

**24K Project Completion Workshop Summary**  
**Division of State Lands Conference Room, Salem**  
**February 19, 2003**  
**By Cedric Cooney, ODFW**

What follows is a summary of the 1:24,000 Fish Habitat Distribution Development Project Completion Workshop. The purpose of the workshop was to provide project funders and other interested agencies and entities with a post-project synopsis of accomplishments and challenges, and to discuss potential future directions. Specific questions asked during the workshop were not recorded. However, suggestions and input related to improving the format and content of the final report, and plans for the future were recorded and are included with this summary. Two of the three handouts provided during the workshop: 1) a list of data contributors, 2) a description of the primary data products can be found on the 1:24K Project web page (<http://oregonstate.edu/dept/nrimp/24k/workshop.htm>). Hardcopies of the presentation slides were also distributed to workshop attendees. The presentation itself will be posted soon.

The workshop began with a review and modification of the agenda. Cedric Cooney, Jon Bowers, and Rick Kepler presented the main body of the presentation and responded to questions from attendees. The presentation started with slides outlining the goals and objectives of the project, along with lists of contributing agencies/entities and project staff, the chronology and process of the project, and a summary list of final products.

Then, the Workshop shifted direction a bit to related presentation from Bob Harmon of the Dept. of Water Resources, who provided an overview of the status of the 1:24,000 hydrography development effort. Bob also fielded questions as they were raised. Major discussion centered on the hydrography update process, and also included questions on how feasible it would be to use a similar approach to maintain the distribution data.

Subsequent to this, the focus turned to the specific objectives and tasks of the 24K Distribution Development Project. For each objective, accomplishments and results were described, along with specific examples of project tools, databases, and procedures, deviations from original plans, and tasks not accomplished during the project.

Questions and discussions occurred throughout the presentation. Once the formal presentation was completed, the remainder of the workshop was spent discussing how to improve the delivery of products, suggestions related to the completion report, and the future direction of this work. One of the most significant discussions centered around whether or not the report should include a description of how the data could/ought to be used. Project staff agreed to take suggestions on wording, but affirmed that a description of the data, and very general examples of use is most appropriate for project staff to provide. Not all attendees agreed. Other significant discussions related to data maintenance and the quality criteria coding system we used.

The following pages include the workshop agenda, as well as the suggestions that were made by Workshop attendees. No commitment is made to doing any or all of these by including them in this summary.

## **24K Project Completion Workshop Agenda February 19, 2003**

9:15 - Arrive, Organize Materials, Attendee Introductions

9:30 - Review project's goals and objectives - chronology and process

10:00 - Project Accomplishments:

    Linkage to 1:24K Hydrologic Data Development (Bob Harmon WRD)

    Where the data can be found and the data format

    Review deviations from the original plan

    Identify what we weren't able to do (all by data type)

11:30 - Major challenges encountered by the project

Noon - Lunch on your own

1:00 - Answer questions posed prior to the workshop

1:30 - Group Discussion - Identification of Important Questions and Issues

2:00 - Open discussion and questions

**24K Project Completion Workshop**  
**Attendee Suggestions and Recommendations for Future Fish Distribution**  
**Data Development Activities**  
**(in no particular order of priority)**

1. Use a stratified randomly selected sampling strategy to assess the accuracy of the distribution (either using existing information, or initiating a new sampling program with this goal in mind).
2. Keep this information updated and usable, (described by attendees as probably the most key recommendation that can come out of this workshop).
3. Initiate a pilot updating process using the hydro clearinghouse model of checking data in and out to make updates, possibly using the Rogue basin as the focus of the pilot.
4. Use ODFW's Scientific Take tracking process to capture observation information. Make reporting observations a requirement.
5. The final data steward needs to institute a document management system so all information used to document fish observations are maintained and made available in an appropriate way.
6. Develop products (either digital or hardcopy) that display the full detail of each of our data types and provide it back to the data contributors so they can confirm that what we developed was what they intended.
7. Develop a process for converting 24K points to event format, present it to OGIC, and coordinate development of event data.
8. State natural resource field and management staff need to see data management as a priority equal with data collection.
9. Develop products that would interest executive staff level folks and would encourage them to consider this type of work a priority. (Ideas related to this suggestion are welcomed)
10. Prototype a 'movie of fish movement over time' project to give a large-area-look using the products of this project.
11. Put any caveats about the data on the web in plain English.
12. Coordinate with ODFW research projects to leverage all staff expertise to update the distribution data, but also develop an update procedure that works outside ODFW.

**24K Project Completion Workshop**  
**Attendee Suggestions and Recommendations for the Final Report**  
**(in no particular order of priority)**

1. Note that the information that is based on professional judgment is conservative, in that whenever a concerted effort is made to identify documentation of direct observation, the distribution is usually extended beyond what exists based on professional judgment.
2. Discuss who becomes, or should become the data steward once the project is complete. StreamNet is not a good data steward because of its focus in the Columbia basin and strong marriage to the 100K hydrography.
3. Explain how edits and updates will be handled (both the preferred approach, and the actual approach).
4. The report needs to be sent out for independent review.
5. Propose a process for converting 24K points to event format, present it to OGIC, and coordinate development of event data.
6. Recommend the establishment of a workgroup to update this information, and list who should be on it.
7. Provide a summary of miles of habitat distribution by ownership broken down by tribal, state, USFS, BLM, and private.
8. Include examples of maps at different scales in the report.
9. Provide general guidelines for using the data. Make sure the caveats are written in plain English in the report.
10. Clearly state what the project was intended to do.
11. Clearly explain how documented observations can exist on sections of streams that have a quality criteria that is something less than documented, and how data users can tell when this is occurring.