

# Public Review Comments and Responses for the Minnesota Geospatial Advisory Council Stream ID Standard V1.0.8

The Standards Committee of the Minnesota Geospatial Advisory Council (GAC) held a public review period for proposed version 1.0.8 of the GAC Stream ID Standard from May 1, 2022, to July 31, 2022. Below is a table showing the comments received and responses approved by the Standards Committee on 10/19/2022. Responses include changes to the standard and other actions.

| # | Comment   | Submitter                                 | Standards Committee Response  |
|---|---|---|---|
|   | <b>Section 1. Data Elements</b>   |   |   |
| 1 | <p>1.1 Watercourse ID Kittle Number</p> <p>Linse Lahti:<br/>Are the kittle numbers sourced from the Fisheries stream survey database or the DNR hydrography dataset? Are the two data systems connected and auto-updated (when a change occurs in one, the change is automatically updated in the other?) or are the separate datasets updated manually in parallel?</p> <p>Note: The “Sources of this Standard” section references the MN DNR Hydro Layer while this section references the Fisheries Stream Survey Database. Update to be consistent.</p> <p>Does something similar play out with the NHD dataset and PCA’s database that contains the AU_IDs? Keep the focus on the DNR Hydro and NHD datasets.</p> <p>Jamie Schulz:<br/>[The description of element 1.1] should maybe say “DNR Fisheries Stream Survey Kittle Numbering system” [instead of “DNR Fisheries Stream Survey database”]. Kittles that need to be assigned to a feature without a kittle are normally verified with the area fisheries office.</p> | Linse Lahti,<br>DNR, Jamie<br>Schulz MNIT | <b>Action: in the description for 1.1, change “DNR Fisheries Stream Survey database” to “DNR Fisheries Stream Kittle numbering system, as depicted in the DNR Hydrography Dataset.”</b> |
|   | <b>General Comments</b>   |   |   |
| 2 | Page 4: Consider making this change: The state government watercourse identifier is the Kittle numbering system, <del>used</del> <b>managed and assigned</b> by the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources   | Linse Lahti,<br>DNR                       | <b>Action: Make the proposed change.</b>  |

|   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| 3 | <p>On page 5 it says: “Within each of these major drainages, watercourses are numbered, with each upstream tributary represented as an additional number, separated by a dash.”</p> <p>When looking through the hydrography dataset, there appears to be kittle numbers with decimals. What is the reason for having Kittle IDs that have decimals? Is it appropriate to explain that in this standard?</p>                                | Linse Lahti,<br>DNR                           | <b>Action: add an example to Element 1.1 that includes a decimal.</b>                                       |
| 4 | <p>In the document sometimes “GNIS-ID” has a ‘dash’ and sometimes it doesn’t. Run a check of the document for consistency and implement updates as appropriate</p>   | Linse Lahti,<br>DNR                           | <b>Action: Ensure GNIS ID is treated consistently without the dash throughout document.</b>                 |
| 5 | <p>On page 5 it says “Unlike the federal GNIS-ID, the Kittle number includes information about upstream/downstream relationships.”</p> <p>Linse Lahti: Are these upstream and downstream relationships ever messy? Are they ever impacted by the dynamic nature of streams? It may not be appropriate to explore that complexity in this standard.</p> <p>John Hoxmeier DNR: For the most part, these relationships are fairly static.</p> | Linse Lahti,<br>DNR and John<br>Hoxmeier, DNR | Thank you for these comments. We agree that exploring that complexity is beyond the scope of this standard. |