**DRAFT MEETING NOTES**

**StreamNet Steering Committee Meeting**

Feb. 9, 2017 (12 noon – 5 pm)

PSMFC Main Conference Room, 205 SE Spokane Street Portland, Oregon 97202

Attendees: Chris Wheaton, Bob Woodard, Tom Pansky, Nancy Leonard (phone), Cedric Cooney, Bill Kinney, Paul Clayton, Greg Wilke, Dawn Anderson (phone), Bart Butterfield (phone), Evan Brown (phone), Stan Allen, Doug Threloff (USFWS), Tom Iverson (phone), Jen Bayer (phone)

**Introductions – Including Doug Threloff, the new Regional Data Manager for USFWS in the Portland Regional office**

**Begin Review of FY 17 Budgets** Noon

**Preparation for Ex Comm Meeting on March 7 & Action Items for Follow-Up**

Review PowerPoint (Each State/Tribe go over staff assignments, spending etc. in their subcontract & relationship to StreamNet program priorities (15 minutes each)

BPA would like a budget review (this meeting is in preparation for that review/ presentation at the next SN Exec Com mtg in March) to figure out “why does it cost so much to deal with data?”

Figure out where the money is being spent, and what does that cost cover

Reviewed Chris’s slides

Most of the budget is people (70%), indirect (18%), and subcontracts (7%); nickel and diming travel/ rent/ etc. will not save you money. Number the slides, Keep slides 3 and 4.

**5) Major Elements from SOW**: Coordination, Mgmt., Reporting (46%), Coordinated Assessments (27%), Enhancing Efficiency of Data Transfer (16%), Traditional Data (10%); the SOW breakdown by work element shows ¾ of work done on tasks other than CA- Decided that we need to **explain what these categories mean (glossary/ definitions)**

**6) 2017 SOW Priorities**: shorten the text; connect back to previous ‘percentage of effort’ slide, or have available as a handout. Delete from presentation

**7) 2017 Priorities from ExComm**: delete from presentation

Add as a separate slide right before partners that flexibility from the budget templates provided (i.e. the specific staff listed, number of months, etc. in each agency) is often needed to address in-year issues, changes, shortfalls, cost increases, etc.

**Started to review each partner presentation;**

**PSMFC:** % effort, tasks involved, proportion & type of technical assistance provided, other uses of SN staff time; Seems to be a good starting place for breaking down and evaluating where the money goes

**CCT**: bulleted, quantitative approach- is there a better way to present it? Detailed accounting of hours spent- may be too fine of detail to break it down by hours, may make more sense to convert to months or FTE to be uniform among all the agencies; might want to include an explanation for Sitka’s involvement

IDFG: estimated how much time each staff person spends on each task; **what does ‘technical assistance’ mean?** Show people how to work with/ access/ manipulate the data; could combine with training into ‘Training and User Assistance’

\*Would help to have a clear definition of each task to make sure they are all being interpreted in

the same way

 **WDFW:** time broken down by staff and databases they work on; can lease devices from

 the state thru indirect funds- **story of the seed money and R&D of the field collection**

 **devices may be useful to include in a separate slide**

 **MFWP:** most of time on traditional datasets & resident fish due to rest of project’s focus

 on anadromous species, will add in management and coordination tasks; customized for

 what they are currently doing rather than slide’s bullet points to avoid entering ‘0’s;

 should make sure to put in Bull Trout meeting and also the sub-contracting piece of

 their budget

**Management, Coordination, Project Administration (meetings, leave, etc.) all go in one category- do task breakdowns all in percentages of time spent**

 **ODFW:** potential always exists for staff being reassigned to other projects depending on agency priorities so StreamNet funding can get diverted to other staff as time and resources allow to focus on targeted StreamNet priorities (same for all agencies- should

 make this point earlier in the presentation and reference the relationship building

 aspect), 44% of time paid by BPA goes towards CA

 Keep the breakdowns by agency to one page each

**USFWS:** has not had direction from management as to what they want to see in this presentation; traditionally StreamNet funds have gone to Vancouver office but discussions on where the money is going for the future have not been held

**Add slide that highlights** **other in-kind contributions that help BPA- have a high level slide of regional benefits from the project that aren’t paid for by BPA. Explain how BPA StreamNet funding is used by most partners as an integral part of a broader data management infrastructure; PSMFC (facilities database, PTAGIS, RMIS) – use WDFW examples – StreamNet staff have helped with all of these.** Add Slide with a list of regional projects that StreamNet staff have contributed to, may include ‘beyond-the-basin’ contributions that could translate to regional needs.

Add slide of WDFW example of how their staff time is used to calculate NOSA, RperS, etc.

Look at slide of application development, data capture, technology sharing, etc. and put in final presentation if it fits and tells a good story.

Agencies will revise slides to include the percentage of time spent 4 SOW Major Element bullet points and send to Chris W by Friday 2/17/17. Also send copy to your ExComm representative to prepare them to provide the info in the meeting.

**Revised slide direction for all:**

Get your final slide down to a single page. Header will remain the staff and FTE block. Those with contracts will have a couple sentences – a paragraph explaining the contract amount, purpose and history.

Each partner will report percentages like this (ODFW example), customized for your organization:

40% Coordination, Management, Reporting

44% Coordinated Assessments

4% Enhancing Efficiency and Transfer of Data

11% Traditional Data

Can end with a brief narrative description of any budget-related history, etc. if you would like, but keep it short and simple. Can briefly make the point about the issues surrounding level funding in the presentation- each agency describe the reductions in months, reductions in datasets being available to region, etc.- BPA advice is to not say anything until you can quantify the reductions

**Get the revised slides back to Chris no later than February 17**. Also, each SNSC member to discuss the presentation with your Exec Comm member prior to the March 7th meeting to make sure they are comfortable with the presentation. Tom and Nancy please do a quick check with Tony and Brian to make sure we are on the right track with the presentation – let Chris know if something different is needed.

**BREAK** 2:15 PM

**FY 2018 Prep: (BPA Budget Format, new SOW, etc. for** **FY 2018** 2:30 PM

Tom P has not heard if there is a new budget format (by hour, with medical and benefit rates

 split out) but other PSMFC BPA-funded projects have received new budget templates

 Also need to know when the budgets and SOW are due- should be done 6 months ahead of start

 of new contract (April 1) but BPA doesn’t finalize their numbers until June 1; start on budget

 now assuming level funding for FY 2018, prepare Year 1 and Year 2 budgets (gives the option to

 roll any cost savings from Year 1 into Year 2)

 Start to look at cuts or reductions to work elements out of the SOW specifically in response

to number of years at level funding. Perhaps could tie number of populations/indictors that can be developed to funding levels somehow?

PSMFC costs could rise in FY 2018 if off-setting funding goes away in the future (GIS Team, Chris

W time); should be a topic for the next Exec Comm meeting so would need budgets and SOW

cuts from everyone by then. Chris needs to look at contracts and costs on a two-year basis and plot out PSMFC expenses prior to Exec discussion.

Priorities: 1) Budgets by March 1

 2) Annual Reports by March 15

 Tom will clarify the budget template ASAP – Chris provided contacts

**Discuss Bull Trout Meeting – Missoula, Montana** 3:30 PM

April 12th - will have remote access as well. Each State/Tribe ID Participants (have gotten names from you in the past, but please review list.

Agenda is - existing (year 2000-current) goals and objectives for bull trout (species/core populations/ management units/ habitat)

- Available data?

- Current reporting needs at different scales that could benefit from facilitated data sharing (e.g., local entity, across jurisdiction and regional such as recovery status updates.

Invitees: Federal, State and Tribal fish biologists and managers working to achieve goals and objectives and who are interested in improving reporting on status and progress towards objectives

Participants: Individuals who manage and synthesize information to inform bull trout recovery and to meet their entities management objectives. Ideally have one representative from each Fish and Wildlife state agencies and Tribe, as well as federal agencies that are familiar with existing objectives, available data, and reporting needs at different scales (entity, local, management unit, regional, etc.)

Working on email list to send to execs and wider possible audience. Current list is attached for your review – please send any additions or changes to Chris. Nancy is looking for a contact for Blackfeet Nation in Montana. Dawn will see if she can get one.

**Discuss Predicted data flow for FY 2017** 3:45 PM

 Each State/Tribe came with predicted data flow by population and indicator. IDFG will return to the data flow web app after Jay Hesse has a chance to do it next week.

Tom I will verify with Bill B if Yakama is going to supply C.A. data in FY-17 for Population 76 – Yakima R Upper Mainstem summer steelhead.

Change summary slide to remove CRITFC SARs so that the years are comparable.

Note that not all of this data collection or work is BPA funded on the slide.

Add a map display of the indicator data flow for the ExComm meeting.

**QA/QC of CA Database vs. NOAA SPS**

 Briefly discussed document from Russell and consultant describing some QA/QC issues. WDFW was adamant that the CA database was more accurate than the 2015 SPS download as there continue to be some direct contacts with field biologists that result in data in SPS have not been vetted by their corporate data system. We reminded ourselves that NOAA did not use CA in the 2015 update, but they planned to do so in the future.

Decided it would be good to have Mari Williams as an invited member of the SNSC – Chris will extend the invitation. Also StreamNet will proactively set up a system to QA/QC the CA database with each published, downloadable SPS database version, starting with the 2015, so that any issues are 1) corrected if in error (will require back checking with partners) or 2) understood so that they might be explained clearly. Thought it would be a good idea to invite Brian Mashoff and Russell Scranton over for a QA/QC discussion.

**Steve Pastor came by for a visit, impromptu Himalayan slide show, and then a dinner to celebrate his retirement. Good Luck Steve!**

**Adjourn**  5:00 PM