

Meeting Minutes
Catalog Workgroup Meeting
August 18, 2017
9:30 – 10:30 pm

This was a webinar meeting at the following location:

Registration URL: <https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/936528105243632641>
Call-in number: 1.888.670.3525
PIN: 511 706 2548

Welcome, roll call

The following 14 participants were present at the webinar meeting:

David Polk – DOH
Margaret Guyette – SJRWMD
Julianne LaRock – SFWMD
Brian Turcotte – SFWMD
Kris Stair – SWFWMD
Shawn Landry – USF
Jan Allyn – USF
Jason Scolaro – USF
Dave Reed – FWC
Denise Miller – FDEP
Kyle Ferris – FDEP
Carolyn Voyles – FDEP
Kate Muldoon – FDEP
Dan Dourte – The Balmoral Group

A. Passing the Torch

Person(s) who will assume responsibility for the Water-CAT contract and the Catalog workgroup

Kate Muldoon announced Denise Miller as the new Water-CAT leader and contract manager.

B. Highlights of meeting with USF

Kate reviewed the following highlights of the USF meeting:

- 1. Metadata are still incomplete for many organizations or projects*
- 2. Kate & other WMS staff working to get bioassessment, springs, and special projects metadata into Water-CAT*
- 3. FWC freshwater fish & WQ metadata will be used as test case to link Water-CAT & Terra-CAT.*

4. *It is requested that Council members provide a link to the Water-CAT on their agency/entity websites to promote the Water-CAT. Can there be some standard language/logos to link from other sites? Whom to contact at each agency to identify the most sensible place to link from?*
5. *Water-CAT will contain individual notification system for additional information needed.*

C. Water-CAT metadata elements vs. WIN metadata elements

- a. Priority metadata elements
 - Accurate contact information
 - Project description and project type
 - Project intended use/purpose/theme

The following information was reviewed for project description and intended use metadata elements (see attached spreadsheet):

- *Project Description metadata will remain the same – Water-CAT allows for more space. Both are text attributes (4000 characters in Water-CAT vs. 1999 characters in WIN). There is no change needed.*
- *Project intended use: there are different categories in Water-CAT and WIN (9 in Water-CAT, 7 in WIN). WIN team is OK with expanding WIN categories to include Water-CAT domain. USF said we will need a crosswalk, e.g., BMAP and 319 Program (WIN) will be under Regulatory in Water-CAT. USF wants to add Routine Monitoring (WIN) to Water-CAT—will discuss later with WIN team.*

- b. Other metadata element comparison

The following other metadata elements were compared between WIN and Water-CAT:

- *Primary and Secondary station types in Water-CAT and WIN – types are very different; there is some overlap, but there are many more types in WIN. USF will develop a crosswalk from WIN to groups in Water-CAT.*
 - *B. Turcotte preferred Water-CAT types.*
 - *USF can reconcile the lists to categorize WIN types to match Water-CAT. Some Water-CAT types may be added depending on crosswalk development. USF will suggest new elements that might be added to the Water-CAT, and these suggestions will go to the workgroup for discussion/approval.*
- *Not directly related to metadata elements, there was some discussion of the general usefulness of Water-CAT. It was explained that the Water-CAT contains metadata for organizations that do not report to STORET or WIN. Water-CAT clearly explains station types and contact information, providing a comprehensive starting point for exploring what data are available for a region or parameter of interest. There are bioassessment metadata in the Water-CAT that are not in STORET or WIN. An analog was provided to illustrate the distinction between Water-CAT and other resources : the Water-CAT is wide and shallow, but WIN is narrow and deep (fewer stations but more data and analysis).*
- *Project type: There are 5 categories in Water-CAT and 2 categories in WIN. As long as Water-CAT is superset of WIN (has more categories than WIN) there is no problem. Water-CAT*

necessarily needs more categories because of the broader reach of monitoring types represented. Project type is NOT required in WIN; this field could be blank. There is no change.

- *ORG_ID is used in both WIN and Water-CAT. There is no change.*
- *Project ID: Water-CAT has 35 characters (this needs to be confirmed) – Water-CAT project ID not directly used, WIN metadata has 35 characters. There is no change.*
- *Project Name: Water-CAT uses 250 characters; WIN uses 120 characters – this works fine because Water-CAT characters exceed WIN limit. There is no change.*
- *Project start date: Water-CAT has station start date linked to the project start date; WIN only has project start date. USF said WIN's project start date is OK. There is no change.*
- *Project end date: Water-CAT has station end date linked to the project end date; WIN only has project end date. USF said WIN's project end date is OK. There is no change.*
- *Additional contact information: unknown issue – this issue is tabled for now. USF and WIN teams will talk about this later.*
- *County name: Water-CAT has GA and AL stations as well as all FL counties; USF will add FIPS county code. This is a simple lookup that can be added easily.*
- *x/y datum method: identical in WIN and Water-CAT except for parcel matching (PARC), transit (T), and township/range (TOWN). This is an optional field in Water-CAT. There was agreement that USF will drop PARC, T, TOWN in the Water-CAT.*
- *x/y datum: identical in Water-CAT and WIN. There is no change.*
- *z datum: identical in Water-CAT and WIN. There is no change.*
- *z datum method: agreed to table for later discussions between WIN/USF teams, and bring back to the workgroup for future discussion. This is called land surface elevation method in WIN.*
- *Location description: sufficiently similar. This is called Station Description in the Water-CAT and Monitoring Description in WIN.*
- *Monitoring Location ID: Water-CAT has 50 characters, WIN has 35 – this works fine as Water-CAT character limit exceeds the WIN character limit. There is no change.*
- *Monitoring Location Name: identical in Water-CAT and WIN. There is no change.*
- *Organization lat/lon: number types are different, but they are sufficiently similar. There is no change.*
- *Waterbody name: identical in Water-CAT and WIN. There is no change.*
- *Primary elevation datum: sufficiently similar. There is no change.*
- *Well total depth: sufficiently similar. There is no change.*
- *Well type: Water-CAT has 2 types (potable and non-potable). Water-CAT will likely need another type for situations where well type is not known. WIN has 12 well types included. S. Landry suggested adding all well types to Water-CAT. This is a required field in WIN. B. Turcotte interpreted the Water-CAT list as a well-type, and the WIN list as a well purpose. One well type can have several purposes. There was further discussion to recommend adding more well types to allow multiple well types. This is not a separate metadata element in Water-CAT: the well descriptions are part of station type. A decision needs to be made whether or not to add an additional well attribute to Water-CAT. Decision was made to at a minimum add "well" as a generic station type in Water-CAT.*

D. Next steps for Catalog Workgroup

Teleconference with WIN and USF Catalog team to address outstanding elements from today. This outcome will be brought back to Catalog Workgroup in the next few months.

ACTION ITEM: Balmoral will coordinate a teleconference between USF and WIN teams to discuss crosswalks and other identified issues. The work products will be brought back to the Catalog Workgroup.