# Nutrient Management in the Tampa Bay Estuary

TBEP Offices

## Ed Sherwood Senior Scientist TBEP





Image © 2009 DigitalGlobe Data U.S. Navy

#### **Open Bay Segments & Drainage Areas**



## Tampa Bay Estuary: An Urban Watershed

- Urban Centers in Pinellas County & City of Tampa
- 2.5 million people reside in Tampa Bay area
- Agriculture / Mining Activities in Eastern Portion

St. Petersburg





## Tampa Bay in the 1970s

- Phytoplankton and macroalgae dominated
- 50% loss of seagrass coverage between 1950 and 1980
- Newspapers declared Tampa Bay "dead"
- Poorly-treated Domestic Point Source, Untreated Industrial Point Sources & Stormwater, Rampant Dredge & Fill Activities



## **Citizens Adopt Goals for a Healthier Bay**

To make the Bay look more like it did in 1950 than in did in 1980

#### Citizen Input:

- Clear water, like the "good old days"
- Better fishing
- Swimming without "seaweed" (macroalgae)

Photo by Capt. Bryon Chamberlin

## **Citizens Demanded Action**

- Citizens in Tampa demanded legislative action
- In 1978, State legislation (Grizzle-Figg Act) for Tampa Bay required all wastewater treatment plants discharging in the Tampa Bay watershed to reach AWT standards (3 mg/L TN max) or 100% reuse within 3 years.
- Resulted in a 90% reduction of TN loading from WWTP point source discharges.



#### Tampa Bay Nitrogen Management Strategy Paradigm



# A Public – Private Partnership

#### Tampa Bay Nitrogen Management Consortium

- Formed in 1998, now includes 40+ public/private partners
- Members include TBEP government and regulatory agency participants, local phosphate companies, agricultural interests and electric utilities
- Mid-1990s, collectively accepted responsibility for meeting nitrogen load reduction goals
- Consortium members may choose to implement any combination of projects to maintain loads to Tampa Bay at 1992-1994 levels

#### Public Partners:

#### Private Partners: Hillsborough Eastern Terminals

- Mosaic CSX
- Manatee County
- Pinellas County
- Pasco County
- Polk County Sarasota County
- City of Tampa

County

- City of St.
- Petersburg

City of Largo

City of Bradenton

- Progress Energy City of Clearwater City of Palmetto
  - Tropicana Products, Inc.

Nitrogen

Eagle Ridge, LLC

Knoll Investments,

LDC Donaldson

LLC

Transportation

 Florida Power & Light

Tampa Electric Co.

CF Industries

Kinder Morgan

Bulk T., Inc.

- Kerry I&F
- Trademark
- City of Lakeland City of Oldsmar
  - Yara N.A.
- City of Gulfport Alafiia Preserve, 110
- City of Mulberry
- City of Plant City City of Safety
- Harbor
- SWFWMD
- US EPA
- FDEP
- FDACS
- FDOH
- FDOT
- MacDill AFB
- TBRPC
- Tampa Bay Water
- Tampa Port Authority
- EPC of
- Hillsborough County
- AEDC of Hills. County

#### **Voluntary Actions Become Regulatory Requirements**

- In mid-1990s, TBEP established goal to "hold the line" on TN loadings to the bay & preclude 17 tons TN / yr from entering bay to offset anticipated loads from continued growth
- 1998 TMDL for TN first established by EPA (based on 1992-1994 TN loads to Tampa Bay)
- 2002 NMC and TBEP granted "Reasonable Assurance" that TB will meet State WQ Criteria for Nutrients
- 2007 FDEP and EPA require allocations to be developed to meet federal TMDL and continue State "Reasonable Assurance" determination
- 2009 NMC voluntarily developed TN load allocations to 189+ sources in the bay; Effectively capping TN loads



#### **TN Loads Capped & Reductions Documented**

### All TN Loads Apportioned to SourcesFuture loads will require offsets/transfers

 
 Table IX-3:
 Proposed allowable, transferable nitrogen allocations for 2008-2012 for Middle Tampa Bay. SW=Surface water discharge, RE=Reuse discharge.

Entity	Source	Proposed MS4 and Point Source Permit Limit (%)	TMDL Load (tons/year)	
Harbor Bay	NPS	<0.1%	0.2	
Hillsborough County	MS4 Point Source - South County RE	9.9%	70.9 0.5	
MacDill Air Force Base	MS4 Point Source - WWTP_RE	1.0%	7.0 0.7	
Manatee County	MS4	3.0%	21.8	
Pinellas County	MS4	0.5%	3.2	
City of Pinellas Park	MS4	0.7%	5.3	
City of St. Petersburg	MS4 Point Source - St. Pete Facilities RE	6.5%	46.5 20.8	
Mosaic	Point Source - Four Corners SW	4.1%	29.3	
TECO Big Bend*	Point Source – SW* Point Source - RE		56.5* 2.1	
Non-MS4/Non-Ag NPS		0.5%	3.8	
Atmospheric Deposition		35.2%	252.1	
Other (Groundwater, Springs, Conservation)		5. <b>1</b> %	36.7	
FDACS (Agriculture)		33.4%	239.2	
Small Sources			2.4	
Total Note: The resulting MS4 and	point source TMDL loads based on r	percent allocations	799 are not proposed	

\*Includes a Set Allocation of 35.0 tons/year and an Interim Allocation through 2012 of an additional 21.5 tons/year to allow determination of new discharge loads.

#### http://apdb.tbeptech.org

•Load reductions reported every 5-yrs





## **Partner-Driven Load Reduction Reporting**



<u>Guidelines for Calculating Nitrogen Load Reduction Credits. 1997. Technical Report #02-97 of the Tampa Bay National Estuary Program. Prepared by Coastal Environmental (H.W. Zarbock and A.J. Janicki).</u>



## **Reducing TN Loads to Tampa Bay**





#### Water Quality Has Improved

Increase Water Clarity

	(ug/L) Hillsborough Bay		Year	Old Tampa Bay	Hillsbor- ough Bay	Mid Tampa Bay	LowTampa Bay
	36 Average		1974	No	No	No	Yes
	Regulatory Threshold		1975	No	No	No	Yes
:	32		1976	No	No	No	Yes
		AWT & Reuse	1977	No	No	No	No
	28 🛉 🔰	Ctandarda	1978	No	No	No	Yes
		Standards	1979	No	No	No	No
	24		1980	No	No	No	No
		Implemented	1981	NO	NO	NO	No
	20		1902	No	No	No	No
		Stormwator	1984	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	16	Stornwater	1985	No	No	No	Yes
7	15.0 ug/L	Regulations	1986	No	No	Yes	Yes
Ø		Regulations	1987	No	Yes	No	Yes
<b>_</b>		Enacted	1988	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
σ			1989	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
I	1072 1076 1080 1084 1088 1002 1006 2000 2004 2008 2012 20	16	1990	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ξ			1991	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2			1992	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Q			1993	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
5	Average Regulatory Threshold		1994	No	No	No	Ves
0	Regulatory micshold		1996	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
F	16		1997	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
0			1998	No	No	No	No
	14		1999	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
		TBFP Partner &	2000	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
			2001	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
		NMC Actions 🗲	2002	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
		Implemented	2003	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
	10	Implemented	2004	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
		-	2005	Yes	Yes	Yes	NO
			2000	Ves	Ves	Yes	Ves
	δ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓		2007	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	<b>ĕ</b> <sup>■</sup> Υ		2009	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
	<b>6</b>		2010	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	1972 1976 1980 1984 1988 1992 1996 2000 2004 2008 2012 207	16	2011	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
			2012	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

#### **Seagrass Coverage Continues to Expand**

ncreas

Seagrass



#### Sustaining Success: Adaptively Managing TB



#### New Management Actions That Will Make a Future Difference on Water Quality

- Reduce Residential Fertilizer Contributions to Stormwater Runoff
- Continue to Reduce Wastewater & Stormwater Inputs Through Expansion of Reuse / Recharge Projects
- Develop & Fund Localized Research & Management Actions for Problematic Areas (e.g. Old Tampa Bay)
- Improve and Restore Other Coastal Habitats





## **TBEP's Role In the Process**

- Facilitate scientific and technical discussions and evaluations – Convene the NMC
- Provide public education and communication
- Develop and convene partnerships to restore and protect Tampa Bay
- Keep the ball-rolling and showcase partner's continuing, successful efforts ...



### Key Elements in Tampa Bay's Adaptive Management Approach

- Long-term monitoring
- Target resources identified by both public and scientists as "worthwhile" indicators (seagrass)
- Science-based numeric goals & targets
- Multiple tools: Regulation; Public/private collaborative actions; Citizen actions
- Recognized "honest broker" to track, facilitate, assess progress
- Ongoing assessment & adjustment



#### **Thank You!**

Ed Sherwood Tampa Bay Estuary Program esherwood@tbep.org http://www.tbep.org



Visit TBEP on Facebook

## **Tracking our Progress**



- by NMC local partners
- Regulatory agencies partners in the process
- Load allocation targets periodically re-assessed

 Local-programs consistently monitor water quality since 1970's

- Bay-Segment Specific Annual Targets Developed
- Targets tied to Seagrass **Restoration Goal**

- consistently estimates seagrass coverage since 1980's
- Restoration endpoint clearly defined

5-Yr Annual Assessment; Tied to Observed Bay Conditions

#### **Bottom Line**

Annually-Assessed; Localized Management Responses Implemented, if necessary

~2-Yr Assessment; Water-quality Targets Re-Evaluated, if necessary



#### **Open Bay Segments & Drainage Areas**



#### Mid Tampa LowTampa Old Tampa Hillsbor-Year **Meeting Regulatory Thresholds** ough Bay Bay Bay Bay 1974 Yes No No No 1975 No No No Yes Hillsborough Bay 1976 No No No Yes (ug/L)1977 No No No No 36 - Average 1978 No No No Yes AWT & Reuse Regulatory Threshold 1979 No No No No 32 1980 Standards No No No No 1981 No No No No 28 Implemented 1982 No No No No 1983 No No No No Stormwater 24 1984 Yes Yes No Yes 1985 No No No Yes Regulations 20 1986 No No Yes Yes Enacted 1987 No Yes Yes No 16 1988 Yes Yes Yes Yes 15.0 ug/L 1989 No Yes Yes Yes 12 1990 Yes Yes Yes No 1991 Yes Yes Yes Yes 8 1992 Yes Yes Yes Yes 1972 1976 1980 1984 1988 1992 1996 2000 2004 2008 2012 2016 1993 Yes Yes Yes Yes Old Tampa Bay 1994 No No No No (ug/L)1995 No No Yes No 18 Average 1996 Yes Yes Yes Yes Regulatory Threshold 1997 Yes Yes Yes Yes 16 1998 No No No No 1999 Yes Yes Yes Yes 2000 Yes Yes Yes Yes 14 2001 Yes Yes Yes Yes TBEP Partner & 2002 Yes Yes Yes Yes 12 NMC Actions 2003 No Yes Yes Yes 2004 No Yes Yes Yes Implemented 2005 Yes Yes 10 Yes No 2006 Yes Yes Yes Yes 9.3 ug/L 2007 Yes Yes Yes Yes 8 2008 Yes Yes Yes Yes 2009 Yes Yes Yes No 2010 Yes Yes Yes Yes 1972 1976 1980 1984 1988 1992 1996 2000 2004 2008 2012 2016 2011 No Yes Yes Yes 2012 Yes Yes Yes Yes

#### **Annual Decision Support Process**



Annual report card for Tampa Bay

Specific to each of the 4 major bay segments Provides for adaptive management of a sentinel estuarine indicator (seagrass)

#### Restoration Success Tied to Significant Nutrient Reductions



#### Water Quality Assessment / Management Framework

- Bay segment observed values compared to established bay segment targets for chlorophylla and light attenuation
- Results of each comparison placed into a decision matrix framework
- Overall management response determined for each bay segment in a clear, "policylevel" format



Table 1. Decision matrix identifying appropriate categories of management actions				
in response to various outcomes of the monitoring and				
assessment of chlorophyll- <i>a</i> and light attenuation data.				
CHLOROPHYLL	LIGHT ATTENUATION			
+	Outcome 0	Outcome 1	Outcome 2	Outcome 3
Outcome 0	GREEN	YELLOW	YELLOW	YELLOW
Outcome 1	YELLOW	YELLOW	YELLOW	RED
Outcome 2	YELLOW	YELLOW	RED	RED
Outcome 3	YFLLOW	RED	RED	RED

Green	"Stay the course;" partners continue with planned projects to implement the CCMP. Data summary and reporting via the Baywide Environmental Monitoring Report and annual assessment and progress reports.
Yellow	TAC and Management Board on caution alert; review monitoring data and loading estimates; attempt to identify causes of target exceedences; TAC report to Management Board on findings and recommended responses needed.
Red	TAC, Management and Policy Boards on alert; review and report by TAC to Management Board on recommended types of responses. Management and Policy Boards take appropriate actions to get the program back on track.

#### **TBEP Nitrogen Management Strategy**

