

Agenda
Catalog Workgroup
Wednesday, October 29, 2014
2:00 - 3:30 pm
SUMMARY

1. Reporting: results of discussions b/t USF and FDEP

- a. Combining the spatial and tabular databases – status
- b. Reporting/analyses of user searches and downloads
- c. Addition of glossary of water resource monitoring terms

2. Issues: Feedback from workshops and data providers

- a. Adding second-tier search fields
 - Project Name **not really useful (J. LaRock); freeform text search recommended (B. Turcotte); provides flexibility for all fields. Jan: USF would be able to do free text search; what is most desirable? What keywords most useful? Names & descriptions are not really standardized. Tabled until we have a better handle on searches**
 - Project Description (searchable text) **Free form text search would also apply here. However, Brian wants to keep everything simple rocket ship vs. Fisher-Price Toy. Simpler=more sustainable. Fewer options presented to user may result in more use. Jan indicated that this decision doesn't need to be made right now. We need to design analytics to find out what folks are searching for.**
 - Project Data Quality Objectives **N/A**
 - Proximity to Sampling Activity (see 2.g., below) **N/A**
 - Medium **Kate thinks this will be desirable. Jan indicates would be similar to checkboxes. Aisa thinks this would be very useful. Jan- would be all open—no default (water) J. LaRock thinks that a search should return lumpable media, and that Kate's approach would require additional coding. We'll wait until we get a better handle once metadata are loaded.**
- b. Revision of existing biological parameters
 - should fish, porewater, and plants/macrophytes be considered media or biological parameters? **B. Turcotte agrees that these are listed in his lab that way. Parameter is looked for in medium, such as fish, or plants (trying to extract analyte from) Brian can map (transformation) attributes to sample list, but need to know what target list is. Needs to be done with consistency!**
- c. Merging multiple STORET codes that refer to divisions within a single organization/agency (FFWCC, FWRI/FWC, FWC/ FWRI, e.g.) **for searches only Individual data provider would determine. B Turcotte asks whether crosswalk table would be maintained, or would agencies need to submit as one code to STORET? Would this change historically as FWRI moved around from agency to agency? B. Turcotte thinks it should be state of Florida, or "no searching by organization". Jessica Griffith recommends sticking to workgroup for decisions, rather than discrete sections or groups; otherwise, it can get all over the place. J. LaRock agrees. Jan agrees. Kate suggests standard name, lumping for the most part. No decision made, will be made in future. Jan indicates that we can split orgs again, if needed. Tabled.**

- d. Add value of “Discrete – One Time” to the list of sampling frequency for Domains-Projects. B. Turcotte says that this is more useful for event-driven or probabilistic networks. Jan reminds everyone that sampling frequency tied to project now, not for station. B. Turcotte will look at data again to learn if question is valid. Resolved. Not added unless Brian brings it up again!
- e. Add value of “Varied” to the list of sampling frequency for Domains-Projects. Jan indicates that this pertains to sampling that is temporal, e.g. at one time it was quarterly, now is continuous. Revision: revise metadata description to pertain to project. Jan wants to provide guidance to data providers concerning which monitoring frequency to use. Develop strawman-bring back to CWG.
- f. Addressing multiple spellings for a water resource name. B. Turcotte – lump it! Jan indicated that the Water-Atlas already has this feature, and there is no standard list of alternate names, so this will be a work in progress. Metadata submissions would be cross-checked with NHD, and if not there, would be updated with alternates. Another issue is to accurately select the correct waterbody if there are six lakes or seven springs that all have the same name. Should we use the county name or nearest municipality as a suffix to this? Jan indicates that we should review and provide different alternatives so that the CWG can select the most appropriate approach.
- g. How to handle sample locations without lat/long (randomized, or within transect/grid/polygon) Addressed in metadata elements as proximity to sampling location.

3. **Beta-testing new features in Water-CAT:** <http://dev.catalog.wateratlas.usf.edu/>

a. additions to Tabular search page:

- WBIDs
- Groundwater metadata
- Project status

b. new project pages

c. new station pages

d. new filters under “browse”

Kate would like the CWG to review and comments/reported back in two weeks