

**Chapter 40E-61 FAC Rule Development
Public Comments**

Commenter	Date Comment Received	Agency or Organization Represented	Comment Summary	SFWMD Workshop Response
Summary of Comments Received from SFWMD Rulemaking Workshop in Okeechobee (November 5, 2019)				
Mr. Robert Norton	11/5/2019	Ecosystem Watch	Handwritten letter. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A (Not Applicable)
Mr. Wes Williamson	11/5/2019	Williamson Cattle Company	Suggested drafting the rule try to avoid unintended consequences. For example, taxes in the south drove many cattle ranchers out of the area.	None needed.
Mr. Doug Bournique	11/5/2019	Indian River Citrus	Farmers have implemented Best Management Practices (BMPs) since 1998. The District should focus on septic tanks and land transitioning from agriculture to urban.	The Department of Health (DOH) currently regulates septic tanks. However, the water quality monitoring data associated with the rules will assist in identifying and addressing issues related to septic tanks. Additionally, the Blue Green Algae Task Force (BGATF) established by the Governor's Executive Order 19-12, has made recommendations related to regulatory oversight of septic tanks.
Mr. Wes Carlton	11/5/2019	Private Citizen	Inquired about monitoring locations in the St. Lucie River Watershed (in particular along the C-23 canal east of I-95 and the C-25 canal).	The urban areas to the north of the C-23 canal predominantly drain northeast towards North Fork St. Lucie River. Water that flows south from the urban areas in the vicinity of the C-23 canal would be captured in monitoring conducted at the S-48 structure. There are several water quality monitoring stations along the North and South Forks of the St. Lucie River and along the St. Lucie Estuary. Water quality monitoring is not conducted along the C-25 canal because the water from the basin drains towards the canal, which flows east into the Indian River Lagoon, outside of the Northern Everglades and Estuaries Protection Program (NEEPP) boundaries. Water that flows from the urban areas in the vicinity of the C-25 canal would be captured in monitoring conducted at the S-50 structure.

**Chapter 40E-61 FAC Rule Development
Public Comments**

Commenter	Date Comment Received	Agency or Organization Represented	Comment Summary	SFWMD Workshop Response
Mr. Tony Federico	11/5/2019	Federico & Associates	Inquired about the status of monitoring stations in the St. Lucie River Watershed.	The green dots on the maps provided at the workshop indicate active upstream monitoring sites. See meeting handouts.
Mr. Gary Ritter	11/5/2019	Florida Farm Bureau	Suggested studying legacy phosphorus and nutrient dynamics within the flood control system. Also, tailwater recovery systems have been difficult to permit.	None needed.
Ms. Nyla Pipes	11/5/2019	One Florida	Suggested studying legacy phosphorus and nutrient dynamics within the flood control system. Also, study soil dredge materials that have been placed on the land.	None needed.
Dr. Paul Gray	11/5/2019	Audubon	Inquired about the rule coverage in the Northern Everglades since some of the lands are outside of the South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) designation. Asked if those lands will be covered under this rule.	The SFWMD will work towards having agreements with the other water management districts for geographic areas outside our jurisdiction if needed.
Mr. Brad Phares	11/5/2019	Lazy JP Ranch	Inquired about monitoring in the northern portion of the Lake Okeechobee Watershed, and it appears that there are no sampling sites in the urban areas along the I-4 corridor near the headwaters.	Monitoring in the headwaters is being conducted by other entities such as the Reedy Creek Improvement District and Osceola County. The Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) website https://ca.dep.state.fl.us/mapdirect/?webmap=5234166c10744a9a91715434a9ff067d provides a Watershed Monitoring Map showing sampling sites.
Ms. Beth Lewis	11/5/2019	The Nature Conservancy	Concerned with economic viability and tailwater recovery programs. Would like to see opportunities through cost-share programs.	None needed.

**Chapter 40E-61 FAC Rule Development
Public Comments**

Commenter	Date Comment Received	Agency or Organization Represented	Comment Summary	SFWMD Workshop Response
Ardis Hammon	11/5/2019	Frienson Farms	There is no monitoring in Lee County or in Hutchinson Island. The District needs a map showing FDEP and other agencies' monitoring locations.	Monitoring in Lee County is currently being monitored by other government agencies. Hutchinson Island is outside of the NEEPP boundary. The FDEP website https://ca.dep.state.fl.us/mapdirect/?webmap=5234166c10744a9a91715434a9ff067d provides a Watershed Monitoring Map showing sampling sites.
Ms. Benita Whalen	11/5/2019	Florida Cattlemen's Association	Wanted confirmation that the intent of the monitoring upstream is to capture data and flow from the natural system, and the intent of the NEEPP legislation direction is for a collaboration among agencies. Appreciates the opportunity SFWMD has provided to the Association by allowing them to showcase their agricultural lands to SFWMD Governing Board members.	None needed.
Mr. John Small	11/5/2019	Cal-Maine Foods	Inquired about the frequency of monitoring in the watershed.	In August 2019, SFWMD Governing Board approved an expansion of its monitoring network by increasing the frequency to biweekly and increasing the parameters collected at the upstream monitoring sites.
Mr. Rick Hartman	11/5/2019	Private Citizen	Inquired about the sampling parameters near the St. Lucie Estuary, and suggested SFWMD should sample for coliform.	SFWMD's monitoring under the rule will focus on nutrients.
Mr. Doug Danzen	11/5/2019	Audubon	Asked how this program will integrate with FDEPs program such as BGATF, septic tanks, BMPs and Basin Management Action Plans (BMAPs).	SFWMD is working with FDEP on a weekly basis to finalize the monitoring network. FDEP is updating the BMAP monitoring plan sites based on SFWMD sampling sites as a coordinated effort, that include the BGATF. The BGATF has provided recommendations to the Governor on septic tank oversight.

Chapter 40E-61 FAC Rule Development
Public Comments

Commenter	Date Comment Received	Agency or Organization Represented	Comment Summary	SFWMD Workshop Response
Ms. Kate English	11/5/2019	Pavese Law	Asked if SFWMD use data from other sources, and how will the programs integrate.	Data collected by other agencies is integrated through the BMAP. SFWMD will consider those data for 40E-61. SFWMD may use data from other agencies for investigative work if there is a priority site of water quality concern.
Mr. Wes Carlton	11/5/2019	Private Citizen	Suggested we use all available data from other agencies and look at what they are sampling for and their frequency. Suggested SFWMD should be sampling for bacteria.	FDEP is looking at sources of all publicly available monitoring data and is coordinating with SFWMD and BGATF. The NEEPP legislation specifies phosphorus for the Lake Okeechobee Watershed and "pollutants" for the Caloosahatchee River and St. Lucie River Watersheds which has been determined to include nitrogen. Other agencies like FDEP, BGATF, and Department of Health will be considering bacteria.
Mr. Gary Ritter	11/5/2019	Florida Farm Bureau	Inquired about the data gaps and how will this be picked up by monitoring, and which agency will be responsible for urban, agriculture or industrial lands, and what their roles are with data gaps. It seems SFWMD's Governing Board is in favor of regulation that may be associated with the rule.	The three agencies (FDEP, Florida Department of Agriculture & Consumer Services (FDACS) and SFWMD) are working together to fill in the gaps in monitoring data.
Mr. Gary Lee	11/5/2019	Southport Ranch LLC	Concerned with monitoring along Lake Toho's tributaries. Inquired about ongoing hydrilla projects in Orange County, and about the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) lands such as retention areas and ditches along roadways.	FDEP is considering water quality monitoring to represent each tributary, and ensuring all data being used is accessible to other agencies and the public. FDOT is permitted through environmental resource permits and has extensive BMP requirements.
Ms. Susan Gosselin	11/5/2019	Osceola County	Mentioned there is water quality monitoring occurring in the northern part of the watershed. Osceola County entered a collaborative agreement with SFWMD for water quality; their staff is conducting the sampling and using the SFWMD lab for analysis.	None needed.

**Chapter 40E-61 FAC Rule Development
Public Comments**

Commenter	Date Comment Received	Agency or Organization Represented	Comment Summary	SFWMD Workshop Response
Ms. Nyla Pipes	11/5/2019	One Florida	Commented on one of the slides in the presentation being unclear of the responsibilities of each agency.	SFWMD will provide clarification of each agency and their roles and responsibilities at future workshops.
Comments Received from SFWMD Rulemaking Workshop in Ft. Myers (November 15, 2019)				
Roland Ottolini	11/15/2019	Lee County	Asked what is meant by monitoring "in lieu of" BMPs, and what the monitoring is compared to (e.g. numeric nutrient criteria).	The NEEPP statute allows entities under BMAPS to conduct monitoring in lieu of implementing BMPs (agriculture or urban). FDEP has adopted a monitoring rule that defines the general state-wide monitoring requirements. The monitoring requirements relate to the total maximum daily load (TMDL) established for the specific area under a BMAP. FDEP's rule does not specify how the monitoring will be implemented nor the benchmark for comparison.
Mr. James Evans	11/15/2019	City of Sanibel	Stated that it appears that the NEEPP rules focus on phosphorus, and asked if there would be any monitoring of nitrogen since it is the nutrient downstream that typically impacts the estuaries.	In August, SFWMD Governing Board approved an expanded monitoring network that includes data collection for nitrogen in all three watersheds of the Northern Everglades.
Mr. John Cassani	11/15/2019	Calusa Water Keeper	Inquired about attributing load to a specific property or a non-point source discharger. It seems most of the programs use modeling to address this.	SFWMD rules will have specific individual monitoring requirements for entities under a BMAP not implementing BMPs. The rule will also address SFWMD monitoring that represents entities "collectively" in a hydrologic area. This monitoring will provide "measured" data. FDEP's BMAPs use modeling to estimate nutrient load contributions. FDEP also uses SFWMD's measured data.
Ms. Rae Ann Wessel	11/15/2019	Sanibel-Captiva Conservation Foundation	Asked what is the standard or threshold that will be used to determine the need for actions. Inquired if the Lake will be assigned a nitrogen criteria and if the Caloosahatchee Estuary will be assigned a specific phosphorus criteria.	FDEP is the authority for determining action under the BMAP umbrella for water quality. FDEP is currently establishing benchmarks, in addition to the established TMDLs, to identify priority areas. SFWMD rules will be aligned with FDEPs requirements.

**Chapter 40E-61 FAC Rule Development
Public Comments**

Commenter	Date Comment Received	Agency or Organization Represented	Comment Summary	SFWMD Workshop Response
Ms. Lisa Kreiger	11/15/2019	Lee County	Inquired about monitoring from urban areas (private developments) or non-point source dischargers from stormwater management systems. Asked if any of this information can be used to dovetail into any Environmental Resource Permitting (ERP) processes if stormwater management systems are a contributor to pollutant loading.	SFWMD monitoring locations are selected to represent hydrologic drainage areas of different scales. Conceptually, triggers could include ERP action, FDACS Notice of Intent action, FDEP National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) action, or any other existing tools to assist in solving the water quality issues.
Mr. Gary Ritter	11/15/2019	Florida Farm Bureau	Stated that many agencies at the local and state level are conducting monitoring that could be used to make decisions in the watershed. Asked if the data being used will be sampled in accordance with the FDEP 62-160 Criteria, and will split sampling occur between agencies.	Any data considered by SFWMD would have to be collected in accordance with FDEP's quality assurance requirements, 62-160 F.A.C. Also, SFWMD could audit other entities and collect split samples.
Ms. Wanda Klopf	11/15/2019	Clean Water Now	Seeking a timeline and a statement of goals, and asked if the statement includes " saving Florida's wildlife and providing clean water for all now and in the future."	The goal for the overall restoration strategies is to restore and protect the Everglades. The goal of this particular rule is covered by the statute and is one component of the overall strategy.
Comments Received from SFWMD Rulemaking Workshop in Kissimmee (November 19, 2019)				
Unidentified	11/19/2019	Unknown	Asked what will the responsibilities be for those already implementing BMPs under this rule.	Under the BMAP, for those implementing BMPs through a FDACS or FDEP program, no individual monitoring is required.
Mr. Roland Overstreet	11/19/2019	Overstreet Packing, LTD.	Inquired about the TMDL goals set for the Lake and how it compares to other states and their requirements. Commented on consideration of availability of phosphorus.	FDEP is the agency that determines the load requirements for the receiving water bodies to maintain their ecosystem.
Mr. Kevin Whaley	11/19/2019	Private Citizen	Asked if urban areas will have to follow the same rules as the agricultural areas.	Yes, the BMAPs and rules are for agricultural and non-agricultural areas.

**Chapter 40E-61 FAC Rule Development
Public Comments**

Commenter	Date Comment Received	Agency or Organization Represented	Comment Summary	SFWMD Workshop Response
Mr. Todd Harvey	11/19/2019	Unknown	Asked if a landowner with 1/2-acre lot need to follow the same rules as an agricultural landowner.	FDEP is responsible for regulating non-agricultural lands and FDACs is responsible for regulating agricultural lands. Both agencies are looking at ways to address smaller properties. SFWMD rules will be applicable to monitoring discharges regardless of land uses.
Unidentified	11/19/2019	Unknown	Asked if FDEP reviews data from all sources.	FDEP is currently reviewing monitoring data from other sources.
Unidentified	11/19/2019	Unknown	Requested a color coded map depicting areas of "hot spots".	FDEP is currently in the process identifying areas of concern.
Unidentified	11/19/2019	Unknown	Asked if the rules are for phosphorus only.	SFWMD is focusing on monitoring for nutrients. The NEEPP legislation specifies phosphorus for Lake Okeechobee. However, for the Caloosahatchee River and St. Lucie River watersheds and estuaries, it specifies "pollutants" for which the BMAPs include nitrogen.
Unidentified	11/19/2019	Unknown	Asked if the monitoring sites marked as a yellow dots have data.	The yellow dots indicate proposed monitoring locations. Most of those stations have historical data.
Mr. John White	11/19/2019	Osceola County	Commented that monitoring has been ongoing for years, and asked what the trends are for water quality.	The South Florida Environmental Report (SFER) Chapter 8, provides water quality data for the basins and subwatersheds. The report is updated every year, and can be found on the SFWMD website.
Unidentified	11/19/2019	Osceola County	Inquired about the implementation of BMPs on District owned lands and on private homeowner's land.	Yes, lessees of SFWMD-owned lands are held, at minimum, to the same BMP requirements as other landowners. Additionally, FDEP is considering ways to address smaller entities.
Mr. Todd Harvey	11/19/2019	Crespens Bar Carrier	Asked if homeowners with 1/4 acre lots are going to be held to the same standards as agriculture, and if they will be doing the testing.	FDEP is considering ways to address smaller entities.

**Chapter 40E-61 FAC Rule Development
Public Comments**

Commenter	Date Comment Received	Agency or Organization Represented	Comment Summary	SFWMD Workshop Response
Ms. Kimberly Lawrence	11/19/2019	Reedy Creek Improvement District	She added a comment about local governments and their permitting requirements for subdivisions.	None needed.
Mr. Stacy Strickland	11/19/2019	IFAS	Inquired about BMPs and if there is a presumption of compliance to avoid monitoring.	Entities implementing BMPs are granted, by statute, a presumption of compliance with water quality standards.
Ms. Kimberly Lawrence	11/19/2019	Reedy Creek Improvement District	Commented that one of the data gaps is the lack of flow data. How are hot spots being measured if there is no flow data?	Currently, SFWMD measures flow at the primary basin level monitoring stations. Monitoring flow at a smaller scale exists at some locations. Monitoring may be expanded in the future based on identified needs and prioritized resources.
Mr. Clifton Chapman	11/19/2019	Double C Bar Ranch	Stated that agricultural lands have decreased in the state of Florida and development has increased. A stronger focus should be on septic tanks and new development.	None needed.
Summary of Comments Received from SFWMD Rulemaking Workshop in Stuart (November 19, 2019)				
Mr. Newton Cook	11/19/2019	United Waterfowlers-Florida	The United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Refuge Project has several cooperative programs and projects occurring in the Lake Okeechobee Watershed, and encourages SFWMD to coordinate with USFWS.	None needed.
Mr. Gary Goforth	11/19/2019	Florida Oceanographic Society	Wants to see actions in the rule to reduce phosphorus concentrations in the Lake. Recommended using technical support documents from 2013 for the foundation of the rule revisions.	None needed.
Mr. Merritt Mathesa	11/19/2019	City of Stuart	How often is SFWMD communicating with FDEP regarding the BMAP revisions?	SFWMD and FDEP, at times, communicate weekly regarding the BMAP revisions and at routine coordination meetings several times a month.

**Chapter 40E-61 FAC Rule Development
Public Comments**

Commenter	Date Comment Received	Agency or Organization Represented	Comment Summary	SFWMD Workshop Response
Mr. Merritt Mathesa	11/19/2019	City of Stuart	Inquired about the sampling frequency and parameters for sampling sites (like Roosevelt Bridge), and who is responsible for the sampling and enforcement.	The Roosevelt Bridge is a long-term monitoring site where a grab sample is collected biweekly by SFWMD. The data is presented in the SFER available on SFWMD's website. FDEP reviews the data for BMAP purposes, and is responsible for BMAP enforcement.
Mr. Gary Ritter	11/19/2019	Florida Farm Bureau	Commented on the Works of the District (WOD) program in the late 1980's and that 750 permits were issued, but it was primarily an administrative task. SFWMD lacked the knowledge and expertise to help landowners develop BMPs.	None needed.
Mr. Gary Goforth	11/19/2019	Florida Oceanographic Society	SFWMD and their water quality monitoring program should be commended. FDEP ignores real data and uses a computer model to calculate nutrient reductions. There is a discrepancy between SFWMD and FDEP's data.	None needed.
Ms. Jacqui Thurlow-Lippisch	11/19/2019	SFWMD Governing Board Member	Asked for clarification on the types of monitoring described in the draft concept.	The draft concept includes two types of water quality monitoring. Individual monitoring of a property's discharges is required if not implementing BMPs (agriculture or urban land uses). The other type of monitoring conducted by the SFWMD is at a "collective" level to represent larger (regional and sub-regional) hydrologic areas.
Summary of Comments Received from SFWMD Rulemaking Workshop in West Palm Beach (November 20, 2019)				
Ms. Susan Caruso	11/20/2019	Broward Sierra Club	Inquired about the timeline for rule development, and if the presentation from today's meeting is available.	The timeline is our best estimate at this time. The presentation is posted on the SFWMD website under the rulemaking page at the link below. https://www.sfwmd.gov/sites/default/files/documents/40E_61_rd_wksp_1_presentation2019_11_05.pdf

**Chapter 40E-61 FAC Rule Development
Public Comments**

Commenter	Date Comment Received	Agency or Organization Represented	Comment Summary	SFWMD Workshop Response
Ms. Susan Caruso	11/20/2019	Broward Sierra Club	Inquired about SFWMD's example of the rule possibly being practical for 60% of the stakeholders, but not the remaining 40%. Which stakeholders belong to each group?	The 60/40 was a hypothetical example.
Ms. Susan Caruso	11/20/2019	Broward Sierra Club	Inquired about monitoring instead of BMPs, and if the farmer would be required to conduct monitoring if he is already grandfathered in. Asked if BMPs effective, and what are some examples of BMPs.	<p>Under a BMAP, if an entity or person is implementing BMPs through FDACS or FDEP, individual monitoring is not required. A landowner that is implementing BMPs is granted, by statute, a presumption of compliance with water quality standards. There are BMPs from three categories: nutrient controls, sediment/erosion control, and water management controls. Agriculture BMPs can be found at: https://www.fdacs.gov/Agriculture-Industry/Water/Agricultural-Best-Management-Practices</p> <p>Non-Agriculture BMPs can be found at: https://floridadep.gov/dear/dear/documents/best-management-practices-enhancement-environmental-quality-golf-courses https://ffl.ifas.ufl.edu/pdf/GIBMP_Manual_Web_English_2015.pdf https://floridadep.gov/sites/default/files/BMP%20Efficiencies%20July%202018.pdf</p>
Ms. Laura Reynolds	11/20/2019	Issac Walton League, Native Plant Society	Asked if a hot spot is found during monitoring, and the landowner is not implementing BMPs, would the landowner be required to do anything additional under any of the rules.	Agricultural landowners should be enrolled in a program under FDACS or FDEP. If the landowner is not implementing BMPs, FDACS would report the landowner to FDEP to initiate enforcement, if needed.

**Chapter 40E-61 FAC Rule Development
Public Comments**

Commenter	Date Comment Received	Agency or Organization Represented	Comment Summary	SFWMD Workshop Response
Ms. Laura Reynolds	11/20/2019	Issac Walton League, Native Plant Society	Inquired how a hot spot is handled, and if it is raised to another level, or is the BMP sufficient.	The rule will assist with identifying and addressing hot spots. SFWMD would assess the data that is showing increasing trends and notify FDEP or FDACS. The actions to take are not in place yet; it is anticipated that the revisions to the rule will require and outline appropriate actions under certain circumstances.
Ms. Susan Caruso	11/20/2019	Broward Sierra Club	Asked for confirmation of agricultural lands being considered non-point source dischargers, and if it is too expensive to sample each individual landowner. Asked how does SFWMD identify the source of a particular hot spot.	Agricultural lands are non-point source dischargers. Monitoring would be required if an individual agricultural landowner is not implementing BMPs. Monitoring would also be conducted by SFWMD at the basin level and upstream; downstream of multiple land owners and upstream of our basin monitoring stations.
Ms. Susan Caruso	11/20/2019	Broward Sierra Club	Mentioned the uncertainty of identifying the individual source with the District monitoring proposed. Asked if there any government programs that could assist farmers with more effective BMPs.	Additional monitoring in areas of concern would assist in delineating drainage basin areas. FDACS has cost share funding to assist farmers with implementing their BMPs.
Mr. HM Ridgely	11/20/2019	Evans Properties	Inquired about how legacy phosphorus is going to be addressed versus a current discharge. An example was provided for an area with no agricultural lands for several years, but the phosphorus concentrations are increasing.	It is possible that the data considered under the rules may support legacy phosphorus research.
Mr. Yogesh Khare	11/20/2019	Everglades Foundation	Suggested the rule should consider basin load allocations consistent with Lake Okeechobee's TMDL. The assimilative coefficients in the rule are being used as constants.	None needed.

**Chapter 40E-61 FAC Rule Development
Public Comments**

Commenter	Date Comment Received	Agency or Organization Represented	Comment Summary	SFWMD Workshop Response
Summary of Comments Received from SFWMD Rulemaking Workshop (May 19, 2020)				
Ms. Diane Perry	5/19/2020	Earthian Stewardship Corporation Inc.	At what depth are surface water samples collected; primarily concerned with the depth of water samples collected in Lake Okeechobee?	Generally sample collection depth for monitoring surface water bodies in the watershed is 0.5 meters. The Lake's water column is homogeneous and water quality samples are collected at 0.5 meters and at deeper various depths depending on the project's objective. The rule focuses on water quality monitoring of surface water runoff from the watershed while other monitoring programs collect samples in Lake Okeechobee or other receiving water bodies.
Mr. Doug Gaston	5/19/2020	Audobon Florida	In favor of expanding the rule boundary to include the Upper Kissimmee watershed. Inquired about the timeframe for assessment and restoration in correlation with the FDEP BMAP. Asking to specify the timeframe in achieving restoration.	Achieving TMDLs is based on a long-term iterative process through FDEP BMAPs. The BMAPs are reviewed by FDEP every five (5) years and updated as needed.
Mr. Mark Perry	5/19/2020	Florida Oceanographic	Inquired about how the Rule and monitoring are tied into the BMAP, the TMDL criteria, and if there is a timeline for meeting this requirement. Asked if there are consequences or enforcement for individual permittees if water quality standards are not met.	Part II of these draft rules are only applicable for landowners that have chosen not to implement BMP specified under a BMAP. – The timeline for compliance will depend on the landowner's monitoring plan and on the amount of data based on their discharge frequency and quantity. SFWMD will review the permittee's data annually. If a permittee is not meeting water quality standards, SFWMD would notify the appropriate agency. The permittee or landowner would need to implement BMPs under the appropriate agency's rule.

**Chapter 40E-61 FAC Rule Development
Public Comments**

Commenter	Date Comment Received	Agency or Organization Represented	Comment Summary	SFWMD Workshop Response
Mr. Gary Ritter	5/19/2020	Florida Farm Bureau	Asked for clarification on the definition of a non-point source discharger. Inquired about how different landuses will be covered under the rule and the methodology to assess various landuses and non-point source dischargers. Stated our existing monitoring network does not represent all landuses. Appreciates that other agencies are involved and participating in the rule making effort.	The landowner would have to be a non-point source discharger to be regulated under the FDEP or FDACs BMP program. If the landowner chooses to conduct monitoring (under draft Part II of the rules) instead of implementing BMPs, a permit would be issued by SFWMD to approve the monitoring plan. The District monitoring network (under draft Part I of the rules), is a collective representation of an area typically with mixed landuses. Part I of the Rule describes a process for the District to zoom into areas that are greater contributors to nutrient loads to identify enhanced activities that may be needed. SFWMD would consider data from other entities if it met proper collection and quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) protocols. If there is not enough data, we may recommend conducting additional monitoring.
Mr. Yogesh Khare	5/19/2020	Everglades Foundation	Asked for clarification on the definition of priority target restoration areas (PTRAs). Inquired if water quality discharge targets for individual permittees would be consistent with FDEP target levels for the three watersheds: Lake Okeechobee, St. Lucie, and Caloosahatchee. Inquired how concentration target levels would be established for individual permittees.	PTRA is a priority target restoration area. FDEP defines targeted restoration areas for each watershed in the BMAPs. SFWMD will consult with FDEP to prioritize selection of targeted restoration areas to conduct detailed assessments and identify programs or projects needed. The TMDLs established by FDEP in BMAPs are specific to the receiving water body. Individual permittees conducting monitoring would be required to demonstrate that discharges from the permitted lands comply with state water quality standards for pollutants addressed by FDEP. The permit will specify the water quality target that must be achieved, but a permittee may propose an alternate water quality target with technical justification.

**Chapter 40E-61 FAC Rule Development
Public Comments**

Commenter	Date Comment Received	Agency or Organization Represented	Comment Summary	SFWMD Workshop Response
Mr. Richard Budell	5/19/2020	Budell Water Group, LLC	Stated Part 1 of the rule should be part of the Interagency Agreement between SFWMD, FDEP, and FDACs, and should not be considered under rulemaking and recommends reassessing. Commented that the existing water quality monitoring network is not representative of all landuses and that legacy Phosphorus should be accounted for as it is part of the load.	None needed.
Ms. Diane Perry	5/19/2020	Earthian Stewardship Corporation Inc.	Inquired about permits being grandfathered in or if there are any permits exempt from FDEP BMAP. Asked about actionable ways to achieve the TMDL.	No landowners are grandfathered in or are exempt from having a permit under the rules. If not implementing BMPs under the FDACs or FDEP programs, they will be required to obtain a permit from SFWMD and conduct monitoring. SFWMD may take action under Part I of the rules by implementing additional programs/projects or enhancement of restoration projects.
Dr. Paul Gray	5/19/2020	Audobon Florida	Asked if any landowners offered to collect their own monitoring data and how many landowners preferred to be permitted by SFWMD instead of conducting BMPs under FDACs or FDEP's programs.	No landowners have volunteered to conduct monitoring.
Mr. Ernie Barnett	5/19/2020	Florida Land Council	Stated that he agrees with Mr. Budell's comments (provided above). He added that he intends to prepare a letter with written comments on the rule.	None needed.
Ms. Becky Harris	5/19/2020	Private Citizen	Inquired about how the landowner not implementing BMPs under FDEP or FDACs program would be identified/notified. Added that it seems our permitting and rule is a voluntary process. Inquired about the existing monitoring network and how it can be utilized to define hot spots, move upstream, and address the problems.	SFWMD is working with coordinating agencies to determine which landowners are not implementing BMPs under the FDACs or FDEP programs. Monitoring is conducted by SFWMD at the basin level and upstream, and this data is being utilized to identify areas with problems upstream.
Mr. Gary Ritter	5/19/2020	Florida Farm Bureau	Agrees with other commenters in stating Part 1 of the rule should be an Interagency Agreement between coordinating agencies and legacy Phosphorus is a concern.	None needed.

**Chapter 40E-61 FAC Rule Development
Public Comments**

Commenter	Date Comment Received	Agency or Organization Represented	Comment Summary	SFWMD Workshop Response
Mr. Mark Perry	5/19/2020	Florida Oceanographic	Stated in favor of the preamble in the rule. Also stated again concerns of legacy Phosphorus and how it is going to be addressed, as nutrients continue to enter our waterways and watersheds.	None needed.
Ms. Benita Whalen	5/19/2020	Florida Cattlemen's Association	Commented that 40E-61 should not duplicate other coordinating agencies rules and avoid overlapping. Stated that BMPs are one component of the treatment train for the watershed. Also added that residual phosphorus is throughout the watershed from public lands to private lands.	None needed.
Ms. Nyla Pipes	5/19/2020	One Florida	Concerned with legacy phosphorus and it may not be able to be traced to an ultimate source due to groundwater flow. Also concerned with septic systems around the Lake and their contribution to pollution.	None needed.
Mr. John Cassani	5/19/2020	Calusa Waterkeeper, Inc.	Inquiring about how SFWMD is going to define upstream contributors to the water quality issue.	Monitoring is being conducted at the basin level and upstream, and this data is being utilized to identify upstream contributors collectively.
Comments Received from SFWMD Rulemaking Workshop (May 21, 2020)				
Ms. Diane Goldberg	5/21/2020		Inquired about other contaminants associated with herbicides and if the rule would consider these. Suggested removal of all invasive plants from District-owned and privately-owned lands near the waterways and canals.	SFWMD's monitoring under the rule will focus on nutrients (Phosphorus and Nitrogen). There are other programs offered by FDACs that address pesticides and herbicides.
Ms. Kathy Fitzpatrick	5/21/2020		Inquired about legislation and how it can limit the rule.	House Bill 5003 section 85 (budget bill) clarifies the rulemaking intent and has not been signed by the governor. Specific documents regarding the House Bill and Florida statute can be found on SFWMD's website and as links on the first page of the rule text.

**Chapter 40E-61 FAC Rule Development
Public Comments**

Commenter	Date Comment Received	Agency or Organization Represented	Comment Summary	SFWMD Workshop Response
Ms. Diane Goldberg	5/21/2020		Stated that Nitrogen and Phosphorus are not only an issue on farms, but are also a concern on individual properties. Inquiring if the rule will address fertilizer application, and asked about the monitoring network and what types of properties are monitored.	SFWMD's monitoring under the rule will focus on nutrients (Phosphorus and Nitrogen). There are other programs under other agencies, such as FDACs that address pesticides and herbicides. Many municipalities have implemented ordinances regulating the application of fertilizer, herbicides, and pesticides. SFWMD conducts monitoring at the basin level and upstream (within the watershed and along the borders of the basin). If a landowner is not implementing BMPs under another program, individual monitoring on their property will be required under a permit issued by SFWMD.
Ms. Kathy Fitzpatrick	5/21/2020		Inquired about obtaining the presentation for today's workshop and where she can find more information regarding the rule.	The video of today's presentation and historical presentations can be found on the SFWMD YouTube channel. Information pertaining to the 40E-61 Rule can be found on the SFWMD website at: https://www.sfwmd.gov/doing-business-with-us/rules
Comments Received from SFWMD Rulemaking Workshop (June 3, 2020)				
Ms. Bari Litschauer	6/3/2020	Private Citizen	Inquired about funding availability.	The existing water quality monitoring conducted by SFWMD is funded. If the permittee elects to conduct individual monitoring on their property, it would be their responsibility to fund their monitoring.
Ms. Diane Perry	6/3/2020	Earthian Stewardship Corporation Inc.	Concerned about phosphorus in Lake Okeechobee and asked about mechanical methods to remediate the Lake.	The rule pertains to the watershed runoff and the BMAPS address achieving TMDLs in the Lake and other receiving water bodies.
Mr. Chad Gilis	6/3/2020	Fort Myers News-Press	Asked the percentages of farms implementing BMPs in each of the watersheds (Lake Okeechobee, St. Lucie, and Caloosahatchee).	The agricultural BMP program is governed by FDACs and their website has details regarding the implementation of BMPs in the watersheds.

**Chapter 40E-61 FAC Rule Development
Public Comments**

Commenter	Date Comment Received	Agency or Organization Represented	Comment Summary	SFWMD Workshop Response
Ms. Beth Lewis	6/3/2020	Nature Conservancy	Asked for clarification about SFWMD's role and the action process.	The SFWMD will conduct monitoring and assessments on the priority targeted restoration areas. This data and information would be shared with the appropriate agencies for action as appropriate, e.g. FDACs or FDEP under the BMAP.
Ms. Bari Litschauer	6/3/2020	Private Citizen	Inquired which agency is taking action.	The SFWMD will conduct monitoring and assessments on the priority targeted restoration areas. This data and information would be shared with the appropriate agencies for action as appropriate, e.g. FDACs or FDEP under the BMAP.
Mr. Christopher Duffy	6/3/2020		Concerned that monitoring will be conducted and areas of concern will be identified, but there will be no action taken.	None needed.
Mr. Chad Gillis			Confirmed the nutrient constituents (phosphorus and/or nitrogen) goals for each watershed.	None needed.
Ms. Diane Perry	6/3/2020	Earthian Stewardship Corporation Inc.	Inquired about the rules and sample depth of monitoring conducted by SFWMD and by individual permittees. Also asked how SFWMD will determine what is old and new phosphorus, how will it be treated, and who is responsible for legacy phosphorus research.	Generally, the sample collection depth for monitoring surface water bodies in the watershed is 0.5 meters. SFWMD collects water quality samples in accordance with FDEP guidelines. Monitoring conducted by individual permittees must also follow the FDEP criteria. Legacy phosphorus research associated with the Lake does not pertain to this rule. Research on legacy phosphorus is being conducted by SFWMD under other programs/departments and by other entities such as the University of Florida.
Ms. Dianne Umpierre	6/3/2020	Sierra Club	Suggested adding legacy phosphorus frequently asked questions to the SFWMD website.	None needed.

**Chapter 40E-61 FAC Rule Development
Public Comments**

Commenter	Date Comment Received	Agency or Organization Represented	Comment Summary	SFWMD Workshop Response
Ms. Nyla Pipes	6/3/2020	One Florida	Added that legacy phosphorus is an ongoing concern in our canals, and studies indicate internal and external phosphorus loading due to canals and drainage.	The rule will focus on the monitoring of watershed runoff, and identifying solutions to nutrient loading issues.
Ms. Diane Perry	6/3/2020	Earthian Stewardship Corporation Inc.	Stated that phosphorus is naturally occurring from the land and asked if it is being considered.	All sources for phosphorus contributors are being considered.
Mr. Chad Gillis	6/3/2020		Inquired about where to obtain the presentation provided today.	The video of today's presentation and historical presentations can be found on the SFWMD YouTube channel. Information pertaining to the 40E-61 Rule can be found on the SFWMD website at: https://www.sfwmd.gov/doing-business-with-us/rules
Mr. Gary Ritter	6/3/2020	Florida Farm Bureau	Asked if the public's comment and responses from the workshops are available.	The comments and responses from the Round 1 workshops is available on the SFWMD website at: https://www.sfwmd.gov/doing-business-with-us/rules The comments and responses from the Round 2 workshops will be posted in the near future.

Summary of Comments Received from SFWMD Rulemaking Website, via email, or regular mail (Up through July 3, 2020)

Mr. Gary Goforth	10/8/2019	Florida Oceanographic Society	Comments submitted by email. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A
Mr. Gary Ritter	10/9/2019	Florida Farm Bureau Federation	Comment letter. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A
Mr. Robert Norton	10/18/2019	Ecosystem Watch	Handwritten letter. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A
Mr. R. Vince	11/4/2019	Private Citizen	Comment submitted through rulemaking website. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A
Mr. Robert Norton	11/7/2019	Ecosystem Watch	Handwritten letter. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A
Mr. Robert Norton	11/14/2019	Ecosystem Watch	Handwritten letter. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A
Mr. Robert Norton	11/22/2019	Ecosystem Watch	Handwritten letter. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A
Mr. Michael Ellis	11/27/2019	U.S. Sugar	Comment letter. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A
Mr. Gary Ritter	12/2/2019	Florida Farm Bureau	Comment Letter. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A

**Chapter 40E-61 FAC Rule Development
Public Comments**

Commenter	Date Comment Received	Agency or Organization Represented	Comment Summary	SFWMD Workshop Response
Mr. Gary Goforth	12/9/2019	Florida Oceanographic Society	Comments submitted by email. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A
Mr. Matt Pearce	12/12/2019	Florida Cattleman's Association	Comment letter. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A
Ms. Betsey Boughton	12/13/2019	Archbold Biological Station - Buck Island Ranch	Comments submitted by email. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A
Mr. Doug Gaston	12/19/2019	Audobon Florida	Comment letter. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A
Mr. Robert Norton	1/21/2020	Ecosystem Watch	Handwritten letter. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A
Mr. Robert Norton	1/29/2020	Ecosystem Watch	Handwritten letter. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A
Mr. Robert Norton	2/18/2020	Ecosystem Watch	Handwritten letter. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A
Ms. Becky Harris	5/18/2020	Private Citizen	Comments submitted by email. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A
Mr. Robert Norton	5/25/2020	Ecosystem Watch	Handwritten letter. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A
Ms. Becky Harris	5/30/2020	Private Citizen	Comments submitted by email. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A
Mr. Robert Norton	6/2/2020	Ecosystem Watch	Handwritten letter. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A
Mr. Robert Norton	6/7/2020	Ecosystem Watch	Handwritten letter. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A
Mr. Robert Norton	6/20/2020	Ecosystem Watch	Handwritten letter. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A
Mr. Kerry Kates	6/25/2020	Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association	Comment letter. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A
Mr. Robert Norton	6/25/2020	Ecosystem Watch	Handwritten letter. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A
Mr. Gary Ritter	7/1/2020	Florida Farm Bureau Federation	Comment letter. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A
Mr. Ernie Barnett	7/1/2020	Florida Land Council	Comment letter. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A
Mr. Doug Gaston	7/2/2020	Audubon Florida	Comment letter. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A
Mr. Michael Sparks	7/2/2020	Florida Citrus Mutual	Comment letter. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A

**Chapter 40E-61 FAC Rule Development
Public Comments**

Commenter	Date Comment Received	Agency or Organization Represented	Comment Summary	SFWMD Workshop Response
Mr. Steve Smith	7/2/2020	Gulf Citrus Growers Association	Comment letter. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A
Mr. Todd Swingle	7/2/2020	TOHO Water Authority	Comment letter. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A
Mr. Richard Budell	7/3/2020	Florida Agribusiness Council	Comment letter. Click here to view correspondence.	N/A