

Oregon Hydrography Framework Implementation Team Meeting

Wednesday, October 8, 2014, 9:30 – 11:30

Conf. rm 124A, North Mall Office Building, 725 Summer St. NE, Salem

Attendees (*via phone):

Bob Harmon, OWRD

Meredith Carine, OWRD

Jon Bowers, ODFW

Ruth Schellbach, ODFW

Jed Roberts, DOGAMI

Margaret Matter, ODA

Emmor Nile, ODF

Bob DenOuden, DAS GEO

Dick Lycan, PSU

Jay Stevens, BLM

Tamiko Stone, BLM

Shelley Moore, BLM

*Malavika Bishop, DEQ

*Steve Aalbers, DEQ

*Janet Bretz, USFS

*Ian Reid, NRCS

Agenda:

- 1) Welcome & introductions, Bob & group.
- 2) NHD updates from the agencies, group.

OWRD: In the process of transferring their stream codes [for ~27,000 streams] to the NHD. Likely six to nine months from completion. [BobH forgot to add during the meeting that whole stream routes are created from the conflated stream codes and indexes derived for water right diversions, stream gages, and dams. OWRD will turn around and create NHD events for the diversions, gages, and dams.]

ODFW: Migrated a subset of LLID routes (~48,000) to NHD. Fish habitat distribution data migrated to NHD. Fish Passage Barrier data migrated to NHD. Planning to publish these migrated datasets soon, including web services. Amendment to data standard to reflect NHD migration needed. ODFW has very little resource available for work on NHD at this point. They will be pursuing another USGS Partnership Grant.

Oregon DEQ: Lost employee recently that was working on their migration pilot. They are looking for a three-month temporary staff to complete NHD work to move ambient monitoring stations onto NHD (for mid-coast pilot area).

DOGAMI: Completed updates to NHD in Tualatin Basin based on lidar data. Submitted to USGS for inclusion. This was a manual delineation; not flow accumulation based, but should be hydrologically correct. Emmor noted that the 3DEP program specifies a hydro-enforced DEM, but this doesn't make sense if the hydrography features are not accurate to begin with. It was suggested that this issue be brought up with Tom Carlson (USGS).

ODF: Continue to maintain separate hydrography because Forest Protection Act's regulatory basis is in some cases tied to boundaries in hydro, sometimes paper maps. Stream size and fish presence are key attributes for ODF in administering FPA.

ODA: Use NHD for administering the agriculture water program and for riparian area protection, but ODA has not edited the data. Noted that irrigation districts often point out data discrepancies in existing NHD linework (between DEQ, ODFQ, USGS, & OWRD maps).

BLM: In process on Western Oregon Plan Revision (main writing due in January). Will start looking at more 12-digit HUs for lidar revision of the NHD after work on the Plan is wrapped up. Recently updated stream order attribute in NHD. Web services are starting to be opened up outside of agency for first time in a while. This will present opportunities. Working on a mark-up tool (web-based) for noting NHD irregularities. Periodicity is an attribute of priority for them.

BobH noted that in some municipalities, their building code is tied to stream periodicity. It was noted that DSL also uses this attribute in fill/removal permits and has a large amount of paper records that could be used to update the NHD.

BLM also noted that they are working on porting a MatLab tool, GeoNET, to Python for use in deriving streams from DEMs. Using simple query to focus on only those sub-basins of event data requiring HEM synchronization (twice a year?).

USFS announced they are updating their fish distribution data for Oregon (Jon also offered to provide their fish distribution data in HEM). They are also using lidar (Sandy and Farmer Creek) to derive stream data updates; and are still in the process of migrating from LLID.

- 3) Issues with the currency of NHD data downloads were discussed. The staged NHD dataset have been observed not to be updated for as much as 6-months after edits have occurred. This leads to more checkouts of the stewardship dataset for access to the “good” NHD data, which the USGS discourages. This has been noticed by all of the editors (state, BLM, & USFS). It will be brought to the attention of the USGS through the NHD management conference calls.

The issue of data degradation was also brought up in relation to this—small gaps appearing in the linework where they hadn’t been previously.

- 4) The WBD update was discussed. Emmor asked if CUSP (NOAA’s Continually Updated Shoreline Product) could be incorporated into the WBD for Oregon as this would be an improvement. Estuary lines in CUSP are not yet completed (in next 1 – 3 years). BLM and NRCS noted that this topic has been discussed in the past. No resolution was achieved.
- 5) Draft language in support of the hydro portion of state funding package for GIS for upcoming legislative session. BobH discussed a draft statement from Hydro FIT in support of the Navigator POP which will, if approved, provide funding for FIT data development efforts, including Hydro. JonB noted that perhaps the funding could be used to support a centralized NHD editing function at the state level.
- 6) River miles. Bob shared a question he had received from Bill Clingman and Don Pettit regarding river miles. These features are, apparently, used in emergency

response in some cases to help find incidents occurring along rivers. They used to be shown on quad maps, but are no longer part of the topo product. Others noted that they are useful for recreationists who go out on rivers, as well. BLM noted that they have a river mile dataset (created a decade ago?). Bob will circle back to Don (DEQ) and Bill (Lane Council of Governments) to better define their needs.

- 7) Stewardship. PNWHydro consortium stewardship agreements are robust. It was noted that a website showing current editing activity within Oregon NHD would be helpful so people don't encroach on each other's work. This would work better than a stewardship contact database. Better communications when updates are being done (BLM's Douglas Complex area NHD updates mentioned). Ian reminded us not to forget WBD stewardship as well in the discussion.
- 8) Outcomes.
 - a) Stream miles. [Bob will speak with Don Pettit (DEQ) , Bill Clingman (LCOG), and Daniel Stoelb (OR Emergency Management) to work on data requirements for this theme.]
 - b) NHD edits reflected in output products in more timely manner. [*Jay at NHD Management conference calls? PNW Hydro?*]
 - c) Discussion of integration of CUSP product (shoreline) into NHD. [*Jay/Ian/PNW Hydro?*]
 - d) Draft language in support of the hydro portion of state funding package for GIS for upcoming legislative session. This group to review the document over the next few weeks and get final version to GEO by the end of October.
 - e) Next meeting. Likely in March 2015 (after PNW Hydro meeting (*January?*)).