

**CFWI GAT Meeting Minutes**  
**Skype Conference Call, Friday, December 14, 2018, 10:00 a.m. – Noon**  
**Toll Number: 786-749-6127, Access Code: 11685014**

**Participants:** Brian Starford (SWFWMD), Claire Muirhead (SJRWMD), David MacIntyre (AquaSciTech Consulting), Brian Megic (Liquid Solutions Group), Janet Llewellyn (Nature Conservancy), Tammy Bader (SJRMWD), Doug Leeper (SWFWMD), Kym Rouse Holzwart (SWFWMD), Lori Burklew (SJRWMD), Dan Rutland (Royal Consulting Group), Fatih Gordu (SJRWMD), Ron Basso (SWFWMD), and Christine Russell (OUC).

**I. WRAT Sub-Team Updates**

**a. EMT – Kym Holzwart**

Pending Kevin Rodberg's approval, the GIS work needed for the wetland analysis has been completed. The EMT is still working on issues related to the data distributions, specifically the plain wetlands; the district wetland scientists have a conference call scheduled this afternoon to discuss options; the recommended option will be presented to the full EMT during the next meeting on Dec. 20<sup>th</sup> at 10:00 am.

**b. HAT – Ron Basso**

1. **East Central Florida Transient – Expanded Model:** The meeting with the Peer Review Panel was held on Wed., Dec. 12<sup>th</sup>. The presentation on the transient model calibration (2004-2012) and verification (2013-2014) was very successful, and the Panel was pleased. The water level spike issue was addressed. The Panel will provide a summary memo in the next week or so indicating that they are satisfied that the model is calibrated in a hydrologically appropriate manner based on the information presented to the panel. The memo will have language that makes it clear that they will wait to review the entire model report before making their final determination. A report on the model will be prepared in the future; it will take a couple months to prepare. We can move forward with model scenarios.
2. **Pumping Normalization:** Kevin Rodberg has completed the normalization process (which is necessary for the model scenario runs) and wants Tammy Bader to review (Tim D. is no longer with SJRWMD). A meeting has been scheduled by Claire for Kevin to present the results of the normalization process to the MFLRT (and others, including Ron). Calculating the return flows (which include returns from agriculture, self-supply from septic tanks, and landscape irrigation) was discussed. Return flows are calculated for each scenario (reference, 2030, and 2040); these scenarios will be done first, followed by the 25 and 50% reference condition reductions for MFL freeboard determination). The SJRWMD was going to calculate the return flows for the 2003 and 2005 scenarios that they are doing for MFL freeboard determination (estimated time to complete would be a couple of weeks); however, they have determined that adjustments to the return flows for these model runs may not be necessary (they

will use the 2014 return flows). Fatih stated that he wanted the GAT to comment on what they propose to do. Ron stated that he thought pumping in 2014 was not much different than 2003 or 2005 pumping (but that should be double checked). Tammy stated that the 2003 and 2014 pumping rates are identical, but 2005 is lower because of less agricultural pumping. Brian M. suggested a table documenting the pumping for 2003, 2005, and 2014. It was decided that SJRWMD will review the data, make a decision, and prepare a table and provide this information to the GAT during the next meeting for their review and approval. Brian M. stated that the details of the normalization process have not been discussed by the HAT, since they have been working on model calibration. Ron was not involved in the normalization process during the previous RWSP (which varies withdrawals from year to year and month to month for certain use types). Brian S. stated that it might be best to wait until after the meeting on the 19<sup>th</sup> to go into detail about necessary model input, assignments, and deadlines (the goal of this meeting, which was requested by the MFLRT, is to understand the normalization process and how it would affect the model scenarios).

**c. MFLRT – Doug Leeper**

See below.

**II. MFLRT Recommendation (Continuation) – Constraints/Considerations**

Doug gave a slide presentation that was provided to the GAT in advance of the meeting, so minimal notes were taken.

1. “As available” was added to some of the Considerations; none will be ready by April 2019. Everything on the list of Considerations that will not be ready by April 2019 is acknowledged with a footnote as agreed to during the last GAT meeting.
2. Seven lakes that exhibit no significant Floridan aquifer connection (e.g., well confined) were re-included on the list of Considerations, and there was discussion on whether or not these lakes should be included. They were included for the 2015 RWSP plan, and if they are removed, the list is skewed toward a higher percentage of MFLs not being met in future scenarios. David stated that they’re not really important to the GAT but are important for the larger picture (e.g., the general public). MFLs continuing to be met are important to the big picture, and keeping them in is not doing any harm. Janet concurred that the general public (especially those that live near these particular lakes) may be concerned if they don’t see them on the list. The model is still providing useful info regarding these well-confined lakes: that they’re not affected by groundwater withdrawals. Ron cautioned that the model results are on a regional scale and not a local scale. There was consensus by the GAT to leave these well-confined lakes on the list of Considerations.
3. Regarding the non-MFL lakes/wetlands bullets on the slide: plain wetlands acreage would be added to the first bullet (both ridge and plain wetlands are

being evaluated), reference to specific model scenarios will be removed, and the second bullet is fine for now (as Kym concurred).

4. Regarding the 16 MFL Considerations: If a new MFL or MFL re-evaluation on the Considerations list is completed by April 2019 or if additional time to perform the groundwater availability analysis is granted by the MOC or SC, inclusion of these MFLs consideration could result in delays in the schedule. It was decided that a new MFL or re-evaluated MFL on the Considerations list won't be added to the groundwater availability analysis without discussing it first with the GAT. Everyone was on the same page regarding an understanding that, at some point, the analysis must be frozen. If a new MFL or re-evaluated MFL is completed after April 2019, but before Fall 2020, they will be discussed in the documentation. There was agreement that the slides that Doug prepared captured what was discussed at the last GAT meeting.

### **III. ECFTX Preparation for Model Scenarios**

#### **a. Assignments**

#### **b. Dates**

It was decided that this topic (and this topic only) would be discussed during a GAT meeting that Brian S. will schedule for Dec. 21<sup>st</sup>.

### **IV. Presentations to MOC/SC**

The MOC has requested that the EMT, HAT, and MFLRT provide presentations at their next meeting on Jan. 14<sup>th</sup> regarding the current status of each teams' work. Because the presentations will need to be reviewed by the WRAT prior to the meeting, the WRAT meeting (currently scheduled for the next day, Jan. 15<sup>th</sup>) will be moved to the previous week.

### **V. GAT Meeting Schedule**

Brian S. questioned the group regarding the frequency of the GAT meetings. It was decided that weekly meetings will be scheduled for now (best to get placeholders on the calendar; meetings could always be cancelled if they were not needed). If the meeting frequency (or duration) needs to be increased, additional invitations will be sent.

### **VI. Open Discussion**

### **VII. Future Meetings**

- a. **WRAT – In-Person Meeting – Friday, January 11, 2019**
- b. **Management Oversight Committee – Monday, January 14, 2019**
- c. **Steering Committee – Thursday, January 17, 2019**