## Peace River Area Monitoring Program (PRAMP) Committee

## Technical Working Group Meeting

### October 19, 2017

**1. Administration:**

* Reviewed the draft of Terms of Reference, section by section
* Discussed the governance dynamic as it needs to be determined how the group will operate and report to the Board

**2. Canister Sampling Program:**

* Provided an overview of the current approach of the canister sampling program
* Identified human errors associated with missed canister events; provided a summary of the history
* Short-term solution identified: lower the alarm level to bring attention to potential canister sampling events.

### November 2, 2017

**1. Administration:**

* Reviewed the revised Terms of Reference
* TWG will approve the TWG meeting minutes by email so they can be shared with the Board in a timely manner.
* Standing items, such as dashboard review, complaints and results, will be migrated from the Board meeting to the TWG. The TWG will report highlights back to the Board of Directors. Standing items on the Board agenda would then be TWG update. Network operator will be invited to only attend the TWG meeting, not the Board meeting.

**2. Canister Sampling Program:**

* Alert setting for NMHC hourly max has been added (0.25ppm) and the alert for NMHC hourly average has been updated (0.1ppm). PRAMP TPMs will receive an alert when NMHC concentrations reach the new alert point.
* The TWG was provided with a proposed modification to the existing canister sampling system. A pressure sensor will be added on the canister system between the canister valve and sample control valve. The intended objective is to minimize human errors that have negatively impacted the current canister system by hard-wiring an trigger alarm.
* A canister system design including the location of the new sensor that will be installed will been provided to the TWG by emails for approval.

**3. DAS Business Case Study:**

The DAS Business Case study was introduced in the TWG. The proposal involves moving the data management functions directly to PRAMP, away from the network contractors. Benefits and challenges were provided to TWG. The TWG will make a recommendation to proceed with the data management initiative to the Board.

**4. Continuous Monitoring Program:**

* A decision regarding the daily zero span check protocol was made. Analyzers will be challenged at 23-hour interval, not 24-hour interval.
* The decision to change span interval was made by the network contractor without prior consultation with PRAMP TPM. Contractors are required to get approval by the PRAMP TPMs before any procedural change is made.
* A decision regarding the data validation protocol was made. Hourly average data that are considered will need to be re-averaged if one-minute data (instantaneous data) are determined to be invalid. Reviewing one-minute data and five-minute data for data validation purposes are always recommended, but not required. However, when instantaneous data is concluded as an invalid value and is discarded during the data validation process, the hourly average must be re-calculated to get true value.