StreamNet Executive Committee Meeting

Thursday, May 5

8:30 – 12:30 Pacific Time

**PSMFC main conference room**

8:30 AM Introductions, Tribal Representation discussion

* Attendees: Chris Wheaton (PSMFC), Tom Pansky (BPA), Pete Hassemer (IDFG), Tom Iverson (Coordinated Assessments), Tom Rein (ODFW), Nancy Leonard (Council), Judy Gordon (USFWS), Stan Allen (PSMFC), Russell Scranton (BPA), Zach Penney (CRITFC), Brady Allen (BPA), Kristin Jule (BPA), Mike Banach (PSMFC), Dan Rawding (WDFW), Brian Mercier (BPA), Tom Cooney (NOAA Science Center), Greg Sieglitz (NOAA RM&E)
* Phone: Jay Hesse (Nez Perce), John Arterburn (Colville), Don Skaar (MFWP), Jim Ruzycki (ODFW)
* Executive Committee has been providing guidance to Coordinated Assessments project, but would like to invite sovereign tribes or agencies that are providers or consumers of data to participate in the decision making process for setting regional data priorities. Proposal is to extend membership in the Executive Committee to these parties
  + May want to discuss travel assistance costs in next budget year discussions
  + CRITFC tribes all in different places in terms of their data needs/ priorities, so Zach not necessarily comfortable making decisions on their behalf until he is more up to speed; varied response on their level of interest in participation; level of engagement from individual tribes may differ- what does it mean if they do not participate? Does absence imply assent?
    - No, but will require Chris to further engage with those non-participatory entities to make sure they are aware of decisions
  + John A, Dan R, Nancy L- support the inclusion of individual sovereigns to address their unique needs and challenges
  + Jay H- appreciates the effort to be inclusive and collaborative; will draft letter to Chris indicating a commitment to participate as observer at next 2-3 ExComm meetings to:
    - Understand the decision structure and assess
    - Understand how tribal representation can be balanced with inter-tribe projects
    - Understand how the invitation to participate may change the perceived standing or role of the StreamNet project in the region through participation or non-participation of tribes
      * Recent evolution/ restructuring of StreamNet is a positive thing, but concerned StreamNet is now being used by others as a means to determine what data is being collected
  + Pete H- could also send out copy of charter with invitation, tribes should also consider participation in the Steering Committee
  + Tom C- wants to make sure the process continues to encourage common goals and objectives in promoting regional priorities and data management. Going in good direction. Want to see it work. Encourage collaboration over competition.
  + Greg Sieglitz may be the new SNEC member from NMFS in future.

Action: Chris will extend invitation to join Executive Committee, along with the Strategic Plan from several years ago (Pete's suggestion) to Tribes and agencies who are involved in CA but not currently on the Committee. The intent is to be inclusive of any that have data or are consuming data. This may be expanded in future as additional species/areas/subjects are addressed in CA. For now, Chris understands this means the 4 individual CRITFC tribes plus the Shoshone-Bannock Tribe. If others should be invited now, please let Chris know. Did receive a suggestion to invite the action and land management agencies (USFS, BLM, COE, BOR) as well as USGS.

8:45 AM Current Year Budget Discussion Savings and Reprogramming Recommendation from the Steering Committee (Note: amount TBD as of 4/25) Including both StreamNet and EPA grant budgets

Spending Update

Recommendations for funding changes in the current fiscal year

* Reviewed budget snapshot (at halfway point in budget year)
  + Colville got their contract from PSMFC on 12/10/15, can’t start work until they’ve signed (on 2/15/16), subcontract to Paul at Sitka not sent until 3/15/16, first billings will start to show up in May
    - Would be helpful to get subcontracts from PSMFC sent out in a timelier fashion so that spending can occur closer to contract start date
    - Not sure of potential savings at this point; recommends putting currently available money towards staff, and use any available end-of-contract monies for equipment purchases
  + USFWS not sure why nothing spent yet- in the past they’ve billed one time
    - Have $39,500 available that will be unspent this budget year
* Solicited ideas from Steering Committee for reallocation of any unspent/ unallocated funds
  + $10, 000- WDFW unanticipated personnel expense (COLA increases)
  + $17,000- ODFW programmer time
    - Not getting this money would impact security of their data, spawner survey, and the data clearinghouse
  + $3500- ODFW replacement desktop
  + $3500- IDFG replacement tablets
  + $7000- WDFW 2 tough pads
  + $7000- ODFW 2 tough pads
  + Total of all requests is $48,000
  + Also on the table- possible assistance to states and tribes to be used for the BPA Priority Population Exercise
    - What type of assistance is needed in order for them to participate?
    - WDFW could use help with Upper Columbia- a couple more months of staff time would help

Action: Fund the two staffing needs now from available USFWS money, and wait on equipment needs until later. This Leaves $12,500 available from USFWS- will keep in reserve and combine with any other available savings and have conversations on BPA Priority Population Exercise. Will offer this up if it is helpful to those that need assistance getting priority data in. If unspent towards end of year, will consider equipment

9:00 AM Next Contract, SOW, and Discussion of EPA Grant Application

* Starts October 1, 2016
* Will do an additional year of this contract via contract modification process, may move to a 2-year contract next time
* BPA may consider application of savings into next FY if under ~$50K through a line item budget transfer
* Changes to SOW
  + Simplification
  + CA 5 Year Plan emphasis
  + Draft for review by June
  + Due date to BPA July 1
  + Include tribes that submit data on StreamNet Exec Committee
* No more HEP or EPA grant
* BPA funding for PSMFC StreamNet staff (direct only) decreased 7.9% from 2015, down 27.2% over the last 3 years. Program Manager time to drop to ~60% in FY17 given current funding.
* Would need additional $145,000 base budget for full program to cover a 3% increase across partners and to restore cuts to PSMFC budget in 2018 (have balanced the budget for 2017 through cuts and shifting staff to other projects)
  + Need to start having 2018 budget discussions within next 6 months
* EPA Grant Requests
  + Hatchery DES Development grant for 2017 was rejected because EPA did not want to fund “expanding” existing systems
  + Need a state or tribal sponsor, applications due in November so need to identify a sponsor soon if we are going to apply in the next cycle
    - Does anyone want to be a sponsor?
    - Core Team wrote the grant for the previous one, Brody offered to host again if no one else wants to; WDFW recognizes that new indicators will require additional funds
    - Tribal Consortium can be an application, so can a state consortium (PSMFC) be an applicant?
    - Might make sense for IDFG or MFWP to sponsor if decision is to do Resident Trout or Bull Trout- may be easier to make a case to EPA for this over Hatchery again
    - CRTIFC has one in for this year (It is CRITFC policy to not compete with any member tribe’s proposal), PNAMP considering applying for Location Exchange for next cycle
  + Possible ideas
    - Lamprey, Sturgeon, Bull Trout (together or singularly)
    - Hatchery again?
    - Resident Trout
    - Other?
      * Habitat Indicators might be a better fit for this grant
      * BPA sees value in pursuing Bull Trout, Lamprey, Sturgeon, (in that order) as the focus of the next grant

John Arterburn: If StreamNet wants to create a data sharing system for Sturgeon and/or lamprey the Colville Tribes will need to include Jason McLellan. The Colville would place Sturgeon first. Funding for his time would be important as he runs major programs in the Upper and mid-Columbia River. His time is not currently included in the existing StreamNet project but could be leveraged to help with some specific tasks. If sturgeon/lamprey is the focus of the EPA grant, please keep us in the loop as it gets started.

Action: Plan for July check-in on this topic after receiving additional guidance from EPA. In the meantime, any partners who decide they have an interest please let us know so that we can discuss the specifics with EPA and start thinking about partnerships, focus, etc.

* + What is the status of the PCSRF grant?
    - Shift in priorities to on-the-ground projects, data management not a targeted priority for them, monitoring is a lower priority
    - WDFW expecting a significant reduction in funds; PCSRF funds already fully allocated with California ramping up activity

9:30 AM Updates, Good of the Order, Other Business

* IDFG- working on CA indicators for Sockeye, getting Steelhead data into DES format; CA DES lets everyone know the process/ where the data is/ where the data comes from and reduces the timetable to 2 months
* WDFW- RperS on track for delivery, need to get population scale sorted out at the CA level- missing opportunities to report on critical information (sub-populations need to flagged, etc.), State of Salmon Report benefitted from CA process
* USFWS- still hoping to get vacant position announced before end of summer
* BPA- would like to identify needs and points of contact for Bull Trout
  + Didn’t create indicators in isolation of resident fish- the anadromous indicators can still be built upon and applied to resident fish
  + Neil Ward may have good insight on this, worked on it through CBFWA five years ago
  + Genetics data is an important component of Bull Trout data for USFWS
* CRITFC- talking with member tribes about participation in these meetings, some are ready to submit data (Yakama and Nez Perce are close), the Accords are ending soon- thinking about how to provide dedicated data management programs within the tribes post 2018 using BPA funds. Don’t drop the Tribal Data Network funding as positive momentum has been gained to build needed corporate data management infrastructure at member tribes.
* COLV- NOSA data completed for Okanogan Steelhead, ready to input juvenile data once there is resolution on partial scale data
* MFWP- hired contractor to help with data transfer system; looking forward to when they can work on Bull Trout
* Council- maintaining fish data indicators, will integrate StreamNet trend data, and looking into integrating with CA display tool, Council meeting and objectives mapping tool meeting both next week
* NOAA- would like to talk about organizational framework for reporting output, application of CA to abundance helped with 5-year review (data quality, efficiency of data delivery). Would like information from the "2-pagers" to be part of the data delivery, as those are very helpful.

10:25 AM Break

10:45 AM Hatchery Data & DES Discussion (Results from the CA Workshop)

* Hatchery DES is ready to be sent out for final approval, options from here include:
  + #1- Adopt Current Hatchery DES, begin populating with data
  + #2- Reconvene development team to revise Hatchery DES
  + #3- Put Hatchery DES on back burner while concentrating on Natural Origin Fish Data and reconsider later
* Survey Results
  + obvious consensus on a few indicators (adult returns, total juveniles release, adult spawners, SAR, Percent Hatchery/ NO Spawners)
* Additional Indicators?
  + Currently DES includes # Fish Spawned, Egg Take, PNOB, Egg to Release Survival, SAR, Recruits per Spawner, PNI of Integrated Natural/ Hatchery Populations (proportion of natural broodstock used within the hatchery program)

DISCUSSION:

* Need to make sure hatchery stock ID names are linked to the population id names
* Who is this information for? How is it informing decision making?
  + Use indicators already identified in VSP DES
* Is there room in the 5-year plan to do this work? Juveniles still needs work done to bring it up to speed.
  + Took over a year to develop indicators for Natural Origin
    - data managers/ suppliers are not involved in that process
    - need to move on Hatchery indicators now if want to be delivering on them in two years
    - may not have enough regional buy in yet to move it forward
  + Re-look at hatchery indicators to get more regional buy-in
    - Could incorporate survey suggestions as indicator priorities
  + There are existing databases on the production side of hatcheries
    - Are they talking to each other? Are they already exchanging data?
* Do some testing first with select examples to see if/ how it works
  + What are they going to be used for? If for HGMPs, then those individuals need to be included to guide the development of the DES
  + Are we getting enough to report against the HGMPs in the region?
* CRITFC just now submitting natural origin indicators, may be treaty issues with hatcheries that need to be taken into account
* COLV concerned about current DES and the value of sharing that type of data across the region, doesn’t want to duplicate effort in the region to track hatchery information
* Indicators & metrics should address HGMPs (once they exist). Include program purpose, objectives, etc. (Is this already in HSRG reports)
* Did not appear to be consensus from group on either moving forward or stopping the effort
  + could talk to USFWS to see about submitting their data to StreamNet in the indicator format as a test (not sure USFWS has the person in place that could assist with this)
  + StreamNet could summarize what can be obtained out of existing regional datasets for the group
  + DES is supposed to reflect the metadata, so going elsewhere to obtain the data can hurt you in the end
  + Need some better direction if reconvening the development team- they are not to select or change the indicators, the Exec Comm needs to do that; need a policy sub group to explain and justify to BPA/ NOAA why this is important on a basin-wide level, what the metrics are going to be used for (and not used for), and clarification on terminology
* Need more input from policy leaders about what is needed in a Hatchery DES
* BPA contacts will be Kristen Jule, with decision review by John Barco

Action:  A policy-level discussion is needed to define what is needed and useful.  StreamNet will try to facilitate a work group that will define what hatchery information should be pursued -- DES work can follow if needed.  StreamNet Executive Committee participants will provide names of correct people to invite to this work group.

Confidence Interval Decision (John A):

* Artificially truncated numbers in a shared system is highly problematic
* Should not be our place to change the data
* Dan R- when spawner abundance is entered at -20 fish, and you publish that, then your entire dataset is considered suspect; happy to work with people to help them avoid reporting negative fish

Action: Mike will look at how many negative fish are reported to determine how widespread of a problem it is. Mike’s report: "The answer is that there are no records with a lower confidence limit less than zero. I checked all fields of all tables. There were some zero values. Whether those were truncated at zero because they calculated to less than zero I don't know and can't know." Mike will work further with John and Dan R and will have a conference call and if agreement not reached at that point then it will come back to the Exec Comm for further discussion

11:30 AM CA Priorities and the 5 Year Plan

– BPA Priority Populations Exercise

* Have created a data flow web page for Tier 1 and Tier 2 populations
* Outreach ongoing to contractors by BPA (ISEMP/CHaMP to date)
* Trying to maximize the flow of data that comes in, some are integrated into StreamNet, some are not
  + Intent is NOT to harvest data and put it into CA
  + Intent is to talk to people to see if it’s possible for THEM to put their data into CA, and to coordinate with the appropriate state/tribe to set up process for future submissions also
* This has been brought up at the CA workshop- the real disconnect is for those not involved in CA

Action: PSMFC will cc Steering Committee and Exec Committee on the emails as they are sent out to the projects. PSMFC and/or BPA will talk with Idaho, tribal partners prior to sending out further communications

12:00 PM CA Query System Data Display & Access to Data

Change the terminology of “trends” in the CA Database – recommendation from the Steering Committee

New Data Sharing Agreement

* Reviewed CA Query System Data Display
  + Agreement that ability to select populations by species/ESU/MPG should be added. Currently populations are selected by species/run/MPG. Both of these alternate pathways should be available to user.
* Please review Revised Data sharing agreement (posted on first page of StreamNet website). Provide comments to Chris. Proposal is to share both Indicator and metric information
* Subsequent comments from Dan Rawding on DES/related display: some more thought is needed on subpopulation and multiple populations and how to use them. We made some progress but I am not sure where we ended up. I am proposing some next steps to move this along and they will likely need to be modified.
  + It is my understanding that we want to include multiple and subpopulations in the DES. The justification for the DES is that we want the metadata, which helps with transparency and defensible of the metrics and indicators. If that is correct, we need to think about clarification/modifications to the DES for multiple pops.
* “Trends” recommendation is that they be renamed “Related Data” in CA Query System- more granular information related to the CA populations; allows user to see more info on the selected population than is shown by the indicator
  + Could display as a CA sub-population indicator on the map
  + Still need to have the metadata associated with the “Related Data”
  + Are these “trends” displayed and delivered elsewhere?
    - It is the same information as would be found on the state agency site, and has been selected by the agency providers
      * Is the data selected the data that you want shown?
    - Advantage is that it is displayed in a regional view, rather than multiple disparate state views

Actions: Add ability to filter data by species/ESU/MPG. Trends to be renamed “Related Data” in CA and displayed. Display of Related Data will be fine-tuned with Steering Committee to get consistency. Goal is to display granular, more local information that helps with understanding of populations, and to clearly articulate that these are not alternatives to HLIs or useful to do observers' own calculations of HLIs. Needs to be on-going discussion about how the HLI’s fit together and display. As per Dan’s request DES team will try to resolve subpopulation and multiple population issues. Send any additional feedback to Mike. Any feedback on Data sharing agreement to Chris. If no feedback received or only minor editorial issues will consider adopted. More serious issues, will return to this group.

12:30 PM Adjourn