

**Oregon Framework Implementation Team Meeting
September 12, 2006
ODF, SunPass Conference Rm - Salem**

Present: Emmor Nile, ODF; Jimmy Kagan, OSU; Phil McClellan, DOR; Nancy Tubbs, USGS (by phone); Gail Ewart, GEO; Dennis Scofield, ODOT; Corey Plank, BLM; Mark Darienzo, DLCD; Chris Shirley, DLCD; Paul Staub, DOGAMI; George Taylor, OSU; Brett Juul, DOR

Scribe: Mark Darienzo, supplemented by Gail Ewart

Topic	Discussion Summary	Result	Action Req'd Yes/No	Resp. Party
Introductions		Self introductions	No	
Next Meeting	December meeting will be skipped due to 8 th Standards Forum on December 7.		No	
Framework Theme Status Reports	Status reports have been collected from several teams and will be posted with the minutes.	Post on FIT Web page.	Yes	Ewart

Discussion Summaries:

A. navigatOR (Ewart)

DAS and OGIC are working on funding and governance issues. DAS-GEO policy option package (POP) requests \$5m (not from general funds) for data development and stewardship. The POP is awaiting support from agency directors. GEO is garnering support from the legislature, city and county associations, governor's office and state agencies.

Action: Contact Cy Smith to find out how your director can support the navigatOR POP.

B. Framework Organization Chart (Ewart)

Ewart presented an organizational chart showing the relationship among framework themes. Nile recommended a "mind-mapping" approach to revising the chart with DAS in center and connecting lines between groups that relate to each other. Someone recommended another chart that depicts data locations (distribution network).

Action: Ewart will revise the visualization and distribute for comments.

Portal Development (Kagan)

There are two efforts related to portal development.

1. BPA's regional portal

Software has been installed but there is no data (empty portal). BPA asked OGIC where data is located. One suggestion is to add GOS2 data. There is a concern with duplicate databases. Need to provide BPA a vision on how it will work.

2. OSU library (Oregon Explorer), navigatOR for spatial data

OSU Library will provide updates to metadata server
ESRI software installed

Imagery portlet will be used to serve imagery data due to its special needs

Concerns: Version control and updating metadata. Need for different versions to track changes. Nile suggested developing conventions for versioning and naming files. Attribute styling, too.

Action: Put conventions on agenda for next FIT meeting.

Framework Database Application (Ewart)

Not much has happened in the last six months due to resources focusing on portal projects.

Action: Contact K. Walsh to get the permission structure set up.

8th Standards Forum Planning (Ewart)

The last Standards Forum is scheduled for December 7 in McMinnville. USGS will sponsor. Forums will probably be called Framework Forums in the future. There will be more emphasis on workshops and Framework issues.

The 8th forum agenda looks like this right now:

Standards

- Land Cover Classes

- Bioscience - Wetlands

- Hazards – Floodplain

- Transportation – Road Centerlines (update)

Workshops (up to 3)

- Accuracy Measurement & Reporting – USGS is working on arranging a speaker.

- Framework Prioritization (based on suggestion during Framework discussion)

- Transitioning to Stewardship – the PLSS model

Action: Provide Gail with workshop ideas.

Framework Discussion: Issues and Strategies

1. Element prioritization

Prioritization needed to provide groups outside of GIS with information to make decisions on funding.

Rankings (very high, high, medium and low) were based on factors that included funding needs

There is a need for more than one priority list (business purpose, funding, data dependency)

Shirley recommend that each FIT team submit dependency needs, i.e., which elements that each theme is dependent upon) by Nov 1.

Suggestion that Framework prioritization be a workshop at the forum on Dec 7.

Action: Each FIT lead will prepare a list of data dependencies for their theme. Lists should be submitted to Ewart before November 1, so that information can be compiled and discussed at December 7 forum.

2. Input to ORMAP re uses of reliability cod

Would a spatial reliability code be helpful and thus worthwhile to pursue?

Action: Provide ideas/feedback to Gail on how reliability codes might be used by state agencies.

3. Vertical integration issues – Cadastral, attribute styling

Public lands often not differentiated by federal ownership (BLM vs. Forest Service)

Conventions needed for attribute styling provide consistency between layers

Action: Add attribute styling to list of conventions to be discussed at next FIT meeting

4. Stewardship - PLSS

GEO is working on a Model Stewardship Agreement that can be used to formalize a stewardship arrangement. Stewardship plans will vary depending on the needs of the particular data element and its community of interest.

Action: Ewart will continue refining stewardship documents.

5. Data development registry

Internet tool to share planned and ongoing data development projects. Good idea but difficult to keep current.

Other suggestions

- a. use framework database (only covers Framework)

- b. “what’s new” section on web site

- c. Use blog for each theme or one blog with different threads (themes)

Action: Ewart will look into viability of establishing a blog.

6. Horizontal integration – certifying data meets acceptance criteria
Representatives of each theme decide for themselves
Updates *en masse* (climate, elevation) or continual (tax lots, endangered species)
More frequent updates needed (ORMAP - yearly)

7. Other

Recommendation: develop conventions for versioning, naming files and naming attributes

Kagan discussed a) the state-wide fish passage inventory and prioritization summit on Sept 21 and passed out a copy of a presentation, b) wetland standard update (largely complete), c) the updated vegetation map for state to be completed Dec 2007, and d) and effort to fund standards for all conservation projects. Brief discussion re wetlands data development status.

Status of GIS classification study (Ewart)

First meeting held, but may be on hold pending outcome of the federal Dept. of Labor's class study.

Data sharing/licenses

Ongoing discussions between the state and local governments

13 counties have sharing agreements with state

13 are willing to share without agreements

The rest are resistant to sharing data with state or at all

What's the timetable for data sharing resolution? The process is organic and cannot be driven by a timetable.