

Lower and Middle Suwannee River Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP) Meeting Summary

Thursday, April 13, 2017 at 6:00 PM

*Suwannee River Water Management District (SRWMD) Headquarters, Board Room
9225 CR 49, Live Oak, FL 32060*

Attendees

Charles Barrett, UF/IFAS	Tom Kallemeyn, DEP
Leigh Brooks, FDACS OAWP	Greg Lang, Mittauer & Associates
Katie Britt, DEP	Jamie Letendre, St. Martins Marsh Aquatic Preserve
Tiffany Busby, Wildwood Consulting	Wendy Lin-Bartlett, UF
Buck Carpenter, Madison SWCD	Joel Love, UF/IFAS
Jason Chandler, Generation Farms	Celeste Lyon, DEP
Pete Collins	Chris Mericle, Sierra Club
Laura Donaldson	Bob Palmer, Florida Springs Council
Cathy Foerster, Wildwood Consulting	Eric Nagid, FWC
Steve Glachin	Steve Peene, ATM
Wendy Graham, UF	John Quarterman, Suwannee Riverkeeper
Roxanne Groover, FOWA	Jason Scarborough, Pilgrims
Katie Hallas, FDACS OAWP	Ray Scott, FDACS OAWP
Terry Hansen, DEP	Charles Shinn, FFBF
W.C. Hart, Lafayette SWCD	Cliff Starling, FDACS OAWP
Dan Hilliard, Florida Springs Council	Hugh Thomas, SRWMD
Tammy Hinkle, FDACS	John Thomas
Ray Hodge, Southeast Milk	Dave Townsend, Pilgrims
Carol Lee Howe	Travis Tuten, FWC
Brian Katz, DEP	Barton Wilder, FDACS
Bob Hochmuth, UF/IFAS	Kevin Wright, Generation Farms
George Hochmuth, UF/IFAS	
Stephen James, Pilgrims	

Introduction

Tiffany Busby opened the meeting at 6:00 PM by welcoming everyone. She stated that this is a public meeting for the Lower and Middle Suwannee River Basin (SRB) BMAP. She stated that this BMAP is being prepared under the new (2016) legislation and those requirements will be discussed today. Tiffany thanked SRWMD for arranging the meeting room. She reminded attendees to sign in and to provide their email information should they desire to be on the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) contact list to receive meeting notices. She also requested that attendees let her or Terry Hansen, DEP basin coordinator, know if they are not receiving emails notices through the DEP GovDelivery system. She introduced herself and Terry and requested that each person in the room introduce them self.

Overview of the BMAP Study Area

Terry stated that DEP identified the Suwannee River to be impaired for nutrients in the lower and middle basins and subsequently adopted total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) which are addressed in the BMAP. The Florida portion of the Withlacoochee Basin and associated

Lower and Middle Suwannee River Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP) Meeting Summary

springs are also included in the BMAP, based on high nitrogen levels that flow into the Suwannee Basin at the convergence of the Withlacoochee and Suwannee Rivers near Falmouth. The BMAP study area is over one million acres in size and contains 175 springs of which 8 are first magnitude springs (Outstanding Florida Springs [OFSs]) and 54 are second magnitude springs. The study area extends from the Georgia line down to the Gulf of Mexico.

Terry provided an overview of the water quality framework and regulatory framework associated with the adoption of a BMAP. The BMAP is DEP's method for restoring water quality to an impaired water body. A BMAP is adopted by DEP by Secretarial Order. BMAPs are enforceable and reviewed annually; updated every five years.

Preparation of the SRB BMAP began in 2015, but was placed on hold pending the outcome of the 2016 legislation. The new legislation now requires that BMAPs are adopted within two years of initiation and must include detailed project, financial, and water quality information; five-year incremental milestones; and an implementation plan to achieve the TMDL within 20 years of BMAP adoption. The project list must be prioritized; include a planning level cost estimate and completion date; and identify funding sources. The BMAP must identify point and nonpoint source categories with estimated load allocations; delineate priority focus areas (PFAs); include agricultural best management practices (BMPs); and contain an onsite sewage treatment and disposal system (OSTDS) remediation plan if OSTDS loads are greater than or equal to 20 % of the nitrogen load, or determined to be needed by DEP. An OSTDS remediation plan is not required for the SRB BMAP.

PFA Requirements and Delineation Process

A PFA is defined as an area or areas of a basin where the Floridan aquifer is generally most vulnerable to pollutant inputs and a known connection between groundwater pathways and an OFS. The delineation process considers factors that may lead to degradation of an OFS, such as groundwater travel time to the springs; hydrogeology; nutrient load, etc. Terry stated that the conduit and connectivity in the SRB is difficult to ascertain; however, a PFA boundary must follow defined boundaries such as roads, geopolitical boundaries, etc.

Three PFAs have been delineated by DEP in consultation with SRWMD for the SRB:

- Withlacoochee River (Madison Blue OFS).
- Middle Suwannee River (Falmouth, Lafayette Blue, Peacock, and Troy OFSs).
- Lower Suwannee River (Fanning and Manatee OFSs).

Terry presented a series of slides with maps that explained the different items analyzed in determining the PFAs, using the Middle Suwannee River PFA as the example: recharge, aquifer vulnerability, stream to sink features, soils, state lands, land use, wastewater, animal feeding operations, and elevation contours. All of this information was overlaid in a geographic information system (GIS) for determination of the proposed boundary. The DEP groundwater team produced three PFA reports which will be a part of the BMAP.

Per the legislation, certain activities are prohibited within a PFA: wastewater treatment facilities greater than 100,000 gallons per day, unless advanced wastewater treatment (AWT) is used; new

Lower and Middle Suwannee River Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP) Meeting Summary

OSTDS on less than one-acre lots; ban on land application of biosolids; and hazardous waste facilities.

Terry then showed a series of slides that depicted the three PFAs in relation to the BMAP study area. The study area is larger than the three PFAs. The BMAP must address loading and reductions within the entire study area, not just the PFAs.

Questions/comments by attendees

1. Roxanne Groover: Even though an OSTDS remediation plan is not required, DEP will still require AWT for septic systems? Terry: Yes, new or replaced OSTDS will need to have AWT, such as drain field enhancement.
2. I am surprised to see Falmouth identified as an OFS. Terry: The Florida Legislature identified Falmouth as an OFS; therefore, DEP has to treat it as such.
3. Is the aquifer vulnerability map showing there are areas of no vulnerability? Terry: The areas are less to more vulnerable. All areas are vulnerable.
4. Are the maps more detailed in the PFA reports? Terry: Yes, the PFA reports contain higher resolution maps.
5. FWC: Regarding the water quality framework, what parameters are looked at? Terry: The focus is on nitrates. At the springs, SRWMD monitors for major isotopes, ions, other contaminants, and bioparameters.
6. FWC: FWC will have side scan imagery (habitat monitoring) available on the main stem of the springs. Terry: FWC should be a stakeholder in the BMAP and the side scan project included in the list of projects.
7. Bob Palmer: I am trying to get a sense of where we are in the process. Is the BMAP final or will a draft be routed for comment and subject to amendment? Terry: The BMAP is not final, but I am presenting the best information we have now so that we can continue to move forward. The PFAs were reviewed by SRWMD. The Nitrogen Source Inventory Loading Tool (NSILT) is an analysis of the entire springshed. A "draft final" BMAP will be routed for comments. We do not have a lot of hard data. Tiffany: Bob, please review the PFA reports and send in comments now rather than waiting for the BMAP to be released.
8. Greg Lang: So there is one PFA for Fanning and Manatee? Will it be re-evaluated at the five-year interval? Terry: Yes, there is one PFA for Fanning and Manatee. It will probably not be updated in five years. In reality, it is the best information we can use.
9. John Quarterman: Why is Cherry Lake not included in the Withlacoochee PFA? There are roads nearby that can be used as boundaries. How can I receive the GIS files? Terry: The DEP groundwater team made a judgment call as to the areas included in the PFAs. For example, Cherry Lake was deemed to not be as vulnerable as other areas, but it is still within the BMAP boundary though not in a PFA. Please email me a request for GIS files.
10. Will the BMAP address phosphorous abatement? Terry: Phosphorous is not a pollutant of concern in the basin. There is not excessive phosphorous compared to the nitrates. The BMAP will not address phosphorous.

NSILT

Brian Katz of the DEP Groundwater Program provided a brief overview of the NSILT prepared for the SRB BMAP. The NSILT is a GIS-based and spreadsheet-based tool that provides spatial estimates of the relative contribution of nitrogen from various sources while considering the transport pathways and processes affecting the various forms of nitrogen as they move through the land surface through soil and geologic strata into the Floridan aquifer (groundwater). The NSILT is a planning tool that provides estimation of nitrogen loading sources to groundwater based on best available data at the time the tool is used for a particular geographic area, in this case, the groundwater contributing areas and spring contributing areas for three springsheds within the SRB BMAP area.

Brian provided the steps to estimating the nitrogen load to groundwater:

1. Estimate the nitrogen input to the land surface from various sources (best available data) within the BMAP boundary.
2. Estimate the environment's ability to uptake and utilize the nitrogen. This process is called "attenuation."
3. Evaluate the degree of recharge within the BMAP boundary; this naturally varies based on geologic conditions and influences the quantity of water reaching the aquifer. DEP applies a weighted recharge factor to account for the variation.
4. Reach out to stakeholders regarding estimates and methodology; fine tune as needed.

Brian presented a hybrid flow chart to visually depict the nitrogen cycle and attenuation. The nitrogen sources are the following: atmospheric deposition, wastewater treatment facilities (WWTFs), septic systems, livestock waste, urban turfgrass fertilizer, sports turfgrass fertilizer, and farm fertilizer. After all the nitrogen input to the land surface are estimated, attenuation factors are applied to each nitrogen source. Attenuation factors for each nitrogen source are determined upon an extensive literature and peer review. The final step in estimating nitrogen loads to groundwater is to apply the recharge factor based on where each contributing source is located within the coverage area. Recharge factors are used to estimate the percentage of the non-attenuated nitrogen expected to reach the aquifer in a given year. In the high recharge area, most of the springshed areas, DEP estimated that 90 % of all the non-attenuated nitrogen will reach the aquifer, 50 % in the medium recharge and 10 % in the low recharge.

Celeste Lyon of the DEP Groundwater Program then provided details on how each source category was analyzed for portions of six counties that comprise the three springsheds. The predominant land uses in each springshed are forest and agriculture (74 % or more of the land use within the springsheds).

Atmospheric Deposition

Atmospheric deposition is largely a diffuse, albeit continual, source of nitrogen. In Florida, the Clean Air Status and Trends Network (CASTNET) has two stations that collect and analyze dry deposition. Wet deposition data currently are collected at nine stations around the state as part of the National Atmospheric Deposition Program (NADP) National Trends Network (NTN).

Lower and Middle Suwannee River Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP) Meeting Summary

Schwede and Lear (2014) developed a hybrid model for estimating the total atmospheric deposition of nitrogen and sulfur for the entire U.S., referred to as "TDEP." Deposition data from several monitoring networks—including CASTNET, the NADP Ammonia Monitoring Network, the Southeastern Aerosol Research and Characterization Network, and modeled data from the Community Multi-Scale Air Quality (CMAQ) Modeling System—are combined in a multistep process with NTN wet deposition values to model total deposition. The TDEP model run used for the NSILT included data from 2011 to 2013.

Terry acknowledged that atmospheric deposition is a significant nitrogen source and DEP needs more adequate data. Since atmospheric deposition is an uncontrollable load, addressing it will be set aside for five years while DEP obtains more data. In the meantime, stormwater treatment projects should reduce some of the load.

WWTFs

There are 16 WWTFs in the Lower and Middle Suwannee River springsheds; none in the Withlacoochee River springshed. DEP reviewed total nitrogen (TN) effluent concentrations as reported to DEP and separated the data based on treatment type: rapid infiltration basins, absorption fields, sprayfields, or reuse. Nitrates were used to project TN data, if necessary.

Septic Systems

The number of septic systems were derived from the Florida Department of Health (FDOH) Florida Water Management Inventory. Accuracy of the data was verified through an aerial analysis. DEP calculated the number of people relying on septic systems (average persons per household) and multiplied that number by the average annual input to septic system of 9.012 pounds of nitrogen/person (lb-N/person).

Livestock Waste

A literature review was conducted to determine animal waste factors for common livestock animals in Florida. The 2012 Census of Agriculture was used to ascertain the number of livestock in the six counties. A 2016 U.S. Department of Agriculture survey was used to determine the number of beef cattle. DEP then used county-level land use information to estimate livestock population within the springsheds.

The primary livestock waste contributors are dairy operations, poultry operations, and cow-calf operations (beef cattle). Celeste presented detailed slides on how nitrogen inputs were calculated for the dairy, poultry, and cow-calf operations.

Farm Fertilizer

DEP determined irrigated lands crop types using the Florida Statewide Agriculture Irrigation Demand (FSAID) irrigated lands geodatabase (ILG). If property was outside of the ILG, DEP determined agriculture areas based on SRWMD land use. Crop fertilizer application rates were applied to the acreages identified within the springsheds based on crop type. Application rates

Lower and Middle Suwannee River Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP) Meeting Summary

were based on University of Florida Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences (UF/IFAS) recommended rates as well as producer feedback.

Urban Turfgrass Fertilizer

The acreage (residential and nonresidential) likely to receive fertilizer was estimated from property appraiser data and property values. DEP assumed that the maximum fertilizable acreage was capped at one acre. Annual application rates that were applied were based on a Southwest Florida Water Management District study.

Sports Turfgrass Fertilizer

Sports field acreages were estimated from aerial analysis of property appraiser land use data. Fertilizer application rates were based on lawn service company estimates. Golf course acreage (there is only one golf course in all springsheds) was estimated from property appraiser land use data. DEP applied an application rate of 4.5 lb-N/1,000 square feet.

Celeste then presented a series of slides with pie charts that show the estimated nitrogen loading to land surface and estimated loading to groundwater for each springshed. She reminded attendees that the estimated loading to groundwater takes into consideration recharge and biochemical attenuation factors. Farm fertilizer and livestock waste are the largest nitrogen sources within each springshed, accounting for at least 80 % of the nitrogen loading in each springshed.

Nitrogen Reductions Needed by Source

Terry presented a series of slides in which he calculated the estimated nitrogen reductions by source for each springshed. He stated that the groundwater loads are broad brush estimates and will be re-evaluated in five years.

For each springshed, Terry identified the estimated nitrogen load to groundwater by source and the adopted TMDL. The load reduction was calculated by taking the groundwater load minus the TMDL load multiplied by the source percentage. For example, in the Withlacoochee River Basin, the required load reduction for farm fertilizer is calculated as 451,424 lb-N/year minus 77,355 lb-N/year multiplied by 77 % which equals 288,033 lb-N/year. The estimated total load reduction for all sources in the Withlacoochee River Basin is 374,069 lb-N/year. The estimated total load reduction for all sources in the Middle Suwannee River Basin is 3,518,830 lb-N/year. The estimated total load reduction for all sources in the Lower Suwannee River Basin is 2,170,983 lb-N/yr. Therefore within 20 years, within the springsheds, an estimated total of 6,063,882 lb-N/yr will need to be reduced, of which 55 % is attributed to farm fertilizer and 31 % is attributed to livestock waste.

Terry reminded attendees that the BMAP area is larger than the three springshed areas and that loading has to be addressed for the entire BMAP area. Therefore, he estimates that a total of 9.5 million lb-N/yr will need to be reduced in 20 years within the entire BMAP area. He stated that

Lower and Middle Suwannee River Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP) Meeting Summary

since atmospheric deposition is an uncontrollable load, addressing it will be deferred for five years.

The needed reductions will be the basis for the 5-, 10-, and 15-year milestones. In the first five years, DEP's goal is to achieve 30 % reduction; an additional 50 % within 10 years (80 % total); and the remaining 20 % within 15 years. That will leave a 5-year cushion to achieve the reduction goals within 20 years.

Terry presented options to meet the reductions needed by the first five-year interval:

Farm Fertilizer

The 2016 legislation now requires the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (FDACS) to work with DEP and water management districts on projects and better BMPs. DEP and FDACS need to determine reductions associated with BMP implementation as well as develop and implement additional BMPs.

Livestock Waste

Terry stated there are no verifiable reductions associated with BMPs for livestock waste. Through the FDACS verification process, there needs to be documentation of reductions from BMP implementation. Also, additional BMPs need to be developed and implemented.

Sports Turfgrass Fertilizer – Golf Courses

Terry acknowledged there are data gaps for golf courses and DEP is determining how best to obtain real numbers for fertilizer application on the golf course within the study area. Also, there needs to be documentation of relevant BMP implementation.

Urban Turfgrass Fertilizer (UTF)

Terry stated there is uncertainty regarding input data in the DEP NSILT for UTF. A local government can achieve 6 % total credit for UTF if it enacts a fertilizer ordinance, landscape ordinance, irrigation ordinance, pet waste ordinance, public education, and implements the Florida Yards and Neighborhood Program. Each ordinance counts as 0.5 % credit. Terry stated that if a local government has adopted a fertilizer ordinance that is more stringent than the DEP model ordinance, reductions need to be documented to justify an increased credit associated with the ordinance as well as overall effectiveness. Within the first five-year period, DEP needs to work toward better data and additional measures should be developed that will reduce fertilizer application.

Septic Systems

There will likely need to be a combination of system enhancement and replacement to meet the five-year reduction milestone. DEP is of the opinion that the under drain field liner is the simplest solution for enhancement, but the liner is not yet permissible by FDOH. FDOH needs to complete its rulemaking to allow the liner system, hopefully by August 2017. Septic to sewer conversion plans are necessary.

Lower and Middle Suwannee River Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP) Meeting Summary

WWTFs

WWTF reductions should be achievable through system upgrades.

Questions/Comments by Attendees

1. Bob Palmer: Do you make assumptions about how much fertilizer is taken up by plants?
Brian: Uptake by plants varies considerably based upon crop type; however, we calculated that 60 %–80 % is attenuated before reaching groundwater. Bob: That seems to be a very high attenuation range. Brian: The attenuation range is based on many studies, which we can share with you.
2. Did you look at ammonia emissions from the animal operations? Brian: Celeste has more details, but I recall that for the poultry operations, we considered volatilization of waste while stored.
3. Dan Hilliard: Are the final NSILT reports available? Brian: The reports are still in process, but we can share data with you in the meantime.
4. The dark blue coverage on your atmospheric deposition map is where the Duke Energy plant is located. Celeste: Thank you for that information.
5. Bob Palmer: Atmospheric deposition is not trivial and is not just caused by power plants and auto emissions; fertilizer is a factor. Are there local agriculture fertilizer numbers in relation to atmospheric deposition? Terry: There are no local numbers since the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency stations are not within the study area. DEP acknowledges that farm fertilizer and livestock waste are potential sources of atmospheric deposition. Brian: DEP is utilizing a nationwide model that has a really large grid size. It is difficult to make local interpretations.
6. Ammonia emissions from animal production operations are a source of atmospheric deposition. DEP needs to address this issue.
7. Jamie Letendre: Is the forest land use considered to be timberland? If it is timberland, it should be considered included in the fertilizer analysis since timberlands are fertilized. Celeste: Thank you for the suggestion. We will indeed research further.
8. Did the septic system data account for the age of the system? Celeste: The age of the system was not included in the FDOH septic system data.
9. Leigh Brooks: Which septic system classifications were used from the FDOH inventory? Celeste: We used known septic and most likely septic classifications.
10. Does the 9.012 lb-N/person account for treatment? Terry: The 9.012 lb-N/yr is the input to the septic system prior to any treatment.
11. Was there a property value limit that was considered in the urban turfgrass fertilizer analysis? Celeste: We accounted for all property values through three range classes.
12. FWC: How does the BMAP effort align with the SRWMD Coastal Surface Water Improvement Management (SWIM) Plan? Terry: We consult SWIM plans for projects that would also be applicable to the BMAP. We will review the SRWMD Coastal SWIM Plan for applicability. Hugh Thomas: SRWMD references the BMAP in the SWIM plan. I will post the latest draft on the SRWMD website. Tiffany: The monitoring components and projects in the SWIM plan are mined for relevance and inclusion in the BMAP.

Lower and Middle Suwannee River Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP) Meeting Summary

13. Steve Peene: You are assuming a correlation of the TMDL load and needed reduction. Terry: Yes, there is a correlation. I did not provide a slide that shows the loading to groundwater, current OFS discharge, and TMDL goal.
14. Did you take flow and concentration at the spring to figure out the loading? Terry: The loading to groundwater was determined based on calculation of the load to surface and then taking into consideration recharge and biological attenuation. The nitrogen loading to groundwater is higher than the TMDL goal. There are a lot of unknowns due to fate and transport of the system.
15. Did you use data from monitoring wells in the area? Some have pollutants that have increased 100 %–700 %! Terry: The NSILT did not rely on monitoring well data; however, DEP agrees that an understanding of trends is needed.
16. I am not optimistic about your 20-year plan. Terry: It is an ambitious plan.
17. To accomplish the needed farm fertilizer reductions in 20 years, agriculture would look entirely different than it does now. Terry: DEP has been speaking with FDACS regarding 100 % BMP implementation and other projects such as precision fertilization. It appears that we can meet the 5-year goal of 30 % which gives us time to come up with other solutions. Agriculture will need to help redefine how it does business since DEP does not have all of the answers. Tiffany: Other approaches are needed to be successful beyond the first five years. We need everyone's help to reach solutions.
18. The numbers seem very high for the existing crop mix. Celeste: The initial crop numbers are using UF/IFAS rates.
19. UF/IFAS: There may be an opportunity for research of Florida-specific conditions. FDACS may not know all that is possible. Tiffany: The BMAP will include a science summary.
20. These reductions appear to be an unfunded mandate. Terry: The Florida Legislature has appropriated \$50 million per year for springs-related projects. DEP wants as many projects as possible to take to the Legislature to have legislators understand the magnitude of the problem and funding needed.
21. Dan Hilliard: Use fertilizer tonnage when presenting on fertilizer so that it is easier to understand.

Required BMAP Components and Schedule

Terry reminded attendees that the BMAP must include an overall study area; PFAs for OFSs; load reductions for the entire BMAP area (based on NSILT estimates); 5-, 10-, and 15-year milestones to achieve the reductions; prioritized projects to meet the milestones by source category to meet the TMDLs within 20 years; and a monitoring plan. He mentioned that SRWMD has real time water quality springs monitoring at Troy, Fanning, Manatee, Falmouth, and Madison Blue Springs.

Terry stated that DEP intends to route a draft BMAP, which will include the prioritized project list, for public review by the end of May 2017. A public meeting will be held in June 2017; anticipated adoption in July 2017.

Lower and Middle Suwannee River Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP) Meeting Summary

Questions/Comments by Attendees

1. Bob Palmer: Are the milestones and projects the subject matter of the next meeting? Terry: Yes, we will discuss projects and milestones at the June meeting.
2. John Thomas: What other funding options are there? What about Amendment 1 money and legislative appropriations? Katie Britt: The DEP Nonpoint Source Program administers the federal 319 grant which is funded at \$6 million this year in Florida. We are struggling to spend the money. Terry's division evaluates projects for eligibility to receive springs funding. Terry: \$50 million is not enough money for all of the needed projects. The FDACS cost-share program is an option, but its funding is low.
3. John Thomas: The BMAP needs to be honest about funding needs.
4. When is DEP going to notify the neighboring homeowners that the monitoring wells are sampling above drinking water standards? On behalf of the residents, I am monitoring residential drinking wells that are within 75 feet of the DEP monitoring wells in the Ginny Springs area. Terry: My understanding is that FDOH has notified residents and the DEP Drinking Water Section is aware of the notification.
5. Greg Lang: Can we tweak prior submitted projects? Terry: Yes, we are in the project collection phase now.
6. Will the projects include data collection by DEP to refine loading estimates? Are you formulating a plan for refinement of the estimates? Terry: We are defining data gaps and will revise the NSILT by the five-year interval.
7. Katie Hallas: FDACS provided producer projects and research options to DEP.
8. Ray Scott: What is the guidance for prioritizing projects in accordance with the new legislation? Terry: No guidance was provided in the legislation; therefore, DEP will prioritize a project as high if it is needed to meet the 5-year commitment.

Next Meetings

The next meeting will occur in June 2017.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:14 PM.

Action Items

Below are action items from the meeting.

1. Terry: Post final presentation and meeting summary to the DEP public access site.
2. FWC: Send Terry the project description for the side scan project.
3. All: Send Terry an email request for GIS files or PFA reports.
4. Celeste/Brian: Determine if the SRWMD forest land use includes timberland. If so, consider modifying the fertilizer calculations to include timberland.
5. Celeste: Provide Bob Palmer the pamphlet on fertilizer and atmospheric deposition link.
6. Terry/Cathy: Review the SRWMD Coastal and Suwannee River SWIM Plans.
7. Hugh: Post the latest draft Coastal and Suwannee River SWIM Plans.
8. Terry/Cathy: Send project collection requests to stakeholders.
9. Cathy: Coordinate with local government PIOs regarding the June BMAP meeting.

Lower and Middle Suwannee River Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP) Meeting Summary

10. Terry: Publish notices for the June public meeting in the applicable newspapers.
11. Cathy: Send a save-the-date notice via GovDelivery to stakeholders for the June meeting.
12. Terry: Prepare Florida Administrative Register (FAR) notices and post June agenda to DEP BMAP web page.
13. Terry: Route the SRB BMAP for DEP internal review by May 10, 2017 and release for public review by May 31, 2017.