

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

Minutes – September 9, 2014, 2pm MDT (1pm PDT, 3pm CDT)

Attendees:

WSWC - Sara Larsen

Texas CEQ - Jurgen Koch, Pat Robards, Gayle Stewart, Gloria Castillo

Idaho DWR – Michael Ciscell, Linda Davis

Oklahoma WRB - Lindy Clay, Kent Wilkins

Oregon WRD – Ken Smith, Ken Stahr

Roll Call, Minutes: Sara took roll for the attendees on the phone and welcomed everyone. The group went over the minutes from the last meeting, which were adopted (Lindy Clay motioned to adopt, Ken Smith seconded the motion).

Redhat Conference Call Recap: Jurgen described a conference call that was held with Redhat, a web service provider, earlier that week. Redhat has an online cloud solution for deploying applications like WaDE called OpenShift. Clients can either run their application on the cloud or deploy the OpenShift environment internally, like a virtual machine. Jurgen discussed with Redhat how WaDE could be deployed initially as a ‘proof of concept’ (POC) setup to see if this could provide a more streamlined way for the partners to deploy the WaDE data. The POC would be free and would allow the partners to see how they would interface with the Postgres version of the WaDE database if implemented online. Sara will give Redhat the Postgres database and PHP code and they can implement it on a pre-made ‘cartridge’. If it work we could demo this for the partners and see if they like that option. It would be easy to simply copy that POC database and re-implement it for more and more partners. Deploying it in this fashion would allow for scalability of the system, might be more cost effective for long-term operations and maintenance. The data housed in the OpenShift environment was not proprietary or sensitive, so there were no heightened security concerns, and this implementation would allow some of the partners to address bandwidth concerns effectively. Ken Smith asked how they would load data. Jurgen answered that he thought it would be the same as if it were deployed locally. Sara talked about some of the other benefits of using this approach. Linda said that Idaho would be able to do the WaDE work within a certain window, and would probably use the prior method of deployment. Jurgen mentioned that they were hoping to have the POC set up by the end of next week if possible. Ken Smith asked if they could still take the original approach. Sara and Jurgen both said that whatever would be easiest for the partners, that’s what they should do. Michael asked if Redhat provided any schematics of their system? Jurgen said no, but they could open a free account on Openshift for small applications.

TCEQ Legal Documentation Questions: Sara went over the WSWC’s version of the main grant agreement, describing different section and attachments. She also described how their work with TCEQ ended up streamlining the process so that the partners only have to fill out an Outlined GAD, instead of a PGA and GAD separately. She stepped through the sections in the Outlined GAD document that had

WSWC information in it as an example. Jurgen and Gayle indicated that they still had several changes to make, none that were material in the main grant agreement, but several larger changes in the GAD that was being worked on by WSWC. Sara asked about a timeline for receiving their changes. Jurgen indicated later in the week they would hopefully have it to a point that they like it. They were also working on developing a FSR document so that the partners could use that to submit their costs. Ken Smith asked if they should hold off on giving their legal folks the documents until the GAD was finalized by TCEQ. Gayle said yes, but that the documents would be sent soon.

General Updates: Sara gave a quick update on Wyoming’s status. They are working intermittently through the process, but hoped to be able to demo some data in October. She also said that Utah had received enough funds to begin the deployment process, so they would not continue on as a formal steering committee partner, but would share their ‘lessons learned’ with the group. They may be able to demo their data in October. Sara said that she would like to test the Redhat Openshift POC to see if this would be an option for Oracle states, but if it turned out to not be ideal, she would start working on the Oracle database development this fall.

Wrap up: The group indicated that they could meet again in mid-October for another meeting. The call was adjourned.

Action Items:

	Description	Assignee
1	Review more recent TCEQ legal contract when distributed (likely a week or so) and modify as needed. Set up one-on-one appointments with TCEQ’s legal team (Pat Robards)	All partner agencies
2	Use the GAD Outline and WSWC’s sample GAD to fill out that attachment	All partner agencies
3	Update Postgres database and code for POC demonstration with OpenShift	WSWC
4	Get the QARF/QAPP expectations from EPA in writing.	TCEQ
5	Get clarification on ‘Indirect Costs’ with EPA (in writing?)	TCEQ