

## MEETING MINUTES

### Springs Coast Management Committee

December 9, 2015

The Springs Coast Management Committee meeting was convened at 1:00 p.m., December 9, 2015, at the Southwest Florida Water Management District, Conference Rooms 112 A & B, Building 4, 2379 Broad Street, Brooksville, Florida.

#### **Members Present**

Alys Brockway, Hernando County  
David Bruzek, Industry  
Maya Burke, Regional Planning Council  
David Burnell, City of Crystal River  
Jeff Rogers for K. Cheek, Citrus County  
Charles Lee, Environmental  
Michael Molligan, SWFWMD  
Laura Rankin for M. Nachabe, Academia  
Richard Owen, Public Supply  
Keith Moran for R. Owen, State Parks  
Curt Williams, Agriculture  
Kevin Kemp, FFWCC  
Jessica Stempien, FDACS  
Brian Katz for R. Hicks, FDEP

#### **Members Absent**

Flip Mellinger Marion County

#### **SWFWMD Staff**

Chris Anastasiou  
Terri Behling  
Veronica Craw  
Sean King  
Jennette Seachrist  
Chris Zajac

#### **Others Present**

---

SWFWMD – Southwest Florida Water Management District  
FDEP – Florida Department of Environmental Protection

FFWCC – Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission  
FDACS – Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services

---

A list of others present who signed the attendance sheet is filed in the permanent files of the Springs Coast Management Committee.

#### **1. Call to Order and Roll Call**

Mr. Molligan called the meeting to order. A quorum was noted.

#### **2. Action Item: Minutes Approval from October 14, 2015**

Charles Lee moved for approval of the minutes of the October 14, 2015; second by Richard Owen. Mr. Owen noted that those who made the motions and seconded were not identified in these minutes, but they had been in previous minutes. He felt it more appropriate to have the individuals identified. Mr. Molligan noted Mr. Owen's comments and said that those individuals' names will be noted in future minutes. The motion carried unanimously.

**3. Summary of Springs Coast Steering Committee Actions – Veronica Craw, SWFWMD**

Ms. Craw announced that at the November 4, 2015, meeting, the Steering Committee approved the Rainbow Springs Plan. The final editorial touches are being made and everyone will get a copy when it's finalized. The next step is to bring the plan to the Governing Board in March for its approval. Since this does serve as a SWIM plan, per statute, it has to go to the Governing Board. Once approved by the Governing Board, it will be submitted to DEP for final approval. Ms. Craw said that she and Chris Zajac have been visiting the affected local governments to get resolutions in support of the Plan. The District currently has resolutions from WRWSA and Marion County and is on the upcoming agenda for the City of Dunnellon. A similar approach will take place with the Crystal River/Kings Bay Plan once that is ready to go forward.

The Committee also approved the priority management actions for the Kings Bay Plan. Ms. Craw said there was significant discussion during that presentation regarding some additional items that several Committee members wanted to have reflected in an Appendix. There will be an Appendix added to the Plan to reflect the conversation that focused on the need for a berm and swale program in Crystal River. The Committee also wanted to reorder the management actions. The Committee was advised that they were not in any priority order but the Committee's desire was to reorder them. After reordering, the management actions for water quality starts with septic tanks, then stormwater, then urban and residential fertilizer. There was also discussion on the improvements needed to the U.S. 19 drainage system. The Committee wanted its comments to reflect that when the gas turbine plant is built by Duke Energy, the Committee requests that Duke build a small sub-regional plant as opposed to a package plant which could be expanded to produce reclaimed water in the future. A copy of the minutes of that discussion will be in an appendix so that these comments are reflected in detail in the SWIM Plan.

Mr. Charles Lee asked about the Duke Energy turbine plant and how it produces a sewage treatment plant that is producing reclaimed water. He asked for an explanation as to how power is generated from a turbine.

Mr. Bruzek responded that the generation of electricity and turbine has nothing to do with the package plant. He said Duke just started clearing land for the plant so the plant is under construction and it will be a combined cycle gas turbine plant. With that, Duke will have to have a package sewage treatment plant for the staff members. He said since there is already a design, the suggestion would be very difficult to incorporate a larger sub-regional plant that could get involved with reclaimed water as well. It would be part of the power plant site because it would handle sewage from the plant. The amount of sewage from the plant will be very nominal because combined cycle gas turbine is pretty much an automated plant; there is a very small staff.

Mr. Lee said that was his assumption and he was trying to figure out on what factual basis the Steering Committee thought it was relevant to bring up that item to Duke Energy's turbine unit. He said he is not sure of the relevance.

Mr. Bruzek said Duke is required to do prudent and reasonable measures when it comes to costs because it goes to the customers so, it becomes more difficult to justify additional costs associated with the project for perhaps some future gain that's not related to the generation of electricity. Mr. Bruzek said that's a very difficult thing to get past the Public Service Commission. He welcomed the recommendation and suggestion and said that Duke may want to look further into where that's coming from and the future intent. He said Duke will do what it can to participate with all the needs moving forward but he would like to get more information about what's behind it before the suggestion would be seriously entertained. Ms. Craw noted that the specific item was brought up by Commissioner Damato of Citrus County.

Mr. Lee said he could see if Duke Energy had a piece of land as part of its complex that might serve as the site for a treatment plant, and then there could be a collaborative project in which the County and others would build the plant on that land. He said he thinks it's somewhat of a flight of fancy to think the Steering Committee would recommend that Duke Energy would be able to build a sophisticated community sewage treatment plant with the capability of producing reclaimed water. He doesn't see how that adds anything to this set of recommendations.

Mr. Molligan said that the Steering Committee's action was simply to incorporate the comments made at its meeting as an item in the Appendix; not to put this in the body of the Plan directing anyone to do anything. The Committee wanted its comments reflected somewhere in the Plan so it voted to include those comments in the Appendix.

It was asked if approval of the final Crystal River/Kings Bay SWIM Plan with edits is something that the Committee would be approving by its vote. Ms. Craw said that the SWIM Plan edits that will be brought up are separate from the Appendix and since the Steering Committee is a level higher, it would probably not be brought back to this group as an action item. She wanted to make sure that everyone was aware that that item was going to be added to the Plan.

Ms. Craw advised that the final item the Steering Committee took action on was to approve the revised schedule. Therefore, the agenda topics for the next meeting will involve the newly approved, extended schedule for the Chassahowitzka, Homosassa and Weeki Wachee SWIM plans. Mr. Molligan said that the Committee understood that the vote was not only to approve the 18-month schedule but also the ability of the Management Committee to vote to extend that schedule if it found it necessary.

**4. Action Item: Approve the Final Crystal River/Kings Bay SWIM Plan with edits – Dr. Chris Anastasiou, SWFWMD**

Dr. Anastasiou provided a brief overview of project additions that were submitted late for the Committee's consideration for inclusion in the Priority Projects list. The first project is the Indian Waters Sewer Expansion with the lead entities being City of Crystal River and SWFWMD. The Committee is being asked to approve inclusion of this as a Priority Proposed Project because it is being reviewed by the District for cooperative funding with the City of Crystal River [statement later corrected]. This project proposes to take homes that are on septic and put them on central sewer. The majority of the homes in the area are on canals and it was developed in the 1960s and 1970s and most of the septic systems are down in the ground at the water table. The TMDL process identified septic as the primary source of nutrients going into the bay; therefore, it is consistent with both the District's plan, DEP's TMDL, and BMAP.

Ms. Brockway asked in which portion of the Plan this would go if it were added. Dr. Anastasiou said this and the next two items to be discussed are being proposed to go into the Priority Proposed Projects section, so it would go into the body of the document after the ongoing projects. Ms. Brockway suggested that the vote be done on the projects one at a time.

Mr. Lee asked if the \$1M provides 100% of the costs of conversion of those homes from septic tanks to central sewers and if the homeowner has to pay anything. He also asked who is paying for removal of the septic tanks and drain fields. Mr. Burnell said he didn't know what the proportions are but whatever the grant doesn't cover, the homeowner would need to cover after design and construction. He said it always includes removal of the septic tanks and the field. In this case, it's a combination of the City, the County and the Health Department getting together for each one of those sites to remove the septic system and put the sewer system on line. The homeowner has 365 days after installation to connect.

It was mentioned that there is presently a Crystal River/Kings Bay spring shed septic to sewer initiative that's listed and this is separate because it's a specific project that has identified 95 actual homes. This could potentially be viewed as an offshoot of that because it is part of the initiative, but this is a specific project to service those homes.

Mr. Lee asked if this is seeking \$1M in funding from the state through the water management district. Dr. Anastasiou said that it is cooperative funding initiative so it would be a 50/50 cost split between the District and the cooperator [statement later corrected]. He didn't know if the City and the County have a cost share or if it's just the City but the District will be paying for half of that cost through the cooperative funding initiative.

Mr. Lee said he was asking these questions because of the various efficiencies associated with how these projects are carried out and the various methodologies by which you can connect a septic tank service community to central sewer. He mentioned the methods of how other locations around the state are designing these systems and said the cost efficiencies are 15 to 20% of what building a standard sewer system would cost. He was just wondering if anyone is looking at those kinds of innovations. He said he's just looking into the future and whether there is any thought being given to greater efficiencies by innovative technologies.

Richard Owen asked how the cost compares per homeowner and if it is common practice that those who are participating are charged for whatever is not covered by grants. Mr. Rogers said that is the common practice that what cost that the city or county does not fund through a grant program will be assessed to the homeowners.

Dr. Anastasiou said that he misspoke previously when he said that this came through the cooperative funding initiative. It came through DEP springs initiative funding, which is why that's been changed from the District to DEP. It's actually springs money that is being applied for; it is not 50/50. Ms. Craw clarified that this project is proposed so there is no DEP funding commitment yet. This is funding that might come out of a legislative appropriation in 2016.

Mr. Rogers moved to approve, which was seconded by Mr. Lee. The motion was called and passed unanimously.

Dr. Anastasiou then presented to the Committee the City of Crystal River Stormwater Alternative Analysis. This project came in through the District's cooperative funding initiative and it is a 50/50 cost split with the City and the District, should it be approved. It looks at specific areas to implement BMPs for stormwater.

Ms. Brockway asked if there are any other plans that are in the top priorities. Mr. Lee said he presumes the City will hire a consultant, which statement was confirmed. Ms. Craw said there are several other alternative analyses and assessments that have already been approved as priority projects in the Kings Bay Plan.

Mr. Richard Owen made a motion to approve the project, which was seconded by Mr. Lee. The motion was called and passed unanimously.

The final project Dr. Anastasiou presented was land acquisition for the Crystal River Preserve State Park. This was added because it was identified that land acquisition is an important component of the District's management action. The Crystal River Preserve State Park Management Plan was updated in 2014 in which 47 individual parcels were identified that could be acquired for preservation but not all of those parcels fall within Kings Bay proper. Dr. Anastasiou showed the Committee a map identifying the proposed potential parcels to be acquired.

After further discussion, Ms. Brockway moved to approve and Mr. Lee seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Next, discussion was opened for the Committee to discuss any specific edits it may want to address regarding the Plan.

Mr. Molligan mentioned that some edits have been made that were submitted, such as typographical errors. There was one set of edits that did not get into the document that was available for review online.

Mr. Richard Owen, referred to Table 8, starting on Page 54, Water Quantity Management Actions. He said there were three things under the Regulatory portion which he wanted to discuss. The first is Evaluate springs-specific Water Use Permitting criteria. He referred to the text in the document on page 45 of his version, where water quantity issues within the springshed are described, and it mentions that groundwater withdrawals currently are a relatively minor contributor to the changes in flows that have been observed and are projected to stay a relatively minor issue contributing to the problems being experienced within the springsheds. He feels it would be inappropriate for this document to focus attention on things addressing groundwater withdrawals as a significant issue, particularly in the main body of the document as opposed to within one of the Appendices. Mr. Owen said that it is his understanding that this would mean the District would look at the potential to adopt new rules that would govern how they issue water use permits in this springshed. He thinks it would be a waste of the District's time since this is such a minor contributor to the problem.

The next item Mr. Owen discussed was Evaluate the need for Water Use Caution Areas. He said he doesn't feel that even one water use caution area would be needed within the springshed. Water use caution areas can lead to new regulatory programs or other forms of management actions but he thinks it would be duplicative of creating the most up-to-date SWIM plan.

The third water quantity management action Mr. Owen discussed was Develop and utilize inter-District planning and permitting criteria. He felt this might be appropriate for a springshed that is adjacent to or goes over a water management district boundary; however, since this one doesn't, he recommends that all three of these items be deleted. Mr. Owen made a motion to remove all three of the items from the Plan in their entirety. Ms. Burke seconded the motion. Mr. Molligan called for further discussion.

Mr. Lee recognized the current status of the claim that the groundwater withdrawals are a small percentage but he said he is also skeptical that that is entirely accurate. He said groundwater modeling used across all water management districts is relatively primitive in terms of capability of performing accurately in karst situations. He said in the entire watershed, 2% may not be much if you look at or expand wellfields in the proximity of karst features that are channeling water to the springs but, the actual effect on the springs might be greater than 2%. He thinks that part of the problem is that the balance of what's coming in and out of the aquifer is always neutral as to the question of the tendency of weather patterns and he said we've gone through a 25-year period where the amount of rainfall available to recharge the aquifer has been less than the amount of rainfall that is normally attributed to this region of central Florida. He is not convinced that it is accurate or relevant in all circumstances; therefore, his vote would be to leave this in place.

Mr. Owen said that at a minimum, he would recommend these three items be moved to the Appendix but his motion is to remove them in their entirety. After further discussion on the matter, the question was called. There were three ayes present and one on the phone; six nays. The motion failed. Mr.

Owen moved that the third item, Develop and utilize inter-District planning and permitting criteria, be deleted, which was seconded by Mr. Lee. The motion passed.

Mr. Owen then moved that the second item, Evaluate springs-specific Water Use Permitting criteria, be moved from Table 8 to the appropriate Appendix. The motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Owen said that in Appendix C, Jurisdictional Authority, in the Regional category, the document still refers to the Withlacoochee Regional Planning Council even though it's the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council. That section mentions the Withlacoochee Regional Water Supply Authority, and he said they are considered an agency. Ms. Burke also mentioned that her title is wrong. A correction will be made. Mr. Owen asked if there was a specific reason why the District did not include the Withlacoochee Regional Water Supply Authority in this section. A correction will be made. He was advised that it was in the Rainbow Plan.

Mr. Owen mentioned that in Appendix F, there's one project entitled Arsenic Load Study/Pilot. He suggested the write up should describe how addressing arsenic and groundwater is relevant to the SWIM plans and goals. He said that it is not evident to him how it addresses the goals and issues identified.

The next item Mr. Owen mentioned was a project entitled Climate change, precipitation patterns and sea-level rise impacts. He said he thought this was a very good idea, but it seemed like the scope of the project does not do the issue justice and should be significantly expanded.

Dr. Anastasiou said from the technical working group perspective, most of the comments that Mr. Owen brought up were comments that were discussed during the vetting process and the fact that this one is reduced to one sentence is why it was put into the list of potential projects rather than priority proposed projects; it needs a lot more vetting. The project could potentially be added in the next update as a priority if there were more substantive information added.

Mr. Molligan said that he was not comfortable with the language that characterizes what the projects in Appendix F are. He recommended the following language for the introductory paragraph to Appendix F: "Draft potential projects and initiatives were provided by members of the TWG for review by the SCMC and SCSC. Tables 20, 21 and 22 list the projects and initiatives provided by members of the TWG that were not approved by the SCMC or the SCSC to be included as a priority project."

Mr. Owen also mentioned the following projects: meter all groundwater withdrawals within the spring shed, reevaluation of conservation tiered rate structure, reassess consumptive use permitting for drought conditions and low-flow or no-go permit conditions for residential and commercial construction. He suggested that either the write up should include some way of making it relevant to what we're trying to accomplish or they should be deleted.

Ms. Jessica Stempien mentioned that Appendix C, Jurisdictional Authority, lists Office of Agricultural Water Policy, AES and Florida Forest Service under FDACS, but in Appendix E, Office of Agricultural Water Policy is not listed. She suggested adding in Appendix E the same Office of Agricultural Water Policy language as in Appendix C.

Dr. Anastasiou went over what he has listed as the changes to be made, as follows:

Change Maya Burke's title on the table; in the regional agency section, change Withlacoochee Regional Planning Council to Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council; add Withlacoochee Regional Water Supply Authority under the regional agencies; take the text from FDACS Office of Water Policy and copy and put it in Appendix E.

Dr. Anastasiou noticed another edit needed in the local government section where the City of Crystal River is listed but there is no text so information will be added on the City. In Appendix F, change the text as stated above by Mr. Molligan. Also, delete develop and utilize inter-district planning and permitting as a management action.

Mr. Molligan called for a motion to approve the Plan. Mr. Lee moved to approve the Plan, seconded by Mr. Richard Owen. Motion passed unanimously.

**5. Public Input**

None.

**6. Agenda Topics for Next Meeting (February 10, 2015)**

- a. Minutes Approval for December 9, 2015
- b. Weeki Wachee, Homosassa, Chassahowitzka
  - i. Introduction to Next Systems
  - ii. Issues & Drivers
  - III. Quantifiable Objectives

**7. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:42 p.m.