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Information Update

Notes from November 13’s External User Event have been posted on the Water Board’s Internet site (http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/ciwqs/usergroups.html).

Water Board staff is working on a glossary of terms to accompany the reports page. It will be the first step in making the reports page more user-friendly. Staff is also working on putting a new contract in place. Currently, an outside contractor does much of the “hard-coded” reports work.

Patrick requested that when there are issues to decide on that they be written up with pros, cons, and the decisions so others that are not at the meeting may know the issue. (See below for documentation of three issues.)

Priorities

During the last meeting the group agreed that posting a definition of terms, removing displays of potential violations, and adding a column for violation type or some other type of violation categorization would be the first set of priorities.

As noted above, Water Board staff is developing a definition of terms. The group agreed to delay further discussion of the potential violation issue until the next meeting because the bulk of potential violations were to be removed during the December 14th CIWQS update.

Most of the potential violations were a result of a function in CIWQS that automatically generated potential violations if information was not entered by a certain time; however, this function is being re-worked and the majority of the information was not being entered, resulting in the large number of potential violations seen in reports. In the production update to CIWQS, these violations were removed because they were not accurate. With many of the potential violations gone, the group can now review the data and decide if this is still a priority issue.

The following items are discussed more in the attachments:
Displaying records with the status of “allegation dismiss” or “dismiss”
“Sun-setting” of violations
Adding More Details About Violations

Ranking Violations
Debbie suggested that violations have an indicator that they fit into one of three categories:
• Violation has been looked at and likely needs enforcement
• Violation has been looked at and likely does not need enforcement
• Violation has not been looked at.

While this may have benefits in the perception of Water Board’s data, currently there is no such flag in CIWQS; such a flag may conflict with the confidentiality of some enforcement actions; and what may not be a cause for enforcement initially, may evolve into an issue that needs enforcement if the problem is ongoing or not resolved.

Issue Resolution Procedures
The group would like to have procedures on how to resolve data issues. This issue is difficult because each office is set up differently among the CIWQ data entry staff, enforcement staff, and permit writing staff. Water Board staff will discuss this issue with the various roundtables involved to start developing procedures.

Cross User Group Issues
Ann requested clarification on how issues that involved multiple user groups would be resolved.

At the user group level, user groups prioritize issues. For a particular issue, if the Reports group thinks the SSO report is a high priority, but the SSO group is focused on other issues, it would go in the reports queue.

At the Steering Committee level, the interdisciplinary issues can be discussed with the Steering Committee.

Next Meeting
Date: January 4, 2008
Time: 8:30 – 10 am
Telephone: 916-227-1132
Place: CalEPA Building room 1520 or WebEx (see WebEx email for information)
Topics:
• Update
• Issue write-ups
• Questions/Issues from last time
• Demo of information collected in CIWQS
• Other