GRP Session

ESIs are a tool/data source for the Geographic Response Plan (GRP).

Each area committee has unique criteria for "A, B, C" protection priorities; ESI data must be able to support this, but how to make that easier?

Out-of-date data makes ESI of limited value to process – needs regular updates to GRPs – more frequent than ESI

Mid-Atlantic GRPs:

- GeoPDF; 1 sheet/priority protection site
- 1 page size – vertical/oblique photography (ESI could provide)
- Roads – these should be part of ESI and available for GRPs – base map updates for digital products

PDF searchability increases usability
Common grid systems across mapping efforts (ESIs/GRPs) increases usability (7.5' USGS quads)

Background image:

- Nautical hybrid preferred, but DRGs adequate

Use:

- Base/first cut for Florida planning
- Great Lakes uses bio, not socecon/human-use
- Input for GRP spatial data
- Sensitive sites and summary of ESI
- Priorities
- GRP attempts to prioritize response, but
    - Not actual vs. theoretical
    - Not regulatory driven
    - "It looks easy on paper"

Content:

- Driven by ESI – shoreline and bio data; some human-use

Current "grids" for GRPs:

- AL – ESI
- CA – Geographic Response Area (GRA), based on specific areas or counties
- Gulf District 8 – ESI-based USGS quads
- Atlantic area – Great Lakes group
- D7 – ESI-based

Map types:

- AL/CA – NOT ESI-like text and map strategy
- TX – ICS 204

Background basemap:

- AL/CA/D7/8 – imagery

Size:

- 8.5 x 11

Distribution:

- On-line
- FedEx - Kinko's
- Limited hard copy
- Digital distribution preferred, but retain ability to print – 8.5 x 11
- Distribution – Web most common and preferred
- Some sensitive data are protected/restricted
- All formats

Local involvement of area committees:

- D7 – Highly involved
- D8 – much improved
- AL – high
- CA – varies
- Local involvement government and NGO – varies
- GRPs are site-specific – "all oil spills are local"

Challenges:

- No common operating plan
- 1-way sharing of data
- Limited map production capabilities
- Need more local government involvement
- Portability (ability to use disconnected from Internet)
- Getting ESI/GRP data to field people – email attachment vs. drop box, etc.
- Concern about mis-use and need for training/education of users
- Hardware, plotting, PDF accessibility
- Who needs the info – audience dependent

Scale and "wants":

- Ability to pick out geography and scale; print out page size to posters
- Resolution of basemaps – for zooming want "Google effect." Maybe create larger-scale maps that can be used at different scales
- Scale dependent on GRP-specific needs
- GIS workflow management – no duplication required is goal

- ESI – GRP: ESI scale is to provide overview of info and template guidance at ACP level, but not designed for "micro" response

Standards/guidance:

- Need federal/statewide standards, but allow for regional variation
- "ESI-like" common themes, yes! And symbology
- National Standard = GOOD! – large variation in GRP process by state
- Educate USCG about GRPs in academy; can they develop standards as a project?
- Not universal by ACP state
- Standardization critical
- Education
- Need awareness/education on purposes of ESIs and GRPs and their relationship
    - ESI guidelines
    - GRP-specific strategies

Technology:

- Field
- Compatibility
- Apps in field

Louisiana – too complex for "maps" – selected areas; elsewhere, quads are OK
Texas maps – digital GeoPDF, quads, specific areas
Map scale re geomorphology
If quads, use logical extent
Digital data – use whatever scale and extent is required
Stakeholder buy-in
NGOs, municipalities, county, etc.

Most GRPs use imagery for the backdrop