SRRTTF Data Management Workgroup
Recommendation Regarding Data Management

Purpose Statement

Establish a central repository for data that helps the SRRTTF (Task Force) achieve the objectives of the Memorandum of Agreement, which includes public access to data and tools for analysis and source identification.

Options 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 are in EIM or the permits database. The PCB discharge monitoring data are reported in different ways. 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 hires a staff member 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 (**preferred**)

   In this scenario, ACE contracts with a vendor to provide the services, similar to the way the Task Force technical work is currently managed. ACE currently manages the electronic data for the Task Force

   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.

Recommendation for Decision by Task Force:

The Data Management Workgroup recommends the following:

1. ACE to manage a contract pilot project that uses a small set of Task Force data to evaluate the performance of the DRBC database. The set of data would be representative of the types of data the Task Force anticipates entering into the database. This includes: a set of Task Force collected data, some historical data from Ecology EIM, discharger data, with a range of media (water, sediment, fish, effluent) and analytical methods (1668 and 608).

   The outcome of this project would result in:
   a. An assessment of the usability of the database for managing Task Force information.
   b. An assessment of the usability of the database for managing historical information.
   c. An evaluation and recommendation of the suitability of the DRBC database for the SRRTTF, taking into consideration previously identified database options (EIM, EQUIS, and custom Access systems).
   d. An assessment of options for providing public access to the data.
   e. A set of recommended changes to the DRBC database to meet SRRTTF needs.
   f. A list of specifications to be used for scoping and procurement purposes.

2. For the long term ACE manage a contractor that would:
   a. Obtain the selected database (DRBC or other if DRBC is not suitable).
   b. Develop a system for data submission and entry using Task Force approved protocols.
   c. Gather data needed for input into the database.
   d. Perform data quality checks prior to data entry and qualify data as needed.
   e. Enter data into the system.