



Minutes were approved on 9-15-05

**University of Florida Conservation Study Committee
August 25, 2005 @ 1:00 PM
Facilities Planning and Construction Conference Room
226 Stadium
MINUTES**

Members Present:

Ms. Linda Dixon, Manager, Planning Office, Facilities Planning & Construction
Fred Cantrell, Finance and Administration
Peggy Carr, Landscape Architecture
Mark Clark, IFAS, Soil & Water Science
Joyce Dewsbury, Special Collections
Mark Hostetler, IFAS, Wildlife Ecology
Gerald Kidder, IFAS, Soil & Water Science
Erik Lewis, Facilities Planning & Construction
Sheri Munn, IFAS, Facilities Planning & Operations
Jack Putz, Botany
Erick Smith, Physical Plant Division
Tom Walker, IFAS, Natural History

Members Absent:

Mark Brown, Environmental Engineering Sciences
Eva Czarnecka, Microbiology & Cell Science
Chuck Hogan, Physical Plant Division
Cecile Kiley, College of Nursing
Nancy Menzel, College of Nursing
Clay Montague, Environmental Engineering Sciences
Mackenzie Moritz, Student
Meghan Pressley, Student
Marty Werts, Physical Plant Division

The University Conservation Study Committee (CSC) met on Thursday, August 25, 2005 at Facilities Planning and Construction Division, 226 Stadium West Conference Room. Linda Dixon, Chair, presided and called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

I. Welcome and Introductions

Linda Dixon welcomed committee members to the August 1, 2005 TSC meeting and members agreed introductions were not necessary.

II. Adoption of Agenda

Motion: Erick Smith moved to approve the agenda as presented.

Second: Peggy Carr

Motion carried unanimously

III. Adoption of August 4, 2005 Minutes

Motion: Gerald Kidder moved to approve the August 4, 2005 minutes as presented.

Second: Erick Smith

Motion carried unanimously

IV. Stormwater Element Policies and Data and Analysis Report

Erik Lewis presented the draft Stormwater Element Policies and Data and Analysis Report along with comments submitted by Mark Clark regarding his views on stormwater to the CSC members for discussion and approval.

Mark Clark began with an overview of issues he has regarding federal and state regulatory requirements for stormwater management and water quality protection based on its designated use. Mark indicated that all States are required to designate uses for water bodies and established a set of criteria that are protective of that designated use. Mark stated that Lake Alice has two designated uses. It has been permitted to be a stormwater basin and also classified as a Class III water body. Mark Clark stated that the contention for a long time was whether or not Lake Alice was a natural water body. Erik Lewis indicated that in the 305B report in the 1990s, Lake Alice was treated as a state water body and did not meet water quality. This became some part of the driving mechanism to remove waste water and use more reclaimed water on campus. Once the bulk of the reclaimed water was removed out of Lake Alice, it then met Class III water standards. Mark Clark indicated before getting into whether or not the standards were met, his question would be; is Lake Alice a Class III water body? If it is, therefore, it would have an expectation for certain designated use and, to protect that designated use, a set of criteria are established. These criteria are thresholds of water quality below which monitoring should not fall or else the water body is considered is impaired. In general, Class III water bodies are monitored and evaluated as to whether or not it is meeting that designated use. However, in

the instance of Lake Alice, it has been permitted as a stormwater body and does not require monitoring. It does not have clear expectations for water quality standards. It is presumed that the stormwater basin is built correctly and is meeting stormwater standards. So there is a question, from a regulatory standpoint, if Lake Alice is a Class III water but does not have any specific criteria because it is also permitted as a stormwater basin. Therefore, you have two questions as to what the water quality should be in that water body. The purpose for setting designated uses and establishing criteria is based on protecting it for some expectation. It is different if the State imposes that. Dr. Clark feels that the CSC committee has generated a certain expectation of that water body being conservation. Therefore, whether or not the state supersedes or they established criteria is an unknown. Erik Lewis stated that the last time they reviewed the permit this conflict was recognized, and he didn't know how they could reconcile it. Mark Clark stated that he sees Lake Alice as a Class III water, but because it permitted as a stormwater basin, it has no specific expectations other than meeting ground water standards because that is what it is discharging into. However, that does not necessarily mean that the committee can not adopt certain expectations. If for nothing else such criteria can raise a flag when certain thresholds are not being met. This too, could apply to tributaries and other water bodies flowing into Lake Alice. Mark Clark stated that another way to approach the water quality standards is NPDS permit which recommends implementing the best available technology. He stated that these policies are wonderful but he feel there should be some type of driving mechanism.

After further discussion committee members suggested that a self imposed policy should be adopted to improve the water bodies standards on campus with a target to meet Class III standards. The committee approved the following language:

Policy 3.7: The University shall continue to monitor Lake Alice and other surface water bodies for compliance with existing standards for water quality in order to meet Class III water quality standards and report findings to the Lakes, Vegetation and Land Use committee annually.

Motion: Jack Putz made a motion to accept Policy 3.7 as amended.

Second: Mark Hostetler

Motion carried unanimously

- Members also discussed Objective 2.0 and related policies. They agreed that this section should More clearly apply to stormwater facilities and infrastructure. There was also discussion about stormwater BMPS for use during construction.
- Members also suggested creating a new objective related to public education.
- Member completed their discussion of the draft Stormwater Element. Staff will make the recommended changes and bring it back on the next agenda for approval.

V. Conservation Area Land Management (CALM) Plan Draft

This item was deferred to the next agenda due to lack of time.

VI. The meeting Adjourned at 3:15 pm.