Review Comments

Specific Project Responses:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***ri\_project*** | ***Grant*** | ***Mapper Comment*** | ***Reply*** |
| 15451 | NULL | streams are a bit different in weyerhauser map vs the wc\_oregon. I mapped in the correct location, but wc\_oregon shp shows 1 stream when weyerhauser shows 2. | See layer accuracy precedence below |
| 15355 | 210-1018 | Culvert should be a little to the East from what is shown, I see a road on the NAIP. | This was placed okay, given that the road layer is off and the scale of the respondent's map |
| 15467 | 208-4074-6562 | Planting Zone 2 shp crashes Arc, not used. Should I take out the shapes around the stream, maybe too much info? | The shapefiles provided were almost too much information. Based on the RI form, they should have only turned in line shapefiles. I deleted the extraneous info. |
| 15473 | 208-4056 | Should points be snapped to stream even though they are from shp? | Yes they should |
| 15570 | 18-10-014 | Not confident about location of springs. Provided map very vague. | In cases like these, kick the project back here so that we can follow up with the respondent. |
| 15477 | 208-2034 | Should I get rid of the big long line that shows habitat opened up? | Yes, fish passage is always only a point indicating the location of the barrier, with an assessment of the location (see OWRI mapping protocol); we don't track habitat opened up as a result of fish passage barrier removal; I deleted this line and created point. |
| 15720 | 16-12-014 | Should the fence be converted from a polygon to a polyline? It is an enclosed area, so polygon makes sense. All other fences are polylines. | In checking with the OWRI report, the only activity that is to be reported is one - offsite watering sites developed. So in reality, there should only be one point, no lines and no polygon. I deleted extraneous data. |
| 15193 | 21-12-010 | instream water rights not highlighted in map, just did all streams within property boundary. | Referring to OWRI project file, grant only covered 75 acres of property. Map shows property boundary only (943 acres). With this discrepancy, unable to figure out project and should be noted as 'not mapped' and kicked back to OWEB for clarification. We will do here, as this is somewhat related to 15550 (you were also unable to map). |
| 15244 | 210-1032 | Map does not show where riparian planting was done. Culverts also not on map. Not all road work mapped either. | I noticed the instream work (LWP) was digitized as points; per the OWRI protocols, instream projects should always be mapped as a line if possible. Will follow up here. |
| 15283 | 03-12-007 | Culvert removal point from shp not on a road or stream. | This was placed correctly according to the NAIP imagery the Department of Fish and Wildlife provided in the grant application. |
| 15418 | 210-3050 | Provided shp lines are not the same as wc\_oregon | Since it is pretty apparent where the side channels are, in this instance I would follow the NAIP/wc layers. Their shape file somewhat does this, but it was rather crudely rendered. I would, in this instance, retrace using their shape file as a guide. |
| 15457 | 08-10-009 | lines from shapefile do not go along streams | Another example of a shapefile submitted with a poorly digitized line. I would retrace the features so they align with the appropriate watercourse layers. |
| 15516 | NULL | wc\_oregon does not have the streams shown. Not confident about placement. | For road-related projects from timber companies, this is often the case; see layer accuracy precedence. For timber company maps, due to their small scale, we often have to match the stream locations using the NGS Topo layer to match roads, and contour lines to indicate where stream may be (especially if not shown on our watercourses layer). If you are unsure as to the placement on these timber company maps, you can mark for follow up. |
| 15518 | NULL | Traced wc\_oregon stream looks wrong compared to us topo basemap and logging map | In this case, the wc layer is off, based on the timber company map, road layer, and Topo, Short Creek, and the area that was the tree retention area should follow the portion of short creek that is in the TOPO map (i.e. the wc layer is off). |
| 15272 | 20120272 |  | The shapefiles provided were almost too much information. Based on the RI form, they should have only turned in line shapefiles. I deleted the extraneous info. |

General Project Comments:

* Projects where you have low confidence on the placement should be marked for follow up or kicked back to get more information from the respondent.
* In general, the layer accuracy precedence is: NAIP imagery, timber company maps (in terms of very small streams and unimproved roads), US Topo layer, wc\_layers.
* For instream especially, and riparian generally, activities should be mapped primarily as lines. Even though respondents may give you individual points, they should most likely be mapped as lines. Refer to OWRI mapping protocols for instream projects on Pg. 3.
* You only need to note the treatment comment and can shorten large wood placement to LWP if you would like. In the future don’t need to note 'from. . .' in the comment section
* Don't take the shapefile for granted as being mapped correctly; check their attribute info and mapping per OWRI protocols (what should be mapped as points, polys, etc.), and especially the OWRI reported activities. Also in the shapefile, check the respondent comments and make sure they follow the activities/treatments listed in the OWRI report; e.g. Project 15473 for instream work, the comments were pretty detailed and didn't need to be.
* For projects with mixed activities (and mixed points, lines, and/or polys), you only need to list the treatment\_comment field for that particular data type. For instance, if a project does instream work with a treatment of LWP and fish passage work with a treatment of culvert removal; the treatment comment for the line feature would be LWP; the treatment comment for the point feature would be culvert removed. The only time you need to 'string' the activity treatments together in the comments are when there are multiple treatments for the same activity. An example of this would be a line feature for instream work occurring on the same stretch w/multiple instream treatments such as: 'Alcoves created with tributary/spring input; LWP; Main stream channel modified / created" (e.g. project ID's 15370, 15411, 15501, 15244, and 15492)