

Agency	slide #	Question	Response
DOI/EPA	3	Consider clarifying any distinctions in the use of FWY and WY on the different slides. The glossary defines FWY, but WY is used on several other slides. If FWY and WY are defined in the same manner, consider eliminating one.	Slide was edited
DOI/EPA	3	Consider defining the red/white hashed circle in the legend.	Slide was edited
DOI/EPA	3	Consider stating the period of record for the trends test.	Slide was edited
DOI/EPA	3	"Increased flows as a result of COP have driven the LTL down to the minimum and the frequency of exceedances has increased." As observed in the graph, the earlier three years that were also at the minimum LTL (2013, 2016, 2018) did not have exceedances. It is important to note why and explain what conditions were different in those years, compared to 2021, 2022, and 2023. Consider eliminating 2023 from all the data analysis as numbers are preliminary.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
DOI/EPA	3	Consider stating the period of record for the trends test.	Slide was edited
DOI/EPA	3	Consider clarifying the meaning of the smaller green boxes on the x-axis.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
DOI/EPA	6	Consider clarifying why WY2019 was selected as the focal period.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
DOI/EPA	6	Consider stating the rationale for a 5-year average.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
DOI/EPA	8	Consider clarifying why WCA3 structures S339 and S340 are marked as inflows. What areas are they providing inflow to? What is their water source? Is it a combination of local rain, local upstream marsh water (no levee separating the Miami Canal from the marsh), or does S8 inflow dominate?	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
DOI/EPA	9	Consider including an arrow through Mullet Slough from Big Cypress.	Slide was edited
DOI/EPA	10	Consider describing the data screening process for this slide as we are not able to reproduce these values given the present information.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
DOI/EPA	10	Consider clarifying what the empty blue and white circles represent in the figure.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
DOI/EPA	10	The slide has a table that indicates averages, while the figure has geomean. Please clarify the period of record for the geomeans in the figure.	Slide was edited
DOI/EPA	10	Considering that FWM is used at SRS inflows for Appendix A and STA outflows for STA permits, and in the SFER, please clarify why structure TP data for WCA3A is expressed as GM rather than FWM. Consider including how much higher FWM TP are relative to GM for structures on slides 10, 13, 15. It would be most informative to show both GM and FWM.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
DOI/EPA	10	Consider providing the FWM and GM TP for S-9 and S-9A in the presentation.	Comment not relevant to this slide. S9 & S9A are not analyzed in relation to the Western inflow region.
DOI/EPA	10	"High-TP inflows that enter the marsh via S190 and S140 reduced after a short distance." Please clarify the distance defined as "short".	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
DOI/EPA	10	Currently, this slide seems to conclude that land within the Miccosukee Reservation is being used to attenuate TP from S140 and S190. Consider revising if this is not the intended message.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
DOI/EPA	10	The SFER reports higher TP for S140 and S190. Is this because FWMs are higher than GMs at these structures?	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
DOI/EPA	11	S333s do not appear to be presented correctly. It is not clear how the volume of flow delivered at stages <9.2 ft is greater than the total volume delivered.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
DOI/EPA	11	This slide seems to argue that low flow contributions from the S12A structure are inconsequential to achieving compliance. Consider revising if this is not the intended message. If it is, please provide statistical analysis.	To be discussed during TOC presentation. Statistical analysis to be considered for future analysis
DOI/EPA	11	For the statement "typically has good WQ", consider defining parameters for "typically" (i.e. frequency) and "good WQ" (is it related to the 8-ppb target defined for SRS?).	Slide was edited
DOI/EPA	11	Consider providing the concentration range during flow at the S12A.	Noted. The GM shown in the previous slide for S12A is higher than the FWMC since it accounts for higher concentrations taken during no-flow, low-stage periods.
DOI/EPA	11	Would the title "Park inflows" be more appropriate for this slide	Slide was edited
DOI/EPA	12	"S339 & S340 are almost always closed and prevent direct canal flows between S8 and L-67A." Please note when S339 and S340 were opened, and how often (i.e., peak wet season with high flow?)	Slide was edited
DOI/EPA	13	Consider providing data screening methodology as these numbers are not reproducible with the data provided on DBHYDRO. Consider clarifying what "Seasonally screened data from WY2019-2023" means.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
DOI/EPA	13	Consider a seasonal evaluation of marsh and canal connectivity if the aim is to understand the dynamic interaction between these two media. The aggregation to five-year averages tends to mask much of the informative signals.	To be considered for future analysis

DOI/EPA	13	It would benefit the discussion if the S8 FWM was included.	To be considered for future analysis
DOI/EPA	14	S-9 and S-9A. "Typically minimal dry season discharges". Please note during which years there have been dry season discharges as these are not always minimal.	Slide was edited
DOI/EPA	14	Slides numbered 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, and 15: Consider adding volumes to the arrows indicating flow. It is unclear if arrows are flow proportional throughout the slides.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
DOI/EPA	15	We are not able to reproduce the presented TP concentrations.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
DOI/EPA	15	Consider providing all data in geometric means	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
DOI/EPA	15	Consider including how FWMs compare to GMs for these structures?	To be considered for future analysis
DOI/EPA	16	Clarify if the S9 and S333 weekly TP mean data are FWM or GM.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
DOI/EPA	17	Was the daily correlation between S9s and S333 without lags evaluated? If so, consider presenting those results. We found positive correlations for direct comparison between concentrations at the S9s and S333s. Similarly, we found correlations between loads among these locations.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
DOI/EPA	21	Bar colors and symbology are not defined. Consider providing legends.	Slide was edited
DOI/EPA	23	Consider providing evidence that there is a statistical increase in frequency or magnitude of exceedances.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
DOI/EPA	23	More water delivered in the dry seasons seems to be limited to the three years of COP. A statistical evaluation of this statement needs to be pursued	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
DOI/EPA	23	Marsh data do not support this argument as the monitoring network is not designed to capture the impact of S190 releases as discussed and agreed upon in multiple TOC meetings.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
DOI/EPA	23	Consider providing evidence that Miami Canal water is being explicitly influenced by the marsh. The authors should also consider acknowledging that the elevated TP levels from the marsh are a result of long-term TP loading from the canal and upstream sources.	To be discussed during TOC presentation. Future analysis are necessary
DOI/EPA	23	The S9 to marsh interaction was not demonstrated in this presentation.	To be discussed during TOC presentation. Future analysis are necessary
DOI/EPA	General Comments	The presentation declares WY2023 a preliminary exceedance. We recommend removing 2023 from all analyses done in this presentation as these numbers are still preliminary. TOC would need to follow the process and parameters already established. Generally, TOC members start looking at exceedances in April of the year to follow the preceding September sample event. To change the process, the TOC would need to vote on this change or the Principals would have to provide this direction after consulting and agreeing among themselves.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
DOI/EPA	3	WY2017 was not excused as an exceedance by the TOC. TOC only determined the year as an extraordinary natural phenomenon. Consider revising the text.	Slide was edited
DOI/EPA	3	Restoration is driving improved water delivery throughout the system, including to Everglades National Park. The LTL was designed based on existing flows at the time. COP is not driving the LTL lower. If an argument for there being a higher frequency of exceedances under COP is to be pursued, a statistical analysis would need to be performed to evaluate this conjecture based on three years of monitoring data.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
DOI/EPA	3	There have only been three years of COP operations. To better understand these dynamics consider comparing these identified years to years with comparable conditions (rainfall and antecedent water conditions).	To be discussed during TOC presentation. Future analysis are necessary
DOI/EPA	4	Consider clarifying how the upward trend of flows <9.2 ft is linked to being "Associated with higher TP concentrations". The previous slide states there was no trend in FWMC.	Slide was edited
DOI/EPA	6	WY2017 was not excused as an exceedance by the TOC. TOC only determined the year as an extraordinary natural phenomenon. Consider revising the text.	Slide was edited
DOI/EPA	9	"Flow from L-28 borrow canal to C-60 canal" suggests that water from S140 stays in the C60 canal. However, water exits this canal via culverts into WCA3A.	Slide was edited
DOI/EPA	9	The slide argues that Mullet Slough separates the northern and southern L28 canal. Nonetheless, the loads of TP discharged directly into the Miccosukee lands has generated a growing plume of invasive vegetation extending greater than 2 miles of the described 7-mile-wide basin. Consider acknowledging that P from the western basin runoff is currently being attenuated on these tribal lands.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
DOI/EPA	10	Are the 5-year average concentrations filtered by flow for the structures or does that represent all the concentrations for the period? In the past, FDEP staff members have represented TP concentrations as geometric means when aggregating over various periods as the data not normally distributed. Considering presenting the concentrations as geometric means to match the figure.	Slide was edited

DOI/EPA	12	It appears this slide that the wetlands near the release structures are being used to treat western basin discharges. If so, consider clearly stating it.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
DOI/EPA	12	A discussion of how the dense vegetation lining the canal from S8 down to S339 would be helpful in describing where the S8 nutrient load is deposited. Explaining how the dense vegetation lining the canal from S339 down to L67A continues to grow will also help us understand the fate of nutrient transport. Explaining these components and the interrelationship between the marsh, the canal and legacy TP in the marsh would benefit the technical discussions. The top picture in this slide can serve as a good example for this dynamic. Consider offering information on water circulation for the Miami canal and adjacent marsh system connectivity.	To be considered for future analysis
DOI/EPA	13	C123SR84 is a good indicator of how impacted the marsh has been adjacent to the Miami canal and what is being returned to the canal downstream of the structures and ultimately delivered to L67A. Consider discussing this point.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
DOI/EPA	16	This slide does not seem to consider the loading to L67A from the S9s as a source to the S333.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
DOI/EPA	16	It is not clear where the sediments and associated nutrients from the S9s are being deposited based on the information provided. Consider clarifying.	To be considered for future analysis
DOI/EPA	17	We suggest not mixing loads and concentrations to determine correlations between locations ~25 miles apart. Consider maintaining a clear distinction in correlation between loads and between concentrations.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
DOI/EPA	17	Please clarify the relevance of the long lag times. Perhaps consider evaluating the time it takes for water released from the S9s to reach the S333s.	To be considered for future analysis
DOI/EPA	17	Consider using water travel time from S9 to S333 as the estimated lag time so that lag-time has a physical meaning. Going out as far as 360 days does not seem to have a physical meaning.	To be considered for future analysis
DOI/EPA	17	Consider mentioning that loads from the S9s contribute to the mass of TP in the L67A canal over time and that some fraction of these materials are ultimately delivered down the L67A through regular and continuous transport processes.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
DOI/EPA	17	TP in sediments and TP in water have different travel times. Consider delineating these signals to then relate transport dynamics to physical mechanisms.	To be considered for future analysis
DOI/EPA	18	Consider providing evidence that Mullet Slough prevents S190 and S140 flows from reaching S12A. Using stations outside of the flow path is not conducive for this evaluation and a monitoring design and data collection aimed specifically to address this topic should be considered to provide evidence to support this conjecture.	To be discussed during TOC presentation. Future analysis are necessary
DOI/EPA	18	While S339 and S340 are closed much of the year, S8 contributions have loaded the marsh surrounding Miami canal for decades and is picked back up downstream as evidenced by the presented C123SR84 concentrations.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
DOI/EPA	18	Relative to these lag-based correlations, has a water and nutrient budget been attempted to determine the potential contribution of the S9s to the S333s?	To be considered for future analysis
DOI/EPA	18	Forming conclusions based on 5-year averages for the highly variable dynamics between marsh and canal does not seem appropriate as the system is seasonally highly dynamic. Consider performing evaluations at a higher temporal resolution to understand the dynamics of the system drivers.	To be discussed during TOC presentation. Future analysis are necessary
DOI/EPA	18	Considering that canal water that seeps into the marsh when the structures are closed can quickly seep back into the canal downstream of the structure, are S339 and S340 effective?	To be discussed during TOC presentation. Future analysis are necessary
DOI/EPA	23	"P concentrations rise at an increasing rate when S333HW stage recedes at a constant rate". It is unclear if this is referring to slide 20. The terms constant rate and increasing rate were not used on slide 20. What has a constant rate? Consider using language from slide 20.	Slide was edited
DOI/EPA	No Slide	Consider providing timeseries of flows for the S8, S11s, S9s, and S333s as this will allow for understanding of temporal flow dynamics among these structures.	To be considered for future analysis
FWS	No Slide	I would put slide 5 before slide 3. Otherwise it is confusing why years 2013, 2016, and 2018 are highlighted in Green. If you put the COP slide first, the viewer will have the right perspective leading into slides 3 and 4.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
FWS		I am concerned with slide 3 and 4 where WY2023 data is used before QA/QC by SFWMD. The TOC has not historically considered this data until final.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.

FWS	8	S339 and S340 are both inflows and outflows when water levels are high enough to move water southward. This water can also hydrate the marsh. This regime is often discussed during the ecosystem based management meetings during dry periods in NW 3A.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
FWS	11, Qualitative statements	"S-12A generally has good WQ". Technical representatives need data to back up this statement.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
FWS	14, Qualitative statements	when discussing the S-9 flows that are "Typically minimal dry season discharges". Flow data is needed to illustrate and back-up this statement.	Slide was edited
FWS	18, Qualitative statements	•Mullet Slough splits L-28 and prevents S190 &S140 outflows from reaching to S12A". How do we know this? Flow vectors from data or modeling are needed to illustrate this conclusion	Slide was edited
FWS	18, Qualitative statements	•"TP enters marsh & is attenuated within a few miles of outflow point". Data is needed to describe how many miles is a "few miles".	To be discussed during TOC presentation. Future analysis are necessary
FWS	23, Qualitative statements	Miami Canal water entering L-67A has been highly influenced by marsh interaction". This statement needs some clarification. Are you saying the marsh is affecting TP in the canal, or is the canal affecting the marsh TP level? What has been influenced? Data is needed to show how much Miami Canal water is actually reaching the L-67A to substantiate this statement and determine the relevancy of Miami Canal water in the scheme of WQ and its effects at S-333 complex.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
USACE	3	Is the frequency increase anecdotal or has a chi-square test confirmed a significant increase in frequency pre and post COP?	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
USACE	5	Please note the COP EIS, supported by Water Quality sub-team evaluations, did not anticipate annual exceedances. 1) Consider "Exceedances of Appendix A have occurred with increased frequency since COP implementation" (or similar).	Slide was edited
USACE	5	For consideration, an additional sub-bullet may be added to reflect that "Adaptive management measures have been evaluated by an interagency team for opportunities to mitigate potential negative impacts associated with water quality, consistent with COP trigger criteria" -- this may also be a point to raise during the presentation without putting on the slide, since the agencies have collected recommended not to employ COP adaptive management options to reduce TTF deliveries; minimum flows to S-333 were used during 2023 per COP AM.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
USACE	6	Is it that the magnitude has truly increased under COP, or that COP has driven the LTL to the lowest value with little changes in seasonal TP concentrations? Magnitude might not be the best way to characterize it if comparing the exceedance when the LTL is 10 ppb vs when it is 7.6.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
USACE	17	Please include a tabular summary of the S-9 5-year TP inflow concentration in the slide deck, for consistency with the other WCA-3A inflow structures. Note that although a FWM correlation is not apparent with S-333, S-9 TP load is still reaching the L-67A Canal system (the focus area of the S-333 WG investigations). With S-9 being a flood control pump station, operations generally occur during wet periods when WCA-3A stages are elevated above the S-333HW threshold of 9.2 ft NGVD.	New slide was added
USACE	18	During the COP implementation period, S339 and S-340 have been closed most of the time, but operations follow a regulation schedule based on 3A-62 stage. Consider "closed most of the time when TP concentrations are elevated", or similar.	Slide was edited
USACE	24	For this slide, consider also recognizing the State's completion of Restoration Strategies at the end of 2025, as this effects the inflow TP quality reaching the CEPP North structures and the S-11s from WCA-2A.	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
USACE	24	What is the take away message from this slide? The presentation shows much of the TP flowing in doesn't make it to SRS, and the TP is driven more by stage changes and higher dry season flow and many of these projects (e.g., BCWPA attenuate flows into WCA3A) so is the take away message that these project will increase water levels within WCA3A and reduce the frequency of water levels <9.2 ft at S333?	To be discussed during TOC presentation.
USACE	24	Please indicate that WERP, unlike CEPP, is a proposed project -- the draft PIR is expected to be released in mid-December 2023	Slide was edited