

ITAC Conference Call July 9, 2014

Attendance:

Michael Lewis
Nate Booth
Terri Moore
Bob Avery

Gary Krammes
Daniel Pearson
Kate Flynn
Kris Lund

Marijke van Heeswijk
John Bumgarner
Gary Cottrell
Kim Martz

Agenda:

- Face-to-Face poll
 - Why did only 7 members respond? What does this mean?
- Is a Face-to-Face meeting still desirable? If so, when and where?
- Identifying and adopting initiatives for ITAC to address

Minutes:

Face-to-Face (F2F) poll and is a F2F meeting still desirable? – An email to ITAC on May 30, 2014, requested that ITAC participate in a Doodle poll to determine availability for a F2F meeting. Prior to today's call, only 7 members had participated. What happened? The only response from the group was from John Bumgarner who responded that he was not on the original email distribution (sent prior to his becoming an ITAC member). Upon request, Kim sent the Doodle poll link to John, and he has participated in the poll.

Michael commented that since we were unable to identify a date, and due to Center Director turnover in New Mexico, (Linda Weiss is retiring), the group will need to identify other potential dates to have a meeting. Potential weeks in the October/November timeframe are as follows: week of October 20, week of November 3, and the week of November 17. Michael will work with Kim to set up a Doodle poll to determine the best week. We will also need to decide on a location. Michael's thought is that ITAC shift direction and hold the meeting at a center that is progressive with its IT issues; suggestions are California and Texas (Austin).

ACTION – Michael and Kim will work to set up a Doodle poll to determine the best week for a F2F meeting.

ACTION – Kim will check to see when ITAC last met in California and Texas. *Update* – ITAC last met in California and Texas in 2007 (see table at end of this document).

Identifying and adopting initiatives for ITAC to address – Brainstorming session

Nate recommended that the group come forward with ideas, especially those with diverse perspectives. Michael mentioned the idea of Supergages and asked Nate to comment. Nate commented that he likes putting out big challenges. What would be required to see this through? Nate added that there is demand from our customers for new types of products. How is USGS doing with this? How can we accommodate our Cooperator needs? Regarding the idea of supergages, Marijke asked if the issue includes working the record or if it's just the technological issues involved. Nate responded that all of those things would need to be considered.

Michael asked Kate if she had any suggestions. Kate responded that it would be good to go out to our constituents for input on what they would like to see done. For Kate, her constituents are the Discipline offices and Program offices. Michael asked if Kate had any pet issues. Kate commented on the software pages noting that feedback from users about software being upgraded from UNIX and DOS platforms. How do we address the issue? Michael redefined the issue into three parts – 1) How much is our formal software being used? 2) If there is significant usage, how do we update our software? 3) Is there software that we don't have that is needed? Kate added that the issue of "who's responsible" needs to be addressed as well. People don't want to take on long-term responsibility.

Michael asked Daniel for his thoughts. Daniel responded that we, as ITAC, need to keep our eye on emerging technologies and promote those that are in line with our business model. For Daniel, personally, he would like to see USGS move toward Open Source and work on our mobile application development. It behooves ITAC to contribute to these discussions. Daniel added that he is also interested in Nate's supergage concept and how that might come about. Daniel suggested that ITAC follow a framework similar to what has been done in the past.

Kris commented that from the customer's perspective, data retrieval is very disjointed (traditional NWIS, WaterWatch, WaterAlert, WaterNow, etc...) How can we help our customers better locate the data they want? Kris added "now that the ADR is going away, what policy is replacing it?" Tools need to be developed, how will a policy be structured? How do we publish a revision? It was an annual process before, but is now a continuous process. Nate responded that he likes Kris' idea. There needs to be a better way to disseminate our data and information.

John Bumgarner commented that from an Investigations Chief perspective, GIS seems to be a skillset that a lot of folks don't have. It should be promoted more. Michael commented that it would be good to know what the needs are and what impediments keep people from using GIS. John added that if we identify a need, how do we promote usage?

Gary Krammes commented that he would like to figure out how web reengineering will affect Center pages. Gary added that he's not sure what ITAC's role can be in this effort. Terri commented that she has talked to Bill Werkheiser about this. There is a new team of leaders that will be meeting. Terri will try to find out more and update on the next call. Michael added that this issue is critical and important. Nate commented that the frustration with the web reengineering effort comes in fitting our information into nice "boxes." It's hard to do this with Water. Nate added that ITAC may be able to play a role in supporting a position paper from all WSCs regarding this issue. Nate added that content management issues may improve, but the challenge will be in fitting our information into the new framework. Additional comments from Daniel – how will our data presence fit? How much reimbursable work will fit in? Michael asked if Terri had any additional ideas. Terri responded that she has no new thoughts; these are all good ideas and will keep us busy.

Kris asked what part of the ITAC SharePoint (SP) is open to all USGS. If we don't have a portion of it open to all, we should. We need to build an audience for ITAC. Michael asked for feedback regarding the web and SP sites. Do we need both, and if not, which is preferred? Kris responded that the SP is not intuitive. Marijke suggested that we have a simple web portal to the SP site. Kate commented that the SP site needs to be completely redone. It is not organized. She noted that the Office of Surface Water SP site has good connections. Other SP sites to reference include CARP and NWIS Vision. Marijke added that communication with other disciplines should be more open. Nate agreed and added that there is a unique role in linking these pieces together.

- **ACTION** - Based on today's discussion, a small group will meet to discuss improvements to the SP site. Bob Avery suggested asking Dave Pratt to provide assistance. Kris, Bob, Marijke, and Kim will meet to start working on the SP site. *Update* – Kris sent out a Doodle poll to determine availability of the group for a meeting next week.

Michael's wrap-up –

- There are some overlaps with all of our disparate online data and tools. It would be good to help identify how we can help ensure that our customer and cooperator needs are being met.
- What role, if any, is there in web reengineering efforts for ITAC? Centers struggle with cutting edge web development.
- Reaching out to our constituents is a great idea. Michael recommended that members send out the list of ideas from today's call to their constituents and request feedback and additional ideas. **ACTION** – bring any responses to the next call.

Next Steps –

Next call – Doodle poll will be sent closer to our next call to determine a date and time.

F2F meeting – A poll will be sent out with potential dates for a F2F meeting. Once received, members have one week to participate so that a date can be confirmed. Identify issues to work on based on today's discussion.

Constituents – Members will reach out to their constituents and request input/feedback on the potential initiatives discussed on the call.

SP – SP subcommittee will meet to discuss updates to SP site; proposal is to create a new SP site

ACTIONS –

- Michael and Kim will work to set up a Doodle poll to determine the best week for a F2F meeting.
- Kim will check to see when ITAC last met in California and Texas.
 - *Update* – ITAC last met in California and Texas in 2007.
- SP subcommittee will meet to discuss improvements to the SP site.
 - *Update* – Kris sent out a Doodle poll to determine availability of the group for a meeting next week.
- Members will reach out to their constituents and seek feedback regarding the potential initiatives discussed on today's call. Bring responses/feedback to our next call.
- Identify potential dates for a F2F meeting in the October/November timeframe
- Identify agenda topics for the August call

History of ITAC Meeting Locations

DATE	MEETING LOCATION
2013	Madison, WI
2012	Lincoln, NE
	Richmond, VA
2011	Bismarck, ND
	Portland, OR
	Jackson, MS
2010	Honolulu, HI
	Iowa City, IA
	Tucson, AZ
2009	Louisville, KY
	Helena, MT
	Salt Lake City, UT
2008	Northborough, MA
	Tacoma, WA
	Baton Rouge, LA
2007	Austin, TX
	Lansing, MI
	San Diego, CA
2006	Ft. Lauderdale, FL
	Madison, WI
	Oklahoma City, OK
2005	Boise, ID
	Augusta, ME
	Atlanta, GA
2004	Little Rock, AR
	Anchorage, AK
	Indianapolis, IN
2003	Rapid City, SD
	New Cumberland, PA
	Guaynabo, Puerto Rico
2002	Montgomery, AL
	Troy, NY
	Carson City, NV
2001	Cheyenne, WY
	Nashville, TN
	Columbus, OH
2000	Honolulu, HI
	Reston, VA
	St. Paul, MN
	Columbia, SC
1999	Baltimore, MD
	Tucson, AZ
	Albuquerque, NM
1998	Miami, FL
	Tacoma, WA
	Austin, TX
1997	Raleigh, NC
	Bow, NH
	Urbana, IL
	Menlo Park, CA
1996	Las Vegas, NV
	Lawrence, KS
	Altamonte Springs, FL
	Reston, VA
1995	Denver, CO
	Rolla, MO