

**St. Johns River Water Management District's Comments on the Harris Chain of Lakes Restoration Council's Third Draft of the 2008 Legislative Report Sent by Email on October 15, 2008 from Patrick Hunter to Nancy Christman.**

**Harris Chain of Lakes Restoration Council  
Draft 2008 Report to the Florida State Legislature (page ii-iii)**

*“The Council concludes the estimated 25 additional years to complete the restoration of Lake Apopka is not an acceptable target, given the hundreds of millions of dollars that have already been spent on the restoration efforts. Further reduction of phosphorus inputs will not achieve the goal of restoring the once world-renowned fishery at Lake Apopka. The Council concludes that annual expenditures for phosphorus control at Lake Apopka shall rise considerably over the next 25 years and the restoration techniques currently employed are not economically sustainable.”*

**District Response**

The degradation of Lake Apopka occurred over a period of several decades. Restoration should be given a reasonable amount of time for completion. The complete restoration of Lake Apopka depends on the response of a complex ecosystem to adaptive management, and the timing of that response cannot be accurately predicted. The Council missed two important facts. Lake Apopka already has begun to improve due to reduced loading of phosphorus. Second, improvement is not all-or-nothing but is incremental.

The Council is wrong to conclude that annual expenditures for phosphorus control at Lake Apopka will continue to rise and that the restoration techniques are not economically sustainable. The opposite is true. Expenditures for phosphorus control currently are at a maximum and will decline as greater areas of the former farms are flooded. The restoration techniques are sustainable because the major infrastructure investments already have been made or will be made in the next two years. Total costs will decline from that point forward when the only remaining expenses are for operation, monitoring and adaptive management.

**Harris Chain of Lakes Restoration Council  
Draft 2008 Report to the Florida State Legislature (page iii)**

*“The Council supports the efforts of the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) to improve water quality in the Harris Chain of Lakes by implementing the Total Maximum Daily Load program.”*

**District Response**

The Council contradicts themselves with this statement because major components of the Upper Ocklawaha River Basin – TMDL Basin Management Action Plan (UORB-BMAP) are projects they no longer support, according to their report. The UORB-BMAP includes the Lake

Apopka Marsh Flow-Way, gizzard shad harvesting, the Harris Bayou project, and the Lake Apopka North Shore Restoration. These projects contribute to nutrient reductions throughout the basin.

**Harris Chain of Lakes Restoration Council  
Draft 2008 Report to the Florida State Legislature (pages iii and 36)**

*“The Council no longer supports gizzard shad harvest as a possible method for improving water quality in the Harris Chain of Lakes. The Council further believes funding should cease and appropriations be directed to proven technologies or experimental techniques that offer greater promise of restoration.”*

**District Response**

The Council concluded that the current level of gizzard shad harvest was insufficient to affect phosphorus concentrations in the Harris Chain of Lakes and that increasing the gizzard shad harvest would adversely affect populations of black crappie in the lakes (page 35). These conclusions apparently were based on the results of an experimental study of shad harvesting impacts over two years in Lake Dora conducted by the University of Florida /IFAS.

The Council misinterpreted the results from the UF/IFAS study in one lake (Lake Dora) as being representative of rough fish harvesting impacts in all basin lakes. The Executive Summary of the UF/IFAS report on this research included the statement; “We cannot conclude that biomanipulation is not a viable management tool for restoration of Florida lakes, but our study clearly shows that 40% biomass reduction over two years did not significantly influence lake nutrients and zooplankton abundance at Lake Dora.”

District scientists would not have expected such an early water quality response in the Lake Dora study because drought conditions during the study period substantially extended water residence times in Lake Dora so that water quality improvements would be slow to occur. Under those conditions, gizzard shad would need to be removed longer than two years to affect water quality.

Finally, in their conclusion not to support further harvest of gizzard shad, the Council seems not to have considered information presented to them that points to benefits of gizzard shad removal. The Principal Investigator for a Virginia Wesleyan College (VWC) study of impacts of gizzard shad on nutrient cycling in basin lakes presented his work to the Council (page 36). The overview of this presentation stated that the shad biomass harvested from Lake Apopka in a typical year (1-million pounds) would excrete about 7.8 metric tons of phosphorus (nearly equal to the phosphorus loading from the former farms in a typical rainfall year). Other statements in the Council overview were that the mechanisms of excretion, bioturbation and algal resuspension are all important (to the nutrient budget of the lake) and that fish removals can greatly reduce nutrient and phytoplankton concentrations by preventing excretion and

bioturbation. The results of the VWC study showed clearly that the presence of a large population of this fish can have major impacts on nutrient cycling in basin lakes. These findings are consistent with numerous other published studies from European and US lakes.

**Harris Chain of Lakes Restoration Council  
Draft 2008 Report to the Florida State Legislature (page iv and pages 48-50)**

*“The Council can no longer, unconditionally endorse the modified lake level fluctuation schedule previously approved by the St. Johns River Water Management District. Council support can only be provided after the establishment of minimum flows and levels for the Harris Chain of Lakes. The Council also does not support the direct withdrawal of surface water from Lake Apopka until the impacts on the restoration efforts are addressed...”*

**District Response**

On September 9, 2008, in response to a petition to initiate rulemaking filed by the LCWA, the District’s Governing Board directed District staff to include the adoption of minimum levels in the MFL Priority List and Schedule for 2008, which will be considered by the District Governing Board at its November 2008 meeting. The staff’s recommendation is to complete adoption of the rule by 2013. The Governing Board’s September 9, 2008 Final Order explains in detail the interrelationship between the adoption of minimum levels for Lake Apopka and the Harris Chain of Lakes and the District’s ongoing programs to revise the regulation schedules for these lakes and complete restoration of the north shore of Lake Apopka. Additionally, any consumptive use permit applications that seek to withdraw water from Lake Apopka will be evaluated in accordance with the District’s applicable consumptive use permitting rules, including the criterion that a consumptive use must not cause unacceptable harm to the environment, and that a use not cause water levels and flows on any water source to fall below minimum levels and flows adopted by rule.

**Harris Chain of Lakes Restoration Council  
Draft 2008 Report to the Florida State Legislature (page 35)**

*“Additionally, it was determined that increasing the gizzard shad harvesting efforts would adversely affect populations of black crappie (specks), which is one of the major sport fish in the Harris Chain of Lakes”*

**District Response**

Neither growth nor recruitment overfishing of black crappie stocks has been documented to occur in any basin lake and, in fact, recreational fish stocks have improved in other basin lakes where shad have been harvested. In stating that increased harvest of gizzard shad would adversely affect populations of black crappie in the lakes (page 36), the Council may also have misinterpreted the results of the research relative to the black crappie by-catch impacts from shad

harvesting. The UF/IFAS report Executive Summary included the statement; “Black crappie is the primary sport fish targeted by recreational anglers at Lake Dora, and our results show that the population could be negatively impacted by increases in exploitation from either the recreational fishery or by-catch from the commercial gill net fishery for gizzard shad.” The Council report overview of a March 2007 presentation by the Principal Investigator of the UF/IFAS study included the statements; “Recruitment overfishing [of black crappie stocks] in Lake Dora is unlikely based on two years of [shad] harvest data” and “Gill net harvests have had a minimal impact on black crappie populations as compared to impacts by recreational fishing” (page 29).

**Harris Chain of Lakes Restoration Council  
Draft 2008 Report to the Florida State Legislature (page iii)**

*“The Council no longer believes the marsh flow-way can be relied upon as a primary management technique for restoring Lake Apopka or the Harris Chain of Lakes. Furthermore, the Council believes public funding should cease and appropriations be redirected to proven technologies or other experimental techniques that offer greater promise of restoration. Alternatives such as hydraulic dredging need to be implemented.”*

**District Response**

The marsh flow-way at Lake Apopka is not the “primary” management technique to restore Lake Apopka or the Harris Chain of Lakes. The District’s restoration of Lake Apopka depends upon “pollution abatement combined with a cost-effective program for phosphorus removal” (Lowe et al., 1992). Restoration of Lake Apopka includes reducing phosphorus inputs from its watershed. The marsh flow-way is one management technique that will help accelerate removal of phosphorus that is already in Lake Apopka water.

**Harris Chain of Lakes Restoration Council  
Draft 2008 Report to the Florida State Legislature (page iv)**

*“The Council no longer supports the Lake Apopka north shore restoration activities of the St. Johns River Water Management District, unless they are placed in the context of reconnecting the restored wetlands to the lake. The Council recommends to the Legislature that the agreement with Natural Resources Conservation Service (prohibiting reconnection to the lake) be examined to determine if it can be modified, rewritten, or if needs to be voided. The Council now strongly believes the approaches currently being used by the St. Johns River Water Management District are not adequate to restore Lake Apopka in a timely manner and alternative approaches need to be developed.”*

**District Response**

Restoration of the former farms on the north shore of Lake Apopka is key to restoration of the Lake because that area was the source of excess nutrient loading in stormwater runoff for fifty years. To date, the District has safely converted around 3,500 acres of former farmland to

wetlands. We soon expect approval to flood an additional 1,400 acres. Because of residual organochlorine pesticides in the soils and the potential risks to fish-eating birds, all restoration activity on the NSRA must be done with deliberation and planning. We expect to flood the majority of the north shore property (about 12,000 acres) within the next five years. This action will not only result in important wetland habitat, but it also will allow greater flexibility in water management and greatly decrease nutrient discharges into Lake Apopka. Reconnection of portions of the former farm area to Lake Apopka will be considered first when pesticide residues in fish in the restored wetlands reach levels that are safe for human consumption.

**Harris Chain of Lakes Restoration Council  
Draft 2008 Report to the Florida State Legislature (page v)**

*“The Council concludes the restoration of Lake Apopka must involve dredging at least some portion of the bottom sediments. Dredging becomes especially important because of the amount of phosphorus that can be removed per dollar expended exceeds other restoration strategies and deposition of the dredged Lake Apopka sediments into the north shore area would raise the marshes sufficiently to permit reconnection of Lake Apopka, which would act as a “kidney” for the lake.”*

**District Response**

Dredging has been discussed by the District and other agencies several times and abandoned because of cost. A dredging study contracted by the District 20 years ago estimated it would take five 24-inch dredges 5.9 years to dredge sediments from Lake Apopka. It is estimated that such a dredging project would cost \$791,000,000 in 2007 dollars. The District disagrees with the Council’s assertion that dredging is the most cost-effective means of phosphorus (P) removal from Lake Apopka since other restoration strategies remove more P per dollar. At the cost cited above, dredging Lake Apopka would remove about 7 g P per dollar. In contrast, removal of gizzard shad from L. Apopka removes about 12 g P per dollar and has other benefits to reduce nutrient recycling. Operation of the marsh flow-way has removed at least 9 g P per dollar and has additional benefits for wetland habitat restoration. Furthermore, dredging removes not only phosphorus that is available for algal growth but also phosphorus that was unavailable because it was bound to minerals or buried. If this fact is considered, the efficiency of removal of available P by dredging decreases to less than 1 g P per dollar.

The dredging study cited above also calculated the total amount of dried material dredged from the lake. Assuming that this material were spread evenly over one-half (6,000 acres) of the north shore, the material would raise the surface elevation only by 0.9 ft. Soil subsidence over 50 years of farming has resulted in a surface elevation that is on average 4-5 ft below the mean water level in the lake. An increase of less than 1 ft would not raise the marshes sufficiently to permit reconnection to Lake Apopka and still sustain a healthy marsh. Restored marshes will act as a “kidney” for the lake by preventing nutrient loading even if these marshes are behind levees.

As these marshes are established, less water will need to be pumped back into the lake for management purposes, further improving water quality in the lake.

When the District was developing the restoration plan for Lake Apopka it was determined that control of external nutrient loading was the critical component of the restoration strategy and that any restoration plan that did not include control of external nutrient loading would fail. Dredging of the lake would not have reduced external nutrient loading and would not have resulted in a permanent improvement in lake water quality. To be successful a restoration strategy that included dredging of the lake would have also needed to include many, if not all, of the other restoration strategies that the District has been implementing over the last 10 years, all of which the Council now opposes. District scientists believe that implementation of the existing restoration strategy for Lake Apopka will improve the water quality to the lake to meet the TMDL and will result in restoration of a healthy lake, without extremely costly dredging of the lake bottom. Therefore, the District opposes lake dredging in Lake Apopka as an unnecessary and wasteful use of taxpayer's dollars.

**Harris Chain of Lakes Restoration Council  
Draft 2008 Report to the Florida State Legislature (page 7)**

*“The Council has reviewed seven years of water quality data provided by the SJRWMD which included total phosphorus, algal biomass as measured by chlorophyll, and water clarity as measured by Secchi disk. Additionally, after the review of recent data provided by other agencies including the University of Florida and published historical data from the 1970s and 1980s; the Council has determined there have been no major improvements in lake water quality, which can be directly attributed to the restoration efforts of the SJRWMD.”*

**District Response**

A complete review requires consideration of the full twenty-year data set from the SJRWMD. A complete review shows that pre-1995 (dating back until 1987) average total phosphorus concentrations in Lake Apopka water were 0.22 mg L<sup>-1</sup>, chlorophyll-*a* was 99 µg L<sup>-1</sup>, and water clarity as measured by Secchi depth was 0.22 meters. Recent data (between 2003 and April 2008) indicate that average concentrations for total phosphorus, chlorophyll-*a* and Secchi depth are 0.11 mg L<sup>-1</sup>, 59 µg L<sup>-1</sup>, and 0.33 meters, respectively. This represents a decrease of 50% in total phosphorus concentrations, a 40% decrease in chlorophyll-*a*, and a 50% increase in water clarity. These improvements in Lake Apopka water quality conditions due to restoration efforts of the SJRWMD have been published in peer-reviewed international journals.

**Harris Chain of Lakes Restoration Council  
Draft 2008 Report to the Florida State Legislature (page 7)**

*“Measured changes in the water quality parameters are more closely related to changes in regional rainfall, with improvements occurring during wet periods and degradations being seen during periods of drought (low lake levels).”*

**District Response**

This statement is incorrect. Since the start of the SJRWMD monitoring in 1987 there have been wet periods, normal rainfall periods, dry periods, and drought periods. Overall water quality has improved significantly in those twenty years during high, normal, and low rainfall periods. The only exceptions were two extreme droughts, when Lake Apopka lost up to 70% of its volume and water quality worsened. The Council uses these temporary periods of declining water quality due to extreme drought to misrepresent the overall pattern of improvement.

**Harris Chain of Lakes Restoration Council  
Draft 2008 Report to the Florida State Legislature (page 13)**

*“After reviewing the long-term water quality database compiled by the SJRWMD for the Harris Chain of Lakes, the Council is led to conclude the sole reliance on reducing phosphorus inputs to improve overall water quality in Lake Apopka and the downstream lakes is no longer a cost-effective or near-term successful restoration strategy.”*

**District Response**

This statement is incorrect. As stated earlier, the SJRWMD is not solely relying on reducing phosphorus inputs to improve water quality in Lake Apopka and the downstream lakes. The SJRWMD depends upon pollution abatement combined with a cost-effective program for phosphorus removal.

**Harris Chain of Lakes Restoration Council  
Draft 2008 Report to the Florida State Legislature (page 13)**

*“At Lake Apopka, the compiled water quality database provides evidence there is no relationship between the reductions in phosphorus inputs and in-lake water quality.”*

**District Response**

This statement is incorrect. The compiled water quality database for Lake Apopka shows that pre-1995 (dating back until 1987) average total phosphorus concentrations in Lake Apopka water were 0.22 mg L<sup>-1</sup>, chlorophyll-a was 99 µg L<sup>-1</sup>, and water clarity as measured by Secchi depth was 0.22 meters. Recent data (between 2003 and April 2008) indicate that average concentrations for total phosphorus, chlorophyll-a and Secchi depth are 0.11 mg L<sup>-1</sup>, 59 µg L<sup>-1</sup>,

and 0.33 meters, respectively. This represents a decrease of 50% in total phosphorus concentrations, a 40% decrease in chlorophyll-*a*, and a 50% increase in water clarity. The improvement in Lake Apopka water quality coincides with reduced phosphorus inputs to the lake. The District published these results in peer-reviewed international scientific journals.

**Harris Chain of Lakes Restoration Council  
Draft 2008 Report to the Florida State Legislature (page 21)**

*“Throughout the 2008 reporting year, the Council has continued to review operational data of the Lake Apopka Marsh Flow-way. In August 2008, the Council heard updates on the value and performance of the flow-way. Information received from a LCWA review of recent operational data indicated an average phosphorus reduction of 8.4% over the past four years, with an average phosphorus concentration entering the system of 130 ppb and average concentration flowing out of 119 ppb. The LCWA review also indicated the Lake Apopka Marsh Flow-way provides approximately 10 – 12% reduction in phosphorus which is mostly in the particulate form.”*

**District Response**

The use of average concentrations into and out of the marsh flow-way is an incorrect method to determine the amount of phosphorus removed by the flow-way. The District determines the amount of phosphorus removed by the system on a mass basis. This approach uses both flows into and flows out of the system, in addition to using total phosphorus concentrations into and out of the system. The median percent mass removal of total phosphorus since early operation (Jan 2004) until June 2008 is 30%. The median percent mass removal of particulate phosphorus since early operation (Jan 2004) until June 2008 is 53%.

**Harris Chain of Lakes Restoration Council  
Draft 2008 Report to the Florida State Legislature (page 22)**

*“The original proposal by the SJRWMD said it would remove 30,000 kilograms of phosphorus per year and Lake Apopka would be restored in 60 years.”*

**District Response**

The original proposal did state that the flow-way would remove 30,000 kilograms of phosphorus per year. However, the original proposal is not the system that was constructed and operated since late 2003. The original estimates were based upon a marsh flow-way system with 12 treatment wetland cells and an approximate area of 10 km<sup>2</sup>. The District constructed and operates a marsh flow-way system that has four treatment cells with an approximate area of 3 km<sup>2</sup>. After the District constructed these flow-way cells, the Legislature directed the District to purchase the farms on the north shore of Lake Apopka. The District then determined that its water quality objectives could be achieved without constructing additional flow-way cells.

**Harris Chain of Lakes Restoration Council  
Draft 2008 Report to the Florida State Legislature (page 25)**

*“The establishment of a marsh flow-way is a centerpiece in the SJRWMD Lake Apopka restoration strategy to reduce phosphorus and sediments.”*

**District Response**

The marsh flow-way at Lake Apopka is not the “centerpiece” in the SJRWMD Lake Apopka restoration strategy. The SJRWMD’s restoration of Lake Apopka depends upon preventing further pollution from the watershed. The marsh flow-way is a cost-effective method for removing phosphorus that is already in the lake.

**Harris Chain of Lakes Restoration Council  
Draft 2008 Report to the Florida State Legislature (page 25)**

*“It is now clear that the Lake Apopka Marsh Flow-way, like the Lake Griffin flow-way, is not performing according to the original expectations for phosphorus removal.”*

**District Response**

The Lake Apopka Marsh flow-way is performing to original expectations. The projected long-term removal efficiency was 30%. The median percent mass removal of total phosphorus since early operation (Jan 2004) until June 2008 is 30%.

**Harris Chain of Lakes Restoration Council  
Draft 2008 Report to the Florida State Legislature (page 25)**

*“Even with the 2008 installation of alum treatment systems at the flow-way to enhance phosphorus removal, less than four metric tons are removed annually (30 metric tons per year was originally predicted).”*

**District Response**

The original predicted removal rate by the marsh flow-way was 30 metric tons of phosphorus per year. However, that original prediction was based on a larger proposed marsh flow-way system that had an approximate area of 10 km<sup>2</sup>. The SJRWMD constructed and operates a marsh flow-way system that has an approximate area of 3 km<sup>2</sup>. This flow-way is functioning as designed.

**Harris Chain of Lakes Restoration Council  
Draft 2008 Report to the Florida State Legislature (page 25)**

*“Phosphorus returned to the lake after the water has been treated in the flow-way (up to 70% returned to the lake) is readily available for algal growth in Lake Apopka and the downstream lakes.”*

## **District Response**

This statement is incorrect. The marsh flow-way was not expected to operate at 100% efficiency. The flow-way was designed to remove 30% of the incoming total phosphorus load and the efficiency to date is 30%. The phosphorus returned to the lake after marsh flow-way treatment is not all readily available for algal growth. Of the total amount of phosphorus that is returned from the marsh flow-way back to the lake less than one third is readily available for algal growth.

## **Harris Chain of Lakes Restoration Council Draft 2008 Report to the Florida State Legislature (pages 26)**

*“The Council no longer believes the marsh flow-way can be relied upon as primary management technique for restoring Lake Apopka or the Harris Chain of Lakes.”*

## **District Response**

The marsh flow-way is not the primary management technique for restoring Lake Apopka or the Harris chain of lakes. The marsh flow-way is a management practice to help accelerate the removal of phosphorus from Lake Apopka. The District uses several other practices and techniques to control the amount of phosphorus reaching Lake Apopka. Overall, the restoration program includes acquiring land; restoring upland, wetland and lake habitat; stormwater treatment; and rough fish harvesting. These practices and techniques have both reduced the amount of phosphorus going into Lake Apopka and accelerated the removal of phosphorus from the lake.