

**bold italicized text is used to indicate items requiring attention before next meeting*

Florida Water Resources Monitoring Council (FWRMC)
Public Meeting of Statewide Council – November 16, 2011

Attendees (X indicates present):

Agency	Primary Members	Webinar
DACS	Chris Brooks	
DOH	Bob Vincent	X
FWC	Amber Whittle	X
DEP	Kate Muldoon	X
NWFWMD	Nick Wooten	X
SRWMD	Megan Wetherington	X
SJRWMD	Aiša Cerić	X
SWFWMD	Roberta Starks	X
SFWMD	Linda Crean	X
USEPA	Dave Melgaard	
NOAA	Cathy Tortorici	X
USGS	Rafael Rodriguez	
FLERA-NW	Keith Wilkins	X
FLERA-SR	Chris Bird	
FLERA-SJ	Vince Seibold	X
FLERA-SW	Rob Brown	X
FLERA-S	Susan Markley	X
Volunteer Monitoring Programs - FL LAKEWATCH	Mark Hoyer	X
Agency	Alternate Members	Webinar
DACS	Kal Knickerbocker	
DOH	Patti Anderson	
FWC	Paul Carlson	
DEP	Rick Copeland	X
NWFWMD	Graham Lewis	
SRWMD	Louis Mantini	
SJRWMD	Steven Richter	X
SWFWMD	Mark Rials	
SFWMD	Julianne LaRock	X
USGS	David Sumner	
FLERA-SJ	Michelle Leigh	X
FLERA-SW	Kelli Levy	
FLERA-S	Rob Robbins	
Agency	Council Chair	Webinar
DEP	Gail Sloane	X

**bold italicized text is used to indicate items requiring attention before next meeting*

Agency	Council Liaison	Webinar
DEP	Stephanie Sunderman	X
Agency	Guests	Webinar
FWC	Laura Yarbro	X
DEP	Trina Vielhauer	X
SJRWMD	Tom Mirti	X
SJRWMD	Nathan Johnson	X
Alachua Co.	Jim Myles	X
Escambia Co.	Taylor Kirschenfeld	X
Palm Beach Co.	Edmund Gibson	X
City of Jacksonville, Env. Quality Division	Betsy Deuerling	X
US Army Corps of Engineers - Jacksonville District	Susan Kemp	X
England, Thims, and Miller	Amy Tracy	X

Introduction

Gail Sloane (GS) welcomed everyone to the meeting, and indicated that the three workgroups (Action Plan Review, Monitoring Catalog, and Salinity Network) that formed during the Aug 30-31, 2011 Statewide FWRMC meeting have had their first meeting and will now update the Council on their efforts.

Action Plan Review Workgroup

Steve Richter (Steve R.) gave the update from the Action Plan Review Workgroup.

(For a more detailed report from the Action Plan Review Workgroup meeting, please see the archived materials from the meeting on 11/08/11.)

- The existing action plan took a long time to develop, so there was no great interest in trying to make significant changes. Instead, the workgroup decided to highlight a few key items in the action plan as priorities for the current Council to focus on.
- Action Issue 1 (improve knowledge of monitoring activities) was identified as a priority.
 - o Main action item for this issue is creating and maintaining the monitoring catalog
 - o Encouraged Monitoring Catalog Workgroup to develop a timeline for completing tasks, with the goal of developing a product in 12 months.
- Action Issue 2 (improve coordination among monitoring entities) was also identified as a priority.
 - o Major action item for this task is formation of Regional Councils
 - o Suggestion was made to form core group of 3 representatives (one each from state, WMD, and local organizations) in each region to lead organization effort for their respective Regional Council.
 - o GS will identify key DEP contacts in each of the five regions, to participate in the Regional Councils
 - o Representatives from WMDs and FLERA on the statewide FWRMC should be encouraged to participate in their respective Regional Councils
 - o Need to develop a short survey for core groups to use for gathering contact information from organizations in their regions
 - o The Regional Councils will also play an important role in populating the monitoring catalog, by serving as a point of contact and encouraging organizations to submit their information.
- Support Issue 1 (promote and coordinate stewardship among local, state, and federal monitoring programs) was identified as important, but perhaps better suited as a priority to implement within the Regional Councils, once they have been formed

**bold italicized text is used to indicate items requiring attention before next meeting*

- Action Issue 3 (increase data comparability and consistency of monitoring strategies) was identified as an important issue, but it was suggested that the current FWRMC wait until progress has been made on other items before focusing on this issue
- Potential additions to the Action Plan should include explicitly stating that ground water (GW) monitoring efforts will be included in all Council efforts

Questions / Discussion:

GS asked the Action Plan Review Workgroup leaders, Steve R. and Rob Brown (Rob B.), if they were planning to meet again. Rob B. responded that he doesn't see a need to meet again regarding the Action Plan, but he would like to move forward with the effort to start the Regional Councils at the next face-to-face meeting.

GS suggested that this workgroup and other interested persons start another workgroup to act as a Planning Group for the Regional Councils. GS suggested that the Planning Group could consist of the core group in each region and could help to develop agendas and coordinate interaction among Regional Councils. The RAMP (Regional Ambient Monitoring Program) in southwest FL could be invited to speak and/or participate to share their experience with regional coordination. Rob B. agreed, but suggested having a face-to-face meeting as the first meeting of the Planning Group.

Anyone who is interested in participating in the Planning Group for the Regional Councils should notify Stephanie Sunderman (SS) at stephanie.sunderman@dep.state.fl.us, to be added to the email distribution list.

GS noted that it is important to encourage all types of organizations to participate in the Regional Councils (e.g. federal, state, local, regional, and volunteer groups, tribal representatives, universities, consultants, and planners). GS indicated that she has begun obtaining contact information from organizations involved with the DEP BMAP (Basin Management Action Plan) program.

Monitoring Catalog Workgroup

Kate Muldoon (Kate M.) gave the update from the Action Plan Review Workgroup.

(For a more detailed report from the Monitoring Catalog Workgroup meeting, please see the archived materials from the meeting on 10/26/11.)

- The workgroup reviewed and evaluated 13 online mapping catalogs and atlases based on their user interface (ease of navigation, tools available, etc), their ability to search metadata for program/project information, and their ability to support uploading of stations and metadata by individual entities.
 1. NOAA Gulf of Mexico (GOM) Digital Atlas - <http://gulfatlas.noaa.gov/>
 - Attractive user interface, but limited tools
 - Static / not very interactive
 - Ideal for linking to other projects' interactive stand-alone websites / applications
 2. EPA My Environment - <http://www.epa.gov/myenvironment/>
 - Attractive user interface
 - Limited metadata and searchability
 - Data uploaded through STORET / WQX
 3. USGS Water Data Discovery - <http://water.usgs.gov/data/>
 - Attractive overview map
 - Unknown if other organizations can add / submit data
 4. USGS SOFIA (South Florida Information Access) - <http://sofia.usgs.gov/>
 - Very comprehensive and easy to navigate
 - Extensive metadata available, but not easy to search
 - Projects are not linked together well (can't view all stations on one map)

**bold italicized text is used to indicate items requiring attention before next meeting*

- Many data providers, but unsure how data/information is uploaded
- 5. Gulf of Mexico Ecosystem Portal – <http://ecowatch.ncddc.noaa.gov/catalog/gom>
 - Limited search and navigation options
 - Many data providers, but unsure how data/information is uploaded
- 6. SECOORA (Southeast Coastal Ocean Observing Regional Association) Biological and Habitat GIS - http://ocean.floridamarine.org/biohab_gis/
 - Attractive overview map and navigation
 - Limited metadata search functions/information
 - Many data providers (through SECOORA consortium), but unsure how data/information is uploaded
- 7. FWC GAME (Geospatial Assessment of Marine Resources) - <http://ocean.floridamarine.org/GAME/Viewer.htm>
 - Possibly not currently being updated – replaced by FWC MRGIS? (***Amber Whittle will send Kate M. information regarding which online mapping websites are being actively maintained by FWC/FWRI.***)
 - Other organizations can add / submit data, but upload access is maintained by FWC
- 8. FWC MRGIS (Marine Resource Geographic Information System) - <http://ocean.floridamarine.org/mrgis/>
 - Limited navigation / search options and metadata available
 - Other organizations can add / submit data, but upload access is maintained by FWC
- 9. DEP MapDirect (STORET focus) - <http://ca.dep.state.fl.us/mapdirect/?focus=storet>
 - Many navigation options / tools available (can be overwhelming at first)
 - Currently no searchable metadata available
 - Many types of data available from many data providers, but upload access is strictly maintained by DEP and data must have complete FGDC metadata
- 10. SRWMD Water Data Portal - <http://www.mysuwanneeriver.com/index.aspx?NID=345>
 - Attractive user interface
 - Limited search functions and metadata available
 - Other organizations cannot add / submit data
- 11. SWFWMD Water Management information System - <http://www.swfwmd.state.fl.us/data/wmdbweb/disclaimer.htm>
 - Map interface not available at startup – must first go through search options (with some options for searching metadata)
 - Other organizations cannot add / submit data
- 12. Water Atlas (FL Center for Community Design, USF) - <http://www.wateratlas.usf.edu/>
 - Very comprehensive and easy to navigate (no user drawn polygon search tool, but has tools for searching by water body, watershed, county, etc)
 - Some metadata available, but no ability to search by metadata
 - Participating organizations can upload information themselves
- 13. Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan (CERP) - http://www.evergladesplan.org/pm/projects/cerp_gis.aspx
 - Susan Markley indicated that other, more current CERP online mapping applications exist.
 - Susan Kemp (Susan K.) indicated that CERP has just completed developing an integrated ecological database that has a spatial component, and they are now looking to link to other databases. ***Susan K. will present the latest CERP online mapping application at the next Monitoring Catalog Workgroup meeting.***

**bold italicized text is used to indicate items requiring attention before next meeting*

- Highlights from evaluation of existing online catalogs and data portals
 - o USGS Water Data Discovery, USGS SOFIA, DEP MapDirect, SRWMD Water Data Portal, SWFWMD WMIS, and Water Atlas all have features that may be desirable to include in the Monitoring Catalog.
 - o Water Atlas has the most desirable features, but finding adequate funding to join the Water Atlas project may present difficulties.
 - o User interface
 - Should be focused around a spatial component so that information isn't strictly tied to projects, and documentation can continue even if sampling organization changes
 - Partitioning monitoring information into historical vs. current (active vs. inactive stations) is desirable to facilitate more targeted searches and increase information retrieval speed
 - May want to provide links to organization's websites where data can be downloaded, instead of incorporating all data into the Monitoring Catalog
 - o Metadata searchability
 - Need to determine level of metadata necessary to include in the Monitoring Catalog. Desired elements include: data quality objectives (DQOs), period of record, sampling frequency, station locations, organizations responsible for sampling and data management, links to organizations' websites and data
 - Need to address the level of detail to include with information related to analytes / analyte groups
 - May want to include other types of data, such as flow data from USGS
 - o Ability for individual entities to upload metadata
 - Need to have a strategy to maintain continuity in data collection when sampling responsibility is transferred from one agency to another
 - Need to develop strategy to information management that allows organizations to upload and update their own data as frequently as needed (to reflect program changes, etc.)
 - Want to include as many organization as possible (not only FWRMC participants)
 - o Funding
 - High maintenance cost may be a problem with using a structure with individual pages for each program (like USGS SOFIA)
 - Possibility to dovetail with Gulf of Mexico Alliance (GOMA) catalog of monitoring programs application that is currently being developed by the University of Miami
 - South Atlantic Alliance (SAA) also has plans for developing a monitoring catalog
- Issues for Next Workgroup Meeting
 - o Research SJRWMD data retrieval tools
 - o Discuss potential collaboration with other existing / developing efforts
 - o Discuss strategy for presenting Monitoring Catalog effort to upper management
 - o Develop priorities and timeline / goals for products
 - o Visit NOAA GOM Atlas site to consider how monitoring catalog effort could potentially collaborate by adding a plate that links back to the interactive monitoring catalog
- The group has seen a lot of different efforts related to building catalogs and data portals, but there is still the need for a united, comprehensive effort that shows where all of the monitoring efforts are in Florida.

Questions / Discussion:

Amber Whittle asked if the Water Atlas covers areas other than Tampa Bay and Charlotte Harbor. Kate M. indicated that it covers several other counties, and that Jim Griffin (Water Atlas representative) had indicated that they would like to expand the project to cover entire regions. Such collaborative efforts may also help to lower the cost for each of the participating entities.

Rob B. noted that the Water Atlas has data from many providers (USGS, STORET, counties, and other organizations), and that tier 2 metadata (required for TMDL) is requested from all data providers.

**bold italicized text is used to indicate items requiring attention before next meeting*

Rob B., Steve R., and Roberta Starks (Roberta S.) also noted that using Water Atlas eliminates the need for data providers to enter data into multiple databases because the Water Atlas can upload to STORET if an organization submits data directly to the Atlas, or download from STORET if an organization submits data directly to STORET.

Rick Copeland (Rick C.) asked if the Water Atlas has GW data available. Kate M. indicated that the Atlas currently has USGS GW data and is beginning to gather GW data from other organizations.

Roberta S. and GS noted that incorporating GW data into STORET is still in development.

Steve R. asked if it would be possible to use an application that has already been developed, host it at DEP or another organization, and give other organizations the opportunity to add their information to it. Kate M. and GS indicated that further research needs to be done regarding both getting permission to use an application that has already been developed, and finding an organization able to host the database of information that the Monitoring Catalog would contain. Kate M. indicated that it would not be possible to borrow the Water Atlas application, although we would be able to use the information available from the Water Atlas in another application.

Kate M. asked for clarification regarding how the NOAA Digital Atlas could be utilized, and SS and Cathy Tortorici (Cathy T.) indicated that there is not currently an option to include additional interactive features in the NOAA Digital Atlas plates.

Mark Hoyer (Mark H.) added that it is important to clarify the scope of the project to better understand the effort required. The Monitoring Catalog is intended to contain metadata (information about monitoring stations and their associated programs and organizations conducting sampling), not the actual data. Kate M. agreed and added that we are only interested in “who is doing what, where” with the possibility to link to where the actual data are available.

Mark H. added that the cost for adding statewide LAKEWATCH data to the Water Atlas was about \$10,000, and suggested that we look into getting a cost estimate to use the Water Atlas for the statewide Monitoring Catalog, since most of the background information has already been developed.

Cathy T. asked if the Monitoring Catalog would include an element that indicated how the data should be used. Kate M. indicated that there hasn't been much discussion of that topic because the catalog won't contain actual data, and suggested that DQOs could be used to inform data use decisions.

Linda Crean (Linda C.) indicated that SFWMD has a lot of information (data and GIS layers) available, although they do not have an online mapping application. ***Linda C. will summarize / present the SFWMD information that may help to inform the Monitoring Catalog effort at the next Monitoring Catalog Workgroup meeting.***

Salinity Network Workgroup

Rick Copeland (Rick C.) gave the update from the Salinity Network Workgroup.

(For a more detailed report from the Salinity Network Workgroup meeting, please see the archived materials from the meeting on 10/26/11.)

- Reason for forming the Salinity Network: Several reports that have come out in the past few years showed increasing salinity in GW and declining GW levels.
- Federal, state, and WMDs have all agreed or tentatively agreed (pending knowledge of the workload) to participate, and Rick C. has now begun contacting counties, to gauge interest and resources available.
- Next meeting will be December 14 from 10:00am-12:00pm (webinar registration link: <https://www2.gotomeeting.com/register/558455298>).
- Agenda will include discussion of developing indices for salinity and water levels.

**bold italicized text is used to indicate items requiring attention before next meeting*

- Have started to compile list of existing resources and information (stations, analytes, etc.).
- Next steps will include developing mission statement and framework document.

Questions / Discussion:

Susan K. asked to be included in the Salinity Network Workgroup, as a representative for CERP.

Susan Markley (Susan M.) asked if the Workgroup will be including surface water (SW) salinity issues in estuarine areas. In south FL, many restoration efforts with long term monitoring components are related to restoring natural salinity patterns in estuaries that are affected by alteration of flows or discharges from Lake Okeechobee. Rick C. indicated that including SW is still up for discussion, and ***suggested that Susan M. discuss SW salinity monitoring needs during the next Salinity Network Workgroup meeting. GS suggested that a new workgroup (or perhaps the Regional Councils) may be able to address those issues.***

Gulf of Mexico Alliance (GOMA) Update

Kate Muldoon (Kate M.) gave an update on GOMA Water Quality Priority Issue Team (WQ PIT) activities

- Many overlapping concerns between FWRMC and GOMA WQ PIT (monitoring catalog, data comparability, coordination among participating organizations)
- The GOMA WQ PIT held a Monitoring Forum in Pensacola on November 1-3, 2011.
 - Goal was to share information about what monitoring is being done in the Gulf of Mexico (GOM), discuss the priorities and needs for future monitoring in the GOM, and begin developing a monitoring framework for the GOM.
 - GS gave a presentation on WQ monitoring in FL using much of the information that was presented at the August 30-31, 2011 FWRMC meeting.
 - Discussed common monitoring efforts and common obstacles to conducting long term monitoring, data comparability, methods for storing and sharing data / information, and reporting at multiple scales.
 - Developed recommendation for long term monitoring priorities (would possibly receive funding from Deepwater Horizon oil spill penalty funds).
 - o 1st Priority = use the existing GOMA interagency coordination structure to ensure the necessary actions are taken to coordinate funding and monitoring elements (design, sampling, laboratory, data analysis, data management, reporting).
 - o 2nd priority = monitoring that supports nutrient management and reduction efforts
 - o 3rd priority = monitoring that supports human health issues (coastal pathogens, harmful algal blooms, and mercury in fish)
- More information on GOMA is available on their website (<http://www.gulfofmexicoalliance.org/index.php>).

Questions / Discussion:

Bob Vincent (Bob V.) added that Alyssa Dausman also spoke at the Monitoring Forum regarding the draft GOM Restoration Task Force recommendations for GOM monitoring. Cathy T. added that the final GOM Restoration Task Force strategy is expected to be released on 12/4/11. Cathy T. also added that a separate science workgroup document has been compiled, to provide a detailed outline structure that comprehensively addresses long term monitoring and adaptive management in the GOM.

Discussion of logistics for next statewide FWRMC meeting

- Previous polls indicated a preference for holding the meeting as two half days (afternoon of day 1, morning of day 2).
- Next meeting could be held in Tampa / St. Petersburg.
- FWC / FWRI and SWFWMD both volunteered to host the meeting at their offices.
- There was a request to choose the SWFWMD location to facilitate ease of parking / meeting access.

**bold italicized text is used to indicate items requiring attention before next meeting*

- ***The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for February 21-22, 2012 at the SWFWMD Tampa service office in the governing board room, with webinar access available for those unable to travel to Tampa.***

Discussion of Potential Agenda Topics

Draft Agenda Topics

- Workgroup updates
 - o Monitoring Catalog
 - o Salinity Network
- Regional Councils
 - o Brief discussion of logistics / organizing FWRMC Regional Councils (Planning group will meet to discuss details on 2/22, after the statewide FWRMC meeting concludes.)
 - o RAMP (Regional Ambient Monitoring Program)
 - o DEP BMAP (Basin Management Action Plan) linkage to Regional Councils
 - o FLERA (FL Local Environmental Resource Agencies)
- Presentations about current monitoring efforts
 - o NOAA
 - o CERP (Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan)
 - o USGS
 - o SWFWMD
 - o DEP Watershed Monitoring Section
 - o FGS ground water projects
 - o Volunteer monitoring efforts
 - o Estuary programs management plans
 - o Water Atlas
 - o Other local organizations?
- Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill
 - o Deepwater Horizon oil spill summary / update
 - o NRDA funding update
 - o Discussion of forming workgroup to share information about event specific response communication & coordination

GS suggested having fewer topics, with more time for discussion, based on comments received from last meeting's evaluations.

Susan M. suggested adding an agenda item for next meeting to address the need to get a better feeling of what monitoring efforts are going on in south FL, and what data / metadata cataloging efforts are currently underway with CERP (Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan). South FL ecosystem restoration efforts will be of use to Monitoring Catalog and Salinity Network efforts.

Susan K. suggested adding presentations from other federal agencies such as US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the National Park Service (NPS).

Roberta S. suggested adding presentations from WMDs. ***GS nominated Roberta S. to give a presentation on current SWFWMD monitoring efforts.***

GS suggested prioritizing presentations from groups in the region where the meeting will be held, and possibly adding more presentations from local groups and volunteer groups.

Nick Wooten (Nick W.) suggested that the Planning Group for the Regional Councils could be formed before the next statewide FWRMC meeting, so that they could start developing the questionnaire to use for gathering information from local groups. ***GS nominated Rob B. to be the leader for the Regional Council Planning Group.*** Rob B. suggested postponing the first meeting of the planning group until they could meet in person at the next statewide FWRMC meeting. ***GS and SS suggested having the***

**bold italicized text is used to indicate items requiring attention before next meeting*

Regional Councils Planning Group meeting after the statewide FWRMC meeting concludes (early afternoon on 2/22/12).

GS asked for volunteers / nominations to give presentations on current federal monitoring efforts during the February 2012 statewide FWRMC meeting.

- ***Susan K. volunteered to give a presentation on CERP monitoring efforts***, but indicated that she may have to give the presentation remotely. Susan M. suggested that the presentation include some basic background information on recovery, restoration, and the various roles and participants in the CERP efforts.
- ***Cathy T. volunteered to find an appropriate person to give a presentation on NOAA efforts***, possibly giving a presentation similar to Chris Sinigalliano's presentation at the GOMA Monitoring Forum.

Rob B. suggested that FLERA, RAMP, and the Estuary Programs give presentations at the Tampa meeting because they are all involved in collaborative efforts in the southwest region.

Mark H. indicated that he could give a presentation on volunteer monitoring efforts.

GS indicated that she would invite a representative from the Water Atlas to give a presentation.

GS indicated that she would find a DEP representative to give a presentation about some of the current monitoring efforts that include activities in the southwest region.

GS indicated that she could invite DEP representatives to give a summary of the monitoring that occurred as part of the response efforts to the Deepwater Horizon oil spill (mostly in FL panhandle). Steve R. asked if there was any ongoing monitoring related to the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. GS indicated that it has been curtailed.

Some dissatisfaction with monitoring efforts for the Deepwater Horizon event response was expressed, regarding coordinating baseline sampling efforts through NRDA, but relying on individual organizations' (counties, etc.) resources for many response efforts. ***GS indicated that she would invite representatives from the DEP Coastal and Aquatic Managed Areas Division, who were involved with the coordination effort, to give a presentation or discuss the effort.*** Rob B., GS, Kate M., Laura Yarbro (Laura Y.), and Roberta S. expressed interest in starting a dialog to develop a strategy for communication and monitoring coordination during future event specific response efforts. Laura Y. indicated that Harry Norris had already worked with the US Coast Guard to compile a plan for the response side of the effort, but the NRDA side of the effort has not been addressed. Laura Y. also suggested developing an introduction / training document to orient new sampling entities to the chain of custody and QA processes required for the NRDA / response efforts. ***GS suggested that a workgroup could be formed to facilitate developing the strategy and other related materials.***

Questions / Public Comments / Open Member Dialog

GS indicated that a Co-Chair for the statewide FWRMC has not yet been selected, and asked that participating agencies send contact information for volunteers / nominations to SS.

Amy Tracy asked if there was any additional information available regarding the larger regional efforts (GOMA, SAA, etc.). GS indicated that there will be additional GOMA updates at future FWRMC meetings. ***GS will ask a SAA representative to give an update during the next meeting***, but the SAA may be too new to provide regular updates. More information on the SAA is available on their website (<http://www.southatlanticalliance.org>).

Mark H. asked what boundaries will be used to delineate the areas covered by each of the Regional Councils. GS indicated that the WMD boundaries will be used.

**bold italicized text is used to indicate items requiring attention before next meeting*

Meeting Evaluations

Satisfaction with workgroup updates:

- The format was effective. (5 votes)
- The format was not effective. (1 vote)

Suggestions for improving the format for giving workgroup updates:

- It seemed like there was not enough pertinent information to share, and that the meeting should have been scheduled for a shorter block of time. We need to look and move forward rather than doing so much review.
- Presenting Workgroup updates using PowerPoint (even just simple bullet format slides), rather than narrative updates only, would be helpful to those attending via webinar.
- Future meetings should focus on current priority goals identified by the Council – monitoring catalog, salinity workgroup efforts, and establishing Regional Councils.

Questions / comments for workgroups to consider:

- The Council should focus on developing an action plan (item) to strategize a centralized repository for all qualified data collected in the state for surface and ground water. A repository can begin receiving any new data and older existing data can be included as the resources are made available to convert and insert.

Suggestions for changes to draft agenda for February 2012 meeting:

- Set specific time allotments for each presentation
- May have too many topics
- Focus more of the February meeting and future meetings on working on goals identified by the Council. Workgroups are productive, but input from the entire Council is needed to make continued progress.
 - o Identify participants for Regional Councils so coordination and contact lists can be developed. Use RAMP program as template for Regional Councils and start developing questionnaire or survey for Regional Councils to distribute.
 - o Make primary focus of meetings working on Council goals and consider reducing regional monitoring presentations. The regional monitoring presentations are interesting, but will be more useful for potential Regional Council meetings.

Other comments / suggestions:

- Some organizations have no budget to travel for FWRMC meetings. Continue to have webinar access for participants unable to travel.