**StreamNet Executive Committee**

**Thursday, Nov. 20, 2014**

**Draft Meeting Notes**

PSMFC

205 SE Spokane Street, Suite 100

Portland, Or. 97202

**9:00 AM Introductions and Welcome Randy Fisher**

Attendees: Randy F (PSMFC), Roy E (FWS), Chris W (PSMFC), Phil R (CRITFC), Tom I (CA coordinator), Rich C (ODFW), Pete H (IDFG), Peter P (NPCC), Tom P (BPA), John A (Colville), Jen M (Colville), Don Skaar (MFWP- phone), Dan R (WDFW), Tom C (NWFSC), Sean C (FWS), Russell S (BPA), Van H, Greg, Bill, Mike (PSMFC)

This is the 2nd meeting of Executive Committee. The intent of the meetings is to make sure StreamNet’s work is aligned with the data management needs of regional fish and wildlife managers. There is a tremendous amount of effort underway to collecting Columbia Basin information and we want that portion coming through StreamNet to be well-aligned with regional and partner agency needs.

StreamNet has 3 main components to the project- a coordination role, an infrastructure role (pass through money to partners to build infrastructure for their data management needs), and a repository role (a place for people to put data that is both accessible and secure). The Executive Committee is an oversight group to make sure StreamNet is focused on the priorities for the region.

**9:15 AM New StreamNet Website**

Link to the new development site: <http://sndev2.psmfc.org>

Send comments/ edits to Amy (aroberts@psmfc.org) and Chris (cwheaton@psmfc.org)

One comment received: make the geographic focus: “Pacific Northwest”

**9:45 EPA Grant Funding: Plans and Priorities Chris & Tom Iverson**

Coordinated Assessments started with 3 indicators for anadromous salmonid populations (NOSA, RperS, SAR), the pace of work is determined by level of funding

EPA grant this year was catalyst funding to help states develop CAX (Coordinated Assessments database) and focus/ define what the exchange system would be; How would data actually be shared for the three key indicators?

Tribes wanted to build their own internal systems rather that utilize a temporary application, but there wasn’t enough funding to accomplish this in the first year, so for second year submitting additional grant proposals specifically for tribes

Partners (IDFG, ODFW, WDFW, PNAMP, StreamNet, Colville and Grand Ronde tribes) are forwarding a new proposal (sponsored by WDFW) to continue development of CAX with additional indicators and expanding beyond the Columbia River Basin

Two new proposals (sponsored by CRITFC) applied to two categories and would provide three programmers to Nez Perce, Yakama, and CRITFC to build internal enterprise systems so the tribes can be full participants in the CAX

Grants allow for three years of funding, but they planned for two year workplans

Important for Executive Committee to understand what would be provided under the WDFW grant and determine how best to deploy resources within their organizations to support those new efforts (data flow to CAX with new indicators, expanding efforts outside the Columbia River Basin) Chris showed draft budgets. Would not be terribly substantial, but would allow half time (or full time for one year) data management positions in each state, new contract for Tom, funding for each of the tribal partners and StreamNet.

Tom C- has the purpose of the DES been established? What will each indicator be used for? Are these aligned with priorities?

Chris W- asked for objectives and targets to be provided for the first three indicators to help guide monitoring decisions

Tom C- BiOP language says “at least one population”

John A- hatchery indicator data is stock-specific rather than population-specific

**10:45 Priorities for Coordinated Assessments All**

Review and Approve Population Priorities for 2015

Natural Origin Spawners, RperS, SARs

 Objectives and Targets for Newer Indicators and Areas;

 Juveniles, Hatcheries, Resident Fish, Other?

 Consistency of Indicators for Populations;

Do indicators always represent an entire population? Combining/working with multiple stewards for one population? Population naming protocols, Other?

**Population Priorities for 2015**

Chris had asked everyone to report back on what kind of data will be provided for the indicators in 2015; hoped to get feedback on whether or not it was the right amount

341 TRT populations with 134 NOSA records for 2015. These are for the Pacific Northwest and not just the Columbia Basin (possibly the total number of populations that indicator will be derived for?)

What is the optimum number of populations reported on? Is the number of populations currently being reported on adequate? Does that number of populations represent the current capacity for population monitoring? Idea: use the CA workplan and reporting exercise as a tool in discussing the adequacy of monitoring generally. We will now know the number of populations where this HLI information is collected and reported annually.

Tom C- NOAA is primary consumer of these records to describe population level patterns; they are not terribly interested in independent estimates

Rich C- Have had discussions about multiple datasets/ estimates for the same population (that can be flagged in the database until group formally decides to move to a single approved dataset)

Tom C- would like data for 5 year reviews to come directly from SPS

Tom I- would like the SPS data to also be in CAX so we know it’s all the same; everyone should be aware that CA will be working with new sets of indicators in the next year

Rich C- There needs to be more discussion of hatchery indicators to make sure the right/ most useful ones have been selected; They need to be cautious of what is committed to in the EPA process- already have two or three years of work to do in order to be able to share NOSA indicators. Would like to see some help in accomplishing what they’ve already committed to first, before adding more tasks.

Tom C- Having an emphasis on getting the first three indicators done well is good; would still be good to start having conversations about what are the primary uses for juvenile and hatchery data

Dan R- Council is asking NOSA questions already, so doesn’t want to lose sight of fulfilling the obligation to answer those questions

Tom C- Get the ones that are already in the pipeline done before you start adding in new items and there needs to be prioritization and recommendations coming from the agencies as to what the database should be aiming for

Dan R- The resource/ funding question needs to be dealt with if additional indicators are added

Chris W- Someone at the agency level has to say what the priorities are and allocate resources for DES development and then for data collection and flow accordingly

Russell- Previous BPA guidance: told StreamNet to focus on NOSA instead of updating fish distribution, other “traditional” StreamNet data

Chris W- Fish Distribution is the most used component of the StreamNet database; clearly valuable to the region

**Population Naming Protocols:**

Rich C- need to resolve population naming discrepancies amongst the databases; need a naming convention established

Tom C- NOAA has a list of the most current names that should be used (will share with group)

Tom P- BPA has a naming convention already established (Hydroside database), could be used as a resource for this effort if they want to look as it

Chris W- as NOAA does their 5 year review, the hope is that we can do whatever testing is needed so that next time the data can come directly from the CAX as intended

Tom C- The primary function of this effort is to get the derived data for the 5 year review; down the line would be great if a researcher could drill down into the data (this is also the intent of the system)

Pete H- need to narrow group down in order to develop naming conventions

Chris W- assumed that TRT names were correct and want to follow NOAA’s lead and be consistent with whatever they choose

Tom C- some populations are stream names, some populations are sections of streams- this is what needs to be reconciled. Don’t need a different way of naming populations; just need to fix what’s there.

Chris W- Should we identify ALL unlisted populations or only those for which data actually exists?

Rich C- if the information is to be used to assess across a geographic area then it should be done for all populations

Tom C- names in SPS will be consistent with new lists (he will send out reconciled population names and list of codes)

General consensus- apply TRT conventions to non-listed and let tribes/ states decide what the names should be

**Do indicators always represent an entire population?**

Chris W- assumption is that these are rolled up high level indicators that are indicative of the population. Do the data in the database always reflect the entire population?

Rich C- every indicator has the ability to identify the level of data represented

Dan R- can an indicator that doesn’t represent the entire population have an asterisk indicating its limited representation when it is accessed/ viewed by a user?

Tom C- needs to be very clear when you are not looking at population level data

Rich C- SAR and Juvenile Abundance is where you have the potential for aggregate data or partial populations

Tom I- could add something about this to the user agreement

Chris W- as we display the information, it’s our responsibility to make sure users know what they are looking at

Tom P- could add a map visual (show the whole population plus the portion of the population that the user is actually looking at); Evan Brown (IDFG) indicated that they have this capability now

Tom C- NOAA is interested in working with people to determine how to roll up the data and display it in a meaningful way

**Progress on available data**

Rich C/ Chris W- are we making enough progress on the data that is available?

Russell- how many more estimates for RperS, SAR should be expected?

Tom C- should be more discussion on how SAR will/ should be used before we can talk about how to roll them up; CA is delivering access to SAR in a way that the methodology can be tracked

Rich C- focusing on NOSA and RperS for 2015 because the databases and methodology for the others aren’t developed yet

Dan R- also dealing with NOSA and RperS right now

Pete H- In order for the Executive Committee to evaluate success, they need to know if everything is on track to be able to build the data exchange system. The number of populations is generated by the agencies and is not a metric by which to judge StreamNet’s success; StreamNet’s job is to make that data accessible.

Tom I/ Chris W/ Bill K- StreamNet sent data to CAX/ SPS but hasn’t heard back if it’s being used or worked

Chris W- Is it possible that NOAA could put a technical data person on the StreamNet Steering Committee to promote communication (Tom C- yes, will look into sending someone)

Tom C- worked through TRT to identify the data streams that agency people had the most confidence in and used those for the 5 year review; Bill sending in data separately caused confusion as it was assumed that was the data for the 5 year review (did not understand it was a test scenario). If data is being sent, please notify Tom C to avoid confusion during the review process/ transition process.

Chris W- not trying to create a back-up plan for current mode of gathering data for the 5 year review; hoping to create a replacement for that method.

CA project governance; Group wants to meet/conference call prior to the CA Planning group meeting in late winter spring. Will serve as the Executive lead for the CA project, review priorities, DES plans, flow of data, and attempt to focus priorities and establish workplans for deliverables for the CA project.

**11:15 Review StreamNet Strategic Plan All**

Chris went through the Strategic Plan and entered comments

The Strategic Plan contains 5 goals with objectives for each

Want to add ‘Pacific Northwest, with an emphasis on the Columbia River Basin’ to the introduction, per earlier website conversation

Will change Tom Iverson’s title to CA Project Coordinator since he is not on the Steering Committee to represent himself

Will clarify role of Executive Committee in targeting and prioritizing future work for Steering Committee; road map would be useful, having clear direction provided would be great

Chris will send out “final” version for one more review

**1:00 PM NPCC Indicators, Dashboards, Reporting and StreamNet Chris & Peter**

Council is interested in a graphic display of high level indicators and sub-basin dashboards; Are they looking at the right things and are the data there that can populate them? New project for PSMFC to populate high level indicators at NPCC website for Resident Fish; have subcontracted to QW Consulting to do the work. Want to eventually automate data flow from StreamNet to have them continually and automatically updated

These displays are meant to be high level and for use by council members rather than the general public; they will also be used for annual reports to Congress.

Will be looking at other species that haven’t been included yet (such as resident fish) to figure out what they need to create the graphics they need and answer the questions they need to answer

Will be talking to agencies and tribes about how to use the data already on hand to assess the high level indicators and what is needed to do the same for resident fish, others

Dan R- ideally the council would like to pull the data directly from CA at the sub-basin scale (aggregates of populations)

Pete H- they don’t view population level data as a high level indicator, but can be used in measuring progress at the Columbia Basin Scale

Tom I- sub basin scale will be used for prioritizing projects; it shows context for information but not analysis

Chris W- one of the reasons to bring this up is that it is now a PSMFC project; meetings will happen late winter/ spring 2015 to talk about indicators that should be chosen for resident fish (relying on Coordinated Assessments for anadromous fish) and harvesting what data already exists; StreamNet wants to construct a system that automates data flow for the indicators- this may impact the work for staff in the agencies

Dan R- Is the intent of this effort that agencies will download their information to StreamNet and StreamNet will then package it for the Council needs?

Chris W- Yes. StreamNet would make it a priority to make sure the data needed is updated on a regular basis and will work with the Council to automate data delivery from StreamNet to the Council.

Rich C- important to note that these objectives may not line up with others they have to meet

**2:00 PM Executive Committee/Steering Committee Review All**

Current Budget & Statement of Work

 StreamNet funding/staffing within your programs/Other Issues?

For 2015, were able to add staff for ODFW, WDFW, and IDFG by removing PSMFC GIS staff from StreamNet funding and by taking on new projects at PSMFC; Partners need to be aware that this is not necessarily a permanent assignment and alternate funding arrangements may need to be made in the future.

Need to work together to identify where additional staff funding will come from in the next budget cycle

Need all invoices/ billings submitted to PSMFC by Tuesday November 25 to meet the BPA’s closeout deadline for FY 2014

One role of the Executive Committee members is to make sure the StreamNet resources are deployed in a way that best meets their agency needs

In 2015, PSMFC StreamNet staff will be tasked with assisting BPA projects that still need a data repository to get their data into the Data Store, will be working on CA, will resume updates to ‘traditional’ StreamNet data and hydrography as time/ staffing permits, and will contact projects with device trials for inventory purposes.

IDFG will need another $5500 to cover staff salary- Chris is working with Bart to find the funds for this year

WDFW really needs an east side data steward; should start building a case for it now with BPA (as well as a case for keeping the funding we have now) - having the CA deliverables this year will also help make this case

**Next Meeting:**

Dan R- would like to make sure the Executive Committee meeting schedule is lined up with BPA contract due dates- should definitely meet in June to talk about priorities for the next contract

Rich C- didn’t we identify some things today that need to be reviewed and hashed out before June? Everyone needs to stand their ground on the data displays that agencies/ entities want to use; developing them is not part of the CA process. This committee should say how it should be done and provide guidance to BPA.

Tom C- with the caveat that this is what we have time and resources to do

Dan R- this group has never even discussed Juvenile Outmigrant indicator

Chris W- policy decisions sometimes creep into the technical forum (who are not authorized to make those kind of decisions); need policy level guidance from the Executive Committee to counter that

Chris W- will determine from the notes the need for resolving issues (naming conventions, next set of CA indicator priorities, etc.) before June- we will schedule a meeting or conference call in late winter/ spring before the next CA Workshop so that the group can provide CA project guidance to the workshop. Will schedule a meeting in June prior to final submission of next SOW and budget for FY 2016.

Pete H- for the Executive Committee to be functional to the Steering Committee will require meeting more than once per year; updates from Chris on status of other groups would be helpful for Executive Committee to guide their work. Chris will send status reports on CA and Steering Committee notes to the Executive Committee.