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## INTRODUCTION

The Florida Keys are a low lying archipelago of Pleistocene limestone islands that extends off the southeastern tip of the Florida Peninsula in a southwest direction from Biscayne Bay to Key West. They stretch a total distance of 240 km (Fig. 1, Halley et al., 1995), enclosing Florida Bay to the north. They are typically divided into the Upper Keys, which are oriented parallel to the shelf edge and Lower Keys, which lie perpendicular to the shelf edge. The Upper Keys are considered to be those north of Bahia Honda and are composed of Key Largo Limestone. Key Largo Limestone consists of ancient hermatypic corals with intra- and interbedded calcarenites and thin beds of quartz sands (Halley et al.,
1995). The formation is extremely porous and permeable due conduits and interconnected pore spaces created by ancient coral growth and meteoric diagenesis.

On the southern tip of Big Pine Key, Key Largo limestone grades into the Miami oolite facies that is characteristic of the Lower Keys. Miami oolite consists of well-sorted ooids with varying amounts of skeletal material (corals, echinoids, mollusks, and algae) and some quartz sand (Halley et al., 1995). On Big Pine Key, the oolite has a maximum thickness of approximately 6 m and is underlain by Key Largo Limestone. The Lower Keys are the remnants of a oolitic shoal or tidal bar system (Hoffmeister et al., 1967; Halley and Evans, 1983) deposited during the Pleistocene. The Miami oolite is much less permeable than the Key Largo limestone of the Upper Keys.

Florida Bay is a shallow lagoon bordered by the Keys and the Florida mainland. It covers an area of approximately $1800 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ and has an average depth of about one meter. Its western margin is open to the Gulf of Mexico. Shallow carbonate mud banks divide the bay into basins, restrict circulation, and attenuate tidal influences from the Gulf (Robblee et al., 1991). Most freshwater enters the bay from the north through Taylor Slough or as sheet flow from the Everglades generated by local precipitation. Salinity in the bay oscillates between brackish and hypersaline. Extensive seagrass beds can be found in the bay. In 1989, Zieman et al. estimated that seagrasses covered more than $80 \%$ of the bay. Many commercially important types of fish and crustaceans can be found in the bay. Some are year round residences, others depend on seagrass beds as a nursery ground (Robblee et al., 1991).

Around 1987, water quality in Florida Bay began deteriorating (Robblee et al. 1991). The clear and quiescent waters that once characterized the Bay began appearing green and turbid. Algae blooms and seagrass die-offs became commonplace. With seagrasses' death, the muddy bottom sediments of Florida Bay are more easily disturbed. Newly suspended sediments release nutrients to the water column which in turn fuels
microalgae blooms. As turbidity and algal densities increase, light penetration to the bottom decreases and prevents seagrasses from recovering which in turn leads to a less stable bottom. The scenario could lead to a shift from a system dominated by benthic primary production to one dominated by water column photosynthesis. The scientific community generally agrees that this drastic change can be attributed to elevated salinity and/or increased nutrient loading resulting from the agricultural development and rapid urbanization of south Florida and the Florida Keys (EPA, 1991). Many facets of Florida Bay are now being studied to aid in the development of a model to characterize the physical, chemical, and biological conditions of the bay. This model will be used to predict what restoration steps could be most beneficial to the Bay. It is important that this model consider all significant nutrient sources for the bay.

Groundwater discharge has been documented as being highly significant for nutrient supply in some coastal areas. For example, Valiela et al. (1978), Valiela and Teal (1979), and Valiela et al. (1990) have shown that groundwater inputs of nitrogen are very important to the overall nitrogen economy of salt marshes in Massachusetts. In follow-up studies of Great South Bay, Capone and Bautista (1985) and Capone and Slater (1990) showed that SGD is a significant source $(\geq 50 \%)$ of nitrate, as well as freshwater, to the bay. Nitrogen-rich groundwater is also suspected of nourishing Cladophora algal mats in Harrington Sound, Bermuda (Lapointe and O'Connell, 1989). SGD is particularly important in these cases because shallow groundwaters are often enriched in nitrogen, usually because of contamination from septic tanks.

In a more pristine environment, submarine springs were shown to cause measurable dilution of salinity and enrichment of nitrogen in Discovery Bay, Jamaica (D'Elia et al., 1981). Groundwater was also shown to be a significant component of terrestrial nutrient and freshwater loading to Tomales Bay, California (Oberdorfer et al. 1990). In an excellent review of the subject, Johannes (1980) points out that SGD delivers
several times as much nitrate to coastal waters near Perth, Australia, than does river runoff. Johannes (1980) states that "it is ... clear that submarine groundwater discharge is widespread and, in some areas, of greater ecological significance than surface runoff." Indeed, there are some areas, such as the west coast of the island of Hawaii (Kay et al., 1977) and parts of the Yucatan Peninsula (Hanshaw and Back, 1980), where virtually all fresh water entering the sea is in the form of submarine discharge.

The above studies have addressed the case of a freshwater aquifer in contact with a coastal marine or lake environment. The situation in the Florida Keys is different in that most of the aquifer is saline to hyper-saline and the driving force is thought to be tidal rather than topographic. Therefore, the direction of groundwater flow beneath the Keys must oscillate as the fluctuating Atlantic tides create a differential head with respect to Florida Bay where tides are extremely damped. When the tide is high in the Atlantic, there is a negative hydraulic head associated with the wells on the Atlantic side and water is pushed into the Keys. Simultaneously, on the Bay side wells, there is a positive head as water is pushed from the Keys into the Bay. When the tide is low on the Atlantic the situation reverses and water is sucked from the Bay and transported into the Atlantic. Another study showed that sea level in Florida Bay is higher than on the Atlantic side of Keys more than $50 \%$ of the time (Halley et al., 1995). Higher water levels in the Bay suggests that net groundwater flow is toward the Atlantic.

The majority of the aquifer underlying the Keys is saline. Meteoric fresh water lenses do exist on some of the lower Keys due to the lower permeability of the Miami oolite compared to the Key Largo limestone of the upper Keys (Vacher et al., 1992). Approximately 600 sewage disposal (injection) wells ranging in depth from $10-30 \mathrm{~m}$ have been installed in the Florida Keys. In addition, there are also some 24,000 septic tanks and an estimated 5,000 illegal cess pools (Shinn et al., 1994) that can contribute to elevated nutrient levels in shallow groundwaters. The USEPA calculates that approximately 897 kg
of nitrogen and 215 kg of phosphate are put into the subsurface groundwaters daily by these three methods of waste disposal (USEPA, 1996). Lapointe et al. (1990) have shown significant nutrient enrichment (up to 5000 -fold) in groundwaters contiguous to septic tanks on Big Pine Key. In another study, Lapointe and Clark (1992) showed that phosphate and dissolved inorganic nitrogen levels were elevated in canals and some nearshore waters of the Keys.

Canals may be particularly impacted by sewage-derived nutrients due to their low flushing rates and their direct contact with contaminated groundwaters. Paul et al. (1995) conducted two tracer tests on Key Largo. They found that bacteriophages flushed into a toilet and injected into a simulated injection well all showed up in a nearby canal within 11 hours. Estimated rates of transport ranged from 0.57 to $24.2 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{h}$. Paul et al. (1997) repeated the simulated injection well portion of this experiment at this same location and found similar transport rates ( 2.5 to $35 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$ ). The greatest tracer concentrations in canals and wells corresponded with major stages of the tide. Some stations showed the greatest viral tracer concentration during high tide, while others showed a maximum at low tide. They speculated that the low tides enable drainage of the tracer and wastewater from the limestone, while high tides move the material back into the Keys, to be drained by another low tide.

In their 1997 study, Paul et al. also injected viral tracers into the class V injection well located at the Keys Marine Lab on Long Key (Middle Keys). They found slower rates of groundwater transport ( 0.12 to $2.0 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) than those in Key Largo with the greatest movement being in the direction of the Atlantic Ocean. Some movement of the tracer was also observed toward Florida Bay. Movement of groundwater at this site seemed to be mostly along the north/south axis of Long Key with no indication of tidal pumping. Surface marine waters showed traces of the bacteriophages after 53 hours. They attributed
this slower movement at the Long Key site to differences in geology, rate and force of tidal pumping, and/or the lack of numerous canals cut into the limestone.

This evidence suggests that significant quantities of sewage from on-site disposal systems may reach the surficial waters of the Florida Keys within hours to days. To date, there have been no studies examining bacterial utilization of this waste in situ (water polishing), adsorption of phosphate by the carbonate matrix, or the dilution of the sewage reaching the surface. Dilution, however, would not necessarily reduce the flux of nutrients to the surface waters. If the waste water plume reaches surface waters rapidly with a little dilution or polishing or if the flux into surface waters is high then human and ecosystem health could be at risk and different wastewater disposal methods would be needed.

The purpose of this study was two-fold: (1) perform a preliminary evaluation of the significance of groundwater discharge as a source of nutrients to Florida Bay and the reef tract using natural tracers; and (2) use artificial tracers obtain information on the fate of wastewater in the Florida Keys. As for the first objective, we have attempted to locate areas in the bay where groundwater seepage is more pronounced by reconnaissance surveys of the concentrations of radon and methane in the bay waters. These trace gases appear to function as natural indicators of submarine groundwater discharge into standing bodies of water due to higher concentrations in the groundwater (Cable et al., 1996; Bugna et al., 1996). Radon is typically elevated in groundwater because of production from dissolved radium and radium within the aquifer matrix, while methane is produced from the decay of organic matter. While both processes occur within the aquifer and result in elevated tracer concentrations within groundwaters, the production of each is completely independent of the other. Nutrient samples were collected and analyzed from surface and porewaters within the Bay, along the reef tract, and in some springs, wells, and canals.. In addition, the natural abundance of ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ in algae collected at various sample sites will help serve as a potential indicator of nutriet inputs from groundwater (McClelland et al., 1997;

Fry, 1994; Sweeny et al., 1980). Algae with a groundwater input of nutrient N maybe enriched in the heavy isotope ( $+10-20 \%$ ) due to denitrification in the suboxic surface.

The second objective focuses on the determination of directions and rates of groundwater transport in the Florida Keys and determination of dilution of contaminated groundwaters prior to its input into surface waters. Also, it was our hope to determine how transport and dilution differ in the Keys due to varying locations and different waste disposal methods (i.e. septic tanks vs. injection wells). To examine the problem, we used two artificial tracers, sulfur hexafluoride $\left(\mathrm{SF}_{6}\right)$ and radio-iodine ( $\mathrm{I}-131$ ) to monitor groundwater movement in the Keys.
$\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ is a very stable, slightly water soluble gas that has primarily been used since the 1960's as a gaseous electrical insulator (Wanninkhof et al., 1991). Due to its perfluorinated structure, $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ is an electrophilic compound that which reacts readily with free electrons, but virtually nothing else. Therefore, it can be measured at very low levels with a gas chromatograph equipped with an electron capture detector (GC-ECD). It has been successfully utilized to study gas exchange rates in lakes (Wanninkhof et al., 1985, 1987) and in the North Sea (Watson et al., 1991). It has also been used to examine vertical mixing rates in the Santa Monica Basin (Watson et al., 1991). It is well suited as a groundwater tracer because it is nontoxic, has extremely low background concentrations ( 0.05 fM , Watson and Liddicoat, 1985) and has been shown to be a conservative tracer in saturated sandy media with low organic content (Wilson and Mackay, 1993).

Radio-iodine is a water soluble isotope of iodine that has been used in hospitals for decades to treat thyroid cancer. All things considered, radio-iodine is an excellent groundwater tracer for several reasons: (1) the detection limits are extremely low, especially on an atomic (molar) basis; (2) the overall sensitivities are extremely high; (3) it has a relatively short half-life ( 8.04 days) so it will completely disappear from the system in a short time period and (4) it is considered conservative under the conditions present in the
limestone matrix of the Keys. Due to the high cost of I-131; however, this tracer was only used in one experiment to confirm results obtained using $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ as a tracer.

## METHODS

## Natural Tracers

## Radon and Methane Sampling

Samples for tracer analysis were collected at over 200 stations in Florida Bay and along the reef tract between August, 1995 and August, 1997. Radon samples were collected at each station using a peristaltic pump and 4 -liter evacuated bottles. Standing water was purged from the hose at each depth prior to filling the sampling bottles, and the bottles were immediately sealed to prevent gas loss. Radon gas was extracted and counted using a modified emanation technique described by Mathieu et al. (1988). After radon stripping and transfer into alpha scintillation cells, counting was performed using Ludlum flask counters. After the initial radon analysis, the samples were sealed and stored for at least five days for ${ }^{222} \mathrm{Rn}$ ingrowth and then sparged again in order to determine the ${ }^{226} \mathrm{Ra}$ activity. "Excess" (unsupported) radon was determined as the difference between the "total" ${ }^{222} \mathrm{Rn}$ in samples and the supported ${ }^{222} \mathrm{Rn}$, assumed to be equal to the ${ }^{226} \mathrm{Ra}$ activity. These values were decay-corrected back to the time of sampling in order to assess the in situ excess radon concentrations.

Methane samples were collected in Wheaton BOD bottles and stored on ice until analysis. Ethylene was also quantified to look for possible trends with other tracers. Both gases could be analyzed from the same sample. Upon return to the laboratory, water samples were transferred to $50-\mathrm{mL}$ disposable syringes which were pre-flushed with nitrogen. An extraction volume of 10 mL of $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ to 40 mL of water was added to each syringe, and the methane/ethylene extracted via headspace equilibration. Samples were run
on a Shimadzu flame ionization gas chromatograph equipped with a $2-\mathrm{m}$ stainless steel column packed with Poropack Q (McAuliffe, 1971).

Samples for ${ }^{222} \mathrm{Rn}, \mathrm{CH}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ in groundwater were also obtained from monitor wells at depths ranging from 5 to 60 meters. The locations of these sites were primarily within Florida Bay, onshore and offshore of Key Largo, and at the Key Marine Laboratory located on Long Key (Figure 1).
${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$
Algae samples collected from sites in Florida Bay and along the reef tract were sealed in plastic bags and frozen. Upon return to the University, samples were thawed, dried, and ground to a fine powder. Preweighed powdered samples, analysed by Isotope Services, Inc., were encapsulated in tin foil in duplicate and placed in a Carlo-Erba NA 1500 elemental analyzer. The elemental analyzer combusts the sample and yeilds a pulse of pure nitrogen using gas chromatograph column. This pulse of pure nitrogen gas is sampled by a VG-Isomass mass spectrometer for ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ isotope analysis. The mass spectrometer admits a reference gas into the helium carrier stream and is measured along with every sample analysis.

## Seepage

Direct measurements of groundwater seepage were made using an instrument design modified from Lee (1977). The "seepage meter" is simply a chamber implanted in the bottom sediments which has an open port where a plastic bag can be attached to collect seepage over measured time intervals. All seepage meters used in this study were either placed in areas which had sufficient sediment to provide a seal between the meter and surrounding sediment or directly cemented to the hard-bottom surface (cemented meters were placed by Gene Shinn et al.). Four liter plastic bag "collectors" were used and were
prefilled with 1000 mL of bay water to prevent short-term artifacts (Shaw and Prepas, 1989). Addition of an initial 1000 mL of water allows for measurement of negative seepage, i.e., recharge into the underground aquifer. The lower reliable limit of measurement for seepage meters depends upon the length of deployment and the conditions under which the sampling occurs-based on our experience using these meters, we normally expect a lower useful limit of $3-5 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{m}^{2} \cdot \mathrm{~min}$ (Cable et al., 1997).

## Artificial Tracers

## Experimental Design and Sites

Three basic types of experiments were carried out using artificial tracers to evaluate different wastewater disposal methods at varying locations in the Keys. The different experiments examined were: (1) septic tanks in Miami oolite, Big Pine Key, (2) a simulated septic tank in Key Largo Limestone, and (3) a class V injection well in Key Largo Limestone. SF6 was used in all of these experiments while the I-131 was only used in one class $V$ injection well experiment. The first type of experiments to be discussed were conducted with septic tanks on Big Pine Key. Residential units in this area obtain their tap water from individual wells that penetrate the underlying fresh water lens at a depth of about 2 meters. There is a potential problem as these residences have septic tanks in close proximity. Septic tanks in the Keys are typically placed less than a meter below the land's surface since the tank's leeching lines must be installed above the water table.

Two concerned residences allowed us to inject $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ saturated water into their toilets and then collected samples from their kitchen taps for approximately two months to ascertain the potential of well contamination. The approximate locations of the septic tanks in relation to these residential wells is shown in Figure 2. The first experiment was started on December 13, 1996 at site A (experiment A1). On June 12, 1997, we began two
more experiments at site A and site B (experiments A2 and B). Background samples were collected from the kitchen faucet before each injection. In each case, sixty liters of tap water were sparged with $99.8 \%$ pure $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ (Scott Specialty Gases) for 20 minutes. A sample was collected from the $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ sparged water which was then poured into a toilet. Samples were collected from each well via a sink faucet within 20 minutes of injection and then once daily for a week or two. After this initial period, samples were collected at the leisure of the residents for approximately two months. Experiment A2 was only conducted for one week.

A simulated septic tank site was established at the Ranger Station on Key Largo. The well used for injection is eight inches in diameter with a depth of 10 meters. The well is screened from 0.66 m to the bottom. Due to the shallowness of the screened portion of this well, results from this study site may be comparable to results for septic tanks. Approximately 3 m to the south is a monitoring well that is 5 cm in diameter with depth of 6 m . It is screened from 1 meter to the bottom. Twenty six meters to the north of the injection well lies Florida Bay (Fig. 3). Three experiments were conducted at this site. For the first two experiments (July and August, 1996), $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ was bubbled directly into the injection well for ten or twenty minutes at a low Atlantic tide. For the third, 100 L of water was pumped from the injection well, sparged for 20 minutes with concentrated $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$, then pumped back into the well at a rate of $10 \mathrm{~L} /$ minute during high tide.

The water level within the injection and monitor wells were determined as the distance from the top of the well which was then corrected to a relative tide. The tide modeling program, Tides and Currents for Windows (Version 2.0, Nautical Software), was used to plot the Atlantic tide. Observations from a nearby site on the Atlantic side of Key Largo have shown that this program is accurate for this location (Fig. 4). Water levels in Florida Bay were measured with a meter stick stuck into the sediment.

Sulfur Hexafluoride samples were collected from the well and the Bay periodically. Due to the large screened portion of the monitoring well, it was assumed to be an open system and therefore it was not purged before sampling. Tubing was inserted 2 m into the well and pumped to the surface for collection. Each piece of tubing was rinsed with a minimum of 3 times its volume prior to sampling. A second piece of tubing, looped at the end and weighted, was used to sample Florida Bay waters. Water was collected from just above the water/sediment interface. The tubing was put into position before injection and was not moved during the course of each experiment. Either a peristaltic pump or a glass syringe was used to collect the samples. During the August ' 97 experiment, samples were collected from 5 different locations in the Bay in an attempt to evaluate any spatial variability of seepage that could be occurring. Sample tubing was tied to the sides of cinder blocks which were placed in an X-formation in the boat basin (Fig. 3).

The third and largest study site was a class V injection well located at the Keys Marine Lab on Long Key. This type of injection well is currently used by multi-unit residences such as hotels, trailer parks, campgrounds, and small communities in the Keys (Paul et al., 1997). The class V injection well used for this study is drilled to 27.7 m and cased to 18.5 m . After treatment in a package plant, waste water is gravity fed into the injection well. There are seven monitor well clusters surrounding the injection well (Fig. 5). Each well cluster contains 4 wells drilled to depths of $4.6,9.2,13.8$, and 18.5 m . Each well had a 1.2 m screened portion at the bottom. Two tracer experiments were conducted at this location, one in October 1996 and another in February 1997. In each case, two hundred liters of water was sparged with concentrated $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ gas for 20 minutes. For the February experiment, I-131 tablets were dissolved into the injection slug for a total activity of 150 mCi . The solution was siphoned into the injection well at a low Atlantic tide. Approximately 1000 L of waste water (salinity $=0 \mathrm{ppt}$ ) was then injected from the package plant's holding tank as a chaser to drive the solutions into the aquifer. The
surrounding well clusters were then monitored for the presence of $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ (and I-131 for Feb exp.). Before each well was sampled, they were first purged to remove 3 well volumes. Purge water was stored in a large holding tank for the duration of the experiment. Water samples were collected using glass syringes or peristaltic pumps.

Atlantic tides for Long Key were obtained from the computer tide program described earlier. Measurements taken from the canal across US-1 confirm that this program is also accurate for this location (Fig. 6). Florida Bay tides were measured with a meter stick taped to the boat basin dock.

Groundwater transport rates for all experiments were determined for each sampling location by dividing the distance from the site of injection by the time of the peak concentration of the tracer at that sampling location. In some cases, well concentrations were still rising at the end of the experiment and no peak concentrations were observed. For these events, the last (and highest) concentration was used to estimate the transport rate. This method results in a minimum estimation of the transport time and thus a maximum estimate of the transport rate. These values are therefore presented as being less than the calculated maximum transport rate. In the injection well experiments, it was possible to sample multiple depths at each well location and vertical transport rates were also calculated. For these estimations, the wells' depths were subtracted from the injection depth $(18.3 \mathrm{~m})$ and then divided by the time of peak concentration.

## Sampling methods

Sulfur Hexafluoride samples for all experiments were collected with two different variations of a head space extraction technique. Early in the study, samples were extracted on site. Water was collected from wells with syringes and $1 / 8$ inch copper tubing.

Approximately 2 m of tubing was inserted into a well. A glass syringe was attached to the tubing with a 3-way stopcock and a small piece of tubing. After clearing the tubing and
syringe of all air bubbles, three syringe volumes were drawn and discarded to act as a rinse. The sample was then pulled into the syringe. A headspace of argon or ultra-high purity nitrogen was then added to the syringe which was then shaken for two minutes to extract the $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ from solution into the headspace. Approximately 8 mLs of headspace was then injected into a 4 mL Vacutainer ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$. Standards stored in this fashion show no loss of $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ from the vacutainer for more than 500 days (Fig. 7, Table 1). Samples were analyzed within a month of collection.

Although the vacutainer method was adequate, it was too time intensive to allow the collection of a large number of samples. To reduce sampling time, extraction was delayed until the samples were to be analyzed. Therefore, samples were collected in 30 mL serum vials with a peristaltic pump. To prevent contamination, each well or water body being sampled had its own unique piece of tubing. After purging the tubing, a sample was pumped into a serum vial and allowed to overflow for three bottle volumes. The vial was then sealed with a rubber septa and a crimp cap. To prevent loss of $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ through the septa, the samples were stored on their sides until the samples could be extracted and analyzed. Samples were extracted in the lab by adding a small headspace (typically 4 mL ) of argon or ultra-high purity nitrogen to the sample. Simultaneously, a volume of water from the sample had to be removed and discarded to allow room for the headspace. The serum vials were slightly over pressurized with 1 cc of nitrogen to allow several injection volumes (100 uL or less) for the gas chromatograph (GC) to be pulled from each sample.

A comparison of these methods showed that both extracted $95+\%$ of the $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ from a water sample (Table 2). The latter method has the advantage of being able to change the water to gas ratio during extraction, which allows $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ to be extracted from a larger sample volume, resulting in a lower limit of detection which was, at best, $0.1 \mathrm{pM}\left(10^{-13}\right.$ moles/L). It is possible to reach sensitivities of $0.03 \mathrm{fM}\left(3 \times 10^{-17} \mathrm{moles} / \mathrm{L}\right)$ by concentrating the $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ from a 500 mL sample onto a cold trap (Wanninkhof et al., 1991). This extraction
procedure is very time intensive and is unrealistic for the large numbers of samples generated for the majority of the experiments presented here.

I-131 samples were collected in one liter containers with a peristaltic pump. The water samples were returned to the laboratory and processed. In order to use this isotope in the field, it was necessary to develop a procedure that was simple, quick, and inexpensive. The majority of present procedures use an ion-exchange column and determine the I-131 yield gravimetrically or consider the recovery to be quantitative. However, increased ionic strength of a solution may inhibit accurate estimation of the yield using these methods. Since most of the water we would be analyzing would be saline, a different approach had to be taken. The procedure described below was originally designed to be used with geothermal waters of moderate salinity and allows for the measurement of I-131 using I-129 as a reference for the recovery.

## Analytical methods

$\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ samples were analyzed with a Shimadzu model 8A gas chromatograph equipped with an electron capture detector. Typically, the volume injected was 100 uL or less. The gas chromatograph contained a stainless steel column ( $180 \mathrm{~cm} \times 0.1 \mathrm{~cm}$ I.D.) packed with molecular sieve 5A (80/100 mesh). Initially, a P5 mixture ( $95 \%$ argon, 5\% methane) was used as a carrier gas with a flow rate of $25 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$. After having problems with carrier gas contamination, we switched to ultra-high purity nitrogen as a carrier at the same flow rate. Column and detector temperatures were set at $90^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and $220^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, respectively.

Headspace concentrations in ppmv (parts per million by volume, $=\mu \mathrm{L} / \mathrm{L}$ ) of $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ were determined by reference to a 1.04 ppm standard (Scott Specialty Gases). The standard was run at the beginning of each day, after every ten sample injections, and at the end of the day. Headspace concentrations were converted to dissolved concentrations in $\mu \mathrm{M}$ as shown below:

$$
\begin{equation*}
(\mu \mathrm{L} / \mathrm{L}) /(\mathrm{R}((\mathrm{Latm}) /(\mathrm{mol} \mathrm{~K})) * \mathrm{~T}(\mathrm{~K})) * \mathrm{E} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where R is the gas constant from the ideal gas law, $(\mathrm{PV}=\mathrm{nRT})$, and T is temperature in degrees K . The parameter E is the extraction efficiency which is determined by repeated extractions of some of the water samples. All headspace gas is purged between extractions. The repeated extractions are continued until $99 \%$ of the gas of interest has been extracted. E is then calculated as:

Quantity of gas in first extraction/ Quantity of gas in summed extractions

Extraction efficiency for $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ is at least $95 \%$. Dilution of the standard show a linear relationship between $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentration and response of the GC (Fig. 8).

Replicates were collected for $10 \%$ of the samples. In addition, duplicate injections were run on the gas chromatograph every fifth injection. Precision between replicate samples and duplicate injection were usually less than $10 \%$.

To test for radio-iodine, one liter water samples are spiked with a known amount of iodine-129 (I-129) and put through a series of oxidation/reduction steps to adjust the oxidation state of the radioactive (I-131) and stable area iodine carrier (I-129) (Fig. 8). Once in the correct oxidation step, the iodine is then precipitated as AgI in a slightly acidic solution. Depending on the matrix of the sample, other silver compounds may coprecipitate with the iodine. Many of these may be redissolved during the filtration process. In addition to the radiometric determination of the recovery, samples may be filtered through preweighed filters for a gravimetric yield determination. Filtered samples can then be counted on a NaI detector for the quantification of both I-131 and I-129. A simple equation may be used to estimate the number of I-131 counts in the I-129 counting region.

Taking the low energy I-131 counts into consideration, the radiometric yield can be determined and the I-131 sample activity may be estimated.

## NATURAL TRACERS

## Results and Discussion

## Tracer concentrations

Results of the tracer analyses for groundwater samples collected on and offshore exhibited elevated tracer concentrations relative to surface waters, except for ethylene which had a limited data set ( $\mathrm{n}=15$, measured only in offshore wells) and had similar concentrations as surface waters (Table 3). Both methane and radon appear to vary considerably spatially ( $82-1,124 \mathrm{dpm} / \mathrm{L}$ and $10-16,604 \mathrm{nM}$, respectively), however, radon did not vary over time in the same well measured over a year apart (April 1995-291 $\pm 58 \mathrm{dpm} / \mathrm{L}$, June 1996-342 $\pm 118 \mathrm{dpm} / \mathrm{L}$ ). Although the two gases are produced independently, there is a statistically significant correlation between the two in groundwater samples collected ( $\mathrm{r}=0.46, \mathrm{n}=47, \mathrm{p}<0.01$ ). Ethylene did not correlate well with either radon $(\mathrm{r}=0.34, \mathrm{n}=15, \mathrm{p}>0.05)$ or methane $(\mathrm{r}=0.25, \mathrm{n}=15, \mathrm{p}>0.05)$ in groundwaters. Radon and methane concentrations in groundwater samples averaged approximately one to two orders of magnitude greater than that of surface waters. This large difference in concentrations should allow for the use of these gases as indicators for groundwater/surface water interaction in the Florida Keys.

Surface water radon and methane concentrations varied from $<1 \mathrm{dpm} / \mathrm{L}$ to $>20 \mathrm{dpm} / \mathrm{L}$ and 5 to 100 nM , respectively. Radon and methane samples collected from the reef-side of the Keys varied from $<1 \mathrm{dpm} / \mathrm{L}$ to approximately $20 \mathrm{dpm} / \mathrm{L}$ and 4 to 40 nM , respectively (Table 4). As with the groundwaters, radon and methane were also statistically correlated on both the bay-side $(\mathrm{r}=0.51, \mathrm{n}=191, \mathrm{p}<0.01)$ and the reef-side $(\mathrm{r}=0.81, \mathrm{n}=84, \mathrm{p}<$
0.01 ) of the Keys. Ethylene concentration in bay waters were statistically correlated with both radon ( $\mathrm{r}=0.27, \mathrm{n}=145, \mathrm{p}<0.01$ ) and methane $(\mathrm{r}=0.31, \mathrm{n}=151, \mathrm{p}<0.01)$ if samples collected in canals and deep holes/springs are neglected, otherwise the correlation is not statistically significant (see below). Ethylene samples collected on the reef-side were statistically correlated with methane ( $\mathrm{r}=0.62, \mathrm{n}=41, \mathrm{p}<0.01$ ), but not as well with radon ( $\mathrm{r}=0.42, \mathrm{n}=41, \mathrm{p}<0.05$ ). Radon and methane are statistically correlated in all surface waters sampled throughout the Keys and since the production of the two gases is totally independent of each other, these findings are consistent with their being from a common source. As shown above, the two gases are also correlated in groundwaters, therefore it is probable that the common source of these gases in groundwater discharge into the overlying surface waters.

## Tracer Distribution in Surficial Water

General trends in surface water concentration were established by contouring data from each tracer survey using a kriging method developed by Surfer, Jandel Scientific (Fig. 9-20). Concentration data were then grouped into four different categories according to region in order to evaluate spatial differences. Regions include samples taken near the North Coast (within $\sim 2$ miles of coast), Keys Bay-side (within $\sim 2$ miles of coast), Mid North East Bay (east of Black Betsy Keys), and Mid Bay (west of Black Betsy Keys). Samples from the Keys Bay-side were more elevated in groundwater tracer concentrations (e.g. radon, methane, and ethylene) than were samples from the other regions within the bay throughout the study period (Table 5). In particular, one of the narrowest areas of Key Largo (near the Sheraton and Rock Harbor) continually showed some of the highest tracer concentrations in surface waters on both the bay and reef side of the Keys, excluding canals and holes/springs. The tracer results suggest that the greatest groundwater seepage
into Florida Bay occurs from and along the back-side of the Keys, and that groundwater input into the Mid-bay, North-East Bay and North Bay regions is of lesser importance.

Samples collected along the reef-side of the Keys showed very little variation throughout the study period. Surface water concentrations were relatively low on the reefside (Table 5 and 6), except near Rock Harbor, Dove Key, and Rodriguez Key. Tracer concentrations in this area were typically 2-4 times higher in for both radon and methane. Samples were also collected along the reef tract and from cracks within some of the healthy (e.g. Molasses, French) and degraded reefs (Algae, Carysfort). There was not any significant difference between samples collected from cracks and surface waters or between degraded and healthy reefs. Sample concentrations along the reef tract are generally lower than samples collected near shore. These differences in concentration between the reef and near shore waters, as well as the lack of differences between surface water and water within the reef, are may be attributed to the highly energetic environment along the reef tract. Water within the reef is quickly exchanged with ambient surface water, therefore dilution of the tracers is probable. At any rate, with the exception of the reef-side areas near the Keys, Rock Harbor and Dove Key, our data do not provide any evidence for groundwater directly discharging along the reef tract. This is not to say that the phenomena does not occur. It is difficult in the study of nature to eliminate any possibility definitively. However, we see no evidence for the process.

Within the Keys, samples collected from artificial canals/trenches and submarine springs were extremely elevated in tracer concentrations and generally fully saline (e.g. more saline than surficial waters at the time of sampling; Table 6). Three submarine springs were identified and investigated during the study period: (1) Garden Cove Spring, located on the Atlantic-side of N. Key Largo ( $25^{\circ} 10.22^{\prime}, 80^{\circ} 22.02^{\prime}$ ); (2) Lois Key Spring on the Atlantic-side of Surgarloaf Key ( $24^{\circ} 36.11^{\prime}, 81^{\circ} 27.48^{\prime}$ ); and (3) a spring located on the bay side of Big Pine Key, "Four Corners" spring, in an open area
equidistant from Big Pine Annette, Cutoe, and Howe Keys. Upon further investigation of these springs, it was determined that Four Corners spring was more dependent on rainfall than tidal influence. This particular spring did not appear to be moving water in or out of the solution hole, which measured about two feet in diameter. Samples taken from Four corners spring had similar concentration of tracers as that of the surface water. Samples were collected in May, 1997 during a relatively dry period for the area. The low rainfall and possible low water table may explain the lack of flow from the spring. However, elevated tracer concentrations were measured in the other two springs and in several canals, suggesting that subsurface fluids are actively seeping into these features, and from them may spill into Florida Bay/Atlantic Ocean. Submarine springs (Lois and Garden Cove) appear to be heavily influenced by the Atlantic tide. During high tide in the Atlantic, surface waters were sucked into the springs. Periods of low Atlantic tides showed the opposite, waters moving out of the springs at relatively high flow rates (Table 7). This is consistent with other observations of a tidally driven sloshing effect of groundwaters beneath the Keys. Water samples were collected during both high and low tides when ever possible. Not surprisingly, submarine springs appear to have a very similar composition, although slightly diluted, as that of the groundwater (Fig. 21). The natural tracer concentrations in groundwaters and samples collected from springs (Lois and Garden Cove) have a significant correlation ( $\mathrm{r}=0.98, \mathrm{n}=9, \mathrm{p}<0.01$ ). Radon and methane ratios for the two water masses are almost identical (groundwater $\mathrm{Rn}: \mathrm{CH}_{4}=0.32$, spring water $\mathrm{Rn}: \mathrm{CH}_{4}=0.30$; ratios are based on averages for each water mass). The similarities in the water masses indicates groundwater as the source for the springs rather than recirculated surface water (reef-side surface water $\mathrm{Rn}: \mathrm{CH}_{4}=0.13$, bay-side surface water $\mathrm{Rn}: \mathrm{CH}_{4}=$ 0.18). Flow rates were measured from the Garden Cove spring, Key Largo with a handheld mechanical flow meter manufactured by General Oceanics (Table 7). Flow from the spring was strong enough to produce a boil on the surface of the water on an outgoing tide.

Canals and trenches had a low tracer ratio (0.02) due to the high methane concentrations measured in these features. The higher methane contribution can probably be attributed to a higher organic content in the water masses and the sediments underlying them. Canals are typically a sink for particulate matter due to the low energy environment. Decaying organic matter would be a source for methane without radon production, leading to a lower $\mathrm{Rn}: \mathrm{CH}_{4}$ ratio. The high organic content and low energy of the canals tends to lead to eutrophic conditions (Lapointe and Clark, 1992; FDPC, 1973). In any case, the high radon concentrations in these features (springs and canals/trenches) are consistent with a significant influx of groundwater. It is likely that when these features were dredged, less permeable layers in the rock were cut and removed resulting in greater conductivity between surface water and the Key aquifer.

Nutrient samples were collected and analyzed from select surface waters, groundwaters, springs, and canals/trenches (Table 7). Nutrient concentrations in groundwater wells may have been biased due to the limited data set, because many of the wells were located in close proximity to a Class V sewage injection well (Keys Marine Laboratory). It is interesting to note that majority of the phosphate concentrations are below detection limit, except for samples collected in groundwater wells, springs, canals/trenches, and the interstitial fluid near Porjoe Key. All of these areas are suspected of being heavily influenced by groundwater based on the natural tracer concentrations. Surface waters were typically low in nutrient concentrations. Nitrate was the only parameter present in all waters sampled. On average nitrate and ammonia concentrations were equal within the Bay. Although the nutrient content of these various water masses may seem low, the total flux of groundwater carrying these constituents may be important. For instance, the garden cove spring has relatively low nitrogen concentration, contributing approximately $0.1 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N}^{\text {day }}{ }^{-1}$. However, this was occurring over an extremely small area, only about one square meter. The seepage meter near Porjoe Key could be used to make a
crude estimate of nutrient input from passive groundwater flow. This particular meter was flowing extremely rapidly $\left[(7.35 \pm 0.96) \times 10^{-5} \mathrm{~m}^{3} \mathrm{~min}^{-1}\right]$ (Fig. 22a), filling a four liter bag in less than an hour (Table 7), which is much faster than most measurements. Seepage meters in this area had an average flow of $(3.35 \pm 1.82) \times 10^{-6} \mathrm{~m}^{3} \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$. More interesting was the composition of the interstitial water from the seepage meter near Porjoe Key. Salinity of the interstitial water taken from two seepage meters were significantly different ( $\mathrm{p}<0.01$ ) than the ambient seawater ( $28.5 \mathrm{ppt}, \mathrm{n}=6$ ) measured by titration (Fig. 22b). Although the contribution from an average seepage meter is only $0.001 \mathrm{gN} /$ day (based on nitrogen concentrations collected from the Porjoe Key seepage meter and the average seepage meter flow), this is only over a quarter of a square meter. This would be an extremely large source of nitrogen to surface waters if this flux occurred over all of Florida Bay.

## ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ Enrichment in Algae

Algae was collected for ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ analysis as a possible indicator of nitrogen derived from groundwater inputs. Samples were collected throughout the study period independent of season, The data presented is a compilation of all analyses performed up to June 1997. As with the other natural tracers, ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ also is significantly higher near the Back-Keys than the other regions sampled (Table 5), although enriched nitrogen is also present near the North Coast in the Eastern Bay. The ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ results exhibit somewhat similar trends as the other tracer data when contoured (Fig. 23). The elevated ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ results are probably a signal for denitrification. Denitrification is a form of anaerobic respiration and takes place in a suboxic environment in the presence of organic matter. During denitrification the lighter nitrogen isotope $\left({ }^{14} \mathrm{~N}\right.$ ) is converted to $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ gas at a more rapid rate, leaving ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ enriched nitrate behind to be taken up by algae and seagrasses. Along the North Coast these conditions are met in the muddy sediments of the bays and lagoons along the shore.


#### Abstract

Along the Keys, however, and particularly along the bay-side of Key Largo, the bay floor is sediment poor, with only a thin veneer of sediment overlying rock. Denitrification is not as likely to occur in the sediments near the Keys. Therefore the enriched ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ values near the Back-Key areas must be from a different source. We propose that the suboxic environment where denitrification occurs in this area is in the subsurface, within the carbonate framework of the Keys. ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ of groundwater nitrate is enriched (J.K. Bohlke, pers. comm., 1996). Groundwater seepage can then bring these suboxic fluids to surface water where ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ is taken up. The most pronounced enrichment with ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ and other tracers occurs near Rock Harbor on either side of the island. Interestingly, this area is one of the thinnest points in the island and is near a large commercial Class V sewage injection well. The natural tracers (radon and methane) suggests that there is a significant amount of groundwater/surface water interaction around this area on both sides of the key, while the nitrogen data may suggest that groundwater entering the area is enriched in the heavier isotope, possibly due to waste disposal practices.


## Tidal Experiment

An extensive twelve hour tidal experiment was conducted on both sides of Key Largo near Rock Harbor where high concentrations of radon and methane were previously observed. Groundwater wells (two wells at each site, 15 ft . and 60 ft .; installed by Gene Shinn, USGS) were monitored for pressure head relative to ambient water. Surface waters were collected hourly and analyzed for radon, methane, and nutrient concentrations. Groundwater seepage was monitored throughout the tidal cycle using seepage meters which were cemented directly to the hard-bottom (groundwater wells and seepage meters were installed by Gene Shinn et al., United States Geological Survey).

Results from the experiment verify the dependence of subsurface water movement beneath the Keys to the Atlantic tide stage. The pressure head within the well on the bayside perfectly tracks the Atlantic tide with a very small lag time (Fig. 24). As the tide in the Atlantic increases, the well head becomes more positive and water begins to move rapidly out of the well. As the tide decreases in the Atlantic, the well head also decreases leading to a negative head which would cause water to be sucked into the well. This blowing and sucking of water to/from the well was observed on both sides of the Keys during the experiment. In contrast, the pressure head on the reef-side of the Keys exactly mirrored that of the Atlantic tide. As the tide increased, the pressure head decreased creating a sucking action within the well, and vice versa as the tide fell. Therefore, one would expect that groundwater entering the bay would be more pronounced during a high tide in the Atlantic and less pronounced on the reef-side during the same tide. The constituents associated with that groundwater should also follow those same patterns.

Seepage rates measured on both sides of the island showed a similar pattern to that expected based on the well information (Fig. 25). Consider first the reef-side (Fig. 25a), where seepage rates from one of two meters were low during the high tide compared to those rates measured during the low tide. This meter also showed recharge during the Atlantic high tide as expected. Seepage rates vary considerably between the two meters demonstrating the extensive spatial heterogeneity. On the bay-side with the exception of the first three measurements at the beginning of the period (circled), the seepage rates almost exactly mimic the Atlantic tide as was hypothesized based on the pressure head of the wells (Fig. 25b).

If elevated radon and methane concentrations in surface waters are due to groundwater inputs, then similar trends may be observed in seepage and tracer data. Although methane did not show a significant difference in concentration throughout the experiment, radon may show some correlation to the seepage data. Differences in radon
concentrations are very small, but the trend is suggestive, e.g., on the reef-side there are somewhat higher concentrations during a low Atlantic tide and somewhat lower concentrations during a high Atlantic tide (Fig. 26 a and b). Nutrient trends were not as obvious during this experiment, however, results for some of the nutrient analyses are shown for completeness (Fig. 27 and 28). The nutrient data is not surprising due to the multiple sources/sinks and complicated dynamics of these parameters.

This tidal experiment, along with multiple observations of submarine springs blowing and sucking in response to the Atlantic tide, demonstrates the extreme dependency of groundwater movement below the Keys to the Atlantic tide. Current studies are examining the water level of both Florida Bay and the Atlantic on longer time scales so that a better understanding of the tidal induced flow beneath the Keys may be reached. The average water level in Florida Bay fluctuates very little on a daily basis, but may change by as much as 0.5 meters seasonally. This seasonal change may be important to the net groundwater movement in the northern Keys where the change in the height of the Bay is more pronounced. Assuming groundwater contributes to nutrient loading of surface waters, these seasonal changes may be important.

## ARTIFICIAL TRACERS

## Results

## Septic Tank

The $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations of the 70 L injection slugs used in the septic tank experiments were $42.96 \pm 2.65 \mu \mathrm{M}, 199.93 \pm 2.12 \mu \mathrm{M}$, and $210.46 \pm 4.67 \mu \mathrm{M}$ for experiments $\mathrm{A} 1, \mathrm{~A} 2$, and B ; respectively. $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ was detectable in tap water for each experiment within 20 minutes of injection and peak concentrations were observed within one day (Table 8). For experiment A1, the peak concentration, $9.62 \pm 0.07 \mathrm{pM},(1 \mathrm{pM}=$
$10^{-12} \mathrm{M}$ ) was seen 15 minutes after injection (Fig. 29a). This peak is suspicious as a flow rate of $80 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$ would have to exist for the $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ plume to travel to the well that rapidly. Lapointe et al. (1990) reported a maximum flow rate of $3.7 \mathrm{~m} /$ day $(0.15 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr})$ on Big Pine Key. Contamination of this sample while sparging the water slug is likely. To test this, a second experiment was conducted at site A (exp. A2) for one week. Particular care was taken not to allow concentrated $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ gas come in contact with the sample vials. While sparging the injection slug, the vials were kept outside and brought in as needed after the injection. No initial peak was observed for experiment A2 (Fig. 29b), suggesting contamination may have been to blame for the initial peak observed in previous experiment. In fact, no significant changes in $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentration was observed for an entire week after the second injection. With the exception of the initial peak observed in experiment A1, all of the samples collected at site A showed very low $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations (less than 1.2 pM ) for the duration of both experiments.

Experiment B showed much higher concentrations than either experiment at site A. Fifteen minutes after injection, duplicate samples were collected from the kitchen sink. These samples had relatively high $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations of 10 and $27.6 \mathrm{nM}\left(1 \mathrm{nM}=10^{-9} \mathrm{M}\right)$. The large discrepancy in these samples along with their rapid appearance suggests that these samples were also contaminated during the sparging process. For this reason, they were discarded and are not included in the data set. The rest of the data is included in Fig. 9c and Table 3. Values for experiment $B$ ranged from 0 to 4.0 nM .

Before injection, background levels at site $B$ were $0.48 \pm 0.09 \mathrm{pM}\left(1 \mathrm{pM}=10^{-12}\right.$ $\mathrm{M})$, presumably from the previous work done at site A . The first sample ( 0.18 days) revealed a concentration of 3.5 nM . By 0.44 days, the concentration fell to 0.41 nM then shot up to 4.0 nM again at 0.85 days. After this second peak, values began to tail off until day 10 when two elevated samples were observed with values of 0.49 and 0.48 nM (Fig. 29c). After this small rise, values fell to 39 pM and continued to fall, eventually becoming
undetectable at 47 days. Values remained below detection for the remainder of the experiment which lasted for 68 days.

Transport rates were not calculated for either experiment at site A due to the lack of a reliable peak in $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentration. The one peak observed during experiment A 1 was questionable enough to doubt its validity. As mentioned above, a transport rate of $80 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$ would have to exist for this peak to be a result of groundwater movement. In addition, a similar peak wasn't observed at all for experiment A2. The larger initial peak observed at 0.85 days during experiment $B$ indicates a transport rate of $1.37 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$ ( $32.9 \mathrm{~m} /$ day ). This is considerably higher than previously published flow rates of groundwater through Miami oolite. The small peak observed at 10 days; however, corresponds to a flow rate of 0.11 $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{hr}$, very close to the flow rate of $0.15 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$ reported by Lapointe et al. (1990) on Big Pine Key.

## Simulated Septic Tank

The results from the July '96 experiment at the Ranger Station are shown in Fig. 30 and Table 9. The injection well was sparged for 10 minutes during a nearly low Atlantic tide. The rational for injecting at low tide was that if tidal pumping was occurring, groundwater would be moving toward the Bay during a rising tide. $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ samples for the monitor well and the Bay waters were collected for approximately 16 hours. The tides plotted from the monitor well water level data and the Atlantic indicate a 1.43 hour lag between their respective high tides. There is also a damping of $60 \%$ of the tidal amplitude as the pressure wave moves through the carbonate rock. The tidal levels in Florida Bay were not monitored during this experiment. It is well known that the tidal level in this region of the Bay is controlled primarily by local winds. The highest Bay tides occur when the winds blow from the west, piling water up in the Bay. Lowest tides are associated with
easterly winds which force water out of the Bay. There was very little wind during this experiment and the water level in the Bay didn't visually appear to change by more that a couple of centimeters during the entire experiment.
$\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ was detected in Florida Bay after 6.75 hours after injection at a concentration of 35.5 pM (Fig. 30). A peak concentration of 85.4 pM corresponding with a high Atlantic tide was observed after 7.93 hrs . This yields a transport rate of $3.28 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$. As the Atlantic tide turned and began to fall, the $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ quickly disappeared, presumably degassing from the surface waters and/or advecting from the sampling area. $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ was detected in the monitor well 5 hours after injection at a concentration of 0.223 nM . Values fluctuated slightly for 3 hours then dropped below detection. At just under 10 hours, the $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations began increasing again, reaching a peak concentration of 2.27 nM an hour later during a falling tide. A transport rate of $0.27 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$ was calculated from the monitor well data. This is most likely an underestimate if the $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ plume moved first north toward the Bay on the rising Atlantic tide then turned south on the falling tide before reaching the monitor well, as the data suggests.

The second Key Largo experiment was conducted in August '96 at the same location. Due to background $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ levels from the previous experiment, both wells and the Bay were monitored for 6 hours before injection for $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations and water levels. Residual $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ was still present in the injection and monitor wells at concentrations of $<14$ nM and $<3 \mathrm{nM}$, respectively and didn't fluctuate much with time. The elevated value in the injection well could represent $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ contamination of the well casing from the previous injections as $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ can bind to organic materials such as $\mathrm{PVC}^{\text {. No residual } \mathrm{SF}_{6} \text { was detected }}$ in the Bay, although it was only sampled during a falling Atlantic tide. The injection well was sparged for 10 minutes with concentrated $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ during a low Atlantic tide. It was assumed that this would be sufficient to overcome the background concentrations already present in the wells.

The tidal levels for the Atlantic Ocean, the injection well and Florida Bay are plotted against time in Fig. 31a. Due to more intense monitoring, the tidal lag between the Atlantic and the injection well noted in the previous experiment is much more evident. A lag time of $1.78 \mathrm{hrs}( \pm 0.38)$ was calculated from three observed tidal cycles. This was simply done by taking the time difference from each low and high tide. A damping of 52\% $( \pm 6 \%)$ of the tidal amplitude was observed. The water level in Florida Bay was also monitored and didn't vary more than 4.6 cm .

The $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ results for the August '96 experiment are shown in Fig. 31b and Table 10. After a complete tidal cycle ( 0.71 days), no change in $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ had been observed in the monitor well. This raised concerns whether the well was sparged adequately enough to overcome background levels. The injection well was resparged with concentrated $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ gas for 20 more minutes at the next low tide ( $t=0.77$ days) in hopes of resparging the same water mass as before. No more measurable changes in $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ were seen until 1.16 days when the monitor well's concentration started rising. A maximum concentration ( 24.6 nM ) was reached at low tide ( 1.20 days) indicating a transport rate of $0.30 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$. As discussed previously, this could likely be an underestimation. Values returned to baseline after 1.26 days as the tide began to rise. A larger peak was observed at the next low tide ( 1.71 days) with a maximum $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentration of 72.2 nM . By 2 days, values were returning to baseline values. No further samples were collected until 2.64 days during a falling tide. The $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentration in the monitoring well at this time ( 70.4 nM ) was similar to the previous maximum.

No $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ was detected in Florida Bay until 1.25 days, just as the first peak in the monitor well was declining, when a concentration of 70.8 pM was observed. This peak declined to 27.1 pM then increased slightly at 1.46 days to a concentration of 41.1 nM . This double peak may be the result of the multiple injections. After 1.5 days, $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations in the Bay were below our limit of detection. No further traces of $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ were
detected in the Bay waters for the remainder of the experiment. The maximum concentration observed at 1.25 days correspond with a groundwater transport rate of 2.30 $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{hr}$. This calculation assumes that this peak concentration was from the second injection. If the same is assumed for the second, smaller peak at 1.46 days, a transport rate of 1.59 $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{hr}$ can be inferred. If one were to assume that this double peak was due to the first injection alone then transport rates of 1.08 and $0.90 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$ could be calculated.

It is interesting to note that for these two experiments (July and August '96), the injections occurred at a low tide and subsequent peaks in the monitor well were all detected at nearly the same tidal stage that existed during the injections. This suggests that net movement of the plumes may be small even though they are covering a distance of at least 29 m during the courses of both experiments.

The third and final experiment at this location was during August, 1997. This time, 100 liters of water was pumped from the injection well, sparged for 20 minutes with concentrated $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ then pumped back into the well. Unlike the two previous experiments, injection was conducted during a high Atlantic tide rather than a low. The water level in the monitor well (approximately 3 m south of the injection well) was measured during the injection and had increased by more than 1 meter as the injected slug was pumped into the aquifer. The monitor well water level quickly returned to normal after the injection was completed. The monitor well was sampled for $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ and water levels every 30 minutes while the five Bay stations were sampled for $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ every hour. The water level in the Bay was also monitored hourly.

The tidal data are summarized in Fig. 32a. Once again, a time lag was observed between water levels in the Atlantic and in the monitor well. This lag was estimated to be $1.37 \pm 0.27 \mathrm{hrs}$ during the course of this experiment. The amplitude of the Atlantic tide was dampened by $52 \%( \pm 4 \%)$ by the time it reached the monitor well, just as it was in the August ' 96 experiment. The Bay water levels were out of phase with the Atlantic tide but
the amplitude was much smaller ( $<14 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) and coincided with high northerly winds. It is unclear whether this small tidal change in the Bay affected groundwater movement during the course of this experiment.

Background concentrations for the injection well and the monitor well were 0.31 and 0.03 nM , respectively. As in the August ' 96 experiment, no increase in the monitor well's $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentration was observed during the first tidal cycle after injection (Fig. 32b, Table 11). During the next rising tide, monitor well $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations increased along with the tidal level of the monitor well, reaching a peak value of 1.56 nM at 14 hrs . This yields a transport rate of $0.21 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$. This may be an underestimation if the plume either moved through the monitor well undetected for the first tidal cycle or moved a little to the north before turning and heading south toward the monitor well. This peak coincided with the highest water level in the monitor well. As the tide fell, the $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentration followed suit, finally reaching background levels at low tide ( 18.5 hrs ). A second, larger peak was observed with the next high tide. Once again, the maximum $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentration ( 4.63 nM ) of this peak occurred during the highest monitor well tide. As the tide ebbed, $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ levels dropped returning to baseline at low tide then began rising with the next flooding tide. These results are similar to the two previous experiments in the respect that peak $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations were observed in the monitor well during the same tidal stage that existed at the time of injection.

Five sample sites were monitored in FL Bay to evaluate the spatial variability of groundwater seepage with time. Before injection, a background sample with a concentration of 2.54 pM was collected from site \#3. $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations are plotted against time for each Bay site (1-5) in Fig. 33. The water level in the monitor well is also shown. All of the sites showed similar trends. The highest concentrations were observed shortly after Atlantic high tide as one would expect. The calculated time lag between these maximas and the highest monitor well water level is $2.19 \pm 1.62 \mathrm{hrs}$. Only one sample from
the Bay had a higher concentration than the background sample during the entire experiment. This suggests that the $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ observed in the Bay for this experiment was left over from the two previous experiments. This residual plume seems to be sloshing back and forth between the monitor well and the Bay. Since this injection occurred at high tide (unlike the previous experiment where injection occurred at low tide), the newly injected $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ plume was probably transported to the south initially then turned with the tide and moved back to the north. We suggest that this tidal pumping movement kept the $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ plume in the southern vicinity of the injection well and most likely prevented the $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ plume from reaching the Bay waters over the timescale of this experiment. This is also supported by the low values observed in the Bay, which were significantly less than those observed in previous experiments.

Since the trends for each Bay sample site were so similar, the average Bay concentration and standard deviation were computed for each sampling round. Both the average and the standard deviation are plotted against time in Fig. 34. The highest variability between the Bay sites followed shortly after an Atlantic high tide when, according to the tidal pumping theory, one would expect seepage into the Bay to be the greatest. This suggests that when maximum seepage occurs, it is somewhat patchy. Conversely, the concentrations and variability are the lowest just after low Atlantic tide when water from Florida Bay is presumably being sucked into the bedrock of the Keys.

These simulated septic tank experiments show that substances injected into the upper portion of the water Table in Keys can be transported rapidly ( 0.21 to $3.28 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) through Key Largo limestone and has the potential to reach surface waters within hours. The groundwaters seem to be driven through the subsurface matrix by tidal pumping, moving north (bayward) as the Atlantic tide rises and to the south (seaward) as the tide falls. Results from the five Bay stations in the last experiment indicate that residual $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ seems to be seeping into the Bay little by little with each tidal cycle. A year had passed
between the last two experiments and $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ was still present in the Bay before the last experiment, suggesting a long resident time of substances injected into the aquifer. It is unclear how nutrients from septic tanks are affected by this long resident time. If given enough time, it is quite possible that the majority of the nutrients could be stripped from the water by indigenous microorganisms or in the case of phosphate, adsorbed onto the carbonate rock. Another possibility is that with each tidal cycle, a small portion of the wastewater plume could be introduced to surficial waters at a slow enough rate to be scavenged by benthic macroalgae or bacteria. On the other hand, if the nutrients aren't utilized in situ, this situation could lead to suspended algae blooms in the water column which could potentially be fueled by the anthropogenic nutrients pulsing out of the limestone with each passing tide for as long as one year.

## Injection (sewage disposal) Well

During the October 1996 injection well experiment, there was heavy daily rainfall for the first two weeks of sampling. Results of the October 1996 experiment are shown in Fig. 35-42 and Appendix 1. Note that Fig. 35a and 35b are the same data on different time scales. The 200 L injection slug had a $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentration of $46.25 \pm 1.21$ $\mu \mathrm{M}$. Due to a spill of purge water in the first few hours of the experiment, the Bay waters were not sampled for $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$. In addition, there was no lag observed between tidal levels in the wells and the Atlantic tide (Corbett, personal communication). This suggests that the aquifer's hydraulic conductivity is too high to be accurately measured with the 30 minute sampling regime conducted.

The first major flow path observed was southward. Two hours after injection, the first trace of $\mathrm{SF}_{6}(58.06 \mathrm{nM})$ was seen at well 1 at 18.3 meters and increased to a maximum of 70.38 nM after 2.9 hours had passed (Fig. 35). Well 1 is located 5 m south of the injection well, resulting in a transport rate of $1.72 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$. The maximum $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$
concentration observed at this well was 3 orders of magnitude ( $0.1 \%$ ) of that injected. A much smaller peak ( 1.49 nM ) was also observed at well $3,18.3 \mathrm{~m}$ ( 5 m east of injection well) during the first hour of the experiment (Fig. 37). The $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentration at this well rapidly dropped to below 0.10 nM and remained there until 18 hrs .

Another small peak comparable to that of well $3,18.3 \mathrm{~m}$ was also observed at well 5 at the shallowest depth, 4.6 m (Fig. 39). Well 5 is 10 m south of the injection well. $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations here rose to 0.80 nM , a dilution of 10,000 times the injected concentration, after 6.2 hrs had passed. This yields a horizontal transport rate of 1.61 $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{hr}$, very close to that calculated for well $1,18.6 \mathrm{~m}$; and a vertical transport rate (VTR) of $2.2 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$. After 6 hours, $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ was also detected in well 1 at shallower depths ( 13.7 and 9.1 m) at concentrations of 0.74 and 0.30 nM (Fig. 34). By 10.6 hours, well 113.7 m reached a peak concentration of 27.0 nM . The 9.1 m well peaked out approximately 7 hours later with a concentration of 9.45 nM . The results of these two depths gives horizontal transport rates of 0.47 and $0.28 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$, respectively. Vertical transport rates for these two depths were calculated to be 0.43 and $0.51 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$, respectively. These shallow flow paths at wells 5 and 1 illustrate the buoyancy of the wastewater plume (salinity $=0$ ppt ) as it is injected into the saline aquifer. These data shows a portion of the waste has the potential to travel 15 meters upward over a horizontal distance of 10 m on timescale of a few hours.

The next traces of $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ were observed at wells 3 and 2 (Fig. 37 and 36), respectively. After about one day, $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ reached a maximum in well $3,13.7$ meters of 18.5 nM (horiz. transport rate $(\mathrm{HTR})=0.22 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$, vert. transport rate $(\mathrm{VTR})=0.20 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr})$. During this time, concentrations at 9.1 m were increasing much slower and finally reached a maximum concentration of 11.6 nM in 20 days ( $\mathrm{HTR}=0.01 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}, \mathrm{VTR}=0.02 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$ ). Well 319.3 m, which showed a small peak earlier in the experiment, slowly crept up to a
value of 1.1 nM after 7.0 days then hovered between 1.0 and 0.2 nM for the remainder of the experiment.

Well 2 is 5 m north of the injection well and shows trends similar to well $3,9.1$ meters. Concentrations at all depths here began increasing slowly over a week or two period (Fig. 36). The two deeper wells (13.7 and 18.3 m ) reached their maximas ( 2.96 and 4.65 nM ) at 20 days and then began to decline. This yields transport rates of 0.01 $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{hr}$ for both horizontal and vertical transport. The shallower wells' ( 4.6 and 9.1 m ) concentrations were still rising as of the last sampling period. This yields HTRs of less than $0.008 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$ for both depths and VTRs of less than 0.005 and $0.008 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$, respectively. These are maximum estimations of transport rates since these $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations were still rising as of the last sampling round. In most cases, the time of peak concentration was used to calculate the transport rate; however, if no peak was observed the last and therefore highest value was used to estimate a transport rate. For this reason, these estimations are presented as maximums in Table 12, which summarizes the transport rates for this study. The remainder of the wells: 4,6 and 7 took much longer than the others to show signs of $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ and were generally of lower concentrations (Fig. 38, 40, 41). As of the last sampling period ( $t=77$ days ), some of the depth at these wells were still increasing in concentration.

A canal across US-1 was sampled 5 days after injection and showed a $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentration of 1.3 pM (Fig. 42). At 6 days, a maximum of 1.4 pM was reached (HTR $=0.74 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) then levels declined. This maximum concentration is more than seven orders of magnitude less than the original injection slug. After 46 days, no $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ was detected in the canal. This shows that sewage has the potential to reach the surface waters in a few days, although it is greatly diluted within the surface waters. The flux of contaminants into surface waters has not been investigated.

These results suggest there are 2 types of movement for deep well injected sewage. The first is rapid advection through conduits presumably formed by the dissolution of or fractures within the calcium carbonate. The results presented here indicate that this rapid flow can be as much as $1.72 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$ ( $41 \mathrm{~m} /$ day) horizontally and as great as $2.2 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$ vertically. This suggests that buoyantly driven vertical flow can be greater than the horizontal flow. The next type of groundwater movement is slow diffusive transport through portions of the rock with lower permeability. Estimated horizontal flow rates for this diffusive transport can be less than $0.01 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$ while vertical rates can be less than $0.002 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$.

In February 1997, we repeated the experiment using $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ as well as I-131 as tracers to determine if the major conduit pathways observed previously persist temporally and in association with different seasonal meteorological conditions. Due to the previous work done on site, a background concentration of less than $2 \mathrm{nM} \mathrm{SF}_{6}$ was found at all the wells. This relatively low background was not expected to hinder our observations of major flowpaths although the resolution of the slow, diffusive type of transport would be lost. No background I-131 was detected. Due to the presence of residual $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ and the short halflife of the I-131, the February experiment was only monitored for nine days. There was no significant rainfall during the course of this experiment.

SF $_{6}$ results of the February '97 experiment are shown in Fig. 43-51 and Appendix 2. Since I-131 results correlated so well with SF6, results for the radio-tracer are tabulated in Appendix 3 rather than graphed (Fig. 52). Significant concentrations (defined as those I-131 values above the y-intercept of Fig. 52, 18319 dpm ) of I-131 were only observed in wells associated with rapid flow (wells $1,2,3$, and 4 ) therefore only these figures are shown in this report. Wells 5, 6, and 7 occasionally showed elevated values for I- 131 but these peaks were relatively small ( $<7000 \mathrm{dpm}$ ) and are beleived to be contamination artifacts. Since the I-131 results support those obtained using $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$, the
transport rates and dilutions discussed below were calculated using the results from the $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ data.

The first flowpath observed in February was once again southward at well 1, 18.3 meters (Fig. 43) with a peak $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentration of 358 nM after 11 hours (HTR $=0.45$ $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{hr}$ ). This horizontal flow rate is an order of magnitude slower than the previous estimate at this location, although the $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentration is four times more concentrated than before. The 13.7 meter well climbed to $78 \mathrm{nM} \mathrm{SF}_{6}$ in about 33 hours corresponding to flow rates of $0.14 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$ both vertically and horizontally. The 9.1 and 4.6 meter wells at this location each took about 80 hours to top out with concentrations of 22.4 and $2.7 \mathrm{nM} \mathrm{SF}_{6}$, respectively. The HTR for both depths was calculated to be $0.06 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$ while the VTRs were 0.11 and $0.17 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$, respectively. With the exception of the shallowest well, which reached a peak $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentration of 2.68 nM after $79 \mathrm{hrs}(\mathrm{HTR}=0.06 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}, \mathrm{VTR}=0.17$ $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{hr}$ ), the transport of the tracer to well 1 was slower and less diluted than in the previous experiment.

At well 3, the shallow well ( 4.6 m ) showed no increase in $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentration (Fig. 45). The deepest well ( 18.3 m ) showed a small peak of 1.52 nM at 19.2 hours then began to decrease slowly, yielding a flow rate of $0.26 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$. The intermediate depth wells $(9.1$ and 13.7 m ) peaked out at 2.92 and 3.31 days, respectively, with much higher concentrations of 14.49 and 21.81 nM . These results suggest transport rates horizontally of 0.07 and $0.06 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$ and vertically of 0.13 and $0.07 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$. Similar results were seen at well $4,9.1 \mathrm{~m}$ (Fig. 26) where concentrations began increasing at 1.08 days, reaching a maximum of 19.72 nM after 2.96 days ( 71 hrs ). This yields a HTR of $0.07 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$ and a VTR of $0.13 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$. None of the other depths at well 4 showed any significant increase in $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations.

Well $3,13.7 \mathrm{~m}$ took much longer to reach a peak concentration during the February experiment than it did previously. In October, this well quickly reached a maximum after
just 0.95 days ( 22.8 hrs ). During this experiment, however it took 3.31 days. These results are similar to those observed at well 1 , where higher concentrations were seen during the February experiment although the transport rates were slower. This could be due to the fact that there was no rainfall during the February experiment, whereas during the October '96 experiment there was daily heavy rainfall for the first two weeks of the experiment. Less recharge may result in less dilution of the $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ plume as well as slower movement away from the injection well.

Trends observed at well $3,9.1 \mathrm{~m}$ and at well $4,9.1 \mathrm{~m}$ (east and west of the injection well) support the idea that local recharge may alter flow paths for the waste water plume. At these intermediate depths, a maximum concentration of $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ was seen after approximately three days. This is in contrast to the previous experiment where slightly smaller peak values were seen in these wells after about three weeks. This seems to indicate that the plume moved more radially in February than the plume observed in October. Less recharge may allow the waste water plume to move outward in a more radial manner. It has been shown that the potentiometric surface at this site is sloped toward the Atlantic (Kump, 1996). Increased rainfall may increase this gradient, causing greater southward advection of the plume. At times of little or no recharge, this potentiometric gradient may be small enough to allow the waste water to move more east and west from the injection well . Local winds could also effect the hydraulic gradient in this area. Winds can act to force water in or out of the Bay thus steepening or lessening the hydraulic gradient in this area.

The remainder of the wells for the February experiment showed no signs of rapid conduit flow. For the first day of the experiment, we closely monitored $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations in most wells ( $1,2,3,4$, and 5 ) and tidal levels in the Atlantic. The $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ background fluctuations at wells 2, 4 and 5 (all depths, Fig. 44, 46, 47) did show fluctuations that may indicate tidal pumping. These results show that peak background $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations
corresponded to a rising tide for the first day of the experiment (Fig. 53). After one day, the sampling intervals were increased and/or newly injected $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ was observed in the wells, thus the fine resolution was lost. Although wells 6 and 7 were only sampled every other sampling round due to time constraints, they also lend support to the idea that tides play an important part influencing groundwater flow in this region. The trends observed in background $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations in all depths at these two wells match up perfectly with one another (Fig. 48, 49). These two wells are approximately 40 m apart. The similarities in trends suggest that a common mechanism, tidal pumping, may be responsible for their observed fluctuations .

The concentrations measured in both the Bay and the canal across US-1 were near the limit of detection; however, results from the Bay may due to tidal action. Fig. 50b shows that for the first day of the experiment, $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ was only detectable in the Bay while the tide was high in the Atlantic. It is difficult to evaluate whether these peaks are residual background from the October experiment or from this injection. In either case, tidal pumping may explain these results. The canal concentrations were measured less frequently and showed no signs of tidal influences (Fig. 51). These concentrations in the canal are an order of magnitude less than observed during the October experiment.

## Discussion

A summary of calculated transport rates is shown in Table 12. These results suggest that substances injected into the water Table beneath the Florida Keys has the potential to travel rapidly through the porous limestone matrix. The septic tank results from Big Pine Key suggest that during the time of these experiments the plumes from septic tanks in this neighborhood move in an eastward direction. The lack of any large $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ peaks for site A (Fig. 29 a, b) suggests that the tracer did not travel west toward the well
at this site. Results from site B (Fig. 29c), however, indicate that the plume here did move toward that well, which lies approximately 27 m east of the septic tank's drainfield.

The rapid transport rate at this location $(1.37 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr})$ is an order of magnitude higher than the flow rate of $0.15 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$ ( $3.7 \mathrm{~m} /$ day) reported by Lapointe (1990). Two plausible explanations for this high transport rate are conduit / fracture flow or contamination during the initial sparging process carried out just before injection. Although no cores were available for examination from Big Pine Key, previous coring work done by Shinn et al. (1994) at the Saddlebunch Keys show that some portions of cores collected had unrecoverable portions in the upper 2 meters which could represent conduits, rubble, or sand layers that could have a much higher hydraulic conductivity than Miami oolite. The Saddlebunch Keys are located approximately 30 km west of Big Pine Key and are considered to be in the same geological formation of Miami oolite. It is possible that similar features could also be found at our site on Big Pine Key.

It is also possible that the $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ samples for this experiment could have been contaminated by concentrated $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ gas. At site A , the sparging and subsequent injections were conducted in a downstairs restroom that had a lot of windows and doors for ventilation. These were left open while sparging the injection slug with concentrated $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ gas. In addition, samples were collected from a sink on the second floor of the house so the chances of contamination were greatly reduced. The house at site B was one leveled so the sparging process had to be conducted down the hall from the sink that was to be used to collect samples from the well. In addition, the room where injection occurred had no windows and may not have been well ventilated. It is possible that residual $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ gas from the injection lingered in the house for several days and that the breakthrough curve observed after injection was actually sample contamination while the house degassed. A slower groundwater transport rate of $0.11 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$ can be calculated from the small peak observed after 10 days at site B. This agrees remarkably well with Lapointe's (1990)
estimate. This transport rate is most likely representative of the Miami oolite's primary porosity.

The most rapid transport rates found in this study were during the simulated septic tank experiments on Key Largo. Rates of groundwater transport were between 0.21 and $3.28 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$. The highest rate of transport was seen during the July '96 experiment when the tidal amplitude of the Atlantic was the highest of the three experiments (Fig. 30). The tidal amplitude in the Atlantic was $0.88( \pm 0.03) \mathrm{m}$ during the July ' 96 experiment. The next highest rates, 1.59 and $2.30 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$ was observed during the August ' 96 experiment when the tidal amplitude was 0.56 ( $\pm 0.04$ ) m (Fig. 31a). These observations indicate that the rate of groundwater flow is controlled by the amplitude of the Atlantic tide. We suggest that when the differences between high and low tides are largest, such as during a spring tide, groundwater moves more rapidly. When the tidal variations are smaller (neap tide), groundwater transport should be slower. It should be kept in mind that these maximum flow rates represent an average of the flow rate over a tidal cycle. Flow rates probably change dramatically over the course of a tidal cycle, responding to the changing pressure heads as the Atlantic and Florida Bay water levels oscillate.

Groundwater flow rates can typically be calculated with Darcy's law:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{v}=(-\mathrm{K} / \mathrm{n}) * \mathrm{dh} / \mathrm{dl} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where v is the groundwater velocity, K is the hydraulic conductivity, n is the porosity, and $\mathrm{dh} / \mathrm{dl}$ is the hydraulic gradient. If the velocity, porosity, and hydraulic gradient are known then one can estimate K . The data from the Key Largo experiments indicates that the hydraulic gradient varies over a tidal cycle. At high tide, we observed groundwater flow towards the bay, indicating the hydraulic gradient is sloped to the north. At low tide, flow was toward the Atlantic, suggesting the gradient was sloped toward the south. This
indicates that the gradient undergoes a reversal at some point in the tidal cycle. The maximum Atlantic tidal amplitude observed on Key Largo was 0.88 m . If one assumes that the Atlantic's mean tidal level is equal to the bay's mean water level, then one can conclude that the greatest difference in the Atlantic and bay's water levels is 0.44 m at extreme high or low tide, which would establish maximum hydraulic gradients of $\pm 1.02$ * $10-3(0.44 \mathrm{~m} / 430 \mathrm{~m})$. Using the highest and lowest rates of groundwater transport ( 3.28 and $0.27 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$ ), one can estimate two absolute values of K as 1602 and $131 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$, respectively.

The low end of these hydraulic conductivity estimates for Key Largo Limestone is twice the value of $60 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}(1440 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{d})$ reported by Vacher et al. (1992). This estimate was calculated by using equations of the Dupuit-Ghyben-Herzberg (DGH) analysis of the fresh water lens underlying Big Pine Key. Hydraulic conductivity is a property that is dependent on the permeability of the rock as well as the viscosity of the fluid moving through it. In a karstic matrix such as Key Largo limestone, $K$ could vary tremendously depending on local geological features of the limestone (i.e. the presence or lack of conduits). Obviously, a much broader range could be calculated with different estimates of the hydraulic gradient. These estimates merely put a range on the possible values of K for this region of Key Largo. Other methods of estimating K, such as with a permeameter or a slug test, may give more precise estimates although these tests can also be affected by local geological features. The best estimation would be based on a large scale area. Such a calculation can be made for a confined aquifer using the tidal lag between a well and the ocean and the well's distance from the ocean but no such equations have been developed for an unconfined aquifer.

Numerous studies cite the large degree of secondary porosity in Key Largo limestone (Vacher et al., 1992; Shinn et al., 1994; Halley et al., 1995). The majority of the flow through this formation is believed to be via channel or conduit flow. These conduits
were originally formed as ancient coral reefs developed vertically. More recently, meteoric diagenesis has contributed to the dissolution of calcium carbonate, resulting in further development of secondary porosity. This increase in secondary porosity increases the permeability of the Key Largo limestone and profoundly affects groundwater flow (Vacher et al., 1992).

The lowest groundwater transport rates for these simulated septic tank experiments were calculated from data obtained from the monitor well. As mentioned previously, these values are most likely underestimations due to the bi-directional advection of the $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ laden plume. During the July and August '96 experiments, injection occurred during a low Atlantic tide. As a result, the $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ injected into the well initially moved toward the Bay as the Atlantic tide rose. As the Atlantic tide fell, the plumes' movements turned to the south and were subsequently detected in the monitor well during low or falling tides. For the last experiment at this study site, injection was conducted close to high tide. This can be seen in Fig. 32b as the large spike for the water level of the monitor well. Subsequent $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ peaks in the monitor well were observed while the water level in the well was at its highest. This is consistent with the two previous experiment, where peak $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations in the monitor well were observed at the same tidal stage that existed when the injections occurred. This suggests that over a tidal cycle, the net movement of the plumes is small even though these plumes can travel a substantial distance in the course of a tidal cycle.

It is unclear why no $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ was detected in either the monitor well or the Bay after the first injection of the August '96 experiment (Fig. 31b). A plausible explanation is that the injected plume may have been so concentrated and narrow during the first tidal cycle that it passed through the monitor well undetected between sampling rounds. As the experiment continued, mechanical dispersion, along with diffusion, would tend to make the plume larger and less concentrated. As the plume moved through the porous limestone, some of it probably encountered pathways that were more or less hydraulically conductive. Dead end
pore spaces could also trap some of the plume during it's movement. These differences in permeability would tend to disperse the plume more and more with each passing tidal cycle.

The dispersive behavior of the plume may also explain some of the other results from the August '96 and August '97 experiments. In each of these experiments, the $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ peaks observed for the monitor well were larger the second time they were observed. The results suggest that the $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ plumes did not completely travel across the monitor well during these experiments. If they had, then there would be a double peak for the monitor well each time the plume came in contact with the monitor well. One peak as the center of the plume crossed the monitor well in one direction, followed closely by a second peak observed after the tide turned and the most concentrated portion of the plume moved back across the monitor well. Instead, there is only one peak for each associated extreme tide. This suggests that the edge of both plumes came into contact with the monitor well, then turned with the tide before the center of the plume could make it to the monitor well. As the plume became more dispersed, a higher concentration of the edge of the plume may have came in contact with the monitor well, resulting in a larger peak concentration of the tracer.

Background samples collected from the injection and monitor wells suggest that the residence time of substances injected into the water Table can be quite long. No $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ experiments were conducted at this site between August ' 96 and August ' 97 yet there were still a residual concentration of 0.31 nM in the injection well. A background of 0.03 nM was detected in the monitor well. The elevated value in the injection well could represent $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ contamination of the well casing from the previous injections. In any event, these concentrations are several orders of magnitude less concentrated than the maximum concentration observed in the monitor well a year earlier. The concentrations of samples from the Bay all reflect background values of less than 4 pM , approximately 20 times more diluted than those collected a year earlier. Residual traces of SF6 were not detected in the Bay before the August ' 96 experiment yet it was detected in the Bay before the August ' 97
experiment. This was due to the fact the sampling technique was altered slightly between the August '96 and August '97 experiments, resulting in a lower limit of detection. Collecting samples in serum vials rather than glass syringes improved the lower limit of detection by an order of magnitude due to a change in the water to nitrogen ratios used during the extraction procedures for the two different sampling methods. In any case, the these lingering concentrations of $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ suggest that substances put into the water table and advected into marine surface water can persist for at least a year and can be continually pumped into the Bay with each passing tidal cycle.

Results from the deep well injection experiments on Long Key show that horizontal transport rates can range from less than $0.003 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$ to as high as $1.72 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$. Vertical transport rates are similar ( $<0.002-2.2 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) due to the buoyancy of the plume. Local recharge may partially control the dispersion of the plume. Heavy precipitation could steepen the hydraulic gradient in this area, causing higher rates of southward advection. During the second experiment, there was no significant precipitation. Lack of recharge could lessen the hydraulic gradient on Long Key. It is hypothesized that such a gradient could allow radial dispersion of the waste water plume away from the injection well. During dry periods, the Atlantic tide seems to be a driving mechanism for groundwater transport. This isn't evident from the October data set when heavy rainfall seems to have dominated the system. In February, however, the residual $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ from this first experiment did show signs of tidal pumping. This indicates that both recharge and/or tides may effect groundwater flow in this region, depending on local meteorological conditions. During the course of these experiments, the meteorological conditions were extreme (i.e. very wet or very dry) and may have allowed one or the other of these mechanisms to control groundwater flow. During periods of moderate rainfall, both of these forces could hypothetically influence the system simultaneously.

The deep well injection experiments conducted at KML had the best well coverage of the four sites used for this study with seven well clusters, each containing 4 wells of different depths. This provided a much more detail picture of the fate of substances injected into the aquifer underlying the Florida Keys than the experiments previously discussed. This relatively extensive coverage made it possible to roughly estimate what portion of the $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ injected could be accounted for by the results. The ease of which this can be estimated depends on the physical characteristics of the aquifer itself as well as the distribution of monitoring wells. In a homogeneous, isotropic aquifer that flows in only one direction this calculation would be quite simple. Many plotting programs are currently available for such applications. There are none; however, for a tidally driven, anisotropic aquifer with three dimensional flow that is riddled with innumerable holes and conduits. This structure is not only evident from the cores taken when these wells were drilled (Kump, personal communication, 1996) but can be seen in the many canals that have been cut into the Keys. One can see the remnants of ancient coral heads as well as cracks and cavities that formed as these reefs developed vertically. Due to the heterogeneity of this system, the buoyancy of the observed flow, and the limited distribution of monitoring wells, it became impractical to use any available programs to quantify the observed plume.

For these reasons, the author chose to use a simple interpolation of the data by essentially slicing up the study area into a stack of 8 pies and rings, each 2 m tall (Fig. 54). The volume represented in this method is cylindrical with a diameter of 20 m and a height of 20 m and is centered around the injection well. Although the injection well is screened from 20 to 30 meters, the data suggests that the plume rises vertically. The shallowest component (above 5 m ) of the plume could not be assessed because no data was available above 5 m . Monitoring of the system was thus restricted to between 5 and 20 m . This same restriction was used in the mass balance of $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$, thus the volume used for this estimation was limited between 4 m and 20 m . Porosity was assumed to be $50 \%$ (Kump,
personal communication). Several other assumptions had to be made in order to use this technique. First, the system's matrix is heterogeneous and the plume spreads in a dispersive manner as it rises. Another assumption is that a well located in a particular slice is representative of the entire slice. This allows the known concentrations of individual wells to be used to estimate the concentration of a particular volume in each piece of the model that contains a well. The missing concentrations were then interpolated horizontally around the pies and rings and then vertically throughout the rest of the cylinder. None of these assumptions are completely correct but they do put some constraints on the problem which allow some crude quantifications to be made.

These interpolations are shown in Appendixes 3 and 4. The calculations were carried out for each sampling round of both experiments. Round 1 in the October ' 96 experiment isn't included. This round was conducted before injection as background and the $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations were below detection at all wells. The estimated $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ for the first experiment hovers between 19 and $34 \%$ of the injected amount for the first ten days (Fig. 55). After 17 and 20 days, this Fig. rises to 52 and $45 \%$, respectively. After 46 days, $89 \%$ of the tracer could be accounted for by this method. After another month ( $\mathrm{t}=71$ days), the estimation climbs to $144 \%$ of the injected amount. The values shown for the first 10 days may be underestimated due to the fact that the concentrations for each pie slice are based upon the outer edge of the pie, not the center. This is particularly true of the deeper depths, close to where the injection enters the aquifer. The most concentrated portion of the plume was probably located near the injection well and decreased with distance from the injection well.

As time continued, this plume probably dispersed in a more even fashion. This could lead to an overestimation in the later sampling rounds. This is due to the huge volumes in the outer rings of the finite model. Monitoring wells were only located in three of the eight outer rings. The remaining five rings had to be interpolated from these three.

These outer rings have a huge volume and consequently even a small overestimation of concentration can cause the estimated mass of $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ to increase drastically. Data from these experiments along with those conducted by Paul et al. (1997) indicate that tidal pumping sloshes the plume back and forth (north-south). Consequently, the plume may not ever reach the model's outer slices that are east and west of the injection well. This suggests the estimations of the outer rings located east and west of the injection well may be gross overestimates since the interpolations were made using data from wells 6 and 7, north and south of the injection well.

In February, there was a background of less than 2 nM at all wells. These values were used to obtain a total background which was then subtracted from the estimations for the second experiment. Due to this background, the sensitivity for the outer wells (wells 5, 6, and 7) which presumably represent diffusive transport, was lost. For this reason, the second trial was only monitored for 9 days. The first two sampling rounds were conducted one and 2.6 hours after injection. These estimates were virtually the same as the background estimate, indicating that a significant portion of the plume hadn't yet reached the monitoring wells. After six hours, the estimated amount of $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ began rising (54\%) and continued to climb until 11 hours when a maximum of $164 \%$ of the injected mass was accountable (Fig. 56). Over the next 30 hours the estimate dropped to $74 \%$, then fluctuated between 66 and $140 \%$ for the remainder of the experiment. Although crude and rather elementary, this method shows that a significant portion of tracer injected can be accounted for with the well coverage at this location.

## SUMMARY

Surface waters in and around the Florida Keys have experienced rapid decline in the last decade. There is not a simple explanation to describe this change. The research performed over the last two years and described here may offer some insight into part of the problem. Groundwater in the Keys maybe a potential contributor of nutrients to surface waters. Although the ultimate detrimental impact of groundwater is difficult to assess, it has been shown through this research that groundwater moving into surface waters, especially near the Keys. Natural tracers are consistent with the hypothesis that waters closest to the Keys receive more groundwater than other locations within Florida Bay and along the reef tract. Wastewater disposal directly into subsurface waters can potentially increase nutrient concentrations within these waters. Nutrient analyses show elevated nutrient concentrations in groundwater and spring water relative to surface waters.

Artificial tracers were used to make a direct link between wastewater and surface waters and to provide information and transport rates, direction, and dilution rates. In general, it appears that transport rates and direction can differ throughout the Keys due to changes in local geology, rainfall and tidal levels. Transport direction at the study sites on Big Pine Key seems to be eastward in orientation and is probably dependent on the hydraulic gradient established by local recharge to the freshwater lens. Transport directions probably vary across Big Pine Key, depending on location. Conduit flow or contamination are the most likely explanations for the rapid transport, $1.37 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$ observed at site B . The lower estimate of $0.11 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$ is comparable to that presented by Lapointe et al. (1990) and most likely represents the primary porosity of Miami oolite.

The most rapid groundwater transport rates were observed during the simulated septic tank experiments on Key Largo. Rates were as high as $3.28 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$ and were closely coupled to the Atlantic tide. Directions of groundwater transport were north/south in orientation. The observed plumes shifted directions as the Atlantic tide rose and fell. As this "sloshing" movement continued, the plume was dispersed more and more. The rate of
transport is influenced by tidal amplitude with the highest rates corresponding to maximum tidal variations such as those observed during a spring tide. The high transport rates are an order of magnitude higher than the calculated hydraulic conductivity and are more indicative of a system that is dominated by conduit or fracture flow.

The deep well injection experiments conducted on Long Key illustrate the buoyancy of low salinity wastewaters injected into the saline aquifer. Vertical flow rates were comparable to horizontal rates. Due to the more extensive well coverage at this location, two types of transport were observed. The rapid flow rates ( $0.22-2.20 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) represent conduit flow while the slower rates ( $<0.03 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) are representative of the diffusive flow associated with the limestone's primary porosity. Both precipitation and tides may be major mechanisms controlling groundwater transport at this location. Less recharge to the system may result in a more radial dispersion of the wastewater plume while high recharge rates may result in the plume being advected towards the south more rapidly. Obviously, more experiments need to be conducted at this or similar sites during the wet and dry seasons to accurately describe the effects of recharge on groundwater movement.

Determination of the amount of dilution that occurs before contaminated groundwaters reach nearby surface waters was also addressed. Results from Long Key indicate that by the time substances injected into the water table reach nearby surface waters they are diluted by six orders of magnitude or more. This dilution rate is representative of the processes that act to dilute $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ at this location only. Dilution must be factored by the input amount of nutrients. High dilution along with a high flux could still allow the delivery of significant quantities of nutrients to surface waters. The maximum $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations observed in the Bay during the Key Largo experiments ( 85 and 71 pM ) were generally much higher than those concentrations observed in surface waters during the Long Key experiments, suggesting a lower dilution rate. However, dilution rates could not be calculated at this location due to the injection method. Dilution rates could be
dramatically different at other locations. It is unclear how reactive substances, such as phosphates and dissolved nitrogenous compounds, are effected by subsurface processes of adsorption, dilution and/or degradation. Several other studies currently being conducted in the Keys are investigating the behavior of these reactive substances (FSU, Penn State, and USGS). However, it is clear from the results that no matter which disposal method is used, some contaminates have the ability to reach surficial waters on a short timescale of hours to days.
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Tables

Table 1. Comparison of peak heights between old standards stored in vacutainers and newly prepared standards. Results for each aged standard are given as percentage of fresh standard, averaged from 2 injections from the same vacutainer. Standard deviation of injections is also shown.

| Age (days) | \% of new standard |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 |  | standard deviation (\%) |
| 71 | 94.0 | 0.31 |
| 118 | 98.7 | 0.52 |
| 281 | 97.5 | -- |
| 281 | 100.3 | 3.75 |
| 281 | 97.4 | 1.84 |
| 489 | 96.4 | 0.81 |
| 489 | 100.9 | 2.24 |
| 489 | 99.2 | 0.05 |
| 511 | 100.8 | 2.65 |
| 511 | 99.8 | 1.88 |
| 511 | 99.4 | 1.72 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Table 2. Comparison of $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ extraction efficiencies for samples collected in Vacutainers (Vac) and serum vials (SV).
$\left.\begin{array}{ccccc}\begin{array}{c}\text { sample } \\ \text { container }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { 1st extraction } \\ \text { peak height }\end{array} & & \begin{array}{c}\text { 2nd extraction } \\ \text { peak height }\end{array} & \end{array} \begin{array}{c}\text { Extraction } \\ \text { Efficiency (\%) }\end{array}\right)$

Table 3: Natural tracer concentrations in groundwater wells.

| Date/Site | Rn-222 <br> $(\mathbf{d p m} / \mathrm{L})$ | Methane <br> $(\mathbf{n M})$ | Ethylene <br> $(\mathbf{n M})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

February 1995
NURC, Key Largo

$$
\begin{array}{lc}
537 \pm 6 & 96 \pm 110 \\
(\mathrm{n}=2) & (\mathrm{n}=2)
\end{array}
$$

## April 1995

| Offshore Wells, Atlanic-Side | $455 \pm 124$ | $465 \pm 498$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $(\mathrm{n}=12)$ | $(\mathrm{n}=11)$ |
| Offshore Wells, Bay-Side | $641 \pm 293$ | $655 \pm 212$ |
|  | $(\mathrm{n}=3)$ | $(\mathrm{n}=3)$ |
|  | $338 \pm 67$ | $322 \pm 244$ |
| Ranger Station, Key Largo | $(\mathrm{n}=2)$ | $(\mathrm{n}=2)$ |

May 1996

| Keys Marine Lab, Long Key | $245 \pm 69$ | $998 \pm 712$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | $(\mathrm{n}=28)$ | $(\mathrm{n}=2)$ |
| Ranger Station, Key Largo | $442 \pm 141$ |  |
|  | $(\mathrm{n}=2)$ |  |

## December 1996

Offshore Wells, Bay-Side

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
615 \pm 237 & 2520 \pm 4756 & 15 \pm 23 \\
(\mathrm{n}=16) & (\mathrm{n}=16) & (\mathrm{n}=15)
\end{array}
$$

June 1997
Offshore Wells, Bay-Side

$$
\begin{array}{cc}
294 \pm 59 & 545 \pm 499 \\
(\mathrm{n}=8) & (\mathrm{n}=8)
\end{array}
$$

| Total Average $=$ | $398 \pm 208$ <br> $(n=73)$ | $1241 \pm 2997$ <br> $(n=44)$ | $15 \pm 23$ <br> $(n=15)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |




| UMK 10/24/95 (-3) | Oct. 95 | 24.94 | -80.62 | 0.86 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 1.78 | $\pm$ | 0.10 | 2.64 | $\pm$ | 0.11 | 39.24 | $\pm$ | 0.42 | 0.88 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| UMK 10/27/95 (-3) | Oct. 95 | 24.94 | -80.62 | 0.68 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 3.66 | $\pm$ | 0.11 | 4.34 | $\pm$ | 0.11 | 47.96 | $\pm$ | 3.40 | 1.12 |  |  |
| BS\#1 | 7-May-96 | 25.00 | -80.55 | 1.26 | $\pm$ | 0.07 | 1.33 | $\pm$ | 0.09 | 2.59 | $\pm$ | 0.11 | 13.05 | $\pm$ | 0.18 | 1.91 |  |  |
| BS\#3 | 7-May-96 | 25.08 | -80.46 | 1.91 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 4.87 | $\pm$ | 0.18 | 6.78 | $\pm$ | 0.20 | 15.56 | $\pm$ | 5.70 | 2.06 | $\pm$ | 0.63 |
| BS\#4 | 8-May-96 | 25.09 | -80.45 | 2.56 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 1.94 | $\pm$ | 0.13 | 4.50 | $\pm$ | 0.14 | 21.06 | $\pm$ | 0.93 |  |  |  |
| BS\#5 | 8-May-96 | 25.08 | -80.47 | 1.91 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 3.87 | $\pm$ | 0.16 | 5.78 | $\pm$ | 0.18 | 23.88 | $\pm$ | 0.87 | 2.26 |  |  |
| BS\#6 | 8-May-96 | 25.07 | -80.47 | 1.91 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 3.00 | $\pm$ | 0.14 | 4.91 | $\pm$ | 0.16 | 23.18 | $\pm$ | 0.34 |  |  |  |
| BS\#7 | 8-May-96 | 25.06 | -80.48 | 1.91 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 3.67 | $\pm$ | 0.15 | 5.58 | $\pm$ | 0.17 | 17.75 | $\pm$ | 0.20 | 2.11 |  |  |
| BS\#8 | 8-May-96 | 25.07 | -80.47 | 1.87 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 3.68 | $\pm$ | 0.19 | 5.54 | $\pm$ | 0.21 | 14.83 | $\pm$ | 2.65 | 1.38 | $\pm$ | 0.11 |
| BS\#9 | 8-May-96 | 25.04 | -80.51 | 1.76 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 0.82 | $\pm$ | 0.11 | 2.58 | $\pm$ | 0.13 | 12.20 | $\pm$ | 0.14 |  |  |  |
| BS\#10 | 8-May-96 | 25.03 | -80.51 | 1.59 | $\pm$ | 0.07 | 2.21 | $\pm$ | 0.15 | 3.80 | $\pm$ | 0.17 | 14.36 | $\pm$ | 2.39 | 1.56 | $\pm$ | 0.28 |
| BS\#11 | 8-May-96 | 25.03 | -80.51 | 1.65 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 5.35 | $\pm$ | 0.22 | 7.01 | $\pm$ | 0.23 | 106.29 | $\pm$ | 18.40 | 1.91 | $\pm$ | 0.49 |
| BS\#13 | 8-May-96 | 25.02 | -80.51 | 1.69 | $\pm$ | 0.07 | 5.19 | $\pm$ | 0.17 | 6.88 | $\pm$ | 0.18 | 29.10 | $\pm$ | 2.18 | 2.08 | $\pm$ | 0.52 |
| BS\#15 | 8-May-96 | 24.98 | -80.56 | 0.73 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 1.21 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 1.93 | $\pm$ | 0.09 | 15.24 | $\pm$ | 1.90 | 1.22 | $\pm$ | 0.14 |
| BS\#16 | 8-May-96 | 24.96 | -80.57 | 0.73 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 1.23 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 1.96 | $\pm$ | 0.09 | 17.04 | $\pm$ | 0.84 |  |  |  |
| BS\#18 | 9-May-96 | 25.07 | -80.47 | 1.80 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 4.25 | $\pm$ | 0.14 | 6.05 | $\pm$ | 0.16 | 23.77 | $\pm$ | 1.21 | 2.39 | $\pm$ | 0.36 |
| BS\#19 | 10-May-96 | 25.07 | -80.47 | 1.80 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 4.49 | $\pm$ | 0.15 | 6.30 | $\pm$ | 0.17 | 19.50 | $\pm$ | 0.29 |  |  |  |
| BS\#20 | 14-May-96 | 25.07 | -80.47 | 2.04 | $\pm$ | 0.07 | 8.90 | $\pm$ | 0.25 | 10.94 | $\pm$ | 0.26 | 40.21 | $\pm$ | 5.45 | 3.33 | $\pm$ | 0.49 |
| BS\#21 | 14-May-96 | 25.06 | -80.48 | 2.07 | $\pm$ | 0.07 | 6.58 | $\pm$ | 0.27 | 8.65 | $\pm$ | 0.28 | 36.58 | $\pm$ | 5.92 | 3.35 | $\pm$ | 0.40 |
| BS\#22 | 6-Aug-96 | 24.81 | -80.84 | 0.58 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 1.82 | $\pm$ | 0.10 | 2.39 | $\pm$ | 0.11 | 15.70 | $\pm$ |  |  |  |  |
| BS\#23 | 6-Aug-96 | 24.82 | -80.83 | 0.74 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 1.34 | $\pm$ | 0.10 | 2.08 | $\pm$ | 0.11 | 12.17 | $\pm$ |  |  |  |  |
| BS\#24 | 6-Aug-96 | 24.82 | -80.82 | 0.63 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 1.14 | $\pm$ | 0.10 | 1.77 | $\pm$ | 0.11 | 13.17 | $\pm$ |  |  |  |  |
| BS\#25 | 6-Aug-96 | 24.83 | -80.82 | 0.65 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 1.11 | $\pm$ | 0.10 | 1.76 | $\pm$ | 0.11 | 10.45 | $\pm$ |  |  |  |  |
| BS\#26 | 6-Aug-96 | 24.84 | -80.80 | 0.62 | $\pm$ | 0.03 | 1.56 | $\pm$ | 0.10 | 2.17 | $\pm$ | 0.11 | 20.94 | $\pm$ |  |  |  |  |
| BS\#27 | 6-Aug-96 | 24.84 | -80.81 | 1.08 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 0.88 | $\pm$ | 0.13 | 1.96 | $\pm$ | 0.14 | 11.56 | $\pm$ |  |  |  |  |
| BS \#76 | 1-Jul-97 | 24.97 | -80.56 | 1.37 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 2.30 | $\pm$ | 0.13 | 3.67 | $\pm$ | 0.14 | 36.36 | $\pm$ |  | 14.20 | $\pm$ | 0.59 |
| BS \#77 | 1-Jul-97 | 24.97 | -80.56 | 1.28 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 3.41 | $\pm$ | 0.14 | 4.69 | $\pm$ | 0.14 | 38.49 | $\pm$ |  | 15.48 | $\pm$ | 0.77 |
| BS \#78 | 1-Jul-97 | 25.00 | -80.54 | 1.75 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 4.08 | $\pm$ | 0.17 | 5.83 | $\pm$ | 0.18 | 35.54 | $\pm$ |  | 17.60 | $\pm$ | 0.35 |
| BS \#79 | 1-Jul-97 | 25.02 | -80.52 | 1.76 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 7.38 | $\pm$ | 0.22 | 9.14 | $\pm$ | 0.23 | 52.04 | $\pm$ |  | 15.30 | $\pm$ | 0.10 |
| BS \#80 | 1-Jul-97 | 25.07 | -80.47 | 2.45 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 9.43 | $\pm$ | 0.27 | 11.87 | $\pm$ | 0.27 | 41.52 | $\pm$ |  | 18.34 | $\pm$ | 0.38 |
| BS \#81 | 1-Jul-97 | 25.09 | -80.46 | 2.84 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 9.44 | $\pm$ | 0.28 | 12.28 | $\pm$ | 0.28 | 53.90 | $\pm$ |  | 19.13 | $\pm$ | 1.21 |
| BS \#82 | 1-Jul-97 | 25.10 | -80.44 | 2.90 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 4.53 | $\pm$ | 0.19 | 7.43 | $\pm$ | 0.20 | 45.89 | $\pm$ |  | 16.15 | $\pm$ | 0.51 |
| BS \#83 | 1-Jul-97 | 25.12 | -80.43 | 2.50 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 4.33 | $\pm$ | 0.18 | 6.83 | $\pm$ | 0.19 | 81.55 | $\pm$ |  | 14.87 | $\pm$ | 0.64 |
| BS \#84 | 1-Jul-97 | 25.16 | -80.40 | 1.98 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 2.34 | $\pm$ | 0.13 | 4.32 | $\pm$ | 0.13 | 40.63 | $\pm$ |  | 15.43 | $\pm$ | 0.35 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Average: | 1.44 | $\pm$ | 0.61 | 3.89 | $\pm$ | 2.21 | 5.32 | $\pm$ | 2.49 | $35 . \overline{35}$ | $\pm$ | 20.45 | 3.92 | $\pm$ | 5.55 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| North Coast |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FB \#36 Long Sound 10/31/95 | Oct. 95 | 25.23 | -80.48 | 0.75 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 1.06 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 1.81 | $\pm$ | 0.10 | 9.49 | $\pm$ | 0.60 |  |  |  |
| FB \#41 L. BWS | Oct. 95 | 25.21 | -80.44 | 0.12 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 2.15 | $\pm$ | 0.09 | 2.27 | $\pm$ | 0.10 | 5.65 | $\pm$ | 1.09 |  |  |  |
| FB \#58 Bradley Key | Oct. 95 | 25.12 | -80.95 | 0.91 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 0.63 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 1.54 | $\pm$ | 0.07 | 13.86 | $\pm$ | 0.62 | 0.45 | $\pm$ | 0.23 |
| FB \#59 Flamingo Key | Oct. 95 | 25.13 | -80.92 | 0.68 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 2.69 | $\pm$ | 0.12 | 3.37 | $\pm$ | 0.13 | 50.73 | $\pm$ | 3.83 | 1.25 | $\pm$ | 0.11 |


| FB \#60 Tin Can Channel | Oct. 95 | 25.13 | -80.86 | 1.21 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 0.32 | $\pm$ | 0.07 | 1.53 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 29.21 | $\pm$ | 1.67 | 0.69 | $\pm$ | 0.04 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BS \#34 | 24-Jun-97 | 25.18 | -80.57 | 1.31 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 1.91 | $\pm$ | 0.11 | 3.22 | $\pm$ | 0.13 | 8.34 |  |  | 1.66 |  |  |
| BS \#35 | 24-Jun-97 | 25.18 | -80.59 | 1.43 | $\pm$ | 0.07 | 3.66 | $\pm$ | 0.15 | 5.09 | $\pm$ | 0.16 | 13.87 |  |  | 2.35 | $\pm$ | 0.66 |
| BS \#36 | 24-Jun-97 | 25.18 | -80.61 | 1.38 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 2.43 | $\pm$ | 0.12 | 3.80 | $\pm$ | 0.14 | 15.37 |  |  | 1.66 | $\pm$ | 0.09 |
| BS \#37 | 24-Jun-97 | 25.14 | -80.64 | 1.83 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 1.59 | $\pm$ | 0.14 | 3.42 | $\pm$ | 0.16 | 8.01 |  |  | 2.24 | $\pm$ | 0.63 |
| BS \#38 | 24-Jun-97 | 25.14 | -80.62 | 2.15 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 1.27 | $\pm$ | 0.13 | 3.42 | $\pm$ | 0.15 | 6.43 |  |  | 1.58 | $\pm$ | 0.66 |
| BS \#41 | 25-Jun-97 | 25.11 | -81.03 | 1.78 | $\pm$ | 0.07 | 1.05 | $\pm$ | 0.12 | 2.83 | $\pm$ | 0.14 | 11.64 |  |  | 2.91 | $\pm$ | 0.15 |
| BS \#42 | 25-Jun-97 | 25.11 | -81.09 | 1.81 | $\pm$ | 0.07 | 1.12 | $\pm$ | 0.12 | 2.93 | $\pm$ | 0.14 | 10.22 |  |  | 1.86 |  |  |
| BS \#44 | 25-Jun-97 | 25.09 | $-81.00$ | 1.61 | $\pm$ | 0.10 | 3.19 | $\pm$ | 0.17 | 4.80 | $\pm$ | 0.20 | 14.64 |  |  | 2.78 | $\pm$ | 0.55 |
| BS \#44* | 25-Jun-97 | 25.09 | -81.00 | 1.61 | $\pm$ | 0.10 | 2.56 | $\pm$ | 0.15 | 4.17 | $\pm$ | 0.18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BS \#46 | 25-Jun-97 | 25.12 | -80.83 | 1.62 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 1.52 | $\pm$ | 0.12 | 3.14 | $\pm$ | 0.14 | 15.50 |  |  | 2.48 | $\pm$ | 0.55 |
| BS \#46* | 25-Jun-97 | 25.12 | -80.83 | 1.62 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 1.56 | $\pm$ | 0.12 | 3.18 | $\pm$ | 0.15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BS \#48 | 26-Jun-97 | 25.11 | -80.72 | 1.82 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 2.98 | $\pm$ | 0.15 | 4.80 | $\pm$ | 0.17 | 23.55 |  |  | 1.87 | $\pm$ | 0.26 |
| BS \#64 | 30-Jun-97 | 25.11 | -80.79 | 1.63 | $\pm$ | 0.07 | 2.15 | $\pm$ | 0.13 | 3.79 | $\pm$ | 0.15 | 71.61 |  |  | 4.62 | $\pm$ | 0.52 |
| BS \#65 | 30-Jun-97 | 25.14 | -80.81 | 1.75 | $\pm$ | 0.07 | 2.90 | $\pm$ | 0.16 | 4.64 | $\pm$ | 0.17 | 21.71 |  |  | 3.27 | $\pm$ | 0.33 |
| BS \#66 | 30-Jun-97 | 25.13 | -80.81 | 1.74 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 2.51 | $\pm$ | 0.14 | 4.25 | $\pm$ | 0.16 | 13.84 |  |  | 2.25 | $\pm$ | 0.34 |
| BS \#67 | 30-Jun-97 | 25.11 | -80.74 | 0.57 | $\pm$ | 0.03 | 2.74 | $\pm$ | 0.10 | 3.31 | $\pm$ | 0.11 | 223.01 |  |  | 4.47 | $\pm$ | 0.30 |
| BS \#68 | 30-Jun-97 | 25.12 | -80.90 | 2.29 | $\pm$ | 0.07 | 3.06 | $\pm$ | 0.16 | 5.35 | $\pm$ | 0.18 | 16.54 |  |  | 2.30 | $\pm$ | 0.28 |
| BS \#69 | 30-Jun-97 | 25.12 | -80.93 | 1.87 | $\pm$ | 0.07 | 3.25 | $\pm$ | 0.17 | 5.13 | $\pm$ | 0.19 | 11.00 |  |  | 2.15 | $\pm$ | 0.55 |
| BS \#70 | 30-Jun-97 | 25.11 | -80.95 | 1.91 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 2.39 | $\pm$ | 0.14 | 4.30 | $\pm$ | 0.15 | 6.49 |  |  | 1.49 | $\pm$ | 0.43 |
|  |  |  | Average: | 1.48 | $\pm$ | 0.53 | 2.11 | $\pm$ | 0.90 | 3.59 | $\pm$ | 1.11 | 27.31 | $\pm$ | 46.37 | 2.22 | $\pm$ | 1.05 |
| Mid North East |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FB \#31 Elbow 10/31/95 | Oct. 95 | 25.02 | -80.51 | 1.62 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 1.15 | $\pm$ | 0.10 | 2.77 | $\pm$ | 0.12 | 21.84 | $\pm$ | 1.02 | 0.51 |  |  |
| FB \#32 East Bay 10/31/95 | Oct. 95 | 25.18 | -80.46 | 1.37 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 0.94 | $\pm$ | 0.10 | 2.31 | $\pm$ | 0.12 | 8.56 | $\pm$ | 0.21 | 0.28 | $\pm$ | 0.01 |
| FB \#33 Shell Key | Oct. 95 | 25.19 | -80.45 | 1.54 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 4.16 | $\pm$ | 0.16 | 5.70 | $\pm$ | 0.17 | 16.76 | $\pm$ | 3.64 | 0.30 |  |  |
| FB \#34 Snipe Point 10/31/95 | Oct. 95 | 25.20 | -80.51 | 1.39 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 6.54 | $\pm$ | 0.19 | 7.93 | $\pm$ | 0.20 | 18.52 | $\pm$ | 1.80 | 0.42 | $\pm$ | 0.09 |
| FB \#35 Stump Pass 10/31/95 | Oct. 95 | 25.20 | -80.54 | 0.67 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 4.13 | $\pm$ | 0.14 | 4.80 | $\pm$ | 0.15 | 10.88 | $\pm$ | 1.00 | 0.21 |  |  |
| FB \#40 Mid BWS | Oct. 95 | 25.18 | -80.42 | 1.34 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 0.43 | $\pm$ | 0.09 | 1.77 | $\pm$ | 0.11 | 21.14 |  |  |  |  |  |
| FB \#42 Duck Key | Oct. 95 | 25.18 | -80.50 | 1.55 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 1.45 | $\pm$ | 0.10 | 3.00 | $\pm$ | 0.11 | 7.25 |  |  |  |  |  |
| FB \#43 Eagle Key | Oct. 95 | 25.15 | -80.59 | 1.34 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 1.16 | $\pm$ | 0.11 | 2.50 | $\pm$ | 0.13 | 5.24 | $\pm$ | 0.11 |  |  |  |
| FB \#44 Nest Key | Oct. 95 | 25.14 | -80.52 | 1.57 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 1.62 | $\pm$ | 0.11 | 3.19 | $\pm$ | 0.12 | 5.11 | $\pm$ | 0.19 | 0.19 |  |  |
| FB \#45 Porjoe Key | Oct. 95 | 25.14 | -80.48 | 0.51 | $\pm$ | 0.03 | 2.63 | $\pm$ | 0.10 | 3.14 | , | 0.10 | 9.95 | $\pm$ | 0.21 | 0.35 |  |  |
| BS\#17 | 9-May-96 | 25.14 | -80.47 | 2.22 | $\pm$ | 0.11 | 0.23 | $\pm$ | 0.10 | 2.46 | $\pm$ | 0.11 | 6.97 | $\pm$ | 0.23 |  |  |  |
| BS \#28 | 24-Jun-97 | 25.18 | -80.46 | 2.27 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 3.40 | $\pm$ | 0.17 | 5.67 | $\pm$ | 0.18 | 13.39 |  |  | 1.86 | $\pm$ | 0.22 |
| BS \#29 | 24-Jun-97 | 25.18 | -80.48 | 2.70 | $\pm$ | 0.09 | 1.33 | $\pm$ | 0.15 | 4.03 | $\pm$ | 0.18 | 10.12 |  |  | 2.20 | $\pm$ | 0.30 |
| BS \#30 | 24-Jun-97 | 25.18 | -80.50 | 2.15 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 1.19 | $\pm$ | 0.13 | 3.33 | $\pm$ | 0.15 | 9.08 |  |  | 1.89 | $\pm$ | 0.19 |
| BS \#31 | 24-Jun-97 | 25.18 | -80.51 | 2.57 | $\pm$ | 0.10 | 0.79 | $\pm$ | 0.16 | 3.35 | $\pm$ | 0.19 | 7.94 |  |  | 1.64 | $\pm$ | 0.21 |
| BS \#31* | 24-Jun-97 | 25.18 | -80.51 | 2.60 | $\pm$ | 0.09 | 0.70 | $\pm$ | 0.14 | 3.30 | $\pm$ | 0.16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BS \#32 | 24-Jun-97 | 25.18 | -80.53 | 2.43 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 0.77 | $\pm$ | 0.13 | 3.20 |  | 0.16 | 6.23 |  |  | 1.78 | $\pm$ | 0.54 |



| RS\#2 | 6-May-96 | 2500.89 | $80 \quad 22.61$ | 0.22 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 0.02 | $\pm$ | 0.03 | 0.23 | $\pm$ | 0.03 | 4.91 | $\pm$ | 0.19 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RS\#3 | 6-May-96 | 2501.42 | $80 \quad 23.45$ | 0.22 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 0.66 | $\pm$ | 0.03 | 0.88 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 8.33 | $\pm$ | 0.07 |  |  |
| RS\#4 | 6-May-96 | 2501.80 | $80 \quad 24.12$ | 0.16 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 0.72 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 0.88 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 9.48 | $\pm$ | 0.05 |  |  |
| RS\#5 | 6-May-96 | $25 \quad 03.44$ | $80 \quad 26.90$ | 0.16 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 0.49 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 0.65 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 9.32 | $\pm$ | 0.29 |  |  |
| RS\#6 | 6-May-96 | $25 \quad 04.17$ | $80 \quad 27.46$ | 0.64 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 1.23 | $\pm$ | 0.07 | 1.87 | $\pm$ | 0.07 | 10.89 | $\pm$ | 0.35 |  |  |
| RS\#7 | 6-May-96 | $25 \quad 03.89$ | $80 \quad 27.95$ | 0.64 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 1.51 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 2.15 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 8.73 | $\pm$ | 0.04 |  |  |
| RS\#8 | 6-May-96 | 2503.54 | $80 \quad 28.32$ | 0.42 | $\pm$ | 0.03 | 0.66 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 1.07 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 7.21 | $\pm$ | 0.51 |  |  |
| RS\#9 | 7-May-96 | $25 \quad 02.61$ | $80 \quad 29.04$ | 0.61 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 0.60 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 1.21 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 5.58 | $\pm$ | 0.23 | 5.97 | 0.47 |
| RS\#10 | 7-May-96 | $25 \quad 00.84$ | $80 \quad 30.25$ | 0.94 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 0.74 | $\pm$ | 0.07 | 1.68 | $\pm$ | 0.09 | 9.41 | $\pm$ | 0.76 |  |  |
| RS\#11 | 7-May-96 | $25 \quad 00.55$ | $80 \quad 30.76$ | 1.04 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 1.98 | $\pm$ | 0.11 | 3.02 | $\pm$ | 0.13 | 14.74 | $\pm$ | 0.37 |  |  |
| RS\#12 | 7-May-96 | 2500.30 | $80 \quad 30.95$ | 0.86 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 1.04 | $\pm$ | 0.09 | 1.90 | $\pm$ | 0.10 | 8.27 | $\pm$ | 0.03 |  |  |
| RS\#13 | 7-May-96 | $24 \quad 59.56$ | $80 \quad 29.77$ | 0.31 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 0.29 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 0.60 | $\pm$ | 0.07 | 6.36 | $\pm$ | 0.35 |  |  |
| RS\#14 | 9-May-96 | 2504.17 | $80 \quad 27.65$ | 0.59 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 0.57 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 1.17 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 8.30 | $\pm$ | 0.51 |  |  |
| RS\#14 | 9-May-96 | $25 \quad 04.17$ | $80 \quad 27.65$ | 0.58 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 0.76 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 1.34 | $\pm$ | 0.09 |  | $\pm$ |  |  |  |
| RS\#15 | 10-May-96 | 2504.17 | $80 \quad 27.65$ | 0.61 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 0.87 | $\pm$ | 0.07 | 1.48 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 8.59 | $\pm$ | 0.31 |  |  |
| RS\#16 | 10-May-96 | $25 \quad 04.17$ | $80 \quad 27.65$ | 0.61 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 1.01 | $\pm$ | 0.07 | 1.61 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 8.30 | $\pm$ | 0.13 |  |  |
| RS\#17 | 10-May-96 | 2506.65 | $80 \quad 20.50$ | 0.42 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 0.23 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 0.65 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 9.82 | $\pm$ | 0.03 |  |  |
| RS\#18 | 10-May-96 | 2506.72 | $80 \quad 18.32$ | 0.24 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 0.00 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 0.24 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 4.83 | $\pm$ | 1.63 |  |  |
| RS\#19 | 10-May-96 | $25 \quad 07.46$ | $80 \quad 18.00$ | 0.18 | $\pm$ | 0.03 | 0.10 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 0.27 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 4.47 | $\pm$ | 0.53 |  |  |
| RS\#20 | 10-May-96 | 2508.11 | $80 \quad 19.22$ | 0.27 | $\pm$ | 0.03 | 0.25 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 0.52 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 9.96 | $\pm$ | 0.17 |  |  |
| RS\#21 | 10-May-96 | 2508.23 | $80 \quad 22.07$ | 0.45 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 0.00 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 0.45 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 4.13 | $\pm$ | 0.23 |  |  |
| RS\#22 | 12-May-96 | $25 \quad 12.99$ | $80 \quad 17.33$ | 0.25 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 0.47 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 0.71 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 13.90 | $\pm$ | 0.96 |  |  |
| RS\#23 | 12-May-96 | $25 \quad 13.27$ | $80 \quad 15.82$ | 0.23 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 0.75 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 0.97 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 11.93 | $\pm$ | 0.23 |  |  |
| RS\#24 | 12-May-96 | $25 \quad 13.42$ | $80 \quad 13.01$ | 0.27 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 0.28 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 0.54 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 6.16 | $\pm$ | 0.25 |  |  |
| RS\#25 | 12-May-96 | $25 \quad 16.41$ | $80 \quad 12.51$ | 0.29 | $\pm$ | 0.03 | 0.19 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 0.48 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 5.67 | $\pm$ | 0.09 |  |  |
| RS\#26 | 12-May-96 | $25 \quad 16.28$ | $80 \quad 13.91$ | 0.31 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 0.22 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 0.53 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 10.54 | $\pm$ | 0.35 |  |  |
| RS\#27 | 12-May-96 | $\begin{array}{lll}25 & 16.81\end{array}$ | $80 \quad 16.76$ | 0.65 | $\pm$ | 0.03 | 2.14 | $\pm$ | 0.09 | 2.79 | $\pm$ | 0.10 | 10.28 | $\pm$ | 0.35 |  |  |
| RS\#28 | 13-May-96 | $25 \quad 04.71$ | $80 \quad 25.36$ | 0.41 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 0.57 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 0.98 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 12.12 | $\pm$ | 0.27 | 1.92 | 0.04 |
| RS\#29 | 13-May-96 | $25 \quad 03.66$ | $80 \quad 21.41$ | 0.24 | $\pm$ | 0.01 | 0.51 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 0.75 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 15.84 | $\pm$ | 0.99 | 1.19 | 0.24 |
| RS\#30 | 13-May-96 | $25 \quad 01.99$ | $80 \quad 20.95$ | 0.23 | $\pm$ | 0.01 | 0.21 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 0.44 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 5.17 | $\pm$ | 0.15 |  |  |
| RS\#31 | 13-May-96 | 2509.03 | $80 \quad 17.65$ | 0.19 | $\pm$ | 0.01 | 0.77 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 0.96 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 7.55 | $\pm$ | 0.41 |  |  |
| RS\#32 | 13-May-96 | $25 \quad 13.29$ | $\begin{array}{lll}80 & 19.37\end{array}$ | 0.55 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 1.80 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 2.35 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 7.25 | $\pm$ | 0.20 |  |  |
| RS\#33 | 13-May-96 | $25 \quad 11.49$ | $80 \quad 20.51$ | 0.40 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 1.96 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 2.35 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 16.04 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 1.67 | 0.09 |
| RS\#34 | 13-May-96 | 2509.60 | 8021.03 | 0.36 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 0.83 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 1.19 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 9.50 | $\pm$ | 0.30 | 1.08 | 0.07 |
| RS\#35 | 13-May-96 | $25 \quad 06.18$ | $80 \quad 23.94$ | 0.53 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 0.70 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 1.23 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 10.58 | $\pm$ | 0.18 | 2.98 | 0.51 |
| RS\#36 | 14-May-96 | $25 \quad 04.17$ | $80 \quad 27.65$ | 0.70 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 4.97 | $\pm$ | 0.14 | 5.67 | $\pm$ | 0.15 | 20.42 | $\pm$ | 0.21 |  |  |
| RS\#37 | 14-May-96 | $\underline{25} 14.52$ | $80 \quad 18.36$ | 0.34 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 2.20 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 2.54 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 14.53 | $\pm$ | 0.61 |  |  |
| RS\#38 | 14-May-96 | $25 \quad 16.09$ | $80 \quad 17.39$ | 0.61 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 1.58 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 2.19 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 15.47 | $\pm$ | 0.14 |  |  |
| RS\#39 | 14-May-96 | 25.14 .94 | $80 \quad 14.90$ | 0.40 | $\pm$ | 0.01 | 0.69 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 1.09 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 15.37 | $\pm$ | 0.14 |  |  |
| RS\#40 | 14-May-96 | $25 \quad 11.54$ | $80 \quad 17.65$ | 0.28 | $\pm$ | 0.01 | 0.68 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 0.95 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 17.49 | $\pm$ | 0.46 | 2.35 |  |
| RS\#41 | 14-May-96 | $25 \quad 04.18$ | $80 \quad 27.64$ | 1.10 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 7.72 | $\pm$ | 0.21 | 8.82 | $\pm$ | 0.21 | 32.04 | $\pm$ | 2.06 |  |  |
| RS\#42 | 14-May-96 | $25 \quad 03.43$ | $80 \quad 23.17$ | 0.26 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 0.37 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 0.63 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 13.66 | $\pm$ | 0.28 |  |  |
| RS\#43 | 14-May-96 | $25 \quad 04.80$ | $80 \quad 21.63$ | 0.30 | $\pm$ | 0.03 | 0.76 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 1.06 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 13.67 | $\pm$ | 0.19 |  |  |
| RS\#44 | 7-Aug-96 | 2449.95 | $80 \quad 47.78$ | 0.68 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 0.53 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 1.20 |  | 0.09 | 12.67 |  |  |  |  |

Table 4: Continued.

| RS\#45 | 7-Aug-96 | 2448.93 | $80 \quad 46.92$ | 0.22 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 1.69 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 1.91 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 13.68 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RS\#46 | 7-Aug-96 | 2448.46 | $80 \quad 48.01$ | 0.34 | $\pm$ | 0.01 | 0.93 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 1.27 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 14.17 |  |  |  |  |  |
| RS\#47 | 7-Aug-96 | 2449.78 | $80 \quad 49.05$ | 0.16 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 1.58 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 1.74 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 14.85 |  |  |  |  |  |
| RS\#48 | 7-Aug-96 | 2448.42 | $80 \quad 49.59$ | 0.47 | $\pm$ | 0.01 | 1.15 | $\pm$ | 0.07 | 1.62 | $\pm$ | 0.07 | 13.94 |  |  |  |  |  |
| RS\#49 | 7-Aug-96 | 2448.12 | $80 \quad 50.50$ | 0.61 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 1.37 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 1.98 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 13.66 |  |  |  |  |  |
| RS \#50 | 28-Jun-97 | 25.15 | -80.30 | 0.24 | $\pm$ | 0.03 | 0.79 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 1.04 |  | 0.06 | 10.08 | $\pm$ | 1.76 | 3.28 | $\pm$ | 0.99 |
| RS \#51 | 28-Jun-97 | 25.19 | -80.29 | 0.49 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 0.39 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 0.88 | $\pm$ | 0.07 | 11.37 | $\pm$ | 0.31 | 3.91 | $\pm$ | $0 . \overline{45}$ |
| RS \#52 | 28-Jun-97 | 25.11 | -80.38 | 0.51 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 0.41 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 0.92 | $\pm$ | 0.07 | 9.77 | $\pm$ | 0.63 | 5.19 | $\pm$ | 1.06 |
| RS \#53 | 28-Jun-97 | 25.13 | -80.39 | 1.06 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 4.37 | $\pm$ | 0.12 | 5.43 | $\pm$ | 0.13 | 36.37 | $\pm$ | 0.14 | 26.52 | $\pm$ | 5.89 |
| RS \#54 | 28-Jun-97 | 25.06 | -80.45 | 0.46 | $\pm$ | 0.03 | 0.69 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 1.15 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 16.31 | $\pm$ | 0.56 |  |  |  |
| RS \#55 | 28-Jun-97 | 25.00 | -80.50 | 0.49 | $\pm$ | 0.03 | 1.02 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 1.52 |  | 0.06 | 11.61 | $\pm$ | 0.20 | 5.86 |  |  |
| RS \#56 | 28-Jun-97 | 24.96 | -80.53 | 0.46 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 1.10 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 1.56 | $\pm$ | 0.07 | 13.52 | $\pm$ | 0.64 | 3.23 | $\pm$ | 0.89 |
| AS \#57 | 28-Jun-97 |  |  | 0.30 | $\pm$ | 0.03 | 0.24 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | $0.53 \pm$ | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 3.87 | $\pm$ | 1.02 | 2.67 | $\pm$ | 0.12 |
| RS \#58 | 2-Jul-97 | 25.14 | -80.26 | 0.39 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 0.00 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 0.39 | $\pm$ | 0.07 | 3.71 | $\pm$ | 0.10 | 1.06 | $\pm$ | 0.03 |
| RS \#59 | 2-Jul-97 | 25.14 | -80.26 | 0.29 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 0.03 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 0.32 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 2.71 | $\pm$ | 0.19 | 1.91 | $\pm$ | 0.10 |
| RS \#60 | 2-Jul-97 | 25.12 | -80.30 | 0.19 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 0.44 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 0.63 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 6.06 | $\pm$ | 0.18 | 2.65 | $\pm$ | 0.51 |
| RS \#61 | 2-Jul-97 | 25.12 | -80.30 | 0.28 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 0.52 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 0.80 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 5.76 | $\pm$ | 0.78 | 1.97 | $\pm$ | 0.60 |
| RS \#62 | 2-Jul-97 | 25.11 | -80.31 | 0.34 | $\pm$ | 0.01 | 0.50 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 0.84 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 8.80 | $\pm$ | 0.28 | 2.29 | $\pm$ | 0.12 |
| RS \#63 | 2-Jul-97 | 25.11 | -80.31 | 0.27 | $\pm$ | 0.01 | 0.72 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 0.99 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 8.15 | $\pm$ | 0.59 | 2.54 | $\pm$ | 0.06 |
| RS \#64 | 2-Jul-97 | 25.11 | -80.34 | 0.34 | $\pm$ | 0.03 | 0.59 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 0.93 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 15.17 | $\pm$ | 0.26 | 2.69 | $\pm$ | 0.20 |
| RS \#65 | 2-Jul-97 | 25.07 | -80.39 | 0.33 | $\pm$ | 0.01 | 0.89 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 1.22 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 18.29 | $\pm$ | 0.47 | 2.62 | $\pm$ | 0.61 |
| RS \#66 | 2-Jul-97 | 25.03 | -80.40 | 0.30 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 0.64 | $\pm$ | 0.07 | $0.94 \pm$ | $\pm$ | 0.09 | 9.98 | $\pm$ | 1.70 | 2.25 | $\pm$ | 0.23 |
| RS \#67 | 2-Jul-97 | 25.07 | -80.46 | 0.76 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 5.39 | $\pm$ | 0.15 | $6.15 \pm$ | $\pm$ | 0.15 | 18.99 | $\pm$ | 0.80 | 3.51 | $\pm$ | 0.19 |
| RS \#68 | 3-Jul-97 | 25.15 | -80.29 | 0.29 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 0.70 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 0.99 | $\pm$ | 0.06 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RS \#69 | 3-Jul-97 | 25.15 | -80.29 | 0.23 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 1.34 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 1.58 | $\pm$ | 0.07 | 15.95 | $\pm$ | 0.39 | 2.28 | $\pm$ | 0.51 |
| RS \#70 | 3-Jul-97 | 25.15 | -80.29 | 0.28 | $\pm$ | 0.03 | 0.83 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | $1.11 \pm$ | $\pm$ | 0.07 | 17.08 | $\pm$ | 0.33 | 2.68 | $\pm$ | 0.34 |
| RS \#71 | 3-Jul-97 | 25.15 | -80.30 | 0.30 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 0.90 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 1.20 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 17.89 | $\pm$ | 0.24 | 2.48 | $\pm$ | 0.23 |
| RS \#72 | 3-Jul-97 | 25.04 | -80.35 | 0.22 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 0.38 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 0.59 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 6.98 | $\pm$ | 0.15 | 1.53 | $\pm$ | 0.11 |
| RS \#73 | 3-Jul-97 | 25.04 | -80.35 | 0.18 | $\pm$ | 0.01 | 0.40 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | $0.57 \pm$ | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 6.26 | $\pm$ | 0.09 | 1.90 | $\pm$ | 0.22 |
| RS \#74 | 3-Jul-97 | 25.04 | -80.35 | 0.29 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 0.22 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 0.51 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 9.74 | $\pm$ | 6.11 | 1.90 | $\pm$ | 0.30 |
| RS \#75 | 3-Jul-97 | 25.01 | -80.37 | 0.48 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 0.18 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 0.66 | $\pm$ | 0.07 | 4.21 | $\pm$ | 0.35 | 2.02 | $\pm$ | 0.52 |
| RS \#76 | 3-Jul-97 | 25.01 | -80.37 | 0.23 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 0.08 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 0.31 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 3.81 | $\pm$ | 0.11 | 2.30 | $\pm$ | 0.73 |
| RS \#77 | 4-Jul-97 | 25.20 | -80.34 | 0.82 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 2.13 | $\pm$ | 0.11 | 2.94 | $\pm$ | 0.11 | 8.71 | $\pm$ | 0.08 | 3.44 | $\pm$ | 0.38 |
| RS \#78 | 4-Jul-97 | 25.18 | -80.35 | 0.52 | $\pm$ | 0.02 | 3.40 | $\pm$ | 0.12 | 3.91 | $\pm$ | 0.12 | 19.36 | $\pm$ | 0.11 | 3.06 | $\pm$ | 0.46 |
| RS \#79 | 4-Jul-97 | 25.16 | -80.35 | 0.47 | $\pm$ | 0.03 | 1.57 | $\pm$ | 0.20 | 2.04 | $\pm$ | 0.20 | 9.68 | $\pm$ | 0.22 | 2.55 | $\pm$ | 0.12 |
| RS \#80 | 4-Jul-97 | 25.15 | -80.37 | 0.71 | $\pm$ | 0.03 | 2.20 | $\pm$ | 0.12 | 2.91 | $\pm$ | 0.12 | 7.25 | $\pm$ | 0.12 | 2.69 | $\pm$ | 0.26 |
| RS \#81 | 4-Jul-97 | 25.12 | -80.38 | 0.79 | $\pm$ | 0.03 | 1.16 | $\pm$ | 0.10 | $1.95 \pm$ | $\pm$ | 0.10 | 13.06 | $\pm$ | 0.41 | 2.75 | $\pm$ | 0.85 |
| RS \#82 | 4-Jul-97 | 25.09 | -80.43 | 0.89 | $\pm$ | 0.03 | 3.26 | $\pm$ | 0.15 | 4.15 | $\pm$ | 0.16 | 21.40 | $\pm$ | 1.26 | 5.07 | $\pm$ | 0.14 |
| RS \#83 | 4-Jul-97 | 25.07 | -80.44 | 0.78 | $\pm$ | 0.03 | 2.84 | $\pm$ | 0.13 | 3.63 | $\pm$ | 0.14 | 14.43 | $\pm$ | 0.30 | 2.88 | $\pm$ | 0.57 |
| RS \#84 | 4-Jul-97 | 25.07 | -80.46 | 1.16 | $\pm$ | 0.04 | 10.48 | $\pm$ | 0.28 | 11.64 | $\pm$ | 0.28 | 31.14 | $\pm$ | 0.47 | 4.42 | $\pm$ | 1.40 |
| AS \#84-2 | 4-Jul-97 | 25.07 | -80.46 | 0.49 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 8.04 | $\pm$ | 0.69 | 8.53 |  | 0.69 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| RS \#85 | 4-Jul-97 | 25.06 | -80.47 | 1.71 | $\pm$ | 0.05 | 16.34 | $\pm$ | 0.40 | $18.05 \pm$ | 0.41 | 43.53 | $\pm$ | 0.17 | 10.30 | + | 0.11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RS \#85-2 | 4-Jul-97 | 25.06 | -80.47 | 1.92 | $\pm$ | 0.06 | 17.64 | $\pm$ | 0.44 | $19.56 \pm$ | 0.44 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Average: | 0.48 | $\pm$ | 0.31 | 1.64 | $\pm$ | 2.94 | $2.12 \pm$ | 3.19 | 11.93 | $\pm$ | 7.00 | 3.55 | $\pm$ | 4.03 |

Table 5. Tracer concentrations by region, and significance (difference) relative to Keys Bay-side. Keys Bayside was defined as sites located on the Florida Bay side of the upper Keys (Key Largo, Plantation Key and the Matecumbe Keys). North Coast Sties were along the Everglades Coast in muddy bottomed areas. Mid NE sites were in the Northeastern areas of the bay and typically had very little sediments overlying a rock bay floor. Mid Bay sites were typically basins within the mud-banked areas of the middle bay.

| Natural Tracers | Keys Bay-side <br> $(\sigma, \mathbf{n})$ | Mid Bay <br> $(\sigma, \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{p})$ | N. Coast <br> $(\sigma, \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{p})$ | Mid N.E. <br> $(\sigma, \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{p})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }^{222} \mathrm{Rn}\left(\mathrm{dpm} \cdot \mathrm{L}^{-1}\right)$ | $4.38(3.24,73)$ | $2.23(1.43,40,0.00)$ | $2.89(2.15,33,0.02)$ | $2.40(1.96,32,0.00)$ |
| ${ }^{226} \mathrm{Ra}\left(\mathrm{dpm} \cdot \mathrm{L}^{-1}\right)$ | $1.44(0.59,73)$ | $1.42(0.41,40,0.86)$ | $1.49(0.48,33,0.63)$ | $1.95(0.61,32,0.00)$ |
| $\mathrm{CH}_{4}(\mathrm{nM})$ | $38.2(23.3,73)$ | $16.4(8.8,40,0.00)$ | $22.0(19.3,30,0.00)$ | $13.2(10.8,30,0.00)$ |
| $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}(\mathrm{nM})$ | $3.80(5.40,60)$ | $1.28(1.50,39,0.00)$ | $1.87(1.13,26,0.08)$ | $1.80(1.57,25,0.07)$ |
| $15 \mathrm{~N}(\% 0)$ | $7.89(2.54,23)$ | $3.92(1.98,26,0.00)$ | $5.83(2.26,13,0.02)$ | $5.57(2.46,7,0.04)$ |

Table 6: Average tracer concentrations from samples collected in various surface waters.

| Site | Rn-222 <br> $(\mathbf{d p m} / \mathrm{L})$ | Methane <br> $(\mathbf{n M})$ | Ethylene <br> $(\mathbf{n M})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Canals/Trenches | $19 \pm 11$ <br> $(\mathrm{n}=10)$ | $830 \pm 1140$ <br> $(\mathrm{n}=10)$ | $2.9 \pm 1.5$ <br> $(\mathrm{n}=10)$ |
| Garden Cove Spring, Key Largo | $66 \pm 19$ <br> $(\mathrm{n}=4)$ | $141 \pm 176$ <br> $(\mathrm{n}=4)$ |  |
| Garden Cove Surface, Key Largo | $4.3 \pm 1.2$ <br> $(\mathrm{n}=4)$ | $41 \pm 11$ <br> $(\mathrm{n}=2)$ |  |
| Lois Key Spring, Sugarloaf Key | $122 \pm 2$ <br> $(\mathrm{n}=2)$ | $493 \pm 41$ <br> $(\mathrm{n}=3)$ |  |
| Porjoe Key Interstitial Fluid | $67 \pm 1$ <br> $(\mathrm{n}=1)$ | $176 \pm 11$ <br> $(\mathrm{n}=3)$ |  |
| Porjoe Key Surface | $0.2 \pm 0.1$ <br> $(\mathrm{n}=1)$ | $7.0 \pm 0.2$ <br> $(\mathrm{n}=3)$ |  |
| Bay Average | $4.8 \pm 2.7$ <br> $(\mathrm{n}=178)$ | $27 \pm 26$ <br> $(\mathrm{n}=173)$ | $2.5 \pm 3.7$ <br> $(\mathrm{n}=150)$ |
| Reef Average | $1.5 \pm 1.4$ <br> $(\mathrm{n}=57)$ | $11 \pm 6$ <br> $(\mathrm{n}=57)$ | $4.8 \pm 6.4$ <br> $(\mathrm{n}=14)$ |

Table 7: Nutrient concentrations of of springs, goundwater, and surface waters.

| Site | Flow Rate (m3/min) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \begin{array}{l} \text { NH4+ } \\ (\mathrm{uM}) \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{NOB}^{-} \\ & (\mathrm{uM}) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P O 4}^{2-} \\ & (\mathrm{uM}) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Salinity } \\ & \text { (ppt) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { KML Well }\left(15 ' \text { and } 60^{\prime}\right)^{1} \\ & (\mathrm{n}=2) \end{aligned}$ |  | $13.3 \pm 0.04$ | $0.62 \pm 0.48$ | $0.98 \pm 0.18$ |  |
| Canals/Trenches ( $\mathrm{n}=3$ ) |  | $6.2 \pm 4.7$ | $0.90 \pm 0.33$ | $0.07 \pm 0.03$ |  |
| Garden Cove Spring, Key Largo ( $\mathrm{n}=3$ ) | $7.10 \pm 0.87^{2}$ | $0.53 \pm 0.15$ | $0.40 \pm 0.16$ | $0.08 \pm 0.04$ | 31 |
| Garden Cove Surface, Key Largo ( $\mathrm{n}=3$ ) |  | $B D^{3}$ | $1.24 \pm 0.09$ | BD | 29 |
| Lois Key Spring, Sugarloaf Key |  | 12.03 | 0.1 | 0.94 | 38 |
| Porjoe Key Interstitial Fluid (seepage meter) ${ }^{4}$ | $(7.35 \pm 0.96) \times 10^{-5}$ | 15.17 | 0.68 | 0.03 | 24.9 |
| Porjoe Key Surface |  | BD | 1.14 | BD | 28.5 |
| Bay Average ( $\mathrm{n}=27$ ) |  | $1.2 \pm 1.5$ | $1.1 \pm 0.96$ | BD |  |
| Reef Average ( $\mathrm{n}=49$ ) |  | BD | $0.30 \pm 0.38$ | BD |  |

[^0]Table 8a. Results from septic tank experiments at site A on Big Pine Key. $\left(^{*}\right)$ indicates dates of injections.
B.D. $=$ below detection

| sampling date | time after injection (days) | tap water SF6 conc (pM) | $\underline{S D}(\mathrm{pM})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12/13/96 * | 0.01 | 9.62 | 0.07 |
| 12/14/96 | 1 | 0.33 |  |
| 12/15/96 | 2 | 0.31 | 0.01 |
| 12/16/96 | 3 | 0.69 | 0.03 |
| 12/17/96 | 4 | 0.93 | 0.00 |
| 12/18/96 | 5 | 0.58 | 0.01 |
| 12/19/96 | 6 | 0.09 |  |
| 12/20/96 | 7 | 0.81 | 0.02 |
| 12/22/96 | 9 | 0.34 | 0.01 |
| 12/24/96 | 11 | 0.11 |  |
| 12/26/96 | 13 | 0.34 | 0.00 |
| 12/30/96 | 17 | 0.55 |  |
| 1/1/97 | 19 | 0.14 |  |
| 1/3/97 | 21 | 0.64 | 0.11 |
| 1/5/97 | 23 | 1.15 |  |
| 1/9/97 | 27 | 0.56 |  |
| 1/11/97 | 29 | 0.39 | 0.00 |
| 1/13/97 | 31 | 0.18 |  |
| 1/15/97 | 33 | 0.27 |  |
| 1/17/97 | 35 | 0.60 |  |
| 1/19/97 | 37 | 0.53 |  |
| 1/21/97 | 39 | 0.13 |  |
| 1/23/97 | 41 | 0.32 |  |
| 1/25/97 | 43 | 0.32 | 0.02 |
| 1/29/97 | 47 | 0.44 |  |
| 2/2/97 | 51 | 0.39 |  |
| 2/6/97 | 55 | 0.53 |  |
| 2/10/97 | 59 | 0.41 |  |
| 2/14/97 | 63 | 0.32 | 0.01 |
| 6/12/97* | 181.48 | 0.33 | 0.03 |
| 6/12/97 | 181.50 | 0.37 | 0.03 |
| 6/12/97 | 181.71 | B.D. |  |
| 6/12/97 | 181.96 | 0.10 | 0.00 |
| 6/13/97 | 182.33 | 0.04 | 0.06 |
| 6/14/97 | 183.33 | 0.04 | 0.00 |
| 6/15/97 | 184.33 | 0.12 | 0.02 |
| 6/16/97 | 185.83 | 0.06 | 0.08 |
| 6/17/97 | 186.33 | 0.14 | 0.01 |
| 6/18/97 | 187.33 | 0.16 | 0.01 |
| 6/18/97 | 187.33 | 0.13 | 0.00 |
| 6/19/97 | 188.33 | 0.10 | 0.01 |
| 6/20/97 | 189.33 | 0.11 | 0.01 |

Table 8b. Results from septic tank experiments at site B on Big Pine Key. ${ }^{*}$ ) indicates date of injection.
B.D. $=$ below detection

| sampling <br> date | time after injection <br> (days) | tap water <br> SF6 conc (pM) | SD (pM) <br> $6 / 12 / 97$ <br> $6 / 12 / 97$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -0.01 <br> $6 / 12 / 97$ | -0.01 | 0.38 | 0.07 |
| $6 / 12 / 97$ | 0.01 | 0.52 | 0.08 |
| $6 / 12 / 97$ | 0.01 | 27559.14 | 140.19 |
| $6 / 12 / 97$ | 0.18 | 3537.98 | 70.93 |
| $6 / 13 / 97$ | 0.44 | 410.40 | 18.74 |
| $6 / 14 / 97$ | 0.85 | 4053.65 | 45.00 |
| $6 / 14 / 97$ | 1.80 | 1099.73 | 1.78 |
| $6 / 15 / 97$ | 2.43 | 880.79 | 16.05 |
| $6 / 17 / 97$ | 2.76 | 692.27 |  |
| $6 / 18 / 97$ | 4.80 | 252.09 | 3.40 |
| $6 / 19 / 97$ | 5.84 | 153.50 | 0.42 |
| $6 / 20 / 97$ | 6.84 | 127.55 | 1.59 |
| $6 / 21 / 97$ | 7.83 | 92.21 | 0.35 |
| $6 / 22 / 97$ | 8.78 | 75.22 | 1.34 |
| $6 / 22 / 97$ | 9.89 | 58.47 | 0.08 |
| $6 / 23 / 97$ | 10.43 | 414.86 | 103.27 |
| $6 / 24 / 97$ | 10.82 | 479.07 | 1.16 |
| $6 / 26 / 97$ | 11.82 | 38.64 | 0.32 |
| $6 / 30 / 97$ | 13.86 | 29.31 | 0.46 |
| $7 / 2 / 97$ | 17.91 | 4.07 | 0.04 |
| $7 / 2 / 97$ | 19.84 | 2.82 | 0.00 |
| $7 / 4 / 97$ | 19.94 | 2.08 | 0.02 |
| $7 / 6 / 97$ | 22.36 | 1.77 | 0.09 |
| $7 / 8 / 97$ | 24.41 | 1.16 | 0.04 |
| $7 / 17 / 97$ | 26.45 | 0.84 | 0.02 |
| $7 / 30 / 97$ | 34.84 | 0.14 | 0.20 |
| $8 / 12 / 97$ | 60.47 | B.D. | 0.00 |
| $8 / 21 / 97$ | 69.47 | B.D. | 0.00 |
|  | B.D. | 0.00 |  |

Table 9. Results from July '96 simulated septic tank experiment on Key Largo.
$\left.\begin{array}{lccc}\text { Location } & \begin{array}{c}\text { time after } \\ \text { injection(hrs) }\end{array} & & \begin{array}{c}\text { SF6 } \\ \text { conc nmoles }\end{array}\end{array} \begin{array}{c}\text { well water } \\ \text { level (m) }\end{array}\right\}$

Table 10. Results from August ' 96 simulated septic tank experiment on Key Largo.

| Location | time after injection (hrs) | $\begin{gathered} \text { SF6 } \\ \text { conc (nM) } \end{gathered}$ | St. Dev. (nM) | time after injection (hrs) | well water level (m) | Lecarion | time after injection(hrs) | $\begin{gathered} \text { SF6 } \\ \text { conc (nM) } \end{gathered}$ | St. Dev. (nM) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Monitor Well | 0.00 | 1.94 | 0.12 | -0.02 | 1.02 | Boat Basin | 3.33 | B.D. |  |
|  | 2.17 | 1.57 |  | 1.42 | 0.98 |  | 4.50 | B.D. |  |
|  | 3.58 | 2.76 | 0.77 | 2.42 | 0.92 |  | 5.67 | B.D. |  |
|  | 4.75 | 2.39 | 0.01 | 3.75 | 0.88 |  | 7.17 | B.D. |  |
|  | 5.92 | 2.61 | 0.19 | 4.92 | 0.83 |  | 8.08 | B.D. |  |
|  | 6.75 | 2.89 | 0.03 | 6.02 | 0.83 |  | 9.00 | B.D. |  |
|  | 7.00 | 2.58 | 0.24 | 6.62 | 0.83 |  | 9.92 | 0.04 |  |
|  | 7.17 | 2.33 | 0.29 | 6.92 | 0.85 |  | 9.92 | 0.22 |  |
|  | 7.50 | 2.57 |  | 7.08 | 0.86 |  | 10.75 | B.D. |  |
|  | 7.92 | 2.01 | 0.08 | 7.70 | 0.90 |  | 11.75 | B.D. |  |
|  | 8.33 | 2.49 | 0.22 | 8.05 | 0.91 |  | 12.83 | B.D. |  |
|  | 8.75 10.17 | 2.63 | 0.09 | 8.95 | 0.97 |  | 13.88 | B.D. |  |
|  | 10.17 | 2.22 | 0.09 | 10.35 | 1.04 |  | 14.87 | B.D. |  |
|  | 10.92 | 2.49 | 0.18 | 11.75 | 1.05 |  | 15.83 | B.D. |  |
|  | 11.93 | 2.45 | 0.18 | 12.15 | 1.09 |  | 16.97 | B.D. |  |
|  | 13.05 | 2.38 | 0.05 | 13.20 | 1.06 |  | 18.70 | B.D. |  |
|  | 14.07 | 2.30 | 0.23 | 14.22 | 1.00 |  | 19.67 | B.D. |  |
|  | 15.03 | 2.43 | 0.03 | 15.18 | 0.95 |  | 20.75 | B.D. |  |
|  | 15.98 | 2.42 | 0.00 | 16.12 | 0.88 |  | 21.40 | B.D. |  |
|  | 17.15 | 2.39 | 0.01 | 17.28 | 0.81 |  | 21.88 | B.D. |  |
|  | 18.57 | 2.64 | 0.06 | 18.32 | 0.80 |  | 22.13 | B.D. |  |
|  | 19.00 | 2.39 | 0.39 | 18.93 | 0.78 |  | 22.50 | B.D. |  |
|  | 19.67 | 2.33 | 0.06 | 19.95 | 0.83 |  | 22.92 | B.D. |  |
|  | 20.50 | 2.18 | 0.15 | 20.35 | 0.85 |  | 23.33 | B.D. |  |
|  | 21.67 | 2.29 | 0.25 | 20.73 | 0.86 |  | 23.72 | B.D. |  |
|  | 22.75 | 2.21 | 0.03 | 21.85 | 0.93 |  | 24.20 | B.D. |  |
|  | 23.52 | 1.99 | 0.23 | 22.08 | 0.95 |  | 24.58 | B.D. |  |
|  | 24.03 | 2.30 | 0.14 | 22.50 | 0.98 |  | 24.95 | B.D. |  |
|  | 24.77 | 2.36 | 0.04 | 22.88 | 1.00 |  | 25.43 | B.D. |  |
|  | 25.25 | 2.39 | 0.01 | 23.10 | 1.02 |  | 26.13 | B.D. |  |
|  | 26.12 | 2.59 | 0.19 | 23.70 | 1.03 |  | 26.67 | B.D. |  |
|  | 26.87 | 2.43 | 0.00 | 23.97 | 1.04 |  | 27.70 | B.D. |  |
|  | 27.73 | 7.35 | 0.45 | 24.72 | 1.06 |  | 28.60 | B.D. |  |
|  | 28.33 | 14.50 | 0.60 | 25.38 | 1.04 |  | 29.92 | 0.07 | 0.03 |
|  | 28.68 | 24.59 | 1.67 | 26.32 | 0.99 |  | 30.92 | 0.04 | 0.03 |
|  | 29.20 | 22.44 | 6.26 | 26.98 | 0.97 |  | 32.00 | B.D. |  |
|  | 29.70 | 5.49 | 1.26 | 27.87 | 0.91 |  | 33.00 | 0.03 | 0.00 |
|  | 30.20 | 2.62 | 0.27 | 28.53 | 0.88 |  | 34.42 | 0.03 |  |
|  | 30.70 | 2.43 | 0.05 | 28.85 | 0.87 |  | 35.08 | 0.04 | 0.02 |
|  | 31.20 | 2.42 | 0.02 | 29.32 | 0.85 |  | 35.52 | 0.01 | 0.02 |
|  | 31.75 | 2.74 | 0.07 | 29.83 | 0.85 |  | 36.02 | B.D. |  |
|  | 32.20 | 2.62 | 0.24 | 30.33 | 0.84 |  | 36.83 | B.D. |  |
|  | 32.75 | 2.85 | 0.02 | 30.83 | 0.84 |  | 37.37 | B.D. |  |
|  | 33.20 | 2.89 | 0.12 | 31.35 | 0.84 |  | 37.83 | B.D. |  |
|  | 34.13 | 2.83 |  | 31.93 | 0.87 |  | 38.33 | B.D. |  |
|  | 34.87 | 3.00 | 0.09 | 32.45 | 0.89 |  | 39.33 | B.D. |  |
|  | 35.33 | 3.15 | 0.97 | 32.93 | 0.92 |  | 40.18 | B.D. |  |
|  | 35.75 | 2.73 | 0.41 | 33.33 | 0.94 |  | 41.12 | B.D. |  |
|  | 36.25 | 3.04 | 0.02 | 34.37 | 1.00 |  | 43.20 | B.D. |  |
|  | 37.22 | 5.46 | 0.86 | 35.05 | 1.04 |  | 44.25 | B.D. |  |
|  | 37.67 | 6.52 | 0.88 | 35.48 | 1.06 |  | 45.17 | B.D. |  |
|  | 39.20 | 40.23 | 4.12 | 35.70 | 1.07 |  | 46.33 | B.D. |  |
|  | 40.03 | 61.96 | 0.95 | 35.88 | 1.09 |  | 48.00 | B.D. |  |
|  | 41.00 | 72.17 | 0.62 | 36.20 | 1.09 |  | 63.13 | B.D. |  |
|  | 43.00 | 38.35 | 0.95 | 36.62 | 1.11 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 44.12 | 13.80 | 0.84 | 36.80 | 1.10 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 46.00 | 6.23 | 1.17 | 37.17 | 1.10 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 47.87 | 4.05 | 0.02 | 37.55 | 1.09 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 63.35 | 70.43 | 0.26 | 37.82 | 1.08 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 38.30 | 1.05 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 39.15 | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 39.50 | 0.98 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 40.00 | 0.94 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 41.00 | 0.88 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 43.17 | 0.77 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 44.10 | 0.79 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 45.00 | 0.84 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 46.08 | 0.90 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 47.83 | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 63.33 | 1.05 |  |  |  |  |

Table Monitor Well results for August ' 97 simulated septic tank experiment, Key 11a. Largo.

| 1 (hrs) | ave conc (pM) | SD | 1 (hrs) | Athantic tide (cm) | 1 (hrs) | MW tide (em) | time | Bay tide (cm) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.25 | 33.46 |  | -1.5 | 58 | -0.5 | 27.28 | 6 | 11.5 |
| 0.77 | 32.42 | 0.36 | -0.5 | 73 | 0.05 | 133.96 | 7 | 9.5 |
| 1.28 | 49.82 |  | 0.5 | 82 | 0.25 | 32,36 | 8.98 | 7 |
|  | 0.00 |  | 1.5 | 79 | 0.7 | 33.63 | 9.85 | 6.5 |
| 1.88 | 43.69 | 3.91 | 2.5 | 67 | 0.9 | 33.63 | 10.85 | 6 |
| 2.25 | 0.00 |  | 3.5 | 49 | 1.12 | 36.805 | 11.85 | 5.5 |
| 2.75 | 40.80 |  | 4.5 | 30 | 1.3 | 35.662 | 12.95 | 4.5 |
| 3.30 | 28.01 |  | 5.5 | 15 | 1.43 | 39.98 | 13.95 | 2 |
| 3.75 | 34.21 | 8.82 | 6.5 | 6 | 1.85 | 42.52 | 14.98 | 3.5 |
| 4.25 | 20.67 |  | 7.5 | 6 | 2.23 | 41.885 | 15.95 | 7 |
| 4.75 | 13.31 | 0.30 | 8.5 | 15 | 2.5 | 41.7326 | 17 | 7 |
| 5.15 | 13.38 |  | 9.5 | 34 | 2.75 | 39.345 | 17.97 | 8.5 |
| 5.83 | 8.75 |  | 10.5 | 52 | 3.25 | 38.71 | 19 | 8 |
| 6.30 | 8.22 |  | 11.5 | 67 | 3.73 | 34.9 | 19.93 | 9 |
| 6.78 | 9.61 |  | 12.5 | 76 | 4.25 | 33.63 | 20.95 | 7 |
| 7.25 | 11.72 | 0.16 | 13.5 | 76 | 4.75 | 30.455 | 21.98 | 6 |
| 7.75 | 13.10 |  | 14.5 | 70 | 5.12 | 26.645 | 24.03 | 6.75 |
| 8.25 | 12.71 | 0.16 | 15.5 | 52 | 5.8 | 23.47 | 24.97 | 6 |
| 8.75 | 31.17 |  | 16.5 | 34 | 6.27 | 19.66 | 26 | 4.5 |
| 9.25 | 44.56 |  | 17.5 | 15 | 6.72 | 15.85 | 26.95 | 4.3 |
| 9.78 | 36.24 |  | 18.5 | 3 | 7.23 | 13.31 | 28.07 | 4.5 |
| 10.28 | 43.50 | 0.80 | 19.5 | 0 | 7.75 | 9.5 | 28.98 | 5 |
| 10.78 | 47.69 |  | 20.5 | 6 | 8.25 | 8.23 | 29.88 | 10 |
| 11.28 | 45.46 |  | 21.5 | 18 | 8.75 | 6.96 | 30.93 | 1.3 |
| 11.80 | 136.59 |  | 22.5 | 37 | 9.25 | 8.865 | 32.02 | 5 |
| 12.30 | 294.24 | 1.32 | 23.5 | 55 | 9.77 | 13.31 | 32.85 | 3.5 |
| 13.07 | 1067.97 |  | 24.5 | 70 | 10.27 | 13.945 | 34.05 | 1 |
| 13.40 | 1334.63 |  | 25.5 | 76 | 10.77 | 19.025 | 34.95 | 0 |
| 14.07 | 1554.83 |  | 26.5 | 76 | 11.27 | 22.835 | 35.7 | 0 |
| 14.52 | 974.17 | 11.51 | 27.5 | 67 | 11.78 | 29.185 |  |  |
| 15.10 | 302.93 |  | 28.5 | 52 | 12.27 | 34.265 |  |  |
| 15.57 | 83.83 |  | 29.5 | 34 | 13.07 | 39.345 |  |  |
| 16.07 | 85.22 |  | 30.5 | 18 | 13.4 | 39.98 |  |  |
| 16.53 | 80.05 | 1.70 | 31.5 | 12 | 14.05 | 44.425 |  |  |
| 17.10 | 44.18 |  | 32.5 | 12 | 14.48 | 42.52 |  |  |
| 17.55 | 22.39 |  | 33.5 | 21 | 15.08 | 40.615 |  |  |
| 18.15 | 11.17 |  | 34.5 | 34 | 15.55 | 38.075 |  |  |
| 18.53 | 12.14 |  | 35.5 | 49 | 16.05 | 36.17 |  |  |
| 19.03 | 11.56 |  | 36.5 | 64 | 16.5 | 35.535 |  |  |
| 19.53 | 12.14 |  |  |  | 17.08 | 32.36 |  |  |
| 20.00 | 11.48 |  |  |  | 17.53 | 26.01 |  |  |
| 20.53 | 15.93 |  |  |  | 18.08 | 22.835 |  |  |
| 21.02 | 16.18 |  |  |  | 18.5 | 21.438 |  |  |
| 21.53 | 19.07 |  |  |  | 19 | 17.12 |  |  |
| 22.02 | 48.67 | 1.23 |  |  | 19.5 | 13.31 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 19.97 | 11.405 |  |  |
| 23.25 | 214.71 |  |  |  | 20.5 | 6.96 |  |  |
| 23.57 | 459.04 |  |  |  | 21 | 6.96 |  |  |
| 24.17 | 752.45 |  |  |  | 21.5 | 6.96 |  |  |
| 24.60 | 1403.01 | 47.47 |  |  | 21.98 | 9.5 |  |  |
| 25.08 | 2387.46 |  |  |  | 23.25 | 17.12 |  |  |
| 25.55 | 3103.66 |  |  |  | 23.55 | 19.66 |  |  |
| 26.08 | 3624.55 |  |  |  | 24.13 | 22.835 |  |  |
| 26.52 | 4627.82 |  |  |  | 24.58 | 28.55 |  |  |
| 27.08 | 4039.77 | 65.90 |  |  | 25.07 | 31.09 |  |  |
| 27.52 | 2526.60 |  |  |  | 25.53 | 32.995 |  |  |
| 28.10 | 510.51 |  |  |  | 26.07 | 36.17 |  |  |
| 28.58 | 754.17 |  |  |  | 26.5 | 38.71 |  |  |
| 29.07 | 246.96 |  |  |  | 27.07 | 39.345 |  |  |
| 29.52 | 164.54 |  |  |  | 27.5 | 38.71 |  |  |
| 30.02 | 126.44 |  |  |  | 28.08 | 37.44 |  |  |
| 30.55 | 52.68 | 0.24 |  |  | 28.53 | 35.535 |  |  |
| 31.12 | 36.75 |  |  |  | 29.05 | 32.995 |  |  |
| 31.53 | 26.65 |  |  |  | 29.5 | 31.725 |  |  |
| 32.00 | 18.96 |  |  |  | 30 | 27.28 |  |  |
| 32.55 | 22.34 |  |  |  | 30.53 | 24.74 |  |  |
| 33.02 | 34.63 |  |  |  | 31 | 20.93 |  |  |
| 33.50 | 51.39 |  |  |  | 31.5 | 18.39 |  |  |
| 34.02 | 88.47 | 0.56 |  |  | 32 | 15.215 |  |  |
| 34.53 | 222.40 |  |  |  | 32.55 | 12.04 |  |  |
| 34.98 | 671.24 |  |  |  | 33 | 10.77 |  |  |
| 35.53 | 1084.23 | 0.75 |  |  | 33.48 | 8.865 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 34 | 13.31 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 34.5 | 13.31 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 34.97 | 14.58 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 35.52 | 22.2 |  |  |

Table
Results from Bay stations for August '97 simulated septic tank experiment. 11 b .

| time(hrs) | Bay 1 SF6 <br> conc. (pM) | SD | $\text { Bay } 2 \text { SF6 }$ $\text { conc. }(\mathrm{pM})$ | SD | Bay 3 SF6 conc. (DM) | SD | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bay } 4 \text { SF6 } \\ & \text { conc. ( } \mathrm{DM} \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | SD | Bay 5 SF6 <br> conc. ( pM ) | SD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.35 | 0.68 | 0.09 | 0.84 | 0.03 | 0.83 | 0.01 | 0.66 | 0.01 | 1.05 | 0.02 |
| 1.55 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.94 | 0.01 | 1.14 | 0.03 | 0.75 | 0.02 | 0.98 | 0.01 |
|  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.88 | 0.70 | 0.05 | 0.83 | 0.00 | 1.15 | 0.01 | 0.84 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| 3.82 | 0.70 | 0.00 | 1.23 | 0.00 | 1.29 | 0.02 | 0.74 | 0.01 | 0.99 | 0.01 |
| 4.83 | 0.64 | 0.01 | 1.01 | 0.02 | 1.67 | 0.01 | 0.71 | 0.03 | 0.44 | 0.62 |
| 5.90 | 0.63 | 0.01 | 0.92 | 0.00 | 1.49 | 0.09 | 0.72 | 0.02 | 0.79 | 0.02 |
| 6.85 | 0.57 | 0.01 | 0.83 | 0.04 | 1.53 | 0.00 | 0.76 | 0.00 | 0.64 | 0.03 |
| 7.82 | 0.47 | 0.01 | 0.63 | 0.02 | 1.64 | 0.04 | 0.83 | 0.12 | 0.67 | 0.07 |
| 8.80 | 0.40 | 0.01 | 0.69 | 0.02 | 1.46 | 0.02 | 0.46 | 0.04 | 0.78 | 0.28 |
| 9.82 | 0.58 | 0.04 | 0.85 | 0.00 | 1.48 | 0.00 | 0.55 | 0.02 | 0.56 | 0.01 |
| 10.80 | 0.47 | 0.01 | 0.51 | 0.01 | 1.22 | 0.02 | 0.47 | 0.02 | 0.38 | 0.03 |
| 11.80 | 0.36 | 0.00 | 0.53 | 0.00 | 0.98 | 0.03 | 0.43 | 0.00 | 0.36 | 0.02 |
| 12.82 | 0.60 | 0.01 | 0.55 | 0.02 | 0.49 | 0.01 | 0.45 | 0.02 | 0.40 | 0.02 |
| 13.82 | 0.55 | 0.07 | 0.44 | 0.01 | 0.70 | 0.06 | 0.50 | 0.01 | 0.48 | 0.04 |
| 14.82 | 1.64 | 0.06 | 1.12 | 0.04 | 0.59 | 0.00 | 0.48 | 0.03 |  | 0.04 |
| 15.80 | 1.57 | 0.04 | 1.01 | 0.01 | 0.87 | 0.01 | 0.36 | 0.04 | 0.83 | 0.10 |
| 16.82 | 0.89 | 0.01 | 0.39 | 0.02 | 1.54 | 0.04 | 0.63 | 0.01 | 0.95 | 0.02 |
| 17.83 | 0.85 | 0.04 | 0.17 | 0.01 | 1.15 | 0.11 | 0.95 | 0.01 | 1.12 | 0.00 |
| 18.78 | 0.89 | 0.02 | 0.15 | 0.03 | 0.99 | 0.00 | 1.02 | 0.01 | 0.93 | 0.04 |
| 19.77 | 0.98 | 0.08 | 0.40 | 0.04 | 0.91 | 0.03 | 0.93 | 0.03 | 1.00 | 0.05 |
| 20.80 | 0.84 | 0.04 | 0.27 | 0.01 | 0.69 | 0.03 | 0.77 | 0.01 | 0.69 | 0.05 |
| 21.80 | 0.88 | 0.01 | 0.65 | 0.04 | 0.85 | 0.04 | 0.85 | 0.02 | 0.76 | 0.04 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 0.77 | 0.03 |  |  |  |  |
| 23.90 | 0.64 | 0.03 | 0.61 | 0.03 | 0.68 | 0.02 | 0.72 | 0.03 | 0.71 | 0.03 |
| 24.83 | 0.66 | 0.08 | 0.63 | 0.04 | 0.68 | 0.01 | 0.59 | 0.01 | 0.68 | 0.02 |
| 25.83 | 0.74 | 0.02 | 0.56 | 0.10 | 0.65 | 0.02 | 0.53 | 0.03 | 0.61 | 0.02 |
| 26.82 | 0.54 | 0.23 | 0.62 | 0.09 | 0.68 | 0.37 | 0.51 | 0.01 | 0.58 | 0.06 |
| 27.85 | 0.65 | 0.02 | 1.34 | 0.00 | 1.07 | 0.03 | 0.54 | 0.02 | 0.19 | 0.00 |
| 28.82 | 1.04 | 0.02 | 1.69 | 0.00 | 3.54 | 0.05 | 0.50 | 0.00 | 0.50 | 0.03 |
| 29.88 | 0.51 | 0.00 | 0.51 | 0.03 | 1.73 | 0.00 | 0.85 | 0.01 | 0.61 | 0.02 |
| 30.82 | 0.77 | 0.02 | 0.53 | 0.09 | 0.77 | 0.03 | 0.62 | 0.03 | 0.57 | 0.02 |
| 31.90 32.85 | 0.48 | 0.01 | 0.64 | 0.06 | 1.84 | 0.08 | 0.61 | 0.03 | 0.65 | 0.01 |
| 32.85 33.88 | 0.49 | 0.01 | 0.85 | 0.00 | 1.41 | 0.05 | 0.67 | 0.01 | 0.52 | 0.04 |
| 33.88 34.83 | 0.63 0.67 | 0.01 0.02 | 0.77 | 0.04 | 0.75 | 0.06 | 0.48 | 0.02 | 0.61 | 0.03 |
| 34.83 35.57 | 0.67 0.54 | 0.02 0.04 | 0.57 | 0.04 | 0.50 | 0.02 | 0.42 | 0.05 | 0.55 | 0.02 |
| 35.57 | 0.54 | 0.04 | 0.53 | 0.01 | 0.52 | 0.02 | 0.45 | 0.01 | 0.55 | 0.02 |

Table Estimates of groundwater transport rates for septic tank experiments on 12a. Big Pine Key and simulated septic tank experiments on Key Largo.
Horizontal TransportRate (m/hr)
Experiment / DateDate
Septic A1Dec-96
Septic A2 ..... Jun-97
Septic B ..... Jun-97
simulated septic (RS-1) ..... Jun-96
Bay
Monitor Wellsimulated septic (RS-2)Aug-96
BayMonitor Wellsimulated septic (RS-3)BayAug-971.59-2.300.3
Monitor Well ..... 0.21

Table 12b.Estimated groundwater transport rates from injection well experiments on Long Key. Horizontal and verticle transport rates (HTR and VTR's) are shown.

| sampling <br> location |  | October '96 |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { February } \\ & \text { 197 }\end{aligned}\right.$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | depth | HTR | VTR | HTR | VTR |
|  | (m) | (m/hr) | (m/hr) | (m/hr) | (m/hr) |
| Well 1 | 4.6 | $<0.003$ | <0.008 | 0.06 | 0.17 |
|  | 9.1 | 0.28 | 0.51 | 0.06 | 0.11 |
|  | 13.7 | 0.47 | 0.43 | 0.15 | 0.14 |
|  | 18.3 | 1.72 | --- | 0.46 | --- |
| Well 2 | 4.6 | $<0.003$ | $<0.008$ | --- | --- |
|  | 9.1 | < 0.003 | < 0.005 | --- | --- |
|  | 13.7 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.02 |
|  | 18.3 | 0.01 | --- | --- | --- |
| Well 3 | 4.6 | < 0.003 | < 0.008 | --- | --- |
|  | 9.1 | < 0.003 | 0.02 | 0.07 | 0.13 |
|  | 13.7 | 0.22 | 0.2 | 0.06 | 0.06 |
|  | 18.3 | 0.03 | --- | 0.14 | --- |
| Well 4 | 4.6 | < 0.003 | < 0.008 | --- | --- |
|  | 9.1 | < 0.003 | $<0.005$ | 0.07 | 0.13 |
|  | 13.7 | < 0.003 | < 0.002 | --- | --- |
|  | 18.3 | < 0.003 | --- | --- | --- |
| Well 5 | 4.6 | 1.61 | 2.2 | --- | --- |
|  | 9.1 | 0.004 | 0.008 | --- | --- |
|  | 13.7 | <0.003 | < 0.005 | --- | --- |
|  | 18.3 | < 0.003 | < 0.002 | --- | --- |
| Well 6 | 4.6 | < 0.01 | < 0.008 | --- | --- |
|  | 9.1 | < 0.01 | < 0.005 | --- | --- |
|  | 13.7 | < 0.01 | < 0.002 | --- | --- |
|  | 18.3 | < 0.01 | --- | --- | --- |
| Well 7 | 4.6 | < 0.01 | < 0.008 | --- | --- |
|  | 9.1 | < 0.01 | <0.005 | --- | --- |
|  | 13.7 | < 0.01 | < 0.002 | --- | --- |
|  | 18.3 | < 0.01 | --- | --- | --- |
| Canal |  | 0.74 | --- | --- | --- |

Figures


Figure 1: The Florida Keys are located off the southern tip of Florida. Florida Bay separates the Keys from the mainland.


Figure 2. Study sites A and B for septic tank experiments on Big Pine Key. Figures are not drawn to scale.


Figure 3. Study site at Ranger Station on Key Largo.


Figure 4. Comparison of tide program's predicted tide and actual tidal measurements for Atlantic Ocean side of Key Largo. Tide was measured in the Key Largo Canal.


Figure 5: Sampling site located at the Keys Marine Laboratory. The canal that was used as an indicator of the Atlantic tide is located S.E. of Highway 1.


Figure 6. Comparison of tide program and actual tidal measurements from canal across US-1 from the Keys Marine Laboratory, Long Key.


Figure 7. Results from 1.04 ppm standards stored in Vacutainers for differing time periods. Aged standards are compared with a newly prepared standard.

Flow Chart for I-131 Analysis


Figure 8: Schematic of iodine procedure used in field experiments used to concentrate I131 from one liter saline water samples.


Figure 9: Contour of excess radon (dpm/L) in bottom water samples collected in December 1994.

$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}-81.20 & -81.10 & -81.00 & -80.90 & -80.80 & -80.70 & -80.60 & -80.50 & -80.40 & -80.30 & -80.20\end{array}$

Figure 10: Contour of methane (nM) in bottom water samples collected in December 1994.


Figure 11: Contour of ethylene (nM) in bottom water samples collected in December 1994.


Figure 12: Contour of excess radon (dpm/L) in bottom water samples collected in October 1995.


Figure 13: Contour of methane ( nM ) in bottom water samples collected in October 1995.


Figure 14: Contour of ethylene (nM) in bottom water samples collected in October 1995.


Figure 15: Contour of excess radon ( $\mathrm{dpm} / \mathrm{L}$ ) in bottom water samples collected in May 1996.


Figure 16: Contour of methane ( nM ) in bottom water samples collected in May 1996.


Figure 17: Contour of ethylene (nM) in bottom water samples collected in May 1996.


Figure 18: Contour of excess radon (dpm/L) in bottom water samples collected in June 1997.


Figure 19: Contour of methane $(\mathrm{nM})$ in bottom water samples collected in June 1997.

$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}-81.20 & -81.10 & -81.00 & -80.90 & -80.80 & -80.70 & -80.60 & -80.50 & -80.40 & -80.30 & -80.20\end{array}$

Figure 20: Contour of ethylene (nM) in bottom water samples collected in June 1997.


Figure 21: Radon and methane concentrations in springs sampled throughout the Keys. The groundwater tracer concentrations are based on the overall average of all the data collected.


Figure 22: Seepage rates (A) and chlorinity (B) measured at Porjoe Key. Asterick (*) indicates a significant difference ( $\mathrm{p}<0.01$ ) between meter and overlying water.

$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}-81.20 & -81.10 & -81.00 & -80.90 & -80.80 & -80.70 & -80.60 & -80.50 & -80.40 & -80.30 & -80.20\end{array}$

Figure 23: Contour of $15 \mathrm{~N}(0 / 00)$ in macroalgae collected in throughout the study period.


Figure 24: Well head shown relative to the Atlantic tide on the reef-side (A) and the bay-side (B).


Figure 25: Seepage rates on the reef-side ( A ) and bay-side (B) relative to the Atlantic tide.


Figure 26: Excess radon on the reef-side ( A ) and bay-side ( B ) relative to the Atlantic tide.
A.

B.


Figure 27: Nitrate concentration on the reef-side (A) and the bay-side ( $B$ ) relative to the Atlantic tide.


Figure 28: Phosphate (A) and ammonia (B) concentrations on the bay-side relative to the Atlantic tide.


Figure 29. $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations vs. time for (a.) site A, December 96; (b.) site A, June 97; and (c.) site B, June 97. Note that the time scale for $b$. is continued from a. Also note difference in concentration scale for site B.


Figure 30. $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations and tidal levels vs. time for July ' 96 simulated septic tank experiment.


Figure 31. (a.) Tides and water levels for August ' 96 simulated septic tanks experiment. (b.) $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations plotted against time for monitor well and Florida Bay. Injection well water level shown for reference.



Figure 32. (a) Tidal / water levels for Atlantic Ocean, monitor well, and Florida Bay. (b) Monitor well $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentration plotted with monitor well water level.



monitor well water level (cm)

Figure 33. Results from the August ' 97 experiment's five bay sampling sites. $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations and monitor well water level plotted against time.


Figure 34. (a) Average $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentration of Bay stations $1-5$ vs time. Standard deviationis shown by error bars. (b) Standard deviation values from (a) plotted against time. Monitor well tidal level is also shown for both plots.


Figure 35a. Well $1 \mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations vs. time for October '96 injection well experiment. Days 0-20.


Figure 35b. Well $1 \mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations vs. time for October ' 96 injection well experiment.



Figure 39. Well $5 \mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations vs. time for October ' 96 injection well experiment.


Figure 40. Well $6 \mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentration vs. time for October ' 96 injection well experiment


Figure 41. Well $7 \mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations vs. time for October ' 96 injection well experiment.


Figure 42. Canal $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations vs. time for October ' 96 injection well experiment.


Figure 43. Well $1 \mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentration vs. time for February ' 97 injection well experiment.


Figure 44. Well $2 \mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentration vs. time for February ' 97 injection well experiment.


Figure 49. Well $7 \mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations vs. time for February ' 97 injection well experiment.


Figure 50a. Florida Bay $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations vs. time for February ' 97 injection well experiment.


Figure 50b. Florida Bay $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations vs. time for February ' 97 injection well experiment.


Figure 51. Canal $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations vs. time for February ' 97 injection well experiment.


Figure 52 . All samples collected and analyzed for radio-iodine and SF6 during February ' 97 experiment. Note the excellent correlation between the two tracers.


Figure 53. $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ concentrations (presumably residual fron $10 / 96$ experiment) for wells 2,4 , and 5. Only 1 depth is shown for each well. Solid line is Atlantic tide. Note how SF concentrations seem to follow tidal flucuations.


Figure 54. Schematic of finite model used to estimate the quantity of SF6 present at the sewage disposal well site on Long Key. Diagram is not drawn to scale.


Figure 55. Estimated percent of $\mathrm{SE}_{6}$ injected accounted for by finite model of study site, October 1996.


Figure 56. Estimated percent of $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ injected accounted for by finite model of study site, February 1997.

## Appendix 1

| time | Well $1,4.6 \mathrm{~m}$ |  | Well 1, 9.1m |  | Well 1, 13.7 m |  | Well 1, 18.3m |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (days) | $\frac{\mathrm{SF} 6 \text { conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev | $\frac{\mathrm{SF} 6 \text { conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev | $\frac{\mathrm{SF} 6 \text { conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev |
| 0.09 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 21.979 |  |
| 0.12 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 72.540 |  |
| 0.22 | 0.000 |  | 0.035 |  | 0.738 |  | 77.655 |  |
| 0.28 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 71.005 |  |
| 0.38 | 0.000 |  | 0.229 |  | 19.389 |  | 46.990 |  |
| 0.44 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 43.384 |  |
| 0.55 | 0.002 |  | 2.352 |  | 30.993 |  | 35.999 |  |
| 0.63 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 33.305 |  |
| 0.74 | 0.028 |  | 4.812 |  | 21.259 |  | 23.324 |  |
| 0.93 | 0.000 |  | 9.277 |  | 34.458 |  | 38.040 |  |
| 1.40 | 0.000 |  | 13.974 |  | 26.994 |  | 14.049 |  |
| 1.84 | 0.000 |  | 13.162 |  | 27.621 |  | 27.085 |  |
| 2.02 | 0.000 |  | 9.798 |  | 21.387 |  | 16.753 |  |
| 2.76 | 0.000 |  | 7.816 |  | 10.535 |  | 42.528 |  |
| 3.10 | 0.000 |  | 5.403 |  | 21.917 |  | 8.902 |  |
| 3.80 | 0.003 |  | 6.533 |  | 20.777 |  | 13.377 |  |
| 4.77 | 0.029 |  | 6.356 |  | 19.967 |  | 4.098 |  |
| 5.83 | 0.029 |  | 7.668 |  | 20.532 |  | 5.970 |  |
| 6.70 | 0.039 |  | 7.288 |  | 16.820 |  | 15.835 |  |
| 7.81 | 0.064 | 0.007 | 5.874 | 1.578 | 12.656 | 0.126 | 12.457 | 1.867 |
| 10.03 | 0.026 | 0.017 | 7.285 | 1.619 | 7.158 | 3.468 | 12.519 | 0.605 |
| 17.07 | 0.032 | 0.001 | 12.727 | 0.995 | 21.167 | 0.146 | 21.274 | 0.007 |
| 19.95 | 0.173 |  | 13.865 |  | 10.016 |  | 15.467 |  |
| 46.31 | 1.082 | 0.187 | 6.680 | 1.774 | 4.994 | 0.499 | 0.160 | 0.022 |
| 70.77 | 2.495 |  | 6.459 |  | 2.560 |  | 7.525 |  |


| time | Well $2,4.6 \mathrm{~m}$ |  | Well 2, 9.1m |  | Well 2, 13.7m |  | Well $2,18.3 \mathrm{~m}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (days) | $\frac{\mathrm{SF}^{2} \text { conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev | $\frac{\mathrm{SF6} \text { conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev |
| 0.05 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 0.12 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.000 |  |
| 0.21 | 0.012 |  | 0.003 |  | 0.023 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 0.27 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.000 |  |
| 0.37 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 0.44 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.000 |  |
| 0.54 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 0.62 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.73 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.026 |  |
| 0.92 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.010 |  |
| 1.33 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.200 |  |
| 1.78 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.086 |  |
| 2.19 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.022 |  | 0.076 |  |
| 2.82 | 0.000 |  | 0.015 |  | 0.069 |  | 0.166 |  |
| 3.15 | 0.000 |  | 0.017 |  | 0.096 |  | 0.407 |  |
| 3.85 | 0.000 |  | 0.040 |  | 0.136 |  | 0.459 |  |
| 4.82 | 0.000 |  | 0.084 |  | 0.166 |  | 0.708 |  |
| 5.92 | 0.008 |  | 0.105 |  | 0.092 |  | 0.272 |  |
| 6.81 | 0.023 |  | 0.143 |  | 0.192 |  | 0.707 |  |


| 7.92 | 0.027 | 0.000 | 0.272 | 0.002 | 0.289 | 0.026 | 0.779 | 0.057 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 9.92 | 0.014 | 0.001 | 0.250 | 0.001 | 0.428 | 0.064 | 1.529 | 0.624 |
| 17.01 | 0.196 | 0.073 | 2.217 | 0.142 | 2.756 | 0.139 | 3.826 | 1.168 |
| 20.02 | 0.621 |  | 2.739 |  | 2.945 |  | 4.654 |  |
| 46.31 | 1.510 | 0.581 | 4.304 | 0.635 | 2.059 | 0.017 | 3.373 | 0.481 |
| 70.77 |  |  | 5.105 |  | 2.243 |  | 2.387 |  |


| time | Well 3, 4.6m |  | Well 3, 9.1m |  | Well 3, 13.7m |  | Well 3, 18.3m |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (days) | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev |
| 0.04 | $\frac{(\mathrm{nM})}{0.000}$ |  | $\frac{(\mathrm{nM})}{0.000}$ |  | $\frac{(\mathrm{nM})}{0.000}$ |  | $\frac{(\mathrm{nM})}{1.493}$ |  |
| 0.23 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.161 |  | 0.029 |  |
| 0.41 | 0.000 |  | 0.170 |  | 4.442 |  | 0.068 |  |
| 0.57 | 0.000 |  | 0.200 |  | 10.797 |  | 0.065 |  |
| 0.75 | 0.000 |  | 0.065 |  | 8.276 |  | 0.217 |  |
| 0.95 | 0.006 |  | 0.111 |  | 18.541 |  | 0.139 |  |
| 1.35 | 0.024 |  | 0.315 |  | 14.677 |  | 0.159 |  |
| 1.80 | 0.000 |  | 0.790 |  | 15.514 |  | 0.184 |  |
| 2.18 | 0.000 |  | 0.656 |  | 11.354 |  | 0.111 |  |
| 2.80 | 0.000 |  | 1.621 |  | 13.052 |  | 0.181 |  |
| 3.13 | 0.000 |  | 2.789 |  | 12.390 |  | 0.199 |  |
| 3.83 | 0.000 |  | 3.678 |  | 13.785 |  | 0.177 |  |
| 4.80 | 0.004 |  | 4.826 |  | 13.245 |  | 0.128 |  |
| 5.89 | 0.000 |  | 5.069 |  | 12.240 |  | 0.190 |  |
| 6.75 | 0.000 |  | 3.654 |  | 12.587 |  | 0.550 |  |
| 7.88 | 0.000 |  | 4.113 | 0.223 | 9.008 | 0.038 | 1.111 | 0.068 |
| 9.88 | 0.000 |  | 4.894 | 0.286 | 8.016 | 0.165 | 0.774 | 0.073 |
| 16.98 | 0.000 |  | 10.519 | 0.161 | 10.183 | 0.637 | 1.101 | 0.220 |
| 20.05 | 0.000 |  | 11.659 |  | 12.169 |  | 0.872 |  |
| 46.31 | 0.008 | 0.003 | 5.961 | 0.330 | 4.249 | 1.085 | 0.204 | 0.042 |
| 70.77 | 0.040 | 0.001 | 3.470 |  | 1.834 |  | 0.793 |  |


| $\begin{gathered} \text { time } \\ \text { (days) } \end{gathered}$ | Well 4, 4.6m |  | Well 4, 9.1m |  | Well 4, 13.7m |  | Well 4, 18.3m |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SE6 conc. | st dev | SF6 conc. | st dev | SF6 conc. | st dev | SF6 conc. | st dev |
|  | (0M) |  | (nM) |  | $(\mathrm{nM})$ |  | (nM) |  |
|  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 0.25 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.008 |  |
| 0.41 | 0.014 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 0.59 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.018 |  | 0.005 |  |
| 0.78 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.017 |  | 0.060 |  |
| 0.97 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.056 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 1.38 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.082 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 1.82 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.101 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 2.16 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.058 |  | 0.000 |  |


| 2.78 | 0.000 |  | 0.005 |  | 0.080 |  | 0.073 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3.12 | 0.000 |  | 0.013 |  | 0.096 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 3.82 | 0.000 |  | 0.025 |  | 0.101 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 4.78 | 0.000 |  | 0.055 |  | 0.117 |  | 0.009 |  |
| 5.87 | 0.000 |  | 0.071 |  | 0.072 |  | 0.015 |  |
| 6.73 | 0.000 |  | 0.131 |  | 0.086 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 7.84 | 0.000 |  | 0.170 | 0.012 | 0.134 | 0.012 | 0.011 |  |
| 9.84 | 0.000 |  | 0.623 | 0.005 | 0.458 | 0.046 | 0.000 |  |
| 17.05 | 0.000 |  | 5.902 | 0.070 | 2.141 | 0.138 | 0.007 | 0.000 |
| 19.98 | 0.000 |  | 1.687 | 0.255 | 0.427 | 0.116 | 0.016 | 0.009 |
| 46.31 | 0.026 | 0.020 | 5.314 | 1.044 | 0.357 | 0.444 | 0.034 | 0.013 |
| 69.06 | 0.069 |  | 6.788 |  | 1.813 |  | 0.213 |  |


| time | Well 5, 4.6m |  | Well $5,9.1 \mathrm{~m}$ |  | Well 5, 13.7 m |  | Well 5, 18.3m |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (days) | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev | $\frac{\text { SE6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev | $\frac{\mathrm{SF6} \text { conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev |
| 0.10 | $\frac{0}{0.007}$ |  | $\frac{0.000}{}$ |  | $\frac{(\mathrm{nM}}{0.000}$ |  | $\frac{(\mathrm{nM})}{0.000}$ |  |
| 0.26 | 0.798 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 0.42 | 0.137 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 0.60 | 0.097 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 0.79 | 0.114 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 0.99 | 0.057 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 1.42 | 0.088 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 1.85 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.010 |  | 0.056 |  |
| 2.12 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 2.74 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 3.08 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 3.79 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 4.75 | 0.000 |  | 0.010 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 5.81 | 0.000 |  | 0.025 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 6.68 | 0.000 |  | 0.024 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 7.79 | 0.000 |  | 0.034 | 0.004 | 0.000 |  | 0.007 | 0.002 |
| 9.80 | 0.000 |  | 0.048 | 0.003 | 0.000 |  | 0.037 | 0.000 |
| 17.11 | 0.024 | 0.001 | 1.924 | 0.114 | 0.000 |  | 0.141 | 0.004 |
| 19.94 | 0.019 | 0.005 | 1.159 | 0.416 | 0.007 | 0.002 | 0.055 | 0.007 |
| 46.31 | 0.022 | 0.004 | 10.887 | 2.484 | 0.069 | 0.037 | 0.000 |  |
| 70.77 | 0.088 |  | 10.297 |  | 0.208 |  | 0.334 |  |


| time | Well 6, 4.6m |  | Well 6, 9.1m |  | Well 6, 13.7 m |  | Well 6, 18.3 m |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (days) | $\frac{\mathrm{SF} 6 \text { conc. }}{\text { (nM) }}$ | st dev | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev | $\frac{\mathrm{SF} 6 \text { conc. }}{\text { (n) }}$ | st dev | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{}$ | $\underline{\text { st dev }}$ |
| 0.06 | $\frac{(\mathrm{nM})}{0.000}$ |  | $\frac{(\mathrm{nM})}{0.000}$ |  | $\frac{(\mathrm{nM})}{0.000}$ |  | $\frac{(\mathrm{nM})}{0.000}$ |  |
| 0.24 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 0.40 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.011 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 0.58 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |


| 0.76 | 0.000 |  | 0.004 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.005 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.96 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 1.36 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.007 |  |
| 1.81 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 2.21 | 0.011 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 2.83 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 3.16 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 3.82 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 4.83 | 0.009 |  | 0.006 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.005 |  |
| 5.94 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 6.78 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 7.95 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 9.95 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 17.03 | 0.000 |  | 0.039 | 0.006 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 20.00 | 0.000 |  | 0.039 | 0.006 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 46.31 | 1.931 | 0.220 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.063 | 0.004 |
| 69.06 | 5.095 |  | 3.296 |  | 0.006 |  | 0.191 |  |
| time | Well 7, 4.6m |  | Well 7, 9.1m |  | Well 7, 13.7m |  | Well 7, 18.3m |  |
| (days) | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev | $\frac{\mathrm{SF} 6 \text { conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev |
| 0.11 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 0.27 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 0.44 | 0.008 |  | 0.020 |  | 0.019 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 0.61 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 0.80 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 1.02 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 1.43 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 1.86 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.006 |  |
| 2.11 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 2.73 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 3.07 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 3.78 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 4.74 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 5.78 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 6.65 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 7.77 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.004 | 0.000 | 0.000 |  |
| 9.78 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 17.12 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 19.90 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 46.31 | 0.000 |  | 0.685 | 0.159 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 69.06 | 0.036 |  | 6.102 | 0.302 | 0.161 |  | 0.007 |  |


| time <br> (days) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FL Bay } \\ & \frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})} \end{aligned}$ | St dev | time <br> (days) | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \text { Canal } \\ \text { SE6 conc. } \end{array} \\ (\mathrm{nM}) \end{gathered}$ | st dev |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.12 |  | 11.558 | 5.05 | 1.304 | 0.061 |
| 0.28 | 17.009 |  | 6.15 | 1.402 | 0.200 |
| 0.44 | 12.737 |  | 6.85 | 1.254 |  |
| 0.61 | 12.588 |  | 10.13 | 0.802 |  |
| 0.80 | 11.140 |  | 17.64 | 0.680 |  |
| 0.99 | 6.242 |  | 20.08 | 0.711 | 0.030 |
| 1.42 | 5.762 |  | 46.31 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 1.84 | 5.971 |  |  |  |  |
| 2.21 | 5.448 |  |  |  |  |
| 2.84 | 3.474 |  |  |  |  |
| 3.16 | 3.058 |  |  |  |  |
| 3.86 | 2.557 |  |  |  |  |
| 4.83 | 1.748 |  |  |  |  |
| 5.94 | 1.151 |  |  |  |  |
| 6.83 | 1.302 | 0.068 |  |  |  |
| 7.96 | 1.044 |  |  |  |  |
| 9.95 | 0.643 | 0.068 |  |  |  |
| 17.63 | 0.000 | 0.000 |  |  |  |
| 20.07 | 0.762 | 0.006 |  |  |  |
| 46.31 | 0.000 | 0.000 |  |  |  |



> Appendix 2


| time | Well 1, 4.6m |  | Well 1, 9.1m |  | Well $1,13.7 \mathrm{~m}$ |  | Well 1, 18.3 m |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (days) | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | St dev | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | St dev | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | St dev | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev |
| -0.74 | 0.567 |  | 0.317 |  | 0.203 |  | 0.691 |  |
| 0.04 | 0.051 |  | 0.366 | 0.263 | 0.141 |  | 0.574 |  |
| 0.11 | 0.593 | 0.027 | 0.320 |  | 0.021 |  | 6.791 | 0.186 |
| 0.25 | 0.898 |  | 0.337 |  | 0.261 |  | 106.725 | 8.218 |
| 0.45 | 0.468 |  | 0.181 |  | 0.138 |  | 358.732 | 17.60 |
| 0.57 | 0.530 |  | 0.150 |  | 1.010 |  | 315.095 | 15.69 |
| 0.84 | 0.991 |  | 0.326 | 0.004 | 44.382 | 0.876 | 217.436 | 7.488 |
| 1.10 | 0.893 |  | 0.295 | 0.002 | 75.528 | 6.649 | 148.047 | 2.856 |
| 1.36 | 0.671 |  | 0.210 |  | 77.972 | 4.142 | 112.118 | 3.811 |
| 1.67 | 0.779 | 0.004 | 0.987 | 0.009 | 71.231 | 1.009 | 83.046 | 2.621 |
| 2.01 | 0.923 | 0.004 | 4.917 | 0.082 | 65.724 | 1.598 | 82.704 | 3.994 |
| 2.34 | 1.140 | 0.014 | 10.792 | 0.125 | 57.717 | 1.648 | 62.165 | 1.665 |
| 2.96 | 2.214 |  | 18.955 |  | 45.967 | 1.544 | 34.332 | 3.415 |
| 3.34 | 2.683 | 0.055 | 22.444 | 0.345 | 33.292 | 1.385 | 24.908 | 2.398 |
| 4.00 | 2.578 | 0.001 | 21.033 | 0.542 | 24.927 | 0.523 | 15.410 | 0.346 |
| 4.34 | 2.001 |  | 21.623 |  | 22.080 |  | 30.594 | 0.472 |
| 4.96 | 1.730 | 0.131 | 21.367 | 0.041 | 20.448 |  | 24.554 | 0.655 |
| 5.34 | 1.639 |  | 18.999 | 0.606 | 20.751 | 0.292 | 22.668 | 0.885 |
| 5.97 | 1.557 | 0.025 | 17.823 |  | 21.187 |  |  |  |
| 6.32 | 1.407 |  | 18.694 |  | 20.204 | 0.154 | 21.374 |  |
| 8.00 | 1.474 |  | 18.253 |  | 19.490 |  | 19.001 | 0.516 |
| 8.92 | 1.134 | 0.044 | 13.429 |  | 13.720 |  | 12.552 |  |


| time | Well 2, 4.6m |  | Well 2, 9.1m |  | Well 2, 13.7m |  | Well 2, 18.3 m |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (days) | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | St dev | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | St dev | $\frac{\text { SE6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | St dev |
| -0.74 | 0.615 |  | 0.384 |  | 0.088 |  | 0.249 |  |
| 0.09 | 0.782 |  | 0.334 |  | 0.062 |  | 0.409 |  |
| 0.23 | 0.989 |  | 0.453 |  | 0.100 |  | 0.499 |  |
| 0.39 | 0.669 |  | 0.260 |  | 0.051 | 0.002 | 0.275 |  |
| 0.55 | 0.692 |  | 0.098 |  | 0.045 |  | 0.300 |  |
| 0.81 | 0.993 |  | 0.457 |  | 0.097 |  | 0.668 | 0.017 |
| 1.07 | 0.973 |  | 0.395 |  | 0.090 | 0.001 | 0.539 |  |
| 1.31 | 0.658 |  | 0.268 |  | 0.058 |  | 0.040 | 0.004 |
| 1.64 | 0.818 |  | 0.347 |  | 0.086 | 0.003 | 0.766 |  |
| 1.99 | 0.964 |  | 0.413 |  | 0.107 | 0.004 | 1.238 |  |
| 2.31 | 1.353 |  | 0.521 |  | 0.169 | 0.003 | 1.830 | 0.054 |
| 2.95 | 1.435 |  | 0.603 | 0.007 | 0.328 |  | 3.195 |  |
| 3.32 | 1.173 | 0.113 | 0.498 |  | 0.486 | 0.003 | 2.971 | 0.053 |
| 3.98 | 1.092 |  | 0.440 |  | 0.853 |  | 1.693 | 0.005 |
| 4.31 | 1.068 | 0.007 | 0.447 |  | 1.134 |  | 1.456 |  |
| 4.94 | 1.045 |  | 0.429 |  | 1.545 | 0.040 | 1.321 | 0.003 |
| 5.32 | 0.979 |  | 0.393 |  | 1.546 | 0.009 | 1.041 |  |
| 5.95 | 0.750 |  | 0.240 | 0.002 | 1.254 |  | 0.747 | 0.006 |
| 6.29 | 1.396 |  | 0.562 | 0.017 | 3.066 |  | 1.521 |  |
| 7.98 | 1.464 | 0.002 | 0.636 |  | 15.868 | 0.009 | 1.615 | 0.010 |
| 8.89 | 1.159 |  | 0.427 | 0.001 | 2.047 |  | 1.279 | 0.030 |


| time | Well 3, 4.6m |  | , |  | Well 3, 13.7 m |  | W |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (days) | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{\text { (nM) }}$ | st dev | SF6 conc. | st dev | SF6 conc. | St dev |


| -0.74 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.134 |  | 0.096 |  | 0.078 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.02 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.126 |  | 0.029 |  | 0.047 |  |
| 0.08 | 0.000 |  | 0.069 |  | 0.042 |  | 0.068 | 0.002 |
| 0.22 | 0.001 |  | 0.119 |  | 0.084 |  | 0.218 |  |
| 0.38 | 0.002 | 0.000 | 0.086 |  | 0.036 |  | 0.308 |  |
| 0.04 | 0.001 |  | 0.059 | 0.001 | 0.039 |  | 0.684 |  |
| 0.80 | 0.001 |  | 0.132 |  | 0.240 |  | 1.519 |  |
| 1.06 | 0.001 |  | 0.124 | 0.002 | 0.905 |  | 1.342 |  |
| 1.30 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.074 |  | 1.082 |  | 1.111 | 0.002 |
| 1.63 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.088 | 0.000 | 1.582 |  | 0.928 |  |
| 1.99 | 0.005 |  | 0.179 |  | 6.065 |  | 0.859 |  |
| 2.30 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.643 |  | 9.006 | 0.296 | 1.140 | 0.032 |
| 2.94 | 0.002 |  | 14.491 | 0.391 | 21.755 |  | 0.934 |  |
| 3.31 | 0.001 |  | 13.715 |  | 21.811 | 0.193 | 0.742 |  |
| 3.97 | 0.003 | 0.000 | 9.870 | 0.475 | 21.060 | 0.413 | 0.646 |  |
| 4.31 | 0.001 |  | 11.078 | 0.020 | 20.872 | 0.694 | 0.463 |  |
| 4.93 | 0.002 |  | 11.736 | 0.034 | 20.053 |  | 0.443 | 0.020 |
| 5.31 | 0.001 |  | 9.529 |  | 18.732 | 0.028 | 0.352 | 0.017 |
| 5.94 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 8.978 | 0.143 | 20.103 | 0.528 | 0.265 |  |
| 6.29 | 0.002 | 0.000 | 8.826 | 0.041 | 16.758 | 0.573 | 0.505 | 0.009 |
| 7.97 | 0.002 | 0.000 | 9.713 |  | 16.395 | 1.318 | 0.433 |  |
| 8.88 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 8.214 | 0.112 | 11.744 | 0.193 | 0.176 | 0.002 |


| time | Well 4, 4.6m |  | Well 4, 9.1m |  | Well 4, 13.7m |  | Well 4, 18.3 m |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (days) | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\underline{\mathrm{nM})}}$ | st dev | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | $\underline{\text { st dev }}$ | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev |
| -0.74 | 0.000 |  | 0.297 |  | 0.601 |  | 0.149 |  |
| 0.10 | 0.574 |  | 0.074 |  | 0.301 |  | 0.123 |  |
| 0.24 | 0.745 | 0.002 | 0.114 |  | 0.445 |  | 0.091 |  |
| 0.41 | 0.421 |  | 0.059 |  | 0.239 |  | 0.034 | 0.034 |
| 0.56 | 0.489 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.228 |  | 0.061 |  |
| 0.82 | 0.751 |  | 0.136 |  | 0.539 |  | 0.194 | 0.001 |
| 1.09 | 0.671 |  | 0.342 | 0.017 | 0.400 |  | 0.137 |  |
| 1.34 | 0.856 |  | 1.125 |  | 0.340 | 0.001 | 0.112 |  |
| 1.65 | 0.582 |  | 3.192 | 0.161 | 0.342 | 0.004 | 0.095 |  |
| 2.00 | 0.569 |  | 5.979 |  | 0.310 |  | 0.137 |  |
| 2.32 | 1.284 |  | 9.548 | 0.490 | 0.586 |  | 0.233 | 0.004 |
| 2.96 | 1.162 |  | 19.717 | 0.417 | 0.521 |  | 0.268 |  |
| 3.33 | 1.164 |  | 18.259 |  | 0.531 |  | 0.232 | 0.001 |
| 3.99 | 0.992 |  | 9.870 | 0.475 | 0.434 |  | 0.229 |  |
| 4.33 | 1.233 | 0.002 | 17.672 |  | 0.537 | 0.013 | 0.170 |  |
| 4.95 | 0.890 |  | 15.829 | 0.126 | 0.398 |  | 0.162 | 0.021 |
| 5.33 | 0.987 |  | 15.120 |  | 0.438 |  | 0.159 | 0.001 |
| 5.96 | 0.439 | 0.006 | 7.221 |  | 0.247 |  | 0.091 |  |
| 6.31 | 1.559 | 0.003 | 13.567 | 1.633 | 0.639 | 0.020 | 0.197 |  |
| 8.00 | 1.639 |  | 15.877 | 0.170 | 0.715 |  | 0.277 | 0.000 |
| 8.91 | 0.936 |  | 11.702 | 0.468 | 0.719 | 0.003 | 0.202 |  |


| time | Well 5, 4.6m |  | Well 5, 9.1 m |  | Well 5, 13.7m |  | Well 5, 18.3m |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (days) | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | St dev |
| -0.74 | 0.092 | 0.007 | 0.483 |  | 0.283 |  | 0.233 |  |
| 0.05 | 0.037 |  | 0.252 |  | 0.498 |  | 0.193 |  |
| 0.12 | 0.021 |  | 0.312 |  | 0.205 |  | 0.565 |  |
| 0.26 | 0.041 |  | 0.637 |  | 0.357 |  | 0.345 |  |
| 0.47 | 0.026 |  | 0.357 |  | 0.104 |  | 0.110 |  |


| 0.58 | 0.020 | 0.001 | 0.289 | 0.163 |  | 0.122 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0.85 | 0.034 |  | 0.636 | 0.454 | 0.030 | 0.346 |  |
| 1.12 | 0.022 | 0.001 | 0.571 | 0.360 |  | 0.339 |  |
| 1.37 | 0.013 |  | 0.309 | 0.135 |  | 0.126 |  |
| 1.67 | 0.027 |  | 0.422 | 0.152 |  | 0.278 | 0.026 |
| 2.02 | 0.019 |  | 0.438 | 0.313 | 0.064 | 0.205 | 0.005 |
| 2.35 | 0.043 |  | 0.438 | 0.738 | 0.007 | 0.449 |  |
| 2.97 | 0.037 | 0.001 | 0.791 |  | 0.489 |  | 0.515 |
| 3.35 | 0.034 |  | 0.652 | 0.402 | 0.004 | 0.437 |  |
| 4.01 | 0.043 | 0.001 | 0.613 |  | 0.400 |  | 0.414 |
| 4.35 | 0.038 |  | 0.686 |  | 0.412 | 0.013 | 0.412 |
| 4.97 | 0.027 |  | 0.671 |  | 0.425 | 0.019 | 0.414 |
| 5.35 | 0.038 |  | 0.588 |  | 0.366 | 0.001 | 0.361 |
| 5.98 | 0.021 | 0.001 | 0.321 |  | 0.178 |  | 0.179 |
| 6.32 | 0.057 |  | 0.845 | 0.012 |  |  | 0.514 |
| 8.01 | 0.042 |  | 0.903 |  | 0.412 |  | 0.582 |
| 8.93 | 0.031 | 0.001 | 0.420 |  | 0.403 |  | 0.371 |


| time | Well 6, 4.6m |  | Well 6, 9.1m |  | Well 6, 13.7m |  | Well 6, 18.3m |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (days) | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | St dev | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | $\underline{\text { st dev }}$ | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev |
| -0.74 | 1.426 |  | 0.633 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.047 |  |
| 1.32 | 0.756 |  | 0.292 |  | 0.001 |  | 0.029 |  |
| 2.31 | 1.880 |  | 0.955 |  | 0.000 | 0.001 | 0.084 |  |
| 3.32 | 1.716 | 0.035 | 0.770 |  | 0.002 |  | 0.023 |  |
| 4.32 | 1.597 |  | 0.706 | 0.007 | 0.001 |  | 0.084 |  |
| 5.32 | 1.382 |  | 0.597 |  | 0.001 |  | 0.068 | 0.001 |
| 6.30 | 1.955 |  | 0.798 |  | 0.004 |  | 0.106 | 0.001 |
| 7.99 | 2.093 |  | 0.905 | 0.004 | 0.003 |  | 0.119 |  |
| 8.90 | 1.593 | 0.052 | 0.617 |  | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.081 |  |


| time | Well 7, 4.6m | Well 7, 9.1 m |  |  |  | Well 7, 13.7m | Well 7, 18.3 m |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (days) | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | st dev | $\frac{\text { SF6 }}{\text { (n) }}$ |  | st dev | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | $\underline{\text { st dev }}$ | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | St dev |
| -0.74 | 0.001 |  |  |  |  | 0.051 |  | 0.005 | 0.000 |
| 1.39 | 0.001 | 0.000 |  |  |  | 0.028 |  | 0.005 | 0.001 |
| 2.36 | 0.003 |  |  | 1 | 0.001 | 0.073 |  | 0.010 |  |
| 3.36 | 0.003 |  |  |  |  | 0.064 | 0.003 | 0.009 |  |
| 4.35 | 0.003 | 0.000 |  |  |  | 0.061 |  | 0.007 |  |
| 5.36 | 0.003 |  |  |  |  | 0.056 |  | 0.004 | 0.000 |
| 6.33 | 0.005 | 0.000 |  |  |  | 0.092 | 0.004 | 0.007 |  |
| 8.02 | 0.006 |  |  |  | 0.004 | 0.109 |  | 0.012 |  |
| 8.94 | 0.004 |  | 0.8 |  |  | 0.073 | 0.003 | 0.008 |  |
| time | FL Bay |  | time |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (days) | $\frac{\text { SF6 conc. }}{(\mathrm{nM})}$ | St dev |  |  |  | st dev |  |  |  |
| 0.13 | 0.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.28 | 0.000 |  | 0.292 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.48 | 0.287 | 0.074 | . 292 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.59 | 0.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.86 | 0.153 | 0.076 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.13 | 0.082 | 0.108 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.40 | 0.164 | 0.070 | . 135 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.68 | 0.221 | 0.068 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.03 | 0.169 | 0.080 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


\left.| 2.37 | 0.087 | 0.056 |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2.98 | 0.087 | 2.375 |  |
| 3.37 | 0.203 | 0.080 | 0.108 |
| 4.02 | 0.000 | 2.992 |  |$\right) 0.000$

## Appendix 3



| 9/1/30 | 2/20/1997 11:05 | 2.01 | 1586.35 | 10464.6152 | 0.586202143 | 0.00696331 | 0.8 | 80.6406595 | 142918.036 | $\pm$ | 1884.72835 | 2381967.26 | $\pm$ | 31412.1391 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9/1/30 recount | 2/20/1997 11:05 | 2.01 | 1245.13 | 7712.6552 | 0.544388586 | 0.00670902 | 0.8 | 118.618996 | 154941.539 | $\pm$ | 2117.60561 | 2582358.98 | $\pm$ | 35293.4269 |
| 10/1/30 | 2/20/199718:50 | 2.34 | 3246.43 | 23940.2552 | 0.774998138 | 0.00853412 | 0.8 | 61.7121789 | 250212.706 | $\pm$ | 3072.44994 | 4170211.77 | $\pm$ | 51207.499 |
| 10/1/30 recount | 2/20/1997 18:50 | 2.34 | 2419.87 | 17127.1352 | 0.69841285 | 0.00789233 | 0.8 | 95.8008221 | 277884.08 | $\pm$ | 3495.50245 | 4631401.33 | $\pm$ | 58258.3741 |
| 11/1/30 | 2/21/19979:50 | 2.96 | 5688.33 | 41822.4318 | 0.941 | 0.01407637 | 0.8 | 102.439998 | 399828.877 | $\pm$ | 8284.31914 | 6663814.61 | $\pm$ | 138071.986 |
| 12/1/30 | 2/21/1997 18:57 | 3.34 | 6701.41 | 54949.5152 | 0.669447044 | 0.00707243 | 0.8 | 77.89791 | 724935.512 | $\pm$ | 8568.61001 | 12082258.5 | $\pm$ | 142810.167 |
| 12/1/30 recount | 2/21/199718:57 | 3.34 | 4772.17 | 37493.2352 | 0.752084926 | 0.00807453 | 0.8 | 99.9864711 | 634897.857 | $\pm$ | 7615.46756 | 10581631 | $\pm$ | 126924.459 |
| 13/1/30 | 2/22/1997 10:40 | 4.00 | 6881.73 | 51125.0718 | 0.973 | 0.01449431 | 0.8 | 107.668043 | 513707.687 | $\pm$ | 10617.4612 | 8561794.79 | $\pm$ | 176957.687 |
| 13/1/30 recount | 2/22/1997 10:40 | 4.00 | 5065.65 | 36328.3518 | 0.973 | 0.01459809 | 0.8 | 150.733138 | 511033.947 | $\pm$ | 10607.4647 | 8517232.45 | $\pm$ | 176791.078 |
| 14/1/30 | 2/22/1997 18:52 | 4.34 | 6387.87 | 46276.2318 | 0.993 | 0.01481509 | 0.8 | 111.773987 | 482718.611 | $\pm$ | 9986.41914 | 8045310.19 | $\pm$ | 166440.319 |
| 14/1/30 recount | 2/22/1997 18:52 | 4.34 | 4953.99 | 35598.8718 | 0.993 | 0.0149072 | 0.8 | 148.00703 | 491715.495 | $\pm$ | 10210.1133 | 8195258.25 | $\pm$ | 170168.554 |
| 15/1/30 | 2/23/19979:43 | 4.96 | 6105.75 | 44679.3918 | 0.99 | 0.014785 | 0.8 | 114.733681 | 478402.559 | $\pm$ | 9902.7788 | 7973375.98 | $\pm$ | 165046.313 |
| 16/1/30 | 2/23/1997 18:56 | 5.34 | 5322.15 | 38215.5318 | 0.969 | 0.01451921 | 0.8 | 124.817852 | 445155.686 | $\pm$ | 9232.89575 | 7419261.44 | $\pm$ | 153881.596 |
| 17/1/30 | 2/24/1997 10:04 | 5.97 | 4993.35 | 36871.2318 | 0.957 | 0.01436364 | 0.8 | 129.834077 | 446757.3 | $\pm$ | 9274.90855 | 7445955 | $\pm$ | 154581.809 |
| 18/1/30 | 2/24/1997 18:18 | 6.31 | 4468.77 | 31856.7318 | 0.927 | 0.01395795 | 0.8 | 141.6339 | 421079.161 |  | 8759.07594 | 7017986.01 | $\pm$ | 145984.599 |
| 19/1/30 | 2/26/1997 10:46 | 8.00 | 3723.15 | 26390.5518 | 0.962 | 0.01457308 | 0.8 | 154.413257 | 380301.788 | $\pm$ | 7939.67806 | 6338363.14 | $\pm$ | 132327.968 |
| 20/1/30 | 2/27/19978:46 | 8.92 | 3416.13 | 23589.1518 | 0.968 | 0.0147117 | 0.8 | 165.004851 | 363248.936 | $\pm$ | 7599.0301 | 6054148.93 | $\pm$ | 126650.502 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0/1/45 | 2/18/1997 11:37 | 0.04 | 332.29 | 4.2752 | 1.02065205 | 0.02086852 | 0.8 | 36.8911727 | 26.7109049 | $\pm$ | 17.5154062 | 445.181749 | $\pm$ | 291.923436 |
| 1/1/45 | 2/18/1997 13:21 | 0.11 | 313.15 | 4.7552 | 0.96160861 | 0.0199631 | 0.8 | 39.4386346 | 31.761453 | $\pm$ | 18.7618239 | 529.35755 | $\pm$ | 312.697065 |
| 2/1/45 recount | 2/18/1997 16:45 | 0.25 | 341.65 | 116.1152 | 1.010321658 | 0.02051449 | 0.8 | 57.5748738 | 1132.22248 | $\pm$ | 44.1319594 | 18870.3747 | $\pm$ | 735.532656 |
| 3/1/45 | 2/18/1997 21:37 | 0.45 | 1182.26 | 99.368 | 1.005656854 | 0.01250966 | 0.8 | 31.6263857 | 258.256916 | $\pm$ | 13.4904677 | 4304.28193 | $\pm$ | 224.841128 |
| 4/1/45 | 2/19/19970:27 | 0.57 | 615.19 | 2425.5152 | 1.043903846 | 0.01880055 | 0.8 | 38.4786693 | 15806.4284 | $\pm$ | 307.062334 | 263440.474 | $\pm$ | 5117.70557 |
| 4/1/45 recount | 2/19/19970:27 | 0.57 | 513.01 | 1580.7752 | 1.025087655 | 0.01905958 | 0.8 | 57.1033636 | 15287.6774 | $\pm$ | 310.946537 | 254794.623 | $\pm$ | 5182.44228 |
| 5/1/45 recount | 2/19/19976:47 | 0.83 | 8255.97 | 62241.6318 | 1.003 | 0.0148915 | 0.8 | 115.464718 | 670695.796 | $\pm$ | 13834.7798 | 11178263.3 | $\pm$ | 230579.663 |
| 6/1/45 | 2/19/199713:15 | 1.10 | 22269.07 | 190281.435 | 1.005 | 0.01031376 | 0.8 | 41.8512798 | 1348698.47 | $\pm$ | 15532.6894 | 22478307.9 | $\pm$ | 258878.157 |
| 6/1/45 recount | 2/19/1997 13:15 | 1.10 | 15238.39 | 125906.355 | 1.005 | 0.01037463 | 0.8 | 63.0720703 | 1344913.78 |  | 15571.1201 | 22415229.6 | $\pm$ | 259518.669 |
| 7/1/45 | 2/19/1997 19:22 | 1.36 | 22107.97 | 198647.955 | 1.077 | 0.01616036 | 0.8 | 41.0528571 | 1381138.37 | $\pm$ | 21944.6775 | 23018972.8 | $\pm$ | 365744.625 |
| 7/1/45 recount | 2/19/199719:22 | 1.36 | 17215.81 | 142190.535 | 1.077 | 0.0161881 | 0.8 | 55.0715203 | 1326195.22 | $\pm$ | 21108.9523 | 22103253.7 | $\pm$ | 351815.872 |
| 8/1/45 | 2/20/1997 2:42 | 1.66 | 18432.15 | 136768.172 | 0.912 | 0.01341534 | 0.8 | 97.6193455 | 1245994.85 | $\pm$ | 25563.0514 | 20766580.9 | $\pm$ | 426050.856 |
| 8/1/45 recount | 2/20/1997 2:42 | 1.66 | 13158.99 | 97594.5318 | 0.912 | 0.01345603 | 0.8 | 137.716462 | 1254315.12 | $\pm$ | 25779.2855 | 20905252 | $\pm$ | 429654.758 |
| 9/1/45 | 2/20/1997 11:05 | 2.01 | 18897.69 | 143242.052 | 1.003 | 0.01475118 | 0.8 | 93.2455421 | 1246504.72 | $\pm$ | 25570.457 | 20775078.6 | $\pm$ | 426174.283 |
| 9/1/45 recount | 2/20/1997 11:05 | 2.01 | 15235.83 | 115994.132 | 1.003 | 0.01477736 | 0.8 | 116.576055 | 1261945.76 | $\pm$ | 25913.8638 | 21032429.3 | $\pm$ | 431897.73 |
| 10/1/45 | 2/20/1997 18:50 | 2.34 | 17961.15 | 135949.892 | 1.037 | 0.01525709 | 0.8 | 91.2473628 | 1157695.92 | $\pm$ | 23753.9933 | 19294932 | $\pm$ | 395899.889 |
| 10/1/45 recount | 2/20/199718:50 | 2.34 | 13562.79 | 102529.292 | 1.037 | 0.01529551 | 0.8 | 121.479209 | 1162372.24 | $\pm$ | 23884.9197 | 19372870.6 | $\pm$ | 398081.995 |
| 11/1/45 | 2/21/19979:50 | 2.96 | 42648.26 | 320340.428 | 0.948 | 0.00861636 | 0.8 | 41.3954154 | 1089732.35 | $\pm$ | 10703.8701 | 18162205.9 | $\pm$ | 178397.834 |
| 11/1/45 recount | 2/21/19979:50 | 2.96 | 28695.62 | 207674.168 | 0.948 | 0.00865306 | 0.8 | 62.6058056 | 1068446.88 | $\pm$ | 10538.5995 | 17807448 | $\pm$ | 175643.325 |
| 12/1/45 | 2/21/1997 18:57 | 3.34 | 11541.01 | 92181.1952 | 0.975 | 0.01471066 | 0.8 | 53.3098424 | 832260.797 | $\pm$ | 13297.917 | 13871013.3 | $\pm$ | 221631.949 |
| 12/1/45 recount | 2/21/1997 18:57 | 3.34 | 8254.45 | 63988.0952 | 0.975 | 0.01477777 | 0.8 | 74.6774233 | 809278.889 | $\pm$ | 12990.5816 | 13487981.5 | $\pm$ | 216509.694 |
| 13/1/45 | 2/22/1997 10:40 | 4.00 | 26253.44 | 195773.768 | 0.956 | 0.00873666 | 0.8 | 74.6328354 | 1200715.98 | $\pm$ | 11856.5896 | 20011932.9 | $\pm$ | 197609.827 |
| 14/1/45 | 2/22/1997 18:52 | 4.34 | 8418.31 | 66541.6952 | 1.006 | 0.0152429 | 0.8 | 55.8488814 | 629387.399 | $\pm$ | 10099.4542 | 10489790 | $\pm$ | 168324.237 |
| 14/1/45 recount | 2/22/1997 18:52 | 4.34 | 6409.57 | 50598.0152 | 1.006 | 0.01531744 | 0.8 | 73.9574763 | 633760.647 | $\pm$ | 10219.5881 | 10562677.5 | $\pm$ | 170326.468 |
| 15/1/45 | 2/23/19979:43 | 4.96 | 21409.58 | 154298.168 | 0.971 | 0.0089024 | 0.8 | 47.5679334 | 603157.734 | $\pm$ | 5974.94183 | 10052628.9 | $\pm$ | 99582.3639 |
| 16/1/45 | 2/23/199718:56 | 5.34 | 6768.31 | 52182.1952 | 1.011 | 0.01537695 | 0.8 | 60.5761679 | 535345.117 | $\pm$ | 8623.69651 | 8922418.61 | $\pm$ | 143728.275 |
| 17/1/45 | 2/24/1997 10:04 | 5.97 | 6318.37 | 49754.4752 | 0.958 | 0.01459087 | 0.8 | 65.6731121 | 553387.635 | $\pm$ | 8926.23316 | 9223127.25 | $\pm$ | 148770.553 |
| 18/1/45 | 2/24/1997 18:18 | 6.31 | 5957.47 | 46169.6552 | 0.986 | 0.01503611 | 0.8 | 67.4010254 | 527026.969 | $\pm$ | 8512.0448 | 8783782.81 | $\pm$ | 141867.413 |
| 19/1/45 | 2/26/1997 10:46 | 8.00 | 4602.15 | 33205.7118 | 0.983 | 0.01478811 | 0.8 | 146.009778 | 452470.27 | $\pm$ | 9406.87694 | 7541171.17 | $\pm$ | 156781.282 |
| 20/1/45 | 2/27/1997 8:46 | 8.92 | 9781.64 | 73277.168 | 0.959 | 0.00897843 | 0.8 | 67.9624261 | 409254.438 | $\pm$ | 4136.47926 | 6820907.3 | $\pm$ | 68941.321 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| 12/2/15 | 2/21/1997 18:20 | 3.32 | 303.07 | 28.6952 | 0.922227729 | 0.01931183 | 0.8 | 56.4616868 | 274.392862 | $\pm$ | 29.7809711 | 4573.21436 |  | 496.349518 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12/2/15 recount | 2/21/1997 18:20 | 3.32 | 311.11 | 37.7552 | 0.943789911 | 0.01962678 | 0.8 | 79.5530409 | 508.678363 | $\pm$ | 43.6884276 | 8477.97271 |  | 728.14046 |
| 13/2/15 | 2/22/1997 10:10 | 3.98 | 368.79 | 156.33175 | 0.964643623 | 0.01933846 | 0.8 | 108.795961 | 1587.28633 | $\pm$ | 55.5671603 | 26454.7722 | $\pm$ | 926.119338 |
| 13/2/15 recount | 2/22/1997 10:10 | 3.98 | 358.23 | 135.03175 | 0.942757442 | 0.01904858 | 0.8 | 140.413552 | 1769.45791 | $\pm$ | 65.5576978 | 29490.9652 |  | 1092.6283 |
| 14/2/15 | 2/22/1997 18:17 | 4.31 | 313.87 | 38.9552 | 0.951860034 | 0.01974886 | 0.8 | 59.1846907 | 390.46717 | $\pm$ | 32.6741836 | 6507.78617 |  | 544.569727 |
| 15/2/15 | 2/23/19979:16 | 4.94 | 350.37 | 8.49175 | 0.964203086 | 0.01960111 | 0.8 | 118.078715 | 93.5759258 | $\pm$ | 27.6932605 | 1559.59876 | $\pm$ | 461.554342 |
| 16/2/15 | 2/23/1997 18:19 | 5.32 | 1134.98 | 36.908 | 0.97173369 | 0.01224497 | 0.8 | 50.5795089 | 153.409046 | $\pm$ | 19.3924058 | 2556.81743 | $\pm$ | 323.206763 |
| 17/2/15 | 2/24/19979:34 | 5.95 | 314.89 | 14.4752 | 0.963560827 | 0.01997471 | 0.8 | 65.5486863 | 160.693485 | $\pm$ | 32.4771767 | 2678.22475 | $\pm$ | 541.286278 |
| 18/2/15 | 2/24/1997 17:46 | 6.29 | 305.77 | 29.5352 | 0.930239219 | 0.01943365 | 0.8 | 71.5396451 | 357.846193 | $\pm$ | 37.8724726 | 5964.10322 | $\pm$ | 631.207876 |
| 19/2/15 | 2/26/1997 10:11 | 7.98 | 342.93 | 2.01175 | 0.945876248 | 0.01934412 | 0.8 | 157.818301 | 29.6296613 | $\pm$ | 35.7287987 | 493.827689 | $\pm$ | 595.479979 |
| 20/2/15 | 2/271997 8:02 | 8.89 | 362.19 | 18.69175 | 0.993351443 | 0.02001096 | 0.8 | 161.411013 | 281.564853 | $\pm$ | 40.1273517 | 4692.74756 | $\pm$ | 668.789195 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1/2/30 | 2/18/1997 12:48 | 0.09 | 344.73 | -1.28825 | 0.951969708 | 0.01944014 | 0.8 | 79.1725529 | -9.5185351 | $\pm$ | -17.61761 | -158.64225 | $\pm$ | -293.62684 |
| 2/2/30 | 2/18/1997 16:09 | 0.23 | 332.77 | 3.9152 | 1.022254482 | 0.02089369 | 0.8 | 37.9525814 | 25.165466 | $\pm$ | 17.9930571 | 419.424433 | $\pm$ | 299.884285 |
| $3 / 2 / 30$ | 2/18/1997 20:06 | 0.39 | 1163.72 | 84.668 | 0.991300615 | 0.01239232 | 0.8 | 32.1324629 | 223.572902 | $\pm$ | 13.3646498 | 3726.21503 | $\pm$ | 222.744163 |
| 4/2/30 | 2/18/1997 23:59 | 0.55 | 356.97 | 0.21175 | 0.98524343 | 0.01992619 | 0.8 | 80.3960136 | 1.58874153 | $\pm$ | 18.0293352 | 26.4790255 | $\pm$ | 300.48892 |
| 4/2/30 recount | 2/18/199723:59 | 0.55 | 359.31 | 5.91175 | 0.989759061 | 0.01998186 | 0.8 | 116.764476 | 64.420206 | $\pm$ | 26.99649 | 1073.6701 | $\pm$ | 449.9415 |
| 5/2/30 | 2/19/1997 6:08 | 0.81 | 344.01 | 3.15175 | 0.94846863 | 0.01938001 | 0.8 | 85.7577232 | 25.2243694 | $\pm$ | 19.5333617 | 420.406157 | $\pm$ | 325.556029 |
| 6/2/30 | 2/19/1997 12:32 | 1.07 | 314.35 | 7.5752 | 0.964313416 | 0.01999926 | 0.8 | 43.7111878 | 56.0785036 | $\pm$ | 21.0368386 | 934.641726 | $\pm$ | 350.613977 |
| 7/2/30 | 2/19/1997 18:12 | 1.31 | 332.95 | 11.1752 | 1.020268586 | 0.02085026 | 0.8 | 43.4628892 | 82.2590332 | $\pm$ | 21.2326598 | 1370.98389 | $\pm$ | 353.877663 |
| 8/2/30 | 2/20/1997 2:02 | 1.64 | 488.13 | 328.11175 | 1.235483919 | 0.02314416 | 0.8 | 72.2586176 | 2212.61956 | $\pm$ | 62.2450068 | 36876.9926 | $\pm$ | 1037.41678 |
| 8/2/30 recount | 2/20/1997 2:02 | 1.64 | 370.53 | 39.99175 | 1.009109933 | 0.02020449 | 0.8 | 144.169388 | 538.07 | $\pm$ | 40.6510335 | 8967.83333 | $\pm$ | 677.517225 |
| 9/2/30 | 2/20/1997 10:37 | 1.99 | 360.93 | 11.43175 | 0.992348699 | 0.02000965 | 0.8 | 94.4214613 | 100.73462 | $\pm$ | 22.5129453 | 1678.91033 | $\pm$ | 375.215754 |
| 10/2/30 | 2/20/1997 18:05 | 2.31 | 327.07 | 11.6552 | 1.002013525 | 0.02056975 | 0.8 | 47.9742269 | 94.6972613 | $\pm$ | 23.4846535 | 1578.28769 | $\pm$ | 391.410891 |
| 11/2/30 | 2/21/19979:26 | 2.95 | 1061.60 | 26.348 | 0.909787653 | 0.01172114 | 0.8 | 43.2116206 | 93.5629823 | $\pm$ | 16.2819966 | 1559.38304 | $\pm$ | 271.366611 |
| 11/2/30 recount | 2/21/19979:26 | 2.95 | 1057.64 | 8.348 | 0.908320536 | 0.01171717 | 0.8 | 71.0788338 | 48.7616712 | $\pm$ | 26.0118155 | 812.69452 | $\pm$ | 433.530258 |
| 12/2/30 | 2/21/199718:20 | 3.32 | 357.87 | 2.67175 | 0.986888947 | 0.01994574 | 0.8 | 104.07616 | $25.9503007 \pm$ | $\pm$ | 23.6448515 | 432.505012 | $\pm$ | 394.080858 |
| 13/2/30 | 2/22/199710:10 | 3.98 | 1189.40 | 174.728 | 1.003684598 | 0.0124618 | 0.8 | 42.7212379 | 613.426004 | $\pm$ | 20.7477947 | 10223.7667 | $\pm$ | 345.796578 |
| 14/2/30 | 2/22/1997 18:17 | 4.31 | 358.23 | 19.83175 | 0.982032308 | 0.01984214 | 0.8 | 113.496962 | 210.05866 | $\pm$ | 28.406245 | 3500.97767 |  | 473.437417 |
| 15/2/30 | 2/23/19979:16 | 4.94 | 1112.78 | 23.888 | 0.954050259 | 0.01209955 | 0.8 | 48.4797383 | 95.1690875 | $\pm$ | 18.1918067 | 1586.15146 |  | 303.196779 |
| 16/2/30 | 2/23/199718:19 | 5.32 | 1141.28 | 46.928 | 0.976071246 | 0.01227776 | 0.8 | 50.4331806 | 194.493124 | $\pm$ | 19.66435 | 3241.55206 | $\pm$ | 327.739166 |
| 17/2/30 | 2/24/19979:34 | 5.95 | 347.37 | 10.89175 | 0.955104195 | 0.0194626 | 0.8 | 130.833788 | 132.988134 | $\pm$ | 31.1020537 | 2216.46891 |  | 518.367561 |
| 18/2/30 | 2/24/1997 17:46 | 6.29 | 364.83 | 36.45175 | 0.994583553 | 0.01999652 | 0.8 | 132.38162 | 450.340899 - | $\pm$ | 36.5594882 | 7505.68164 | $\pm$ | 609.324803 |
| 19/2/30 | 2/26/199710:11 | 7.98 | 374.31 | 94.83175 | 1.000847098 | 0.01998513 | 0.8 | 149.337871 | 1321.65784 | $\pm$ | 57.2476847 | 22027.6306 | $\pm$ | 954.128078 |
| 20/2/30 | 2/27/1997 8:02 | 8.89 | 1289.78 | 914.348 | 1.010379777 | 0.01224446 | 0.8 | 64.5836881 | 4852.7756 . | $\pm$ | 76.6174909 | 80879.5934 | $\pm$ | 1276.95818 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1/2/45 | 2/18/1997 12:48 | 0.09 | 1115.24 | -3.292 | 0.959090175 | 0.01215468 | 0.8 | 31.9823029 | -8.6521772 | $\pm$ | -11.493011 | -144.20295 | $\pm$ | -191.55019 |
| 2/2/45 | 2/18/1997 16:09 | 0.23 | 341.37 | 1.05175 | 0.941897593 | 0.01928752 | 0.8 | 81.4937299 | 7.99893248 | $\pm$ | 18.3561325 | 133.315541 | $\pm$ | 305.935542 |
| 3/2/45 | 2/18/1997 20:06 | 0.39 | 320.83 | 3.1352 | 0.985799333 | 0.02033697 | 0.8 | 40.1653856 | 21.3268589 | $\pm$ | 18.9822981 | 355.447648 | $\pm$ | 316.371635 |
| 4/2/45 | 2/18/1997 23:59 | 0.55 | 1089.50 | 5.588 | 0.936006623 | 0.01195396 | 0.8 | 34.610077 | 15.8933267 | $\pm$ | 12.6105608 | 264.888778 | $\pm$ | 210.176014 |
| 5/2/45 | 2/19/19976:08 | 0.81 | 1161.80 | 14.108 | 0.997243764 | 0.01247312 | 0.8 | 33.1945114 | 38.4846534 | $\pm$ | 12.2596346 | 641.41089 | $\pm$ | 204.327243 |
| 6/2/45 | 2/19/1997 12:32 | 1.07 | 341.49 | 13.41175 | 0.938014954 | 0.01920611 | 0.8 | 88.9054929 | 111.278012 | $\pm$ | 21.4417451 | 1854.63353 | $\pm$ | 357.362418 |
| 7/2/45 | 2/19/199718:12 | 1.31 | 367.65 | 22.17175 | 1.007235825 | 0.02020905 | 0.8 | 87.1022717 | 180.22904 | $\pm$ | 22.0978492 | 3003.81733 | $\pm$ | 368.297487 |
| 8/2/45 | 2/20/1997 2:02 | 1.64 | 2472.74 | 252.248 | 0.884 | 0.00929933 | 0.8 | 41.1446984 | 852.89872 | $\pm$ | 22.0075444 | 14214.9787 | $\pm$ | 366.792406 |
| 9/2/45 | 2/20/1997 10:37 | 1.99 | 1112.24 | 487.988 | 0.903639288 | 0.01146205 | 0.8 | 42.1973631 | 1692.1946 | $\pm$ | 32.9283702 | 28203.2433 | $\pm$ | 548.80617 |
| 9/2/45 recount | 2/20/1997 10:37 | 1.99 | 1156.70 | 306.068 | 0.961438523 | 0.01204204 | 0.8 | 63.5684459 | 1598.87815 | $\pm$ | 38.2666792 | 26647.9691 | $\pm$ | 637.777986 |
| 10/2/45 | 2/20/1997 18:05 | 2.31 | 478.35 | 264.57175 | 0.996 | 0.01874092 | 0.8 | 95.4882136 | $2357.70005 \pm$ | $\pm$ | 69.4316405 | 39295.0009 | $\pm$ | 1157.19401 |
| 10/2/45 recount | 2/20/1997 18:05 | 2.31 | 408.21 | 211.23175 | 0.996 | 0.01945101 | 0.8 | 126.669304 | 2497.04228 | $\pm$ | 78.9104825 | 41617.3713 | $\pm$ | 1315.17471 |
| 11/2/45 | 2/21/19979:26 | 2.95 | 377.89 | 663.2552 | 0.930405294 | 0.01844098 | 0.8 | 52.6186256 | 5910.57684 ] | $\pm$ | 135.760368 | 98509.614 | $\pm$ | 2262.6728 |



| 5/3/15 | 2/19/1997 5:58 | 0.80 | 339.27 | 40.41175 | 0.922682215 | 0.01892704 | 0.8 | 89.2590243 | 336.631776 | $\pm$ | 25.2755901 | 5610.52959 |  | 421.259836 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5/3/15 recount | 2/19/1997 5:58 | 0.80 | 342.57 | 17.43175 | 0.939625464 | 0.01922197 | 0.8 | 154.414025 | 251.201973 | $\pm$ | 38.1177695 | 4186.69955 | $\pm$ | 635.296159 |
| 6/3/15 | 2/19/1997 12:17 | 1.06 | 317.17 | 8.8952 | 0.972526125 | 0.02012276 | 0.8 | 43.3991824 | 65.3803091 | $\pm$ | 21.001439 | 1089.67182 |  | 350.023984 |
| 7/3/15 | 2/19/1997 17:59 | 1.30 | 312.49 | 8.4752 | 0.958277145 | 0.01990493 | 0.8 | 46.4160302 | 66.6235322 | $\pm$ | 22.4223946 | 1110.3922 | $\pm$ | 373.706576 |
| 8/3/15 | 2/20/1997 1:48 | 1.63 | 331.47 | 31.65175 | 0.904139013 | 0.0186703 | 0.8 | 98.8756939 | 292.067065 | $\pm$ | 26.5719573 | 4867.78441 | $\pm$ | 442.865955 |
| 9/3/15 | 2/20/1997 10:27 | 1.99 | 1707.39 | 10427.6718 | 1.157692411 | 0.01828535 | 0.8 | 81.1495004 | 78971.1599 | $\pm$ | 1692.59015 | 1316186 | $\pm$ | 28209.8358 |
| 9/3/15 recount | 2/20/1997 10:27 | 1.99 | 1351.17 | 7776.15175 | 1.078422765 | 0.01737104 | 0.8 | 117.972755 | 85613.4039 | $\pm$ | 1858.75622 | 1426890.06 | $\pm$ | 30979.2703 |
| 10/3/15 | 2/20/199717:56 | 2.30 | 311.17 | 8.1152 | 0.954342693 | 0.01984523 | 0.8 | 50.4339778 | 69.3157864 | $\pm$ | 24.3269888 | 1155.26311 | $\pm$ | 405.449813 |
| 11/3/15 recount | 2/21/19979:16 | 2.94 | 1105.64 | 11.588 | 0.949235957 | 0.01206398 | 0.8 | 68.1088039 | 64.8586027 | $\pm$ | 25.0536433 | 1080.97671 | $\pm$ | 417.560721 |
| 12/3/15 | 2/21/199718:11 | 3.31 | 353.25 | 6.81175 | 0.972725283 | 0.01972967 | 0.8 | 106.244725 | 67.5400524 | $\pm$ | 24.6864021 | 1125.66754 |  | 411.440034 |
| 13/3/15 | 2/22/19979:59 | 3.97 | 1090.94 | 61.388 | 0.931239313 | 0.01188785 | 0.8 | 46.1136814 | 232.631825 | $\pm$ | 18.4354959 | 3877.19708 | $\pm$ | 307.258265 |
| 14/3/15 | 2/22/1997 18:09 | 4.31 | 189.85 | 28.5152 | 0.924 | 0.02234062 | 0.8 | 61.1263577 | 295.198839 | $\pm$ | 32.4124186 | 4919.98064 | $\pm$ | 540.206976 |
| 15/3/15 | 2/23/19979:09 | 4.93 | 1123.04 | 65.648 | 0.958376225 | 0.01211806 | 0.8 | 48.3621391 | 260.905269 | $\pm$ | 19.4719332 | 4348.42115 | $\pm$ | 324.53222 |
| 16/3/15 | 2/23/1997 18:08 | 5.31 | 1191.62 | 181.868 | 1.004824651 | 0.01246876 | 0.8 | 49.517836 | 740.071698 | $\pm$ | 24.3394319 | 12334.5283 | $\pm$ | 405.657198 |
| 17/3/15 | 2/24/19979:22 | 5.94 | 305.83 | 10.8152 | 0.936972131 | 0.01957328 | 0.8 | 67.5623065 | 123.751003 | $\pm$ | 32.9602984 | 2062.51671 | $\pm$ | 549.338307 |
| 18/3/15 | 2/24/199717:38 | 6.29 | 307.57 | 23.5952 | 0.937853945 | 0.01956227 | 0.8 | 71.7233025 | 286.611522 | $\pm$ | 36.9786328 | 4776.8587 | $\pm$ | 616.310547 |
| 19/3/15 | 2/26/1997 10:00 | 7.97 | 361.65 | 48.21175 | 0.981796739 | 0.01978619 | 0.8 | 152.938959 | 688.123424 | $\pm$ | 45.2987821 | 11468.7237 | $\pm$ | 754.979702 |
| 20/3/15 | 2/27/19977:52 | 8.88 | 1184.06 | 17.768 | 1.015986105 | 0.01263216 | 0.8 | 64.3735904 | 93.9944315 | $\pm$ | 23.9150835 | 1566.57386 | $\pm$ | 398.584724 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (-1)-3-30 | 2/17/1997 17:00 | -0.74 | 1167.54 | -6.6497453 | 1.004415237 | 0.01022874 | 0.8 | 5.49057657 | -15.709004 | $\pm$ | -8.4905354 | -261.81673 | $\pm$ | -141.50892 |
| 0/3/30 | $2 / 181199711: 11$ | 0.02 | 357.99 | -6.38825 | 0.990308978 | 0.02001303 | 0.8 | 74.7079735 | -44.539381 | $\pm$ | -16.206557 | -742.32301 | $\pm$ | -270.10928 |
| 1/3/30 | 2/18/1997 12:32 | 0.07 | 409.65 | -7.70825 | 1.133352051 | 0.02211404 | 0.8 | 66.941121 | -48.155299 | $\pm$ | -14.428053 | -802.58832 | $\pm$ | -240.46755 |
| 2/3/30 | 2/18/1997 15:55 | 0.22 | 356.79 | 0.93175 | 0.984501122 | 0.01991392 | 0.8 | 78.7270037 | 6.84570908 | $\pm$ | 17.7217371 | 114.095151 | $\pm$ | 295.362285 |
| 3/3/30 | 2/18/1997 19:48 | 0.38 | 1202.66 | -6.412 | 1.034578216 | 0.01280155 | 0.8 | 30.8621426 | -16.262055 | $\pm$ | -11.037504 | -271.03426 | $\pm$ | -183.9584 |
| 4/3/30 | $2118 / 1997$ 11:42 | 0.04 | 1109.66 | 13.628 | 0.95247228 | 0.01209067 | 0.8 | 34.0688247 | 38.1544435 | $\pm$ | 12.5731344 | 635.907392 | $\pm$ | 209.55224 |
| 5/3/30 | 2/19/19975:53 | 0.80 | 1168.16 | 0.128 | 1.004215796 | 0.01253872 | 0.8 | 33.3771025 | 0.35108676 | $\pm$ | 12.0578352 | 5.85144598 | $\pm$ | 200.96392 |
| 6/3/30 | 2/19/1997 12:14 | 1.06 | 343.65 | 7.17175 | 0.946104421 | 0.01933739 | 0.8 | 88.2614975 | 59.0733702 | $\pm$ | 20.5492792 | 984.556171 | $\pm$ | 342.487986 |
| 7/3/30 | 2/19/1997 17:55 | 1.30 | 372.99 | 19.35175 | 1.022936825 | 0.02044534 | 0.8 | 86.0276086 | 155.365079 | $\pm$ | 21.4657967 | 2589.41798 | $\pm$ | 357.763279 |
| 8/3/30 recount | 2/20/1997 1:44 | 1.62 | 1030.82 | 14.948 | 0.884553916 | 0.01151223 | 0.8 | 66.8917593 | 82.1696724 | $\pm$ | 24.7400494 | 1369.49454 | $\pm$ | 412.334157 |
| 9/3/30 recount | 2/20/199710:24 | 1.99 | 1158.86 | 181.328 | 0.97672001 | 0.01222621 | 0.8 | 62.6488401 | 933.541769 | $\pm$ | 30.8039497 | 15559.0295 | $\pm$ | 513.399161 |
| 10/3/30 | 2/20/1997 17:53 | 2.30 | 469.35 | 911.97175 | 0.984592935 | 0.01860475 | 0.8 | 96.7160161 | 8231.4264 | $\pm$ | 207.240704 | 137190.44 | $\pm$ | 3454.01174 |
| 11/3/30 | 2/21/19979:13 | 2.94 | 3651.13 | 30111.0752 | 0.924 | 0.0142844 | 0.8 | 53.0468632 | 270517.694 | $\pm$ | 4428.51912 | 4508628.23 | $\pm$ | 73808.652 |
| 11/3/30 recount | 2/21/19979:13 | 2.94 | 2522.29 | 18774.0752 | 0.924 | 0.01450654 | 0.8 | 81.0722324 | 257774.759 | $\pm$ | 4287.91897 | 4296245.98 | $\pm$ | 71465.3162 |
| 12/3/30 | 2/21/1997 18:08 | 3.31 | 3821.65 | 30310.8152 | 0.95 | 0.01466346 | 0.8 | 55.0742317 | 282719.503 | $\pm$ | 4621.72479 | 4711991.71 | $\pm$ | 77028.7464 |
| 12/3/30 recount | 2/21/1997 18:08 | 3.31 | 2835.43 | 21111.2552 | 0.95 | 0.01483338 | 0.8 | 77.7750715 | 278076.43 | $\pm$ | 4600.14493 | 4634607.16 | $\pm$ | 76669.0822 |
| 13/3/1930 | 2/22/1997 7:55 | 3.88 | 3288.73 | 25565.1152 | 0.908 | 0.01409098 | 0.8 | 58.6308652 | 253853.854 | $\pm$ | 4172.72579 | 4230897.57 | $\pm$ | 69545.4298 |
| 13/3/30 recount | 2/22/1997 7:55 | 3.88 | 2415.37 | 17954.8952 | 0.908 | 0.01428645 | 0.8 | 83.4695978 | 253817.113 | $\pm$ | 4231.4176 | 4230285.22 | $\pm$ | 70523.6266 |
| 14/3/30 | 2/22/1997 18:06 | 4.31 | 2645.05 | 19210.6352 | 0.962 | 0.01506854 | 0.8 | 58.711803 | 191019.123 | $\pm$ | 3170.57643 | 3183652.05 | $\pm$ | 52842.9404 |
| 14/3/30 recount | 2/22/1997 18:06 | 4.31 | 2645.05 | 17758.2752 | 0.962 | 0.01506854 | 0.8 | 69.7432853 | 209755.273 | $\pm$ | 3483.19883 | 3495921.22 | $\pm$ | 58053.3138 |
| 15/3/30 | 2/23/19979:05 | 4.93 | 3023.05 | 22663.6352 | 0.985 | 0.01533761 | 0.8 | 58.5445373 | 224711.683 | $\pm$ | 3706.9052 | 3745194.72 | $\pm$ | 61781.7533 |
| 16/3/30 | 2/23/1997 18:05 | 5.31 | 8231.60 | 56427.008 | 0.937 | 0.00883689 | 0.8 | 53.1817172 | 246606.902 | $\pm$ | 2511.25109 | 4110115.03 | $\pm$ | 41854.1849 |
| 17/3/30 | 2/24/19979:19 | 5.94 | 2795.49 | 19312.7118 | 0.982 | 0.01505473 | 0.8 | 127.540229 | 229871.836 | $\pm$ | 4834.13555 | 3831197.27 | $\pm$ | 80568.9258 |
| 18/3/30 | 2/24/1997 17:36 | 6.29 | 2621.25 | 17805.8718 | 0.965 | 0.0148409 | 0.8 | 137.909986 | 229168.155 | $\pm$ | 4828.88868 | 3819469.26 | $\pm$ | 80481.4779 |
| 19/3/30 | 2/26/1997 9:58 | 7.97 | 2354.73 | 15259.0518 | 1.001 | 0.01548263 | 0.8 | 150.004967 | 213613.403 | $\pm$ | 4517.74026 | 3560223.39 | $\pm$ | 75295.671 |
| 20/3/30 | 2/27/1997 7:46 | 8.88 | 2300.41 | 16437.4952 | 1.009 | 0.01591627 | 0.8 | 80.6319956 | 224467.129 | $\pm$ | 3752.76632 | 3741118.81 | $\pm$ | 62546.1054 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (-1)-3-45 | 2/17/199717:00 | -0.74 | 372.90 | -3.4926648 | 1.030487922 | 0.01555056 | 0.8 | 13.1391432 | -22.440422 | $\pm$ | -5.8264725 | -374.00704 | $\pm$ | -97.107876 |
| 0/3/45 | 2/18/1997 11:11 | 0.02 | 1131.80 | -9.292 | 0.973972018 | 0.01228429 | 0.8 | 30.9145258 | -23.606285 | $\pm$ | -11.008049 | -393.43808 | $\pm$ | -183.46749 |
| 1/3/45 | 2/18/1997 12:32 | 0.07 | 1181.48 | -7.192 | 1.01645437 | 0.01264657 | 0.8 | 30.3767512 | -17.953406 | $\pm$ | -10.851012 | -299.22343 | $\pm$ | -180.8502 |
| 2/3/45 | 2/18/199715:55 | 0.22 | 1136.18 | -5.332 | 0.97731119 | 0.01231106 | 0.8 | 32.2759076 | -14.142443 |  | -11.562256 | -235.70739 |  | -192.70426 |




| 9/4/30 | 2/20/1997 10:50] | 2.00 | 2127.79 | 14721.9152 | 1.018 | 0.01612807 | 0.8 | 46.784688 | 116648.123 | $\pm$ | 1959.242 | 1944135.38 |  | 32654.0333 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9/4/30 recount | 2/20/199710:50 | 2.00 | 1601.71 | 10373.8352 | 1.018 | 0.01643179 | 0.8 | 65.4114313 | 114921.874 | $\pm$ | 1968.47992 | 1915364.57 | $\pm$ | 32807.9987 |
| 10/4/30 | 2/20/1997 18:30 | 2.32 | 11572.52 | 55464.488 | 0.934 | 0.00869212 | 0.8 | 41.5605842 | 189431.632 | $\pm$ | 1907.34122 | 3157193.86 | $\pm$ | 31789.0203 |
| 10/4/30 recount | 2/20/1997 18:30 | 2.32 | 5476.82 | 33657.968 | 0.934 | 0.009017 | 0.8 | 68.4656122 | 189372.205 | $\pm$ | 1974.25929 | 3156203.42 |  | 32904.3215 |
| 11/4/30 | 2/21/19979:40 | 2.95 | 5097.99 | 44664.7518 | 0.937 | 0.01405558 | 0.8 | 103.619057 | 431916.578 | $\pm$ | 8961.2124 | 7198609.63 | $\pm$ | 149353.54 |
| 11/4/30 recount | 2/21/19979:40 | 2.95 | 4708.41 | 34223.0118 | 0.937 | 0.01408669 | 0.8 | 135.981926 | 434304.899 | $\pm$ | 9025.50177 | 7238414.98 | $\pm$ | 150425.03 |
| 11/4/30 duplicate | 2/21/19979:40 | 2.95 | 22099.52 | 119338.988 | 0.94 | 0.00861348 | 0.8 | 41.9984017 | 411880.244 | $\pm$ | 4080.59927 | 6864670.73 |  | 68009.9879 |
| 11/4/30 dup. recount | 2/21/19979:40 | 2.95 | 10277.84 | 71937.668 | 0.94 | 0.00878409 | 0.8 | 68.9263996 | 407472.024 | $\pm$ | 4112.16706 | 6791200.4 | $\pm$ | 68536.1177 |
| 12/4/30 | 2/21/1997 18:45 | 3.33 | 6526.81 | 54024.2552 | 0.965 | 0.01468779 | 0.8 | 54.478453 | 498451.903 | $\pm$ | 8033.90241 | 8307531.72 | $\pm$ | 133898.373 |
| 12/4/30 recount | 2/21/1997 18:45 | 3.33 | 4626.43 | 36813.4352 | 0.965 | 0.01480823 | 0.8 | 78.1874106 | 487475.597 | $\pm$ | 7922.30335 | 8124593.28 | $\pm$ | 132038.389 |
| 13/4/30 | 2/22/1997 10:26 | 3.99 | 5694.63 | 41838.5118 | 0.947 | 0.01416575 | 0.8 | 111.388337 | 434921.886 | $\pm$ | 9011.3036 | 7248698.1 | $\pm$ | 150188.393 |
| 13/4/30 recount | 2/22/1997 10:26 | 3.99 | 4980.63 | 35905.4118 | 0.947 | 0.01421454 | 0.8 | 139.968731 | 469014.48 | $\pm$ | 9737.8308 | 7816908 | $\pm$ | 162297.18 |
| 14/4/30 | 2/22/1997 18:39 | 4.33 | 5306.49 | 38442.6918 | 0.982 | 0.01471512 | 0.8 | 114.052433 | 409179.302 | $\pm$ | 8486.95941 | 6819655.04 |  | 141449.324 |
| 14/4/30 recount | 2/22/1997 18:39 | 4.33 | 4606.47 | 32886.9318 | 0.982 | 0.01477265 | 0.8 | 135.831204 | 416886.876 | $\pm$ | 8667.1475 | 6948114.61 | $\pm$ | 144452.458 |
| 15/4/30 | 2/23/19979:29 | 4.95 | 13952.60 | 101121.848 | 0.99 | 0.00916215 | 0.8 | 46.909883 | 389820.968 | $\pm$ | 3896.81349 | 6497016.13 | $\pm$ | 64946.8914 |
| 15/4/30 recount | 2/23/19979:29 | 4.95 | 11323.88 | 78970.448 | 0.99 | 0.00921989 | 0.8 | 59.2681929 | 384629.097 | $\pm$ | 3868.90056 | 6410484.95 | $\pm$ | 64481.676 |
| 16/4/30 | 2/23/1997 18:37 | 5.33 | 4213.47 | 30229.9518 | 0.969 | 0.01461721 | 0.8 | 125.192041 | 353190.887 | $\pm$ | 7354.85467 | 5886514.78 | $\pm$ | 122580.911 |
| 17/4/30 | 2/24/19979:50 | 5.96 | 11836.76 | 87399.248 | 0.834 | 0.00775583 | 0.8 | 61.5948029 | 442392.356 | $\pm$ | 4442.78714 | 7373205.93 | $\pm$ | 74046.4524 |
| 18/4/30 | 2/24/199718:05 | 6.31 | 3586.15 | 27277.2752 | 0.965 | 0.01492766 | 0.8 | 75.252791 | 347642.85 | $\pm$ | 5696.52408 | 5794047.5 | $\pm$ | 94942.0679 |
| 19/4/30 | 2/26/1997 10:38 | 8.00 | 3165.27 | 21962.3718 | 0.974 | 0.01484903 | 0.8 | 155.256145 | 318216.982 | $\pm$ | 6669.38031 | 5303616.37 | $\pm$ | 111156.339 |
| 20/4/30 | 2/27/1997 8:35 | 8.91 | 2928.33 | 20233.4118 | 1.016 | 0.01554234 | 0.8 | 158.598988 | 299477.946 | $\pm$ | 6289.68995 | 4991299.1 | $\pm$ | 104828.166 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1/4/45 | 2/18/199713:03 | 0.10 | 330.25 | 1.8152 | 1.015237435 | 0.02079011 | 0.8 | 37.9186334 | 11.6570018 | $\pm$ | 17.8256659 | 194.283363 | $\pm$ | 297.094432 |
| 2/4/45 | 2/18/199716:27 | 0.24 | 324.91 | 16.6352 | 0.993627236 | 0.02043209 | 0.8 | 39.6277068 | 111.64433 | $\pm$ | 19.8150389 | 1860.73883 | $\pm$ | 330.250648 |
| 2/4/45 recount | 2/18/199716:27 | 0.24 | 322.03 | 4.2752 | 0.989091811 | 0.0203853 | 0.8 | 63.0853406 | 45.6766867 | $\pm$ | 29.9522604 | 761.278111 |  | 499.204339 |
| 3/4/45 | 218/1997 20:38 | 0.41 | 350.01 | -2.60825 | 0.966993703 | 0.01966344 | 0.8 | 81.3512774 | -19.801993 | $\pm$ | -17.980975 | -330.03322 | $\pm$ | -299.68292 |
| 4/4/45 | 2/19/1997 0:14 | 0.56 | 1085.48 | -8.632 | 0.93408112 | 0.01194411 | 0.8 | 35.126507 | -24.917373 | $\pm$ | -12.520465 | -415.28954 |  | -208.67442 |
| 5/4/45 | 2/19/1997 6:30 | 0.82 | 342.21 | 2.19175 | 0.943827522 | 0.01931365 | 0.8 | 87.6939588 | 17.937256 | $\pm$ | 19.8722165 | 298.954267 | $\pm$ | 331.203608 |
| 6/4/45 | 2/19/1997 12:52 | 1.09 | 295.59 | -3.08825 | 0.816946088 | 0.01745861 | 0.8 | 106.335234 | -30.646788 | $\pm$ | -23.447147 | -510.77979 | $\pm$ | -390.78578 |
| 7/4/45 | 2/19/199718:57 | 1.34 | 324.49 | 13.1552 | 0.993552618 | 0.02043732 | 0.8 | 44.9049555 | 100.046392 | $\pm$ | 22.1224585 | 1667.43986 | $\pm$ | 368.707641 |
| 8/4/45 | 2/20/1997 2:15 | 1.65 | 312.45 | 6.63175 | 0.860169608 | 0.01807349 | 0.8 | 104.360147 | 64.5889381 | $\pm$ | 24.2270547 | 1076.4823 | $\pm$ | 403.784244 |
| 9/4/45 | 2/20/199710:50 | 2.00 | 366.33 | 20.61175 | 1.00412418 | 0.02016607 | 0.8 | 93.8407843 | 180.510226 | $\pm$ | 23.5909718 | 3008.50377 |  | 393.182863 |
| 10/4/45 | 2/20/1997 18:30 | 2.32 | 318.55 | 17.0552 | 0.973916661 | 0.02012887 | 0.8 | 49.5507001 | 143.125269 | $\pm$ | 24.8234346 | 2385.42115 |  | 413.723909 |
| 11/4/45 | 2/21/19979:40 | 2.95 | 464.29 | 1506.2552 | 0.901290129 | 0.01708585 | 0.8 | 54.5628546 | 13918.9139 | $\pm$ | 288.479845 | 231981.898 | $\pm$ | 4807.99742 |
| 11/4/45 recount | 2/21/19979:40 | 2.95 | 401.65 | 951.4952 | 0.902664376 | 0.01764515 | 0.8 | 83.0879046 | 13389.1841 | $\pm$ | 293.516156 | 223153.068 |  | 4891.93593 |
| 12/4/45 | 2/21/199718:45 | 3.33 | 352.35 | 13.05175 | 0.968113695 | 0.01964996 | 0.8 | 107.436847 | 130.863134 | $\pm$ | 25.8551545 | 2181.05223 | $\pm$ | 430.919242 |
| 13/4/45 | 2/22/199710:26 | 3.99 | 1138.46 | 43.388 | 0.974027957 | 0.01226179 | 0.8 | 44.5575943 | 158.871946 | $\pm$ | 17.2701149 | 2647.86576 | $\pm$ | 287.835248 |
| 14/4/45 | 2/22/199718:39 | 4.33 | 312.25 | 12.9152 | 0.95598576 | 0.01986134 | 0.8 | 58.8587514 | 128.742484 | $\pm$ | 28.9697267 | 2145.70807 | $\pm$ | 482.828779 |
| 15/4/45 | 2/23/1997 9:29 | 4.95 | 351.57 | 9.21175 | 0.967269884 | 0.01964485 | 0.8 | 118.127902 | 101.552343 | $\pm$ | 27.8164392 | 1692.53905 | $\pm$ | 463.60732 |
| 16/4/45 | 2/23/1997 18:37 | 5.33 | 310.63 | 6.6152 | 0.953206336 | 0.01983065 | 0.8 | 64.4608533 | 72.2185449 | $\pm$ | 30.9003889 | 1203.64241 |  | 515.006482 |
| 17/4/45 | 2/24/19979:50 | 5.96 | 1011.80 | 40.568 | 0.865445771 | 0.01133752 | 0.8 | 59.4207689 | 198.096915 | $\pm$ | 22.9332431 | 3301.61525 | $\pm$ | 382.220718 |
| 18/4/45 | 2/24/1997 18:05 | 6.31 | 328.15 | 9.2552 | 1.006175188 | 0.02063788 | 0.8 | 72.2640552 | 113.270767 | $\pm$ | 35.0207632 | 1887.84612 | $\pm$ | 583.679386 |
| 19/4/45 | 2/26/1997 10:38 | 8.00 | 331.09 | 72.0752 | 0.993244016 | 0.02032667 | 0.8 | 77.068032 | 940.740474 | $\pm$ | 49.2450117 | 15679.0079 |  | 820.750195 |
| 20/4/45 | 2/27/1997 8:35 | 8.91 | 1289.12 | 789.728 | 1.023224083 | 0.01240195 | 0.8 | 64.0906628 | 4159.37567 | $\pm$ | 68.0333741 | 69322.9278 | $\pm$ | 1133.88957 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1/4/60 | 2/18/1997 13:03 | 0.10 | 358.29 | -5.54825 | 0.990850665 | 0.0200194 | 0.8 | 76.8669471 | -39.800724 | $\pm$ | -16.743052 | -663.3454 | $\pm$ | -279.05087 |
| 2/4/60 | 2/18/1997 16:27 | 0.24 | 413.91 | 18.51175 | 1.136171472 | 0.02211248 | 0.8 | 68.5655693 | 118.453767 | $\pm$ | 17.0166151 | 1974.22946 | $\pm$ | 283.610252 |
| 2/4/60 recount | 2/18/1997 16:27 | 0.24 | 424.59 | 5.19175 | 1.170191796 | 0.02263362 | 0.8 | 123.692811 | 59.9312787 | $\pm$ | 28.4839848 | 998.854645 | $\pm$ | 474.733081 |
| 3/4/60 | 2/18/1997 20:38 | 0.41 | 1148.18 | -1.492 | 0.987213955 | 0.01239399 | 0.8 | 32.4300885 | -3.976242 | $\pm$ | -11.686331 | -66.270699 | $\pm$ | -194.77219 |




| 5/5/60 | 2/19/1997 7:05 | 0.85 | 316.75 | 23.1752 | 0.966238971 | 0.01999955 | 0.8 | 43.4780691 | 170.648881 | $\pm$ | 22.3703139 | 2844.14801 |  | 372.838565 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5/5/60 recount | 2/19/19977:05 | 0.85 | 321.49 | 8.7752 | 0.985856623 | 0.02032739 | 0.8 | 74.3875445 | 110.552088 | $\pm$ | 35.9786062 | 1842.5348 | $\pm$ | 599.643436 |
| 6/5/60 | 2/19/1997 13:35 | 1.12 | 323.41 | 20.7752 | 0.987564973 | 0.0203315 | 0.8 | 44.6983409 | 157.270157 | $\pm$ | 22.7551643 | 2621.16929 | $\pm$ | 379.252739 |
| 7/5/60 | 2/19/1997 19:42 | 1.37 | 1193.84 | 9.908 | 1.025239566 | 0.01271477 | 0.8 | 35.1004536 | 28.5794966 | $\pm$ | 12.8768014 | 476.324943 | $\pm$ | 214.613357 |
| 8/5/60 | 2/20/1997 2:53 | 1.67 | 357.97 | 9.8552 | 1.097693016 | 0.02203642 | 0.8 | 41.7946219 | 69.7582452 | $\pm$ | 20.3032909 | 1162.63742 | $\pm$ | 338.388182 |
| 8/5/60 recount | 2/20/19972.53 | 1.67 | 323.41 | 8.8952 | 0.991720656 | 0.02041706 | 0.8 | 59.2547755 | 89.2665557 | $\pm$ | 28.6735755 | 1487.77593 | $\pm$ | 477.892926 |
| 9/5/60 | 2/20/199711:20 | 2.02 | 369.39 | 3.87175 | 1.018277587 | 0.02040481 | 0.8 | 92.8138711 | 33.536328 | $\pm$ | 21.2222202 | 558.9388 | $\pm$ | 353.70367 |
| 10/5/60 | 2/20/1997 19:04 | 2.35 | 1108.64 | 5.048 | 0.952518803 | 0.01209492 | 0.8 | 40.891871 | 16.9633716 | $\pm$ | 14.886715 | 282.72286 | $\pm$ | 248.111916 |
| 10/5/60 recount | 2/20/1997 19:04 | 2.35 | 1108.64 | 2.948 | 0.952744807 | 0.01209779 | 0.8 | 67.6551447 | 16.3901963 | $\pm$ | 24.5488613 | 273.169938 | $\pm$ | 409.147688 |
| 11/5/60 | 2/21/1997 10:05 | 2.97 | 315.13 | 13.2752 | 0.964718844 | 0.01999474 | 0.8 | 51.1129505 | 114.916325 | $\pm$ | 25.1953544 | 1915.27208 | $\pm$ | 419.922574 |
| 12/560 | 2/21/1997 19:10 | 3.35 | 318.37 | 21.6752 | 0.971746874 | 0.02008696 | 0.8 | 54.3274038 | 199.430588 | $\pm$ | 27.7684151 | 3323.84313 | $\pm$ | 462.806919 |
| 13/5/60 | 2/22/1997 10:55 | 4.01 | 306.21 | 71.67175 | 0.82077189 | 0.01735101 | 0.8 | 129.911407 | 868.941641 | $\pm$ | 44.3905759 | 14482.3607 | $\pm$ | 739.842932 |
| 14/5/60 | 2/22/1997 19:02 | 4.35 | 355.65 | 6.63175 | 0.979411181 | 0.01982834 | 0.8 | 114.586907 | 70.9183228 | $\pm$ | 26.5981926 | 1181.97205 | $\pm$ | 443.303211 |
| 15/5/60 | 2/23/19979:56 | 4.97 | 389.07 | 103.89175 | 1.038499164 | 0.02052879 | 0.8 | 110.322481 | 1069.6468 | $\pm$ | 44.1828189 | 17827.4467 | $\pm$ | 736.380314 |
| 16/5/60 | 2/23/1997 19:10 | 5.35 | 359.43 | 3.45175 | 0.990928969 | 0.02000366 | 0.8 | 123.193561 | 39.6846594 | $\pm$ | 28.1052434 | 661.410989 | $\pm$ | 468.420723 |
| 17/5/60 | 2/24/1997 10:16 | 5.98 | 985.70 | 17.708 | 0.845468618 | 0.0111799 | 0.8 | 60.27741 | 87.7162273 | $\pm$ | 22.3946468 | 1461.93712 | $\pm$ | 373.244114 |
| 18/5/60 | 2/24/1997 18:28 | 6.32 | 1154.78 | 15.068 | 0.991105572 | 0.01242017 | 0.8 | 54.178934 | 67.0875474 | $\pm$ | 20.0406872 | 1118.12579 | $\pm$ | 334.011454 |
| 19/5/60 | 2/26/1997 10:57 | 8.01 | 1224.20 | 57.848 | 1.046179782 | 0.01287532 | 0.8 | 58.1576387 | 276.471877 | $\pm$ | 23.0900608 | 4607.86462 | $\pm$ | 384.834347 |
| 2015/60 | 2/27/1997 9:00 | 8.93 | 361.05 | 5.13175 | 0.99482777 | 0.02005783 | 0.8 | 162.362688 | 77.7583505 | $\pm$ | 37.3793517 | 1295.97251 | $\pm$ | 622.989196 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3/6/15 | 2/18/1997 20:18 | 0.40 | 339.75 | 0.21175 | 0.937712413 | 0.01922765 | 0.8 | 84.243884 | 1.66478102 | $\pm$ | 18.8922463 | 27.7463503 | $\pm$ | 314.870772 |
| 7/6/15 | 2/19/1997 18:32 | 1.32 | 297.07 | 7.2152 | 0.91128526 | 0.01918549 | 0.8 | 49.1085164 | 60.0087931 | $\pm$ | 23.600209 | 1000.14655 | $\pm$ | 393.336816 |
| 10/6/15 | 2/20/1997 18:16 | 2.31 | 301.99 | 7.1552 | 0.926440398 | 0.01941857 | 0.8 | 52.2930687 | 63.3688185 | $\pm$ | 25.1240546 | 1056.14698 | $\pm$ | 418.734244 |
| 12/6/15 | 2/21/1997 18:32 | 3.32 | 1137.56 | 8.648 | 0.976992996 | 0.01230225 | 0.8 | 43.0504334 | 30.5949013 | $\pm$ | 15.7618986 | 509.915022 | $\pm$ | 262.69831 |
| 14/6/15 | 2/22/1997 18:27 | 4.32 | 318.25 | 23.4152 | 0.970769088 | 0.02006871 | 0.8 | 58.7133152 | 232.83281 | $\pm$ | 30.2400881 | 3880.54683 | $\pm$ | 504.001469 |
| 16/6/15 | 2/23/1997 18:27 | 5.32 | 312.01 | 2.3552 | 0.958941449 | 0.01992676 | 0.8 | 64.4793893 | 25.7192567 | $\pm$ | 30.3777333 | 428.654278 | $\pm$ | 506.295556 |
| 18/6/15 | 2/24/1997 17:55 | 6.30 | 1123.52 | 10.208 | 0.964755355 | 0.01219703 | 0.8 | 55.7354079 | 46.7549603 | $\pm$ | 20.4569244 | 779.249339 | $\pm$ | 340.948741 |
| 19/6/15 | 2/26/1997 10:23 | 7.98 | 325.93 | 25.2752 | 0.993742488 | 0.02041812 | 0.8 | 79.4032979 | 339.893489 | $\pm$ | 41.2254388 | 5664.89149 | $\pm$ | 687.090647 |
| 20/6/15 | 2/27/19978:18 | 8.90 | 1154.84 | 8.408 | 0.991873906 | 0.01242959 | 0.8 | 66.2748975 | 45.7928439 | $\pm$ | 24.2556872 | 763.214065 | $\pm$ | 404.261453 |
| 20/6/15 duplicate | 2/27/19978:18 | 8.90 | 363.57 | 6.09175 | 1.001456238 | 0.02015349 | 0.8 | 161.461939 | 91.7925744 | $\pm$ | 37.3673038 | 1529.87624 | $\pm$ | 622.788396 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3/6/30 | 2/18/1997 20:18 | 0.40 | 1097.60 | -8.272 | 0.944461565 | 0.01203228 | 0.8 | 34.0404392 | -23.139903 | $\pm$ | -12.139938 | -385.66504 | $\pm$ | -202.33229 |
| 7/6/30 | 2/19/1997 18:32 | 1.32 | 335.43 | -1.04825 | 0.926217825 | 0.01906119 | 0.8 | 95.5928839 | -9.3515963 | $\pm$ | -21.297774 | -155.85994 | $\pm$ | -354.9629 |
| 10/6/30 | 2/20/1997 18:16 | 2.31 | 350.97 | 15.33175 | 0.963527274 | 0.01957809 | 0.8 | 99.4775634 | 142.335156 | $\pm$ | 24.2560242 | 2372.25261 | $\pm$ | 404.267071 |
| 12/6/30 | 2/21/199718:32 | 3.32 | 1142.48 | 18.128 | 0.980202324 | 0.01232557 | 0.8 | 43.198164 | 64.3533307 | $\pm$ | 16.0581026 | 1072.55551 | $\pm$ | 267.635043 |
| 14/6/30 | 2/22/1997 18:27 | 4.32 | 351.15 | 23.49175 | 0.961242144 | 0.01952889 | 0.8 | 117.313307 | 257.1923 | $\pm$ | 30.0058367 | 4286.53833 | $\pm$ | 500.097279 |
| 16/6/30 | 2/23/199718:27 | 5.32 | 354.69 | 3.51175 | 0.977825063 | 0.01981092 | 0.8 | 125.106358 | 41.0013623 | $\pm$ | 28.5509199 | 683.356038 | $\pm$ | 475.848664 |
| 18/6/30 | 2/24/1997 17:55 | 6.30 | 1183.22 | 676.628 | 0.944357032 | 0.01174416 | 0.8 | 56.987049 | 3168.70626 | $\pm$ | 54.8114041 | 52811.7709 | $\pm$ | 913.523402 |
| 19/6/30 | 2/26/1997 10:23 | 7.98 | 361.29 | 1.05175 | 0.996881208 | 0.02009561 | 0.8 | 156.601721 | 15.3710794 | $\pm$ | 35.2738597 | 256.184656 | $\pm$ | 587.897662 |
| 20/6/30 | 2/27/1997 8:18 | 8.90 | 320.17 | 1.3952 | 0.984377803 | 0.02031843 | 0.8 | 83.0257464 | 19.6181911 | $\pm$ | 38.9652843 | 326.969851 | $\pm$ | 649.421405 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3/6/45 | 2/18/1997 20:18 | 0.40 | 311.23 | 5.0552 | 0.955597659 | 0.01987032 | 0.8 | 41.8336191 | 35.8157033 | $\pm$ | 19.9256008 | 596.928389 | $\pm$ | 332.093347 |
| 7/6/45 | 2/19/1997 18:32 | 1.32 | 1270.22 | 45.728 | 1.087046113 | 0.01323222 | 0.8 | 33.1483662 | 124.56619 | $\pm$ | 12.892616 | 2076.10317 | $\pm$ | 214.876933 |
| 10/6/45 | 2/20/1997 18:16 | 2.31 | 1094.72 | 62.168 | 0.934404918 | 0.01191454 | 0.8 | 41.7795191 | 213.445096 | $\pm$ | 16.7247652 | 3557.41826 | $\pm$ | 278.746087 |
| 10/6/45 recount | 2/20/199718:16 | 2.31 | 1135.64 | 31.088 | 0.972927424 | 0.01225772 | 0.8 | 66.0971843 | 168.861868 | $\pm$ | 25.0977349 | 2814.36447 | $\pm$ | 418.295582 |
| 12/6/45 | 2/21/1997 18:32 | 3.32 | 1143.44 | 9.008 | 0.982009107 | 0.01234497 | 0.8 | 43.1703439 | 31.9572745 | $\pm$ | 15.8148172 | 532.621242 | $\pm$ | 263.580287 |
| 14/6/45 | 2/22/1997 18:27 | 4.32 | 367.15 | 380.5952 | 0.996244427 | 0.01987958 | 0.8 | 57.2804793 | 3692.1527 | $\pm$ | 93.0585975 | 61535.8783 | $\pm$ | 1550.97662 |
| 14/6/45 recount | 2/22/199718:27 | 4.32 | 354.85 | 286.8752 | 0.991192776 | 0.0199404 | 0.8 | 76.6471578 | 3723.90647 | + | 100.831386 | 62065.1079 |  | 1680.52309 |





[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ KML refers to Key Marine Laboratory located on Long Key, wells were within 10 meters of Class V sewage injection well.
    ${ }^{2}$ Flow rate measured by a General Oceanics flow meter with low flow propeller.
    ${ }^{3} \mathrm{BD}=$ Below Detection.
    ${ }^{4}$ Sample taken directly from seepage meter port. Seepage meter covers an area of $0.25 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$.

