

**Oregon/Washington Hydrography Framework Groups
Meeting Notes
REO, Portland, OR
November 26, 2002**

Attendees

Bob Harmon	OWRD	Ken Adee	USFS
Nancy Tubbs	USGS	Dan Wickwire	BLM
Dale Guenther	REO	Sharon Clarke	CLAMS

Introductions & agenda adjustments

Review period for hydro updates after submission to clearinghouse

Agreed that:

- 1) Review of data (points, arcs, and polys/regions) to be handled by data maintainers before submission. We'll check on the process to see if we need to adjust this. Changes to the data will be reflected by the next business day.
- 2) **Watersheds** will undergo a quarterly update, compiled by the REO from posted changes. This will initially start with a 30-day cycle. The group will watch and adjust the cycle, if necessary to accommodate the number of changes submitted for any given period of time.
- 3) To speed up the process there was posed the option to flag review of watersheds where the change in area change is greater than five percent.
- 4) Fourth-field (sub-basin) hydrologic units will be submitted to the USGS; 5ths & 6ths-fields will go to the NRCS. Kenny Legleiter (NRCS) is anxious to review the 5ths and 6ths. Dale has to migrate the attributes to the "standard" format before shipping them to Kenny.

Roles & responsibilities

Ken will add his edits to the document and get them to Dan.

User guide (UG)

- The group agreed not to embed all documents in the (UG). The UG will continue to mirror the Training Guide. Consistency is important. The UG will include the Roles & Responsibilities document, while the Data Dictionary remains separate.
- Dan will get a technical writer to wrap up the document after the final draft is complete. He estimates that the "wrap up" will take one to two weeks.
- Nancy agreed to review the final draft.
- Ken suggested having the technical writer review all of the hydro documents (listed under the first bullet) and identify any areas of overlap and suggest changes back to group.

Ken reported on the Forest Service hydro training. He said that the tools worked very well and were extremely useful. There is a need for water point and water body editing tools.

MOU

Oregon is ready to sign. The Forest Service needs to review. Others will probably re-review and incorporate "genericized" BLM recommended changes.

Notes by rh, 1/2/2003