

Upper Hillsborough River Basin, Florida
Total Maximum Daily Load for
Dissolved Oxygen and BOD in
Blackwater Creek (WBID 1482), Itchepackesassa Creek
(WBID 1495B), and New River (WBID 1442)

Prepared by:
US Environmental Protection Agency
Region 4
Atlanta, GA

December 2005



Table of Contents

List of Tables 5
List of Figures 5
SUMMARY SHEET 8
SUMMARY SHEET 8
BLACKWATER CREEK INTRODUCTION 9
BLACKWATER CREEK PROBLEM DEFINITION 9
BLACKWATER CREEK WATERSHED DESCRIPTION 11
BLACKWATER CREEK WATER QUALITY STANDARD AND TARGET IDENTIFICATION..... 12
 Nutrients..... 13
 Dissolved Oxygen (DO) 13
 Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) 13
BLACKWATER CREEK: EXAMINE WATER QUALITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL DATA 13
 Ambient Water Quality Data 13
 Precipitation Data..... 25
BLACKWATER CREEK SOURCE ASSESSMENT 26
 Nonpoint sources 29
 Point sources 30
BLACKWATER CREEK ANALYTICAL APPROACH/ MODEL SELECTION AND DEVELOPMENT 30
 Mechanistic Model Approach..... 30
 TMDL Development..... 37
BLACKWATER CREEK ALLOCATIONS..... 41
 Waste Load Allocations (Regulated with treatment plant and stormwater permits) 42
 Load Allocations (Non- Regulated)..... 42
BLACKWATER CREEK MARGIN OF SAFETY 42
BLACKWATER CREEK CRITICAL CONDITIONS..... 42
BLACKWATER CREEK SEASONAL VARIATION 42
ITCHEPACKESASSA CREEK INTRODUCTION..... 42
ITCHEPACKESASSA CREEK PROBLEM DEFINITION..... 43
ITCHEPACKESASSA CREEK WATERSHED DESCRIPTION 45
ITCHEPACKESASSA CREEK WATER QUALITY STANDARD AND TARGET IDENTIFICATION..... 46
 Nutrients..... 46
 Dissolved Oxygen (DO) 46
 Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) 47
ITCHEPACKESASSA CREEK: EXAMINE WATER QUALITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL DATA..... 47
 Ambient Water Quality Data 47
 Precipitation Data..... 54
ITCHEPACKESASSA CREEK SOURCE ASSESSMENT 55
 Nonpoint sources 57

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin

Point sources	58
ITCHEPACKESASSA CREEK ANALYTICAL APPROACH/ MODEL SELECTION AND DEVELOPMENT	58
Mechanistic Model Approach.....	58
TMDL Development.....	64
ITCHEPACKESASSA CREEK ALLOCATIONS	66
Waste Load Allocations (Regulated with treatment plant and stormwater permits)	67
Load Allocations (Non- Regulated).....	67
ITCHEPACKESASSA CREEK MARGIN OF SAFETY	67
ITCHEPACKESASSA CREEK CRITICAL CONDITIONS	67
ITCHEPACKESASSA CREEK SEASONAL VARIATION	67
NEW RIVER INTRODUCTION	67
NEW RIVER PROBLEM DEFINITION	68
NEW RIVER WATERSHED DESCRIPTION.....	69
NEW RIVER WATER QUALITY STANDARD AND TARGET IDENTIFICATION	69
Nutrients.....	70
Dissolved Oxygen (DO)	70
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD).....	70
NEW RIVER EXAMINE WATER QUALITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL DATA.....	70
Ambient Water Quality Data	71
NEW RIVER SOURCE ASSESSMENT	76
Nonpoint sources	78
Point sources	78
NEW RIVER ANALYTICAL APPROACH/ MODEL SELECTION AND DEVELOPMENT	78
Mechanistic Model Approach.....	79
TMDL Development.....	85
NEW RIVER ALLOCATIONS	87
Expression and Allocation of the TMDL.....	87
NEW RIVER CRITICAL CONDITIONS.....	88
NEW RIVER SEASONAL VARIATION	88
REFERENCES	89

List of Tables

Table 1: Biological Assessments for the 303(d) listed water bodies.(FDEP, IWR Database version 14

Table 2: Water Quality Observation Stations used in assessment for Blackwater Creek, WBID 1482..... 15

Table 3: Summary of data for BLACKWATER CREEK 16

Table 4: Summary of data for ITCHEPACKASASSA CREEK 17

Table 5: Landuse in acres 28

Table 6: County Estimates of Septic Tanks and Repair Permits (FDEP, 2001)..... 29

Table 7: NPDES Facilities discharging to Impaired Waters 30

Table 8: Model predicted nitrogen, phosphorous and biochemical oxygen demand loads 33

Table 9: Point source permitted loads..... 33

Table 10: TMDL load allocations to Blackwater Creek..... 42

Table 11: Biological Assessments for the 303(d) listed water bodies.(FDEP, IWR Database version 16_2, 2004)..... 47

Table 12: Water Quality Observation Stations used in assessment for ITCHEPACKASASSA CREEK, WBID 1495B 48

Table 13: Summary of data for ITCHEPACKASASSA CREEK 48

Table 14: Landuse in acres 56

Table 15: County Estimates of Septic Tanks and Repair Permits (FDEP, 2001)..... 57

Table 16: NPDES Facilities discharging to Impaired Waters 58

Table 17: Model predicted nitrogen, phosphorous and biochemical oxygen demand loads 61

Table 18: Point source permitted loads..... 61

Table 19: TMDL allocations..... 67

Table 20: Biological Assessments for the 303(d) listed water bodies. 71

Table 21: Water Quality Observation Stations used in assessment for New River..... 71

Table 22: Summary of data for NEW RIVER 71

Table 23: Landuse in acres 77

Table 24: County Estimates of Septic Tanks and Repair Permits (FDEP, 2001)..... 78

Table 25: Model predicted nitrogen, phosphorous and BOD loads..... 81

Table 26: Comparison of Modeled and Observed Stream Flow at USGS 02303100 81

Table 27: 2003 Nutrient and BOD loads 87

List of Figures

Figure 1: Tampa Bay Tributaries, Impaired WBIDs that EPA is addressing 10

Figure 2: Dissolved Oxygen (DO) data. Median DO is 6.1mg/l. 17

Figure 3: Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) data. Median BOD is 1.3 mg/l and the statewide average is 1.4. 18

Figure 4: Chlorophyll-a data. Median chlorophyll-a is 4.38 ug/l and the statewide median ranges from 3 to 4. 18

Figure 5: Ammonia data from Blackwater Creek has a median of 0.05 mg/l and the statewide median is 0.036 mg/l..... 19

Figure 6: Nitrate plus nitrite data from Blackwater Creek has a median of 0.358 mg/l and the statewide median is 0.069. Note: Chart data is in mg/l not ug/l. 20

Figure 7: Median organic nitrogen in Organic nitrogen data from Blackwater Creek has median of 0.79 ug/l and the statewide median is 0.84. 20

Figure 8: Median TKN is 0.86 mg/l and the statewide median is 1.1. 21

Figure 9: Median total nitrogen is 1.17 mg/l and the statewide median is 1.2. 22

Figure 10: Median dissolved orthophosphate is 0.4 mg/l and the statewide median is 0.045..... 22

Figure 11: Median total orthophosphate is 0.475 mg/l and the statewide median is 0.03.23

Figure 12: Median total phosphorus is 0.521 mg/l and the statewide median is 0.075.... 23

Figure 13: DO data at several stations in Blackwater Creek 25

Figure 14: Itchepackesassa Creek observed and predicted ammonia..... 33

Figure 15: Itchepackesassa Creek observed and predicted nitrate..... 34

Figure 16: Itchepackesassa Creek observed and predicted phosphorous 34

Figure 17: Blackwater Creek observed and predicted phosphorous..... 35

Figure 18: Blackwater Creek observed and predicted ammonia 35

Figure 19: Blackwater Creek observed and predicted nitrate 36

Figure 20: Blackwater Creek in-stream DO with in-stream CBOD at 1xBOD5 and 3xBOD5 38

Figure 21: In-stream DO with in-stream CBOD at 1xBOD5 and 3xBOD5 38

Figure 22: Blackwater Creek predicted CBODu and observed BOD5..... 39

Figure 23: Blackwater Creek DO with Chlorophyll at 1 ug/l and 11 ug/l..... 39

Figure 24: Instream DO with watershed DO concentration at 2 and 5 mg/l 40

Figure 25: Blackwater Creek Instream DO with watershed DO concentration at 2 and 5 mg/l 41

Figure 26: Tampa Bay Tributaries, Impaired WBIDs that EPA is addressing 44

Figure 27: Median DO is 4.99 mg/l..... 49

Figure 28: Median chlorophyll-a is 9.35 ug/l and the statewide median ranges from 3 to 4..... 49

Figure 29: Ammonia median is 0.19 mg/l and the statewide median is 0.036 mg/l..... 50

Figure 30: Median nitrate plus nitrite is 0.47 ug/l and the statewide median is 0.069. 50

Figure 31: Median TKN is 1.1 mg/l and the statewide median is 1.1. 51

Figure 32: Median total nitrogen is 1.44 mg/l and the statewide median is 1.2. 52

Figure 33: Median dissolved orthophosphate is 0.48 mg/l and the statewide median is 0.045..... 52

Figure 34: Median total phosphorus is 0.63 mg/l and the statewide median is 0.075. 53

Figure 35: Predicted and observed ammonia..... 61

Figure 36: Predicted and observed nitrate 62

Figure 37: Predicted and observed phosphorous 62

Figure 38: In-stream DO with in-stream CBOD at 1xBOD5 and 3xBOD5 65

Figure 39: In-stream DO with chlorophyll = 11 and 1 ug/l. There is no noticeable effect on DO..... 65

Figure 40: Instream DO with watershed DO concentration at 2 and 5 mg/l 66

Figure 41: Tampa Bay Tributaries, Impaired WBIDs that EPA is addressing 69

Figure 42: Dissolved oxygen median is 2.61 mg/L 72

Figure 43: Chlorophyll-a median is 4.4; statewide median ranges from 3 to 4 mg/L 72

Figure 44: Ammonia nitrogen median is 0.067 mg/L; statewide median is 1.11mg/L 73

Figure 45: Nitrate plus nitrite median 0.011 mg/L; statewide median is 0.069..... 73

Figure 46: Dissolved orthophosphate median is 0.255 mg/L; statewide median is 0.045 74

Figure 47: TKN median is 2.05 mg/L; statewide median is 1.1 74

Figure 48: Total phosphorous median is 0.355; statewide median is 0.075 mg/L 75

Figure 49: New River observed and predicted ammonia..... 82

Figure 50: New River observed and predicted phosphorous 82

Figure 51: New River observed and predicted nitrate 83

Figure 52: New River observed and predicted BOD 83

Figure 53: New River observed and predicted chlorophyll-a..... 84

Figure 54: New River observed and predicted dissolved oxygen..... 84

Figure 55: New River DO sensitivity to levels of BOD (BOD has little affect on in-stream DO)..... 86

Figure 56: New River DO sensitivity to two levels of chlorophyll-a (Chlorophyll-a has little affect on in-stream DO)..... 86

Figure 57: New River DO sensitivity to two levels of watershed DO. DO from the watershed strongly influences the minimum in-stream DO 87

SUMMARY SHEET
Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL)

1. 303(d) Listed Waterbody Information

State: Florida **County:** Hillsborough **Major River Basin:** Tampa Bay Basin
(HUC 03100205)

Waterbody (List ID)	Listing Year	Impairment(s)	Pollutant(s)
Blackwater Creek (WBID 1482)	1998	Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD)	BOD
Blackwater Creek (WBID 1482)	1998	Dissolved Oxygen (DO)	Natural wetland DO consumption
Itchepackesassa Creek (WBID 1495B)	1998	Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD)	BOD
Itchepackesassa Creek (WBID 1495B)	1998	Dissolved Oxygen (DO)	Natural wetland DO consumption
New River (WBID 1442)	1998	Dissolved Oxygen	Natural wetland DO consumption

2. TMDL Endpoints (i.e., Targets) for Class III Waters (fresh):
Dissolved Oxygen (DO) shall not be less than 5.0 milligrams/L. Normal daily and seasonal fluctuations above these levels shall be maintained.

3. Pollutant Allocations (No Reduction Required)

Pollutant	TMDL	WLA		LA	MOS
		Continuous	MS4		
WBID 1482 Biochemical Oxygen Demand	554 kg/d	52.2 kg/d	No reduction	452 kg/d	50 kg/d
WBID 1495B Biochemical Oxygen Demand	376 kg/d	53 kg/d	No reduction	292 kg/d	32 kg/d
WBID 1442 Biochemical Oxygen Demand	24 kg/d	0	No reduction	22 kg/d	2 kg/d
WBID 1442 Total Phosphorus	6 kg/d	0	No reduction	5.4 kg/d	0.6 kg/d
WBID 1442 Total Nitrogen	19 kg/d	0	No reduction	17.1 kg/d	1.9 kg/d

4. Endangered Species (yes or blank):

5. EPA Lead on TMDL (EPA or blank): EPA

6. TMDL Considers Point Source, Nonpoint Source, or both: Both

7. Major NPDES Discharges to surface waters addressed in EPA TMDLs:

Facility Name	NPDES No.	Facility Type	Impacted Stream
Plant City Water Reclamation Facility	FL0026557	Domestic WTP	East Canal, Itchepackesassa Creek, Blackwater Creek
CSX Transportation	FL0032581	Contact Stormwater Runoff	Winston Creek, Itchepackesassa Creek, Blackwater Creek

BLACKWATER CREEK INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is proposing this Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for Blackwater Creek (WBID 1482) as required by the 1999 Consent Decree in *Florida Wildlife Federation, Inc., et al. v. Browner, et al.*, Northern District of Florida, Civil Action No. 4: 98CV356-WS. .

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has analyzed the available data and information for this waterbody, and has determined that this waterbody is *likely* not meeting the State of Florida's applicable water quality standard for dissolved oxygen (DO) due to naturally-occurring conditions. If the waterbody is not meeting its applicable water quality standards due to natural conditions, a TMDL would not be necessary nor would it be required by the consent decree. Florida's water quality standards recognize that some deviations from water quality standards occur as the result of natural background conditions, that is, the condition of the water in the absence of man-induced alterations. Florida's water quality standards also set out how the State is to establish the appropriate criteria for an altered waterbody, that is, where it can be demonstrated that the deviations would occur in the absence of any human-induced discharges or alterations to the water body. For such altered waterbodies, the State may establish a site-specific alternative criteria, based upon a similar unaltered waterbody or on historical pre-alteration data.

However, the existing data and information does not provide certainty that the deviations from the DO water quality standard are naturally occurring. EPA is therefore fulfilling its court-ordered commitment by proposing a TMDL for this waterbody. The TMDL, as proposed, indicates that the existing water quality standard for DO is not attainable in this waterbody, and therefore, recommends that the State of Florida establish a site-specific criterion for DO for this waterbody.

BLACKWATER CREEK PROBLEM DEFINITION

Blackwater Creek, WBID 1482 is on the 1998 303 (d) list for low dissolved oxygen, biochemical oxygen demand, and coliforms. This TMDL will address the DO and BOD impairment, and the other impairments will be covered by separate TMDL documents.

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin




Figure 1: Tampa Bay Tributaries, Impaired WBIDs that EPA is addressing

BLACKWATER CREEK WATERSHED DESCRIPTION

The FDEP Water Quality Assessment Report describes the Hillsborough River Basin which begins east-northeast of Zephyrhills and drains 690 square miles before emptying into the upper Hillsborough Bay, a part of Tampa Bay. Its headwaters originate in the southwestern portion of the Green Swamp, where it also receives overflow from the Withlacoochee River. The river channel is not clearly defined until the river leaves the swamp. From there, it flows southwesterly 54 miles through parts of Polk, Pasco, and Hillsborough Counties to upper Hillsborough Bay.

Perennially flowing tributaries to the Hillsborough River are Big Ditch and Flint Creek. Intermittent streams are Indian Creek, New River, Two Hole Branch, Basset Branch, Hollomans Branch, Clay Gully, Trout Creek, Blackwater Creek, and Cypress Creek. High floodwaters are diverted from the Hillsborough River at the confluence of Trout Creek and upstream of the Tampa Reservoir Dam through the Tampa Bypass Canal to McKay Bay.

Channelization has extended Sixmile Creek west and north to intersect the Hillsborough River at two points, the confluence of Trout Creek and near the midpoint of the Tampa Reservoir, which supplies drinking water to the city of Tampa. The modified Sixmile Creek was then renamed the Tampa Bypass Canal, which comprises two canals. The Harney Canal (C-136) runs from the Tampa Reservoir to join the second and longer canal, C-135, which connects the Hillsborough River at Trout Creek and Palm River. Both canals control flooding in the city of Tampa. Urban and built-up areas dominate the landscape in the southern quarter of the planning unit, which includes the urban and suburban areas of Tampa, Plant City, and Lakeland. In the upper half of the planning unit (to the north), urban and suburban areas appear as an east-west band encompassing Zephyrhills, Wesley Chapel, and Land O' Lakes. Together, urban and built-up lands comprise 25 percent of the total area. Within the region, which is characterized by expanding population growth and land development, large areas of swamps and forested uplands remain undeveloped along portions of the Hillsborough River and its principal tributaries. Together with other undeveloped lands, natural lands (uplands and wetlands) comprise 39 percent of the planning unit.

Throughout most of the rest of the planning unit, particularly in the upper reaches of its tributaries, land uses are primarily rangeland, pasture, and agriculture, including citrus groves and row crops. The greatest acreages of citrus are found around Land O' Lakes, in the Plant City/Dover/Seffner area south and east of Lake Thonotosassa, in the area around Lakeland, and in a wide area north of Zephyrhills. Generally, the northern and central portions of the watershed are rural, while the southern portions are mainly urban and industrial. However, suburban development radiating from major urban areas such as Tampa is spreading into rural areas.

Additional information about the river's hydrology and geology are available in the Basin Status Report for the Tampa Bay Tributaries Basin (Florida Department of Environmental Protection, 2003). For assessment purposes, the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (the Department) has divided the Tampa Bay Tributaries Basin

into water assessment polygons with a unique **waterbody identification** (WBID) number for each watershed or stream reach. The Hillsborough River has been divided into WBIDs or segments and this TMDL addresses Blackwater Creek, WBID 1482.

Several tributaries to the Hillsborough River are also impaired, such as Itchepackesassa Creek, Cow House Creek, and Crystal Springs. There are 127 permitted domestic and industrial facilities in the Hillsborough River planning unit. Urban land comprises 25 percent of the planning unit, natural lands comprise 39 percent, rangeland, pasture, and agriculture make up the rest of the planning unit.

Additionally, the Blackwater Creek and the Hillsborough River Basin are part of the Tampa Bay watershed for which a nitrogen management plan has been developed to protect and restore seagrasses in Tampa Bay. This plan implemented by the Tampa Bay Nitrogen Management Consortium (TBNMC) specifies target levels for nitrogen loading to the Tampa Bay at 1992-1994 levels. The TBNMC action plan includes stormwater treatment upgrades, conversion of septic systems to sewers, wastewater reuse, industrial retrofits, agricultural best management practices, land acquisition, and habitat restoration projects. Also, in 1980 all municipal wastewater treatment plants were required to provide Advanced Wastewater Treatment (AWT) for discharges directly to the bay and its tributaries.

BLACKWATER CREEK WATER QUALITY STANDARD AND TARGET IDENTIFICATION

Florida's surface waters are protected for five designated use classifications, as follows:

Class I	Potable water supplies
Class II	Shellfish propagation or harvesting
Class III	Recreation, propagation, and maintenance of a healthy, well-balanced population of fish and wildlife
Class IV	Agricultural water supplies
Class V	Navigation, utility, and industrial use (there are no state waters currently in this class)

Waterbodies in the Hillsborough River Basin are classified as freshwater Class III waters, with a designated use classification for recreation, propagation and maintenance of a healthy, well-balanced population of fish and wildlife. The water quality criteria for protection of Class III waters, are established by the State of Florida in the Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), Section 62-302.530. The individual criteria should be considered in conjunction with other provisions in water quality standards, including Section 62-302.500 F.A.C. [Surface Waters: Minimum Criteria, General Criteria] that apply to all waters unless alternative or more stringent criteria are specified in F.A.C. Section 62-302.530. In addition, unless otherwise stated, all criteria express the maximum not to be exceeded at any time. The specific criteria are as follows:

Nutrients

The discharge of nutrients shall continue to be limited as needed to prevent violations of other standards contained in this chapter [Section 62.302 F.A.C.] In no case shall nutrient concentrations of a body of water be altered so as to cause an imbalance in natural populations of aquatic flora and fauna [Section 62.302530 F.A.C.].

Dissolved Oxygen (DO)

Dissolved Oxygen (DO) shall not be less than 5.0 milligrams/L. Normal daily and seasonal fluctuations above these levels shall be maintained.

Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD)

BOD shall not be increased to exceed values which would cause dissolved oxygen to be depressed below the limit established for each Class and, in no case, shall it be great enough to produce nuisance conditions.

BLACKWATER CREEK: EXAMINE WATER QUALITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL DATA

The FDEP Water Quality Assessment Report describes that the status of surface water quality in the Tampa Bay Tributaries Basin was determined by evaluating three categories of data; chemistry data, biological data, and fish consumption advisories. The main source of water quality data was information collected between 1996 and 2003 and stored in the EPA's STorage and RETrieval (STORET) database. Other sources included the FDEP's Biology Database (SBIO) and fish consumption advisory and beach closure information from DOH. In order to develop the TMDL, these data sources and all additional available data was used.

Ambient Water Quality Data

Biological data and chemical water quality data was assessed during the review and listing process. This data is summarized here as background information for the TMDL development. First, the biological data is discussed.

Blackwater Creek scored excellent and good on 1996 SCI, and an overall rating of healthy on the bioecon analysis, and considered not impaired under the FDEP bioassessment summary of all biological data.

Itchepackasassa Creek which flows into Blackwater Creek scored excellent and good on 1996 SCI and poor on one 1995 SCI sample. It was considered not impaired under the FDEP bioassessment summary for 5 of 6 sample events. Also, two other segments of this creek (WBIDs 1524 and 1495A) were considered healthy based on the 1996 sample data. (FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, Division of Water Resource Management Basin Status Report, SOUTHWEST DISTRICT • GROUP 2 BASIN • JUNE 2002)

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin

A list of biological assessment results from FDEP's IWR database is shown in Table 1. This shows that Blackwater Creek (WBID 1482) scored good to excellent in 1995 to 1999, then fell to poor in 2000.

Table 1: Biological Assessments for the 303(d) listed water bodies.(FDEP, IWR Database version 16_2, 2004)

WBID	Score	Method	Station ID	Station Name	Test Result	Date
1482	Excellent	SCI	BLCKWTER 4	Blackwater Creek adjacent to Cone Ranch	33	1/6/1997
1482	Excellent	SCI	BLCKWTER 5	Blackwater Creek adjacent to Cone Ranch	29	10/25/1999
1482	Healthy	BIORECON	TP40BLKWTR	BLKWTR CRK, ~0.5MI E OF CONFLUENCE W/ HILLS.R	3	3/6/1996
1482	Healthy	BIORECON	TP40BLKWTR	BLKWTR CRK, ~0.5MI E OF CONFLUENCE W/ HILLS.R	3	8/16/1995
1482	Excellent	SCI	BLCKWTER 5	Blackwater Creek adjacent to Cone Ranch	31	4/22/1996
1482	Excellent	SCI	BLCKWTER 4	Blackwater Creek adjacent to Cone Ranch	31	4/22/1996
1482	Excellent	SCI	AO1-BLKCK	Blackwater Ck, 700 ft upstream of Hwy 39 Bridge	31	10/21/1996
1482	Excellent	SCI	BLCKWTER 4	Blackwater Creek adjacent to Cone Ranch	29	7/15/1996
1482	Excellent	SCI	BLCKWTER 5	Blackwater Creek adjacent to Cone Ranch	33	1/6/1997
1482	Excellent	SCI	BLCKWTER 4	Blackwater Creek adjacent to Cone Ranch	29	10/14/1996
1482	Good	SCI	BLCKWTER 5	Blackwater Creek adjacent to Cone Ranch	23	7/15/1996
1482	Excellent	SCI	AO4-BLKCK	Blackwater Ck 20 ft above Deeson Rd deadend	27	10/21/1996
1482	Excellent	SCI	BLCKWTER 5	Blackwater Creek adjacent to Cone Ranch	29	1/25/2000
1482	Good	SCI	AO5-BLKCK	Blackwater Ck, 10 ft below Shady Oak Dr West	25	10/21/1996
1482	Excellent	SCI	BLCKWTER 5	Blackwater Creek adjacent to Cone Ranch	27	4/29/2000
1482	Excellent	SCI	BLCKWTER 5	Blackwater Creek adjacent to Cone Ranch	31	10/14/1996
1482	Excellent	SCI	BLCKWTER 4	Blackwater Creek adjacent to Cone Ranch	33	1/25/2000
1482	Poor	SCI	BLCKWTER 4	Blackwater Creek adjacent to Cone Ranch	15	4/24/2000
1482	Poor	SCI	BLCKWTER 5	Blackwater Creek adjacent to Cone Ranch	19	8/29/2000
1482	Poor	SCI	BLCKWTER 4	Blackwater Creek adjacent to Cone Ranch	19	8/29/2000

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin

1495B	Good	SCI	FLJUICEREF	ITCHEPACKESASSA Ck, ref site for Fla Juice FYI	23	4/29/1996
1495B	Good	SCI	ICHTP60TST	Itchepackasassa Ck @ CR 582	23	8/6/1996
1495B	Good	SCI	FLJUICETST	ITCHEPACKESASSA Ck, test site for Fla Juice FYI	21	4/29/1996
1495B	Good	SCI	FLJUICEREF	ITCHEPACKESASSA Ck, ref site for Fla Juice FYI	21	11/6/1995
1495B	Suspect	BIORECON	ICHTP60TST	Itchepackasassa Ck @ CR 582	2	10/25/2002
1495B	Poor	SCI	FLJUICETST	ITCHEPACKESASSA Ck, test site for Fla Juice FYI	19	11/6/1995
1495B	Suspect	BIORECON	IC10	Itchepackasassa Creek downstream of Kraft Rd bri	1	2/7/2002
1495B	Healthy	BIORECON	ICHTP60TST	Itchepackasassa Ck @ CR 582	3	1/31/2002

Next the chemical water quality data is summarized. Tables showing the water quality monitoring stations in each WBID and a summary of the water quality results are shown below.

Table 2: Water Quality Observation Stations used in assessment for Blackwater Creek, WBID 1482

Station number	Station Name	First	Last Date
21FLKWATHIL-BLREEK150-2	hillsborough-blackwater creek-150-2	1/25/2000	11/26/2002
112WRD 280828082062900		7/24/2001	9/4/2001
112WRD 280858082124800		5/8/2001	9/4/2001
21FLGW 7442	swb-hs-1062	5/23/2000	5/23/2000
21FLHILL143	blackwater creek at sr 39 under rr bridge	1/19/1999	12/10/2002
21FLHILL24030003	blackwater cr at sr 39 under rr bridge	1/22/1991	12/8/1998
21FLKWATHIL-BLREEK114-1	hillsborough-blackwater creek-114-1	5/20/2000	5/20/2000
21FLKWATHIL-BLREEK114-2	hillsborough-blackwater creek-114-2	5/20/2000	5/20/2000
112WRD 02302500	blackwater creek nr knights, fla.	1/16/1991	9/12/2001
21FLKWATHIL-BLREEK150-1	hillsborough-blackwater creek-150-1	1/25/2000	11/26/2002
21FLTPA 24030100	cr5 - blackwater creek	9/27/1999	8/29/2000
21FLKWATHIL-BLREEK150-3	hillsborough-blackwater creek-150-3	1/25/2000	11/26/2002
21FLPOLKBLACKWATERCR1	blkwtr cr @ n harrelson r	6/14/1994	11/5/1998
21FLPOLKBLACKWATERCR2	blackwater creek2	11/4/2003	11/12/2003
21FLSWDFLO 51 2513 0	blackwater creek @ shady oak dr.	12/10/2002	12/10/2002
21FLSWDFLO 51 2515 0	blackwater creek @ sr 39	12/10/2002	12/10/2002
21FLSWDFLO0011	hills r - black wtr ck ab itchepackasassa ck	3/23/1992	8/24/1993
21FLSWDFLO0013	hills r - e canal ab itchepackasassa ck- grif rd	12/10/1992	12/10/1992
21FLTPA 24030097	cr4 - blackwater creek	9/27/1999	8/29/2000
21FLKWATHIL-BLREEK114-3	hillsborough-blackwater creek-114-3	5/20/2000	5/20/2000

Biochemical Oxygen Demand

BLACKWATER CREEK is on the 303(d) list for Biochemical Oxygen Demand and low DO. The water quality criteria for fresh waters states that the dissolved oxygen should not be less than 5.0 mg/L, and for water quality assessments the dissolved oxygen should not be less than 5.0 in more than 10% of the samples. Florida's criterion states that BOD

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin

shall not be increased to exceed values which would cause dissolved oxygen to be depressed below the limit established for each Class and, in no case, shall it be great enough to produce nuisance conditions.

Table 3: Summary of data for BLACKWATER CREEK

Parameter	Obs	Max	Min	Mean	StDev	Violations	Florida Criteria
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/l)	163	12.40	1.30	6.27	1.56	29	5
BOD 5-Day (mg/l)	112	5.70	0.10	1.51	0.85	NA	none

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin

Table 4: Summary of data for ITCHEPACKASASSA CREEK

Parameter	Obs	Max	Min	Mean	StDev	Violations	Florida Criteria
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/l)	57	9.98	0.56	4.87	2.27	29	5




Figure 2: Dissolved Oxygen (DO) data. Median DO is 6.1mg/l.

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin




Figure 3: Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) data. Median BOD is 1.3 mg/l and the statewide average is 1.4.




Figure 4: Chlorophyll-a data. Median chlorophyll-a is 4.38 ug/l and the statewide median ranges from 3 to 4.




Figure 5: Ammonia data from Blackwater Creek has a median of 0.05 mg/l and the statewide median is 0.036 mg/l.

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin




Figure 6: Nitrate plus nitrite data from Blackwater Creek has a median of 0.358 mg/l and the statewide median is 0.069. Note: Chart data is in mg/l not ug/l.




Figure 7: Median organic nitrogen in Organic nitrogen data from Blackwater Creek has median of 0.79 ug/l and the statewide median is 0.84.




Figure 8: Median TKN is 0.86 mg/l and the statewide median is 1.1.

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin




Figure 9: Median total nitrogen is 1.17 mg/l and the statewide median is 1.2.




Figure 10: Median dissolved orthophosphate is 0.4 mg/l and the statewide median is 0.045.

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin




Figure 11: Median total orthophosphate is 0.475 mg/l and the statewide median is 0.03.




Figure 12: Median total phosphorus is 0.521 mg/l and the statewide median is 0.075.

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin

Dissolved oxygen (DO) ranges from 1.3 to 12.4 mg/l. Twenty-nine of 163 (18%) DO samples were below the criterion of 5 mg/l. As an indication of imbalance of natural flora or fauna, FDEP's IWR states a maximum annual mean value of chlorophyll-a should not exceed 20 ug/l or annual mean chlorophyll-a values should not have increased by more than 50% over historical values for at least two consecutive years. Blackwater Creek data show chlorophyll-a has been below 20 in all samples taken since 1996 when levels were measured up to 60 ug/l.

BOD in Blackwater Creek ranges from 0.1 to 5.7 with a median value of 1.3 and the statewide average is 1.4.

Median total phosphorus and total nitrogen is 0.521 and 1.17 mg/l, respectively. This gives a nitrogen to phosphorus ratio of about 2, which results in a nitrogen limitation and excess phosphorus in the water. Calculating similarly with the portions of phosphorus and nitrogen readily available to plant uptake, the ratio is 0.05 ammonia to 0.4 dissolved orthophosphate. This gives a ratio of about 0.125 which confirms the nitrogen limitation.




Figure 13: DO data at several stations in Blackwater Creek


Figure 13 shows the DO is near or above the standard at stations 21FLGW7442 and 21FLPOLKBLACKWATERCR1 which are upstream of the confluence with Itchepackasassa Creek. The DO is frequently below the standard at station 112WRD02302500 which is below the confluence with Itchepackasassa Creek. The DO improves farther downstream at station 112WRD02303000 in the Hillsborough River.

Precipitation Data


NCDC meteorological stations in the Hillsborough River Basin include two WBAN stations and three COOP stations. These are WBAN 12818 Brooksville, WBAN 92802 Newport Ritchie, COOP 083986 Hillsborough River State Park, COOP 088783 Tampa Fowler Ave., and COOP 087205 Plant City. Annual summaries of the precipitation recorded at these stations shows wet and dry periods in the years from 1997 to 2003.

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin

Annual Precipitation Summary for Station WBAN 12818



Annual Precipitation Summary for Station WBAN 92802



BLACKWATER CREEK SOURCE ASSESSMENT

An important part of the TMDL analysis is the identification of sources or source categories in the watershed and the amount of pollutant loading contributed by each of these sources. Sources are broadly classified as either point or non-point sources.

A point source is defined as a discernable, confined, and discrete conveyance from which pollutants are or may be discharged to surface waters. Point source discharges of industrial wastewater and treated sanitary wastewater must be authorized by National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits. NPDES permitted facilities including certain urban stormwater discharges such as municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4 areas), certain industrial facilities, and construction sites over one acre are storm water driven sources that are considered as “point sources” in this report.

Non-point sources of pollution are diffuse sources that cannot be identified as entering a waterbody through a discrete conveyance. These include nutrient runoff of agricultural fields and golf courses, septic tanks, and residential developments outside of MS4 areas.

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin

	Residential (FLUCCS 1100-1300)	Comm, Ind, public (FLUCCS 1400- 1500,1700-1900)	Agriculture (FLUCCS 2100-2600)	Rangeland (FLUCCS 3100-3300)	Forest (FLUCCS 4100- 4400)	Water (FLUCCS 5100- 5400)	Wetlands (FLUCCS 6100-6500)	Barren &Extractive (FLUCCS 1600,7100- 7400)	Transportation and Utilities (FLUCCS 8100- 8300)	TOTAL
WBID										
1482	1525.99	180.60	8569.83	1810.92	2144.85	76.65	4913.52	371.06	151.96	19745.39
1495B	1054.04	1038.08	2581.96	420.83	1692.29	144.55	1302.62	13.52	182.46	8430.34

Table 5: Landuse in acres

Nonpoint sources

Nonpoint sources that ultimately contribute to depletion of in-stream dissolved oxygen include sources of nutrients such as animal waste, waste-lagoon sludge, fertilizer application to agricultural fields, lawns, and golf courses, and malfunctioning onsite sewage treatment and disposal systems or septic tank systems.

The State of Florida Department of Health (www.doh.state.fl.us/environment/statistics) publishes septic tanks data on a county basis. Table 6 summarizes the number of septic systems installed since the 1970 census and the total number of repair permits issued between 1996 and 2001. The data does not reflect septic tanks removed from service.

Table 6: County Estimates of Septic Tanks and Repair Permits (FDEP, 2001)

County	Number of Septic Tanks (2002)	Number of Repair Permits Issued (1996 – 2002)
Hillsborough	100,483	1,651

In 1982, Florida became the first state in the country to implement statewide regulations to address the issue of nonpoint source pollution by requiring new development and redevelopment to treat stormwater before it is discharged. The Stormwater Rule, as outlined in Chapter 403 Florida Statutes (F.S.), was established as a technology-based program that relies upon the implementation of BMPs that are designed to achieve a specific level of treatment (i.e., performance standards) as set forth in Chapter 62-40, F.A.C.

Florida's stormwater program is unique in having a performance standard for older stormwater systems that were built before the implementation of the Stormwater Rule in 1982. This rule states: "the pollutant loading from older stormwater management systems shall be reduced as needed to restore or maintain the beneficial uses of water" (Section 62-4-.432 (5)(c), F.A.C.).

Nonstructural and structural BMPs are an integral part of the State's stormwater programs. Nonstructural BMPs, often referred to as "source controls", are those that can be used to prevent the generation of NPS pollutants or to limit their transport off-site. Typical nonstructural BMPs include public education, land use management, preservation of wetlands and floodplains, and minimizing impervious surfaces. Technology-based structural BMPs are used to mitigate the increased stormwater peak discharge rate, volume, and pollutant loadings that accompany urbanization.

Landuse in the impaired WBIDs is shown in Table 5. The spatial distribution and acreage of different land use categories were identified using the 1999 land use coverage (scale 1:40,000) contained in the FDEP's GIS library. This dataset was derived from Ifrared Digital Orthophoto Quadrangle photo interpretations using the Florida Land Use Classification Code System (FLUCCS). Land use categories in the watershed were aggregated using the FLUCCS Level 2 codes.

Point sources

There are six NPDES permitted continuous dischargers to the impaired waters addressed by EPA developed TMDLs in the Tampa Bay tributaries basin. One of these discharges to Blackwater Creek, and one to Itchepackessassa Creek.

Table 7: NPDES Facilities discharging to Impaired Waters

NPDES	Facility	Receiving Waters
FL0026557	Plant City WRF(D001)	Westside Canal to Pemberton Creek to Hillsborough River (prior to 1997)
FL0026557	Plant City WRF(D002)	Blackwater Creek (after 1997)
FL0032581	CSX Transportation, Inc.	Winston Creek to Itchepackessassa Creek

Also, there are municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4) throughout the Hillsborough River Basin since the area is extensively developed. The MS4 areas by WBID1482 are Kathleen, Lakeland, and Winston.

BLACKWATER CREEK ANALYTICAL APPROACH/ MODEL SELECTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Since this WBID was impaired for low DO, a water quality simulation model of the complex DO processes was utilized to analyze and develop a TMDL. Only seasonal trends of DO were simulated since DO violations of the standard were observed in the monthly trend monitoring data. The purpose of utilizing water quality models for the development of DO and BOD TMDLs in this stream system is to understand the linkage between the low in-stream DO and the factors that cause the low DO. The models can help determine which factors cause a greater effect than others. Some of the major factors in DO processes include watershed and stream flow and geometry, nutrient loads from the watershed, BOD loads from the watershed, in-stream plants and algae, and sediment oxygen demand.

The approach here is to model the Hillsborough River watershed hydrology, nutrient loads, BOD loads, then deliver these flows and loads to the impaired receiving streams, and finally model the in-stream water quality processes within these receiving streams. The major unknowns are the DO concentrations of the water flowing from the watershed into the receiving streams, and the BOD decay rates.

Due to the major unknown factors and the limited data, this model application is not intended to predict absolute DO values, but instead to predict the relative effect of nutrients, algae, and BOD on in-stream DO.

Mechanistic Model Approach

WAM was utilized to simulate the watershed hydrology and water quality loads for most of the Hillsborough River Basin. WASP models were set up to examine the DO processes in the Hillsborough River mainstem and the major tributaries Blackwater Creek,

Itchepackesassa Creek, Baker Creek, New River, and Cypress Creek. The WAM model was used to predict flows and loads that were then linked to the WASP models.

The following summary on of the WAM model is from EPA's Watershed and Water Quality Modeling Technical Support Center web site (<http://www.epa.gov/athens/wwqtsc/WAMView.pdf>). WAM's interface uses ESRI's ArcView 3.2a with Spatial Analyst 1.1 (or 2.0). WAM was developed to allow engineers and planners to assess the water quality of both surface water and groundwater based on land use, soils, climate, and other factors. The model simulates the primary physical processes important for watershed hydrologic and pollutant transport. The WAM GIS-based coverages include land use, soils, topography, hydrography, basin and sub-basin boundaries, point sources and service area coverages, climate data, and land use and soils description files. The coverages are used to develop data that can be used in the simulation of a variety of physical and chemical processes.

WAM was developed based on a grid cell representation of the watershed. The grid cell representation allows for the identification of surface and groundwater flow and phosphorus concentrations for each cell. The model then "routes" the surface water and groundwater flows from the cells to assess the flow and phosphorus levels throughout the watershed. The model simulates the following elements: surface water and ground water flow allowing for the assessment of flow and pollutant loading for a tributary reach at both the daily and hourly time increment as necessary; water quality including particulate and soluble phosphorus, particulate and soluble nitrogen (NO₃, NH₄, and organic N), total suspended solids, and biological oxygen demand.

WAM was linked to WASP (SWET, 2003), which enables the simulation of dissolved oxygen and chlorophyll-a. The WAM model simulates the hydrology of the watershed using other imbedded models including "Groundwater Loading Effects of Agricultural Management Systems" (GLEAMS; Knisel, 1993), "Everglades Agricultural Area Model" (EAAMod; Botcher et al., 1998; SWET, 1999), and two submodels written specifically for WAM to handle wetland and urban landscapes. Dynamic routing of flows is accomplished through the use of an algorithm that uses a Manning's flow equation based technique (Jacobson et al., 1998). Attenuation is based on the flow rate, characteristics of the flow path, and the distance of travel. The model provides many features that improve its ability to simulate the physical features in the generation of flows and loadings including:

- Flow structures simulation
- Generation of typical farms
- BMPs
- Rain zones built into unique cells definitions, which also allows use with NEXRAD Data
- Full erosion/deposition and in-stream routing –is used with ponds and reservoirs
- Closed basins and depressions are simulated
- Separate simulation of vegetative areas in residential and urban
- Simulation of point sources with service areas

- Urban retention ponds
- Impervious sediment buildup/washoff
- Shoreline reaches for more precise delivery to rivers, lakes, and estuaries
- Wildlife diversity within wetlands
- Spatial map of areas having wetland assimilation protection
- Indexing submodels for BOD, bacteria, and toxins

The overall operation of the model is managed by the ArcView-based interface. The interface allows the user to view available data, modify land use conditions, execute the model, and view results.

In order to evaluate the effect of BOD, nutrients, algae, and other oxygen demanding substances on DO processes a Water Quality Analysis Simulation Program (WASP) model was setup for this river segment. The Water Quality Analysis Simulation Program version 6 (WASP6) is an enhancement of the original WASP (Di Toro et al., 1983; Connolly and Winfield, 1984; Ambrose, R.B. et al., 1988). This model helps users interpret and predict water quality responses to natural phenomena and man-made pollution for various pollution management decisions. WASP6 is a dynamic compartment-modeling program for aquatic systems, including both the water column and the underlying benthos. The time-varying processes of advection, dispersion, point and diffuse mass loading, and boundary exchange are represented in the basic program. Water quality processes are represented in special kinetic subroutines that are either chosen from a library or written by the user. WASP is structured to permit easy substitution of kinetic subroutines into the overall package to form problem-specific models. WASP6 comes with two such models -- TOXI for toxicants and EUTRO for conventional water quality. Earlier versions of WASP have been used to examine eutrophication of Tampa Bay; phosphorus loading to Lake Okeechobee; eutrophication of the Neuse River and estuary; eutrophication and PCB pollution of the Great Lakes (Thomann, 1975; Thomann et al., 1976; Thomann et al., 1979; Di Toro and Connolly, 1980), eutrophication of the Potomac Estuary (Thomann and Fitzpatrick, 1982), Kepone pollution of the James River Estuary (O'Connor et al., 1983), volatile organic pollution of the Delaware Estuary (Ambrose, 1987), and heavy metal pollution of the Deep River, North Carolina (JRB, 1984). In addition to these, numerous applications are listed in Di Toro et al., 1983.

The flexibility afforded by the Water Quality Analysis Simulation Program is unique. WASP6 permits the modeler to structure one, two, and three-dimensional models; allows the specification of time-variable exchange coefficients, advective flows, waste loads and water quality boundary conditions. The eutrophication module of WASP6 was applied to the Blackwater Creek in this study.

Flow, depth, velocity, and nutrient and BOD loads predicted by the WAM model was used in the WASP models. Solar radiation data was obtained on the University of Florida Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences, Florida Automated Weather Network world-wide-web site <http://fawn.ifas.ufl.edu/>. Sediment oxygen demand (SOD) can be a major contributor to low D.O. SOD measurements in the nearby Alafai River range from 1.2 to over 7 grams/square meter/day, (Measured Sediment Oxygen Demand Rates, USEPA). SOD measurements in the Ocklawaha River Basin's Rice Creek upstream of the Georgia Pacific Mill discharge range from 1.5 to 3.0. SOD rate of 1.5 was used in this WASP

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin

model for Blackwater Creek. Incremental BOD and nutrient loads were entered into WASP from the results of the WAM model. These estimated existing nutrient and BOD loads from the watershed are summarized in Table 8. In-stream model predictions compared to observed water quality data are shown next.

Table 8: Model predicted nitrogen, phosphorous and biochemical oxygen demand loads

<u>Year</u>	<u>TN (kg/d)</u>	<u>TP (kg/d)</u>	<u>BOD (kg/d)</u>	<u>Annual Average Flow (m3/s)</u>
1999	128	31	226	1.52
2000	159	50	283	1.77
2001	259	75	554	2.81
2002	218	51	353	2.39
2003	264	61	442	3.34

Table 9: Point source permitted loads

<u>Point Source Facilities</u>	<u>TN (kg/d)</u>	<u>TP (kg/d)</u>	<u>CBOD₅ (kg/d)</u>	<u>Flow (m3/s)</u>
Plant City, FL0026557	30.4	10.1	50.7	0.12




Figure 14: Itchepackesassa Creek observed and predicted ammonia

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin




Figure 15: Itchepackesassa Creek observed and predicted nitrate




Figure 16: Itchepackesassa Creek observed and predicted phosphorous

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin




Figure 17: Blackwater Creek observed and predicted phosphorous




Figure 18: Blackwater Creek observed and predicted ammonia




Figure 19: Blackwater Creek observed and predicted nitrate

TMDL Development

The TMDLs were developed by using the model to understand the river system and determine the levels of the water quality parameters that result in attainment of the DO water quality standard. As shown in Figure 3 and again in Figure 22, BOD is relatively low, near detection limits and has little impact on the DO in this river system. Figure 20 and Figure 21 show that the DO varies little with a three fold difference in BOD. Nutrients can affect the DO through algae production and respiration. An excess of algae growth can imbalance the natural system and cause large DO swings from high supersaturation to low levels. Additionally, the algae population can reach a limiting level of nutrients or light and then experience a large die-off, that can then result in DO consumption and low in-stream DO. Figure 23 shows that DO in this river system is not greatly affected by algae production. Excess growth of algae may be partially prevented by the naturally dark water in this system.

Sediment oxygen demand (SOD) is another factor that can contribute to low DO. However, based on measured data from similar streams and the model results, the SOD in the stream channel is likely not high enough to cause the chronic low DO found in this river system.

After examining each of the factors that can contribute to low DO, the levels of these factors found in the Itchepackesassa Creek and Blackwater Creek system are not excessive enough to cause the chronically low DO found in this system. The low DO in this river system is likely a result of natural processes in the wetlands and groundwater flowing into these streams. Since the watershed model is not simulating the DO processes on the watershed and wetland areas, and the receiving stream model is simulating only the processes that occur in the streams, the DO levels in the water flowing from the wetlands and groundwater to the streams is unknown. The sensitivity of the in-stream DO to the DO concentration of the water entering from the watershed can be simulated by ranging these watershed DO concentrations. Figure 24 (Itchepackesassa Creek) and Figure 25 (Blackwater Creek) show simulated in-stream DO with the watershed DO set to 2 mg/l and then at 5 mg/l. This demonstrates that if the water flowing from the watershed had DO concentrations of 5 mg/l then the in-stream DO would remain above the water quality standard. Note that the few days in June 2000 and Sept. 2001 during which the DO drops slightly below 5 mg/l are due to model upsets and are ignored.

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin




Figure 20: Blackwater Creek in-stream DO with in-stream CBOD at 1xBOD5 and 3xBOD5




Figure 21: In-stream DO with in-stream CBOD at 1xBOD5 and 3xBOD5

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin




Figure 22: Blackwater Creek predicted CBODu and observed BOD5




Figure 23: Blackwater Creek DO with Chlorophyll at 1 ug/l and 11 ug/l

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin




Figure 24: Instream DO with watershed DO concentration at 2 and 5 mg/l




Figure 25: Blackwater Creek Instream DO with watershed DO concentration at 2 and 5 mg/l

BLACKWATER CREEK ALLOCATIONS

The TMDL and allocation of the load is shown in Table 10. Since the low in-stream DO is a result of low DO water flowing from groundwater and wetlands, and not the result of in-stream algae, nutrient, and BOD oxygen consumption, no load reductions are specified in this TMDL report. It is recommended that loads of nutrients and BOD be maintained at current levels. Florida standards state at 62-302.300(15) FAC, “Pollution which causes or contributes to new violations of water quality standards or to continuation of existing violations is harmful to the waters of this State and shall not be allowed. Waters having water quality below the criteria established for them shall be protected and enhanced. However, the Department shall not strive to abate natural conditions.” The purpose of a TMDL is to allocate pollutant loading such that water quality standards are achieved. The Clean Water Act at Section 303(d)(1)(C) states, “Such load shall established at a level necessary to implement the applicable water quality standards ...” In expressing this TMDL, EPA must apply the applicable dissolved oxygen water quality standard while also considering the directive not to abate natural conditions.

This TMDL analysis demonstrated that neither nutrients, BOD, chlorophyll, or sediment oxygen demand caused the low DO in Blackwater Creek. Instead the low DO was the result of natural processes in the wetlands and groundwater flowing into these streams. Therefore the DO TMDL requires no reductions of BOD, SOD, or nutrients.

Table 10: TMDL load allocations to Blackwater Creek

Pollutant	TMDL	WLA		LA	MOS
		Continuous	MS4		
Biochemical Oxygen Demand	554 kg/d	52.2 kg/d	0.0	452 kg/d	50 kg/d

Waste Load Allocations (Regulated with treatment plant and stormwater permits)

The waste load allocation (WLA) is divided into continuous discharges from treatment plants and storm water loads from municipal separate storm sewer systems. For 5-day carbonaceous biochemical oxygen demand the continuous WLA is a maximum of 52.2 kg/d which is based on the current permit limits of 5 mg/l. The regulated storm-water loads should also be held at current levels which is specified as zero percent reduction of BOD.

Load Allocations (Non- Regulated)

For 5-day carbonaceous biochemical oxygen demand the LA is a maximum of 452 kg/d which is based on the estimated watershed loads less a ten percent margin of safety.

BLACKWATER CREEK MARGIN OF SAFETY

A ten percent explicit margin of safety is included in the allocation of BOD. This also implies an implicit margin of safety on the DO allocation.

BLACKWATER CREEK CRITICAL CONDITIONS

Critical conditions were considered by analyzing a multi year period containing wet, normal, and dry conditions. Since these impaired waters receive both storm water driven loads and continuous flow loads, both wet events and dry events were analyzed.

BLACKWATER CREEK SEASONAL VARIATION

Seasonal variation was considered by analyzing a multi year period containing all seasons and wet, normal, and dry conditions.

The next section discusses the TMDL for Itchepackesassa Creek.

ITCHEPACKESASSA CREEK INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is proposing this Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for Itchepackesassa Creek (WBID 1495B) as required by the 1999 Consent Decree in Florida Wildlife Federation, Inc., et al. v. Browner, et al., Northern District of Florida, Civil Action No. 4: 98CV356-WS. .

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has analyzed the available data and information for this waterbody, and has determined that this waterbody is *likely* not meeting the State of Florida’s applicable water quality standard for dissolved oxygen (DO) due to naturally-occurring conditions. If the waterbody is not meeting its applicable water quality standards due to natural conditions, a TMDL would not be necessary nor would it be required by the consent decree. Florida’s water quality standards recognize

that some deviations from water quality standards occur as the result of natural background conditions, that is, the condition of the water in the absence of man-induced alterations. Florida's water quality standards also set out how the State is to establish the appropriate criteria for an altered waterbody, that is, where it can be demonstrated that the deviations would occur in the absence of any human-induced discharges or alterations to the water body. For such altered waterbodies, the State may establish a site-specific alternative criteria, based upon a similar unaltered waterbody or on historical pre-alteration data.

However, the existing data and information does not provide certainty that the deviations from the DO water quality standard are naturally occurring. EPA is therefore fulfilling its court-ordered commitment by proposing a TMDL for this waterbody. The TMDL, as proposed, indicates that the existing water quality standard for DO is not attainable in this waterbody, and therefore, recommends that the State of Florida establish a site-specific criterion for DO for this waterbody.

Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act requires each state to list those waters within its boundaries for which technology based effluent limitations are not stringent enough to protect any water quality standard applicable to such waters. Listed waters are prioritized with respect to designated use classifications and the severity of pollution. In accordance with this prioritization, states are required to develop Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for those water bodies that are not meeting water quality standards. The TMDL process establishes the allowable loadings of pollutants or other quantifiable parameters for a waterbody based on the relationship between pollution sources and in-stream water quality conditions, so that states can establish water quality based controls to reduce pollution from both point and non-point sources and restore and maintain the quality of their water resources (USEPA, 1991).

The Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) has developed 303(d) lists since 1992. The list of impaired waters in each basin, referred to as the Verified List, is also required by the FWRA (Subsection 403.067[4]), Florida Statutes [F.S.]). However, the FWRA (Section 403.067, F.S.) stated that all previous Florida 303(d) lists were for planning purposes only and directed the Department to develop, and adopt by rule, a new science-based methodology to identify impaired waters. After a long rule-making process, the Florida Environmental Regulation Commission adopted the new methodology as Chapter 62-303, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.) (Identification of Impaired Surface Waters Rule, or IWR), in April 2001. The TMDLs developed in this report are for impaired waters on the 1998 303(d) list but not on FDEP's verified list.

ITCHEPACKESASSA CREEK PROBLEM DEFINITION

Itchepakesassa Creek, WBID 1495B is on the 1998 303 (d) list for low dissolved oxygen, and biochemical oxygen demand. This TMDL will address the low DO and BOD impairment.

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin




Figure 26: Tampa Bay Tributaries, Impaired WBIDs that EPA is addressing

ITCHEPACKESASSA CREEK WATERSHED DESCRIPTION

The FDEP Water Quality Assessment Report describes the Hillsborough River Basin which begins east-northeast of Zephyrhills and drains 690 square miles before emptying into the upper Hillsborough Bay, a part of Tampa Bay. Its headwaters originate in the southwestern portion of the Green Swamp, where it also receives overflow from the Withlacoochee River. The river channel is not clearly defined until the river leaves the swamp. From there, it flows southwesterly 54 miles to upper Hillsborough Bay.

Perennially flowing tributaries to the Hillsborough River are Big Ditch and Flint Creek. Intermittent streams are Indian Creek, New River, Two Hole Branch, Basset Branch, Hollomans Branch, Clay Gully, Trout Creek, Blackwater Creek, and Cypress Creek. High floodwaters are diverted from the Hillsborough River at the confluence of Trout Creek and upstream of the Tampa Reservoir Dam through the Tampa Bypass Canal to McKay Bay.

Channelization has extended Sixmile Creek west and north to intersect the Hillsborough River at two points, the confluence of Trout Creek and near the midpoint of the Tampa Reservoir, which supplies drinking water to the city of Tampa. The modified Sixmile Creek was then renamed the Tampa Bypass Canal, which comprises two canals. The Harney Canal (C-136) runs from the Tampa Reservoir to join the second and longer canal, C-135, which connects the Hillsborough River at Trout Creek and Palm River. Both canals control flooding in the city of Tampa. Urban and built-up areas dominate the landscape in the southern quarter of the planning unit, which includes the urban and suburban areas of Tampa, Plant City, and Lakeland. In the upper half of the planning unit (to the north), urban and suburban areas appear as an east-west band encompassing Zephyrhills, Wesley Chapel, and Land O' Lakes. Together, urban and built-up lands comprise 25 percent of the total area. Within the region, which is characterized by expanding population growth and land development, large areas of swamps and forested uplands remain undeveloped along portions of the Hillsborough River and its principal tributaries. Together with other undeveloped lands, natural lands (uplands and wetlands) comprise 39 percent of the planning unit.

Throughout most of the rest of the planning unit, particularly in the upper reaches of its tributaries, land uses are primarily rangeland, pasture, and agriculture, including citrus groves and row crops. The greatest acreages of citrus are found around Land O' Lakes, in the Plant City/Dover/Seffner area south and east of Lake Thonotosassa, in the area around Lakeland, and in a wide area north of Zephyrhills. Generally, the northern and central portions of the watershed are rural, while the southern portions are mainly urban and industrial. However, suburban development radiating from major urban areas such as Tampa is spreading into rural areas.

Additional information about the river's hydrology and geology are available in the Basin Status Report for the Tampa Bay Tributaries Basin (Florida Department of Environmental Protection, 2003). For assessment purposes, the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (the Department) has divided the Tampa Bay Tributaries Basin into water assessment polygons with a unique **waterbody identification (WBID)** number

for each watershed or stream reach. The Hillsborough River has been divided into WBIDs or segments and this TMDL addresses WBID1495B.

Several tributaries to the Hillsborough River are also impaired, such as Blackwater Creek, Cow House Creek, and Crystal Springs. There are 127 permitted domestic and industrial facilities in the Hillsborough River planning unit. Urban land comprises 25 percent of the planning unit, natural lands comprise 39 percent, rangeland, pasture, and agriculture make up the rest of the planning unit.

Itchepackesassa Creek is impaired for DO and BOD.

ITCHEPACKESASSA CREEK WATER QUALITY STANDARD AND TARGET IDENTIFICATION

Florida's surface waters are protected for five designated use classifications, as follows:

Class I	Potable water supplies
Class II	Shellfish propagation or harvesting
Class III	Recreation, propagation, and maintenance of a healthy, well-balanced population of fish and wildlife
Class IV	Agricultural water supplies
Class V	Navigation, utility, and industrial use (there are no state waters currently in this class)

Waterbodies in the Hillsborough River Basin are classified as freshwater Class III waters, with a designated use classification for recreation, propagation and maintenance of a healthy, well-balanced population of fish and wildlife. The water quality criteria for protection of Class III waters, are established by the State of Florida in the Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), Section 62-302.530. The individual criteria should be considered in conjunction with other provisions in water quality standards, including Section 62-302.500 F.A.C. [Surface Waters: Minimum Criteria, General Criteria] that apply to all waters unless alternative or more stringent criteria are specified in F.A.C. Section 62-302.530. In addition, unless otherwise stated, all criteria express the maximum not to be exceeded at any time. The specific criteria are as follows:

Nutrients

The discharge of nutrients shall continue to be limited as needed to prevent violations of other standards contained in this chapter [Section 62.302 F.A.C.] In no case shall nutrient concentrations of a body of water be altered so as to cause an imbalance in natural populations of aquatic flora and fauna [Section 62.302530 F.A.C.].

Dissolved Oxygen (DO)

Dissolved Oxygen (DO) shall not be less than 5.0 milligrams/L. Normal daily and seasonal fluctuations above these levels shall be maintained.

Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD)

BOD shall not be increased to exceed values which would cause dissolved oxygen to be depressed below the limit established for each Class and, in no case, shall it be great enough to produce nuisance conditions.

ITCHEPACKESASSA CREEK: EXAMINE WATER QUALITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL DATA

The FDEP Water Quality Assessment Report describes that the status of surface water quality in the Tampa Bay Tributaries Basin was determined by evaluating three categories of data; chemistry data, biological data, and fish consumption advisories. The main source of water quality data was information collected between 1996 and 2003 and stored in the EPA’s STOrage and RETrieval (STORET) database. Other sources included the FDEP’s Biology Database (SBIO) and fish consumption advisory and beach closure information from DOH. In order to develop the TMDL, these data sources and all additional available data was used.

Ambient Water Quality Data

Biological data and chemical water quality data was assessed during the review and listing process. This data is summarized here as background information for the TMDL development. First, the biological data is discussed.

Itchepackasassa Creek scored excellent and good on 1996 SCI and poor on one 1995 SCI sample. It was considered not impaired under the FDEP bioassessment summary for 5 of 6 sample events. Also, two other segments of this creek (WBIDs 1524 and 1495A) were considered healthy based on the 1996 sample data. (FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, Division of Water Resource Management Basin Status Report, SOUTHWEST DISTRICT • GROUP 2 BASIN • JUNE 2002)

A list of biological assessment results from FDEP’s IWR database is shown in Table 1.

Table 11: Biological Assessments for the 303(d) listed water bodies.(FDEP, IWR Database version 16_2, 2004)

WBID	Score	Method	Station ID	Station Name	Test Result	Date
1495B	Good	SCI	FLJUICEREF	ITCHEPACKESASSA Ck, ref site for Fla Juice FYI	23	4/29/1996
1495B	Good	SCI	ICHTP60TST	Itchepackasassa Ck @ CR 582	23	8/6/1996
1495B	Good	SCI	FLJUICETST	ITCHEPACKESASSA Ck, test site for Fla Juice FYI	21	4/29/1996
1495B	Good	SCI	FLJUICEREF	ITCHEPACKESASSA Ck, ref site for Fla Juice FYI	21	11/6/1995
1495B	Suspect	BIORECON	ICHTP60TST	Itchepackasassa Ck @ CR 582	2	10/25/2002
1495B	Poor	SCI	FLJUICETST	ITCHEPACKESASSA Ck, test site for Fla Juice FYI	19	11/6/1995
1495B	Suspect	BIORECON	IC10	Itchepackesassa Creek downstream of Kraft Rd bri	1	2/7/2002

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin

Next the chemical water quality data is summarized. Tables showing the water quality monitoring stations in each WBID and a summary of the water quality results are shown below.

Table 12: Water Quality Observation Stations used in assessment for ITCHEPACKASASSA CREEK, WBID 1495B

Station number	Station Name	First	Last Date
21FLWQA 280212708201460	itchepackesassa creek @ kraft road	10/18/1999	1/31/2002
21FLGW 8034	swb-ls-1019	8/23/2000	8/23/2000
21FLKWATHIL-ITREEK116-1	hillsborough-itchepackesassa creek-116-1	4/5/2000	12/19/2002
21FLKWATHIL-ITREEK116-2	hillsborough-itchepackesassa creek-116-2	4/5/2000	12/19/2002
21FLKWATHIL-ITREEK116-3	hillsborough-itchepackesassa creek-116-3	4/5/2000	12/19/2002
21FLTPA 24030081	tp60 - itchepackasassa creek	1/31/2002	10/22/2002
21FLTPA 280159708200285	ic04-itchepackesassa creek	1/31/2002	2/10/2003
112WRD 02302260	itchepakesassa creek at s-582 nr knights, fl	5/9/2001	9/10/2001
21FLTPA 280304908201427	itche-2 itchepackasassa creek	5/30/2002	10/22/2002
21FLWQA 280615208206442	itche ck upstream of east canal	1/29/2002	1/29/2002
21FLWQA 280226108201472	itchepackesassa creek @ frontage rd south	10/19/1999	1/29/2002
21FLWQA 280232108201061	itchepackesassa creek @ galloway road	10/19/1999	1/29/2002
21FLWQA 280233408200475	trib to itche coming from lakeland golf course	10/19/1999	3/5/2002
21FLWQA 280304908201427	itchepackesassa creek @ swindell road	10/18/1999	1/31/2002
21FLWQA 280405608201528	itchepackesassa @ walker road	10/19/1999	1/29/2002
21FLWQA 280449408204227	itchepackesassa creek @ knights-griffin road	10/14/1999	1/31/2002
21FLTPA 280212708201460	ic10-itchepackesassa creek	2/7/2002	2/7/2002

ITCHEPACKASASSA CREEK is on the 303(d) list for Biochemical Oxygen Demand and low DO. For fresh waters the dissolved oxygen should not be less than 5.0 mg/L, and for assessments the dissolved oxygen should not be less than 5.0 in more than 10% of the samples.

Table 13: Summary of data for ITCHEPACKASASSA CREEK

Parameter	Obs	Max	Min	Mean	StDev	Violations	Florida Criteria
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/l)	57	9.98	0.56	4.87	2.27	29	5

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin




Figure 27: Median DO is 4.99 mg/l.




Figure 28: Median chlorophyll-a is 9.35 ug/l and the statewide median ranges from 3 to 4.

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin




Figure 29: Ammonia median is 0.19 mg/l and the statewide median is 0.036 mg/l.




Figure 30: Median nitrate plus nitrite is 0.47 ug/l and the statewide median is 0.069.




Figure 31: Median TKN is 1.1 mg/l and the statewide median is 1.1.

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin




Figure 32: Median total nitrogen is 1.44 mg/l and the statewide median is 1.2.




Figure 33: Median dissolved orthophosphate is 0.48 mg/l and the statewide median is 0.045.




Figure 34: Median total phosphorus is 0.63 mg/l and the statewide median is 0.075.

Dissolved oxygen (DO) ranges from 0.56 to 9.98 mg/l. Twenty-nine of 57 (51%) DO samples were below the criterion of 5 mg/l. As an indication of imbalance of natural flora or fauna, FDEP's IWR states a maximum annual mean value of chlorophyll-a should not exceed 20 ug/l or annual mean chlorophyll-a values should not have increased by more than 50% over historical values for at least two consecutive years. Itchepakesassa Creek chlorophyll-a data show one of the six samples slightly exceeded 20.


No BOD measurements were recorded in Itchepakesassa Creek.

Median total phosphorus and total nitrogen is 0.63 and 1.44 mg/l, respectively. This gives a nitrogen to phosphorus ratio of about 2, which results in a nitrogen limitation and excess phosphorus in the water. Calculating similarly with the portions of phosphorus and nitrogen readily available to plant uptake, the ratio is 0.19 ammonia to 0.48 dissolved orthophosphate. This gives a ratio of about 0.4, which confirms the nitrogen limitation.

Precipitation Data


NCDC meteorological stations in the Hillsborough River Basin include two WBAN stations and three COOP stations. These are WBAN 12818 Brooksville, WBAN 92802 Newport Ritchie, COOP 083986 Hillsborough River State Park, COOP 088783 Tampa Fowler Ave., and COOP 087205 Plant City. Annual summaries of the precipitation recorded at these stations shows wet and dry periods in the years from 1997 to 2003.

Annual Precipitation Summary for Station WBAN 12818



December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin

Annual Precipitation Summary for Station WBAN 92802



ITCHEPACKESASSA CREEK SOURCE ASSESSMENT

An important part of the TMDL analysis is the identification of sources or source categories in the watershed and the amount of pollutant loading contributed by each of these sources. Sources are broadly classified as either point or non-point sources.

A point source is defined as a discernable, confined, and discrete conveyance from which pollutants are or may be discharged to surface waters. Point source discharges of industrial wastewater and treated sanitary wastewater must be authorized by National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits. NPDES permitted facilities including certain urban stormwater discharges such as municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4 areas), certain industrial facilities, and construction sites over one acre are storm water driven sources that are considered as “point sources” in this report.

Non-point sources of pollution are diffuse sources that cannot be identified as entering a waterbody through a discrete conveyance. These include nutrient runoff of agricultural fields and golf courses, septic tanks, and residential developments outside of MS4 areas.

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin

	Residential (FLUCCS 1100-1300)	Comm, Ind, public (FLUCCS 1400- 1500,1700-1900)	Agriculture (FLUCCS 2100-2600)	Rangeland (FLUCCS 3100-3300)	Forest (FLUCCS 4100- 4400)	Water (FLUCCS 5100- 5400)	Wetlands (FLUCCS 6100-6500)	Barren &Extractive (FLUCCS 1600,7100- 7400)	Transportation and Utilities (FLUCCS 8100- 8300)	TOTAL
WBID										
1495B	1054.04	1038.08	2581.96	420.83	1692.29	144.55	1302.62	13.52	182.46	8430.34

Table 14: Landuse in acres

Nonpoint sources

Nonpoint sources that ultimately contribute to depletion of in-stream dissolved oxygen include sources of nutrients such as animal waste, waste-lagoon sludge ,fertilizer application to agricultural fields, lawns, and golf courses, and malfunctioning onsite sewage treatment and disposal systems or septic tank systems.

The State of Florida Department of Health (www.doh.state.fl.us/environment/statistics) publishes septic tanks data on a county basis. Table 15 summarizes the number of septic systems installed since the 1970 census and the total number of repair permits issued between 1996 and 2001. The data does not reflect septic tanks removed from service.

Table 15: County Estimates of Septic Tanks and Repair Permits (FDEP, 2001)

County	Number of Septic Tanks (2002)	Number of Repair Permits Issued (1996 – 2002)
Hillsborough	100,483	1,651

In 1982, Florida became the first state in the country to implement statewide regulations to address the issue of nonpoint source pollution by requiring new development and redevelopment to treat stormwater before it is discharged. The Stormwater Rule, as outlined in Chapter 403 Florida Statutes (F.S.), was established as a technology-based program that relies upon the implementation of BMPs that are designed to achieve a specific level of treatment (i.e., performance standards) as set forth in Chapter 62-40, F.A.C.

Florida’s stormwater program is unique in having a performance standard for older stormwater systems that were built before the implementation of the Stormwater Rule in 1982. This rule states: “the pollutant loading from older stormwater management systems shall be reduced as needed to restore or maintain the beneficial uses of water” (Section 62-4-.432 (5)(c), F.A.C.).

Nonstructural and structural BMPs are an integral part of the State’s stormwater programs. Nonstructural BMPs, often referred to as “source controls”, are those that can be used to prevent the generation of NPS pollutants or to limit their transport off-site. Typical nonstructural BMPs include public education, land use management, preservation of wetlands and floodplains, and minimizing impervious surfaces. Technology-based structural BMPs are used to mitigate the increased stormwater peak discharge rate, volume, and pollutant loadings that accompany urbanization.

Landuse in the impaired WBIDs is shown in Table 5. The spatial distribution and acreage of different land use categories were identified using the 1999 land use coverage (scale 1:40,000) contained in the FDEP’s GIS library. This dataset was derived from Ifrared Digital Orthophoto Quadrangle photo interpretations using the Florida Land Use Classification Code System (FLUCCS). Land use categories in the watershed were aggregated using the FLUCCS Level 2 codes.

Point sources

There are six NPDES permitted continuous dischargers to the impaired waters addressed by EPA developed TMDLs in the Tampa Bay tributaries basin.

Table 16: NPDES Facilities discharging to Impaired Waters

NPDES	Facility	Receiving Waters
FL0026557	Plant City WRF(D001)	Westside Canal to Pemberton Creek to Hillsborough River (prior to 1997)
FL0026557	Plant City WRF(D002)	Blackwater Creek (after 1997)
FL0032581	CSX Transportation, Inc.	Winston Creek to Itchepackessassa Creek

Also there are municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4) throughout the Hillsborough River Basin since the area is extensively developed. The MS4 areas by WBID 1495B are Lakeland, and Winston.

ITCHEPACKESASSA CREEK ANALYTICAL APPROACH/ MODEL SELECTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Since this WBID was impaired for low DO, a water quality simulation model of the complex DO processes was utilized to analyze and develop a TMDL. Only seasonal trends of DO were simulated since DO violations of the standard were observed in the monthly trend monitoring data. The purpose of utilizing water quality models for the development of DO and BOD TMDLs in this stream system is to understand the linkage between the low in-stream DO and the factors that cause the low DO. The models can help determine which factors cause a greater effect than others. Some of the major factors in DO processes include watershed and stream flow and geometry, nutrient loads from the watershed, BOD loads from the watershed, in-stream plants and algae, and sediment oxygen demand.

The approach here is to model the Hillsborough River watershed hydrology, nutrient loads, BOD loads, then deliver these flows and loads to the impaired receiving streams, and finally model the in-stream water quality processes within these receiving streams. The major unknowns are the DO concentrations of the water flowing from the watershed into the receiving streams, and the BOD decay rates.

Due to the major unknown factors and the limited data, this model application is not intended to predict absolute DO values, but instead to predict the relative effect of nutrients, algae, and BOD on in-stream DO.

Mechanistic Model Approach

WAM was utilized to simulate the watershed hydrology and water quality loads for most of the Hillsborough River Basin. WASP models were set up to examine the DO processes in the Hillsborough River mainstem and the major tributaries Blackwater Creek, Itchepackessassa Creek, Baker Creek, New River, and Cypress Creek. The WAM model was used to predict flows and loads which were then linked to the WASP models.

The following summary on of the WAM model is from EPA’s Watershed and Water Quality Modeling Technical Support Center web site

(<http://www.epa.gov/athens/wwqtsc/WAMView.pdf>). WAM's interface uses ESRI's ArcView 3.2a with Spatial Analyst 1.1 (or 2.0). WAM was developed to allow engineers and planners to assess the water quality of both surface water and groundwater based on land use, soils, climate, and other factors. The model simulates the primary physical processes important for watershed hydrologic and pollutant transport. The WAM GIS-based coverages include land use, soils, topography, hydrography, basin and sub-basin boundaries, point sources and service area coverages, climate data, and land use and soils description files. The coverages are used to develop data that can be used in the simulation of a variety of physical and chemical processes.

WAM was developed based on a grid cell representation of the watershed. The grid cell representation allows for the identification of surface and groundwater flow and phosphorus concentrations for each cell. The model then "routes" the surface water and groundwater flows from the cells to assess the flow and phosphorus levels throughout the watershed. The model simulates the following elements: surface water and ground water flow allowing for the assessment of flow and pollutant loading for a tributary reach at both the daily and hourly time increment as necessary; water quality including particulate and soluble phosphorus, particulate and soluble nitrogen (NO₃, NH₄, and organic N), total suspended solids, and biological oxygen demand.

WAM was linked to WASP (SWET, 2003), which enables the simulation of dissolved oxygen and chlorophyll-a. The WAM model simulates the hydrology of the watershed using other imbedded models including "Groundwater Loading Effects of Agricultural Management Systems" (GLEAMS; Knisel, 1993), "Everglades Agricultural Area Model" (EAAMod; Botcher et al., 1998; SWET, 1999), and two submodels written specifically for WAM to handle wetland and urban landscapes. Dynamic routing of flows is accomplished through the use of an algorithm that uses a Manning's flow equation based technique (Jacobson et al., 1998). Attenuation is based on the flow rate, characteristics of the flow path, and the distance of travel. The model provides many features that improve its ability to simulate the physical features in the generation of flows and loadings including:

- Flow structures simulation
- Generation of typical farms
- BMPs
- Rain zones built into unique cells definitions, which also allows use with NEXRAD Data
- Full erosion/deposition and in-stream routing –is used with ponds and reservoirs
- Closed basins and depressions are simulated
- Separate simulation of vegetative areas in residential and urban
- Simulation of point sources with service areas
- Urban retention ponds
- Impervious sediment buildup/washoff
- Shoreline reaches for more precise delivery to rivers, lakes, and estuaries
- Wildlife diversity within wetlands
- Spatial map of areas having wetland assimilation protection

- Indexing submodels for BOD, bacteria, and toxins

The overall operation of the model is managed by the ArcView-based interface. The interface allows the user to view available data, modify land use conditions, execute the model, and view results.

In order to evaluate the effect of BOD, nutrients, algae, and other oxygen demanding substances on DO processes a Water Quality Analysis Simulation Program (WASP) model was setup for this river segment. The Water Quality Analysis Simulation Program version 6 (WASP6) is an enhancement of the original WASP (Di Toro et al., 1983; Connolly and Winfield, 1984; Ambrose, R.B. et al., 1988). This model helps users interpret and predict water quality responses to natural phenomena and man-made pollution for various pollution management decisions. WASP6 is a dynamic compartment-modeling program for aquatic systems, including both the water column and the underlying benthos. The time-varying processes of advection, dispersion, point and diffuse mass loading, and boundary exchange are represented in the basic program. Water quality processes are represented in special kinetic subroutines that are either chosen from a library or written by the user. WASP is structured to permit easy substitution of kinetic subroutines into the overall package to form problem-specific models. WASP6 comes with two such models -- TOXI for toxicants and EUTRO for conventional water quality. Earlier versions of WASP have been used to examine eutrophication of Tampa Bay; phosphorus loading to Lake Okeechobee; eutrophication of the Neuse River and estuary; eutrophication and PCB pollution of the Great Lakes (Thomann, 1975; Thomann et al., 1976; Thomann et al, 1979; Di Toro and Connolly, 1980), eutrophication of the Potomac Estuary (Thomann and Fitzpatrick, 1982), kepone pollution of the James River Estuary (O'Connor et al., 1983), volatile organic pollution of the Delaware Estuary (Ambrose, 1987), and heavy metal pollution of the Deep River, North Carolina (JRB, 1984). In addition to these, numerous applications are listed in Di Toro et al., 1983.

The flexibility afforded by the Water Quality Analysis Simulation Program is unique. WASP6 permits the modeler to structure one, two, and three-dimensional models; allows the specification of time-variable exchange coefficients, advective flows, waste loads and water quality boundary conditions. The eutrophication module of WASP6 was applied to the Blackwater Creek in this study.

Flow, depth, velocity, and nutrient and BOD loads predicted by the WAM model was used in the WASP models. Solar radiation data was obtained on the University of Florida Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences, Florida Automated Weather Network world-wide-web site <http://fawn.ifas.ufl.edu/>. Sediment oxygen demand (SOD) can be a major contributor to low D.O. SOD measurements in the nearby Alafai River range from 1.2 to over 7 grams/square meter/day, (Measured Sediment Oxygen Demand Rates, USEPA). SOD measurements in the Ocklawaha River Basin's Rice Creek upstream of the Georgia Pacific Mill discharge range from 1.5 to 3.0. SOD rate of 1.5 was used in this WASP model for Blackwater Creek. Incremental BOD and nutrient loads were entered into WASP from the results of the WAM model.

The estimated existing nutrient and BOD loads from the watershed are summarized in Table 17. The permitted annual average loads for the Plant City discharge are shown in

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin

Table 18. The CSX discharge is intermittent and small and is not expected to discharge BOD or significant amounts of nutrients. Model predictions compared to observed water quality data are shown next.

Table 17: Model predicted nitrogen, phosphorous and biochemical oxygen demand loads

<u>Year</u>	<u>TN (kg/d)</u>	<u>TP (kg/d)</u>	<u>BOD (kg/d)</u>	<u>Annual Average Flow (m3/s)</u>
1999	87	23	178	1.10
2000	103	35	217	1.24
2001	148	46	376	1.75
2002	134	35	268	1.60
2003	171	43	359	2.22

Table 18: Point source permitted loads

<u>Point Source Facilities</u>	<u>TN (kg/d)</u>	<u>TP (kg/d)</u>	<u>CBOD₅ (kg/d)</u>	<u>Flow (m3/s)</u>
Plant City, FL0026557	30.4	10.1	50.7	0.12




Figure 35: Predicted and observed ammonia

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin




Figure 36: Predicted and observed nitrate




Figure 37: Predicted and observed phosphorous

TMDL Development

The TMDLs were developed by using the model to understand the river system and determine the levels of the water quality parameters that result in attainment of the DO water quality standard. Figure 21 shows that the DO varies little with a three fold difference in BOD. Nutrients can affect the DO through algae and other plant production and respiration. An excess of algae growth can imbalance the natural system and cause large DO swings from high super saturation to low levels. Additionally, the algae population can reach a limiting level of nutrients or light and then experience a large die-off, that can then result in DO consumption and low in-stream DO. Figure 39 shows that DO in this river system is not greatly affected by algae production. Excess growth of algae may be partially prevented by the naturally dark water in this system.

Sediment oxygen demand (SOD) is another factor that can contribute to low DO. However, based on measured data from similar streams and the model results, the SOD in the stream channel is likely not high enough to cause the chronic low DO found in this river system.

After examining each of the factors that can contribute to low DO, the levels of these factors found in the Itchepackesassa Creek system are not high enough to cause the chronically low DO found in this system. The low DO in this river system is likely a result of natural processes in the ground water and wetlands flowing into these streams. Since the watershed model is not simulating the DO processes on the watershed and wetland areas, and the receiving stream model is simulating only the processes that occur in the streams, the DO levels in the water flowing from the wetlands to the streams is unknown. The sensitivity of the in-stream DO to the DO concentration of the water entering the stream from the watershed can be simulated by ranging these watershed DO concentrations. Figure 40 shows simulated in-stream DO with the watershed DO set to 2 mg/l and then at 5 mg/l. This demonstrates that if the water flowing from the watershed had DO concentrations of 5 mg/l then the in-stream DO would remain above the water quality standard. Note that the few days in June 2000 and Sept. 2001 during which the DO drops slightly below 5 mg/l are due to model upsets resulting from extreme high flow spikes, and are ignored.

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin




Figure 38: In-stream DO with in-stream CBOD at 1xBOD5 and 3xBOD5




Figure 39: In-stream DO with chlorophyll = 11 and 1 ug/l. There is no noticeable effect on DO.




Figure 40: Instream DO with watershed DO concentration at 2 and 5 mg/l

ITCHEPACKESASSA CREEK ALLOCATIONS

The TMDL and allocation of the load is shown in Table 19. Since the low in-stream DO is a result of low DO water flowing from groundwater and wetlands, and not the result of in-stream algae, nutrient, and BOD oxygen consumption, no load reductions are specified in this TMDL report. It is recommended that loads of nutrients and BOD be maintained at current levels. Florida standards state at 62-302.300(15) FAC, "Pollution which causes or contributes to new violations of water quality standards or to continuation of existing violations is harmful to the waters of this State and shall not be allowed. Waters having water quality below the criteria established for them shall be protected and enhanced. However, the Department shall not strive to abate natural conditions." The purpose of a TMDL is to allocate pollutant loading such that water quality standards are achieved. The Clean Water Act at Section 303(d)(1)(C) states, "Such load shall established at a level necessary to implement the applicable water quality standards ..." In expressing this TMDL, EPA must apply the applicable dissolved oxygen water quality standard while also considering the directive not to abate natural conditions. This TMDL analysis demonstrated that neither nutrients, BOD, chlorophyll, or sediment oxygen demand caused the low DO in Itchepackesassa Creek. Instead the low DO was the result of natural processes in the wetlands and groundwater flowing into these streams. Therefore the DO TMDL requires no reductions of BOD, SOD, or nutrients. We recommend that a site-specific DO criteria be developed for Itchepackesassa Creek to account for the influence of natural low dissolved oxygen in ground water and surrounding wetlands under low flow conditions.

Table 19: TMDL allocations

Pollutant	TMDL	WLA		LA	MOS
		Continuous	MS4		
Biochemical Oxygen Demand	376 kg/d	53 kg/d	292 kg/d	292 kg/d	32 kg/d

Waste Load Allocations (Regulated with treatment plant and stormwater permits)

The waste load allocation (WLA) is divided into continuous discharges from treatment plants and storm water loads from municipal separate storm sewer systems. For 5-day carbonaceous biochemical oxygen demand the continuous WLA is a maximum of 53 kg/d which is based on the current permit limits of 5 mg/l. The regulated storm-water loads should also be held at current levels which is specified as zero percent reduction of BOD. The sum of the MS4 load and the LA should not be more than 292 kg/d BOD.

Load Allocations (Non- Regulated)

The sum of the MS4 load and the LA should not be more than 292 kg/d BOD.

ITCHEPACKESASSA CREEK MARGIN OF SAFETY

A ten percent explicit margin of safety is included in the allocation of BOD. This also implies an implicit margin of safety on the DO allocation.

ITCHEPACKESASSA CREEK CRITICAL CONDITIONS

Critical conditions were considered by analyzing a four year period containing wet, normal, and dry conditions. Since these impaired waters receive both storm water driven loads and continuous flow loads, both wet events and dry events were analyzed.

ITCHEPACKESASSA CREEK SEASONAL VARIATION

Seasonal variation was considered by analyzing a four year period containing all seasons and wet, normal, and dry conditions.

The next section discusses the TMDL for New River.

NEW RIVER INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is proposing this Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for New River (WBID 1442) as required by the 1999 Consent Decree in Florida Wildlife Federation, Inc., et al. v. Browner, et al., Northern District of Florida, Civil Action No. 4: 98CV356-WS.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has analyzed the available data and information for this waterbody, and has determined that this waterbody is *likely* not meeting the State of Florida’s applicable water quality standard for dissolved oxygen

(DO) due to naturally-occurring conditions. If the waterbody is not meeting its applicable water quality standards due to natural conditions, a TMDL would not be necessary nor would it be required by the consent decree. Florida's water quality standards recognize that some deviations from water quality standards occur as the result of natural background conditions, that is, the condition of the water in the absence of man-induced alterations. Florida's water quality standards also set out how the State is to establish the appropriate criteria for an altered waterbody, that is, where it can be demonstrated that the deviations would occur in the absence of any human-induced discharges or alterations to the water body. For such altered waterbodies, the State may establish a site-specific alternative criterion, based upon a similar unaltered waterbody or on historical pre-alteration data.

However, the existing data and information does not provide certainty that the deviations from the DO water quality standard are naturally occurring. EPA is therefore fulfilling its court-ordered commitment by proposing a TMDL for this waterbody. The TMDL, as proposed, indicates that the existing water quality standard for DO is not attainable in this waterbody, and therefore, recommends that the State of Florida establish a site-specific criterion for DO for this waterbody.

In this proposed TMDL, EPA is seeking comments on the technical analysis presented in the TMDL. EPA is also requesting stakeholders to submit any additional data and information related to the causes of non-attainment of the DO water quality standard in this waterbody. If EPA is able to establish that the low DO conditions of the waterbody are due to natural conditions, the TMDL will not be finalized. If, on the other hand, EPA obtains data and information indicating a pollutant to be the cause, EPA will revise the TMDL to reflect this finding.

NEW RIVER PROBLEM DEFINITION

New River, WBID 1442 is on the 1998 303 (d) list for low dissolved oxygen, and coliforms. This TMDL will address the DO impairment, and separate documents will cover the TMDLs addressing the other impairments.




Figure 41: Tampa Bay Tributaries, Impaired WBIDs that EPA is addressing

NEW RIVER WATERSHED DESCRIPTION

The FDEP Water Quality Assessment Report describes the Hillsborough River Basin, which begins east-northeast of Zephyrhills and drains 690 square miles before emptying into the upper Hillsborough Bay, as a part of Tampa Bay. Its headwaters originate in the southwestern portion of the Green Swamp, where it also receives overflow from the Withlacoochee River. The river channel is not clearly defined until the river leaves the swamp. From there, it flows southwesterly 54 miles to upper Hillsborough Bay. New River, WBID 1442 is a tributary to the Hillsborough River

NEW RIVER WATER QUALITY STANDARD AND TARGET IDENTIFICATION

Florida’s surface waters are protected for five designated use classifications, as follows:

- Class I Potable water supplies
- Class II Shellfish propagation or harvesting

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin

Class III	Recreation, propagation, and maintenance of a healthy, well-balanced population of fish and wildlife
Class IV	Agricultural water supplies
Class V	Navigation, utility, and industrial use (there are no state waters currently in this class)

Waterbodies in the Hillsborough River Basin are classified as freshwater Class III waters, with a designated use classification for recreation, propagation and maintenance of a healthy, well-balanced population of fish and wildlife. The water quality criteria for protection of Class III waters, are established by the State of Florida in the Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), Section 62-302.530. The individual criteria should be considered in conjunction with other provisions in water quality standards, including Section 62-302.500 F.A.C. [Surface Waters: Minimum Criteria, General Criteria] that apply to all waters unless alternative or more stringent criteria are specified in F.A.C. Section 62-302.530. In addition, unless otherwise stated, all criteria express the maximum not to be exceeded at any time. The specific criteria are as follows:

Nutrients

The discharge of nutrients shall continue to be limited as needed to prevent violations of other standards contained in this chapter [Section 62.302 F.A.C.] In no case shall nutrient concentrations of a body of water be altered so as to cause an imbalance in natural populations of aquatic flora and fauna [Section 62.302530 F.A.C.].

Dissolved Oxygen (DO)

Dissolved Oxygen (DO) shall not be less than 5.0 milligrams/L (mg/L). Normal daily and seasonal fluctuations above these levels shall be maintained.

Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD)

BOD shall not be increased to exceed values which would cause dissolved oxygen to be depressed below the limit established for each Class and, in no case, shall it be great enough to produce nuisance conditions.

NEW RIVER EXAMINE WATER QUALITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL DATA

The FDEP Water Quality Assessment Report describes that the status of surface water quality in the Tampa Bay Tributaries Basin was determined by evaluating three categories of data; chemistry data, biological data, and fish consumption advisories. The main source of water quality data was information collected between 1996 and 2003 and stored in the EPA's STorage and RETrieval (STORET) database. Other sources included the FDEP's Biology Database (SBIO) and fish consumption advisory and beach closure information from DOH. In order to develop the TMDL, these data sources and all additional available data was used.

Ambient Water Quality Data

Biological data and chemical water quality data was assessed during the review and listing process. This data is summarized here as background information for the TMDL development. First, the biological data is discussed.

A list of biological assessment results from FDEP’s IWR database (FDEP, IWR Database version 16_2, 2004) is shown in Table 1. This shows that New River (WBID 1442) scored suspect in 1996 and improved to good in 1998 and 2002.

Table 20: Biological Assessments for the 303(d) listed water bodies.

WBID	Score	Method	Station ID	Station Name	Test Result	Date
1442	Good	SCI	NEWRVTP47	NEW RIVER AT SR579	21	9/14/1998
1442	Healthy	BIORECON	NEWRVTP47	NEW RIVER AT SR579	3	10/2/1995
1442	Suspect	BIORECON	NEWRVTP47	NEW RIVER AT SR579	2	3/14/1996
1442	Good	SCI	NEWRIVER	New River@ Chancey Rd	23	11/20/2002

Next the chemical water quality data is summarized. Tables showing the water quality monitoring stations in each WBID and a summary of the water quality results are shown below.

Table 21: Water Quality Observation Stations used in assessment for New River

Station number	Station Name	First Date	Last Date
21FLTPA281312821558	nr-3 new river	6/26/2002	11/5/2002
21FLTPA280954821553	nr-2 new river	6/27/2002	11/5/2002
21FLTPA24030075	tp47 - new river	2/16/1998	11/5/2002
21FLSWDFLO0060	new river above hillsborough river	12/10/1992	9/15/1993

New River is on the 303(d) list for Dissolved Oxygen. For fresh waters the dissolved oxygen should not be less than 5.0 mg/L, and for assessments the dissolved oxygen should not be less than 5.0 in more than 10% of the samples.

Table 22: Summary of data for NEW RIVER

Parameter	Obs	Max	Min	Mean	StDev	Violations	Florida Criteria
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/l)	24	6.79	0.31	3.01	2.05	18	5




Figure 42: Dissolved oxygen median is 2.61 mg/L




Figure 43: Chlorophyll-a median is 4.4; statewide median ranges from 3 to 4 mg/L




Figure 44: Ammonia nitrogen median is 0.067 mg/L; statewide median is 1.11mg/L




Figure 45: Nitrate plus nitrite median 0.011 mg/L; statewide median is 0.069.

Note: the data in Figure 45 is in mg/L not µg/L




Figure 46: Dissolved orthophosphate median is 0.255 mg/L; statewide median is 0.045




Figure 47: TKN median is 2.05 mg/L; statewide median is 1.1




Figure 48: Total phosphorous median is 0.355; statewide median is 0.075 mg/L

Dissolved oxygen (DO) ranges from 0.31 to 6.79 mg/l. Eighteen of 24 (75%) DO samples were below the criterion of 5 mg/l. This percentage is well above the 10% monitoring and assessment threshold that indicates a waterbody is not meeting the DO criteria. However, the biological monitoring data documented in Table 1 indicates that in 1998 and 2002 the New River aquatic community was not impaired. In addition, the New River data show chlorophyll-a has been below 13 ug/l in all samples and the median of the data is 4.4 ug/l. These values are typical of unimpaired Florida streams and would not be sufficient to adversely impact the DO in the stream. No BOD data were recorded in the New River.

Additional analyses of the nutrient data indicate that the median total phosphorus and total nitrogen concentrations are 0.355 mg/l and 2.05 mg/l, respectively. This translates to a nitrogen to phosphorus ratio of about 6, which results in a nitrogen limitation and excess phosphorus in the water. Also, most of the total nitrogen is organic nitrogen and not nitrate- nitrite, less than 0.1 mg/l, indicating that natural decay processes are the likely source of the nitrogen and not application of inorganic nitrate-ammonia fertilizer.

NEW RIVER SOURCE ASSESSMENT

An important part of the TMDL analysis is the identification of sources or source categories in the watershed and the amount of pollutant loading contributed by each of these sources. Sources are broadly classified as either point or non-point sources.

A point source is defined as a discernable, confined, and discrete conveyance from which pollutants are or may be discharged to surface waters. Point source discharges of industrial wastewater and treated sanitary wastewater must be authorized by National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits. NPDES permitted facilities including certain urban stormwater discharges such as municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4 areas), certain industrial facilities, and construction sites over one acre are storm water driven sources that are considered as “point sources” in this report.

Non-point sources of pollution are diffuse sources that cannot be identified as entering a waterbody through a discrete conveyance. These include nutrient runoff of agricultural fields and golf courses, septic tanks, and residential developments outside of MS4 areas.

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin

Table 23: Landuse in acres

WBID	Residential (FLUCCS 1100-1300)	Comm, Ind, public (FLUCCS 1400- 1500,1700-1900)	Agriculture (FLUCCS 2100-2600)	Rangeland (FLUCCS 3100-3300)	Forest (FLUCCS 4100- 4400)	Water (FLUCCS 5100- 5400)	Wetlands (FLUCCS 6100-6500)	Barren &Extractive (FLUCCS 1600,7100- 7400)	Transportation and Utilities (FLUCCS 8100- 8300)	TOTAL
1442	1167.93	141.02	6894.22	1099.31	1479.61	99.88	2276.80	174.25	26.34	13359.35

Nonpoint sources

Nonpoint sources that ultimately contribute to depletion of in-stream dissolved oxygen include sources of nutrients such as animal waste, waste-lagoon sludge, fertilizer application to agricultural fields, lawns, and golf courses, and malfunctioning onsite sewage treatment and disposal systems or septic tank systems.

The State of Florida Department of Health (www.doh.state.fl.us/environment/statistics) publishes septic tanks data on a county basis. Table 24 summarizes the number of septic systems installed since the 1970 census and the total number of repair permits issued between 1996 and 2001. The data does not reflect septic tanks removed from service.

Table 24: County Estimates of Septic Tanks and Repair Permits (FDEP, 2001)

County	Number of Septic Tanks (2002)	Number of Repair Permits Issued (1996 – 2002)
Hillsborough	100,483	1,651

Landuse in the impaired WBIDs is shown in Table 5. The spatial distribution and acreage of different land use categories were identified using the 1999 land use coverage (scale 1:40,000) contained in the FDEP’s GIS library. This dataset was derived from Ifrared Digital Orthophoto Quadrangle photo interpretations using the Florida Land Use Classification Code System (FLUCCS). Land use categories in the watershed were aggregated using the FLUCCS Level 2 codes.

Point sources

There are no continuous point sources in the New River basin. However, there are municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4) throughout the Hillsborough River Basin since the area is extensively developed. The MS4 area in WBID 1442 is Wesley Chapel South.

NEW RIVER ANALYTICAL APPROACH/ MODEL SELECTION AND DEVELOPMENT

The New River is a tributary to the Hillsborough River system being modeled for nutrient, BOD, and DO TMDLs. This section documents EPA’s attempt to relate pollutant loadings and the observed low DO values in the New River. Only seasonal trends of DO were simulated since DO violations of the standard were observed in the monthly trend monitoring data. The purpose of utilizing water quality models for the development of DO and BOD TMDLs in this stream system is to understand the linkage between the low in-stream DO and the factors that cause the low DO. The models can help determine which factors cause a greater effect than others. Some of the major factors in DO processes include watershed and stream flow and geometry, nutrient loads from

the watershed, BOD loads from the watershed, in-stream plants and algae, and sediment oxygen demand.

The major unknowns are the DO concentrations of the water flowing from the watershed into the receiving streams, and the BOD decay rates. Due to the major unknown factors and the limited data, this model application is not intended to predict absolute DO values, but instead to predict the relative effect of nutrients, algae, and BOD on in-stream DO.

Mechanistic Model Approach

WAM was utilized to simulate the watershed hydrology and water quality loads for most of the Hillsborough River Basin. WASP models were set up to examine the DO processes in the Hillsborough River mainstem and the major tributaries Blackwater Creek, Itchepackesassa Creek, Baker Creek, New River, and Cypress Creek. The WAM model was used to predict flows and loads were then linked to the WASP models.

The following summary on of the WAM model is from EPA's Watershed and Water Quality Modeling Technical Support Center web site (<http://www.epa.gov/athens/wwqtsc/WAMView.pdf>). WAM's interface uses ESRI's ArcView 3.2a with Spatial Analyst 1.1 (or 2.0). WAM was developed to allow engineers and planners to assess the water quality of both surface water and groundwater based on land use, soils, climate, and other factors. The model simulates the primary physical processes important for watershed hydrologic and pollutant transport. The WAM GIS-based coverages include land use, soils, topography, hydrography, basin and sub-basin boundaries, point sources and service area coverages, climate data, and land use and soils description files. The coverages are used to develop data that can be used in the simulation of a variety of physical and chemical processes.

WAM was developed based on a grid cell representation of the watershed. The grid cell representation allows for the identification of surface and groundwater flow and phosphorus concentrations for each cell. The model then "routes" the surface water and groundwater flows from the cells to assess the flow and phosphorus levels throughout the watershed. The model simulates the following elements: surface water and ground water flow allowing for the assessment of flow and pollutant loading for a tributary reach at both the daily and hourly time increment as necessary; water quality including particulate and soluble phosphorus, particulate and soluble nitrogen (NO₃, NH₄, and organic N), total suspended solids, and biological oxygen demand.

WAM was linked to WASP (SWET, 2003), which enables the simulation of dissolved oxygen and chlorophyll-a. The WAM model simulates the hydrology of the watershed using other imbedded models including "Groundwater Loading Effects of Agricultural Management Systems" (GLEAMS; Knisel, 1993), "Everglades Agricultural Area Model" (EAAMod; Botcher et al., 1998; SWET, 1999), and two submodels written specifically for WAM to handle wetland and urban landscapes. Dynamic routing of flows is accomplished through the use of an algorithm that uses a Manning's flow equation based

technique (Jacobson et al., 1998). Attenuation is based on the flow rate, characteristics of the flow path, and the distance of travel. The model provides many features that improve its ability to simulate the physical features in the generation of flows and loadings including:

- Flow structures simulation
- Generation of typical farms
- BMPs
- Rain zones built into unique cells definitions, which also allows use with NEXRAD Data
- Full erosion/deposition and in-stream routing –is used with ponds and reservoirs
- Closed basins and depressions are simulated
- Separate simulation of vegetative areas in residential and urban
- Simulation of point sources with service areas
- Urban retention ponds
- Impervious sediment buildup/washoff
- Shoreline reaches for more precise delivery to rivers, lakes, and estuaries
- Wildlife diversity within wetlands
- Spatial map of areas having wetland assimilation protection
- Indexing submodels for BOD, bacteria, and toxins

The overall operation of the model is managed by the ArcView-based interface. The interface allows the user to view available data, modify land use conditions, execute the model, and view results.

In order to evaluate the effect of BOD, nutrients, algae, and other oxygen demanding substances on DO processes a Water Quality Analysis Simulation Program (WASP) model was setup for this river segment. The Water Quality Analysis Simulation Program version 6 (WASP6) is an enhancement of the original WASP (Di Toro et al., 1983; Connolly and Winfield, 1984; Ambrose, R.B. et al., 1988). This model helps users interpret and predict water quality responses to natural phenomena and man-made pollution for various pollution management decisions. WASP6 is a dynamic compartment-modeling program for aquatic systems, including both the water column and the underlying benthos. The time-varying processes of advection, dispersion, point and diffuse mass loading, and boundary exchange are represented in the basic program.

Water quality processes are represented in special kinetic subroutines that are either chosen from a library or written by the user. WASP is structured to permit easy substitution of kinetic subroutines into the overall package to form problem-specific models. WASP6 comes with two such models -- TOXI for toxicants and EUTRO for conventional water quality. Earlier versions of WASP have been used to examine eutrophication of Tampa Bay; phosphorus loading to Lake Okeechobee; eutrophication of the Neuse River and estuary; eutrophication and PCB pollution of the Great Lakes (Thomann, 1975; Thomann et al., 1976; Thomann et al, 1979; Di Toro and Connolly, 1980), eutrophication of the Potomac Estuary (Thomann and Fitzpatrick, 1982), kepone

pollution of the James River Estuary (O'Connor et al., 1983), volatile organic pollution of the Delaware Estuary (Ambrose, 1987), and heavy metal pollution of the Deep River, North Carolina (JRB, 1984). In addition to these, numerous applications are listed in Di Toro et al., 1983.

The flexibility afforded by the Water Quality Analysis Simulation Program is unique. WASP6 permits the modeler to structure one, two, and three-dimensional models; allows the specification of time-variable exchange coefficients, advective flows, waste loads and water quality boundary conditions. The eutrophication module of WASP6 was applied to New River in this study.

Water quality concentrations and temperature from the water quality stations near the headwaters of New River were entered as the upstream boundary conditions. Flow, depth, and velocity data predicted by the WAM model was used in the WASP models. Solar radiation data was obtained on the University of Florida Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences, Florida Automated Weather Network world-wide-web site <http://fawn.ifas.ufl.edu/>. Sediment oxygen demand (SOD) can be a major contributor to low D.O. SOD measurements in the nearby Alafai River range from 1.2 to over 7 grams/square meter/day, (Measured Sediment Oxygen Demand Rates, USEPA). SOD measurements in the Ocklawaha River Basin's Rice Creek upstream of the Georgia Pacific Mill discharge range from 1.5 to 3.0. A SOD rate of 1.5 was used in this WASP model for New River. Incremental BOD and nutrient loads were entered into WASP from the results of the WAM model.

The estimated existing nutrient and BOD loads from the watershed are summarized in Table 25. In-stream model predictions compared to observed water quality data are shown next.

Table 25: Model predicted nitrogen, phosphorous and BOD loads

<u>Year</u>	<u>TN (kg/d)</u>	<u>TP (kg/d)</u>	<u>BOD (kg/d)</u>	<u>Annual Average Flow (m3/s)</u>
1999	10	4	13	0.11
2000	10	4	13	0.10
2001	25	9	41	0.23
2002	23	7	26	0.23
2003	19	6	24	0.21

Table 26: Comparison of Modeled and Observed Stream Flow at USGS 02303100

Ave. monthly flow (cfs)	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
1964-1974 observed data	5.37	6.70	9.42	2.91	0.45	6.90	11.5	32.5	26.1	8.77	1.46	4.53
Modeled results	5.2	4.2	4.1	2.0	1.2	13.3	9.6	11.6	15.5	5.4	1.6	7.0

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin




Figure 49: New River observed and predicted ammonia




Figure 50: New River observed and predicted phosphorous




Figure 51: New River observed and predicted nitrate




Figure 52: New River observed and predicted BOD




Figure 53: New River observed and predicted chlorophyll-a




Figure 54: New River observed and predicted dissolved oxygen

TMDL Development

The TMDLs were developed by using the model to understand the river system and determine the levels of the water quality parameters that result in attainment of the DO water quality standard. As shown in Figure 52 and again in Figure 55 BOD is relatively low, near detection limits and has little impact on the DO in this river system. These data also indicate that the DO varies little with a three-fold difference in BOD.

Nutrients can affect the DO through algae production and respiration. An excess of algae growth can imbalance the natural system and cause large DO swings from high supersaturation to low levels. Additionally, the algae population can reach a limiting level of nutrients or light and then experience a large die-off, that can then result in DO consumption and low in-stream DO. Figure 56 shows that DO in this river system is not greatly affected by algae production. Excess growth of algae may be partially prevented by the naturally dark water in this system.

Sediment oxygen demand (SOD) is another factor that can contribute to low DO. However, based on measured data from similar streams and the model results, the SOD in the stream channel is likely not high enough to cause the chronic low DO found in this river system.

After examining each of the factors that can contribute to low DO, the levels of these factors found in the New River system are not high enough to cause the chronically low DO found in this system.

The low DO in this river system is likely a result of natural processes in the wetlands and groundwater flowing into these streams. Since the watershed model is not simulating the DO processes on the watershed and wetland areas, and the receiving stream model is simulating only the processes that occur in the streams, the DO levels in the water flowing from the wetlands and groundwater to the streams is unknown. The sensitivity of the in-stream DO to the DO concentration of the water entering from the watershed can be simulated by ranging these watershed DO concentrations. Figure 57 shows simulated in-stream DO with the watershed DO set to 2 mg/l and then at 5 mg/l. This demonstrates that if the water flowing from the watershed had DO concentrations of 5 mg/l then the in-stream DO would remain above the water quality standard. Note that the few days in May during which the DO drops below 5 mg/l is due to model upsets and is ignored.

December 2005 TMDL for DO and BOD in the Upper Hillsborough Basin




Figure 55: New River DO sensitivity to levels of BOD (BOD has little affect on in-stream DO)




Figure 56: New River DO sensitivity to two levels of chlorophyll-a (Chlorophyll-a has little affect on in-stream DO)




Figure 57: New River DO sensitivity to two levels of watershed DO. DO from the watershed strongly influences the minimum in-stream DO

NEW RIVER ALLOCATIONS

Since the low in-stream DO is a result of low DO water flowing from groundwater and wetlands, and not the result of in-stream algae, nutrient, and BOD oxygen consumption, no load reductions are specified in this TMDL report. It is recommended that loads of nutrients and BOD be maintained at current levels. Model estimates of these total nitrogen, total phosphorus and biochemical oxygen demand loads for 2003 are shown in Table 27.

Table 27: 2003 Nutrient and BOD loads

TN (kg/d)	TP (kg/d)	BOD (kg/d)
19	6	24

Expression and Allocation of the TMDL

The objective of a TMDL is to provide a basis for allocating loads among all of the known pollutant sources. A TMDL is expressed as the sum of all point source loads (Waste Load Allocations, or WLAs), nonpoint source loads (Load Allocations, or LAs), and an appropriate margin of safety (MOS), which takes into account any uncertainty

concerning the relationship between effluent limitations and water quality. The equation is:

$$\text{TMDL} = \sum \text{WLA} + \sum \text{LAS} + \text{MOS}$$

Florida standards state at 62-302.300(15) FAC, "Pollution which causes or contributes to new violations of water quality standards or to continuation of existing violations is harmful to the waters of this State and shall not be allowed. Waters having water quality below the criteria established for them shall be protected and enhanced. However, the Department shall not strive to abate natural conditions." The purpose of a TMDL is to allocate pollutant loading such that water quality standards are achieved. The Clean Water Act at Section 303(d)(1)(C) states, "Such load shall established at a level necessary to implement the applicable water quality standards ...". In expressing this TMDL, EPA must apply the applicable dissolved oxygen water quality standard while also considering the directive not to abate natural conditions. This TMDL analysis demonstrated that neither nutrients, BOD, chlorophyll, nor sediment oxygen demand caused the low DO in New River. Instead the low DO was the result of natural processes in the wetlands and groundwater flowing into these streams. Therefore the DO TMDL requires no reductions of BOD, SOD, or nutrients.

NEW RIVER CRITICAL CONDITIONS

The New River TMDL analysis demonstrates that low DO is a chronic issue that occurs frequently under many conditions. Low DO is not limited to a particular critical condition.

NEW RIVER SEASONAL VARIATION

Seasonal variation was considered by analyzing a four year period containing all seasons, wet, normal, and dry conditions.

REFERENCES

Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), Basin Status Report for the Tampa Bay Tributaries Basin, DEP Division of Water Resource Management, Central District, Group 2 Basin, March 2003.

Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.). Chapter 62-302, Surface Water Quality Standards.

Hillsborough County Environmental Protection Commission. Surface Water Quality 1996 – 2000 Hillsborough County, Florida.

National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS), Agricultural Census for 1997, U.S. Department of Agricultural.

SWET. 2002. WAM Training Manual. Developed for EPA Region IV Training. Published by: Soil and Water Engineering Technology, Inc., Gainesville, FL.

USDA, 1997. 1997 Census of Agriculture, Volume 1, Geographic Area Series, Part 42, U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service. AC97-A-42, March 1999.

USEPA, 1991. Guidance for Water Quality –based Decisions: The TMDL Process. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Washington, DC. EPA-440/4-91-001, April 1991.

US Environmental Protection Agency – Region 4 Atlanta, GA, 2001, Water Quality Analysis Simulation Program (WASP) Version 6.0 DRAFT: User’s Manual By Tim A. Wool, Robert B. Ambrose, James L. Martin, Edward A. Comer