credits will be assigned since this project is in construction. Marcy responded that in previous meetings there have been discussions about taking that project credit off the total required reductions, and then allocating the remaining allocations to the stakeholders. Kevin added that none of the regional Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan (CERP) projects in the basin would be done in the next five years, so there is time to discuss this further. Dianne asked how FDEP would reconcile the TMDL with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) numeric nutrient criteria (NNC) because there are big differences. Katie responded that the NNC have not been finalized yet. Once finalized, FDEP would need to make a policy decision on whether to use the TMDL numbers as site-specific alterative criteria (SSAC) or to use the NNC. FDEP would also make an assessment of how well the TMDL and NNC match up. Kevin added that there are two different NNC processes underway. FDEP's proposal uses the existing TMDLs as the criteria. EPA recently proposed estuarine criteria that are different from existing TMDLs. They are starting the public comment process on their criteria and will take comments until February 15th. FDEP and EPA are still talking about which criteria to use. In addition, EPA is working on a path forward on the remaining consent decree waterbodies. The St. Lucie BMAP process is at a point where it can go through the first iteration while FDEP determines how NNC will affect the process.

Katie asked if the stakeholders are comfortable with using the 2004 land uses with the understanding that FDEP will work on refining the model in the future. Dianne asked what the differences are in the allocations between the 1999 and 2004 land uses. Katie responded that it is difficult to tell because the allocations with the 1999 land uses involved different clipping steps and boundaries. FDEP would have to recalculate the allocations using the 1999 land uses for comparison. Tom noted that the stakeholders asked for the change to 2004 land uses, so it seems unfair to ask FDEP to go back to 1999 land uses. Dianne added that she agrees and thinks that even newer land uses should be used. The process should continue to move forward.

Dianne asked if anything is happening at the legislative level to put the BMAP and SLRWPP on the same schedule since the BMAP will be revised every five years and the SLRWPP is revised every three years. Kevin responded that he is not aware of any legislative language; however, over time, the two plans will start to sync up better. When the SLRWPP process started, it was during TMDL development, so the TMDL numbers were not available for planning. During the SLRWPP Update, the BMAP was underway so additional information was available. When it is time for the next update to the SLRWPP, the BMAP will be completed. Therefore, the SLRWPP can focus on water quantity since the water quality portion will be covered in the BMAP. Katie added that she would talk with Ernie Marks (FDEP) to see if he knows of any legislative action.

Katie noted that most of the stakeholders have achieved 30% of the required reductions. She encouraged the stakeholders to continue working on projects for the next BMAP iteration, even if they have achieved the reductions for this iteration. Stakeholders that have not achieved their

allocations for the first iteration should submit projects planned for the next five years. The project collection information is posted to the FTP site, and this information should be provided to Katie and Marcy by February 15th. H.M. asked how agriculture is supposed to submit additional projects by that date if they will not find out their credit until the next meeting. Katie responded that the agricultural entities could have additional time to submit projects.

Monitoring Plan

Kevin stated that SFWMD has been putting information together on their monitoring for the meeting next month. As a clarification to the discussion at the last meeting, what many people have been calling the tributary network is now part of the source control network. The source control stations are an evolution from the tributary monitoring work, so there is continuity in the data. SFWMD will provide maps of this monitoring at the next meeting. Katie stated that the focus of the February meeting would be on monitoring. If stakeholders have not provided graphical information or contacts for the monitoring discussed at the December meeting, they should provide that information to Katie as soon as possible. Mark asked if the SFWMD could bring the data from the station at the Roosevelt Bridge to the next meeting. Kevin responded that he would bring these data, which are also available in the South Florida Environmental Report (SFER). Katie asked Mark to send contacts for the monitoring he mentioned at the last meeting.

Mark stated that the TMDL assumes that the loads from Lake Okeechobee are being addressed. The influence from the Lake Okeechobee discharge is huge because the TP concentration in the lake is 140 parts per billion (ppb), and the St. Lucie TP target is 80 ppb. Katie responded that FDEP is starting work on the Lake Okeechobee BMAP. She is not sure of the kickoff meeting date, but FDEP has started some of the behind-the-scenes work with stakeholders. If anyone is interested in being on the Lake Okeechobee distribution list, they can let Katie know, and she will send their contacts to Beth Alvi (FDEP), who is the Lake Okeechobee Basin Coordinator. The St. Lucie TMDL makes the assumption that Lake Okeechobee is meeting its TMDL, so the stakeholders in this basin are not being held responsible for the loads coming out of Lake Okeechobee.

Mark stated that at some point, the Lake Okeechobee load has to be factored out of the equation when looking at the concentrations at the Roosevelt Bridge. The TMDL for Lake Okeechobee is 40 ppb and the lake is not close to this now and will not be close in the near future. Katie responded that part of the discussions at the monitoring meeting would be about the best locations for monitoring to determine the effectiveness of the BMAP projects to identify the benefits of the BMAP without Lake Okeechobee influences. Deb Drum stated that she understands the point Katie is trying to make, but she does not see this happening in reality. There is no place that can be monitored in the estuary that is not affected by Lake Okeechobee. She is unsure of how monitoring can identify the success of the BMAP projects for this reason. This concern needs to be brought to FDEP upper management. Katie responded that there is existing monitoring for the Lake Okeechobee structures, which can be used to determine the loads coming from the lake and out of the C-44. Katie will bring this concern back to FDEP upper management and it can be included in as a consideration in the BMAP.

Mark asked when the start date is for the first five years. Katie responded that the first five years would start when the BMAP is adopted, and there is no set date for this. However, FDEP is

trying to move this BMAP forward since the process started in July 2009. Completing the BMAP depends on information from the stakeholders and FDEP providing the draft BMAP for review. Mark asked what the process is going forward. Katie responded that what she envisions is that the February meeting will be about the monitoring plan and project calculations with the agricultural information. The March meeting would be to talk more about the monitoring plan, projects (if needed), and the components of the BMAP. The meetings after that would be to go through the BMAP sections in detail to obtain stakeholder comments. In addition, a policy briefing will be held to brief the policy makers on the BMAP. Once the BMAP is completed, FDEP will work through the BMAP adoption process with the FDEP Secretary. Then, at least annual meetings would be held to discuss BMAP process. Meetings could be held more frequently to discuss the model and/or monitoring.

Gordon England noted that since Lake Okeechobee is masking the concentrations and loads to the estuary, the streams in the watershed would need to be monitored to determine BMAP progress. Katie responded that this consideration was discussed at the December meeting, and it can be further discussed at the meeting next month. Deb noted that the stakeholders are open to any funding that FDEP can provide for monitoring.

Public Comments

The next meeting will be on February 13th at 9:30 AM.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 11:42 AM.

Action Items

- Katie Hallas will post the meeting handouts and presentation to the FTP site. – *Completed*.
- Kevin Carter will provide information about the C-23 subbasin TP concentrations to compare to the BMAP model concentrations.
- FDEP will check the TP estimated current concentration for the C-23 subbasin because it is higher than the other areas.
- FDEP will add legacy loads as a BMAP consideration. The stakeholders will discuss ways to monitoring for these loads during the next meeting.
- Katie will update the sub-watershed TN reduction totals in the model, handout, and presentation. – *Completed*.
- The stakeholders should review the allocation model and provide comments to Katie by January 31st.
- Katie will change the percent reduction achieved for agriculture to "to be determined" on the handout and presentation. – *Completed*.
- The stakeholders should review the project credit calculations and provide corrections and additional information to Katie and Marcy by January 31st.
- Katie will check with Ernie Marks (FDEP) to determine if there is any legislative action to align the BMAP and SLRWPP. – *Completed*.
- Stakeholders should submit projects planned in the next five years to Katie and Marcy by February 15th. Agricultural entities can have additional time.
- SFWMD will provide maps and tables of their monitoring at the next meeting.

- Stakeholders should submit graphical information or contacts for the monitoring stations to Katie as soon as possible.
- SFWMD will bring the data from the station at Roosevelt Bridge to the next meeting.
- Mark Perry will send Katie the contacts for the monitoring he mentioned during the December meeting.
- Stakeholders should email Katie if they want to be included on the Lake Okeechobee BMAP distribution list.
- Katie will talk with FDEP upper management about the concern of the influences of Lake Okeechobee on the loading in the St. Lucie Basin. – *Completed*.
- FDEP will add Lake Okeechobee loading to the list of BMAP considerations. – *Completed*.