

CERS 3.0 Proposed Enhancements Reviewed by the Data Steering Committee					
APSA: 7 TOPICS					
		NOT SUPPORTED	SUPPORTED	<i>Defer for Action other than CERS 3.0 implementation</i>	<i>Need Follow Up</i>
		0	7	0	0
ID	TITLE				NOTES
APSA1 SUPPORT	New Data Field: Date of SPCC Plan Certification or 5 year Review				Impacts on EDT and local systems Title 27 - Data Dictionary Per workshop discussion: include a Help Bubble by each tank related field to note the definition of "tank" as a 55 gallon drum or other type of storage container.
APSA2 SUPPORT	New Data Field: Total Aboveground Petroleum Storage Capacity				
APSA3 SUPPORT	New Data Field: Number of Tanks in Underground Area				
APSA4 SUPPORT	NEW APSA Submittal Element related to 3 NEW APSA Data Fields Revised to NEW APSA User Interface screen that encompasses the APSA submittal element and 3 new data fields.				Impacts on EDT and local systems Title 27 - Data Dictionary Some details revised to APSA6 and APSA7
APSA5 SUPPORT	Modify DESCRIPTION for Data Field 8 (Own or Operate an Aboveground Petroleum Storage Tank)				Impacts on EDT and local systems Title 27 - Data Dictionary

APSA6 SUPPORT	Revise EDT schema to exchange the 3 new APSA data fields with CUPA software providers and others consistent with current exchange agreements.	Impacts on EDT and local systems Title 27 - Data Dictionary
APSA7 SUPPORT	Modify the existing FACILITY search function to return results that display these fields. Modify the existing FACILITY search Excel export to include columns for these 3 new data fields.	Impacts on EDT and local systems Title 27 - Data Dictionary

CME: 14 TOPICS

	NOT SUPPORTED	SUPPORTED	<i>Defer for Action other than CERS 3.0 implementation</i>	<i>Need Follow Up</i>
	2	12	4	3

<i>ID</i>	<i>TITLE</i>	<i>NOTES</i>
CME3 SUPPORT	NEW "Non Inspection Related" Violation Type Example: Failure to submit an HMBP or HMIS	Impacts on EDT and local systems Title 27 - Data Dictionary
CME16 SUPPORT	Auto populate field 932 (Violation Date) by field 906 (Inspection Date)	Impacts on EDT and local systems Title 27 - Data Dictionary
CME17 SUPPORT	NEW check boxes for each Tiered Permitting Unit Type (PBR, CA, CE)	Impacts on EDT and local systems Title 27 - Data Dictionary
CME19 SUPPORT	Field 935: RTC Qualifier- Definition for "4-Unobserved" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change definition in Title 27 for data field 935 Change text in CERS 	Title 27 - Data Dictionary

<p>CME10 SUPPORT</p>	<p>"Delete" all related enforcement actions and violations when a single inspection is "deleted." When an inspection is deleted, all violations associated with that deleted inspection will automatically be deleted by CERS. Currently, the inspection can be deleted by any associated violations have to also be independently deleted.</p>	<p>Impacts on EDT and local systems</p>
<p>CME18 SUPPORT</p>	<p>Transfer of Ownership- Archive CME Data and create report</p>	<p>Impacts on EDT and local systems Combine with CME15</p>
<p>CME13 SUPPORT</p>	<p>Searchable & Sortable column with Citation/Law/Regulation in Violation Library Work with CFB to revise and/or reference inspection checklists</p>	<p>This could be done as an enhancement to CERS 3. May impact local systems.</p>
<p>CME6 SUPPORT</p>	<p>Clarification of NTC, NOV, Informal/Formal Enforcement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add text to CERS to clarify a violation can be/will be counted as an informal action AUTOMATICALLY, regardless of it being a NOV/NTC • Because UPAs will no longer be required to enter "NOV-Only" informal enforcement actions, should we remove or hide this field/option in CERS? <p><i>Defer for Action other than CERS 3.0 implementation</i></p> <p><i>Need Follow Up</i></p>	<p>ISSUE NEW Policy via FAQ for Informal Enforcement: Violations to be considered Informal Action</p> <p>Delete "Nov-Only" option from field 914?</p> <p>Title 27 - Data Dictionary</p> <p>Impacts on EDT and local systems</p>

<p>CME8 SUPPORT</p>	<p>Develop a Way to Note "Graduated Enforcement" in CERS When a NOV/NTC is Not Corrected Initially and Escalated to a Class 1 or 2 Violation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FAQ needs to clarify the current options to either create a new violation and comment OR go back in and change minor violations to “not resolved” RTC status and issue a NEW Class 2 violation and /or comment. • If violations aren’t labeled as “not resolved” and a Class 2 violation is generated, duplicated counts of violations may exist. • Can CERS omit counting "not resolved" violations if they may also be reentered as Class 2's? • For RCRA or LQG Program, graduated enforcement must be reported by UPAs. Otherwise, graduated enforcement “may” be entered in CERS.-??? 		
	<p><i>Defer for Action other than CERS 3.0 implementation</i></p>	<p>Issue FAQ (CalEPA) Also see FAQ: “Reporting Escalated Violations.”</p>	
<p>CME4 SUPPORT (1st option)</p>	<p>Create a Web-Based FILLABLE Page for UPAs to Complete and Upload Formal Enforcement Summary Reports directly in CERS</p> <p>Rather than create a web-based fillable page, new fields will be added to the "ENFORCEMENT ACTION DETAILS" screen, for each CUPA, and titles of existing data fields will be revised to mirror the Formal Enforcement Summary template currently available. Additionally, a report (MS Excel download) will be created and accessible for the public, without having to log into CERS.</p>	<p>Impacts on EDT and local systems</p> <p>Title 27 - Data Dictionary</p>	
	<p><i>Defer for Action other than CERS 3.0 implementation</i></p>	<p>Defer to DSC/TAG to determine how Statewide cases will be documented. <i>Should a field be added for Statewide cases?</i> Enforcement against a business could cover a lot of multi-jurisdictional facilities.</p>	
<p>CME1 SUPPORT</p>	<p>NEW Type or Status for a "Not Applicable" Violation / Inspection in CERS</p> <p>NOTE: data field on MS Excel Upload is 20.0041</p>	<p>Need research</p> <p>Impacts on EDT and local systems</p> <p>Title 27- Data Dictionary</p>	
	<p><i>Need Follow Up</i></p>	<p>Need to determine:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • what status options to use , “Rescinded,” or “Not Applicable” or both • HOW the change in status will flow to RCRA Info, HWTS if applicable • Make comment fields “minimally required” so that a reason has to be given for the “Rescinded” or “Not Applicable” status 	

<p>CME15 SUPPORT</p>	<p>CME data to follow same relocation logic as Submittal data in the event of a facility transfer or merge (for a duplicate record, and no change of ownership)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option for a check box to transfer info to a new owner, or it will be archived. • If the check box is checked and the violations no longer apply to the facility's new owner, simply change RTC status of the violation to "Not Resolvable" OR complete violation/RTC BEFORE the transfer/merge of the facility. • If check box is checked for submittals, CERS creates editable draft of the last submittal from the old owner for the new owner. • Separate archive section for INSPECTIONS and VIOLATIONS of the previous owner will show up in the archive section of the new owner for transfer or merge. • Process "How To" will be different for EDT & data uploading. <p>CERS Records know the transfer date and can differentiate owners of the violations. Provide an archive view feature for history, similar archival submittal UI.</p>	<p>Impacts on EDT and local systems</p> <p>Combine with CME18</p>
	<p><i>Need Follow Up</i></p>	<p>Provide an FAQ to describe the process for manually changing violation status BEFORE merging facilities/new owner transfer.</p>
<p>CME5 NOT SUPPORTED</p>	<p>Develop ability to directly generate a corresponding Enforcement Action when a violation is created</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maneuvering in CERS back to the “create an Enforcement” button for Formal Enforcements isn’t that terrible to do, and it doesn’t happen that often. This only affects UPAs entering data directly into CERS. • This will benefit a very small # of UPAs & will seldomly occur with the button on this screen, you’d have to know it’s going to be a Formal Enforcement before entering the violation • CME 6: with the new policy, UPAs will no longer be required to make a separate entry for any NOV/NTC issued as an informal enforcement • CME8: FAQ issued will address how to report escalation of violation. 	
<p>CME14 NOT SUPPORTED</p>	<p>Pop Up selection of most common Violations</p> <p>This can already be done in Envision Connect and with the MS Excel Export feature. With the MS Excel Export, the UPA simply has to add a “rank” or “priority order” in a blank column next to each violation, then sort according to the priority column.</p>	
	<p><i>Defer for Action other than CERS 3.0 implementation</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue FAQ (D. Firth-CalePA) on how this can currently be done. • The CFB or ESC can develop a comprehensive statewide list of priority and most common violations, if so desired.

GENERAL/ OTHER: 22 TOPICS					
		NOT SUPPORTED	SUPPORTED	<i>Defer for Action other than CERS 3.0 implementation</i>	<i>Need Follow Up</i>
		4	18	1	6
ID	TITLE				NOTES
G24 SUPPORT	This is CERS 3 This is the actual description for CERS 3.0 and is not considered an enhancement request.				
G27 SUPPORT	Provide Program Element AND Submittal Element search filters in all "Search" and "Report" locations where one or the other is currently provided (including NEW APSA data fields)				
G28 SUPPORT	"Action Required" for Businesses Access request notifications will be sent to business lead users under the "Notifications" section rather than the "Action Required" section.				
G29 SUPPORT	Auto translation of "State" data fields to all CAPS If OPTION 1 is done, OPTION 2 is no longer needed. Similar to "auto convert" date field enhancement, G5				
G11 SUPPORT	Verification of EPA ID Numbers with US EPA and CERS and the Local Agency The Data Warehouse resolution will include this. HWTS and CERS will validate US EPA ID #'s with each other. Duplicates, military sites and campuses will be taken into consideration. This will help UPAs identify facilities with EPA ID #'s but no CERS ID #'s.				May impact EDT and local systems
G5 SUPPORT	Format of Dates when manually keying in CERS				
G1 SUPPORT	Retain query results and filters when returning to SEARCH results from a selected "DETAIL" page				
G26 SUPPORT	"Next Item" button when reviewing the Chemical Inventory				
G21 SUPPORT	New Email Notification: PBR Annual Renewal 60-day and 5-day Reminder Two notifications: 1 @ 60 days prior to "next due date" and 1 @ 5 days prior to "next due date" UPAs should have the ability to determine if they want to use this reminder notification or if it is not needed because they do reminders a different way.				Combine with G2, G22
G22 SUPPORT	Submittals Due: Automated Email Notification to Regulated Facilities UPAs should have the ability to determine if they want to use this reminder notification or if it is not needed because they do reminders a different way.				Combine with G2, G21
G18 SUPPORT	Add "Local Facility Grouping" Number (registry field # 20.0404) to UPA "Submittal Notification" email Add "Local Facility Grouping" Number to the SUBJECT line of the notification.				Combine with G2

G8 SUPPORT (1 st option- partially)	Make non-applicable or options not accepted by UPAs unavailable for businesses to select in all program/submittal elements EX) Grey out ability to upload SPCC plan for APSA		Impacts on EDT and local systems
	<i>Need Follow Up</i>	Need to determine which options will be greyed out for each submittal element.	
G13 SUPPORT Depending on feedback	Improving Usability of CERS User Interface: Navigation		
	<i>Need Follow Up</i>	Need to obtain details and examples from CBUG and DSC regarding design specifics.	
G14 SUPPORT Depending on feedback	Improving Usability of CERS User Interface: Dashboard and Search ability for Businesses Plan Data		
	<i>Need Follow Up</i>	Need to obtain details and examples from CBUG and DSC regarding design specifics.	
G15 SUPPORT Depending on feedback	Improving Usability of CERS User Interface: Drop Down Menus for Selections		
	<i>Need Follow Up</i>	Need to obtain details and examples from CBUG and DSC regarding design specifics.	
G16 SUPPORT Depending on feedback	Improving Usability of CERS User Interface -Develop a floating header to make certain information ALWAYS available when reviewing/drafting data		
	<i>Need Follow Up</i>	Need to obtain details and examples from CBUG and DSC regarding design specifics.	
G25 SUPPORT	Develop FILLABLE FORMS and/or TEMPLATES for Plans/Statements to upload into CERS		Combine with HW7
	<i>Defer for Action other than CERS 3.0 implementation</i>	DSC/TAGs to develop fillable forms and revise existing forms. Links to the fillable forms will be made available in CERS 3.0.	

<p>G2 SUPPORT with solution suggested at Workshop</p>	<p>Email Notifications: Ability for Users and LEAD Users to set preferences on what types of notifications they automatically receive via CERS Workshop Suggested Solution: Support adding a field in the Lead User profile to add email addresses for additional recipients to receive notifications. Replicate the functionality of the Regulator Lead User for the Business Lead User to identify users that can receive <i>certain</i> notifications.</p>	<p>Combine with HMBP14, S1, G21, G22, G18</p>
	<p>Need Follow Up</p> <p>DSC to identify which <i>certain</i> notifications lead business users can choose for other businesses users.</p>	
	<p>1. Not supported. Not possible, notifications are generated by each action in CERS. 2. Addressed with suggested solution above. 3. Addressed with suggested solution above. 4. Not supported. No CME notifications exist to send to business users. 5. Addressed with suggested solution above. 6. Addressed with suggested solution above. 7. Not supported. No CME notifications exist to send to business users. 8. Not supported. There are businesses that still wish to receive the notifications. Not possible to allow for opting out due to notifications being generated by each action in CERS. 9. Addressed with suggested solution above.</p>	
<p>G19 NOT SUPPORTED</p>	<p>NEW Notification Email Sent to CERS Business Users- REMINDER for EPA ID CERS is a reporting tool, not a data management tool.</p>	
<p>G30 NOT SUPPORTED</p>	<p>In Search parameters, cursor should start at the "CERS ID" field</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benefit is not worth the effort to decide a default field for the cursor. Too much variation among users with the methods for searching. It would save one mouse click IF the cursor was defaulted in the field the user wanted, but wouldn't save any mouse clicks if the cursor wasn't in the field the user wanted. 	
<p>G9 NOT SUPPORTED</p>	<p>Under Threshold Reporting for Sites No Longer Regulated There are not many businesses with a significantly large volume of facilities. They often fall under multiple jurisdictions (regulated by different UPAs). The need for declaring under threshold reporting for multiple facilities doesn't happen very often. The business is likely going to have more operational changes for each facility in addition to the changes needed in CERS to designate each facility as being "under threshold" for reporting.</p>	
<p>G10 NOT SUPPORTED</p>	<p>Identifying CFATS facilities, Add a field for Federal Tier 2, or Both Benefit is not worth the effort. There are approximately 160,000 regulated facilities in California. Of those, approximately 400 are CFATS facilities. Each time CFATS changes the list, CERS would have to be updated as well. Users can currently search by "chemical" in CERS. Data may not be reliable because of misspelled chemicals or errors based on entries made by businesses.</p>	

HMBP: 10 TOPICS					
		NOT SUPPORTED	SUPPORTED	<i>Defer for Action other than CERS 3.0 implementation</i>	<i>Need Follow Up</i>
		3	7	0	1
ID	TITLE				NOTES
HMBP 20 SUPPORT	Bulk Upload of Auto Populated Start/End Dates As a result of discussions during the WORKSHOP (6/23-25/15), this enhancement was suggested and supported. This may be a data seeding request and not necessarily a CERS 3.0 enhancement.				Related to HMBP 12, S35
HMBP1 SUPPORT with solution suggested at Workshop	Add Fields For Hazardous Substances Listings (Chemical Library) <u>Workshop Suggested Solution:</u> Add field for CalARP reporting thresholds. Upon entering the quantity, a pop up may be triggered to inform the business to contact their local UPA to ensure whether or not the facility may be subject to CalARP reporting requirements.				May impact EDT and local systems
HMBP18 SUPPORT	Require a complete HMBP submission A pop-up can be created to remind businesses of what is included in an annual submittal. EX) "If this is an Annual Submittal, the following elements are required...."				Related to PPT: S8, S15, S30
HMBP15 SUPPORT	Trade Secrets Only actions possible now: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • have "YES" radial button trigger a pop-up to confirm Trade Secret should be noted for the chemical • CalEPA will work with businesses to verify current Trade Secret entries and remove any that are not legit. 				May impact local systems. Title 27 will need to be revised to address Trade Secret information, parallel to US EPA requirements.
HMBP10 SUPPORT	Add Pop-Up Bubble for guidance when "WASTE" is selected: Chemical Inventory – Material vs. Waste				
HMBP14 SUPPORT	Email Notification: Business Plan Due Dates				See G2

HMBP12 SUPPORT	Auto Populate Fields 100 (Beginning Date) & 101 (Ending Date) "Next Due Date" is auto populated +365 days and auto populates start and end dates.		Impacts on EDT and local systems Title 27 - Data Dictionary Related to HMBP 20, S35
	<i>Need Follow Up</i>	Defer to DSC to determine if: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • efforts for automating the start and end dates is more or less than the benefit • Need to determine how the dates will be auto populated 	
HMBP17 NOT SUPPORTED	Chemical Inventory- Prop 65 Carcinogens/Reproductive Toxins Tracking Prop 65 chemicals is outside the scope of the Unified Program and CERS		
HMBP19 NOT SUPPORTED	NEW Lat/Long and Comment Fields For Identifying Storage Locations of Hazardous Materials Lat/Long/Comment can be entered currently in field 201, the existing description field. Emergency responders are not likely to rely on this information as it is unverified and populated by business users.		Previously HW3
HMBP3 NOT SUPPORTED	QA/QC of Chemical Inventory Ability for variation amount entries currently exists. Authority does not allow for constraining reporting variations among businesses.		This can already be done

HAZARDOUS WASTE GENERATOR: 6 TOPICS

		NOT SUPPORTED	SUPPORTED	Defer for Action other than CERS 3.0 implementation	Need Follow Up
		1	5	0	1
ID	TITLE	NOTES			
HW1 SUPPORT	Revise Title and Definition of Small Quantity Generator (SQG) Facility Indicator 1 st option- approved as is. 2 nd option- support proposed solution for auto population based on HWG/SQG answers. No need for a separate user interface.				
HW8 SUPPORT	NEW FIELD: Schools Hazardous Waste Collection, Consolidation and Accumulation Facilities Notification (SHWCCAF)	Impacts on EDT and local systems Need to change Title 22 Title 27 - Data Dictionary			

HW11 SUPPORT	Amend text in Block 6 of the Business Activities page as follows: Does your facility generate in any single calendar month equal or greater than: 1,000 kg (2,200 pounds) or more of RCRA hazardous waste, or 1 kg (2.2 lbs) of RCRA acutely hazardous waste? Do not check the box if: your generation rates of RCRA hazardous waste does not exceed either of the two preceding criteria or you generate only non-RCRA hazardous waste(s).		
HW7 SUPPORT	Consolidated Emergency Response/ Contingency Plan (New Field on FILLABLE FORM and Revise Text on FILLABLE FORM)		Combine with G25
HW10 SUPPORT	DTSC Haz Waste ID Numbers vs USEPA EPA ID Numbers This is Question 3 on the Business Activities Page.		May impact Title 27 - Data Dictionary
	<i>Need Follow Up</i>	The data field will not change. DTSC will provide clarifying instructions of what businesses need to report. Existing text in the Help Bubble will be revised.	
HW3 NOT SUPPORTED	NEW Lat/Long and Comment Fields For Identifying Storage Locations of Hazardous Materials <i>Renamed: HMBP 19</i>		
HW9 NOT SUPPORTED	NEW Data Field for Annual Generation/Disposal of Haz Waste Need to have statute/regulation to require this information		

REPORTS: 8 TOPICS

	NOT SUPPORTED	SUPPORTED	<i>Defer for Action other than CERS 3.0 implementation</i>	<i>Need Follow Up</i>
	2	6	0	1

ID	TITLE	NOTES
R8 SUPPORT	Create Report or Excel Export to Show Submittal Comments Chronologically for One or More Facilities	
R2 SUPPORT	New Report: Basic facility and APSA submittal information	
R7 SUPPORT with solution suggested at Workshop	UST Reporting Tool for Business Users <i>Workshop Suggested Solution:</i> Create a MS Excel export of all UST data for a business use, specific to the facilities under that business (similar to MS Excel exports currently available for Regulators).	
R4 SUPPORT	Add REGULATOR KEY and AGENT to all CERS Reports and spreadsheet outputs, when applicable Also add Regulator Key to the RCRA LQG CME Data Download Report.	Combine with R6
R6 SUPPORT	Add "Local Facility Grouping" number (registry field # 20.0404) to the submittal download report	Combine with R4

R3 SUPPORT	Consolidated Reporting options for businesses and regulators to create reports				
	<i>Need Follow Up</i>	Defer to DSC/TAGs to define parameters & contents for businesses & regulators			
R5 NOT SUPPORTED	Add REGULTOR KEY to MS Excel CME Upload This already exists as "Column B" in the MS Excel CME Upload spreadsheet.				
R1 NOT SUPPORTED	NEW Chemical Inventory Report to Review Changes There are currently other ways to accomplish this. Information is not likely to be used by Emergency Responders.				
SUBMITTALS: 33 TOPICS					
		NOT SUPPORTED	SUPPORTED	<i>Defer for Action other than CERS 3.0 implementation</i>	<i>Need Follow Up</i>
		14	19	4	4
ID	TITLE				NOTES
S30 SUPPORT	REVISE Submittal Process and Develop a SUMMARY OF SUBMITTAL STATUS for all Program Elements				PPT Presentation by: Shelly Lee & Laurel Funk -Kern Co.
S15 SUPPORT	NO CHANGE Submittals: Automate the Process for submittal/acceptance of Annual Submittals with "No Changes" From Previous Accepted Submittal				
S8 SUPPORT	Additional Options for Submittal "Status" (field 20.0005), Define/Clarify use of each status				
S12 SUPPORT	Set Status of Multiple Submittal Elements Simultaneously, even with a different status for each selected				
S20 SUPPORT (1 st option)	Inform Businesses of Submittal Errors Using ATTACHED COMMENTS				
S37 SUPPORT with solution suggested at Workshop	Transfer of Ownership- Option for Regulator to clear/reset "Next Reporting Due Date" <i>Workshop Suggested Solution:</i> UPAs can currently change the next due date. This will automatically clear all reporting dates and next due dates when the facility is transferred and submittal elements are set as "Not Applicable."				
S27 SUPPORT	NEW Comment Field in Regulator Portal for "Not Applicable" status				Impacts on EDT and local systems Title 27 - Data Dictionary

S33 SUPPORT	Bulk Changes and Submittals For Basic Info		Should have no impact on EDT and local systems Related to PPT, S8, S15, S30
S41 SUPPORT	Editing & Reviewing UST Submittal Data This is a “comparison tool” to view two UST submittals at one time.		
S40 SUPPORT	Change “Submittal History” link to Show Only the History of the Specific Facility		
S25 SUPPORT	Comment Field (20.009)- "Submit" button N/A if PPT Suggestions are implemented for HMBP		Related to PPT, S8, S15, S30
S6 SUPPORT	Site map – Clarify Map Uploading Instructions		
S45 SUPPORT	CERS to compare multiple fields to prevent NEW/DUPLICATE CERS IDs being issued		See S43 for a possible method
S28 SUPPORT (Pop-up only)	Create a Warning Pop-Up box to confirm when "Business Activities" change from NO to YES/YES to NO Pop-up will direct business user to use the existing comment box at the bottom of the screen to provide reason(s) why the change occurred.		
S1 SUPPORT	Email Notification: Submittal "Status" (and/or comments) sent to Businesses from Regulators should automatically include Regulator contact information		Combine with G2
S35 SUPPORT	Auto Populate START/END Date Fields <i>Need Follow Up</i>	Defer to DSC to determine if: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • efforts for automating the start and end dates is more or less than the benefit • Need to determine how the dates will be auto populated 	Impacts on EDT and local systems Title 27 - Data Dictionary Related to HMBP12, HMBP 20
S46 SUPPORT	Certification Boxes for Facility Information Business Owner/Operator Identification (FIELDS 134-137) Fields will most likely be hidden, not deleted. Objective is to impact EDT schema the least amount possible. <i>Need Follow Up</i>	Defer to CalEPA legal to ensure these fields can be removed without jeopardizing “Certification Requirements”	Impacts on EDT and local systems Title 27 - Data Dictionary

S47 SUPPORT	Delete fields 603, 605, 703, 731, 732: relative to names/titles/dates of Haz Waste submittals Fields will most likely be hidden, not deleted. Objective is to impact EDT schema the least amount possible.	Impacts on EDT and local systems Title 27 - Data Dictionary
	<i>Need Follow Up</i>	
S43 SUPPORT	New CERS ID not issued unless CERS verifies physical location change	See S45 for a possible method
	<i>Need Follow Up</i>	
S18 NOT SUPPORTED	Inform Businesses of Submittal Errors Using Data Field 20.0009 and/or a NEW MS Excel export from CERS Regarding the MS Excel export: This functionality should be exercised at the local level between the local regulator and business, keeping in mind that CERS is a reporting tool not a management tool.	
S19 NOT SUPPORTED	Inform Businesses of Submittal Errors Using PORTAL submission review (MS Excel document from Joel Martens) Regarding the MS Excel export: This functionality should be exercised at the local level between the local regulator and business, keeping in mind that CERS is a reporting tool not a management tool.	
S29 NOT SUPPORTED	New Field: Address Verification for Emergency Responder Use Having two addresses in CERS could potentially create more confusion and inconsistency than the benefits.	
S48 NOT SUPPORTED	Email Notification to Regulators- Submittal Warnings Each UPA may consider different notifications to have different importance and value.	
S3 NOT SUPPORTED	Transfer of Ownership- Tracking information more detail (i.e. Transfer, merge, reporting requirements change) This functionality should be exercised at the local level between the local regulator and business, keeping in mind that CERS is a reporting tool not a management tool. This information is currently available in the "Notifications" history.	
S4 NOT SUPPORTED	Transfer of Ownership – Warning Triangle When Business Name is Changed Each UPA may consider different notifications to have different importance and value.	
S44 NOT SUPPORTED	Transfer of Ownership- Change of Ownership This functionality should be exercised at the local level between the local regulator and business, keeping in mind that CERS is a reporting tool not a management tool. A change in ownership may also require additional updates to the facility information, such as issued permits.	
S42 NOT SUPPORTED	Modify Submittal Comments Display It appears that this can already be done.	

<p>NOT SUPPORTED</p>	<p>S39</p>	<p>Revise UST and HMBP/HMP Comment Pages This functionality should be exercised at the local level between the local regulator and business, keeping in mind that CERS is a reporting tool not a management tool.</p>			
<p>NOT SUPPORTED</p>	<p>S7</p>	<p>Chemical Inventory Uploads: Develop Detailed Comparison/Processing Tool of Current/Previous Submitted via MS Excel Upload Concept is SUPPORTED, however development and implementation is <i>not supported</i> with the current CERS operating system.</p>			
<p>NOT SUPPORTED</p>	<p>S22</p>	<p>Modify "Reviewer Comments" fields for each submittal element (field 20.0009) If field 20.0009 is increased in size, or if formatting is added, changes in EDT schema will result. The intent of the comment field is to provide simple instructions for correction of simple errors regarding submittals. If more than a couple sentences are needed to convey required correction, the UPA should be corresponding with the business in addition to the information contained in field 20.0009.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="317 548 1703 691"> <tr> <td data-bbox="317 548 541 691"> <p><i>Defer for Action other than CERS 3.0 implementation</i></p> </td> <td data-bbox="548 548 1703 691"> <p>Provide guidance to UPAs as to how best use the comment field.</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p><i>Defer for Action other than CERS 3.0 implementation</i></p>	<p>Provide guidance to UPAs as to how best use the comment field.</p>	
<p><i>Defer for Action other than CERS 3.0 implementation</i></p>	<p>Provide guidance to UPAs as to how best use the comment field.</p>				
<p>NOT SUPPORTED</p>	<p>S26</p>	<p>Comment Field (20.009)- increase # of characters, more than 1500 If field 20.0009 is increased in size, or if formatting is added, changes in EDT schema will result. The intent of the comment field is to provide simple instructions for correction of simple errors regarding submittals. If more than a couple sentences are needed to convey required correction, the UPA should be corresponding with the business in addition to the information contained in field 20.0009.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="317 873 1703 1016"> <tr> <td data-bbox="317 873 541 1016"> <p><i>Defer for Action other than CERS 3.0 implementation</i></p> </td> <td data-bbox="548 873 1703 1016"> <p>Provide guidance to UPAs as to how best use the comment field.</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p><i>Defer for Action other than CERS 3.0 implementation</i></p>	<p>Provide guidance to UPAs as to how best use the comment field.</p>	
<p><i>Defer for Action other than CERS 3.0 implementation</i></p>	<p>Provide guidance to UPAs as to how best use the comment field.</p>				
<p>NOT SUPPORTED</p>	<p>S38</p>	<p>User Interface Modifications: Facility Contact Information pop-up</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="317 1068 1703 1214"> <tr> <td data-bbox="317 1068 541 1214"> <p><i>Defer for Action other than CERS 3.0 implementation</i></p> </td> <td data-bbox="548 1068 1703 1214"> <p>Provide FAQ to UPAs as to how this can already be done.</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p><i>Defer for Action other than CERS 3.0 implementation</i></p>	<p>Provide FAQ to UPAs as to how this can already be done.</p>	
<p><i>Defer for Action other than CERS 3.0 implementation</i></p>	<p>Provide FAQ to UPAs as to how this can already be done.</p>				
<p>NOT SUPPORTED</p>	<p>S5</p>	<p>Transfer of Ownership- Changing and Viewing NEW Business/Facility Name The existing warning notification explains the name won't change in the business user view until it has been accepted by the regulator.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="317 1328 1703 1466"> <tr> <td data-bbox="317 1328 541 1466"> <p><i>Defer for Action other than CERS 3.0 implementation</i></p> </td> <td data-bbox="548 1328 1703 1466"> <p>CalEPA to develop a training PPT for businesses and regulators to address "How To Merge a Business/Facility," "How to Submit for Name Change," "How to process a change in ownership," "What data and Where it is archived/found after a merge," etc.</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p><i>Defer for Action other than CERS 3.0 implementation</i></p>	<p>CalEPA to develop a training PPT for businesses and regulators to address "How To Merge a Business/Facility," "How to Submit for Name Change," "How to process a change in ownership," "What data and Where it is archived/found after a merge," etc.</p>	
<p><i>Defer for Action other than CERS 3.0 implementation</i></p>	<p>CalEPA to develop a training PPT for businesses and regulators to address "How To Merge a Business/Facility," "How to Submit for Name Change," "How to process a change in ownership," "What data and Where it is archived/found after a merge," etc.</p>				

TITLE 27: 2 TOPICS					
		NOT SUPPORTED	SUPPORTED	<i>Defer for Action other than CERS 3.0 implementation</i>	<i>Need Follow Up</i>
		0	2	0	0
ID	TITLE				NOTES
TTS5 SUPPORT	Fields 111 and 117- Environmental Contact No Title 27 change needed. Add a Help Bubble and/or change existing text.				
TTS6 SUPPORT	Business Owner Name (Field 111)- What if owner is a Corporation? No Title 27 change needed. Add a Help Bubble and/or change existing text.				
UST: 43 TOPICS					
		NOT SUPPORTED	SUPPORTED	<i>Defer for Action other than CERS 3.0 implementation</i>	<i>Need Follow Up</i>
		9	34	0	2
ID	TITLE				NOTES
UST27 SUPPORT	Split Existing UST Submittal Element Into 3; Modify submittal element rules for submitting				R Impacts on EDT and local systems Title 27 - Data Dictionary Related to UST 28, UST 29
UST28 SUPPORT	Create a New Business User Permission Level				Impacts on EDT and local systems Title 27 - Data Dictionary Related to UST27
UST29 SUPPORT	Create a New Alert Notification				Related to UST27

<p>UST1 SUPPORT</p>	<p>Auto Complete SOC Status Based on Selected Violations</p>	<p>Impacts on EDT and local systems</p> <p>Title 27 - Data Dictionary</p> <p>Related to UST2</p>
<p>UST2 SUPPORT</p>	<p>Violation Library- Identify RD and RP SOC Related Violations</p>	<p>Impacts on EDT and local systems</p> <p>Title 27 - Data Dictionary</p> <p>Related to UST1</p>
<p>UST21 SUPPORT</p>	<p>Convert "Certification of Installation" data entry screen black to a PDF for upload in new "3rd Party UST Submittal Element"</p>	<p>Impacts on EDT and local systems</p> <p>Title 27 - Data Dictionary</p>
<p>UST5 SUPPORT</p>	<p>Develop CERS Generated Unique UST ID numbers (field 432)</p>	<p>Impacts on EDT and local systems</p> <p>Title 27 - Data Dictionary</p>
<p>UST40 SUPPORT</p>	<p>Make "Petroleum Financial Responsibility Code" (Field 422) a Minimally Required Field.</p>	<p>Impacts on EDT and local systems</p> <p>Title 27 - Data Dictionary</p>
<p>UST48 SUPPORT</p>	<p>Make Field 435 (Date UST Installed) a Minimally Required Field.</p>	<p>Impacts on EDT and local systems</p> <p>Title 27 - Data Dictionary</p>

UST4 SUPPORT	Modify UST Field 437 to be a Minimally Required Field	Impacts on EDT and local systems Title 27 - Data Dictionary
UST32 SUPPORT	Modify Petroleum Tank Contents valid values (field 440)	Impacts on EDT and local systems Title 27 - Data Dictionary
UST33 SUPPORT	Allow Selection of Multiple Options for Piping System (field 458)	Impacts on EDT and local systems Title 27 - Data Dictionary
UST34 SUPPORT	Allow Selection of Multiple Options for Piping Monitoring (field 490-29)	Impacts on EDT and local systems Title 27 - Data Dictionary
UST19 SUPPORT	Modify UST Red Tag Fields (913 b-e) (914)	Impacts on EDT and local systems Title 27 - Data Dictionary
UST8 SUPPORT	Change the Name of Monitoring Site Plan	Impacts on EDT and local systems Title 27 - Data Dictionary
UST42 SUPPORT	Multiple Facility Bulk Upload UST Documentation & Data	
UST50 SUPPORT	Multiple Facility UST Submittals	
UST51 SUPPORT	Create DRAFT UST facility and tank data by copying another tank facility dataset	

UST3 SUPPORT	Increase Field Lengths for UST Monitoring Devices	Impacts on EDT and local systems Title 27 - Data Dictionary
UST56 SUPPORT	Change “owner” to “owner or operator” in Titles 23 and 27	Title 27 - Data Dictionary Title 23
UST17 SUPPORT	Prevent Deletion of Valid UST Records	
UST38 SUPPORT	Hide Document Upload Option for: UST Letter from Chief Financial Officer	
UST54 SUPPORT	UST Element View and Organization	
UST24 SUPPORT	Transfer of Ownership- Provide UST Tank Information/Monitoring Plan for Each Tank as DRAFT to New Owner	(pop-up)
UST31 SUPPORT	Modify UST Facility/Tank Data Download Report Overview Page	
UST13 SUPPORT	Modify BOE Help Bubble	
UST14 SUPPORT	Add Help Bubble: UST Tank Form- UDC Monitoring Stops Flow of Product at Dispenser Help Bubble)	
UST36 SUPPORT	Create Model PDF Form for UST Owner/Operator Agreement	
UST52 SUPPORT	Combine Misc. UST PDF forms	Combine with UST27, UST45
UST39 SUPPORT	Delete fields: 424-427, 470-472, 490-76, 490-77, 490-78, 490-79. Names and Title of Preparer and Signature Dates	
UST55 SUPPORT	Revise Tank Information screens to the tank ID number(s) are always visible	
UST57 SUPPORT	Arrangement of Print Submittal results and tank information on the Monitoring Plan	

<p>UST20 SUPPORT</p>	<p>Convert UST Unauthorized Release Form to Data Entry Screen & Create NEW Reporting Process This would require creating 17 new data fields. Concept is SUPPORTED, however development and implementation is <i>not supported</i> within CERS 3.0.</p>	<p>Impacts on EDT and local systems</p> <p>Title 27 - Data Dictionary</p>
<p>UST22 SUPPORT with solution suggested at Workshop</p>	<p>Modify fields 430 & 430a, Create 2 new fields for Regulators to report UST Tank closure Workshop Suggested Solution: Fields 430 and 430a will remain to be completed by business users. Two new fields will auto populate based on information entered in fields 430 and 430a, regulator users can edit the information in these new fields if necessary. Report 6 will auto-generate from the two new fields.</p>	<p>Impacts on EDT and local systems</p> <p>Title 27 - Data Dictionary</p>
<p>UST23 NOT SUPPORTED</p>	<p>Make Field 430 (Date UST Permanently Closed) a Minimally Required Field <i>Addressed by UST22</i></p>	
<p>UST46 NOT SUPPORTED</p>	<p>Modify UST CME Reporting to Report Violations for Specific Tank <i>Not Supported by UST Workgroup</i></p>	
<p>UST41 NOT SUPPORTED</p>	<p>Entering UST Data <i>Not Supported by UST Workgroup</i></p>	
<p>UST58 NOT SUPPORTED</p>	<p>Indicate if monitoring plan is identical for all tanks <i>Not Supported by UST Workgroup</i></p>	
<p>UST18 NOT SUPPORTED</p>	<p>Modify PDF Form to Remove Expiration Date and Modify Reporting process to allow reporting to multiple facilities at the same time. <i>Already completed.</i></p>	
<p>UST10 NOT SUPPORTED</p>	<p>Add A Guidance Link or Help Bubble for "Corrosion Protection" (field 448) Name already provides relevant information.</p>	
<p>UST37 NOT SUPPORTED</p>	<p>Create a Monitoring Equipment Resource Link This is not relevant to CERS 3.0. There are no SWRCB resources available to dedicate to this task at this time.</p>	

<p>UST45 NOT SUPPORTED</p>	<p>Create Specific Upload Document Names for 19 "Misc State Required Documents" <i>Same as UST52</i></p>	
<p>UST35 NOT SUPPORTED</p>	<p>Verify Statement of Compliance (SOC) <i>Already completed.</i></p>	