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

Minutes – July 28, 2014, 1pm MDT (12pm PDT, 2pm CDT)

Attendees:

WSWC - Sara Larsen

Texas CEQ - Jurgen Koch, Pat Robarts, Gayle Stewart

Idaho DWR – Michael Ciscell

Oklahoma WRB - Lindy Clay, Kent Wilkins

Utah DWRe – Dave Cole

Oregon WRD – Ken Smith, Ken Stahr

Roll Call, Minutes and Action Items: Sara took roll for the attendees on the phone and welcomed everyone. Some technical issues needed to be overcome for the first few minutes. As there was a quorum of the Steering Committee in attendance, the minutes from the June meeting were approved. Action items were reviewed, including modifying the Grant Agreement, creation of Proposed Grant Activities (PGA) template and using the master tasklist to fill in the PGA.

TCEQ Legal Documentation Questions: Sara solicited any questions about the Grant Agreement. Ken Smith asked whether TCEQ had received their Texas Identification Number (TIN) form and other documents. Jurgen said that they probably had, but he hadn't had time to review them. They would check. The next step for Oregon would be to review the Grant Agreement and schedule a time to meet with TCEQ.

Review of PEL and PGA: Michael asked about an email he'd sent in July requesting the Personnel Eligibility List (PEL) and PGA. Sara showed the draft PEL on the screen and Jurgen explained that these were new documents that still needed some revision before they could be sent out to the group. He also explained that there was some confusion about the PGA, Grant Activities Description (GAD), Quality Assurance Release Form (QARF) and Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP). He had asked EPA representatives to clarify whether any grant sub-recipients must supply a QARF or QAPP. On the call, they indicated no, that only one QARF and/or QAPP would be required from the lead agency. He is hoping to get that in writing. He is also seeking more clarity about indirect costs. For this reason, all the language regarding QARFs and QAPPs in both the Grant Agreement and the draft PGA will be removed. The typical procedure for TCEQ for partner situations is for them to send a PGA to the partner and the partner would respond with a GAD and a QAPP. For the purposes of this partnership, the PGA and GAD will be one document, and no QAPP is required. Sara asked to clarify the steps so far: 1) to review the Grant Agreement and work with TCEQ to develop an acceptable version, 2) fill out the PEL, 3) after TCEQ sends out the PGA template, fill it out, 4) compile all materials into a contract package and sign. Lindy asked about the timeline for the development of an Oracle version of the database. Sara said that USGS' CIDA staff were reviewing the SQL version to see if it is something they could replicate in Oracle for the WSWC, but that she would begin to update the Oracle version in the meantime in case they decided not

to help. She estimated she could have this ready by mid to late fall. She asked Lindy if they had a specific timeline to work on WaDE and she said that yes, they could work on this fall and so they wanted to do that.

Deployment with Wyoming: Sara gave an update on the process of Wyoming getting the WaDE services deployed. She said they'd been able to set up the data base and get the web services running fairly quickly, but that their remaining task was to transfer their native data to the WaDE database. They'd been able to do some of this work, but not in time for a demo at the summer council meeting. Jurgen asked if they were flowing data. Sara said that they had the system working internally, but wouldn't make it public facing until their data were transferred to their satisfaction. She also mentioned a recent change to the way that WaDE supports GIS access. Instead of supporting only lat/long coordinates, instead WaDE is now enabled to link to a web feature service for the specific data type and would include a feature ID to access the specific feature. This expands the GIS support to points, lines and polygons, while minimizing the data retrieval time for the user. There were several questions about including the spatial data as an initial XML return. Sara said that the WFS approach was useful in that users could get at the spatial data if they wanted to, but pages of polygon-point coordinates would not be included in that initial return, which would speed the retrieval process. There were no objections to using the approach at that time. Ken Smith mentioned that they already had WFS stood up and would this be sufficient. Sara said yes, they would just need to include the WFS address in one column and the corresponding feature ID in another. Michael asked about Wyoming flowing data and that he recalled that they use Oracle. Sara said that when referencing Wyoming, she was referring to the State Engineer's Office, which uses SQL Server; however, the Development Commission uses Oracle. Most states have the issue of having two or three different agencies that oversee WaDE-targeted data.

Wrap up: Sara asked the states to work with TCEQ to get contracts in place before attempting any work so that the partners could get started and start flowing data. The process of getting the contract revised was straightforward for WSWC. Jurgen said that they would start to schedule appointments with Utah and WSWC. Sara said that WSWC was on track to sign soon, so maybe a meeting with Idaho would be better. The partners agreed to have another meeting in early September, after Labor Day.

Action Items:

	Description	Assignee
1	Review TCEQ legal contract and modify as needed AND set up one-on-one appointments with TCEQ's legal team (Pat Robards)	All partner agencies
2	Finalize a template PGA document	TCEQ
3	Use the PGA template and master tasklist to fill out a PGA	All partner agencies
4	Get the QARF/QAPP issue resolved with EPA in writing	TCEQ
5	Get clarification on 'Indirect Costs' with EPA (in writing?)	TCEQ