

(Draft 7/18/02)
Hillsborough County Wellhead and Resource Protection Study
Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)-Meeting 10 Minutes
Surface and Ground Water Protection for Hillsborough County
May 16, 2002
9:00 AM

Conference Room, 22nd Floor
Hillsborough County Center
601 East Kennedy Blvd.
Tampa, FL 33602

Meeting Objectives

- Review of TAC Purpose Statement;
- Finalize GWRPA Approach;
- Review and Consensus on Approach for Surface Water RPA's;
- Review of TAC Comments on Draft Ordinance;
- Overview and Discussion of Proposed Comp Plan Amendments;
- Discussion and Resolution of Any Remaining Issues; and
- Overview and Consensus on Remaining Issues;

Agenda

Purpose Statement Review

The TAC Purpose Statement was reviewed. No changes were recommended.

Review and Consensus on GW Final Report

The final report on groundwater modeling was presented to the TAC. Changes recommended from the groundwater subcommittee meeting were incorporated including sensitivity analyses on selected groundwater modeling parameters.

In addition the TAC recommended:

- A "Future Source" designation be attached as a label for Cone Ranch
- Property boundaries for Cone Ranch be added to the maps
- Any well modifications/locations within Section 21 Wellfield be considered as part of the GW modeling
- To put out the groundwater report on CD

Surface Water Resource Protection Area Review and Consensus

An overview of what was discussed and presented at TAC Meeting # 9 was given and the results of SW subcommittee meeting #1. The consensus for the subcommittee meeting was to evaluate the 100-year floodplain on the main stem of the Alafia and Hillsborough Rivers with a 200-foot buffer. The remaining areas would include those portions of the 100-year FEMA floodplain layer that were connected (not isolated) to one of the rivers but without a buffer.

This evaluation, which included the number of acres of different land classes impacted, was presented to the TAC and there was general consensus from the group on the methodology and approach to SW protection.

Comments and requests on the SW protection strategy included:

- A table that compares the original proposed SW protection strategy (100-year plus the quarter section buffer) and the newly proposed strategy would be helpful to the TAC. This should also include the new GW areas.
- Cypress Cr. was left off the map and out of the calculations. Rerun the numbers incorporating this area.
- What is the definition for DOR Code "0"?
- Provide Steve Gran the layers and numbers for him to compare to his agricultural model
- Include a map alteration trigger in the ordinance when FEMA updates flood mapping
- An encroachment into the 100-year floodplain through filling would trigger a review via the ordinance rather than a map amendment
- Should a minimum setback from a wetland be considered if there is a hydraulic connection to the rivers?
- How should existing mining be handled in the ordinance?
- Should the TBC be regulated differently since there is such a large GW contribution to that system?

Review of Draft Water Resource Protection Ordinance TAC Comments

Dan Blood gave an update on where we stood in the process of amending the current county ordinance. He suggested to the TAC that we “freeze” where we are in time and allow the staff to go back and incorporate all of the suggestions and comments received through the last several TAC meetings. Dan recommended that he update the ordinance package and that the TAC meet again in August of this year.

A preliminary schedule for completion of the project would entail public meetings and other outreach to take place this fall and land development code adoption by the HCBOCC to take place in the January through March time frame.

Public Comment

There was no public comment and the meeting adjourned at approximately 12:15 PM.