

St. Lucie River and Estuary Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP)

Webinar Summary

Wednesday, May 29, 2019

2:00 pm – 2:44 pm

Participants

Silvia Alderman, Akerman	Cailynn Houlihan, DEP
Khalil Atasi, GAI Consultants	Amanda Kahn, SFWMD
William Baker, MacVicar Consulting	Donna Kaminski, UF
Venetia Barnes, City of Fort Pierce	Kerry Kates, FFVA
Katie Bowes, Martin County	Lisa Krinsky, UF
Joe Capra, Captec	Kathryn LaMartina, SFWMD
Stacy Cecil, DEP	Bonnie Landry, Village of Indiantown
Troy Craig, FDOT	Paul Laura, Citizen
Kelly Cranford, Culpepper and Terpening	Drew Liddick, DEP
Breanna Crowell, DEP	Donald Luke, Phosphorus Free
Sara Davis, DEP	Debbie Madden, Gunster
Greg DeAngelo, DEP	Dale Majewski, City of Port St. Lucie
Amy Eason, AECOM	Jennifer McGee, St. Lucie County
Rebecca Elliott, FDACS	Dee Ann Miller, DEP
Vincent Encomio, UF	Alexander Miranda, DEP
Kate English, Pavese Law	Andrew Morris, DEP
Yesenia Escribano, FDACS	Greg Nolte, Captec
Julie Espy, DEP	Stacey Ollis, SFWMD
Cathy Foerster, ATM	Denise Palmatier, Kimley-Horn
Marcy Frick, Tetra Tech	Mark Perry, Florida Oceanographic Society
Stan Ganthier, DEP	Luna Phillips, Gunster
Doug Gaston, Audubon	Nico Pisarello, ATM
Lawrence Glenn, SFWMD	Rama Rani, Kimley-Horn
Kathleen Greenwood, FDACS	Dawn Ritter, Highlands County
William Griffin, City of Stuart	Gerard Rouse, SLWSD
Chris Guth, Federico & Associates	Eric Shea, FPL
Dennis Hanisak, FAU	Jerry Smith, Citizen
Hugh Harling, ECFRPC	Butch Terpening, Culpepper and Terpening
Anne Harvey, Save the Manatee Club	Amy Thibaut, Pavese Law
Bill Hayden, SLWSD	Harold Tourjee, Captec
Kenny Hayman, DEP	Eva Velez, Citizen
Janet Hearn, ATM	Rachel Vitek, E Sciences
Eric Hinton, DEP	Kevin Williams, DEP

The full webinar recording and supporting materials are posted to the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) file transfer protocol (FTP) site at
http://publicfiles.dep.state.fl.us/DEAR/BMAP/StLucie/Meetings/2019/05_29_PathForwardWebinar/.

Questions and Answers

Question: Can you please send the PowerPoint when the call is completed via email to participants?

Answer: Following the meeting, the presentation, recording, and other meeting materials will be available through the ftp site, <http://publicfiles.dep.state.fl.us/DEAR/BMAP/StLucie/>.

Question: Who was named Chief Science Officer?

Answer: Dr. Thomas K. Frazer was appointed to Chief Science Officer on April 1, 2019.

Question: With the Blue-Green Algae Task Force just being formed, and a goal of updating the BMAPs by the end of the year, how much input do you anticipate coming from the Blue-Green Algae Task Force members?

Answer: This is something we are trying to answer ourselves. We are prepared to provide everything that we presented to you in this meeting and previous meetings to that Task Force when they are ready for it. We expect that they are going to review not only this BMAP but the other two Northern Everglades BMAPs that are being updated this year on schedule for the Executive Order. I do not know what the input will look like or how much input there will be, but we are expecting to provide all the information to that Task Force for review.

Question: What has changed since the 2016 Progress Report? Was there a 2018 Report (first five years)?

Answer: The St. Lucie 5-Year Review has multiple parts and it is a three-chapter report. The first chapter was an overview of the setup of the BMAP. The second chapter acted as the progress report for the first five years. It included total projects completed, projects that are underway, a summary of a reductions and project credits calculated at that point, and percentages achieved by the different stakeholders. That information can be found there.

Question: Why aren't you using the actual basin loads data from the South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) DBHYDRO database rather than modeling calculations for verification of load reductions?

Answer: I am imagining that question is in reference to the subbasin concentration calculations. I will address this in two parts. We went with the modeled concentration data because that matches up to how the rest of the numbers presented here today were calculated so the starting loading and model reductions came out of the model output. The modeled concentrations for the subbasins were calculated using the exact same process so it keeps everything very equal across the way. As I mentioned there was a lot of effort that went into updating the Watershed (WaSh) model and that is fully documented in the WaSh report. That included a whole calibration and verification effort and returned the fact that the model well represents flow within the watershed and nutrient dynamics patterns within the watershed and made us confident moving forward that using the model, while it is a model, it was doing a pretty good job estimating what was going on within the watershed. So, it was used for all the things we just discussed. We did also take a look at the South Florida Environmental Report, the most recent one, and compared the total load we calculated out of the WaSh model for the entire updated BMAP boundary to comparable numbers within the South Florida Environmental Report for the same subbasin area in that report. The total loads coming out of the WaSh model and reported in the South Florida Environmental Report were very close so that also made us feel OK about moving forward using the model for these things.

Question: Do we know the amount of nitrogen and phosphorus contributed by Class AA fertilizer in the agricultural area in St. Lucie basin?

Answer: That is not something that is really tracked as part of the BMAP process. It is tracked through various agencies because those are fertilizers it is something that is in a separate part of the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP). The answer is yes that amount is known as far as what is sold in the basin, but it is not something that is calculated in the model.

Question: Are the draft required reductions for the second phase (2018-2023)?

Answer: The required reduction numbers are meant to represent the required reductions for the remainder of the BMAP up to the 15-year mark. That is with the caveat that this plan will be reviewed in another five years as required by statute so there could be changes or updates within that timeframe but the numbers themselves are meant to represent the total amount that would need to be reduced to get to the TMDL point we want to be at.

Question: Does DEP know if the Task Force has the option to recommend revising the total maximum daily loads (TMDLs)?

Answer: I do not think that we know yet since a lot of that stuff is still getting worked out. As far as the BMAPs are concerned, we know that they are expected to provide recommendations for the BMAP update but I am not sure about what other recommendations they might be making or expected to make.

Question: Who can we discuss the WaSh model inputs with? Were the inputs to WaSh the same as the spreadsheet model?

Answer: There were differences between the spreadsheet model and the WaSh model. It was the SFWMD that assisted us with the updates to the WaSh model. It was a cooperative effort. The best thing to do would be to shoot Sara and Breanna an email, our emails will be at the end of the presentation, and then we can direct your questions appropriately from there.

Question: Will stakeholders have opportunities to discuss the shapefiles and any discrepancies found for allocation purposes?

Answer: We do have the shapefiles posted online. At this point, we are looking at moving forward so I do not think the plan at this point is to rerun from the beginning, but we have talked on a one-on-one basis with stakeholders about potential land use change projects or other modifications that could be made if there is justification to do so. That is a one-on-one conversation that we are happy to have that conversation about.

Answer: Over the past year or so as we have been working through trying to come up with this approach for this process for calculating these numbers, we have worked with quite a few of the stakeholders. We asked them for their boundaries and we provided them outputs from the clipping methodology that Breanna described so there has been a lot of back and forth with a lot of the stakeholders with specific local knowledge where that differs from the input land use file, so we have worked through some of those things already. Like Breanna mentioned, we are on a schedule from the Governor, we have to be done by January, so starting over with new ones would be tough but we are still working through if there are discrepancies that change loading trying to figure out how to document that and keep track of that in the BMAP process.

Question: What is the process for suggesting projects within this BMAP Review? Is it similar to the Lake Okeechobee Watershed Protection Plan (LOWPP) process?

Answer: The Lake Okeechobee Watershed Construction Project is going through a pretty significant review right now between the three Coordinating Agencies (SFWMD, Florida Department of

Agriculture and Consumer Services, and DEP). That is a fairly unique thing although if there are project ideas that you have within the estuary BMAPs, reach out to Breanna and Sara. We are looking at beginning something similar to that Construction Project review that is happening in Lake Okeechobee for the estuaries. I am not sure how that will land but we are having a lot of discussions. If there are suggestions or specific areas that you think a certain type of project will help and get a good return on the investment of the state's money, then just let us know what your ideas are.