

**Oregon Fish Habitat Distribution Data Standard  
Bioscience Framework Implementation Team, Workgroup  
February 24, 2015  
ODFW, Salem**

Agenda

- 1:00 Introductions, meeting objectives
- 1:05 Review January 14<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes / action items
- 1:20 Review and Discuss Remaining Proposed Amendments (Business Rules 5-8, Attribute Domains, Definitions, Other? - see accompanying document)
- 3:20 Wrap up, Assignments, Next Steps
- 3:30 Close

Meeting Attendees

Name	Agency	Location
Jon Bowers	ODFW	Salem
Cedric Cooney	ODFW	Salem
Phil Smith	ODOT	Salem
Jay Stevens	BLM	Salem
Shelly Moore	BLM	Salem
Bob Denouden	DAS-GEO	Salem
Erin Gilbert	ODFW	Phone
Erin Butts	USFWS	Phone
Malavika Bishop	DEQ	Phone
Aron Borok	DEQ	Phone

Meeting Objectives

The primary meeting objectives were:

- 1) Review January meeting minutes and action items
- 2) Review and discuss remaining proposed amendments not reviewed at previous meetings; adopt / modify / reject based on workgroup consensus
- 3) Determine next steps to finalize version 3.0 of the standard document

January Meeting Minutes Review

The workgroup reviewed the decision points and action items stemming from the January meeting, as documented in the January meeting minutes. Schema changes for proposed amendments 1 through 4 were adopted and proposed amendments 5 through 7 were rejected. Business rule amendment 1 was adopted as proposed. Rules 2, 3.5 and 4 were adopted as modified in the draft standard document. However, it was suggested that the language be reviewed further by agency subject matter experts. The workgroup briefly discussed rule 2 (minimum habitat use thresholds for identification within the database). The USFS data are more focused on fish presence while BLM data include records that are more habitat-based.

The proposal related to “rule” 3 was agreed upon however, it will be built into the stewardship plan rather than the standard document. Where the workgroup reached consensus on

proposed amendments, those changes were incorporated into the standard Oregon Fish Habitat Distribution Data Standard (OFHDDS) document, version 3.0 draft.

### Remaining Proposed Amendments Not Review During January Workgroup Meeting

#### Business Rules

5) Add a new rule to address surveys with negative observations.

The workgroup recognized the challenge of utilizing fish surveys with negative (0) observations to inform the habitat distribution dataset. The BLM noted that they maintain coding for “absence verified” but it was unclear what the specific criteria are for making this determination. ODFW explained that in an internal document (Distribution Update Protocol), there are some criteria that are spelled out for determining non-presence and thus the lack of suitable / accessible habitat.

➔ Action: drop proposed amendment. Consider incorporating into stewardship plan.

6) Clarify rules for origin coding above historically impassable natural waterfalls where passage was provided via a fishway.

The workgroup discussed this within the context of the updates to the Origin attribute domain. Since that domain focuses at a Species Management Unit level, it was determined that implementing it at a finer scale was not practical given the business needs related to this information.

➔ Action: Drop proposed amendment.

7) Clarify historical habitat framework language to better align with acceptable thresholds for intrinsic extent?

ODFW shared that it used intrinsic potential (IP) for the coho conservation plan and also for the coastal multi-species plan. It was used to make relative comparisons at a population scale and there was lack of confidence in the accuracy of IP at the individual reach level. BLM shared these same concerns. When lidar-based elevation models become available for broader areas of the state, it will be worth reconsidering the use IP when the reach scale accuracy improves.

➔ Action: The general business rules related to intrinsic extent were left “as is” with no changes.

8) Drop portion of Basis business rule pertaining to the formulation of a concurrence of professional opinion (CPO). Place this language in the Stewardship Plan.

Since the CPO steps are not actual business rules, but rather steps for implementing the rules, they would be more appropriately located within a stewardship plan. Since the stewardship plan has not yet been finalized it may be necessary to finalize and publish it with similar timing to the standard document revision.

➔ Action: adopt proposed amendment. Incorporate the CPO steps into the stewardship plan. Within the standard business rules for the Basis attribute, reference the CPO steps as described within the stewardship plan.

## Attribute Domains

- 1) Modify Origin categories of Native Reintroduced and Non-native Reintroduced to be relative to Species Mgt. Unit (SMU) and their associated populations. The reference to subbasin would be dropped. (see proposed domain changes below)

A short discussion revolved around how this relates to proposed business rule 6 which would implement origin coding at a finer scale. It was determined that Origin coding should remain at the SMU level and not be applied at a finer scale.

➔ Action: adopt proposed amendment.

Fish habitat distribution origin (fhdOrig)

Code	Description
NativeLocal	Native origin. Species indigenous to Oregon that were present within the species management unit (SMU) prior to European settlement (1800).
NativeNonLocal	Native origin. Species indigenous to Oregon that were not present within the SMU prior to European settlement (1800) but are now present there due to human involvement.
NonNative	Non-native origin. Species not indigenous to Oregon that were introduced to waters of the state.
NativeLocalReintro	Native, locally reintroduced. A species from within the SMU that has repopulated an area within the SMU that had become void of that species.
NativeNonLocalReintro	Native, non-local reintroduced. The original stock within the SMU was extirpated, but native, non-local fish (fish from outside the SMU) were introduced to re-establish the historical distribution.
Unknown	Unknown origin.

- 2) Modify Origin code and description for NonNativeReintro. Non-native and “originating from outside of a Species Mgt. Unit” are separate descriptions. (see proposed domain changes above)

The discussion for this proposed change was combined with #1 above.

➔ Action: adopt proposed amendment.

- 3) Modify Production code of WildNatural to the value of “Natural” to be consistent with ODFW’s Native Fish Conservation Policy. (see proposed domain changes below)

The discussion keyed in on the proposal to drop the Production attribute category of “Introduced”. Upon further investigation outside of the workgroup meeting, it was determined there are only 2 cases

where this code was used in the Oregon Fish Habitat Distribution Database (Pacific Lamprey, Umatilla Basin: Winter Steelhead, Upper Willamette Basin). Consultation with the ODFW district fish biologist for the upper Willamette basin winter steelhead confirmed that they are best described as having natural production. The ODFW district fish biologist clarified that Umatilla basin Pacific Lamprey are best described as having mixed hatchery and natural production.

→ Action: new codes were verified to be adequate for describing cases where the Production code of “Introduced” was used previously.

Fish habitat distribution production (fhdProd)

Code	Description
Natural	Natural production. Fish reproduce and complete their full life cycle in natural habitats.
Mixed	Hatchery and natural production. Reproduction from a mix of hatchery and natural means.
Hatchery	Hatchery production. Production is the result of fish being incubated or reared under artificial conditions for at least a portion of its life.
None	No current production occurs due to local extirpation.
Unknown	Unknown production.

### Definitions

- 1) **Species management unit:** means a collection of populations from a common geographic region that share similar genetic and ecological characteristics.
- 2) **Indigenous:** means descended from a population believed to have been present in the same geographical area prior to the year 1800 or from a natural colonization of another indigenous population.
- 3) **Non-native:** Species not indigenous to Oregon that were introduced to waters of the state.
- 4) **Native:** Species indigenous to Oregon that were present prior to European settlement (1800).
- 5) **Natural Production:** Fish reproduce and complete their full life cycle in natural habitats.

→ Action: adopt amendment as proposed.

### Other Action Items

The business rule describing the Basis Order of Precedence was discussed. There are some exceptions to the rule as it is described in version 2.0 of the standard. In some cases, protocol

based habitat surveys identify a definitive end extent for accessible (anadromous) habitat within a stream reach. These may be at odds with non-protocol based observations that were made lower in the reach and the end extent that was delineated by the biologist (especially during the 1:24k Fish Habitat Distribution Mapping Project) extends upstream of the habitat survey end extent. In these cases, the habitat survey with a definitive end extent determination would prevail when compared to a record that includes an observation but the end extent “call” was based on opinion.

- Action: Update the business rule for Basis Order of Precedence to reflect the exception as described above.

### Next Steps

The OFHDDS steward will update the draft, version 3.0 data standard document and distribute to the workgroup for final review and comment. Efforts will be made to reach consensus via email exchange by March 20<sup>th</sup>. If workgroup consensus cannot be reached via this remote approach, then an in person meeting will be scheduled toward the end of March. A final, revised standard must be provided to DAS-GEO by April 3<sup>rd</sup> at the latest to leave time for a 45 day public review period ahead of the Framework standards forum that is scheduled for May 20<sup>th</sup>.