

**BLM – SHPO Cultural Resources Data Sharing Partnership (CRDSP)
Meeting Minutes**

Attending to the Past while Meeting the Challenges of the Future

Hotel Santa Fe, NM
February 15-17, 2011

Hosts: New Mexico Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico BLM

Attendees:

Joan Dale, AK SHPO
Dave McMahan AK SHPO
Rick Karl, AZSITE
Dan McGrew, BLM AZ
Bill Hedman, BLM AK
Eric Allison, CA SHPO
Ashley Blythe, BLM CA
Mary Sullivan, CO SHPO
Monica Weimer, BLM CO
Natalie Dovgan, BLM COSO GIS
Glenda King, ID SHPO
Kirk Halford, BLM IDSO & WO
Damon Murdo, MT SHPO
Zane Fulbright, BLM MT
Derek Pierce, NM HPD (SHPO)
Signa Larralde, BLM NMSO (1st morning)
Dave Simons, BLM NMSO
Karyn de Dufour, NV SHPO
Rachel Crews, BLM NV
Scott Goodman, BLM OR
Arie LeeFlang, UT SHPO
Laurel Glidden, BLM UT
Ross Hilman, WY SHPO
Ardeth Hahn, BLM WY
Eric Ingbar, Gnomon, Inc.
Jenna Gaston, BLM ID Meeting Recorder
Richard Wilshusen, CO SHPO

Guests:

Jan Biella, NM SHPO
Andres Abeyta, IGIS
Frank McManamon, tDAR
Tim Seaman, (formerly with NM HPD / SHPO, first morning only)

Tuesday, February 15

Welcome Kirk Halford BLM CRDSP Coordinator; Derek Pierce, Program Manager Archaeological Records Management Section, NM State Historic Preservation Division, Dave Simons BLM NM Archaeologist-Data Steward

Introductions and Review Agenda

New Mexico Cultural Resources Information System (NMCRIS) demonstration

Derek Pierce gave a presentation on the newly implemented NMCRIS application in use by the New Mexico Historic Preservation Division.

Tours of Museums and Special Collections

The group was given a behind the scenes tour of the following facilities

- ❖ Museum of Indian Arts and Culture (MIAC)
- ❖ Archaeological Records Management Section (ARMS)
- ❖ Archaeological Research Collection (ARC)
- ❖ Individually Catalogued Collection (ICC)

During the tour, there was considerable informal discussion about how data sharing is essential to the operation of museums that serve the public (as most of these do). Without collaboration between the land managing agencies and the museum community, the public would be locked out of seeing a lot of the nation's heritage. The foundation of that collaboration lies in the recognition of shared management interest between New Mexico, the federal agencies (who manage many sites), and in New Mexico's case the Native American communities themselves.

Wednesday, February 16

Welcome and Opening Remarks – Jan Biella New Mexico HPD / SHPO

Biella explained that under the State Cultural Properties Act, SHPO has responsibilities to survey and maintain site register plus National Register nominations. The SHPO is the policymaker for its department (Cultural Affairs) regarding cultural resources in general. New Mexico, unlike some other places, has a living heritage in that places with prehistoric roots have use today by descendants from prehistoric times.

HPD's role in the nomination process for the State Register can be difficult, but it absolutely relies upon excellent sources of information. For instance, the Mount Taylor nomination involved five different tribes – each of whom has a different view as to why Mount Taylor is important. The archaeology around Mount Taylor was therefore important to the overall nomination process.

New Mexico HPD has an estimated 30,000 sites in its backlog of records to enter in an automated system. The partnership with BLM is very important because so much work occurs on BLM-managed lands and the one thing that HPD and BLM share is a desire to make decisions based on the cultural resource record itself, not opinions about it. HPD looks forward to an enhanced collaboration with BLM both through the new NMCRIS system and through BLM's new guidelines (being drafted now).

New Mexico has long been an advocate of requiring background records checks before planning projects and certainly before starting new fieldwork. This was a major reason for the state's deep

investment in NMCRIS. HPD's current goal is to tie use of NMCRIS for search and for entry to state-mandated permitting. This is the "stick" for use of the system. On the "carrot" side, HPD's goal is to have the system be so valuable that it is indispensable to professionals.

A future goal is to have a public-facing part of their information system. This will be both an educational tool and a resource for those seeking to travel in New Mexico to see historic sites.

Biella was asked how tribes currently use NMCRIS. She said that some do and others do not. However, information in the system is shared with tribes when they request it, regardless of whether they are NMCRIS users / contributors or not.

Review and Discussion of Previous Days Business and Events – Eric Ingbar and All

A brief review of the previous day was made.

Budget Update: How Does the Future Look? Kirk Halford and Emily Palus WO

Palus called in on a speaker phone to attend.

Currently \$350K in CRDSP funding. In FY12, the BLM Cultural Resource (CR) program has a \$9.4 million increase. This includes National Landscape Conservation System (NLCS) and trails, so some funds are not directly intended for CR. About 7.8 million is just CR. This results in a general increase from 16 to 25 million for CR in 2012.

A proposed increase strategy is to fund everything for CRDSP out of CR not out of the other program areas (fire, range etc.) Under this strategy, 1050 will cover costs but if budget doesn't come through as planned for CR, then the CRDSP funding will have to go back to seeking funds from the other programs that have supported it up to now. As in the past, this requires showing how the other programs benefit.

Paulus also told the group that Challenge Cost Share is back and the 1711 subactivity has \$15 million in the proposed budget. As well, a "Youth Initiative" has a provision to hire interns. This might be used to reduce backlogs of data entry or other kinds of records processing, if appropriate. For instance, BLM could fund interns who work under the direction of the SHPO data manager.

The question was asked if this funding increase is likely or just proposed. Paulus replied that she cannot be certain. Usually increases are smaller than requested but still are granted at some level.

Another question was asked if there is a mechanism for moving other program funds directly into 1050? Emily answered that funds become 1050 dollars if they are moved; moving funds from another program in to 1050 makes them permanent 1050 dollars. So, there would be opposition to simply "moving" funds from other benefiting programs to the 1050 budget. Paulus mentioned that one option is to place funds through general directives and PTA's that describe mandated support levels for the CRDSP.

There was further discussion about how CRDSP draws money in to itself through involving other agencies (including money that SHPOs themselves put in through labor, facilities, and services). Paulus suggested that documenting this would help justify continued funding of the CRDSP.

A final note from Halford was that as DOI moves toward corporate databases, CRDSP may benefit because so much of the "inventory" of cultural resources is maintainable through the partners.

State Snapshots

Alaska: Bill Hedman BLM Fairbanks FO, Joan Dale and Dave McMahan AK SHPO (OAHP). State Partners working on data system, opened users dialogue HRS advisory group, A meeting was held in March 2010 with all users of the Alaska Heritage Resource System (AHRS). Alaska SHPO has followed up from the meeting with major progress in bringing the AHRS system on-line and accessible to external (non-state) users. The AHRS is part of the overall Integrated Business System (IBS). Since 2002, the IBS has cost approximately \$600k. Not all of this (by any means) is the AHRS cost.

Arizona: Rick Karl, AZSite manager. AZSite recently upgraded itself again to a more powerful web interface for query and viewing of records. Backlog less than a year for negative surveys. The system is self-supporting with 300 users and 70 agencies. A new feature that is being created now is a close tie to the Arizona SHPO review and compliance data system, so that partial records will be created in AZSite when projects are reviewed at SHPO.

California: Ashley Blythe BLM Ridgecrest FO, Eric Allison CA OHP (SHPO). New GIS database system converting data making progress determining data standards, partnerships being developed with agencies and tribes. Getting things digitized. California is complicated due to multiple information centers, so that records are not in single systems necessarily.

Colorado: Monica Weimer Canon City FO, Mary Sullivan Colorado OAHP (SHPO) Richard Wilshusen (CO OAHP). Good news on BLM side is that the BLM now has Natalie Natalie Dovan as the GIS representative for data sharing and internal GIS for cultural resources. This brings a high level of professionalism and consistency to the partnership in Colorado. Updating data, goals redefined. The state will be migrating to a new system in a few months.

Idaho: Kirk Halford IDSO, Glenda King, SHPO. Annual PDFs of sites and shapefiles sent to BLM. GIS is not on line but a goal is to move this direction towards digital entry and access. Record searches at SHPO by contractors bring in about \$100k year to support digitization at the SHPO. Idaho has no back log. There are 48,000 sites in the database and 25,000 reports.

In the field offices, some new tools have been developed that make creating GIS for cultural resources much easier. These are similar to the toolbar used in California. Also a new permitting agreement promotes use of GPS and GIS within Idaho, so that information is created and then kept in digital forms.

Montana: Zane Fulbright BLM, Damon Murdo SHPO. Zane is the new data representative for Montana BLM . SHPO has developed a new online access method for BLM. The SHPO has a major collection of data to bring in to their GIS – they need to download all FO shapefiles (especially the Miles City District Office files) and put them into their GIS database. SHPO will then distribute the files back to each field office (updated). All site forms scanned and on line. Will also scan inventories soon. A new regulation allows the SHPO to charge for file searches. This has allowed them to hire a professional staff member to maintain the data system. Zane is looking into any data download issues from FO transfer.

New Mexico: Dave Simons BLM NMSO. Dave Simons BLM NMSO. Major milestone with enhanced version of NMCRIS for data entry and enhanced search, allowing permittees and researchers direct data entry capability for GIS and tabular data. The biggest goal of the partnership in New Mexico is to decrease backlog. This will be addressed by having the permittees who do most of the work to enter their data directly into NMCRIS, eliminating future backlog, and allowing

current backlog to be entered remotely. Training is another goal to market system to permittees so that it is populated accurately by those closest to the information.

Nevada: Rachel Crews BLM Carson City FO, Karyn de Dufour SHPO. Nevada BLM is being converted to CITRIX for its GIS usage. No idea how it will work. Some discussion about this being basically successful in California BLM. There is a major effort under way to revise the BLM report standards in the state. This will include GIS and GPS in some way. Currently, standards for electronic information collection are done through fieldwork permits.

The SHPO may be changing agencies (to Conservation and Natural Resources). Although SHPO has put a lot of effort in to data creation and update, as NVCRIS has become more available, other agencies and offices are going through their files and sending older records for inclusion (paper backlog, basically). This has doubled the backlog of entry to be done at SHPO. However, one problem in populating the NVCRIS system is that if reports have not been reviewed by SHPO they cannot be entered. Karyn and Rachel both sought ideas from others about stipulations for the new standards.

Oregon: Scott Goodman, Prineville FO Oregon will be having a BLM-internal meeting to discuss how to set up a portal for consultant entry to the OHIMS (BLM-maintained) database and GIS. This internal meeting will probably lead to further discussions with SHPO about creating a shared portal, since information entry is currently duplicated between BLM and SHPO. BLM (and consultants) send SHPO paper records, even if those records were created from a digital database. Approximately 40% of the 25,000 sites in Oregon are in the BLM database. Because of multiple site nodes and project polygons, there are approximately 40 to 80 thousand polygons in the OHIMS GIS (representing sites and projects). OHIMS use by BLM is not universal in Oregon. However, the GIS will be consolidated between all field offices by the end of the current fiscal year. Goal is to have all field offices using OHIMS (and perhaps a shared component with SHPO) within two years.

Utah: Laurel Glidden BLM Cedar City FO UT, Ari Leeftang UT SHPO. BLM and SHPO are rebuilding their data sharing methods. Recent efforts have reduced the backlog. Internally, UT SHPO is rebuilding their data system so that it is a fully on-line entry system. Consultants and others will use this system. The state handbook is being studied for revision. Any revision effort will include GPS and GIS standards and requirements.

A major obstacle has been hiring at the SHPO The SHPO can only hire temporary help from U of Utah. Further, a hiring freeze has prevented even these internships. The state is capturing all user fee dollars, so the information system at the SHPO must seek ways to re-capture its own revenue. Staffing and funding the information system will be a challenge in the coming years.

Wyoming: Ardeth Hahn, BLM Buffalo FO, Ross Hilman SHPO. Wyoming BLM has been updating equipment in the field offices (and software) so that BLM can meet the same field requirements as contractors. The BLM and the SHPO will be updating state protocols over the next year, so this will result in further integration of the already fairly tightly joined efforts to manage data together.

SHPO will be updating its submittal standards so that consultants are required to submit shapefiles when they request a site number. BLM already creates digital data for SHPO. The SHPO posts field office updates on a nightly basis (so new GIS files are created daily for each FO). Wyoming has approximately 2/3 of all sites digitized as distinct polygons. The remaining third can be mapped by cadastral location and UTM coordinate alone but the SHPO continues to have a goal of all sites in

GIS. BLM funds 3 interns to do digitizing. Because there are lots of “non-GIS” users, Wyoming SHPO is investigating alternatives to ArcMap that are free: QGIS, MapWindow, etc.

Discussion

Kirk Halford put the 2008 goals up on the projection screen.

REQUEST: Each SHPO should please send to Kirk how BLM funding helps their data management:

- What is the total cost of data management at the SHPO?
- What percentage of that cost is paid by BLM data-sharing directly?
- What percentage of that cost is paid by money drawn in by BLM data-sharing money indirectly?

Data Sharing -- It Works Both Ways and Let’s Not Forget the Dinosaurs – Dave Simons

Simons presented how the NM BLM State Office shares data from the NMCRIS system (and from the NM Museum of Natural History paleontological database) with the field offices and with consultants under direct contract to BLM for activities like Class I overviews. With the old NMCRIS system there were problems getting new cultural resource information from the field offices and permittees into NMCRIS, as there was no good mechanism for capturing, sending on, and then automating GIS data or tabular data on reports and sites. Once fully operational the new NMCRIS is a major solution to this problem and current and future backlogs.

Simons also discussed the need for training.

There were several questions pertaining to training – how often was training held, who did it, etc. Other questions concerned simplifying the data products that the field offices were given from the very complicated NMCRIS database. Simons showed several examples of how GIS attributes were created for generally useful, foreseeable, situations. For example, he showed a dataset that was “canned” of GIS shapes for resources that might be susceptible to fire.

Simons showed the paleontological GIS maintained by BLM. GIS layers were shown for paleontological locations for specimens derived from the NM Museum of Natural History database, related to geological formations or mapped strata.

NMSO has also prepared GIS “potential fossil yield” maps based on 1:500,000 scale geologic maps, supported with paleo site locations.

Short discussion followed on how the new paleontological law will affect funding. Kirk stated that paleontology will come out of 1050 (as it always has). There are regional paleontologists: CO, UT WY, NM. Dan Martin said that the USFS has put together a paleontological database. Dan has also discussed some of the issues around maintaining this data with the WO 250 paleontologist. A source of confusion seems to be who is actually responsible for any data management of paleontological information, as it is handled differently in different states.

E-Learning: Massage the Cyber Message to Get Your Story Out – Andres Abeyeta

Abeyeta discussed how important it is to train users in ways that are appropriate for their skill level and the job they are asked to do with computer software. More generally, Abeyeta discussed how training can be “evidence-based”. For example, give staff training by using stories that take up their

common workflows and tasks, perhaps in small pieces. Abeyta discussed how this generally works better than trying to teach people to be computer experts: teach them to be computer *users*.

Abeyta went on to show some examples from the NMCRIS training videos that he created and some other training materials. For instance, he showed a National Guard example in which a hypothetical sergeant used an information system to update facilities information for sharing with other state guards and the national bureau.

Abeyta also showed one of the NMCRIS training videos that walked the user through a file search. His point: no discussion about GIS tools, etc., just “I use this tool do to this task”. An important point though, he stated, was that training does need to be kept “fresh” by giving it frequently (to new users, for instance) and by updating it to current technology and data content.

Abeyta was asked for costs to produce a 5 to 10 minute formal training. He estimated a typical cost to be about \$20,000.

California (Allison) said they have considered using YouTube or similar on-line tools for training.

There was discussion about creating a CRDSP message that would explain the CRDSP in a “training video”, since many people do not understand what the Partnership does. This would benefit everyone.

Someone then asked if there would be a way to measure how many people watched a video. Dan replied there are many methods for tracking the number of hits on a web resource like a video.

FGDC Standards Development and Working Group Update – Deidre McCarthy NPS

McCarthy joined by speakerphone to update the group on the NPS-led standards effort for cultural resource metadata standards under the Federal Geographic Data Committee. There is a GIS cultural resource (CR) workgroup working on database standards for all federal agencies, and NPS is the lead agency on this. Some members of the CRDSP have attended these meetings and participated in teleconferences. (Kirk, Eric I. Eric A., Kristen Jensen)

NPS has established task groups. Although the standard pertains to metadata, the functional need for metadata is data transfer from one organization to another. Data content is obviously important, but documenting data (including content) is required as part of intelligent transfer. There are about 40 agencies represented on the task force as a whole: 20 federal agencies, 10 SHPOs, 10 THPOs, the National Conference of SHPO (NCSHPO).

NPS will soon finish a schedule defining priorities for task groups. By April, NPS hopes to collate and distribute existing standards and how to meld them in to a single standard. By July, NPS hopes to evaluate relevance of existing data standards and transfer methods. By October, NPS intends to have the critical elements for its work plan draft. December 2011, will see an outline of data transfer standards. From this draft, there is a 12 step FGDC process. This will take awhile, but the aim is have a completed standard by April 2014.

Best Practices: Statement of Purpose and Need – Working Group, Chair Bill Hedman AK, Ashley Blythe, CA, Scott Goodman, OR, Monica Weimer, CO

This group presented their initial thoughts on formulating a “best practices” paper. This was an assigned activity from the 2010 meeting. The 8110 manual was suggested as the venue for distribution of best practice guidance.

There was considerable discussion about the need for having this in the 8110 manual. On the one hand, some participants thought it would be too specific and would quickly become either out-dated or irrelevant within different states and field offices. Others thought it would have no value in the 8110 manual because if it was too general, no one would follow it.

In the end, the conclusion reached was that there would be two efforts made. The first effort would continue with the group already created. This group would look to craft language for the 8110 manual that defined good data management (and field) practices generally. This language would include recommended content for state-based requirements documents that serve as addenda to the 8110 manual itself.

A second group, consisting of de Dufour, Weimer, LeeFlang, Dale, will create general programmatic best practice goals. The intent of these is to be functional and also prescriptive. For instance (perhaps): “field offices will design databases with assistance and comment from the SHPO data manager”.

BLM/State Reports on Review & Comment regarding Interagency Wildfire Geodatabase -- Dan Martin Chairman

Martin led discussion concerning the draft materials (posted to the CRDSP web site) concerning cultural resources in the Wildland Fire Distributed Information System (WFDIS). The WFDIS would take cultural resource data from various contributors in “near real-time” for wildfire response teams. A simplified set of attributes was proposed (see documentation). Shared attributes include location, material types (susceptibility to fire being the reason for this), site depth.

Dan said that the planned method of populating the cultural information in WFDIS is ETL – extract, transform, load. Each contributor (presumably the shared systems at the state level), would have an ETL pathway defined. The transfer is one-way (to WFDIS).

Dan is looking for comments on this proposed system. Hahn said Wyoming BLM has already sent in review comments (due March 18, 2011). Wyoming BLM is concerned that field office archaeologists would be cut out of the management of resources in wildland fire situations. There was also concern in Wyoming about the confidentiality of the information, and how it would be protected from release.

Glidden was worried about how information would be populated and maintained. Martin explained that it is a “pull” situation in which WFDIS requests information but does not maintain it. Glidden pointed out this could mean WFDIS gets information known to be incomplete due to digitizing backlog.

There was a recommendation that this information, with a cover letter explaining WFDIS, be sent out to the field office. No one was identified as the person who would take responsibility to do this.

Martin made the further point that cultural resources in general needs to interact and become part of both the GIS and Fire programs in BLM. He argued that the benefits to resources through protection by knowledge outweigh the risks of destruction by ignorance.

Dave Simon worked with fire and proposed using predictable model to determine where sites would be.

Dan asked that BLM and SHPO express their comments through the on-line comment forms in his earlier emails.

Overview of tDAR: Is there Common Ground –What are the Opportunities? -- Frank McManamon tDAR (Digital Archaeological Record)

tDAR is a trusted digital archive (an ISO 9000) term for cultural resource datasets and records, housed at (but independent of) Arizona State University. The project was funded with a Mellon Grant that provided startup funding. tDAR is an archive that stores a limited range of common format files *forever*. As software changes, formats will be refreshed by tDAR (thus the limited format range). As hardware changes, data will be migrated by tDAR. Thus, the archive remains fresh and available in contemporary formats at all times.

Mission is to enhance resource management, to give broader access to records, and to provide a public outreach/ education archive.

Data search is accomplished by requiring metadata about each file or file set stored in tDAR. The fairly simple metadata is searchable by potential users to help them find datasets or publications.

Data input includes an extent map in GoogleMaps. Some full reports included if small, and no site confidential info included. All information in tDAR is redacted to remove sensitive references and precise locations.

May be able to have security patch so if fed agency using this as repository can have full report in there. Person submitting would do redaction. Have contractors do both original and redacted version. Would then be reviewed by BLM SHPO before going to tDAR.

Meta data input. One drawback is that currently can't input a group e.g BLM, just individuals.

tDAR's Intent is to be self sustaining by getting support funding from agencies, researchers, etc. The general business model is a "pay to store" approach. For instance, tDAR costs could be added to the cost of a project, just as curation costs for artifacts get added to a project. A preliminary cost model is being devised now.

Discussion from the group followed the presentation. Some questions:

- can corporate (BLM-required) data be housed solely at tDAR?
Probably not because of redaction
- how does tDAR guarantee follow-through? What if tDAR goes away?
tDAR has not yet created MOU or PA sorts of documents

Where does tDAR go from here? There is a grant program to "try tDAR". Kirk suggested tDAR produce a white paper on tDAR as a solution to an agency / SHPO problem set. In other words, define how tDAR helps, rather than just becoming another "good thing to do".

Review and Closeout

General discussion ensued, followed by a brief closeout.

Thursday, February 17

Review and Discussion of Previous Days Business – Eric Ingbar, Kirk Halford and All

The morning review focused on tDAR follow up. Kirk suggested it could be the Amazon.com of CR – a one-stop shop for tribes, contractors, etc. He urged folks to think about it and figure out how tDAR might work for our workflows.

Following up from yesterday, the best practices group membership is now:

CRDSP group

Karyn de Dufour
Monica Weimer
Richard Wilshusen
Eric Allison
Glenda King
Jenna Gaston

BLM Data Reps

Bill Hedman
Scott Goodman
Ashley Blythe
Kirk Halford
Laurel Glidden
Dan Martin?

The groups will have quarterly conference calls. A report from each group is expected at the next CRDSP group call.

AZSITE: The Next Generation – Rick Karl AZSITE Administrator

Arizona had 51 repositories scattered across state. AZsite is a central repositories that all state and federal agencies utilize along with the private sector. AZSITE was declared the official state repository by the governor – this helped compliance and use a lot. Federal agencies require contractors to use AZsite. AZsite considered a self sustaining program in the AZ university system UofA system. SHPO has its own system, but AZSITE will soon be getting data from SHPO through an automated link.

90k sites, 22k survey, 126 hits/day

AZSITE brings in about \$300,000 annually. \$85,000 from user fees, \$200,000 from record searches and the remainder from copying and other fees. There is a \$34/sq mile charge for GIS dataset extracts. The annual fee has a \$3600 top end. Solo shops have other options, and in general fees are based on the number of users in an organization.

AZSITE recently re-built its mapping application. Great mapping applications allow researchers to access data bases to do record searches

AZSITE also has building and structure information. Access to this does not require meeting the Secretary of Interior standards. Access to archaeological data is tightly controlled.

Creation of Content Standard – Eric Ingbar, All

Reference to proposal put forth several years ago by Eric and Linda Clark. Need to standardize data output. Use for planning not compliance.

2 types of data: resources, investigation

Resources would have attributes and spatial data would use polygons,

Investigations would have same aspects.

The group agreed to a proof of concept project in which each state will contribute its data in a common format. These data will then be aggregated to create a western U.S. cultural resources map by county (or watershed). This will be presented to the Preservation Board in its June meeting, so a draft should be done by mid-May.

May be opportune time to share the issue of backlogs with Preservation Board, especially if we get extra \$\$ this FY. Need to use standard maybe linear feet of backlog as opposed to # reports etc. Make it simple and maybe use just “intensive” and “extensive” survey level rather than CL II, III. Need to explain what your definition of backlog is. Also need to include legacy data as part of backlog. Preservation Board needs to be aware that states are not equal in terms of issues, backlogs.

Breakout Sessions: Theme: The State of the States and What is Our Vision and Expectations for the CRDSP’s Future?

SHPO Session, Rick Karl facilitator

BLM Data Representative Session, Kirk Halford facilitator

BLM Session

Monica/Natalie--Issues of BLM security system and accessing FTP sites for sharing data. Will be more difficult to access and share data. Logins will change every 30 days. Monica--Can CRDSP get a FTP site of our own? Dan==it will be an uphill battle. Need to have support from WO to NOC to get it approved. Thinks its feasible. Need to request a Communication Portal. IT relates to that. Natalie will get Kirk in touch with appropriate person to see how to pursue.

Lack of GIS lead in WO is hampering progress. Dan suggested fire may help to move this forward too as they need data. Having consistency with data servers at SHPOs would be helpful. Maybe be a 5 yr goal. Now 3-4 states don’t have ARCGIS server so sharing data more difficult. Can use BLM data sharing \$\$ to help SHPOs get these systems up and running. User interface as well as access is the issue. Some states like UT and AL have ARCGIS systems but falls apart regularly and if you don’t know ARCGIS can be difficult. Real time access is problem because BLM can send data into SHPO but can’t get it back from them. So BLM ends up using their own data bases instead. Would have to use Citrix interface as the database is so huge. Future goal is really just to go directly to SHPO server to get the data.

Five year group goal is to have consistent user interface and access.

Biggest Issues - BLM

Bill Hedman: Lack of progress in workable map application, automated user interface. Data transfer

Scott Goodman OR: We need to be able to share data both ways, preferably across the web.

Ashley Blythe CA bring all FOs STE? together into central interface, support partnership w/ SHPO

Zane Fulbright MT: Get FO data into SHPO system, interface for data entry e.g. contractors

Ardeth Hahn WY Need to get contractors sending data to SHPOs via contract stips, Better connection w/SHPO overload on staff

Dan McGrew AK Get standard GPS equip, Juneau or Geo explorer, build site form w/ dropdowns to facilitate input

Monica Weimer CO FTP data transfer and contract stips, web-based interface

Rachel Crews NV Contractor permit stipulations will go statewide in revised handbook (need training internally and to have skill sets to review digital data at BLM). BLM needs to be able to get current contractor layers of data and shapefiles before these go through SHPO review, instead of having to get them after SHPO review.

Laurel Glidden UT User web based interface (communication with SHPO), need standards and process from SHPO; SHPO's standards may be too generic, so BLM may establish their own additional standards.

Question about small firms who don't have ARCGIS – what could they use instead:

- Mapwindows
- Udig
- DNRgarmin
- QGIS

SHPO Session

1. Felt there was good communication w/data reps but some miscommunication.
2. Freshness of FO data shared ,used: need GIS tech involvement to share data, share more often
3. NOT getting feedback from FOs to correct data base.

Monica suggested doing some of this discussion at annual BLM/SHPO protocol mtg. and also have data reps in each state do a quarterly call w BLM FOs. Dan--State leads also need to promote this. States vary as to who has control of access and manipulation of data. E.g. GIS has control of using data, don't want to give CRS access.

SHPO's recommended the following action items:

- Action item-- data reps do regular calls with field office; quarterly
- Action item—involve GIS data techs in calls
- Action item—on site, side by side training with FO and SHPO

Identify Action Items from Breakout Sessions and Develop Strategies for Implementation

Below, issues are show left justified and the action items are indented.

Fix or solve the data transfer problems that will be presented as the FTP method goes away in favor of HTTPS.

Action item: talk to NOC experts about HTTPS IT “Communication Portal”

BLM needs information formats for inclusion in stipulations. These need to be formulated with SHPO help.

Action item: consult w/SHPOs to build templates for format using best practices (be specific in writing so contractors understand)

Define policies regarding data retention at the field offices.

Develop and then update a list of open-source software for GIS, so the agency cannot be accused of requiring people to buy particular kinds of software: Examples: QGIS, uDIG, MapWindows.

Action item: sharepoint for CRDSP

Action item: do query of group to see what people are using and tools they have developed and share among folks. Also do manuals and post on web page

Work toward having near real-time data on demand from SHPOs

Action Item: Put info flow into protocol. What happens to dead projects? Does an un-reviewed project get entered? Site survey data should still be input or it could end up being re-surveyed. Project data may not necessarily be entered. Consider tracking “bad”/exempted projects. Discuss in quarterly calls, remind FOs. E.g. mineral exemptions or a number of small exempted survey in an area could become a cumulative impact.

This (above) will require consultants to provide records in digital forms.

Action Item solutions

- a. Contractor can copy into BLM network
- b. Data can be served to BLM desktop from SHPO server
- c. Contractor files can be held as “pending” at FO or at SHPO

BLM eGIS and the CRDSP – Cindy Lou McDonald, WO200

McDonald presented eGIS – the BLM’s centralized GIS service. It relies upon “corporate data” layers.

The map and data views are very powerful and flexible.

WO (eGIS) has input on data standards but field controls the data. Programs will determine if their data will be included as a layer. Currently only has ACEC, planning units and grazing. Now its internal only but anticipated to go public.

Will employees be able to load specific map for their own data into map and work with it? Cindy Lou: Yes that will be possible and it will be confidential.

Layer priorities this year are:

Roads, land surface management, NLCS including trails

We, as a team, need to decide if we want to have a cultural resources layer (or layers) in eGIS. This would involve migrating information from field office to state office (or SHPO?) to eGIS. eGIS then pulls the data from these sources.

For this to move forward, for cultural, cultural needs to define:

Content standard

Data model

How data is managed (BLM, SHPO, shared?)

Can this work “by state”? – unclear.

Eric--What kind of programming service does eGIS provide? Can do mobile access and tools e.g. check out map for use in field, add data then check back in and it is reviewed by eGIS.

One might create a tool suite (cf. Dave Sisson’s work in Cottonwood FO) applicable nationally.

Group discussion followed there was some thought that it may be redundant to our current efforts. However, there was agreement that this is beneficial for large-area use. eGIS also has research applications, modeling etc.

There are definitely issues here – per group discussion: Confidentiality issues. Trust and stewardship issues, access and use issues.

Where Do We Want the CRDSP to be in the Future? All

1. Vision statement in 2007.
2. Need to continue our involvement and visibility in the agency.
3. DOI initiative under 1 umbrella with IT – we can use CRDSP as a model of how to manage information and perhaps be the test or example case across the DOI not just BLM.
4. We need to transmit our message to management about how we can more efficiently manage data.
5. As a team, we may need to be more cognizant of academia and its needs. For instance site forms capture so much more information than is in our systems May be consider something like tDAR as some sort of repository.

Discussion of Future Meetings and Closing Remarks - Halford

Next conference call items:

- Present results of each group best practices (10 minutes)
- Roll up for Kirk’s presentation for Preservation Board

Next call: May 5th 10a PST

Denver was proposed for next meeting.

Kirk Halford closed the meeting by announcing that he will step down as the CRDSP Coordinator by the end of the fiscal year due to demands of his new position as ID state lead.

The meeting adjourned.