Environmental Sampling and Results (ESAR) Standards Review Meeting Minutes
Meeting Date: October 21, 2004
Time: 11:00 a.m. Adjourned: 3:00 p.m.
Location: Lockheed Martin Environmental Information Systems Engineering Center
1010 North Glebe Road, Suite 800
Arlington, VA 22201

Attendees

Lynn Singleton LMIT, Robert King (EPA), Lee Manning (EPA), Todd Dabolt, (EPA), Joe Wilson (EPA), Cary McElhinney (EPA), Douglas Timms (enfoTech), Sandy Rock (LMIT) Alex Smith (LMIT), Steve Beltz (LMIT) Robin Sinckler (LMIT)

Recorded by Robin Sinckler

1.0   ACTION ITEMS AND MEETING MINUTES REVIEW

The Action Items from the September 23, 2004 meeting minutes were reviewed. It was noted that the scoping statement for the ESAR Standards has not been completed. The minutes were approved.

2.0   TOPIC: TASK 6 INFORMATION AND START-UP

S. Rock reported on the LMIT status on Task 6. She has reviewed the complexities of legacy STORET parameter codes as well as modern STORET's characteristic codes and the Substance Registry System terminology and codes.

L. Manning asked if S. Rock had access to CAS (she does not) and whether Lois Fritz will participate on the Chemical Nomenclature Committee. Paul White is the routine member. Manning stated that while OW has no funding for Sandy's attendance, an independent point of view would be valuable. John Harman and Mike Pendleton would have to agree to the expense of Sandy's attendance. ESAR and STORET harmonization will result in an updated EDR/STORET nomenclature standard. John Harmon participates with Paul White on the Chemical Nomenclature Committee.

L. Singleton verified that OW owners would like to purge the EDR of bad data before having their lists reviewed. This issue has been initially discussed with EDR administrators but will be addressed again.

T. Dabolt reported that PCS parameter codes are based on legacy STORET. L. Manning raised the issue that OW has stopped maintaining parameter codes; as a result, they are now called PCS codes, not STORET codes. He added that the National Park Service has cross-walked the old parameter codes to new STORET characteristics. This work will be a resource for S. Rock.

C. McElhinney suggested that the Task 6 team call for others who have attempted this work to find out how other organizations have identified STORET and non STORET codes. He also asked that the ESAR Task Order 8 meeting minutes be posted on the Web (with format revisions). Lee Manning stated that cost information should be removed. R. King noted that the September 23rd format is acceptable for posting purposes.

See 7.0 Action Items Summary

3.0 TOPIC: PILOT SELECTION CRITERION

It was determined that network grants will help support some States' participation in the pilot while other States have no network implementation support. The following questions were posed: What kind of support can EPA offer states? Will there be three pilots that include multiple states or one pilot that could include three states? Is it important to select current STORET users? If so, can we determine who is currently using STORET?

L. Singleton proposed the Pacific/Northwest (current super node) and Region 10 as pilot participants. He has met with Pacific/Northwest, and Alaska is a STORET user. If Alaska can play a role, it could provide the STORET upload. Singleton has a scope of work for Alaska Gold/Windsor Solutions uploads into ESAR and then downloads to STORET. Michigan has been involved in the Network and the TRG. Texas was interested in being a pilot and will have an operational node in December.

T. Dabolt indicated that he is not interested in pushing STORET data into ESAR. The model of the ESAR schema is to push it to STORET.

R. King stated that Peter Grevatt will select the pilot participants and may want a participant who is not using STORET. Additionally, pilot participants need to have integrated their environmental data.

Decision(s)
Selection Considerations—Target state agencies; consider timing and phasing, geographic representation, current/non current involvement in STORET, node, expertise, capacity and willingness to commit, ability to operate without having a node, no spectators, active participants.

Recommended Participants— Texas, Michigan, Great Lakes, Pacific Northwest and Region 10. The Great Lakes monitoring program was proposed by Todd Dabolt. He would contact them to explore options.

See 7.0 Action Items Summary

4.0 TOPIC: NEW ORLEANS MEETING REQUIREMENTS

C. McElhinney reported that Curtis Cude and Robert King are on the New Orleans conference agenda and slated to give a presentation on the ESAR pilot. He would like to get a group of ESAR pilot participants together in New Orleans; however, he expects that staff members from States will attend, and he is not sure if these are the right people. He stated that there is funding for participation for one person from each State. Michigan is the only State that is not sending representatives to the conference.

Decision(s)
Hold a meeting with pilot participants (if they can get there) on Wednesday, November 17th.
See 7.0 Action Items Summary

5.0   TOPIC: COORDINATION WITH OTHERS

Doug Timms will coordinate with CDX and TRG (namespace issue) on the Core Reference Model Pilot. The coordinator provides management. Doug attended TRG (Technical Resources Group). In addition to DS, the schema is becoming the core reference model link for DS. They want to evaluate the schema when available.

See 7.0 Action Items Summary

6.0   TOPIC: SCHEMA REVIEW, CDX, AND PILOT

D. Timms presented a schema based Excel spreadsheet. He recommended keeping binary objects out of XML and moving Station out from under Project. Station cannot be under ORG, and Station should be a child of Organization.

Alex Smith stated that there is a notification mechanism available through CDX. It is asynchronous machine sent/people sent. CDX monitors this functionality. The functionality can be designed to send an email back. CDX validates the activity and places a report in a folder in the State POCs account. What passes gets passed. Big problems get resubmitted. You decide if you want to kick everything out or allow some through; however, if the submission fails Schematron validation—CDX "chucks" it.

Recommendations for the Pilot

- Pilot participants can help to define the access and maintenance requirements. These issues are questions for the first meeting. Oregon has figured out creating, updating and modifying and should participate to share how they have accomplished this. EPA programs have experienced the same questions.

- Turn Web services on the System of Registries into domains.

- Ask for functionality relative to CDX as another case for the pilot i.e., asynchronous and email sent with URL. Make logins available to CDX administrators and automate transmission of data in a two-step process: 1. Rejection of the submission 2. Error notification to the sender of what must be repaired. The sender wants confirmation. CDX is the repository for all regulated facilities. There should be notification that the submission got into the holding bin; it is now posted, go look.

- How will senders validate their submissions to ESAR? Options include building a database browser or query function for submitters to validate.

Decision(s)

- Bring binary objects e.g., PDF and QAPP documents into Project Plan and make them mandatory elements. Move Project Description under Station/Activity. Do not assign Station to Projects, only Activities.

- Rename the schema: OW Pilot

- Create a Library function for QA/ Lib Ref

- Reject all errors for resubmission. CDX has a transaction identifier: Query transaction identifier functionality. Validate by code/schema.

- Create a rule for the ESAR data warehouse: No public access except through STORET.

- Build a cartoon that describes the process flow: CDX>Staging Area>ESAR DB>STORET> (Only people who put data in, can access)>STORET Warehouse>Moved monthly to the warehouse that is available to the public.

7.0 ACTION ITEM SUMMARY

ACTION ITEM SUMMARY

ASSIGNED ACTIONS (Status = <mark>New, Open, Closed</mark>)

MMDD-No.	Assigned to:	Due	Action/Status	Status
2.0	Sandy Rock		Produce a validated list of current data and versioning.	Open
2.0	L. Singleton		Deliver a concept paper on how EDR and Office of Water will move forward (parameter codes).	Open
3.0	L. Singleton		Provide Peter Grevatt with a proposed list of conference participants. Schedule another phase of calls for EPA discussion w/ Peter Grevatt. Create a matrix that reflects the pros and cons w/ recommendations-- include overlap. Make calls to states: Texas, Michigan, Pacific Northwest, Great Lakes. Identify serious participants.	Open
3.0	T. Dabolt	10/25	Contact Great Lakes to see if they want to participate and make another call to Texas.	Open
4.0	T. Dabolt	10/26	Communicate who wants to participate to Peter Grevatt.	Open
4.0	L. Singleton		Create an OEI briefing schedule and include Michigan.	Open
5.0	D. Timms		Coordinate with CDX (EPA); coordinate with TRG (namespace issue); Core Reference Model Pilot: Talk with Molly O'Neill, the main contact for ECOS.	Open
6.0	D. Timms		Update schema. The cardinality should reflect schema telephonic address Identifier to see element, Library concept, File size, unresolved Library etc. Rename the schema: OW Pilot. Complete a schema compare (for Schematron); add complex clients and email the comparison to EPA who will fill in definitions. Create a project cartoon, storyboard, and graphic for staging process.	Open
6.0	R. King	10/28	Fill out the definitions for open items. These were not in ESAR. Complete the Scope statement. Send the spreadsheet and schema to Curtis. Thursday, October 28th, send spreadsheet with schema mapping to NW.	Open
6.0	L. Singleton		Set up conference call w/Mitch (Oregon) to determine how they add, edit, and delete. Follow-up on pre-meeting issue with CDX.	Open
6.0	T. Dabolt		Follow-up on Web services w/CDX which is ready for prime time (SoR registries outside John Harman).	Open