From: Kern, Tim
To: Juliusson, Lara
Cc: Doherty, Kevin; Sean Finn; Matthew Heller
Subject: Re: Lek Data and LC Map
Date: Friday, May 02, 2014 11:38:48 AM

I think most of my questions were answered by a previous email. On your questions:

- "Loose relationships" vs "all in one community" are about managing data (who owns and can allow access) and not search limitations. LC MAP can present these all in a common view regardless of what community "owns" the data; it just related to permissions to view, edit, etc.
- Moving very large datasets is a potential headache, especially if those data are somewhat dynamic. LC MAP provides image services for very large raster data that lets modelers zoom into an area of interest for slicing/subsetting before processing. If the modeling need is landscape/West-wide level, then you would not use the image services (you would need the whole boat for model runs). Does FWS have permission to use GridFTP to move datasets around? That is what we implemented to access large datasets (over 200Gb).
- Since we have a global community set up for these data I do not think we need a special vocabulary.

Thanks, and sorry to be slow reading my previous emails.

Tim Kern
Chief, Information Science Branch
USGS Fort Collins Science Center
2150 Centre Ave, Building C
Fort Collins, CO 80526-8118
970-226-9366
970-226-9230 (fax)

On Fri, May 2, 2014 at 11:27 AM, Juliusson, Lara <lara_juliusson@fws.gov> wrote:

> Kevin, Tim and all,
>
> My two cents,
> I would second Kevin's answer to question 1) specifically that we do not want to slow down, or even stop model development due to having to work over a network. I do not know if this would be the case, but as a rule, I prefer to do geoprocessing locally.
>
> 2) Yes, we should be organizing these data together, but this can include just having shortcuts through LC MAP to other communities. I believe this is what we discussed the other day. I'm not sure what you mean, Tim, by "just maintaining loose relationships to expedite search and discovery?". Are you saying that not maintaining loose relationships slows down search and discovery? LC MAP's community structure would seem to provide this type of expedition. One question I have regarding using shortcuts, Matt and Sean, is how do we handle broken links?
>
> 3) Yes, I think we want these data to be able to be identified as developed to support, or supporting the listing decision. I would think that including them within, or linked to by, LC MAP would do this, but if we want to explicitly by means of tags, or comments in the metadata, I think that would be

helpful.

Thanks,
Lara

Lara Juliusson, GIS Biologist
Sage-grouse Energy Team
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service,
Region 6, Lakewood, CO
Lara_Juliusson@fws.gov
303-236-9876

On Fri, May 2, 2014 at 11:08 AM, Doherty, Kevin <kevin_doherty@fws.gov> wrote:

Tim,

The answer to your first question is a bit unknown right now. I believe the SGI folks have access to the raw lek data and will be doing there own specific analyses, which will be integrated into the USFWS decision. We are having a modeling workshop within a month to hammer out these details. From my standpoint Its all about memory and processing time and if working over the internet causes a lag.

2nd) Yes, I believe we should be organizing the LC map into one community if possible. I have cced Lara, who is leading the USFWS GIS group so she can weigh in as well. Sean, Matt, Lara, is this consistent with the file structure we talked about the other day?

3rd) I also believe that is the case, but want the 3 folks above to weigh in.

Cheers
Kevin

On Fri, May 2, 2014 at 10:56 AM, Kern, Tim <kernt@usgs.gov> wrote:

Hi all -- I limited this reply to just the tech folks, but we can include FWS management if these are questions beyond our pay range.

As Kevin pointed out, we are setting up a mechanism to collect lek data though a state-controlled LC MAP community. We are assuming that USFWS modelers will need a way to do post-processing of these data within these state-controlled communities (combining shapefiles and geodatabases to build a region-wide dataset, generating grids from these data) in LC MAP. So far, so good.

Will there also be a need for the modelers to access data collected under the Sage Grouse Initiative, or is that a completely separate effort? Specifically, LC MAP has a request to serve some rather large datasets as mosiacs with color maps through an image server. The first of these, mapped juniper data across the sage grouse range (5400 raster tiles, 750Gb), will be ready for upload in June. There are several other large datasets that are being developed now with a summer due date. If these efforts are linked, we have some questions:

1. Will you need the sage grouse initiative datasets as predictor layers as

well? If so, do you need them on local systems or will you be able to work with the services provided by LC MAP?

2. Should we be organizing all sage grouse-related data together though a single LC MAP community, or just maintaining loose relationships to expedite search and discovery?
3. Is there any special treatment we should be giving products developed to support the listing decision? A specific set of tags?

Thanks for your time.

Tim Kern
Chief, Information Science Branch
USGS Fort Collins Science Center
2150 Centre Ave, Building C
Fort Collins, CO 80526-8118
970-226-9366
970-226-9230 (fax)

On Tue, Apr 29, 2014 at 2:53 PM, Doherty, Kevin <kevin_doherty@fws.gov> wrote:

Noreen,

I talked with Tim Kern, Chief of Information Science at the Ft Collins Science Center today along with Sean Finn & Matt Heller (science apps). They confirmed lek data could be housed within LC MAP and we would be able access, organize, and query lek data for spatial modeling.

The USGS offered additional help to the USFWS to make this system of data storage work. The folks at USGS are going to set up an external server (amazon??) for the states to upload lek data. Ownership and access of the server and the lek data will be controlled by the states, but we can link to the data through LC MAP.

We will need the lek data prior to the main data call for the conservation database. It will take ~ 3- 4 weeks to finish processing all of the spatial data which will be used as predictor variables for spatial modeling. After that it is delaying our efforts.

Cheers
Kevin
--

Kevin Doherty, PhD

Spatial Ecologist

United States Fish & Wildlife Service

(303) 921-0524
kevin_doherty@fws.gov

--

Kevin Doherty, PhD

Spatial Ecologist

United States Fish & Wildlife Service

(303) 921-0524
kevin_doherty@fws.gov