AGENDA St. Lucie River Watershed Protection Plan Working Team Meeting #8

Tuesday, June 24, 2008 1330 - 1630

SFWMD Martin/St. Lucie Service Center 780 Southeast Indian Street Stuart, FL 34997 (772) 223-2600

Conference Call Information: Local: 561-682-6700 Toll-Free: 866-433-6299 MEETING ID# 3447

- 1. Introduction and Opening Remarks
- 2. Coordinating Agencies Update
- 3. Project Status and Schedule
- 4. Summary of St. Lucie River Issues Team Projects
- 5. Status of Regional Simulation Modeling
- 6. Management Measures and Alternative Development
- 7. Water Quality Spreadsheet Analysis
- 8. Public Comment Period*
- 9. Closing Remarks and Action Items (Next Meeting Tuesday, July 22, 2008)















sfwmd.gov



St. Lucie River Watershed Protection Plan

Draft Outline - 6/24/2008

- **1.0 Executive Summary:** To be written following completion of the Draft Plan
- **2.0 Introduction:** Final revisions in process
 - 2.1 Background
 - 2.1.1 Historical Conditions
 - 2.1.2 Current Conditions
 - 2.2 Northern Everglades and Estuaries Protection Program
 - 2.2.1 Lake Okeechobee Watershed Protection Plan
 - 2.2.2 St. Lucie River Watershed Protection Plan
 - 2.2.3 Caloosahatchee River Watershed Protection Plan
 - 2.3 Purpose and Scope
 - 2.4 Study Area
 - 2.4.1 St. Lucie River Estuary
 - 2.4.2 St. Lucie River Watershed
 - 2.4.3 South Fork Sub-Watershed
 - 2.4.4 C-44 and S-153 Sub-Watershed
 - 2.4.5 4-5-6 Sub-Watershed
 - 2.4.6 C-23 Sub-Watershed
 - 2.4.7 C-24 Sub-Watershed
 - 2.4.8 North Fork Sub-Watershed
 - 2.4.9 C-25 Sub-Watershed and C-25 East Sub-Watershed
 - 2.4.10 Basin 1 Sub-Watershed
- **3.0 Planning Process:** Final revisions in process
 - 3.1 Ongoing Restoration Efforts and Other Relevant Projects
 - 3.1.1 Federal and State Partnership Efforts
 - 3.1.2 State and Local Efforts
 - 3.1.3 Stormwater Master Programs
 - 3.2 Problems
 - 3.2.1 Ecological Problems in the St. Lucie River Estuary
 - 3.2.2 Potential Causes
 - 3.3 Planning Objectives
 - 3.3.1 St. Lucie River Estuary Salinity Envelope Objective
 - 3.3.2 St. Lucie River Watershed Water Quality Objective
 - 3.4 Planning Constraints
 - 3.4.1 Water Supply and Flood Protection
 - 3.4.2 Minimum Flows and Levels
 - 3.4.3 State Water Quality Standards
 - 3.5 Performance Measures and Indicators

4.0 Interagency Coordination and Public Involvement: Preliminary Draft scheduled for 9/08

- 4.1 Interagency Coordination
- 4.2 Public and Stakeholder Involvement

5.0 Total Maximum Daily Loads: Preliminary Draft scheduled for 8/08

- 5.1 Development of TMDLs for the Watershed
- 5.2 Basin Management Action Plan Coordination
- 5.3 Recommendations

6.0 Watershed Construction Project

- 6.1 **Summary of Management Measures:** Preliminary Draft undergoing Working Team review
 - 6.1.1 Management Measures Toolbox
 - 6.1.2 Types of Management Measures
 - 6.1.2.1 Watershed Water Quality Projects
 - 6.1.2.1.1 Source Control
 - 6.1.2.1.2 Stormwater Treatment Areas
 - 6.1.2.1.3 Chemical Treatment
 - 6.1.2.1.4 Hybrid Wetland Treatment Technology
 - 6.1.2.1.5 Alternative Treatment
 - 6.1.2.2 Estuary Water Quality Projects
 - 6.1.2.2.1 Muck Sediment Removal
 - 6.1.2.2.2 Oyster Habitat Creation
 - 6.1.2.3 Water Quantity/Storage
 - 6.1.2.3.1 Reservoirs
 - 6.1.2.3.2 Aquifer Storage and Recovery
 - 6.1.2.3.3 Alternative Water Storage Facilities
 - 6.1.2.4 Water Disposal
 - 6.1.2.5 Land Management and Restoration
 - 6.1.2.5.1 Wetland Restoration
 - 6.1.2.5.2 Land Conservation
 - 6.1.2.5.3 Integrated Growth Management and Restoration

6.2 Water Quantity Analysis Method and Base Condition Characterization:

Preliminary Draft completed and is scheduled for working team review by June 27, 2008

- 6.2.1 Analysis Method
 - 6.2.1.1 Northern Everglades Regional Simulation Model
 - (NERSM)
 - 6.2.1.1.1 Model Setup
 - 6.2.1.1.2 Conceptualization
 - 6.2.1.1.3 Boundary Conditions
 - 6.2.1.1.4 NERSM Model Scenarios

- 6.2.1.2 Long Term Salinity Model
- 6.2.1.3 Oyster Model
- 6.2.2 Water Quantity Base Conditions Characterization
 - 6.2.2.1 High Discharge Criteria
 - 6.2.2.2 Salinity Envelope
 - 6.2.2.3 Supplemental Irrigation Requirements
- 6.2.3 Water Quantity Conclusions

6.3 Water Quality Analysis Method and Base Condition Characterization:

Preliminary Draft completed and is scheduled for working team review by June 27, 2008

- 6.3.1 Water Quality Spreadsheet
 - 6.3.1.1 Current Base Condition
 - 6.3.1.2 River Watershed Base Condition
 - 6.3.1.3 Alternative Condition
- 6.3.2 SLR Watershed Water Quality Current Base Condition Characterization
 - 6.3.2.1 SLR Watershed Water Quality Profile
 - 6.3.2.2 Sub-Watershed Water Quality Profiles
 - 6.3.2.3 Benefits from Base Projects
 - 6.3.2.4 Comparison of Flows and Loads from Sub-watersheds
- 6.3.3 Water Quality Conclusions
- 6.4 **Formulation of Alternatives:** Writing of Preliminary Draft in process and anticipated in July
- 6.5 Alternative Plan Evaluation and Comparison: Preliminary Draft scheduled for July
- 6.6 Planned Projects and Actions: Preliminary Draft scheduled for August
 - 6.6.1 Summary
 - 6.6.2 Plan Features
 - 6.6.3 Real Estate
 - 6.6.4 Operations & Maintenance
 - 6.6.5 Monitoring
 - 6.6.6 Permitting
 - 6.6.7 Implementation
 - 6.6.8 Preliminary Cost Estimates
 - 6.6.9 Funding Opportunities

7.0 Watershed Pollutant Control Program: Preliminary draft scheduled for July

- 7.1 Non-Point Source BMPs
 - 7.1.1 Innovative Technologies
- 7.2 Compliance with Water Quality Standards, TMDLs, BMPs
- 7.3 Public-Private Partnerships

7.4 Current Practices

7.5 St. Lucie River Wastewater Residuals

7.6 St. Lucie River Watershed Septage

7.7 St. Lucie River Watershed Animal Manure Rule

- **8.0 Watershed Research and Water Quality Monitoring Program:** Sections 8.1 through 8.3 have been drafted and District internal review in progress; Schedule for remaining sections under development (NOTE Entire R&WQ Section may be included as an Appendix and summarized in Chapter 8.0 of the Final Plan)
 - 8.1 Introduction
 - 8.1.1 Description of Enabling Legislation
 - 8.1.2 Document Structure
 - 8.2 Goals and Objectives of Monitoring and Research
 - 8.3 The River and Its Watershed: Status, Trends and Targets in Hydrology, Water Quality and Aquatic Habitat
 - 8.3.1 Delineation of Study Area
 - 8.3.2 Watershed Hydrology and Loading
 - 8.3.3 River/Estuary Salinity, Water Quality and the Related Aquatic Habitats
 - 8.3.4 Salinity Envelopes and Freshwater Inflow Targets
 - 8.3.5 Influence of Lake Okeechobee and Watershed Discharge on Freshwater Inflow to Estuaries
 - 8.4 Monitoring on a Regional Scale
 - 8.4.1 Definition of Regional Scale Monitoring
 - 8.4.2 Nutrient Loading and Water Quality Monitoring Program
 - 8.4.3 Freshwater Inflows Monitoring Program
 - 8.4.4 Aquatic Habitat Monitoring Program
 - 8.4.5 Power Analysis
 - 8.5 Monitoring on the Project Scale
 - 8.5.1 Definition of Project Level Monitoring
 - 8.5.2 Projects Considered in the Plan (these are examples at this point)
 - 8.5.3 Monitoring for Load Reduction-removal efficiency, permit requirements
 - 8.6 Research for Adaptive Management
 - 8.6.1 Purpose of Research
 - 8.6.2 Status of Current Research Related to Water Quality
 - 8.6.3 Status of Current Assessment Tools
 - 8.7 Recommendations
 - 8.7.1 Recommendations
 - 8.7.2 Plan Implementation

9.0 Recommended Projects and Actions: Preliminary draft scheduled for August

- 9.1 Watershed Construction Project
- 9.2 Watershed Pollutant Control Program
- 9.3 Watershed Research and Water Quality Monitoring Program
- 9.4 Plan Refinement and Revision







St. Lucie River Issues Team

Issue Team formed by South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Working Group, 1998

Develop an Interim Action Plan to accelerate improving water & habitat quality in SLE







St. Lucie River Issues Team Membership*

*the voting members represent 17 different organizations

- > Indian River Citrus League
- Martin County
- Florida Department of Environmental Protection
- US Environmental Protection Agency
- > St. Lucie River Initiative
- > US Geological Services
- Florida Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission
- **US Army Corps of Engineers**
- National Marine Fisheries Services

- Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services
- South Florida Water Management District
- Florida Marine Research Institute
- Rivers Coalition
- > US Fish and Wildlife Service
- Natural Resources Conservation Service
- University of Florida IFAS
- > St. Lucie County









south florida water management district St. Lucie Issues Team Projects

Other Projects Past & Present

Mobile Irrigation Labs (Martin & St. Lucie Co.) Decommissioning of Florida Wells Florida Yards & Neighborhoods Programs Research of Agricultural BMP's



St. Lucie River Issues Team

- 111 individual projects funded to date
- Total project dollars to date: \$126 Million
 - \$61 million State Allocations
 - \$ 2 million Federal Funding
 - ★\$63+ million Local Match Dollars

SOUTH FLORIDA WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

FY Funding Process

- RFP went out May 1, 2008
- Deadline for Submittals August 22, 2008
- Presentations, September 19, 2008
- Ranked List October 2008
- Expected Award Date, July 1, 2009







Update on Hydrologic Modeling For St. Lucie River Watershed Protection Plan

(by Larry Brion, HESM, SFWMD)



Presentation Outline

- Modeling Assumptions
- Performance Measures
- Performance Indicators
- Modeling Results:
 - LOWCP P2TP Current Base
 - RWPP Base Run
 - RWPP Alternative 1



Modeling Assumptions

- The link-node version of the Regional Simulation Model (RSM) is the regional tool used to evaluate alternatives for St. Lucie River Watershed Protection Plan (SLRWPP)
- NERSM = specific implementation of RSM covering the northern extent of the District down to Lake Okeechobee
- Current Base:
 - Represents conditions as they exist in the Northern Everglades Watershed in 2005.
 - Assumes no projects as defined by the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan (CERP).
 - Period of record: 1970 to 2005.
 - Lake Okeechobee flood control releases to estuary and Water Conservation Areas are based on the existing WSE regulation schedule.
 - Same as LOWCP P2TP current base scenario.



Modeling Assumptions (con't)

- SLRWPP Base Run:
 - Represents conditions likely to exist in Northern Everglades Watershed after implementation of Acceler8, Lower & Upper Kissimmee water resources projects such as:
 - C-44 reservoir and STA
 - C-43 reservoir
 - EAA Phase A-1 Reservoir
 - Kissimmee River Restoration Project and the Kissimmee River Headwaters Revitalization Project
 - Other projects south of Lake Okeechobee such as authorized MODWATERs and C-111 projects



Modeling Assumptions (con't)

- SLRWPP Base Run (con't):
 - Represents future base conditions plus implementation of projects described in the Lake Okeechobee Watershed Construction Project Phase II Technical Plan
 - C-44 reservoir & STA operating with 50.25 kaf of effective storage; 9,700 acres; 1,060/1,060 cfs inflow/outflow capacity
 - C-43 reservoir used solely to meet EST05 targets in the Caloosahatchee estuary as in the C43 reservoir Phase I PIR
 - Based on the LOWCP P2TP ALT4 with refinements in the simulation of the St. Lucie River watershed
 - Additional level of detail in conceptualizing the St. Lucie River sub-watershed into component basins
 - Fewer boundary conditions driving the model, e.g. backflows from C-44 basin are now simulated relative to water level fluctuations in Lake Okeechobee



Modeling Assumptions (con't)

- SLRWPP Base Run (con't):
 - Based on the LOWCP P2TP ALT4 with refinements in the simulation of the St. Lucie River watershed
 - Addition of Ten-mile Creek Reservoir and STA:
 - » Reservoir/STA footprints: 620 /132 Acres
 - » Reservoir/STA operating depths: 10 / 2 ft
 - Update of C-44 reservoir and STA
 - » Reservoir/STA footprints: 3,400 / 6,300 Acres
 - » Reservoir/STA operating depths: 12 / 1.5 ft
 - Lake Okeechobee is not used in making environmental deliveries to the St. Lucie Estuary.



Modeling Assumptions (con't)

- SLRWPP Alternative 1:
 - SLRWPP Base Run plus CRWPP Alt1 management measures and components of the Indian River Lagoon-South Recommended Plan
 - Combined C-23/C-24 Reservoir:
 - » Reservoir footprint: 6,940 Acres
 - » Reservoir operating depth: ~ 13 ft
 - C-23/C-24 Stormwater Treatment Area (STA)
 - » STA footprints: 2,568 Acres
 - » STA operating depths: 1.5 ft
 - Natural Floodplain Restoration and creation of natural storage and water quality areas.



Management Measures in Alternative 1

IRL-South Recommended Plan

C-44 Basin Components

- 1 C-44 Reservoir
- 2 C-44 Stormwater Treatment Area(East)
- 3 C-44 Stormwater Treatment Area (West)
- 4 Palmar Complex Natural Storage and Water Quality Area

C-23/24 Basin Components

- 5 C-23/C-24 North Reservoir
- 6 C-23/C-24 South Reservoir
- 7 C-23/C-24 Stormwater Treatment Area
- 8 Allapattah Complex Natural Storage and Water Quality Area
- 9 Cypress Creek/Trail Ridge Complex Natural Storage and Water Quality Area 🥣

C-25, Northfork and Southfork Basin Components

- 10 C-25 Reservoir 🗙
- 11 C-25 Stormwater Treatment Area 🗙
- 12 Northfork Natural Floodplain Restoration
- 13 Muck Remediation and Artificial Habitat 🗙



Natural Storage and Water Quality Area

- Reservoir
- 3 Stormwater Treatment Area

Included in RSM as Runoff Reduction

X Excluded in RSM

sfwmd.gov



Performance Measures Specific to SLRWPP

- An objective of the St. Lucie River Watershed Protection Plan is to reduce frequency and duration of harmful freshwater releases into the St. Lucie Estuary.
 - Number of Times St. Lucie Estuary High Discharge Criteria Exceeded (mean monthly flows > 2000 & 3000 cfs from 1970 – 2005)
 - Goal is to reduce the frequency of damaging discharges
 - > 2,000 cfs causes stress to the ecosystem and > 3,000 cfs causes severe damage
 - Targets of no more than twenty-one (21) occurrences between 2,000 and 3,000 cfs and six (6) occurrences over 3,000 cfs are used.
 - Number of Times Salinity Envelope Criteria NOT met for the St. Lucie Estuary
 - Goal is to have salinity concentrations that are conducive to estuary ecologic health by maintaining inflows to the estuary. Specifically, "the goal is to avoid mean monthly flows less than 350 cfs and 14-day rolling average discharges from exceeding 2,000 cfs."



Performance Indicators

- Maintain other water-related needs for the other parts of the system; provides a way to evaluate water supply impacts of different alternatives.
 - Lake Okeechobee performance measures as used in LOWCP P2TP
 - Mean annual EAA/LOSA supplementation irrigation (4-in-1)
 - LOSA demand cutback volumes for 7 water years in the simulation period with the largest cutbacks



Modeling Domain





Node-Link Representation of the St. Lucie Sub-watershed in the NERSM for SLRWPP Base



Node-Link Representation of the St. Lucie Sub-watershed in the NERSM for SLRWPP Alternative 1



Modeling Results

- Comparison of LOWCP P2TP Current Base Scenario {CBASE}, RWPP Base Run {RWPPB} and RWPP Alternative1 {ALT1} using performance measures and indicators
- Additional alternative scenarios will be compared against CBASE and RWPPB incrementally as they become available



Recap: Scenario Comparison Using Performance Measures and Indicators

- goal is to re-establish salinity regimes suitable for the maintenance of healthy, naturally-diverse and wellbalanced estuarine ecosystems while meeting the other water related needs of the region including water supply.
 - Number of times SLE Estuary High Q Criteria Exceeded
 - Number of times salinity envelope criteria NOT met for SLE estuary
 - Water year (Oct-Sep) LOSA demand cutback volumes (7worst years)
 - Mean annual EAA/LOSA supplemental Irrigation: demands and demands-not-met (4-in-1 ws indicator)



Estuary-Specific Performance Measures

Number of Times St. Lucie High Discharge Criteria Exceeded (mean monthly flows > 2000 cfs from 1970 - 2005)



Note: A favorable maximum monthly flow was developed for the estuary (2000 cfs) that will theoretically provide suitable salinity conditions which promote the development of important benthic communities (eg. oysters & shoalgrass). Mean monthly flows above 3000 cfs result in freshwater conditions Filename: stluc_2000_flow_bar.out.agr

sfwmd.gov



Estuary-Specific Performance Measures

Number of Times Salinity Envelope Criteria NOT Met for the St. Lucie Estuary (mean monthly flows 1970 - 2005)



sfwmd.gov

Estuary-Specific Performance Measures

 Breakdown of Flows to Estuary By Source (Number of months out of 432 total months of simulation for 1970-2005 period of record)

	CBASE	RWPPB	ALT1	Operational Target (OPTI-6)
Basins bet. 2000 & 3000 cfs	25	22	17	17
Add'l LOK bet. 2000 & 3000 cfs	1	2	0	N/A
Add'I (Basins + LOK) bet. 2000 & 3000 cfs	11	8	8	N/A
Total bet. 2000 & 3000 cfs	37	32	25	17
	CBASE	RWPPB	ALT1	Operational Target (OPTI-6)
Basins > 3000 cfs	13	12	7	5
Add'l LOK > 3000 cfs	1	0	0	N/A
Add'l (Basins + LOK) > 3000 cfs	14	8	9	N/A
Total > 3000 cfs	28	20	16	5
	CBASE	RWPPB	ALT1	Operational Target (OPTI-6)
Tot. Flow <350 cfs	134	140	171	196

sfwmd.gov

Performance Indicators (Lake Okeechobee)



sfwmd.gov



Performance Indicators (Lake Okeechobee)

Number of Times LOK Proposed Minimum Water Level & Duration Criteria were Exceeded During the 1970-2005 Simulation



below 11ft NGVD for greater than 80 days more often than once every six years (Target derived from For Planning Purposes Only 1952-1995 historical stage data for Lake Okeechobee).

Script used: lok_stage_events.scr ID4506/24/08 Filename: lok minlvl bar.ag



Performance Indicators (Water Supply)

Water Year (Oct-Sep) LOSA Demand Cutback Volumes

350 CURRENT BASE RWPPB ALT1 315 28 280 Cutback Vol (1000 acft) 245 210 17.7% 175 12.4% 140 0.9% 105 Ö 70 6.1% 3.4% %0 2% % 35 . mi 1% 8 0.4% 0.4% 0.3% 0.4% 0.2% ò 0 1973 1974 1981 1982 1990 1991 2001 For Planning Purposes Only Ending Water Year Script used: losa_cutback_yrs.scr V370 Filename: losa cutback vrs bar.agr

sfwmd.gov

6/24/08

for the 7 Years in Simulation Period with Largest Cutbacks

Performance Indicators (Water Supply)

Mean Annual EAA/LOSA Supplemental Irrigation: Demands & Demands Not Met for 1970 - 2005



Other LOSA Areas: S236, S4, L8, C43, C44, North & Northeast Lakeshore, & Lower Istokpoga

For Planning Purposes Only Script used: ssm_4in1.scr, ID327 Filename: losa_dmd_4in1.agr



sfwmd.gov 22

Future Modeling Using NERSM

- Incorporation of SLRWPP-specific Alternative 2 management measures
- Integration with Alternative 2 management measures for the Caloosahatchee River Watershed Protection Plan (CRWPP)
- Continued alternative formulation, simulation and evaluation



- Website: <u>www.sfwmd.gov/northerneverglades</u>
- Questions?



Alternative 1 DRAFT													
MM#	Sub-Watershed	Project Feature/Activity	Level	Alternative	TP (mt/yr)	TN (mt/yr)							
LO 14	C-44	CERP - IRL South: C-44 Reservoir/STA	В	0	26.1	85.01							
LO 66	Outside of SLE Watershed	L-8 Reservoir Phase I	В	0	n/a	n/a							
LO 101	Outside of SLE Watershed	ECP Diversions	В	0	n/a	n/a							
LO 102	Outside of SLE Watershed	EAA Reservoir	В	0	n/a	n/a							
SLE 45	North Fork	10 Mile Creek - Reservoir and STA	В	0	4.45	18.5							
LO 1	SLE Watershed	Agricultural BMPs - Owner Implemented , Funded Cost Share, and Cost Share Future Funding (Combined LO 1, 2, and 49	1	1	Roll-up	Roll-up							
LO 3	SLE Watershed	Urban Turf Fertilizer Rule (LOER)	1	1	Roll-up	Roll-up							
LO 4	SLE Watershed	Land Application of Residuals	1	1	Roll-up	Roll-up							
LO 5	SLE Watershed	Florida Yards and Neighborhoods	1	1	Roll-up	Roll-up							
LO 7	SLE Watershed	ERP Regulatory Program	1	1	Roll-up	Roll-up							
	SLE Watershed	NPDES Stormwater Program	1	1	Roll-up	Roll-up							
10.12	SLE Watershed	Coastal and Estuarine Land Conservation Program	1	1	Roll-up	Roll-up							
		Recovery	-	1	n/a	n/a							
LO 12f		AWS - Indiantown Citrus Growers Association	1	1	n/a	n/a							
LU 12j		AVVO - Dupuis	4	1	n/a	n/a							
		AWS - Waste Management St. Lucie Site	4	1	n/a	n/a							
LO 124	SLE Watershed	St. Lucie River Watershed Works of the District Rule Regulatory	2	1	Roll-up	Roll-up							
1 0 21	SLE Watershed	LO and Estuary Watershed Basin Rule (LOER)	3	1	Roll-up	Roll-up							
LO 50	SLE Watershed	Agricultural BMPs - Additional Agricultural BMPs	1	1	Roll-up	Roll-up							
LO 63	SLE Watershed	Wastewater and Stormwater Master Plans	4	1	Roll-up	Roll-up							
LO 64	SLE Watershed	Unified Statewide Stormwater Rule	4	1	Roll-up	Roll-up							
LO 68	SLE Watershed	Comprehensive Planning-Land Development Regulations	3	1	Roll-up	Roll-up							
LO 87 Revised		Florida Ranchlands Environmental Services Project- existing, future, and full implementation		1	n/a	n/a							
LO 87a_1	C-25	Alderman-Deloney Ranch (C-25 basin)	1	1	n/a	n/a							
LO 87c	SLE Watershed	Florida Ranchlands Environmental Services Project- full implementation	5	1	n/a	n/a							
SLE 02	North Fork	White City Drainage Improvements (canals B, C,D, E, F, G) SLE2a and 2b	2	1	u	u							
SLE 03	North Fork	White City Drainage Improvements (Citrus/Saeger)	1	1	0.01	0.03							
SLE 06	North Fork	Indian River Estates/Savannas Ecosystem Management Project	1	1	0.76	0.83							
SLE 07	North Fork	Platt's Creek Wetland Restoration	1	1	0.03	0.11							
SLE 09	0.44.0 # 5 1	Natural Lands in CERP IRL-South Project		1	n/a	n/a							
SLE 09a	C-44, South Fork	CERP - IRL South: PalMar Complex - Natural Storage and Water Quality Area	1	1	3.43	13.39							
SLE 09b	C-23	CERP - IRL South: Allapattah Complex - Natural Storage and Water Quality Area	1	1	8.47	32.73							
SLE 09c	C-23	CERP - IRL South: Cypress Creek/Trail Ridge Complex - Natural Storage and Water Quality Area	2	1	6.49	25.29							
SLE 11	Estuary	Creation of suitable oyster substrate in the St. Lucie Estuary at Various sites identified in IRL-South PIR (Artificial Habitat Creation)	1	1	n/a	n/a							
SLE 16	C-23/C-24	Improved management of sludge disposal in St. Lucie County through the use of an innovative technology (Plasma-Arc)	1	1	n/a	n/a							
SLE 22	North Fork	North River Shores Vacuum Sewer System	1	1	2.18	8.57							
SLE 24	C-23, C-24, North Fork	CERP - IRL South: C-23/24 Reservoir/STA	1	1	24	104.2							
SLE 26	North Fork	CERP - IRL South: Northfork Natural Floodplain Restoration	2	1	0.57	2.23							
SLE 27	Estuary	CERP - IRL South: Muck Remediation	3	1	n/a	n/a							
SLE 28	South Fork	I ropical Farms Roebuck Creek Stormwater Quality Retrofit	1	1	0.04	0.21							
SLE 29	4, 5, & 6	UID Palm City Phase III Stormwater Quality Retrofit	1	1	0.03	0.07							
SLE 30	South Fork	Ivianalee Pocket Dredging Project	1	1	n/a Roll-up	n/a Roll-up							
SI F 40	C-23 C-44	CERP – IRL South: Southern Diversion C-23 to C-44 interconnect	1	1	n/a	n/a							
SLE 42	North Fork	Jensen Beach Retrofit	1	1	0.01	0.03							
SLE 43	North Fork	Leilani Hts/ Warner Creek Retrofit - Phase 1, 2 & 3	1	1	0.16	0.41							
SLE 44	South Fork	Manatee Creek Water Quality Retrofit; PhII & PhIII; New Monrovia, Dixie Park	1	1	0.08	0.2							
SLE 52	North Fork	E-8 Canal Storm Water Retrofit	1	1	u	u							
SLE 53	South Fork	Frazier Creek Water Quality	1	1	0	0.02							
SLE 54	South Fork	Haney Creek Wetland Restoration	1	1	u	u							
SLE 55	South Fork	Poppleton Creek	1	1	0.09	0.16							

St. Lucie River Watershed Protection Plan

Roll-up - benefit included in BMP reductions

St. Lucie River Watershed Protection Plan

Alternative 2 - Water Storage													
	DRAFT												
MM#	Sub-Watershed	Project Feature/Activity	Level	Alternative	TP (mt/yr)	TN							
						(mt/yr)							
No Specific Water Storage Features are sited within the St. Lucie Watershed for Alternative													

Alternative 3 - Water Quality														
MM#	Sub-Watershed	Project Feature/Activity	Level	Alternative	TP (mt/yr)	TN (mt/yr)								
SLE 13	SLE Watershed	On-site Sewage Treatment and Disposal System (OSTDS) inspection and pump-out program	4	3	u	u								
SLE 18	TBD	Additional Reservoir Storage and WQ Treatment Areas	-											
SLE 18b	C-24	C-23/C-24 Water Quality Treatment Project	5	3	30	100								
SLE 19	SLE Watershed	Conversion of existing canals into "linear wetland treatment areas"	4	3	u	u								
SLE 31		Stormwater Baffle Box Retrofit - City of Stuart	1	3	u	u								
SLE 32	4, 5, & 6	Danforth Creek Stormwater Quality Retrofit	3	3	0.01	0.03								
SLE 33	North Fork	North St. Lucie River Water Control District Stormwater Retrofit; Structures 81-1-2 and 85-1-2	1	3	u	u								
SLE 35	4, 5, & 6	All American Boulevard Ditch Retrofit	3	3	0.08	0.2								
SLE 41	South Fork, 4-5-6, North Fork	Martin County Baffle Boxes	4	3	u	u								
SLE 46	SLE Watershed	Small Acreage Manure Management	3	3	u	u								
SLE 48	Estuary	Danforth Creek Muck Removal Dredging project	2	3	n/a	n/a								
SLE 49	Estuary	Warner Creek Muck Removal Dredging Project	2	3	n/a	n/a								
SLE 50	Estuary	Hidden River Muck Removal Dredging Project	2	3	n/a	n/a								

TABLE TP Summary of Estimated Total Phosphorus Load Reductions to the St. Lucie Estuary Working DRAFT

		(3) Cu	irrent Base C	ondition		4) River Wate	ershed Bas	e Condition	1	(5) Alternative 1											
(1) Subwatarshad	(2) Area	(3a) Average	(3b) Average Annual TP Load (1995) 2005) (Mtons)	(3c) Average	(4a)	(4b) Romain	(4c) Romain	(4d) Adjusted	(4e) Base Brojosts	(5a Owner Imp BMF	a) plemented Ps**	(5) Cost-Shar	b) e BMPs***	(50 Local Pi	c) rojects	(5 Regional	d) I Projects) Summary o	5e) f Alternative	: 1
(1) Subwatershed	(acres)	Discharge (1995-2005) (Acre-ft)		6 Conc. (Calculated) (ppb)	Load Red. (Mtons)	Discharge (acre-ft)	Conc. (ppb)	Remain. Load* (Mtons)	Load Reduction (%)	Load Red. (Mtons)	Remain. Load (Mtons)	Load Red. (Mtons)	Remain. Load (Mtons)	Load Red. (Mtons)	Remain. Load (Mtons)	Load Red. (Mtons)	Remain. Load (Mtons)	Load Red. (Mtons)	Remain. Conc (ppb)	Adjusted Remain. Load* (Mtons)	Alt 1 Load Reduction (%)
Basins 4 5 6	15,055	23,620	6.38	218.96	0.00	23,620	218.96	6.38	0%	0.40	5.98	0.46	5.52	0.03	5.49	0.00	5.49	0.89	188.30	5.49	14%
C-23	112,675	152,789	90.57	480.55	0.00	152,789	480.55	90.57	0%	6.88	83.69	10.17	73.52	0.00	73.52	38.96	34.56	56.01	183.36	34.56	62%
C-24	87,706	178,853	75.73	343.25	0.00	178,853	343.25	75.73	0%	6.41	69.32	9.14	60.17	0.00	60.17	0.00	60.17	15.55	272.75	60.17	21%
C-44&S-153	129,719	158,194	39.69	203.38	26.10	158,194	81.00	15.81	60%	2.41	13.40	3.48	9.92	0.00	9.92	2.71	7.21	8.60	81.00	15.81	0%
North Fork	119,168	126,152	43.26	278.00	4.45	126,152	249.40	38.81	10%	1.82	36.99	2.05	34.95	3.15	31.80	0.57	31.23	7.58	200.68	31.23	20%
South Fork	49,965	59,408	20.90	285.16	0.00	59,408	285.16	20.90	0%	1.91	18.99	2.28	16.70	0.21	16.49	0.00	16.49	4.40	225.06	16.49	21%
Lake Okeechobee	-	414,754	96.25	188.14	67.39	170,805	136.96	28.86	70%	0.00	28.86	0.00	28.86	0.00	28.86	0.00	28.86	0.00	136.96	28.86	0%
Total	514,287	1,113,771	372.76	271.33	97.95	869,821	256.14	277.04	26%	19.82	257.22	27.59	229.63	3.39	226.24	42.24	184.00	93.04	171.49	192.60	30%

					(6) Alterna	tive 2				(7) Alternative 3									
	Alt 1 Adjusted	(6 Local P	(6a) Local Proiects		(6b) Regional Projects		(6c) Summary of Alternative 2				a) roiects	(7t Regional) Projects	(7c) Summary of Alternative 3					
(1) Subwatershed	Remain. Load* (Mtons)	Load Red. (Mtons)	Remain. Load (Mtons)	Load Red. (Mtons)	Remain. Load (Mtons)	Load Red. (Mtons)	Remain. Conc (ppb)	Adjusted Remain. Load* (Mtons)	Alt 2 Load Reduction (%)	Load Red. (Mtons)	Remain. Load (Mtons)	Load Red. (Mtons)	Remain. Load (Mtons)	Load Red. (Mtons)	Remain. Conc (ppb)	Adjusted Remain. Load* (Mtons)	Alt 3 Load Reduction (%)		
Basins 4 5 6	5.49	0.00	5.49	0.00	5.49	0.00	188.30	5.49	0%	0.09	5.40	0.00	5.40	0.09	185.21	5.40	2%		
C-23	34.56	0.00	34.56	0.00	34.56	0.00	183.36	34.56	0%	0.00	34.56	0.00	34.56	0.00	183.36	34.56	0%		
C-24	60.17	0.00	60.17	0.00	60.17	0.00	272.75	60.17	0%	0.00	60.17	30.00	30.17	30.00	136.76	30.17	50%		
C-44&S-153	15.81	0.00	15.81	0.00	15.81	0.00	81.00	15.81	0%	0.00	15.81	0.00	15.81	0.00	81.00	15.81	0%		
North Fork	31.23	0.00	31.23	0.00	31.23	0.00	200.68	31.23	0%	0.00	31.23	0.00	31.23	0.00	200.68	31.23	0%		
South Fork	16.49	0.00	16.49	0.00	16.49	0.00	225.06	16.49	0%	0.00	16.49	0.00	16.49	0.00	225.06	16.49	0%		
Lake Okeechobee	28.86	0.00	28.86	0.00	28.86	0.00	136.96	28.86	0%	0.00	28.86	0.00	28.86	0.00	136.96	28.86	0%		
Total	192.60	0.00	192.60	0.00	192.60	0.00	179.51	192.60	0%	0.09	192.51	30.00	162.51	30.09	151.46	162.51	16%		

* When reductions were projected to results in concentrations less than 81 ppb, the remaining load was estimated by mulitplying the basin flow by 81 ppb.

** Owner implemented BMPs reduction is adjusted by (1) urban pervious area percentage and (2) the percentage of the BMPs has already been achieved in citrus (80%), ornamentals/nursery (50%), and row crops (30%). *** Cost-share reduction is adjusted by (1) the percentage of urban area in 1988 to current and (2) the percentage of the BMPs has already been achieved in citrus (80%), ornamentals/nursery (50%), and row crops (30%).

TABLE TN Summary of Estimated Total Nitrogen Load Reductions to the St. Lucie Estuary Working DRAFT

		(3) Cu	rrent Base C	ondition		4) River Wat	ershed Bas	e Conditior							(5) Alte	ernative 1					
(1) Subwatarahad	(2) Area	(3a) Average	(3b) Average	(3c) Average	(4a)	(4b) Romain	(4c) Romain	(4d) Adjusted	(4e) Base	(5 Owner Im BM	a) plemented Ps**	(5b Cost-Share	o) e BMPs***	(5 Local P	c) Projects	(5) Regional	d) Projects		(Summary o	5e) f Alternative	91
(1) Subwatershed (acr	(acres)	Discharge (1995-2005 (Acre-ft)	Load (1995) 2005) (Mtons)	Conc. (Calculated) (ppm)	Load Red. (Mtons)	Discharge (acre-ft)	Conc. (ppm)	Remain. Load* (Mtons)	Load Reduction (%)	Load Red. (Mtons)	Remain. Load (Mtons)	Alt 1 Load Reduction (Mtons)	Remain. Conc. (ppm)	Adjusted Remain. Load* (Mtons)	Alt 1 Load Reduction (%)						
Basins 4 5 6	15,055	23,620	34.43	1.18	0.00	23,620	1.18	34.43	0%	4.03	30.40	4.71	25.69	0.07	25.62	0.00	25.62	8.81	0.88	25.62	26%
C-23	112,675	152,789	329.78	1.75	0.00	152,789	1.75	329.78	0%	34.37	295.41	24.68	270.73	0.00	270.73	162.22	108.51	221.27	0.72	135.70	59%
C-24	87,706	178,853	355.00	1.61	0.00	178,853	1.61	355.00	0%	43.30	311.70	28.31	283.40	0.00	283.40	0.00	283.40	71.61	1.28	283.40	20%
C-44&S-153	129,719	158,194	300.49	1.54	85.01	158,194	1.10	215.48	28%	22.15	193.33	17.68	175.66	0.00	175.66	10.58	165.08	50.40	0.85	165.08	23%
North Fork	119,168	126,152	185.31	1.19	18.50	126,152	1.07	166.81	10%	19.23	147.58	25.91	121.67	9.98	111.69	2.23	109.46	57.35	0.72	112.04	33%
South Fork	49,965	59,408	91.13	1.24	0.00	59,408	1.24	91.13	0%	11.43	79.70	10.75	68.95	0.57	68.38	0.00	68.38	22.75	0.93	68.38	25%
Lake Okeechobee	-	414,754	922.00	1.80	623.91	170,805	1.41	298.09	68%	0.00	298.09	0.00	298.09	0.00	298.09	0.00	298.09	0.00	1.41	298.09	0%
Total	514,287	1,113,771	2,218.14	1.61	727.42	869,821	-	1,490.72	33%	134.51	1,356.22	112.04	1,244.18	10.62	1,233.56	175.03	1,058.53	432.19	0.99	1,088.30	27%

					(6) Alterna	ative 2				(7) Alternative 3									
	Alt 1 Adjusted	6) Local F	(6a) Local Projects		(6b) Regional Projects		(60 ummary of <i>I</i>	c) Alternative	2	(7a) Local Projects		(7b Regional) Projects	s	(7 Summary of	c) Alternative	3		
(1) Subwatershed	Remain. Load* (Mtons)	Load Red. (Mtons)	Remain. Load (Mtons)	Load Red. (Mtons)	Remain. Load (Mtons)	Alt 1 Load Reduction (Mtons)	Remain. Conc. (ppm)	Adjusted Remain. Load* (Mtons)	Alt 1 Load Reduction (%)	Load Red. (Mtons)	Remain. Load (Mtons)	Load Red. (Mtons)	Remain. Load (Mtons)	Alt 1 Load Reduction (Mtons)	Remain. Conc. (ppm)	Adjusted Remain. Load* (Mtons)	Alt 1 Load Reduction (%)		
Basins 4 5 6	25.62	0.00	25.62	0.00	25.62	0.00	0.88	25.62	0%	0.23	25.39	0.00	25.39	0.23	0.87	25.39	1%		
C-23	135.70	0.00	135.70	0.00	135.70	0.00	0.72	135.70	0%	0.00	135.70	0.00	135.70	0.00	0.72	135.70	0%		
C-24	283.40	0.00	283.40	0.00	283.40	0.00	1.28	283.40	0%	0.00	283.40	100.00	183.40	100.00	0.83	183.40	35%		
C-44&S-153	165.08	0.00	165.08	0.00	165.08	0.00	0.85	165.08	0%	0.00	165.08	0.00	165.08	0.00	0.85	165.08	0%		
North Fork	112.04	0.00	112.04	0.00	112.04	0.00	0.72	112.04	0%	0.00	112.04	0.00	112.04	0.00	0.72	112.04	0%		
South Fork	68.38	0.00	68.38	0.00	68.38	0.00	0.93	68.38	0%	0.00	68.38	0.00	68.38	0.00	0.93	68.38	0%		
Lake Okeechobee	298.09	0.00	298.09	0.00	298.09	0.00	1.41	298.09	0%	0.00	298.09	0.00	298.09	0.00	1.41	298.09	0%		
Total	1,088.30	0.00	1088.30	0.00	1088.30	0.00	1.01	1088.30	0%	0.23	1088.07	100.00	988.07	100.23	0.92	988.07	9%		

* When reductions were projected to results in concentrations less than 0.72 ppm, the remaining load was estimated by mulitplying the basin flow by 0.72 ppm. ** Owner implemented BMPs reduction is adjusted by (1) urban pervious area percentage and (2) the percentage of the BMPs have already been achieved in citrus (80%), ornamentals/nursery (50%), and row crops (30%). *** Cost-share reduction is adjusted by (1) the percentage of urban area in 1988 to current and (2) the percentage of the BMPs have already been achieved in citrus (80%), ornamentals/nursery (50%), and row crops (30%).