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Interviews- New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection

TCEQ HIGHLIGHTS
Texas CEQ Highlights

• TDS early warning for irrigators
• Guiding and assessment of remediation activities; assessment of WQ attainment
• Emergency preparedness, recreational activities (flows)
• Assessment of sediment NPS loads
• Public engagement
Texas CEQ Highlights

• Moving from LEADS (air quality!) and MANVAL to AQUARIUS

• Provisional data published within 30-60 minutes, manually validated data within 150 days.

• Pre- and post-deployment QC are necessary, not sufficient.

• Sensors deployed by partners (GBRA, USGS)
Interviews- New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection

NJDEP HIGHLIGHTS
New Jersey DEP Highlights

• Buoys and airborne sensor to support shellfish management
• Glider deployed to improve marine assessments of attainment
• Continuous data in streams and rivers used for criteria and TMDL development, source water protection, long-term trends
• QAPPs required for assessment data
New Jersey DEP Highlights

• Some data available near-realtime with lower QC, all available in 3-9 months with full QC.
• Marine data currently available through web portal, freshwater data will also be added.
• Other:
  – “Continuous Monitoring could use EPA’s continuous support.
  – Get USGS to put more emphasis on WQ.
Interviews – Integrated Ocean Observing System

IOOS HIGHLIGHTS
IOOS Highlights

• Coordinates ocean data from buoys, gliders, satellites, models for monitoring, assessment and management of HABs, acidification, coral reefs, beach closures, biodiversity

• Most data are realtime with automated QC, some climate-related data published on a delayed basis
  – Certain data published worldwide through GTS
IOOS Highlights

• Hybrid data management framework includes both centralized and distributed elements.
  – How much should Data Management and Communications reflect governance structure?

• IOOS is more operationally oriented, consistent with its mission.
  – Cost per sample is lower for sensor data
  – Currently implementing automated QC: Quality Assurance of Real-Time Ocean Data
Interviews – Integrated Ocean Observing System

USGS HIGHLIGHTS
USGS Highlights

• Nutrients
  – Great Lakes tributaries: nutrient surrogates
  – Iowa: source water protection
  – Mississippi River: nitrate photometers

• Fisheries: temperature monitoring to improve understanding of fish movements

• Other applications
  – Road salt, lake turnover, manure spreading
IOOS Highlights

• Generally homogenous hardware
  – Campbell Scientific CR1000, CR800, CR10
  – Some level loggers, OnSet Hobos

• Extensive QA, QC and management toolset
  – Continuous Record Plan (CRP) and Techniques and Methods (T&M) documents
  – ADAPS, GRSat, DCT, RDT, NWIS RA, QW, AQUARIUS, CHIMP, SITES, …
Small Thoughts

LATENCY AND QC
# Latency, Quality and Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower QC</th>
<th>Higher QC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Latency</strong></td>
<td>“Operational”</td>
<td>Unrealistic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available within</td>
<td>• Automated QC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minutes or hours</td>
<td>• Useful for trends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Exceedance of an action limit may not be a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>violation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Latency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Assessment”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available weeks or</td>
<td>Useless?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>months after</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Manual QC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Can be compared to WQ standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Small Thoughts

DESIRABLE ATTRIBUTES
Desirable Attributes

• **Discoverability, transparency and interoperability** are data management virtues.
  – Development and publication of metadata in accessible catalogs.
  – Use of appropriate detail and a controlled vocabulary in metadata and datasets.
  – Publication of data using open standards.

• **Provenance, scalability and sustainability** too.
Small Thoughts

DEFINING “CONTINUOUS”
What we’ve heard ...

• Hourly or better; minimal human involvement/automated (TWDB)
• Demonstrates serial correlation; reflects/captures diurnal cycles (TCEQ)
• Usually no less than hourly frequency; deployed for at least 72 hours (NJDEP)
• Unattended/autonomous; metadata less variable than data; considers Nyquist limit (IOOS)
• In-situ time series in-situ, cost-effective (USGS)
Working definition?

• A time series of observations taken at regular intervals with an automated sensor:
  – Sensor may be fixed or moving (glider/AUV)
  – Data may be delivered in real time or logged for later retrieval
  – Metadata are invariant for a deployment (?)
  – QC information may be observation-specific (?)

• What about automated samplers?
SOME EXISTING ALTERNATIVES
Some Existing Alternatives

- Status Quo: WQX, STORET, Water Quality Portal
- USGS/NWIS
- USEPA/AirNow
- CUAHSI/HIS
- NOAA/IOOS
Status Quo

[Diagram showing the flow of data and metadata between Organization, Sensor, WQX, WQ Portal, and STORET.]
## Status Quo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Familiar</td>
<td>• Clumsy to enter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing support and sustainability</td>
<td>• Inefficient storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Difficult to discover and access time series data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
USGS NWIS (AQUARIUS Buildout)
USGS NWIS

Pro
• Centralized
• Standardized
• Well-established

Con
• Rigorous QA and QC requirements preclude publication of “just anybody’s” data
• In the midst of transition
AirNow

**Pro**
- Established system already integrating sensors across the US and the world.
- Designed to support extension to water, other media
- Adaptable to new parameters
- Handles real-time and bulk upload data processing
- Existing homogeneous and heterogeneous QA/QC routines
- Web-based

**Con**
- Does not currently support full range of desired OGC services (SOS/WaterML 2, CS-W)
CUAHSI-HIS

Pro
• Built on OGC standards to support discoverability and interoperability
• Working on inexpensive cloud-based appliances for serving data.
• Supports heterogeneous problem domain by standardizing data exchange

Con
• Scalability uncertain
• Current issue with connection between sensors and cloud appliances.
NOAA/IOOS: Detail for GLOS

**Metadata:** sources scanned nightly for ISO XML metadata files

Data: harvested nightly

GLOS FTP
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**Metadata:** curated metadata manually added to searchable repository*
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Harvests Scripts download ISO records from sources, into git folder**

PostGIS
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BaseX
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BaseX Ingestion
Every other hour, an ingestion script reads the ISO Metadata Documents on db.glos.us and inserts them into the BaseX XML Data Store

**proposed future would be direct harvest of Thredds to GeoNetwork to avoid duplication

**At various intervals, depending on the source (usually by size of the dataset)
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NOAA/IOOS

Pro
- Like CUAHSI, heavily OGC-compliant to promote interoperability and discoverability.
- Involved in development of standardized QC for real-time data.
- Tools like Scalability Experiment demonstrate value of approach.

Con
- Data standards are well-defined, but many different technology stacks exist for implementation.
- Focus is on oceanographic variables, which include only some WQ parameters.
HYBRID APPROACH?
Hybrid Approach: A Trial Balloon

Principles:

- Data (observations) available from distributed servers.
- Metadata (site/sensor/deployment) harvested and made available from centralized server.
- Interoperable with WQX and Water Quality Portal
Hybrid Approach

User Activities

• Submit CWQS site to WQX
• Submit sensor/deployment QC metadata to ?
• Connect (near-realtime) or upload (batch) observations and QC data to appliance
• Search for sensors in discovery tool
• Download metadata and data through discovery tool
Hybrid Approach

Required Elements

• Servers for data, ideally “owned” by submitter
  – Commercial software (AQUARIUS, KiWIS, ...) or
  – Data appliance in cloud (CUAHSI HIS server?)

• Repository and server for metadata
  – Extend WQX with tagging of sites as continuous

• Discovery tool
  – WQ Portal or IOOS Scalability Experiment
Status Quo
Status Quo (worst case)
Hybrid Approach
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Hybrid Approach

Concerns (so far)

• Handling of QC metadata
  – Serve with site (WQX) or with data (appliances)?

• Disambiguation/deduplication of data
  – Integrating NWIS, IOOS, other data streams

• Sustainability: archiving of data
  – Design to support optional transition to centralized data? System of record?
Hybrid Approach (2)
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