

**FY2013 Water Data Exchange (WaDE)  
Project/EN Grant Recipients Conference Call**

**Minutes – January 8, 2013, 3pm MST (2pm PST, 4pm CST)**

**Attendees:**

WSWC - Sara Larsen

Texas CEQ - Jurgen Koch (Grant Manager / Project Manager), and TCEQ Legal/Contract Team

Idaho DWR – Linda Davis, Michael Ciscell

Washington ECY - Ann-Marie Sweeten

Oklahoma WRB - Kent Wilkins, Lindy Clay

Oregon WRD - Ken Stahr, Ken Smith

**Roll Call, Minutes and Action Items:** Sara took roll for the attendees on the phone and welcomed everyone. She also went over the minutes and Action Items from the group's September 2013 meeting. The minutes were approved by the group. Sara said that many of the Action Item documents had just been delivered via email and that they needed review by the group.

**Steering Committee:** The group reviewed the draft steering committee charter document. Sara stepped through the document, explaining the highlights concerning voting members, monthly meetings, how members will vote, committee adherence to EN Grant terms and conditions and Texas' state statutes, as well as minutes practices. Sara asked if the attendees had any immediate comments and question regarding the draft charter, and would the group be willing to offer their membership nominations at this time. One question was whether Sara could be a committee member on behalf of one of the states, but as she would be co-chair and maintain a vote for the WSWC, she did not think that would be feasible. There were no immediate questions or objections to the draft charter and each state's attendees nominated a primary and secondary voting member for the steering committee. At this point a group member asked whether Utah and/or New Mexico would be discussed. Sara noted that a discussion about Utah was on the agenda and that they could discuss it now.

**Utah Grant Partner Status:** Sara told the group about other states that were interested in plugging into the WaDE project, but wanted to start the tasks sooner or coincident with the EN grant partners. This included Utah, Wyoming, New Mexico and Nebraska, with Utah being the first. For the most part these states had not asked for any additional resources to do the deployment, except for Utah. The UT Division of Water Resources wants to proceed with the WaDE deployment tasks and was dedicating staff time to accomplish this as soon as possible, but had asked for financial assistance to maintain server capacity and a database license from their centralized IT department. The total they were requesting was about \$9,000, a relatively small portion of the grant's total funding. Sara explained that, as these pilot states would be the first to go through the deployment, they would be able to work through a lot of the system "bugs" for the partners and document their "Lessons Learned." The use of some grant funding to assist them with their purchase would provide a valuable return on investment to the partners. Jurgen pointed out that these funds would not be taken out of the funding allocated to the

states, but would be taken from either TCEQ's allotted funds or WSWC's. Sara noted that she and Jurgen thought the easiest way to allow Utah to go forward would be to invite them to be a grant partner, similar to the existing partners. Sara asked the group if they would be willing to incorporate Utah into the grant partnership. Several members agreed to this proposal and Sara asked for any objections. There were no objections to the proposal.

**TCEQ Legal Requirements:** Sara opened the first of several other documents that were sent to the group before the meeting. Jurgen explained the first document: a Texas Payee ID number form. He asked that attendees fill out and send the form to him, and that this was a pretty straightforward document. The next document was the template legal contract document. The PDF version sent to the attendees is the full, comprehensive version, while the Word file is a smaller subset of the whole for customization of the contract with the individual partners. Jurgen advised that each state work with their legal person to customize the Word file to their specific needs. The TCEQ contract team used their own grant obligations with the Exchange Network as a template for the language in this document. Each state will have different tasks, so each contract needs to be specific for that partner. The TCEQ legal team suggested that naming the contract or legal representative for the state be an action item for the next meeting. A question was raised about whether the states would be inputting their tasks and costs into this contract. Jurgen indicated that yes, that would be a good thing to incorporate into the document. If there were any problems or any questions about terms etc., being able to talk to the legal person would be the best way to address these.

The third document under review was a short summary of costs. Jurgen noted that "Indirect Costs" were included and hoped that wouldn't be an issue. Oklahoma indicated that they would like to review whether they would need to bill for indirect cost. Sara asked for an example of what these might be. Jurgen and the legal team indicated that they covered things like rental of space, utilities, overhead, etc. He indicated that if this was a problem for any states, he and TCEQ would be willing to go back to the EPA and see if there was any recourse for them. Jurgen went over the format for the grant activities list. States should provide some language that indicates what they will be doing for the project. Partners should explain how they would accomplish the task with the grant funding. TCEQ would then give the go-ahead for the work. Jurgen said to start with the proposed grant activities (PGA) and that would get the legal requirements started. Sara agreed to send out a more detailed tasklist and timeline with the meeting materials, and that she would be available to answer questions about those tasks with any partners that needed assistance developing a PGA.

**EN 2014 Conference:** Sara noted how the EN conference had been moved from May to Feb., and unfortunately it was unlikely that the contracts would be in place in time for any of the partners to attend and then bill their grant pool. She and Jurgen had been able to get an abstract into the conference organizers and Jurgen and Tony Willardson (WSWC's executive director) would be giving a presentation. A group member asked if the presentation would be made available. Sara said that yes, they would definitely give the presentation to the group and that typically the conference was recorded and shared online. Jurgen noted that the EN may return to an annual schedule, so the next conference may be sooner than 2016.

**Wrap up:** Ken Smith asked for a copy of the current version of the WaDE SQL database. Sara said she would post this on the group’s meeting material webpage. Lindy Clay also noted that she and Kent had new email addresses. Sara said she would fix this in the agendas and in future emails. Sara thanked the group and noted that the next meeting for the steering committee would be in February. Jurgen asked that that be held before the EN conference, the week of the 25<sup>th</sup>.

**Action Items:**

	Description	Assignee
1	Review the Draft Steering Committee Charter and send any comments/change requests to Sara and Jurgen	All partner agencies
2	Provide contact information for legal or contract representatives within each state agency that can interface with TCEQ on customizing the template legal contract.	All partner agencies
3	Minutes and meeting materials, including the detail tasklist and WaDE SQL database backup file, to be posted on the grant partners’ webpage	WSWC
4		
5		
6		
7		