

## Hazards FIT Meeting, November 25, 2014 at DOGAMI, Portland

### Attendees:

In Portland: Steve Lucker (DLCD), Bob DenOuden (GEO), Ian Madin (DOGAMI), Jed Roberts (DOGAMI), Clark Niewendorp (DOGAMI), Bill Burns (DOGAMI), Jeff Weiber (DLCD), Jon Allan (DOGAMI), George Priest (DOGAMI), Chris Shirley (DLCD)

On Phone: Don Pettit (DEQ), Daniel Stoelb (OEM), Marc Rempel (OSU/OE), Joe Murray (OMD)

**A**=action item

**D**=decision

Steve began the meeting with introductions, then walked us through the proposed meeting agenda, noting the Marc Rempel had to leave the meeting early so the discussion on standards for hazards web applications was moved up in the agenda.

While reviewing the agenda Bob noted that the FIT's task of reviewing the list of Hazards Framework data elements should first focus on whether the elements list was still current and relevant and whether data are available, either as a downloaded GIS dataset or through services, leaving the detailed discussion of data standards as a task once we have an agreed upon elements list. In terms of data availability, Bob noted that the focus for Framework data availability is the Oregon Geospatial Data Library (OSDL) on Oregon Explorer and that the Alphalist has not been kept completely in synch with the OSDL. This, along with a review of available framework data services to ensure they point to the most current source data, is a task for GEO to complete in the near term. We also discussed the idea of adding framework theme designations to the alphalist page. Bob noted that in the long term it is likely that this page will go away and be replaced by functionality in OSDL.

Also during agenda review we had a discussion about use of the hazards-fit email list server. An effort will be made to reach out to others who should be on this list. **A** Bob will add a sign-up link for the list onto the Hazards FIT page on the GEO web site.

We then discussed the potential for standards for Hazards data web viewers noting that currently the data they referenced by these sites (Hazards Explorer, HazVu, etc...) is not consistent. Ian noted that the goal for these viewers is to provide a way to make the hazards data more usable for the public, while the hazards data access sites, such as OSLD, are a tool for GIS professionals – not the public. He noted that FITs have not typically worked in the realm of public user data tools. Others noted that the FITs role really is to coordinate amongst viewers that might be accessing hazards data in order to make sure they are accessing the correct framework data sets. Steve asked if the format of framework data had to be GIS data or whether pdf maps, such as FIRM maps where spatial data was not available, could be considered framework. It was agreed that this was possible if the FIT deemed them to constitute a data element within their theme.

We also discussed the topic of climate change data, raising the question of whether data on sea level change, future climate forecast results, and others belong within the Hazards FIT or in the Climate FIT (or elsewhere). **A** Bob will approach the State Climatologist Office for their input on the question of

which FIT theme should encompass forecast results, since their expertise will be needed if these elements are added to Framework (they currently are not part of the elements list)

We then began to review the list of Hazards Framework Elements. We briefly discussed the origin of this list with Bob noting that the set of framework elements were defined early in the framework program (2001?) and that over the years some modifications have occurred. Steve noted that for the most part the list resembled the hazards included in the Oregon statewide hazards mitigation plan. There were questions about the inclusion of dust storm occurrence areas, wind storm hazards, and winter storm hazards where it is difficult to contemplate where these data would come from. After discussing the potential of removing these elements it was agreed that they could stay, at their current low priority, in order to support opportunities for potential future data development work in these areas.

It was noted that the list showed the element Avalanche Zone as being 100% complete. There was some speculation as to what the source of these data might be. Some suggested ODOT as a potential source. **A** Bob will research the existence of these data.

After reviewing the Hazards Elements list it was decided that the addition of a further hierarchical grouping, denoting which hazard type an element belongs to, should be added. Each of these hazards sub-groupings currently have a lead. **A** Each of these leads will review the elements in their area and update the information in the elements list, including what the appropriate datasets representing it are and whether there are published web services available for the element. In some cases elements might be combined (or proposed for elimination) and other elements might be proposed for addition. Bob noted that the Framework database structure already includes a field (called GROUP) that could be used. The Administrative Boundaries FIT makes use of this field to categorize their large list of elements.

We then discussed some potential additions to hazards framework data and/or elements. Bob had noted that the USGS recently updated their seismic event susceptibility datasets and a request had been made to add these data to the OSDL as framework data. **D** Ian noted that DOGAMI plans to update their derived, more usable dataset based on these data and it was agreed that it would be best to wait for this processing to be completed in order to make these data available as Oregon framework data.

We then discussed the potential addition of two new hazards framework data elements; Naturally Occurring Hazardous Materials (NOHM), and Abandoned Mine Locations. Clark described the work that he has led for ODOT to map the existence of a set of 16 hazardous materials that naturally exist in various parts of Oregon, including asbestos, erionite, arsenic, and others. He also described recent work he has completed to map, using lidar, the location of abandoned mine hazards. **D** It was agreed that both of these elements should be added to the Hazards framework theme and the published DOGAMI data for these elements made available to represent these elements..

Another potential element addition that was discussed was channel migration zone. Jed noted that DOGAMI is working on a statewide planning level data layer of channel migration zones for DLCD. **D** It was agreed by the FIT that channel migration zone (CMZ) should also be added as an element to the Hazards framework theme and that the recent DOGAMI dataset would serve as the framework data layer and be made available when published.

We briefly discussed the need for a work plan for the Hazards FIT. A first step in this work plan will be the review and update of the hazards framework element list. Upon completion of that task, we will review the elements for which no data or standard exists and, using the assigned element priorities, plan the work necessary to complete these elements.

We also discussed how the Hazards FIT might forge a closer tie with the State Interagency hazards Mitigation Team (IHMT). **A** The IHMT is coordinated by OEM and Daniel agreed to inquire as to whether Hazards FIT could get time on their agenda at a future meeting in order to update that group on the status of hazards data.

Finally, we discussed timing for the next hazards FIT meeting. Bob asked for a deadline for completion of the elements review task. **D** It was agreed that mid December (week of December 15<sup>th</sup>?) would be an achievable and reasonable deadline. The FIT will then pan on meeting in mid January to review the updated elements list, further discuss interaction with IHMT, and begin to look at potential FIT funding proposals for hazards framework data projects.