

Florida Water Resources Monitoring Council

January 24 & 25, 2007, Meeting Two

Tampa, Florida

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ellen McCarron, Florida Department of Environmental Protection (Chair*)
Gail Sloane, Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP)
Paul Carlson, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC)
Kal Knickerbocker, Florida Dept. of Agriculture and Consumer Services (DACS)
Bob Vincent, Florida Department of Health (DOH)
Kevin Carter, Florida League of Environmental Resource Agencies (FLERA)
Graham Lewis, Northwest Florida Water Management District (NFWMD)
Megan Wetherington, Suwannee River Water Management District (SRWMD)
Mark Rials, Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD)
Linda Lindstrom, South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD)
Steve Richter, St Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD)

Alternates Present:

Kate Muldoon, Florida Department of Environmental Protection
Nenad Iricanin, South Florida Water Management District
Roberta Starks, Southwest Florida Water Management District

There were 9 observers.

*Denotes non-voting member

DAY ONE: JANUARY 24, 2007

AGENDA REVIEW/MEETING GUIDELINES

Janice Fleischer, Council facilitator, opened the meeting. In reviewing the Agenda for the day (**Exhibit A**), she explained that the Council meetings would be scheduled on the two day model of this meeting by beginning late the first day (after lunch) to allow members to travel to the meeting on the first day and would end early the second day to allow members to return home on the second day. In this way, only one night stay would be necessary. There may be occasions with an agenda that will require a longer meeting that may require a two-night stay, but those would be infrequent. Ms. Fleischer then reviewed the Meeting Guidelines (**Exhibit B**) and Consensus Rules (**Exhibit C** as corrected) adopted at the first meeting. It was pointed out that the consensus rules as presented were incorrect. The decision made at the last meeting if a vote was necessary was that a super majority (majority plus 2) of the voting members present at a meeting would be necessary to pass an item. The rules as presented indicated a simple majority. The change was made.

Ms. Fleischer then went over the sign in sheets, comment cards and public comment guidelines.

All Reports of Proceedings of the Committee, Discussion Guidelines and Committee related information, can be found either on the FDEP website at: [Steve you need to fill this in.](#)

Ms. Fleischer then turned the meeting over to Council Chair, Ellen McCarron.

WELCOME

Ellen McCarron, Chair, welcomed everyone and reviewed the charges to the Council:

Four goals were identified for the council to address in its first year:

1. Develop a list of water quality metadata standards for agencies and water management districts to adopt.
2. Support development of a STORET database replacement as a repository for stakeholder water quality monitoring data.
3. Coordinate fresh water and coastal statewide monitoring program networks.
4. Coordinate Florida's monitoring efforts with federal programs.

Ms. McCarron reminded the members of the Council that she is a non-voting member and that her primary function is to ensure that Council functions and activities are in accordance with FDEP management direction. The representative on the Council for the Florida Department of Environmental Protection is Gail Sloane. Ms. McCarron will provide briefings to and receive guidance and information from FDEP senior management as necessary and will communicate information to the Council regarding these FDEP management advisories. Ms. McCarron will also take part in the Council's deliberations, but will otherwise remain a "listener" to the input of the Council.

Ms. McCarron announced that Mike Sole is the new Secretary of the FDEP, appointed by Florida's new Governor, Charles Crist. She pointed out that Secretary Sole was a member of the FDEP senior management team that finalized the current charges to the Council.

She introduced Steven Wolfe, Council Liaison, who was unable to attend the Council's first meeting.

PRESENTATION: COASTAL MONITORING FRAMEWORK

Mr. Wolfe delivered a presentation on the different aspects supporting Florida's Coastal Monitoring effort ([Exhibit D](#)). These include this Council, the Florida Oceans and Coastal Resources Council, the Florida Coastal Monitoring Technical Advisory Group (TAG), the existing local and regional monitoring programs, and the monitoring efforts all around the state by FWC and FDEP CAMA. It was pointed out that the Coastal Monitoring Framework produced by the TAG was the result of one of the FDEP Secretarial Strategic Priorities for 2004-2007, but it was never intended to be an end result. The framework addresses an overall approach to comprehensive coastal monitoring that must now be implemented and that will require a multi-agency effort. He indicated that the FDEP is looking for commonalities among the representatives on the Council. While it is understood that each agency has its own priorities and projects and would not be asked to change those, the purpose of this effort is to assist in coordinating water monitoring efforts among the agencies to collectively meet the goals and objectives of the proposed framework. It is further thought that this process of interagency collaboration for coastal monitoring goals will also have potential benefits for freshwater monitoring programs and the charges of the Council.

PRESENTATION: UPDATE ON FLORIDA OCEAN'S COUNCIL 2007-2008 RESEARCH PLAN AND RESOURCE ASSESSMENT

Following the presentation on Coastal Monitoring, Mr. Wolfe, who is also the liaison for the Florida Oceans and Coastal Resources Council for FDEP, delivered a presentation on the Oceans Council's 2007-2008 Research Plan and its Resource Assessment. (Exhibit E)

He explained that the Oceans Council was created two years ago to recommend funding priorities for oceans-related research. The Oceans Council came up with their "3M"s, those areas that form tools that support research: mapping, monitoring and modeling. They identified four major areas for funding: the administration of the Oceans Council (including support of the Research Review and the Resource Assessment), Integrated Data Management (IDM), Coastal and Ocean Observing Systems and Coastal and Ocean Research.

He explained that if the Water Monitoring Council makes recommendations on aspects of IDM such as metadata standards, and those proposals address the Oceans Council's concerns, the Oceans Council would probably adopt them. He went on to say that it is likely an easier task to establish metadata standards than to implement them and the Legislature is going to want to see a single set of standards. Mr. Wolfe explained that data availability and exchange was very important to all Oceans Council members and the Legislature understands this important element.

Further, monitoring is a high priority for the Oceans Council. Mr. Wolfe reviewed the monitoring objectives of the Oceans Council. There are many federal monitoring efforts already ongoing and FDEP'S Office of Coastal and Aquatic Managed Areas (CAMA) and the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) already have monitoring around the state. This points out that there is high interest in monitoring at many governmental levels which is why the work of this Water Resources Monitoring Council is so important.

Mr. Wolfe explained that the Oceans Council had a charge of making a Resource Assessment list of natural and human resources, where they are located and their status. He showed a demonstration of their proposed Resource Assessment that was created by the Oceans Council for the legislature .

PRESENTATION: SOUTHWEST FLORIDA WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT (SWFWMD) MONITORING PROGRAM

Catherine Wolden, Environmental Scientist at the SWFWMD was first to present (Exhibit F). Following Ms. Wolden's presentation, Council members made the following comments:

- 1) Pesticides are not monitored for groundwater monitoring program.
- 2) Within the upper Peace River, trace metals are not monitored
 - a. There are nine wells in that network
- 3) Manatee County does its own sampling.
- 4) Is data stored on the web or accessible to public?
 - a. No, but if you contact Catherine she will get the information to you
- 5) Is the SWFWMD data in the Florida Water Atlas(a USF website atlas).

The second presenter was the District's Mary Szafraniec who discussed the Surface Water Improvement and Management (SWIM) Program at the SWFWMD. (Exhibit G) . Following this presentation, members made the following comments:

- 1) Will this information be accessible to the public?
 - a. That is the plan, in about a year from now.
 - b. It is a ten year project
- 2) Are you thinking in terms of a statewide renovation and are we thinking of a ten year time frame?

The third presenter was Veronica Crow, Environmental Section of the SWFWMD, who focused on diagnostic and project effectiveness studies (Exhibit H).

Member comments following the presentation:

1. What were the Biological parameters?
 - a. Project COAST: rivers study, UF goes out annually and does vegetative sampling along with some biota and puts it together to see what is happening with the vegetation. This has been done for about the last four years.
2. Does the WMD put their information into STORET themselves or does each project manager do it?
 - a. It can be done either way.
3. Have you looked at other methods of chlorophyll analysis other than spectrophotometric?
 - a. Each project manager decides on how to collect the data
4. There is a battle over whether to use the corrected or uncorrected chlorophyll.
 - a. St. John's River WMD does this sampling as well.
5. On freshwater side of DEP monitoring, they will be monitoring for uncorrected chlorophyll.
 - a. There are six chlorophyll parameters; we should get all of them.
6. Is groundwater data going into STORET?
 - a. No only surface water data due to STORET not currently having a lot of the standard groundwater-related data fields such as well casing size, etc.
7. SCADA= Supervisory Control And Data Acquisition: is this a new development that would be helpful for Council to use as something for a state standard?

PRESENTATION: SOUTHWEST FLORIDA REGIONAL AMBIENT MONITORING PROGRAM (RAMP)

Keith Kibbey, environmental laboratory manager, Lee County Division of Natural Resources, delivered a presentation of the southwest Florida Regional Ambient Monitoring Program (RAMP). (Exhibit I) Initially, this was a direct spin-off of the Tampa Bay National Estuary Program (NEP) but has expanded to include much of SW Florida. It is a group of many labs that work together to gather data.

Member comments:

1. FELQS: Florida Environmental Laboratories Quality Systems: they get together to set standards; look at audits.
2. With regard to standardization of auditors; not all auditors are created equally.
3. What would you tell a group of ten labs from elsewhere: why are you successful?
 - a. Originally it may not have been so voluntary; but now it is.
 - b. Provides a forum for discussing concerns and problems across labs.
4. Did RAMP settle on a common Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS) data base ?
 - a. No, they did not.
5. The presenter advocates the use of the STORET system because of its high profile as a central repository for the state; however, he added that it is not the easiest system with which to work. His main point was that data standardization for reporting is the key.
 - a. If an organization must keep going with different data sets; better to stay with one data set and not keep changing around, federal STORET at least will listen to possible additional parameters if not already on there.
6. Total Minimum Daily Load (TMDL) Program is not a data monitoring program, they are data miners.
7. Although there are some citizen monitoring efforts that are used by the TMDL program, citizen monitoring may have lower quality assurance (QA) and therefore would not necessarily be of prime use in developing the state's list of impaired waters.
8. Why did larger agencies leave the picture?
 - a. Not sure that they did, it may just be that they had smaller labs and may have closed them at times.
9. You need to have enough labs to make it work, if too few participate then it doesn't work.
10. One of the great strides that was made in the Tampa Bay NEP program was providing a single place to find all partners' data pertaining to Tampa Bay. The SW RAMP uses and builds on this same approach.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment was invited. Two people spoke.

Rob Brown, Manatee County

Keith Kibby, Lee County

Note: Public comment is not recorded. 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.

OPEN MEMBER DIALOGUE

Members had an open discussion. Subjects discussed were varied, but included the possible expansion of the membership of the Council and the status of the previous monitoring workshops held several years ago.

1. It was decided to begin this Council small and then, if suggested and approved, expand the scope of it duties.
2. We should do a small tangible list of objectives on a statewide comment.
3. Get list of all folks who participated in the previous Monitoring retreats to add to interested parties list
4. Let's put previous retreat minutes on website.
5. Are RAMP meetings open to the public?
 - a. No public notice, not a sunshine issue, but they are open to the public.
 - b. RAMP has no website.
6. We might want to do a stakeholder analysis to see if one or two additional members could be added.
7. First we would have to go to new Secretary Sole and ask if any additional members should/would be considered.
8. We may need to break into workgroups that could include outside participants to assist rather than making the Council bigger.

EVALUATIONS/ADJOURN

Ms. Fleischer reminded members to please fill out their Evaluations. The meeting was then adjourned.

DAY TWO, JANUARY 25, 2007

CORE VALUES EXERCISE

At the last meeting, Ms. Fleischer introduced the concept of visioning to the Council. At this meeting the Council will be developing a list of their “core” values and then drafting a Vision Statement. To begin, Ms. Fleischer directed members to their meeting packets for the definition of a “value”: A principle, standard, or quality considered worthwhile or desirable. She went on to ask the members to think about the following questions

1. What will coordination and cooperation look like?
2. What single words would you use to describe the successful effort of the Council?
3. What single words would you use to describe how things are different from the current state of water monitoring?

Members then did a “brainstorming” exercise suggesting values for the vision they will be developing. After values were listed, each member was given five “dots” to put next to the five values they thought were the most important or “core”. This exercise resulted in the following list.

VALUE	COMBINED WITH	DOTS
1. Quality		7
2. All Encompassing	45, 61	N/A
3. Cost Effective		1
4. Connectivity	44	N/A
5. Native		0
6. Cutting Edge	34, 50	N/A
7. Flexible	36, 56, 58	N/A
8. Consistent	51	N/A
9. Accountability	10	N/A
10. Scientifically defensible	9	N/A
11. Feasible		0
12. Sustainable		4
13. Common database		0
14. Accessible		6
15. Responsive	24	0
16. Value added		0
17. Collegial	32, 33	N/A
18. User Friendly	20, 19	N/A
19. Understandable	20, 18	1
20. Intuitive	18, 19	N/A
21. Applicable	22, 25, 30	N/A
22. Relevant	21, 25, 30	1
23. Authoritative	49, 35	N/A
24. Timely	15	N/A
25. Useable	21, 22, 30	N/A
26. Well orchestrated	28	N/A
27. Planned	29, 31, 37, 40, 55	4
28. Coordinated	26	2
29. Logical	27, 31, 37, 40, 55	N/A
30. Necessary	21, 22, 25	N/A
31. Well defined	27, 29, 37, 40, 55	N/A
32. Professional	33, 17	N/A

33. Cooperative	32, 17	4
34. Innovative	6, 50	1
35. Recognizable	49, 23	N/A
36. Dynamic	56, 58, 7	N/A
37 Well thought out	27, 29, 31, 40, 55	N/A
38. Inclusive		4
39. Informative (Provides guidance/direction)		1
40. Simple	27, 29, 31, 37, 55	N/A
41. Funded/supported		2
42. Affordable		0
43. Efficient		0
44. Integrated	4	2
45. Holistic	2, 61	N/A
46. Leveraged		0
47. Mandated		0
48. Legally defensible		0
49. Accepted	23, 35	0
50. World class	34, 6	N/A
51. Standardized	8	5
52. Transferable	57	N/A
53. Multi-purpose		0
54. Quantity		0
55. Practical	27, 29, 31, 37, 40	N/A
56. Adaptable	58, 36, 7	2
57. Portable	52	1
58. Expandable	56, 36, 7	N/A
59. Non-redundant		1
60. Focused		0
61. Comprehensive	45, 2	6
62. Original		0

The values marked in blue on the above table were listed as the potential core values. The first five were adopted immediately since they had the highest ranking. The remaining three (planned, cooperative and inclusive) all had 4 dots. The members decided to combine “cooperative” with “inclusive” and adopt the following as their core values:

1. Quality
2. Accessible
3. Comprehensive
4. Standardized
5. Sustainable
6. Planned
7. Cooperative (was combined with Inclusive at this juncture)

VISIONING EXERCISE

Once the Council had adopted its core values, Ms. Fleischer went on to introduce the next exercise of creating a Vision. She had the members read the Elements (**Exhibit J**) and Definition (**Exhibit K**) of a Vision. She then had the members break into two groups and instructed the groups to draft a Vision Statement. Once drafted by the two small groups, these two statements would then be combined and edited by the Council to create a final Vision Statement for the Council. Each small group was given a worksheet to assist them in their drafting. (**Exhibit L**) The groups worked on drafting their statements for the next hour.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Prior to finalizing the Vision, public comment was invited. No one spoke.

Note: Public comment is not recorded. 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.

VISIONING STATEMENT FINALIZATION

Group One Vision Statement Draft:

There is a cooperative and sustainable and inclusive water resources monitoring program that uses standardized methods and a comprehensive database accessible to all users and populated with data of known quality. Or : which meets the quality assurance criteria.

Group Two Vision Statement Draft:

There is improved awareness and understanding of all state monitoring. Communication, cooperation, connectivity and coordination are facilitated. A cooperative user-friendly access tool about statewide programs is communicated and supported. This effort encompasses all fresh and salt water resources information. Monitoring program attributes provide an understanding of the purpose and scope of monitoring. Data is of known quality, scientifically defensible and accessible to different audiences. Guidance is available for new monitoring programs. Communication exists with and supports existing portals such as RAMP and the USF Water Atlas. There is highly visible access to information which facilitates awareness among all programs.

Working together as a full group, Council members talked through their edits and finalized the following Vision:

Florida Water Resources Monitoring Council Final Vision Statement:

The Vision of the Florida Water Resources Monitoring Council is to better protect, preserve, manage and restore water resources in the state of Florida by coordinating water resource monitoring and by sharing information. A user-friendly access tool about statewide water resource monitoring programs is implemented and supported. This effort encompasses fresh and salt water resources information. Standardized monitoring program attributes provide an understanding of the purpose, quality and scope of monitoring. Data and metadata are accessible to all users. There are links to other water resource information portals. Communication, cooperation, connectivity and coordination have improved awareness and understanding of water resource monitoring throughout the state.

Ranking of Vision Statement

5	4	3	2	1
3	7	0	0	0

Consensus achieved.

The Council then took a break for lunch.

OPEN DISCUSSION- ELEMENTS OF COUNCIL CHARGES AND NEXT STEPS

Ms. McCarron addressed the Council regarding the next session of the meeting. She asked the Council to have an open discussion on the four Objectives for the Council; funding for next fiscal year and next steps now that they had developed a Vision Statement.

Steve Wolfe added that the Council can come up with their own ways to accomplish these goals.

Comments:

To begin, Council members wanted to take advantage of the presence of Keith Kibby (RAMP) and ask him some questions:

1. He indicated he is now more comfortable as a representative of RAMP that what the Council will be doing won't be expecting RAMP to change course.
2. You may want to ask the other counties, cities, etc. to come together and put their data in a RAMP like entity, rather than dictating how data is put in.
3. Chair: With regard to the TMDL program, we might want to have a representative of that program speak to the Council and have Council understand how to be helpful with that program. How do they describe their data elements? What is the TMDL program doing now to replace STORET? Our (the Council) role is bigger than the TMDL program.
4. Would RAMP members be willing to comment on Council's recommendations for data elements?
5. Mr. Wolfe: no intent to change any agency/entity current programs; just to get data more able to be collected in a standardized form.
6. Mr. Kibby: if you want something simple to be done, you would probably get good buy-in pretty quickly.
7. We might want to start a survey approach. RAMP could be helpful with this effort.
8. Recounting the history of how the data was collected, etc. very difficult, but instituting new current methods would be much easier.
9. We need to look at how we do things from this point forward; if we can get historical information that is great, but realize this might not be feasible.
10. Just do initially what is easy to do re: collecting data.
11. This Council needs to be very compatible with the desires of the Oceans Council. You want to have your metadata standard establishing effort to also address the needs of the Ocean's Council.
12. The handout (Exhibit M) was from the National Water Quality Monitoring Council's taskforce on Data Elements.; it is intended to be a resource for the states for standardizing metadata. It is not intended to dictate to states how to standardize.

13. I like the survey approach and we need to discuss what we are going to survey.
14. To Mr. Kibby re: sharing of data: Answer by Mr. Kibby: every time you change what you are doing there is a significant cost to making the change and many of us don't have the time to get around to doing what is necessary to get the information to you. I personally don't mind STORET but it isn't the method I use for my own data use. Each entity has its own qualifiers, but sharing data is cumbersome if you have to meet each entities' qualifiers. The more you put in the longer it takes. You always want to know that the data you provide will really be used if you are going to the effort to send the data in. Mr. Kibby's laboratory uses a LIMS system.
15. How would you estimate the effort you use (Kibby): he puts into two files and then it combines data, then needs to be entered into STORET.
16. Regarding RAMP. How much interaction do you have with other disciplines? Lab data varies more than anything because most labs use the same Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), except when you get a new lab person in, sometimes that causes a problem getting that person on board. We do share and work together with those who are putting together other data information from other disciplines.
17. Important to know what the purpose of the data collection was so one knows what use the data is. Is there something special about the data that would keep someone from wanting to use it?
18. Audits differ and are not uniform as they should be.
19. DEP has an SOP but there is no certified auditing system.

Mr. Kibby was thanked for his attendance and willingness to respond to questions. The Council went on to discuss its four charges as previously stated earlier in this Report.

1. Since much of our mission is data sharing, we might make a representative from one COOS entity a member of the panel.
2. Use a technical committee for each objective and have them report back to the Council.
3. On the first two objectives, we should look at Oceans Council IDM piece. See Page 42 of the Ocean's Council's research plan and decide if we want to make a suggestion as to how this is done.
4. We may want to adopt the first two objectives of the Oceans Council as this Council's objectives. See #11 below.
5. We should do a survey of the metadata standards used by national and state level entities.
6. Objective two: Presentation by Impaired Waters program re: STORET and their data storage plans.
7. FWRI presentation on metadata and status of Geospatial Assessment of Marine Ecoregions (GAME) project: Harry Norris
8. Ocean observing systems groups: what they are doing re: metadata (e.g., NOAA).
9. Like to hear from the National Water Quality Monitoring Council re Objective 4. Many states are involved in the national level. **Look into the status of this.**
10. At some point we should do a survey of all potential stakeholders.

11. No 4 above: Say why we want to adopt the first two Oceans Council objectives. Timeliness for number one.
12. Objective Three: clarify the scope of the monitoring objective.
13. Objective Four: Need a comprehensive list of current federal programs. Federal may put together a national coastal monitoring program; but right now there is no federal funding.
14. Objective Four: don't create any conflict with federal efforts that are on-going.
15. Objective Four: Make sure we incorporate the non-coastal fresh water federal efforts.

EVALUATIONS/ADJOURN

Ms. Fleischer reminded members to complete their Evaluations and the meeting was adjourned.

COMMENT CARDS RECEIVED AT THE MEETING

*"The Florida Coastal Ocean Observing Systems (FICOOS) Consortium website:
<http://www.marine.usf/flcoos> for further information and questions, please email Jyotika I. Virmani, Ph.D.
FICOOS Coordinator at jyotika@marine.usf.edu"*
