

MINUTES

Everglades Technical Oversight Committee Meeting
Friday, Feb. 9, 2001
10 a.m. to 3 p.m.
South Florida Water Management Headquarters
3301 Gun Club Road, West Palm Beach, FL 33406
Storch Conference Room

TOC Members Present

Laura Brandt, A.R.M. Loxahatchee National Wildlife (Refuge)
Mike Zimmerman, Everglades National Park (ENP)
Garth Redfield, South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD)
Bob Barron, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
Absent: Frank Nearhoof, Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP)
Kenneth Weaver represented FDEP

Others Present

Abtwew, Wossenu	SFWMD	McCafferty, Randy	SFWMD
Aumen, Nick	ENP	McCarthy, Linda	SFWMD
Bechtel, Tim	SFWMD	McGinnes, Paul	SFWMD
Bennett, Susan	SFWMD	Meiers, Damon	SFWMD
Charkhian, Bahram	SFWMD	Mo, Cheol	SFWMD
Cheesman, Maxine	SFWMD	Pathak, Chandra	SFWMD
Colecchio, Gary	SFWMD	Pfeuffer, Richard	SFWMD
Crean, Linda	SFWMD	Powell, Barbara	SFWMD
Davis, Linda	SFWMD	Riley, Jim	USACE
Duncan, Gene	Miccosukee Tribe	Schuster, Glenn	USACE
Fink, Larry	SFWMD	Smith, Bo	USACE
Fontaine, Tom	SFWMD	Smith, Lisa	SFWMD
Grosser, Larry	SFWMD	Struve, Dave	SFWMD
Hewitt, Cindy	InfoTech	Trost, Sharon	SFWMD
Ivanoff, Delia	SFWMD	Ulrich, Cheryl	USACE
MacVicar, Tom	MacVicar, Federico and Lamb Inc.	Waldon, Mike	USFWS
Marshall, Ana	SFWMD	Walker, Bill	Consultant to Dept. of the Interior
		Weaver, Ken	FDEP
		Xue, Shi Kui	SFWMD

1. Introductory Comments – Garth Redfield

- Garth Redfield opened meeting at 10:05 a.m. and announced agenda order changes because of another meeting overlapping TOC meeting. Sept. 7 meeting TOC meeting minutes approved.
- Redfield explained purpose of TOC: According to 1995 modification to Consent Agreement language, the TOC is a consensus-building body to communication technical information between agencies and try to resolve issues if possible and/or suggest approaches to principals to get them resolved.

- Gene Duncan asked for clarification of 1995 modification and, to his knowledge, the judge did not accept the modifications. Redfield said he would get an attorney to clarify and answer Duncan's question.

2. Introduction to water quality conditions in C-111; Section 6 of the C-111 General Re-evaluation Report (GRR) concerning water quality – Cheryl Ulrich, USACE

- Cheryl Ulrich gave a presentation regarding water quality conditions in C-111 (GRR) and modified water deliveries to Everglades National Park (Attachment A).
- Ulrich said the Corps' goal was to obtain support and input from TOC agencies about the water quality aspect since it is new to the GRR project.
- Dr. Walker provided comments on the C-111 GRR supplement and these were provided for consideration by the TOC (Attachment B).

3. C-111 monitoring data analysis and other water quality assessment issues – Ken Weaver, FDEP

- Ken Weaver presented an overview of the quality of C-111 data (attachment C) and highlighted areas of concern as a result of an audit of the three monitoring labs: DEP lab, SFWMD lab and PPB lab. He pointed out that there is more variability apparent in data from the PPB lab than is the case for either the SFWMD or FDEP labs; four pages of preliminary graphic analysis of data between the various labs was provided as part of Attachment C. PPB lab could not quantify reasons for differences between the labs. Weaver said the DEP memo (attachment C) recommends that the DEP and SFWMD work with PPB lab to improve the problem.
- Maxine Cheesman pointed out that the SFWMD conducts round robin sampling in addition to the DEP and PPB labs for quality assurance.
- Bill Walker asked if the noise, change and spikes shown in the PPB lab could be real and the differences are a result of timing, i.e., samples taken during higher flows, or methodology differences. Graphics provided by DEP on split samples would eliminate differences due to sampling and demonstrate unexplainable variability in PPB data.
- Garth Redfield asked if all three labs' data sets that may show different sampling times are available that could be compiled into one place for review.
- Cheol Mo distributed tow scatter plot handouts (attachment D) that show data from all three labs, including sample splits to the three labs. Periods having both grab and auto sampler data analyzed by the District do not show consistent differences in phosphorus levels associated with sampling method. Comparing data between labs and sampling methods (Attachment D second graphic) shows greater variability and higher values for the PPB lab.
- Bill Walker asked why do we care? What decision is being made on these data sets?
- Lisa Smith responded that these data will be used to foresee any water quality problems as a result of the C-111 project, and longer term, the Corps will use the data in its GRR supplement to strategize approaches to water quality monitoring.

4. Update on Amendment of Chapter 40E-63 (EAA BMP Rule) – Sharon Trost, SFWMD

- Sharon Trost explained the rule making process for the EAA in her presentation summarized in overheads given in Attachment E. She organized her presentation around the following :
 - 1) Modification of criteria for basin load calculations for 298 Districts and diversions
 - 2) Update for the BMP water replacement Model

3) Cleanup language to deal with agricultural performance accountability and changes in land-use.

- There was a discussion over the Federal Government's concerns regarding the proposed rule initiated by a review provided by Dr. Walker as Attachment F. Themes in Walker's review are poor data fit to the existing model, inconsistency with tracking procedures, confidence intervals, and implications for water supply planning.
- A debate ensued between Bill Walker and Tom McVicar. Dr. Aumen and Dr. Walker expressed that in their view that BMP placement model assumptions were inconsistent with reality. Ms. Trost indicated that these matters were too technical for detailed decision at the TOC and that she did not have key technical staff available to discuss the objections in detail. Mr. Fink recommended that both use chemical tracers to verify the water budget they adopted to calibrate their models
- Ms. Trost reacted by saying that if there were strong objections to the proposed Model, a compromise would be to present a partial rule recommendation to the Board with cleanup language and provisions to account for the Chapter 298 District diversion project. She concluded that the timing and staff availability would not permit further analysis to support changing the model and agreed to table the more contentious modeling portion of the Board proposal.

5. Topics for the 2002 Everglades Consolidated Report – Garth Redfield, SFWMD

- Garth Redfield asked TOC members and interested parties for content input for the 2002 Everglades Consolidated Report and to provide him with any specific ideas by early March.

6. Water Quality Conditions Report to the TOC – Tim Bechtel, SFWMD

- Tim Bechtel presented the Water Quality Conditions Report (Attachment G) and briefly discussed water quality findings.
- Gene Duncan requested he would like to see evaluation of P load reduction to the WCAs covered in the quarterly TOC report. He defined load reduction as actual mass loading, not EAA regulatory calculations. Tim Bechtel pointed out that WCA data doesn't change or have interpretability on a quarterly basis and is reported annually in the Everglades Consolidated Report (Chapter 4). After a discussion among the TOC, it was decided that WCA water quality evaluation will not be included in the quarterly TOC report. The annual reporting in the ECR is wholly adequate for long-term reporting of phosphorus loads.

7. Open Public Comment

No public comments were offered.

8. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

A video tape of the meeting is saved with the record.