

**DOCUMENTATION REPORT FOR GIS DATABASE:
RIVERCARE 2000
RESOURCE ASSESSMENT THEMES
FOR GEORGIA RIVERS**

**Georgia Department of Natural Resources
Environmental Protection Division
Geologic Survey Branch**

Atlanta
1998

DOCUMENTATION REPORT 98-25

**DOCUMENTATION REPORT FOR GIS DATABASE:
RIVERCARE 2000
RESOURCE ASSESSMENT THEMES
FOR GEORGIA RIVERS**

Atlanta
1998
DOCUMENTATION REPORT 98-25

OVERVIEW

GLOSSARY

PART A. GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE GIS DATABASE

1.0 Identification / Project Background	Page 1
2.0 Data Quality	Page 1
2.1 Attribute Accuracy	Page 1
2.2 Logical Consistency	Page 2
2.3 Completeness	Page 2
2.4 Geographic Accuracy	Page 2
2.5 Lineage	Page 2
3.0 Spatial Data Organization Information	Page 4
4.0 Spatial Reference Information	Page 4
5.0 Entity and Attribute Information	Page 4
6.0 Distribution Information	Page 5
7.0 Metadata Reference Information	Page 5
APPENDIX A. SIGNATURES	

PART B. TECHNICAL DESCRIPTION OF THE DATABASE

1.0 Identification Information	Page 1
1.1 Citation	Page 1
1.2 Description	Page 1
1.3 Time Period of Content	Page 1
1.4 Status	Page 1
1.5 Spatial Domain	Page 2
1.6 Keywords	Page 2
1.7 Access Constraints	Page 2
1.8 Use Constraints	Page 2
1.9 Point of Contact	Page 2
2.0 Data Quality Information	Page 2
2.1 Attribute Accuracy	Page 2
2.2 Logical Consistency	Page 4
2.3 Completeness	Page 6
2.4 Positional Accuracy	Page 7
2.5 Lineage	Page 8
3.0 Spatial Data Organization Information	Page 45
3.1 Indirect Spatial Reference Method	Page 45
3.2 Direct Spatial Reference Method	Page 45
3.3 Point and Vector Object Information	Page 45
4.0 Spatial Reference Information	Page 45
4.1 Horizontal Coordinate System Definition	Page 45
5.0 Entity and Attribute Information	Page 46
5.1 Detailed Description	Page 46
6.0 Distribution Information	Page 54
6.1 Distributor	Page 54
6.2 Resource Description	Page 54
6.3 Distribution Liability	Page 54
6.4 Standard Ordering Process	Page 54
6.5 Custom Order Process	Page 54
7.0 Metadata Reference Information	Page 54
7.1 Metadata Date	Page 54
7.2 Metadata Review Date	Page 54
7.4 Metadata Contact	Page 54
7.5 Metadata Standard Name	Page 55
7.6 Metadata Standard Version	Page 55

PART C. THE DIGITAL FILES CONTAINING THE GIS DATABASE

Diskettes	Jacket
-----------------	--------

OVERVIEW

This document contains a three part documentation report for a Geographic Information System (GIS) database developed by the Geologic Survey Branch, Environmental Protection Division of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources. Part A is intended as a general purpose summary of the database. Part B is a more technical section included primarily for the benefit of GIS processors. Part C is a digital product which contains the database and associated documentation. The digital documentation includes a digital copy of the paper publication.

This documentation report follows the "Content Standards for Digital Geospatial Metadata" (Standards) developed by the Federal Geographic Data Committee. As a convenience, Parts A and B employ the outline and headings contained in the Standards. Part A and Part B provided as hardcopy and Part C is a digital product. Part B meets the technical requirements of the Standards.

The digital documentation in Part C contains two digital copies of this publication. One digital copy is stored as an ASCII file, the other is in WordPerfect 6.0 format. The digital database in Part C consists of an Arc/Info Export file. The digital files are written to several diskettes using pkzip compression.

This database was developed to satisfy specific project purposes. Users are advised to read the entire Documentation Report and to evaluate the suitability and limitations of the database for the user's purposes.

GLOSSARY

Arc/Info: a popular GIS software, developed and marketed by Environmental Research Systems Institute (ESRI), Redlands, California.

ASCII: acronym for American Standard Code for Information Interchange. A set of codes for representing alphanumeric information in a format which any computer can read.

attribute: a characteristic of a geographic feature. For example, if the geographic feature is a river, then the attributes of the river are the river name, the flow rate, the chemical history, etc.

attribute accuracy: a measure of how well the reported characteristics actually match the real-world characteristics of a geographic feature.

Compact Disk Read Only Memory (CDROM): an optical media which can store 650 Mb of information.

completeness: a description of the relation between items in the database as they represent the real world. For example, if a database contains water wells in Georgia, then it could contain all the water wells in Georgia, or a defined subset of wells. If the database contains a defined subset of wells, a completeness statement would indicate whether the database contains every well in Georgia that meets the definition by which the subset was chosen.

Content Standards for Digital Geospatial Metadata: a standard developed by the FGDC which specifies the information content of metadata for a set of digital geospatial data.

database: a logical collection of interrelated information, managed and stored as a unit on a computer or other storage media. A GIS database includes information about the spatial location and shape of geographic features recorded as points, lines, or areas, as well as their attributes.

decimal degree: a unit of measure for geographic coordinates. The conversion formula for decimal degrees is: $\text{Decimal Degrees} = \text{Degrees} + \text{Minutes}/60 + \text{Seconds}/3600$.

Department of Natural Resources (DNR): a department of the government of the State of Georgia.

digital: refers to the process of conversion of information into machine language so that a computer can read, write, store, and process the information.

Digital Line Graph (DLG): computer files from the USGS which contain digital maps of transportation, hydrography, contours, and public land survey boundaries.

digital maps: a map is an abstract representation of the physical features of a portion of the Earth's surface graphically displayed on a piece of paper. When converted into a form which the computer can use, the map is then digital.

diskette: a magnetic storage medium, usually measuring 3.5 inches in diameter, which is used to store information or transfer it from one computer to another.

Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC): an inter-governmental committee established through the Office of Management and Budget and charged with the responsibility to coordinate various surveying, mapping, and spatial data activities to meet the needs of the Nation.

FIPS: Federal Information Processing System

Geographic Information System (GIS): an organized collection of computer hardware, software, geographic data, and personnel designed to efficiently capture, store, update, manipulate, analyze, and display all forms of geographically referenced information.

label points: a single x,y coordinate pair which identifies an area, and holds a place in a database wherein the area's attribute information is stored.

latitude, longitude: components of a geographic reference system used to locate positions on the Earth. Latitude and longitude are angles measured from the Earth's center to the position on the Earth's surface. Latitude measures angles in a north-south direction, while longitude measures angles in an east-west direction.

lineage: information about the events, parameters, and source data which went into the construction of a geographic database, and information about the responsible parties.

logical consistency: an explanation of the fidelity of the relationships in the database. For example, for a geographic area, when the vector lines which create area boundaries join to encircle the area with no gaps then logical consistency is good. Or for example, for a particular attribute, if all the values given are within a valid range, then they are logically consistent.

longitude, latitude: see latitude, longitude.

metadata: information about the content, quality, condition, and other characteristics of a database.

National Map Accuracy Standards: a set of standards developed by the USGS which defines the level of accuracy required for a map product of a particular scale.

positional accuracy: an assessment of how well the reported position of a geographic feature represents the real-world position.

United States Geological Survey (USGS): a branch of the United States Department of Interior.

vector lines: lines which are described by x,y coordinates and are commonly used to represent linear geographic features. Each linear feature is represented as an ordered list of vertices.

WordPerfect: a popular PC-based word processing software.

**PART A. GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE GIS DATABASE:
RIVERCARE 2000
RESOURCE ASSESSMENT THEMES
FOR GEORGIA RIVERS**

1.0 Identification / Project Background

The Georgia Department of Natural Resources(DNR) has completed a statewide rivers assessment under the RiverCare 2000 program by appointing and coordinating the work of a River Assessment Team. The RiverCare 2000 rivers assessment report, *Georgia's Rivers: An Initial Assessment* (GRIA) is now available from the DNR web site at

http://www.dnr.state.ga.us/dnr/enviro/gaenviron_files/watrqual_files/rc2000.html for viewing or download. This documentation report (DR 98-25) describes the GIS database which was used for the GRIA report. Database users should use this DR 98-25 in conjunction with the GRIA report.

The Geologic Survey Branch (GSB) of the Environmental Protection Division (EPD) developed this GIS database at the request of the Water Protection Branch (WPB) to organize and spatially analyze the RiverCare 2000 data for the River Assessment Team. GSB produced a set of page-sized maps at a scale of 1:2,500,000 and some data tables from the GIS database to for use in the GRIA report.

The database contains information about the major rivers and streams of Georgia. River resources have been identified by the River Assessment Team. The 15 resource themes are: agricultural, botanical, cultural (archeological), cultural (historic structures), economic, fish (ecologically important), fish (recreational and commercial), flood-plain, forest, geological, recreational boating, scenic, water quality, water supply, and wildlife. For each resource theme, the River Assessment Team selected segments of rivers and streams to be classified as 'superior', 'outstanding', or 'significant'. The themes and classifications were input into the GIS database. The theme classifications were then aggregated into three broader resource themes: developed; recreation and education; and natural.

2.0 Data Quality

Section 2.0 contains information about the lineage, positional accuracy, attribute accuracy, logical consistency, and completeness of this database.

2.1 Attribute Accuracy

The term 'attribute' refers to descriptive items of information that are contained in the GIS database. This database includes the classifications of 'significant', 'outstanding', and 'superior' for selected river segments for each resource theme. The River Assessment Team organized 13 Technical Working Groups; each concentrated on one or two themes. Each Working Group developed its own methodology, so the accuracy varies by theme. In general, each Working Group used the best available data, in their judgement, to develop the assessment classifications for each resource theme. For details about individual themes see section 2.1 in Part B.

Other attributes in this database are: the river name, name of the river basin, river basin code, name of the major river in that basin, and a county code. These attributes came from pre-existing GIS databases used in processing this RiverCare 2000 database. The accuracy of the attributes in

the pre-existing databases is addressed in section 2.1 of Part B.

2.2 Logical Consistency

The term 'logical consistency' refers to the fidelity of the data relationships in the database. In this database, the main data relationships concern the rivers and streams. For example, is each river and stream segment a separate entity, or are they continue at the confluence of adjoining river and stream segments? In the original database of rivers and streams, acquired from the USGS, all the rivers and streams were connected at each confluence. This connectivity was maintained throughout the processing of the RiverCare 2000 database. The logical consistency of this database is considered good.

2.3 Completeness

This database is considered complete in the sense that it contains all the segment classifications that each Working Group provided for each resource theme. In some cases, a Working Group indicated that they did not have complete information on a particular theme. In general, each Working Group used the most complete information available. The database contains only what the USGS considers to be the major rivers and streams in Georgia.

2.4 Geographic Accuracy

The geographic accuracy of the database is appropriate for its intended display scale of 1:2,500,000. Accuracy at this scale is typically considered plus or minus 4200 feet. Most of the resource themes were mapped to this accuracy or better, as described in section 2.4 of Part B. The exceptions are the two cultural resource themes, historic structures and archeological resources. These were mapped to within an estimated 2-3 miles of their actual location. The original scale of the rivers and streams was 1:100,000, with an accuracy considered to be plus or minus 167 feet. Irregularities of the larger rivers were generalized in some places to remove excessive detail for the final 1:2,500,000 scale.

2.5 Lineage

In producing this database, the Working Groups developed classifications within the fifteen resource themes. The resource themes are: Agricultural, Botanical, Cultural (Archeological), Cultural (Historic Structures), Economic, Fish (Ecologically Important), Fish (Recreational and Commercial), Flood-Plain, Forest, Geological, Recreational Boating, Scenic, Water Quality, Water Supply, and Wildlife. Most of the Working Groups first developed a paper map depicting the classification of river segments within a particular resource theme. Some of the Working Groups developed GIS databases for their particular resource theme.

The GSB used a GIS database of major rivers and streams in Georgia, acquired from the U.S. Geological Survey, as a base to develop the RiverCare 2000 database. The GSB transferred the classifications from the river segments on each paper map to the corresponding river segments in the GIS database. The GSB transferred the classifications of river segments from individual

resource theme GIS databases, where available, into the final RiverCare GIS database. Technical information about GIS methods used is described in section 2.5 of Part B. The fifteen themes overlap on many river segments. River mileage summaries were calculated for each resource theme and included in tables in the GRIA report.

The data for the fifteen resource themes was then aggregated into three broader themes: developed, recreational and educational, and natural. The aggregated themes were developed from the original 15 theme classifications as shown in the table below. The three themes overlap on some river segments. Value classes were developed by the individual Working Groups. The descriptions are presented in the GRIA report, along with descriptions of the aggregated themes.

Developed	
Resource Themes	Value Class
Agricultural	Superior
Economic	Superior
Forest	Superior
Water Quality	Significant
Water Supply	Superior

Recreational and Educational	
Resource Themes	Value Class
Cultural (Archeological)	Superior
Cultural (Historic Structures)	Superior
Fish (Recreational and Commercial)	Superior
Geological	Superior
Recreational Boating	Superior
Scenic	Superior
Water Quality	Outstanding

Natural	
Resource Themes	Value Class
Botanic	Superior
Fish (Ecologically Important)	Superior
Flood-Plain	Superior

Water Quality	Superior
Wildlife	Superior

Eight categories represent all possible combinations of the three aggregate themes overlapping on river segments. The categories were assigned to individual river segments based on the following table.

Category	Aggregate Themes		
1	Not Developed	Not Recreation and Education	Natural
2	Not Developed	Recreation and Education	Not Natural
3	Developed	Not Recreation and Education	Not Natural
4	Not Developed	Recreation and Education	Natural
5	Developed	Not Recreation and Education	Natural
6	Developed	Recreation and Education	Not Natural
7	Developed	Recreation and Education	Natural
8	Not Developed	Not Recreation and Education	Not Natural

Using these categories, a composite map and a river mileage table were produced for the final GRIA report.

3.0 Spatial Data Organization Information

The geographic features in this database are represented as a set of vector lines which correspond to the major rivers and streams of Georgia. The data model is that used in Arc/Info, the GIS software developed by the Environmental Systems Research Institute, Redlands, California.

4.0 Spatial Reference Information

The geographic features in this database are stored as a set of geographic coordinates using an Albers Conic Equal Area projection, centered on the state of Georgia, and the North American Datum of 1927. For more detail, see section 4.0 in the technical Part B.

5.0 Entity and Attribute Information

In this database, geographic features are limited to the major rivers and streams of Georgia. These rivers have been segmented so that each section of river could be classified within the 15 different resource themes. A particular section of river could be of 'superior' value in all fifteen themes, of no value to any theme, or any combination thereof. The fifteen resource themes are: agricultural,

botanical, cultural (archeological), cultural (historic structures), economic, fish (commercial and recreational), fish (ecologically important), flood-plain, forest, geological, recreational boating, scenic, water quality, water supply, and wildlife. For each segment of a river, for each of 15 themes, a value class of 'superior', 'outstanding', or 'significant' was assigned, or the field was left blank to indicate an unclassified segment. The river segments are further identified by their aggregated themes of developed, natural, and recreational and educational resources. For more detailed descriptions of the value classes and the aggregate themes see the GRIA report.

Each river and stream is also identified by name, name of the river basin, 8 digit hydrologic unit code number, name of the major river associated with the basin, and the FIPS code for the county.

6.0 Distribution Information

This database is maintained in the Geologic Survey Branch's Technical Files as DOCUMENTATION REPORT 98-25 and is contained in the digital files in Part C of this publication.

7.0 Metadata Reference Information

The metadata is incorporated within this publication, DOCUMENTATION REPORT 98-25: RIVERCARE 2000 RESOURCE ASSESSMENT THEMES FOR GEORGIA RIVERS. Part B, the Technical Section of this publication, meets the "Content Standards for Digital Geospatial Metadata" as defined by the Federal Geographic Data Committee.

APPENDIX A. SIGNATURES

**Appendix A. Signatures for GIS Database:
RiverCare 2000
Resource Assessment Themes
For Georgia Rivers**

Preparation of Database and Documentation Report

Prepared by: _____ (Signed) _____
 Elizabeth Cheney _____ (Printed) (Date Signed)
 Environmental Specialist _____ (Title)
 DNR Environmental Protection _____ (Division)

Reviewed by: _____ (Signed) _____
 Chris Canalos _____ (Printed) (Date Signed)
 GIS Specialist _____ (Title)
 DNR Wildlife Resources _____ (Division)

Data Source and Data Provider

Source Data
Reviewed by: _____ (Signed) _____
 Harvey Young _____ (Printed) (Date Signed)
 Executive Assistant For Program Coordination _____ (Title)
 DNR Commissioner's Office _____ (Division)

Authorization

The Geologic Survey Branch of the Environmental Protection Division of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources approves of the release of the GIS database as presented in Parts A, B and C of the accompanying documentation report.

Reviewed by: _____ (Signed) _____
 B. Roger Carter _____ (Printed) (Date Signed)
 Regulatory Support Program Manager _____ (Title)
 DNR Environmental Protection _____ (Division)

Authorized by: _____ (Signed) _____
 Dr. William H. McLemore _____ (Printed) (Date Signed)
 State Geologist _____ (Title)
 DNR Environmental Protection _____ (Division)

**PART B. TECHNICAL DESCRIPTION OF THE DATABASE:
RIVERCARE 2000
RESOURCE ASSESSMENT THEMES
FOR GEORGIA RIVERS**

1.0 Identification Information

1.1 Citation

1.1.8.1 Originator: **Geologic Survey Branch (GSB)
Environmental Protection Division
Georgia Department of Natural Resources**

1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **11/98**

1.1.8.4 Title: **DOCUMENTATION REPORT 98-25:
RIVERCARE 2000
RESOURCE ASSESSMENT THEMES FOR
GEORGIA RIVERS**

1.1.8.5 Edition: **Ver. 1.0**

1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data
Presentation Form: **GIS Database**

1.1.8.7 Series Name: **none**

1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **Atlanta, Georgia**

1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **Geologic Survey Branch**

1.1.8.10 Online Linkage:
<http://www.dnr.state.ga.us/dnr/environ/techguide/gismenu.html>

1.2 Description

1.2.1 Abstract:

This GIS database contains the value classes for river segments within the 15 resource themes of the RiverCare 2000 Rivers Assessment project. Each resource theme has river segments classified by the values of ‘superior’, ‘outstanding’, and ‘significant’. The resource themes are: agricultural, botanical, cultural (archeological), cultural (historic structures), economic, fish (ecologically important), fish (recreational and commercial), flood-plain, forest, geological, recreational boating, scenic, water quality, water supply, and wildlife. These themes were aggregated into three broader themes: developed; recreation and education; and natural.

1.2.2 Purpose:

This GIS database was developed for the Department of Natural Resources to produce a set of thematic maps and data tables for the report “*Georgia’s Rivers, an Initial Assessment*”. The database was developed to be used at a display scale of 1:2,500,000.

1.3 Time Period of Content

1.3.0.9.1.1 Calendar Date: **varies by theme**

1.3.1 Currentness Reference: **varies by theme**

1.4 Status

1.4.1 Progress: **Complete**

1.4.2 Update Frequency: **Not Planned**

1.5 Spatial Domain

1.5.1 Bounding Coordinates

1.5.1.1 West Bounding Coordinate: **-85 28 53**

1.5.1.2 East Bounding Coordinate: **-80 44 16**

1.5.1.3 North Bounding Coordinate: **34 59 24**

1.5.1.4 South Bounding Coordinate: **30 20 49**

1.6 Keywords

1.6.1 Theme

1.6.1.1 Theme Keyword Reference: **None**

1.6.1.2 Theme Keyword: **RiverCare 2000**

1.6.2 Place

1.6.2.2 Place Keyword: **state**

1.6.2.2 Place Keyword: **Georgia**

1.6.2.2 Place Keyword: **USA**

1.7 Access Constraints: **None**

1.8 Use Constraints: **See intended purpose, section 1.2**

1.9 Point of Contact:

1.9.10.1.1 Contact Person: **Alan Giles**

1.9.10.1.2 Contact Organization: **Geologic Survey Branch**

1.9.10.3 Contact Position: **Information Geologist**

1.9.10.4. Contact Address

1.9.10.4.2a Address: **Agricultural Building, Rm. 400**

1.9.10.4.2b Street: **19 Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive**

1.9.10.4.3 City: **Atlanta**

1.9.10.4.4 State: **Georgia**

1.9.10.4.5 Postal Code: **30334-9004**

1.9.10.4.6 Country: **USA**

1.9.10.5 Contact Voice Telephone: **(404) 657-6127**

1.9.10.7 Contact Facsimile Telephone: **(404) 657-8379**

1.9.10.8 Contact Electronic Mail Address: **alan_giles@mail.dnr.state.ga.us**

1.9.10.9 Hours of Service: **8am - 1:15pm, 2pm - 4:30pm, EST**

2.0 Data Quality Information

2.1 Attribute Accuracy

2.1.1 Attribute Accuracy Report:

The accuracy of the each attribute depends on the source accuracy. For the resource themes (agricultural, botanical, etc), GSB assigned the attributes as directed by the various working groups. In cases where the working groups delivered both an attributed map and a table of

attribute locations, GSB compared the two and marked any discrepancies. GSB then returned the data to the working groups for review. The working groups would then correct any noted discrepancies on the paper maps, which GSB then used to correct the database. GSB did no independent verification of accuracy of the attributes provided by the working groups. Other attributes in the database came directly from overlay operations of databases listed in the source citations. GSB did not alter the accuracy of these attribute items during processing. The original level of attribute accuracy from the source database applies. GSB did no independent verification of accuracy of the attributes derived from the overlay processes.

The **River Assessment Support Staff** reports the following as a statement of attribute accuracies for theme-specific data: For **Agricultural Resources** data (AGCODE) see *Georgia's Rivers: An Initial Assessment* (GRIA),p.14; for **Botanical Resources** data (BOTCODE) see GRIA,p.21-22; for **Cultural Resources** data (CULTCODE and ARCHCODE) see GRIA,p.31; for **Forest Resources** data (FORCODE) see GRIA,p.66; for **Geological Resources** data (GEOLCODE) see GRIA,p70-74; for **Recreational Boating Resources** data (BOATCODE), "Recreation Boating ranked need or lack of public access rather than ranking the absolute level of boating access. This point is important because the other resources save their highest ratings (superior class) for what was best about the resource, not what was most lacking. Therefore the recreational boating rankings system is the opposite (inverse) of that used by the other resources." The River Assessment Support Staff used display maps to review the accuracy of the developed, (DEVELOP), recreational and education (RECEDEU), natural (NATURAL), and combined themes (DEVREC, DEVNAT, RECNAT, HARVCAT) Any errors found were corrected.

The **Economic Resources Working Group** reports the following as a statement of attribute accuracies for **Economic Resources** data (ECONCODE): "High for surface water intakes [GDNRSWIP], used EPD information on permits issued for all water intakes on river segments. High for waste water treatment plants [GDNRWTPP], used EPD information on permits issued for wastewater assimilation at wastewater treatment plants on the river segments. High for waterborne commerce statistics [GPAWCS], figures compiled by the Georgia Ports Authority on all commerce shipped in and out of ports - slightly out of date as figures were 3 or 4 years old."

The **Fisheries Resources Working Group** reports the following as a statement of attribute accuracies for **Fishery and Ecologically Important Fish Resources** data (FISHCODE and ECFISHCODE): "High for Ecologically Important Reaches, Moderate for Recreational and Commercial Fisheries."

The **Scenic Resources Working Group** reports the following as a statement of attribute accuracies for Scenic Resources data (SCENCODE): "The 1:24,000 scale maps [24KTOPO] had relatively high accuracy for stream segment and configuration, but did not show all relevant riverine features; the stream descriptions from Sehlinger and Otey (1980) [OTSEH1, OTSEH2] and the color infrared aerial photographs [IRPHOTO] provided additional information on these features. Some stream segments lengths noted in Sehlinger and Otey were inaccurate, and were adjusted based on direct measurement from topographic maps. Similarly, some older topographic maps did not accurately depict current levels of development along rated stream segments; in most cases, information from aerial photographs was used as a supplementary data source for this part of the evaluation. Given the relatively broad range of scenic resource quality,

these slight inaccuracies probably had little influence on overall stream rankings.”

The **Water Quality Working Group** reports the following as a statement of attribute accuracies for **Water Quality Resources** data (WQCODE): “High, except that some river segments were incorrectly labeled as trout streams, or of significant value.”

The **Water Resources Working Group** reports the following as a statement of attribute accuracy for **Flood-Plain Resources** data (FLOODCODE): “DNR staff derived land cover statistics from land cover map files [LCCG] based on LANDSAT Thematic Mapper satellite imagery with a spatial resolution of 100 ft. x 100 ft. Image dates are 1988-1990. Limited ground-truthing was undertaken to verify image classification. The DNR estimated that the minimum accuracy level for class determinations is 85% and also concluded that this database is likely to underestimate wetland cover classes throughout the state.”

The **Water Resources Working Group** reports the following as a statement for attribute accuracy of **Water Supply Resources** data (WRESCODE): “Moderate for both sources.”

The **Wildlife Resources Working Group** reports the following as a statement of attribute accuracy for **Wildlife Resources** data (WILDCODE): “Any database on wildlife species distribution has inherent inaccuracies based on various factors such as the age of the information, the type of data, the mapping standards employed, and the life history characteristics of the species in question. The various databases of Georgia DNR’s Wildlife Resources Division comprise the most accurate and complete information available on wildlife in Georgia. However, they are not adequate for a comprehensive assessment of wildlife resources along major rivers in the state. For this reason, the professional judgement of wildlife biologists concerning patterns of wildlife diversity and habitat quality was used to supplement digital information on species occurrences and landcover types [LCCG]. The accuracy of landcover data was considered adequate for a general characterization of vegetation along river corridors.”

The source documentation [REACH] does not specifically address the attribute accuracy of the primary river name item (PNAME).

The source documentation [HUC250] does not specifically address the attribute accuracy of the hydrologic unit codes (HUC), the major river associated with the hydrologic unit (MAJRIVNAME), or the name of the hydrologic basin (EPDBASIN).

The source documentation [GSBCO] reports that the county code (CNTYFIPS) was originally extracted from the U. S. Bureau of Census Tiger files. In checking the data, GSB found no county incorrectly coded.

2.2 Logical Consistency:

The source documentation [REACH] for logical consistency of the original river lines is reported as: “Chain-node topology present.”

The logical consistency of the database was maintained using the BUILD command in Arc/Info to ensure that all arcs have a beginning and ending node, and that arcs do not intersect.

The **River Assessment Support Staff** reports the following statement of logical consistency for theme-specific data: for **Agricultural Resources** data see GRIA,p.14; for **Botanical Resources** data see GRIA,p.20; for **Forest Resources** data see GRIA,p.66; for **Geological Resources** data see GRIA,p.72-73; for **Recreational Boating Resources** data see GRIA,p.80.

The **Cultural Resources Working Group** reports the following statement of logical consistency for **Historic Cultural Resources** data: “Consistency of information varies from source to source. Historic structures field surveys [GDNRGHR] provide minimal information on a full range of resources in a broad geographical area (county wide in most instances), whereas National Register and National Historic Landmark files [GDNRNHL] contain highly detailed and reliable information on a relatively small number of historic resources.”

The **Economic Resources Working Group** reports the following statement of logical consistency for **Economic Resources** data: “Good for surface water intakes [GDNRSWIP]. Good for waste water treatment plants [GDNRWTPP], same information gathered for all treatment plants. Good for waterborne commerce statistics [GPAWCS], value of commerce based on actual export/import figures.”

The **Fisheries Resources Working Group** reports the following statement of logical consistency for **Ecologically Important Fish Resources** and **Recreational/Commercial Fish Resources** data: “Information utilized is at the same level of detail for all Ecologically Important Reaches and for all Recreational/Commercial reaches, but not between these 2 categories.”

The **Scenic Resources Working Group** reports the following statement of logical consistency for **Scenic Resources** data: “As mentioned in the attribute accuracy and completeness reports, the amount and type of information available on scenic resources was relatively consistent for stream segments considered. The use of multiple data sources (maps [24KTOPO], aerial photographs [IRPHOTO], and descriptive information [OTSEH1, OTSEH2]) in the assessment helped to minimize problems of data inconsistency. In general, the patterns of diversity of natural and man-made features shown on topographic maps [24KTOPO] were corroborated by the aerial photographs [IRPHOTO] and text descriptions [OTSEH1, OTSEH2].”

The **Water Quality Working Group** reports the following statement of logical consistency for **Water Quality Resources** data: “Consistent.”

The **Water Resources Working Group** reports the following statement of logical consistency for **Floodplain Resources** data: “Logical consistency is good although the completeness is limited as noted above.”

The **Water Resources Working Group** reports the following statement of logical consistency for **Water Supply Resources** data: “Logical consistency is moderate. Limitations on logical consistency include 1) the use of dated information for location of water supply intakes [WRWG2] and 2) the contrast between point data (i.e, location of historic water supply intakes) and the watershed-level hydrologic modeling [WRWG1] used to delineate segments with value as future water supply resources.”

The **Wildlife Resources Working Group** reports the following statement of logical consistency for **Wildlife Resources** data: “As mentioned in the report on attribute accuracy and

completeness, the amount of information available on wildlife species varies geographically and by taxonomic group. The landcover data [LCCG] can be assumed to be relatively consistent in quality from one region of the state to another. The knowledge of wildlife biologists concerning specific river corridors varies according to personal experience and familiarity with a given region.”

2.3 Completeness:

The rivers included in the original base coverage [REACH] do not represent all of the rivers in Georgia. Rather, they are what the USGS considers to be the “Major Rivers of Georgia”. The USGS provides no explanation of the term “Major Rivers” in their documentation.

The River Assessment Support Staff reports the following statement of completeness for theme-specific data: for **Agricultural Resources** data see GRIA,p.15; for **Botanical Resources** data see GRIA,p.21-22; for **Forest Resources** data see GRIA,p.66; for **Geological Resources** data see GRIA,p.74; for **Recreational Boating Resources** data see GRIA,p.80-82; for **Wildlife Resources** data see GRIA,p.102. The River Assessment Support Staff reviewed the completeness of the combined themes and found no incomplete themes.

The **Cultural Resources Working Group** reports the following statement of completeness for **Archeological Resources** data: “Site specific information is relatively complete. However, statewide coverage is only about 10%. Recorded information varies widely from minimal (for those sites reported by avocational archaeologists) to extensive (for those sites reported by professional archaeologists).”

The **Cultural Resource Working Group** reports the following statement of completeness for **Historic Cultural Resources** data: “The completeness of information is relatively high for the three-quarters of the state covered by these inventories (the greatest gaps are in the southwest portion of the state).”

The **Economic Resources Working Group** reports the following statement of completeness for **Economic Resources** data: “High for surface water intakes [GDNRSWIP], list included all water intakes on river segments included in report. High for waste water treatment plants [GDNRWTPP], list included all wastewater treatment plants in state. High for waterborne commerce statistics [GPAWCS], included information on all ports listed in report.”

The **Fishery Resources Working Group** reports the following statement of completeness for **Ecologically Important Fish Resources** and **Commercial/Recreational Fish Resources** data: “Ecologically Important assessments based upon some complete information, e.g. locations of hydropower facilities and likelihood or knowledge of occurrence of significant faunal elements. Only a subjective assessment of the state of the watershed was possible, due to lack of specific comparable information. Assessment of important recreational and commercial fisheries suffer from lack of specific comparable fisheries catch data, that are not available. Assessments were based upon expert opinions of fishery professionals.”

The **Scenic Resources Working Group** reports the following statement of completeness for **Scenic Resources** data: “Full coverage of the evaluated streams was provided by the 1:24,000 scale topographic maps [24KTOPO]. Color infrared aerial photographs [IRPHOTO] were

readily available for most, but not all, stream segments. As noted in the Scenic Resources Report, seven stream segments not considered in Sehlinger and Otey [OTSEH1, OTSEH2] were added to the list, based on existing file information that was available to the Scenic Resource Work Group.”

The **Water Quality Working Group** reports the following statement of completeness for **Water Quality Resources** data: “Complete, except that some lakes not on the base map were not delineated, and some trout streams not on the base map were not delineated.”

The **Water Resources Working Group** reports the following statement of completeness for **Floodplain Resources** data: “Due to time constraints, the extent of wetlands in corridors along major rivers was chosen as the sole indicator for this assessment. It should be noted that this is a relatively crude indicator and that the focus on major rivers neglects the functional significance of flood-plains and wetlands associated with small and moderate-sized streams. Time and resource constraints, however, prevented more comprehensive evaluation of floodplain resources. This approach was selected to incorporate minimal information on floodplain resources along large rivers. In future assessments, this component should be expanded to include additional indicators and smaller streams. Limited due to: 1) focus on major rivers; and 2) use of extent of wetlands as the sole indicator of floodplain resources. These limitations are discussed in more detail in the Work Group's report on floodplain resources [GRIA2].”

The **Water Resources Working Group** reports the following statement of completeness for **Water Supply Resources** data: “Data sources used for development of the polygon coverage [WRWG1] are relatively complete. As historic data, the point coverage of water supply intakes [WRWG2] is dated and incomplete.”

The **Wildlife Resources Working Group** reports the following statement of completeness for **Wildlife Resources** data: “As discussed in the Wildlife Resources Report, many areas of the state have not been adequately surveyed for the full suite of terrestrial and wetland wildlife species considered in this effort. For this reason, general patterns of species diversity and habitat quality served as indicators of wildlife resource value. However, there is no substitute for field survey data in determining wildlife habitat value of a given river corridor.”

2.4 Positional Accuracy:

The positional accuracy of the database is consistent with its intended display scale of 1:2,500,000. At this scale the map of the state of Georgia fits on an eight and a half by eleven inch sheet of paper. The hydrology lines came from the REACH database, whose scale was reported as 1:100,000, with an associated accuracy of plus or minus 167 feet. GSB generalized the hydrology lines in some places to remove excessive detail. This was done using the GENERALIZE command on selected arcs in ArcEdit.

The **River Assessment Support Staff** reports the following statement of overall positional accuracy: “Positional accuracy has been limited in this report for several reasons. First, more accurate, statewide information was not available. Second, these committees were made up of volunteer experts who were chosen for their knowledge of the resource, not its exact location. Third, many of the resources require protection (e.g. archeological sites, endangered plants, etc.) and the exact position has been obfuscated in order to protect the resource.”

The **River Assessment Support Staff** reports the following statement of theme-specific positional accuracy: for **Agricultural Resources** data see GRIA,p.14; for **Botanical Resources** data see GRIA,p.20; for **Forest Resources** data see GRIA,p.66; for **Geological Resources** data see GRIA,p71; for **Scenic Resources** data see GRIA,p85; for **Wildlife Resources** data see 100K400CFS. No report was provided for the positional accuracy of **Economic Resources** data, **Fisheries Resources** data, and **Recreational Resources** data.

The **Cultural Resources Working Group** reports the following statement of the positional accuracy for **Archeological Resources** data: “The accuracy of locational information from the original digitized source [ARCHUGA] is highly accurate (within 250 feet in most cases). The accuracy of the final paper map [CRWG1] is low (within 2-3 miles).”

The **Cultural Resources Working Group** reports the following statement of the positional accuracy for **Historic Cultural Resources** data: “The accuracy of locational information on the original paper maps in the files varies from high (for USGS quadrangle maps) [24KTOPO] to low (for DOT county highway maps) [DOTCO]. The accuracy when transferred to the 1:500,000-scale paper map [CRWG2] is relatively low (within 2-3 miles).”

The **Water Quality Working Group** reports the following statement of the positional accuracy for **Water Quality Resources** data: “High.”

The **Water Resources Working Group** reports the following statement of the positional accuracy for **Floodplain Resources** data: “DNR staff derived land cover statistics from land cover map files [LCCG] based on LANDSAT Thematic Mapper satellite imagery with a spatial resolution of 100 ft. x 100 ft.”

The **Water Resources Working Group** reports the following statement of the positional accuracy for **Water Supply Resources** data: “Moderate for both sources.”

2.5 Lineage

2.5.1 Source Information

- 2.5.1.1 Source Citation: **see 1.1**
- 2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator:
- 2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **machine-readable files**
- 2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **RCARE**
- 2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

GSB performed data processing in Arc/Info with data received from the sources below. GSB performed analysis based on methodology provided by WPB1.

2.5.2 Process Information:

GSB downloaded the river line data [REACH] from an Arc/Info exchange format file named rf3mjr.e00. The IMPORT command was used to import the coverage into Arc/Info software as a coverage named reach1.

To reduce the size of the arc attribute table, items which were unnecessary for RiverCare analysis were dropped using the DROPITEM command. The items, which had been carried over from the reach coverage [REACH] and dropped, are:

CU, SEG, MILE, UP, DOWN, UPMI, RFLAG, OWFLAG, TFLAG, SFLAG, REACHTYPE, LEVEL, JUNC, DIVERGENCE, USDIR, TERMID, TRMBLV, PNMCD, CNAME, CNMCD, OWNAME, OWNMCD, DSCU, DSSEG, DSMI, CCU, CSEG, CMILE, CDIR, ULCU, ULSEG, ULMI, URCU, URSEG, URMI, SEGL, RFORFLAG, ALTPNMCD, ALTOWNMC, DLAT, DLON, ULAT, ULON, MINLAT, MINLONG, MAXLAT, MAXLONG, NDLGREC, UPDTC1, UPDTSRC2, UPDATE3, UPDTC3, UPDTSRC3, DIVCU, DIVSEG, DIVMI, DLGID, FILLER, RF3RCHID, DSF3RCHID, CURF3RCHID, ULR3RCHID, URRF3RCHID, DIVRF3RCHID.

Geological Resources - GSB received a 1:500K paper map [GRWG] and a text table describing the location of the significant, outstanding, and superior segments. On the map, [GRWG], the significant, outstanding, and superior segments were marked by a yellow, blue, or green highlighter over the river line. The ADDITEM command was used to add the item GEOLCODE to the coverage reach1. In ArcEdit, reach1 was the editcover and detailed hydrology [DLGHYDRO], major roads [DLGRD], and county outlines [GSBCO] were used as backcovers. GSB visually matched river arcs in reach1 river coverage to the highlighted segments on the paper map [GRWG]. The arcs were selected using the mouse and the ASEL command. The command MOVEITEM was used to assign a value 'y', 'g', or 'b' to item GEOLCODE for the selected arcs, based on the coding scheme of the paper map. The text table was used to check that the locations described matched those on the map. Some discrepancies were found and noted in a text document named qacomments.geology. The ADD command was used to add to the coverage a few arcs representing a few small streams of geologic importance as depicted on the paper map. These arcs were then assigned a value for GEOLCODE using the MOVEITEM command. The coverage was then saved and topology was rebuilt using the BUILD command with the line option. In ArcPlot, a draft map at a scale of 1:500K was plotted, depicting the reach1 coverage with the 'y', 'g', and 'b' values plotted as thick colored lines overlaying the river lines. The draft map and the text file qacomments.geology was delivered to the Geologic Resources Work Group for review and revisions.

Economic Resources - GSB received a 1:500K paper map [EcRWG]. GSB used the same methodology as was applied to geological resources to add and populate the item ECONCODE. A draft map and textfile qacomments.econ were delivered to Economic Resources Work Group for review and revision. The coverage reach1 was copied to reach2.

Recreational Boating Resources - GSB received a 1:500K paper map [RRWG]. GSB used the same methodology as was applied to geological resources to add and populate the item BOATCODE. A draft map and textfile qacomments.boat were delivered to the Recreational Resources Work Group for review and revision. The coverage reach2 was copied to reach3.

Agriculture Resources - GSB received a 1:500K paper map [ARWG]. The rivers on the paper map were coded by river basin HUC codes. Rather than select each river segment in a river basin individually to assign a value, the command IDENTITY was used on the coverage reach3 with a river basin coverage

[HUC250] to create coverage reach4, with the HUC codes assigned to each river line. The following items which had been carried over from the river basin coverage [HUC250] were dropped: HUC250#, AREA, PERIMETER, HUC250-ID. The HUC item was retained. The item NAME was renamed to MAJRIVNAME using the ALTER command in Tables. The item DNRBASIN was renamed EPDBASIN. The ADDITEM command was used to add the item AGCODE to reach4. In Tables, records were selected by HUC code and the value of 'y', 'g', or 'b' as shown on the paper map was moved to item AGCODE. The topology was rebuilt using the BUILD command. A draft map was prepared and delivered to the Agricultural Resources Working Group for review and revisions. The coverage reach4 was copied to reach5.

Scenic Resources - GSB received a 1:500K paper map [SRWG]. GSB used the same methodology as was applied to geological resources to add and populate the item SCENCODE. A draft map and textfile comments.scenic were delivered to Scenic Resources Work Group for review and revision.

Educational Resources - (note - educational resources were eventually dropped from this database and done as a separate database) GSB received a 1:500K paper map [EdRWG]. Some of the rivers were coded by county. Other codes on the map represented point data. Rather than select each river segment in a county individually to assign a value, the command IDENTITY was used on the coverage reach5 with the county outline coverage [GSBCO], to create coverage reach6, with a county code assigned to each river line. The following items which had been carried over from the county coverage [GSBCO] were dropped: STATE#, AREA, PERIMETER, STATE-ID, CNTYNAME, SHRTNAME, LONGNAME. The CNTYFIPS item was retained. The ADDITEM command was used to add the item EDUCODE. In Tables, records were selected by county code and the value of 'y', 'g', or 'b' as shown on the paper map was moved to the item EDUCODE. In ArcEdit, additional river features which were not county-wide were selected individually and assigned the values of 'y', 'g', or 'b'. A coverage named EDUPT was created using the CREATE command with tics from reach6. The points from the paper map were added using the ADD command with the mouse in ArcEdit. The points were located visually by their proximity to river features with on-screen digitizing by using reach6 as a backcover. The item EDUCODE was added to the coverage EDUPT, and populated by selecting the points in ArcEdit and moving the value 'y', 'g', or 'b' to the item. The 'y', 'g', or 'b' value of the point was then transferred to the nearest river segment in reach6, by selecting the arc in ArcEdit and moving the value. The segment was defined as that part of the river nearest the point, from the upstream confluence to the downstream confluence. Some points were not near any river and so were not assigned. The topology of reach6 was rebuilt using the BUILD command. In ArcPlot, a draft map was plotted at a scale of 1:500K, depicting the river lines with their 'y', 'g', and 'b' values, and depicting the nearby points with their 'y', 'g', and 'b' values. The draft map was delivered to the Educational Resources Work Group for review and revision. The coverage reach6 was copied to reach7.

Cultural Historic Resources - GSB received a 1:500K paper map [CRWG2]. On

the paper map, the historic sites were coded as yellow, green, or blue points near rivers. GSB created a new point coverage named cultpt, using tics from reach7. Points and the item CULTCODE were added, and the item populated using the same methodology as was applied to the educational resources. In ArcEdit, all cultural points values were assigned to a nearby river arc in reach7. In ArcPlot, a draft map was plotted at a scale of 1:500K, depicting the river lines with their 'y', 'g', and 'b' values, and depicting the nearby points with their 'y', 'g', and 'b' values. The draft map was delivered to the Cultural Resources Work Group for review and revision.

Water Quality Resources - GSB received a map [WQWG] identifying river segments to be coded as significant, outstanding, or superior. Using the paper map to locate segments, GSB visually selected arcs in reach7 river coverage, using the mouse and the ASEL command in ArcEdit. Using the command MOVEITEM, GSB assigned value 'y', 'g', or 'b' to item WQCODE for the selected arcs, based on the coding scheme of the paper map. GSB received an Arc/Info export file named tstreams.e00 [CRSMSTS], delineating trout streams in north Georgia. GSB created a coverage named streampol, using the tics from tstreams. Using tstreams as a backcover, lines outlining the edges of the trout stream areas were added to streampol using the ADD command. Polygon topology was then built using the BUILD command with the POLY option. Polygon labels were added using the CREATELABEL command. An item named WQCODE was added to the polygon attribute table using the ADDITEM command. A value of 'b' was assigned to each polygon which encompassed a trout stream area. To assign the wqcode values to the river lines in the reach7 coverage, the IDENTITY command was used on coverage reach7, with the identity coverage as streampol, to create coverage reach8. The line topology of reach8 was built using the BUILD command. The items STREAMPOL#, AREA, PERIMETER, STREAMPOL-ID were dropped from reach8.aat, while the item WQCODE was retained. In ArcPlot, a draft map was plotted at a scale of 1:500K, depicting the river lines with their 'y', 'g', and 'b' values. The draft map was delivered to the Water Quality Resources Work Group for review and revision.

Revisions - The Geologic Resources Work Group reviewed the draft paper map of geologic resources, marked corrections to the GEOLCODE 'y', 'g', and 'b' values and returned the map to GSB for revisions. GSB copied the coverage reach8 to reach9. Using the marked draft map to locate segments, GSB visually selected arcs in the reach9 coverage, using the mouse and the ASEL command in ArcEdit. The command MOVEITEM was then used to revise the values for GEOLCODE. The changes were saved, and a revised draft map was plotted in ArcPlot at a scale of 1:500K. The revised draft map was delivered to Geologic Resources Work Group for finalization. The Economic, Recreational, and Scenic Resources Work groups reviewed the draft paper maps and returned them to GSB for revisions. GSB made the revisions to the RCARE database starting with version reach9 and ending with version reach12, using the same methodology as was applied to geologic resources.

Water Supply Resources - GSB received an Arc/Info export file named ranks.e00 [WRWG1]. GSB imported the file into a coverage named ranks. GSB added the item WRESCODE to the polygon attribute table. In Tables, GSB populated the

WRESCODE item from the RANK item. For RANK = 1 , WRESCODE = g; for RANK = 2, WRESCODE = b. Then the IDENTITY command was used to overlay the coverage ranks onto the coverage reach12 to create the coverage reach13. The items RANKS#, AREA, PERIMETER, RANKS-ID, RANK, CLASS, were dropped. The item WRESCODE was retained. GSB received an Arc/Info export file named sfwatin.e00 [WRWG2]. GSB imported the file into a point coverage named swint. The item WRESCODE was added to the attribute table, and then each record was assigned a value of 'y' for item WRESCODE. The ERASE command used to overlay the coverage swint with the coverage ranks to create the coverage swint2, containing only the points from swint which did not lie within a ranked polygon. In ArcEdit, for each swint2 point, a value of 'y' was added for item WRESCODE for the nearest segment of river in coverage reach12. In ArcPlot, a draft map was plotted at a scale of 1:500K, depicting the river lines with their 'y', 'g', and 'b' values, and depicting the nearby points with their 'y' values. The draft map was delivered to the Water Resources Work Group for review and revision.

Botanical Resources - GSB received a set of maps [BRWG] and a table identifying segments to be coded as significant, outstanding, and superior. GSB copied the coverage reach13 to create the coverage reach14. GSB used the same methodology as was applied to geological resources to add and populate the item BOTCODE. A draft map and textfile comments.scenic were delivered to the Botanical Resources Work Group for review and revision. The coverage reach14 was copied to reach15.

Revisions - The Water Resources Work Group reviewed the draft paper map depicting WRESCODE values and returned the map with the revisions marked. Instead of the coding the nearest segment of river to each surface water intake point, the group requested that the segments for eight miles upstream from each surface water intake point be coded 'y' for WRESCODE. This was accomplished in ArcEdit by SELECTing a number of upstream arcs, so that by running the STATISTICS command, the length was calculated as 12,785 meters, plus or minus 100 meters. Other river segment codes were changed as marked on the draft map. The coverage was then copied from reach15 to reach16.

Forest Resources - GSB received a 1:500K paper map [FoRWG]. GSB used the same methodology as was applied to geological resources to add and populate the item FORCODE. A draft map and textfile forest.comments were delivered to the Forest Resources Work Group for review and revision. The coverage reach16 was copied to reach17.

Revisions - The Botanical, Recreational Boating, Forest, Water Quality, Water Supply, and Cultural Resources Work Groups reviewed the draft paper maps and returned them the GSB with revisions marked. GSB made the revisions using the same methodology as was applied to the geologic resources revisions. The Recreational Boating Work Group requested an additional round of revisions, which were done the same way. The coverage reach17 was copied to a separate coverage for each revision, ending with reach25.

Flood-Plain Resources - GSB received a paper map [WRWG3] identifying segments to be coded as significant, outstanding, and superior. GSB used the same methodology as was applied to geological resources to add and populate the item FLOODCODE. A draft map was delivered the Water Resources Work Group for review and revision. The coverage reach25 was copied to reach26.

Wildlife Resources - GSB received a paper map [WiRWG] identifying segments to be coded as significant, outstanding, and superior. GSB used the same methodology as was applied to geological resources to add and populate the item WILDCODE. A draft map was delivered to the Wildlife Resources Work Group for review and revision. The coverage reach26 was copied to reach27.

Cultural Archeological Resources - GSB received a paper map [CRWG1]. On the paper map, sites of archeological interest were coded as yellow, green, or blue points near rivers. GSB created a new coverage named archpt. The item ARCHCODE was added with the ADDITEM command. In ArcEdit, points were ADDED into coverage archpt, with backcovers reach27, county outlines [USGSCO], and roads [DLGRD] for visual orientation, using the mouse as an on-screen digitizing puck. As each point was added, the attribute for WILDCODE was populated with the value 'y', 'g', or 'b', as designated from the paper map. The AP command was used with the DRAW command to refresh the display during editing, to ensure that all points were added and coded correctly. Once all the points were added the coverage was saved and point topology built with the BUILD command. The BUFFER command was used to create a coverage named arch400 which contained a 400 meter circular polygon around each point. The point attributes were then transferred to the polygon coverage using the GET command in ArcEdit, with arch400 as the editcover. The coverage arch400 was saved and polygon topology built with the BUILD command. The INTERSECT command with the line option was used with reach27 as the incover, arch400 as the intersect cover to create sigseg400 as the outcover containing attributed set of lines clipped to the 400 foot buffers. In Info, the reach27.aat file was SELECTed, and the RELATE command was used with sigseg400.pat as the relate file on the reach27# field. The MOVE command was used to transfer the values from the item BUFFERCODE to the item ARCHCODE. The coverage reach27 was copied to reach28.

Fish Resources - Recreational and Commercial - GSB received a map [FiRWG2] identifying segments to be coded as significant, outstanding, and superior. GSB used the same methodology as was applied to geological resources to add and populate the item FISHCODE. A draft map and textfile names comments.scenic were delivered to Fisheries ResourcesWork Group for review and revision. The coverage reach28 was copied to reach29.

Fish Ecology Resources - GSB received a map [FiRWG1] identifying segments to be coded as significant, outstanding, and superior. GSB used the same methodology as was applied to geological resources to add and populate the item FISHCODE. A draft map and textfile named comments.scenic were delivered to Fisheries Resources Work Group for review and revision. The coverage reach29

was copied to reach30.

Revisions - the Cultural and Forest Resources Work Groups reviewed the draft paper maps and returned them the GSB with revisions marked. GSB made the revisions using the same methodology as was applied to the geologic resources revisions. The Recreational and Water Resources Work Groups requested an additional round of revisions, which were done the same way. The coverage reach30 was copied to a separate coverage for each revision, ending with reach31t.

The item EDUCODE was dropped using the DROPITEM command.

Aggregate Themes - the items DEVELOP, RECEDU, and NATURAL were added using the ADDITEM command. In Tables, the arc attribute table reach31t.aat was SELECTed. The table was RESELECTed for AGCODE='g', then ASELECTed for ECONCODE='g', then ASELECTed for WQCODE='y', then ASELECTed for WRESCODE='g'. The value 'dy' was MOVEd to item DEVELOP. The selection set was reversed using the NSELECT command and the value 'dn' was MOVEd to item DEVELOP. All records in the table were SELECTed again. The table was RESELECTed for BOATCODE='g', then ASELECTed for WQCODE='y', GEOLCODE='g', then ASELECTed for ARCHCODE='g', then ASELECTed for CULTCODE='g', then ASELECTed for FISHCODE='g'. The value 'ry' was MOVEd to item RECEDU. The selection set was reversed using the NSELECT command and the value 'rn' was MOVEd to item RECEDU. All records in the table were SELECTed again. The table was RESELECTed for WQCODE='g', then ASELECTed for FLOODCODE='g', then ASELECTed for ECFISHCODE='g', then ASELECTed for WILDCODE='g', then ASELECTed for BOTCODE='g', then ASELECTed for FORCODE='g', then ASELECTed for SCENCODE='g'. The value 'ny' was MOVEd to item NATURAL. The selection set was reversed using the NSELECT command and the value 'nn' was MOVEd to item NATURAL. The items DEVREC, DEVNAT, and REC NAT were added using the ADDITEM command. In Tables the arc attribute table reach31t.aat was SELECTed. The table was RESELECTed for DEVELOP='dy', then RESELECTed for RECEDU='ry'. The value 'dry' was MOVEd to DEVREC. The selection set was reversed using the NSELECT command and the value 'drn' was MOVEd to item DEVREC. All records in the table were SELECTed again. The table was RESELECTed for DEVELOP='dy', the RESELECTed for NATURAL='ny'. The value 'dny' was MOVEd to DEVNAT. The selection set was reversed using the NSELECT command and the value 'dnn' was MOVEd' to DEVNAT. All records in the table were SELECTed again. The table was RESELECTed for RECEDU='ry', the RESELECTed for NATURAL='ny'. The value 'rny' was MOVEd to REC NAT. The selection set was reversed using the NSELECT command and the value 'rnn' was MOVEd to REC NAT.

The coverage reach31t was copied to rcare1. The item HARVCAT was added to rcare1.aat using the ADDITEM command. In Tables the arc attribute table rcare1.aat was SELECTed. The table was RESELECTed for NATURAL='ny' AND DEVELOP='dn' AND RECEDU='rn'. The value '1' was MOVEd to HARVCAT. All records in the table were SELECTed again. The table was RESELECTed for RECEDU='ry' AND DEVELOP='dn' AND NATURAL='ny'.

'nn'. The value '2' was MOVED to HARVCAT. All the records in the table were SELECTed again. The table was RESELECTed for DEVELOP = 'dy' AND RECEDU = 'rn' AND NATURAL = 'nn'. The value '3' was MOVED to HARVCAT. All the records in the table were SELECTed again. The table was RESELECTed for RECEDU = 'ry' AND NATURAL = 'ny' AND DEVELOP = 'dn'. The value '4' was MOVED to HARVCAT. All the records in the table were SELECTed again. The table was RESELECTed for DEVELOP = 'dy' AND NATURAL = 'ny' AND RECEDU = 'rn'. The value '5' was MOVED to HARVCAT. All the records in the table were SELECTed again. The table was RESELECTed for DEVELOP = 'dy' AND RECEDU = 'ry' AND NATURAL = 'nn'. The value '6' was MOVED to HARVCAT. All the records in the table were SELECTed again. The table was RESELECTed for DEVELOP = 'dy' AND NATURAL = 'ny' AND RECEDU = 'ry'. The value '7' was MOVED to HARVCAT. All the records in the table were SELECTed again. The table was RESELECTed for DEVELOP = 'dn' AND NATURAL = 'nn' AND RECEDU = 'rn'. The value '8' was MOVED to HARVCAT. The coverage rcare1 was copied to rcare and exported to file rcare.e00

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator:	Burgoon, Diane and McFadden, Keith
2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date:	1996
2.5.1.1.8.4 Title:	U.S. EPA River Reach File, Version 3, Major Streams of Georgia
2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition:	1.0
2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data	
Presentation Form:	digital data
2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name:	Digital Data
2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information	
2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place:	Atlanta, Ga.
2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher:	U.S. Geological Survey
2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage:	http://csat.gatech.edu/csat/statewide/statewide.html

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **100,000**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **online**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **REACH**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Provided database which was imported into Arc/Info by GSB, used as the hydrology base for the Rivercare database [RCARE] .

2.5.2 Process Information: **see online documentation.**

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator:	River Assessment Team; Geologic Resources Work Group
-------------------------	---

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **not published**
 2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Geologic Resources**
 2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **not applicable**
 2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data
 Presentation Form: **map**
 2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name:
 2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information
 2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **not applicable**
 2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **not applicable**
 2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **none**
 2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator:
 2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **paper**
 2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **GRWG**
 2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:
Prepared a map depicting geological resources, to be input into the RCARE database as geolcode.

2.5.2 Process Information:

The Geologic Resources Work Group provided the following report on process information: “delineated geological resources onto paper 1:100K topographic maps [100KTOPO] using the committee’s expert knowledge of the geologic resources of Georgia. The delineations were then transferred onto a 1:500K map [GA500K] to produce the Geologic Resources map [GRWG].”

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **Musser, J. W., and Alhadeff, S. J.**
 2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **1996**
 2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Hydrography of Georgia**
 2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **1.0**
 2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data
 Presentation Form: **GIS database**
 2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **Digital Data Series**
 2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information
 2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **Atlanta, GA**
 2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **U.S. Geological Survey**
 2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage:

<http://csat.gatech.edu/csat/statewide/statewide.html>

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **100,000**
 2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **online**
 2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **DLGHYDRO**
 2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Prepared a 1:100,000 scale hydrology coverage used by GSB as a backcover in ArcEdit for visual identification of additional streams which were not present in the major rivers database [REACH] .

2.5.2 Process Information:

see online documentation.

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **McFadden, K. W. and Musser, J. W.**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **1996**

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Roads of Georgia**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **1.0**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form: **GIS database**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **Digital Data Series**

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **Atlanta, Ga.**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **U. S. Geological Survey**

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage:

<http://csat.gatech.edu/csat/statewide/statewide.html>

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **100,000**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **online**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **DLGRD**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Prepared a 1:100,000 scale roads coverage used by GSB as a backcover in ArcEdit for visual identification of streams of interest for RCARE.

2.5.2 Process Information: **see online documentation.**

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **Geologic Survey Branch, Environmental Protection Division, Georgia Department of Natural Resources**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **11/96**

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **DOCUMENTATION REPORT 96-24
COUNTIES AND SELECTED
HYDROGRAPHY OF GEORGIA
(1:250,000)**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **1.0**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form: **GIS Database**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **none**

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **Atlanta, Georgia**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **Geologic Survey Branch**

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **none**

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **250,000**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **machine readable files**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **GSBCO**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Prepared a 1:250,000 scale coverage of county outlines used by GSB as a backcover in ArcEdit for visual identification of streams. Coverage was also

used as an **IDENTITY** cover to assign county codes to stream segments in **RCARE**.

2.5.2 Process Information: see **Documentation Report 96-24**

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **River Assessment Team; Economic Resources Work Group**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **not published**

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Economic Resources**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form: **map**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **none**

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **500,000**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **paper**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **EcRWG**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Prepared a map depicting economically important resources to be input into the RCARE database as item econcode. The Work Group marked the economically important river segments onto a base map [GA500K].

2.5.2 Process Information:

The Economic Resources Work Group reports that they used data on surface water intakes [GDNRSWIP], wastewater treatment plants [GDNRWTPP], waterborne commerce statistics [GPAWCS], to locate stream segments of economic importance.

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **River Assessment Team; Recreational Resources Work Group**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **not published**

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Recreational Boating Resources**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form: **map**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **none**

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **500,000**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **paper**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **RRWG**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Prepared a map depicting recreational boating resources, to be input into the RCARE database as item boatcode

2.5.2 Process Information:

The Recreational Boating Resources Committee provided the following report on process information: “used a paper 1:500,000 scale map [GA500K] as the basis of its work. The Law Enforcement Personnel delineated the stream segments by verbal descriptions using general geographic points of reference such as roads or county boundaries. The Committee then delineated the stream segments on the 1:500,000 [RRWG] scale paper map. Data Sources used were the Georgia Department of Natural Resources Law Enforcement Personnel.”

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **River Assessment Team; Agricultural Resources Work Group**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **not published**

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Agricultural Resources**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form: **map**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name:

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **none**

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **500,000**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **paper**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **ARWG**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Prepared a map depicting agricultural resources to be input into the RCARE database as item agcode, using a base map [HUC500] on which they marked the agriculturally important river segments.

2.5.2 Process Information: **See [GRIA;p14.]**

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **Alhadeff, S. Jack**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **1996**

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Hydrologic Units of Georgia**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **2.0**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form: **GIS database**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **Digital Data Series**

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **Atlanta, Ga.**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **U.S. Geological Survey**

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage:

<http://csat.gatech.edu/csat/statewide/statewide.html>

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **250,000**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **online**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **HUC250**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Provided a 1:250,000 scale coverage of river basins used by GSB as an IDENTITY cover to assign river basin names to stream segments in RCARE. Also provided data used by the Forest Resources Work Group in preparing the Forest Resources map [FoRWG].

2.5.2 Process Information: **See online documentation.**

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **River Assessment Team; Scenic Resources Work Group**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **not published**

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Scenic Resources**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form: **map**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **none**

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **500,000**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **paper**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **SRWG**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Prepared a map depicting scenic resources, to be input into the RCARE database as item scencode.

2.5.2 Process Information:

The Scenic Resources Work Group provided the following report on process information: “used 1:24,000 scale topographic maps [24KTOPO], 1988 color infrared aerial photographs [IRPHOTO], and annotated county road maps from Sehlinger and Otey(1980) [OTSEH1 and OTSEH2]. Evaluation methods are described in the Scenic Resources Report. Stream segment endpoints were based in conspicuous landmarks (e.g. highway crossings, stream confluences), and these segment endpoints were noted on the data sheets. These ranked segments were then delineated on a 1:500,000 scale map of Georgia [GA500K] and provided to the GIS team. The transfer process was completed November 1997 and required approximately 15 person-hours. Jon Ambrose, Wildlife Resources Division, is the contact person for the Scenic Resources Report.”

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **River Assessment Team; Educational Resources Work Group**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **not published**

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Educational Resources**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form: **map**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **none**

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **500,000**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **paper**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **EdRWG**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Prepared a map depicting educational resources on a base map [GA500K], to be input into the RCARE database as item educode. This item was later removed and not used.

2.5.2 Process Information:

The Educational Resources Work Group provided no report on process information. The educational resources item has been removed from the database.

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **River Assessment Team; Cultural Resources Work Group**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **not published**

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Cultural Historic Resources**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form: **map**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **none**

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **500,000**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **paper**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **CRWG2**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Prepared a map depicting cultural historic resources to be input into the RCARE database as item cultcode

2.5.2 Process Information:

The Cultural Resources Work Group provided the following report on process information: “the Cultural Resources Assessment Team relied upon data from several standard structural survey and inventory files (see below for details). These files contain locational information on two different sets of maps: 1:24,000 USGS quadrangle maps [24KTOPO] (for approximately half the state), and DOT county highway maps [DOTCO] at scales of 1" = 1 mile or 1" = 2 miles (for approximately half the state). This locational information was manually transferred from these paper maps to a 1:500,000-scale paper map of the state [GA500K]. Work was completed in December 1996. This required approximately 120 work hours to produce. Richard Cloues, Historic Preservation Section, Department of Natural Resources, is the contact person. The sources of information about historic structural resources are: Georgia Historic Resources Survey [GNDRGHR], State-Owned Buildings Survey [GDNRSOBS], National Register of Historic Places files [GDNRNRHP], and National Historic Landmarks [GDNRNHL] files. All are located at the Historic Preservation Division, Department of Natural Resources, Atlanta.”

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator:	River Assessment Team; Water Quality Work Group
2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date:	not published
2.5.1.1.8.4 Title:	Water Quality Resources
2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition:	not applicable
2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data Presentation Form:	map
2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name:	not applicable
2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information	
2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place:	not applicable
2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher:	not applicable
2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage:	none
2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator:	500,000
2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media:	paper
2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation:	WQWG
2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:	Prepared a map depicting water quality resources to be input into the RCARE database as item wqcode.

2.5.2 Process Information:

The Water Quality Work Group reports the following process information: “used the narrative segment descriptions for water uses of Wild and Scenic, Outstanding Natural Resource Waters, Trout Streams, Recreation, and Drinking Water contained in the Georgia Rules and Regulations for Water Quality Control [GDNRWQC] as the basis of its work. The committee used the methodology cited in the Water Quality Work Group committee report, Appendix II, for ranking the segments. The GSB used the narrative segment descriptions for water uses and mapped the segments on a 1:500,000 scale paper map of the State of Georgia [GA500K]. Trout Stream locations were provided in an electronic file by the

Wildlife Resources Division [CRSMSTS] to the GSB for mapping on the 1:500,000 scale paper map [WQWG]. Mork Winn, GAEPD Water Protection Branch, is the contact person with respect to the water use classifications, and Russ England, Wildlife Resources Division, is the contact for trout stream locations.”

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator:	Center for Remote Sensing and Mapping Sciences University of Georgia
2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date:	not published
2.5.1.1.8.4 Title:	Trout Streams of Georgia Map Database
2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition:	Version 1
2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data	
Presentation Form:	GIS database
2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name:	not applicable
2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information	
2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place:	not published
2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher:	not published
2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage:	none
2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator:	100,000
2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media:	machine-readable files
2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation:	CRSMSTS
2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:	

Provided trout stream data in digital format used by the Water Quality Work Group in preparing the Water Quality Resources map [WQWG].

2.5.2 Process Information:

The Center for Remote Sensing and Mapping Science provided the following report on process information: “converted the digital line graph [USGSDLG] files into an Arc/Info coverage, then plotted working maps depicting streams and roads to DNR Wildlife Resources Division (WRD). WRD staff marked on the working maps the locations of trout streams as listed in the EPD rules [GDNRWQC]. CRSMS staff then separated the trout streams into a separate coverage and exported the coverage into file TSTREAMS.E00. The file [CRMSTSTS] was delivered to DNR WRD, who then delivered the file to GSB. More information can be found in the thesis entitled ‘A GIS Assessment of Trout Habitat in North Georgia’ by Tom Litts, graduate student at the University of Georgia.”

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator:	Institute of Community and Area Development, University of Georgia
2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date:	not published
2.5.1.1.8.4 Title:	Watershed with Outstanding or Superior Value as Water Supply Resources
2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition:	not applicable
2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data	

Presentation Form: **machine readable files**
 2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **not applicable**
 2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information
 2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **not applicable**
 2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **not applicable**
 2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **not available**
 2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **500,000**
 2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **on-line file**
 2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **WRWG1**
 2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Provided polygon coverage of ranked water supply resources for input into the RCARE database as item WRESCODE.

2.5.2 Process Information:

The Water Resources Work Group reports that “A different approach was used to map stream segments with value as future water supply sources. A GIS polygon coverage was generated using the GRID module of ARC/INFO. The state’s elevation coverage [DEM250K] and data on average annual runoff [CARTER1983] were used as input to hydrologic modeling via GRID. The GRID modeling was structured to delineate watersheds in seven discharge categories. Watersheds within 20 miles of the geographic center of demand clusters were then assigned a ranking using the methodology described in the Water Resources Work Group report [GRIA2](see Appendix II for definition of demand clusters and for description of this methodology). Rankings were applied to each segment in the polygon to produce a coverage of ranked stream segments.”

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation
 2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **United States Geological Survey**
 2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **not published**
 2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Municipal Public Water Supply - Permitted Surface Water Intakes in Georgia, 1986**
 2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition:
 2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data
 Presentation Form: **GIS database**
 2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **not applicable**
 2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information
 2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **not published**
 2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **not published**
 2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **not available**
 2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **100,000**
 2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **machine readable files**
 2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **WRWG2**
 2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Provided point data imported into Arc/Info as coverage SWINT, used to locate significant water supply resources river segments.

2.5.2 Process Information: **See GSB draft Documentation Report 97-1**

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **River Assessment Team; Botanical Resources Work Group**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **not published**

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Botanical Resources**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form: **maps**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **none**

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **100,000**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **paper**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **BRWG**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Provided GSB with a set of maps depicting botanically important resources to be input into the RCARE database as item botcode. The Work Group marked 1:100,000 scale Topo maps [100KTOPO] with the locations of botanically important river segments, to produce the Botanical Resources map [BRWG].

2.5.2 Process Information: **See [GRIA;p20]**

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **River Assessment Team; Forest Resources Work Group**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **not published**

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Forest Resources**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form: **map**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **none**

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **500,000**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **paper**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **FoRWG**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Prepared a map depicting Forest resources to be input into the RCARE database as item forcode.

2.5.2 Process Information:

The Forest Resources Work Group provided the following report on process

information: “in an effort to narrow its focus on Forest assessments of stream corridors, the Forest Assessment Team decided to evaluate only the rivers that were identified in the River Corridor Protection Act. Based on US Geological Survey (USGS) river gauging stations, any perennial river or watercourse with an average annual flow of at least 400 cubic feet per second was identified and mapped on a 1:500,000 map up to the point where the flow was less than 400cfs [100K400CFS]. The team then used the DNR Wildlife Resources Division’s 1988-1990 Landcover of Georgia data base [LCCG]. In order to evaluate the forest cover in the corridors of the selected rivers, the following process was used: 1. Subsetted land cover database [LCCG] into 4 selected forest types (forested wetlands, bottom land hardwoods, mixed pine/hardwood, and coniferous). 2. Clipped the forest land cover data by selected river corridors with 400cfs [100K400CFS]. 3. Used polygons representing buffered river segments by HUC [HUC250] units and varying widths (1 mile each side in the mountains and Piedmont and 2 miles wide each side in the Coastal Plain.) 4. Established break points for % forest cover within polygons to create quality classes. (Superior, Outstanding, Significant, and Non-significant). 5. Classified each polygon in quality classes 6. Transferred to 1:500,000 scale map.[FoRWG] 7. Classifications modified with team’s knowledge. 8. Corrections transferred to 1:500,000 scale map. [FoRWG]”

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator:	River Assessment Team; Water Resources Work Group
2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date:	not published
2.5.1.1.8.4 Title:	Flood-Plain Resources
2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition:	not applicable
2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data	
Presentation Form:	map
2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name:	not applicable
2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information	
2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place:	not applicable
2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher:	not applicable
2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage:	none
2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator:	500,000
2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media:	paper
2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation:	WRWG3
2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:	

Prepared a map depicting floodplain resources to be input into the RCARE database as item floodcode.

2.5.2 Process Information:

The Water Resources Work Group provided the following report on process information: “For assessment of floodplain resources, the Water Resources Work Group used a paper map of river corridors lying downstream of the point at which the rivers attain an average annual discharge of 400 cfs [100K400CFS]. The map was produced by the Georgia Natural Heritage Program (scale unknown).

Individual segments were ranked using the methodology described in the Water Resources Work Group report [GRIA2](see Appendix II), using data on percent of wetlands [LCCG] which was also provided by the Georgia Natural Heritage Program. Ranked segments were delineated on the 1:500,000 scale paper map of the state of Georgia [GA500K]. The map was completed in April 1997. Gail Cowie, Institute of Community and Area Development, University of Georgia is the contact.”

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **River Assessment Team; Wildlife Resources Work Group**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **not published**

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Wildlife Resources**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form: **map**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **none**

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **500,000**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **paper**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **WiRWG**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Prepared a map depicting wildlife resources, to be input into the RCARE database as item wildcode

2.5.2 Process Information:

The Wildlife Resources Work Group provided the following report on process information: “A 1:500,000 scale map of Georgia [GA500K] was used as a base map. River segments to be evaluated were derived from a digital database on streams with flows greater than 400 cfs [100K400CFS], and these segments were delineated on a map generated by the Georgia Natural Heritage Program. Two additional streams were included in the assessment for purposes of geographic coverage. Methods employed in the river assessment are described in the Wildlife Resources Report [GRIA2]. The ranked segments were delineated as a color-coded map [WiRWG] and provided to the RiverCare 2000 GIS team in March 1997. Development of the map required approximately 10 person-hours. Jon Ambrose, Wildlife Resources Division, is the contact person for the Wildlife Resources Report.”

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **River Assessment Team; Cultural Resources Work Group**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **not published**
 2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Archeological Resources**
 2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **not applicable**
 2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data
 Presentation Form: **map**
 2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **not applicable**
 2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information
 2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **not applicable**
 2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **not applicable**
 2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **none**
 2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **500,000**
 2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **paper**
 2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **CRWG1**
 2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Prepared a map depicting archeological resources to be input into the RCARE database as item archcode

2.5.2 Process Information:

The Cultural Resources Work Group provided the following report on process information: “The Cultural Resources Assessment Team relied upon digitized data from the Georgia Archaeological Sites Files [ARCHUGA] at the Department of Anthropology at the University of Georgia in Athens. Locational data in these computerized files was digitized from paper USGS 1:24,000 quadrangle maps [24KTOPO]. For the River Care project, paper maps showing locational information at a 1" = 300,000 meter scale were produced (this was the largest map that could be produced by the Department of Anthropology's Atlas GIS system). These paper maps were converted to transparencies and projected onto a 1:500,000 statewide paper map [GA500K]. This map was completed in April 1997. This required about 32 work hours to complete. Richard Cloues, Historic Preservation Division, Department of Natural Resources, is the contact person.”

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation
 2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **Alhadeff, S. Jack**
 2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **1996**
 2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **County Boundaries of Georgia**
 2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **1.0**
 2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data
 Presentation Form: **database**
 2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **Digital Data Series**
 2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information
 2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **Atlanta, Ga.**
 2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **U. S. Geological Survey**
 2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage:
<http://csat.gatech.edu/csat/statewide/statewide.html>
 2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **100,000**
 2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **online**
 2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **USGSCO**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Used as a backcover in ArcEdit for visual orientation when adding ARCHCODE features from paper map to archpt coverage, used in preparing the Archeologic Resources map [CRWG1].

2.5.2 Process Information: **see online documentation**

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **River Assessment Team; Fisheries Resources Work Group**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **not published**

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Fisheries**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form: **map**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **none**

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **500,000**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **paper**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **FiRWG2**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Prepared a map depicting fishery resources to be input into the RCARE database as item fishcode.

2.5.2 Process Information:

The Fisheries Resources Work Group provided the following report on process information. “ The fisheries work group used the map of GA HUC boundaries [HUC500] to define the reaches evaluated for the recreational and commercial fisheries reaches. The rankings were delineated on a 1:500,000 scale paper map of the State of Georgia [GA500K]. The map was completed in April 1997. Byron J. Freeman is the contact person.”

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **River Assessment Team; Fisheries Resources Work Group**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **not published**

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Ecologically Important Fish Resources**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form: **map**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **not applicable**
2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **none**
2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **500,000**
2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **paper**
2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **FiRWG1**
2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Prepared a map depicting ecologically important fish resources to be input into the RCARE database as item ecfishcode

2.5.2 Process Information:

The Fisheries Resource Work Group provided the following report on process information: “The fisheries work group used the delineated 400CFS stream map [500K400CFS], provided by GDNR, for the Ecologically Important Stream Reaches. The rankings were delineated on a 1:500,000 scale paper map [GA500K] of the State of Georgia. The map was completed in April 1997. Byron J. Freeman is the contact person. Data sources used included digital databases [UGAFISH] maintained by the UGA Museum of Natural History on the distribution of fishes in Georgia, unpublished field notes and various data [FREEMAN] belonging to Dr. B. J. Freeman at the UGA Institute of Ecology and Museum of Natural History, Water Resources for Georgia (USGS) [USGSWRG], and questionnaires completed by fishery professionals (see committee report)[GRIA2]”.

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **USGS**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **varies**

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **varies**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **varies**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form: **map**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **30 x 60 Minute Series 1:100,000-Scale Topographic Maps**

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **Reston, VA.**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **U. S. Geological Survey**

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **none**

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **100,000**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **paper**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **100KTOPO**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Provided data used by the Geologic Resources Work Group in producing the Geologic Resources map [GRWG]. Used as basemaps on which the Botanical Resources Work Group delineated the Botanical Resources map [BRWG].

2.5.2 Process Information: **see publisher**

2.5.1 Source Information

- 2.5.1.1 Source Citation
- 2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **United States Department of the Interior, Geological Survey**
 - 2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **1970**
 - 2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **State of Georgia**
 - 2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **Edition of 1970**
 - 2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data
 - Presentation Form: **map**
 - 2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **unknown**
 - 2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information
 - 2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **Washington, D.C.**
 - 2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **U. S. Geological Survey**
 - 2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **unknown**
 - 2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **500,000**
 - 2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **paper**
 - 2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **GA500K**
 - 2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Used as a basemap on which the various Work Groups delineated geological resources [GRWG], economic resources [EcRWG], recreational boating resources [RRWG], scenic resources [SRWG], educational resources [EdWRG], cultural historic resources [CRWG2], water quality [WQWG], flood-plain resources [WRWG3], wildlife resources [WiWRG], archeological resources [CRWG1], fisheries resources [FiRWG2], and ecologically important fish resources [FiRWG1].
- 2.5.2 Process Information: **see publisher**
-

2.5.1 Source Information

- 2.5.1.1 Source Citation
- 2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Division**
 - 2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **not published**
 - 2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Surface Water Intakes; permits issued and other data**
 - 2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **1996**
 - 2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data
 - Presentation Form: **unknown**
 - 2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **not applicable**
 - 2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information
 - 2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **not applicable**
 - 2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **not applicable**
 - 2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **none**
 - 2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **unknown**
 - 2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **unknown**
 - 2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **GDNRSWIP**
 - 2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Provided data used by the Economic Resources Work Group in preparing the Economic Resources map [EcWRG].

2.5.2 Process Information: **unknown**

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **Georgia Department of Natural Resources
Environmental Protection Division**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **not published**

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Wastewater Treatment Plants; permits issued
and other data**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **1996**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data
Presentation Form: **unknown**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **none**

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **unknown**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **unknown**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **GDNRWTPP**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

**Provided data used by the Economic Resources Work Group in preparing the
Economic Resources map [EcWRG].**

2.5.2 Process Information: **unknown**

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **Georgia Ports Authority**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **not published**

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Waterborne Commerce Statistics**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **1997**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data
Presentation Form: **unknown**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **unknown**

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **none**

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **unknown**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **unknown**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **GPAWCS**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

**Provided data used by the Economic Resources Work Group in preparing the
Economic Resources map [EcWRG].**

2.5.2 Process Information: **unknown**

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **U. S. Geological Survey**
2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **1974**
2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Hydrologic Unit Map - 1974, State of Georgia**
2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **1988 reprint**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form: **map**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **unknown**

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **Reston, VA.**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **U. S. Geological Survey**

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **none**

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **500,000**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **paper**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **HUC500**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Used as a basemap on which the Agricultural Resources Work Group delineated agricultural resources [ARWG]. Provided data used by the Fisheries Resources Work Group in preparing the Fisheries Resources map [FiRWG2].

2.5.2 Process Information: **see publisher**

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **Allan Hallum, Study Manager
Chief, Water Protection Branch
Environmental Protection Division
Georgia Department of Natural Resources**
2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **1998**
2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Georgia Rivers: An Initial Assessment. Volume One.**
2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **Georgia Rivers: An Initial Assessment**

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **Atlanta, Georgia**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **Georgia Department of Natural Resources**

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **<http://www.dnr.state.ga.us>**

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **not applicable**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **paper**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **GRIA**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Report describes data quality information for the RiverCare themes.

2.5.2 Process Information: **see publisher**

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **USGS**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **varies**

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **varies**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **varies**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form: **map**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **7.5 Minute Series 1:24,000-Scale Topographic Maps**

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **Reston, VA.**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **U. S. Geological Survey**

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **none**

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **24,000**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **paper**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **24KTOPO**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Provided data used by the Scenic Resources Work Group in preparing the Scenic Resources map [SRWG]. Used as basemaps on which the Cultural Resources Work Group delineated archeological resources in detail before transferring the delineations to the more generalized Archeological Resources map [CRWG1].

2.5.2 Process Information: **see publisher**

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **National Aerial Photography Program**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **1988**

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Color Infrared Aerial Photographs**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **1988**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form: **photo**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **unknown**

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **Sioux Falls, South Dakota**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **EROS Data Center, U.S. Geological Survey, U.S. Department of the Interior**

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **unknown**

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **40,000**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **photographs**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **IRPHOTO**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Provided data used by the Scenic Resources Work Group in preparing the Scenic Resources map [SWRG].

2.5.2 Process Information:

The originator provided no report on process information.

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **Sehlinger, Bob, and Otey, Don**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **1980**

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Northern Georgia Canoeing**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **unknown**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form: **maps**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **Hillsborough, North Carolina**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **Menasha Ridge Press**

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **unknown**

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **varies**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **paper**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **OTSEH1**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Provided data used by the Scenic Resources Work Group in preparing the Scenic Resources map [SWRG].

2.5.2 Process Information:

See publisher.

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **Sehlinger, Bob, and Otey, Don**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **1980**

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Southern Georgia Canoeing**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **unknown**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form: **maps**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **Birmingham, Alabama**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **Menasha Ridge Press**

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **unknown**

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **varies**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **paper**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **OTSEH2**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Provided data used by the Scenic Resources Work Group in preparing the Scenic Resources map [SWRG].

2.5.2 Process Information:

See publisher.

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **Georgia Department of Transportation**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **varies**

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **varies**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **varies**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form: **map**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **General Highway Map**

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **Atlanta, Ga.**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **Georgia Department of Transportation**

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **none**

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **varies, mostly 63,360**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **paper**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **DOTCO**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Provided data used by the Cultural Resources Work Group in preparing the Cultural Historic Resources map [CWRG2].

2.5.2 Process Information: **see publisher**

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Historic Preservation Division.**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **not published**

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Georgia Historic Resources Survey**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **unknown**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form: **maps**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **unknown**

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **not published**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **not published**

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **none**

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **varies**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **paper**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **GDNRGHS**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Provided data used by the Cultural Resources Work Group in preparing the Cultural Historic Resources map [CWRG2].

2.5.2 Process Information:

The Cultural Resources Work Group provided the following report: “The Cultural Resources Assessment Team relied upon data from several standard structural survey and inventory files (see below for details). These files contain locational information on two different sets of maps: 1:24,000 USGS

quadrangle maps [24KTOPO] (for approximately half the state), and DOT county highway maps [DOTCO] at scales of 1" = 1 mile or 1" = 2 miles (for approximately half the state). ”

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Historic Preservation Division.**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **not published**

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **State-Owned Buildings Survey**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **unknown**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form: **maps**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **unknown**

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **not published**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **not published**

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **none**

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **varies**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **paper**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **GDNRSOBS**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Provided data used by the Cultural Resources Work Group in preparing the Cultural Historic Resources map [CWRG2].

2.5.2 Process Information:

The Cultural Resources Work Group provided the following report: “ the Cultural Resources Assessment Team relied upon data from several standard structural survey and inventory files (see below for details). These files contain locational information on two different sets of maps: 1:24,000 USGS quadrangle maps [24KTOPO] (for approximately half the state), and DOT county highway maps [DOTCO] at scales of 1" = 1 mile or 1" = 2 miles (for approximately half the state).”

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Historic Preservation Division.**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **not published**

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **National Register of Historic Places Files**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **unknown**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form: **maps**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **unknown**

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **not published**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **not published**

- 2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **none**
- 2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **varies**
- 2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **paper**
- 2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **GDNRRHP**
- 2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Provided data used by the Cultural Resources Work Group in preparing the Cultural Historic Resources map [CWRG2].

2.5.2 Process Information:

The Cultural Resources Work Group provided the following report: “ The Cultural Resources Assessment Team relied upon data from several standard structural survey and inventory files (see below for details). These files contain locational information on two different sets of maps: 1:24.000 USGS quadrangle maps [24KTOPO] (for approximately half the state), and DOT county highway maps [DOTCO] at scales of 1" = 1 mile or 1" = 2 miles (for approximately half the state). ”

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Historic Preservation Division.**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **not published**

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **National Historic Landmarks Files**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **unknown**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form: **maps**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **unknown**

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **not published**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **not published**

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **none**

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **varies**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **paper**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **GDNRNHL**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Provided data used by the Cultural Resources Work Group in preparing the Cultural Historic Resources map [CWRG2].

2.5.2 Process Information:

The Cultural Resources Work Group provided the following report: “ The Cultural Resources Assessment Team relied upon data from several standard structural survey and inventory files (see below for details). These files contain locational information on two different sets of maps: 1:24.000 USGS quadrangle maps [24KTOPO] (for approximately half the state), and DOT county highway maps [DOTCO] at scales of 1" = 1 mile or 1" = 2 miles (for approximately half the state). ”

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **Georgia Secretary of State**
2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **November 6, 1996**
2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Rules of Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Division, Chapter 391-3-6, Water Quality Control**
2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **November 6, 1996**
2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data
Presentation Form: **paper text**
2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **unknown**
2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information
2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **Atlanta**
2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **Office of the Secretary of State**
2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage:

<http://www.georgianet.org/dnr/environ/rules/>

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **not applicable**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **paper**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **GDNRWQC**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Contains listing of trout streams in Georgia, 391-3-6-.03(14), contains listing of specific water use classifications for rivers in Georgia, 391-3-6-.03(13), data used by the Water Quality Work Group to assign values to the Water Quality Resources Map [WQWG].

2.5.2 Process Information: **see publisher**

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **US Geological Survey**
2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **unknown**
2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **1:100,000 Series Digital Line Graph (DLG) Data, Transportation and Hydrography**
2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **unknown**
2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data
Presentation Form: **machine readable files**
2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **US Geodata**
2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information
2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **Reston, Virginia**
2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **U.S. Geological Survey**
2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage:

<http://edcftp.cr.usgs.gov/pub/data/100K/>

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **100,000**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **CDROM**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **USGSDLG**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Used by Center for Remote Sensing and Mapping Science as a base map to develop trout stream coverage tstream [CRSMSTS].

2.5.2 Process Information: **see online documentation.**

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **U.S. Geological Survey**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **1996**

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Elevation of Georgia**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **1.0**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form: **GIS database**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **Digital Data Series**

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **Atlanta, GA**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **U.S. Geological Survey**

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage:

<http://csat.gatech.edu/csat/statewide/statewide.html>

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **250,000**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **on-line**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **DEM250K**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Provided data used by the Water Resources Work Group to develop the water supply resources map [WRWG1].

2.5.2 Process Information: **see online documentation.**

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **USGS**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **1983**

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Storage Requirements for Georgia Streams**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **Open File Report 82-557**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form: **paper tables**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **unknown**

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **Atlanta, Georgia**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **U.S. Geological Survey**

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **none**

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator:

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **paper**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **Carter1983**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Provided data used by the Water Resources Work Group to rank water supply resources for the water supply resources map [WRWG1].

2.5.2 Process Information: **see publisher**

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator:

**Allan Hallum, Study Manager
Chief, Water Protection Branch
Environmental Protection Division
Georgia Department of Natural Resources**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date:

unpublished

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title:

**Georgia Rivers: An Initial Assessment.
Volume 2**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition:

not applicable

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form:

not applicable

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name:

Georgia Rivers: An Initial Assessment

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place:

not applicable

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher:

not applicable

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage:

none

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator:

not applicable

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media:

paper

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation:

GRIA2

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Contains the Water Resources Work Group Report, the Wildlife Resources Work Group Report, the Fisheries Work Group Report. Describes data quality information for RiverCare resource themes.

2.5.2 Process Information: **see originator**

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator:

Musser, Jonathan

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date:

1996

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title:

**River Corridors With Mean Annual Flow
Greater Than 400 CFS**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition:

1.0

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form:

GIS database

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name:

Digital Data Series

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place:

Atlanta, Ga.

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher:

U. S. Geological Survey

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage:

<http://csat.gatech.edu/csate/statewide/statewide.html>

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator:

100,000

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media:

online

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation:

100K400CFS

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Provided data used by the various Work Groups in preparing the Forest Resources map [FoRWG], the Wildlife Resources map [WiRWG], the Flood-

Plain Resources map [WRWG2].

2.5.2 Process Information: **see online documentation**

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

- 2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **Georgia Natural Heritage Program,
Wildlife Resources Division,
Georgia Department of Natural Resources**
- 2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **1995, 1996**
- 2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Landcover Classification of Georgia, 1988-1990**
- 2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **2.0**
- 2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data
Presentation Form: **GIS database**
- 2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **Digital Data Series**
- 2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information
- 2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **Atlanta**
- 2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **U. S. Geological Survey**
- 2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage:
<http://csat.gatech.edu/csat/statewide/statewide.html>
- 2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **100000**
- 2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **machine readable files**
- 2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **LCCG**
- 2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Provided data used by the Forest Resources Work Group in preparing the Forest Resources map [FoRWG]. Provided data used by the Water Resources Work Group in preparing the Flood-Plain Resources map [WRWG3].

2.5.2 Process Information: **See online documentation.**

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

- 2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **University of Georgia, Department of Anthropology**
- 2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **not published**
- 2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Georgia Archeological Site Files**
- 2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **unknown**
- 2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data
Presentation Form: **database**
- 2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **unknown**
- 2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information
- 2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **not published**
- 2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **not published**
- 2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **none**
- 2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **unknown**
- 2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **machine readable files**
- 2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **ARCHUGA**
- 2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Provided data used by the Cultural Resources Work Group used in preparing the Archeological Resources map [CRWG1].

2.5.2 Process Information:

The Cultural Resources Work Group provided the following report: “Locational data in these files was digitized from paper USGS 1:24,000 [24KTOPO] quadrangle maps.”

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **Stamey, Mike C.**
2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **not published**
2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Streams with Discharge >= 400CFS**
2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **1991**
2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data
Presentation Form: **map**
2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **not applicable**
2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information
2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **not published**
2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **not published**
2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **none**
2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **500000**
2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **paper**
2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **500K400CFS**
2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Provided data used by the Fisheries Resources Work Group in preparing the Ecologically Important Fish Resources map [FiRWG1].

2.5.2 Process Information:

The Fisheries Resources Work Group provided no report on process information.

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **University of Georgia, Museum of Natural History, Athens**
2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **not published**
2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Database of Distribution of Ichthyological Collections**
2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **unknown**
2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data
Presentation Form: **digital database**
2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **unknown**
2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information
2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **not published**
2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **not published**
2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **unknown**
2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **unknown**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **machine readable files**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **UGAFISH**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Provided data used by the Fisheries Resources Work Group in preparing the Ecologically Important Fish Resources map [FiRWG1].

2.5.2 Process Information:

The Fisheries Resources Work Group provided no report on process information.

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **Freeman, Byron J.**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **not published**

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Field Notes and Various Data**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **unknown**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form: **files**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **not applicable**

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **not published**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **not published**

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **none**

2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **unknown**

2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **paper**

2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **FREEMAN**

2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Provided data used by the Fisheries Resources Work Group in preparing the Ecologically Important Fish Resources map [FiRWG1].

2.5.2 Process Information:

The Fisheries Resources Work Group provided no report on process information.

2.5.1 Source Information

2.5.1.1 Source Citation

2.5.1.1.8.1 Originator: **Stokes, W.R. and McFarlane, R.D.**

2.5.1.1.8.2 Publication Date: **1996**

2.5.1.1.8.4 Title: **Water Resources Data for Georgia Water Year 1996. GA-96-1**

2.5.1.1.8.5 Edition: **1996**

2.5.1.1.8.6 Geospatial Data

Presentation Form: **table**

2.5.1.1.8.7 Series Name: **Water Resources Division Report**

2.5.1.1.8.8 Publication Information

2.5.1.1.8.8.1 Publication Place: **Atlanta, Georgia**

2.5.1.1.8.8.2 Publisher: **U.S. Geological Survey, Water Resources Division**

2.5.1.1.8.10 Online Linkage: **unknown**
2.5.1.2 Source Scale Denominator: **not applicable**
2.5.1.3 Type of Source Media: **paper**
2.5.1.5 Source Citation Abbreviation: **USGSWRG**
2.5.1.6 Source Contribution:

Provided data used by the Fisheries Resources Work Group in preparing the Ecologically Important Fish Resources map [FiRWG1].

2.5.2 Process Information:

The Fisheries Resources Work Group provided no report on process information.

3.0 Spatial Data Organization Information:

3.1 Indirect Spatial Reference Method: **river basin, river name**

3.2 Direct Spatial Reference Method: **vector**

3.3 Point and Vector Object Information

3.3.1 SDTS Terms Description:

3.3.1.1 Object Type: **complete chain**

3.3.1.2 Object Count: **38,863**

4.0 Spatial Reference Information:

4.1 Horizontal Coordinate System Definition:

4.1.2 Planar:

4.1.2.1 Map Projection:

4.1.2.1.1 Map Projection Name: **Albers Conical Equal Area**

4.1.2.1.2 Standard Parallel: **29 30 00**

4.1.2.1.2.1 Standard Parallel: **45 30 00**

4.1.2.1.2.2 Longitude of Central Meridian: **-83 30 00**

4.1.2.1.2.3 Latitude of Projection Origin: **23 00 00**

4.1.2.1.2.4 False Easting: **0**

4.1.2.1.2.5 False Northing: **0**

4.1.2.4 Planar Coordinate Information:

4.1.2.4.1 Planar Coordinate Encoding Method: **coordinate pair**

4.1.2.4.4 Planar Distance Units: **meters**

4.1.4 Geodetic Model

4.1.4.1 Horizontal Datum Name: **North American Datum of 1927 (NAD27)**

4.1.4.2 Ellipsoid Name: **Clarke 1866**

4.1.4.3 Semi-major Axis: **6378206.4**

4.1.4.4 Denominator of Flattening Ratio: **294.9786982**

5.0 Entity and Attribute Information:

5.1 Detailed Description

5.1.1 Entity Type

- 5.1.1.1 Entity Type Label: **rcare.aat**
- 5.1.1.2 Entity Type Definition: **arc attribute table**

5.1.2 Attribute

- 5.1.2.1 Attribute Label: **FNODE#**
- 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **Internal node number for the beginning of an arc (from-node)**

5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source:

Understanding GIS - The Arc/Info Method, by ESRI, pg. 5-9

- 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **Binary number, assigned by software**

5.1.2 Attribute

- 5.1.2.1 Attribute Label: **TNODE#**
- 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **Internal node number for the end of an arc (to-node)**

5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source:

Understanding GIS - The Arc/Info Method, by ESRI, pg. 5-9

- 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **Binary number, assigned by software**

5.1.2 Attribute

- 5.1.2.1 Attribute Label: **LPOLY#**
- 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **Internal number for the left polygon**
- 5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source: **Understanding GIS - The Arc/Info Method, by ESRI, pg. 5-9**

- 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **Binary Number, assigned by software**

5.1.2 Attribute

- 5.1.2.1 Attribute Label: **RPOLY#**
- 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **Internal number for the right polygon**
- 5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source: **Understanding GIS - The Arc/Info Method, by ESRI, pg. 5-9**

- 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **Binary Number, assigned by software**

5.1.2 Attribute

- 5.1.2.1 Attribute Label: **LENGTH**
- 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **Length of each arc, measured in coverage units**
- 5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source: **Understanding GIS - The Arc/Info Method, by ESRI, pg. 5-9**

- 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **Floating point number, calculated by software**

5.1.2 Attribute

- 5.1.2.1 Attribute Label: **RCARE#**
- 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **Internal arc number (values assigned by Arc/Info)**
- 5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source: **Understanding GIS - The Arc/Info Method, by ESRI, pg. 5-9**

- 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **Binary Number, assigned by software**

5.1.2 Attribute

- 5.1.2.1 Attribute Label: **RCARE-ID**
- 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **User-ID (values assigned by the user)**
- 5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source: **Understanding GIS - The Arc/Info Method, by ESRI, pg. 5-9**

- 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **Binary Number**

5.1.2 Attribute

- 5.1.2.1 Attribute Label **AGCODE**
- 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **agricultural resources**
- 5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source: **ARWG**
- 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **1 Character Alpha-Numeric**
 - 5.1.2.4.1 Enumerated Domain
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **y**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **significant**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **g**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **superior**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **b**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **outstanding**

5.1.2 Attribute

- 5.1.2.1 Attribute Label **ARCHCODE**
- 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **cultural resources - archeological**
- 5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source: **CRWG1**
- 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **1 Character Alpha-Numeric**
 - 5.1.2.4.1 Enumerated Domain
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **y**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **significant**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **g**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **superior**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **b**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **outstanding**

5.1.2 Attribute

- 5.1.2.1 Attribute Label **BOATCODE**
- 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **recreational boating resources**
- 5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source: **RRWG**
- 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **1 Character Alpha-Numeric**
 - 5.1.2.4.1 Enumerated Domain
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **y**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **significant**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **g**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **superior**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **b**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **outstanding**

5.1.2 Attribute

- 5.1.2.1 Attribute Label **BOTCODE**
- 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **botanical resources**
- 5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source: **BRWG**
- 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **1 Character Alpha-Numeric**
 - 5.1.2.4.1 Enumerated Domain
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **y**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **significant**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **g**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **superior**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **b**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **outstanding**

5.1.2 Attribute

- 5.1.2.1 Attribute Label **CULTCODE**
- 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **cultural resources - historic structures**
- 5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source: **CRWG2**
- 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **1 Character Alpha-Numeric**
 - 5.1.2.4.1 Enumerated Domain
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **y**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **significant**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **g**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **superior**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **b**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **outstanding**

5.1.2 Attribute

- 5.1.2.1 Attribute Label **ECONCODE**
- 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **economic resources**
- 5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source: **EcRWG**
- 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **1 Character Alpha-Numeric**
 - 5.1.2.4.1 Enumerated Domain
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **y**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **significant**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **g**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **superior**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **b**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **outstanding**

5.1.2 Attribute

- 5.1.2.1 Attribute Label **FISHCODE**
- 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **fish resources - recreational and commercial**
- 5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source: **FiRWG2**
- 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **1 Character Alpha-Numeric**
 - 5.1.2.4.1 Enumerated Domain
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **y**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **significant**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **g**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **superior**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **b**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **outstanding**

5.1.2 Attribute

- 5.1.2.1 Attribute Label **ECFISHCODE**
- 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **fish resources - ecologically important**
- 5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source: **FiRWG**
- 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **1 Character Alpha-Numeric**
 - 5.1.2.4.1 Enumerated Domain
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **y**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **significant**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **g**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **superior**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **b**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **outstanding**

5.1.2 Attribute

- 5.1.2.1 Attribute Label **FLOODCODE**
- 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **flood-plain resources**
- 5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source: **WRWG3**
- 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **1 Character Alpha-Numeric**
 - 5.1.2.4.1 Enumerated Domain
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **y**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **significant**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **g**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **superior**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **b**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **outstanding**

5.1.2 Attribute

- 5.1.2.1 Attribute Label **FORCODE**
- 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **forest resources**
- 5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source: **FoRWG**
- 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **1 Character Alpha-Numeric**
 - 5.1.2.4.1 Enumerated Domain
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **y**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **significant**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **g**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **superior**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **b**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **outstanding**

5.1.2 Attribute

- 5.1.2.1 Attribute Label **GEOLCODE**
- 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **geological resources**
- 5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source: **GRWG**
- 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **1 Character Alpha-Numeric**
 - 5.1.2.4.1 Enumerated Domain
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **y**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **significant**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **g**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **superior**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **b**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **outstanding**

5.1.2 Attribute

- 5.1.2.1 Attribute Label **SCENCODE**
- 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **scenic resources**
- 5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source:
- 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **1 Character Alpha-Numeric**
 - 5.1.2.4.1 Enumerated Domain
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **y**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **significant**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **g**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **superior**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **b**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **outstanding**

5.1.2 Attribute

- 5.1.2.1 Attribute Label **WILDCODE**
- 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **wildlife resources**
- 5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source:
- 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **1 Character Alpha-Numeric**
 - 5.1.2.4.1 Enumerated Domain
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **y**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **significant**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **g**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **superior**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **b**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **outstanding**

5.1.2 Attribute

- 5.1.2.1 Attribute Label **WQCODE**
- 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **water quality resources**
- 5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source:
- 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **1 Character Alpha-Numeric**
 - 5.1.2.4.1 Enumerated Domain
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **y**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **significant**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **g**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **superior**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **b**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **outstanding**

5.1.2 Attribute

- 5.1.2.1 Attribute Label **WRESCODE**
- 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **water supply resources**
- 5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source:
- 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **1 Character Alpha-Numeric**
 - 5.1.2.4.1 Enumerated Domain
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **y**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **significant**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **g**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **superior**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **b**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **outstanding**

5.1.2 Attribute

- 5.1.2.1 Attribute Label **EPDBASIN**
- 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **Major River Basin as designated by Georgia Department of Natural Resources**
- 5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source: **Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Division 1995**
- 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **15 Character Alpha-Numeric**
 - 5.1.2.4.1 Enumerated Domain
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **ALTAMAHA**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **CHATTAHOOCHEE**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **COOSA**
 - 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **FLINT**

5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **OCHLOCKONEE**
 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **OCMULGEE**
 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **OCONEE**
 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **OGEECHEE**
 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **SAINT_MARYS**
 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **SATILLA**
 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **SAVANNAH**
 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **SUWANNEE**
 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **TALLAPOOSA**
 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **TENNESSEE**

5.1.2 Attribute

5.1.2.1 Attribute Label **PNAME**
 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **Primary name of the stream or river.**
 5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source: **REACH**
 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **30 Character Alpha-Numeric**

5.1.2 Attribute

5.1.2.1 Attribute Label **HUC**
 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **Hydrologic Unit ID**
 5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source: **HUC250**
 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **8 Character Alpha-Numeric**

5.1.2 Attribute

5.1.2.1 Attribute Label **MAJRIVNAME**
 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **Name of Hydrologic Cataloging Units, which is the name of the major river which runs through a particular river basin.**
 5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source: **HUC250, GSB**
 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **30 Character Alpha-Numeric**

5.1.2 Attribute

5.1.2.1 Attribute Label **CNTYFIPS**
 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **Federal Information Processing System (FIPS) standard county code.**
 5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source: **GSBCO**
 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **3 Character Number, odd numbers only, with leading zeros, from 001 through 321**

5.1.2 Attribute

5.1.2.1 Attribute Label **DEVELOP**
 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **developed segments**
 5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source: **RiverCare Assessment Team**
 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **2 Character Alpha-Numeric**
 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **dy**
 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **river segment contains any combination of the following attribute values: ECONCODE='g'; and/or AGCODE='g'; and/or FORCODE='g'; and/or WQCODE='y'; and/or WRESCODE='g'**
 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **dn**
 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: **any river segment which does not meet the 'dy' criteria.**

5.1.2 Attribute

- 5.1.2.1 Attribute Label: **RECEDU**
- 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **recreational and educational segments**
- 5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source: **River Assessment Team**
- 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **2 Character Alpha-Numeric**

- 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **ry**
- 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition:
**river segment contains any combination of the following attribute values:
ARCHCODE='g'; and/or FISHCODE='g'; and/or GEOLCODE='g';
and/or CULTCODE='g'; and/or BOATCODE='g'; and/or
SCENCODE='g'; and/or WQCODE='b'**
- 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **rn**
- 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition:
any river segment that does not meet the 'ry' criteria.

5.1.2 Attribute

- 5.1.2.1 Attribute Label: **NATURAL**
- 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **natural segments**
- 5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source: **River Assessment Team**
- 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **2 Character Alpha-Numeric**

- 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **ny**
- 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition:
**river segment contains any combination of the following attribute values:
WQCODE='g'; and/or FLOODCODE='g'; and/or ECFISHCODE='g';
and/or WILDCODE='g'; and/or BOTCODE='g'**
- 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **nn**
- 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition:
any river segment that does not meet the 'ny' criteria.

5.1.2 Attribute

- 5.1.2.1 Attribute Label: **DEVREC**
- 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **developed AND recreational, educational segments**
- 5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source: **River Assessment Team**
- 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **3 Character Alpha-Numeric**

- 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **dry**
- 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition:
**river segment meets the following criteria: DEVELOP='dy' AND
RECEDU = 'ry'**
- 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **dnn**
- 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition:
any river segment that does not meet the 'dry' criteria.

5.1.2 Attribute

- 5.1.2.1 Attribute Label: **DEVNAT**
- 5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **developed AND natural segments**
- 5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source: **River Assessment Team**
- 5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **3 Character Alpha-Numeric**

- 5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **dny**
- 5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition:
river segment meets the following criteria: DEVELOP = 'dy' AND

NATURAL = 'ny'

5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **dnn**

5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition:

any river segment that does not meet the 'dny' criteria.

5.1.2 Attribute

5.1.2.1 Attribute Label **REC NAT**

5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **recreation, education AND natural segments**

5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source: **River Assessment Team**

5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **3 Character Alpha-Numeric**

5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **rny**

5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition:

river segment meets the following criteria: RECEDU = 'ry' AND NATURAL = 'ny'

5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **nn**

5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition:

any river segment that does not meet the 'rny' criteria.

5.1.2 Attribute

5.1.2.1 Attribute Label **HARV CAT**

5.1.2.2 Attribute Definition: **composite resource classes**

5.1.2.3 Attribute Definition Source: **River Assessment Team**

5.1.2.4 Attribute Domain Values: **1 Character Alpha-Numeric**

5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **'1'**

5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition:

river segment meets the following criteria: NATURAL = 'ny' AND DEVELOP = 'dn' AND RECEDU = 'rn'

5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **'2'**

5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition:

river segment meets the following criteria: RECEDU = 'ry' AND DEVELOP = 'dn' AND NATURAL = 'nn'

5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **'3'**

5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition:

river segment meets the following criteria: DEVELOP = 'dy' AND RECEDU = 'rn' AND NATURAL = 'nn'

5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **'4'**

5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition:

river segment meets the following criteria: RECEDU = 'ry' AND NATURAL = 'ny' AND DEVELOP = 'dn'

5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **'5'**

5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition:

river segment meets the following criteria: DEVELOP = 'dy' AND NATURAL = 'ny' AND RECEDU = 'rn'

5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **'6'**

5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition:

river segment meets the following criteria: DEVELOP = 'dy' AND RECEDU = 'ry' AND NATURAL = 'nn'

5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **'7'**

5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition:

river segment meets the following criteria: DEVELOP = 'dy' AND

NATURAL = 'ny' AND RECEDU = 'ry'
5.1.2.4.1.1 Enumerated Domain Value: **'8'**
5.1.2.4.1.2 Enumerated Domain Value Definition:
**river segment meets the following criteria: DEVELOP = 'dn' AND
NATURAL = 'nn' AND RECEDU = 'rn'**

6.0 Distribution Information:

6.1 Distributor: **See Point of Contact, 1.9**

6.2 Resource Description: **DOCUMENTATION REPORT 98-25**

6.3 Distribution Liability: **Users must assume responsibility to evaluate the usability of this data for their purposes.**

6.4 Standard Ordering Process: **Contact the Geologic Survey Branch, see 1.9**

6.5 Custom Order Process: **Contact the Geologic Survey Branch, see 1.9**

7.0 Metadata Reference Information:

7.1 Metadata Date: **11/98**

7.2 Metadata Review Date: **See Part A, Appendix A: Signatures**

7.4 Metadata Contact:

- 7.4.10.1.1 Contact Person: **Elizabeth Cheney**
- 7.4.10.1.2 Contact Organization: **Geologic Survey Branch**
- 7.4.10.3 Contact Position: **Environmental Specialist**
- 7.4.10.4 Contact Address
 - 7.4.10.4.2 Address: **19 Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive, SW**
 - 7.4.10.4.2 Address: **Rm 400**
 - 7.4.10.4.3 City: **Atlanta**
 - 7.4.10.4.4 State: **Georgia**
 - 7.4.10.4.5 Postal Code: **30334-9004**
 - 7.4.10.4.6 Country: **USA**
- 7.4.10.5 Contact Voice Telephone: **(404) 656-3214**
- 7.4.10.7 Contact Facsimile Telephone: **(404) 657-8379**
- 7.4.10.8 Contact Electronic Mail Address: **echeney@mail.dnr.state.ga.us**
- 7.4.10.9 Hours of Service: **8:30 - 4 EST**

7.5 Metadata Standard Name: **FGDC Content Standards for Digital Geospatial Metadata**

7.6 Metadata Standard Version: **6/8/94**

**PART C. THE DIGITAL FILES CONTAINING THE GIS DATABASE:
RIVERCARE 2000
RESOURCE ASSESSMENT THEMES
FOR GEORGIA RIVERS**

SUMMARY OF THE CONTENTS OF THE DIGITAL FILES OF PART C

The digital files are written on the enclosed 5 diskettes. The files have been compressed into a single zip file named rcarez.zip. Use Pkzip, Winzip, or similar program to extract the files:

1. READ.ME - an ascii file which is a digital copy of this summary.
2. DR9825.ASC - an ascii file which is a digital copy of this publication.
3. DR9825.WPD - a WordPerfect 6.0 file which is a digital copy of this publication.
4. rcare.e00 - a 32,354 KB file which contains the GIS database in Arc/Info export format