

**FINAL SUMMARY**  
**TECHNICAL OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**March 16, 1999**

South Florida Water Management District Headquarters

**TOC Members Present:**

Garth Redfield (SFWMD) Chair  
Bob Barron (COE) Vice-Chair via telephone  
Laura Brandt (USFWS)  
Frank Nearhoof (FDEP) via telephone  
Mike Zimmerman (ENP)

**Others Present:**

Tim Bechtel (SFWMD)  
Maxine Cheesman (SFWMD)  
Barbara DeMeo (Seminole Tribe of Florida)  
Tony Federico (MacVicar, Federico and Lamb, Inc.)  
Shawn Komlos (NAS)  
Christy Kulich (Lewis Longman and Walker, PA)  
John Arthur Marshall  
Paul McGinnes (SFWMD)  
Nancy Urban (SFWMD)  
Bill Walker (Consultant)

Garth Redfield called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. Nancy Urban took notes and composed the meeting summary.

**1. What is the charge of the TOC? Should TOC meet with ETAC?**

Garth Redfield gave a brief history of the definition of the TOC and read points in the 1995 consent decree update. Tony Federico asked if the TOC was a sunshine body. Mike Zimmerman stated that it was designated a sunshine body by the courts. The issue of discussion between members of the TOC outside of the meetings falling under sunshine rules was brought up. Maxine Cheesman asked if legal could look into that issue. Garth said he would check with the District's legal staff.

Garth said the TOCs mission is to communicate information and resolve issues. He wanted to know if these same issues could be addressed in ETAC because it seemed like a duplication of efforts. Frank Nearhoof said TOC issues are of equal interest to ETAC and the TOC and ETAC are in his opinion a duplication of effort.

Maxine asked if the District's Water Quality Monitoring Division really needs TOC's blessing on routine monitoring network changes. (Follow-up: Since the TOC is for information updates and consensus building, monitoring changes should be communicated to TOC and relevant issues discussed. Formal approval is not required.) Bill Walker said that the primary function of TOC is too follow compliance process and convene on a quarterly basis in conjunction with the District's quarterly reports. Bob Barron was in agreement. Garth suggested that we schedule TOC meetings one month

after Tim Bechtel issues the quarterly report. Bob Barron stated that the ACOE may have issues that they want discussed in smaller meetings.

Frank Nearhoof asked why is there a disconnect in briefing principals on status of rulemaking. TOC members should make an effort to communicate more fully with TOC principals. Bob Barron said that the principals need to get more information from the TOC. Do we need to make a linkage to them? He was concerned that the TOC will become unfocused if combined with a larger group.

Garth concluded the discussion of item one by stating that the TOC would meet quarterly and would remain separate from the ETAC. TOC would improve linkages to principals. Bill Walker suggested that the minutes would be a good form of communication for the principals. Barbara DeMeo asked if there was a mission statement for the TOC and Garth responded that the mission was defined in the 1995 Consent Decree update.

**The TOC voted unanimously in favor of quarterly and separate meeting for the TOC.**

## **2. Water quality analysis of triplicate samples in the interior of the Refuge**

Bill Walker gave a presentation on his paper, 'Analysis of Marsh Phosphorus Data from Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge' which was prepared for the U.S. Department of the Interior. Bill stated that the two northern stations (1 and 2) had high P and were not included in the analysis of the interior sites. Bill made the following comments in reference to his paper:

- No correlation between water level and variability of samples.
- Average concentration increases when water levels decrease and this may be due to the sample being taken closer to the sediment and the water residence time in the Refuge.
- Sampling down to 10 cm doesn't affect sample results.
- It is not cost effective to collect replicates on every date.
- The monthly sampling regime is fairly accurate and there is no need to increase the number of sampling dates.

Bill proposed sampling at stations 1 and 2 to document marsh improvements prior to STA 1W start-up. Garth said there is a lot of noise at those two stations and perhaps stations 3, 4 and 5 are enough. Bill stated that 18% in measurement error appears to be due primarily to analytical variability and he doesn't have Ron Jones' data. Based upon the analysis of sources of variation done by Bill Walker, Laura Brandt said we only need to be taking one sample at each station in the Refuge on a routine basis. Garth said he would like to get the FIU data analyzed. Laura Brandt said she will work on getting the FIU data and will work cooperatively with Maxine on data collection in the Refuge.



### **3. Quality Control Report**

Paul McGinnes asked for further comments and questions on the Quality Control Report. The following questions were asked:

- Bill Walker: What is the variability due to laboratory measurement? Bill wants variability for low concentration, say less than 25 ppb. Bill also requested quantitative data from QA samples, not just inventory information and a list of flagged TP samples.
- Shawn Komlos: Can we have field variability and lab variability?
- Barbara DeMeo: Would like to see a white paper on how data will be analyzed, variability and how flagged data are handled.

Garth suggested that people put together a list of what they would like to see in the QA report and bring it to the next TOC meeting.

Maxine Cheesman said the lab could provide the information requested, but was concerned as to whether the data will actually be used.

### **4. Discussion of third quarterly report on water quality**

Tim Bechtel said four months of data exceeded the frequency limit for 10ppb in Shark River and may be due to low water levels (p.2). Tony Federico suggested looking at individual structures and report on operational procedures that differ from normal. Adding more operational information to compliance reports is seen as a positive change to TOC members.

### **5. Everglades Consolidated Report - Update**

Garth Redfield gave a brief explanation of the Consolidated Everglades Report. Tony Federico asked if the Everglades Annual Report will be discontinued and will there be a peer review panel. Garth answered that the Everglades Annual Report will be discontinued and converted to the Consolidated Report and yes, there will be a peer review panel. Frank Nearhoof said a letter from FDEP supporting this project was forthcoming. (Note: The letter has been received by the District.)

### **6. Consent Decree Compliance Test for Shark River slough, ENP (S-335A and B, 334)**

Mike Zimmerman gave a presentation on Tracking Phosphorus Inflows to Everglades National Park. He stated that water levels are high for the Cape Sable Sparrow with a potential of flooding the population out. The Corp has come up with an emergency plan: close S-12A and B and divert water to NE Shark slough.

Members noted no obvious concerns with these changes, but Mike said he would produce a summary memo on this for distribution to the TOC.

## **7. Atmospheric Deposition Project - Scope of Work**

Garth gave an introduction on the Scope of Work for the Atmospheric Deposition contract. A copy of the SOW was distributed with a request for comments.

## **8. Date for next TOC meeting is May 25, 1999, 1:00 – 4:00 p.m. at SFWMD Headquarters, B-1 Richard Rogers Conference Room (2<sup>nd</sup> floor)**

## **9. Proposed Agenda Items for the May 25 meeting:**

- QA/QC Report - Paul McGinnes
- Discussion of the Quarterly Water Conditions Report
- Discussion of needs for QA reporting
- Consent Decree Compliance Test for Shark River Slough - continued

**Subject: ETOC agenda**

**Date:** Tue, 18 May 1999 15:58:33 -0400

**From:** "Water Resource Management" <water@gate.net>

**To:** <gredfiel@sfwmd.gov>

Hello Garth;

I am going to be out of town for the ETOC on the 25th and but wanted to ask that the group review a few items.

**STA 6**

1) The water sampling report that was out in April. The Tribe did not get a copy (at least the best of my knowledge) so I can't really address it specifically. Of course the concerns will be any outflows that exceed inflows and what the permit requirements for those occasions? Are we addressing this issue via the permit requirements? Mercury is a major concern.

2) The dry-down conditions that exist in STA6. What is the percent of time that this STA is operating below the minimum (or desired) levels? What are the TP/mercury levels associated with this condition?

3) I spoke to Larry Fink about some of these concerns and he mentioned soil analysis. Wasn't there supposed to be some soil sampling experiments going on in the ERR to determine the relationship of dry-down to TP discharges? Since the soils are different in the STA6 could we begin to investigate this option?

**Water Quality Data:**

1) I would like to see some kind of standard process for data retrieval that deals with the flagged data consistently. Tim Bechtel may have more info on this as it was brought up at our SFWMD/STOF working group meeting. We could also include this process into the reporting format that the SFWMD will be using (see below).

2) Reports for the Data should have at least:

- \* summary statistics of parameters, including handling of outliers,
- \* accuracy and precision summary information of lab data,
- \* changes in any reporting, flagging, SOP, or other protocols and
- \* all criteria used for flagging, etc. should be detailed.

Thanks for your attention.

Barbara DeMeo, Remediation Coordinator  
Water Resource Management  
Seminole Tribe of Florida  
6300 Stirling Rd.  
Hollywood, FL 33024  
(954) 966-6300 ex. 1122  
(954) 967-3489 (fax)