

GLAC conference call

01-13-2005 1:00pm

Participating: Chris Hoard, Steve Kalkhoff, Mary Ann Thomas, John Mullaney, Kelly Warner, Terri Arnold, Bill Morrow, George Groschen, Sarah Flanagan, Joe Ayotte, Jim Stark, Mike Yurewicz
Minutes respectfully submitted by Terri Arnold

Went over action items from last conference call.

Status: Piper diagrams have been posted (Terri)

Status: District chiefs have been informed of the GLAC web page (Kelly)

Status: John Mullaney gave Terri the data set and Terri posted on the web site– COOK data not in the data set he made

Status: John said he also has data CPG – have 500-m landuse around all the wells. John has data for all available data. Some wells don't have the data. John said he could join the data to the well points and give that to Terri to post. Sarah said only CPG only did land use wells.

ACTION: John send CPG data to Terri to post

ACTION: All send data to Terri at colleague review stage for archiving (continuing)

ACTION: framework by network info (Mary Ann and Kelly) – discuss and update missing networks (continuing)

Status: George got feedback from Neil regarding the Trace Elements report. Made suggestion to make an index like PTI or focus on co-occurrences and not on individual risk. Mike sent George the health based risk report.

Status: Sarah checked and the HDSN wells she was looking at are carbonate rock aquifer wells – not glacial.

Discussed Dorothy Tepper's comments on our annotated outlines.

Dorothy suggested reserving consecutive report numbers. Because of the way the reports are scheduled and may be approved over consecutive years consecutive report numbers might not be necessary.

ACTION: Kelly call Dorothy and ask about particulars about reserved numbers. Advantages/disadvantages. What happens if they are approved in different years?

We should have similar covers to somehow show they all go together. Maybe something like the NAWQA circular – same look/layout but different picture. Maybe have a map of the glacial aquifer on the back cover?

ACTION: Terri mockup a layout of a cover and have people look at it.

ACTION: Terri post GLAC conference call minutes on internal web page.

Dorothy said that the reports should be similar. We should let her know we are using different subsets of the data. Things that might be similar between reports are description of the networks and glacial framework. Kelly and Terri are working on a 1-2 page fact sheet describing the glacial framework so we could all reference that if needed.

Weren't some reports going to be journal articles? Arsenic and radchem(?) were going to be articles but the authors are willing to do a report instead. Maybe do a report and if there are substantial findings then do a journal article also. Mary Ann doesn't mind switching to a report and then maybe she and a few of the authors can do journal articles if they have journal worthy info. Additional publication would require more money. We should plan ahead now for budgeting if we're going to do additional reports. We have to update our 2-page proposals so make sure to put that in if that's what you're going to do. We do have to accomplish what we say

we're going to do though. If we have a series of reports, we need to be sure our conclusions don't contradict each other. We're not all working with the same elements/constituents and not same subsets of data so conclusions may differ a little but the reports need to be cross-referenced and fully describe what we've done. By the publish date the data should be available to the public.

Dorothy wants us to all be consistent in the nomenclature in what we're calling the glacial aquifer. She doesn't want us to use 'aquifer system' – she suggests "glacial aquifers of the Northern United States". 'Aquifer' infers yield. When we say 'system' we imply a whole system which is what we're looking at. Aquifers (plural) implies more than one aquifer where we know the components that make it up. We are looking at one regional aquifer as a whole. We will keep it 'glacial aquifer system of the Northern United States'.

ACTION: All use 'glacial aquifer system of the Northern United States'. Lower case glacial aquifer (Kelly will check on capitalization).

ACTION: Kelly - Ask someone in Office of Ground Water to make sure our naming/terminology is acceptable.

Went over Dorothy's comments on our outlines:

Comments on Kelly's intro too long – reference other works. Keep in mind Homeland security issues when wells are shown on maps.

Comments on Mary Anne's – were about order of sections. Use of terminology – like 'selected hydrogeologic settings' in reference to the modeling part of her report. All comments were pretty minor.

Comments on Terri's -- Dorothy suggested everyone use Terri's outline as a template for the introductory parts of their reports – it would be a good foundation report for the series. Didn't like 'implication' in title.

ACTION: Terri email annotated outline to everyone to look at introduction part. People can look at web page.

ACTION: Terri Make figures of CO and NYNE and get covers together for everyone. Post on the Web page. (simple location maps).

Comments on John's report – about organization of the outline. Didn't like 'relation to explanatory variables' in the title. She didn't like the 'implications' in title either.

ACTION: ALL everyone get updated outlines to Kelly and Terri. Terri will post on the web.

Comments on Sarah – didn't like 'implication' in title. Didn't like outline in journal format. She didn't like the discussion section. The report will now be an SIR so they'll be re-doing outline in USGS style. 'Discussion' for USGS is in summary.

Comments on George's – didn't like 'mixture' in the title because the meaning wasn't clear. She also didn't like 'glacial aquifer system of the Northern United States'.

ACTION: ALL update 2-page proposals to accurately reflect what we're doing. Pay particular attention to benefits and implications --- for posting to a public web page. Be sure to include the publication format. By tomorrow preferable but no later than next week.

Discussed potential additional funding

Things that benefit a regional report would be given priority. How much money is there?

There are several pots of money available. The biggest pot of money with uncommitted funds is not associated with any particular component. NLT meeting next week – will discuss additional requested funds. Priority so

far is MRB and PA studies to do as much more work in FY05 as possible. Also topical studies will be prioritized.

What have people been thinking about?

- A meeting of the principal investigators to share results and have a discussion. "Team member interaction" Special meeting planned with money to support getting investigators together to discuss our methods. Would benefit this principal aquifer and maybe all principal aquifer groups. There is Nat'l money currently set aside for SW regional authors to get together. Figure how much money per person and how many people.
- National Ground Water meeting attendance -- \$\$ to pay for travel. Maybe have an extra day at the hotel or in the San Antonio Sub-district office to have a GLAC or PA meeting (like described in #1 above).
ACTION: Kelly submit estimate for travel costs to NGW meeting. (Sarah, Joe, John Mullaney, Kelly) and cc group.
- \$\$ for SPlus training – pay for travel for NAWQA people? (Mary Ann, Sarah, Chris, John, Dan would also be interested – maybe 10 total in glacial team).
ACTION: Kelly - Send cost estimate about the SPlus training to Wayne and Mike Y.
- Source water assessment studies in glacial (maybe 3-4?) – could synthesize data and at least prepare a fact sheet of the results for source water assessments in the glacial aquifer system. This work would have to be done in FY05. Mike Y. said that Jim Kingston and Jessica (?) are working on QW reports to make a report template. Touch base with Greg on it. Jim did check and their work is going to be in FY06? May not be pertinent at that point. People want to see results of the studies now – they don't want to wait on a template. Maybe ask Greg on Friday's conference call what the status is.
- Purchase GIS grid of snowfall from a private company (about \$500).
ACTION: Have John Mullaney submit the request (should through the study unit chief)

ACTION: ALL - If anyone submits request for additional funds to Mike, cc Kelly so that she knows what's going on. Include account number.

Discussion about NGW meeting in April

- Plan for a 15 minute presentation and 5 minutes for questions.
 - Share powerpoint presentations on the web as we make them. Maybe make a banner or icon showing that all our talks are based on the same aquifer system. Standard intro slide with different titles – maybe showing location map Terri made.
- ACTION:** Terri make template for intro/title slide in powerpoint for everyone to use.

Other issues:

None. This was a helpful meeting. We need to keep up our communications among whole group.

Next conference call: March 10, 2005 at 2:00 EST. Kelly will reserve the line.