

**NSDI Cooperative Agreements Program
Final Project Report 04HQAG0151
07/10/07**

Agreement Number: 04HQAG0151

Organization:

The Nature Conservancy in Alaska
715 L Street, Suite 100
Anchorage, AK 99501

Website: <http://nature.org/wherewework/northamerica/states/alaska/>

Collaborating Organizations:

The Nature Conservancy, Rocky Mountain Division, Tyrone Guthrie
Nature Serve, Lynn Kutner

Project Leader:

Corinne Smith
(907) 276-3133 x 121
(907) 276-2584 fax
corinne_smith@tnc.org

1. Number of Metadata files created as a result of this project: 36

1. Previously proposed priority areas

Recommended Ecological Sites in Yukon and Northwest Territories
Potential Natural Landmarks in Arctic Lowland
Ecological Sites in Northern Canada, by Nettleship and Smith
Conservation Sites Selected by TNC and Alaska Natural Heritage Program
Proposal for an Ecological Reserve System
Proposed Ecological Reserve System for Taiga & Tundra
Proposed Freshwater Reserves
Proposed Geological and Ecological Natural Landmarks

2. Alaska Habitat Management Guides (species distribution & concentration areas)

Caribou statewide (1 geodatabase & 7 shapes)
Bear statewide (1 geodatabase & 7 shapes)
Freshwater fish southwest Alaska (4 shapefiles)
Moose southwest Alaska (3 coverages)
Beaver southwest Alaska (1 coverage)
Bear southwest Alaska (1 coverage)

3. Human Activities Assessment

4. Statewide Land Management and Conservation Status

5. Conservation Blueprint for Alaska – Areas of Biological Significance

2. Clearinghouse address: <http://agdc.usgs.gov>

NSDI Cooperative Agreements Program
Final Project Report 04HQAG0151
07/10/07

3. Training Assistance:

Number of individuals that received training: 4

Is metadata documentation and creation a part of your organization's workflow?

With this grant, we have improved our ability to create metadata in several ways. First, we received training at a workshop by the Rocky Mountain Division of The Nature Conservancy and NatureServe (funded in part by an NSDI Cooperative Agreement). Second, we developed a template to aid in starting all metadata for our datasets. The template includes some typical language, contact information, and suggestions for how to fill out some of the mandatory fields. Third, we wrote an in-house guide for metadata. Fourth, and most important, the grant gave us the opportunity to actually write metadata. That practice took some of the mystery out of creating metadata and helped us to learn some valuable tricks in streamlining the process.

4. and 5. NA

6. Project Narrative

The grant helped us to hire an intern to create some statewide datasets and write metadata for those datasets. We have a metadata template and priority list of existing datasets that we need to create metadata for. The intern and three full-time staff received some metadata training. We presented the datasets and metadata at a statewide GIS conference. The great strengths of the project are the comfort we now have in creating metadata, new tools for facilitating metadata creation, and the completed metadata we have for 36 important datasets. Our next steps are to create metadata for other datasets on our priority list and to continue to integrate metadata creation into normal workflow.

7. Feedback on Don't Duck Metadata Program:

The program definitely made a difference for our non-profit organization. It enabled an intern and three full-time staff to spend the time to learn how to create metadata correctly and to actually write 36 metadata files. For metadata training and creation, I think the grant amount was sufficient for building capacity and getting started. Our biggest problem in using the grant was finding metadata training that fit into our schedules and was affordable to attend from our location.