Final

Santa Fe River
Basin Management Action Plan

Division of Environmental Assessment and Restoration Water Quality
Restoration Program
Florida Department of Environmental Protection

with participation from the
Santa Fe River Basin Stakeholders

June 2025

2600 Blair Stone Rd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399
FloridaDEP.gov

Exhibit 1

Acknowledgments

The Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) adopted the *Santa Fe River Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP)* by Secretarial Order as part of its statewide watershed management approach to restore and protect Florida's water quality. The plan was developed in coordination with stakeholders identified below, including participation from affected local, regional and state governmental entities, non-governmental organizations and entities, and local residents.

Florida Department of Environmental Protection
Alexis A. Lambert, Secretary

Table ES-1. Santa Fe River stakeholders

Type of Entity	Participant
Responsible Entities	Agriculture Alachua County Bradford County Columbia County Gilchrist County Suwannee County Union County City of Alachua City of Archer City of Gainesville City of Hampton City of High Springs City of Lake Butler City of Lake City City of Lawtey City of Newberry City of Starke City of Waldo Town of Brooker Town of Fort White Town of La Crosse Town of Raiford Town of Worthington Springs Private Wastewater Treatment Facilities Private Golf Courses
Responsible Agencies	County Health Departments Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (FDACS) DEP Florida Department of Transportation-District 2 (FDOT) Suwannee River Water Management District (SRWMD)
Other Interested Stakeholders	Florida Farm Bureau Florida Native Plant Society Florida Onsite Wastewater Association (FOWA) Florida Springs Council Howard T. Odum Florida Springs Institute

Type of Entity	Participant
	Ichetucknee Springs Partnership Residents/Homeowners Santa Fe River Partnership Septic Contractors University of Florida Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences (UF-IFAS)

See **Appendix A** for links to resources referenced in this document. For additional information, contact:

Florida Department of Environmental Protection/ Water Quality Restoration Program
2600 Blair Stone Road, Mail Station 3565
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2400
Email: BMAPProgram@FloridaDEP.gov

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments **2**
Table of Contents **4**
List of Figures **6**
List of Tables **7**
List of Acronyms and Abbreviations **9**
Executive Summary **12**
Santa Fe River Priority Focus Areas (PFAs) **12**
Nitrogen Source Identification, Required Reductions, and Options to Achieve Reductions **13**
Restoration Approaches **15**
Section 1: Background **18**
1.1 Legislation **18**
1.2 Water Quality Standards and TMDLs **18**
1.3 BMAP Requirements **19**
1.4 BMAP Area **19**
1.5 PFAs **20**
1.6 Other Scientific and Historical Information **24**
1.7 Stakeholder Involvement **24**
1.8 Description of BMPs Adopted by Rule **25**
Section 2: Implementation to Achieve TMDL **27**
2.1 Allocation of Pollutant Loads **27**
2.2 Load Reduction Strategy **38**
2.3 Entity Allocations **39**
2.4 Prioritization of Management Strategies **46**
2.5 OSTDS Management Strategies **47**
2.6 WWTF Management Strategies **50**
2.7 UTF Management Strategies **55**
2.8 STF Management Strategies **58**
2.9 Agricultural Sources Management Strategies **58**
2.10 Atmospheric Deposition Management Strategies **63**
2.11 Future Growth Management Strategies **64**
2.12 Funding Opportunities **69**

Section 3: Monitoring and Reporting **70**
3.1 Methods for Evaluating Progress **70**
3.2 Adaptive Management Measures **70**
3.3 Water Quality Monitoring **71**
Section 4. Commitment to Plan Implementation **82**
4.1 Adoption Process **82**
4.2 Tracking Reductions **82**
4.3 Revisions to the BMAP **82**
Section 5. References **83**
Appendices **84**
Appendix A. Important Links **84**
Appendix B. Projects to Reduce Nitrogen Sources **86**
B.1 Prioritization of Management Strategies **86**
B.2 Description of the Management Strategies **86**
Appendix C. Planning for Additional Management Strategies **114**
Appendix D. Santa Fe River PFA Reports **115**
Appendix E. OSTDS Remediation Plan **116**
E.1 Plan Elements **116**
E.2 Collection and Evaluation of Credible Scientific Information **118**
E.3 Remediation Options **119**
E.4 Public Education Plan **122**
Appendix F. Technical Support Information **124**
Appendix G: Wastewater Facilities **125**
Appendix H: Golf Course NMPs **126**
Appendix I. Agricultural Enrollment and Reductions **132**
Agricultural Landowner Requirements **132**
FDACS Office of Agricultural Water Policy (OAWP) BMP Program **132**
Other FDACS BMP Programs **134**
Agricultural Land Use **135**
FDACS BMP Program Metrics **137**
FDACS Cost Share **141**
Future Efforts **143**
Appendix J. Private Golf Courses with BMAP responsibilities **147**
Appendix K. Private Wastewater Treatment Facilities with BMAP Responsibilities **148**

List of Figures

Figure ES-1. Santa Fe River BMAP and PFA boundaries 13
Figure 1. Santa Fe River BMAP and PFA boundaries 21
Figure 2. Loading to groundwater by source in the Devil's Ear springshed area 33
Figure 3. Loading to groundwater by source in the Hornsby springshed area 34
Figure 4. Loading to groundwater by source in the Ichetucknee springshed area 35
Figure 5. Loading to groundwater by source outside the springshed area 36
Figure 6. Estimated OSTDS locations and density in the Santa Fe River BMAP area and PFAs 50
Figure 7. Locations of domestic WWTFs in the Santa Fe River BMAP area 55
Figure 8. Florida NOx emissions for 2005 to 2016 and projected emission decreases for 2017 to 2028 from industrial and on-road mobile sources 64
Figure 9. Water quality monitoring stations in Santa Fe River BMAP 74
Figure 10. Nitrate plus nitrite concentration over time at Devil's Complex Basin OFS spring vents 75
Figure 11. Nitrate plus nitrite concentration over time at Ichetucknee Basin OFS spring vents 76
Figure 12. Nitrate plus nitrite concentrations over time at Hornsby Basin OFS spring vents 76
Figure 13. Devil's Ear Springshed nitrate concentrations of early and late periods with outliers 78
Figure 14. Hornsby Springshed nitrate concentrations of early and late periods with outliers 79
Figure 15. Ichetucknee Springshed nitrate concentrations of early and late periods with outliers 80
Figure E-1. Locations of OSTDS in the PFA in the Santa Fe River BMAP 122
Figure I-1. Agricultural land use in Santa Fe BMAP 137
Figure I- 2. Agricultural land use in the Santa Fe BMAP 139
Figure I-3. Count of potentially enrollable parcels by size class 141

List of Tables

Table ES-1. Santa Fe River stakeholders 2
Table 1. Restoration targets for the Santa Fe River Basin 18
Table 2. Acreage for each springshed in the BMAP area 22
Table 3. OFS for each springshed in the BMAP area 22
Table 4. BMPs and BMP manuals adopted by rule as of July 2025 25
Table 5. Estimated total nitrogen load to groundwater by source in the Devil's Ear springshed 28
Table 6. Estimated nitrogen load to groundwater by source in the Hornsby springshed 29
Table 7. Estimated nitrogen load to groundwater by source in the Ichetucknee springshed 29
Table 8. Estimated nitrogen load to groundwater by source in the outside springshed area 30
Table 9. Total reductions required to meet the TMDL 37
Table 10. Nitrogen reduction schedule 38
Table 11. Required reductions by entity in the Devil's Ear springshed area 39
Table 12. Required reductions by entity in the Hornsby springshed area 39
Table 13. Required reductions by entity in the Ichetucknee springshed area 40
Table 14. Required reductions by entity outside the springshed area 40
Table 16. 5-year milestone required reductions by entity in the Devil's Ear springshed area 42
Table 17. 5-year milestone required reductions by entity in the Hornsby springshed area 42
Table 18. 5-year milestone required reductions by entity in the Ichetucknee springshed area 42
Table 19. 5-year milestone required reductions by entity outside the springshed area 43
Table 20. Progress towards next 5-year milestone by entity in the Devil's Ear springshed 44
Table 21. Progress towards next 5-year milestone by entity in the Hornsby springshed 44
Table 22. Progress towards next 5-year milestone by entity in the Ichetucknee springshed 45
Table 23. Progress towards next 5-year milestone by entity outside the springsheds 45
Table 24. Nitrogen effluent standards for the BMAP area 52
Table 25. Dominant crop types in the Santa Fe River BMAP 63
Table 26. Estimated nitrogen load from future growth in the BMAP area 68
Table 27. Core water quality indicators and field parameters for spring vent and groundwater 72
Table 28. Supplemental water quality indicators and field parameters for spring vent and groundwater 72
Table 29. Groundwater well data availability for Santa Fe River BMAP analysis 77
Table 30. Biological response measures for spring runs 80

Table B-1. Stakeholder projects to reduce nitrogen sources 87
Table E-1. Estimated reduction credits for OSTDS enhancement or sewer Devil's Ear springshed 120
Table E-2. Estimated reduction credits for OSTDS enhancement or sewer Hornsby springshed 120
Table E-3. Estimated reduction credits for OSTDS enhancement or sewer Ichetucknee springshed 120
Table G-1. Wastewater facilities subject to the nitrogen and phosphorus limits set forth in section 403.086, F.S. 125
Table H-1. Nutrient ranges for warm-season turfgrass species 127
Table I-1. Comparison of land uses in the Santa Fe BMAP 137
Table I-2. Agricultural lands enrolled in the Santa Fe BMAP area by BMP program commodity 137
Table I-3. Agricultural acres enrolled by commodity and crediting location 138
Table I-4. Agricultural lands in Santa Fe BMAP by crediting location 140
Table I-5. Potentially enrollable acres by crop type 140
Table I-6. Cost share project types and estimated nutrient reduction efficiencies 142
Table I-7. Nutrient reductions from FDACS cost share - springsheds 143
Table I-8. Overall nitrogen remaining for crop uptake with the described systems 145
Table I-9. Estimated dairy loading at different attenuation rates 146
Table J-1. Privately owned or operated golf courses in Santa Fe River BMAP 147
Table K-1. Privately owned or operated WWTFs in Santa Fe River BMAP 148

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

AC	Autocorrelation
ACE	Agricultural Cooperative Regional Water Quality Elements
ALG	Agricultural Lands (Data)
AWT	Advanced Waste Treatment
BEBR	Bureau of Economic and Business Research
BMAP	Basin Management Action Plan
BMPs	Best Management Practices
CAFO	Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation
CASTNET	Clean Air Status and Trends Network
CMAQ	Community Multiscale Air Quality
DEP	Florida Department of Environmental Protection
DMR	Discharge Monthly Report
DO	Dissolved Oxygen
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency (U.S.)
F.A.C.	Florida Administrative Code
F.A.R.	Florida Administrative Register
FDACS	Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services
FDOH	Florida Department of Health
FDOT	Florida Department of Transportation
FF	Farm Fertilizer
FFS	Florida Forest Service
FGS	Florida Geological Survey
FLWMI	Florida Water Management Inventory
FNAI	Florida Natural Areas Inventory
FOWA	Florida Onsite Wastewater Association
F.S.	Florida Statutes
FSAID	Florida Statewide Agricultural Irrigation Demand
GIS	Geographic Information System
gpd	Gallons Per Day
HA	Habitat Assessment
HB	House Bill
in/yr	Inch Per Year
L.O.F.	Laws of Florida
lbs	Pounds
lbs-N/yr	Pounds of Nitrogen Per Year
LVS	Linear Vegetation Survey
LW	Livestock Waste
MFLs	Minimum Flows and Levels
mgd	Million Gallons Per Day
mg/L	Milligrams Per Liter
MS4	Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System
N	Nitrogen

N/A	Not Applicable
NADP	National Atmospheric Deposition Program
NELAC	National Laboratory Environmental Accreditation Conference
NHD	National Hydrography Database
NMP	Nutrient Management Plan
NNC	Numeric Nutrient Criteria
NOI	Notice of Intent
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge and Elimination System
NRCS	National Resource Conservation Service
NSILT	Nitrogen Source Inventory Loading Tool
NTN	National Trends Network
OAWP	Office of Agricultural Water Policy (FDACS)
OFS	Outstanding Florida Spring
OSTDS	Onsite Sewage Treatment and Disposal System
PFA	Priority Focus Area
QA/QC	Quality Assurance/Quality Control
RAP	Reasonable Assurance Plan
RFA	Restoration Focus Area
RIB	Rapid Infiltration Basin
RPS	Rapid Periphyton Survey
RRLA	Rapid Rate Land Application
SBIO	DEP Statewide Biological Database
SCI	Stream Condition Index
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
SRLA	Slow Rate Land Application
SRWMD	Suwannee River Water Management District
STAR	Statewide Annual Report
STF	Sports Turf Fertilizer
STORET	Florida Storage and Retrieval Database
SWIM	Surface Water Improvement and Management
TDEP	Total Atmospheric Deposition Model
TDS	Total Dissolved Solids
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
TN	Total Nitrogen
TP	Total Phosphorus
TSS	Total Suspended Solids
UFA	Upper Floridan aquifer
UF–IFAS	University of Florida-Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
UTF	Urban Turfgrass Fertilizer
VAC	Vegetable and Agronomic Crops
WBID	Waterbody Identification (Number)
WIN	Florida Watershed Information Network Database

WMD	Water Management District
WWTF	Wastewater Treatment Facility

Executive Summary

The Florida Springs and Aquifer Protection Act (Chapter 373, Part VIII, Florida Statutes [F.S.]), along with the Watershed Restoration Act (section 403.067, F.S.), provide for the protection and restoration of Outstanding Florida Springs (OFS), which comprise 24 first magnitude springs, six additional named springs, and their associated spring runs. The Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) has assessed water quality in each OFS and determined that 26 of the 30 OFS are impaired for the nitrate form of nitrogen. The BMAP area contains six OFS: Columbia, Devil's Ear, Hornsby, Treehouse, Poe, and the Ichetucknee Spring Group. All are impaired except for Poe Spring.

The Santa Fe River BMAP area (**Figure ES-1)** comprises over one million acres in Alachua, Bradford, Columbia, Gilchrist, Suwannee, and Union counties. Population centers include Lake City and Fort White in Columbia County and Alachua, Archer, High Springs, La Crosse, and Newberry in Alachua County.

Santa Fe River Priority Focus Areas (PFAs)

This BMAP delineates three PFAs in the Santa Fe River BMAP area: Devil's Complex PFA; Hornsby PFA; and the Ichetucknee PFA. The Devil's Complex PFA includes 125,528 acres; the Hornsby PFA covers 49,542 acres; and the Ichetucknee PFA includes 182,864 acres. Additional springs in this basin that are not designated as OFS include Devil's Eye Spring, Little Devil's Spring, Ginnie Springs, Gilchrist Blue Spring, July Spring, and Rum Island Spring.



Figure ES-1. Santa Fe River BMAP and PFA boundaries

Nitrogen Source Identification, Required Reductions, and Options to Achieve Reductions

DEP set nitrate water quality restoration targets of 0.35 milligrams per liter (mg/L) for the Santa Fe River and associated springs, including the five OFS addressed by this BMAP.

DEP developed the Nitrogen Source Inventory Loading Tool (NSILT) to provide information on

the major categories of nitrogen sources in the groundwater contributing areas for the springs. In the BMAP, farm fertilizer (FF) represents 50% and livestock waste (LW) represents 15% of the total nitrogen loading to groundwater, based on the results of the NSILT.

The total load reduction required to achieve the total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) is 1,432,101 pounds of nitrogen per year (lbs-N/yr). To measure progress towards achieving the total necessary load reduction, DEP has established the following milestones:

- A reduction of 429,630 lbs-N/yr (30%) by 2028.
- An additional 716,050 lbs-N/yr (50%) by 2033.
- The remaining 286,420 lbs-N/yr (20%) by 2038.
- For a total of 1,432,101 lbs-N/yr.

Reductions will be achieved through projects implemented by stakeholders to reduce nutrient loading across the basin. Springs systems are complex, particularly because of the karst geology where conduits or fractures can impact the relative conveyance of water to the spring vents. In some areas, water can take decades to travel to the spring vent, but in others it can reach the spring vent in a matter of weeks or months. Due to the delayed impact projects may have on water quality at the spring vent, DEP will continue to monitor groundwater stations throughout the BMAP and the springs to better understand the benefits from the policies, implemented projects and management strategies within the springshed. The BMAP is designed to achieve 80% of the load reductions to the spring vent by 2033 and 100% by 2038. DEP will evaluate progress towards these milestones and will report to the Governor and Florida Legislature annually. Assessment of progress toward these milestones must be conducted every five years and revisions to the BMAP must be made as appropriate. BMAPs use an adaptive management approach that allows for incremental load reductions through the implementation of projects and management strategies; however, the restoration target, the TMDL, remains the same. If needed, policies and management strategies will be adjusted to ensure the target spring vent concentrations are achieved. This may include requiring additional management strategies or expanding the area to which the existing OSTDS remediation policies apply and any such change would be incorporated into a future updated BMAP through a formal adoption process.

Cost estimates were provided by stakeholders for more than 50% of the projects and management actions listed in the BMAP. For the projects where estimates were provided, the total estimated cost exceeds $37.8 million. Of the total estimated cost, approximately $29.9 million has been expended to date on completed projects. While stakeholders are required to implement additional projects listed in the BMAP, accurate cost estimates have not been developed for every project. The total cost estimate for all projects referenced in the BMAP is unknown until more cost information is provided. By the next 5-year BMAP milestone, stakeholders are projected to achieve additional reductions in annual nutrient loadings to the Santa Fe River Basin, including 21,415 pounds of TN, based on estimates of the planned and underway projects listed to date.

For the list of water quality improvement projects and management strategies, see **Appendix B**. Included are owner-implemented best management practices (BMPs) for FF, LW and sports turfgrass fertilizer (STF); wastewater treatment facility (WWTF) upgrades; projects to reduce urban turfgrass fertilizer (UTF) application; and onsite sewage treatment and disposal systems (OSTDS) remediation projects.

Successful BMAP implementation requires commitment, dedicated funding and ongoing assessment. Stakeholders have expressed their intention to carry out the plan, monitor its effects, and continue to coordinate within and across jurisdictions to achieve nutrient reduction goals. As the BMAP and TMDLs must be achieved by 2038, DEP, water management districts (WMDs), FDOH, and FDACS will also implement state-level management strategies using relevant state and federal funding.

Restoration Approaches

Reduction in the nitrogen loading to the aquifer is needed to achieve the load reduction requirements at the spring vent. To ensure that load reductions are achieved at the spring vent, the restoration actions described below are being implemented. These actions are designed to reduce nutrient loading to the aquifer, which will reduce the load at the vent and ultimately achieve the TMDL target. Monitoring at the spring vent during implementation will continue to assess progress.

- **New OSTDS** – Florida law (sections 373.811 and 403.067, F.S.) and the OSTDS remediation plan required under subsection 373.807(3), F.S. (**Appendix E**), prohibit new OSTDS on lots of one acre or less within the BMAP boundary, unless the systems are enhanced nutrient-reducing OSTDS systems or other wastewater treatment systems that achieve at least 65% nitrogen reduction. The OSTDS remediation plan pursuant to section 373.807, F.S. was updated in this BMAP iteration to prohibit the installation of new OSTDS on any lot size within the PFA unless the systems are enhanced nutrient-reducing OSTDS systems or other wastewater treatment systems that achieve at least 65% nitrogen reduction.

- **Existing OSTDS** – In this BMAP, the OSTDS remediation plan required under subsection 373.807(3), F.S. does not include requirements for the addition of enhanced nitrogen reducing treatment to conventional systems upon the need for modification or repair of existing OSTDS. However, remediation of existing conventional OSTDS will still be beneficial to mitigate nitrogen loading from this source, restore associated groundwater and surface water to achieve the TMDL and to minimize nitrogen loads from future growth. Local governments may have existing ordinances or could adopt new ordinances that add additional requirements for enhancement of OSTDS. To expedite remediation of wastewater sources and to facilitate achievement of assigned milestones in this BMAP, DEP encourages local governments to adopt such ordinances.

- **WWTFs** – The required treatment of wastewater effluent to advanced waste standards applies to all surface water disposal and certain reuse disposal determined necessary by

the department within the BMAP area. In the 2020 Clean Waterways Act, local governments were required to submit WWTF plans in accordance with section 403.067, F.S., if applicable, to DEP by Aug. 1, 2024, to address wastewater loads and the potential for future additional loads, including those created from sewering OSTDS. Subparagraph 403.067(7)(a)9., F.S., was amended in 2024 to clarify that private domestic wastewater facilities must provide this information to local governments effective July 1, 2024. Information related to private facilities will need to be included in future local government WWTF plans if not captured in the initial plans. Loading from WWTFs in this BMAP does not meet the contribution threshold required; therefore, local governments were not required to submit a wastewater treatment remediation plan. However, DEP encourages all local governments to undertake planning initiatives to address loading from WWTFs in their jurisdictions and plan for future growth.

- **Local governments with OSTDS or WWTF** are expected to meet their overall reduction milestones and to keep their project lists current, including any efforts to address OSTDS loading and any necessary wastewater facility improvements. Private wastewater facilities are also expected to meet their assigned reductions and keep their project lists current

- **UTF** – UTF consists of fertilizers applied to turfgrass typically found in residential and urban areas (including residential lawns and public green spaces). Fertilizers are applied either by the homeowner or a lawn service company on residential properties. On nonresidential properties, fertilizers may be applied by contractors or maintenance staff. UTF sources are assigned to the applicable responsible entity. Strategies to address UTF include education, adoption and enforcement of local government ordinances related to appropriate use of fertilizer, and stormwater projects.

- **STF –** STF sources include golf courses and other sporting facilities. Reductions from most sports facilities, including publicly-owned golf courses and school district sites, are assigned to the applicable local government. Private sporting facilities are assigned to the owner. Sporting facilities are required to follow the 2025 Sports Turf BMP Manual to protect water resources. Reductions from private golf courses are assigned to the golf course owners. All golf courses within the BMAP are required to follow the 2021 DEP Golf Course BMP Manual and submit for approval a final nutrient management plan (NMP) to DEP within two years of BMAP adoption, and to follow their plan.

- **FF Enrollment** – All FF sources are required to implement BMPs or perform monitoring to demonstrate compliance with the TMDL. A 15% reduction to groundwater is estimated for owner-implemented BMPs. Additional reduction credits could be attained through better documentation of nutrient reductions achieved through BMP implementation or implementation of additional agricultural cost-share BMPs, projects or practices, such as precision irrigation, soil moisture probes, controlled release fertilizer and cover crops.

- **LW Enrollment** – All LW sources are required to implement BMPs or perform monitoring to demonstrate compliance with the TMDL. A 10% reduction to groundwater is estimated for owner-implemented BMPs. Additional credits may be attained through better documentation of nutrient reductions achieved through BMP implementation, NMP updates and implementation, and additional projects.

- **Additional Agriculture** – Cooperative agricultural regional water quality improvement elements are being developed to reduce agricultural nutrient loading in combination with owner-implemented BMPs, cost-share BMPs, state-sponsored regional projects and other measures. The BMAP outlines a collaborative framework for identifying, prioritizing and implementing regional projects that address nutrient loading from agricultural operations. Partner agencies will work in annual cycles with agricultural landowners to provide technical support, regulatory guidance and funding opportunities to further implementation and the success of regional water quality improvement initiatives.

Section 1. Background

1.1 Legislation

Chapter 373, Part VIII, F.S., the Florida Springs and Aquifer Protection Act, along with the Watershed Restoration Act (section 403.067, F.S.), provide for the protection and restoration of OFS, which comprise 24 first magnitude springs, six additional named springs, and their associated spring runs. DEP has assessed water quality in each OFS and determined that 26 of the 30 OFS are impaired for the nitrate form of nitrogen. Five springs in the Santa Fe River Basin are impaired OFS: Columbia Spring; Devil's Ear Spring; Hornsby Spring; Treehouse Spring; and the Ichetucknee Spring Group. There is one additional OFS in the Santa Fe BMAP area that remains unimpaired (Poe Spring). Development of the BMAP to meet the requirements of the Florida Springs and Aquifer Protection Act for the Santa Fe River Basin was initiated in 2016. Since adoption, additional statutory requirements in Chapter 373, F.S., and section 403.067, F.S., have been and continue to enhance the protection and restoration of water quality throughout Florida. For specific requirements, please refer to the source management sections below.

1.2 Water Quality Standards and TMDLs

A TMDL represents the maximum amount of a given pollutant that a waterbody can assimilate and still meet water quality standards. The Santa Fe River and impaired springs addressed in this BMAP are Class III waterbodies with a designated use of fish consumption; recreation, propagation, and the maintenance of a healthy, well-balanced population of fish and wildlife. These waters are impaired by nitrate nitrogen, which in excess has been demonstrated to adversely affect flora or fauna through the excessive growth of algae. Excessive algal growth results in ecological imbalances in the springs and river and can produce human health problems, foul beaches, inhibit navigation, and reduce the aesthetic value of the resources.

DEP adopted nutrient TMDLs for certain waters in the Santa Fe River Basin in 2008, including three sections of the Lower Santa Fe River (**Table 1**). The TMDLs established a monthly average nitrate target of 0.35 milligrams per liter (mg/L) of nitrate to be protective of the aquatic flora or fauna in the Lower Santa Fe River and the associated springs. The period of record for water quality data evaluated for the TMDLs was June 1, 2000, through June 30, 2007. The OFS associated with the Santa Fe River are required to meet the same water quality target.

Table 1 lists the nitrate (as nitrogen) restoration targets of 0.35 mg/L. The TMDL targets are listed as monthly averages instead of daily values because changes in aquatic vegetation biomass do not respond instantaneously to changes in nutrient concentrations. A yearly average was not appropriate because algal growth responds to seasonal changes.

Table 1. Restoration targets for the Santa Fe River Basin

Waterbody or Spring Name	Waterbody Identification (WBID)Number	Parameter	TMDL (mg/L)
Lower Santa Fe	3605A, 3605B, 3605C	Nitrate, monthly average	0.35

It should be noted that since the development of the BMAP, the TMDL WBIDs may have been modified. The most updated version of WBID boundaries can be found on the DEP Watershed Assessment Section webpage.

1.3 BMAP Requirements

Subsection 403.067(7), F.S., provides DEP with the statutory authority to develop and implement BMAPs. A BMAP is a comprehensive set of strategies to achieve the required pollutant load reductions. It requires any entity with a specific pollution load reduction to submit to DEP projects or strategies to meet 5-year pollution reduction milestones. In addition to this authority, the Florida Springs and Aquifer Protection Act (Part VIII of Chapter 373, F.S.) describes additional requirements and prohibitions for the 30 OFS.

1.4 BMAP Area

The BMAP area includes the surface water basin as well as the groundwater contributing areas for the springs (or springsheds). This area has complicated hydrogeologic factors that influence the movement of water as both surface flow to rivers and tributaries and percolation into groundwater. The BMAP boundary generally follows the delineation between the water managements districts.

The BMAP area contains six OFS: Columbia, Devil's Ear, Hornsby, Treehouse, Poe, and the Ichetucknee Spring Group. All are impaired except for Poe Spring. Additional springs in this basin that are not designated as OFS include Devil's Eye Spring, Little Devil's Spring, Ginnie Springs, Gilchrist Blue Spring, July Spring, and Rum Island Spring. Springsheds for the OFS were delineated or reviewed by Suwannee River Water Management District (SRWMD) with input from the Florida Geological Survey (FGS). A springshed is the area of land that contributes water to a spring or group of springs, mainly via groundwater flow. **Table 1** lists the acreage, number of designated OFS, and land uses associated with the three priority focus areas (PFAs).

Treehouse and Columbia Springs are the most recently impaired OFS within the Santa Fe basin which contribute flow to the impaired Lower Sante Fe. Columbia Spring is specifically listed as a waterbody in the Santa Fe TMDL planning unit. Treehouse Spring is included in BMAP analyses as part of both the Hornsby springshed and Hornsby PFA. While the Columbia springshed has yet to be delineated as of this BMAP update, the existing BMAP boundaries ensure that all water quality protections and restoration strategies are in place in order to address this impairment. **Table 2** and **Table 3** list the acreage and designated OFS associated with the three springsheds within the BMAP area.

In addition to the three springsheds, the outside the springsheds area refers to the portion of land within the BMAP boundary but outside of the designated OFS springsheds, as shown in **Figure 1**. It comprises 550,985 acres across portions of Alachua, Bradford, Gilchrist, Suwannee, and Union counties. The area contains several important but smaller springs along the western portion of the Santa Fe River that contribute flow to the system but may not have a delineated springshed. Much of this area has high groundwater recharge and soil conditions that tend to leach nitrogen. In the eastern portion of this area, upstream of the River Sink, the hydrology is more dominated by surface water flows to tributaries of the Santa Fe River, including New

River, Olustee Creek, and Turkey Creek, and Sampson River.

1.5 PFAs

In compliance with the Florida Springs and Aquifer Protection Act, this BMAP delineates three PFAs in the Santa Fe River BMAP area: Devil's Complex PFA; Hornsby PFA; and the Ichetucknee PFA. A PFA is defined as the area(s) of a basin where the Floridan aquifer is generally most vulnerable to pollutant inputs and where there is a known connectivity between groundwater pathways and an OFS. The PFAs provide a guide for focusing restoration strategies where science suggests these efforts will most benefit the springs. The documents that describe the delineation process for each PFA are on the DEP website. The link to the PFA documents is provided in **Appendix D.**

1.5.1 Description

Nitrogen sources are more likely to influence groundwater quality under certain conditions. For example, where soils are sandy and well drained, less nitrogen is converted to gas and released into the atmosphere or taken up by plants, compared with other soil types. Therefore, local soil types play a role in how much nitrogen travels from the land surface to groundwater in a specific springshed. Also, the underlying geologic material influences the vulnerability of the underlying aquifers and the rate of lateral movement within the Floridan aquifer toward the springs. These conditions, and others, were considered in the delineation of the Devil's Complex, Hornsby, and Ichetucknee PFAs (see **Appendix D**).

The geographic information system (GIS) files associated with the PFA boundaries are available to the public on the DEP Map Direct webpage.



Figure 1. Santa Fe River BMAP and PFA boundaries

Table 2. Acreage for each springshed in the BMAP area

Geographic area	Devil's Ear Springshed	Hornsby Springshed	Ichetucknee Springshed	Outside the Springsheds
Acreage	218,014 acres	77,551	240,224	550,985

Table 3. OFS for each springshed in the BMAP area

Springs	Devil's Ear Springshed - Spring Name (County Where Located)	Hornsby Springshed - Spring Name (County Where Located)	Ichetucknee Springshed - Spring Name (County Where Located)	Outside the Springsheds - Spring Name (County Where Located)
OFS	Devil's Ear Complex (Gilchrist)	Hornsby Spring (Alachua) Treehouse Spring (Alachua)	Ichetucknee Spring Group (Columbia/Suwannee)	Columbia Spring (Columbia) Poe Spring (Alachua)

The Devil's Complex PFA comprises 125,528 acres. The PFA covers areas with high groundwater recharge/vulnerability conditions and soil conditions that tend to leach nitrogen. It includes potential areas of higher nitrogen loading from agriculture and urban land uses, as well as an area where groundwater travel to the springs could occur rapidly. It also includes interconnected areas of agricultural land use, areas of urban development, areas with onsite sewage treatment and disposal systems (OSTDS or septic systems, the terms are used interchangeably through this document), domestic wastewater facilities, and concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs). All of these have the potential to contribute to nitrogen enrichment in the aquifer and springs. The Devil's Complex PFA includes parts of Gilchrist, Alachua, and Columbia counties. The PFA also includes the City of Newberry. Conservation land boundaries, natural features, political boundaries, roads, and survey boundaries in the area were also considered in the development of a readily identifiable boundary.

Hornsby PFA comprises an area of 49,542 acres and serves as a PFA for both Hornsby and Treehouse springs. The PFA covers areas with high groundwater recharge/vulnerability conditions and soil conditions that tend to leach nitrogen. It includes potential areas of higher nitrogen loading from agriculture and urban land uses, as well as an area where groundwater travel to the springs could occur rapidly. It also includes interconnected areas of agricultural land use, areas of urban development, areas with OSTDS, domestic wastewater facilities, and CAFOs. All of these have the potential to contribute to nitrogen enrichment in the aquifer and springs. The Hornsby PFA is located in Alachua County. It includes the cities of High Springs and Alachua. Conservation land boundaries, natural features, political boundaries, roads, and survey boundaries in the area were all considered in the development of a readily-identifiable PFA boundary.

The Ichetucknee PFA includes an area of 182,891 acres. This area has high groundwater recharge/vulnerability conditions and soil conditions that tend to leach nitrogen. It includes

potential areas of higher nitrogen loading from agriculture and urban land uses, as well as an area where groundwater travel to the springs could occur rapidly. It also includes interconnected areas of agricultural land use and larger areas of urban development, which have the potential to contribute to nitrogen enrichment in the aquifer and springs. The Ichetucknee PFA is mainly located in Columbia County, with a portion of Suwannee County as well as a small portion of Union County (about 40 acres). Conservation land boundaries, natural features, political boundaries, roads, and major survey boundaries in the area were all considered so that the PFA boundary would be readily identifiable.

1.5.2 Additional Requirements

In accordance with section 373.811, F.S., the following activities are prohibited in the BMAP boundary:

- New domestic wastewater disposal facilities, including rapid infiltration basins (RIBs), with permitted capacities of 100,000 gallons per day (gpd) or more, except for those facilities that meet an advanced waste treatment (AWT) standard of no more than 3 mg/L total nitrogen (TN) on an annual permitted basis.

- New OSTDS (or septic systems) on lots one acre or less inside the BMAP where central sewer is available. If central sewer is unavailable, then the owner must install a DEP-approved enhanced nutrient-reducing OSTDS that achieves at least 65% nitrogen reduction, or other wastewater system that achieves at least 65% reduction.

- New facilities for the disposal of hazardous waste.

- The land application of Class A or Class B domestic wastewater biosolids not in accordance with a DEP-approved nutrient management plan (NMP) establishing the rate at which all biosolids, soil amendments, and sources of nutrients at the land application site can be applied to the land for crop production, while minimizing the amount of pollutants and nutrients discharged to groundwater or waters of the state.

- New agricultural operations that do not implement BMPs, measures necessary to achieve pollution reduction levels established by DEP, or groundwater monitoring plans approved by a WMD or DEP.

1.5.3 Biosolids and Septage Application Practices

The aquifer contributing to the springs is highly vulnerable to contamination by nitrogen sources and where soils have a high to moderate tendency to leach applied nitrogen. DEP previously documented elevated nitrate concentrations in groundwater beneath septage application zones in contributing areas to springs. Within BMAP areas for OFS, section 373.811, F.S. prohibits the land application of Class A or Class B domestic wastewater biosolids not in accordance with a department approved NMP establishing the rate at which all biosolids, soil amendments, and sources of nutrients at the land application site can be applied to the land for crop production while minimizing the amount of pollutants and nutrients discharges to groundwater or waters of

the state. Further, there are additional requirements for biosolid and septage application practices under Chapter 62-640 Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.).

1.6 Other Scientific and Historical Information

In preparing this BMAP, DEP collected and evaluated credible scientific information on the effect of nutrients, particularly forms of nitrogen, on springs and springs systems. Some of the information collected is specific to the Santa Fe River Basin, while other references provide information on related knowledge for restoring springs, such as nitrogen-reducing technologies, the treatment performance of OSTDS, and runoff following fertilizer applications.

1.7 Stakeholder Involvement

Stakeholder involvement is critical to develop, gain support for, and secure commitments in a BMAP. In the context of the BMAP, there are different organizations named in the plan.

- R***esponsible entities*** are those organizations who are assigned load reductions and must comply with the BMAP provisions; these organizations are sometimes referred to as "***Lead Entities***."
- ***Responsible agencies*** may be accountable for reducing loads from their own activities or have an important public sector role in BMAP implementation such as regulatory oversight, monitoring, research, or other related duties.
- ***Interested stakeholders*** are those organizations that have engaged with BMAP development and implementation with the intention to influence the implementation process and outcomes.
- ***Stakeholders*** is a more general term often used in the BMAP context to include all three of the previously mentioned organizations—responsible entities, responsible agencies, and interested stakeholders.

The BMAP process engages responsible entities, responsible agencies, and interested stakeholders and promotes coordination and collaboration to address the pollutant load reductions necessary to achieve the TMDL. DEP invited stakeholders to participate in the BMAP development process and encouraged public participation and consensus to the greatest practicable extent. **Table ES-1** identifies the stakeholders who participated in the development of this BMAP.

During the development and update of the Santa Fe River BMAP, DEP held a series of meetings involving stakeholders and the public. The purpose of these meetings was to consult with stakeholders to gather information, evaluate the best available science, define management strategies and milestones, update the NSILT, develop entity required reductions, and update monitoring requirements. Public meetings were held virtually in January 2024 and May 2024. An in-person meeting was held on October 28, 2024, in Lake Butler, Florida. All meetings were open to the public and noticed in the *Florida Administrative Register* (F.A.R.). Additionally, a final public meeting was held on April 10, 2025, that was noticed in the F.A.R. and in local newspapers.

In addition to public meetings, DEP held several one-on-one meetings with the responsible

stakeholders for this BMAP. Throughout the process, DEP made themselves available to answer stakeholder questions.

Upon BMAP adoption, DEP intends to facilitate annual meetings with stakeholders to review progress towards meeting entity required reductions identified for the milestones that are needed to achieve the TMDL.

1.8 Description of BMPs Adopted by Rule

Table 4 identifies the FDACS adopted agricultural BMPs and BMP manuals relevant to this BMAP, along with environmental resource permitting requirements for certain land use activities.

Table 4. BMPs and BMP manuals adopted by rule as of July 2025

Agency	F.A.C. Chapter	Chapter Title
FDACS Office of Agricultural Water Policy (OAWP)	5M-1	Office of Agricultural Water Policy
FDACS OAWP	5M-6	Florida Nursery Operations, 2024 Edition: Water Quality and Water Quantity Best Management Practices
FDACS OAWP	5M-8	Florida Vegetable and Agronomic Crop (VAC) Operations, 2024 Edition: Water Quality and Water Quantity Best Management Practices
FDACS OAWP	5M-9	Florida Sod Operations, 2024 Edition: Water Quality and Water Quantity Best Management Practices
FDACS OAWP	5M-11	Florida Cattle Operations, 2024 Edition: Water Quality and Water Quantity Best Management Practices
FDACS OAWP	5M-12	Conservation Plans for Specified Agricultural Operations
FDACS OAWP	5M-13	Florida Specialty Fruit and Nut Crop Operations, 2024 Edition: Water Quality and Water Quantity Best Management Practices
FDACS OAWP	5M-14	Florida Equine Operations, 2024 Edition: Water Quality and Water Quantity Best Management Practices
FDACS OAWP	5M-16	Florida Citrus Operations, 2024 Edition: Water Quality and Water Quantity Best Management Practices
FDACS OAWP	5M-17	Florida Dairy Operations, 2024 Edition: Water Quality and Water Quantity Best Management Practices
FDACS OAWP	5M-18	Florida Agriculture Wildlife Best Management Practices
FDACS OAWP	5M-19	Florida Poultry Operations, 2024 Edition: Water Quality and Water Quantity Best Management Practices
FDACS OAWP	5M-21	Florida Small Farms and Specialty Livestock Operations, 2024 Edition: Water Quality and Water Quantity Best Management Practices
FDACS Division of Agricultural Environmental Services	5E-1	Fertilizer
FDACS Division of Aquaculture	5L-3	Aquaculture Best Management Practices, 2023 Edition
FDACS Florida Forest Service	5I-6	Best Management Practices for Silviculture, 2008 Edition
FDACS Florida Forest Service	5I-8	Florida Forestry Wildlife Best Management Practices for State Imperiled Species

Agency	F.A.C. Chapter	Chapter Title
DEP	62-330	Environmental Resource Permitting

Additionally in 2024, the Florida Legislature ratified changes to the Statewide Stormwater Rule related to the minimum treatment requirements for Environmental Resource Permits for urban stormwater. The treatment requirements for nitrogen and phosphorus were increased to reduce the nutrient loading of future urban development and other structural changes to assist with water quality restoration in impaired waters.

Section 2. Implementation to Achieve TMDL

2.1 Allocation of Pollutant Loads

2.1.1 Nutrients in the Springs and Spring Systems

DEP developed the NSILT to provide information on the estimated nitrogen loading from major sources to groundwater in the BMAP area, including the spring contributing areas for the OFS. The NSILT was updated in 2023 with more current data and some methodology improvements and revised in 2024 based on stakeholder feedback. The NSILT is a GIS- and spreadsheet-based tool that provides spatial estimates of the relative contribution of nitrogen from major nitrogen sources to groundwater and accounts for the transport pathways and processes affecting the various forms of nitrogen as they move from the land surface through the soil and geologic strata to groundwater.

The first major factor to be considered in estimating the loading to groundwater in the NSILT is the attenuation of nitrogen as it moves from its source through the environment, before it reaches the Upper Floridan Aquifer (UFA). Biological and chemical processes that occur as part of the nitrogen cycle, as well as hydrogeological processes, control the movement of nitrogen from the land surface to groundwater. Many of these processes attenuate (impede or remove) the amount of nitrogen transported to groundwater. An understanding of how water moves through the subsurface and the processes that transform the different forms of nitrogen is essential for estimating nitrogen loading to groundwater from various sources.

A second major factor to consider in estimating the loading to groundwater is the geologic features in the springshed and the related "recharge rate." Water movement between the shallow groundwater (surficial aquifer, where present) and the deeper aquifer (UFA) is slowed by a low permeability layer of clay, silt and fine sand that retards the vertical movement of infiltrating water from the surface. The UFA is in limestone that can be prone to dissolving and, over geologic time, develop numerous karst features (sinkholes, caves and conduits).

These features allow water to move directly and relatively rapidly from the land surface into the aquifer, and in some areas, the groundwater in the aquifer then moves rapidly to the springs.

Potential recharge rates from the surface to the UFA are affected by variations in geologic materials and the presence of karst features. DEP estimated three recharge rate categories, which were applied to the NSILT:

- Low recharge (0 to 3 inches per year [in/yr]).
- Medium recharge (3.01 to 10 in/yr).
- High recharge (10 in/yr or greater).

In the NSILT, DEP applied different attenuation factors to different types of sources to estimate the various biological, chemical and hydrogeological effects. Attenuation is the process where the nitrogen source is removed or stored by chemical and biological processes before it reaches the groundwater. In the NSILT estimates, the attenuation rates ranged from 90% (for atmospheric deposition) to 25% (for wastewater disposal in a RIB). This means that, for these examples, only 10% of nitrogen from atmospheric deposition is expected to reach the aquifer, while 75% of nitrogen from a RIB is expected to reach groundwater, because the remainder is attenuated by various chemical and biological processes.

Table 5 through **Table 8** list the estimated nitrogen loads to groundwater by source for each subbasin in the BMAP. Note that urban stormwater loads are included in UTF estimates, while agricultural stormwater loads are included in FF and LW estimates. Nitrogen loading to surface water will be reduced through the activities and strategies for the sources identified in this chapter for groundwater loading.

Table 5. Estimated total nitrogen load to groundwater by source in the Devil's Ear springshed

Nitrogen Source	Devil's Ear Total Nitrogen Load to Groundwater (lbs/yr)	% Contribution
OSTDS	96,194	10%
UTF	15,743	2%
Atmospheric Deposition	82,725	9%
FF	571,544	61%
STF	156	<1%
LW Non-CAFO	167,804	18%
Biosolids	855	<1%
WWTFs	3,994	<1%
Total	**939,017**	**100%**

Table 6. Estimated nitrogen load to groundwater by source in the Hornsby springshed

Nitrogen Source	Hornsby Total Nitrogen Load to Groundwater (lbs/yr)	% Contribution
OSTDS	26,750	9%
UTF	6,466	2%
Atmospheric Deposition	18,671	7%
FF	190,615	67%
STF	1,316	<1%
LW Non-CAFO	37,341	13%
WWTFs	3,225	1%
Total	**284,383**	**100%**

Table 7. Estimated nitrogen load to groundwater by source in the Ichetucknee springshed

Nitrogen Source	Ichetucknee Total Nitrogen Load to Groundwater (lbs/yr)	% Contribution
OSTDS	214,633	23%
UTF	82,723	9%
Atmospheric Deposition	100,805	11%
FF	396,844	42%
STF	10,864	1%
LW Non-CAFO	138,864	15%
WWTFs	4,388	<1%
Total	**949,121**	**100%**

Table 8. Estimated nitrogen load to groundwater by source in the outside springshed area

Nitrogen Source	Outside Springshed Total Nitrogen Load to Groundwater (lbs/yr)	% Contribution
OSTDS	196,902	20%
UTF	39,519	4%
Atmospheric Deposition	133,010	14%
FF	428,054	44%
STF	2,243	<1%
LW Non-CAFO	138,023	14%
LW CAFO Dairy	32,127	3%
Biosolids	544	<1%
WWTFs	11,122	1%
Total	**981,544**	**100%**

2.1.2 Assumptions and Considerations

The NSILT estimates are based on the following assumptions and considerations:

- **NSILT Nitrogen Inputs** – The methods used to estimate nitrogen inputs for each pollutant source were based on a detailed synthesis of information, including direct water quality measurements, census data, surveys following University of Florida-Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences (UF-IFAS) trainings, WWTF permits, published scientific studies and reports, and information obtained in meetings with agricultural producers, WMDs and FDACS. For some pollutant source categories, nitrogen inputs were obtained using assumptions and extrapolations and, as a result, these inputs may be further refined if more detailed information becomes available. More details on the NSILT methodology and assumptions are in the NSILT Technical Support Document in **Appendix F**.

- **OSTDS Inventory and Load Contribution** – A per capita contribution to an OSTDS of 10 lbs-N/year was used to calculate the loading from OSTDS. The average household contribution was estimated based on 2020 U.S. Census Bureau Data on the average number of people per household by county (Values ranged from 2.36 to 2.82 for the five counties in the Santa Fe River BMAP).

  The total number of OSTDS in the basin is estimated based on the Florida Water Management Inventory (FLWMI) data. OSTDS loading calculations in future BMAPs may be adjusted based on improved information on the number, location and type (conventional and enhanced nutrient-reducing) of existing septic systems, and will include updates on additional OSTDS installed in the area since the previous BMAP adoption.

Note that all values listed in this report are rounded, while the actual calculations were completed using whole numbers.

Other assumptions and considerations for BMAP implementation include the following:

- **Unquantified Project Benefits** – Nitrogen reductions for some of the projects and activities listed in this BMAP cannot currently be quantified. However, these projects are included because of their assumed positive impact to reduce pollutant loads, and estimated loading reductions may be determined at a later date.

- **Atmospheric Deposition** – Atmospheric sources of nitrogen are local, national and international. Local sources include the petroleum-fueled combustion engines of cars and trucks as well as fertilizers used for agricultural and residential uses. Other local or regional sources may include power plants and industrial facilities. Atmospheric sources have generally low nitrogen concentrations compared with other sources and are further reduced through additional biological and chemical processes before they reach groundwater. Himes and Dawson (2017) indicates that emissions of nitrogen have been generally decreasing in Florida with an up to 55% decrease in emissions estimated by 2028, possibly related to power plant fuel source changes and air treatment upgrades as well as the increased use of electric vehicles, decreasing mobile sources (Himes and Dawson, 2017) and increased use of solar energy. This gradual decrease in atmospheric emission of nitrogen will likely assist with creating the necessary reductions for this source. However, atmospheric deposition is a nitrogen source and is, therefore, estimated as a loading factor to the springs. As other sources are addressed and decreased, the relative percentage contribution of atmospheric sources is expected to increase. For this BMAP, atmospheric deposition sources and trends will be re-evaluated periodically. The regulatory programs that limit atmospheric sources are primarily national or international, which limits how this BMAP can regulate these sources.

- **OSTDS Inventory and Loading Calculations** – The total number of OSTDS in the basin is estimated based on local information and FDOH data. Future BMAPs and the associated OSTDS loading calculations may be adjusted based on improved data on the number, location, and type (conventional and enhanced nitrogen reducing) of existing septic systems, and may include additional OSTDS installed since BMAP adoption.

- **PFA** – The PFA provides a guide for focusing strategies where science suggests efforts will best benefit the springs. The PFA boundary may be adjusted in the future if additional relevant information becomes available.

- **Project Collection Period –** The BMAP project collection period is limited to projects after a certain date, based on the data used to calculate the reductions needed. Reductions from older projects are accounted for in the updated baseline

loading. The timing eligibility for projects is dependent on the data used to estimate the NSILT loads, which also depend on the source type. The following project cutoff dates apply in this BMAP document, which are based on the data used in the most recent NSILT update.

  - Urban and agricultural stormwater projects: Projects completed in the BMAP, on or after January 1, 2000.

  - WWTF Improvements: Projects completed on or after January 1, 2022, or later. Prior projects were included in the NSILT estimates.

  - OSTDS Enhancements/50% Treatment or OSTDS Connection to Sewer: Projects completed on or after January 1, 2022, based on the county in which the project is located and the FLWMI data year used in the 2023 NSILT update.

- **WWTFs** – Allocations for WWTFs were determined by applying effluent limits to each WWTF. This approach allows WWTFs to assume additional flows as OSTDS are phased out and still meet their allocation. It also acknowledges those facilities that already meet a high level of treatment. With this concentration-based approach, the total percent reduction assigned to the WWTFs will be different than the percentage applied to other sources.

- **Legacy Sources** – Land uses, activities or management practices not currently active in the basin may still be affecting the nitrate concentration of the springs. The movement of water from the land surface through the soil column to the UFA and through the UFA to the spring system varies both spatially and temporally and is influenced by local soil and aquifer conditions. As a result, there may be a time lag between when nitrogen input to the UFA occurs and, ultimately, when that nitrogen arrives at the impaired springs. The timing of this delay is not fully known.

- **Milestones –** Assessment of progress toward the milestones must be conducted every five years and revisions to the plan must be made as appropriate. BMAPs use an adaptive management approach that allows for incremental load reductions through the implementation of projects and management strategies; however, the restoration target, or TMDL, remains the same.

- **Implementation Schedule** – Nutrient load reduction in BMAP implementation is intended to occur over 20 years. To meet the TMDL within this timeframe, this plan defines nitrogen reduction milestones for 2028 (30%), 2033 (+50%) and 2038 (+20%) implementation (see **Section 2.1.5** for further details). Further, the total reductions and the project credits may be adjusted under the adaptive management approach used for the BMAP. This approach requires regular follow-up to ensure management strategies are carried out and their incremental effects are assessed. The

process acknowledges that there is some uncertainty associated with the outcomes of proposed management strategies and the estimated response in nitrogen concentration at the springs. As more information is gathered and progress towards each milestone is reviewed, additional management strategies may be developed or existing strategies refined to better address the sources of nitrogen loading to achieve the TMDL.

- **Changes in Spring Flows** – The role of this BMAP is specifically to address the implementation of projects that reduce nitrogen load to groundwater, while the minimum flows and levels (MFLs) established for specific springs address water flows and levels. To maximize efforts between the two programs, it is recommended that when practicable, springs protection projects provide both water quality and quantity benefits.

2.1.3 Loading by Source

Based on the NSILT estimates, the pie charts in **Figure 2**, **Figure 3**, **Figure 4**, and **Figure 5** depict the estimated percentage of nitrogen loading to groundwater by source in each springshed and the outside the springshed areas. FF and LW are responsible for approximately 67% of the nitrogen sources in the BMAP area. Stormwater loading to groundwater is incorporated into the various source categories.



Figure 2. Loading to groundwater by source in the Devil's Ear

springshed area



Figure 3. Loading to groundwater by source in the Hornsby springshed area



Figure 4. Loading to groundwater by source in the Ichetucknee springshed area



Figure 5. Loading to groundwater by source outside the springshed area

2.1.4 Loading Allocation

The nitrogen source reductions are based on the estimated current nitrogen loading to groundwater in the NSILT, the measured nitrate concentrations and flows at the vents, and the TMDL target nitrate concentration. **Table 9** lists the measured nitrate (as nitrogen) loads at the spring vents compared with the TMDL nitrate target concentration of 0.35 mg/L. The difference between the spring vent loading and the TMDL loading target is the required percent reduction to meet the TMDL. The total required load reduction is allocated to sources and to entities based on existing loads.

Table 9. Total reductions required to meet the TMDL

Description	Devil's Ear Nitrogen Loads (lbs/yr)	Hornsby Nitrogen Loads (lbs/yr)	Ichetucknee Nitrogen Loads (lbs/yr)	Outside the Springsheds Nitrogen Loads (lbs/yr)	Source
Total Load at Spring Vents	2,249,219	652,823	347,612	386,236	Upper 95 % confidence interval - nitrate and flow data 2012 to 2022
TMDL Load	617,388	474,374	177,042	304,635	TMDL target of 0.35 mg/L and using the spring vent flow data from 2012 to 2022
Percent Reduction	**73%**	**27%**	**49%**	**21%**	Calculated reduction needed based on the total load at the spring vents and the TMDL load
NSILT Load	939,017	284,383	949,121	981,544	Total load to groundwater from the updated NSILT
Required Reductions	**681,266**	**77,736**	**465,725**	**207,373**	**Percent reduction multiplied by the NSILT load**

The total load at the Devil's Ear spring vent was estimated using data at Devil's Ear, Gilchrist Blue, Ginnie, Rum Island, and other associated springs in the Devil's Complex spring system springs from 2012 through 2022, and other associated springs as data was available.

The total loads at the OFS spring vents for the Hornsby springshed were estimated using data at Hornsby and Treehouse Springs from 2012 through 2022.

The total loads at the OFS spring vents for the Ichetucknee springshed were estimated using data at Ichetucknee Head Spring, Blue Hole Spring, and other associated springs along the Ichetucknee River, from 2012 through 2022; and other associated springs as data was available.

The total loads at the spring vents for the areas outside the springsheds were estimated using data from Columbia, Poe, Santa Fe and Wilson springs from 2012 through 2022, and other associated springs as data was available.

In this BMAP, the total load at the spring vent is larger than the NSILT estimated load to groundwater. In most of the springs BMAPs, the NSILT estimated load is larger. In evaluating the baseline for establishing reductions in this BMAP, it was determined that use of the NSILT loading was appropriate and protective. The discrepancy between spring vent and NSILT loading is believed to be primarily the result of the generalized attenuation and recharge rates used in the NSILT. From a practical perspective, uncertainty due to generalized attenuation and recharge rates does not lessen the required real-world reductions. The same attenuation and recharge factors used in NSILT computations are also applied to BMAP project credits. By applying these factors to both sides of the ledger, uncertainty in the recharge and attenuation rates is inherently offset.

Prior to the next BMAP update, DEP will examine the need to further refine the methodology for estimating nitrogen loads, including recharge and attenuation rates, and will evaluate the impact

that a refined load estimate would have on implementation in future iterations of the BMAP.

2.1.5 Description of 2028, 2033, and 2038 Milestones/Reduction Schedule

In 2023, section 403.067, F.S., was amended to require that TMDL implementation be addressed through milestones that include a list of projects that will achieve the pollutant load reductions to meet the TMDL or the load allocations established pursuant to subsection 403.067(6), F.S. Each project must include a planning-level cost estimate and an estimated completion date. Any responsible entity within the BMAP that has a pollutant load reduction requirement must identify projects or strategies to undertake to meet the current 5-year pollution reduction milestone. The overall load reduction targets are 30% of the total by 2028, 80% of the total by 2033, and 100% of the total by 2038. DEP will evaluate progress towards these milestones and will report implementation progress and project information to the Governor and Florida Legislature annually through the statewide annual report. DEP will adjust management strategies if needed to reduce loading to the aquifer to ensure the target concentrations at the spring vent are achieved. This may include expanding the area to which the OSTDS remediation policies apply, requiring additional projects or management strategies, or developing other nutrient reduction policies. Any changes would be incorporated into a future BMAP update through a formal adoption process.

Table 10 lists the estimated nitrogen reduction schedule by milestone. Progress will be tracked yearly and adjustments made as needed. At the 2028 milestone, progress will be assessed and load reductions adjusted as necessary. Entities have flexibility in the types and locations of projects as long as they achieve their required load reductions. Consideration may be given to entities with projects that are planned or underway that will be completed in a future milestone phase, to allow adequate time for projects to be fully implemented. **Section 2.2** describes detailed source reduction strategies.

Table 10. Nitrogen reduction schedule

Basin	2028 Milestone (30% of Total)	2033 Milestone (+50% of Total)	2038 Milestone (+20% of Total)	Total Nitrogen Reduction (100%)
Devil's Ear	204,380	340,633	136,253	681,266
Hornsby	23,321	38,868	15,547	77,736
Ichetucknee	139,718	232,863	93,145	465,725
Outside Springsheds	62,212	103,687	41,475	207,373

2.2 Load Reduction Strategy

A precise total load reduction to groundwater needed to meet the TMDL is dependent on a number of complex factors and may be refined if additional information becomes available. Based on current information, there must be a reduction of at least 1,432,101 lbs/yr TN by 2038 to achieve the TMDL. However, due to the distance of some reductions in relation to the spring vent and the uncertainties of fate and transport in the karst geology, additional studies, projects or management strategies may be necessary to ensure that loading at the spring vent is reduced

to achieve the TMDL target within the timeline of the BMAP.

To increase our understanding of the relationship between project reductions and changes in concentrations at the spring vent, as well as the time lag of water movement within the springshed to the spring, water quality monitoring of existing groundwater within the BMAP and at the spring vent is essential.

2.3 Entity Allocations

The results from the NSILT and spring vent load analysis were used to calculate the nitrogen loads associated with each responsible stakeholder. **Table 11** through **Table 14** summarize the total required reductions assigned to each entity in each of the springsheds and the outside the springshed areas. Note that some entities may have assigned reductions in more than one sub-basin. Regional projects are state-sponsored management actions that treat nutrient loading from one or many urban sources. Agriculture in **Table 11** through **Table 22** includes loading from FF, LW, CAFO dairies, and biosolids applications. A list of private golf courses with allocations can be found in **Appendix J**. A list of private WWTFs can be found in **Appendix K**.

Table 11. Required reductions by entity in the Devil's Ear springshed area

*Total excludes reductions of atmospheric deposition.

Entity	Total Assigned Reductions by Entity (lbs/yr)
Agriculture	536,405
Alachua County	17,674
City of Archer	3,664
City of Newberry	4,433
Columbia County	24,515
Town of Fort White	3,635
Gilchrist County	26,525
Union County	4,737
Private WWTFs	71
Total, All Reductions	**621,658***

Table 12. Required reductions by entity in the Hornsby springshed area

*Total excludes reductions of atmospheric deposition.

Entity	Total Assigned Reductions by Entity (lbs/yr)
Agriculture	62,312
Alachua County	4,457
City of High Springs	496
Town of La Crosse	80
City of Alachua	5,020
Private WWTFs	15
Private Golf Courses	331
Total, All Reductions	**72,711***

Table 13. Required reductions by entity in the Ichetucknee springshed area

*Total excludes reductions of atmospheric deposition.

Entity	Total Assigned Reductions by Entity (lbs/yr)
Agriculture	262,867
Columbia County	133,375
City of Lake City	9,566
Suwannee County	4,216
Private WWTFs	981
Private Golf Courses	4,919
Regional Projects	338
Total, All Reductions	**416,261***

Table 14. Required reductions by entity outside the springshed area

*Total excludes reductions from atmospheric deposition.

Entity	Total Assigned Reductions by Entity (lbs/yr)
Agriculture	126,499
Alachua County	14,830
City of Gainesville	221
City of High Springs	6,761
Town of La Crosse	41
City of Newberry	124
City of Waldo	7
Bradford County	13,118
Town of Brooker	84
City of Hampton	364
City of Lawtey	418
City of Starke	2,137
Columbia County	5,433
Town of Fort White	201

Entity	Total Assigned Reductions by Entity (lbs/yr)
Gilchrist County	1,753
Suwannee County	1,420
Union County	4,330
City of Lake Butler	5,608
Town of Raiford	159
Town of Worthington Springs	80
Private WWTFs	1,331
Private Golf Courses	474
Total, All Reductions	**185,392***

Table 15 through **Table 18** include the 5-year milestone required reductions for each entity in each of the sub-basins. **Table 19** through **Table 22** compares the current list of planned, underway, ongoing and completed projects to the first 5-year milestone. Reductions are based on projects completed through October 2024. This date was chosen to allow adequate time to review project documentation and calculate reductions based on accepted methodologies and best management practice (BMP) efficiencies. Updated project information will be provided each year in the Statewide Annual Report and at annual meetings. The management actions provided by responsible stakeholders to achieve these reductions are described in **Appendix B**.

Responsible entities must submit a sufficient list of creditable projects with estimated reductions which demonstrates how the entity is going to meet their milestone to DEP no later than January 14, 2026, to be compliant with the upcoming BMAP milestone or be subject to department enforcement.

If any lead entity is unable to submit a sufficient list of eligible management strategies to meet their next 5-year milestone reductions, specific project identification efforts are required to be submitted by January 14, 2026. Any such project identification efforts must define the purpose of and include a timeline to identify sufficient projects to meet the upcoming milestone. The project description and estimated completion date for any such project identification effort must be provided and reflect the urgency of defining, funding, and implementing projects to meet the upcoming and future BMAP milestones.

These planning efforts are ineligible for BMAP credit themselves but are necessary to demonstrate that additional eligible management actions will be forthcoming and BMAP compliance will be achieved. Examples of project identification efforts are included in **Appendix C**. Only those entities that provide sufficient project identification efforts will be deemed as possessing a defined compliance schedule. Those entities without an adequate project list nor a defined compliance schedule to meet their upcoming 5-year milestone may be subject to enforcement actions.

Table 15. 5-year milestone required reductions by entity in the Devil's Ear springshed area

Entity	2028 Milestone Assigned Reductions (30%) (lbs/yr)	2033 Milestone Assigned Reductions (80%) (lbs/yr)	2038 Milestone Assigned Reductions (100%) (lbs/yr)
Agriculture	160,921	429,124	536,405
Alachua County	5,302	14,139	17,674
City of Archer	1,099	2,931	3,664
City of Newberry	1,330	3,546	4,433
Columbia County	7,355	19,612	24,515
Town of Fort White	1,091	2,908	3,635
Gilchrist County	7,957	21,220	26,525
Union County	1,421	3,789	4,737
Private WWTFs	21	57	71
Total, All Reductions	**186,497**	**497,326**	**621,658**

Table 16. 5-year milestone required reductions by entity in the Hornsby springshed area

Entity	2028 Milestone Assigned Reductions (30%) (lbs/yr)	2033 Milestone Assigned Reductions (80%) (lbs/yr)	2038 Milestone Assigned Reductions (100%) (lbs/yr)
Agriculture	18,694	49,849	62,312
Alachua County	1,337	3,565	4,457
City of High Springs	149	397	496
Town of La Crosse	24	64	80
City of Alachua	1,506	4,016	5,020
Private WWTFs	4	12	15
Private Golf Courses	99	265	331
Total, All Reductions	**21,813**	**58,169**	**72,711**

Table 17. 5-year milestone required reductions by entity in the Ichetucknee springshed area

Entity	2028 Milestone Assigned Reductions (30%) (lbs/yr)	2033 Milestone Assigned Reductions (80%) (lbs/yr)	2038 Milestone Assigned Reductions (100%) (lbs/yr)
Agriculture	78,860	210,293	262,867
Columbia County	40,012	106,700	133,375
City of Lake City	2,870	7,653	9,566
Suwannee County	1,265	3,372	4,216

Entity	2028 Milestone Assigned Reductions (30%) (lbs/yr)	2033 Milestone Assigned Reductions (80%) (lbs/yr)	2038 Milestone Assigned Reductions (100%) (lbs/yr)
Private WWTFs	294	785	981
Private Golf Courses	1,476	3,935	4,919
Regional Projects	101	270	338
Total, All Reductions	**124,878**	**333,009**	**416,261**

Table 18. 5-year milestone required reductions by entity outside the springshed area

Entity	2028 Milestone Assigned Reductions (30%) (lbs/yr)	2033 Milestone Assigned Reductions (80%) (lbs/yr)	2038 Milestone Assigned Reductions (100%) (lbs/yr)
Agriculture	37,950	101,199	126,499
Alachua County	4,449	11,864	14,830
City of Gainesville	66	177	221
City of High Springs	2,028	5,409	6,761
Town of La Crosse	12	33	41
City of Newberry	37	99	124
City of Waldo	2	5	7
Bradford County	3,935	10,494	13,118
Town of Brooker	25	67	84
City of Hampton	109	291	364
City of Lawtey	125	334	418
City of Starke	641	1,710	2,137
Columbia County.	1,630	4,346	5,433
Town of Fort White	60	161	201
Gilchrist County.	526	1,403	1,753
Suwannee County	426	1,136	1,420
Union County	1,299	3,464	4,330
City of Lake Butler	1,682	4,486	5,608
Town of Raiford	48	127	159
Town of Worthington Springs	24	64	80
Private WWTFs	399	1,065	1,331
Private Golf Courses	142	379	474
Total, All Reductions	**55,618**	**148,314**	**185,392**

Table 19. Progress towards next 5-year milestone by entity in the Devil's Ear springshed

** Planned and underway project reduction estimates are not verified by DEP.*
*** Projected reductions include projects with a project status of completed, ongoing, planned, and underway.*
[+]These reductions are a combination of projects completed by FDACS and the WMDs.

Entity	2028 Milestone Assigned Reductions (30%) (lbs/yr)	TN Reductions From Completed & Ongoing Projects (lbs/yr)	TN Reductions From Planned & Underway Projects* (Not Verified) (lbs/yr)	Total Projected** Project TN Reductions by Entity Through 2028 (lbs/yr)	TN Reduction Needed to Achieve 30% Milestone (2028) (lbs/yr)
Agriculture[+]	160,921	85,026	254	85,280	75,641
Alachua County	5,302	104	0	104	5,198
City of Archer	1,099	0	3,183	3,183	0
City of Newberry	1,330	354	2,955	3,309	0
Columbia County	7,355	0	0	0	7,355
Town of Fort White	1,091	0	0	0	1,091
Gilchrist County	7,957	0	0	0	7,957
Union County	1,421	0	0	0	1,421
Private WWTFs	21	0	0	0	21
Total, All Reductions	**186,497**	**85,484**	**6,392**	**91,876**	**-**

Table 20. Progress towards next 5-year milestone by entity in the Hornsby springshed

** Planned and underway project reduction estimates are not verified by DEP.*
*** Projected reductions include projects with a project status of completed, ongoing, planned, and underway.*
[+]These reductions are a combination of projects completed by FDACS and the WMDs.

Entity	2028 Milestone Assigned Reductions (30%) (lbs/yr)	TN Reductions From Completed & Ongoing Projects (lbs/yr)	TN Reductions From Planned & Underway Projects* (Not Verified) (lbs/yr)	Total Projected** Project TN Reductions by Entity Through 2028 (lbs/yr)	TN Reduction Needed to Achieve 30% Milestone (2028) (lbs/yr)
Agriculture[+]	18,694	16,092	0	16,092	2,602
Alachua County	1,337	76	0	76	1,261
City of High Springs	149	0	0	0	149
Town of La Crosse	24	0	0	0	24
City of Alachua	1,506	0	0	0	1,506
Private WWTFs	4	0	0	0	4

Entity	2028 Milestone Assigned Reductions (30%) (lbs/yr)	TN Reductions From Completed & Ongoing Projects (lbs/yr)	TN Reductions From Planned & Underway Projects* (Not Verified) (lbs/yr)	Total Projected** Project TN Reductions by Entity Through 2028 (lbs/yr)	TN Reduction Needed to Achieve 30% Milestone (2028) (lbs/yr)
Private Golf Courses	99	0	0	0	99
Total, All Reductions	**21,813**	**16,168**	**0**	**16,168**	**-**

Table 21. Progress towards next 5-year milestone by entity in the Ichetucknee springshed

** Planned and underway project reduction estimates are not verified by DEP.*

*** Projected reductions include projects with a project status of completed, ongoing, planned, and underway.*

[+]These reductions are a combination of projects completed by FDACS and the WMDs.

Entity	2028 Milestone Assigned Reductions (30%) (lbs/yr)	TN Reductions From Completed & Ongoing Projects (lbs/yr)	TN Reductions From Planned & Underway Projects* (Not Verified) (lbs/yr)	Total Projected** Project TN Reductions by Entity Through 2028 (lbs/yr)	TN Reduction Needed to Achieve 30% Milestone (2028) (lbs/yr)
Agriculture[+]	78,860	31,484	0	31,484	47,376
Columbia County	40,012	0	8,100	8,100	31,912
City of Lake City	2,870	0	0	0	2,870
Suwannee County	1,265	0	0	0	1,265
Private WWTFs	294	0	0	0	294
Private Golf Courses	1,476	0	0	0	1,476
Regional Projects	101	0	0	0	101
Total, All Reductions	**124,878**	**31,484**	**8,100**	**39,584**	**-**

Table 22. Progress towards next 5-year milestone by entity outside the springsheds

** Planned and underway project reduction estimates are not verified by DEP.*

*** Projected reductions include projects with a project status of completed, ongoing, planned, and underway.*

[+]These reductions are a combination of projects completed by FDACS and the WMDs.

Entity	2028 Milestone Assigned Reductions (30%) (lbs/yr)	TN Reductions From Completed & Ongoing Projects (lbs/yr)	TN Reductions From Planned & Underway Projects* (Not Verified) (lbs/yr)	Total Projected** Project TN Reductions by Entity Through 2028 (lbs/yr)	TN Reduction Needed to Achieve 30% Milestone (2028) (lbs/yr)
Agriculture[+]	37,950	28,815	1,832	30,647	7,303
Alachua County	4,449	888	19	906	3,543

Entity	2028 Milestone Assigned Reductions (30%) (lbs/yr)	TN Reductions From Completed & Ongoing Projects (lbs/yr)	TN Reductions From Planned & Underway Projects* (Not Verified) (lbs/yr)	Total Projected** Project TN Reductions by Entity Through 2028 (lbs/yr)	TN Reduction Needed to Achieve 30% Milestone (2028) (lbs/yr)
City of Gainesville	66	57	0	57	9
City of High Springs	2,028	0	0	0	2,028
Town of La Crosse	12	0	0	0	12
City of Newberry	37	0	0	0	37
City of Waldo	2	0	0	0	2
Bradford County	3,935	0	0	0	3,935
Town of Brooker	25	0	0	0	25
City of Hampton	109	0	0	0	109
City of Lawtey	125	0	0	0	125
City of Starke	641	0	0	0	641
Columbia County	1,630	0	0	0	1,630
Town of Fort White	60	0	0	0	60
Gilchrist County	526	0	0	0	526
Suwannee County	426	0	0	0	426
Union County	1,299	0	0	0	1,299
City of Lake Butler	1,682	0	0	0	1,682
Town of Raiford	48	0	0	0	48
Town of Worthington Springs	24	0	0	0	24
Private WWTFs	399	0	0	0	399
Private Golf Courses	142	0	0	0	142
Total, All Reductions	**55,618**	**29,760**	**1,851**	**31,610**	**-**

2.4 Prioritization of Management Strategies

Required under Chapter 373.807, F.S., management strategies listed in **Appendix B** are ranked with a priority of high, medium, or low. To help prioritize projects towards the next milestone as required under 403.067, F.S., planning-level details for each listed project, along with their priority ranking have been determined.

Project status was selected as the most appropriate indicator of a project's priority ranking based primarily on if the project is going towards the next 5-year milestone, as well as need for

funding. Overall, any project that is needed by a responsible entity to meet their next reduction milestone is considered a priority. Projects classified as "underway" were assigned a high or medium priority because some resources have been allocated to these projects, but additional assistance may be needed for the project to be completed. High priority was assigned to projects listed with the project status "planned" that are needed to meet the next milestone, as well as certain "completed" projects that are designated as “ongoing” each year, and select projects that are elevated because substantial, subsequent project(s) are reliant on their completion.

2.5 OSTDS Management Strategies

2.5.1 Management of New OSTDS Loads

As of July 1, 2023, sections 373.811 and 403.067, F.S., prohibited the installation of new conventional OSTDS serving a lot of one acre or less where central sewer is available. Within the Santa Fe BMAP area, if central sewer is unavailable on any lot size within the PFA or on lots of one acre or less outside the PFA, then the owner must install a DEP-approved enhanced nutrient-reducing OSTDS that achieves at least 65% nitrogen reduction, or other wastewater system that achieves at least 65% reduction. The OSTDS remediation plan pursuant to section 373.807, F.S., (**Appendix F**) was updated in this BMAP iteration to include this additional requirement for new systems.

2.5.2 Existing OSTDS Remediation

Currently, existing OSTDS are not required to receive additional nitrogen treatment. In this iteration, this BMAP does not require OSTDS remediation plans from local governments. However, annually through the statewide reporting process, management actions that reduce loads from existing OSTDS such as sewer connection, adding enhancement nitrogen treatment to OSTDS, or installing another type of wastewater system on the property, are eligible as restoration efforts.

Enhanced OSTDS can achieve an estimated 50% improvement in the load to groundwater compared to a conventional system. OSTDS replaced by sewer reduces the conventional nitrogen inputs by an estimated 95%, assuming a sewer connection to a WWTF meeting AWT levels. For projects addressing OSTDS loads, load reductions are estimated based on average nitrogen loads per person and the U.S. Census information on the county’s average number of persons per household. The OSTDS location determines the applicable county. The improvement to groundwater is calculated by applying an attenuation rate as well as a location-based recharge factor, which estimates how likely the improved loading will travel into the deep groundwater system. For more information about how OSTDS loads were estimated, see the NSILT Technical Support Document in **Appendix F**.

2.5.2.1 Section 373.807, F.S.

Subsection 373.807(3), F.S., specifies that if, during the development of a BMAP for an OFS, DEP identifies OSTDS as contributors of at least 20% of nonpoint source nitrogen pollution in a

PFA or if DEP determines OSTDS remediation is necessary to achieve the TMDL, the BMAP must include an OSTDS remediation plan. The OSTDS remediation plan requires policies for new OSTDS to be consistent with achieving the TMDL within 20 years of plan adoption (subparagraph 373.807(1)(b)8., F.S.).

DEP assessed the overall OSTDS loading compared to other nitrogen sources in the BMAP area. Based on these assessments, DEP has determined that OSTDS contribute less than 20% of nonpoint source nitrogen pollution to the OFS. Currently, the remediation plan for this BMAP does not include requirements for the addition of enhanced nitrogen reducing treatment to conventional systems upon the need for modification or repair of existing OSTDS. However, remediation of existing conventional OSTDS will still be beneficial to mitigate nitrogen loading from this source, restore associated groundwater and surface water to achieve the TMDL and to minimize nitrogen loads from future growth.

Based on FLWMI data (2022), there are approximately 4,607 known and likely OSTDS in the Devil's Ear PFA, approximately 1,890 in the Hornsby PFA, and approximately in the 12,410 Ichetucknee PFA. **Appendix E** summarizes the estimated count of OSTDS on lots less than one acre in the PFAs. **Figure 6** shows the locations of all OSTDS in the BMAP area based on FLWMI; however, local governments or utilities may have more current information about OSTDS locations in their jurisdiction.

2.5.2.2 Subsection 403.067(7)(a)9., F.S

Subparagraph 403.067(7)(a)9., F.S., also requires local governments within a BMAP to develop an OSTDS remediation plan that is adopted as part of the BMAP no later than July 1, 2025, if DEP identifies OSTDS as contributors of at least 20% of point source or nonpoint source nutrient pollution or if DEP determines remediation is necessary to achieve the TMDL. Loading from OSTDS in this BMAP does not meet the 20% contribution threshold; therefore, local governments were not required to submit an OSTDS remediation for this BMAP iteration.

This BMAP encourages local governments to include the remediation of OSTDS as options for their management actions, including those described in **Appendix B** and updated annually through the statewide reporting process that reduce loads from existing OSTDS through either sewer connection, adding enhancement nitrogen treatment to OSTDS, or installing another type of wastewater system on the property, as applicable. Local governments are encouraged to submit projects describing how OSTDS loads are addressed as part of BMAP reporting and estimate the load reductions associated with each project. The estimated reductions to the spring from addressing these septic systems will be based on several factors, including how they are addressed (i.e., connection to sewer or enhancement) and the amount of attenuation and recharge that occurs.

2.5.2.3 Local Government Ordinances

Local governments may have existing ordinances or could adopt new ordinances that add

additional requirements for enhancement of OSTDS. To expedite remediation of wastewater sources and to facilitate achievement of assigned milestones in this BMAP, DEP encourages local governments to adopt such ordinances.



Figure 6. Estimated OSTDS locations and density in the Santa Fe River BMAP area and PFAs

2.6 WWTF Management Strategies

2.6.1 Facility Improvements and Effluent Limits

There are several WWTFs located in the Santa Fe River BMAP area, including 11 domestic WWTFs permitted to discharge more than 100,000 gallons of treated effluent per day (or 0.1 million gallons per day [mgd]). **Figure 7** shows the locations of domestic WWTFs in the Santa

Fe River Basin with discharges to surface water and other disposal methods.

In the Santa Fe River BMAP area, treated effluent containing nitrogen is discharged to sprayfields, RIBs, and percolation ponds, and is reused for irrigation water and power generation. The estimated nitrogen load from WWTFs is estimated to be 22,729 pounds. The discharge location (such as proximity to the spring, highly permeable soils, etc.) and level of wastewater treatment are important factors to consider when addressing loadings to groundwater. Additionally, addressing the nitrogen loading from OSTDS could increase the volume of effluent treated and disposed of by WWTFs.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) authorizes DEP to issue permits for discharges to surface waters under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Program. Permits for discharges to groundwater are issued by DEP based on Florida law and rules. Wastewater discharge permits establish specific limitations and requirements based on the location and type of facility or activity releasing industrial or domestic wastewater from a point source. In areas with an adopted, nutrient-related BMAP prior to July 1, 2023, section 403.086, F.S., requires any facility discharging to a waterbody to upgrade to AWT by January 1, 2033. Further, for any waterbody determined not to be attaining nutrient or nutrient-related standards after July 1, 2023, or subject to a nutrient or nutrient-related BMAP or adopted RAP after July 1, 2023, sewage disposal facilities are prohibited from disposing any waste into such waters without providing advanced waste treatment, as approved by the department within 10 years after such determination or adoption.

Further, section 373.811, F.S., prohibits new domestic wastewater disposal facilities, including those discharging to RIBs, with permitted capacities of 100,000 gallons per day or more, unless the discharge meets the AWT standard of no more than 3 mg/L TN, on an annual permitted basis, or a more stringent treatment standard if the department determines the more stringent standard is necessary to attain a TMDL for the OFS.

The nitrogen effluent limits set forth in **Table 23** will be applied as an annual average, taken at end of pipe before any land disposal, to all new and existing WWTFs with a DEP-permitted discharge or disposal area within this BMAP pursuant to sections 403.067(7)(b), 403.086(1)(c)1.c., 2., or (2), F.S., as applicable. If a facility has effluent disposal located in an area where the boundaries of a surface water and OFS BMAP overlap, the more stringent nitrogen effluent limits apply. DEP will evaluate the need for more stringent nutrient effluent limits as appropriate.

Table 23. Nitrogen effluent standards for the BMAP area

*Including rapid-rate land application systems permitted under Part V of Chapter 62-610, F.A.C.

95% of the Permitted Capacity (gpd)	Surface Water Discharges (mg/L)	WWTFs Not Listed in Appendix G – Slow-Rate Land Application (SRLA) and Rapid-Rate Land Application (RRLA) Systems (mg/L)	WWTFs Not Listed in Appendix G – All Other Reuse or Effluent Disposal Methods, Excluding SRLA and RRLA* (mg/L)
Greater than 100,000	3	3	3
20,000 to 100,000	3	3	6
Less than 20,000	3	6	6

Where the law does not provide a compliance timeframe, new effluent standards will take effect at the time of permit renewal or no later than five years after BMAP adoption, whichever is sooner.

Additionally, new and existing wastewater permits in the BMAP area must require at least quarterly sampling of the effluent discharge for TN concentrations and report these sampling results in the discharge monitoring reports (DMRs) submitted to DEP.

In 2021, subsection 403.064(16), F.S., was amended to require domestic wastewater utilities that dispose of effluent, reclaimed water, or reuse water by surface water discharge to submit for DEP review and approval, a plan for eliminating non-beneficial surface water discharge by January 1, 2032. A utility must fully implement the approved plan by January 1, 2032. If a plan was not timely submitted or approved by DEP, the utility's domestic WWTFs may not dispose of effluent, reclaimed water, or reuse water by surface water discharge after January 1, 2028. Violations are subject to administrative and civil penalties pursuant to sections 403.121, 403.131, and 403.141, F.S.

2.6.2 Reclaimed Water Effluent Limits

In accordance with section 403.086(1)(c)3., F.S., 10 years after adoption of this BMAP, any WWTF providing reclaimed water that will be used for commercial or residential irrigation or be otherwise land applied within a nutrient BMAP or RAP area is required to meet AWT standards for TN and total phosphorus (TP), such that the reclaimed water product contains not more, on a permitted annual average basis, of 3 mg/L of TN and 1 mg/L of TP if DEP has determined in an applicable basin management action plan or reasonable assurance plan that the use of reclaimed water is causing or contributing to the nutrient impairment being addressed. These requirements do not apply to reclaimed water that is land applied as part of a water quality restoration project or water resource development project approved by DEP to meet a TMDL or minimum flow or level and where the TN and TP will be at or below AWT standards prior to entering groundwater or surface water.

DEP has determined that certain WWTFs providing reclaimed water for the purpose of commercial or residential irrigation or that is otherwise being land applied within this BMAP area are causing or contributing to the nutrient impairments being addressed in this BMAP. Based on DEP's determination, these facilities are identified in **Appendix G** and are subject to the nitrogen and phosphorus limits set forth in section 403.086(1)(c)3., F.S. The list of facilities does not include those facilities that are otherwise required to meet the advanced wastewater treatment limits for phosphorous and nitrogen pursuant to **Table 23** above. The facilities listed in **Appendix G** have 10 years from BMAP adoption to meet the applicable AWT standards. This requirement does not prevent the department from requiring an alternative treatment standard, if the department determines the alternative standard is necessary to achieve the TMDL(s) or applicable water quality criteria. For facilities that did not have adequate information to complete an evaluation or where a change occurred to the facility's application of reclaimed water after the initial evaluation (e.g., an increase in facility capacity or change in location of reclaimed water application), the department will evaluate the land application of reclaimed water as more information becomes available pursuant to section 403.086(1)(c)3., F.S.

All new permitted facilities providing reclaimed water that will be used for commercial or residential irrigation or be otherwise land applied within the BMAP area are required to meet AWT standards for TN in accordance with section 403.086(1)(c)3., F.S.

DEP encourages the reuse of treated wastewater for irrigation as a water conservation measure. The expansion of reuse water for irrigation can reduce reliance on the Floridan aquifer for water supply. The nitrogen load to groundwater from reuse water is expected to be reduced through these WWTF policies, as improvements in reuse water quality will both reduce loads from this source and minimize future increases in nutrient loading from reuse because of higher treatment levels.

2.6.3 Wastewater Treatment Facility Plans

Subparagraph 403.067(7)(a)9., F.S., requires local governments within a BMAP to develop WWTF plans to be adopted as part of nutrient BMAPs no later than July 1, 2025, if DEP identifies domestic wastewater as contributors of at least 20% of point source or nonpoint source nutrient pollution or if DEP determines remediation is necessary to achieve the TMDL. The WWTF plans must be developed by each local government in cooperation with DEP, WMDs, and public and private domestic wastewater facilities within the jurisdiction of the local government. Each local government's wastewater treatment plan for applicable BMAPs must contain the information outlined in Final Order 23-0112 to 23-0135 for each existing or proposed domestic wastewater facility in the local government's jurisdiction.

Subparagraph 403.067(7)(a)9., F.S., was amended in 2024 to clarify that private domestic wastewater facilities must provide this information to local governments effective July 1, 2024. Information related to private facilities will need to be included in future local government WWTF plans if not captured in the initial plans.

Loading from WWTFs in this BMAP does not meet the 20% contribution threshold; therefore,

local governments were not required to submit a wastewater treatment remediation plan for this BMAP iteration. However, DEP strongly encourages all local governments to undertake planning initiatives to address loading from WWTFs in their jurisdictions and plan for future growth.

2.6.4 Connection to Sewer

The installation of new OSTDS within a BMAP area is prohibited where connection to sewer lines is available. For existing OSTDS, the owner must connect to sewer within 365 days of written notification by the utility that connection to its sewer line is available. A utility is statutorily required (section 381.00655, F.S.) to provide written notice to existing OSTDS owners regarding the availability of sewer lines for connection. Additionally, existing OSTDS needing repair or modification must connect to available sewer lines within 90 days of notification by DEP.

To facilitate an inventory of noncompliant properties, by February 2, 2026, and every two years thereafter, each utility with sewer lines in the BMAP shall provide DEP a list of properties with existing OSTDS where sewer is available (as defined in 381.00655, F.S.) but have not been connected. For each identified property, include the date(s) which the utility provided written notice to the owners of the availability of sewer.

2.6.5 Biosolids and Septage

To provide assurance that nitrogen and phosphorus losses to surface water and groundwater are minimized from the permitted application of biosolids and septage in the BMAP area, the requirements in Chapter 62-640 F.A.C. apply to newly permitted application sites and existing application sites upon permit renewal. Where biosolids materials mixed with yard waste or other organic materials are distributed as compost or soil amendments, DEP recommends the recipients of these materials be notified of their increased nutrient content, so that any fertilization practices on the site can be adjusted accordingly.



Figure 7. Locations of domestic WWTFs in the Santa Fe River BMAP area

2.7 UTF Management Strategies

UTF consists of fertilizers applied to turfgrass typically found in residential and urban areas (including residential lawns and public green spaces). It is applied by either the homeowner or a lawn service company on residential properties, while on nonresidential properties they may be applied by contractors or maintenance staff. UTF can be addressed through a mix of efforts,

including public education, enforcement of local ordinances (regulating fertilizer use and irrigation), land development codes or stormwater projects. Based on progress towards meeting the TMDL and water quality monitoring results, reduction requirements and crediting of projects such as fertilizer ordinances and education efforts may be reevaluated in future BMAP updates, particularly with respect to enforcement of fertilizer ordinances. As part of the annual reporting process, stakeholders will be required to provide a detailed and quantified description of their ordinance enforcement and environmental education activities to receive credits for these activities.

It is recommended that appropriate grasses are used based on soil characteristics, irrigation needs and fertilization needs. It is recommended that Bahia grass (*Paspalum notatum*), which is a durable grass that can be drought and heat tolerant should be used over St. Augustinegrass (*Stenotaphrum secundatum*) on sandy soils within spring BMAPs. Both homeowners and developers should follow the recommendations within the BMAP. If a local government has recommendations for what grasses should be used, DEP recommends that homeowners and developers follow them for the protection of water resources, if they are different than the BMAP.

Using reclaimed water is a way to distribute nutrients that need to be disposed of onto locations where nutrients are needed. However, caution needs to be exercised when applying nutrients (through fertilizer or reclaimed water) in the recharge area for the springs. For areas using reclaimed water for irrigation, it is important to understand the amount of nitrogen and phosphorus that is needed for the landscape and how much is being applied through reclaimed water. Monitoring the concentration of nitrogen and phosphorus in reclaimed water is important for understanding how much nutrients are being applied onto the urban landscape. The result may be that reclaimed water customers will not need to add more phosphorus or nitrogen, resulting in lower fertilizer costs and possibly fewer maintenance requirements and costs (e.g., mowing, turf replacement).

Given the limitations with the data used in the NSILT to estimate the UTF loading to groundwater, DEP will work with entities and other agencies to collect better data by requiring more detailed documentation on behavior changes and water quality improvements. In addition, DEP will work with stakeholders to improve measures to reduce residential and commercial property fertilizer application, such as requiring annual reporting on ordinance enforcement and results from local governments.

2.7.1 Fertilizer Ordinance Adoption

Subsection 373.807(2), F.S., requires local governments with jurisdictional boundaries that include an OFS or any part of a springshed or delineated PFA of an OFS to develop, enact and implement a fertilizer ordinance by July 1, 2017. The ordinance is required to be based, at a minimum, on the DEP model ordinance for Florida-friendly fertilizer use on urban landscapes. As part of the annual reporting process, stakeholders will be required to provide a detailed and quantified description of their ordinance enforcement to receive credits for these activities.

2.7.2 MS4 Designations

Although loading from urban stormwater is not specifically estimated in the NSILT, urban stormwater can be a considerable source of nutrient loading and many urban areas are already regulated under the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) NPDES Stormwater Program. An MS4 is a conveyance or system of conveyances, such as roads with stormwater systems, municipal streets, catch basins, curbs, gutters, ditches, constructed channels, or storm drains. If an MS4 permittee is identified as a contributor in the BMAP, the permitted MS4 must undertake projects specified in the BMAP.

Regulated MS4s are required to implement stormwater management programs (SWMP) to reduce pollutants to the maximum extent practicable and address applicable TMDL allocations. Both Phase I and Phase II MS4 permits include provisions for the modification of SWMP activities. Phase I medium and large MS4s are regulated under an individual permit, with multiple permittees having coverage under the same permit as "co-permittees." Phase II small MS4s are regulated under a generic permit. Under the "NPDES Two-Step Generic Permit for Discharge of Stormwater from Phase II MS4s" (paragraph 62-621.300(7)(a), F.A.C.), regulated Phase II MS4s must develop a SWMP that includes BMPs with measurable goals and a schedule for implementation to meet six minimum control measures.

DEP can designate an entity as a regulated MS4 if its discharges meet the requirements of the rule and are determined to be a significant contributor of pollutants to surface waters of the state in accordance with Rule 62-624.800, F.A.C. A Phase II MS4 can be designated for regulation when a TMDL has been adopted for a waterbody or segment into which the MS4 discharges the pollutant(s) of concern. Because urban areas located in the BMAP that are not currently covered by an MS4 permit also significantly contribute to nutrient loading, individually or in aggregate, the NPDES Stormwater Program will evaluate any entity located in the BMAP area that serves a minimum resident population of at least 1,000 individuals that is not currently covered by an MS4 permit and designate eligible entities as regulated MS4s, in accordance with Chapter 62-624, F.A.C.

2.7.3 Stormwater Rule

On June 28, 2024, Governor Ron DeSantis signed Senate Bill 7040 into law, which updates Florida's stormwater rules and design criteria, including Chapter 62-330 F.A.C., to protect the state's waterways. The new regulations aim to manage runoff from developments, ensuring that future stormwater systems are better maintained. Operation and maintenance entities will be required to have estimates for the expected routine maintenance costs and to certify that they have the financial capability to maintain the stormwater system over time. The rule will also provide for more consistent oversight through a required periodic inspection routine and reporting on the inspection results to the permitting agency.

Additionally, Chapter 62-330 F.A.C., establishes requirements for applicants to demonstrate, through calculations or modeling, that the future stormwater management systems would provide additional treatment to meet new Environmental Resource Permits stormwater treatment

performance standards for an 80% reduction for TP and 55% reduction for TN, along with additional requirements that would apply where a project discharges to Outstanding Florida Waters or impaired waters. Additional permitting requirements to protect groundwater can be found within the Stormwater Applicant Handbook Volume I, Section 8.5.2.

2.8 STF Management Strategies

Sports turfgrass areas fall into two main categories that are evaluated separately: golf courses and sporting facilities (such as baseball, football, soccer and other fields). There are five golf courses covering 348 acres in the Ichetucknee springshed, Hornsby springshed, and outside of the springsheds in the Santa Fe BMAP area. There are sports fields covering 18 acres in the Devil's springshed, nine acres in the Hornsby springshed, and 71 acres in the Ichetucknee springshed. DEP and UF-IFAS are collaborating to create a BMP manual addressing sports turfgrass management for public and private entities, which will be completed in 2025.

DEP will work with sports field managers and golf course superintendents to ensure relevant BMPs are implemented and to estimate reductions associated with these efforts. To improve the golf course loading estimate to groundwater over a literature-based approach, DEP will also confer with golf course superintendents to update fertilizer application rates based on site-specific data.

For other sports facilities, managers of sports fields can assist by reducing fertilizer use, using products that reduce leaching, and irrigating sports turf more efficiently.

2.8.1 Golf Courses

All golf course superintendents within the BMAP must obtain a certification for golf course BMPs (UF-IFAS Florida Golf Courses Best Management Practices Program) under section 403.9339 F.S. and all golf courses must implement the BMPs described in the DEP golf course BMP manual, *Best Management Practices for the Enhancement of Environmental Quality on Florida Golf Courses (DEP, 2021)*. All golf courses located within a BMAP are required to submit an NMP to DEP that is designed to sustain even plant growth while minimizing excessive growth and nutrient losses. Required information for the NMP is available in **Appendix H**. A draft NMP must be submitted to DEP within one year of BMAP adoption and a final document is due two years after adoption. All soil, water and tissue sampling must include appropriate nitrogen and phosphorous analyses.

If a facility (either golf course or other sporting facility) uses fertilizer rates greater than those in the BMP manuals, the facility is required to conduct water quality monitoring prescribed by DEP or a WMD that demonstrates compliance with water quality standards. Private golf courses in the BMAP area are listed in **Appendix J**.

2.9Agricultural Sources Management Strategies

Based on data including Florida Statewide Agricultural Irrigation Demand (FSAID) IX geodatabase land use, FDACS identified agricultural acreage within the BMAP. An estimated

72,456 acres in Devil's Complex, 27,948 acres in Hornsby, and 50,791 acres in Ichetucknee springsheds are considered agricultural. In the area outside the springsheds, 95,218 acres of land are considered agricultural.

While agriculture is essential, it is important to manage potential environmental impacts associated with agricultural operations. Nitrogen and phosphorus, essential for crop growth, can enter waterways through various agricultural activities, including fertilizer application, livestock waste disposal and irrigation runoff. To address nutrient loading from agricultural operations effectively, it is necessary to have a balanced approach that supports agricultural productivity while safeguarding water resources. This entails promoting farming practices that optimize nutrient and water use efficiency, minimize runoff and enhance soil health.

Section 403.067, F.S., requires agricultural producers in adopted BMAPs either enroll and properly implement the applicable FDACS BMPs for their operation or to conduct water quality monitoring activities as required by Chapter 62-307, F.A.C. BMPs include practices such as nutrient management, irrigation management, and water resource protection. They can mitigate nutrient loading while promoting environmental stewardship. In many BMAPs, however, the implementation of BMPs alone will not be sufficient to meet water quality restoration goals, and regional projects and innovative technologies will be needed.

Information on agricultural enrollment and reductions in this BMAP was provided by FDACS and is available in **Appendix I**.

2.9.1 FF Loading

Nitrogen in agricultural fertilizer is applied at varying rates, depending on the crop and individual farm practices. The NSILT estimated total nitrogen load to groundwater from FF is as follows:

- 571,544 lbs/yr TN, or 61% of the total nitrogen load to groundwater in the Devil's Ear springshed.
- 190,615 lbs/yr TN, or 67 % of the total nitrogen load to groundwater in the Hornsby springshed.
- 396,844 lbs/yr TN, or 42% of the total nitrogen load to groundwater in the Ichetucknee springshed.
- 428,054 lbs/yr TN, or 44% of the total nitrogen load to groundwater outside the springsheds.

The overall percent contribution to groundwater in the entire BMAP area is 50%. FF includes commercial inorganic fertilizer applied to row crops, field crops, pasture, hay fields, and nurseries.

2.9.2 LW Loading

Agricultural practices specific to livestock management were obtained through meetings with UF-IFAS extension, FDACS, agricultural producers and stakeholders. The NSILT estimated total nitrogen load to groundwater from non-CAFO LW is as follows:

- 167,804 lbs/yr TN, or 18% of the total nitrogen load to groundwater in the Devil's Ear springshed.
- 37,341 lbs/yr TN, or 13% of the total nitrogen load to groundwater in the Hornsby springshed.
- 138,864 lbs/yr TN, or 15% of the total nitrogen load to groundwater in the Ichetucknee springshed.
- 138,023 lbs/yr TN, or 14 % of the total nitrogen load to groundwater in outside the springsheds.

The overall percent contribution to groundwater in the entire BMAP area is 15%.

2.9.3 Dairies and Other CAFOs

Dairies and other CAFOs permitted under Chapter 62-670, F.A.C., located within a BMAP, may not cause or contribute to a violation of water quality standards and must implement nutrient management practices identified in their permits. To minimize infiltration of liquid manure, if a dairy uses a clay liner or some other type of engineered waste storage pond system, within two years of the BMAP adoption, the dairy will submit to the DEP an evaluation identifying the environmental, technical and economic feasibility of upgrading to a concrete or geosynthetic liner. The evaluation may alternatively demonstrate that the existing liner/pond does not allow leaching that causes or contributes to water quality exceedances. Upon review of the evaluation, DEP may identify required upgrades in a subsequent BMAP update.

Additionally, sampling for TN and TP of land applied effluent/wastewater must be included in the DEP-approved nutrient monitoring plan established in the permit and implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan.

The NSILT estimated total nitrogen load to groundwater from CAFOs is as follows:

- There are no CAFOs in the Devil's Ear, Hornsby, or Ichetucknee springsheds.
- 32,127 lbs/yr TN, or 3% of the total nitrogen load to groundwater outside the springsheds.

The overall percent contribution to groundwater in the entire BMAP area is 1%.

2.9.3.1 Livestock Operations Without CAFO Permits

Livestock operations may not cause or contribute to a violation of water quality standards. Not all livestock operations are large enough to require an NPDES CAFO permit under Chapter 62-670, F.A.C. For these operations, section 403.067, F.S., requires the operation to enroll in the FDACS BMP Program and implement applicable BMPs or to conduct a monitoring program according to Chapter 62-307, F.A.C., that is approved by DEP or the applicable WMD.

2.9.4 Aquaculture

Under the federal Clean Water Act, aquaculture activities are defined as a point source. In 1999, the Florida Legislature amended Chapter 597, F.S., Florida Aquaculture Policy Act, to create a program within FDACS that requires those who sell aquatic species to annually acquire an

Aquaculture Certificate of Registration and implement Chapter 5L-3, F.A.C., Aquaculture BMPs. Permit holders must be certified every year.

2.9.5 Silviculture

The Florida Forest Service (FFS) within FDACS is the lead entity responsible for assisting landowners, loggers, and forestry professionals with silviculture BMP implementation as well as for conducting statewide silviculture BMP training and compliance monitoring. The FFS implements Chapter 5I-6, F.A.C., and assists both private and public forest landowners across the state with BMP compliance and the rule. Compliance with the rule involves submitting a Notice of Intent to Implement BMPs (NOI) to the FFS and thereby committing to follow BMPs during all current and future silviculture operations.

2.9.6 Prioritized Management Strategies and Milestones

In addition to the above requirements, subsection 373.811(5), F.S., prohibits any new agricultural operations that do not implement either applicable FDACS BMPs, or measures necessary to achieve pollution reduction levels established by DEP, or groundwater monitoring plans approved by a WMD or DEP. Failure to implement BMPs or conduct water quality monitoring that demonstrates compliance with pollutant reductions may result in enforcement action by DEP (paragraph 403.067(7)(b), F.S.).

Every two years, FDACS is required to perform onsite inspections of each agricultural producer that enrolls in BMPs to ensure that the practices are being properly implemented. The verification includes: review and collection of nutrient application records that producers must maintain to demonstrate compliance with the BMP Program; verification that all other applicable BMPs are being properly implemented; verification that any cost shared practices are being properly implemented; and identification of potential cost share practices, projects or other applicable BMPs not identified during enrollment. Rule 5M-1.008, F.A.C., outlines the procedures used to verify the implementation of agricultural BMPs. Producers not implementing BMPs according to the process outlined in Chapter 5M-1, F.A.C., are referred to DEP for enforcement action after attempts at remedial action by FDACS are exhausted. Failure to implement BMPs or conduct water quality monitoring that demonstrates compliance with pollutant reductions may result in enforcement action by DEP (paragraph 403.067(7)(b), F.S.).

Pursuant to paragraph 403.067(7)(c), F.S., where water quality problems are demonstrated despite the appropriate implementation, operation, and maintenance of adopted BMPs, DEP, a WMD or FDACS, in consultation with DEP, must conduct a reevaluation of the BMPs. If a reevaluation of the BMPs is needed, FDACS will include DEP, the appropriate WMD, and other partners in the reevaluation and BMP update processes.

FDACS works with applicable producers within the BMAP area to implement BMPs. As of July 2024, NOIs covered 104,487 acres in the Santa Fe River BMAP area (of 195,616 adjusted agricultural acres). FDACS conducts an evaluation to determine if lands classified as agricultural have verified agricultural activity, and then adjusts the total agricultural acreage for enrollment accordingly, as described in **Appendix I.** Currently, no producers are conducting water quality

monitoring in lieu of implementing BMPs. **Appendix B** lists project information. **Appendix I** provides detailed information on BMPs and agricultural practices in the BMAP area.

2.9.7 Agricultural Cooperative Regional Elements (ACE)

Section 403.067, F.S., requires FDACS, DEP, and agricultural producers to work together to establish ACE in BMAPs where agricultural nonpoint sources contribute at least 20% of nonpoint source nutrient discharges to impaired waterbodies, or where DEP determines this element is necessary to achieve the TMDLs. FDACS is responsible for providing DEP a list of projects which, in combination with BMPs, state-sponsored regional projects and other management strategies, will achieve the needed pollutant load reductions established for agricultural nonpoint sources. The list of projects included in the ACE must include a planning-level cost estimate of each project along with the estimated amount of nutrient reduction that project will achieve. Partner agencies and key stakeholders referred to in this process include FDACS, DEP, and agricultural producers.

Addressing nutrient loading from agricultural sources requires partnership among the key stakeholders, and consultation with the WMDs. By fostering cooperation and engagement, the ACE framework facilitates the exchange of knowledge, resources, and expertise, leading to innovative solutions and effective strategies for tackling water quality challenges. Engaging producers in the decision-making process ensures that projects are practical, feasible, and tailored to the needs and realities of agricultural operations. Partner agencies provide technical support, regulatory guidance, and funding opportunities that will enhance the implementation and success of regional water quality improvement initiatives. This cooperative effort is essential for implementing targeted actions that balance the economic and social benefits of agriculture with the obligation to address agricultural nonpoint source loading beyond BMP implementation and cost share.

The ACE framework leverages resources and technical expertise to efficiently identify regional projects and other strategies tailored to the diverse agriculture production methods, landscapes, and watersheds that will need to be implemented to achieve the TMDLs. Regional project types will vary among the different BMAPs, and can include, but are not limited to, a combination of traditional projects that focus on water treatment, land acquisition in fee or conservation easements on the lands of willing sellers, site-specific water quality improvement projects, dispersed water management projects, innovative technologies, and regional projects funded through existing or enhanced cost share programs administered by FDACS or the WMDs.

While FDACS is assigned the lead role on project solicitation, development, selection, and implementation, they work closely with all the key stakeholders, including DEP, to define and identify regional projects that will be included in the BMAP and to leverage existing programs and resources. FDACS will lead engagement with producers and industry groups through workshops to identify potential regional projects. Identified projects will be implemented through various mechanisms, such as existing cost share or grant programs or through a legislative budget request and eventual appropriation. Upon identification of a project, FDACS will update DEP on project development and implementation, including the funding strategy.

FDACS and DEP will work together to track progress on agricultural water quality projects under the ACE framework through the development of performance metrics and evaluation of water quality monitoring data in the basin or, if necessary, at the project level. The default performance measures will be the expected range of pollutant removal efficiencies associated with a project or strategy. Tools may be needed to determine the effectiveness of projects, such as modeling and where feasible onsite water quality monitoring.

FDACS will report on ACE projects annually through DEP's Statewide Annual Report (STAR) process and during BMAP update and/or development. Projects and other management strategies implemented through the ACE will be evaluated cooperatively by partner agencies using the predetermined performance metrics. The ACE process provides for adaptive management, allowing flexibility to adapt and improve based on regional project or management strategy results.

Agricultural sources contribute to 67% of the nitrogen sources in Santa Fe BMAP. Pursuant to subparagraph 403.067(7)(e)1., F.S., an ACE is required in this BMAP. Most agricultural lands are engaged in row crop production. **Table 24** shows the three dominant crop types within the Santa Fe BMAP.

Table 24. Dominant crop types in the Santa Fe River BMAP

Crop Type	Acres
Row Crops	128,891
Grazing Land	53,132
Hay	45,274

Targeting future funding toward precision agriculture, manure management, innovative technologies or soil health practices, including combining practices where applicable, to address nutrient impacts from row crop production on a regional scale could provide additional reductions.

FDACS will continue to work with key stakeholders in the Santa Fe River BMAP to identify additional options for addressing agricultural nonpoint source nutrient loading. For more information on the FDACS Regional Projects Program, see the links in **Appendix I**.

2.10 Atmospheric Deposition Management Strategies

2.10.1 Summary of Loading

Atmospheric deposition is largely a diffuse, albeit continual, source of nitrogen. Nitrogen species and other chemical constituents are measured in wet and dry deposition at discrete locations around the U.S. In 2014, Schwede and Lear developed a hybrid model for estimating the total atmospheric deposition of nitrogen and sulfur for the entire U.S., referred to as the total atmospheric deposition model (TDEP). Deposition data from several monitoring networks,

including the Clean Air Status and Trends Network (CASTNET); the National Atmospheric Deposition Program (NADP) Ammonia Monitoring Network; the Southeastern Aerosol Research and Characterization Network; and modeled data from the Community Multiscale Air Quality (CMAQ) Modeling System—are combined in a multistep process with National Trends Network (NTN) wet deposition values to model total deposition. The TDEP model run used for the NSILT included data from 2019 to 2020.

2.10.2 Description of Approach

Atmospheric sources of nutrients are local, national, and international. Nitrogen atmospheric sources are generally of low concentration compared with other sources and are further diminished through additional biological and chemical processes before they reach groundwater. Himes and Dawson (2017) indicates that emissions of nitrogen have been generally decreasing in Florida with an up to 55% decrease in emissions estimated by 2028, possibly related to power plant fuel source changes and air treatment upgrades as well as the increased use of electric vehicles, decreasing mobile sources (Himes and Dawson, 2017). This gradual decrease in emissions is likely to result in reductions to atmospheric deposition (**Figure 8**). Currently, since the scale of the national and international programs to address these air deposition loads are difficult to integrate into the much smaller scale of this water quality plan, there are no specific reductions assigned to this source category. Atmospheric deposition sources and trends will be re-evaluated periodically.



Figure 8. Florida NOx emissions for 2005 to 2016 and projected emission decreases for 2017 to 2028 from industrial and on-road mobile sources

2.11 Future Growth Management Strategies

Nutrient impacts from new development are addressed through a variety of mechanisms outlined

in this BMAP, as well as provisions of Florida law. While most of the restoration projects and management strategies listed in this BMAP address current nutrient loading, the need to plan and implement sound management strategies to address additional population growth must be considered.

DEP has included in this BMAP specific elements to address current and future WWTF effluent, OSTDS loading and stormwater sources. Broader requirements - such as local land development regulations, comprehensive plans, ordinances, incentives, environmental resource permit requirements, and consumptive use permit requirements—all provide additional mechanisms and avenues to protect water resources and reduce the impact of new development and other land use changes as they occur.

Further strengthening of comprehensive plans is addressed under section 163.3177, F.S., which required local governments to amend their comprehensive plans with the following considerations:

- Identify and prioritize projects to meet the TMDLs.
- Update the wastewater section to include plans for treatment updates—not just capacity—and AWT must be prioritized.
- In developments with more than 50 lots with more than one OSTDS per acre, the plan must consider the feasibility of providing sanitary sewer within a 10-year planning horizon and identify the facility that could receive the flows. The plan must review the capacity of the facility and any associated transmission facilities; projected wastewater flow at that facility for the next 20 years, including expected future new construction and connections of OSTDS to sanitary sewer; and timeline for the construction of the sanitary sewer system. The plan was required to be updated by July 1, 2024.
- Comprehensive plans must contain capital improvements element to consider the need for and the location of public facilities:
    - Construction, extension, or increase in capacity of public facilities as well as principals for correcting existing public facility deficiencies. Components must cover at least a 5-year period.
    - Costs, timeline, general location, and projected revenue sources to fund the facilities.
    - Standards to meet an acceptable level of service.
    - Schedule of capital improvements, which may include privately funded projects.
    - A list of projects necessary to achieve the pollutant load reductions attributable to the local government, as established in a BMAP.
    - The element must address coordinating the extension of, increase in the capacity of, or upgrade in treatment of facilities to meet future needs; prioritizing AWT while maximizing the use of existing facilities and discouraging urban sprawl; conserving potable water resources; and protecting

the functions of natural groundwater recharge areas and natural drainage features.

Through this array of laws and the requirements in this BMAP, new development must undertake certain nutrient-reduction measures before the development is complete. DEP recommends that local governments revise their planning and land use ordinance(s) to adequately address future growth and the associated environmental impact. Maintaining land at lower intensity uses through land purchases or easements for conservation and recreational use is one strategy that can help reduce water quality impacts in the basin. Any additional nutrient loading from land use intensification will be evaluated during future BMAP update efforts. If an increase in loading occurs, a responsible entity may receive new reduction allocations that will require additional management actions by the responsible entity to mitigate those water quality impacts.

2.11.1 Future Growth Analysis

An analysis was done to consider the impacts of future population growth and urban development on loading in the basin. Wastewater sources were evaluated using per-person estimations calculated for portions of the population estimated to be served by OSTDS and those connected to central sewer. Stormwater sources were evaluated using per-acre estimations calculated for portions of a jurisdictional area that may be developed.

First, population growth for each county was taken from the Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR) 2040 Medium Growth Projections. Then, a spatial analysis was performed to determine the proportion of developable land area attributed to each entity within each county. Areas where there are permanent waterbodies or which have been set aside for conservation are unlikely to see future development or increased population, so lakes and ponds identified in the National Hydrography Database (NHD) and Florida Natural Areas Inventory (FNAI) conservation lands were not considered developable and were removed from the analysis. The percentage of remaining land attributed to each entity was applied to the county projected population growth to determine the number of additional people anticipated to contribute to loading by 2040.

The next step was to distinguish the future population expected to be served by sewer versus those with OSTDS based on the most recent FLWMI for each BMAP county. For this, FLWMI parcels within each entity's jurisdiction were counted and categorized based on the Wastewater Type field. The number of points in "Known Sewer," "Likely Sewer," and "Somewhat Likely Sewer" divided by the total number of points estimated a portion of the population that are served by central wastewater collection system. The remainder are assumed to have an OSTDS.

Per person loading calculations were used to estimate future loads from WWTFs and OSTDS under different planning scenarios, described below. DEP's Domestic Wastewater Program estimates each person in Florida generates 100 gallons of wastewater per day. For OSTDS, FDOH estimates each person in Florida generates 10 lbs TN/yr. Average attenuation for wastewater effluent disposal and a weighted basin recharge factor were applied to loading

calculations to derive the estimated future load to groundwater.

Per acre loading calculations were used to estimate future loads from increased urban turfgrass as a result of development under different planning scenarios, described below. First, a number of developed acres were derived by applying percentages to the developable lands from the initial GIS analysis for each entity. Then, the loadings were based on UF-IFAS recommended fertilization rates for different turfgrass species. Finally, attenuation for UTF and a weighted basin recharge factor were applied to loading calculations to derive the estimated future load to groundwater.

Scenario 1 represents a future planning scenario with the highest levels of treatment feasible. It assumes all local governments within the BMAP have a minimum of 90% of their population served by centralized sewer, and all domestic wastewater will be treated to AWT standards (3 mg/L TN or less) by 2040 based on current Florida law and BMAP management strategies. This scenario also assumes that all future OSTDS will be enhanced nutrient-reducing systems or other wastewater systems with a nitrogen treatment efficiency of at least 65%. For urban development, this scenario represents a conservative growth future where 2% of developable land is converted to urban, development codes only allow a 10% coverage of turfgrass, and the species used is centipedegrass, which has low TN fertilization requirements.

Scenario 2 utilizes the current rates of sewer availability based on the FLWMI parcels to estimate the population served by central wastewater collection system. This future planning scenario assumes that all domestic wastewater will be treated to AWT standards (3 mg/L TN or less) by 2040 based on current Florida law and BMAP management strategies. This scenario also assumes that all future OSTDS will be enhanced nutrient-reducing systems or other wastewater systems with a nitrogen treatment efficiency of at least 65%. For urban development, this scenario represents a moderate growth future where 10% of developable land is converted to urban, development codes only allow a 10% coverage of turfgrass, and the species used is centipedegrass, which has low TN fertilization requirements.

Scenario 3 represents a future planning scenario with the lowest levels of treatment feasible. It utilizes the current rates of sewer availability based on the FLWMI parcels to estimate the population served by central wastewater collection system and assumes that all domestic wastewater will be treated to 6 mg/L TN by 2040. This scenario also assumes that all future OSTDS will be conventional systems. For urban development, this scenario represents an extreme growth future where 17% of developable land is converted to urban, development codes allow up to 25% coverage of turfgrass, and the species used is St. Augustine grass, which has higher TN fertilization requirements.

Based on the methodology above, **Table 25** shows the estimated future loads from wastewater and urban stormwater sources that may be assigned to local governments if growth continues as projected under the three planning scenarios. DEP encourages local governments to consider these additional nutrient loads when authorizing new development or changes in land uses, and

when developing local plans for wastewater infrastructure expansion and maintenance, to ensure that the TMDL target is achieved and maintained.

Table 25. Estimated nitrogen load from future growth in the BMAP area

Entity	BEBR 2040 Additional Population	2040 Additional Nitrogen Loading Scenario 1 (lbs/yr)	2040 Additional Nitrogen Loading Scenario 2 (lbs/yr)	2040 Additional Nitrogen Loading Scenario 3 (lbs/yr)
Alachua County	19,929	13,563	41,599	370,997
Alachua	2,058	1,276	3,842	37,405
Archer	421	213	788	7,650
Gainesville	721	527	1,166	12,741
High Springs	1,382	1,098	4,687	29,330
La Crosse	305	127	294	4,995
Newberry	3,533	1,465	4,256	59,537
Waldo	30	12	38	504
Bradford County	1,452	1,707	15,334	258,891
Brooker	3	4	34	570
Hampton	4	5	44	753
Lawtey	9	11	97	1,637
Starke	39	47	426	7,040
Columbia County	4,808	3,601	25,140	421,249
Fort White	30	22	154	2,608
Lake City	140	109	773	12,361
Gilchrist County	1,326	1,142	8,684	147,614
Suwannee County	64	75	661	11,233
Union County	1,633	1,605	13,174	223,887
Lake Butler	18	18	148	2,506
Raiford	4	4	35	590
Worthington Springs	6	6	51	873
Basin Totals	**37,917**	**26,636**	**121,423**	**1,614,969**

Scenario 1 resulted in an additional basin load of 26,636 lbs/yr TN. Scenario 3 resulted in an additional basin load of 1,614,969 lbs/yr TN. When compared to the results of the Santa Fe River NSILT (3,154,065 lbs/yr TN), it is estimated that growth in the basin could result in a 1% to 51% increase in nitrogen loading to the groundwater by 2040 from urban and residential growth.

While it is unlikely that additional nutrient loading from future populations can be entirely avoided, the results of this analysis provide local governments information on how to mitigate future nitrogen loading from urban and residential sources.

This broad analysis is not being used to determine allocated reductions for responsible entities because it does not capture all local considerations and complexities of mixed land use, or current allocation approaches for wastewater. In addition, changes in nutrient loading from future population and development are difficult to model because much of it is dependent on the type and location of development, enforcement of local ordinances, future home values, and future social attitudes towards lawn maintenance and waste management. There are also complex dynamics associated with new urban

development in which loading from human activities is compounded by potential removal or conversion of forest lands or green spaces, which had previously provided natural remediation of atmospheric and soil nutrients, as well as other ecosystem benefits. However, the results show trends in how loading in the basin might change in the coming decades without comprehensive local and regional planning. Local governments can use this information to incorporate water quality considerations when developing and implementing local ordinances, comprehensive plans, stormwater planning, and enhanced OSTDS incentive programs in areas of urban expansion.

There is likely to be additional nutrient loading from the intensification of agricultural practices, though a sufficient dataset was not available at the time of this update to adequately analyze those land use scenarios. DEP encourages local governments and producers to collaborate with the responsible agencies to identify ways to mitigate water quality impacts from agricultural practices on both an individual and regional scale.

2.12 Funding Opportunities

Chapter 2023-169, Laws of Florida (L.O.F.), expanded grant opportunities for local governments and eligible entities working to address TMDLs or impaired waters. When funding is available, eligible entities can also apply for grant funding for stormwater, regional agricultural projects, and a broader suite of wastewater projects including collection systems and domestic wastewater reuse through the Water Quality Improvement Grant program. Projects are prioritized that have the maximum nutrient load per project, demonstrate project readiness, are cost-effective, have cost-share by the applicant (except for *Rural Areas of Opportunity*), have previous state commitment, and are in areas where reductions are most needed. There are multiple competitive funding resources available under the Protecting Florida Together website, including $50 million in springs-specific funding.

Financial and technical assistance through FDACS and the SRWMD are available to agricultural producers within the Santa Fe River BMAP. FDACS provides outreach and education on BMP implementation for enrolled operations, as well as working with interested producers to provide cost share funding for projects to improve on-farm nutrient and irrigation efficiencies that work in tandem with the applicable practices from the producer's BMP checklist. The SRWMD cost share program also provides outreach and funding for projects that provide nutrient and irrigation management benefits. FDACS and the SRWMD work closely to ensure their cost share programs complement each other to meet the needs of the producers while considering the characteristics of the region.

Section 3. Monitoring and Reporting

3.1 Methods for Evaluating Progress

DEP will work with stakeholders to track project implementation and organize and evaluate the monitoring data collected each year. The project and monitoring information will be presented in an annual update. Stakeholders have agreed to meet annually after the adoption of the BMAP to follow up on plan implementation, share new information, and continue to coordinate on TMDL restoration related issues. The following activities may occur at annual meetings~

Implementation data and reporting:

- Collect project implementation information from stakeholders, including FDACS agricultural BMP enrollment and FDOH-issued permits, and compare with the BMAP schedule.
- Discuss the data collection process, including any concerns and possible improvements to the process.
- Review the monitoring plan implementation, as detailed in **Section 3.3**.

Sharing new information:

- Report on results from water quality monitoring and trend information.
- Provide updates on new management strategies in the basin that will help reduce nutrient loading.
- Identify and review new scientific developments on addressing nutrient loads and incorporate any new information into annual progress reports.

Coordinating on TMDL restoration-related issues:

- Provide updates from DEP on the basin assessment cycle and activities related to any impairments, TMDL, and BMAP.
- Obtain reports from other basins where tools or other information may be applicable to the TMDL.

3.2 Adaptive Management Measures

Adaptive management involves making adjustments in the BMAP when circumstances change or monitoring indicates the need for additional or more effective restoration strategies. Adaptive management measures may include the following:

- Implementing procedures to determine whether additional cooperative strategies

are needed.

- Using criteria/processes for determining whether and when plan components need revision because of changes in costs, project effectiveness, social effects, watershed conditions or other factors.

- Revising stakeholders' roles during BMAP implementation and after BMAP completion.

- Updating information on corrective actions (and any supporting documentation) being implemented as data are gathered to refine project implementation schedules and performance expectations.

Key components of adaptive management are tracking plan implementation, monitoring water quality and pollutant loads, and holding periodic meetings.

3.3 Water Quality Monitoring

3.3.1 Objectives

Focused objectives are critical for a monitoring strategy to provide the information needed to evaluate implementation success. Since the BMAP implementation involves an iterative process, the monitoring efforts are related to primary and secondary objectives. The primary objectives focus on achieving water quality targets, while the secondary objectives focus on sub-regional effectiveness of projects and management strategies and other water quality parameters that can be used to provide information for future refinements of the BMAP. The monitoring strategy may be updated as necessary.

Primary objectives:

- Measure the water quality and biological response in the impaired springs and groundwater at the beginning of the BMAP period and during implementation.

- Document nutrient trends in the Santa Fe River Basin.

Secondary objectives:

- Identify areas where groundwater data and modeling might help in understanding the hydrodynamics of the system.

- Evaluate groundwater quality trends and nutrient loading to the aquifer across the basin.

- Confirm and refine nutrient removal efficiencies of agricultural and/or urban BMPs, projects and other management efforts.

- Identify and implement more effective nutrient reduction strategies.
- Use nitrogen isotope and tracer sampling for evaluating nitrogen contributions from organic and inorganic sources.

3.3.2 Parameters, Frequency and Network

To achieve the objectives listed above, the monitoring strategy will focus on two types of indicators to track improvements in water quality at the spring vent and in the groundwater: core and supplemental (**Table 26** and **Table 27**, respectively). The core indicators are directly related to the parameters causing impairment in the associated springs. Supplemental indicators will be monitored primarily to support the interpretation of core water quality parameters. The monitoring network is established for a variety of purposes.

For this BMAP, nitrate is the core parameter measured, to track progress in decreasing nitrogen concentrations in groundwater and the water surfacing at the spring vent. The other parameters are considered supplementary parameters for the BMAP, as they build information about groundwater and the spring but are not direct measurements of impairment.

At a minimum, the core parameters will be tracked to determine the progress that has been made toward meeting the TMDL and/or achieving the numeric nutrient criteria (NNC). Resource responses to BMAP implementation may also be tracked. A significant amount of time may be needed for changes in water chemistry to be observed.

Table 26. Core water quality indicators and field parameters for spring vent and groundwater

Core Parameters
TN
Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen
Nitrate as Nitrogen
Orthophosphate as Phosphorus
TP

Table 27. Supplemental water quality indicators and field parameters for spring vent and groundwater

Supplemental Parameters
Specific Conductance
Dissolved Oxygen (DO)
pH
Temperature
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)
Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)
Turbidity
Chloride

Supplemental Parameters
Color
Ammonia (as N)
Total Organic Carbon
Calcium
Magnesium
Sodium
Potassium
Sulfate
Fluoride
Alkalinity

Surface water and groundwater monitoring network locations were selected to track changes in water quality and allow the annual evaluation of progress toward achieving the TMDL. **Figure 9** shows the locations of the river and spring stations currently being sampled that will be used for the BMAP monitoring in the Santa Fe River Basin. Station locations for the monitoring networks will be reviewed and modified as needed.

The secondary research objectives will be developed based on the results of the actions occurring in the adjoining Santa Fe Basin Restoration Focus Area (RFA). The number and location of the monitoring wells to be sampled or installed will be determined after the initial effort in the Santa Fe Basin RFA provides information on the state of the system and where additional monitoring might be most effective. DEP and SRWMD will be responsible for activities to satisfy secondary monitoring objectives.



Figure 9. Water quality monitoring stations in Santa Fe River BMAP

3.3.3 Monitoring

Water quality is monitored to evaluate progress towards achieving the TMDL target of 0.35 mg/L of nitrate-nitrite to be protective of the aquatic flora and fauna. Surface water quality data are collected at the spring vent to determine if the TMDL nitrate targets are being achieved, and once achieved, are being maintained. Flow data are collected in support of the secondary

objective of estimating total mass loading of nitrate at the vent and can be used to evaluate TN loading in the BMAP. Groundwater well data are collected to evaluate aquifer conditions in the source water for the springs. A robust groundwater monitoring program can be used to evaluate TN loading in the BMAP. Monitoring may give an indication of future changes in spring vent concentrations as nutrient levels in the groundwater are expected to respond to changes in loading prior to the spring vent due to transport time to the spring vent.

3.3.3.1 Spring Sampling

In the Ichetucknee basin, samples at spring vents are collected quarterly by SRWMD and discharge is recorded at least twice per year by USGS at Ichetucknee Spring Main and Blue Hole Spring Vent. In the Hornsby Spring basin, samples at spring vents are collected quarterly by SRWMD and discharge is recorded quarterly by USGS at Hornsby Springs and Treehouse Spring. Treehouse Spring did not have discharge measurements from 2013 through 2017. In the Devil's Complex basin, samples at spring vents are collected at least twice per year at Ginnie Spring and Devil's Ear Spring and at least quarterly at Gilchrist Blue Spring by SRWMD and discharge is recorded SRWMD for Ginnie Spring and Gilchrist Blue while USGS records discharge at Devil's Ear Spring. **Figure 10**, **Figure 11**, and **Figure 12** display the nitrate plus nitrite concentration at the relevant spring vent stations for the OFS in the Santa Fe River BMAP.



Figure 10. Nitrate plus nitrite concentration over time at Devil's Complex Basin OFS spring vents



Figure 11. Nitrate plus nitrite concentration over time at Ichetucknee Basin OFS spring vents



Figure 12. Nitrate plus nitrite concentrations over time at Hornsby Basin OFS spring vents

3.3.3.2 Groundwater Results

Data from groundwater monitoring wells were obtained from DEP's Water Information Network (WIN) database and SRWMD. The analyte of concern is nitrate, including both the total and the dissolved species. For these analyses, no differentiation between the two species was made. There was insufficient data to perform statistically robust trends analyses. Available data was evaluated in order to perform a visual analysis using box plots to review change in nitrate concentrations for two periods of time within the available period of record. To determine what wells would be included in the analysis, the frequency of sampling was considered. Wells that were sampled regularly through the period of record were considered "fixed." Wells with inconsistent sampling (i.e. less than four samples over the period of record) were considered "sporadic." Data from the fixed wells were preferred for analyses because comparisons between time periods represent changes in the same set of wells. **Table 28** below provides an overview of the data availability in each springshed.

Table 28. Groundwater well data availability for Santa Fe River BMAP analysis

* Only data from fixed wells was used in groundwater analysis in Devil's Ear and Ichetucknee. Fixed and sporadic wells were used in Hornsby.

Springshed	Total number of wells	Number of sporadic wells	Number of fixed wells	Total number of medians used in analysis*
Devil's Ear	42	16	23	146
Hornsby	16	14	2	21
Ichetucknee	41	21	20	146

Groundwater data are subject to serial and spatial autocorrelation (AC), meaning that sampling that occurs temporally or spatially close can potentially affect the results of any trend-analysis hypothesis test. The effect of serial correlation in groundwater samples can be accounted for by using increments of time one year or longer, (Helsel, 2006). Regarding spatial AC, nitrate concentrations from wells located close to each other (clusters) often have significant correlations. Using the annual medians of all samples within the basins was determined to be the best way to reduce the effect of spatial AC before a more thorough correlation matrix can be completed. For these reasons, after initial data clean up to remove qualified data results, a grand median of the annual median nitrate concentrations from each well was used for the visual analysis for each time period evaluated.

Box plots were generated for each spring basin as seen in **Figure 13, Figure 14,** and **Figure 15** below. To create the box plots, the period of record was divided into early (2017 to 2020) and late (2021 to 2024) subperiods. For each box plot, the upper horizontal line of the box represents the 75th percentile. The lower horizontal line of the box represents the 25th percentile (Q1). The middle horizontal line in the box represents the median (50th percentile or Q2). The top of the point of the upper whisker is the 95th percentile. The bottom point of the lower whisker is the 5th percentile. Circles represent outliers.

In the Devil's Ear Springshed, 23 fixed sampling points were evaluated and used to develop 67 median annual nitrate values for the early period and 79 for the late period. The overall basin median value in the early period was 1.85 mg/L nitrate, and the basin median for the late period was 1.80 mg/L nitrate. Note the horizontal axis and presence of extreme outliers.



Figure 13. Devil's Ear Springshed nitrate concentrations of early and late periods with outliers

In the Hornsby Springshed, two fixed sampling points and 14 sporadic sampling points were evaluated and used to develop 11 median annual nitrate values for the early period and 10 for the late period. The overall basin median value in the early period was 0.04 mg/L nitrate, and the basin median for the late period was 0.27 mg/L nitrate.



Figure 14. Hornsby Springshed nitrate concentrations of early and late periods with outliers

In the Ichetucknee Springshed, 20 fixed sampling points were evaluated to develop 70 median nitrate values were used for the early period and 76 for the late period. The overall basin median value in the early period was 0.77 mg/L nitrate, and the basin median for the late period was 0.76 mg/L nitrate.



Figure 15. Ichetucknee Springshed nitrate concentrations of early and late periods with outliers

DEP is working to evaluate monitoring networks in these basins and develop a sampling schedule that will allow for trend analysis of groundwater conditions in future iterations of the BMAP. A review of spatial distribution and well construction details will allow DEP to focus monitoring efforts that will provide the most informative data about groundwater trends and potentially nitrogen loading in the Upper Floridan aquifer.

3.3.4 Biological Monitoring

Biological resource responses represent improvements in the overall ecological health of the Santa Fe River BMAP area (see **Table 29**). DEP recommends that several types of biological monitoring be conducted to assess the health of the Santa Fe River and associated springs.

Table 29. Biological response measures for spring runs

Biological Response Measures	Target Community	Sampling Methods
Chlorophyll *a*	Phytoplankton	DEP SOP FS 2100
Stream Condition Index (SCI) score	Aquatic Macroinvertebrates	DEP SOP SCI 1000
Linear Vegetation Survey (LVS) score	Aquatic Vegetation	DEP SOP FS 7320
Rapid Periphyton Survey (RPS) score	Attached Algae (Periphyton)	DEP SOP FS 7230

The rapid periphyton survey (RPS) is a rapid assessment tool for evaluating streams' ecological condition based on the attached algae. The RPS quantifies periphyton length and extent in a 100-

meter stretch of a stream by assigning a rank category to the length of periphyton filaments. The linear vegetation survey (LVS) is a rapid assessment tool for evaluating the ecological condition of streams based on the nativity status and relative human disturbance tolerance of vascular plants. The RPS, LVS, and chlorophyll *a* are used to evaluate the floral integrity of the spring.

The SCI evaluates the aquatic macroinvertebrate community present in the river and/or springs. In addition, habitat assessments (HAs) are conducted per DEP SOP FT 3100 to assess the habitat present to support the aquatic macroinvertebrates. Water quality samples and field measurements of physical water quality are collected with the biological monitoring.

3.3.5 Data Management and Assessment

As of June 30, 2017, entities that collect water quality data in Florida enter the data into the Florida WIN Database, which replaced the Florida Storage and Retrieval System (STORET). DEP pulls water quality data directly from WIN and U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) databases to evaluate waters according to the Impaired Waters Rule, Chapter 62-303, F.A.C., and for TMDL development. Data providers must upload their data regularly, so DEP can use the information as part of the water quality assessment process, for annual reporting and trend analyses. Data providers should upload their data to WIN upon completion of the appropriate quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) checks. All data collected in the last quarter of the calendar year should be uploaded no later than April 1 of the following year.

DEP sampling teams enter their biological data into the DEP Statewide Biological (SBIO) database. Biological data should be collected and regularly provided to DEP following the applicable standard operating procedures. All biological data collected in the last quarter of the calendar year should be uploaded or provided no later than April 1 of the following year.

Available water quality data will be analyzed during BMAP implementation to determine trends in water quality and the health of the biological community. A wide variety of statistical methods are available for the water quality trend analyses. The selection of an appropriate data analysis method will depend on the frequency, spatial distribution, and period of record available from existing data. Specific statistical analyses were not identified during BMAP development.

3.3.6 QA/QC

Stakeholders participating in the BMAP monitoring plan must collect water quality data in a manner consistent with Chapter 62-160, F.A.C. Therefore, field samples must be collected following the DEP SOPs, and lab analyses must be conducted by National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Conference (NELAC) accredited laboratories.

Section 4. Commitment to Plan Implementation

4.1 Adoption Process

The 2025 BMAP update is adopted by Secretarial Order and assigns TN load reductions to the responsible stakeholders in the Santa Fe River BMAP area.

4.2 Tracking Reductions

The required loading reductions are expected to be met by 2038. Each entity responsible for implementing management actions to meet their upcoming 5-year milestone as part of the BMAP will provide DEP, via the statewide annual report process, with an annual update of progress made in implementing load reductions. The update will track the implementation status of the management actions listed in the BMAP and document additional projects undertaken to further water quality improvements in the basin. DACS will continue to report acreage enrolled in NOIs at least annually to DEP.

4.3 Revisions to the BMAP

Adaptive management involves setting up a mechanism for making course corrections in the BMAP when circumstances change, or feedback mechanisms indicate that a more effective strategy is needed. Section 403.067, F.S., requires that the plan be revised, as appropriate, in collaboration with basin stakeholders. All or part of a revised BMAP must be adopted by Secretarial Order. Adaptive management measures include the following:

- Need to update based on new information, including model updates.
- New law requirements.
- Procedures to determine whether additional cooperative actions are needed.
- Criteria/process for determining whether and when plan components need to be revised because of changes in costs, environmental impacts, social effects, watershed conditions, or other factors.
- Descriptions of the stakeholders' role after BMAP completion.

Section 5. References

Florida Department of Environmental Protection. 2017. *Priority Focus Area for Ichetucknee Springs*. Tallahassee, FL.

Florida Department of Environmental Protection. 2017. *Priority Focus Area for Devil's Spring System and Hornsby Spring*. Tallahassee, FL.

Florida Department of Environmental Protection. 2021. *Best Management Practices for the Enhancement of Environmental Quality on Florida Golf Courses*. Tallahassee, FL.

Florida Stormwater Association. 2012. *Methodology for calculating nutrient load reductions using the FSA assessment tool.*

Helsel, D.R., and Frans, L.M., 2006, Regional-Kendall test for trend. Environmental Science and Technology, v. 40, no. 13, pp. 4066-4073.

Himes, B. and Dawson, J. 2017. *Florida Nitrogen Oxides Emissions Trends*. Division of Air Resource Management, Florida Department of Environmental Protection. August 11, 2017.

Schwede, D.B., and G.G. Lear. 2014. A novel hybrid approach for estimating total deposition in the United States. *Atmospheric Environment* 92: 207–220.

Appendices

Appendix A. Important Links

The links below were correct at the time of document preparation. Over time, the locations may change and the links may no longer be accurate. None of these linked materials are adopted into this BMAP.

- DEP Website: https://floridadep.gov/
- DEP Map Direct Webpage: https://ca.dep.state.fl.us/mapdirect/
- DEP Watershed Assessment Section WBID Boundaries: https://floridadep.gov/dear/watershed-assessment-section/content/basin-411-0
- PFA information: https://floridadep.gov/dear/water-quality-restoration/content/bmap-public-meetings
- Florida Statutes: http://www.leg.state.fl.us/statutes:
  - Florida Watershed Restoration Act (Section 403.067, F.S.)
  - Florida Springs and Aquifer Protection Act (Part VIII of Chapter 373, F.S.)
- DEP Model Ordinances: https://ffl.ifas.ufl.edu/ffl-and-you/gi-bmp-program/fertilizer-ordinances/
- DEP Onsite Sewage Program: https://floridadep.gov/water/onsite-sewage/content/permitting-enhanced-nutrient-reducing-onsite-sewage-treatment-and
- DEP Standard Operating Procedures for Water Quality Samples: https://floridadep.gov/dear/quality-assurance/content/dep-sops
- National Environmental Laboratory Accredidation Program (NELAP): https://floridadep.gov/dear/florida-dep-laboratory/content/nelap-certified-laboratory-search
- FDACS BMPs: https://www.fdacs.gov/Agriculture-Industry/Water/Agricultural-Best-Management-Practices
- FDACS BMP and Field Staff Contacts: https://www.fdacs.gov/Divisions-Offices/Agricultural-Water-Policy/Organization-Staff
- Florida Administrative Code (Florida Rules): https://flrules.org/
- SRWMD 2024 Suwannee River Surface Water Improvement and Management (SWIM) Plan: https://www.mysuwanneeriver.com/DocumentCenter/View/18987/2024-Suwannee-River-Basin-SWIM-Plan

- SRWMD Springs: https://www.mysuwanneeriver.com/267/Springs
- UF–IFAS Research: http://research.ifas.ufl.edu/

Appendix B. Projects to Reduce Nitrogen Sources

B.1 Prioritization of Management Strategies

BMAPs must now include projects that show how responsible entities will meet their 5-year milestones. To help prioritize projects towards the next milestone as required under 403.067, F.S., planning-level details for each listed project, along with their priority ranking have been determined. The management strategies listed in **Appendix B** are ranked with a priority of high, medium, or low.

Project status was selected as the most appropriate indicator of a project's priority ranking based primarily on if the project is going towards the next 5-year milestone, as well as need for funding. Overall, any project that is needed by a responsible entity to meet their next reduction milestone is considered a priority. Projects classified as "underway" were assigned a high or medium priority because some resources have been allocated to these projects, but additional assistance may be needed for the project to be completed. High priority was assigned to projects listed with the project status "planned" that are needed to meet the next milestone, as well as certain "completed" projects that are designated as "ongoing" each year, and select projects that are elevated because substantial, subsequent project(s) are reliant on their completion.

B.2 Description of the Management Strategies

Responsible entities submitted these management strategies to the department with the understanding that the strategies would be included in the BMAP, thus requiring each entity to implement the proposed strategies as soon as practicable. However, this list of strategies is meant to be flexible enough to allow for changes that may occur over time. Any change in listed management strategies, or the deadline to complete these actions, must first be approved by the department. Substituted strategies must result in equivalent or greater nutrient reductions than expected from the original strategies.

While the 20-year planning period for this BMAP is 2018 to 2038, urban and agricultural stormwater projects completed since January 1, 2000 and OSTDS and wastewater projects completed since January 1, 2022, count toward the overall nitrogen reduction goals. Estimated nitrogen reductions provided by the responsible entity are subject to refinement based on DEP verification and/or on adjustment to calculations based on loading to groundwater that takes into consideration recharge and attenuation.

Projects with a designation of TBD (to be determined) denote information is not currently available but will be provided by the responsible entity when it is available. Projects with a designation of NA (not applicable) indicate the information for that category is not relevant to that project. Projects with a designation of "Not Provided" denote that information was requested by DEP but was not provided by the responsible entity.

Table B-1. Stakeholder projects to reduce nitrogen sources

Proj ID	Lead Entity	Partners	Project Number	Project Name	Project Description	Project Type	Project Status	Estimated Completion Date	TN Reduction (lbs/yr)	Crediting Location	Cost Estimate	Funding Source	Funding Amount
2118	Alachua County	SRWMD	AC-01	Poe Springs Domestic Sewage Infrastructure Upgrade	Install new waterless restrooms with larger holding tanks adjacent to springshed. Replace OSTDS with enhanced passive nitrogen system using biosorption activated media (BAM). Reduction estimate to land surface of 5,776 lb-N/yr. Original credit was never verified.	Onsite Sewage Treatment and Disposal System (OSTDS) Enhancement	Completed	2020	225	Outside Springsheds	$346,600	SRWMD; Alachua County	SRWMD - $150,000.00; Alachua County - $196,600.00
2117	Alachua County	DEP	AC-02	Hornsby Spring Restoration	Install temporary aerator to improve dissolved oxygen conditions, remove sediment to improve spring flow, and install submerged aquatic vegetation to improve water quality. Reduction estimate to land of 1,260 lb-N/yr.	Hydrologic Restoration	Completed	2022	TBD	Hornsby Springshed-Inside PFA	$443,480	DEP; Alachua County	DEP - $423,480.00; Alachua County - $20,000.00
2116	Alachua County	DEP	AC-03	Mill Creek Sink Water Quality Improvement Project - Phase II	See AL-01 for the Phase I project info. Phase II is the acquisition of 240 additional acres surrounding and upstream of Mill Creek Swallet.	Land Acquisition	Canceled	2018	NA	Hornsby Springshed-Outside PFA	$0	NA	NA - $0.00
2115	Alachua County	DEP; Gainesville Clean Water Partnership	AC-04	Fertilizer Social Marketing Campaign	Implement a social marketing campaign designed to reduce fertilizer use and to estimate the resultant load reduction.	Education Efforts	Underway	TBD	TBD	Basinwide	$202,257	DEP; Gainesville Clean Water Partnership	DEP - $135,000.00; Gainesville Clean Water Partnership - $67,257.00
2114	Alachua County	Adventure Outpost	AC-05	Interactive Paddling Trips	Implement education by coordinating 5-6 interactive paddling trips on the Santa Fe River with 120 stakeholders to explore actions that affect the health of our springs and groundwater.	Education Efforts	Completed	2019	NA	Basinwide	$12,600	Alachua County; Wildlife Foundation of Florida Springs Protection License Plate Grant	Alachua County - $6,900.00; Wildlife Foundation of Florida Springs Protection License Plate Grant - $5,700.00
2119	Alachua County	Gainesville Clean Water Partnership	AC-06	Interactive Stormwater and Wastewater Model	Interactive table top model for teaching children and adults about the difference between storm sewers and sanitary sewers.	Education Efforts	Completed	2018	NA	Basinwide	$6,500	Gainesville Clean Water Partnership	Gainesville Clean Water Partnership - $6,500.00

Proj ID	Lead Entity	Partners	Project Number	Project Name	Project Description	Project Type	Project Status	Estimated Completion Date	TN Reduction (lbs/yr)	Crediting Location	Cost Estimate	Funding Source	Funding Amount
2120	Alachua County	NA	AC-07	Santa Fe River Springs Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (SAV) Assessment	The goal of this project is to document the current condition of SAV at selected springs (pools and associated spring runs) on the Santa Fe River.	Study	Completed	2022	NA	Basinwide	$24,500	Wildlife Foundation of Florida Springs Protection License Plate Grant; Alachua County	Wildlife Foundation of Florida Springs Protection License Plate Grant - $40,000.00; Alachua County - $0.00
2121	Alachua County	Gainesville Clean Water Partnership	AC-08	Stream Bioassessment Study	The Stream Bioassessment Study project includes Stream Condition Index (SCI) in-stream biological assessment and Hester-Dendy sampling and analysis to provide ambient monitoring for TMDL and impaired watersheds.	Monitoring/Data Collection	Completed	2019	NA	Basinwide	$85,970	FDOT	FDOT - $85,970.00
2122	Alachua County	Camp Kulaqua	AC-09	Hornsby Springs Dissolved Oxygen and Faunal Study	This project seeks to evaluate the role of dissolved oxygen temporally and spatially and to explore what effect this may have on organisms, particularly macro-invertebrates.	Study	Completed	2019	NA	Outside Springsheds	$14,000	Wildlife Foundation of Florida Springs Protection License Plate Grant; Alachua County	Wildlife Foundation of Florida Springs Protection License Plate Grant - $14,000.00; Alachua County - $0.00
2123	Alachua County	Local and State Parks	AC-10	Santa Fe River Springs Signage	The goal of this project is to increase awareness about the springs of the Santa Fe River and current springs issues and solutions. Interpretive signs will be installed at selected springs or parks along the Santa Fe River.	Education Efforts	Completed	2019	NA	Basinwide	$12,600	Alachua County; Wildlife Foundation of Florida Springs Protection License Plate Grant	Alachua County - $0.00; Wildlife Foundation of Florida Springs Protection License Plate Grant - $12,600.00
4553	Alachua County	Wildlife Foundation of Florida; Gainesville Clean	AC-11	Aquifer Model	Mobile model used for outreach to children and adults designed and created to teach the public about the connection between how what we do on the land surface and how we use water affects our springs, rivers, and aquifer.	Education Efforts	Ongoing	NA	NA	Basinwide	$6,000	Alachua County; Wildlife Foundation of Florida Springs Protection	Alachua County - $0.00; Wildlife Foundation of Florida Springs Protection License Plate Grant - $0.00

Proj ID	Lead Entity	Partners	Project Number	Project Name	Project Description	Project Type	Project Status	Estimated Completion Date	TN Reduction (lbs/yr)	Crediting Location	Cost Estimate	Funding Source	Funding Amount
												License Plate Grant	
4554	Alachua County	NA	AC-12	Poe Spring Sediment Removal and Habitat Restoration	Alachua County proposes to remove 1,100 to 1,200 cubic yards of sediment from the main spring and stabilize soils and restore habitat.	Muck Removal/Restoration Dredging	Planned	TBD	NA	Outside Springsheds	$259,970	DEP; SRWMD	DEP - $0.00; SRWMD - $0.00
4555	Alachua County	City of Gainesville	AC-13	4 Creeks Preserve Acquisition	Fee simple acquisition. No increase in surface runoff of pollutants due to land use change, continued aquifer recharge and ecosystem/habitat preservation.	Land Acquisition	Completed	2018	NA	Outside Springsheds	$4,382,966	Wild Spaces Public Places	Wild Spaces Public Places - $0.00
4556	Alachua County	NA	AC-14	Poe Springs Aquatic Habitat Enhancement and Outreach	The project goal is enhancement of the aquatic plant community and assessment of infaunal macroinvertebrate populations in selected areas of Poe and Little Poe springs.	Wetland Restoration	Completed	2020	NA	Outside Springsheds	$12,500	Alachua County; Wildlife Foundation of Florida Springs Protection License Plate Grant	Alachua County - $0.00; Wildlife Foundation of Florida Springs Protection License Plate Grant - $12,500.00
4557	Alachua County	NA	AC-15	Santa Fe River - Santa Fe River Ranch (Hitchcock)	Conservation easement acquisition. No increase in surface runoff of pollutants due to land use change, continued aquifer recharge and ecosystem/habitat preservation. Drains into Santa Fe River.	Land Acquisition	Completed	2021	NA	Hornsby Springshed-Inside PFA	$5,627,944	Wild Spaces Public Places II Surtax	Wild Spaces Public Places II Surtax - $5,627,943.51
4558	Alachua County	NA	AC-16	Hickory Sink - Kanapaha Timber Land & Cattle (Lee)	Conservation easement acquisition. No increase in surface runoff of pollutants due to land use change, continued aquifer recharge and ecosystem/habitat preservation.	Land Acquisition	Planned	TBD	NA	Outside Springsheds	$0	Wild Spaces Public Places	Wild Spaces Public Places - $0.00

Proj ID	Lead Entity	Partners	Project Number	Project Name	Project Description	Project Type	Project Status	Estimated Completion Date	TN Reduction (lbs/yr)	Crediting Location	Cost Estimate	Funding Source	Funding Amount
4559	Alachua County	City of Gainesville; FDOT District 2	AC-17	Pet Waste Outreach	Implement social marketing campaign to motivate citizens to scoop, bag, and trash dog wastes at home and in the community. Reduces bacteria and nutrient sources in all watersheds.	Enhanced Public Education	Ongoing	NA	NA	Basinwide	$40,655	SJRWMD; FDOT; Alachua County; City of Gainesville	SJRWMD - $0; FDOT - $0; Alachua County - $0; City of Gainesville - $0
4560	Alachua County	City of Gainesville; FDOT District 2	AC-18	Landscaping Debris Social Marketing	Implement social marketing campaign designed to get citizens to keep landscaping debris out of the roads and stormwater collection systems. Reduces bacteria and nutrient sources in all watersheds.	Enhanced Public Education	Ongoing	NA	NA	Basinwide	$50,000	SJRWMD; FDOT; Alachua County; City of Gainesville	SJRWMD - $0; FDOT - $0; Alachua County - $0; City of Gainesville - $0
4561	Alachua County	City of Gainesville; FDOT District 2	AC-19	Water Conservation and LID	Conduct targeted public outreach to encourage water conservation and rain harvesting. Includes rain barrel sales and LID promotion.	Enhanced Public Education	Ongoing	NA	NA	Basinwide	$0	SJRWMD; FDOT; Alachua County; City of Gainesville	SJRWMD - $0; FDOT - $0; Alachua County - $0; City of Gainesville - $0
4562	Alachua County	City of Gainesville; FDOT District 2; SJRWMD	AC-20	Landscaping Behavior Change Social Marketing	Implement social marketing campaign designed to get citizens to make landscaping behavior changes that reduce nutrients in stormwater. Reduces nutrients sources in all watersheds.	Enhanced Public Education	Completed	2019	TBD	Basinwide	$600,000	SJRWMD; FDOT; Alachua County; City of Gainesville	SJRWMD - $0; FDOT - $0; Alachua County - $0; City of Gainesville - $0
4563	Alachua County	City of Gainesville; FDOT District 2	AC-21	Alachua County Water Quality Code Implementation	Alachua County Water Quality Code Implementation, includes public education, outreach, and enforcement.	Regulations, Ordinances, and Guidelines	Ongoing	NA	NA	Basinwide	$17,400	FDOT; SJRWMD; Alachua County; City of Gainesville	FDOT - $0.00; SJRWMD - $0.00; Alachua County - $0.00; City of Gainesville - $0.00
4564	Alachua County	NA	AC-22	Fertilizer and Landscape Irrigation Codes	Adopt and enforce Fertilizer Management and Landscape Irrigation Ordinances. Reduce volume of runoff from over irrigation and reduce nutrient loading from the use of fertilizers.	Regulations, Ordinances, and Guidelines	Ongoing	NA	660	Outside Springsheds	$0	Alachua County	Alachua County - $0.00

Proj ID	Lead Entity	Partners	Project Number	Project Name	Project Description	Project Type	Project Status	Estimated Completion Date	TN Reduction (lbs/yr)	Crediting Location	Cost Estimate	Funding Source	Funding Amount
7677	Alachua County	NA	AC-22a	Fertilizer and Landscape Irrigation Codes	Adopt and enforce Fertilizer Management and Landscape Irrigation Ordinances. Reduce volume of runoff from over irrigation and reduce nutrient loading from the use of fertilizers. Alachua County currently not receiving eductaion credit in Santa Fe. Need to update credits for one of these projects and also look to extending credits to municipalities covered by the county codes.	Regulations, Ordinances, and Guidelines	Ongoing	NA	NA	Hornsby Springshed-Inside PFA	$0	Alachua County	Alachua County - $0.00
7678	Alachua County	NA	AC-22b	Fertilizer and Landscape Irrigation Codes	Adopt and enforce Fertilizer Management and Landscape Irrigation Ordinances. Reduce volume of runoff from over irrigation and reduce nutrient loading from the use of fertilizers. Alachua County currently not receiving eductaion credit in Santa Fe. Need to update credits for one of these projects and also look to extending credits to municipalities covered by the county codes.	Regulations, Ordinances, and Guidelines	Ongoing	NA	NA	Devil's Complex Springshed-Inside PFA	$0	Alachua County	Alachua County - $0.00
5461	Alachua County	NA	AC-23	Countywide Stormwater Treatment Code	Adopt a stormwater treatment code for new development. Code requires 70/80% TN/TP reductions in stormwater discharges. 95% for OFWs and 10% below predevelopment for impaired waters. LID techniques are required in sensitive karst area.	Regulations, Ordinances, and Guidelines	Completed	2019	NA	Basinwide	$0	Alachua County	Alachua County - $0.00
5462	Alachua County	NA	AC-24	Countywide Florida Friendly Landscaping Homeowner Association Code	Adopt a FFL HOA Code that prohibits HOAs from prohibiting FFL. The code also prohibits neighborhood codes, covenants, and regulations adopted after 2016 from requiring irrigation.	Regulations, Ordinances, and Guidelines	Completed	2019	NA	Basinwide	$0	Alachua County	Alachua County - $0.00

Proj ID	Lead Entity	Partners	Project Number	Project Name	Project Description	Project Type	Project Status	Estimated Completion Date	TN Reduction (lbs/yr)	Crediting Location	Cost Estimate	Funding Source	Funding Amount
5463	Alachua County	NA	AC-25	Aquifer Awareness Campaign	Billboards and social media to teach the public about the connection between our water use, the aquifer, and the health of our springs.	Enhanced Public Education	Completed	2020	NA	Basinwide	$20,000	SJRWMD; FDOT; Alachua County; City of Gainesville; Wildlife Foundation of Florida Springs Protection License Plate Grant	SJRWMD - $0.00; FDOT - $0.00; Alachua County - $0.00; City of Gainesville - $0.00; Wildlife Foundation of Florida Springs Protection License Plate Grant - $10,000.00
5464	Alachua County	NA	AC-26	J Kinnard	Fee simple acquisition. No increase in surface runoff of pollutants due to land use change, continued aquifer recharge and ecosystem/habitat preservation.	Land Acquisition	Completed	2019	NA	Devil's Complex Springshed-Outside PFA	$221,850	Wild Spaces Public Places	Wild Spaces Public Places - $221,850.00
5465	Alachua County	NA	AC-27	R&D Kinnard	Fee simple acquisition. No increase in surface runoff of pollutants due to land use change, continued aquifer recharge and ecosystem/habitat preservation.	Land Acquisition	Completed	2019	NA	Devil's Complex Springshed-Outside PFA	$67,500	Wild Spaces Public Places	Wild Spaces Public Places - $67,500.00
5466	Alachua County	NA	AC-28	Lundgren	Donation from land owner. No increase in surface runoff of pollutants due to land use change, continued aquifer recharge and ecosystem/habitat preservation. Drains into Santa Fe River.	Land Acquisition	Completed	2021	NA	Outside Springsheds	$0	Donation	Donation - $0.00
5467	Alachua County	NA	AC-29	Brown	Conservation easement acquisition. No increase in surface runoff of pollutants due to land use change, continued aquifer recharge and ecosystem/habitat preservation.	Land Acquisition	Completed	2022	NA	Outside Springsheds	$480,166	Wild Spaces Public Places	Wild Spaces Public Places - $480,166.00
5468	Alachua County	NA	AC-30	Mattews	Fee Simple acquisition. No increase in surface runoff of pollutants due to land use change, continued aquifer recharge and ecosystem/habitat preservation. Drains into Santa Fe River.	Land Acquisition	Completed	2023	NA	Outside Springsheds	$841,799	Wild Spaces Public Places	Wild Spaces Public Places - $841,798.96

Proj ID	Lead Entity	Partners	Project Number	Project Name	Project Description	Project Type	Project Status	Estimated Completion Date	TN Reduction (lbs/yr)	Crediting Location	Cost Estimate	Funding Source	Funding Amount
5469	Alachua County	NA	AC-31	Johnson	Fee Simple Land Conservation acquisition. No increase in surface runoff of pollutants due to land use change, continued aquifer recharge and ecosystem/habitat preservation. Drains into Lake Santa Fe.	Land Acquisition	Completed	2020	NA	Outside Springsheds	$1,924,993	Wild Spaces Public Places	Wild Spaces Public Places - $2,265,246.00
5783	Alachua County	NA	AC-32	Springs Protection Videos	Five to six 30-second videos on various aspects of springs protection for social media and paid media outlets.	Education Efforts	Ongoing	NA	NA	Basinwide	$17,000	Alachua County; Wildlife Foundation of Florida Springs Protection License Plate Grant	Alachua County - $0.00; Wildlife Foundation of Florida Springs Protection License Plate Grant - $12,000.00
5784	Alachua County	City of Gainesville; FDOT District 2; SJRWMD; SRWMD	AC-33	Turf Swap	Rebates to property owners that convert irrigated turf to FFL or implement water saving irrigation retrofits.	Education Efforts	Completed	2021	NA	Basinwide	$1,000,000	SRWMD; SJRWMD	SRWMD - $150,000.00; SJRWMD - $300,000.00
5785	Alachua County	UF	AC-34	Quantifying Nitrogen Leaching from Residential Soils in Alachua County Phase 1	Assess nitrogen leaching from actual landscapes in Alachua County. A variety of lawn ages and soil types will be assessed along with mulched planting beds. Soil cores will be analyzed and will be collected from 11 lysimeters installed in yards.	Study	Completed	2020	NA	Basinwide	$32,405	Alachua County	Alachua County - $32,425.00
5786	Alachua County	UF	AC-35	Quantifying Nitrogen Leaching from Residential Soils in Alachua County Phase 2	This phase will investigate nitrogen leaching in yards undergoing a variety of treatments, including mineral fertilizer, a biosolids based fertilizer, and top dressing with compost. New lysimeters will be installed in a natural area for comparison.	Monitoring/Data Collection	Completed	2022	NA	Basinwide	$97,475	Alachua County	Alachua County - $97,475.00

Proj ID	Lead Entity	Partners	Project Number	Project Name	Project Description	Project Type	Project Status	Estimated Completion Date	TN Reduction (lbs/yr)	Crediting Location	Cost Estimate	Funding Source	Funding Amount
5787	Alachua County	NA	AC-36	An Evaluation of Nutrient Sources and Potential Nutrient Reduction Projects for Poe Spring	Initial literature and data review phase of a project to identify nutrient sources in Poe Springs and potential nutrient reduction projects for the spring and groundwater generally.	Study	Completed	2023	NA	Basinwide	$34,085	Alachua County	Alachua County - $34,085.00
5788	Alachua County	NA	AC-37	An Evaluation of Nutrient Sources and Potential Nutrient Reduction Projects for Lake Santa Fe	Initial literature and data review phase of a project to identify nutrient sources in Lake Santa Fe and potential nutrient reduction projects for the lake.	Study	Completed	2021	NA	Basinwide	$34,085	Alachua County	Alachua County - $34,085.00
5789	Alachua County	NA	AC-38	Warny	Donation from land owner. No increase in surface runoff of pollutants due to land use change, continued aquifer recharge and ecosystem/habitat preservation.	Land Acquisition	Completed	2021	NA	Devil's Complex Springshed-Outside PFA	$0	Donation	Donation - $0.00
5790	Alachua County	NA	AC-39	Pinkoson & Upshaw	Fee simple land conservation acquisition. No increase in surface runoff of pollutants due to land use change, continued aquifer recharge and ecosystem/habitat preservation.	Land Acquisition	Canceled	2022	NA	TBD	$0	Wild Spaces Public Places	Wild Spaces Public Places - $0.00
5791	Alachua County	NA	AC-40	Bryson	Land conservation easement acquisition. No increase in surface runoff of pollutants due to land use change, continued aquifer recharge and ecosystem/habitat preservation. Drains into Little Lake Santa Fe.	Land Acquisition	Planned	2025	NA	Outside Springsheds	$0	Wild Spaces Public Places	Wild Spaces Public Places - $0.00
5792	Alachua County	NA	AC-41	Santa Fe River - Santa Fe River Ranch (Hitchcock II)	Conservation easement acquisition. No increase in surface runoff of pollutants due to land use change, continued aquifer recharge and ecosystem/habitat preservation.	Land Acquisition	Completed	2021	NA	Hornsby Springshed-Inside PFA	$261,337	Wild Spaces Public Places	Wild Spaces Public Places - $0.00
5793	Alachua County	NA	AC-42	Waldo Tree Farm	Fee simple land conservation acquisition. No increase in surface runoff of pollutants due to land use change, continued aquifer recharge and ecosystem/habitat preservation.	Land Acquisition	Completed	2023	NA	Outside Springsheds	$384,431	Wild Spaces Public Places	Wild Spaces Public Places - $384,430.86

Proj ID	Lead Entity	Partners	Project Number	Project Name	Project Description	Project Type	Project Status	Estimated Completion Date	TN Reduction (lbs/yr)	Crediting Location	Cost Estimate	Funding Source	Funding Amount
5794	Alachua County	SRWMD/ DEP	AC-43	Rembert Conservation Easement	Conservation easement acquisition. No increase in surface runoff of pollutants due to land use change, continued aquifer recharge and ecosystem/habitat preservation. Drains into Mill Creek Sink.	Land Acquisition	Underway	2024	NA	Hornsby Springshed-Outside PFA	$3,279,374	DEP; Wild Spaces Public Places	DEP - $1,000,000.00; Wild Spaces Public Places - $2,279,374.00
5795	Alachua County	NA	AC-44	General Land Acquisition	Fee simple & conservation easement acquisition. No increase in surface runoff of pollutants due to land use change, continued aquifer recharge and ecosystem/habitat preservation.	Land Acquisition	Planned	2026	NA	Hornsby Springshed-Inside PFA	$0	Wild Spaces Public Places	Wild Spaces Public Places - $0.00
6281	Alachua County	SRWMD/ DEP	AC-45	Lime Rock Mines	This is a fee simple land conservation acquisition. No increase in surface runoff of pollutants due to land use change, continued aquifer recharge and ecosystem/habitat preservation.	Land Acquisition	Planned	2025	NA	Hornsby Springshed-Inside PFA	$0	Wild Spaces Public Places; DEP Springs AWS	Wild Spaces Public Places - $0.00; DEP Springs AWS - $800,000.00
6681	Alachua County	NA	AC-46	Phase 2 - An Evaluation of Nutrient Sources and Potential Nutrient Reduction Projects for Lake Santa Fe	This project builds upon the initial literature and data review phase of a project and will identify specific locations for stormwater or other nutrient load reduction projects.	Study	Completed	2023	NA	Outside Springsheds	$79,743	Alachua County Stormwater Assessment	Alachua County Stormwater Assessment - $79,743.00
6712	Alachua County	SRWMD	AC-47	Lake Santa Fe Park Septic System Upgrade	This project is an upgrade of the septic system in Lake Santa Fe Park to an aerobic treatment unit (ATU). The park bathrooms are being relocated and the old system is being replaced with an ATU.	Onsite Sewage Treatment and Disposal System (OSTDS) Enhancement	Completed	2023	3	Outside Springsheds	$230,000	SRWMD; Alachua County	SRWMD - $30,000.00; Alachua County - $200,000.00
6809	Alachua County	Alachua Conservation Trust	AC-48	Santa Fe River - Bell	This is a fee simple land conservation acquisition. No increase in surface runoff of pollutants due to land use change, continued aquifer recharge and ecosystem/habitat preservation.	Land Acquisition	Completed	2023	NA	Outside Springsheds	$441,385	ACT; Wild Spaces Public Places II Surtax	ACT - $73,931.04; Wild Spaces Public Places II Surtax - $377,387.00
6813	Alachua County	None	AC-49	Santa Fe River - Ewel	Conservation easement acquisition. No increase in surface runoff of pollutants due to land use change,	Land Acquisition	Planned	TBD	NA	Outside Springsheds	$0	Wild Spaces Public Places II Surtax	Wild Spaces Public Places II Surtax - $0.00

Proj ID	Lead Entity	Partners	Project Number	Project Name	Project Description	Project Type	Project Status	Estimated Completion Date	TN Reduction (lbs/yr)	Crediting Location	Cost Estimate	Funding Source	Funding Amount
					continued aquifer recharge and ecosystem/habitat preservation.								
7069	Alachua County	N/A	AC-50	Sheffield - Watermelon Pond	Fee Simple acquisition. No increase in surface runoff of pollutants due to land use change, continued aquifer recharge and ecosystem/habitat preservation.	Land Acquisition	Underway	2024	NA	Outside Springsheds	$0	Wild Spaces Public Places II Surtax	Wild Spaces Public Places II Surtax - $0.00
7070	Alachua County	DEP/SRWMD	AC-51	Shires Conservation Easement	Conservation Easement acquisition. No increase in surface runoff of pollutants due to land use change, continued aquifer recharge and ecosystem/habitat preservation.	Land Acquisition	Underway	2025	NA	Outside Springsheds	$0	DEP/SRWMD; Wild Spaces Public Places II Surtax	DEP/SRWMD - $190,575.00; Wild Spaces Public Places II Surtax - $0.00
7065	Alachua County	N/A	AC-52	Elliot Conservation Easement	Conservation easement acquisition. No increase in surface runoff of pollutants due to land use change, continued aquifer recharge and ecosystem/habitat preservation.	Land Acquisition	Underway	2024	NA	Outside Springsheds	$0	Wild Spaces Public Places II Surtax	Wild Spaces Public Places II Surtax - $0.00
7594	Alachua County	NA	AC-53	Trout Street	Installation of Bioswales to treat surface runoff before entering Melrose Bay of Lake Santa Fe.	Bioswales	Planned	2025	19	Outside Springsheds	$0	Alachua County Stormwater Assessment	Alachua County Stormwater Assessment - $460,000.00
2129	City of Alachua	DEP; SRWMD	AL-01	Mill Creek Sink Water Quality Improvement Project	Purchase property to install water quality BMPs to reduce pollutant loads discharging directly into the sink. Nutrient loading should be reduced by 66 % and benefit Hornsby Spring.	BMP Treatment Train	Underway	2022	TBD	Hornsby Springshed-Inside PFA	$2,045,898	SRWMD; DEP	SRWMD - $1,045,898.61; DEP - $1,000,000.00
2130	City of Archer	SRWMD	AR-01	Holly Hills Stormwater Improvements	Increase storage within existing stormwater ponds to alleviate flooding and improve water quality.	Stormwater System Upgrade	Underway	2026	TBD	Devil's Complex Springshed-Outside PFA	$87,000	SRWMD; City of Archer	SRWMD - $0.00; City of Archer - $0.00

Proj ID	Lead Entity	Partners	Project Number	Project Name	Project Description	Project Type	Project Status	Estimated Completion Date	TN Reduction (lbs/yr)	Crediting Location	Cost Estimate	Funding Source	Funding Amount
5796	City of Archer	DEO; DEP; SRWMD; USDA	AR-02	City of Archer Wastewater Systems Improvements	Design and construction of a wastewater collection system, lift stations, and phase out the use of septic tanks in the City of Archer. Using 306 tanks in medium recharge for estimates.	OSTDS Phase Out	Planned	2026	2,523	Devil's Complex Springshed-Outside PFA	$0	TBD; DEP	DEP - $5,850,000.00
7112	City of Archer	DEP; SRWMD	AR-03	Archer Stormwater Improvements	Increase storage within existing stormwater ponds to alleviate flooding and improve water quality at Wilson Robinson Park and Depot Street.	Stormwater System Upgrade	Underway	2026	TBD	Outside Springsheds	$500,000	City of Archer; SRWMD	City of Archer - $0.00; SRWMD - $0.00
7385	City of Archer	DEO; DEP; SRWMD; USDA	AR-04	City of Archer Wastewater Systems Improvements-Phase 2 Addition	Additional septic tank phase outs are to be included in Phase 2, resulting in an expansion of the sewer line due to an increase in sewer connections.	OSTDS Phase Out	Planned	2028	660	Devil's Complex Springshed-Outside PFA	$0	TBD; DEP	DEP - $5,850,000.00
7583	City of Gainesville	Alachua County; City of Gainesville Public Works	GA-01	Gainesville Urban Area Street Sweeping Optimization and Assessment Tool for Pollutant Load Reduction	Gainesville Urban Area MS4 street sweeping study to determine local load reductions. This project may increase pollutant load reductions associated with street sweeping activities in Orange Creek and Santa Fe Basins.	Study	Underway	2026	NA	Outside Springsheds	$0	Alachua County Stormwater Assessment; City of Gainesville Stormwater Management Utility	City of Gainesville Stormwater Management Utility - $63,000.00; Alachua County Stormwater Assessment - $42,000.00
7587	City of Gainesville	City of Gainesville Public Works	GA-02	Street Sweeping	Street sweeping urban Gainesville Blues Creek and Turkey Creek Watersheds.	Street Sweeping	Ongoing	NA	0	Outside Springsheds	$0	City of Gainesville Stormwater Management Utility Fee	City of Gainesville Stormwater Management Utility Fee - $16,000.00
7584	City of Gainesville	Alachua County; City of Gainesville ; FDOT District 2	GA-03	Education Outreach	Educational efforts that result in 0.25 % to 6 % credit, depending on extent of efforts.	Education Efforts	Ongoing	NA	57	Outside Springsheds	$0	Alachua County; Gainesville Clean Water Partnership; City of Gainesville;	Alachua County - $83,946.00; Gainesville Clean Water Partnership - $0.00; City of Gainesville - $115,924.00;

Proj ID	Lead Entity	Partners	Project Number	Project Name	Project Description	Project Type	Project Status	Estimated Completion Date	TN Reduction (lbs/yr)	Crediting Location	Cost Estimate	Funding Source	Funding Amount
												FDOT District 2	FDOT District 2 - $108,150.00
2131	City of Hampton	USACE	HA-01	Master Drainage Study	Undertake study to address severe flooding issues.	Study	Completed	2020	NA	Basinwide	$150,000	USACE	USACE - $150,000.00
7352	City of Hampton	DEP	HA-02	Hampton Villas Stormwater Mitigation	Based on previous assessments, the project proposes to mitigate the flooding through new ditch design depths, widths, and lengths including replacement of all existing culvert pipes under driveways. Exploring additional funding.	BMP Treatment Train	Planned	2025	TBD	Outside Springsheds	$225,950	DEP Resilient Florida	DEP Resilient Florida - $225,950.00
2132	City of High Springs	DEP; SRWMD	HS-01	Infiltrative Wetlands for WWTF Effluent Treatment/Disposal , Phase I	Convert City's existing effluent sprayfield into infiltration wetlands; 10 of 20 acres will be constructed in Phase I. This will benefit water quality in Hornsby and Poe Springs. Reduction estimated load to land surface of 4,870 lb-N/yr.	Constructed Wetland Treatment	Underway	2024	TBD	Basinwide	$6,265,400	DEP	DEP - $6,265,400.00
2133	City of High Springs	DEP; SRWMD	HS-02	Wastewater Collection System Extension - Phase A1	Provide central sewer to remaining areas served by septic systems. Elimination of 132 septic systems. Reduction estimate to land surface of 2,640 lb-N/yr.	OSTDS Phase Out	Completed	2019	TBD	Outside Springsheds	$3,432,700	DEP; City of High Springs	DEP - $3,307,700.00; City of High Springs - $125,000.00
2134	City of High Springs	DEP; SRWMD	HS-03	Camp Kulaqua-Hornsby Spring Water Quality Improvement Project	Remove onsite wastewater treatment plant and effluent disposal and install new wastewater line to city WWTP. Reduction estimated load to land surface of 97 lb-N/yr. Previous reduction listed as 9 lb-N/yr.	WWTF Upgrade	Completed	2018	0	Hornsby Springshed-Inside PFA	$500,000	DEP; SRWMD	DEP - $450,000.00; SRWMD - $50,000.00

Proj ID	Lead Entity	Partners	Project Number	Project Name	Project Description	Project Type	Project Status	Estimated Completion Date	TN Reduction (lbs/yr)	Crediting Location	Cost Estimate	Funding Source	Funding Amount
2135	City of High Springs	SRWMD	HS-04	Septic Tank Abatement	Eliminate 13 residential septic systems and connect to City's central sewer system. Reduction estimate to land surface of 330 lb-N/yr.	OSTDS Phase Out	Completed	2018	TBD	Outside Springsheds	$175,000	SRWMD; City of High Springs	SRWMD - $150,000.00; City of High Springs - $25,000.00
2136	City of High Springs	TBD	HS-05	Wastewater Collection System Extension - Phase A2	Provide central sewer to remaining areas served by septic systems. Elimination of 168 septic systems.	OSTDS Phase Out	Completed	2020	TBD	Outside Springsheds	$3,562,000	DEP; SRWMD	DEP - $0.00; SRWMD - $0.00
2126	City of High Springs	DEP; SRWMD	HS-06	WWTF Expansion & Infiltrative Wetlands, Ph. II	This project upgrades the City's aged and deteriorating WWTF to meet AWT standards. Effluent will be further treated with a constructed infiltrative/treatment wetland for aquifer recharge. Estimated TN reduction around 22,497 lbs/yr. BMAP reductions will be based on PLSM.	WWTF Upgrade	Underway	2024	TBD	Basinwide	$11,982,264	SRWMD; City of High Springs; DEP	SRWMD - $0.00; City of High Springs - $0.00; DEP - $11,982,264.00
7665	City of High Springs	DEP; SRWMD	HS-07	CR 236 Septic Tank Phaseout	This project will construct a gravity sewer collection system adjacent to the existing force main in the CR 236 project area, enabling the removal of approximately 22 septic tanks from service.	OSTDS Phase Out	Underway	2026	327	Basinwide	$1,910,390	City of High Springs; DEP	DEP - $1,910,390.37; City of High Springs - $0.00
6435	City of Lake Butler	DEP; FDOC; SRWMD	LB-01	Lake Butler Wastewater Treatment Facility AWT Upgrade Phases 3 through 5	The project designs and constructs a new AWT WWTF and solar array, converts the City's sprayfield to a constructed treatment wetlands for effluent polishing of nutrients and aquifer recharge, and provides reuse to the FDC RMC and County athletic park.	WWTF Upgrade	Underway	2026	TBD	Outside Springsheds	$54,600,000	SRWMD; DEP	SRWMD - $3,400,000.00; DEP - $29,600,000.00
6642	City of Lake Butler	DEP	LB-02	Wastewater Collection System Improvements, Ph. IA & IB	This project involves design and construction of Phases IA & IB of the rehabilitation and replacement of the wastewater collection & pumping system within the core area of the City of Lake Butler.	Sanitary Sewer and Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF) Maintenance	Underway	2026	NA	Outside Springsheds	$15,000,000	DEP SRF; DEP SRF; DEP SRF	DEP SRF - $11,250,000.00; DEP SRF - $970,400.00; DEP SRF - $242,600.00

Proj ID	Lead Entity	Partners	Project Number	Project Name	Project Description	Project Type	Project Status	Estimated Completion Date	TN Reduction (lbs/yr)	Crediting Location	Cost Estimate	Funding Source	Funding Amount
2105	City of Lake City	DEP	LC-01	I-75/ SR 47 Cannon Creek Sink Wastewater Improvement Project - Phase I	Eliminate septic systems from 30 businesses and 5 residences to benefit water quality in Ichetucknee Spring. Reduction estimate to land surface of 11,950 lb-N/yr.	OSTDS Phase Out	Underway	2024	TBD	Ichetucknee Springshed-Inside PFA	$4,809,437	DEP; City of Lake City	DEP - $3,106,022.00; City of Lake City - $1,703,415.00
2097	City of Lake City	Columbia County; DEP; SRWMD	LC-02	Ichetucknee Springshed Water Quality Improvement Project	Convert effluent disposal system into 120 acres of recharge wetlands. Estimates prepared during project design showed the system was anticipated to reduce TN from 6.5 mg/L to 1.0 mg/L at a flow of 1.2 MGD, for an annual load reduction of 20,100 lbs TN/yr. Original Credit of 4196 lbs-TN/yr. Project was captured in updated loading estimates.	WWTF Nutrient Reduction	Completed	2016	0	Ichetucknee Springshed-Inside PFA	$5,005,175	DEP; SRWMD; Columbia County; City of Lake City	DEP - $3,900,000.00; SRWMD - $805,175.00; Columbia County - $100,000.00; City of Lake City - $200,000.00
2096	City of Lake City	SRWMD	LC-03	Reclaimed Water System Upgrade - Phase I	Upgrade existing system to allow reclaimed water to be used by local golf course and farmer. Noted as canceled in 2018 by SRWMD. Canceled in STAR year 2022.	WWTF Diversion to Reuse	Canceled	NA	NA	Ichetucknee Springshed-Inside PFA	$0	DEP; SRWMD; City of Lake City	DEP - $1,000,000.00; SRWMD - $0.00; City of Lake City - $86,340.00
6644	City of Lake City	DEP; SRWMD	LC-04	Lake City Recharge Wetland Expansion	This project converts the City's Steedley Sprayfields into 53 acres of recharge wetlands to increase AWT capacity as well as effluent disposal capacity to comply with AO 227 NE.	WWTF Nutrient Reduction	Underway	2025	0	Ichetucknee Springshed-Inside PFA	$6,100,000	City of Lake City; DEP Springs	City of Lake City - $79,500.00; DEP Springs - $6,100,000.00
6750	City of Lake City	DEP; SRWMD	LC-05	Lake City Recharge Wetland South	This project proposes to further expand on the City's existing recharge wetland through conversion of the City's third sprayfield to a groundwater recharge wetland with the addition of approximately 80 acres of treatment and recharge area.	WWTF Nutrient Reduction	Planned	2028	0	Ichetucknee Springshed-Inside PFA	$11,300,000	DEP Springs	DEP Springs - $11,300,000.00
6751	City of Lake City	DEP; SRWMD	LC-06	Ichetucknee Springs Quality and Quantity Enhancement Project	Design, permitting, and construction of recharge enhancement to maximize infiltration at sprayfield converted to recharge wetlands to comply with Santa Fe BMAP AWT requirement.	WWTF Disposal Site	Underway	2025	0	Ichetucknee Springshed-Inside PFA	$1,800,000	DEP Springs	DEP Springs - $1,800,000.00

Proj ID	Lead Entity	Partners	Project Number	Project Name	Project Description	Project Type	Project Status	Estimated Completion Date	TN Reduction (lbs/yr)	Crediting Location	Cost Estimate	Funding Source	Funding Amount
7670	City of Lake City	NA	LC-07	Street Sweeping	Established street sweeping program. Not previously entered for credit.	Street Sweeping	Ongoing	2050	TBD	Ichetucknee Springshed-Inside PFA	$0	City of Lake City	City of Lake City - $0.00
6576	City of Lawtey	DEP; SRWMD	LA-01	Stormwater System Improvements	This project will make significant improvements to various components of Lawtey's stormwater system, which is operating inefficiently due to sediment accumulation, deterioration, vegetation overgrowth, clogging/blockages, and structural damage.	Stormwater System Upgrade	Planned	TBD	TBD	Outside Springsheds	$4,880,000	DEP; SRWMD	SRWMD - $0.00; DEP - $0.00
2094	City of Newberry	SRWMD	NEW-01	Potable Water and Central Wastewater Improvements	Replace existing water and wastewater lines in close proximity to historic district, thereby reducing unaccounted water loss and preventing potential sewage spills.	WWTF Upgrade	Completed	2018	NA	Devil's Complex Springshed-Inside PFA	$65,000	SRWMD; City of Newberry	SRWMD - $38,434.00; City of Newberry - $26,566.00
5470	City of Newberry	SRWMD	NEW-02	Canterbury Fairgrounds Wastewater Extension Project	Extend central wastewater lines to Canterbury Fairgrounds site and decommission the existing OSTDS.	OSTDS Phase Out	Completed	2022	354	Devil's Complex Springshed-Inside PFA	$220,600	SRWMD; City of Newberry	SRWMD - $0.00; City of Newberry - $0.00
5471	City of Newberry	SRWMD	NEW-03	Newberry Enhanced Wetland Treatment Project	Installation and operation of a constructed treatment wetland on a portion of the existing sprayfield to achieve AWT standards for TN at the Newberry WWTF.	WWTF Disposal Site	Underway	2026	NA	Devil's Complex Springshed-Inside PFA	$7,000,000	City of Newberry; SRWMD	City of Newberry - $0.00; SRWMD - $0.00
6436	City of Newberry	SRWMD	NEW-04	AWT Upgrade	Upgrade existing WWTF to AWT standards, to include spray field and biosolids handling facilities as a holistic facility. This project type needs to be changed to WWTF Upgrade. Reductions based on new TN effluent limits.	WWTF Upgrade	Underway	2026	2,749	Devil's Complex Springshed-Inside PFA	$89,737,175	Interlocal Agreement; Legislative Appropriation; Legislative Appropriation; DEP; DEP SRF; DEP	Interlocal Agreement - $13,101,628.00; Legislative Appropriation - $750,000.00; Legislative Appropriation - $1,000,000.00; DEP - $6,450,000.00; DEP SRF -

Proj ID	Lead Entity	Partners	Project Number	Project Name	Project Description	Project Type	Project Status	Estimated Completion Date	TN Reduction (lbs/yr)	Crediting Location	Cost Estimate	Funding Source	Funding Amount
													$3,879,600.00; DEP - $4,000,000.00
6437	City of Newberry	SRWMD	NEW-05	Infrastructure Extension	Utility improvements and expansion to Ag Tech Park and central sewer service to approximately 25 OSTDS along a new service area. Estimated reductions using Residential.	OSTDS Phase Out	Underway	2023	206	Devil's Complex Springshed-Inside PFA	$0	City of Newberry; SRWMD	City of Newberry - $0.00; SRWMD - $0.00
6783	City of Newberry	DEP	NEW-06	Land and Water Conservation Fund Application for Newberry Ecological Park	Enhanced wetland for public education benefit and associated facilities.	Enhanced Public Education	Planned	2028	NA	Basinwide	$1,500,000	DEP	DEP - $1,500,000.00
7159	City of Newberry	DEP	NEW-07	City of Newberry Stormwater Facility Plan	Stormwater Facility Plan of the City of Newberry downtown CRA district.	Stormwater System Upgrade	Underway	2025	TBD	Devil's Complex Springshed-Inside PFA	$60,000	City of Newberry	City of Newberry - $60,000.00
2137	Columbia County	SRWMD	CC-01	Rum Island Park	Install new public restrooms with lift station and septic system in place of portable toilets. Install BAM to reduce nutrients around septic system. Project also involves bank restoration and dredging. Original Credit of 59 lbs-TN/yr. Project was captured in updated loading estimates.	Onsite Sewage Treatment and Disposal System (OSTDS) Enhancement	Completed	2019	0	Devil's Complex Springshed-Inside PFA	$300,000	SRWMD; Columbia County	SRWMD - $150,000.00; Columbia County - $150,000.00

Proj ID	Lead Entity	Partners	Project Number	Project Name	Project Description	Project Type	Project Status	Estimated Completion Date	TN Reduction (lbs/yr)	Crediting Location	Cost Estimate	Funding Source	Funding Amount
2125	Columbia County	DEP	CC-02	Ichetucknee Trace - Clay Hole Creek/ Alligator Lake Aquifer Recharge and Stormwater Mitigation	Construct swales, canals, and stormwater canal structures to direct water to Alligator Lake to provide erosion control and water quality treatment before water enters aquifer. Reduction estimate of load to land surface of 30,000 lb-N/yr.	Regional Stormwater Treatment	Underway	2020	8,100	Ichetucknee Springshed-Inside PFA	$2,560,000	DEP; Columbia County	DEP - $2,260,000.00; Columbia County - $300,000.00
2106	Columbia County	DEP	CC-03	Ichetucknee Trace - Cannon Creek Project	Provide flood mitigation, water quality improvement, and aquifer recharge through the replacement of an old drainage well and 13 acres of wetland construction. Reduction estimate of load to land surface of 10,000 lb-N/yr.	Regional Stormwater Treatment	Completed	2021	TBD	Ichetucknee Springshed-Inside PFA	$3,030,000	DEP; Columbia County	DEP - $2,250,000.00; Columbia County - $780,000.00
2127	Columbia County	DEP	CC-04	Dream Inn Motel WWTP Closure	Remove the noncompliant WWTP that serves the motel and connect to the county's sewer system. This also includes relocating, upgrading, and enlarging the county WWTF to handle flow. Estimated load reduction to land surface of 1,000 lb-N/yr. Original Credit of 49 lbs-TN/yr. Project was captured in updated loading estimates.	WWTF Upgrade	Completed	2018	0	Devil's Complex Springshed-Outside PFA	$354,737	SRWMD; Columbia County	SRWMD - $144,300.00; Columbia County - $210,437.00
2141	DEP FPS District 2	NA	FPS-01	Ichetucknee Springs State Park Dampier's Landing	Remove septic system in wetlands at the Dampier's Landing Bath House and connect to existing wastewater treatment system in the uplands.	OSTDS Phase Out	Completed	2019	TBD	Ichetucknee Springshed-Inside PFA	$0	DEP	DEP - $0.00
6438	DEP FPS District 2	NA	FPS-02	Ichetucknee Springs State Park OSTDS Upgrade	Construct new restroom facility to replace old Dampier's Landing Bath House using an advanced wastewater treatment system.	OSTDS Phase Out	Underway	2024	TBD	Ichetucknee Springshed-Inside PFA	$0	NA	NA - $0.00
6439	DEP FPS District 2	FWC; SRWMD	FPS-03	Ichetucknee Springs State Park Restoration	Replant submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) in the spring run of Devil's Eye and Mission Springs.	SAV Planting	Underway	2027	NA	Ichetucknee Springshed-Inside PFA	$0	NA	NA - $0.00

Proj ID	Lead Entity	Partners	Project Number	Project Name	Project Description	Project Type	Project Status	Estimated Completion Date	TN Reduction (lbs/yr)	Crediting Location	Cost Estimate	Funding Source	Funding Amount
6440	DEP FPS District 2	NA	FPS-04	Gilchrist Blue Springs State Park Restoration	Shoreline stabilization at spring run through dilapidated wooden bulkhead removal, natural contouring, stormwater and stabilization.	Shoreline Stabilization	Planned	2025	NA	Devil's Complex Springshed-Inside PFA	$0	NA	NA - $0.00
6441	DEP FPS District 2	SRWMD	FPS-05	Oleno State Park	Convert several antiquated bathhouse facilities and other park facilities to advanced wastewater treatment systems.	Onsite Sewage Treatment and Disposal System (OSTDS) Enhancement	Planned	TBD	TBD	Hornsby Springshed-Inside PFA	$0	NA	NA - $0.00
5800	FDACS	Agricultural Producers	FDACS-01a	BMP Implementation and Verification - Farm Fertilizer	Enrollment and verification of BMPs by agricultural producers. Acres treated and reductions estimated using FDACS June 2024 Enrollment and NSILT Loading tool (based on FSAID IX) developed by FDACS.	Agricultural BMPs	Ongoing	NA	37,709	Devil's Complex Springshed-Inside PFA	$0	NA	NA - $0.00
	FDACS	Agricultural Producers	FDACS-01b	BMP Implementation and Verification - Farm Fertilizer	Enrollment and verification of BMPs by agricultural producers. Acres treated and reductions estimated using FDACS June 2024 Enrollment and NSILT Loading tool (based on FSAID IX) developed by FDACS.	Agricultural BMPs	Ongoing	NA	10,357	Hornsby Springshed-Inside PFA	$0	NA	NA - $0.00
	FDACS	Agricultural Producers	FDACS-01c	BMP Implementation and Verification - Farm Fertilizer	Enrollment and verification of BMPs by agricultural producers. Acres treated and reductions estimated using FDACS June 2024 Enrollment and NSILT Loading tool (based on FSAID IX) developed by FDACS.	Agricultural BMPs	Ongoing	NA	14,907	Ichetucknee Springshed-Inside PFA	$0	NA	NA - $0.00
	FDACS	Agricultural Producers	FDACS-01d	BMP Implementation and Verification - Farm Fertilizer	Enrollment and verification of BMPs by agricultural producers. Acres treated and reductions estimated using FDACS June 2024 Enrollment and NSILT Loading tool (based on FSAID IX) developed by FDACS.	Agricultural BMPs	Ongoing	NA	16,758	Outside Springsheds	$0	NA	NA - $0.00

Proj ID	Lead Entity	Partners	Project Number	Project Name	Project Description	Project Type	Project Status	Estimated Completion Date	TN Reduction (lbs/yr)	Crediting Location	Cost Estimate	Funding Source	Funding Amount
5801	FDACS	Agricultural Producers	FDACS-02a	BMP Implementation and Verification - Livestock Waste	Enrollment and verification of BMPs by agricultural producers. Acres treated and reductions estimated using FDACS June 2024 Enrollment and NSILT Loading tool (based on FSAID IX) developed by FDACS.	Agricultural BMPs	Ongoing	NA	5,187	Devil's Complex Springshed-Inside PFA	$0	NA	NA - $0.00
	FDACS	Agricultural Producers	FDACS-02b	BMP Implementation and Verification - Livestock Waste	Enrollment and verification of BMPs by agricultural producers. Acres treated and reductions estimated using FDACS June 2024 Enrollment and NSILT Loading tool (based on FSAID IX) developed by FDACS.	Agricultural BMPs	Ongoing	NA	1,079	Hornsby Springshed-Inside PFA	$0	NA	NA - $0.00
	FDACS	Agricultural Producers	FDACS-02c	BMP Implementation and Verification - Livestock Waste	Enrollment and verification of BMPs by agricultural producers. Acres treated and reductions estimated using FDACS June 2024 Enrollment and NSILT Loading tool (based on FSAID IX) developed by FDACS.	Agricultural BMPs	Ongoing	NA	2,463	Ichetucknee Springshed-Inside PFA	$0	NA	NA - $0.00
	FDACS	Agricultural Producers	FDACS-02d	BMP Implementation and Verification - Livestock Waste	Enrollment and verification of BMPs by agricultural producers. Acres treated and reductions estimated using FDACS June 2024 Enrollment and NSILT Loading tool (based on FSAID IX) developed by FDACS.	Agricultural BMPs	Ongoing	NA	4,069	Outside Springsheds	$0	NA	NA - $0.00
	FDACS	Agricultural Producers	FDACS-04a	Cost-Share BMP Projects	Cost-share projects paid for by FDACS. Project treatment areas and reductions based on FDACS June 2024 Enrollment and NSILT Loading tool (based on FSAID IX) developed by FDACS.	Agricultural BMPs	Ongoing	NA	42,130	Devil's Complex Springshed-Inside PFA	$0	NA	NA - $0.00
	FDACS	Agricultural Producers	FDACS-04b	Cost-Share BMP Projects	Cost-share projects paid for by FDACS. Project treatment areas and reductions based on FDACS June 2024 Enrollment and NSILT Loading tool (based on FSAID IX) developed by FDACS.	Agricultural BMPs	Ongoing	NA	4,656	Hornsby Springshed-Inside PFA	$0	NA	NA - $0.00

Proj ID	Lead Entity	Partners	Project Number	Project Name	Project Description	Project Type	Project Status	Estimated Completion Date	TN Reduction (lbs/yr)	Crediting Location	Cost Estimate	Funding Source	Funding Amount
	FDACS	Agricultural Producers	FDACS-04c	Cost-Share BMP Projects	Cost-share projects paid for by FDACS. Project treatment areas and reductions based on FDACS June 2024 Enrollment and NSILT Loading tool (based on FSAID IX) developed by FDACS.	Agricultural BMPs	Ongoing	NA	14,114	Ichetucknee Springshed-Inside PFA	$0	NA	NA - $0.00
	FDACS	Agricultural Producers	FDACS-04d	Cost-Share BMP Projects	Cost-share projects paid for by FDACS. Project treatment areas and reductions based on FDACS June 2024 Enrollment and NSILT Loading tool (based on FSAID IX) developed by FDACS.	Agricultural BMPs	Ongoing	NA	7,988	Outside Springsheds	$0	NA	NA - $0.00
2095	FDOT District 2	Not provided	FDOT-01	Fertilizer Elimination	Eliminate fertilizer use in rights-of way. Reduction estimate of load to land surface of 16,901 lb-N/yr.	Fertilizer Cessation	Completed	2010	4,563	Basinwide	$0	Not provided	Not provided - $0.00
2124	Gilchrist County	SRWMD	GC-01	Santa Fe Park and Boat Ramp	Replace boat ramp, add docks and canoe launch, and remedy drainage to reduce sediment and nutrients.	Regional Stormwater Treatment	Completed	2019	NA	Devil's Complex Springshed-Inside PFA	$129,800	SRWMD; Gilchrist County	SRWMD - $123,000.00; Gilchrist County - $6,800.00
2113	GRU	DEP	GRU-01	Wetland Creation at Shands Facility	Constructed a recharge wetland at a new Shands facility that removes nutrients from reclaimed water and stormwater and provides aquifer recharge.	Constructed Wetland Treatment	Canceled	NA	NA	NA	$0	NA	NA - $0.00
2098	GRU	SRWMD	GRU-02	Oakmont Reclaimed Water Main Extension	Provide reclaimed water to irrigate 136 residential properties and 3 acres of common area.	WWTF Diversion to Reuse	Canceled	NA	NA	Outside Springsheds	$0	NA	NA - $0.00
2099	GRU	SRWMD	GRU-03	Oakmont Recharge Wetland	Construct a recharge wetland in an existing stormwater retention basin that will reduce nutrients while recharging aquifer. Canceled in 2019. Scope has changed - GRU looking into feasibility of new project for a large constructed infiltrating wetland.	Constructed Wetland Treatment	Canceled	NA	NA	Outside Springsheds	$0	NA	NA - $0.00

Proj ID	Lead Entity	Partners	Project Number	Project Name	Project Description	Project Type	Project Status	Estimated Completion Date	TN Reduction (lbs/yr)	Crediting Location	Cost Estimate	Funding Source	Funding Amount
6300	GRU	SRWMD	GRU-04	S.W. Nature Park, Groundwater Recharge Wetland	Create a 75-acre groundwater recharge wetland park that will receive 3 MGD of reclaimed water. The wetland will reduce nutrients in the water while simultaneously recharging the aquifer. The recharge will help support flows at the Santa Fe River.	Constructed Wetland Treatment	Underway	2026	TBD	Outside Springsheds	$12,000,000	SRWMD; GRU Ratepayers	SRWMD - $6,000,000.00; GRU Ratepayers - $6,000,000.00
7067	GRU	Homeowners	GRU-05	OSTDS Phase Out - 2019	Abandon 1 OSTDS and connect to GRUs sanitary sewer system and reduce fecal coliform and nutrient loading. Original Credit of 5 lbs-TN/yr. Project was captured in updated loading estimates.	OSTDS Phase Out	Completed	2019	0	Outside Springsheds	$29,000	GRU; Homeowner Contribution	GRU - $29,000.00; Homeowner Contribution - $0.00
2109	Management Strategies	TBD	GOLF-01	Private Golf Course Approach	Private golf courses are expected to follow the BMP manual. Additionally, all golf courses will be required to submit nutrient management plans to DEP.	Golf Course or Sports Field BMPs	Planned	TBD	NA	Basinwide	$0	TBD	TBD - $0.00
2111	Management Strategies	TBD	WU-01	Wastewater Treatment Facility Approach	Achieved by WWTF policy if implemented BMAP-wide. The policy will be implemented through the permit renewal process.	WWTF Upgrade	Planned	TBD	NA	Basinwide	$0	TBD	TBD - $0.00
2100	SRWMD	DEP; Local Governments	SRWMD-01	Suwannee River Surface Water Improvement Management (SWIM) Plan	Implementation and periodic review and update of the Suwannee River SWIM Plan which includes the Santa Fe River and Ichetucknee River.	Study	Completed	2017	NA	Basinwide	$238,563	DEP; SRWMD; NFWF	DEP - $0.00; SRWMD - $0.00; NFWF - $138,563.00
2101	SRWMD	Dairy Producers; DEP	SRWMD-02	Improved Nutrient Application Practices in Dairy Operations - Phase 2	To date, 9 agreements with dairies to install screen separators to reduce wastewater solids. 1 agreement with a dairy in the Santa Fe Basin. DEP has allocated $2,120,000 for districtwide program. Load reduction to land estimate of 1,485 lb-N/yr. to date	Agricultural BMPs	Underway	TBD	200	Basinwide	$838,245	SRWMD; DEP	SRWMD - $0.00; DEP - $2,120,000.00

Proj ID	Lead Entity	Partners	Project Number	Project Name	Project Description	Project Type	Project Status	Estimated Completion Date	TN Reduction (lbs/yr)	Crediting Location	Cost Estimate	Funding Source	Funding Amount
2102	SRWMD	Dairy Producers; DEP	SRWMD-03	Dairy Wastewater System Improvement	Cost-share projects with dairies to invest in advanced treatment technologies (bioreactors), additional wastewater storage, and advanced manure solid separation. Canceled because project location was determined to be outside the basin.	Dairy Remediation	Canceled	NA	NA	Basinwide	$0	NA	NA - $0.00
2112	SRWMD	Dairy Producers; DEP; FDACS	SRWMD-04	Dairy Wastewater Conservation and Nutrient Optimization Project	Improve the management of dairy wastewater by increasing storage pond sizes to achieve greater nutrient uptake and irrigation efficiencies. Six agreements executed to date. Canceled because project location was determined to be outside the basin.	Agricultural BMPs	Canceled	NA	NA	Basinwide	$0	DEP; SRWMD	DEP - $0.00; SRWMD - $0.00
2103	SRWMD	Agricultural Producers; DEP; Landowners; Local Governments; Private Companies	SRWMD-05	Sustainable Suwannee Springs Agriculture Pilot Program - Low Input Agriculture	Operators submit proposals for less intensive cropping, changing the type, or changing fallow or native landscape land use for a certain amount of time or a permanent conservation easement. Load reduction to land estimate of 187,500 lb-N/yr.	Agricultural BMPs	Underway	2029	33,845	Ichetucknee Springshed-Inside PFA	$2,500,000	DEP Springs; DEP; SRWMD	DEP Springs - $0.00; DEP - $2,500,000.00; SRWMD - $0.00
2092	SRWMD	Landowners; DEP; Agricultural Producers; Local Governments; Private Companies	SRWMD-06	Sustainable Suwannee Springs Agriculture Pilot Program - Advanced Water Quality Improvement Technologies	Agriculture operators, landowners, local governments, private companies, other entities may submit proposals for advanced technologies that can cost-effectively reduce nitrogen in groundwater that contributes to spring flow. 1 completed.	Agricultural BMPs	Underway	2025	1,832	Outside Springsheds	$190,273	SRWMD; DEP	SRWMD - $0.00; DEP - $190,273.00

Proj ID	Lead Entity	Partners	Project Number	Project Name	Project Description	Project Type	Project Status	Estimated Completion Date	TN Reduction (lbs/yr)	Crediting Location	Cost Estimate	Funding Source	Funding Amount
2104	SRWMD	Agricultural Producers; Landowners Private Companies; Local Governments	SRWMD-07	Regional Initiative Valuing Environmental Resources (RIVER) Program	Cost-share projects for improving wastewater facilities, preventing potential discharge of wastewater into receiving waters, and reducing loads from septic systems. This project was canceled in 2018 because detailed, individual projects were added.	WWTF Upgrade	Canceled	NA	NA	Basinwide	$0	NA	NA - $0.00
2107	SRWMD	Agricultural Producers	SRWMD-08	Precision Agricultural Practices	Provide cost-share funds to agricultural producers to implement precision nutrient and irrigation management technology. Districtwide program benefits split between Santa Fe and Suwannee BMAPs. Reflects contracts completed through 2023.	Agricultural BMPs	Completed	2023	36,372	Basinwide	$833,333	Producers; DEP	Producers - $208,333.00; DEP - $625,000.00
2108	SRWMD	Agricultural Producers; DEP	SRWMD-09	Nursery Water Conservation Initiative	Assist nurseries in upgrading from overhead irrigation methods to micro-spray or drip irrigation. Load reduction to land estimate of 45,000 lb-N/yr. Canceled in 2019. In 2022 program has been reinstated.	Agricultural BMPs	Planned	2025	TBD	Basinwide	$0	DEP	DEP - $940,000.00
4565	SRWMD	DEP; Agricultural Producers	SRWMD-10	Precision Ag 2	Provide cost share funds to agricultural producers within the PFA and BMAP to reduce nutrients and conserve water.	Agricultural BMPs	Underway	2024	TBD	Basinwide	$100,000	SRWMD; DEP; Producers	SRWMD - $0.00; DEP - $750,000.00; Producers - $250,000.00
4566	SRWMD	Agricultural Producers; DEP	SRWMD-11	Accelerating Suwannee River Restoration and Silviculture Management	Incentivize silviculture and rural land conservation to reduce groundwater pumping and nitrogen loading in the Middle Suwannee springshed and Ichetucknee River.	Agricultural BMPs	Planned	2025	TBD	Basinwide	$0	DEP; SRWMD	DEP - $0.00; SRWMD - $0.00
4567	SRWMD	City of Lake City	SRWMD-12	Ichetucknee Springs Quality & Quantity Enhancement	Increase the wetland polishing from 1 MGD to 3 MGD with estimated recharge of 2 MGD and additional nutrient reduction by adding gravity flow and a recharge well.	Wastewater - Injection Well	Underway	2025	NA	Ichetucknee Springshed-Inside PFA	$1,850,000	DEP; City of Lake City	DEP - $1,800,000.00; City of Lake City - $50,000.00

Proj ID	Lead Entity	Partners	Project Number	Project Name	Project Description	Project Type	Project Status	Estimated Completion Date	TN Reduction (lbs/yr)	Crediting Location	Cost Estimate	Funding Source	Funding Amount
4568	SRWMD	City of Lake City	SRWMD-13	Gwen Lake	The Phase 1 project addresses stormwater, flooding, erosion, and sedimentation concerns that impair the water quality and water storage capacity of Gwen Lake and adjacent waterways. Gwen Lake Phase II Project ID 5460 is still in the planning phase.	Regional Stormwater Treatment	Completed	2021	NA	Outside Springsheds	$466,306	SRWMD; City of Lake City	SRWMD - $200,000.00; City of Lake City - $266,306.00
5460	SRWMD	City of Lake City	SRWMD-14	Gwen Lake Phase 2	Installation of a drop structure behind the Parkview Baptist Church stormwater pond, regrade the conveyance, install stabilization to slow the water velocity and reduce the erosion and sedimentation contributing to the infill of Gwen Lake.	Regional Stormwater Treatment	Planned	2027	NA	Outside Springsheds	$220,000	SRWMD	SRWMD - $220,000.00
5472	SRWMD	Gilchrist County	SRWMD-15	Gilchrist NE 2nd Way Park	Stormwater improvements and bank stabilization.	Shoreline Stabilization	Underway	2025	NA	Outside Springsheds	$316,444	Gilchrist County; SRWMD; FWC	Gilchrist County - $4,500.00; SRWMD - $143,970.00; FWC - $167,974.00
5473	SRWMD	FDOT; Columbia County; SRWMD	SRWMD-16	SR 247 Regional Pond (non-FDOT portion)	Construct regional pond to treat runoff on SR 247 and I-75 benefitting Cannon Creek, a tributary to the Santa Fe River.	Regional Stormwater Treatment	Planned	2025	TBD	Ichetucknee Springshed-Inside PFA	$5,200,000	SRWMD; DEP; FDOT	SRWMD - $651,105.00; DEP - $2,510,000.00; FDOT - $0.00
5474	SRWMD	DEP	SRWMD-17	Ft. White Regional Sanitary System	Phase 1 - Construct a regional wastewater treatment facility and remove 255 existing septic systems in a phased project.	OSTDS Phase Out	Planned	2030	TBD	Devil's Complex Springshed-Inside PFA	$0	DEP	DEP - $5,337,637.00
5475	SRWMD	DEP; Federal WW Grant; Lake Butler	SRWMD-18	Lake Butler AWT Upgrade Phases 1-3	Advanced wastewater treatment facility and created wetland to be constructed in three phases. This project is a duplicate with LB-01 (ProjID 6435). Reductions will be reported under 6435.	WWTF Upgrade	Underway	2027	NA	Outside Springsheds	$0	Federal WW Grant; DEP; SRWMD; Lake Butler	Federal WW Grant - $29,600,000.00; DEP - $3,400,000.00; SRWMD - $0.00; Lake Butler - $3,000,000.00

Proj ID	Lead Entity	Partners	Project Number	Project Name	Project Description	Project Type	Project Status	Estimated Completion Date	TN Reduction (lbs/yr)	Crediting Location	Cost Estimate	Funding Source	Funding Amount
5797	SRWMD	Alachua Conservation Trust; DEP; SRWMD	SRWMD-19	Santa Fe Springs	Land acquisition with conservation easement will ensure less intensive land use.	Land Use Change	Completed	2023	TBD	Outside Springsheds	$1,390,410	DEP; SRWMD; ACT	DEP - $617,000.00; SRWMD - $139,091.00; ACT - $634,369.00
5798	SRWMD	DEP; Municipalities	SRWMD-21	Wastewater Feasibility Studies	Conduct analysis for using reclaimed water including treatment wetlands.	Study	Underway	2025	NA	Basinwide	$700,000	DEP	DEP - $700,000.00
5799	SRWMD	DEP; Alachua Conservation Trust; FWC	SRWMD-22	Devil's Ear	Land acquisition with conservation easement will ensure less intensive land use.	Land Acquisition	Underway	2026	NA	Devil's Complex Springshed-Inside PFA	$8,382,555	DEP; FWC; ACt; 3rd party	DEP - $2,000,000.00; FWC - $0.00; ACt - $0.00; 3rd party - $6,382,555.00
6677	SRWMD	Alachua Conservation Trust	SRWMD-23	Graham Farm Land Acquisition	Fee simple acquisition of approximately 441 acres adjacent to 1.3 miles of Olustee Creek. Land use change from grazing (233 Ac) and row crop (172 Ac.) to long leaf pine. Includes 21 Ac wetland.	Land Use Change	Planned	2026	NA	Outside Springsheds	$1,681,700	ACT; DEP	ACT - $781,700.00; DEP - $900,000.00
6678	SRWMD	Columbia County; DEO; DEP	SRWMD-24	North Florida Mega Industrial Park	Upgrade the WWTF to meet Advanced Waste treatment (AWT) and Public Access Reuse (PAR).	WWTF Upgrade	Underway	2025	NA	Ichetucknee Springshed-Outside PFA	$0	ARPA; Columbia County; DEO; DEP wastewater grant	ARPA - $6,000,000.00; Columbia County - $1,200,000.00; DEO - $10,200,000.00; DEP wastewater grant - $6,379,615.00
6694	SRWMD	Agricultural Producers; DEP	SRWMD-25	Agricultural Springs Protection	Cost-share program for producers to implement practices to reduce nutrient impacts and groundwater pumping. Focus on BMAPs, PFA, and water supply planning areas. Treated acres will be updated as work progresses. $6 M funding is District wide.	Agricultural BMPs	Underway	2027	2,296	Basinwide	$0	Agricultural Producers; DEP Springs	Agricultural Producers - $675.00; DEP Springs - $6,000.00

Proj ID	Lead Entity	Partners	Project Number	Project Name	Project Description	Project Type	Project Status	Estimated Completion Date	TN Reduction (lbs/yr)	Crediting Location	Cost Estimate	Funding Source	Funding Amount
7022	SRWMD	Local Producers	SRWMD-26	Fertigation	Fertigating allows the producer to split up the application of fertilizer needed to grow a crop over the entire length of a growing season. Reflect contracts completed through 2023.	Agricultural BMPs	Completed	2023	1,375	Basinwide	$48,649	SRWMD; DEP; Local Producers	SRWMD - $0.00; DEP - $34,488.00; Local Producers - $14,161.00
7023	SRWMD	Agricultural Producers	SRWMD-27	District Cost Share	Best Management Practices cost share including but not limited to soil moisture probes, irrigation retrofits or upgrades, alternative water supply, centralized control systems not covered under DEP grants. Reflects contracts completed through 2023.	Agricultural BMPs	Completed	2023	26,092	Basinwide	$48,649	Agricultural Producers; SRWMD	Agricultural Producers - $27,711.00; SRWMD - $224,799.00
7084	SRWMD	Agricultural Producers	SRWMD-28	AWS Pivot Retrofits	AWS Pivot retrofits completed through 2023.	Agricultural BMPs	Completed	2023	134	Basinwide	$48,649	SRWMD; Agricultural Producers; DEP AWS	SRWMD - $0.00; Agricultural Producers - $40,868.00; DEP AWS - $49,500.00
7586	SRWMD	Agricultural Producers	SRWMD-29	AWS Pivot Retrofits 2024	AWS Pivot retrofits completed through 2024.	Agricultural BMPs	Underway	2024	22	Devil's Complex Springshed-Inside PFA	$41,939	SRWMD; Agricultural Producers; DEP AWS	SRWMD - $0.00; Agricultural Producers - $5,015.50; DEP AWS - $36,923.17
7585	SRWMD	Agricultural Producers	SRWMD-30	District Cost Share 2024	Best Management Practices cost share including but not limited to soil moisture probes, irrigation retrofits or upgrades, alternative water supply, centralized control systems not covered under DEP grants. Reflects contracts completed through 2024.	Agricultural BMPs	Underway	2024	43	Devil's Complex Springshed-Outside PFA	$1,648	Agricultural Producers; SRWMD	SRWMD - $1,235.82; Agricultural Producers - $411.94
7572	SRWMD	Agricultural Producers; DEP	SRWMD-31	Agricultural Springs Protection 2024	Cost-share program for producers to implement practices to reduce nutrient impacts and groundwater pumping. Focus on BMAPs, PFA, and water supply planning areas. Treated acres will be updated as work progresses. $6 M funding is District wide.	Agricultural BMPs	Underway	2027	412	Basinwide	$50,211	Agricultural Producers; DEP Springs; SRWMD	Agricultural Producers - $5,833.68; DEP Springs - $44,377.52; SRWMD - $0.00

Proj ID	Lead Entity	Partners	Project Number	Project Name	Project Description	Project Type	Project Status	Estimated Completion Date	TN Reduction (lbs/yr)	Crediting Location	Cost Estimate	Funding Source	Funding Amount
7341	SRWMD	Agricultural Producers	SRWMD-32	Precision Agricultural Practices 2024	Provide cost-share funds to agricultural producers to implement precision nutrient and irrigation management technology. Districtwide program benefits split between Santa Fe and Suwannee BMAPs. Reflects contracts completed through 2024.	Agricultural BMPs	Underway	2024	189	Devil's Complex Springshed-Outside PFA	$0	DEP; Producers	DEP - $44,580.00; Producers - $14,860.00
7242	Town of Fort White	Town of Fort White Town Council	FW-01	Fort White Wastewater Treatment Plant and Collection System	Construction of 50,000 GPD WWTP and collection system to eliminate 130 OSTDS in the Town of Fort White, FL.	OSTDS Phase Out	Underway	2025	2,038	Devil's Complex Springshed-Inside PFA	$9,800,000	DEP-WW	DEP-WW - $9,800,000.00

Appendix C. Planning for Additional Management Strategies

Responsible entities must submit a sufficient list of creditable projects with estimated reductions which demonstrates how the entity is going to meet their milestone to DEP no later than January 14, 2026, to be compliant with the upcoming BMAP milestone or be subject to department enforcement.

If any lead entity is unable to submit a sufficient list of eligible management strategies to meet their next 5-year milestone reductions, specific project identification efforts are required to be submitted by January 14, 2026. Any such project identification efforts must define the purpose of and include a timeline to identify sufficient projects to meet the upcoming milestone. The project description and estimated completion date for any such project identification effort must be provided and reflect the urgency of defining, funding, and implementing projects to meet the upcoming and future BMAP milestones.

These planning efforts are ineligible for BMAP credit themselves but are necessary to demonstrate additional eligible management actions will be forthcoming and BMAP compliance will be achieved. Only those entities that provide sufficient project identification efforts will be deemed as possessing a defined compliance schedule. Those entities without an adequate project list or a defined compliance schedule to meet their upcoming 5-year milestone may be subject to enforcement actions. Examples of project identification efforts include the following:

- Planning and identifying water quality projects and related costs and schedules in specific plans.
  - Feasibility studies (e.g., stormwater feasibility studies or wastewater feasibility studies).
  - Flood mitigation plans with nutrient management components.
  - Basinwide water quality management plans.
  - Nutrient management plans.
- Applying for external project funding.
- Developing interagency/interdepartmental agreements or MOUs for collaboration on nutrient reduction projects that cross jurisdictional or administrative boundaries.
- Updating future growth considerations in local comprehensive plans, land development reviews, and audits of relevant codes and ordinances
- Updating existing remediation plans.
- Monitoring water quality in support of project planning and implementation.
- Researching innovative technologies.

Appendix D. Santa Fe River PFA Reports

A PFA (e.g., Devil's Complex PFA; Hornsby Spring PFA; and the Ichetucknee Spring PFA) is defined as the area(s) of a basin where the Floridan aquifer is generally most vulnerable to pollutant inputs and where there is a known connectivity between groundwater pathways and an OFS. As required by the Florida Springs and Aquifer Protection Act, DEP delineated PFAs for the Devil's Complex Springshed and the Hornsby-Treehouse Springshed (DEP, 2017), as well as the Ichetucknee Springs Group Springshed (DEP, 2017). These PFAs are adopted and incorporated by reference into this BMAP. Detailed information on the PFAs is available in report format at the following link: https://floridadep.gov/dear/water-quality-restoration/content/bmap-documents-meeting-materials-and-recordings.

Appendix E. OSTDS Remediation Plan

Section 373.807, F.S., requires that if, during the development of a BMAP for an OFS, DEP identifies OSTDS as contributors of at least 20% of nonpoint source nitrogen pollution in a PFA or if DEP determines remediation is necessary to achieve the TMDL, the BMAP must include an OSTDS remediation plan.

Based on the Santa Fe River NSILT estimates and GIS coverages, OSTDS contribute approximately 17% of the pollutant loading in the BMAP. Irrespective of the percent contribution from OSTDS, DEP has determined that an OSTDS remediation plan is necessary to achieve the TMDLs and to limit the increase in nitrogen loads from future growth.

Permitting for OSTDS is implemented either by DEP, delegated counties, or by County Health Departments under an interagency agreement. To aid in implementation, the DEP Map Direct webpage includes a detailed downloadable springs PFA boundary shapefile for planning purposes. DEP also maintains on its website an interactive map of the PFA and BMAP boundaries; the map can be easily searched for specific street address locations (currently available at https://floridadep.gov/BMAPs-ARP-OSTDS).

E.1 Plan Elements

E.1.1 Installation of New OSTDS

Beginning July 1, 2023, sections 373.811 and 403.067, F.S., prohibit new OSTDS serving lots of one acre or less where central sewer is available. Within the Santa Fe BMAP area, if central sewer is unavailable on any lot size within the PFA or on lots of one acre or less outside the PFA, then the owner must install a DEP-approved enhanced nutrient-reducing OSTDS that achieves at least 65% nitrogen reduction, or other wastewater system that achieves at least 65% reduction. The OSTDS remediation plan was updated in this BMAP iteration to include this additional requirement for new systems.

Installation of new OSTDS is permitted pursuant to Chapter 62-6, F.A.C., and includes not only systems installed on a property where one has not previously been installed, but also systems installed to replace illegal systems, systems installed in addition to existing systems, and other new systems. Permitting requirements with respect to the definition of "new" or "one acre or less" will be followed for this remediation plan. To meet the enhanced nitrogen treatment requirement, the system must be a DEP-approved enhanced nutrient reducing system meeting at least 65% nitrogen reduction.

E.1.2 Modification or Repair of Existing OSTDS

Currently, the remediation plan for this BMAP does not include requirements for the addition of enhanced nitrogen reducing treatment to conventional systems upon the need for modification or repair of existing OSTDS. However, remediation of existing conventional OSTDS will still be beneficial to mitigate nitrogen loading from this source, restore associated groundwater and surface water to achieve the TMDL and to minimize nitrogen loads from future growth.

For existing OSTDS, the owner must connect to sewer within 365 days of written notification by the utility that connection to its sewer line is available. A utility is statutorily required (section 381.00655, F.S.) to provide written notice to existing OSTDS owners regarding the availability of sewer lines for connection. Additionally, existing OSTDS needing repair or modification must connect to available sewer lines within 90 days of notification by DEP.

To facilitate an inventory of noncompliant properties, by February 2, 2026, and every two years thereafter, each utility with sewer lines in the BMAP shall provide DEP a list of properties with existing OSTDS where sewer is available but have not been connected. For each identified property, include the date(s) which the utility provided written notice to the owners of the availability of sewer.

E.1.4 Other Plan Elements

Section 373.807, F.S., also requires that the OSTDS remediation plan contain the following elements.

- An evaluation of credible scientific information on the effect of nutrients, particularly forms of nitrogen, on springs and spring systems. (See **Section E.2**.)
- Options for repair, upgrade, replacement, drain field modification, the addition of effective nitrogen-reducing features, connection to a central sewer system, or other action. (See **Section E.3**.)
- A public education plan to provide area residents with reliable, understandable information about OSTDS and springs. (See **Section E.4**.)
- Cost-effective and financially feasible projects necessary to reduce the nutrient impacts from OSTDS. (See **Section 2** and **Appendix B**.)
- A priority ranking for each project for funding contingent on appropriations in the General Appropriations Act. (See **Section 2** and **Appendix B**.)

Section 373.807, F.S., defines an OSTDS as a system that contains a standard subsurface, filled, or mound drain field system; an aerobic treatment unit; a graywater system tank; a laundry wastewater system tank; a septic tank; a grease interceptor; a pump tank; a solids or effluent pump; a waterless, incinerating, or organic waste–composting toilet; or a sanitary pit privy that is installed or proposed to be installed beyond the building sewer on land of the owner or on other land on which the owner has the legal right to install such a system. The term includes any item placed within, or intended to be used as a part of or in conjunction with, the system. The term does not include package sewage treatment facilities and other treatment works regulated under Chapter 403, F.S.

E.2 Collection and Evaluation of Credible Scientific Information

As discussed in **Section 2,** DEP developed the Santa Fe River NSILT, a planning tool that provides estimates of nitrogen loading to groundwater based on the best available scientific data for a particular geographic area. The NSILT results were peer reviewed by SRWMD and FDACS. Additional technical support information concerning the NSILT can be found in **Appendix F**.

DEP developed calculation methods to estimate nitrogen reductions associated with OSTDS enhancement and replacement projects, WWTF projects, and stormwater projects.

Monitoring and research:

- Improve understanding of the ecological responses to nutrient enrichment and reductions.

- Maintain and expand water quality monitoring programs.
- Report annual status and trends.
- Evaluate new and emerging technologies.
- Research and develop advanced septic systems.
- Monthly water sampling at the spring.

Completed projects:

- Florida Onsite Sewage Nitrogen Reduction Strategies Study.
- Long Term Performance and Operational Experience for Non-Proprietary Passive Nitrogen Reducing Onsite Sewage Treatment And Disposal Systems (https://floridadep.gov/water/onsite-sewage/content/onsite-sewage-research-reports)(DEP).

Ongoing projects:

- Quarterly springs water quality monitoring.
- Stream water quality monitoring.
- Monitoring of in-ground nitrogen reducing biofilters.

Proposed projects:

- UFA nutrient modeling.
- Springs Initiative modeling.
- Groundwater quality monitoring for BMAP assessment.
- Performance Monitoring on Advanced OSTDS in Florida.
- Other DEP projects.

E.3 Remediation Options

As required by Florida law, this OSTDS remediation plan identifies remediation options for existing OSTDS, including repair, upgrade, replacement, drain field modification, the addition of effective nitrogen-reducing features, connection to a central sewer system, or other action. More simply, remediation options can be classified as enhancement or replacement. DEP's Onsite Sewage Program maintains a list of approved nitrogen-reducing systems on its website: https://floridadep.gov/water/onsite-sewage/content/product-listings-and-approval-requirements.

Figure E-1 shows the location of OSTDS in the PFA based on the FLWMI. The NSILT estimates that OSTDS contribute approximately 10% of the pollutant loading to groundwater in the Devil's Ear springshed, 9% in the Hornsby springshed, 23% in the Ichetucknee springshed, and 20% in the area outside of the springsheds in the BMAP. **Table E-1**, **Table E-2**, and **Table E-3** list the number of existing OSTDS in the PFA for each springshed on lots one acre or less and the estimated nitrogen reductions associated with enhancement or connection to sewer.

Table E-1. Estimated reduction credits for OSTDS enhancement or sewer Devil's Ear springshed

*Estimated reductions are for either enhancement or sewer per parcel classification. Reductions cannot be combined for the same parcel classification but can be combined between the different classifications. For example, the sewer credit associated with parcels one acre or less in size can be combined with the sewer credit associated with parcels greater than one acre in size.

Recharge Area	OSTDS Parcels One Acre or Less in PFA	Credit for Enhancement (lbs/yr)	Credit for Sewer (lbs/yr)
High	469	3,801	7,222
Medium	88	383	729
Low	0	0	0
Total	**557**	**4,184**	**7,951**

Table E-2. Estimated reduction credits for OSTDS enhancement or sewer Hornsby springshed

*Estimated reductions are for either enhancement or sewer per parcel classification. Reductions cannot be combined for the same parcel classification but can be combined between the different classifications. For example, the sewer credit associated with parcels one acre or less in size can be combined with the sewer credit associated with parcels greater than one acre in size.

Recharge Area	OSTDS Parcels One Acre or Less in PFA	Credit for Enhancement (lbs/yr)	Credit for Sewer (lbs/yr)
High	283	2,211	4,201
Medium	5	22	41
Low	71	62	117
Total	**359**	**2,294**	**4,359**

Table E-3. Estimated reduction credits for OSTDS enhancement or sewer Ichetucknee springshed

*Estimated reductions are for either enhancement or sewer per parcel classification. Reductions cannot be combined for the same parcel classification but can be combined between the different classifications. For example, the sewer credit associated with parcels one acre or less in size can be combined with the sewer credit associated with parcels greater than one acre in size.

Recharge Area	OSTDS Parcels One Acre or Less in PFA	Credit for Enhancement (lbs/yr)	Credit for Sewer (lbs/yr)
High	4,256	35,125	66,737
Medium	643	2,948	5,601
Low	111	102	193
Total	**5,010**	**38,175**	**72,532**

Estimated reductions are for either enhancement or sewer per parcel classification. Reductions cannot be combined for the same parcel classification but can be combined between the different classifications. For example, the sewer credit associated with parcels one acre or less in size can be combined with the sewer credit associated with parcels greater than one acre in size. Nitrogen impacts from new development could also be reduced through prohibiting new conventional OSTDS on all lot sizes throughout the BMAP area. Local governments can develop programs to help fund the additional costs required to upgrade existing OSTDS to include nutrient reducing features. The funding program will be designed to prioritize OSTDS where it is most economical and efficient to add nutrient reducing features (i.e., systems needing a permit for a repair or modification, within the PFA, and on lots of one acre or less). Local governments can apply for competitive grant funding from DEP programs, which are available at ProtectingFloridaTogether.com.



Figure E-1. Locations of OSTDS in the PFA in the Santa Fe River BMAP

E.4 Public Education Plan

DEP will develop and disseminate educational material focused on homeowners and guidance for builders and septic system contractors. The materials will identify the need for enhanced nitrogen reducing OSTDS along with the requirements for installing nitrogen reducing technologies under this OSTDS remediation plan. DEP will coordinate with industry groups such as Florida Home Builders Association and FOWA.

DEP's Onsite Sewage Program's website provides information on the following:

- The requirements for nitrogen-reducing systems for springs protection and BMAPs: https://floridadep.gov/water/onsite-sewage/content/springs-protection-and-basin-management-action-plans-bmaps.
- Information for septic system owners and buyers: https://floridadep.gov/water/onsite-sewage/content/information-septic-system-owners-and-buyers.
- Information for septic tank contractors: https://floridadep.gov/water/onsite-sewage/content/septic-tank-contractor-registration.

UF-IFAS has developed a website that includes frequently asked questions, and extensive information for septic system owners and local governments: https://water.ifas.ufl.edu/septic-systems/your-septic-system/.

Appendix F. Technical Support Information

The pages that follow are the Technical Support Document that describe the methods that were used for the NSILT. This document is a stand-alone report, so the pages, tables, and figures are numbered accordingly.

Technical Support Document
2023 Nitrogen Source Inventory Loading Tools for Springs
Basin Management Action Plans

Division of Environmental Assessment and Restoration
Watershed Planning & Coordination
Florida Department of Environmental Protection

June 2025

2600 Blair Stone Rd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399
Floridadep.gov

Acknowledgments

This document describes the data sources and values that were used by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) in the 2023 Nitrogen Source Inventory Loading Tools (NSILTs) updates for the following basin management action plans (BMAPs) 2025 updates:

- Chassahowitzka/Homosassa Springs Groups
- Crystal River/Kings Bay
- DeLeon Spring
- Gemini Springs
- Jackson Blue Spring and Merritts Mill Pond Basin
- Lower and Middle Suwannee River Basin
- Rainbow Springs Group and Rainbow Springs Run/Silver Springs, Silver Springs Group, and Upper Silver River
- Santa Fe River Basin
- Upper Wakulla River and Wakulla Spring
- Volusia Blue Spring
- Wacissa River and Wacissa Spring Group
- Weeki Wachee/Aripeka Spring
- Wekiwa and Rock Springs

For additional information on NSILTs and springs water quality restoration efforts, please contact:

Florida Department of Environmental Protection/ Water Quality Restoration Program
2600 Blair Stone Road, Mail Station 3565
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2400
Email: BMAPProgram@FloridaDEP.gov

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments 2
Table of Contents 3
List of Figures 5
List of Tables 5
Introduction 6
Background 7
Estimating Nitrogen Inputs to the Land Surface 8
  Springshed Boundary Adjustments 8
  Boundary Data 9
Atmospheric Deposition 9
WWTFs 10
OSTDS 11
Farm Fertilizer 12
  Blueberries 13
  Soybeans 13
  Sorghum 13
  Field Crops 13
  Nurseries 16
  Pasture Lands 16
Livestock Waste, Except Dairies 17
Dairies 18
  CAFOs 19
  Non-CAFO Dairies 19
Horse Farms/Cattle Farms 20
UTF 20
  Single Family Residential Fertilizer Loading 20
    Determining Parcels 21
    Determining Likeliness to Fertilize 21
    Fertilization Rates by BMAP 21
  Other UTF 22

Sports Turfgrass Fertilizer 23
Golf Courses 23
Other (Non-Golf) Sports Turfgrass Fertilizer 24
Biosolids 24
Estimating Loading to Floridan Aquifer 24
Biochemical Attenuation 24
Recharge 26
References 26
TSD Appendix A. Important Links 32

List of Figures

Figure 1. Map of the spring BMAPs and springsheds with updated NSILTs 7

List of Tables

Table 1. Average TN concentration by facility size for WWTFs with insufficient data 10
Table 2. Year the FWRI data were updated by county 11
Table 3. 2020 U.S. Census persons per household by county 11
Table 4. FSAID crop categories fertilizer application rates in lbs-N/ac 13
Table 5. FSAID nursery and pasture crop categories 17
Table 6. Livestock waste factors by livestock type 18
Table 7. Nitrogen loss percentages for non-CAFO manure handling practices 19
Table 8. Single family residential UTF information 21
Table 9. Other UTF land use categories and estimated impervious area 23
Table 10. Green Industries BMP regional fertilizer application rates 23
Table 11. 2023 NSILT biochemical attenuation factors 24

Introduction

The Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) developed a Nitrogen Source Inventory and Loading Tool (NSILT) to provide information on the major sources of nitrogen in the springs basin management action plan (BMAP) areas (Eller and Katz 2017). These major sources are as follows: Atmospheric deposition; wastewater treatment facilities (WWTFs); urban fertilizers; onsite sewage treatment and disposal systems (OSTDS, also known as "septic systems"); biosolids; livestock waste; and agricultural fertilizers. The approach applies to the groundwater contributing area (or springshed) for the impaired springs and the surface waters they augment. Over time, the nitrogen sources in the spring BMAP areas have changed and the DEP methodology for estimating nitrogen loads has improved. These improvements are a result of additional information as well as new tools that provide better estimates of nitrogen loads.

This technical support information identifies the data sources and methodology used for the 2023 NSILT estimates. This report documents the assumptions used by DEP when applying the NSILT approach to the adopted springs BMAPs as of January 2025. The NSILT is an Arc geographic information system (ArcGIS) and spreadsheet-based tool that provides spatial estimates of the relative current contributions from major nitrogen sources. The NSILT approach involves estimating the nitrogen load to the land surface for various source categories, then applying a source-specific biochemical attenuation factor and a location-specific recharge factor to determine the impact to groundwater quality in the Upper Floridan aquifer (UFA). The estimated load to groundwater determines the scope of reduction strategies needed for BMAP implementation for each source category. Multiple public meetings were held to share the NSILT methodology and results as well as to solicit comments. Between January 2023 to January 2025, location-specific adjustments were made based on feedback from stakeholders. Additional NSILT data and resources are available upon request.

Figure 1 shows the BMAPs that have updated NSILTs described by this document, which includes the following springsheds:

- Chassahowitzka Spring Group
- Homosassa Springs Group
- Crystal River/Kings Bay
- DeLeon Spring
- Gemini Springs
- Jackson Blue Spring
- Rainbow Springs Group
- Santa Fe: Devil's Ear, Hornsby, and Ichetucknee Springs, and Outside Springsheds
- Silver Springs Group
- Suwannee: Madison Blue, Middle Suwannee, Fanning/Manatee Springs, and Outside Springsheds
- Volusia Blue Spring
- Wacissa Spring Group
- Wakulla Spring
- Weeki Wachee/Aripeka Spring
- Wekiwa/Rock Springs



Figure 1. Map of the spring BMAPs and springsheds with updated NSILTs

Background

Florida springs provide sites of recreational and cultural value as well as sources of potable water and afford a way to assess regional groundwater quality. Springs integrate groundwater

vertically, spatially, and temporally from the UFA--the highly transmissive limestone aquifer that is the source of water flowing from the springs (Bush and Johnston 1988; Katz 1992, 2004; Davis 1996). Rainfall that infiltrates into the subsurface and recharges the aquifer system contains nitrogen and other dissolved chemicals of concern originating from anthropogenic activities at or near the land surface. Groundwater with elevated nitrate concentrations flows toward the spring. Elevated nitrate concentrations in Florida's springs contribute to water quality degradation in their receiving surface waters. Therefore, the NSILT results are used in the development and implementation of the BMAPs for impaired spring systems, by focusing nitrogen source reduction efforts on the sources in order to achieve the greatest improvement in water quality. A link to the Water Quality Restoration Program website and the BMAP documents is located in **Appendix A**.

The NSILT does not account for legacy loads of nitrogen that may already be present in the aquifer and continue to adversely impact groundwater quality. Several spring basin studies have reported increasing nitrate-N concentrations in groundwater and springs over time. Nitrogen that entered groundwater from past anthropogenic practices may slowly exit the groundwater flow system via springs, given that the average groundwater residence times in large spring basins in Florida is on the order of decades (Katz et al. 1999, Katz 2004, Phelps 2004, Happell et al. 2006, Toth and Katz 2006, and Knowles et al. 2010).

Estimating Nitrogen Inputs to the Land Surface

Springshed Boundary Adjustments

The NSILT analysis was run on the springshed boundaries which were consistent with the BMAP boundary or the springshed plus outside springshed areas (i.e., the Lower and Middle Suwannee BMAP and the Santa Fe BMAP) that were included in the BMAP boundary because there are adjacent areas that feed the groundwater system that supplies additional springs and baseflow for the river or augments the adjacent contributing tributaries and rivers. Springshed boundaries were previously defined in the first iteration of the NSILTs, published between 2015 and 2018. Where appropriate, the springshed boundaries remained consistent with the previous NSILT evaluation. Some springshed boundaries were adjusted to meet the requirements of priority focus area (PFA) boundaries as defined in the 2016 Springs and Aquifer Protection Act. Requirements of the act dictated that priority focus areas should follow easily identifiable landmarks or political boundaries. To address this requirement, the boundaries for DeLeon, Volusia Blue, Wekiwa, Jackson Blue, Wacissa, and Weeki Wachee springsheds were adjusted.

In their original NSILTs, the Weeki Wachee springshed overlapped the southern part of the Chassahowitzka and the Homosassa springsheds, respectively. In the updated NSILTs, the overlapping area was removed from the Chassahowitzka and Homosassa areas and accounted for in the Weeki Wachee contributing area. Comparably to the prior NSILT versions, the NSILT methodology was run separately on the Homosassa and Chassahowitzka springsheds.

Another boundary change made in the 2023 NSILTs is that the Aripeka and Weeki Wachee springsheds were analyzed as one, instead of separating the two springsheds. Rainbow and Silver springsheds were also analyzed as one area.

It is important to note that the Wekiva River surface water contributing area is a separate BMAP area from the Wekiwa Springs area. For the Wekiwa and Rock Springs NSILT, only the springshed area is evaluated; the surface watershed for the Wekiva River is excluded from the NSILT. Management actions in the Wekiva River BMAP are attributed to benefiting the surface watershed of the river, but projects are needed in the springshed area to benefit the springs.

In the Santa Fe BMAP area, there are three separate springshed areas that are analyzed separately; the Santa Fe springsheds are the following:

- Devil's Ear Complex;
- Ichetucknee; and
- Hornsby springsheds.

In the Suwannee BMAP area, there are also three separate springshed areas that are analyzed separately; the Suwannee springsheds are as follows:

- Fanning/Manatee;
- Falmouth/Troy/Lafayette/Peacock; and
- Madison Blue springsheds.

In Santa Fe and Suwannee springsheds, the areas outside the springsheds but within the BMAP boundary are considered contributing to the rivers. These areas were evaluated in a separate NSILT analysis. The total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) for the Suwannee and Santa Fe BMAPs include numeric nutrient criteria for river water quality. Due to this requirement, a nutrient loading evaluation was performed separately to better characterize impact on outside the springshed areas and surface water quality. The NSILT was applied to support nitrogen source identification and to estimate the nutrient reductions that are needed in these areas to ensure that water quality in both rivers meets the TMDL targets.

Boundary Data

For the 2023 updates, a springshed GIS layer was created for the NSILT analysis, which also includes the county boundaries and the recharge areas. These boundaries were used for all the county-level and recharge-based calculations. The springsheds boundaries used are the same as the BMAP boundary expect for Suwannee and Santa Fe which each are broken up into three springsheds plus the outside areas, respectively. This GIS boundary layer is available upon request.

Atmospheric Deposition

Estimates of nitrogen loading from atmospheric deposition are derived from the U.S. National Atmospheric Deposition Program (NADP) Total Deposition (TDEP) Science Committee's hybrid model. The TDEP model evaluates wet and dry deposition monitoring network data and calculates an estimated total nitrogen deposition load (Schwede and Lear 2014). TDEP data are provided as an annual total and presented in a four-kilometer by four-kilometer grid raster file. Data from the 2019 and 2020 datasets were averaged to estimate nitrogen loading (see link to the

NADP TDEP in **Appendix A**). Data were then spatially evaluated to determine the loading in areas of each groundwater recharge category within each BMAP or springshed. Recharge and biochemical attenuation factors (see **Table 11**) were then applied to the estimated loading to land surface to estimate loading to groundwater.

WWTFs

The average annual input of nitrogen to the land surface for WWTFs was estimated for each effluent land application site for all facilities disposing of effluent in the BMAP area. The average annual input was estimated using the mean total nitrogen (TN) concentration in milligrams per liter (mg/L) and mean discharge volume in million gallons per day (MGD) for each WWTF. The data were sourced from the DEP Wastewater Facility Regulation (WAFR) database for effluent discharged from January 2019 through December 2021.

WWTFs were considered to contribute to loading to a BMAP if the effluent was disposed of within the BMAP, regardless of whether the facility itself was within the BMAP. Some WWTFs were not required to monitor and report TN effluent concentrations, and, therefore, did not have TN data available in the WAFR database. Some of these facilities that did not report TN concentrations reported nitrate-N (NO_3-N) concentrations. For those facilities, an estimated TN concentration was calculated assuming that nitrate-N would compose 38.5% of the TN concentration (Helgeson and McNeal 2009). In cases where no TN data or nitrate-N data were collected at a facility during the data period or the data quality was questionable, an effluent value based on a review of similar-sized facilities within springs BMAP areas was used to estimate the TN concentration. The facilities were classified as "small," "medium," or "large" based on their average daily flow. The estimated TN concentrations for facilities with insufficient WAFR data for a direct estimate are summarized in **Table 1**.

Table 1. Average TN concentration by facility size for WWTFs with insufficient data

Facility Size	Flow (MGD)	Estimated Average TN Effluent Concentration (mg/L)
Large	> 0.1	4.34
Medium	0.1 – 0.02	7.22
Small	< 0.02	11.76

Facilities report nitrogen concentration data and flow data at different intervals depending on their specific permit requirements. When available, the reported monthly average data were used to calculate flow and concentration. If monthly average data were not available, summary data was prioritized in the following order: weekly average, quarterly average, annual average, 3-month rolling average, and maximum. When multiple flow and/or nitrogen monitoring sites existed for a facility, the effluent information that best reflected the effluent quality at the disposal site was used for evaluation.

All applicable wastewater effluent reuse and disposal practices were considered: direct surface water discharges; rapid infiltration basins (RIBs); sprayfields; public access reuse (e.g., golf course and residential reuse); absorption fields; and wetland disposal. Direct surface water discharges were considered surface water sources and excluded as loads to groundwater. For all

other reuse and disposal types, an appropriate biochemical attenuation factor was applied, dependent on the practice (**Table 11**). Effluent disposal locations were spatially evaluated to determine the recharge category of the deposition site, and the appropriate recharge factor was applied to determine the loading to groundwater.

OSTDS

OSTDS loading was calculated by estimating the number of septic systems within a BMAP and multiplying the number of OSTDS by the expected loading per system. The Florida Department of Health (DOH) Florida Water Management Inventory (FLWMI) data were used to estimate the number of OSTDS within each BMAP (see link to the FLWMI in **Appendix A.**

FLWMI data identifies a wastewater source for every parcel in the state in one of eight categories: "Known Septic," "Likely Septic," "Somewhat Likely Septic," "Known Sewer," "Likely Sewer," "Somewhat Likely Sewer," "Unknown," and "Undetermined." Parcels identified as "Known Septic," "Likely Septic," and "Somewhat Likely Septic" in the FLWMI database were considered to use septic systems for wastewater treatment. There was assumed to be one septic system per parcel. FLWMI data were spatially evaluated to determine the appropriate recharge category for each OSTDS location. FLWMI data are provided by county. For this analysis, all FLWMI data used were updated between 2021 and 2023. **Table 2** shows the year of OSTDS data that were used from the FLWMI for the estimated number of septic systems by county.

Table 2. Year the FWRI data were updated by county

County	Update Year
Citrus, Hernando, Orange, Pasco, and Sumter	2023
Alachua, Columbia, Dixie, Gilchrist, Hamilton, Lafayette, Lake, Levy, Madison, Marion, Putnam, Seminole, Suwannee, Taylor, Union, and Volusia	2022
Gadsden, Jackson, Jefferson, Leon, and Wakulla	2021

Loading per septic system was estimated by determining the persons per household and multiplying this by a per capita loading rate. The 2020 U.S. Census data were used to estimate the number of persons per household, by county, as shown in **Table 3.** A per capita contribution of 10 pounds of nitrogen per year (lbs-N/yr) was estimated based on the Florida Onsite Sewage Nitrogen Reduction Strategies Study Final Report (Armstrong 2015), which was an update to the prior NSILT estimates of 9.012 lbs-N/yr.

Loading to the land surface was calculated by multiplying the number of OSTDS by the loading rate. OSTDS locations were spatially evaluated as the centroid of the parcel, and the appropriate recharge factor was determined. A biochemical attenuation factor (**Table 11**) and a recharge factor were then applied to estimate loading to groundwater.

Table 3. 2020 U.S. Census persons per household by county

County	Persons Per Household Based On the 2020 U.S. Census
Alachua	2.48
Baker	2.91

County	Persons Per Household Based On the 2020 U.S. Census
Citrus	2.25
Columbia	2.62
Dixie	2.5
Gadsden	2.43
Gilchrist	2.53
Hamilton	2.6
Hernando	2.46
Jackson	2.27
Jefferson	2.21
Lafayette	2.8
Lake	2.56
Leon	2.38
Levy	2.39
Madison	2.38
Marion	2.4
Orange	2.87
Pasco	2.54
Putnam	2.43
Seminole	2.6
Sumter	2.04
Suwannee	2.82
Taylor	2.51
Union	2.36
Volusia	2.43
Wakulla	2.59

Farm Fertilizer

Farm fertilizer loading to land surface estimates were calculated by determining the agricultural area used for specific crops within a BMAP, multiplied by an estimated crop specific fertilizer application rate. The Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (DACS) Florida Statewide Irrigation Agricultural Demand 9 (FSAID 9) geodatabase was used to estimate the total area used to produce each crop type (**Appendix A**). Fertilization rates for each specific crop category are based on an annual average per acre and are based on estimates previously used in the NSILT with some updates based on feedback received from DACS, Florida water management districts (WMDs), and the University of Florida-Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences (UF-IFAS).

When a parcel was identified as rotating crops (changes in crop type from year to year), the application rate was estimated as an average of the annual application rates for the individual crops. When crops are grown as double or triple crops (more than one crop grown on a parcel in a single year), the fertilizer application rate was estimated by summing the application rate for

each crop type. Some adjustments to application rates for crops grown in a multi-crop system were made based on feedback from DACS. Hay was assumed to be fertilized at 80 pounds of nitrogen per acre (lbs-N/ac) per cutting with an average of 2.5 cuttings per year. Crop-specific fertilizer application rates were consistent across all BMAP areas except for the following adjustments as described in the sections below.

Blueberries

Blueberries fertilizer application rate was reduced to 75 lbs-N/ac per year in the Wakulla BMAP area, based on stakeholder feedback and consistent with the previous NSILT.

Soybeans

Based on stakeholder feedback, soybeans are grown as a commodity crop in the Suwannee and Santa Fe BMAPs and are expected to have an annual application rate of 20 lbs-N/ac per year for these BMAPs. In other BMAPs, soybeans are used most commonly as a cover crop and have no expectation for fertilization.

Sorghum

Based on DACS feedback, sorghum is not grown for grain in the Suwannee and Santa Fe BMAPs and has a lower application rate of 50 lbs-N/ac per year as opposed to an estimated rate of 150 lbs-N/ac per year in other BMAPs.

Field Crops

Based on feedback from the DACS and SJRWMD, producers in the St. Johns River Region tend to grow more nutrient-intensive field crops and recommended an application rate of 90 lbs-N/ac per year for the field crop commodity in the region. **Table 4** describes the fertilizer application rates used in this NSILT update. Note that when more than one crop type is listed in the table, the category is a double or triple crop type.

Table 4. FSAID crop categories fertilizer application rates in lbs-N/ac

Crop	Default Fertilizer Application Rates (lbs-N/ac)	Wakulla Application Rates (lbs-N/ac)	Suwannee & Santa Fe Application Rates (lbs-N/ac)	DeLeon, Gemini, Volusia Bule, Wekiwa, and Silver Springs Application Rates (lbs-N/ac)
Asparagus Fern	90	90	90	90
Aspidistra	90	90	90	90
Beans	100	100	100	100
Berries	100	100	100	100
Blackberries	100	100	100	100
Blueberries	100	75	100	100
Cabbage	175	175	175	175
Cabbage_Kale	175	175	175	175
Cabbage_Onions_Vegetables	175	175	175	175
Carrots	300	300	300	300

Crop	Default Fertilizer Application Rates (lbs-N/ac)	Wakulla Application Rates (lbs-N/ac)	Suwannee & Santa Fe Application Rates (lbs-N/ac)	DeLeon, Gemini, Volusia Bule, Wekiwa, and Silver Springs Application Rates (lbs-N/ac)
Carrots_Corn	300	300	300	300
Carrots_Rye	340	340	340	340
Citrus	140	140	140	140
Container Nursery	150	150	150	150
Coontie Fern	90	90	90	90
Corn	240	240	240	240
Corn	180	180	180	180
Corn_Cotton	175	175	175	175
Corn_Cucumbers	270	270	270	270
Corn_Oats	280	280	280	280
Corn_Peanuts	130	130	130	130
Corn_Rye	280	280	280	280
Corn_Soybeans	120	120	130	120
Cotton	110	110	110	110
Cotton_Peanuts	65	65	65	65
Cropland_Pastureland	50	50	50	50
Cucumbers	150	150	150	150
Cucumbers Fall_Melons	150	150	150	150
Dry Beans_Tomatoes Spring	200	200	200	200
Fern	90	90	90	90
Field Corn	240	240	240	240
Field Corn_Hay	210	210	210	210
Field Crops	60	60	60	90
Field Nursery	90	90	90	90
Grass_Pasture	80	80	80	80
Fruit_Nuts	100	100	100	100
Grains	70	70	70	70
Grapes	90	90	90	90
GreenBeans	100	100	100	100
Hay	180	180	180	180
Hay_Improved Pastures	180	180	180	180
Hay_Melons	180	180	180	180
Hay_Oats	220	220	220	220
HorseFarms	50	50	50	50
Improved Pastures	50	50	50	50
Leatherleaf	90	90	90	90
Liriope	90	90	90	90

Crop	Default Fertilizer Application Rates (lbs-N/ac)	Wakulla Application Rates (lbs-N/ac)	Suwannee & Santa Fe Application Rates (lbs-N/ac)	DeLeon, Gemini, Volusia Bule, Wekiwa, and Silver Springs Application Rates (lbs-N/ac)
Melons	150	150	150	150
Millet	50	50	50	50
Millet_Rye	90	90	90	90
Mixed Crops	60	60	60	60
Nurseries and Vineyards	90	90	90	90
Nursery	90	90	90	90
Oats	70	70	70	70
Oats_Peanuts	60	60	60	60
Onions_Vegetables	150	150	150	150
Ornamentals	90	90	90	90
Other Groves	90	90	90	90
Other Hay_NonAlfalfa	180	180	180	180
Pasture	50	50	50	50
Pasture_Peanuts	50	50	50	50
Pasture_Rye	90	90	90	90
Peaches	60	60	60	60
Peanuts	20	20	20	20
Peanuts_Cotton	65	65	65	65
Peanuts_Rye	60	60	60	60
Peanuts_Wheat	60	60	60	60
Peas	60	60	60	60
Pecans	100	100	100	100
Pittosporum	90	90	90	90
Potatoes	300	300	300	300
Row Crops	60	60	60	60
Rye	70	70	70	70
Small Grains	70	70	70	70
Small Veg	150	150	150	150
Small Veg Fall_Small Veg Spring	150	150	150	150
Small Veg Spring	150	150	150	150
Snap Beans	100	100	100	100
Sod	200	200	200	200
Sorghum	150	150	50	150
Soybeans	0	0	20	0
Specialty Farms	30	30	30	30
Spring Onion_Vegetables	150	150	150	150
Squash	150	150	150	150

Crop	Default Fertilizer Application Rates (lbs-N/ac)	Wakulla Application Rates (lbs-N/ac)	Suwannee & Santa Fe Application Rates (lbs-N/ac)	DeLeon, Gemini, Volusia Bule, Wekiwa, and Silver Springs Application Rates (lbs-N/ac)
Squash_Vegetables	300	300	300	300
Strawberries	150	150	150	150
Sweet Corn	300	300	300	300
Sweet Corn_Zucchini	450	450	450	450
Sweet Potatoes	60	60	60	60
Timber Nursery	50	50	50	50
Tobacco	80	80	80	80
Tobacco_Rye	120	120	120	120
Tomatoes	200	200	200	200
Tomatoes Fall	200	200	200	200
Tomatoes Fall_Tomatoes Spring	400	400	400	400
Tomatoes Spring	200	200	200	200
Tree Nurseries	90	90	90	90
Vegetables	150	150	150	150
Watermelon	150	150	150	150
Wheat	80	80	80	80
Wildlife Strip Crops	30	30	30	30
Winter Wheat	40	40	40	40
Zucchini	150	150	150	150

Crop production areas were spatially evaluated to determine the appropriate acreage for each recharge category. Recharge and attenuation factors (**Table 11**) were applied to estimate the loading to groundwater.

Nurseries

Loading to land surface from nurseries was calculated in a similar way to general farm fertilizer. However, due to greater plant spacing and lower fertilizer leaching rates related due to containerization, adjustments were made to the application rates. It was estimated that only 80% of the acreage identified as nurseries is fertilized. Further, the fertilization leaching amount was reduced by 70% due to the applied fertilizer remaining in the container compared to typical, ground-planted agricultural operations. This container adjustment was not applied to fern crops in Volusia County based on feedback from SJRWMD that these operations are typically ground-planted and not container-based. The nursery crop categories are listed in **Table 5**. Recharge and attenuation factors (**Table 11**) were applied to estimate the loading to groundwater.

Pasture Lands

Loading to land surface from pasture lands was calculated in a similar way to farm fertilizer. However, based on information from DACS, pasture locations are rotated, and it is only

anticipated that 20% of pasture areas will be fertilized in a given year. The acreage of pasture lands identified in FSAID was reduced to 20% of the total, then multiplied by the expected application rate to determine the loading from land surface for pastures. The farm fertilizer biochemical attenuation factors were also used for pasture lands (**Table 11**). Where the rotation adjustment was applied for crop categories that were categorized as pasture lands are identified in **Table 5**.

Table 5. FSAID nursery and pasture crop categories

***** Denotes nursery crop categories adjusted for container practices outside Volusia County.

Nursery Crop Categories	Pasture Crop Categories
Asparagus Fern*	**Grass Pasture**
Aspidistra*	**Horse Farms**
Container Nursery	**Improved Pastures**
Coontie Fern*	**Pasture**
Fern*	
Field Nursery	
Leatherleaf*	
Nurseries and Vineyards	
Nursery	
Ornamentals	
Pittosporum*	
Timber Nursery	
Tree Nurseries	

Livestock Waste, Except Dairies

Twelve types of livestock waste were considered in NSILT loading estimates. However, dairy cows were evaluated differently than the other 11 livestock types (see **Dairies** section below). Cattle farms are included in the NSILT as non-dairy livestock operations. Livestock waste loading to land surface was calculated by estimating the population of each livestock type in each BMAP area and multiplying the estimated count by a livestock type specific waste factor. The livestock waste factors are consistent with the 2018 NSILT and are summarized in **Table 6** below. To estimate livestock populations, the 2017 U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Census of Agriculture data were used (see link in **Appendix A** to the 2017 Census of Agriculture site). The 2017 census data provided estimated animal head count totals, by county, for each livestock type. For cattle, an average of the 2020 and 2021 USDA Survey of Agriculture (see

link in **Appendix A** to the USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service) estimates for cattle were used to determine head county by county. For basins with identified dairies, the estimated cows included in the dairy calculations were removed from the head count for the county in which the dairy was located. To estimate calf numbers, it was estimated that 35% of the cattle were calves.

USDA head counts for the whole county were adjusted based on the proportion of livestock land in the county that was also within the BMAP or springshed, as reported in FSAID 9. The headcounts were also evaluated by recharge category in each BMAP or springshed compared to the livestock land of that recharge category in the county as a whole.

Further adjustments included the consideration that broiler chickens and cow/calves are not anticipated to provide loading for the entire year because they are not *in situ* for an entire 12 months. Broiler chickens are anticipated to be on an eight-week rotation, and cow/calves are estimated to be on a six-month rotation. Annual loading was reduced accordingly to account for these rotations.

Once a livestock waste loading to the land surface was calculated based on the estimated headcount in the springshed by recharge area, waste load based on the type of animal, and rotation considerations, a biochemical attenuation factor (**Table 11**) and a recharge factor were then applied to estimate loading to groundwater.

Table 6. Livestock waste factors by livestock type

Sources: Goolsby et al. 1999; Katz et al. 1999; Chelette et al. 2002; Ruddy et al. 2006; Meyer 2012; and Sprague and Gronberg 2013.

Livestock Type	Waste Factor Per Animal (lbs-N/day)
Beef Cattle	0.337
Other Cattle	0.31
Calves	0.068
Donkeys	0.1
Horses	0.273
Chicken, Broilers	0.002
Chicken, Layers	0.003
Goats	0.035
Hogs	0.19
Sheep	0.198
Turkeys	0.006

Dairies

In the 2023 NSILTs, dairies were divided into concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) where waste is managed under an industrial wastewater permit issued by DEP, and non-CAFO dairies, where a facility's presumption of compliance is through the Best Management Practice (BMP) Program administered by DACS. The evaluation for each type is described below.

CAFOs

CAFO dairies operate under an industrial permit from DEP that requires annual reporting of operations and a nutrient management plan that oversees the waste handling processes for dairy waste. For CAFO dairies, loading to land surface estimates were made by multiplying the number of animals at the operation based on the average of 2019 and 2020 annual reported herd counts as required by the permit, by a per animal waste factor calculated in the nutrient management plan, then reduced by waste load based on their waste handling processes as identified in the nutrient management plan. Nutrient management plans are site specific and vary from operation to operation. Attenuation (**Table 11**) and recharge factors were applied to the estimated loading to land surface to estimate loading to groundwater.

Non-CAFO Dairies

Non-CAFO dairies are governed by the adopted DACS Dairy BMP Manual and the applicable BMPs. Non-CAFO dairies in BMAP areas have a statutory obligation to enroll in the DACS BMP Program or conduct water quality monitoring that is approved by the state. Dairies enrolled in the BMP Program by DACS are subject to DACS Implementation Verification procedures. Non-CAFO dairy information was provided by DACS, including information on herd size, waste handling practices, and animal confinement.

If a dairy herd was identified as grazed in pasture, it was estimated that they would be confined for 15% of the time to account for time in the milking parlors. A waste factor of 0.36 lbs-N/day for dairy cows and 0.15 lbs-N/day for non-milking cows was estimated. Annual loading was estimated by multiplying the number of cows by the daily waste factor, multiplied by 365 days per year, multiplied by application loss coefficients based on waste handling practices. Generally, a 50% application loss factor was applied for waste generated in pasture. For waste generated and collected in confinement, nitrogen loss percentages for specific waste handling practices are identified in **Table 7**.

Table 7. Nitrogen loss percentages for non-CAFO manure handling practices

Manure Handling Practices	Nitrogen Loss %
Scraped Solids	25%
Applied Solids	20%
Concrete Waste Storage Ponds	60%
Sprayfields	30%
Direct Deposition	60%
Sand Separator	5%
Screen Separator	7%
Static "Vat" Separator Solids	85%
Static "Vat" Separator Effluent	15%
Screw Press Solids	80%

Manure Handling Practices	Nitrogen Loss %
Screw Press Effluent	20%
Earthen Lagoon	30%

Horse Farms/Cattle Farms

For the Rainbow Springs and Silver Springs BMAP where there are more such operations than other BMAPs, horse farms and cattle farms were evaluated as separate loading categories. For horse farms and cattle farms, loading from farm fertilizer crops that are associated with these operations were estimated, as well as loading from the livestock categories for the relevant livestock types.

In Silver Springs, of the total pasture lands and hay crop area, it was estimated that 20% of pasture lands and hay acreages were horse farms. Additionally, 100% of acres identified as horse farm area was associated with horse farm operations for the NSILT. In Rainbow Springs, it was estimated that of the total pasture lands and hay crop area in the springshed, 40% of pasture lands and hay acres were horse farms. Also, 100% of horse farmlands identified in the FSAID land use data were associated with horse farms. The remaining pasture lands and hay crop acreages in each springshed, respectively, were attributed to cattle farms.

For livestock waste estimates, 100% of horse livestock waste was attributed to horse farms, and 100% of beef cattle, "other" cattle, and calves were associated with cattle farms in both springsheds. Loading for farm fertilizer and livestock waste categories associated with horse farms and cattle farms were calculated as described above in the livestock waste section, including the spatial evaluation to determine recharge areas. The loading for these categories was removed from the general farm fertilizer and livestock waste categories to avoid double-counting loads. A horse farm- and cattle farm-specific attenuation factor (**Table 11**) was applied to the surface loading to determine the loading to groundwater.

UTF

Since the development of the original NSILT, the methodology used for estimating nitrogen inputs from urban fertilizer has significantly improved. Fertilizers applied to turfgrass typically found in urban areas (including residential lawns, commercial properties, and public green spaces) are referred to as urban turfgrass fertilizers. The UTF load to land surface was estimated separately for single family residential parcels and other UTF as described below. For all UTF loads, a recharge factor was applied based on location, as well as a biochemical attenuation factor (**Table 11**) was applied to land surface loading estimates to determine loading to groundwater.

Single Family Residential Fertilizer Loading

Single family residential UTF loading was estimated using a number of steps. The first step determined the area of single family residential parcels and an impervious area coefficient was applied to remove pervious area from the evaluation. Next, a maximum amount of fertilized area

per parcel was set to evaluate likeliness to fertilize, and finally estimating fertilization amount for the area expected to receive fertilization. The section below goes into these steps in more detail.

Determining Parcels

To determine the area of single family residential parcels, the Florida Department of Revenue CADASTRAL database and land use code DOR001 was used. It was estimated that 27.8% of all single family residential parcels are impervious (Tilley, 2006). For BMAPs with predominantly rural areas, it was estimated that a maximum of 0.5 acres of land per parcel would be fertilized because the parcels tend to be larger and less landscaped, while for predominantly urban BMAPs, it was estimated that a maximum of one acre of land per parcel would be fertilized.

Determining Likeliness to Fertilize

Prior to applying the fertilizer application rates to the pervious land area, the probability that a homeowner will fertilize the lawn needed to be considered. Based on socioeconomic studies, property values can be used as an indicator of probability of fertilization by homeowners in residential areas (Kinzig et al. 2005, Law et al. 2004, Zhou et al. 2008, Cook et al. 2012). Three tiers of property values were considered in each BMAP, where it was estimated that there was a 10%, 75%, and 90% likeliness to fertilize for the low, medium, and high property value categories, respectively. Property value ranges were BMAP specific and were based on property value estimates used in the previous NSILT analysis. There was an estimated increase of 79% since the prior NSILT based on State of Florida average home price evaluations (**Appendix A**) so low and high home value break points were adjusted accordingly.

Fertilization Rates by BMAP

The estimated urban turfgrass self-fertilization amounts were regional and based on survey data. The Florida panhandle region fertilization rate assumptions were updated from the previous NSILT evaluation. These revised NSILT used fertilization values determined by a recent City of Tallahassee survey and were applied in the Jackson Blue, Wakulla, and Wacissa estimates (Skybase7 2023). Fertilization rates for other BMAP areas were consistent with the previous NSILT evaluations (Martin 2008, Suoto 2009). Local ordinances were reviewed for seasonal fertilizer bans; where seasonal bans were in effect, fertilizer application was adjusted proportionately to the period of the year that fertilization was not allowed.

Table 8. Single family residential UTF information

Springshed	Max Fert. Acres	Low Value Break	High Value Break	Average Self Fertilizer Application (lbs-N/ac/year)	Lawn Service Application Rate (lbs-N/ac/year)	% Service	% Self	% None	Average Fert. Rate (lbs-N/ac/year)
Chassahowitzka Spring Group	1	89,500	268,500	96.30	131	32.0%	68.0%	0.0%	107.30
DeLeon Spring	1	89,500	268,500	98.27	131	33.0%	51.0%	16.0%	93.24
Devil's Ear Spring	0.5	136,040	257,402	93.03	108.9	32.0%	68.0%	0.0%	98.11
Falmouth Spring	0.5	89,500	223,750	93.03	108.9	32.0%	68.0%	0.0%	98.11

Springshed	Max Fert. Acres	Low Value Break	High Value Break	Average Self Fertilizer Application (lbs-N/ac/year)	Lawn Service Application Rate (lbs-N/ac/year)	% Service	% Self	% None	Average Fert. Rate (lbs-N/ac/year)
Fanning Springs and Manatee Spring	0.5	98,450	259,550	93.03	108.9	32.0%	68.0%	0.0%	98.11
Gemini Springs	1	89,500	268,500	98.27	131	33.0%	51.0%	16.0%	93.24
Homosassa Spring Group	1	89,500	268,500	96.30	131	32.0%	68.0%	0.0%	107.30
Hornsby Spring	0.5	141,410	304,300	93.03	108.9	32.0%	68.0%	0.0%	98.11
Ichetucknee Spring Group	0.5	108,653	239,860	93.03	108.9	32.0%	68.0%	0.0%	98.11
Jackson Blue Spring	0.5	89,500	268,500	56.91	108.9	19.0%	16.0%	65.0%	29.80
Kings Bay	1	89,500	268,500	96.30	131	32.0%	68.0%	0.0%	107.30
Madison Blue Spring	0.5	89,500	223,750	93.03	108.9	32.0%	68.0%	0.0%	98.11
Rainbow Spring Group	1	107,400	259,550	114.28	131	33.0%	51.0%	16.0%	101.41
Silver Springs	1	89,500	268,500	114.28	131	33.0%	51.0%	16.0%	101.41
Volusia Blue Spring	1	89,500	161100	85.14	131	34.4%	49.6%	16.0%	87.18
Wacissa Spring Group	0.5	85,920	214,800	56.91	108.9	19.0%	16.0%	65.0%	29.80
Wakulla Spring	0.5	89,500	268,500	56.91	108.9	19.0%	16.0%	65.0%	29.80
Weeki Wachee Spring Group	1	89,500	268,500	96.30	131	32.0%	68.0%	0.0%	107.30
Wekiwa Spring	1	89,500	268,500	98.27	131	33.0%	51.0%	16.0%	93.24

Due to different methodologies used in the previous NSILTs, some BMAPs captured the percentage of the population expected to apply zero fertilizer in the average self-application rate, while others separately defined a specific percentage of parcels that do not apply fertilizer that were not included in the self-application rate. The variability in the application rate calculations resulted in some BMAPs being described with 0% of the population applying no fertilizer, when the portion of the population with zero fertilizer application is already incorporated in the average self-application rate.

Other UTF

UTF loading to land surface from non-residential sources was estimated by determining the area of land use types likely to apply fertilizer, applying an impervious area coefficient to remove impervious area from the evaluation, estimating the pervious area likely to receive fertilizer, and estimating the fertilizer application rate for fertilized areas (**Table 9**). Water management district land cover data was used to determine the land area likely to receive fertilizer (**Appendix A**). Fifteen land cover categories were considered likely to receive fertilization, and an estimated impervious area was applied to each land cover category (Tilley 2006). The area of these land cover categories was evaluated against the areas already assessed as single family residential,

and any area that overlapped with single family residential areas was removed from evaluation as area that could receive fertilizer as "other UTF."

Table 9. Other UTF land use categories and estimated impervious area

WMD Land Cover Code	Percent Impervious	Percent of Pervious Area Receiving Fertilizer
1220: Medium Density, Mobile Home Units	32.6%	17.7%
1230: Medium Density, Mixed Units (Fixed and Mobile Home Units)	32.6%	15.4%
1320: High Density, Mobile Home Units	44.4%	20.7%
1330: Multiple Dwelling Units, Low Rise	44.4%	27.8%
1340: High Density, Multiple Dwelling Units, High Rise (Four Stories or More)	44.4%	32.8%
1400: Commercial and Services	72.2%	31.3%
1411: Shopping Centers	72.2%	31.3%
1480: Cemeteries	8.3%	42.2%
1700: Institutional	34.4%	43.3%
1710: Educational	30.3%	60.6%
1720: Religious	39.9%	37.7%
1740: Medical and Health Care	72.2%	33.8%
1750: Governmental	35.4%	41.0%
1850: Parks and Zoos	12.5%	44.9%
1860: Community Recreational Facilities	12.5%	59.8%

Not all pervious area for these land cover codes will be fertilized. To estimate the area of pervious area that will be fertilized, land cover tree canopy coverage data provided by the City of Tallahassee was used to estimate the percentage of pervious area that would receive fertilization as summarized in **Table 9**. It was assumed that all area expected to receive fertilization would be managed by landscaping professionals that would apply fertilizer consistent with the *Green Industries Best Management Practices Manual* (GI-BMP) guidelines (DEP 2010) (see link in **Appendix A**). An evaluation for the GI-BMP was performed to estimate the application rate by region for the north and central regions and is summarized in **Table 10** below.

Table 10. Green Industries BMP regional fertilizer application rates

Region	Annual Fertilizer Application Rate
North	2.5 lbs-N/1,000 square feet
Central	3.0 lbs-N/1,000 square feet

Sports Turfgrass Fertilizer

Golf Courses

Golf course loading to the land surface was estimated by evaluating the active golf courses in each BMAP area, estimating the total acreage of each golf course, and determining the fertilizer application rate based on prior NSILT course-specific survey responses or using an estimated regional fertilizer application rate. The estimated regional rate was derived from a survey of regional golf course practices published by Hort Technology (Shaddox et al. 2023) and

amounted to an estimated application rate of 2.2 lbs-N/1,000 square feet for the whole of the golf course property. Golf courses no longer in operation were excluded as current loading sources. Additionally, the management of each golf course was identified as a local government, special district, or private entity for possible consideration in the allocation process**.**

Other (Non-Golf) Sports Turfgrass Fertilizer

Sports turfgrass loading estimates were consistent with the previous NSILT evaluations. Sports turfgrass area was determined by reviewing areas with the property appraisers land use categories that may include sports turfgrass and performing an aerial review to determine the total acreage used as sports turfgrass. It was assumed that these lands are fertilized at rates and frequencies applied by lawn service companies following the GI-BMP recommendations (DEP 2010). Fertilizer application rates are consistent with the previous NSILT evaluations.

Biosolids

Biosolids loading to the land surface was estimated by determining what biosolid application sites were within BMAP boundaries and reviewing annual reports to determine the application quantity. Annual reports from 2018 to 2022 were evaluated. Data were provided in tons of material applied. It was estimated that biosolids had an approximate nitrogen concentration of five percent. The location of biosolids application sites was spatially evaluated to determine the appropriate recharge categories for the area, and attenuation and recharge factors were applied to estimate loading to groundwater. The biosolid application process and leaching is estimated based on site-specific data. Loading estimates will be refined in future updates to protect the aquifer under vulnerable karstic features. DEP will continue to evaluate data and update loads and allocations as appropriate.

Estimating Loading to Floridan Aquifer

Biochemical Attenuation

A source-specific specific biochemical attenuation factor (BAF) was applied to each loading source to account for near-surface biochemical process that result in a reduction of nitrogen available to leach to groundwater. Processes such as denitrification, volatilization, immobilization, and cation exchange all contribute to the reduction of leachable nitrogen. These processes occur to varying degrees depending on the application method, the form of nitrogen, soil properties, and other factors. BAFs used in this evaluation, listed in **Table 11**, represent the estimated percentage of the nitrogen attenuated or removed by subsurface processes.

Table 11. 2023 NSILT biochemical attenuation factors

*Includes sports turfgrass fertilizer and golf courses.

Nitrogen Source Category	BAF	Literature References
Atmospheric Deposition	90%	Katz et al. 2009; Lombardo Associates 2011; Howard T. Odum Florida Springs Institute 2011
WWTFs-Reuse	75%	Jordan et al. 1997; Candela et al. 2007; Rahil and Antonopoulos 2007

Nitrogen Source Category	BAF	Literature References
WWTFs-RIBs and Absorption Fields	25%	Merritt and Toth 2006; Sumner and Bradner 1996
WWTFs-Sprayfield	60%	Katz et al. 2009; Lombardo Associates 2011; Howard T. Odum Florida Springs Institute 2011
WWTFs-Wetland Treatment	85%	Thompson and Milbrandt, 2016; Liu et al. 2024
Urban Fertilizer*	70%	Goolsby et al. 1999; Erikson et al. 2001; Barton and Colmer 2006; Katz et al. 2009
OSTDS	30%	Armstrong, J.H. 2015
Livestock Waste (Non-Dairy)	90%	Dubeux et al. 2007; Silveira et al. 2007; Burns et al. 2009; Dubeux et al. 2009; Obour et al. 2010; Sigua 2010; Sigua et al. 2010; Silveira et al. 2011; Woodard et al. 2011; White-Leech et al. 2013a; White-Leech et al. 2013b
Farm Fertilizer	80%	McNeal et al. 1995; Wang and Alva 1996; Paramasivam and Alva 1997; Newton et al. 1999; Hochmuth 2000a; Hochmuth 2000b; Simonne et al. 2006; He et al. 2011; Liu et al. 2013
Farm Fertilizer – Irrigated	65%	McNeal et al. 1995; Wang and Alva 1996; Paramasivam and Alva 1997; Newton et al. 1999; Hochmuth 2000a; Hochmuth 2000b; Simonne et al. 2006; He et al. 2011; Liu et al. 2013
Livestock Waste - Dairy (non-CAFO)	50%	Woodard et al. 2002; Landig et al. 2010
Livestock Waste - Dairy (CAFO)	85%	Cabrera et al. 2006
Cattle Farms (Silver and Rainbow Only)	90%	Dubeux et al. 2007; Silveira et al. 2007; Burns et al. 2009; Dubeux et al. 2009; Obour et al. 2010; Sigua 2010; Sigua et al. 2010; Silveira et al. 2011; Woodard et al. 2011; White-Leech et al. 2013a; White-Leech et al. 2013b
Horse Farms (Silver and Rainbow Only)	90%	Dubeux et al. 2007; Silveira et al. 2007; Burns et al. 2009; Dubeux et al. 2009; Obour et al. 2010; Sigua 2010; Sigua et al. 2010; Silveira et al. 2011; Woodard et al. 2011; White-Leech et al. 2013a; White-Leech et al. 2013b
Biosolids	50%	Division of Water Resource Management Staff Feedback

Generally, biochemical attenuation factors are consistent with the prior NSILT evaluation, with a few exceptions. OSTDS attenuation for all BMAPs was revised based on Florida-specific data provided by the DEP Onsite Sewage Program (Armstrong 2015). Attenuation factors for the springsheds in the Suwannee BMAP were updated to be consistent with other BMAPs. The Jackson Blue NSILT was the only BMAP to evaluate farm fertilizer loading with separate irrigated and non-irrigated attenuation factors, respectively, consistent with the previous NSILT evaluation.

Recharge

Nitrogen that is not attenuated during biochemical attenuation processes can leach to groundwater and impact water quality at the spring vent. Subsurface processes dictate the impact of the leached nitrogen on water quality at the spring vents. To evaluate the relative impact of leached nitrogen, a recharge factor was applied to the attenuated load based on the hydrologic conditions of the location of the loading. Four recharge categories were considered: high, medium, low, and discharge. Leaching to groundwater is a function of the properties of the soil and unsaturated (vadose) zone, drainage, wetness, depth to water table, and hydraulic conductivity. In areas where water can readily recharge through the vadose zone into underlying formations that have high hydraulic conductivity, it is anticipated that the majority of nitrogen will impact water quality at the spring vent and would be considered a high recharge area. In areas where water cannot readily recharge the Floridan aquifer due to characteristics of overlying soils, the presence of a surficial aquifer, or other properties that would otherwise retard the movement of leached water to the Floridan aquifer, a low recharge factor was applied, reducing the expected impact on water quality at the spring vent. In areas where water is expected to discharge from the Floridan aquifer, such as in wetland areas, it is not anticipated that nitrogen deposited in these areas will impact at spring vents and the loading was not included in the NSILT evaluation.

For all BMAPs, in areas that were considered to have high recharge, it was estimated that 90% of the attenuated load would impact water quality at the spring vent. In areas that were considered to have low recharge, it was estimated that only 10% of the attenuated nitrogen would impact water quality at spring vents. At all BMAPs except for Wakulla Spring and Jackson Blue Spring, in areas considered to have medium recharge it is estimated that 50% of the attenuated load will impact the spring vent water quality. In Wakulla, the recharge evaluation was based on confinement of the Floridan aquifer, and it was estimated that in semiconfined areas only 40% of the attenuated load would impact the spring vent. In the Jackson Blue springshed, recharge was primarily based on soils. While there is some variation in soils in this springshed, it was determined that it would be unlikely that 50% of the attenuated load would be reduced due to areas with slightly different soils and it was considered that 60% of the load would impact the spring vent.

All recharge factors are consistent with the previous NSILT evaluation, additional information on BMAP specific recharge can be found in the technical support documents in the appendices of the previous BMAP documents.

References

Armstrong, J.H. 2015. Florida Onsite Sewage Nitrogen Reduction Strategies Study Final Report.

Barton, L., and T.D. Colmer. 2006. Irrigation and fertilizer strategies for minimizing nitrogen leaching from turfgrass. *Agricultural Water Management* 80: 160–175.

Burns, J.C., M.G. Wagger, and D.S. Fisher. 2009. Animal and pasture productivity of "Coastal" and "Tifton 44" Bermudagrass at three nitrogen rates and associated soil nitrogen status. *Agronomy Journal* 101 (1): 32–40.

Bush, P.W., and R.H. Johnston. 1988. Ground-water hydraulics, regional flow, and ground-water development of the Floridan aquifer system in Florida and parts of Georgia, South Carolina, and Alabama. *U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper* 1403-C.

Cabrera, V.E., A. de Vries, and P.E. Hildebrand. 2006. Prediction of nitrogen excretion in dairy farms located in North Florida: A comparison of three models. *Journal of Dairy Science* 85:1830–1841.

Candela, L., S. Fabregat, A. Josa, J. Suriol, N. Vigues, and J. Mas. 2007. Assessment of soil and groundwater impacts by treated urban wastewater reuse: A case study: Application in a golf course (Girona, Spain). *Science of the Total Environment* 374: 26–35.

Chelette, A.R., T.R. Pratt, and B.G. Katz. 2002. Nitrate loading as an indicator of nonpoint source pollution in the lower St. Marks–Wakulla Rivers watershed. *Northwest Florida Water Management District Water Resources Special Report 02-1*.

Cook, E.M., S.J. Hall, and K.L. Larson. 2012. Residential landscapes as social-ecological systems: A synthesis of multi-scalar interactions between people and their home environment. *Urban Ecosyst* 15: 19–52.

Davis, J.H. 1996. Hydrogeologic investigation and simulation of ground-water flow in the UFA of north-central Florida and southwestern Georgia and delineation of contributing areas for selected city of Tallahassee, Florida, water-supply wells. *U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report* 95-4296.

Dubeux, J.C.B., Jr., L.E. Sollenberger, B.W. Mathews, J.M. Scholberg, and H.Q. Santos. 2007. Nutrient cycling in warm-climate grasslands. *Crop Science* 47: 915–928.

Dubeux, J.C.B., Jr., L.E. Sollenberger, L.A. Gaston, J.M.B. Vendramini, S.M. Interrante, and R.L. Stewart, Jr. 2009. Animal behavior and soil nutrient redistribution in continuously stocked Pensacola bahiagrass pastures managed at different intensities. *Crop Science* 49: 1503–1510.

Eller, Kirstin T., and Brian G. Katz. 2017. "Nitrogen Source Inventory and Loading Tool: An integrated approach toward restoration of water-quality impaired karst springs." *Journal of Environmental Management.*

Erikson, J.E., J.L. Cisar, J.C. Volin, and G.H. Snyder. 2001. Comparing nitrogen runoff and leaching between newly established St. Augustine turf and an alternative residential landscape. *Crop Science* 41: 1889–1895.

Florida Department of Environmental Protection. 2010. Florida friendly best management practices for protection of water resources by the green industries. Tallahassee, FL.

Goolsby, D.A., W.A. Battaglin, G.B. Lawrence, R.S. Artz, and B.T. Aulenbach et al. 1999. Flux and sources of nutrients in the Mississippi–Atchafalaya River Basin. *National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Coastal Ocean Program* No. 17.

Happell, J.D., S. Opsahl, Z. Top, and J.P. Chanton. 2006. Apparent CFC and 3H/3He age differences in water from Floridan aquifer springs. *Journal of Hydrology* 319:410–426.

He, J., M.D. Dukes, G.J. Hochmuth, J.W. Jones, and W.D. Graham. 2011. Evaluation of sweet corn yield and nitrogen leaching with CERES-maize considering input parameter uncertainties. *Transaction of the American Society of Agricultural and Biological Engineers* 54(4):1257–1268.

Helgeson, T. and McNeal, M. 2009. A Reconnaissance-Level Quantitative Comparison of Reclaimed Water, Surface Water, and Groundwater. *WateReuse Foundation*.

Hochmuth, G.J., and Hanlon, E.A. 2000a. IFAS standardized fertilization recommendations for vegetable crops. *Circular 1152. Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences.*

———. 2000b. A summary of N, P, and K research with tomato in Florida. *Document SL355. Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences.*

Howard T. Odom Florida Springs Institute. 2011. Wakulla Spring–An adaptive management strategy. *Prepared for the Wakulla Springs Working Group. Gainesville, FL*.

Jordan, M.J., H.J. Nadelhoffer, and B. Fry. 1997. Nitrogen cycling in forest and grass ecosystems irrigated with 15N-enriched wastewater. *Ecological Applications* 7 (3): 864–881.

Katz, B.G. 1992. Hydrochemistry of the upper Floridan aquifer, Florida. *U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report* 91-4196.

Katz, B.G. 2004. Sources of nitrate contamination and age of water in large karstic springs of Florida. *Environmental Geology* 46: 689–706.

Katz, B.G, H.D. Hornsby, J.F. Boklke, and M.F. Mokray. 1999. Sources and chronology of nitrate contamination in spring waters, Suwannee River Basin, Florida. *U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report* 99-4252.

Katz, B.G., A.A. Sepulveda, and R.J. Verdi. 2009. Estimating nitrogen loading to ground water and assessing vulnerability to nitrate contamination in a large karstic springs basin, Florida. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 45: 3.

Kinzig, A.P., P. Warren, C. Martin, D. Hope and M. Katti. 2005. The effects of human socioeconomic status and cultural characteristics on urban patterns of biodiversity. *Ecology and Society* 10 (1).

Knowles, L., Jr., B.G. Katz, and D.J. Toth. 2010. Using multiple chemical indicators to characterize and determine the age of groundwater from selected vents of the Silver Springs Group, Central Florida, USA. *Hydrogeology Journal* 18:1825–1838.

Landig, F., O. Fenton, P. Bons, D. Hennessy, K. Richards, and P. Blum. 2010. Estimation of nitrate discharge in a fractured limestone aquifer below a dairy farm in Ireland. In: *Groundwater management in a rapidly changing world, Proceedings from the 7th International Groundwater Quality Conference* (Zurich, Switzerland).

Law, N.L, L.E. Band, and J.M. Grove. 2004. Nitrogen input from residential lawn care practices in suburban watersheds in Baltimore County, MD. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 47 (5): 737–755.

Liu, G.D., E.H., Simonne, and G.J. Hochmuth. 2013. Soil and fertilizer management for vegetable production in Florida. *Document HS711. Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences.*

Liu, T., D. Li, Y. Tian, J. Zhou, Y. Qiu, D. Li, G. Liu, Y. Feng. 2024. Enhancing nitrogen removal in constructed wetlands: The role of influent substrate concentrations in integrated vertical-flow systems. *Environmental Science and Ecotechnology* 21 (2024) 100411.

Lombardo Associates. 2011. Onsite sewage treatment and disposal and management options. *Newton, MA.*

Martin, T. 2008. Lawn care behavior, Crystal River/Weeki Wachee Spring and Rainbow River survey. *Final report prepared for the Southwest Florida Water Management District.*

McNeal, B.L, C.D. Stanley, W.D. Graham, P.R. Gilreath, D. Downey, and J.F. Creighton. 1995. Nutrient loss trends for vegetable and citrus fields in west-central Florida: 1. Nitrate. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 24(1): 95–100.

Merritt, M., and D.J. Toth. 2006. Estimates of upper Floridan aquifer recharge augmentation based on hydraulic and water-quality data (1986–2002) from the Water Conserv II RIB systems, Orange County, Florida. *St. Johns River Water Management Special Publication SJ2006-SP3. Palatka, FL.*

Newton G.L., G.J. Gascho, G. Vellidis, R.N. Gates, and R.K. Hubbard et al. 1999. Nutrient balance for triple-crop forage production systems fertilized with dairy manure or commercial fertilizer. *Water Resource Conference. Athens, GA: University of Georgia.*

Obour, A.K., M.L. Silveira, J.M.B. Vendramini, M.B. Adjei, and L.E. Sollenberger. 2010. Evaluating cattle manure application strategies on phosphorus and nitrogen losses from a Florida spodosol. *Agronomy Journal* 102(5): 1511–1520.

Paramasivam, S., and A.K. Alva. 1997. Leaching of nitrogen forms from controlled-release nitrogen fertilizers. *Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis* 28(17&18): 1663–1674.

Phelps, G.G. 2004. Chemistry of ground water in the Silver Springs Basin, Florida, with emphasis on nitrate. *U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report* 2004-5144.

Rahil, M.H., and V.Z. Antonopoulos. 2007. Simulating soil water flow and nitrogen dynamics in a sunflower field irrigated with reclaimed wastewater. *Agricultural Water Management* 92: 142–150.

Ruddy, B.C., D.L. Lorenz, and D.K. Mueller. 2006. County-level estimates of nutrient inputs to the land surface of the conterminous United States, 1982–2001. *U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report* 2006-5012.

Schwede, D.B., and G.G. Lear. 2014. A novel hybrid approach for estimating total deposition in the United States. *Atmospheric Environment* 92: 207–220.

Sigua, G.C. 2010. Sustainable cow-calf operations and water quality: A review. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* 30: 631–648.

Sigua, G.C., R.K. Hubbard, S.W. Coleman, and M. Williams. 2010. Nitrogen in soils, plants, surface water and shallow groundwater in a bahiagrass pasture of southern Florida, USA. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems* 86: 175–187.

Silveira, M.L., V.A. Haby, and A.T. Leonard. 2007. Response of coastal bermudagrass yield and nutrient uptake efficiency to nitrogen sources. *Agronomy Journal* 99: 707–714.

Silveira, M.L., A.K. Obour, J. Arthington, and L.E. Sollenberger. 2011. The cow-calf industry and water quality in south Florida: A review. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems* 89: 439–452.

Simonne, E., M. Dukes, G. Hochmuth, B. Hochmuth, D. Studstill, and A. Gazula, 2006. Monitoring nitrate concentration in shallow wells below a vegetable field. *Proc. Fla. State Hort. Soc.* 119: 226–230.

Shaddox, T.W., J. B. Unruh, M. E. Johnson, C. D. Brown, and G. Stacey. 2023. Nutrient Use and Management Practices on United States Golf Courses. *HortTechnology* 33(1): 79-97.

Skybase7. 2023. 2023 TAPP Residential Turf Grass Fertilizer Survey. *Report of Findings prepared for the City of Tallahassee.*

Souto, L., M. Collins, D. Barr, G. Milch, J. Reed, and M.D. Ritner. 2009. Wekiva residential fertilizer practices. Contract# G0078. University of Central Florida for the Florida Department of Environmental Protection

Sprague, L.A., and J.M. Gronberg. 2013. Estimation of anthropogenic nitrogen and phosphorus inputs to the land surface of the conterminous United States—1992, 1997, and 2002. U.S. *Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report* 2012-5241.

Sumner, D.M., and L.A. Bradner. 1996. Hydraulic characteristics and nutrient transport and transformation beneath a rapid infiltration basin, Reedy Creek Improvement District, Orange County, Florida.

Thompson, M., Milbrandt, E. 2016. Nutrient Loading from Sanibel's Surficial Aquifer. *Sanibel-Captiva Conservation Foundation Marine Laboratory.*

Tilley, J.S., and E.T. Slonecker, 2006, Quantifying the Components of Impervious Surfaces: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2006-1008.

Toth, D.J., and B.G. Katz. 2006. Mixing of shallow and deep groundwater as indicated by the chemistry and age of karstic springs. *Hydrogeology Journal 14*: 1060-1080.

Wang, F.L., and A.K. Alva. 1996. Leaching of nitrogen from slow-release urea sources in sandy soils. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 60: 1454–1458.

White-Leech, R., K. Liu, L.E. Sollenberger, K.R. Woodard, and S.M. Interrante. 2013a. Excreta deposition on grassland patches. I. Forage harvested, nutritive value, and nitrogen recovery. *Crop Science* 53: 688–695.

———. 2013b. Excreta deposition on grassland patches. II. Spatial pattern and duration of forage responses. *Crop Science* 53: 696–703.

Woodard, K.R., French, E.C., Sweat, L.A., Graetz, D.A., Sollenberger, L.E., Macoon, B., Portier, K.M.,Wade, B.L., Rymph, S.J., Prine, G.M., VanHorn, H.H. 2002. Plant and Environment Interactions: Nitrogen Removal and Nitrate Leaching for Forage Systems Receiving Dairy Effluent. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 31: 1980-1992.

Woodard, K.R., and L.E. Sollenberger. 2011. Broiler litter vs. ammonium nitrate as nitrogen source for bermudagrass hay production: Yield, nutritive value, and nitrate leaching. *Crop Science* 51: 1342–1352.

Zhou, W., A. Troy, and M. Grove. 2008. Modeling residential lawn fertilization practices: Integrating high resolution remote sensing with socioeconomic data. Environmental Management 41: 742–752.

TSD Appendix A. Important Links

The links below were correct at the time of document preparation. Over time, the locations may change, and the links may no longer be accurate. None of these linked materials were adopted into the BMAP.

- Atmospheric Deposition Program (NADP) Total Deposition (TDEP) data: https://catalog.data.gov/dataset/nadp-total-deposition-data

- DEP Springs BMAP documents: https://floridadep.gov/dear/water-quality-restoration/content/florida-springs-basin-management-action-plans

- Florida Friendly Best Management Practices for Protection of Water Resources by Green Industries, GI-BMP Manual: https://ffl.ifas.ufl.edu/ffl-and-you/gi-bmp-program/gi-bmp-manual/

- Florida Statewide Agricultural Irrigation Demand Geodatabase, Version 9: https://www.DACS.gov/Agriculture-Industry/Water/Agricultural-Water-Supply-Planning

- Florida Water Management Inventory with locations of known and estimated septic systems: https://ww10.doh.state.fl.us/pub/bos/Inventory/FloridaWaterManagementInventory/

- Home value price resources:
  - www.roofstock.com
  - www.neighborhoodscout.com
  - www.visualcapitalist.com

- Previous NSILT technical supporting documents: publicfiles.dep.state.fl.us -/DEAR/NSILT/

- Statewide Land Use Land Cover: https://geodata.dep.state.fl.us/datasets/FDEP::statewide-land-use-land-cover/about

- U.S Census Data, 2020: https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census/decade/2020/2020-census-results.html

- USDA Census of Agriculture, 2017: https://www.nass.usda.gov/Publications/AgCensus/2017/index.php

- USDA Survey of Agriculture: https://quickstats.nass.usda.gov/

- Water Quality Restoration Program, DEP: https://floridadep.gov/dear/water-quality-restoration

Appendix G. Wastewater Facilities

DEP has determined that certain WWTFs providing reclaimed water for the purpose of commercial or residential irrigation or that is otherwise being land applied within this BMAP area are causing or contributing to the nutrient impairments being addressed in this BMAP. Based on DEP's determination, the facilities listed below (**Table G-1**) are subject to the nitrogen and phosphorus limits set forth in section 403.086(1)(c)3., F.S. The list of facilities provided below does not include those facilities that are otherwise required to meet the advanced wastewater treatment limits for phosphorous and nitrogen pursuant to **Table 23** above.

These facilities have 10 years from BMAP adoption to meet the applicable AWT standards. This requirement does not prevent the department from requiring an alternative treatment standard, if the department determines the alternative standard is necessary to achieve the TMDL(s) or applicable water quality criteria.

For facilities that did not have adequate information to complete an evaluation or where a change occurs to the facility's application of reclaimed water after the initial evaluation (e.g., an increase in facility capacity or change in location of reclaimed water application), the department will evaluate the land application of reclaimed water as more information becomes available pursuant to section 403.086(1)(c)3., F.S.

Table G-1. Wastewater facilities subject to the nitrogen and phosphorus limits set forth in section 403.086, F.S.

Facility Name	Permit Number
Cannon Creek Mobile Home Park WWTF	FLA011412

Appendix H. Golf Course NMPs

The fertilizers used to maintain golf courses can be significant sources of nutrients in watersheds that are impaired for nitrogen and/or phosphorous. To achieve the TMDL target(s), all nutrient sources need to reduce their nutrient loading. Similar to other sources, golf courses are required to implement management strategies to mitigate their nutrient loading and be in compliance with the BMAP. Florida BMAPs are adopted by Secretarial Order and therefore legally enforceable by the DEP. Requirements for golf courses located in BMAPs are below.

1. Golf Course BMP Certification, Implementation, and Reporting.

    a. In areas with an adopted BMAP, all golf courses must implement the BMPs described in DEP's golf course BMP manual, *Best Management Practices for the Enhancement of Environmental Quality on Florida Golf Courses* (DEP, 2021).

    b. At minimum, the superintendent for each golf course must obtain and maintain certification through the UF-IFAS Florida Golf Courses Best Management Practices Program. It is highly recommended that course managers and landscape maintenance staff also participate in the certification program to ensure proper BMP implementation and understanding of nutrient-related water quality issues and the role of golf courses in water quality restoration and protection. By no later than January 14, 2026, the golf course superintendents must confirm to DEP whether they have completed the certification. Certification must be completed by December 31, 2026. This certification must be renewed every four years.

    c. Beginning in 2026, nutrient application records and management action updates (fertilizer, reuse, BMPs, etc.) must be submitted each year during the BMAP statewide annual reporting process.

    d. Fertilizer rates should be no greater than the UF/IFAS recommendations to help prevent leaching (**Table H-1**). This includes nutrients from reuse or any other source applied. If a facility uses fertilizer rates greater than those in the BMP manual they are required to conduct water quality monitoring prescribed by DEP or WMD that demonstrates compliance with water quality standards.

    e. Example golf course BMPs applicable to protecting water quality are listed below.

        - Use slow release fertilizer to prevent volatilization.
        - Use of lined media in stormwater features.
        - Use of denitrification walls.
        - Use of rain gardens.

- Use of tree boxes.
- Use of bioswales.

Table H-1. Nutrient ranges for warm-season turfgrass species

Note: For more information refer to the Best Management Practices for the Enhancement of Environmental Quality on Florida Golf Courses (DEP, 2021).

Nutrient	Bermudagrass (%)	St. Augustinegrass (%)	Seashore Paspalum (%)	Centipedegrass (%)	Zoysia (%)
N	1.95 - 4.63	1.53 - 2.41	2.80 -3.50	1.5 - 2.9	2.04 - 2.36
P	0.15 - 0.43	0.30 - 0.55	0.30 - 60	0.18 - 0.26	0.19 - 0.22
Potassium (K)	0.43 - 1.28	1.1 - 2.25	2.00 - 4.00	1.12 - 2.50	1.05 - 1.27
Calcium (Ca)	0.15 - 0.63	0.24 - 0.54	0.25 - 1.50	0.50 - 1.15	0.44 - 0.56
Magnesium (Mg)	0.04 - 0.10	0.20 - 0.46	0.25 - 0.60	0.12 - 0.21	0.13 - 0.15
Sulfur (S)	0.07 - 0.02	0.15 - 0.48	0.20 - 0.60	0.20 - 0.38	0.32 - 0.37
Sodium (Na)	0.05 - 0.17	0.00 - 0.17	-	-	-

2. **All golf courses located within a BMAP are required to submit a nutrient management plan (NMP) that is designed to, while maintaining even plant growth, prevent nutrient losses to the Floridan aquifer and surrounding surface waters. A draft NMP must be submitted to DEP within one year of BMAP adoption and a final document is due two years after adoption. The NMP must include the following:**

   a. ***A brief description of the goals of the nutrient management plan.***
      This should be a paragraph that describes the goals of your NMP. Talk about how you are managing for high quality turf and water quality.

   b. ***Identification of areas where nutrient applications will be made including greens, tees, fairways and roughs.***
      Discuss the areas of the course where you plan to use fertilizer, and why. Also discuss the areas that do not need or get any fertilizer applications.

Include a GIS shapefile identifying all of these areas.
Complete the table(s) detailing your nutrient application practices.

Turf Details

Turf Type	Turf Species	Acreage
Tees		
Greens		
Fairways		
Roughs		
Totals		

Fertilizer Applications

Sample fertilizer application table

Month	Turf Type	TN Application Rate (lbs/acre)	TP Application Rate (lbs/acre)	Number of Applications	Total TN Applied (lbs/acre)	Total TP Applied (lbs/acre)
January	Tees					
	Greens					
	Fairways					
	Roughs					
February	Tees					
	Greens					
	Fairways					
	Roughs					
March	Tees					
	Greens					
	Fairways					
	Roughs					
April	Tees					
	Greens					
	Fairways					
	Roughs					
May	Tees					
	Greens					
	Fairways					
	Roughs					
June	Tees					
	Greens					
	Fairways					
	Roughs					

Month	Turf Type	TN Application Rate (lbs/acre)	TP Application Rate (lbs/acre)	Number of Applications	Total TN Applied (lbs/acre)	Total TP Applied (lbs/acre)
July	Tees					
	Greens					
	Fairways					
	Roughs					
August	Tees					
	Greens					
	Fairways					
	Roughs					
September	Tees					
	Greens					
	Fairways					
	Roughs					
October	Tees					
	Greens					
	Fairways					
	Roughs					
November	Tees					
	Greens					
	Fairways					
	Roughs					
December	Tees					
	Greens					
	Fairways					
	Roughs					
Totals						

Amount of Reuse/Reclaimed Water Applied

Sample reclaimed water and fertilizer use table

*Supply reuse/reclaimed water volumes applied, if applicable.

Month	Reuse/Reclaimed Water Quantity (Gallons)	Monthly Average TN (mg/L)	Monthly Average TP (mg/L)	Quantity of TN Applied (lbs)	Running Total of TN Applied per Acre (lbs/acre)	Quantity of TP Applied (lbs)	Running Total of TP Applied per Acre (lbs/acre)
January							
February							
March							
April							

Month	Reuse/Reclaimed Water Quantity (Gallons)	Monthly Average TN (mg/L)	Monthly Average TP (mg/L)	Quantity of TN Applied (lbs)	Running Total of TN Applied per Acre (lbs/acre)	Quantity of TP Applied (lbs)	Running Total of TP Applied per Acre (lbs/acre)
May							
June							
July							
August							
September							
October							
November							
December							
Totals							

Are any other sources of nutrients (i.e. manure, etc.) applied to the grounds? If so, please detail in a table similar to the reuse and fertilizer tables.

c. Current BMP implementation.

Describe existing BMPs and other nutrient management actions here.

d. Soil sampling methods and results for each area receiving fertilizer applications. Areas receiving fertilizer applications shall be sampled once every three years. Soil samples shall be collected and analyzed according to UF-IFAS/DEP recommendations or standard industry practice. Soil samples shall be analyzed, at minimum, for:

1. Nitrogen
2. Phosphorus

Describe existing soil sampling here. Describe your planned soil sampling schedule. Provide information about how long you have been soil sampling and what part of the course you are prioritizing.
If soil samples from areas of similar soil, fertilizer use and management are combined, describe the process and justify combining for a "representative" sample.
Keep all soil test results (or copies of them) in this file as part of your nutrient management plan. Please do not send them in to DEP individually. If you've been soil testing for years, remember to add copies of all those past results to your NMP file.

e. Water quality sampling methods and results. Water quality sampling and analysis should be conducted in accordance with DEP's Standard Operating Procedures. Water quality samples shall be analyzed, at minimum, for:

1. Nitrogen
2. Phosphorus.

If applicable, describe existing water quality sampling. Describe your planned water quality sampling schedule. Provide information about how long you have been doing water quality sampling and what part of the course you are prioritizing.

Keep all water quality test results (or copies of them) in this file as part of your nutrient management plan. Please do not send them in to DEP individually. If you've been testing for years, remember to add copies of all those past results to your NMP file.

f. Tissue sampling methods and results. Tissue samples shall be collected and analyzed according to UF-IFAS/DEP recommendations or standard industry practice.

Describe existing tissue sampling plan. Keep all test results (or copies of them) in this file as part of your nutrient management plan. Please do not send them in to DEP individually. If you've been testing for years, remember to add copies of all those past results to your NMP file.

g. Soil, tissue and water quality sample results shall be maintained for a minimum of five years. Please provide records.

h. When developing new (or expanding) golf courses, pre- and post- monitoring should be implemented in accordance with UF-IFAS/DEP recommendations.

Appendix I. Agricultural Enrollment and Reductions

FDACS provided the following information for this appendix for each BMAP.

Agricultural Landowner Requirements

Section 403.067, F.S., requires agricultural producers and landowners located within BMAP areas to either enroll in the FDACS Best Management Practices (BMP) Program and properly implement BMPs applicable to their property and operation or to conduct water quality monitoring activities as required by Rule Chapter 62-307, F.A.C. Producers or agricultural landowners who are enrolled in the FDACS BMP Program and are properly implementing the applicable BMPs identified on the BMP Checklist, or who are in compliance with the Equivalent Program requirements of Rule Chapter 5M-1, F.A.C., are entitled to a presumption of compliance with state water quality standards per section 403.067(7)(c)3., F.S.

FDACS Office of Agricultural Water Policy (OAWP) BMP Program

Best Management Practices (BMPs) Definition

For the purposes of the OAWP BMP Program, the term "best management practice" means a practice or combination of practices determined based on research, field-testing, and expert review, to be the most effective and practicable on-location means, including economic and technological considerations, for improving water quality in agricultural discharges. Section 403.067, F.S., requires that BMPs reflect a balance between water quality improvements and agricultural productivity. FDACS works closely with the FDEP, water management districts (WMDs), industry experts, and academic institutions to understand the environmental and agronomic effects addressed by BMPs.

Section 403.067, F.S., authorizes and directs FDACS to develop and adopt by rule BMPs that will help Florida's agricultural industry achieve the pollution reductions allocated in BMAPs. To date, FDACS OAWP has adopted 11 commodity specific BMP manuals by rule, covering cattle, citrus, equine, dairy, nurseries, poultry, sod, small farms and specialty livestock, specialty fruit and nut, vegetable and agronomic crops, and wildlife operations. All OAWP BMP manuals are periodically revised, updated, and subsequently reviewed and preliminarily verified by DEP before re-adoption. BMPs serve as part of a multidisciplinary approach to water resource restoration and protection that includes public/private partnerships, landowner agreements and regional treatment technologies, which together form the comprehensive strategy needed to meet the goals established in BMAPs.

Enrolling in an FDACS BMP Program

To initially enroll in the FDACS BMP Program, agricultural landowners and producers must meet with an FDACS representative on site to determine the appropriate practices that are applicable to their operation(s) and to document the BMPs on the Notice of Intent (NOI) and BMP Checklist. FDACS representatives consider site-specific factors when determining the applicability of BMPs including commodity type, topography, geology, location of production, soil type, field size, and type and sensitivity of the ecological resources in the surrounding areas.

Producers collaborate with the FDACS representative to complete an NOI to implement the BMPs and the BMP Checklist from the applicable BMP manual.

Once the NOI and Checklist are completed, signed, and submitted to OAWP, the producer is formally enrolled in the BMP Program. Because many agricultural operations are diverse and are engaged in the production of multiple commodities, a landowner may sign multiple NOIs for a single parcel. Producers must properly implement all applicable BMPs as soon as practicable, but no later than 18 months after completion and execution of the NOI and associated BMP Checklist.

Enrollment Prioritization
To address the greatest resource concerns, OAWP utilizes a phased approach based on commodity type, irrigation, and agricultural acreages, while ensuring that all entities identified as agriculture will be notified. Enrollment efforts have previously focused on enrolling parcels that are most impactful to water quality including parcels containing many agricultural acres, irrigated acres, or more intense agricultural land uses.

Implementation Verification
Section 403.067, F.S., requires FDACS to conduct an Implementation Verification (IV) site visit at least every two years to ensure that agricultural landowners and producers are properly implementing the applicable BMPs identified in the BMP Checklist. An IV site visit includes: review and collection of nutrient application records that producers must maintain to demonstrate compliance with the BMP Program; verification that all other applicable BMPs are being properly implemented; verification that any cost shared practices are being properly implemented; and identification of potential cost share practices, projects or other applicable BMPs not identified during enrollment. During the IV site visit, FDACS representatives also identify opportunities for achieving greater nutrient, irrigation, or water resource management efficiencies, including opportunities for water conservation. Procedures used to verify the implementation of agricultural BMPs are outlined in Rule 5M-1.008, F.A.C.

Nutrient Application Records
Enrolled landowners and producers are required to keep records on the total pounds of nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P) fertilizer from all sources that are applied to their operations to comply with BMP program requirements, including AA bio-solids. Nutrient records from Class A or B biosolids applied in accordance with Chapter 62-640, F.A.C. are collected through the DEP permitting process as described in 5M-1.008(5). FDACS will collect information pertaining to these records for a two-year period identified when an IV site visit is scheduled. OAWP adopted a Nutrient Application Record Form (NARF) (FDACS-04005, rev. 06/24, incorporated in 5M-1.008(4), F.A.C.), to help simplify the record keeping requirement. The form is available under Program Resources at https://www.fdacs.gov/Agriculture-Industry/Water/Agricultural-Best-Management-Practices. As these records relate to processes or methods of production, costs of production, profits, other financial information, fertilizer application information collected during an IV site visit is considered confidential and may be exempt from public records under

chapters 812 and 815, Florida Statutes (F.S.), and Section 403.067, F.S. In accordance with subsection 403.067(7)(c)5., F.S., FDACS is required to provide DEP the nutrient application records.

Compliance Enforcement
If multiple efforts to contact agricultural landowners and producers within BMAPs about enrollment in the BMP Program are unsuccessful or if the landowner or producer chooses not to enroll in the BMP Program FDACS refers them to DEP for enforcement action per Section 403.067(7)(b), F.S.

If a producer is enrolled in the FDACS BMP program and the producer chooses not to properly implement the applicable BMPs, FDACS representatives provide the landowner or producer with a list of corrective measures and the timeframes within which they must be implemented. If a landowner or producer does not cooperate with FDACS to identify or implement corrective or remedial measures, or refuses an IV site visit, FDACS refers them to DEP for enforcement action after attempts at corrective and remedial action are exhausted. Chapter 5M-1, F.A.C. outlines the process to ensure compliance with the BMP Program requirements.

Equivalent Programs
Enrollees operating under one of the Equivalent Programs listed in Rule 5M-1.001(7), F.A.C., are required to complete an NOI and meet the other requirements for Equivalent Programs specified in Rule Chapter 5M-1, F.A.C. Compliance with BMPs on the area(s) of the NOI property subject to the Equivalent Program instrument is demonstrated by fulfilling the requirements of Rule 5M-1.008(8), F.A.C. An Enrollee under an Equivalent Program listed in Rule 5M-1.001(7)(a)-(b), F.A.C., that is not required to complete a BMP Checklist is not subject to IV site visits. For Enrollees under an Equivalent Program listed in Rule 5M-1.001(7)(a)-(b), F.A.C., implementation verification shall be undertaken by the agency that issued the permit pursuant to its statutory and/or rule authority.

Other FDACS BMP Programs

FDACS implements other regulatory programs that help minimize nonpoint source pollution from agricultural activities.

Aquaculture
The FDACS Division of Aquaculture develops and enforces regulations governing the commercial aquaculture industry in Florida. Chapter 597, F.S., Florida Aquaculture Policy Act, requires Floridians who engage in commercial aquaculture to annually acquire an Aquaculture Certificate of Registration and implement all applicable Aquaculture Best Management Practices listed in Rule Chapter 5L-3.004, F.A.C. Facilities with certain production and discharge rates also require an NPDES permit from DEP. The Aquaculture BMPs were last updated by rule in November 2023.

FDACS Division of Aquaculture conducts annual site visits at certified facilities to confirm compliance with BMPs. These include management practices in areas of construction, containment, shrimp culture, sturgeon culture, shellfish culture, live rock culture, aquatic plants, including fertilizer application, and health management. For more information about FDACSs Division of Aquaculture and Aquaculture BMPs go to https://www.fdacs.gov/Divisions-Offices/Aquaculture.

Within the Santa Fe BMAP, there are 11 aquaculture facilities under certification with the FDACS Division of Aquaculture as of November 2024. As with agricultural land use in Florida, aquaculture facilities are frequently in and out of production. The facilities being provided may no longer be in operation and/or there may be new companies in different parts of the basin by the next BMAP iteration.

Forestry

The FDACS Florida Forest Service (FFS) develops, implements (through education and training), and monitors Silviculture BMPs in Florida. Silviculture BMPs are applicable to *bona-fide* ongoing silviculture operations and are not intended for use during tree removal or land clearing operations that are associated with a land-use change to a non-forestry objective. The FFS Silviculture BMP Manual is adopted under Chapter 5I-6.002 F.A.C. and was last updated in 2008. FFS is currently in the process of updating the manual with guidance from the FDACS Silviculture BMP Technical Advisory Council. The current manual is composed of fourteen BMP categories covering many aspects of silviculture operations including timber harvesting, site preparation, forest roads, stream and wetland crossings, and forest fertilization. The primary objectives of Silviculture BMPs are to minimize the risks to Florida's water resources from silviculture-related sources of nonpoint source pollution and maintain overall ecosystem integrity. Section 403.067, F.S., provides silviculture practitioners implementing Silviculture BMPs a presumption of compliance with state water quality standards for the pollutants addressed by the BMPs.

The FFS Silviculture BMP implementation monitoring program was initiated in 1981 and follows the criteria which have been established for state forest agencies in the southeastern United States by the Southern Group of State Foresters. Monitoring surveys are conducted biennially on a random sample of recently conducted silviculture operations throughout Florida with the goal of determining the level of implementation and compliance with Silviculture BMPs. For the period of record (1981 to 2023), Florida's statewide Silviculture BMP compliance rates range from 84% (1985) to 99.7% (2019) and have shown an overall average compliance rate above 98% since 2005. For more information about Silviculture BMPs and to download a copy of the latest FFS Silviculture BMP Implementation Survey Report go to https://www.fdacs.gov/bmps.

Agricultural Land Use

Agricultural Land Use in BMAPs

Land use data are helpful as a starting point for estimating agricultural acreage, determining agricultural nonpoint source loads, and developing strategies to reduce those loads in a BMAP area, but there are inherent limitations in the available data. Agriculture acreages fluctuate when volatile economic markets for certain agricultural commodities provide incentive for crops to change at a fast pace, properties are sold, leases are terminated, production areas decrease, or production ceases, among other reasons. Florida's recent population growth has also resulted in accelerated land use changes statewide, some of which include transitioning agricultural or fallow agricultural lands to developed land uses. The dynamic nature of Florida's agricultural industry creates challenges with comparing agricultural acres from year to year.

When developing a BMAP, agricultural nonpoint source loading is estimated using a broad methodology based on statewide land use data. Oftentimes, this results in properties being designated as agricultural nonpoint pollution sources and creates an obligation for these properties to enroll in the FDACS BMP Program when they may be better addressed under other programs more applicable to the practices occurring on those properties. Examples of these properties include: rural residential/homesteads, ranchettes, or single-family homes with accessory structures for livestock or groves that serve the needs of those living on the property. Continued identification of these properties as agricultural nonpoint sources limits the ability to reliably direct programmatic resources to meet water quality restoration goals.

FDACS uses the parcel-level polygon agricultural lands (ALG) data that is part of the Florida Statewide Agricultural Irrigation Demand (FSAID) Geodatabase to estimate agricultural acreages statewide. FSAID provides acreages and specific crop types of irrigated and non-irrigated agricultural lands statewide. FSAID is updated annually based on water management district land use data, county property appraiser data, OAWP BMP enrollment data, U.S. Department of Agriculture data for agriculture, such as the Cropland Data Layer and Census of Agriculture, FDACS Division of Plant Industry citrus data, as well as field verification performed by the U.S. Geological Survey, water management districts, and OAWP. As the FSAID is detailed and updated on an annual basis, it provides a reliable characterization of agricultural land uses that accounts for the fast-growing population and resultant land use changes taking place statewide. The FSAID also provides FDACS a clearer picture of agriculture's impact on the landscape and consistent method to better track, direct, and assess BMP implementation, cost share projects, and regional projects.

Figure I-1 shows the percentage of agricultural land use within the Santa Fe BMAP, determined by comparing the FSAID 11 ALG and total acreage of the BMAP boundary. Understanding what proportion of a BMAP is comprised of agriculture provides insight as to the potential contribution of agricultural nonpoint sources.

Table I-1. Comparison of land uses in the Santa Fe BMAP

Non-Agricultural Acres	1,076,652
Agricultural Acres	195,617



Figure I-1. Agricultural land use in Santa Fe BMAP

FDACS BMP Program Metrics

Enrollment Delineation and BMAP Metrics

BMP enrollments are delineated in GIS using county property appraiser parcels. In terms of NOIs, enrolled acreage fluctuates when parcels are sold, when leases end or change hands, or when production areas downsize or production ceases, among other reasons. Nonproduction areas such as forest, roads, urban structures, and water features are often included within the parcel boundaries. Conversely, agricultural lands in the FSAID ALG only include areas identified as agriculture. To estimate the agricultural acres enrolled in the BMP program, OAWP overlays the FSAID ALG and BMP enrollment data within GIS to calculate the acres of agricultural land in an enrolled parcel.

Summary Tables

Table I-2. Agricultural lands enrolled in the Santa Fe BMAP area by BMP program commodity

Commodity	Agricultural Acres Enrolled
Citrus	12
Cow/Calf	32,972
Dairy	888
Equine	33
Fruit/Nut	334
Multiple Commodities	45,344
Nursery	612
Poultry	96
Row/Field Crop	23,902
Sod	294
Total	**104,487 (53%)**

Table I-3. Agricultural acres enrolled by commodity and crediting location

Commodity	Devil's Complex	Hornsby	Ichetucknee	Outside Springsheds
Citrus	0	0	0	12
Cow/Calf	8,365	4,487	2,970	17,151
Dairy	0	841	0	46
Equine	10	0	0	23
Fruit/Nut	283	0	6	44
Multiple Commodities	21,280	4,778	7,615	11,671
Nursery	94	227	0	290
Poultry	1	0	0	96
Row/Field Crop	9,744	2,878	5,013	6,267
Sod	0	66	0	228
Total	**39,777**	**13,277**	**15,604**	**35,828**
Percent of Agricultural Lands Enrolled in BMPs	**66%**	**59%**	**39%**	**49%**

As of July 2024, 53% of the agricultural acres in the Santa Fe BMAP area are enrolled in FDACS' BMP program. **Table I-2** and **Table I-3** show the acreages enrolled in the BMP Program by commodity for the BMAP and by crediting location. It is important to note that producers often undertake the production of multiple commodities on their operations, resulting in the requirement to implement the applicable BMPs from more than one BMP manual. When this occurs, the acres enrolled under more than one BMP manual are classified as "multiple commodity" and not included in the individual commodity totals to prevent duplication.

Enrollment Map



Figure I- 2. Agricultural land use in the Santa Fe BMAP

Unenrolled Agricultural Lands

Oftentimes, there are lands initially identified as agriculture which, upon closer evaluation, raise questions as to whether there is agricultural activity and whether it is enrollable within the

purview of OAWP. FDACS characterizes lands classified as agriculture in the FSAID ALG, but not currently enrolled in the FDACS BMP Program using property appraiser data such as parcel owner information, agricultural tax valuation for exemption purposes, other parcel land use details to determine whether the remaining lands are potentially enrollable. More information about the "Unenrolled agricultural lands" characterization analyses is available in ***FDACS Annual Status of Implementation of BMPs Report***.

The assessment of unenrolled agricultural lands at a more granular scale provides an indication of which areas are more likely (or unlikely) to have enrollable agricultural activities occurring on them. It also provides an estimate of the number of parcels and the associated agricultural acres deemed to be enrollable. The number of parcels is a useful proxy for the level of resource dedication needed to enroll the associated agricultural acres and where best to focus finite resources and staffing needs. It is often the case that much of the potentially enrollable acreage is encompassed within many smaller parcels which may require additional resources to enroll and require further evaluation, such as those that have agricultural activity intended solely for personal use ancillary to a residence, those that do not have an agricultural land use per the property appraiser, as well as parcels where there is no current activity to enroll.

Table I-4 shows the breakdown of agricultural lands within the Santa Fe BMAP by Crediting Location based on the FSAID 11 and the results of the FDACS unenrolled agricultural lands characterization.

Table I-4. Agricultural lands in Santa Fe BMAP by crediting location

* Enrollment information current as of July 2024.

Crediting Location	Agricultural Acres	Unenrolled - Unlikely Enrollable Acres	Agricultural Acres - Adjusted	Agricultural Acres Enrolled*
Devil's Complex	72,456	12,544	59,911	39,777
Hornsby	27,948	5,600	22,348	13,277
Ichetucknee	50,791	11,105	39,686	15,605
Outside Springsheds	95,218	21,548	73,671	35,829

Potentially Enrollable Lands

There are 91,184 acres of potentially enrollable lands within the Santa Fe BMAP based on the assessment of unenrolled agricultural lands performed by FDACS. **Table I-5** shows the potentially enrollable acreages by crop type. **Figure I-3** shows the count of potentially enrollable parcels based on size classifications used by FDACS.

Table I-5. Potentially enrollable acres by crop type

Crop Type	Acres
Cropland and/or Pastureland	1,061
Crops	6,525

Crop Type	Acres
Fallow	1,419
Fruit (Non-citrus)	130
Grazing Land	59,584
Hay	19,417
Livestock	1,448
Nursery	431
Open Lands	1,159
Total	**91,175**



Figure I-3. Count of potentially enrollable parcels by size class

FDACS Cost Share

Enrollment in and proper implementation of BMPs makes a producer eligible for cost share for certain BMPs, other practices, and projects. The availability of cost share funds depends on annual appropriations by the Florida Legislature, and therefore, the amount available can vary each year. Cost share applications may be submitted once a producer has enrolled in the BMP Program and has been assigned an NOI number. Cost share practices are categorized as nutrient management, irrigation management, or water resource protection. BMPs, other practices, and projects eligible for cost share funding may include precision agriculture technologies, variable rate irrigation methods, water control structures, and tailwater recovery systems. OAWP seeks to leverage its cost share funding with other cost share programs offered by FDACS and other state and federal agencies. The United States Department of Agriculture NRCS offers funding through its Environmental Quality Incentives Program, and certain WMDs have agricultural cost share programs. Applicants are encouraged to use OAWP cost share in conjunction with other available conservation programs although funding cannot be duplicative.

Table I-6 identifies agricultural technologies eligible for funding through cost-share assistance and the associated nutrient reductions[1] based on BMAP location. The nutrient reductions were used to develop a methodology to estimate nutrient reductions for NOIs that have received cost-share funding[2]. The NOI boundary, based on property appraiser parcel data, was considered the area treated by the cost-shared agricultural technology or project. For parcels with more than one cost-share project, OAWP identified the order of treatment to determine the reductions for the multiple projects based on each cost-shared agricultural technology. Estimated nutrient reductions from FDACS cost share in the Santa Fe BMAP springsheds are shown in **Table I-7-7**.

Table I-6. Cost share project types and estimated nutrient reduction efficiencies

Project Types	BMP Category	Mechanism	N Impact
Nutrient Management Plan	Precision Nitrogen Management	N application reduction	15%
Plastic Mulch Layer - Drip Tape	Precision Nitrogen Management	N leaching reduction	18%
Controlled Release Fertilizer	Precision Nitrogen Management	N leaching reduction	20%
Applicator (Hoop Sprayer)	Precision Nitrogen Management	N application reduction	20%
Applicator (Liquid)	Precision Nitrogen Management	N application reduction	15%
Spreader (Dry Variable)	Precision Nitrogen Management	N application reduction	15%
Applicator (Dry Banding)	Precision Nitrogen Management	N application reduction	25%
Cover Crops	Tillage, Cover Crops and Soil Health BMPs	N leaching reduction	30%
Vertical Till	Tillage, Cover Crops and Soil Health BMPs	N leaching reduction	6%
Flail Mower	Tillage, Cover Crops and Soil Health BMPs	N application reduction	8%
Integrated Crop-Livestock Rotations	Livestock BMPS	N leaching reduction	50%
Rhizoma Peanut Mix Pasture System	Livestock BMPS	N application reduction	31%
Fencing	Livestock BMPS	N leaching reduction	20%
Livestock Water Exclusion	Livestock BMPS	N runoff reduction	33%
Alternative Water Supply - Livestock	Livestock BMPS	N runoff reduction	33%
Free Stall Barn	Livestock BMPS	N leaching reduction	30%
Culvert/Riser	Drainage and Erosion Reduction BMPs	N runoff reduction	16%
Water Control Structures or Stormwater Improvement	Drainage and Erosion Reduction BMPs	N runoff reduction	17%
Tailwater Recovery Ponds	Drainage and Erosion Reduction BMPs	N runoff reduction	42%
Storage – Compost	Storage	N leaching reduction	26%
Storage – Potting Soil	Storage	N leaching reduction	23%
Rotation – mobile corral	Livestock BMPS	N leaching reduction	20%
Rotation – portable feeder/wagon	Livestock BMPS	N leaching reduction	20%

Table I-7. Nutrient reductions from FDACS cost share - springsheds

Devil's Complex BMP Category	TN Reductions to Groundwater (lbs/yr)
Irrigation	16,383
Livestock BMPS	1,685
Precision Nitrogen Management	21,211
Tillage, Cover Crops and Soil Health BMPs	2,851
Hornsby BMP Category	**TN Reductions to Groundwater (lbs/yr)**
Livestock BMPS	1,585
Precision Nitrogen Management	1,261
Tillage, Cover Crops and Soil Health BMPs	1,810
Ichetucknee BMP Category	**TN Reductions to Groundwater (lbs/yr)**
Drainage and Erosion Reduction BMPs	46
Irrigation	4,627
Livestock BMPS	4,385
Precision Nitrogen Management	4,246
Tillage, Cover Crops and Soil Health BMPs	810
Outside Springsheds BMP Category	**TN Reductions to Groundwater (lbs/yr)**
Irrigation	1,713
Livestock BMPS	1,433
Precision Nitrogen Management	3,893
Tillage, Cover Crops and Soil Health BMPs	949
Total	**68,887**

Future Efforts

Outreach

To address resource concerns, FDACS continues enhancing coordination with producers, agencies, and stakeholders to increase enrollment in the BMP program. OAWP is sending correspondence to agricultural landowners within BMAPs that are not currently enrolled in the BMP program to increase enrollment rates and verify land uses where additional focus may be required to achieve resource protection. This effort is utilizing a phased approach and targeting priority land uses, and then evaluating the amount of agricultural acreage for the remaining unenrolled lands, while ensuring that all entities identified as agriculture will be notified. Additionally, OAWP continues to coordinate with industry groups and outreach partners to educate and inform agricultural producers about the BMP program.

Dairy Loading Estimations

Dairy operations represent a diverse agricultural industry within Florida, varying widely from pasture-based operations to confinement facilities where the cows spend the entire day under

roof. Dairies must balance nutrient use and management based on the amounts of manure and wastewater generated onsite. Nutrient management requirements vary based on herd sizes and are implemented either through the permitting process under Chapter 62-670, F.A.C. or through enrollment in the FDACS BMP program.

Manure is typically stored onsite as solids or in the operation's waste storage pond (WSP). Manure solids can be land-applied, composted, or hauled off-site. Waste stored in the waste storage pond can be land-applied as liquid organic fertilizer, such as through a center pivot irrigation system. Use of nutrients from solids or the WSP allows dairy operations to produce forage or silage crops for their herds and maintain a nutrient balance.

Manure is an organic source of Nitrogen (N) subject to volatilization based on many factors including temperature, rainfall, soil type, and storage method. Volatilization provides for less available N to be lost through leaching, but also less available N for crop uptake.

Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation (CAFO) Dairies

Dairies with a herd size over 700 are Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs) and are permitted by FDEP under Chapter 62-670, F.A.C. CAFO dairies are required to implement a Nutrient Management Plan (NMP) as part of their permit. The NMP outlines the nutrient inputs and outputs of a particular dairy operation, including any reuse and off-site disposal of manure and any commercial fertilizers used to grow forage or silage crops. CAFO dairies must perform water quality monitoring onsite and submit quarterly and annual reports demonstrating compliance with water quality standards and their NMP.

While CAFO dairies can meet most of their crop nutrient requirements using waste generated onsite, in some instances the amount of N lost due to volatilization may require the use of supplemental commercial fertilizers. However, when commercial fertilizers are utilized, they are typically applied at rates below the standard application rates for agronomic crops based on the NMPs and annual reports submitted by permitted dairies.

Non-CAFO Dairies

Dairies with herd sizes smaller than 700 are non-CAFO and are subject to the same requirements as other agricultural operations within BMAPs. They must enroll in and implement BMPs applicable to their operation or perform water quality monitoring per Chapter 62-307, F.A.C. While not duplicative of permit requirements, the FDACS Dairy BMP Program has some similarities including lining of WSPs and maintenance of a nutrient balance through record review and collection. Further, enrolled dairy operations are subject to the Implementation Verification (IV) site visit requirement every 2 years as required by s. 403.067(7)(d)3., F.S.

NSILT Estimation of Dairy Loading

The NSILT provides estimates of loading to groundwater based on land use and other factors in a springshed, where it may be harder to capture nuances happening on the ground such as methods of agricultural production.

Attenuation Factors

All dairies must demonstrate a balance between their nutrient inputs and outputs based on the nutrient of concern in a basin, e.g., nitrogen. Nutrient balance considers a variety of factors including waste treatment systems, volatilization losses, and crop uptake. **Table I-8**Table I-8 shows the overall nitrogen (N) remaining for crop uptake for typical dairy waste treatment systems.

Table I-8. Overall nitrogen remaining for crop uptake with the described systems[1]

Type of System	N Remaining
Cows on Pasture	40%
Cows on concrete floor to storage pond with less than 7 days hold time then sprayed through sprinkler or thinly surface applied	35%
Cows on concrete floor to storage pond with less than 7 days hold time then incorporated or seepage ditch	40%
Cows on concrete floor to storage pond with 7 to 30 days hold time then sprayed through sprinkler or thinly surface applied	30%
Cows on concrete floor to storage pond with 7 to 30 days hold time then incorporated or seepage ditch	35%
Cows on concrete floor to storage pond with greater than 30 days hold time then sprayed through sprinkler or thinly surface applied	10%
Cows on concrete floor to storage pond with greater than 30 days hold time then incorporated or seepage ditch	15%
From WSP samples to crop uptake if applied via sprinkler or thinly surface applied	50%
From WSP sample to incorporated or seepage ditch	80%
Solids thinly applied	75%
Solids incorporated	95%

Dairies produce waste daily, and many produce crops year-round, therefore the nutrients in manure that is land applied through spreading or through an irrigation system are either lost to the atmosphere or taken up by a crop. Manure is stored prior to land application and may be treated in some way, e.g., separating solids from process wastewater or held in a WSP, allowing additional time for volatilization to occur. It is reasonable to expect dairy waste to have the same of attenuation at both CAFO and non-CAFO dairies. The NSILT assumes non-CAFO dairy waste has an attenuation rate of 50%, whereas CAFO dairy waste is assumed to attenuate at 85%. A comparison of the loading estimates using the different attenuation rates based on the NSILT is shown in **Table I-9**.

[1] Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services. (2024). Florida Dairy Operations, 2024 Edition: Water Quality and Water Quantity Best Management Practices. https://ccmedia.fdacs.gov/content/download/64582/file/Dairy-Operations-Manual.pdf

Table I-9. Estimated dairy loading at different attenuation rates

BMAP	Springshed	Recharge	Dairy Load to Groundwater - 50% Attenuation	Dairy Load to Groundwater - 85% Attenuation
Suwannee	Middle	High	93,051	27,915
Suwannee	Middle	Medium	20,310	6,093
Santa Fe	Hornsby	Low	2,313	694
Silver	Silver	High	26,535	7,960
Chassahowitzka/Homosassa	Homosassa	High	34,209	10,263

Future Steps to Refine and Address Dairy Loading

While variability in production systems is not unique to dairy operations, it is important to assess the various management systems at both CAFO and non-CAFO dairies to estimate an operation's impact in a springshed. Loading from dairy operations is expected to be reevaluated regularly as part of the adaptive management inherent in BMAP implementation.

The Suwannee River Water Management District (SRWMD) is working with the dairy industry on sustainability projects focused on nutrient mitigation and water conservation. Additionally, CAFO and non-CAFO dairy operations enrolled in FDACS BMPs are eligible for regular cost share funding from FDACS and SRWMD.

Legacy Loads

Legacy loading can present an additional challenge to measuring progress in many areas of Florida with adopted BMAPs. Based on research, initial verification by DEP, and long-term trends in water quality in the BMAP area, it is expected that current efforts, such as BMP implementation, will continue to provide improvements in overall water quality despite the impacts from legacy loads.

While the implementation of BMPs will improve the water quality in the basin, it is not reasonable to assume that BMP implementation alone can overcome the issues of legacy loads, conversion to more urban environments, and the effects of intense weather events. BMP implementation is one of several complex and integrated components in managing the water resources of a watershed.

Collaboration between DEP, FDACS, the water management districts, and other state agencies, as well as local governments, federal partners, and agricultural producers, is critical in identifying projects and programs, as well as locating funding opportunities to achieve allocations provided for under this BMAP. To improve water quality while retaining the benefits that agricultural production provides to local communities, wildlife enhancement, and the preservation of natural areas requires a commitment from all stakeholders to implementing protective measures in a way that maintains the viability of agricultural operations.

Appendix J. Private Golf Courses with BMAP responsibilities

The tables below list privately owned and operated golf courses that have been identified as contributing sources of nitrogen loading to the groundwater in the Santa Fe River BMAP. Publicly-owned facilities have been assigned as a part of the responsible entities allocation and are not included in the list below. The golf courses in **Table J-1** are subject to nutrient management strategies identified in **Section 2.8.1** and **Appendix H** of this document. All facilities listed below have been assigned required TN reductions to meet the TMDLs. DEP encourages coordination between public and private entities as necessary to address loading in the basin.

Table J-1. Privately owned or operated golf courses in Santa Fe River BMAP

Springshed	County	Facility Name	2028 Milestone/ 30% Reduction TN (lbs/yr)	2033 Milestone/ 80% Reduction TN (lbs/yr)	2038 Milestone/ 100% Reduction TN (lbs/yr)
Hornsby	Alachua	Turkey Creek Golf and Country Club	99	265	331
Ichetucknee	Columbia	The Country Club At Lake City	720	1,919	2,398
Ichetucknee	Columbia	Creeks/Dunes/Ponds Courses At Quail Heights Country Club	756	2,017	2,521
Outside the springsheds	Bradford	Starke Country Club	73	194	242
Outside the springsheds	Alachua	Keystone Country Club	69	185	232

Appendix K. Private Wastewater Treatment Facilities with BMAP Responsibilities

The table below lists privately owned and operated facilities that have been identified as contributing sources of nitrogen loading to the groundwater in the Santa Fe River BMAP. Publicly-owned facilities have been assigned as a part of the responsible entities allocation. The WWTFs in **Table K-1** are subject to relevant nutrient management strategies identified in **section 2.6** and **Appendix G** of this document. All facilities listed below must meet the applicable effluent limit (**Table 23**) to meet the TMDLs. DEP encourages coordination between public and private entities as necessary to address loading in the basin.

Table K-1. Privately owned or operated WWTFs in Santa Fe River BMAP

Springshed	Facility ID	Facility Name
Devil's Ear	FLA011298	Archer Homes WWTF
Devil's Ear	FLA011417	FDOT I-75 Rest Area SB - Ellisville WWTF
Hornsby	FLA011313	Florida Welcome Station WWTF
Ichetucknee	FLA011394	Columbia City Elementary School WWTF
Ichetucknee	FLA011398	Paradise Village Mobile Home Park WWTF
Ichetucknee	FLA011403	Super 8 Motel WWTF
Ichetucknee	FLA011406	Pondview Mobile Home Park WWTF
Ichetucknee	FLA011408	Lake City KOA North WWTF
Ichetucknee	FLA011402	Eastside Village Mobile Home Park WWTF
Ichetucknee	FLA011412	Cannon Creek Mobile Home Park WWTF
Ichetucknee	FLA011418	Columbia Correctional Institution WWTF
Outside the springsheds	FLA011312	Gainesville Raceway WWTF
Outside the springsheds	FLA011338	Keystone Village Apartments WWTF
Outside the springsheds	FLA113450	Florida State Prison WWTF