

**Bureau of Air Quality
CEMDPS Trial Kickoff Meeting
Orion Power Midwest, LP
(Reliant Energy)**

The following is a summary of the April 10, 2008 meeting addressing the goals, objectives and processes of the Continuous Emission Monitoring Data Processing System (CEMDPS) trial for Orion Power Midwest, LP.

Participants:

Vince Brisini – Reliant Energy
Kevin Shumaker – Reliant Energy
Tony Catanese – Reliant Energy
Carol Mitchell – Reliant Energy
Luke Beachler – Reliant Energy
Tracy Stanton - ESC
Venkat Ramachandran – Ciber
John Nasta – Ciber
Darin Weaver – PADEP/BIT
Bill Ruesskamp – PADEP/BIT
Thane Lafollette – PADEP/BIT
Gregory Parrish – PADEP/Source Testing & Monitoring
Cheryl Minnich – PADEP/Source Testing & Monitoring
Charles Zadakis – PADEP/CEMS
Natalie Russ – PADEP/CEMS
Rich Basso – PADEP/CEMS

Mr. Parrish called the meeting to order at 1:17 p.m. After a brief introduction of the trial group members in attendance, Mr. Parrish provided a general overview of the agenda topics to be discussed during the meeting. Comments and questions pertaining to the CEMDPS trial would be addressed throughout the meeting.

Mr. Parrish continued to explain that many companies may say, “What’s in it for me?” in regards to being a trial member, stating that the trial will benefit the company by “getting ahead of implementation of Rev. 8”. Although the application has been tested, and most of the bugs have been worked out, Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) needs to see how the external portion will work in regards to evaluating data to monitor system performance. We want to validate the application so we can feel competent when the CEMDPS is used by companies statewide. Ciber and our Bureau of Information Technology (BIT) are working one-on-one to make the CEMDPS work to its full capacity.

We are not here to make changes to the application. The application is complete, so we want to find ways to enhance, but not alter the CEMDPS. The transition from

development to implementation is multi-faceted. This workgroup will help in that transition. It will also help DAHS vendors when dealing with facilities in the future.

Chuck Zadakis continued the meeting: We want to deal with computer access. DEP Greenport is the portal for the CEMDPS application. You will log into the DEP Greenport in order to enter the CEMDPS. Initial users fill out a security access application, which is verified, and are then granted a user name (unless they already have one) and password. The application contains information for us to build your profile for the system which includes your business information and access ability. Having the correct access is important. Configuration data will be accessible according to decisions made at this meeting. Vince, Kevin, Tracy, Luke and Carol Mitchell will be external users. Vince is the submitter. Kevin is the Point of Contact (POC).

Mr. Ramachandran of Ciber gave instruction as how to manipulate Greenport and how to use the CEMDPS application via laptop computer and projection screen.

The following table summarizes the comments and questions provided by trial group members and the results of those comments and questions:

Comment/Question	Result
Mr. Brisini questioned: Is there a procedure to remove someone from Greenport Access?	Mr. Zadakis responded: Contact the Department. There is not currently a set procedure.
Mr. Brisini questioned: What about passwords, will they expire and need to be reset every few months?	Mr. Zadakis responded: No, you can change your password yourself or have us reset your password when necessary.
Mr. Zadakis questioned: Are you going to involve all of your sources in the trial, or only one or two?	Mr. Brisini responded: We want this to be as true to life as possible, so we will be entering as many units as possible.
Mr. Zadakis questioned: When do you as a company feel you can enter the CEMDEPS and devote time to the trial?	Mr. Beachler responded: I prefer to begin in May. The configuration information could be checked in a day.
Mr. Brisini questioned: May seems like a good month to begin. If we begin on May 2 nd , would we need to capture data for May 1 st ?	Mr. Zadakis responded: No. You could capture past emissions data (quarters) if you choose.
Mr. Brisini commented: We would like some communication regarding what should be submitted from week to week.	Mr. Parrish replied: If you refer to the matrix, you can tell us the date you wish to submit certification reports, etc. That way we can track events/units and verify they are successful.
Mr. Brisini commented: I am looking toward the vision of a	Mr. Zadakis replied: The matrix can be moved around; it doesn't

chronological process.	have to be done necessarily in that order.
Mr. Parrish questioned: Is your monitoring plan information in Rev. 8 format?	Mr. Brisini responded: We are not currently dealing with Rev. 8
Mrs. Russ commented: If they are dealing with Rev. 6 or 7, their data still needs to be put in Rev. 8 format.	Mr. Brisini replied: The test program is currently not running in accordance with Rev. 8. We are the guinea pigs to see if this will work in production mode.
Mr. Parrish commented: They could send in first quarter data, the point is to make sure the application functions properly.	Mr. Brisini replied: We will make sure we work together and make decisions together on which data to submit.
Mr. Zadakis commented: May 1 st was set for Reliant to start reviewing the configuration in the production environment. Sending a test protocol would be the next step in the process.	Mr. Beachler replied: I could send in a test protocol by May 7 th .
Mr. Zadakis commented: Phase 1 monitoring plans for a DAS upgrade could be next. It would take some time to populate the system. Monitoring plans for a DAS upgrade would take some time. There's not a lot of information in the system.	Mr. Beachler replied: We should be able to have it in by May 30 th .
Mr. Zadakis questioned: A RATA or some performance data would be good to send in, what would be a reasonable amount of time?	Mr. Beachler responded: By June 3 rd .
Mr. Zadakis questioned: Certification reports? Perhaps we will hold off on those as far as a definitive date. The monitoring plan and protocol, could you put them into EDRs and send them in?	Mr. Nasta responded: We expect the EDRs to come in after successful tests of the on-line system. So we won't set any dates at this time.
Ms. Stanton questioned: Is there any order which you want data sent in?	Mr. Zadakis responded: The order that they are placed in on the trial execution matrix will be the progressive order for sending in data.

Mr. Ramachandran continued to give instruction on how to use the CEMDPS application.

Comment/Question	Result
Mr. Beachler questioned: Will my company's information be pre-populated within the application?	Mr. Nasta responded: Any information we have in the current CEMDPS will be in the new CEMDPS.

<p>Mr. Brisini commented: In the case of acid rain, I don't submit the reports. They are submitted by an agent. In the case of other reports, I sign a letter authorizing others to submit for me. It seems it will take a considerable amount of time for me to personally handle the data these transactions require. Is there the ability to provide different plants to "act as the submitter of data" so I can delegate responsibility to another individual?</p>	<p>Mr. Parrish replied: The information can be submitted by plant supervisory personnel. We opted not to use a pin number as we do with AES on-line. You can build reports, but not submit unless you have a pin number in other systems. In our systems the submitter uses a qualifier button that says that everything I have entered has been truthful and accurate.</p>
<p>Mr. Zadakis commented: Send me a copy of the application you have used in the past to gain permission to give authorization to another party to submit on your behalf.</p>	<p>Mr. Zadakis continued: I will check with legal to be sure where we stand with this.</p>
<p>Mr. Beachler questioned: Is there any way to duplicate information from one unit to another unit?</p>	<p>Mr. Zadakis responded: You could create an EDR file to transfer data.</p>
<p>Mr. Beachler questioned: How accurate does the information we are entering for a Phase 1 monitoring plan need to be?</p>	<p>Mr. Zadakis responded: This will be one of the most time consuming tasks. Some of the information will be pre-populated, but don't be too concerned about accuracy at this point. This will not be put into permanent data for your company.</p>
<p>Mr. Parrish commented: In the future, when you are updating a file, you won't be filling out a blank screen. You will be changing information entered in the past or adding new information to pre-populated information.</p>	
<p>The question was asked: Do you have a document to verify submissions for correctness? Is the system looking for formatting and business rule errors?</p>	<p>Mr. Parrish responded: It's looking for numeric errors and information that is not placed in the report format correctly.</p>
<p>Mr. Zadakis commented: Someone will be reviewing data on our end to make sure it is correct.</p>	<p>Mr. Zadakis continued: We recommend that you save data frequently while putting in information.</p>
<p>Mr. Zadakis commented: If someone had to make changes to three units, they could make changes to an EDR and upload the EDR into the system.</p>	

<p>Mr. Beachler questioned: What is an indicator report?</p>	<p>Mrs. Russ responded: It is an infrequent case when data has been invalidated for some reason and the department would like to see the data as collected by the CEMS.</p>
<p>Mr. Nasta commented: So, that was a quick overview. It would be difficult to retain all of this information. That is why we will be having one-on-one sessions.</p>	<p>Mr. Zadakis commented further: I will have screen shots printed for with some instructional information.</p>
<p>Mr. Parrish questioned: When will it go into production?</p>	<p>Mr. Nasta responded: It will be ready in about two weeks.</p>

Mr. Zadakis asked if there were further questions and offered out his e-mail and phone number to trial group members, commenting that they may want to call rather than e-mail him due to large volumes of e-mails he receives daily.

Mr. Parrish stated that future meetings would be scheduled when needed. Otherwise they would stay in contact and review progress.

The meeting adjourned, 2:59 p.m.