

**Oregon/Washington Hydrography Framework Clearinghouse
Notes for Joint Oregon/Washington Framework Meeting
Oregon State Office, BLM, Portland, OR
May 15, 2001**

Attendees

Bob Harmon	OWRD	Gene Thorley	USGS/NGSO
Byrt Filyaw	WA DNR	Barabara Poore	USGS/UW
Deborah Naslund	WA DNR	Chester Novak	BLM
Carrie Wolfe	WA DNR	Steve Salas	BLM
Stephen Bown	USFS	Ken Adee	USFS
Jon Bowers	ODFW	Dan Wickwire	BLM
Dale Guenther	REO	Eric Gillett	ESRI
Teri Gaffney	Tillamook County	Sharon Clarke	CLAMS (OSU)

Hydro Data Model

The latest version of document is v1.1 dated September 22, 2000 (available at the [Oregon Hydro](#) or [Washington Hydro](#) Framework sites). A need was identified to add the “SECTION” Event table to the documentation. Ken Adee gave a summary of the previously identified requirement for this additional table. Question: Does the Clearinghouse application currently create this event table? Steve Salas: BLM recently tested the “check out” function for the Clearinghouse. He saw the new SECTION table in the coverage provided in the transaction. There was general agreement that we do need to document this. Where? This will be incorporated into the User’s Guide. Dale Guenther and Ken will ensure that this happens. Washington DNR will update the Data Dictionary document and distribute.

User’s Guide

Update on this procedural rules document: No recent activities or updates due to other higher priority work (primarily data integration). Objective: The original objective was to have the user’s guide in place by the start of the Clearinghouse beta test period. This has not happened. There is still much left to do.

Main Sections of the User’s Guide

Introduction:

Spatial Accuracy:

Metadata:

Watercourse Section:

(includes definitions, building, routing, QA/QC, updates for each section)

Shorelines Section:

Waterbodies Section:

Waterpoints Section:

Management of Event Tables:

Clearinghouse Transactions:

Appendices

Transaction Processing: Dale has committed REO to completing this portion of the document. He will begin with the Clearinghouse transaction documentation and then follow-up with the QA/QC documentation. Target date: June 29th for Clearinghouse Transaction section. No target date set for the QA/QC.

Introduction: Joy Denkers had originally volunteered for this section. Carrie Wolfe will check with Joy to determine whether she will still do this section.

Metadata: There was a consensus agreement that we need an FGDC compliant set of metadata at the Clearinghouse level (layer level--one for each layer). Dan Wickwire offered BLM's resources to develop this metadata. Target date: June 29th. *There was a decision to include a scenarios narrative under the metadata section. Deb Naslund agreed to take the lead on this. Target date: June 29th.*

Watercourses: Michelle Davis' and Diane Rainsford's documents need to be integrated. Ken Adee will talk with Michelle and Diane to see if they can follow up with this additional support. Target date: June 29th.

Waterbodies, Shorelines, Waterpoints: Developing the documentation for these other layers will follow the approach used for the Watercourses Layer. This will be completed prior to September 1st.

Management of Event Tables: Dale Guenther volunteered Jim Edmonds to write this portion of the document with help provided by Ken. Target date: September 1st.

Data Integration: Ken Adee highlighted the need to document the technical aspects of data integration. This should include a series of technical scenarios. Ken proposed adding this to the Watercourses Section of the User's Guide. A lead for this section of the document needs to be identified. Target date: June 29th.

Technical editor: The group discussed the need for a technical writer/editor to integrate and format the document. Dale will check availability of Lorie Ystad to help with this. Byrt Filyaw also volunteered her time to support this part of the project.

Watersheds Status:

5th Fields: Dale Guenther provided a status of the 5th field boundary effort. There are still some remaining areas to complete. We are nearing completion in both Oregon and Washington. Both will be done prior to the workshops. The emphasis in the workshop will be on 6th fields, not 5th fields. There may be some errors detected in the 5ths. These will be noted.

6th Fields: Dale also provided an overview of the workshop schedule (available at the following REO web site: <http://www.reo.gov/reo/projects/watersheds/>). All the remaining pieces are being put into place for the workshops. It's a go. The Washington workshop will include finishing the 5th Fields and delineating the 6th field boundaries. Dale also indicated that we will soon have a contract proposal from AverStar for the 6th field digitizing and for the 100K data conversion (to Clearinghouse) for Oregon.

Dale said that the tools and other requirements are in place for the workshop. Chester Novak asked about facilitation. Are the facilitators going to walk through the process ahead of time? Jim Edmonds is holding Net Meetings this week with the volunteer detailers for the workshop. Chester suggested that Jim Edmonds and Ryan Dalton should instruct the volunteers in the process that should be followed. Dale suggested that Bruce McCammon and Chester should also set the stage at the beginning of each workshop.

National Guidelines: Dan Wickwire and Chester Novak gave an overview of the current situation. Kenny Legleiter of NRCS is the lead in finalizing the Federal Standards for Delineation of Hydrologic Unit Boundaries. There was an informal review several weeks ago. Dan said that BLM Oregon/Washington submitted comments and included the PNW data standard. Kenny has promised another review within the next couple of weeks where we can see whether there are remaining issues.

Clearinghouse: REO will be initiating a rent-a-tech contract with ESRI for technical assistance as Bob Varner's participation is phased out. Jim Edmonds is planned as the long term Clearinghouse Administrator and will shift to this after the 6th field watershed workshops. Several organizations are initiating testing of the Clearinghouse. Steve Salas reported on a BLM test checkout. He found one bug—didn't send out email notifying of presence of the coverage. Question: How do we accumulate and organize issues that are encountered during beta test? Need to formalize this so that we have a more structured approach. Target for finalizing beta test: September 1, 2001. Question: Programming on Clearinghouse during this time. Will there be support for this?

Note: The group identified the need to add check out of a single stream to the Clearinghouse testing. Also, need to test whether an LLID check is in place to flag LLID's that are dropped during the course of a transaction.

Data Integration: There was a brief discussion on recent meetings and discussions related to data integration for the Clearinghouse. Specifically, Ken Adee summarized recent discussions on data integration across the Columbia River. Oregon framework partners will provide data along the state boundary (Columbia River) to the DNR. DNR's contractor will build the entire Columbia River for the framework. The Oregon partners will need to complete their side of the river through a transaction on the Clearinghouse. Ken Adee is providing USFS and Dan Wickwire is providing BLM data to the DNR

Roles/Responsibilities Document: DNR met last week and discussed the draft roles and responsibilities document. Byrt is working up the minutes from that meeting. DNR has organized a meeting for June 12th to discuss how this would be implemented in Washington. DNR has several suggestions for slight modifications to the Roles/Responsibilities document. Deb walked through these suggested enhancements. Gene: Asked some questions pertaining to how Theme Management will be implemented. Question: How would a county who is a data producer be able to participate in the process? Solution: We need to allow for the participation at the Theme Management level for any entity that wants to participate at that level. This needs to be flexible. The assumption is that many of the non-federal groups may not want to

participate at this level. Question: What about the major commercial landowners? How can they be involved in process? This was not fully resolved. Stephen Bown asked how does the role of regulatory agencies play into this as far as maintenance of data in the Clearinghouse? We need to include a method for resolving differences between land management and regulatory agencies.

Discussion: At what level should Theme Management occur? Should it be at the 4th Field or 5th Field level? This was not fully resolved but it was agreed that as we get the 5th field coverage done we need to use it to document Theme Management assignments that are resulting from the data integration meetings and place this up on the web. There was more discussion on how to get the Stewardship/Theme Management piece in place. Managing this should be a Clearinghouse function. The group proposed that Jim Edmonds as Clearinghouse Manager should maintain the coverage that lists Theme Managers by 5th field. The local Theme Management groups will feed this information to the Clearinghouse Manager.

DNR will update the Roles/Responsibilities document and send out for review. Roles and Responsibilities group will meet later in summer to finalize.

Tools Development: Steve Salas provided an overview of what's been accomplished to date and what he's currently working on. History: Michelle Davis and Steve originally wrote the program to do spatial route editing and feature history event editing. Steve is now adding the functionality to edit the rest of the Clearinghouse events. Ken Adee asked whether the tools would be suitable for a resource specialist to do the event editing. Steve feels that the tool will be that level. Ken is exploring options for the USFS to assist in funding this effort. Steve will finalize the programming and then we'll schedule a meeting to review. Date to be determined.

ODFW 24K Fish Distribution Project: Jon Bowers gave an overview of the recent workshop that he attended. The ODFW lead on this project is Cedric Cooney. There is lots of cooperation with USFS and BLM. The goal of the project is to compile fish distribution data and barrier information within the range of anadromous salmonid species in Oregon. Fish habitat distribution: Believed and documented distribution. These are separate layers. The third is the barrier layer. Project was not funded for Cutthroat. ODFW does have plans for working on Cutthroat until funding runs out. They will be setting up meetings with BLM and USFS Hydrologists. Approach (1) Hardcopy on maps/mylars (2) Arcview tools developed to use existing data for reference. Initially this will include endpoints of fish distribution. Known absence will be mapped for anadromous species. This is a two-year project. Initially this will be point data. Eventually want to transition to the routed linework when it exists.

Coordination with Washington: To the extent that this effort is compatible with StreamNet including stream passage, height, etc.

A description of the project, including its status exists at <http://osu.orst.edu/dept/nrimp/pages/24k/main.htm>

Jon asked to include two additional data categories that he failed to mention to the Hydro Group regarding this project:

- 1) Life Stage Timing
- 2) Genetic Production and Origin

FGDC Standards Status: Ken Adee provided a summary of the current situation. The Modeling Advisory Team (MAT) had developed a Standards Proposal that was to go to the Subcommittee on Spatial Water. Ken is representing our Framework group on this team. Dan Wickwire is representing BLM (nationally) on the MAT. There were also several other activities involving the MAT that were planned to move the standards process forward. Unfortunately, these did not occur as planned and a new Standards Proposal was put forward by Richard Hogan of the USGS. BLM, USFS, and other participants provided critical comment on the FGDC process and this new proposal. Reacting to the critical nature of comments that have been submitted, the FGDC has indicated that this will be an open process as the Standards Proposal moves forward. We are waiting for more information on how this process will move forward.

Note from Bob: another meeting was not scheduled at this time.

Thanks to Dan for taking the notes!