

Florida Water Resources Monitoring Council

July 25 & 26, 2007
Tallahassee, Florida

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ellen McCarron, Florida Department of Environmental Resources (FDEP), CHAIR

Chris Brooks, Florida Dept. of Agriculture and Consumer Services (DACCS)
Robert Brown, Alternate, Florida League of Environmental Resource Agencies (FLERA)
Paul Carlson, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) (By phone)
Graham Lewis, Northwest Florida Water Management District (NFWFMD)
Linda Lindstrom, South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD)
Mark Rials, Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD)
Steve Richter, Saint Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD)
Gail Sloane, Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP)
Bob Vincent, Florida Department of Health (DOH)
Meagan Wetherington, Suwannee River Water Management District (SRWMD) (Day 1)

There were no observers; however, two members of the newly formed Metadata Expert Panel were present: Brian Turcotte, SFWMD, and Jay Silvanima, FDEP as well as Kate Muldoon, FDEP, alternate to Gail Sloan.

DAY ONE: WEDNESDAY, JULY 25, 2007

AGENDA REVIEW AND MEETING GUIDELINES

Council Chair, Ellen McCarron, opened the meeting and welcomed everyone back. She then turned the meeting over to the Facilitator, Janice Fleischer.

Ms. Fleischer began by reviewing the Agenda (**Exhibit A**), Meeting Guidelines and Public Comment Guidelines. For meeting Reports, exhibits, Guidelines and other Council documentation go to <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/coastal/WaterMonitoringCouncil/>. She then noted that one member of the Council was attending by phone. She explained that this is generally against the Council's policy which favors "in person" meetings; however, at the current time there are no funds for Council member travel so Mr. Carlson was allowed to attend by phone.

LIAISON UPDATE

Council Liaison, Steve Wolfe, delivered his Liaison Update (**Exhibit B**). Mr. Wolfe explained the current budget negotiations and how they are affecting FDEP sponsored activities; reviewed the most recent activities of the Gulf of Mexico Alliance (GOMA) and the Florida Oceans and Coastal Resources Council.

With regard to the State budget: Oceans Council funds are presently still in the budget but everything else is uncertain; FDEP is not certain when this Water Resources Council will have access to the Oceans Council monies, so everything is on hold. This Council has a tight deadline so how much time will be lost waiting for this to resolve itself must be considered. Currently, some state agencies have no travel expenses for their Water Resources Council members.

With regard to the Oceans Council: The last meeting was cancelled because a quorum could not be achieved (vacation time of year). The July meeting was to set next year's priorities, so that task was not accomplished; now they are among those awaiting the budget to be resolved before continuing to meet.

With regard to the GOMA: The "All Hands" meeting was held in St Petersburg, Florida, July 10-12, 2007. For more detail on those activities, see Exhibit B. Mr. Wolfe explained that there are five (5) states involved in this Alliance, as well as supporting federal agencies. There is a workshop planned in September to select standard chlorophyll methods for use across the Gulf. A set of core water quality parameters oriented around nutrient monitoring was standardized at the St. Pete meeting, but chlorophyll was judged too complex to complete in the time available at the meeting. This effort is focused on helping the Gulf states develop coastal nutrient criteria. Mr. Wolfe explained that this is a large and difficult issue that will benefit from the shared effort offered by GOMA.

GOMA and the Gulf of Mexico Coastal Ocean Observing System (GCOOS) are planning a Harmful Algal Bloom Workshop in November, 2007 to design a system for monitoring of red tide in the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. Wolfe will begin to send all GOMA documents and meeting information to this Council by email. He informed this Council that there will be workshops to design the studies and monitoring beginning in the next couple of months.

As a final announcement, Mr. Wolfe reviewed the formation of the Metadata Expert Panel (MEP) in connection with this Council's Metadata Strategy. He explained that Council Member, Steve Richter, had been selected as MEP Chair, after a solicitation of the Council members to see if anyone (in addition to Mr. Richter) desired to Chair the MEP revealed no other volunteers. Mr. Wolfe asked for Council consensus on approving Mr. Richter as EAP Chair.

Expert Panel: Steve Richter, Chair 10 members present participated in the ranking.

Consensus on Steve Richter as Chair of Expert Panel

5	4	3	2	1
10	0	0	0	0

Consensus achieved

METADATA STRATEGY - REVIEW AND REFINE

The current status of the Council's Metadata Strategy was reviewed. Council Chair, Ellen McCarron, discussed the funding complications and options. FDEP will contract with the SFWMD to provide for metadata information collection through one of their vetted contractors. .

The first order of business was for the Council to review, discuss and refine the Metadata Strategy Table which was initiated at the last meeting. (Exhibit C). Mr. Wolfe reminded members that the important thing for refining the table is for members to consider how long it will take to get the Contractor hired before it can actually start work. Another consideration is that the SFWMD fiscal year is different from FDEP and that will have some impact on how this contract moves through the system. Another

complication is that there is uncertainty as to exactly when the Council/FDEP can move ahead with this because of the current budget holdup.

Member comments:

- 1) What are ramifications of moving the contract back to October 1, 2007?
- 2) Do we still want to have the public review whether the Contractor has completed its work or not?
 - a) Contractor contract could be ready for October 1, 2007.
- 3) What kind of budget was allowed for this effort (metadata strategy-IDM) from Oceans Council?
 - a) Approx. \$200K
 - b) This includes public process as well as surveys, data crunching, and public workshops
- 4) This could end up being a really substantial effort, if surveys do not have a good response then your data is minimal.
- 5) Steve Wolfe would like to give the contractor 4 months to complete its tasks.
- 6) I don't have a very good feel for how long it will take the contractor to do this.
- 7) Anything that can be done up front would help with the contractor tasks.
- 8) There was a suggestion to have FDEP Secretary write a letter to those entities that will be getting requests from the contractor asking them to cooperate immediately.

REFINING THE METADATA STRATEGY TABLE

The Council members then went on to refine the Metadata Strategy Table. See Exhibit C with "track changes".

METADATA CONTRACTOR - PROCUREMENT OPTIONS

As the procurement options for hiring the contractor in the available time are limited (see discussion above), the Council members entered into a general discussion concerning the contractor and contracting process. The comments are reflected below:

1. Expert Panel should review the responses to the RFI that have been received in the next couple of weeks in order to prepare recommendations to Council.
2. The issue of how the four potential contractors were selected was discussed
 - a. At the last Council meeting Linda Lindstrom from SFWMD was tasked with selecting contractor from among the pre-vetted SFWMD contractors.
 - b. She has sent out the RFI and received 4 responses, the RFI was sent to all already screened and rate-negotiated contractors on the SFWMD list
 - c. The SFWMD will enter into negotiations with the contractor(s) under the terms of their contracting rules.
3. Should we officially allow the expert panel to make recommendations on qualifications for contractor in order to be selected?
 - a. SFWMD will get the Panel the costs of each contractor

Suggested process for selecting the Contractor:

1. The Expert Panel makes comments to Steve Richter on the qualifications of those firms who responded to the RFI
2. Steve Richter brings that information to Steve Wolfe, Council Liaison
3. Steve Wolfe will bring that information to the Council
4. Council given an opportunity to respond to Steve Wolfe with their comments

5. Council Member Linda Lindstrom selects the Contractor using the Expert Panel comments; she will bring a status report on selection to the Council at September, 2007 meeting.

Adoption of this process by Council:

5	4	3	2	1
3	6	1	0	0

Adopted by consensus

BREAK

Council members took a short break.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No one commented.

Note: Public comment is not transcribed. If anyone from the public desires to have his/her comments appear in the Report of Proceedings, they can submit their comments in writing on the comment cards provided at each meeting or email the Facilitator, Janice Fleischer (janice@flashresolutions.com) within the first week following the meeting.

OVERVIEW OF COUNCIL ROLE IN UPCOMING IDM SYSTEM SCOPING

This item on the Agenda was intended to be discussed at the end of the first day. However, the Agenda was revised and it was covered prior to discussions concerning the finalization of the Scope of Work (SOW) of the Contractor since it was felt this discussion would have a bearing on the SOW discussion.

The #2 legislative recommendation of the Oceans Council is the Integrated Data Management System (IDM), the first two parts of which received legislative funding: Mr. Wolfe delivered a presentation to the Council concerning the second part, Data Focus Area #2 (DFA #2) (Exhibit D).

Council Chair, Ellen McCarron, indicated that she believed Oceans Council Ex-Officio member, Sherman Wilhelm, FDACS, was uncomfortable with a proposed approach for accomplishing DFA #2. The Monitoring Council may have some input into this effort. It was decided to come back to this issue on day two of this meeting in order to have a more full discussion.

METADATA EXPERT PANEL - PANEL CHAIR'S REPORT

Council Member, Steve Richter, reported on the work of the panel. He introduced two Panel members who were in attendance at the meeting:

Brian Turcotte, SFWMD
Jay Silvanima, FDEP

METADATA CONTRACTOR SCOPE OF WORK (SOW) - FINALIZE LANGUAGE

The draft SOW for the Contractor was presented to the Council. The Council then discussed the SOW and made changes to its contents which are reflected in Exhibit E.

In addition to the changes made to the SOW, the following items were brought to the attention of the Council at the request of the Expert Panel for Council input:

1. Penalties for not finishing on time and bonuses for early completion?
2. Universe of areas of all other efforts; how can we tie into other efforts that are being done?
3. How do we make the contractor aware of other efforts?
4. Other incentives for contractors?
5. Difference in adopted versus promulgated metadata standards, i.e. using words to mean the same thing all the time
 - a. We don't want to look at analytical standards but at metadata standards
 - b. Are they peer reviewed or approved rather than independent
 - c. Have Expert Panel define the terms so you know what type of standard it is

The answers to these issues were discussed but not finalized. Options will be considered by Council Liaison Steve Wolfe and potential actions will be suggested.

PRESENTATION: NORTHWEST FLORIDA WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT MONITORING PROGRAM

Council member, Graham Lewis, NFWFMD, delivered a presentation on the monitoring activities of his agency. (Exhibit F).

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned for the day.

Day Two: Thursday, July 26, 2007

WELCOME BACK

The second day of the meeting began with a discussion of Oceans Council's Data Focus Area (DFA) #2 within its Integrated Data Management (IDM) strategy (DFA #1 is to establish a metadata standard, for which the Monitoring Council has assumed responsibility). Ms. McCarron went over the Oceans Council's DFA#2 and this Council's Charge #2:

Oceans Council Data Focus Area #2: Establish means for comprehensive management of assessment, monitoring, real-time, and historical data, including support of researchers, storage and archiving of data, and easy access to data.

Recommended 1st year actions:

1) The Department of Environmental Protection, the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, and the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, in consultation with the Florida Oceans and Coastal Resources Council and collaborating with the Water Management Districts and other stakeholders in Florida's coastal and oceans data, will identify specific shared baseline information needs and collaborate on the design of a system that will store, manage, and maintain this data. Funding requirements to implement this proposal will be provided to the Florida Oceans and Coastal Resources Council for inclusion in the FY2008 - 2009

Annual Research Plan.

Water Resources Council Charge #2: *Support development of a STORET database replacement (or other approach) as a repository for sharing stakeholder water quality monitoring data.*

Ms. McCarron believes the two charges are related and therefore the work of this Council may be impacted by and could influence the Oceans Council Data DFA#2. It is her belief that there should be coordination between the two Councils and their work.

Member Comments:

1. Ms. McCarron wants this Council to be aware of the Oceans Council work and its DFA#2.
2. Metadata standards for the State of Florida is a huge part of the information sharing effort and is directly tied to the Oceans Council work.
3. We should be doing our metadata standard work first, tell the people who are working on STORET to wait for this Council's work before going too far down the line with the new system.
4. The STORET replacement effort needs to be made acutely aware of this Council's metadata standards effort.
5. There is an issue of timelines, the STORET timeline mandate is to happen much sooner than this Council's timeline for finishing the standards effort.
6. STORET is being used by the TMDL (total maximum daily loads) group as well as with others, but we need to make sure there is detailed coordination.
7. We need to be the 'spokescouncil' for all stakeholders.
8. There is still an opportunity to keep the STORET effort apprised of the work of the Oceans Council and the Water Resources Monitoring Council and make sure it is developed with a focus on shared information.
9. Opportunity that input from users is figured into the equation.
10. Hope they are not just creating another database but that the ultimate goal is an interface.
11. We need to gather information that is useful to the TMDL efforts.
12. Someone who needs information should know what data he/she needs and make that clear.
13. All the water management district IT and GIS groups get together regularly, maybe the Chair/Liaison could address them at one of those meetings (Member Graham Lewis will find out when the next meeting is scheduled and will notify Steve Wolfe and Ellen McCarron.)

Referring back to the discussion the day before, Ms. McCarron once again expressed her concern that Sherman Wilhelm, DACS, an ex-officio member of the Oceans Council had some reservations regarding the draft strategy developed to implement the IDM strategy for the Oceans Council. Water Resources Council member Chris Brooks of FDACS expressed his opinion that Mr. Wilhelm's concerns related only to the Oceans Council Action Item #1 of the IDM Strategy which called for a workshop.

Mr. Brooks explained that FDACS collects many types of data. He suggested to the Council that one of Mr. Wilhelm's points was that without first knowing what was collected by every agency or organization operating in Florida, how could we decide what data we need? How could anyone be prepared for a workshop when we all don't even know the universe of data presently collected? Mr. Brooks presented the case for FDACS that they believe that the strategy proposed to implement Oceans Council Action Item 1 was incomplete and needed a step before the workshop to gather the information regarding data. Further, Mr. Brooks explained that this is important because it is entirely possible that unreasonable requests for data collection at a premature workshop could be made of other agencies or organizations that are not attainable due to funding, manpower and perhaps a need to serve a different client who doesn't want the data in that particular format or gathered in a particular way.

Having put Mr. Wilhelm's comments in a proper context, the discussion continued regarding the STORET effort and other coordination elements of the Water Resources Council and what exactly is expected of this Council.

It was decided that Chair McCarron and Mr. Wolfe will go to the water division and let them know more directly exactly what is happening with the work of the Water Monitoring Council and the Oceans Council, most specifically with metadata standards effort and its steps.

It was noted that it is very important to make the STORET effort aware that this Council's charge is to support the sharing of data while the STORET effort is currently just to gather data and store it. Mr. Wolfe encouraged members to share information about IDM with their agencies and entities and encourage them to consider IDM in their planning. Ms. McCarron said she thought there was a need to continue on the path this Council is taking, but there is also a need to be aware of the Oceans Council IDM and other efforts to help us determine what is needed by other stakeholders/users. Ms. McCarron expressed her opinion that workshops to get this part of IDM DFA#2 done must happen before the workshops currently scheduled for the metadata strategy. Mr. Wolfe responded by saying there are discussions underway to line up contractors to set up workshops to address this issue.

COORDINATION STRATEGY - REVIEW AND REFINE

Members were directed to their packets to review the Coordination Strategy Table (Exhibit G) which was created by a subset of the Council at the March meeting during a small-group breakout. This was an initial effort to begin to format this strategy. There was confusion about what was needed to be done with this table at this time. The group looked at the first effort of this work from the Report of Proceedings of the May, 2007 meeting and had a general discussion.

Member comments:

1. Great if you can ask someone to respond to only one survey, however if you are switching subject matter in one survey it is more difficult.
2. That is why I thought it was two separate surveys, not one.
3. If you send the same people two different surveys they often think the second survey is the same survey as the first and they don't respond.
4. What does "coordination" mean in our charge? What does the Secretary of DEP want?
 - a. No real direction on this, they just want it coordinated.
 - b. Universal management concern that monitoring is redundant, not answering questions, duplicating efforts, out of control.
5. Does the Secretary want directing as to where data collection should be happening or is there some other coordination needed?
6. We need maps but that is not the only part of the effort.
7. Do we need a central group entity that coordinates what efforts should be done?
8. Each area is doing its own data gathering on small segments; there is more value in doing things in larger sections.
9. You are being asked "how" coordination should be done.
 - a. Keep in mind coordination of fresh and coastal efforts.
 - b. We need to look at entire watersheds, we should use this type of model for the state.
 - c. How do you do that? That is the real question.
10. If you look at the core of the estuary programs and how they do it, start there.
11. Coordinate with EPA (federal).
12. The table that we first generated was this Council's first stab at these charges to us (#3 and #4).
13. Who oversees this, who is responsible?

- a. DEP has the agency responsibility but we are asking all your agencies to provide input on how best to do this.
- 14. Need to get county, state and all other entities to weigh in.
- 15. Don't see this as one effort; you need a template but then each management plan may differ from each other.
- 16. Coastal monitoring framework document is trying to do this and acknowledges that you can not successfully impose a statewide coastal monitoring program.
 - a. You need to figure out a minimum core.
- 17. You need to coordinate the coastal monitoring strategy with the freshwater effort.
- 18. Unless you are a coastal area you will not be aware of that strategy, the coastal counties are implementing both coastal and freshwater efforts.
- 19. What do you (DEP) mean when you say the efforts are coordinated? So what do you mean in our Charge 3 and 4 in coordination?
- 20. There is some regional coordination; some water management districts are not talking to the locals, etc.
- 21. Are we supposed to develop a strategy/framework for how this could be done?
- 22. We need more information from DEP on charges #3 and #4, do they want this Council to DO the coordination or to develop a method by which the coordination is done?
- 23. I think it must be done regionally with state oversight.
- 24. You have two roles:
 - a. How does this process proceed
 - b. In your individual agencies make sure it is implemented
- 25. There is a policy factor in coordinating efforts
 - a. For example, the SFWMD has mandated requirements which influence how coordinated the effort can be.
 - b. It should be scientifically based not policy based.
 - c. But we can't ignore the fact that agencies have policies that they must fulfill.
 - d. But you should be looking at your goals regularly to see if the agency goals need changing.
- 26. You need an overall design but you can't force the agencies/entities to implement that design, what you do is create the overall design and make everyone aware of it so they begin implementing it in small steps.
- 27. Each area needs to find its own niche, what works best for each region.
- 28. Coordination may be:
 - a. What is being done
 - b. What is being covered
 - c. What needs to still be done
- 29. We also need to know who is at the "helm" of the effort, in the SW area they are more coordinated.
 - a. NEP is at the helm in that region.
- 30. Couple of things that drive the process:
 - a. Recognized need
 - i. Example is Tampa Bay
 - b. Money available or in-kind services
- 31. This makes it really regionalized, you can't do the same thing everywhere.
 - a. Take your resources and set up something.
 - b. Funding is really important to any effort.
- 32. What if we go to the legislature and showed them the success stories (NEP coordination as noted above)?
- 33. It isn't only the money; it is the whole approach that needs changing.

BREAK

Members took a short break.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No one commented.

Note: Public comment is not transcribed. If anyone from the public desires to have his/her comments appear in the Report of Proceedings, they can submit their comments in writing on the comment cards provided at each meeting or email the Facilitator, Janice Fleischer (janice@flashresolutions.com) within the first week following the meeting.

PRESENTATION: DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION MONITORING PROGRAMS

Gail Sloane, Environmental Administrator, FDEP, delivered a presentation to the Council on FDEP Monitoring Programs. (Exhibit H).

Following the presentation, these comments were made by members:

1. IWRM is the status and trends program.
2. We will begin to post the meeting exhibits on the Council's website immediately following the meetings instead of waiting for the completion of the meeting report. That means the labeling of the exhibits will probably change from that of the initial posting.

REFINING THE COORDINATION STRATEGY TABLE

Prior to attempting to refine the Coordination Strategy Table previously begun, the Council felt it was important to define "coordination" as FDEP meant it in this Council's Charges #3 and #4.

The Council discussed the possibility of changing the wording of its Charges #3 and #4 and bringing this new language to the Secretary of FDEP for confirmation that they are moving in the right direction in their discussions and efforts. The proposed new language discussed appears below in italics:

Charge #3: Providing opportunities for understanding and awareness of Florida's ongoing fresh water monitoring with the new coastal monitoring network at the local, state and federal levels while encouraging mutual benefit among the stakeholders.

Charge #4: Providing opportunities for understanding and awareness and encouraging mutual benefit among Florida's state monitoring efforts with local and federal monitoring programs.

It was not decided to make this change at this time. One Council member noted that Charges #3 and #4 should be reversed in sequence because if you accomplish #4 you are a long way toward accomplishing #3. It was explained that #3 originated from the need to specifically coordinate between two state-of-Florida monitoring efforts, the existing freshwater and its pending coastal monitoring systems. Charge #4 referred to general coordination between State and non-State monitoring efforts.

After further discussion, it was decided not to define the term "coordination" in specific terms, but to use a bulleted "includes" format.

"Coordination" includes:

- collection of data from disparate programs
- identifying and reducing data gaps and duplication
- assessing opportunities for building awareness of monitoring programs
- encouraging mutual benefit among the monitoring programs
- striving to improve overall Florida resource monitoring
- cost effectiveness and efficiency

It became apparent that there was not enough information for the Council to finalize its Coordination Strategy until additional direction could be obtained by the Chair and Mr. Wolfe on what the Secretary of FDEP contemplated when using the term "coordination". Further, any strategy needs to first state the issues (problems) to be resolved in order to organize into goals and objectives. The Facilitator suggested an issue "brainstorming" session which was accepted by the Council members.

Once the issues were all collected, the Facilitator asked members to work together and put them in "affinity" groupings. Once that was accomplished, the Council gave initial Goal Statement names to each group. What follows is the result of that work:

#1: Create a collaborative culture that is resource centric.

1A Issues generated:

1. politics
2. no real political will or ongoing funding for coordination effort (freshwater, saltwater) at state/local/federal levels
3. need long term support to make this happen
4. regulatory agencies have different policies affecting monitoring requirements
5. legal mandates
6. is there a carrot? Is there a stick?
7. regulatory flexibility
8. lack of stability in programs
9. variability in local/state/federal goals
10. bottom up vs. top down

1B Issues generated:

1. determine the "why" and outcome to benefit involvement of agencies, etc.
2. maintaining interest in the effort throughout time by agencies/organizations involved
3. establish liaison with federal partners
4. what about key organizations that might refuse to participate?
5. buy in
6. need continued cooperative effort freshwater/coastal (different agencies)
7. partnerships vs. mandates
8. buy-in from all government levels and agencies

#2: Create a strategy for an oversight structure to coordinate monitoring.

Issues generated:

1. how do we address dynamic nature of monitoring
2. monitoring clearinghouse; controlling new monitoring/requests for more monitoring
3. what about review of this process? Who and when will this be evaluated?
4. what is the intended definition of "coordinate"? what is a universal definition?
5. defining roles and responsibilities
6. need to establish who can do oversight
7. creation of an oversight committee to conduct the actual coordination
8. who will be the oversight entity to make coordination happen?
9. entity to oversee coordination, who?

#3: Establish long term funding sources for coordination.

Issues generated:

1. funding for oversight
2. need funding for coastal monitoring
3. need money
4. funding
5. lack of long term dedicated funding sources
6. what about money to achieve the coordination?
7. crisis management drives funding

#4: Coordinate monitoring strategies.

Issues generated:

1. Consider monitoring methods used/sampling and analytical
2. Identify key indicators for freshwater/coastal integration
3. getting agencies to change monitoring designs to improve overall network
4. lack of standardization
5. need paradigm shifts in approach to monitoring
6. no consistent ongoing communication between state/federal/local monitoring efforts (Atlantic coast, except NERRs) unlike GOMA
7. change/update monitoring needs to better coordinate.
8. coordinate groups with common goals/needs by location/region

#5: Create a workplan for data sharing and coordination. (who, what, when, where, why)

Note: emphasize management need that the monitoring addresses

Issues generated:

1. creating a map detailing all existing current activities
2. creating a map detailing all historic activities
3. identify monitoring programs
4. need to know current monitoring networks
5. what other agencies are doing-both quality and quantity frequency
6. Inability of some agencies and organizations to deliver data in proper format
7. redundant monitoring perception
8. need to leverage existing surveys
9. need metadata
10. dealing with metadata issues
11. need sites (map)
12. perpetual update of monitoring networks necessary
13. develop mechanisms for sharing data
14. must be intra-agency review of monitoring to coordinate with outside agencies

15. what is the scope of the necessary coordination
16. defining clear monitoring objectives and key indicators
17. understanding of the needs and goals of monitoring programs
18. identify/group monitoring programs by common needs/goals
19. need goals-data quality objectives
20. Is monitoring short or long term? Event driven? Resource management or regulatory
21. identify metadata for monitoring programs
22. agreement as to what level of detail information must be shared in order to coordinate at a desired level

There was a general discussion regarding the idea of the need to clarify and compare clear goals and objectives in some monitoring programs.

1. You want to have a management need possibly meet other needs.
2. There is a need for a hierarchy of goals for the state, etc.
3. What are the unintended side effects of identifying goals and objectives?
 - o Maximizes use of data and sharing

A request was made that at the next meeting, the Council should work on its Charge #2- STORET and IDM.

EVALUATIONS

Members were reminded to complete their Evaluations.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned.
