From: Turner, Ed
To: Lindsey Wise
Cc: Betty Grizzle
Subject: Re: ORBIC EO Poly / EOdata Table
Date: Tuesday, January 10, 2017 7:26:39 PM

Hello Lindsey,

I was wondering if you could help explain some of the coding in the Wolverine_obs.shp data that you sent. These are data from the "Point Observation Database (PODS)", that is un-QC'd.

Here is some of the POC document:

"An indication of the reliability of these sources can be found in the **Tax_ID_Reliability field**, with a higher number indicating greater reliability of taxonomic identification of the species. "

"Some records may have approximate locational information as noted in the **Locational_Uncertainty_Code field**, with a higher number noting greater locational uncertainty."

The selection you gave for the Wolverine has the following:

Tax_ID_R_1 - (0, 1, 3)

Loc_Uncert - (0, 3, 7, 60, 100, 150, 200, 300, 400, 500, 800, 900. 3000)

I'm wondering if you have any idea what these numbers would equate too?

I know the higher the number the less reliable or less uncertainty in the location, but what would the values actually mean. Would a Tax_ID_R_1 = "1" be considered possibly reliable,

but a “0” would be something you would not consider? I’d assume based on the code a “3” would be ideal to retain.

On the Loc_Uncert, the number range is kind of, all over the place. Therefore, I do not know what would really be the cutoff of what would be a good location and what would not.

Ideally, I’d like to pare down all the various data we’ve received, likely records from those that may be questionable, if possible. Then I can date range what we retain and use that in our efforts.

Plus, I’m trying to make sure I can document most of this in the metadata.

Thanks for any input with this.

Ed

On Fri, Jan 6, 2017 at 4:11 PM, Lindsey Wise <lindsey.wise@pdx.edu> wrote:

> Hi Ed,
>
> It's no trouble. I ran a PDF report of all our wolverine EOs, it can be handy to have the tabular data in one document. The three unmapped EOs are vague locations as we suspected, though if needed to you could guess the approximate area based on the descriptions.
>
> I also discovered that some data had been entered into the wrong field and so wasn't showing up in our exports, so I moved it - check EO_ID 36345 to see, this is the record near Roseburg. It just gives some more info about why we think the record is reliable, description of what was seen, etc.
>
> As for the independent source features, since they aren't tracked as EOs they won't join to any of those tables in the file geodatabase, but they SHOULD join to the visitdata table by joining SOURCE_FEATURE_ID to SFEAT_ID. The Visit table will tell you what information we have about those sightings. If that's not working for you let me know and I can create a new export of those.
>
> The only other useful info for the independent features would be the source feature descriptor and source feature locator fields, which

describe the location (e.g., "Boulder Creek Wilderness near Medicine Creek, off Rd. 450 in upper unit"). Those fields are in the sitedata table (sometimes called sourcedata).

Lastly, I zipped up a shapefile from our point observation database for wolverine sightings - this is an un-QC'd dataset, we use it to store animal observations that we may use at some point, for modeling or other projects. Many of these points are also in the independent source feature set but some are not, either we haven't yet gone through them or they may be more questionable records. There's a disclaimer PDF for this set as well.

Let me know if you have more questions or need anything else.

Cheers,
Lindsey

On Fri, Jan 6, 2017 at 3:02 PM, Turner, Ed <ed_turner@fws.gov> wrote:

> Hello Lindsey, I hope I didn't cause too much work for you.
>
> I just now drilled down in the Eodata table and was able to determine that EO_ID: 2892 and 15068 because they were just too general in location information, were most likely not mapped.
>
> Likewise it seems like the EO_ID 1061 was not mapped either due to the fact that it only reports as 9 MI. SE of Mt Hood. Meaning it could have a very large inaccuracy.
>
> We will just hold on to these records in tabular form as they had historically been seen in Mt Hood vicinity and out west of the Three Sisters.
>
> I do appreciate your help with the source_pt data and that will help determine if we retain those or just look further at the USFS records we will receive.
>
> Thank you again for all your assistance and have a great weekend,
>
> Ed
>
> --
> Edwin Turner, Geographer
> GIS Mapping and Analysis Branch
>
> DOI-R8-CFWO
> USFWS Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
> 2177 Salk Ave. Suite 250
> Carlsbad, CA 92008
> 760.431.9440 x266
>
> Ed_Turner@fws.gov
> 760.431.9440 x266

--
Lindsey K. Wise
Biodiversity Data Manager |Oregon Biodiversity Information Center | http://inr.oregonstate.edu/orbic
Oregon iMapInvasives Data Administrator | sites.google.com/site/orimapresources/
Institute for Natural Resources | http://inr.oregonstate.edu/
Street | Portland State University | SEC 140 | 2112 SW 5th Ave. | Portland OR 97201
Mail | Institute for Natural Resources | Mailcode: INR | P.O. Box 751 | Portland, OR 97207
e-mail | lindsey.wise@pdx.edu Phone | 503-725-9951

--
Edwin Turner, Geographer
GIS Mapping and Analysis Branch

DOI-R8-CFWO
USFWS Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
2177 Salk Ave. Suite 250
Carlsbad, CA 92008
760.431.9440 x266

Ed_Turner@fws.gov
760.431.9440 x266