2019 Framework Development Program Proposal Reviews Report

July 17, 2019

Summary Table

ID	Contact	Title	Framework Coordinator Recommendation
01	Smith	Statewide Land Use Development Project	Fund
02	Anthony	Oregon Coast Watershed Boundary Dataset (WBD) Lidar Derived Feature Update – Phase 2	Fund conditionally There is a risk related to LiDAR funding. The risk is mitigatable.
03	Williams	Building Footprints Dataset of Oregon	This data element is an example of a highly complex data element that requires strong coordination and stewardship in order to meet the goals of Oregon's GIS Framework. Many stakeholders feel that it is important to their work and would like to work together to get the most out of the US Building Footprints published openly in June 2018. Currently various agencies are already working with and modifying these data in an uncoordinated way. OGIC has an opportunity to take the lead on these data and stay out in front of state spatial data infrastructures. Recommendation: Fund conditionally using the proposed proposal amendment process and direct additional funding to ensure coordination and stewardship needs are met.
04	Bauer	Oregon Earthquake Database	Fund conditionally
05	Allan	Oregon Statewide Tsunami Geodatabase Compilation	Enter into the proposed proposal amendment process

ID	Contact	Title	Framework Coordinator Recommendation
06	Salwasser	Oregon Spatial Data Library and Imagery Explorer Integration	Fund conditionally
07	Percy	Oregon Geology Data Schema migration	Do not fund; enter into the proposed proposal amendment process
08	Rynerson	Supertracts - A Census Tract Aggregate Geography for Oregon	Do not fund; enter into the proposed proposal amendment process

Statewide Land Use Development Project
01 Smith

Review summary

This proposal received the highest marks from all reviewing groups, and the work proposed is viewed as highly valuable to multple stakeholders and the Land Use/Land Cover FIT.

Score Summary

Reviewing Team score: **87.7**

FIT, GPL, and PAC cumulative score: **148.5**

Total cumulative score: **236.2** out of 240

Funding pool recommendation:

FIT-General

Funding recommendations:

FIT: Fund

GPL: Fund

PAC: Fund

Framework coordinator: Fund

Basic Requirements

Basic requirements score: **87.7** out of 88

Reviewing Team overall comments: Could tie funding to the county data availability.

Framework Program Review (FIT Leads)

Framework score: **64.5** out of 72

Funding recommendation: Fund

Conditions for funding (if applicable): no conditions

Comments: #1. Pros: data will be useful for multiple agencies. Weaknesses: Proposal identifies risks that may impact the statewide extent of the data. Concerns: work groups are identified as a requirement for this and other proposed projects that will result in hidden costs to the [Framework] volunteer network.

#2. Good project but reliant on the administrative rules to be developed. Concerns: project reliance on volunteer work group. However, the volunteer work load may be reduced if work group is a one-time advisory group.

#3. [lost connection]

Additional comments: High priority for Land Use/Land Cover FIT. Volunteer committees are important FIT and its functioning. This data is a long time coming. Project ideally will be a dynamic data set and to recreate it year-after-year. Maintenance to be addressed in stewardship. There's in-kind match.

Technical Review (GPL)

Technical score: **36.0** out of 40

Funding recommendation: Fund

Conditions for funding (if applicable): Tie funding to the county data.

Comments: #1. Deliverables - would it be useful to include the data model/schema in the proposal? [Larger group responded, "No"]. Would like to see more detail in the deliverables, e.g., attributes and domains. No reference to metadata.

#3. Work is needed and has been for a long time. The key deliverable is the process for developing land use data. It's dynamic. Project will improve the process, making it more cost effective.

#4. Would like to see more detail on the deliverables and feature class. Overall is well-written. Table 1 and 2 were a little confusing. Pretty well-organized. Geographic extent dependency is a little concerning and how does this reflect on the final deliverables?

#2. Agrees with other reviewers' comments. Would fill a gap.

Additional comments. The dependency on the goodwill of the counties to participate creates a risk. Contingencies for not getting all of the data would be valuable.

Policy Review (PAC)

Policy score: **48.0** out of 40

Funding recommendation: Fund

Conditions for funding (if applicable):

Comments: #1: Pros: well-written. Will benefit the FIT program. Expected benefits section was well put and provided good example benefits that gave a better idea of the data set beyond

DLCD needs and furthering the governor's objectives. e.g., housing and education. No weaknesses identified.

#2: Pros: best written proposal. Completes needed dataset. Less certain about meeting Governor's priorities than reviewer #1. Best deal in terms of cost.

Oregon Coast Watershed Boundary Dataset (WBD) Lidar Derived Feature Update – Phase 2
02 Anthony

Review summary

The work described in this proposal is viewed as highly valuable to multple stakeholders, especially those in natural resources and land management-focused agencies. The project requests funding to build on work completed during the 2017-2019 biennium and for LiDAR acquisition to perform the work. Because this project builds on 2017-2019 work, it could be considered a project that is spanning multiple funding cycles. Becasue the project workflow and methods are very time consuming and the project staff very small, it makes sense that the work must span multiple biennia. This was not viewed as an issue among the reviewing groups.

Multiple reviewers were concerned with the LiDAR request and potential risks to adjacent and nearby LiDAR acquisitions in the project area. This risk seems mitigable by either replacing the areas that would require LiDAR with other adjacent watersheds and moving the request for funding for LiDAR to the Elevation FIT or the Oregon Framework in general.

Score Summary

Reviewing Team score: **85.0**

FIT, GPL, and PAC cumulative score: **142.0**

Total cumulative score: **227.0** out of 249

Funding pool recommendation:

FIT-Foundational

Funding recommendations:

FIT: Fund conditionally

GPL: Fund conditionally

PAC: Fund conditionally

Framework coordinator: Fund conditionally

There is a risk related to LiDAR funding. The risk is mitigatable.

Basic Requirements

Basic requirements score: **85.0** out of 88

Reviewing Team overall comments: It's not clear what the expected risk related to the lidar acquisition is.

A possible condition is to clearly define the lidar acquisition risk and a mitigation needs to be appropriately designed.

- □ e.g., select contiguous HUCs that aren't affected by the lidar acquisition
- □ e.g., Pull the lidar piece out of the project

Work with the Elevation and Imagery FITs to identify the best solution(s).

Framework Program Review (FIT Leads)

Framework score: **68.0** out of 81

Funding recommendation: Fund conditionally

Conditions for funding (if applicable): One reviewer suggested that if funded partially, could:

- split into 2 proposals

- take out the lidar

Others would like to see the full funding provided because of the process and the work.

Will there be sufficient time to complete the WBD updates with the timing of the lidar acquisition?

Ask applicant to specify the contiguous HUCs that have existing lidar data available.

Comments: #1. Concerns: project may result in incomplete coverage of the coast due to the phased approach taken by this applicant.

#2. Pros: The proposed project is core work that has been ongoing for years. Concerns: Is the budget reasonable as it's more than 25% of the FIT budget? Is it enough money?

#3. Pros: Project will actually complete the coast and finish up some NHD updates even though contributing basins will not be completed. This work is a big priority [and requirement] to align hydrography features and hydrological units (HUCs). The HUCs and their lines need to be corrected before the hydrography can be corrected.

#4. Doesn't have any issues with project. Better data will result from this project.

#5. Against full funding: recommendation is to move some funding to the Elev-FIT to complete the lidar acquistion described in the project. Risk associated with the lidar acquisition portion of the project is a problem.

Additional comments: Yes the budget is large but it's an expensive process to use [so the expense is justifiable]. Excited about this project because watershed boundaries have been viewed in the past as ancillary but they really are integral to the hydrography-editing process. My agency uses these data regularly and passes edits to DOGAMI. Very supportive of project. Would like to add additional $40K to ensure that the lidar data is fully collected. Proposal seeks to fill a lidar gap. Project also at risk because of possible funding deficit [for lidar acquisition]. Parts of the project can be completed without the lidar collection in [other HUCs in] Southern OR. [This project represents] some of the most important work in Framework.

Technical Review (GPL)

Technical score: **36.0** out of 40

Funding recommendation: Fund conditionally

Conditions for funding (if applicable): Mitigate the risk of the 3DEP project.

Comments: #1. Isn't statewide in extent, but filling gaps. Has place to store and distribute data. Methods are fine.

#2. Most exciting project in this cycle. FIT Leads discussed conditional funding tying it to the lidar acquisition. Recommends splitting off the lidar acquisition part of the scope into its own project. Will do a lot for NHD-dependent feature classes. Would like to ensure that the lidar acquisition happens. Fund with additional funds to fill in the impending lidar gap (12 digit HUCs affected by the 3DEP project).

#3. Agrees that is a good project. What happens in the absence of funding for the lidar acquisition? PNW Hydro group would potentially fund the project if it isn't funded by FIT. Fund it.

#4. Agrees with above comments. Fund it. If the project can't get funding for lidar for the 6 hucs, pick 6 other HUCs contiguous with the project area.

Additional comments. Part of the proposal would also fill a gap in lidar data. DOGAMI is looking for a little more money to fill the hole in the project area. Several voiced support for pulling requested lidar funds and moving them directly to DOGAMI to acquire the 3DEP lidar thereby addressing lidar acquisition risk.

Policy Review (PAC)

Policy score: **38.0** out of 40

Funding recommendation: Fund conditionally

Conditions for funding (if applicable): Mitigate the lidar acquisition risk somehow. Some ideas in process order: [GEO] needs to find funding to fill the small lidar hole. >> Identify substitute

adjacent HUCs to mitigate possibility of lidar acquisition not occurring. >> Move the lidar funding out and choose different HUCs.

Comments: #4: May have a slight conflict of interest because of leadership role with HydroFIT. Pros: emphasizes the WBD. Editing of WBD required for hydrography feature editing. Good cost description and rationale. Concerns:The risk related to lidar acquisition project risks (i.e., funding for the lidar)

#5: High priority data set for which accuracy is very important. Appears to be more costly than it should be for what we're getting. Would like to see more accomplished for the cost, but understand that this is the reality. Might be more efficient from a financial standpoint if project also worked on floodplains. Possible other project?

Building Footprints Dataset of Oregon
03 Williams

Review summary

For many, the data this proposal promises is highly desired and needed. There were clear statements to both fund and do not fund the project leading to an outcome of no consensus among the FIT Leads on the funding recommendation. GPL was more critical of the project and raised some technical issues; again there were mixed recommendations.

Two major concerns were identified with this project.

(1) The license agreement for use of the US Building Footprints product needs more review, and possibly a legal review. This is important because the license determines what can be done with the data in relation to its distribution once modified. For example, open distribution of modifications may be requiredby the license, limiting OGIC's ability to securely share the attributes portion of these data. It is clear that there are real risks related to the license; the license requires further exploration.

(2) Explanation of the coordination aspects of this data set were lacking. This data set is a highly complex data set from start to end of its lifecycle. In addition, the user base is quite broad. As a result, considerable coordination effort is required. The applicant, while techically capable, is unlikely to have the capacity to also coordinate the many needs of the many stakeholders.

Other technical concerns were also voiced about the project, including insufficient clarity and planning of the modifications and attribution of the data. On the other hand, concerns were also voiced about the need for making some measurable progress on the building footprints data, which this project would do, even if not yet perfected.

One other minor concern is that modification of the existing public buildings footprint has been endorsed by the Framework Community at the October 2018 Framework Forum, but may require endorsement by OGIC to be considered a Framework data element.

Score Summary

Reviewing Team score:	**81.3**
FIT, GPL, and PAC cumulative score:	**137.2**
Total cumulative score:	**218.5** out of 249

Funding pool recommendation:

FIT-Foundational

Funding recommendations:

FIT: No consensus

GPL: do not fund/(maybe fund conditionally)

PAC: no fund

Framework coordinator: This data element is an example of a highly complex data element that requires strong coordination and stewardship in order to meet the goals of Oregon's GIS Framework. Many stakeholders feel that it is important to their work and would like to work together to get the most out of the US Building Footprints published openly in June 2018. Currently various agencies are already working with and modifying these data in an uncoordinated way. OGIC has an opportunity to take the lead on these data and stay out in front of state spatial data infrastructures.

Recommendation: Fund conditionally using the proposed proposal amendment process and direct additional funding to ensure coordination and stewardship needs are met.

Basic Requirements

Basic requirements score: **81.3** out of 88

Reviewing Team overall comments: ○ Too many conditions to address within this project and the program.

○ Proposal is short on content and work outcomes. E.g., could ask them to add attributes easily.

○ Could ask them to re-write the proposal to better meet the needs of the community and submit for a second round of funding if we do that.

○ Could ask them to rewrite and submit with the next cycle.

Proposal needs more vetting with the stakeholders and the community and isn't quite ready for primetime.

Framework Program Review (FIT Leads)

Framework score: **70.5** out of 81

Funding recommendation: No consensus

Conditions for funding (if applicable): Data ownership and licensing is problematic in part because it's an unknown situation.

Comments: #7. Pro: statewide in extent. Fixes issues with past lidar acquisitions. Cons: needs to include some attributes, expecially polygon IDs and polygon review. Seems expensive, but could be due to the nature of the work.

#2. Concern: Definition of "building" is vague.

#3. Pros: Timely, important project that will inform natural hazards work and create efficiency by having all data in one collection. Delay of this work may result in further duplication of existing building footprints data (i.e., Microsoft US Buildings). Having a FIT-approved building dataset and FIT-coordinated building workgroup would be best way to get GIS-community buy in [on the data] and ensure a successsful outcome. Good demonstration of familiarity with existing data and level of effort required. Cons: Time required to update will be considerable. Recommendation: Fund as is.

#4. Important work. Agency uses for dam inundation analysis. Concerns: attribution improvements needed. Stewardship not well-developed. Licensing risks exist that need better definition and documentation.

#6. Supportive of data, but not the project. Project out of alignment with the needed coordination for the work. Recommendation: Do not fund.

Additional comments: What will be the process for attribution especially in light of licensing? Licensing issues present a big risk. Seems like the project doesn't do enough relative to the budget requested. Do not fund. Would like to have more work done to understand the stewardship arrangement. Stewardship is critical and change over time must be addressed. Proposal will lean on work group to inform attribution and stewardship. Fund it.

Technical Review (GPL)

Technical score: **32.0** out of 40

Funding recommendation: do not fund/(maybe fund conditionally)

Conditions for funding (if applicable):

Comments: #4. Dataset is needed. Project needs clarity on the licensing and attribution. What can we do with the data in the long run?

#2. Data is critical for many operations. Approach isn't defined well enough and stewardship approach may not be appropriate based on the current operating model of the proposed steward.

#1. This reviewer gave the proposal a rating of "Most improved" over last cycle's proposal. Cons: No attributes proposed. A "Source" attribute would be easy to include; not including it could violate the license. Polygon ID is an essential attribute. Change tracking for the data not clear, but to be fair is complex and unknown.

Additional comments. Applicant didn't engage the FIT buildings work group ahead of proposal development. Conditions might be: engage the FIT work group, address attributes, discuss stewardship, licensing review (potentially a legal review). Might take a brand new proposal that

covers the "set-up" for buidling footprints data. Direct Buildings Work Group to address the issues above. Maybe fund only the coordination piece, smaller piece for scoping purposes. Could be put back on the table if funds are left.

Policy Review (PAC)

Policy score: **34.7** out of 40

Funding recommendation: no fund

Conditions for funding (if applicable):

Comments: #1: Using the Microsoft US Building Footprints layer + DOGAMI data will create an aggregate product. Concerns: license agreement for use of US Building Footprints product needs more review, possibly a legal review. What can be done with the data in terms of developing a product? Aligned use case with the Prep-FIT mission and objectives. Concerns: lack of coordination with the buildings work group. Lacks info about creating a data standard. (would like to see standard included in conditions) Lacks clear coordination plan with Buildings Work Group.

#5: Pros: Would be great to have a good buildings data set. Concerns: lack of attributes, coordination, and stewardship plan. Project does not seem to develop a maintainable data set that adheres to FIT goals.

#4: Pros: Would be good to have the data. Concerns: effort could be wasted on clean up without a standard in place. Big message: yes we need the data, but we need a standard and applicant needs to work with a group to develop the standard.

Additional comments: Promising idea but not fully fleshed out in terms of standard development, coordination efforts, and stewardship. These shortcomings present considerable risk.

Oregon Earthquake Database
04 Bauer

Review summary

Proposal was strong and well-written. Among its strengths were its measurable and tangible deliverable, and strong support from the resilience community and direct linkage to the Oregon Resilience Plan 2021. Concerns included stronger coordination demonstration with the Geosciences FIT and broader user community. In addition, One of the data inputs will be developed simultaneously, presenting a dependency risk.

Score Summary

Reviewing Team score: **87.8**

FIT, GPL, and PAC cumulative score: **139.1**

Total cumulative score: **226.8** out of 240

Funding pool recommendation:

FIT-General

Funding recommendations:

FIT: No consensus

GPL: Fund conditionally

PAC: Fund

Framework coordinator: Fund conditionally

Basic Requirements

Basic requirements score: **87.8** out of 88

Reviewing Team overall comments:

Framework Program Review (FIT Leads)

Framework score: **63.8** out of 72

Funding recommendation: No consensus

Conditions for funding (if applicable):

Comments: #1. Concern: relationship to existing earthquake data is unclear.

#2. Improving these data is a high priority for resilience (see letter of support). Strengths: meaureable, tangible deliverable. Well-presented proposal of work. Outcomes are highly valued, e.g., data is critical for Oregon Resilience Plan 2021. Match is provided. Weaknesses: data is not foundational but is statewide. Will be formed from many datasets and the consistency of the updates is unclear. Fund as-is.

#3. Is there a link to the GeoSciences FIT that can be further explored or explained? Coordination with that FIT could be better defined.

Additional comments: Concerns voiced about the comments made by another DOGAMI employee and the work is for core agency work. Dissenting opinion is that all of the projects are on core agency work. Is a valuable project. Fund it. Project is valuable because it allows for work to be done that wasn't done in the past.

Technical Review (GPL)

Technical score: **36.0** out of 40

Funding recommendation: Fund conditionally

Conditions for funding (if applicable): Include data collectied during most recent or current biennium.

Stewardship/requirements must be clearly demonstrated.

Comments: #1. Would be good to have all of the data in one place. How well will this project align with the other Geosciences project's objectives for GeMS schema?

#2. Statewide product would be useful to multiple agencies. Reviewer doesn't have expertise on the technical aspects of the proposal.

#4. Relevant project and objectives and deliverables are clearly described. Not as solid as Land Use proposal.

Additional comments. Looks good. Has risks associated with one of the primary data inputs being developed simultaneously with project timeline. A mitigation could be a scheduled check-in/status report to GPL, FIT, GEO, or OGIC. Project doesn't clearly demonstrate the update requirement for the data.

Policy Review (PAC)

Policy score: **39.3** out of 40

Funding recommendation: Fund

Conditions for funding (if applicable):

Comments: #1: Concerns: hasn't clearly related the value of the data with the external (non-DOGAMI) user base and their needs. Project risk: incorporates incomplete data. Justification for project's utility depends on other data set updates. Not leveraging a lot of money. Time allotment for stewardship plan task seems excessive.

#4: Can the work be crafted to better meet a wider user base's needs [than just DOGAMI]?

Additional comments: Creates a needed and helpful data set. Meets goals for accessibility.

Oregon Statewide Tsunami Geodatabase Compilation
05 Allan

Review summary

It was broadly accepted that the applicant is an expert in the field of tsunami. However, the proposal lacked clarity in several places, including its methods, for example how it would convert the data from its existing format (especially the irregular grid) to GIS' more rigid data models and why the proposed methods were the right ones to use. All reviewing groups were critical of the GIS methods, however, the Coastal/Marine FIT made a strong case for the proposal by explaining some of the many challenges faced by the coastal data community when transforming coastal data from coastal models to GIS models and the need for linking coastal and land data/information systems. The distribution plan and stewardship process for the data were also not clear.

Score Summary

Reviewing Team score: **84.8**

FIT, GPL, and PAC cumulative score: **115.0**

Total cumulative score: **199.8** out of 240

Funding pool recommendation:

FIT-General

Funding recommendations:

FIT: Do not fund

GPL: Fund conditionally/do not fund

PAC: Fund conditionally

Framework coordinator: Enter into the proposed proposal amendment process

Basic Requirements

Basic requirements score: **84.8** out of 88

Reviewing Team overall comments: ○ This is the first time that we've seen a member of the OOS community trying to produce a GIS product. The applicants haven't done a good job of articulating what they intend to do for GIS and for GIS data.

Ask the applicants to resubmit after working with the Haz-FIT and Prep-FIT to tailor the products for Preparedness. Coastal FIT could be consulted for tying deliverables to GIS, e.g., translating data modeled on irregular grids to regular grids.

Framework Program Review (FIT Leads)

Framework score: **45.3** out of 72

Funding recommendation: Do not fund

Conditions for funding (if applicable):

Comments: #5. Concern over data distribution because will provide legacy copies to GEO. Seemed that wouldn't provide the current data to the public. Could be remedied with different language from the proposer.

#3. Applicant is the right person to do the work. Methods used seem convoluted, incorrect or problematic relative to the input [point] data due to the changing spacing of the original point data. Seems like a step to making data more accessible, but doesn't accomplish the access objective identified in proposal. conditions: needs to be more explicit about products and how public will access the outputs.

#4. Seems that the project work is really important and that the personnel is right but the proposal didn't do a good job of explaining how it would accomplish its objectives.

#2. Standard would be part of the deliverables [and is identified as an in-kind contribution in the budget]. Match funds exist. Proposal was confusing and difficult to follow methods. Error control wasn't well described. Incremental additions needs more definition. Not creating new data. Instead is cleaning and compiling existing data. Somewhere between fund conditionally and don't fund.

Additional comments: Could use more transparency in the standard creation part of the project. Asks for funding for creating a standard. Project doesn't seem to be improving the data in a substantive way (i.e., isn't developing better methods for better data). Several reviewers mentioned that project seems to be an effort to clean up agency data that is probably partly a mess of their own making. Audience [for the data] is the GIS community but proposed work faces challenge of converting the data from its current format to modern GIS formats. Hard to fund the proposal because it's not clear.

Technical Review (GPL)

Technical score: **33.0** out of 40

Funding recommendation: Fund conditionally/do not fund

Conditions for funding (if applicable): Data distribution plan needs to be improved: NANOOS >> GEO

If GEO is solutin, documentation needs to be imporved greatly because of nature.

Comments: #1. Would like to have clearer more measurable objectives and outcomes. E.g., around the nanoos portal. The data is messy and heterogeneous but it's all DOGAMI's data. Condition: the data should be in NANOOS -- this needs to be more clear. Will the data be in there or not?Seeking to esnure that the data are usable.

#2. Really important data but is poorly organized presently. Concerned that the project won't increase data's usability. Likes the condition from #1. Level of detail that they're proposign to deliverable may be more than what's needed by the users.

#3. Agree with other reviewers. What is the usable life for the data?

#4. Agree that proposal isn't clear about it's deliverables.

Additional comments: Data is long-lived and unlikely that the data will be reaquired in the near future. The new data that is going to be developed in the 2019 biennium will be raster data and presents some challenges for inclusion in NANOOS. Data storage/distribution is imprecise at best. Recommends that it state that the data are stored at GEO. Doesn't meet the cut for being Framework data. Concern that if not funded, the data will be effectively "lost".

Policy Review (PAC)

Policy score: **36.7** out of 40

Funding recommendation: Fund conditionally

Conditions for funding (if applicable): Hosting and collaboration pieces required in the final scope.

Comments: #2: Good proposal that addresses wrangling a lot of data. This is a useful effort and the data could be useful if made accessible and consumable. Concerns: Doesn't clearly demonstrate plan for coordination with external stakeholders. Hosting arrangement is not desireable -- it should be available through OSDL or GEOHub, not just the DOGAMI site. [could be a condition]

#1: Concerns: Distribution plan isn't clear; could be because of the complexity or type of data. Challenging to connect project to the external need and applications for the data, however, one point in Benefits is helpful in description of utility for product.

Additional comments: Agreement with #1. Dataset seems useful. Applicant needs to be more collaborative and do more outreach/get more feedback from users. [could be a condition]

Oregon Spatial Data Library and Imagery Explorer Integration 06 Salwasser

Review summary

Proposal received good marks across all reviewing groups. There are a number of technical and contractual risks that must be mitigated for the project to move forward. Technical issues include data storage location and contractual risks include scope of the current imagery hosting provider's contract with GEO.

Score Summary

Reviewing Team score: **81.3**

FIT, GPL, and PAC cumulative score: **125.7**

Total cumulative score: **207.0** out of 240

Funding pool recommendation:

FIT-General

Funding recommendations:

FIT: Fund conditionally

GPL: Fund

PAC: Fund conditionally

Framework coordinator: Fund conditionally

Basic Requirements

Basic requirements score: **81.3** out of 88

Reviewing Team overall comments:

Framework Program Review (FIT Leads)

Framework score: **52.3** out of 72

Funding recommendation: Fund conditionally

Conditions for funding (if applicable): need more GUI specs - guardrails would help to allieviate concerns that the project could balloon in scope quickly and easily during the scopeing procs. Better information on the download needs and possibilities are needed.

Comments: #1. Makes GEO and Framework look good with the integrated interface. Lays groundwork for user friendly clip and ship interface. Cons: relies on work group, budget costs seem to be lacking in detail. Not clear if 2017-18 imagery data would be available or hosted by 3rd party. Most matching funds are related to hardware and software, which seems inadequate. Seems that the survey setting the scope for the project introduces risks and uncertainties.

#2. Well-organized, staffing good. Cons: scope is unknown, specs for GUI are unknown. Clear connection to the QSI hosting isn't clear. Will require very strong project leadership to ensure project success due to numerous competing interests. Would fund if there were better guardrails on the funding.

#3. Reviewer voiced that there may be a conflict of interest, because the proposed product would decrease his workload, also reviewer has long professional relationship with applicants. Pros: Download capability would be very useful. Cons: Wasn't clear what would happen to Imagery Explorer, hosting arrangement unclear, download not in the current GEO-QSI contract so introduces risk in cost and GEO-QSI scope. Overall scope is dependent on survey. Not sure would fund.

Additional comments: Concept makes sense, and figuring out how people want the concept to be implemented. Download might not be an issue depending on the survey results. For last OSDL update, used similar method of survey then work. Scope implies that all data will be available, but this isn't known at this time (i.e., GEO-QSI contract)

Technical Review (GPL)

Technical score: **31.3** out of 40

Funding recommendation: Fund

Conditions for funding (if applicable):

Comments: #1. Loved idea and want to see this come to fruition. Concerns: scoping activities included in the proposal create considerable unknowns and potential risks.

#2. OSDL needs to continue to be developed; it's highly valuable. Condition: add a robust search engine to the scope.

Additonal comments. None. This one is challenging because it develops a tool.

Policy Review (PAC)

Policy score: **42.0** out of 40

Funding recommendation: Fund conditionally

Conditions for funding (if applicable): re-evaluate budget and timeline after the scoping task(s) are completed (before Extraction Tool Development task)

Comments: #2: Strengths: integrates OSDL and imagery explorer to address a need to access geospatial and imagery data. Liked the proposal overall. Reached out to the community to learn what user requirements are. Well-written. Relevant project. Concerns: getting rid of Imagery Explorer front end. There are risks related to the storage location of the imagery data: who will be the provider, provider cost, GEO-provider contracting, and potential duplication. Is download function a user requirement?

#1: Agrees with #2. Strengths: Organization is a good partner and known. Concerns: scoping as part of the project is concerning. Possibly there was insufficient communication with GEO prior to submission of proposal. Possible condition for funding: re-evaluate budget and timeline after the scoping task(s) are completed (before Extraction Tool Development task).

Oregon Geology Data Schema migration
07 Percy

Review summary

This proposal was challenged by all reviewing groups for evidence of lack of coordination, unclear objectives, and lack of original content. The presentation demonstrated the applicant is knowledgeable and would like to see many of the Oregon Framework goals come to fruition, especially those related to standardization and integration.

Score Summary

Reviewing Team score: **75.3**

FIT, GPL, and PAC cumulative score: **76.0**

Total cumulative score: **151.3** out of 249

Funding pool recommendation:

FIT-Foundational

Funding recommendations:

FIT: Do not fund

GPL: Do not fund

PAC: no fund

Framework coordinator: Do not fund; enter into the proposed proposal amendment process

Basic Requirements

Basic requirements score: **75.3** out of 88

Reviewing Team overall comments: Work with the FIT theme to stand up a complete and vetted proposal for the next cycle.

Framework Program Review (FIT Leads)

Framework score: **37.0** out of 81

Funding recommendation: Do not fund

Conditions for funding (if applicable):

Comments: #1. Would expect project to be more connected to the past project and have clear support from previous project team. Not clear how project would accomplish objectives because objectives aren't defined. Fund conditionally

#2. Agrees with previous reviewer about expiring project status. Clear need for the data, but proposal doesn't provide the information needed [to support it].

#3. Would like to see the work of expiring project completed, so why fund this project if it will be completed?

Additional comments: Project could eventually move the data to the GEOMDI standard but this objective is not clearly stated in the proposal.

Technical Review (GPL)

Technical score: **26.0** out of 40

Funding recommendation: Do not fund

Conditions for funding (if applicable):

Comments: #3. Challenging to review because of the starting point for the project: a project from 2017-19 biennium. At presentation, applicant was asked, what if the DOGAMI project is completed? Applicant's response was that he'd take the compilation to the international standards table in order to standardize Oregon's data with international standards. Interoperability portion of the proposal is desirable.

#2. Approached review from perspective of "can the work be performed?" Would be good to take the data to the international level. Conerned that is a carry-over project from 2017-19. Pro: did have an additional plan for the work. Reviewer trusts the applicant's abilities and knowledge.

#1. There's a need for the data. Missing budget. Detail is lacking about work to be performed. More information about what needs to be done. Standard is identified as a deliverable; this isn't traditionally allowable. Seems thrown together and weak overall.

Additional comments. Poor proposal. No clear set of deliverables. Coordination with DOGAMI lacking. Maintenance not defined; data transfers not clear across organizations.

Policy Review (PAC)

Policy score: **13.0** out of 40

Funding recommendation: no fund

Conditions for funding (if applicable):

Comments: #1: Concerns: budget not defined. Deliverables not defined. Coordination with DOGAMI (geology steward) not demonstrated. Misses the mark with coordination and direction.

#2: Concerns: not well-written. Not coordinated with DOGAMI efforts on geology compilation. Many missing pieces. Inappropriate to attach a past proposal as bulk of main proposal.

Supertracts - A Census Tract Aggregate Geography for Oregon 08 Rynerson

Review summary

The proposal was reasonably well-written and hit on themes that guide Oregon's GIS Framework community, such as being widely available and being integrated with other data (in this case Federal census data). Concerns raised included: the proposed project essentially proposed a new data element; use, cooperation, and acceptance outside of the applicant's work group was unclear; and that the data may not provide additional benefit outside of the more densely populated urban and suburban areas. Demonstrated support at the federal level would have been helpful. The final conclusion across reviewing groups was that the proposed data requires support from the Framework community in order to be viable as a Framework Development Program project.

Score Summary

Reviewing Team score: **82.0**

FIT, GPL, and PAC cumulative score: **102.7**

Total cumulative score: **184.7** out of 240

Funding pool recommendation:

FIT-General

Funding recommendations:

FIT: Do not fund

GPL: Do not fund

PAC: no fund

Framework coordinator: Do not fund; enter into the proposed proposal amendment process

Basic Requirements

Basic requirements score: **82.0** out of 88

Reviewing Team overall comments: ○ Lacked vetting of the concept and proposed deliverable

§ Could have been presented to the full FIT since the Reference theme isn't active.

○ Lacked clear demonstration of a broad user base or support from other levels of government (e.g., Federal gov.)

○ Lack of clear demonstration of broad need

○ There's a hole in FIT around census data and the user group of census data.

○ Would like to see the applicant initiate a census work group in FIT

§ Help users use census data

Framework Program Review (FIT Leads)

Framework score: **51.7** out of 72

Funding recommendation: Do not fund

Conditions for funding (if applicable):

Comments: #1. Modest request for a project. Would like more input about the project value. Seems that it would make the census data more user-friendly. Might help people take better advantage of census data. Easy to use census data in less populated geographies, but the applicants stated that even in these locations supertracts would be useful.

#2. Would like to see more about geographies outside of the Portland metro area. Seems that the issue supertracts solves may not help in areas that sparsely populated. Could be addressed more fully/clearly.

Additional comments: will create a new census dataset using aggregation and the proposal suggests that somehow this approach is more robust. Applicant proposing a statewide dataset for a low cost. Proposal isn't demonstrating a clear need for the data. Other data that are more "important" should be prioritized over this "interesting idea." Seems far removed from the program priorities and outside of FW scope.

Technical Review (GPL)

Technical score: **30.0** out of 40

Funding recommendation: Do not fund

Conditions for funding (if applicable):

Comments: #1. Doesn't seem to suport the common process for acquiring and using census data. Audience for the data may be very limited.

#2. Agree with #1. Not on the Framework list even though Census Geographies is on there. Pilot may not provide adequate representation of much of Oregon. Concern: applicants noted during

presentation that was challenging to get cooperation by local authorities outside of Portland metro area. Not clear what the level of cooperation will be; this is a risk to project success.

Addtional comments. Proposal relevance to Framework wasn't clear. Not clear if would be useful or beneficial to eastern/central oregon. Would have liked to have seen more support for the project and method from the federal government.

Policy Review (PAC)

Policy score: **21.0** out of 40

Funding recommendation: no fund

Conditions for funding (if applicable):

Comments: #4: Concerns: found proposal confusing. Not sure if qualifies as a Framework data element. Past work completed in Portland metro area so may not be appropriate in non-rural areas. This shortcoming wasn't well described.

Additional comments: Doesn’t seem like a broadly-useful data element. Proposed a new census anlaysis unit; would have liked to have seen more explicit support from US Census or other states. Doesn't clearly demonstrate the enterprise use of the data. Stakeholder group not clear. Needed more Framework support and connection. Proposal plan for update and maintenance isn't clear, but with 10-yr cycle may not warrant it. Fit for Framework is not very good; better fit for another organization.