

St. Lucie River and Estuary Basin Management Action Plan

Technical Meeting Summary

Wednesday, March 13, 2013

9:30 AM – 12:00 PM

Martin County Commission Chambers

2401 SE Monterey Road, Stuart, Florida 34996

Attendees

Sam Amerson, Stuart	Dianne Hughes, Martin County
George Andreassi, The Stuart News	Kerry Kates, Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association
Jim Angstadt, Port St. Lucie	Kathy LaMartina, SFWMD
Carmela Bedregal, SFWMD	Milton Leggett, Stuart
Jason Bessey, St. Lucie County	Tom Lindsey, Hobe St. Lucie Conservancy District
Tiffany Busby, Wildwood Consulting	Susan Martin, SFWMD
Joe Capra, Captec Engineering	Mary Oakley, UF
Kevin Carter, SFWMD	Ximena Pernet, SFWMD
Deb Drum, Martin County	Mark Perry, Florida Oceanographic Society
Amy Eason, AECOM	Fernando Pleitez, E-Sciences
Stan Ganthier, FDEP	Marcy Policastro, Wildwood Consulting
Glen Gareau, SFWMD	Kenneth Rau, Higgins Engineering
Pattie Gertenbach, E-Sciences	H.M. Ridgely, Evans Properties
Katie Hallas, FDEP	Gerard Rouse, St. Lucie West Services District
Bill Hayden, St. Lucie West Services District	Eric Shea, FPL
Janet Hearn, ATM	Bonnie Wolff Pelaez, FDACS

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.

Review Outstanding Allocation Items

Katie Hallas stated that she wanted to review the changes to the allocation model that were discussed during the February meeting. There were two changes made to the January model, which are part of the final February model. Rounding factors were added because the Excel spreadsheet had several decimal places that were not shown for each number. Therefore, the math in the spreadsheet could not be replicated using a calculator. To address this difference, the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) added rounding factors to the target loads per acre, starting loads, acres, allocations, and required reductions.

The other major change to the model was the split in the C-44/S-153 sub-basin. Katie noted that during the last meeting, the presentation stated that this split was for Lake Okeechobee discharges in the sub-basin; however, the split is actually for the runoff from this sub-basin. Using data collected by the South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) at structures, it was determined that 76.5% of the sub-basin runoff goes to the St. Lucie Estuary and the other 23.5% of the runoff goes to Lake Okeechobee. A factor was added to the model to split the runoff for this sub-basin. This change affected the sub-basin target loads per acre, natural lands loading, allocations and required reductions for the stakeholders, and credits for projects. Katie

St. Lucie River and Estuary Basin Management Action Plan

stated that this split in runoff was made in the “Calc Juris” tab in the model. The “Runoff (Ac-ft)” column for the C-44/S-153 sub-basin was multiplied by 76.5%.

Discuss Draft BMAP Section by Section

Katie stated that she e-mailed a link last week to the File Transfer Protocol (FTP) site where the draft BMAP is posted. The draft BMAP components are the following: the acknowledgements, table of contents, list of figures, list of tables, executive summary, chapters, and appendices. The acknowledgements table shows the entities that are receiving allocations in the BMAP, the state agencies involved in the process, and other interested parties that have been involved in the process. Katie stated that this is a stakeholder driven process, and the stakeholders have done the bulk of the work in creating the substance of the BMAP document. The executive summary summarizes information from the BMAP about the St. Lucie River and Estuary Basin, the total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) that are the basis of the BMAP, key elements of the BMAP, anticipated outcomes of implementation, costs, follow up, and commitment to plan implementation. For the BMAP costs, information was provided for about 33% of projects. FDEP likes to include information about the costs of the projects in the BMAP, but they understand that a lot of projects were implemented for other purposes, so costs may or may not be available for all projects.

Katie stated that Chapter 1 is the context, purpose, and scope of the plan. The BMAP represents joint efforts of multiple stakeholders to prepare a restoration plan to work towards achievement of the TMDLs to restore waterbodies within the basin. The BMAP includes projects to reduce watershed nutrient loading and a monitoring plan to track water quality trends and effectiveness of efforts. The technical meetings started in July 2009, and there has been extensive stakeholder involvement over the last four years. The dates for the technical meetings are listed in the BMAP. FDEP also met one-on-one with stakeholders to discuss projects or BMAP questions. All the technical meetings were open to the public and noticed in the *Florida Administrative Weekly* (FAW), which is now the *Florida Administrative Register* (FAR). A public workshop on the BMAP will be held on April 10, 2013, which will be discussed at the end of the meeting.

Katie presented Figure 2 from the BMAP, which compares the BMAP basin to the St. Lucie River Watershed Protection Plan (SLRWPP) basin. This figure was added to the BMAP at the request of several stakeholders. The BMAP basin includes six sub-basins, which are comparable to the sub-watersheds in the SLRWPP. These sub-basins are Basins 4, 5, and 6; C-23; C-24; C-44/S-153; North Fork; and South Fork. The purpose of the BMAP is to implement total phosphorus (TP), total nitrogen (TN), and related biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) reductions to achieve the TMDLs. The TMDL reductions will be achieved over a 15-year period, and the first iteration will cover a five-year period. Katie stated that the process for BMAP adoption will be discussed later in the meeting, but the BMAP should be adopted in mid-2013, so the end of the first iteration will be mid-2018. During the first five years, the stakeholders will meet at least annually, if not more often, to discuss BMAP efforts. Each entity is required to achieve 30% of the TN and TP reductions in first iteration. The BMAP includes a list of the TMDLs that are being addressed by the BMAP.

Katie stated that the assumptions and considerations language in the presentation is directly from the BMAP so that it could be discussed during the meeting. There were several assumptions

St. Lucie River and Estuary Basin Management Action Plan

used in this iteration of the BMAP including that reductions in TN and TP loading will increase dissolved oxygen (DO) concentration and reduce chlorophyll-*a* concentrations to improve water quality conditions in the waterbodies; the allocations do not include required load reductions from natural land uses because these are considered background, uncontrollable sources, and the stakeholders are not required to make reductions on these lands; achieving the TMDL is contingent upon reductions from the Lake Okeechobee Basin, and a separate BMAP effort is underway to address this load; and some of the best management practices (BMPs) were assigned provisional credit because research is underway to better estimate their effectiveness. Provisional BMPs include aquatic vegetation harvesting, water control structures, muck removal, public education and outreach, and floating islands.

There are also considerations for items that need to be addressed in future iterations of the BMAP. Katie stated that this section has been discussed extensively during past meetings, and she asked the stakeholders to review this section carefully, and let her know if any considerations are missing. One of the considerations is the land use coverage. The loading estimates in the BMAP are based on 2004 land use data. FDEP will use the most up to date land use coverage in the next BMAP iteration. During BMAP development, FDEP worked closely with SFWMD to identify the appropriate boundary for this iteration of the BMAP and SLRWPP. Some of the sub-basins in the SLRWPP are not included in the BMAP at this time, with the main one being the South Coastal sub-basin. Several of Martin County's projects are located in this sub-basin. FDEP will make efforts to include this sub-basin in future iterations, and they have committed to monitoring to provide the necessary information to include this sub-basin in the second iteration of the BMAP. Stakeholders identified the need to include a portion of the C-25 East sub-basin, which is located to the north of the current basin boundary. In addition, SFWMD recently completed a St. Lucie River sub-watershed boundary improvements study in February 2013. Where appropriate, these changes will be incorporated into the second iteration of the BMAP.

Mark Perry asked if the extension of the BMAP boundary, especially to the north, would be included at a later time. Katie responded that this extension would be part of the next BMAP iteration. Changing the St. Lucie River and Estuary BMAP boundary will require coordination with the Indian River Lagoon (IRL) BMAP, because the IRL BMAP covers the area to the north. Jason Bessey stated that it would be helpful to have a clear decision from FDEP on which area belongs in what BMAP because St. Lucie County falls into both BMAPs currently. Katie responded that FDEP would use the hydrologic study that SFWMD just finished and other pertinent information to revise the BMAP boundaries. Katie will also coordinate with Mary Paulic, who is the FDEP Basin Coordinator for the IRL BMAP. Dianne Hughes asked if the SFWMD hydrologic study is available to the public. Carmela Bedregal stated that the study is available, and she will send the link to Katie to send to the stakeholders.

Katie stated that another consideration is the jurisdictional boundaries. Martin County and Stuart are discussing parcels owned by the city that are within the county. St. Lucie County and Martin County are also discussing the Beau Rivage neighborhood, which will be under the jurisdiction of Martin County starting in July 2013. The results of these discussions could change the allocations in the next BMAP iteration. Another consideration is the community development district (CDD) responsibilities. FDEP had several conversations with Port St. Lucie about the CDDs within its boundaries. The previous BMAP coordinator developed three criteria that had

St. Lucie River and Estuary Basin Management Action Plan

to be met for a CDD to receive an allocation, which determined which CDDs were allocated to in this BMAP iteration. As further details are provided, FDEP may revise the allocations to the CDDs in future iterations, and allocate to CDDs that currently do not have required reductions.

Katie stated that the consideration for the event mean concentrations (EMCs) and runoff coefficients (ROCs) in the model acknowledges that additional information about EMCs and ROCs in basin have been collected since the model was developed. FDEP will review this new information, and revise the model as needed for the next iteration. Katie asked for those stakeholders who have mentioned that they have information on EMCs and ROCs to share it, so FDEP can compile information for future discussions. The current model only includes EMCs for untreated stormwater, so FDEP will try to include treated EMCs into the model to the extent practical. Water quality standards modifications are also listed as a consideration because FDEP is developing new statewide DO criteria. Once the criteria are adopted, they will be used to determine if still impairments exist, and required reductions in future BMAP iterations will also be adjusted, as needed. The final consideration is about legacy loads because nutrient loads in the soils and waterbodies may exist throughout the basin due to historical land uses. It is unknown to what extent these legacy loads are affecting water quality in the basin. If additional information is gathered about legacy loading, this information can be included in future BMAPs.

H.M. Ridgely stated that not all of the water from the C-23 and C-24 goes to the North Fork. A lot of this water goes to the C-25 or is held back. A future consideration should be added to determine a split in runoff for these two sub-basins, as was done for the C-44/S-153 sub-basin.

Deb Drum stated that in looking at the considerations list, FDEP has not given the stakeholders any guarantee that it will not make the BMAP more onerous as more information is gathered. This 15-year process could become an unending process that might not be attainable given the assumptions used. Deb stated that as a local government, she is concerned because she will be presenting her commission with budgets for projects to meet the BMAP reductions. In five years, with this list of considerations, she might have to go back to the commission and say that everything she told them previously about the BMAP reductions was wrong. Deb stated that she feels like the BMAP process has been rushed, and there is a list of considerations for the future with no assurance from FDEP that this is not a moving target. This concern needs to be in the BMAP somewhere. Katie responded that there are no second iteration BMAPs yet, so there is not an example of how the process will go. The BMAP reductions could be a moving target and this is something FDEP recognizes. Katie stated that she would bring this concern back to her upper management to discuss what language could be added to the BMAP. Tiffany added that the idea of having iterations is to be able to incorporate new information. The target could become more stringent or less, but FDEP has to ensure that water quality standards are met. Deb responded that the BMAP acknowledges that water quality standards are changing so it is a moving target. From a commission's standpoint, the BMAP looks like a bottomless pit of funding. The local communities need to know when the end of this process will be. Tiffany responded that this BMAP has a five-year time period. The iterative process, which allows new information to be added, is better than creating a 15-year BMAP that does not reevaluate reductions based on new information. It should be to everyone's advantage to evaluate the reductions once more information is collected. Deb stated that the local governments do want to

St. Lucie River and Estuary Basin Management Action Plan

improve the waters and environment, but FDEP has a lot of authority and the water quality goals may never be achieved if the standards keep changing.

Mark stated that another concern with the consideration about water quality standards modifications is that it is difficult for local governments to plan for projects. If the criteria are adopted next year, changing the BMAP reductions so quickly will make it difficult for local governments to plan projects and budgets. Katie responded that the considerations are for after the first five-year BMAP iteration. The water quality standards rule changes would not affect the BMAP until the next iteration. FDEP can do the analysis earlier than this to provide information to the stakeholders, but the BMAP requirements will not change for five years.

Tom Lindsey asked how natural lands are differentiated from agricultural lands because both of those uses drain to the canals. Katie responded that FDEP identified natural lands using the 2004 land use coverage, and the lands with 3000 (except for 3300), 4000, 5000, and 6000 codes were removed from the allocations. Tom asked if any monitoring would occur to determine the loads from natural lands. Katie responded that there is no monitoring specifically for natural land uses. Tiffany added that the BMAP typically focuses on anthropogenic land uses in basins. FDEP does not expect loads from natural lands to be reduced, and it is not as efficient to treat these lands as it is to treat the higher loads from anthropogenic uses. If there are areas that are shown as natural but have human sources, this can be addressed in the next BMAP iteration.

Katie stated that the future growth section is the last section in Chapter 1. State statutes require that a BMAP identify mechanisms for addressing future growth. The St. Lucie River and Estuary BMAP does not include an allocation for future growth; however, new discharges cannot increase existing load and must meet “net environmental improvement” for the Environmental Resource Permit (ERP) program requirements. The BMAP also notes the potential implications of the “10/2” general permit recently approved by the legislature that applies in lieu of ERP for areas up to 10 acres with no more than two acres of impervious area and no wetlands impacts.

Katie stated that Chapter 2 describes the land uses in the basin, which are aggregated using simplified level 1 codes. Agriculture is more than half of the acreage in the basin. Natural land uses are about 27% of the area, urban land uses are about 14.3% of the area, and barren land is the last 0.3% of the area. The total St. Lucie River and Estuary Basin is 515,000 acres. All waterbodies in the basin drain directly to either the St. Lucie Estuary or the Indian River Lagoon South (IRL-S). The South Fork and North Fork of the St. Lucie Estuary converge at the Roosevelt Bridge to form a single waterbody that extends eastward, where it joins the IRL-S. The C-44 canal connects Lake Okeechobee to the South Fork, and it provides a navigable connection between the east and west coasts of Florida. The construction of canals C-23 and C-24 provided connections between their respective sub-basins, and these canals discharge to the North Fork. Katie also reviewed the water quality trends in the basin, which are summarized in the BMAP based on information the 2013 *South Florida Environmental Report* (SFER).

Chapter 3 describes the sources in the TMDL. One of the main sources of nutrient loading is urban stormwater, which includes both municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s) and nonpoint sources. The other major source is agricultural stormwater. The TMDL also identifies Lake Okeechobee as a source, and these loads will be addressed in a separate BMAP effort.

St. Lucie River and Estuary Basin Management Action Plan

Groundwater is also a source but is part of the measured load at the control structures and water quality in the waterbodies. All of the MS4s in the basin are Phase II, and are listed in a table in the BMAP. Katie noted that the MS4 table in the draft BMAP is missing Fort Pierce, but the city will be listed in the revised BMAP. The MS4 permits include a self-implementing clause for BMAP responsibilities. The nonpoint sources in the basin include the CDDs and water control districts (WCDs). The nonpoint source projects are enforceable through the BMAP itself. The primary agricultural uses in the basin are cow/calf (pasture) and citrus. Due to urban encroachment, citrus health issues, and the downturn in the economy, the amount of agriculture in the basin has been affected. Katie noted that these changes in agricultural land uses have been factored into the agricultural reductions in the BMAP. Agricultural producers in the basin must implement appropriate BMPs or water quality monitoring to show that they are not having an impact on water quality. This chapter also includes a list of anticipated outcomes from BMAP implementation in this iteration. This list of outcomes will be refined in future iterations. Katie noted that the outcome about increased coordination also applies to FDEP. The regulatory changes are done in a different section at FDEP from the BMAP group, but Katie stated that it is part of her job to coordinate with them to prepare for the next iteration. George Andreassi asked why the nonpoint sources are not listed in Chapter 3. Katie responded that they are listed in the acknowledgements, stakeholders list, allocations, and maps but they can be added to Chapter 3. Katie noted that she has maps with corrected legends to list “Hobe St. Lucie Conservancy District” instead of “Hobe St. Lucie WCD,” which is shown on the current maps in the draft BMAP. Katie noted that the correct date for the TMDL adoption is March 2009, not October 2008, and this will also be updated in the next draft BMAP.

Katie stated that Chapter 4 describes the allocations, which were discussed in detail at past meetings. Marcy noted that this chapter contains all of the information that was provided to the stakeholders in the allocation handouts at several of the meetings. This chapter includes information on collaborating with SLRWPP efforts, calculating starting loads, natural land uses and the Florida Power and Light pond, *de minimus* determination, target load per acre calculations, allocations and required reductions, and allocations by source. Katie asked the stakeholders to provide feedback on this chapter to ensure the allocations are explained clearly. The allocations by source are listed in tables with the 30% required reductions for all non-*de minimus* entities. The agriculture table combines the required reductions for agriculture as an entity and for agriculture within the WCDs. This is a new table because FDEP has been talking with the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (FDACS). FDACS has the primary responsibility for enrolling growers in BMPs, so FDEP and FDACS decided it was best to include agricultural lands within the WCDs in this table to represent all agriculture in the basin.

Chapter 5 describes the management actions submitted by stakeholders. The projects in the BMAP have the following characteristics: they are mostly stormwater management focused; they are completed or planned to be completed in the first iteration to achieve TN and TP reductions; they are eligible if completed since January 1, 2000; and they received credit only for the portion of reductions above and beyond permit requirements. The management action summary tables are included in Chapter 5, and the project details are included in Appendix D. The summary tables are by source type with the entities and project categories listed. The tables show the total credit for each entity and credit for future BMAPs, if more projects were

St. Lucie River and Estuary Basin Management Action Plan

submitted than what was needed to achieve the 30% of the required reductions. Pattie Gertenbach asked if projects in the South Coastal sub-basin could be listed in this iteration of the BMAP, since FDEP will be adding this sub-basin in the next iteration. Katie responded that Martin County projects in this sub-basin are listed in this BMAP with the project reduction amount shown as “not quantified” with a footnote that FDEP will add this sub-basin in the next iteration. If the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) or any other stakeholder has projects in this sub-basin and they can provide this list by the end of comment period, those projects can be included in this iteration of the BMAP.

Amy Eason asked where agricultural lands within special districts are being assigned because the Troup-Indiantown WCD area has not changed. Katie stated that the agricultural lands within the districts are still assigned to the special districts; however, the loads and reductions for these agricultural lands within the districts are also listed in a separate table to represent all agricultural loads and reductions since FDACS is responsible for agricultural BMP implementation. Dianne noted that the Martin County and Port St. Lucie TP credits are flipped in the MS4 table in the presentation. Katie stated that she would fix the presentation before posting it, and she would recheck all of the tables to make sure they match with the tables in the draft BMAP. Katie stated that agricultural credits were assigned for 90% BMP implementation and changes in land uses. If agricultural lands are fallow and are expected to stay fallow for this first BMAP iteration, credit was assigned. A table is also included in the BMAP to represent all the agricultural required reductions and the estimated reduction credits.

Deb noted that FDEP has enforcement responsibility to verify the agricultural BMP effectiveness and ensure implementation. Katie responded that FDEP does have this responsibility, and FDEP is in the process of creating a guidance document about how they implement these responsibilities. Deb stated that there should be a reference to the development of this guidance document in the BMAP, along with information about FDEP’s responsibilities related to agricultural BMP implementation. Katie responded that she would talk with FDEP upper management about appropriate language to add to the BMAP.

Mark asked where the provisional BMPs are applied. Katie responded that if an entity submitted these project types, they are listed in the project tables in Appendix D as part of the overall BMAP credits. Mark noted that the agricultural tables show a credit, so they have met their BMAP reductions. Katie responded that they have provided enough projects to achieve 30% of the required reductions. However, the 90% BMP implementation is the target for this BMAP iteration, so agriculture has not yet met the reductions for this iteration. Tiffany added that all the entities would meet their first BMAP iteration required reductions if they implement the actions in their project table or their equivalent.

Chapter 6 describes the process to assess progress and make changes. FDEP will work with the stakeholders to organize monitoring data and project implementation information into an annual report. The stakeholders will meet at least annually to review the progress made and make modifications to projects and monitoring, if needed. Katie stated that she is considering holding a meeting in August or September to start discussions on the considerations for the next iteration. This meeting schedule will provide FDEP time to determine an action plan for discussion and for

St. Lucie River and Estuary Basin Management Action Plan

the stakeholders to provide information they have that will help refine the next BMAP provisions.

This chapter includes the monitoring plan, and progress towards the TMDLs will be determined using the existing monitoring network in the basin. Some of the information on the monitoring stations is missing, so stakeholders should provide information to fill in the blank cells. There is also biological monitoring occurring in the basin to help support the water quality data. All ambient water quality data must be collected following FDEP's standard operating procedures and be uploaded to Florida STORET or its replacement. SFWMD data will be stored in DBHYDRO, and FDEP works closely with SFWMD and will have access to their data. Any biological data collected will be maintained by the entity collecting the data. Water quality data will be compiled yearly, but the data will not be evaluated until year four of the BMAP. The research priorities section lists items that could be pursued if funding becomes available. Katie stated that she reviewed the research items in the 2012 SLRWPP Update, and she listed the two relevant priorities--nutrient budget and DO dynamics--in the BMAP. The stakeholders should provide feedback on any other items that should be listed. Mark stated that SFWMD should be listed as the entity conducting the biological monitoring. He asked if the biological monitoring is mapped. Katie responded that she would talk with SFWMD about mapping the biological monitoring network.

Katie stated that Chapter 7 is short and describes the commitment to the BMAP. The stakeholders have worked collaboratively to develop the BMAP, have committed to the activities in the BMAP, will continue to confer with and support each other in implementation. Mark asked if this is where all the stakeholders sign the BMAP. Katie responded that in the past FDEP has asked for letters of commitment from entities for some previously adopted BMAPs. The purpose of those letters was to help local governments show support for the BMAP as their boards or elected officials change over time. FDEP has moved away from asking for letters, because most entities have not provided them for those BMAPs. If any stakeholder wants to provide a letter for the St. Lucie and Estuary BMAP, they can do this. Tiffany added that technically, one board cannot commit another board to a particular action or spending, so the letters were something to show support for the BMAP but were not binding. It is up to the local governments to decide if a letter would be useful for them. Mark asked when agricultural lands are sold, if the buyer must continue to implement BMPs. Tiffany responded that the new owner would have to enroll again in BMPs, just like if the property changed commodity type. Mark noted that a letter from the agricultural landowner committing to BMPs would be useful for the BMAP. Tiffany responded that the notice of intent (NOI) is this BMP written commitment.

Deb asked when the BMAP would be adopted. Katie responded that the schedule would be discussed shortly, but the expectation is for a June 2013 adoption. Deb stated that she wants to make sure the policy briefings occur before BMAP adoption. Katie responded that the adoption is planned for after the briefings occur.

Katie stated that there are several appendices in the BMAP. Appendix A explains the TMDL basin rotation schedule and Appendix B is a summary of statutory provisions that guide BMAP development and implementation. Appendix C lists the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) recommended elements of a comprehensive watershed plan, which need to be met to

St. Lucie River and Estuary Basin Management Action Plan

receive certain types of funding, including Section 319 funds. Appendix D lists the BMP efficiencies and projects submitted by the stakeholders. This is an important appendix, and the stakeholders should carefully review their project information. Appendix E is the glossary of terms, and Appendix F is the bibliography. Deb stated that FDEP did an outstanding job organizing the BMAP information, and she thanked Katie for her efforts.

Document Review Process and Next Steps

Katie stated that she sent the draft BMAP on March 6th, which started the first comment period. The BMAP is being discussed at today's meeting, and comments on this version of the BMAP are due to Katie by March 27th. Katie will then incorporate comments received during today's meeting and during the comment period. The stakeholders should submit comments using the matrix that was sent by e-mail last week. For extensive comments, the stakeholders can edit the BMAP using the track changes function in the Word document. A link to the revised draft BMAP will be sent to the stakeholders on April 3rd, and Katie will send a notice to the distribution list when the BMAP is posted. This will start the 30-day public comment period, which ends on May 2nd. The public meeting will be held on April 10th and will be noticed in the FAR and TC Palm. As comments are submitted, if stakeholders have questions about how their comments were addressed, they can contact Katie.

Katie stated that the FDEP adoption process would start with her briefing management on the BMAP by mid-May. Then, the Deputy Secretary and Secretary will be briefed by the end of May, depending on the Secretary's schedule. Once the Secretary approves the BMAP, it starts the 21-day challenge period. If no challenges are received, then the BMAP will be adopted and enforceable. Katie stated that a signing ceremony may be held where the FDEP Secretary comes to the basin to commemorate the BMAP adoption. The policy briefings will be held in April and early May. Katie stated that she had previously asked everyone for policy maker briefing names. However, in other basins, the meetings for the policy makers were not well attended. Therefore, Katie reached out to some of the stakeholders about individual briefings to their commissions or councils. FDEP is coordinating briefing dates with those stakeholders that requested a briefing. If any other entity would like a briefing, they should let Katie know.

Deb stated that the public comment period ends on May 2nd, but some of the policy briefings occur after that and she asked if there will still be an opportunity to incorporate edits. Marcy Policastro responded that the policy makers typically do not provide edits to the BMAP, and instead have questions about the BMAP implications for their entity. However, there is still some time if any edits need to be made based on comments during the policy briefings. Mark asked if at the April 10th meeting, the information would be oriented to the public and less technical. Katie responded that this meeting would be a combination of information for the public as well as a technical discussion on how the stakeholder comments were addressed. Mark suggested adding maps from the BMAP to the public presentation to help a general audience understand the process. Katie acknowledged his suggestion and also noted that she is open to presenting to the River's Coalition about the BMAP, as she discussed with Mark after the last meeting.

Public Comments and Wrap Up

St. Lucie River and Estuary Basin Management Action Plan

Dianne Hughes stated that she thinks the St. Lucie stakeholders should start discussions on developing a public education task force to develop a basin-wide message about water quality. A program similar to Tampa's "Be Floridian" and Brevard County's "Live Blue" is needed. Anyone interested in participating in these discussions should contact Dianne directly.

Tiffany stated that the next meeting would be held on Wednesday, April 10th, at 9:30 AM at the Martin County Commission Chambers.

Mark asked if the costs for implementation are shown in a table. Katie responded that the Executive Summary includes the percentage of projects where costs were provided and the total cost for those projects. Marcy added that Appendix D lists the costs for projects where that information was provided. Dianne asked if these are the costs for completed projects. Katie responded that the costs are for any completed or planned project that the stakeholders provided cost information. Tiffany stated that the stakeholders need to be careful extrapolating this cost because the projects have different costs, and the available costs may not accurately represent the other projects. Deb stated that she would be presenting to the Martin County Commission at their April meeting on the county's estimated costs for the BMAP. Deb will let Katie know when this presentation will be so she can listen in. Deb noted that the costs in the executive summary are not even in the ballpark for BMAP implementation, and the caveats to the cost information will need to be explained at the policy briefings.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 11:22 AM.

Action Items

- Stakeholders should carefully review the list of considerations in the BMAP and provide comments on any additional items that should be listed.
- Carmela Bedregal will send the link to SFWMD's hydrologic study to Katie Hallas to send to the stakeholders.
- Stakeholders with EMCs and ROCs information should provide it to Katie.
- FDEP will add a future consideration to determine a split in runoff for the C-23 and C-24 sub-basins, as was done for the C-44/S-153 sub-basin. Consider adding a description of the C-44 split in the Considerations section to aid in the description of this point.
- Katie will bring the concern about the BMAP reductions being a moving target back to her upper management to discuss what language could be added to the BMAP.
- FDEP will add the list of nonpoint source entities in Chapter 3. – *Completed.*
- FDEP will add the updated maps with the correct name for Hobe St. Lucie Conservancy District and update the TMDL adoption date. – *Completed.*
- FDOT will provide information about their South Coastal sub-basin projects to Katie by March 27th.
- Katie will fix the TP MS4 management actions table in the presentation to flip the Martin County and Port St. Lucie credits. – *Completed.*
- Katie will talk with FDEP upper management about appropriate language to add to the BMAP about FDEP's responsibilities related to agricultural BMP implementation and the guidance document being developed.

St. Lucie River and Estuary Basin Management Action Plan

- A meeting will be scheduled in August or September to start discussions on the considerations for the next BMAP iteration. Stakeholders should send information they have to help refine the BMAP to Katie.
- Stakeholders should send missing monitoring information to Katie by March 27th.
- FDEP will fix the table numbering in the BMAP. – *Completed*.
- In the table describing the biological monitoring network, FDEP will add SFWMD as the entity conducting the biological monitoring, and will work with SFWMD to map this monitoring if possible.
- Stakeholders should carefully review their project tables in Appendix D and submit changes and/or comments to Katie by March 27th.
- Stakeholders should provide comments on the BMAP using the comment matrix or track changes by March 27th to Katie.
- Stakeholders should let Katie know if she should brief their board on the BMAP.
- FDEP will include additional maps in the public meeting presentation.
- Deb Drum will provide information on her April presentation to the Martin County commission to Katie.
- FDEP will explain the caveats to the implementation cost information in the BMAP at the policy briefings.