

**Hillsborough County Wellhead and Resource Protection Study  
Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
Surface and Ground Water Protection for Hillsborough County  
Meeting 14 Minutes**

**May 22, 2003  
9:00 AM**

**All People's Life Center  
6105 East Sligh Avenue  
Tampa, FL 33604**

**Meeting Objectives**

- Introduction of new TAC Members and TAC Membership Review
  - Mission Statement and Decision Methodology Review
  - Recap of February 26<sup>th</sup> Board Workshop
  - Review TAC Recommended Changes from Meetings #12 and 13;
  - Continued Discussion and Review of Issues Matrix;
  - Review of Regulatory Structure;
  - TAC review of Remaining Project Schedule; and
  - Take Public Comment.
1. Hubbell had all TAC members introduce themselves.
  2. Hubbell presented consensus decision making methodology. The TAC decided to continue using the consensus process.
  3. Hubbell reviewed the Mission Statement. There was discussion about the size of the wells to be protected, whether there is a need to add the new restricted and prohibited activities, water quality versus property rights and cost, and protecting water quantity. It was decided to move forward with updating the ordinance with the existing mission statement.
  4. There were no changes to the TAC 13 Meeting Minutes.
  5. Blood reviewed the Board Directions from the February 26th Board Workshop. The Board direction was to not reduce the size of the resource protection areas (RPA) as adopted in the 1992 ordinance, and to discuss and recommend on the use of the 2002 RPA delineations and chemical protection in and around the large public wells. In the areas between what was delineated in 1992 and 2002, the chemical protection is not to be lessened and is to be consistent with the adopted community based plans. The question was raised whether the chemical protection level was going to be countywide or different for each community planning area. Tampa Bay Water proposed that the 2002 ten year travel time and proposed chemical protections around the large public wells should be a floor. Community decisions could be made in the protected areas outside of the ten year travel time. A question was raised about whether there is a difference in the science and legal basis between wellhead protection and the community based planning process. The county attorney answered that wellhead protection must be science based and the community based planning process is a zoning and land use process. There were several requests to show by DOR or FLUCCS codes what types of industries and land owners will be

regulated and the acreage that will be regulated by using the combined resource protection areas of 1992 and 2002. A request was made to have a review done to determine where the inconsistencies are between the wellhead protection ordinance and the approved community plans.

6. Rebecca Kert reviewed the status of the setback for the petroleum underground storage tanks. In 1992, the Board adopted a 1,000 foot setback with the intention of petition FDEP for approval of the setback. There are no records regarding the FDEP petition. Joe Smith remembered that the process was derailed in 1992 and no petition was filed. The TAC agreed that a 500 foot setback will be used in the ordinance and the FDEP will be petitioned by Hillsborough County and EPC to use a ten year travel time for the setback.
7. Blood presented a map showing the 1,000 foot setback from the Tampa Bypass Canal. Tampa Bay Water wants a 1,000 foot setback from the top of the bank of the Tampa Bypass Canal from Fowler south to the lowest withdrawal point and to include the Harney Canal feed. The TAC agreed.
8. Mineer presented the agricultural issues regarding Intensive Agriculture, Public and Private Stables. The TAC agreed to remove these three uses from the Restricted Activities list and add Animal Production Unit to the list.
9. Mike Dryer of the Health Department presented information regarding septage spreading. The TAC agreed to keep septage spreading as a prohibited use in the resource protection areas.
10. Blood presented a matrix that shows the regulatory structure for approval of restricted and prohibited activities. The TAC agreed that all prohibited activities – existing, new or expansions – will require a Special Use Permit that is approved by the Land Use Hearing Officer. Appeals will go to the Board of County Commissioners. Special Use Permits are to consider water quality protection only, not other zoning or land use considerations. Questions were raised about how staff is going to coordinate with the technical agencies to develop the staff recommendations and what is required for standing to appeal a decision. The Development Review Procedures Manual needs to have a notice requirement for appeals of administrative decisions that go before a Land Use Hearing Officer.
11. Other issues to be spelled out in the ordinance include language that states that the requirements of the Wellhead and Water Resources Ordinance override the non-conforming use regulations in the Land Development Code and that only the portion of a piece of property that actually falls within a resource protection area is covered by the requirements of the ordinance.
12. No additional public comment was heard. The public present participated at the meeting.
13. The TAC adjourned at approximately 1:00 PM.