

**Oregon/Washington Hydrography Framework Groups
Meeting Notes
REO, Portland, OR
July 17, 2003**

Attendees

Bob Harmon	OWRD	Nancy Tubbs	USGS
Dale Guenther	REO	Ken Adee	USFS
Jim Edmonds	REO	Jennifer Terwilliger	USFS
Dan Wickwire	BLM	Carl Harris	WADNR
Gege Coleman	BLM-Titan		

Agenda review

MOU

The MOU has been signed by all of the partners. Nancy asked if it could be posted to the Clearinghouse web site. Dale will oblige.

Clearinghouse

Status. Jim has the auto-posting of submissions working. He has a list of other items (tweaks & minor fixes) that he is working on and implementing as they're completed. The group asked him to purge the test data from the site and prepare to load "real" data. Dan and Carl said that they were ready to start getting data sets to Jim. For initial data loading, the group would like to get the data sets directly to Jim for him to load on the server rather than going through the check-in process. Dale will be buying a new server within the next month. The current box will act as a development machine.

Watersheds. Presently the interim check-in/out process is in place and working according to Ken and Dan. Dale says that the ESRI rent-a-tech work on the watershed portion of the Clearinghouse is proceeding and should be ready for testing by the middle of August. It will be implemented after acceptance testing. Dan and Ken discussed the timing of the watershed fix. They would like to work through the current backlog of edits to the watersheds, through the interim process, before turning the process over to the Clearinghouse.

Remaining issues. *Feature lock out.* The Clearinghouse is currently set up to "lock" overlapping features from editing by another user in either the hydro or watershed themes when either is checked out. This will be an issue when the watershed editing process gets rolled back into the Clearinghouse (see previous item). Ken discussed the pros and cons of keeping the lock, or not, and it was decided to wait and see how it effects our work.

Financial aid. Ken brought up the issue of obtaining some sort of funding for our efforts from national initiatives (homeland security, NSDI, Framework, etc.). It was suggested that a letter should come from the states (Oregon and Washington), addressed to the Congress and President, asking for some sort of assistance for supplying data to these various mandates.

Shoreline routing. Dan and Gegi brought up the issue of the costs of maintaining shoreline features. Carl said that it had been identified in Washington as a large portion of the total hydro costs. However, he asked that shoreline features not be dropped from a watershed's hydro themes if they had already been submitted to the Clearinghouse. It was also added that the water body feature metadata is tied to the shorelines. Everyone agreed that we wouldn't drop the metadata. Carl said that their hydro data conversion contractor had developed some good tools for handling shorelines more easily thereby reducing costs. Ken agreed that better tools would help.

General QA/QC. The Clearinghouse does not carry out a thorough QA/QC of the data when a user is checking it in. Ken would like to see a more robust set of tools used by the server during check-in. He is willing to offer up some development time and perhaps some funding to back such an effort. Carl also offered some QA/QC AMLs used by his developers. Dan proposed that a sub-group be formed to identify and coordinate the issues related to this topic. Carl will organize the group.

Integration

Dan thought that the next workshop would be held in early November. Ken mentioned that the sub-basins to be integrated could be selected during the latter half of August.

Future plans

Dan began the conversation of where the regional hydro framework should go next by framing it in terms of short and long-term issues. In the short term the GIS functions of the REO will be moved to the BLM and Forest Service. This will be completed by the end of the current federal fiscal year (September 30th). It also includes the hydro clearinghouse. The physical server will probably be housed at the BLM. The Forest Service will also participate in its operation. Ken has started budgeting for their share of the maintenance.

In the long term, the group agreed that the hydro data model will evolve beyond the current dynamic segmentation/coverage structure to the geodatabase. There are a lot of advantages to be gained with using an enterprise geodatabase (SDE) such as disconnected editing. We will also look to moving towards the NHD model if and when it becomes a content standard. Dan and Ken are pooling some of their funds (\$75,000 to start) for the next fiscal year to put towards redesign of the clearinghouse.

Notes by Bob, 7/23/2003