# RHPWG Shared Database Subcommittee

Conference Call January 10, 2019

DRAFT Notes:

1. Roll Call: Cindy Hollenberg, Roslyn Higgin, Kristen Martin, Brandon McGuire, Tina Suarez-Murias, Shawn McClure, Frank Forsgren, Ted Friesner, Ed Merta, Tom Moore
2. Administrative
	1. Current Notes – NMED
	2. Last month’s notes at <https://www.wrapair2.org/RHP_SharedDB.aspx> (bottom of page)
	3. Updates from other Work Groups and Subcommittees - none
3. Documentation discussion
	1. FAQs January 2019 – Consensus or alternatives

Suggestion that the FAQ document seems a lot like a guidance document and we may need to simplify or choose another alternative altogether.

To answer this, discussion first focused on who the audience for the TSS is really supposed to be. Consensus was that the TSS is primarily for SIP planners, but there are secondary audiences including (but not limited to) FLMs, EPA, local governments, tribes, environmental organizations, industry (especially sources) and anyone else from the general public. With this in mind, we don’t want to avoid answering questions, but we might consider directing users to various existing documents or at least simplifying answers. Existing documents may be found on EPA web site, WRAP web site, TSS v2, etc. We should keep in mind that states may want to use this type of document for outreach.

Discussion then focused on options:

* Keep FAQ document as a separate documentation piece for educating the public (with the possibility of linking to particular explanations from various places on the TSS tools). We would likely want to simplify many answers and link to other resources.
* Create pop-ups that both ask and answer the question and place these strategically on the TSS. This is different than (and in addition to) the metadata information given with the “i” icons. Each “bit” of information may have a separate URL or anchor on a longer document’s URL.
* Work with the Consultation & Coordination Subcommittee to create a “storyboard” for states to use (and the public to look at) that incorporates much of this information. States could collaborate on the messaging. (This does not preclude the above ideas, but may make it more feasible to greatly simplify FAQs (in whatever form).)

Cindy will ask for feedback on the various options. Clearly, we are not ready to ask for consensus on the FAQs document.

* 1. Minimum functionalities list – requires input

The document is incomplete. Cindy is asking for help on this document. Please review and add to it within the next couple of weeks. Shawn and Ted said this list would be helpful to them especially from those who have experience. The section on modeling information is in dire need of input.

One suggestion was to check the monitors list and capture whether the monitor is representing more than one Class I sites and to indicate whether the IMPROVE monitor represents data for a CIA (i.e., whether it is used for RH). Shawn and Ted are already planning on differentiating monitors (a couple of options being tested).

Shawn and Ted have asked us to list items that would be nice to have but are not included in the minimum functionalities lists. Could be called “Helpful Functionalities”. Differentiate items into one of two categories: 1) what we **need** to have, 2) what we **would like** to have. This will help them prioritize.

Discussion segued into agenda item #5 (discussion questions – see answers below).

1. WRAP Work Plan revisions

As a result of the December TSC Planning meeting in Salt Lake City, Subcommittees are asked to revise tasks within the WRAP Work Plan for presentation to the WESTAR Board in April. Cindy’s draft deletes Task 6 because the SDb subcommittee is doing those tasks anyway. Task 7.8 has been added, condensing the Embedded Progress Report’s required elements that are data-related. Information for the Embedded Progress Report should be available and easily accessible for states. Each state will be responsible for their own progress reports.

Due dates and responsibilities have changed as indicated in the attachment. Review of this draft will be an action item. An added suggestion was to include a “place-holder” in the work plan for the storyboard idea. Cindy will contact Rebecca Harbage, lead of the Consultation & Coordination SC to discuss the idea.

1. Ongoing – Visibility Summary Tool and Haze Analysis Tool
	1. Review both tools for title/legend clarity and information links/pop-ups – suggestions to Cindy by 1.25.2019
	2. Haze Analysis – Seasonal Extinction Charts
		1. Consensus that “seasons” should be calendar quarters? Consensus is “yes.”
		2. Should the vertical axis labels be light extinction? (not discussed due to time constraints)
	3. For which charts would side-by-side comparisons (more than one site / more than one set of year ranges / etc.) be useful (keeping in mind the “horizontal real estate” issue)? (not discussed due to time constraints)
2. Questions submitted – for discussion:
	1. How do you find out the mass for each species measured each day (prior to its conversion to light extinction?)  Is there a downloadable table?  Will the TSSv.2 have this functionality or will states be directed to the IMPROVE FED site, which does not have instructions as to which components to select for regional haze. [The Query Wizard gives us this option, I think, but which components? Most are in concentration units. Why is this needed?]

Answer: Yes, the Query Wizard does offer this information. Shawn and Ted, however, noted that they are working on developing mass (or concentration) charts similar to the light extinction charts. The reason these data are necessary is because light extinction does not translate directly to mass/concentration units since different pollutants cause different amounts of light scattering. Decision-makers/management will need to understand the mass/concentration amounts to decide control levels for sources. The sources themselves will need to understand this information, so both light extinction and mass/concentrations are important.

* 1. How do I find out the PM10 and the PM2.5 fractions for each measured day? (same as prior question, will states need to reconstruct this from the IMPROVE FED site?) [Again, why is this needed? Those of us who have not written RH SIPs do not understand the usefulness of this information.]

The original question was not really answered but the rationale for why it’s needed is essentially the same as above. It is important to understand the levels of pollutants that are causing visibility impairment. Differentiating between PM10 and PM2.5 is necessary for controls analysis.

The answers to these questions could be included in the “storyboard” idea discussed previously.

1. Action Items (by deadlines):
	1. January 14 – Review the work plan and send suggested edits to Cindy so she can collate and forward to RHPWG by the following day. Due to TSC by January 16. Note that this SC’s due dates are often dependent on other SC/WG deliverables.
	2. January 25 – Send suggestions to Cindy for collation
		1. Review the TSS tools (Haze Analysis and Visibility Summary tools) for specific items:
			1. Title/legend clarity
			2. Additional **priority** items to add to the tools (e.g., specific side-by-side comparisons, mass/concentration charts, etc.). These should be added to the “Minimum Functionalities” document requested by Shawn and Ted.
		2. Minimum Functionalities list (document). Be sure to differentiate between minimum (priority) and helpful (as time/resources permit).
	3. February 13 – Have an opinion on FAQs documentation options (for discussion at 2/14 call). If additional options are thought of, please send to Cindy by February 12.
2. Next call scheduled: February 14, 2019

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1.10.2019 | ~~CARB~~ NMED |
| 1.24.2019 | *Cindy unavailable* |
| 2.14.2019 | ~~NMED~~ CARB |
| 2.28.2019 | CABQ |
| 3.14.2019 | MT DEQ |
| 3.28.2019 | AZ DEQ |
|  |  |