

**Northern Tampa Bay Phase II Local Technical Peer Review Group
SWFWMD Tampa Service Office, Hwy 301N, Tampa**

**Meeting 12
May 1, 2002 - 9:30AM**

Summary

The following were in attendance: **Gordon Leslie, Jr.**, Hillsborough County EPC; Peter Owens, Hillsborough County EPC, Rick Muratti, Hillsborough County EPC; **Dave Slonena**, Pinellas County; Shirley Denton, BRA for Pinellas County; Doug Keesecker, Tampa Bay Water; **R. Warren Hogg**, Tampa Bay Water; Chris Shea, Tampa Bay Water; Mike Coates, Tampa Bay Water; **Ralph Craig**, City of St. Petersburg; **Richard Voakes**, City of St. Petersburg; **Andy Smith**, Hillsborough County; Scott Emery, EHI for Hillsborough County; Mario Cabana, Hillsborough County; **Cliff Harrison**, Schreuder, Inc. for WRWSA; **Vivienne Handy**, Quest Ecology, Inc. for WRWSA; **Jeff Vilagos**, City of Tampa; **Michael Hancock**, SWFWMD; Adam Munson, SWFWMD; **Ted Rochow**, SWFWMD; **Doug Leeper**, SWFWMD; John Emery, SWFWMD; Mark Barcelo, SWFWMD; Robert Peterson, SWFWMD; Richard Schultz, SWFWMD; Ken Weber, SWFWMD; B. Terry Johnson, SWFWMD; Jerry Mallams, SWFWMD; John W. Parker, SWFWMD; Clark Hull, SWFWMD; and Jim Guida, SWFWMD. Names in bold are designated representatives for the LTPRG.

Michael Hancock informed the group that Arecovery assessment@has become an important topic internally at the SWFWMD, and will require extensive discussion within the LTPRG. Further discussions will take place on this issue in future meetings.

Mark Barcelo led a discussion on the implementation of MFLs. As an introduction to the topic, a brief review of Chapter 40D-8 rule language was provided regarding the determination of when actual levels are below the adopted minimum lake, wetland, and saltwater intrusion levels, and the definition of Along-term@. Basically, levels are below the adopted minimum lake and wetland levels when the long-term P50s are below the adopted minimum levels. In addition, aquifer levels are below the adopted saltwater intrusion minimum levels when the long-term average levels are below the adopted levels.

Meeting participants were asked to discuss concerns they had regarding the implementation of MFLs. Dave Slonena asked about resetting the clock when determining if actual levels are below adopted levels. District staff acknowledged this as an issue and recognized that prior to determining whether a MFL has been exceeded, consideration should be given to significant changes that have occurred, such as changes in the

quantities of nearby ground-water withdrawals. District staff noted that the factors that need to be considered in evaluating the implementation of MFLs include limiting the length of the window of time when determining Along-term@and possibly Are-setting@the clock when there has been a significant change in stress.

Warren Hogg noted that the first step in Recovery will be the cutback from 158 mgd to 121 mgd. He also noted that there is only a limited amount of time to assess whether or not Recovery to the target levels has been achieved following the cutback from 121 mgd to 90 mgd in 2007 and prior to 2010. He emphasized that we need to be able to assess recovery from the well field cutbacks as we go through the process.

Andy Smith said implementation of MFLs could work as an on/off switch for determining whether a new water withdrawal should be permitted. He recommended it not be used as on/off switch for managing existing withdrawals.

It was discussed that the water suppliers need a minimum of 7 years to plan build a new water supply and that finding out in 2010 that they are not meeting the levels leaves them little time to find additional sources. District staff recognized that the biological response in surface water systems will lag behind the water level recovery and that the evaluation of Recovery will first need to focus on the response of Upper Floridan aquifer levels and the predicted responses in surface systems.

Mr. Smith cautioned against permitting additional ground-water use from within the Recovery area until an assessment of Recovery can be made.

John Emery gave a presentation on the Wetland Assessment Procedure (WAP) used as part of the Consolidated Water Use Permit's Environmental Management Plan (EMP). An evaluation form was developed to assess various biological and physical conditions twice a year at approximately 400 monitored sites within the Northern Tampa Bay area. The results of the WAP were discussed as submitted in Water Year 2000 Annual Reports for the Consolidated WUP. Further discussion of the significance centered on whether or not it is appropriate to have an Overall Rating of the wetland or an analysis of the individual parameters for each monitored site. Mr. Emery suggested that since the WAP has been in use for about 3-4 years, it is necessary for a review group to review the individual parameters. A key goal of the group would be to determine a method that will allow the District and Tampa Bay Water to evaluate the effects of the groundwater withdrawal reductions on the EMP monitored sites. Mr. Hancock noted that the results of the WAP would be needed not only for EMP purposes, but also for the development of future minimum flow and level methodologies.

The next regular LTPRG meeting will be held at 9:30 AM on July 17, 2002. The meeting will take place at the SWFWMD's Tampa Service Office.

**Northern Tampa Bay Phase II
Local Technical Peer Review Group**

**Meeting 12
SWFWMD Tampa Service Office, Hwy 301N, Tampa
May 1, 2002 - 9:30AM**

1. March Meeting Follow-up
2. Miscellaneous Updates
 S Recovery Assessment
3. MFL Implementation and Assessment (Mark Barcelo)
4. Wetland Assessment Procedure (WAP) and Wetland Scoring (John Emery and Michael Hancock)
5. Other issues
6. Issues for the Next Meeting - July 3, 2002 (***changed to July 17, 2002***) at the Tampa Service Office.