# WRAP RHPWG Monitoring & Glide Slope Workgroup

Meeting Notes: Conference Call May 31, 2018

1. Roll Call
2. Administrative
   1. Current Notes – Montana (NPS will take notes on 6/14 call)
   2. Workgroup/Subcommittee updates
      1. Shared Database – meeting June 14th will give the workgroup an overview of the TSS and what tools are available. Members are supposed to review the tools that are currently available to determine what they like before the call.
      2. Working versions of the webpages for subcommittees are set up. Posting instructions will be given to leads in the next few days.
      3. There is a RHPWG call on the 5th. Tom will send out guidance on status report information.
   3. Call for volunteers – Summary document development and Tech analyses
      1. Document development: Cindy and Tina – draft and review report, they will eventually get group input. This will be our summary document for the workgroup.
      2. Technical analysis: Ryan, Brandon, and Kristen.
      3. Please let Ryan know if you would like to help.
   4. Subcommittee Sharefile link: <https://azdeq.sharefile.com/d-sc6c4f002be1402ca>
      1. This link will be for the subcommittee only, including draft documents.
      2. Pat tried to send documents last week and they were too big. These documents have good examples of how to look at the data. These will be put on the Sharefile site.
3. Summary Document Outline – Cindy
   1. The document starts with a general overview of the committee. The focus is on the questions we are trying to answer (taken from the work plan appendix). Categories include initial data usage, natural vs. controllable anthropogenic, recalculating baseline, and natural conditions in 2064.
   2. For each category, there is a section on what work are we doing and what questions are we trying to answer. We will eventually fill in the thought process, discussion and decision points. A lot of the questions feed into each other and may be able to condense down in the future.
   3. There is a list of work products that includes who will do the analysis, when it is complete, and who should receive the product.
      1. A summary of the survey is included.
   4. Appendix B from the work plan is in there now and may be duplicative. Thoughts on if it should be removed?
   5. If people have edits or questions to add to the document - send them to Tina and/or Cindy for now.
   6. Pat noted that we still have a long list of questions – how do we know which ones make a difference and which are most important. Agreement that we should try to focus our work on a few key questions.
      1. For example, prescribed fire questions may need to be answered by another workgroup but will impact our end products.
   7. Members should go through the questions that are outlined in the document and provide a list of what the most important questions are to them. (**ACTION ITEM**) This will drive the work the technical team does.
   8. Tom recommends we download the TSD files and look at them. This will help focus on questions we want to analyze. (**ACTION ITEM**)
   9. We should leverage information that has already been done in previous iterations. Such as incomplete data analysis.
   10. Do we want to build a storyboard about what we are doing and how we are doing it? Tom will send an example of a fire forum example. (**ACTION ITEM**)
4. Representative monitoring sites
   1. The technical team has put together a draft document of possible sites to look at for each location of interest (i.e., high fire site, oil and gas site, urban site, etc.). The first page of the document has the possible sites in each category. Towards the end there is a table that has 2 sites per category as our top choices. Members should review and let Ryan, Brandon, and Kristen know if there are any suggested changes. (**ACTION ITEM**)
   2. Once the list is finalized, the technical team will be running it through multiple tools to see how they perform under different ‘most impaired’ metrics. We will be providing it to group to review. Please provide the technical team with suggestions for how you want to visualize the data. (**ACTION ITEM**). Examples of graphics include:
      1. Comparing how each new metric compares to the worst days
      2. Looking at species contribution on the most impaired days.
      3. How the individual days change in the different metrics.
   3. NC2 is a problem that the technical team is working on it. Be careful with any data downloaded from the fed.
      1. Scott Copeland has NC2 data that we may be able to use but it will not match the fed.
      2. There should be NC2 data available on the TSS. Tom will help us track down this data (**ACTION ITEM**)
      3. We need to find a better source of data than the FED since it is unreliable right now.
   4. Scott Copeland may be joining the call in two weeks to talk us through the data.
5. MID / E3 threshold estimation
   1. Ryan provided a short list of alternatives to the EPA most impaired metric. Please review the list and give feedback on what metrics should be investigated. What is not worth looking at? We need to determine what we can do in house and what needs a contractor. (**ACTION ITEM** – before June 7th)
6. **Action Items**
   1. All - Review the questions outlined in the summary document (on Sharefile) and determine the top priority questions for your state.
   2. Ryan? - Put TSD and guidance documents on Sharefile
   3. Tom –send storyboard example
   4. Ryan and Tom – Find a stable dataset to use for data analysis.
   5. All – Review representative monitoring sites and send suggestions to the technical team.
   6. All – Send technical team suggestions for visualizing the results of the threshold analysis.
   7. All – Review the MID/E3 threshold document and send suggestions to technical team. **Due June 7th.**