

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

Minutes – June 29, 2015, 10am Mountain (9am PT, 11am CT)

Attendees:

WSWC - Sara Larsen

Texas CEQ – Susannah Kosty, Gloria Castillo, Pat Robards

Idaho DWR – Michael Ciscell, Greg McNeil, Glen Gardiner

Oklahoma WRB – Lindy Clay, Kent Wilkins

Oregon Water Resources Dept. – Ken Smith

Washington DEQ – Ann-Marie Sweeten

Roll Call, Minutes: Sara took roll and welcomed the steering committee. The group approved the May meeting minutes. Lindy recommended adoption with Michaels seconding.

Updates from Partners: Michael Ciscell gave an update for IDWR – they are beginning to map the data using the WaDE Data Exchange Template (DET). He is walking through each row and adding IDWR columns and descriptions to that. They will then script the transfer of data from their enterprise databases to the WaDE database. Ken joined the call. Ken gave an update. Their GAD/PEL is awaiting signature, he then received an email from Gayle on an updated GAD document. Lindy gave an update – they are working on the GAD development and should be able to expedite the signing as soon as that is ready.

GAD Format Changes: Sara talked about how the early GAD versions had tables for salaries and benefits, but didn't allow for easy changes or updates in staffing, etc. WSWC requested that the GAD be redrafted to be more flexible. This would allow for the amounts to be adjusted as the WSWC coordination encounters both challenges and successes. Sara showed the committee the WSWC's new GAD. The new GAD has one major table for the tasks and their budget allotment that can be adjusted over the grant activities time period. She recommended that states who already have a signed GAD review the new format and decide if it would be useful. She asked Ken for his feedback on the new format, as Oregon was just submitting their GAD for signatures. He indicated that he did not see a significant difference between the prior GAD format and the new one. The group had a discussion on the details related to the two formats and what exactly what information needs to be submitted to TCEQ. Ultimately, Sara recommended that if the states had a GAD prepared and thought they would only take a few months, not to change that, but to proceed with their current GAD. Otherwise, the new GAD might be nice for the added flexibility allowed. Lindy said that OWRB would probably use the new format. Ken asked if the reporting would be the same. Sara said that their report submission would change, but it would be easier. Ken asked whether the submissions would require reporting for each cost, or if they could submit budget numbers by task. Sara showed the Ken the WSWC's Financial Status Report (FSR) and their GAD to explain how the individual salaries and fringe were reported in both the GAD and the FSR. Sara indicated that the difference is that, with the early version, the salary and fringe would have to be updated anytime it was changed and it would require a new GAD. With the new

version, the salary and fringe changes would be incorporated into the FSR, but the GAD would not have to be resigned.

RedHat Update: Sara worked with RedHat on the different gear sizes and larger datasets. Performance on RedHat has become an issue, despite adding indices to speed up table sorting and not using “views”. This shortened the time needed, but was not adequate even on larger gears. After reviewing the cost, the Colorado data was transferred to WSWC servers for testing locally, which had better performance. This is the WSWC’s back-up plan for hosting on RedHat’s cloud, and would involve providing a secure means of pushing data to any WaDE instance. Sara had talked to Oklahoma, one of the states that this change would impact, about hosting on the premises. She asked Idaho whether they had concerns about hosting at WSWC. They said no. Michael asked about views in the database.

TCEQ Technical Diagram: Sara discussed the states’ next primary deliverable on Task 2.1 – a technical diagram of how each state will deploy their WaDE “node.” This would show progress on the grant. Sara showed the three different templates that the states could use to fill out their information. Michael asked about the format of the document. Sara said it was a Word .docx that could be edited and that it was available on the website. Michael asked about VPN credentials to the WSWC servers. Sara indicated that WSWC had never configured a VPN, but could likely get them set up within a month or so.

Wrap-Up: Sara asked the group if they had any questions. Michael asked about how to divide up information when a place of use crosses a reporting unit boundary. Sara suggested an evaluation of the number of occurrences where that happens, and decide whether or not to go with a larger geospatial unit. She also suggested that each polygon should be converted to an internal centroid, unless the state has the ability to break up the use by the reporting unit. Sara asked Ken if he would like a call later about the new GAD format. He said he would call WSWC.

The call was then adjourned.

Action Items:

	Description	Assignee
1	Execute contracts and GADs	OK, WA
2	Configure WSWC servers for VPN connections	WSWC
3	Work on WaDE transfer agreement with WGA	WSWC
4	Fill out technical diagrams for TCEQ	State Partners