

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

**Meeting 15
November 6, 2002 - 9:30AM**

Summary

The following were in attendance: **Dave Slonena**, Pinellas County; Chris Shea, Tampa Bay Water; Kathleen Coates, Tampa Bay Water; Doug Keesecker, Tampa Bay Water; **Ralph Craig**, City of St. Petersburg; **Andy Smith**, Hillsborough County; Scott Emery, EHI for Hillsborough County; Mario Cabana, Hillsborough County; **Cliff Harrison**, Schreuder, Inc. for WRWSA; Kim Haag, U.S. Geological Survey; **Michael Hancock**, SWFWMD; **Ted Rochow**, SWFWMD; **Doug Leeper**, SWFWMD; Mark Barcelo, SWFWMD; Robert Peterson, SWFWMD, Marty Kelly, SWFWMD; and Donald Ellison, SWFWMD. Names in bold are designated representatives for the LTPRG.

Doug Leeper gave the group an update on the Category III Lake Minimum Level adoption process. Public meetings to discuss the proposed minimum lake levels have been completed. The LTPRG and interested parties will be notified via email when specific dates are known. Staff plans to move forward with the specific levels that have been discussed previously.

Mark Barcelo and Marty Kelly informed the group that the Governing Board has approved the latest MFL priority list. There was a short discussion on the dates set for various waterbodies and rivers.

Mr. Hancock informed the group that the District plans to form a subcommittee on the Wetland Assessment Procedure (WAP) within the next month. Topics of discussion will include various statistical assessments of the WAP, the creation of a database, and an assessment of WAP consistency.

The main topic of the meeting was a brainstorming session on issues, concerns, and ideas related to the Recovery process in Northern Tampa Bay. The idea was originally proposed by LTPRG members in previous meetings. Mr. Hancock explained that a Recovery plan and review process is a requirement of Florida Statute 373, and is explained in Chapter 40D-80 of the District's rules. District and Tampa Bay Water staff have spent a large amount of time evaluating and upgrading the existing data collection network, so it is felt that there will be an excellent database with which to work. Additionally, the District has stressed the importance of continually evaluating the data throughout the process, and to try to make projections of hydrologic conditions to best plan for any additional recovery needed after 2010. In 2010, the District must be

prepared to provide information to the Governing Board for their decision regarding any additional need for Recovery, but will be updating the Board at least annually.

Kathleen Coates asked for the District's definition of Recovery. Mr. Hancock said that he felt it was the Governing Board's responsibility to decide on the status of Recovery, but District staff's job is to provide a clear picture of the hydrologic system's state each year, and to evaluate the response of the system to the various Recovery activities now taking place, such as ground-water withdrawal reductions. Kim Haag was concerned that by 2010, we will have less than three years of "post-recovery" data with which to work, and final conclusions may not be possible on such limited data.

Kim Haag wondered what the District will do in 2010 to advise the Governing Board on the adequacy of minimum levels and the need for more water supply, when such a short period of record will be available between 2008 and 2010. District staff acknowledged this, but felt that the limited data combined with ongoing assessment of the hydrologic system's response to Recovery activities between now and 2010 should provide an excellent base from which to make sound projections past 2010. Mr. Hancock also mentioned that the length of time used to assess minimum flows and levels is a topic currently discussed, and will be more fully developed as time goes on.

Mario Cabana wondered what the District staff's plans were concerning ongoing reports to the Governing Board. Mr. Hancock said that District staff plans on giving an annual report to the Board each spring. Additional reports will be made on more specific issues, or if items of importance come up.

Ms. Coates asked what kind of data would be used in Recovery analysis. Mr. Hancock stated that all data collected should be used, including hydrologic, atmospheric, and biologic, but it is too soon to say specifically which types of analyses will be used. The focus so far has been updating, expanding, and improving the data collection network. Various types of analyses will be discussed with the LTPRG over the next several years. Dave Slonena asked if the District plans to do the large-scale wetland evaluation that was done in 1998. Ted Rochow said that funding for the project is included in the 2003 budget, and that consultants will likely be hired to do the assessment.

Andy Smith asked if the District had considered the possibility of increased flooding as Recovery occurs in the water table. District staff said that they had, and will monitor the situation closely to identify problem areas. Scott Emery suggested reviewing the maps that Hillsborough County created to show flood areas during the last El Nino event. Several expressed concern that stormwater management systems may be installed over the years to deal with flooding problems, which might deter the effects of Recovery. Mr. Hancock reminded everyone that the District's rules in 40D-4 should prevent this from happening, although discussions with the ERP permitting staff will take place to discuss this issue.

Mr. Slonena said that he thought there was a lack of communication with the District's Regulatory staff, since augmentation is not currently allowed up to the minimum level.

Mr. Hancock said that this policy will be discussed further in the future, but currently makes sense since augmentation with ground water is a topic of several ongoing research projects. When more is known about the effects of ground-water augmentation, this policy may change. Mr. Slonena also thought that the ditch block project at Cross Bar should be studied more intensely as a case study, and that monitoring should be expanded. District staff agreed that such a study and monitoring should be considered.

Several LTPRG representatives wondered if hydrologic changes due to the implementation of "tools in the toolbox", such as augmentation, would be incorporated into the IHM model. Mr. Hancock and others felt that such changes should be added to the regional model, but some may be on a scale too small for the large model.

Mario Cabana suggested that the District issue a report outlining all of the analysis techniques that they plan on using for Recovery assessment. Mr. Hancock said that this is not possible now, since the techniques are being developed, and will take several years to finalize. However, one of the main purposes of the LTPRG is to provide feedback on any such techniques, so any analysis performed will be presented to and discussed with the LTPRG in future meetings.

The next regular LTPRG meeting will be held at 9:30 AM on February 5, 2003 at the Tampa Service Office.

AGENDA

Northern Tampa Bay Phase II Local Technical Peer Review Group

Meeting 15 SWFWMD Tampa Service Office, Hwy 301N, Tampa November 6, 2002 - 9:30AM

1. September meeting follow-up
2. Miscellaneous updates
 - Category III lakes
 - MFL priorities
 - Subcommittees
3. Recovery Discussion
4. Other Issues – Upcoming Activities
5. Issues for Next Meeting – January 5, 2003 or February 5, 2003 (at the Tampa Service Office)