

-DRAFT-
WRAP Emissions Forum
Meeting Summary
April 18, 2006
Mission Palms Hotel, Tempe, Arizona

Attendees:

Name	Affiliation
Alice Edwards	Alaska DEC
Lee Gribovicz	Wyoming DEQ
Bob Downing	Maricopa Co. AQD
Roy Doyle	Colorado APCD
Dennis Schwehr	WEST Associates
Bob Palzer	Sierra Club
Jenifer Pond	ITEP
Eric Raisanen	Maricopa Co. AQD
Ken Cronin	NTEC
Brenda Harpring	Nevada DEP
Heather Lancour	NMED
Bob Gruenig	NTEC
Tom Moore	WGA/WRAP
David Holoman	EH Pechan

Phone participants during parts of the meeting included:

Jim Carlin, MT
Don Arkell, WESTAR
Jim Wilson, EH Pechan
Sarah Kelley, ITEP

Meeting Summary:

The main project of the Emission Forum is the Emission Data Management System (EDMS) for managing WRAP emission inventories, and this EDMS EI Management system was the focus of this meeting. The Post-Beta Quality Assurance review of the EDMS revealed problems with the functionality of the system; with incomplete solutions to “fixed” bugs, and with bugs classified as enhancements rather than contractual requirements as originally scoped for the project. The Emission Forum has been tracking the EDMS contractor's performance on the EDMS project and has requested that Pechan correct the problems in an expeditious manner. Pechan responded with a February '06 draft of a 30/60/90 day Action Plan (March, April & May 26th target dates) for addressing the forum concerns (plan revised as an April 7, 2006 draft for this meeting).

David Holoman of Pechan began with a Progress Report on the Action Plan, going through outstanding issues, and noting that a good deal of the problems are now addressed. He also gave

an EDMS operational report, a demonstration of the DBA Administrative functions of the system and a discussion of potential system enhancements.

After the contractor left, the Emission Forum discussed how to best manage the EDMS given shrinking resources and current issues. Pechan has a contract through the end of 2006, but the forum has only funded operations through the first quarter. A decision was made to continue funding for at least 6 more months, to allow time to evaluate Pechan's response to resolving the bugs found during the testing of the system. The forum would work on a scope of work for on-going EDMS operations that could be used in future contracts or solicitations.

Meeting Details

Emission Data Management System

David Holoman, Pechan's EDMS database administrator, presented updates on a number of topics related to the EDMS development and operations. Items covered included 1) Progress on the 30/60/90 day Action Plan, 2) EDMS operational report for the past quarter, 3) a system demo and 4) a discussion of potential enhancements to the system.

EDMS Action Plan

Pechan prepared an April 7th EDMS revision to an earlier February draft of a 30/60/90 Day Action Plan. David Holoman reviewed Pechan's responses to Emission Forum concerns in the following areas.

- SMOKE/IDA ad hoc reports (data is available in the NIF Version 3.0 Export format which complies with the RPO Data Exchange Format for emissions data)
- Standard reports (Top 10 reports had occasionally given more than 10, or less than 10 results – David explained that there might be more than 10 results if there is a tie in emission values. And if there are only two values, that's all that would be presented. They are putting in explanation for these issues.)
- Security (its theoretically possible for a data owner upload data from another jurisdiction, but because of judicious allocation of the data owner status, this is unlikely. All data loads must be looked at by the DBA, so likely to catch a problem)
- FIRE data (the fire data is in place as a point source, and the storage in EDMS is being explained to the FEJF – there is a double count elimination plan to eliminate the wildfire, prescribed fire (& etc) SCC's from area source user data, in favor of the WRAP's modeling fire data)
- Section 508 compliance (this issue revolves around users who may not have advanced computers and thus unable to recognize color distinctions - we concluded that the WRAP is committed to full access, where anyone who is having trouble should contact the DBA for personalized assistance)

- Dashboard (the dashboard now appears satisfactory)
- GIS Functionality (the concern revolves around speed and layers - there now is a warning about slow reaction for the massive data load from point source maps; and there will be a secondary road GIS layer)
- JPG files (graphics can now be saved by all users)

EDMS Operational Report

David Holoman noted that EDMS has been in essentially continuous service since the January 17, 2005 start-up, and it has had six production inventories, along with one training inventory. He noted that UNC is providing the hosting, and he showed extensive usage through user statistics of registration numbers and web visits.

Regarding the budget, late last year Pechan started to predict a shortfall funding for 2005. The WRAP reacted with supplemental funding, and the 2006 Budget generated a pot of money available for the historical cost range around \$15,000 per month. Although there is a 2006 contract in place, there is no agreement to operate the system as after April 1st, so Pechan can't write contracts with the sub-contractor (UNC). This issue is on the agenda for resolution later during this meeting.

David noted that DBA functions include:

- incorporation of new data sets
- answer user questions
- quality control
- participation in steering committee meetings/interaction
- newsletter
- DBA & monthly progress report
- web traffic report
- user training
- project website management

Regarding data access capability, there are three levels. The General User has access to all standard reports, while a Data Analyst can generate Ad Hoc reports of NIF or SMOKE/IDA format. A Data Owner can actually upload data to the system.

David reported that typical monthly charges (last 6 months) are:

Pechan DBA	\$ 11,940
Subcontractor i ² k ²	\$ 1,500
<u>UNC-hosting</u>	<u>\$ 2,920</u>
Total	\$16,360

EDMS Enhancements

Training is one area where David Holoman suggested we need continued emphasis. There have been a couple of training sessions for the General User & Data Analysts, but there hasn't been a session for Data Providers in a couple of years.

He also suggested that color coded emission data maps would provide a good tool for user understanding. Other potential enhancements are:

- Non Point Data Management System
- Enhance GIS Display for specific sectors or units (ie. just display EGUs)
- Low Graphics Version (offering for users using dial-up access)
- Method for Biogenic/Dust Feedback Loop (agency feedback for inventories created by the RMC)
- Capability to Geo-code Certain Area Source Categories (ie. feedlot, oil&gas, etc)

There was a question raised about the use of a FireFox Browser with the EDMS. The EDMS is not currently compatible with FireFox. At this time there is no plan to address this. The Forum could decide to look at this if desired as another enhancement.

Tribal Data Reconciliation

ITEP and the TDDWG have been undertaking a project to review Tribal data in the EDMS. Data is being imported and then will be reconciled with other jurisdictions, primarily this is for point and area sources. The first step is to get the data into the system and available. The second step would be to do the detailed work that is needed to look and make decisions on whether there is an overlap. There was extended discussion on how the WRAP will bring the Tribal Emission Inventories into use without overlapping state data. Pechan was requested to "fix" the problems revealed by the Tribal data review. The forum wants to work together with the TDDWG to make sure there is funding for tribal data reconciliation as tribal data comes into the system over time.

Scope of Work for Ongoing EDMS Operations

David Holoman left the meeting before the Emission Forum began discussions of the Scope of Work (SOW) for ongoing EDMS operations. Roy Doyle had put together a strawman proposal for a SOW on future operations of the EDMS. The forum recognizes that the WRAP funding is shrinking and that we must find efficient, cost-effective ways to operate the infrastructure systems that have been developed, including the EDMS. The forum really wants to find a way to pay only for "necessary" operations, and not end up paying \$10 or \$15K per month without having excellent accountability for the work completed. We want to find the best strategy to obtain the minimum service necessary for normal and repetitive operation, with all other services paid on a time & effort basis. Roy's draft attempts to categorize the EDMS tasks in one of these bins, as either on-going or intermittent specialty service.

Tom Moore informed the forum that David Holoman had provided notice that he is leaving Pechan at the end of this month, thus we they must find another DBA to continue operations.

We also found out that the Database Analyst, Donna McKenzie also is no longer working for Pechan as of a little while ago.

The WRAP “owns” the code, but there is no documentation of how that code was compiled. It was decided that it is critical to get from Pechan, the necessary documentation and details of the Oracle table structure, database relationships, and etc.

There was discussion on whether it would make any sense to shut down the EDMS and focus on getting the necessary information so that we're comfortable. We have a contract through the end of the year, but we haven't provided funding as yet for operations beyond the first quarter. It was pretty much agreed that we need to fund Pechan for a “few” more months. If we funded 3 months at an average fee, then we would put about \$45K more in to the project. If the Emission Forum funds the project for six months, then we might have time to get the necessary code documentation, ensure bugs have been fixed, and make a decision as to whether to begin a new solicitation for system operations. The Forum concluded to authorize funding for this extended six month period.

Action Items:

1. The work group looking at EDMS Operations and Maintenance will work with Pechan to make decisions on the most relevant reports for tracking EDMS operations. We want to make sure we get what we need in an efficient way and can reduce the time/burden at the contractor for producing reports. This workgroup will have its next call on May 10th.
2. The EDMS Steering Committee will continue to work with Pechan on the overall EDMS operations and the 30/60/90 day plan. The next Steering Committee call will be May 1st, with another call likely in late May.
3. Bob Downing will work on better describing the EGU problem and will discuss this with Pechan so that a proposal can be made on how to fix the problem. We need to see what it will take to fix or whether it makes more sense to revert back to the state/tribe/local data. An idea was proposed to have one more review by data providers before solidifying as version 2.0 of Emission Inventory for 2002.
4. Pechan will deliver the “Design as Delivered” report shortly after the end of May.
5. Tom Moore will work with WGA to get another 6 months of funds into the Pechan contract.
6. Tom Moore will continue to coordinate with Pechan on the remaining fire EI issues.
7. Forum needs to continue to track the inventory schedule including a review of the 2002 inventory and the loading of 2018 inventories.

Next Meeting: It was agreed that the next Forum call should occur at the end of May.

The forum agreed that it would be important to meet face to face again in July. It was suggested that the Emission Forum may be able to hold their meeting just after the FEJF meeting in Portland. The Emission Forum meeting would be in Portland on July 12-13.