

24k Fish Distribution Development Project -Summary of Issues-

Distribution Issues:

Lack of resources to include cutthroat data: At the present time, the project proposal does not include compiling information on cutthroat trout, yet this species has been identified as a priority for a number of data users.

Proposed solution: From the onset of the project, include the compilation of cutthroat related data and continue to pursue supplemental sources of funding that would allow for full completion of the project. If funding is not identified, the project will be halted when existing resources are gone, and the project will fall short of the proposed geographic scope. It is estimated that between \$150,000 and \$400,000 is needed to complete the project if we include cutthroat work (depending on the target stream-layer enhancement level).

Other options considered and why:

1. Adhere to the existing proposal agreement and not include cutthroat. (This would make the final data less useful and would cost considerably more to do as a separate effort in the future).
2. ODFW makes this part of its' base program and funds the effort. (This is not feasible during the upcoming budget cycle and would require executive management approval to implement).
3. All agencies using the data contribute directly from their base funding. (This is not feasible during the upcoming budget cycle and would require executive management approval to implement).

Pre-project development of a cutthroat layer: If resources are found to develop distribution information for cutthroat (or if the proposed issue resolution is adopted), how should the initial information be developed so data contributors don't start with a blank map.

Proposed solution: Where electronic data are not available, populate perennial streams with cutthroat distribution; where cutthroat-specific data are available use it as the starting point.

Other options considered:

1. Populate all perennial streams with cutthroat distribution and allow data contributors to eliminate distribution as necessary.
2. Use existing steelhead distribution and allow data contributors to add distribution as necessary.
3. Use existing documented cutthroat areas from survey efforts to create the initial layer and allow data contributors to add distribution as necessary.
4. Use Fish Presence/Upper Distribution Survey data as the initial layer, only when cutthroat are identified as the species establishing the upper extent (Note: some data records just say "fish" or list multiple species with no indication which species established the upper extent).

5. Use Fish Presence/Upper Distribution Survey data regardless of species presence as the initial layer, and assume cutthroat reach all survey endpoints, regardless of whether cutthroat were identified or not.
6. Use Fish Presence/Upper Distribution Survey data as the initial layer, where single "fish" of unknown species or multiple species are noted, map as unknown salmonid, and let the data contributors decide which species it represents.

'Outside the norm' observations: Should observations of a particular species which are outside of the normal expected range of a species be mapped as distribution if no identifiable population is believed to be present (i.e. Chum in the Coos River basin)?

Proposed solution: If observation is outside the norm (e.g. unexpected or surprising), capture the observation in documentation data only and reference the data contributor. If not, map as 'present' in the distribution layer.

Other options considered:

1. Distribution not associated with identifiable populations will not be recorded anywhere.
2. Record observations on the distribution layer the same way identifiable populations are recorded.
3. Record observations that are documented on the documentation layer but not on the distribution layers.
4. Record observations on the distribution layers under a separate (yet undermined) code.

Modifying existing distribution data: Should existing undocumented distribution be modified based on new undocumented professional judgement?

Proposed solution: Allow all distribution not supported by documentation to be modified in accordance with distribution development and arbitration protocols. All existing non-documented distribution would be recorded in a way that allows differences to be identified and resolved.

Other options considered:

1. Do not allow existing distribution to be modified without proof a change is warranted or without consensus among data contributors. Distribution available from ODFW would serve as the initial layer (excluding the NE HUCs which have not been updated since 1996).
2. Do not allow existing distribution to be modified without proof a change is warranted or without consensus among data contributors. Land ownership would determine the initial distribution layer.

Utilizing existing data that lack run information: Some existing 100K & 24K data do not distinguish between runs of fish. How should those data be mapped? (NOTE: Solution should fit within the context of how we handle existing distribution data (raised in earlier issues)?)

Proposed solution: Map it along with existing run information, labeling with species only. Add run information during data compilation.

No other options considered.

Mapping species absence: Fish absence data has been requested as part of this effort. Can long-term fish absence be verified using short-term observation records without the existence of a barrier? If so, what criteria should be used?

Proposed solution: Only map species absence where complete fish passage barriers exist, preventing access and there is no evidence that fish were there previously, or where species absence has been documented over five reproductive life-cycles.

Other options considered:

1. Don't map species absence at all.
2. Only map species absence when supported by one or more year survey records.
3. Only map species absence when supported by multiple year survey records. (NOTE: Number of years would need to be determined)
4. Map distribution that is based on professional judgment and include information about what the judgment or opinion is based on.

Validity of information based on professional judgement: It has been suggested that professional judgment or opinion-based information is not credible and therefore is not a valid resource for developing fish distribution information.

Proposed solution: Map distribution that is based on professional judgment and include information about what the judgment or opinion is based on.

Other options considered:

1. Only map distribution that is supported by recorded observations.

Documentation Issues:

Data reference reliability: Documented observations (or absence information) may come from any number of sources. How should documentation source reliability be assessed and/or rated (for management purposes)?

Proposed solution: Include all observation data and develop a matrix (similar to DEQ's water quality data matrix), which identifies the source types and recommended management uses.

Other options considered:

1. Don't include non-agency sanctioned data.
2. Include only certain non-agency data and identify the actual source. This would require deciding whose data gets left out.

What to included with documentation records: It has been suggested that in addition to the information we already compile for documentation records, we also should include:

- (1) The name of the person who collected the data.
- (2) The person who verified the data
- (3) The source of the data
- (4) The type of data that was collected
- (5) When the data was collected (it's unclear if a specific date or general date range would suffice).

Proposed solution: Don't include any of the recommended data types. This information can be accessed either within the document itself (which the StreamNet Library can provide) or by contacting the reference author.

Other options considered:

1. Include all suggestions.
2. Include some combination of one or more of the suggestions.

Other potential issues that may warrant discussion:

Where do we begin our compilation efforts – prioritize areas to work on first.

Capturing new 24K data as lines rather than points where the hydrography exists.

Steelhead vs. rainbow vs. O. Mykiss delineation: should we insist on a distinction or capture data as resident and anadromous O. Mykiss?

Meeting with a group of data providers vs. individual meeting.