

**DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES
WORK GROUP MEETING
TMDL/BMAP PROJECT**

Tuesday, May 23, 2006

At SWFWMD Tampa Service Office Board Room

8:30am to 12:30 pm

List of attendees: On File at TBEP Office

10 ACTION ITEMS FOR WORK GROUP MEMBERS

(Action Items listed first, to highlight responsibilities of different parties)

1. Tom Singleton will provide the Work Group with any updated information he may receive directly relevant to the Total Coliform issue. As of the date of the meeting, EPA has not acted on the request by FDEP to drop Total Coliform as an indicator parameter.
2. City of Tampa (Chuck Walters) will provide the Work Group with an update on the results of ongoing discussions between the City and USF (Dr. Jim Griffin) pertaining to the City possibly providing funding for USF to continue its work within the Hillsborough River Basin.
3. The members of the unofficial modeling subgroup (Holly or Gerold will contact each of you) will meet within the next few weeks to provide the following recommendations to the Work Group: (a) when would there be a need for a more refined model (as compared with the current SIMPLE model) to examine existing projects and reductions and the potential decreases to impaired WBIDs; (b) what information does the modeling subgroup believe it needs to be able to address the prioritization of projects question; (c) how to deal with the issue of "loadings" and "load reductions"; and (d) adaptive management as an alternative to/addition to calculating specific load reductions.
4. Bob McConnell will send to Jim Griffin the Lithia Springs report for Jim to place on the website, prior to the next Work Group Meeting.
5. Work Group members who have access to wastewater utility records should provide a list of package plants that have been taken off line over the past decade to the Work Group. This effort should be completed by the end of July 2006.
6. Land Use Protection Ordinances for the involved counties (Hillsborough, Pasco, Polk) should be included in the BMAP (perhaps within the list of projects and programs) (HSW Team to follow-up on this).
7. Shawn College will keep the Work Group apprised of upcoming public meetings concerning the proposed new buffer zones as developed by EPC.
8. The Work Group suggested that new, increased buffer requirements be included in the BMAP report, if these are likely to be approved by the County (HSW Team to follow-up on this).

9. Jodi Pracht will accept suggestions from the Work Group regarding the likely queries of the GIS database as part of the project. She stressed the need for input from the Work Group *before* she completes construction of the data base.
10. Holly Greening will contact those persons interested in being part of the unofficial “Projects” sub-group regarding the time and location of their meeting. The most likely date will be sometime after the Stakeholders Group meeting in mid-June.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Holly Greening (TBEP’s Project Manager) welcomed the Work Group attendees to this, the third Work Group Meeting. All Attendees identified themselves for the benefit of the other members.

Total Coliform Update: Tom Singleton (FDEP) provided a status report on the FDEP’s request to USEPA to drop Total Coliform as an indicator. USEPA had not yet provided a response to the FDEP’s request that Total Coliform no longer be used as an indicator of impairment for Florida waters, in as much as it is not a good indicator of public health. Also, still not determined are whether Enterococcus will be added as an indicator and the final outcome on the meaning of the term “daily” as it relates to compliance with TMDL regulations. FDEP representatives indicated that their IWR model has been run using the 400 count standard for Fecal Coliform. (**Action Item #1**).

BMAP Website Tutorial: Dr. Jim Griffin provided the Work Group with a short “tutorial” on how to efficiently utilize the website he and USF have established to support this project. Some of this effort has been undertaken by the University without a funding source. This website has been set up specifically for this project. It is now the repository for agendas, materials, maps, etc. Access <http://www.tampabay.wateratlas.usf.edu/news>, then click on Northeast Tampa Bay Watershed BMAP Working Group. An alternative way to access the website is via the Tampa Bay Estuary Atlas.

Loading Model Recommendations: Dr. Griffin began this presentation on behalf of the unofficial modeling sub-group. The modeling approaches of the EPC, SWFWMD, Hillsborough County Stormwater were briefly described. Each has strong points to recommend it. All use the USEPA SIMPLE approach. All can separate wet and dry season. The unofficial sub-group suggests the USEPA SIMPLE approach be utilized now (any of the 3 above would meet that criteria), and that a base map is used that all agree upon. The model would be used for estimating existing loads and then estimating changes to the loadings from the implementation of pollution reduction projects, BMPs, and factoring in future land use changes. Discussion ensued regarding the high costs of modeling, how to prioritize projects, and at what scale (“micro-scale sub-basin”) the SIMPLE method might not be adequate. Also discussed was to what extent for the BMAP is extensive modeling useful? After lengthy discussion, the unofficial sub-group was given action items (**Action Items #2 and #3**) to bring back to the full Work Group.

Mapping Septic Tanks/Systems Update: This topic was a continuation of the discussion from the April Work Group Meeting. Dr. Griffin explained the current GIS mapping, with a year 2002 parcel map created for the County. The data used included billing records and Department of Health records. It was suggested that looking at the plats can often allow one to estimate the

presence or absence of septic systems and the proximity of these to water bodies.....termed by some as a "hot spot" map. One Work Group member suggested that the asset management systems of local governments can be valuable in showing which areas are on public sewer.

Land Use and Nitrate Migration Potential in Lithia Springs Focus Area: Mr. John Loper presented the results of a study done for Tampa Bay Water on nitrate trends, and potential causative factors. Nitrate concentrations from Lithia Springs increased to 3 mg/l by 1992. The concentration has remained relatively stable at that level since that time. Land use investigations show that citrus dominated the area in the past, but has been declining rapidly in favor of residential developments and their related land uses. Other likely sources of nitrates include septic tanks, package wastewater plants, golf courses, and landscaping activities. Tampa Bay Water will provide the report to USF so that the report can be added to the web site (**Action Item #4**). Removing package plants in favor of more efficient wastewater treatment plants may be a source of "credits" in the BMAP. All Work Group members with information on such change-overs should provide this information to the Work Group (**Action Item #5**).

Water Resource Protection Ordinances and Areas: Dan Blood from Hillsborough County Planning and Growth Management provided information to the Work Group on the County's Wellhead Protection Ordinance. The extent of the protection zones can be viewed (ADOBE) from the County's website. Within the protection zones around wells, certain land use activities are regulated or not allowed. The 100 year floodplain was used to help delineate surface water protection zones (FEMA's new mapping effort may result in modifications). The Work Group suggested that the Land Use Protection Ordinances for the involved counties (Hillsborough, Pasco, Polk) be included in the BMAP (perhaps within the list of projects and programs) (**Action Item #6**).

Setbacks and Buffers: Update and Next Steps: Dr. Gerold Morrison from EPC presented a summary of the EPC's buffer and setback proposal to Hillsborough County. Current required setbacks in Hillsborough County are usually 30 feet, up to 50 feet for preservation areas. Examples from other areas were presented. The Wekiva River system has a 100 foot buffer. Hernando County has a 75 foot buffer. University of Georgia recommends that Georgia has a minimum 50 foot buffer, more when slopes are steep. North Carolina has a 50 foot buffer. In Chesapeake Bay and in New York State there is a 100 foot buffer.

Shawn College, from the Planning Commission, provided a draft schedule of how the EPC proposal will be evaluated. Currently the Commission staff is examining the EPC report (which proposes the 30 foot set-back be increased to between 50 and 100 feet). The Planning Commission will potentially hold a public hearing on this subject late in 2006 (November or December). A BOCC public hearing would potentially be held in March or April of 2007. There will need to be a Consistency Review from DCA and a second public hearing by the BOCC. Also, DCA will need to conduct a Compliance Review. The Work Group suggested that new, increased buffer requirements be included in the BMAP report, should these appear to be likely to be approved by the County (**Action Items #7 and #8**).

IWR Run 24 Results, by Station: Nutrients, BOD, DO, chl a: Tom Singleton of FDEP summarized the results of Run 24. He indicated this information is also available on the website. The results of this run can be used to determine areas of improving water quality as well as those that do not seem to be improving, or that may be declining. Tom explained which thresholds are

being used with respect to chl a (for example, 20 ug/l is the threshold being used for streams) and DO (either 5 mg/l or 4 mg/l depending upon the specific water body/segment). Tom had only time to point out a few examples of how this Run 24 might be used - in McKay Bay, there may be an improving trend, while there may be problems in Hillsborough Bay and Old Tampa Bay. Tom presented a Power Point slide of the screening levels used by FDEP - this slide is on the website. Discussion ensued regarding the difference(s) between screening levels and regulatory water quality standards.

Mapping Existing and Proposed Projects: Initial Efforts: Jodi Pracht, from Hillsborough County, described the process she is developing to allow for the querying of data within the GIS. She stressed the importance of knowing in advance of the set-up, what queries we will likely want. Currently, the set-up is all in draft. She requested Work Group members provide her with input on what types of queries they believe will be useful (**Action Item #9**).

Holly Greening from TBEP led a brief discussion on how far back in time should the BMAP go to provide projects for inclusion. The year 1994 was suggested as the “cut-off”. Also discussed was the inclusion of conservation areas as possible credits in the BMAP. An unofficial “Projects Work sub-group” was formed, based upon a show of hands of interested participants. Each person will be contacted by Holly as to the time and location of their meeting. The most likely date will be sometime after the Stakeholders Group meeting in mid-June. (**Action Item #10**).

Overview of Hillsborough River TMDL Model: Kevin Petrus, from FDEP provided the Work Group with a description of the modeling done by FDEP. He listed those areas that FDEP has or is completing TMDL reports on. The number becomes slightly complicated due to the fact that both FDEP and USEPA are examining the water bodies and segments. There appear to be roughly 20 locations of potential problems with DO and/or nutrients identified by FDEP. USEPA has about 8 (mostly for DO problems). Roughly 12 of these have been “verified”. Kevin then provided several examples of areas determined to have problems. He briefly described: Delaney Creek, Thirty Mile Creek, Lake Thonotosassa, Lake Hunter, Rocky Creek, McKay Bay and the Lower Hillsborough River Estuary.

Next Steps: Holly Greening invited Work Group Members to attend the upcoming Stakeholder’s Meeting, on Friday, June 16. Action Items for the Work Group are listed at the beginning of this report. The next full Work Group meeting will likely come after the meetings of the unofficial sub-work groups.

End draft: compiled by Dr. Scott Emery