

# Oregon/Washington Hydrography Framework Group

## Meeting Notes

REO, Portland, OR

April 11, 2002

### Attendees

Bob Harmon	OWRD	Ken Adee	USFS
Byrt Filyaw	WA DNR	Dan Wickwire	BLM
Carrie Wolfe	WA DNR	Nancy Tubbs	USGS
Jon Bowers	ODFW	Mark Folden	WA DNR
Dale Guenther	REO	Janine Salwasser	OWEB

**Introductions, announcement, & agenda adjustments:** Introductions made. Bob announced that the Oregon/Washington Hydrography Framework Model had been accepted by OGIC (Oregon Geographic Information Council) and was being referred to Oregon's information technology council for approval as an "official" state data standard. OWEB (Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board) will also review the standard. A few adjustments were made to the agenda.

**FGDC standards Status:** Ken Adee provided a summary of the current situation. He is representing the Oregon/Washington Hydrography Framework group on FGDC Modeling Advisory Team (MAT). Dan Wickwire is representing BLM (nationally) on the MAT, also. Ken said that the content model is coming directly from the NHD (National Hydrography Dataset) as expected. He added that the new ArcGIS geodatabase model would have a significant impact on this and our efforts in the near future.

Nancy told us that the National Map prototypes were being expanded which would result in one or two more pilots in the northwest—Seattle-Tacoma and/or Portland-Vancouver. She said that this may provide an opportunity to explore conversion of OR/WA hydro framework data into the NHD—the format used by the National Map.

### **Roles & responsibilities document:**

The group decided to wrap up review of this document. Dan will get a copy from Carrie, insert a few more changes, and send it around for a limited review.

**Clearinghouse:** Dale reported that the beta test fixes identified by the BLM, WA DNR, and others would be taken care of by the end of the following week. Personnel from ESRI Northwest were retained in another contract to implement the changes. The "nearly final" draft 5<sup>th</sup>-field watershed coverage is being used on the Clearinghouse server at the REO for checking out hydro data. In conjunction with a big rollout of the Clearinghouse to the public Dale would like to have the User Guide, Training Manual, and MOU ready. The group agreed, but Dan added that he wanted to test the Clearinghouse one more time to see that the fixes were adequately made. There was general agreement that the rollout would take place soon after the integration workshops in late May (see "Data integration protocols/process" later in these notes).

**Steward sign-up:** Dale said that an ArcIMS site had been developed in conjunction with the

Clearinghouse (<http://hydro.reo.gov/>) that would enable users to find who the data integrator is for a given 5<sup>th</sup>-field watershed. This is a first cut at attempting to assign responsibility for the data at the watershed level. Preliminary assignments were made by overlaying the draft 5<sup>th</sup>-field watershed coverage with public ownership. This interface will also allow users to sign up for email updates when changes are made to the data in a 5<sup>th</sup>-field that they pick. The group stressed the need to limit who could sign up as the responsible party in a watershed. Dale will make the recommended adjustments: make sure that URL to ArcIMS data integrator application is working, and that the data integrator and producer fields are filled out per suggestions made by the group.

**Data disclaimer:** Carrie went over the April 10<sup>th</sup> draft with the group and noted the last batch of changes. It was agreed that our respective attorneys would review the document. The group also discussed where the disclaimer should be placed on the site.

**MOU:** Dale reviewed a draft MOU with the group that seeks to get high-level commitment from the partners—Oregon, Washington, USFS, and BLM—to the Hydro Clearinghouse. He will compile the changes made at the meeting and send it around for a final review.

**Forest plan monitoring team:** Bruce Bingham, USFS, gave a short presentation on the work of his group, the Interagency Regional Monitoring Program. He wanted to make sure that their priorities meshed with the work of our group, especially in southwest Oregon which is the first area where they will focus their activities. We discussed the differences in stream density that occur in some areas and some of the options being explored for addressing them. Ken mentioned a densification tool being worked on that might help.

**User Guide:** Byrt went over what chapters that she has so far in the User Guide. The group went over what topics to keep and where they should go in the document. The revised format is as follows:

1. Introduction
2. Roles and Responsibilities
3. Spatial Accuracy
4. Metadata-Feature level
5. Watercourses (features)
  - a. watercourses
  - b. shorelines & waterbodies
  - c. waterpoints
6. Management of Event Tables
7. Shared Maintenance
8. Guidelines for Data Integration Long Term Maintenance Guidelines-Graphic

Appendices:

- A. Data Dictionary
- B. Route/Event Editing Training Manual

Everyone agreed to get comments back to her by Friday, May 17<sup>th</sup>.

**Training manual:** The group reviewed the few remaining issues regarding the manual with Gee Gee (Titan/BLM), specifically the QC/QA section. Dan noted that he hadn't received many comments. The group thanked him for his work. He said that a generic (non-BLM specific) version would be ready soon.

Other related notes: Dale said that he would send out the Clearinghouse QA/QC AMLs to Mark, Dan, and Ken; the USFS GIS coordinators meeting is scheduled for some time this September; and, Dan said that he would hold a "train the trainer" session this August.

**Data integration protocols/process:** Ken gave an overview of the process that he has been hammering out over the last several months with Dan and others in the USFS and BLM. Workshops will be held in late May—Oregon USFS & BLM hydrologists during the week of the 20<sup>th</sup> (WA to be determined)—with a pilot workshop to be held at the BLM Salem District office on April 25<sup>th</sup>. Approximately 100 5<sup>th</sup>-field watersheds where the USFS and BLM potentially have overlapping hydrography will be examined to pick one or portions of each other's data. There was some discussion over particular questions that the group had for Ken.

**Data conversion effort:** Mark (in the little time that Bob left for him) quickly summarized data conversion efforts at WA DNR. DNR is finishing up its pilot with the contractors. He said that there aren't any "show-stoppers", but he is spending time on how to QC event data and how to edit the water body-shoreline interface at the same time.

Bob and Dan reported, for these notes, that the BLM is wrapping up the conversion end of its contract with the state of Oregon. The data in the remaining watersheds should be complete by the end of this quarter (June). The remainder of the contract will assist with the integration effort between the USFS, BLM, and state (as represented by the BLM).