**MEETING NOTES**

**StreamNet Steering Committee Meeting**

Nov. 10, 2016

9 am – 4 pm

PSMFC Main Conference Room

205 SE Spokane Street

Portland, Oregon 97202

<https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/494537469>

Conference call: 855-257-8693

PIN 8947879

**Attendees:**

PSMFC: Chris Wheaton, Mike Banach, Bill Kinney, Van Hare

ODFW: Cedric Cooney

MFWP: Dawn Anderson

BPA: Tom Pansky, Scott Donahue, Russell Scranton

IDFG: Evan Brown (phone), Bart Butterfield (phone)

WDFW: Brodie Cox

CRITFC: not represented

CCT: Paul Clayton (phone)

USFWS: not represented

Others: Tom Iverson (Tom Iverson International, Ltd.), Nancy Leonard (NPCC), Jen Bayer (USGS/PNAMP)

Specific assignments are highlighted in yellow.

Where these draft notes seem to be lacking or don't make sense you will see [???]. Please help fix these instances.

**Quick Review of FY 17 Budgets and FY 16 Spending and “Spending 9:00 AM**

**Within Categories” Discussion**

* FY2016 ended 9/30/16.
* Rolled $49,758 in FY16 savings to FY2017
* Actual savings was $142,265 as of 11/3/2016
* With 2016 savings and PSMFC cuts everyone is returned to base-level funding for 2017
  + PSMFC cuts of 27.4% over last 4 years were allocated to partners (COLA, additional staff, project needs, etc.)
  + Eliminated most travel, device purchases, extras in the PSMFC budget for 2017
  + For 2017, cuts and shifting staff to Klamath Project were used to balance budget. **Will have a budget problem in 2018 at PSMFC if no increase or change.**
  + 2018 budget development and decisions will happen March- June 2017
    - Will be asking for guidance at next Exec Comm mtg.
* Bart reported IDFG is $10,000 in the hole for FY16. Needs guidance on how to proceed. IDFG has more bills coming for FY16. Chris and Tom said PSMFC should be able to cover it from the surplus.
* ODFW bill not yet in. WDFW has one coming in too.
* We’re looking at a PSMFC budget problem in FY18 (about $177,000 shortfall), because Klamath work for Chris will end. BPA expects tough budget times coming too, so there’s a collision coming.
* On Tuesday at SNEC meeting Brian Mercier of BPA said they want more insight into how partners’ SN money is spent. BPA wants a special budget-focused session with ExCom in the February timeframe. Partners would come prepared to discuss how they use BPA funds to meet current StreamNet priorities. Expectation is no additional funding in 2018.
  + Will schedule a Steering Committee work session in preparation for SNEC meeting where this will be discussed. You should come prepared to outline how your StreamNet subcontract supports the priorities of program, especially the CA project
  + Russell clarified: how much are we spending for each part of budget (NOSA, etc.)? This can help inform how additional moneys could be spent. Also, are there things that could be lowered in priority to allow focusing on more important needs? BPA executives want to know what money would be needed to do what, so they can decide what to fund.
  + Cedric asked if reporting by work element is not good enough. Tom’s answer was that they want to know details inside the agencies – right now BPA only has a good feel for PSMFC, not the subcontractors. They want details on how individual people are being used.
  + Details for us will depend on what BPA’s plans end up being, and how much money for the whole F&W program will be available. The program may shrink.

**Lessons Learned from BPA Priority Population Exercise 9:30 AM**

Discussion primarily focused on the Tier 1 Priority populations. See a number of areas where there just isn’t enough data available to make population estimates

BPA would like to get to the point of knowing what populations have data associated with them; right now we still don’t know what to expect- are there more datasets out there being generated?

Is the reporting for NOSA sufficient to meet BPA’s needs? Do more resources need to be expended to get more data or is it not worth the investment?

BPA doesn’t see a need to invest further in NOSA, but does see a need to invest more in Juvenile data

Would be nice to have a “Planned” column to indicate how many populations are needed/ expected for each indicator

Will need a prioritization list developed for FY17- what progress has been made on the list for FY16? How can that progress be evaluated? Is the progress sufficient?

* Q for BPA: how many populations did Bonneville get data for from the tribes? Answer: Tier 1 = 5
* Work to be done on existing data to get into the exchange template.
* Focus should be on Juvenile data since that seems to be where there are currently gaps
* Per Partners- at the indicator level there isn’t a lot more data out there to be collected; or they don’t have the resources available to go get it
* We reviewed the data that we were able to collect and provide.
* One lesson learned is there are not always data available. We did good in some data types, not as good in others. About ½ of populations have NOSA data; ~25% for R/S; ~10 for SAR; ~8% for smolts, ~2% for parr numbers. Parr numbers was lowest by far, with only 6 populations.
* It takes longer to do these data types than we anticipated.
* Clear direction really helped us know what to work toward. We do well when we have a specific goal defined.
  + We’re going to ask again for expected data flow.
* It will be helpful if we can indicate where data simply don’t exist, so everyone knows which populations to not look for data in the future. This first time people gave optimistic numbers, hoping to be able to meet them.
  + But for next year we want more conservative estimates.
* This is a highly collaborative process, easily broken if a biologist moves on.
* Having data available to do indicators, and having the agency staff to use those data to calculate indicators, are 2 different things.
* Cedric suggested having a color-coded spreadsheet for StreamNet/Coordinated Assessments partners to indicate/track which populations 1) have data available, 2) which will have indicators calculated, and 3) what the status of each is for FY17. He has a template he can share. Where data won’t be coming, it gives the opportunity to tell why not.
  + Cedric’s categories are:
    - Data don’t exist / are not collected.
    - Have data, but no resources to calculate indicators.
    - Delivery expected, but not yet done.
  + Cedric offered to send out spreadsheet, and then these categories can get fine-tuned to reflect all the things we need them to. But Bill says we at PSMFC already have a more current version of this. So actually Bill will send this out instead.
    - It is a lot of work to do this.
    - This will be sent to all the SN/CA partners, including the tribes.
    - See related discussion under CA Priorities A color-coded spreadsheet for this year will be done. Bill will do something also to put this in the database to make the information more queryable. We need to do this by data type. Russell’s collection of which populations have projects can be included in this spreadsheet, which can help make sure the information is accurate, though we need to recognize too that a project in a population does not necessarily mean indicators are possible. But the BPA info can help make sure things are found.

**Review Coordinated Assessments 5 Year Plan and ExComm 10:30 AM**

**Priorities for current FY – Including Bull Trout Discussion**

2016 Priorities included:

* Maintain, update, and automate NOSA
* Finalize DES for hatchery indicators and begin to populate but have not identified a management/ leadership “pull” for this information (wanted by Council, useful for ESA lawsuits in terms of straying, release sizes, rearing strategies, etc.)
* Exploration of Bull Trout- there is interest in collaboration but have not identified a management/ leadership “pull” for this information
* Automation has helped, but has not removed manual effort requirements entirely. So we can’t simply add more indicators and species because some significant part of the annual work still exists.
* We (PSMFC as lead) will work with FPC and CRITFC on gaining SARs.
  + Post meeting update: Mike had met with FPC on September 20 of this year to discuss with them SARs in the context of CA. He followed up with an email to Margaret Filardo on November 15 (after this meeting), inquiring whether FPC and CRITFC had made any progress on this request. So far they had not. FPC is looking into whether they can automate this data flow.
* Decision: Populating existing indicators will remain the priorities for this year.
* Nancy Leonard with Dawn and Chris’s help will convene a bull trout Data/Science/Policy workshop to identify players, discuss data needs, and decide if CA starts pursuing bull trout data. This will probably occur in conjunction with a NPCC meeting in Montana this spring. Partners will need to help with id’ing proper people to communicate with in your organizations. Note: review the 2004-2006 “Regional Bull Trout Monitoring Plan” – USFWS & States

**Roundtable Discussion: Issues with Gathering, Validating, 11:00 AM**

**And QA/QC’ing CA HLI Data**

* Tom P. clarifies: why did 'state X' do things one way, and 'state Y' another? Questions have come up while BPA has tried to use the data. Reading the methods, they have questions and notice inconsistencies between populations.
* Tom I. said this was a huge concern when CA was started. This is a concern of Jay Hesse, and is one reason why we provide contact info with each record of data.
* Russell suggested several new fields for the CA DES, including for methods and a rating. He also pointed out some possible errors in the data so far submitted.
  + Some of the suggestions are record-level. Some are time-series level. Some already exist in the DES, but maybe are not filled in consistently, while others may be working as intended.
  + An "Optional" suggestion was to use a pick list of the ISTM Methods and the ISTM rating scores. Jen said this is not really possible, as ISTM did not create pick lists. Jen offered an explanation of ISTM and how it relates to SN:
    - The PNAMP ISTM (Integrated Status & Trends Monitoring) demonstration project was intended to help inform decisions about monitoring, and ultimately improve efficiency by providing support and resources to enable coordination & collaboration. Several years ago, ODFW and WDFW designed tools to evaluate monitoring & how monitoring aligns with priorities from recovery plans. The project's 2013 report includes the method of evaluation as well as the results of deploying the method to evaluate 103 populations in the lower Columbia River. More details are available at <http://www.pnamp.org/project/3151>.
  + Some of the data questions may be errors, or may be biological differences between populations (age data). [After the meeting Mike reviewed the juvenile tables' age data and found potential errors in both tables. Both USFWS and ODFW have corrected or will correct a few errors in the data. Other instances pointed out may be simply related to different species, runs, and habitats.]
  + A lot of this is probably something that would occur at a “Skamania II”, not within SN.
  + Summary: BPA has requested DES changes. We agreed they are worth looking at. The DDT would need to review these proposals, so that group would need to reconvene for this purpose. But better definition of these issues and discussion of current status is needed first – BPA will enlist Tim Fisher and Brian Maschoff (BPA contractors with the questions). They need to be brought into that preliminary discussion and also the DDT discussions. And, because our budget is not increasing, we may not have ability to do all this.
* BPA will follow up with states/tribes to discuss how they all gather CA data to put in the system.
* Bill K. will send around the notes about this from the recent tech committee meeting.
* Lots of difficult discussion, but difficult to disentangle related issues that exist at different levels in the system.
* Another issue brought up: ability to identify data that don’t and won’t exist, whether at the time series level or the record level.

**LUNCH (NOTE: we will collect from each attendee and get pizza Noon**

**or sandwiches – or feel free to bring your own)**

* Lunch was well attended, with all attendees participating.

**Update from CRITFC on Tribal EPA Grant 1:00 PM**

**& CA-Tribal Futuring Discussion. Also population crosswalk tool.**

**Also how to help researchers use the SN Library.**

* No one was present from CRITFC. Tom Iverson filled us in.
* CRITFC was selected to received $499,000 grant to build tribal data infrastructure (hardware and software) and capability to share data; everything late due to some communication issues with EPA, currently in contracting CRITFC received EPA EN grant for data infrastructure for CA data.
* Grant was for capacity to flow data, not to get it flowing already.
* Umatilla Tribe have a software/database system already, shared with other 3 tribes.
* Nez Perce Tribe has data management plan. Will build CA modules within their system with this money.
* Yakama Indian Nation doesn’t have data management program. So have decided to use consultants to create infrastructure, and maybe hire an employee next year. Will start in Yakima basin.
* Warm Springs Tribe has data in individual databases. CRITFC will hire consultant to help them combine these and create linkages between data types.
* Final contract waiting for signature at EPA.
* CRITFC will use with BPA funds to create ability to deliver CA data. Then will decide which data to provide to CA.
* Henry said at StreamNet Executive Committee meeting 2 days ago that Umatilla Tribes would provide CA data through ODFW. It may be that Umatillas are providing data to ODFW, who will do the high level analyses. ODFW needs to be sure Umatillas are credited in those indicator data.

**Updating “Related Data” Expectations and Concerns 1:30 PM**

* Trying to reach a consistent approach in how related datasets are associated with populations
  + Not getting consistent responses
  + Not seeing that the datasets are being updated regularly by all
* Chris showed a summary of the trends identified by CA population, and the years of data.
* ODFW & WDFW: trends data come in with the CA data. So updates not an issue. Same for IDFG, if it’s information needed for CA indicator calculations. IDFG had personnel turnover problems this past year and expects things to be better next year.
* Priority is indicators. Related data is lower priority. However, where you have related data that is a good data set and you can provide it to StreamNet, please do so!

**Roundtable Discussion 2:30 PM**

* **General item:** Getting Shoshone-Bannock Tribes involved in CA is something we want to do. Bart says Shoshone-Bannocks have had turnover. IDFG works well with them.
* **General item** from StreamNet Executive Committee meeting: BPA has thanked tribes for contributing CA data (though they were delivered to BPA directly rather than into the CA DB. But BPA would like if these data came through CAX. Tom added that YIN has concerns about annual updates related to that; but maybe new db system can help with that.
* **General item:** Salmon crosswalk meeting is coming up 12/6/16 1:00-4:00. See <http://www.pnamp.org/event/5582> for details. PNAMP is convening this meeting. Denise Kelsey of CRITFC is the lead for this work. Topics of discussion at the 12/6 meeting will include:
  + Is anyone using the crosswalk? Is the information stale? Any concerns?
  + Does it do what it’s supposed to? Should the plug be pulled? Should it be modified?
  + Review the user interface for usability.
  + Identify new use cases. Identify interest in web services for data sharing. Review existing APIs against interests.
  + Van mentioned something Denise says, which is that looking at old data with old names is helped by having the crosswalk.
  + BPA and/or PNAMP will provide a list of additional questions for the meeting.
  + Prioritize ideas for tasks.
* **General item:** BPA would like the NMFS population code in the downloaded CA data spreadsheets. Bill and Greg will add that to the output.
* **MFW&P**
  + Jane is retiring at end of year. Hope to get position filled midwinter.
  + Hydrography: still working on 24k NHD, and assigning LLIDs. Not sure what to do with the other 50,000 reaches with no fish data.
  + Native trout assessments: Jane finished 2016 edits for Yellowstone cutthroat trout. Investigating reintegration with inland cutthroat trout protocol (ICP) data system from Wyoming, which includes a web-based data entry system. Will present findings at YCT agencies at December meeting. If it happens then westslope cutthroat could be the next for the ICP structure.
  + Working closely with fish division on internal system called "FishMT", including getting data and regulations to the public. FishMT will replace their current Fishing guide and MFISH, which are being retired due to moving to other programming technologies.
  + A StreamNet priority is development of a genetics module in FIS that will link to existing survey and inventory data. Currently the process is labor intensive and relies on double and sometimes triple data entry. MFW&P's geneticist may be retiring soon and there is concern that the majority of the information and process is in his head or on his hard drive. This project has been identified, drafted in a work proposal, and now a business case needs to be written that will go before their internal board.
  + ArcGIS Online: getting people trained around the state. Over 200 people now. Data are all available online; groups are used to control access. But cannot use Collector due to IT security concerns.
  + Moving office in February, which will result in some down time. SN crew is now part of IT group, which is moving into a new building.
  + Bull trout is a big issue.
  + Question to other states: did you LLID all of hydro, or only what you have data for. WDFW said all; IDFG said only what they have data for. IDFG uses NHD for display, but reduced set for data collection which is added to as-needed. Van said maintenance is a big problem, and this is not a priority. SN mixed-scale hydro is all 100-k, plus high res streams as needed for data. Barriers & distribution is a big need for more streams than what shows up in trends.
* **PNAMP**
  + CAPG meeting to come at end of January. Will work on what CA workshop will be. Watch your emails.
  + Got call from Bruce Jones at EPA, who said “our” application for abstract presentation at annual EPA EN conference is accepted. But Jen isn’t sure who “our” refers to.
    - Post-meeting update: Greg Wilke from PSMFC will attend this meeting and give a presentation.
  + PNAMP is getting started on the data attribution/citation task that was identified at the 2016 CA Workshop. Sheryn Olson (USGS) is the lead and will be reaching out to a small group of volunteers as a start. First task is to review existing best practices with this small group, then draft a proposal for general citation needs as well as the specific needs of the CAX and CA community. PNAMP is planning for completion of a final draft to be vetted at the March 2017 CA workshop. Currently Jay Hesse and Lenora Oftedahl have offered to assist. Today, Chris Wheaton volunteered and Tom Pansky suggested we ask Lenora to reach out to other librarians (Kay Silver at BPA and maybe staff at ACOE). Jen will share this info with Sheryn.
* **Tom Iverson:**
  + Working with tribes on perhaps participating in StreamNet and CA. Jay at NPT is watching and evaluating. YIN may not be interested. Tom is keeping them all informed.
* **WDFW:**
  + Up to date as is possible for all CA tables.
  + IT & security policy changes coming down heavily, and things are difficult.
    - There were 2 major hacks: web site, and the Texas-based fishing and hunting license company.
  + Apps created on Amazon.com for data entry that tribes can participate in.
  + Created mobile regulations app. Offline capable, with maps.
  + Working on CA portal. Will allow data to go to CA, to governor’s office, SASI, etc. It’s for biologists to enter data. Cedric said yeah, they have that too, but people are not required to use it so they mostly don’t.
  + Working on commercial fish ticket app. Problem is sensitive data.
  + Hired new lead developer, and a GIS lead, and a new web services developer.
* **IDFG:**
  + Chris updating spawning ground survey application.
  + Evan worked with harvest bios on SFSR using mobile apps that connect to laptop so that daily catch and harvest estimates can be made. Got really good feedback from grumpy old biologist.
  + Evan busy with CA data. Also training 2 new people on CA processes, so Evan can move on to steelhead and hydro work. Working on automating things to CA as much as possible.
* **CCT:**
  + Nothing at this time.
* **ODFW:**
  + Have been doing QA on CA data.
  + ODFW has 47 ArcGIS Online users. Put together webmap publishing guidelines. Cedric will send this around. Basic, but good. Not everyone gets to be a publisher.
  + Hydro updates, but no submission this past year. May or may not be one in early 2017.
  + Various DES coordination.
  + IT shop did a security audit. Hired a company to look for security problems. They found all kinds of things, and Cedric said this was a good thing. Included was seeing if people fell for phone calls asking for passwords. And they did! Tom said BPA does same thing.
  + Director’s office has made data management a priority. Created a new division: Management Resources Division, which contains RIMP (that’s Cedric and his crew, so they are moving out of the fish division). So this means data and data management are now recognized in a high level part of ODFW.
    - Developing a central system for natural resources data is the first thing they have been asked to do. Cedric gave an overview of what will be in this and how the information will be organized. It’s huge, and scheduled to be done in June. It will be a framework, really, as what was asked for is much too big to actually accomplish in that time frame.
    - Director’s office now pays for Jon Bowers except for the small amount he gets from StreamNet.
* **NPCC:**
  + Successfully connected to CA data from their web site.
  + Salmon/steelhead abundance map web site coming along.
  + Other maps being made for Council, and Nancy told what types.
    - Tom P. expressed concern that there are redundant efforts, and he’s wondering how duplicate effort can be avoided.
* **BPA:**
  + They have noticed that expected expenditures often don’t match what’s really been spent. They request this be monitored more closely and budget mods made as necessary. Chris says we need an informal process to help with this monitoring. It’s a balancing act between being reasonably accurate while still getting work done and not just doing budget monitoring. Tom mentioned that he can OK changes within 5% of the contract.
* **PSMFC:**
  + No comments.

**Adjourn 4:00 pm**