

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

MOU modifications:

1. REO specific language will be removed from the MOU because of the pending decision as recommended by the BLM and FS resources staff.
2. Ken will check with the Planning and Resources staff to ensure that the FS Regional Forester is OK with having REO as a signatory.

Clearinghouse acceptance testing

1. OR
 - a. Need indication of which subwatersheds have data other than portraying the data itself
 - b. Unload and install tools straightforward.
 - c. Only tested the check-in and checkout AML's.
 - d. Missing centerlines on checkout cover
 - e. FTP worked fine
2. WA
 - a. Able to unload and install tools fine.
 - b. FTP did not work initially- made some edits but it still did not work.
 - c. Unable to test the rest.
3. FS
 - a. ArcIMS application did not work consistently or quickly enough to be considered for implementation
 - b. Discovered that IMS layers can be accessed directly from ArcMap and thus the Status map could be portrayed to use in developing a polygon for submitting a request.
 - c. FTP did work even once!
4. BLM – see GeGe's document attached below.
5. Acceptance test failed – Clearinghouse development is on hold for right now – Partner's will meet and determine the best strategy for moving forward.

BLM Clearinghouse Acceptance Testing Notes
April 14 – April 17, 2003

1. So that we would have more data in the Clearinghouse for testing, I submitted another subbasin on Sunday (17100203 - trans #2820). The checkin_error report created by the client tools prior to submission showed no fatal errors in the data. Jim reported to me on Monday, that the QC report run at the server end shows fatal errors (data outside the edit boundary). I double checked the data here and there are no features extending outside the edit boundary. I also re-ran the QC here making sure that I used the updated client AMLs, and got the same results as on Sunday -- no fatal errors. Jim went ahead and started posting the data Monday late afternoon; by Tuesday 11:00 AM, the data has not completed posting, which is tying up the server. (Finished posting at 11:30 PM Tuesday night)
 - a. Two concerns:
 - Why is Jim's QC report different from mine (clients) on the same dataset?
 - Time required to post large transactions.
2. The first client package delivery, which Jim provided to me on Sunday still contained the AML errors reported in section A of the Remaining Issues document. The package also contained the original error_codes Info file in the Reference directory rather than the updated version that I provided earlier. Jim delivered a new package Monday afternoon, which I have not yet checked completely, but it does contain the correct error_codes file and some of the AML fixes.
3. Data for transaction #2940, which I started through the IMS site at 3:45PM on Tuesday afternoon, was never packaged for download even though the website showed the area checked out under my transaction number. I finally asked Jim to cancel the transaction at 1PM today. This morning while I waited for my data from yesterday, Don and Melanie both started transactions and received their data so clearly the server wasn't processing requests in the order they were received or it somehow mishandled my transaction.
4. Hydro data checked out and downloaded today still display only 3 decimal places in the measure fields of the section tables and all event tables.
5. The WC_Back and WS_Back coverages in all transactions that Don, Melanie and I started today were missing the main stem(s) flowing through the edit area, but there were small "tails" outside the edit boundary to which the main stem should connect had it been there. (transactions 3000, 3040 and 3124)

6. The checkout_error reports were consistently reporting a DSC\$FUZZY_VERIFIED error for the WB theme at the time of download.
7. Ftp_checkout_poly.aml still has the error in the exit routine that creates aml errors when trying to reset the &path; this problem was reported as item A2 in the remaining issues document.
8. Checkout_error reports for transactions 3121 and 3124 included Fatal errors pertaining to differences between the WC and Edit Boundary X-max and Y-max.
9. Melanie's first attempt to checkout an area using the IMS site -- transaction 2983 -- failed inexplicably. She received an un-automated email from Jim asking her to start a new transaction for that area.
10. The checkout_error report for transaction 3040 (Melanie) fatal error messages indicated that all LLIDs in the event tables do not fall within the edit boundary. (Note: I think this occurs when points are generated from lat/longs derived by parsing the LLID. I also thought that this QC was going to be eliminated.)
11. The wc.aat includes non-standard items: objectid and wc_llid_nr
12. Don reported that in trying to start transaction 3000 through the website, the IMS site hung twice after he entered his login and password and never generated an ID number for him. The transaction ID was finally generated on his third attempt.
13. I submitted polygons for transactions 3140 and 3141 at 6:20 PM on Wednesday, 4/16. As of noon on Thursday, the data has not yet been packaged for download.
14. Submitted data for transaction 3124 at 4:45pm on 4/16. As of noon on 4/17, I have not received notification that it has posted to the database. (1 watershed)
15. Melanie submitted data for transaction 3040 at 1:30 PM on 4/16. As of noon on 4/17, she has not received notification that it has been posted to the database.
16. Concern: as part of the effort to solve the problems occurring in creating the wc_back and ws_back coverages, the edit boundaries submitted are buffered slightly. This buffering may introduce problems for BLM, since BLM's edit boundaries are derived from our Hydro libraries and ARIMS is so dependent on these boundaries. While I have not had the opportunity to test all the implications of the buffered edit boundary, it does raise red flags for our

situation here.

BLM Testing Transaction Summary

Total transactions initiated: 11

- Failed: 4
- Succeeded without issues: 1
- Succeeded with issues: 1
- In progress: 5
 - 2 no data posted for client download yet
 - 1 submitted to clearinghouse but not posted to data
 - 2 downloaded but not yet checked in