

# April 13<sup>th</sup> Data Management Workgroup Meeting

## Department of Ecology, 10 am -12 pm

### Attendees:

Kris Holm (for City of Coeur d'Alene, on phone)  
Tim Towey (LimnoTech, on phone)  
Adriane Borgias (Ecology)  
Mike Hermanson (Spokane County)  
Adrienne Pearson (City of Spokane)  
Jeff Donovan (City of Spokane)

### Meeting Notes

#### 1. Finalize Recommendation to Task Force

A range of four options was discussed:

- Task Force does not manage data (Task Force or other data).

Ecology will continue to maintain EIM for Task Force data collected under a QAPP. The pros are that it is a legacy system and will continue to be maintained by Ecology. There is currently no cost for this option. (Typically Ecology requires grantees to enter data into EIM, however, and this is a potential future cost.) The cons are that the EIM does not do a good job of managing QA/QC data. Also lack of resources by Ecology to do or facilitate data entry has been a problem in the past.

Not all of the data from the permittees is in EIM or the permits database. The PCB Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs) for example are in pdf form. Not all dischargers report their PCB data on the same basis.

- Task Force member manages

In this scenario a member of the Task Force member manages the data on behalf of the Task Force. This could be an in-kind contribution of labor or it could involve an agreement, such as a staff loan or a contract with ACE, to compensate the member. The pros for this approach is that the workload ebb and flow can be managed. A Task Force member would most likely be knowledgeable about the characteristics of the data. The cons are that it could be difficult identifying a member organization that could volunteer and be accepted to the Task Force.

- ACE hires someone to do the work

In this scenario, ACE would have staff on payroll to manage the data. This has not been done before and would substantially change how ACE operates. No pros were identified and this was not discussed further.

- ACE contracts the work

In this scenario, ACE would contract with a vendor to provide the services, similar to the way the Task Force technical work is currently managed.

The pros are that the ebb and flow of data entry could be managed. Also, data would be managed by a single entity. The cons are that the pool of contractors is limited as the contractor would need to understand the characteristics of the data.

### *General Points of Discussion*

- Costs are important but the Work Group could not identify what these are at this time. It was suggested that an RFP could be prepared once we identify options. The Task Force was requested to supply names of contractors. The suggestions received to date include LimnoTech, GeoEngineers, Datapro Solutions, and (generically), a laboratory, and a local contractor.

Cost considerations include:

- Obtain database (options previously considered include DRBC (free), LimnoTech Access database (modify their current database), EQUIS (commercial data base with licensing and user fees). Customize database for Spokane data (varies based on system)
- Collect and format data (varies by scope of data to be included)
- Data entry (recent, ongoing (new), and historic (extent to be determined))
- Choice of database system: how to scope the database? This has been discussed previously. The DRBC (customized to the Spokane data) is currently a favored choice.
  - Once option is to do a pilot project using a set of current data and the DRBC database to see how it works.
  - Discussion about whether or not this option is covered under the current LimnoTech contract.

ACTION ITEM: APB to review this question with contracts since it is relevant to the contract that Ecology has with ACE.

2. Continue discussion of DRBC protocols for potential adoption by Task Force
  - A. Review scope of protocols (See Revised Table for notes)
  - B. Identify protocols with relevance to Task Force QAPPs (deferred to next meeting)
  - C. Outline process for protocol review and adoption (deferred to next meeting)

Link to DRBC PCB monitoring website: <http://www.nj.gov/drbc/quality/toxics/pcbs/monitoring.html>