Message

From: Montilla, Alex [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=B148B5335FF44AEA8970035668052F01-MONTILLA, ALEX]
Sent: 3/9/2020 7:04:12 PM
To: Gillespie, Andrew [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=dce99ece87694a06b3009d7756e2a89e-Gillespie, Andrew]
CC: Buckley, Timothy [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=197a3461d9824a17850f34cc2b0b37fe-Buckley, Timothy]; Scheitlin, Tom [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=user5f1cea1a]
Subject: FW: ERG-GWTSC-023 Amendment (12 Feb 2020) v2 - with DSB tjb TS changes.docx

Hi Andy,

We'd like to discuss this with you when you have a moment. Please see email string below. Tim, Tom and I spoke this afternoon. Tom and I also spoke with Jerry. We'd like your thoughts regarding expanding ORD's support role to include both NDPE and the ECHO piece. In short, OECA sees the PFAS Qlik effort as one unified effort. In their mind the National PFAS Data Explorer (NDPE) is an extension of their existing ECHO PFAS Analytic Tool. As such, ORD should assume responsibility of supporting both. This hadn't been my understanding so I was amending the language on the contract to focus it on our support of the NDPE and eliminating references to ECHO support altogether. If I do this, the ECHO side will suffer. Did the role you envisioned for ORD acceptance to support NDPE also include us assuming responsibility for the ECHO PFAS Analytic Tool? The emails below summarize the challenge. Please advise.

Thanks,

Alex

From: Barrette, Michael <Barrette.Michael@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 09, 2020 11:12 AM
To: Montilla, Alex <Montilla.Alex@epa.gov>; Buckley, Timothy <Buckley.Timothy@epa.gov>
Cc: Scheitlin, Tom <Scheitlin.Tom@epa.gov>; Yourish, Jesse <yourish.jesse@epa.gov>; Burden, David <Burden.David@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: ERG-GWTSC-023 Amendment (12 Feb 2020) v2 - with DSB tjb TS changes.docx

Hi Alex,

We are supporting (via my staff and some of our base ECHO contracting $) the effort to get EPA/states involved in the overall process via the PFAS Analytic Tools (such as user support for getting new state users into the system so they can use it, maintenance of the PFAS Navigation Page, etc.). This is an area I have suggested to Tim that ORD staff up a bit more (state pilots, data curation of state data, etc) and I think verbally he had agreed with that and was working on it. I view NPDE and PFAS Analytic Tools as two flavors of the same tool – an internal and a public facing view. What the PFAS Analytic Tools provide in addition to the NPDE…

1. A navigation page that provides information to states on how they can increase the flow of data (and provides training and background materials for them as data providers).
2. Provides additional data analysis capabilities that seem of high interest to states (currently only the industries of interest – but could be expanded over time)
3. Provides the security structure for build out of new layers as a testing ground before things go public – under the assumption that any new layers will undergo some EPA/State/Federal partner testing internally before it

becomes public. This aspect may involve some of the gray ovals in our data model that might eventually pan out. TRI might be the next example of a data layer that could be ready in the next 1-2 years.

4. Provides a mechanism to convey data that EPA decides our partners need, but are not seen as public layers (for example, Places of Interest where there is some suspected problem – but it is unverified)

Currently and going forward, I think the NPDE should be thought of as an application that shows a subset of the data that is in the PFAS Analytic Tools – meaning the tools are complementary and developed together. I don't have a specific line item in my budget for PFAS Tools. It is doubtful I will get one. That said, to the extent that I can assist on items that don't cause a big ripple in my overall budget, then I'm happy to do that. I guess at this point, we need to decide whether ORD thinks it should and can support the four areas above, and if the answer is no, then we need to re-evaluate how things are structured.

Mike

From: Montilla, Alex
Sent: Friday, March 06, 2020 11:21 AM
To: Barrette, Michael <Barrette.Michael@epa.gov>; Buckley, Timothy <Buckley.Timothy@epa.gov>
Cc: Scheitlin, Tom <Scheitlin.Tom@epa.gov>; Yourish, Jesse <yourish.jesse@epa.gov>; Burden, David <Burden.David@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: ERG-GWTSC-023 Amendment (12 Feb 2020) v2 - with DSB tjb TS changes.docx

Hi Mike/Tim,

First, thank you for the comments and feedback. I want to make sure that I understand the ORD scope correctly relative to the National PFAS Data Explorer (NDPE) and the ECHO PFAS Analytic Tool. I understood that ORD/OSIM was to take over support, maintenance and development of the NDPE which means completing NDPE development preparing for its public release. Subsequent to the release of NDPE ORD/OSIM would continue the sustainment of the NDPE. I interpreted this to mean NDPE is distinct and separate from the ECHO PFAS Analytic tools. Am I understanding this correctly? Or, is my understanding incorrect? When I look at the scope in the task on STREAMS III contract, I find the existing language to encompass both the NDPE and the ECHO PFAS Analytic Tools. I had come to understand that OECA would continue to provide support for the ECHO PFAS Analytic Tools via the BPA that Jesse Yourish oversees. As a result, I've been removing references to ECHO from within the STREAMS task and assuming ORD would fund and support the NDPE on STREAMS separate from OECA's support of the ECHO PFAS Analytic Tools. Do you draw the same distinction between NDPE and the ECHO PFAS Analytic Tools? Or, are all of the Qlik PFAS tools (NDPE and ECHO) to be supported by ERG under the STREAMS contract? Please advise before I make the mistake of taking out language referencing support of the ECHO PFAS Analytic Tool from within the task. Lastly, if both ECHO and NDPE are to remain on the same contract and task, is OECA funding the ECHO effort and ORD funding the NDPE effort separately? Please advise. Your assistance is very much appreciated.

Thanks,

Alex

From: Barrette, Michael <Barrette.Michael@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 02, 2020 3:17 PM
To: Montilla, Alex <Montilla.Alex@epa.gov>; Buckley, Timothy <Buckley.Timothy@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: ERG-GWTSC-023 Amendment (12 Feb 2020) v2 - with DSB tjb TS changes.docx

Hi Alex – sorry for delay in review. I have a few comments in here. It may be easier to discuss on the phone if you want to call me. I can't be at tomorrow's check in meeting.

Mike

From: Montilla, Alex
Sent: Monday, March 02, 2020 2:09 PM
To: Burden, David <Burden.David@epa.gov>; Barrette, Michael <Barrette.Michael@epa.gov>
Cc: Buckley, Timothy <Buckley.Timothy@epa.gov>; Scheitlin, Tom <Scheitlin.Tom@epa.gov>
Subject: ERG-GWTSC-023 Amendment (12 Feb 2020) v2 - with DSB tjb TS changes.docx

Good Afternoon,

Attached is a modified amendment for the NDPE STREAMS III effort. I've incorporated the comments received from Dave, Tim and Tom. I also removed work related to ECHO so to focus the amendment on NDPE support. I have some additional questions for Dave and Mike. Please review and provide your feedback by 6 March. Let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Alex