

This is an Appendix-A Subteam work product with equal contribution from agency representatives to outline advantages and disadvantages between the various compliance methodologies used to estimate Settlement Agreement Appendix A compliance for Shark River Slough (SRS) and Taylor Slough and Coastal Basins (TSCB).

## Shark River Slough (SRS)

Pros	Cons
<b>Method 1:</b> $S_{12s} + [(S_{333} + S_{355A} + S_{355B}) - S_{334}]$	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accounts for total discharge to SRS <math>S_{12s} + S_{333}</math> as originally envisioned in the Settlement Agreement Appendix A.</li> <li>Simplest monitoring scheme to account for discharges and total phosphorus.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No accounting for any inflow via <math>S_{356}</math> (in COP <math>S_{356}</math> will be used to maintain operational phase of L29).</li> <li>Not accounting for "additional inflows from WCAs" as envisioned in the original Settlement Agreement Appendix A.</li> </ul>
<b>Method 1.5:</b> $S_{12s} + [(S_{333} + S_{355A} + S_{355B} + \min(S_{356}, S_{335})) - S_{334}]$	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parses discharges from WCAs (WCA3B) and seepage.</li> <li>Sticking closer to original SA Appendix A.</li> <li>Provides an option to approximate the Settlement Agreement Appendix A direction to include future inflows from WCAs with data currently collected.</li> <li>Leverages the existing infrastructure currently installed to monitoring discharge and total phosphorus.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not tested explicitly as to parsing of WCA surface flow, WCA seepage and return seepage from south.</li> <li>Not accounting for seepage from WCA3B downstream of <math>S_{335}</math> (south of <math>S_{335}</math> between <math>S_{335}</math> and <math>S_{356}</math>). Also, potentially water supply computation issues.</li> <li>Does not explicitly include all monitoring to account for seepage or exactly compute total phosphorus sources to the level of precision historically required by the TOC.</li> <li>Potentially introduces additional uncertainty for continuity with base period assumptions at 0.1 ppb level of precision currently applied for annual compliance.</li> <li>Uncertainty as to whether this flow route, not included in the derivation of the Long-Term Limit, should be included in the Long-Term Limit annual calculation.</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> WCA = Water Conservation Area; COP = Combined Operational Plan; TOC = Technical Oversight Committee; ppb = part per billion (micrograms per liter); ENP = Everglades National Park

## Shark River Slough (SRS) – Continued

Pros	Cons
<b>Method 2: <math>S_{12s} + [(S_{333} + S_{355A} + S_{355B} + S_{356}) - S_{334}]</math></b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Accounts for all discharge to SRS (recycled or otherwise).</li><li>• Leverages the existing infrastructure currently installed to monitoring discharge and total phosphorus.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• S356 has a potential mix of seepage and additional flows from upstream WCAs (in COP some increases ENP seepage).</li><li>• Potential for double counting discharge with respect to compliance limit (due to recycled seepage).</li><li>• Does not explicitly include all monitoring to account for seepage or exactly compute total phosphorus sources to the level of precision historically required by the TOC.</li><li>• Potentially introduces additional uncertainty for continuity with base period assumptions at 0.1 ppb level of precision currently applied for annual compliance.</li><li>• Uncertainty as to whether this flow route, not included in the derivation of the Long-Term Limit, should be included in the Long-Term Limit annual calculation.</li></ul>

## Taylor Slough and Coastal Basins (TSCB)

---

Pros	Cons
<b>Method 1: S332D + S18C</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Simpler method and fewer structures and associated monitoring.</li><li>• Consistent with recent historical reporting.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Considered obsolete, does not account for all discharge into TSCB (2 monitoring locations).</li><li>• Excludes direct ENP inflows via G737 and S328.</li></ul>
<b>Method 2: S332D + G737 + S18C</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Includes surface water discharge from C-111 basin via G737.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Does not include S328 and S322DX1 explicitly (S328 which may be used more in COP)</li></ul>
<b>Method 3: [S332D – S332DX1 – S328] + S328 +G737 + S18C</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Better approximation while leveraging existing monitoring network of the surface water inflows into TSCB/ENP.</li><li>• S332D provides a robust water balance.</li><li>• Closest Method to using the spirit of the App A... "direct inflows to the Park".</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Increased monitoring effort for this area historically far below the fixed TP Limit (6 monitoring locations). Increased potential for temporary data gaps.</li></ul>

---