

## Joint Hazards FIT – DLCD IMMI PAC Meeting, August 27, 2014

### Attendees:

At DOGAMI in Portland: Bob DenOuden (GEO), Cy Smith (GEO), Rachel Smith (DOGAMI), David Pray (DEQ), Don Pettit (DEQ), Ian Madin (DOGAMI), Jed Roberts (DOGAMI), Steve Lucker (DLCD), Cody Halls (recent OSU graduate)

On Phone: Daniel Stoelb (OEM), Myrica McCune (OSU/OE), Marc Rempel (OSU/OE), Lisa Gaines (INR), Joseph Murray (OMD), Dave Mather (GEO), Bill Clingman (LCOG)

### A=action items:

Cy began the meeting explaining that the DLCD's Information Management Modernization Initiative (IMMI) Policy Advisory Group had met and discussed inconsistencies they were seeing in the data referenced by two hazards data viewers; Oregon Explorer's Hazards Explorer and DOGAMI's HazVu. In the course of those discussions they determined that a larger issue is that there is no well-defined process for determining which data represent framework elements and, once data are identified there is no formal work flow process for publishing these data on the Oregon Spatial Data Library (OSDL) or GEO Alphalist (other than "sending Dave Mather an email")

Cy noted that having multiple data viewers is inevitable and not a problem, but they must be directed at common datasets where there is overlap.

Don Pettit described the Preparedness FIT's data catalog project – which represents a large effort to identify data sets useful to Prep FIT that may or may not be considered framework data.

Steve Lucker asked what resources were available at GEO to manage the process of identifying, managing, and publishing framework data. Cy noted that GEO does offer technology resources, servers and software, to support data hosting but currently is fairly constrained in staffing levels. Hopefully a funding package will be successful next year to increase staffing levels.

Rachel noted that the current process, where she has sent data to GEO (through Bob D.) and they have worked with Oregon Explorer to get it published onto the OSDL, has work well recently, but wondered how this informal process could be scaled up to work for all framework data.

After some discussion it was agreed by the group that the FIT should decide which datasets represent framework elements for their FIT theme and that the FIT chair, or other data steward designee, will communicate these decisions to GEO.

**A** It was mentioned that each FIT team will need to provide a list of designated data stewards or approved persons to GEO for data upload to the OSDL.

We then discussed a recently implemented mechanism on the OSDL site to flag data as a framework element. BobD described how he worked with Myrica this spring to add a symbol next to the listing for framework data sets in the OSDL. These items are tagged through specific text that is added to the data's description within the metadata. To date the process for determining which datasets should receive these tags has been an informal one between Bob D. and Myrica.

**A** It was decided that each FIT team will be asked to review their framework data elements and make recommendations on which data will be flagged as framework within OSDL. This request will be made at a meeting of the FIT Leads on September 24.

The group then discussed what process would be needed to keep the OSDL up to date as data sets are updated and new data are created. Further definition of the work flow process will need to be developed.

The draft process for framework data upload is:

- 1) Any user that has a data layer they would like to be made available in the OSDL, should first coordinate with the appropriate FIT team to begin the process.
- 2) FIT designated persons will send data/service links w/ proper metadata to GEO/Dave Mather.
- 3) Dave M. will then conduct general QA/QC on data and metadata for significant errors.
- 4) Dave then uploads/serves the data and coordinates with Oregon Explorer.

The process for non-framework data is simply to use the current tools to load data or links to data/services to Oregon Explorer, not OSDL.

**A** It was decided that the FIT teams review and edit this draft process. This request will be made at a meeting of the FIT Leads on September 24.

Ian suggested it would be useful to have an indication, when looking at a particular non-framework dataset on OSDL, that a better dataset (framework layer) exists.

Marc Rempel noted that the OSDL has a comments feature, where users can note information about datasets, but it is not being used currently.

Rachel noted that the information describing “what is framework data” currently on the OSDL links to the Framework page on GEO’s web site which contains a lot of information about framework, but does not succinctly define framework data. The group agreed that the term “framework” remains fairly obscure. Perhaps calling it something other than framework would help? Rachel recommended the succinct definition of framework data be added to the main web pages and then additionally provide the current link to the lengthy FIT information page.

Cy described the idea of adding some sort of framework indication within the data itself would be useful, particularly if framework data is “mashed up” with non-framework data by the user in the future. Marc noted that the concept of digital object identifiers (DOI) from the library field could be used.

Ian asked if there was a way to conduct a search on Oregon Explorer that would be restricted only to framework data. This option is not currently available.

Rachel asked Marc R. if it was possible to tag the framework layers so that they come up first in the list of search results.

We then had a discussion of what constitutes framework data, exploring the particular example of floodplain data. Cy initially noted that only official FEMA floodplain data should be considered framework. Others contended that non-FEMA data is often better and is certainly useful to a broad range of users, so why would it not be considered framework? Bob D. suggested that perhaps metadata could be used to differentiate the multiple separate datasets that often comprise a framework element.

**A** It was decided that GEO will send out for review the original criteria needed to create/define a framework dataset.

Rachel then asked the question: who currently can publish data to OSDL? Marc, Myrica, and Dave Mather can, but Dave noted there have been issues with Geoportals metadata format requirements so he typically has the Oregon Explorer team publish data for him. Josh Tanner should also have the ability to add data.

The discussion turned to some confusion between Oregon Explorer and OSDL. Participants felt that some effort to communicate these differences would be helpful. Marc noted that Oregon Explorer is currently in a redesign process. Oregon Explorer is a catalog or repository for framework *and* non-framework data. OSDL is for framework data layers only. The “gate-keepers” for ensuring this distinction are those listed above w/ permission to load to OSDL.

Don noted that the Preparedness FIT data catalog will likely tag data as Prep FIT framework elements that also belong to other Framework themes. This will be a good test of the process for defining framework datasets and getting them published on OSDL.

We then moved on to some Hazards FIT business. BobD brought forward a proposal to switch the Hazards FIT chair position from Ian Madin to Steve Lucker. **A** Since attendance at this meeting was a bit light, BobD will send this proposal out to the full hazards FIT email list.

Ian then proposed that a new element be added to the Hazards FIT framework elements list; Naturally Occurring Hazardous Materials. **A** This proposal was supported by those in attendance and will also be emailed to the Hazards FIT group.