



4-COUNTY Cooperative Weed Management Area

4-County CWMA Mapping & Data Committee Meeting

Wednesday, November 18th, 2020, 8:30am-9:50am

Attendees: Troy Abercrombie (WIN), Justin Cooley (CSWCD), Ari DeMarco (WMSWCD), Courtney Gattuso (CSWCD), Laura Guderyahn (PPRD), Patrick Hendrix (Stillwater Sciences), Nathan Jefcoat (PWB), Jeffrey Lee (M&D Vice-Chair), Monte Matteson (CoP-BES), Lucas Nipp (EMSWCD), Tyler Pedersen (M&D Chair/TSWCD), Lindsey Wise (PSU)

8:30 Convene/Welcome **All**

8:35 Data Sharing Contest & iNaturalist Project Update **Jeffrey Lee**

- Jeffrey reminds that due to low submission rates, the two data sharing contest cycles have been consolidated into one. The submission deadline is 12/31/2020, with the prize winners being announced at the 2021 Pull-Together!
- Jeffrey shares that since the 9/9/20 committee meeting no new observations have been reported for both Priority and Call-for-Data Species iNaturalist projects; this was not unexpected given the growing season has ended. Going forward, the engagement strategy should include a more targeted approach focused on 1-on-1 communications (e.g., direct emails, phone calls, video meetings).
- Other data collection platform news:
 - PDX Ecologists Unite! is in the planning stages for the Portland-Vancouver area's first City Nature Challenge in PDX (using iNaturalist; 4/30/2021-5/3/2021): <https://citynaturechallenge.org/>. There should be opportunities here for the CWMA's efforts in increasing data sharing and publicity.
 - EDDMapS West is consolidating with EDDMapS, at which the data collection process will remain the same but with a new and improved application.

8:40 Priority Map Update **Tyler Pedersen**

- Tyler gives an update on transferring AGOL host privileges for priority weed coordination data from Lindsey Wise at PSU to Troy Abercrombie at WIN.
 - Troy will publish the webmap as a service so partners with AGOL accounts will be able to collect and sync data to AGOL; he will also update it and import data from other platforms including iMapInvasives at least once a year. Administrator privileges will be granted to Tyler, Jeffrey, Lindsey and Courtney.

- Troy clarifies that partners will only be able to add their weed data (not edit or delete it) to the layer; we want to grant permissions in a uniform manner. If a partner is unable to access AGOL, they will have the option to send shapefiles and CSV files.
- If we share the layers with partners, they can make edits and add new features to AGOL. However, for confidential data, they will need to sign off on a confidential data request and use agreement form.
- **ACTION:** The committee will develop and publish an online data agreement form in early 2021.

8:45 Invasive Species Mapping Tutorial Opportunities

Jeffrey Lee

- *The Invasive Species Data Mobilization Campaign* (via Zoom) by NAISMA/Western Governors Association - Dec 16: Learn about the Western Governors' Association's Invasive Species Data Mobilization Campaign to encourage national, state, local land managers, and conservation groups to enter previously unavailable data into new or existing invasive species data management platforms. Also learn how you can work to improve invasive species data exchange in the West. https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_KpnAklAVROyLMzCfpYHy_w
- *Use of GPS for NRCS Conservation Planning: Collecting, Managing, and Entering Data* (recording) by The Forestry Webinar Portal: Learn how to collect GPS data, manage data quality, and enter data into NRCS GIS applications. <https://www.tdwg.org/conferences/2020/>
- *Online Mapping Tools for the Natural Resource Professional Webinar Series* (recording) by The Forestry Webinar Portal: A four-part series intended for natural resource professionals to become familiar with important sources of online mapping tools and data without the need for a complex GIS program. These tools will provide the basic mapping necessary for land management decisions and plan development and can assist in your work with landowners. <http://www.forestrywebinars.net/webinars/part-1-my-land-plan/>

2021 Work Plan Update

Tyler Pedersen

- Tyler and Jeffrey will review and update our 2020 Work Plan for 2021 in December.
- We will circulate an editable version via Google docs in December or January to the M&D Committee Listserv for review and feedback.
- Once we have feedback from the committee and make revisions, we'll officially approve the new work plan at the 2/10/21 committee meeting.

8:50 Standardized Data Field Working Group Discussion (Part 2)

Tyler Pedersen, All

- The working group performs the following action items:
 - Discuss partner comments on data field spreadsheet. **(COMPLETED)**
 - Develop confidential data request form. **(ACTION NEEDED)**
 - Form consensus on tier grouping of data fields. **(COMPLETED)**
 - Verify data field definitions. **(COMPLETED)**

- The working group discusses placement (by tiers/“core elements”) and definition of several highlighted data fields:
 - *Gross vs. net acres. Can calculate net acres if we have gross acres and % cover. NAISMA definition for infested area lacks specificity (essentially the area delineated around infestation).*
 - Courney, Lucas, Troy, Nathan, Ari, and Monte agree that it’s most practical to use gross infested area and % cover, as defined by OSWB Grants (vs. infested area by CWMA's previous Invasive Plant Standards document).
 - Lucas comments that images/photos are very useful for defining data fields.
 - Troy shares that he’s preferred collecting weed data in the field using polygons (vs. point). He also likes to cross reference his survey data with the actual treatment/spray volume data.
 - Monte shares his experience, based on assessing each year’s treatments, they will often be generous with estimating gross infested area to account for plants likely missed. Lucas says it’s a good point, and that he often gets the same measured area over multiple years due to infestations with layered structures.
 - Laura was wondering if % cover is uniform enough to be able to accurately calculate gross area. Unfortunately this comment wasn’t seen in the chat box until after we had moved on to the next topic.
 - *Should treatment data be required if treatment is completed? Otherwise, say if it’s a survey (presence/absence), then it’s not required.*
 - Justin: Because this template would be a resource to partners, especially to those who may not have the capacity to develop templates for weed mapping and treatment data. However, if we do include treatment data, we should determine if the template would serve as (1) a means to capture basic treatment data (as it relates to infestations) or (2) a legal spray record. If the latter, it would be nice to have to fill out just the one record for both weed observations and treatment, but this would also require incorporating many spray log data field requirements for both Oregon and Washington.
 - Troy: We have a Collector for ArcGIS template with the ODA WeedMapper fields and legal spray data outputs (includes dropdown for herbicides and EPA numbers).
 - **ACTION:** Troy will send ODA WeedMapper’s template zipfile to committee chairs to incorporate into data standards and template.
 - Justin: If the product was a database file/package with domains and descriptions that we could pick and choose from, it would be useful for our organizations’ different needs.
 - Monte asks if the treatment data fields will be used to look at treatment efficacy, like CoP does (e.g., tracking herbicide volumes year-to-year to see if there’s improvement/less herbicide used). Tyler confirms that it is an objective, and that he regularly does this to spot-check/follow-up contractor work.
 - Lucas: Should we include treatment data for this template? In the past 15 years, the goal has been focused on sharing weed observations so that we can fill in

those data gaps in weed numbers/distributions. Including treatment data would result in a long list of data fields, which could discourage people and take away from our original goal. Alternatively, we could either have a short/simple version to ease people in or divide the recording purposes by tabs.

- Justin agrees to dividing the weed observation and treatment fields in their own groups. If not, it may be worth making many of those treatment data fields optional (it just wouldn't explicitly serve as a legal spray document).
- **ACTION:** The committee will divide the weed observation and treatment fields into their own separate tiered tabs.
- *Applicator name and license # together? Limits recorder error*
- *Observer name – organization, name (together)*
- *New location or revisit site – is this needed? Will change often*
 - Lucas likes the idea of having this field available for filtering data and planning treatments.
 - Lindsey shares her challenges with using this data field for iMapInvasives, such as whether there would be a need to update this field in the years afterwards.
- *Wind speed and direction at beginning or end of treatment (OR don't specify?)*
- *Terrestrial area treated within 3 feet of creek & area of water body treated (two fields for NPDES permitting, required if you have the permit)*
 - Justin: If the template will be used for NPDES compliance (herbicide use only), it will require an even longer list of data fields. These NPDES fields would not be required if someone was only filling out treatment info for manual removal, and thus, a simplified template could be used.
- *Add Product rate per area (lots of products are not a liquid and some not applied as a solution) and total volume of product applied (required by ODA on spray records)*
- *Horizontal accuracy – optional to highly recommended? How many people collect this data or have ability to?*
 - Justin: It's good to have, but for CSWCD, it's not populated well. He's unsure if ArcMap automatically collects this in their metadata. They use Fulcrum for data collection. It would be good to have this required or highly recommended, as long as it is clearly defined.
 - Nathan: This is automatically collected when using Collector for ArcGIS.
 - Lindsey: For iNaturalist, this is automatically collected from photo metadata.
 - Tyler: On AGOL or ArcCollector, horizontal accuracy data does not show up for every point. It might have something to do with the contractor or recorder placing their data points at 100 foot intervals along the creek. Since these points are user defined, they wouldn't be associated with a GPS receiver or horizontal accuracy data.
- *Remove product supplier – not needed on spray log?*
- *Drop downs for application equipment, application methods, and product/EPA Registration #*
- *Don't list which side of creek treated on – assumed both sides?*

- *Clarification: ODA Site type is different than ODA license categories. One is an optional field for OSWB grants and the other is required on spray logs.*

9:50 Adjourn – Thanks for participating!

Next Mapping & Data Committee Meeting

Wednesday, February 10th, 2021; 8:30-9:50am

Teleconference