**ES Sub-Team meeting**

**2/28/23**

Participants:

1. Jamin Johanson
2. Suzann Kienast-Brown
3. Jon Maynard – absent
4. Suzanne Mayne
5. Travis Nauman
6. Jess Philippe
7. Greg Schmidt
8. Nathan Roe
9. Shawn Salley – absent
10. Stephanie Shoemaker
11. Jim Thompson – absent
12. Zach Van Abbema
13. Dave White – absent

* Review last meeting’s minutes
* ES sub-team channel
* Skill inventory
* Meeting minutes
* Steph Shoemaker – GNP DSM project presentation
* Discussion
* What is the best way to report spatial uncertainty and class confusion from an ecological site perspective?  The ultimate goal of predicting the spatial location of an ecological site concept is to understand the spatial variability of ecosystem dynamics and how that specific pixel/landscape responds to disturbance and/or management.  To the group: how can we better incorporate the current ecological state (or even potential states and expected transitions) into the DSM predicted ES-class map?
* What role do property predictions have in this workflow? (and can we use them more!) For example, we have general rules based on the MLRA key that can also be used to group the landscape based on soil and geomorphology. Are there ways validate site concepts by those thresholds identified in the MLRA key?
* How scale-able are these methods, data, and workflows to near-by areas and far away areas? Do you think it will it always be as iterative or are we closer to a more specific workflow? (I am not implying ‘automation’, but that is the thrust of the question)
* A little more abstract here, assuming that the ES concept is like the soil series and the raster pixel is like a map unit component, Is there a substantial conceptual gap between the ES-concept and the actual pixel on the ground (akin to a component phase).
* These are sort of related to the general questions that came out of the special session on DSM-classed based soil mapping at last year’s SSSA meeting:

1. Are there scales or contexts (while thinking about the specificity, variance, error, users etc.) that either favor class concepts or continuous property data?
2. In traditional US soil survey, spatial precision is defined by intensity of observation and purity of map unit concepts (expressed by cartographic scale and minimum mapping unit). How do we communicate these concepts of spatial precision and model performance when pixel size is more arbitrarily set, often out of convenance? (ie. Landsat, modis, etc)
3. Soil class concepts are a fundamental tool used for soil management. How are continuous soil property predictions (with their own uncertainty) used to derive soil management knowledge? Are there hybrid approaches where continuous property predictions can be constrained by the known variation within soil class concepts?

* Discuss @ March meeting
  + Discussion points following Steph’s presentation (from Shawn; see above)
  + Standards and guidance
  + Adding external members to the team
  + Pedogenon (AU) idea presented in France at DSM/GSM meeting

**1/18/23**

Participants:

1. Colby Brungard
2. Jamin Johanson
3. Suzann Kienast-Brown
4. Jon Maynard
5. Suzanne Mayne
6. Travis Nauman
7. Jess Philippe
8. Greg Schmidt
9. Nathan Roe
10. Shawn Salley
11. Stephanie Shoemaker
12. Jim Thompson
13. Zach Van Abbema
14. Dave White

* Review last month minutes
* Update from other DSM focus team work
  + Quarterly FT meeting TH Jan 26th
* Inventory of member Interest and Skillsets
  + Please send to Suzann if you have not already done so
* Identify goals and timelines
  + Short-term items
    - Meeting frequency
      * Monthly but may adjust based on projects
    - What do members want to get out of each meeting? Discuss the meeting format (presentation, brainstorming, journal club, data review, etc)
      * All of the above
  + Long-term goals
    - Develop framework and workflows to deliver ES-DSM products consistently across special project area (PLU), soil survey area (MLRA), broad climate zones (region), and nationally
      * Institution requires standard scale for products with options for customization
      * Start national scale and resampling techniques to finer scales
      * Training data
        + Constrained by available point data at finer scales
        + Where should this data live? Need a central location
        + State modeling may benefit from site visits related to resource inventory done by FO staff
        + Tag partner data with ecological site
      * Class concepts
        + Groups for larger scales (MLRA, LRU, national)
        + STMs analogous to soil orders – very generalized

Invite folks working on generalized STMs to meeting to present their work – Travis

* + - * + ESGs are desirable for federal partners (BLM, USFS)
    - Create a DSM data covariate library most appropriate for DSM- Site and State mapping
      * On GCP
        + 30m DEM derivatives
        + 30m Landsat derivatives

Have GTAC Landsat disturbance removed but may want something different for this work

* + - * + Want to add Sentinel
    - Develop products that specifically feed decision support tools (CART, CD)
      * There is potential here…keep on the radar
    - Geomorphology/parent material
      * National level maps
      * Work is starting in ME
        + Once workflow is developed, can we apply nationally?
    - Species distribution maps
      * Species association w/in MLRA
      * SDM to ES and STM
      * Need association of species data
      * USGS inhabit model <https://gis.usgs.gov/inhabit/>
* For next meeting: Solicit presentations of current DSM-ES work in the group
  + Steph to present GNP project next month
* Action items
  + Meeting data/time for Feb
  + Steph to present in Feb
  + Quarterly FT meeting

**12/1/22**

Participants:

1. Colby Brungard
2. Jamin Johanson
3. Suzann Kienast-Brown
4. Jon Maynard
5. Suzanne Mayne
6. Travis Nauman
7. Jess Philippe
8. Greg Schmidt
9. Nathan Roe
10. Shawn Salley
11. Stephanie Shoemaker
12. Jim Thompson
13. Zach Van Abbema
14. Dave White – absent

* Introductions – all
  + Location
  + Brief history/interest
* Overview
  + DSM FT structure – Suzann
  + Team charges/DSS priorities – Suzann
  + Expectations – Suzann
  + Research – Jon/Travis
    - Will share papers on cloudvault
  + IBM work – Shawn
    - Unsupervised classification based on regional inputs
    - First cut for clustering ecological groups
* Discussion – all
  + Where we’re heading (long-term)
    - What concepts do you need for an ecological site pixel?
      * Capability/condition/available management per pixel – overarching DSS goal
      * State mapping
      * Start with broad classes within the first year
    - Dynamic vs static properties
    - National vs regional modeling
  + What is the path forward?
    - Look at other ecosystem types/areas besides the west to test some of the current approaches
    - Training data – where do we have it, how do we assemble it?
      * NASIS tables/reports can now accommodate this type of data
      * Provisional ecological sites – what’s next?
        + Enter observation data into NASIS
        + National instruction in progress
    - Generic attributes with veg phases to identify state – canopy height, density, total cover via remote sensing data
    - Minimum set of properties that apply to all veg types
    - Stratification of the country as a strategy for veg prediction
    - Use soils data to help parameterize the veg mapping
    - Predicting sites as fuzzy concepts with potential as goal?
    - How to use keys?
    - Raster Soil Survey approach with focus on local/regional mapping to create product to inform management
  + Potential products (short-term)
    - National geomorphic map
    - Standards
  + Next meeting discussion
    - Geomorphology/parent material
    - Species distribution mapping
* Determine regular meeting schedule – all
  + Will start with monthly frequency
  + Next meeting will focus on identifying initial goals and timeline
  + Inventory of skillsets/projects for team members

