

Woodville Recharge Basin Aquifer Protection Study

BC-07-19-02-29

Final Report

Friday, September 29, 2006
(peer reviewed version, 01/28/07)

by

McGlynn Laboratories Inc.

MACTEC

Tallahassee-Leon County GIS

Ardaman and Associates

Prepared for the

*The Board of Leon County
Commissioners*

French Spring, Leon County Florida



Woodville Recharge Basin Aquifer Protection Study

BC-07-19-02-29

Phase III Draft of the Final Report

Friday, September 29, 2006
(peer reviewed version, 01/28/07)

by
**McGlynn Laboratories Inc.
MACTEC
Tallahassee-Leon County GIS
Ardaman and Associates**

Prepared for the
The Board of Leon County Commissioners

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Woodville Recharge Basin Aquifer Protection Study, Phase III

Executive Summary

A. Summary, Phase I and II

1. Hydrology and Geology

- 1.1. Atmospheric Deposition
- 1.2. Septic Tanks
- 1.3. Conduit Flow
- 1.4. Deep Aquifer
- 1.5. Discharges to Karst Features

2. Geospacial Modeling

- 2.1. Title Page
- 2.2. Physiography
- 2.3. WAM Model Approach and algorithms
- 2.4. Input Data Sources (Woodville WAM Model)
- 2.5. Deliverables
- 2.6. WRB Data (additional Information on Deliverables)

3. Mitigations Options

4. References

5. Appendices

TABLES

Table A.1	Woodville Recharge Basin Recharge Assumptions
Table A.2	LIDAR accuracy assessment, all checkpoints (decimal inches)
Table 1.1.1	Experimental results of the monthly rainfall nutrient data.
Table 1.1.2	Experimental results for background well nutrient data in the WRB
Table 1.2.1	TABLE A
Table 1.2.2	TABLE B
Table 1.2.3	Nitrate + Nitrite septic tank studies.
Table 1.2.4	Sewage effluent collected before the septic system.
Table 1.2.5	Statistical results of the Phosphorus Mesocosm
Table 1.2.6	Statistical results of the Nitrogen Mesocosm
Table 1.2.7	Statistical results of the Phosphorus Mesocosm
Table 1.2.8	Statistical results of the Nitrogen Mesocosm Experiment
Table 1.2.9	Statistical results of the Phosphorus Mesocosm Experiment
Table 1.2.10	Statistical results of the Nitrogen Mesocosm Experiment
Table 1.2.11	Statistical results of the Phosphorus Mesocosm
Table 1.2.12	Statistical results of the Nitrogen Mesocosm
Table 1.4.2	USGS data
Table 1.5.1	Microcystin toxins in Ames Sink and Lake Munson
Table 1.5.2	WRB stormwater data.
Table 2.1	Land Use Categories Occurring
Table 2.2	Global Default Nutrient Content Parameters
Table 2.3	Global Default Climate parameters
Table 2.4	Groundwater nitrate from the land surface
Table 2.3.2	Soluble Nitrate to Groundwater by Land Use
Table 2.3.3	Ratio of Runoff to Percolation
Table 2.3.3	Ratio of Runoff to Percolation
Table 2.3.4	Soluble Nitrate to Groundwater from the SESF
Table 2.3.5	Soluble Nitrate to Groundwater, septic
Table 2.3.6	Annual Average Percolation by Sub Basin (Part 1)
Table 2.3.6	Annual Average Percolation by Sub Basin (Part 2)
Table 2.3.7	Atmospheric deposition of soluble nitrate by sub basin (part 1)
Table 2.3.7	Atmospheric deposition of soluble nitrate by sub basin (part 2)
Table 2.3.8	Existing soluble nitrate loadings to groundwater by land use
Table 2.3.8	Modified soluble nitrate loadings to groundwater by land use
Table 2.1	Sum of ground water soluble nitrate
Table 2.2	Septic tank loading
Table 2.3	Stormwater pollutants to the aquife
Table 2.4	stormwater pollutants flowing to closed karst depressions

Table 2.5	stormwater pollutants flowing to open karst features
Table 2.6	Landuse in the WRB in ascending order
Table 2.7	Nitrate loading to the surface in the WRB by Landuse.
Table 2.8	Nitrates loaded into the groundwater by Landuse.
Table 2.9	The present removal of Nitrates by Landuse
Table 2.10	The Atmospheric loading
Table 2.11	The runoff from subbasins the aquifer
Table 2.13	annual pollutant loadings for each closed basin
Table 2.14	normalized annual pollutant loading
Table 2.15	annual pollutant loadings for each closed basin per acre.
Table 3.1	Modifications to the current SESF.
Table 3.2	Leachable nutrients from soils in the WRB.

FIGURES

Figure A.1	The Woodville Recharge Basin
Figure A.2	Potential point sources of pollution within the WRB
Figure A.3	Domestic OSTDS within the WRB.
Figure A.4	Areas of greatest concern regarding aquifer B
Figure A.5	Piezometric Surface (NFWFMD data).
Figure A.6	Piezometric Surface (from LIDAR data)
Figure A.7	Cross-section of the upper St. Marks River
Figure A.8	Dye injection into OSTDS
Figure A.9	Model for a septic system in normal soils
Figure A.10	Model for a septic system in Karst)
Figure A.11	Average nitrate concentrations in SESF wells
Figure A.12	SESF well with the highest average nitrate
Figure A.13	SESF well with the third highest nitrate
Figure A.14	SESF well with the fourth highest nitrate
Figure A.15	Well locations on the SESF
Figure A.16	Nitrate concentrations in the WRB surface waters
Figure A.17	N and P loading to Lakes Lafayette.
Figure A.18	Nitrogen contribution to sinking streams
Figure A.19	Nitrate concentrations of selected sinks
Figure A.20	Relationship of nitrate concentrations of sinks
Figure A.21	Dilution rate of 2% per mile
Figure A.22	Dilution rate of 10% per mile
Figure A.23	Phosphate in Leon County surface water.
Figure A.24	Nitrate in Leon County surface water.

Figure A.25	Phosphate, daily readings in Wakulla Springs.
Figure A.26	Nitrate, daily readings in Wakulla Springs.
Figure A.27	TN/TP ratios at Wakulla Springs since 1996
Figure A.28	TN and TP vs. discharge at Wakulla Springs
Figure A.29	TN at Wakulla Springs
Figure A.30	TP at Wakulla Springs
Figure 1.1.1	The location of groundwater wells PL1, PL2 and PL3
Figure 1.1.2	This detailed schematic diagrams
Figure 1.1.3	Locations of the three background wells
Figure 1.1.4	The atmospheric deposition sampling device.
Figure 1.1.5	Wet deposition, oxidized nitrogen.
Figure 1.1.6	Wet deposition, total phosphorus.
Figure 1.1.7	Oxidized nitrogen and phosphorus in background well 1..
Figure 1.1.8	Oxidized nitrogen and phosphorus in background well 2.
Figure 1.1.9	Oxidized nitrogen and phosphorus in background well 3.
Figure 1.1.10	95% of the nitrogen in the rainwater was removed
Figure 1.1.11	Coring into the top of the aquifer.
Figure 1.1.12	WRB background monitoring well number 2.
Figure 1.2.1	Septic tank study sites in the WRB
Figure 1.2.2	Septic tank study site, the Hunt Site
Figure 1.2.3	Septic tank study site, the Hunt Site
Figure 1.2.4	Septic tank study site, the Hunt Site
Figure 1.2.5	Septic tank study site, the Valentine Site
Figure 1.2.6	Septic tank study site, the Valentine Site
Figure 1.2.7	Septic tank study site, the Valentine Site
Figure 1.2.8	Septic tank study site, the Valentine Site
Figure 1.2.9	Septic tank study site, the Valentine Site
Figure 1.2.10	Septic tank study site, the Valentine Site
Figure 1.2.11	Native soils in the WRB are paleolithic beach sand mixed with clay.
Figure 1.2.12	Graphical depiction of the 1 st quarter phosphorus mesocosm.
Figure 1.2.13	Graphical depiction of the 1 st quarter nitrogen mesocosm.
Figure 1.2.14	Graphical depiction of the 2 nd quarter phosphorus mesocosm.
Figure 1.2.15	Graphical depiction of the 2 nd quarter nitrogen mesocosm.
Figure 1.2.16	Graphical depiction of the 3 rd quarter phosphorus mesocosm.
Figure 1.2.17	Graphical depiction of the 3 rd quarter nitrogen mesocosm.
Figure 1.2.18	Graphical depiction of the 4 th quarter phosphorus mesocosm.
Figure 1.2.19	Graphical depiction of the 4 th quarter nitrogen mesocosm.
Figure 1.3.1	Natural Bridge and the St. Marks Rise
Figure 1.3.2	Dye studies were also conducted between two disappearing streams
Figure 1.3.3	The location of the dye injection and sensor placement
Figure 1.3.4	This map depicts the eastern and the western cavern

- Figure 1.3.5 This map depicts the topography of the St. Marks Rise
Figure 1.3.6 The location of the dye injection and sensor placement
Figure 1.3.7 This graph depicts the breakout curves from the second dye study
Figure 1.3.8 Front sink (a swallet spring)
Figure 1.3.10 Injecting more dye (James McClean, dye master)
Figure 1.3.9 Injecting dye and pumping it to the cavern.
Figure 1.3.11 Hydrolab DSIV insite Rhodamine sensor.
Figure 1.3.12 The location of the dye injection and sensor placement
Figure 1.3.13 This graph depicts the breakout curves from the third dye study.
Figure 1.3.14 Injecting the dye in the sink at Rhodes Spring #2
Figure 1.3.16 Dye was not detected in Rhodes Spring #4
Figure 1.3.15 Dye going down the sink at Rhodes Spring #2
Figure 1.3.17 Dye in the sink at Rhodes Spring #2 (James and his helpers)

Figure 1.3.18	The location of the dye injection and sensor placement
Figure 1.3.19	This map depicts the topography at Bird Sink.
Figure 1.3.20	This graph depicts the daily dye concentrations
Figure 1.3.21	This graph depicts the breakout curves
Figure 1.3.22	Burnt Mill Creek
Figure 1.3.23	Burnt Mill Creek on July 22, 2006 at 17 20
Figure 1.3.24	The dye was disappearing into the sink by 17 30.
Figure 1.3.25	The location of the dye injection and sensor
Figure 1.3.26	This map depicts the road to Bird Sink..
Figure 1.3.27	This map depicts the topography at Bird Sink.
Figure 1.3.28	This graph depicts the daily dye concentrations
Figure 1.3.29	This graph depicts the breakout curves
Figure 1.3.30	Black Creek is a sinking blackwater stream
Figure 1.3.32	Scenic Black Creek with Cypress knees
Figure 1.3.31	Black Creek flowing into cavern at Bird Sink
Figure 1.3.33	Dye going down Bird Sink.
Figure 1.4.1	Schematic Map of the Deep Wells installed by FGS.
Figure 1.4.2	Roads in the vicinity of the deep wells funded by Leon County.
Figure 1.4.3	Topography in the vicinity of the deep wells funded by Leon County.
Figure 1.4.1	Nitrate concentrations in wells from the SESF to Wakulla Springs.
Figure 1.4.3	Cores from Natural Wells ready for the core library at FGS
Figure 1.4.4	FGS drilling the well (Brie Coane and Ken Campbell)
Figure 1.4.5	Well Construction Data, Natural Wells (typical of the three wells)
Figure 1.4.6	Well Completion Report, Natural Well
Figure 1.4.7	Well Completion Report, Lewis Well
Figure 1.4.8	Well Completion Report, Hunt Well
Figure 1.5.1	Map of the WRB Karst Features sampled for stormwater
Figure 1.5.2	Map of Ames Sink contours. The sink was sampled at the inflow.
Figure 1.5.3	Map of Blueberry Sink contours. The sink was sampled at the inflow.
Figure 1.5.4	Map of Chicken Branch contours.
Figure 1.5.5	Almost half the stormwater samples exceeded
Figure 1.5.6	Four the stormwater samples exceeded
Figure 1.5.7	Nitrogen concentrations in Ames Sink
Figure 1.5.8	Phosphorus concentrations in Ames Sink
Figure 1.5.9	Loadings of nitrates to Ames Sink
Figure 1.5.10	Loadings of nitrogen to Ames Sink
Figure 1.5.11	Loadings of Phosphorus to Ames Sink
Figure 2.1	Shaded relief map of Leon County showing the location
Figure 2.2	Shaded Relief map of Woodville Recharge Basin.
Figure 2.3	Physiographic Provinces
Figure 2.4	Flowchart of BUCShell post processing

Figure 2.1.1.1	Topography, Drainage Units and Stream Reaches
Figure 2.1.1.2	Closed depressions in The Woodville Recharge Basin
Figure 2.1.1.3	Distance from Land Cell to nearest Stream Reach
Figure 2.1.1.4	Distance from Land Cell to Nearest Depression
Figure 2.1.1.5	Distance from Depression to Closest Stream Reach
Figure 2.1.1.6	Distance from land cell to nearest wetland
Figure 2.1.1.7	Distance from wetland to closest stream reach
Figure 2.1.1.8	Land Use and Land Cover
Figure 2.1.1.9	Soils within the Woodville Recharge Basin
Figure 2.1.1.10	Rain Zone Data
Figure 2.1.1.11	Wastewater Utility Service Area
Figure 2.2.2.2	Soluble Nitrate reaching stream
Figure 2.2.2.3	Sediment Nitrate leaving land cel
Figure 2.2.2.4	Sediment Nitrate reaching stream
Figure 2.2.2.5	Subsurface soluble nitrate from land cell
Figure 2.2.2.6	Soluble Phosphorous leaving land cell
Figure 2.2.2.7	Soluble Phosphorous reaching stream
Figure 2.2.2.8	Sediment Phosphorous leaving land cell
Figure 2.2.2.9	Sediment Phosphorous reaching stream
Figure 2.2.2.10	Biological Oxygen Demand
Figure 2.2.2.11	Biological Oxygen Demand reaching stream
Figure 2.3.1	Location map of the SESF
Figure 2.3.2	Soluble nitrate loadings
Figure 2.3.3	Residential Land Uses
Figure 2.3.4	Average Annual Percolation by Sub Basin
Figure 2.3.5	Annual Average Runoff by Sub Basin
Figure 2.3.6	Parcel Boundaries and Soluble Nitrate Loadings
Figure 2.3.7	Parcel Boundaries and Soluble Nitrate Loadings
Figure 2.3.9	Parcel Boundaries and Soluble Nitrate Loadings
Figure 2.3.10	Parcel Boundaries and Soluble Nitrate Loadings
Figure 2.3.11	Soluble Nitrate to Groundwater
Figure 2.3.12	Soluble Nitrate to Groundwater
Figure 2.3.13	Annual Average Percolation by Sub Basin
Figure 2.3.14	Land Use with Sub Basin Boundaries
Figure 2.3.15	Existing and Hypothetical Buildout
Figure 4.3.16	Existing and Hypothetical Buildout Impacts
Figure 4.3.17	Groundwater Soluble Nitrate Concentration
Figure 2.3.17	Groundwater Soluble Nitrate Concentration
Figure 3.1	This map depicts aquifer vulnerable areas within the WRB.
Figure 3.2	locations of shallow surficial aquifer monitoring wells
Figure 3.3	the following is an aquifer vulnerability profile

- Figure 3.4 A clustered low density single family home unit.
- Figure 3.5 Drainages in the Woodville Basin.
- Figure 3.6 map depicting the sites
- Figure 3.7 Stormwater projects suggested for the WRB
- Figure 3.8 This digital elevation map shows the central wetland
- Figure 3.9 hypereutrophic Lake Munson
- Figure 3.10 Aerial view of the central swam
- Figure 3.11 Selected close up views of the heavily logged Central Wetlands
- Figure 3.12 sand mine in foreground with the Southwoods pond just above.
- Figure 3.13 lakes at the terminus of the Shepards Branch drainage.
- Figure 3.14 The sand mine and the Southwoods pond.
- Figure 3.15 the darkest brown areas in this map
- Figure 3.16 The Natural Wells parcels have a certified value of \$62,684.00
- Figure 3.17 The St. Marks Rise parcels have a certified value of \$1,409,004.00
- Figure 3.18 The Verdura parcel has a certified value of \$29,352,393.