**DRAFT AGENDA**

**StreamNet Executive Committee Meeting**

Nov. 8, 2016

9 am – 4 pm

PSMFC Main Conference Room

205 SE Spokane Street

Portland, Oregon 97202

Attendees: Chris W, Roy Elicker, Tom Pansky , Leslie, Tom Iverson, John Arterburn, Pete Hassemer, Bryan Mercier, Russell Scranton, Zach Penney, Mike B, Tony Grover, Scott Donahue, Tom Stahl, Dan Rawding, David, Henry Franzoni

Phone: Greg Seiglitz, Jay Hesse

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

* 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.

Brian M- need to have a conversation about how to prioritize between subcontracts and primary contract. Current default is to fund sub-contracts first with leftovers to PSMFC. Should that prioritization process continue? Need to evaluate if this process is producing the desired product. BPA does not anticipate that there will be extra money to allocate to PSMFC in 2018.

Tony G- recommends partners gather for a strict budget discussion in February (3 scenarios: 1- no increase in funding, 2- additional external funding sources that may be available [grants, etc.], 3- found funds through reallocation and shifting of emerging priorities)

Tom P- might be opportunities for funding by thinking about region’s needs at a broader level

Chris W- SN is a tool to help the region monitor and manage salmon and steelhead populations, not a new program- it’s an efficiency exercise at a regional level; timely to have these discussions in a declining budget era

Decision: Have a special budget-focused session with ExCom in the February timeframe. Partners should come prepared to discuss how they use BPA funds to meet current StreamNet priorities. Expectation is no additional funding in 2018

**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

Rather than targeting data for population-scale estimates, should we be looking at super-populations in order to gather more data?

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

Have Monitoring and Implementation Plan in place before new amendment process begins (2 years from now)

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?

* 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

Chris W- exercise demonstrated how useful it was to have a target when setting priorities

Tom I- tribal work has been done but is not yet necessarily represented in the table; would like to have a discussion about how best to display the contributions from tribes and obstacles they face in participation

Tony G- doing well on NOSA, might be possible to get more NOSA but may not be the best use of limited resources; this group can only influence the capacity relative to funding available- have to identify when you reach the point of diminishing returns; maintenance of current effort is still going to cost something; at what point do we say things are “good enough” and it’s OK to move on?

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

**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

Brian M- focus in FY17 on normalizing existing data flow for the adopted natural origin indicators before turning completely to other data priorities; SN and BPA may not be the right groups to help determine hatchery needs

Dan R- priorities would be low hanging fruit and updating existing data, then SARs, without hatchery data PNI will be difficult to do

Pete H/ Tom S- priorities would be NOSA, then SARs, unsure on hatchery data- someone needs to describe what they need and how they need it for this to be a priority

Bull Trout BiOp will be in 2018- don’t need to do much with it in 2017 but would be good to start thinking about it now to be prepared

Zach P- would be nice to give the tribes a chance to catch up by staying the course rather than expanding further; when funding is of concern should make sure the maintenance component is figured out before adding in new things

Jay H- need to focus on completing NOSA, against elevating PNI to indicator level

Tom I- additional funds are needed to take on additional data; could fund regional hatchery monitoring plan through RRS savings

Tony G- are we sure that we need this kind of process for Bull Trout? Would a workshop on bull trout in the next year or two be sufficient to meet the needs? If so, then there is no need to go down this path. The Council is happy to convene it and answer the question if a SN body and CA process is needed for bull trout. Opportunity to develop a path forward on identifying hatchery needs. NOSA is the priority, but at some point you have to determine when the majority of the needs are being met and move on. This group can make that determination.

Greg S- Greg S- shares similar priorities (NOSA, SARs), not a lot of capacity to move hatchery data forward but should be kept on the radar for the next year and identify the regional body(ies) that will set the targets for what should be done and why before elevating Hatchery Indicators CA priority, would like to clearly establish “how much is good enough” in the next year’s work plan; is the expectation that all the indicators would be fully populated by September 2017? Need to define what this means and reasonable expectations for the 2017 workplan.

John A- continue to fill in the suite of indicators associated with NOSA; adult return information often includes hatchery fish- could this be somewhat easily added to NOSA rather than elevating everything else to do with hatcheries?

Chris W- we have a hatchery DES already in play and a lot of robust hatchery databases that already exist; no need to provide a Bull Trout superstructure if the information is already being provided/ obtained elsewhere

Pete H- there is a process to make sure there is a HGMP in place for every hatchery in the basin which have all the info about releases, straying, etc.; is there a set of metrics related to evaluating performance? If so, it would help determine what data should be compiled and reported. But this has to be a policy-level discussion that feeds StreamNet, not the other way around.

Dan R- current NOSA DES is a good start to think about what would be needed for Bull Trout; will try to pull some old records from previous efforts

Tom P- make sure Montana is involved in the Bull Trout discussions

Decisions: Make populating the existing natural origin indicators the priority for FY 2016. Include discussions with FPC & CRITFC about sharing and displaying SARs for superpopulations. Survey partners to get information on predicted dataflow for the year, including information on “predicted” data, which shows where population level data is not/won’t be available. Continue to work with CRITFC tribes to include them in data flow to the extent that resources allow them to do so.

Nancy Leonard (NPCC), with Chris’s help (StreamNet) will convene a Bull trout workshop to identify players, discuss data needs, and identify future paths forward for regional data sharing for this species. Montana will also be asked to play an important role.

**LUNCH Noon**

**Update on Tribal EPA Grant & CA-Tribal 1:00 PM**

**Futuring Discussion**

* 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 (Greg Wilke can provide contact info for the right person at EPA to talk to)
* How to maintain these systems long-term is a concern they have going forward

Chris W- most effective use of SN funding from BPA is to build a structure that answers the questions your individual agency needs to answer, but making sure the outputs will also answer regional questions to maintain relevancy

Dan R- Having the structure in place for electronic data collection will save time down the road; they are right to be concerned about maintenance and updates in the future

Chris W- is there anything that can be done to get tribal data into CA this year? We continue to invite tribal participation on the Exec Comm, have Tom Iverson on contract to help with tribal coordination, but if there’s other things that SN can do please say so.

Zach P- the tribes did provide data (either directly or submitted by another agency; Umatilla is expecting that ODFW will submit their data), but there were some limitations in how it could be used; individual tribes will need to provide those answers

Jay H- SN staff assistance would be helpful in figuring out citation standards across the data; help would be welcome; continually frustrated at how data generators are labeled separately from data consumers

Tom P- how do we get the Sho-Ban tribe to the table?

Tom I- they are on a project-by-project data management system, are currently working with IDFG; don’t have the resources within their projects to even listen in on these meetings

Brian M- going to have to accept that it’ll be piecemeal for a while due to tribal sovereignty concerns and identified needs

Decisions: Greg Wilke will provide contact info to Henry on the right person at EPA to talk to. Continue to work with tribes on sharing information and resources. Maintain/develop citation standards that credit ALL data contributors as a priority.

**Updating “Related Data” Expectations and Concerns 2:00 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

Dan R- related data associated with a population depends on what was historically brought into the project in the 1990’s

Chris W- some are legacy datasets and will not be updated

Pete H- is there a metadata layer that explains dates, blanks, etc.?

Dan R- some blanks/ lack of updates may be because they haven’t had time to get to them due to higher priority tasks; these datasets are not always at the population scale

Brian M- there’s no leadership/ pull for this data (it’s nice to have, but it’s ancillary and not a need); if there is an existing partner that has something we could leverage for this that’d be great, but shouldn’t be spending a lot of time or energy on this

Pete H- if it’s used to generate NOSA, then should it be a part of the metadata for that population

Chris W- Display of CA data pretty dry if it is just a few indicators with lots of gaps.

Dan R- importance of data with regards to decision-making should guide the prioritization

Greg S. Need to advance conversations about data delivery/serving and develop appropriate tools and robust metadata to accompany this minimal approach to date. Especially important before investing a lot into related data.

Decision: Have DES’s developed for all the traditional “trends”. Will continue collecting and displaying this data as long as it’s not impeding work on higher priority tasks and helps to understand the population status and trend. Will discuss with partners at Steering Committee Thursday to make sure there is common understanding of what we are asking for.

**Roundtable Discussion 3:00 PM**

Pete H- will have a discussion with his staff on what’s been done and what’s available in order to figure out the blanks in the tables (Indicators and Related Data) and either chase it down or document that it doesn’t exist

Dan R- Recognize that we have a real product now, have made a lot of progress! On the Tier 1 table, if it’s not available indicate that with an n/a not a ‘0’ or a blank; seeing a realization of what CA can actually do; establishment of Exec Comm has led to more focus and clear deliverables; will be a fair amount of work at the technical level to link super-populations but need to be able to have this aggregate data available to the region

Tony G- Council will do a Bull Trout workshop but asks partners to share objectives with Nancy; process is working well

Zach P- On the big picture of tribal data collection and management, going forward wants to know what CRITFC has done, and how the four tribes associated with CRITFC are best served in the future.

Tom S- ODFW has an R&D group looking into new and better ways to collect data, and new data streams that would more easily provide more relevant information; looking at more active adaptive management; status and trend information doesn’t do a good job of telling you where to go in the future

Greg S- Also kudos to Chris’ and staff leadership and co-manager efforts to advance the CA program to make it highly successful in making progress over the last year, will pursue regional conversation for RME priorities including the linkage between monitoring programs (e.g. Monitoring Resources.org) and data management (e.g. StreamNet), advance a conversation about “Fully Populate” and clarify expectations.

Jay H- observed tone of regional RM&E priority setting and reiterates idea of proceeding with a Skamania 2 process to bring in more of the regional players that are not currently in the room; Why such a strong push for open access? Fearful it will lead to more analysis and isolation and reduce the collaborative discussion across entities.

**Adjourn 4:00 pm**