



Florida Department of Environmental Protection

Bob Martinez Center
2600 Blair Stone Road
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2400

Rick Scott
Governor

Carlos Lopez-Cantera
Lt. Governor

Noah Valenstein
Secretary

Memorandum

To: Beth Alvi, Staff Director, Office of Ecosystem Restoration

Through: Tom Frick, Director, Division of Environmental Assessment and Restoration (DEAR)

Through: Greg DeAngelo, Deputy Director, DEAR

From: Lisa Van Houdt, Environmental Consultant, DEAR

Subject: DEAR SFY 2016-17 Business Plan Report for Q4 (April through June 2017)

Date: July 21, 2017

Attached, please find the quarter four (Q4) business plan report for state fiscal year (SFY) 2016-17 for the Division of Environmental Assessment and Restoration (DEAR). This quarterly report also includes metrics associated with the department's strategic goals.

DEAR SFY 2016-17 Business Plan Targets for Q4

The division maintains a spreadsheet to track our annual objectives and our performance towards meeting those objectives (see Attachment 1). Each divisional objective identified in our business plan is tied to an associated strategic goal of the department. For ease in implementation, the spreadsheet is sorted by DEAR program area and not by department strategic goal. The spreadsheet does, however, include a cross-walk column that links each of the division's key performance goals (KPG) and key performance measures (KPM) with a specific department strategic goal and objective.

DEAR completed 33 of its 36 business plan targets for Q4. In the spreadsheet, green highlighted rows reflect completed KPGs. Yellow highlights mean the division is behind on the KPG or no longer anticipates being able to complete the KPG within the timeframe of the 2016-17 business plan. The comment boxes provide additional explanation. Both the spreadsheet and our business plan now reflect our new KPG, KPM, and due dates, as proposed and discussed in the DEAR Q1 report.

Business Plan Targets Met	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	SFY
Targets for the quarter	13	16	12	36	77
Targets met or completed (number)	13	14	10	33	70
Targets met or completed (percent)	100 %	88 %	83%	92%	91%

Metric—Number of Employee-Led Efforts that Result in Performance Improvement

To generate this number, the division office collected and vetted performance improvement candidate projects from the program administrators. Some submissions were more accurately characterized as program achievements, and some submissions were not employee-led efforts. For example, DEAR did not include in this metric any projects that were directed to occur from the division office or that were accomplished as part of the business plan. The metric does not include picking up additional work in response to staff departures, and it does not simply highlight achieving significant accomplishments. DEAR included only staff-initiated efforts to find ways to do our work better, such as:

- Automating routine tasks to accomplish them more efficiently in the future.
- Developing standard operating procedures.
- Organizing workflows or mapping work processes.
- Streamlining report formats.
- Eliminating waste or identifying cheaper solutions.
- Publishing new information or providing old information in a new way.
- Coordinating work across programs, divisions, or agencies to save resources.

Attachment 2 contains a very short description of each project; additional details about each employee-led effort are available.

Metric	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	SFY
Number of employee-led performance improvement efforts	7	18	21	20	66

Metric—Number and Percent of Impaired Waterbodies Needing Restoration Plans

This metric reflects the following assumptions. (See Attachment 3 for additional details and results.)

- DEAR should report nutrient and fecal impairments separately.
- "Restoration plans" consist of adopted (or otherwise final) basin management action plans (BMAPs), reasonable assurance plans ("4b plans"), and plans for ongoing restoration activities ("4e plans").
- "Waterbodies" should be calculated as a waterbody segment (as identified by its waterbody identification or WBID number).
- "Nutrient total maximum daily loads (TMDLs)" should not be double-counted if more than one parameter has a TMDL. For example, if DEAR has adopted a TMDL for some combination of total nitrogen (TN), total phosphorus (TP), dissolved oxygen, etc., for one WBID, that will count as a single "nutrient" TMDL.
- "Fecal TMDLs" should count waters where DEAR has adopted a TMDL for a fecal indicator bacteria related impairment. This metric includes both fecal coliform impairments as well as impairments that will be made under the new enterococci or E.coli criteria. It does not include impairments resulting from beach closures or shellfish advisories.

- "Waters needing a plan" are those that are verified impaired for a pollutant and that do not have restoration activities outlined in one of the following:
 - An adopted BMAP that specifically addresses the TMDL for that WBID. (The boundary for a BMAP is a large geographic area, and it can encompass many WBIDs for which DEAR has adopted a TMDL. But, not all of the WBID-TMDL combinations within the borders of a BMAP are considered "addressed" by that BMAP. The TMDL could be for a different pollutant than the BMAP, or the BMAP may not have any relevant restoration activities specified for the WBID.)
 - A final reasonable assurance plan (4b plan).
 - A final 4e plan.
- "Total plans approved" identifies 21 adopted nutrient BMAPs and 8 adopted fecal indicator bacteria BMAPs. The total number of adopted BMAPs is 25, however, because four BMAPs address both nutrients and fecal indicator bacteria. BMAPs addressing nutrient and fecal impairments count for both parameters.

Data for this metric updates infrequently. Adoption of new TMDLs, BMAPs, 4b plans, 4e plans, verified impaired lists, and de-list lists occurs only several times per year. The results in Attachment 3 reflect assessments, TMDLs, and BMAPs through the following activities:

- Assessments—Group 3 Cycle 3 and IWR database Run 52 (adopted October 21, 2016)
 - Data source—Comprehensive Verified List; accessed April 24, 2017.
- TMDLs—Crescent Lake, Lake Roberts, Cross Creek, Lochloosa Lake, Wacissa Spring and Wacissa River (effective May 30, 2017)
 - Data source—Communications/press TMDL tracking spreadsheet.
- BMAPs—Jackson Blue (adopted May 24, 2016)
 - Data sources—Communications/press BMAP tracking spreadsheet, and the "TMDLs addressed by BMAPs" tracking spreadsheet.

DEAR is piloting revisions to this calculation approach to more accurately reflect the intention of the metric. Proposed revisions to the calculation approach will be included with our business plan for SFY 2017-18.

Metric—BMAP Projects Implemented

DEAR is reporting on this metric for structural, nonstructural, and total BMAP projects implemented. The metric follows these assumptions: DEAR should only report BMAP projects associated with nutrient reductions; water quality credit trades are classified separately and not included as a structural or nonstructural project; and projects are categorized as structural or non-structural as per the following table.

Structural Projects	Non-structural Projects
- Wastewater projects—wastewater plant upgrades; enhanced treatment; collection system improvements (including inflow and infiltration improvements); maintenance, repair, and extensions; gypsum stack closures; conversion from septic systems to sewer; lift station improvements; installation of a wastewater collection monitoring system; and landfill treatment improvements. - Urban and agricultural best management practices (BMPs)—detention, retention, baffle boxes, swales, stormwater treatment areas (STAs), hybrid wetland treatment technology (HWTT), and dispersed water management (DWM). - Floating aquatic vegetation treatments. - Alum treatment. - Reclaimed water reuse—if wastewater was previously discharged to surface waters is redirected to a reuse system where it is applied to land. - Wetland creation. - Air emissions improvements (i.e., selective catalytic reduction) that lead to reduced atmospheric deposition. - Hydraulic restoration.	- Education. - Ordinances. - Policies. - Research. - Street sweeping. - Catch basin or BMP clean out. - Land acquisition or conservation purchases (without other land modifications). - Fish removal for the purpose of removing nutrients (e.g., shad harvesting). - County Alliance for Responsible Environmental Stewardship (CARES) program. - Agricultural BMP enrollment. - Fertilizer cessation. - Cost-share program (not the individual projects funded by cost share). - Sampling and monitoring programs. - Inspection programs. - Herbicide spraying and vegetation removal. - Dredging projects. - Marina waste handling improvements. - Databases, such as those to monitor sanitary sewer overflows. - Dumpster inspections.

Only projects classified as "completed" in our BMAP project tables are counted as "implemented" for calculating this metric. Projects that are planned, ongoing, or in progress are not counted as completed, but rather as "identified." We update the metric upon finalizing an annual report for the BMAP. The numbers below represent a snapshot of the BMAP project tables as of December 31, 2016, and they reflect updates through the latest annual reports for St. Lucie and Harney-Monroe. Because this metric is based on cumulative projects identified and completed, the numbers for this quarter are the same as the numbers reported last quarter.

Project Type	Number of Projects Identified	Number of Projects Implemented	Percent of Projects Implemented
Structural	1956	1578	81 %
Nonstructural	971	876	90 %
All Projects	2927	2454	84 %

Attachments

1. Business plan targets met – Q4.pdf
2. Employee-led projects – Q4.pdf
3. Waters needing restoration plans – Q4.pdf