Sept. 20, 2017

StreamNet Executive Committee

PSMFC Office – Portland

DRAFT - StreamNet Executive Committee Meeting Notes – DRAFT

Attendees: John Arterburn (CCT), Tom Stahl (ODFW), Dan Rawding (WDFW), Tom Pansky, Brian Mercier, Jody Lofton, Jeff Lane, Scott Donahue (all BPA), Lance Hebdon (IDFG), Nancy Leonard (Council), Jen Bayer (PNAMP), Colleen Roe (CRTFC), Denise Kelsey (CRTFC), Art Martin (ODFW), Tom Iverson (SN Tribal Coordinator), Roy Elicker, Doug Threloff, Johnna Roy (all USFWS), Tony Grover (Council), Jason Vogel (Nez Perce- phone), Mari Williams (NOAA- phone), Bill Bosch (Yakima Fisheries - phone), Greg Seiglitz (NOAA), Stan Allen, Chris Wheaton, Mike Banach, Amy Roberts, Bill Kinney (all PSMFC)

9:30 AM Budget Updates – last month adjustments – Next FY Budgets All

Reviewed current balances; Steering Committee did not identify any issues with billing

Unspent funds from ODFW will be transferred to WDFW to cover their budget shortfall for FY17 due to WDFW indirect rate increases WDFW identified $52,984 in shortfalls due to increased indirect rate. ODFW offered $27,000 in savings, and subcontract amendments are in the works to move funds to help WDFW. Overall contract will not be exceeded

PSMFC will purchase $4500 in computer replacements for ODFW from their savings

FY18 budgets reduced $450 (all at PSMFC) to cut training. Travel costs had already met reduction targets with your submissions

Our next contract is for two years. FY 18 Budgets total $2,085,033 (after $450 training cut). Subcontract budgets;

CCT $87,960

IDFG $323,771

MFWP $165,049

ODFW $463,704

USFWS $0

WDFW $459,865

PSMFC $584,683

We have a two year contract with BPA. May have option to roll savings from the first year into the next contract year, depending on BPA approval

USFWS is now independently funded through BPA overhead costs and no longer through StreamNet sub-contract

9:45 AM CA Data flow in 2017 How are we doing? End of year priorities All

Note: several of you asked how the CA data flow related to the predictions exercise we ran last year. [Click here](https://psmfc.sharefile.com/d-sa4fc6f2c3e84ae08) to download the Tier 1 & 2 FY17 Predictions & Data Delivered document.

Steering Committee confirms that data for 2017 will be submitted as anticipated

Will tribal data be submitted to the CAX this year?

BPA would like to get tribes engaged in CA and get data flowing in the exchange template; still need to work out the details

CRTFC needs to have conversation with their tribes- Umatilla now has permission to load NOSA data so will be working on getting that in

Nez Perce provided data to Bonneville in ‘flat file’ format; needs funding to get data flowing to CAX; getting infrastructure in place to load CDMS

Yakama has provided data to Bonneville in ‘flat file’ format; until they can manage their data internally it is difficult to share it externally; EPA funding for CDMS will contribute towards progress in data sharing capabilities

Council has on-going interest in ensuring they receive the data they are paying for. The tribal data project with the help of the EPA grant will help (not finish) building tribal infrastructure. The decision on what data to share will remain with the tribes.

Brief review of Coordinated Assessment project and role of the Executive Committee in guiding the project for new attendees. Looking for overall project guidance, priority setting, consensus on where you want the data management staff and effort to be focused in the year(s) ahead.

2008 BiOp may have had too much precision required of it; no idea what the next BiOp will look like, but may involve a transition from a population-centric view; this group will be important for guidance in achieving a useful outcome

BPA is looking to cut programs that are not delivering results or working as intended; if projects can’t demonstrate the utility of their program or provide the data BPA is anticipating receiving, they will not continue funding them (CHAMP, ISEMP discussions)

Dan R- may need to look at rolling up populations going forward to meet regional needs, some were hesitant to share the metrics that go into NOSA, partners are continuing to make progress on data delivery and willing to be flexible on adding new indicators with the caveat that there is always a trade-off in times of level/ reduced funding between adding new work and dropping off other work

Group’s job is to focus on the highest level priorities. Bonneville staff reiterated that their priorities have not changed; Tier 1 and Tier 2 populations, natural origin salmon and steelhead indicators, including juveniles.

10:00 AM FPC data sharing and Hatchery data Update Mike

FPC Data Sharing

FPC created a query for capturing their SARs data, and a methodology for converting it for loading into CAX on an annual basis

PSMFC needs mapping for FPC groups/ populations in CA, then can run the queries and update datasets (CRTFC has already attempted to map it out- Denise will talk with Mike directly)

ExComm members were asked to work with their SC rep to complete the map-out of the FPC SARs and determine which populations they apply to so that Mike can implement data sharing

Hatchery Data

4 possible indicators discussed on June 14th hatchery conference call;

Juvenile releases    (date, location, release type, fish size, maybe marks)

Adult returns by location.    (with / without jacks)

SAR    (by broodstock; start with data from FPC)

R/S    (lowest priority; difficult)

Draft DES is out and open for comments

USFWS sent data sets from FINS/ CRIS systems (releases, returns); FINS should be up and running by next year

IDFG sent info on what they have (electronic transfer of archive hasn’t been completed yet)

WDFW sent Toutle chinook data

FPC is collecting for in-season management, may not get corrected to be suitable for follow-up analysis

Executive Committee was supportive of the project, but only if it did not negatively impact the priority natural origin work. Chris noted that this was 5% or less of staff’s time and were not asking for anything more than that – just wanted to get sample data sets so that PSMFC can compare scales of data, issues, etc.

Email feedback on the DES may not be the most productive method; may be better for managers to discuss DES scale and scope in person. Run reconstruction, harvest information, etc. will be very difficult if attempted.

Now looking for sample data sets from IDFG and ODFW – one facility or salmon/steelhead program from the Columbia basin would do for now, information on adult returns and juvenile releases would be great for a start. We will then compare what is available and determine how/ if it might correlate to desired indicators

11:00 AM Partner Updates All

Tony (Council)- asked ISAB for review of program prior to next amendment process- send any ideas to Tony and Nancy

John A (Colville)- working on process for reporting Habitat data, web-reporting tools and common spatial structure for upper Columbia

Jen B (PNAMP)- Field Tech Conference will be held Nov 7 & 8 in Portland, OFWIM 2018 Conference will be held in Hood River

Tom S (ODFW)- completed Phase 1 of project to bring together disparate data throughout the agency, created new division to assist with efforts (Management Resources Division; StreamNet staff is now part of this new division)

Roy E (USFWS)- working on evaluating hatchery data systems and moving towards web-based hatchery data management systems beginning in 2018. Currently have 3 different systems in the Region

Brian M/ Jeff L/ Jody L (BPA)- facing uncertainty in coming years and can only fund programs at the level that BPA revenue supports; need to cut budgets to make up for revenue losses and are looking to cut those projects that are not adding value/ not delivering results. BPA prioritizing projects that are building capacities (like StreamNet) but those projects also need to deliver results (disappointed that CA has not yet delivered the intended data- still feels stuck in year 1, seems like project is way behind in delivery of Tier 1 and Tier 2 data for being in year 3

Lance H (IDFG)- PowerPoint displayed complexity of indicator calculation in long-lived species like chinook and steelhead, especially with multiple cohorts – slows data flow because it literally takes years to get all the pieces needed for calculation. Takes years to produce Juvenile data (need to curb expectations due to how long it can take to compile the data for run reconstruction) ; converting staff to Status and Trends work has led to rapid advancement, Juvenile Abundance data is being loaded- dealing with the question of at what point has the data gone through enough QC to go into the CAX?

Denise K (CRTFC)- now have project lead (Colleen Roe) for Inter-Tribal Data Project to move forward again

Tom I (YAK)- working on building centralized data management system- goal is to start delivering data to CAX by next year, have website for project level information

Jason V (NZP)- worked in 2017 to standardize data and data acquisition and putting data into electronic format to serve out efficiently, involved in FINS

Dan R (WDFW)- continuing to work on updating indicators for CA, only way they have been able to come close to meeting contract deliverables is to invest heavily in electronic data collection (all smolt traps, all redd surveys, mark-recapture work on Columbia Chum, carcass tagging). Met the limits of electronic field data capture when attempting to count live fall chinook in the Kalama

1:00 PM CA/StreamNet Priorities for new FY and review of 5 year work plan All

Potential Modifications to the DES/New Indicators

(Juvenile Outmigrants & NOSA)

QA/QC discussion

Possible Pilot Project? High Priority Project Data into CAX as “Related Data”?

Current 5 Year Plan appears to have been over-ambitious; need to discuss changes to better reflect reality of what can be done under real-world conditions

Reviewed current plan and proposed changes resulting from the Steering Committee meeting

Should add ‘Implement FPC data sharing’ into Year 3

BPA will follow up on possibility of integrating 1 Fish/ 2 Fish tools with CAX so public has access – everyone likes the visualizations provided

Want to make sure that populating Tier 1 and Tier 2 indicator data remains the highest priority

Year 3/4- finalize hatchery DES for a limited number of high priority indicators

Year 4- if supported by region’s priorities and does not detract from highest priority items, conduct review of lamprey, sturgeon, and bull trout…

Year 5- update/ develop new plan for next 5 years

Council is committed to finding a way to record data on fish other than salmon and steelhead; WDFW wants to be involved in those discussions in whatever forum is most appropriate, MFWP is part of StreamNet and does not have salmon and steelhead, and BPA has broader concerns than just salmon and steelhead

Years 3, 4, and 5 would now be;

**Year 3 - (2017-18)**

Maintain automated flow of existing indicators, especially for priority pops. Obtain more data and share data with tribes if possible

Maintain FPC data sharing. Implement hatchery data sharing if initial exercise is productive

Examine pilot project for getting priority data from certain BPA-funded projects into CAX or as “related data” for populations

Delay review of data on lamprey, sturgeon, and bull trout, and discussion of data availability and relationship to regional data needs until FY 2019

**Year 4 - (2018-19)**

Maintain automated flow of existing indicator data.

Finalize DES for a limited number of high priority hatchery indicators, begin to populate with data

If supported by region’s priorities and does not detract from highest priority items, conduct review of lamprey, sturgeon, and bull trout, to assess and discuss data availability and relationship to regional data needs

**Year 5 - (2019-20)**

Maintain automated flow of all adopted indicators.

If initiated in previous year, finalize and adopt lamprey, sturgeon, and/or bull trout indicators, begin to populate with data

Conduct review of CA project and update/ develop a new plan for next 5 years. Include assessment of regional data needs

Reviewed StreamNet Priority List for FY18

#6 moves up to #3 as it involves a high level indicator with Tier 1 and Tier 2 populations

NOAA doesn’t want to see ‘HLI’s for other populations’ drop too far down the list. The task priority list to implement the CA project in FY 2018 would now be;

**Priority List for FY 18:**

1. HLIs for 18 Tier 1 Populations
2. HLIs for 51 Tier 2 Populations
   1. (Including Implementing FPC data sharing for these Tier 1&2 populations)
3. Addition/modification of indicators for Tier 1 &2 populations, as directed by BPA (i.e. age data?) TBD
4. HLIs for other populations
   1. (Including Implementing FPC data sharing for these populations)
5. Maintain facilities dataset/fish distribution
6. Related data pilot project for high priority populations
7. Hatchery Datasets and DES Development
8. NPCC dashboard trends
9. Other (New Indicators? Bull trout?, etc.)

**Related data pilot project for high priority populations?**

Proposal is that BPA would identify a limited number of projects where there were issues with accessing priority salmon and steelhead data. These projects would be within StreamNet partner agencies. StreamNet staff would contact the internal agency contract manager to determine what the issues are with the data availability, offer assistance to get data into CAX (or identify what it will take to make the data available);

1. BPA Identify StreamNet partner projects that appear to have data, but that data not accessible (pilot – start small scale)
2. StreamNet partners contact their internal agency contract manager – determine issues with data availability
3. If the problem is technical or communication, offer assistance to get data into CAX or as “related data” in display – note that we could put data in the data store if it is unstructured and does not fit DES
4. StreamNet staff NOT contract enforcement personnel – will not impart a “must comply” message during the pilot
5. Will report back on pilot project and decide where to go from here.

Pilot project is a “go”. Bonneville (Scott or Jody) identifies a limited group of projects from StreamNet partners that appear to have inaccessible data. They will check in with Chris by the end of October. Chris will doodle a meeting date soon to get on calendars. He will then contact each StreamNet partner and provide them their list, develop a timeline and a process for response. Will figure out some way to characterize the issues identified (i.e. “multi-cohort analysis required, all data not yet in”; “data is available, in database here\_\_\_\_”, etc.)

Also discussed blanks or null values within the CAX. Bonneville would like to know whether some of those will be/could be filled so we don’t keep on revisiting. Would like a pick list to provide more information on nulls (i.e. “data was not collected that year”) so that we don’t revisit, if possible.

Need a narrow focus to the question- which ‘blanks’ are you wanting documentation on? There are a large number of non-mandatory metric level fields in the DES. Asking everyone to fill every one with a qualitative answer would take a lot of time – is that a priority? Get asked the same question multiple times, so need to be sure the answers are filtering through to the people asking the question. Filling the blanks in with “not available”, etc. creates a much greater workload on the people inputting the data

If no data is available for a population, could there be a drop down with 5 or 6 reasonable answers to the question of ‘why?’

Would also like drop downs for some key metric questions- WDFW not providing total origin spawners and keeps getting asked about it- would like a way to document that to resolve the questions quickly

BPA wants documentation for blanks in the indicator field; but their questions on blanks have not been limited to indicators- in the metrics, if it’s not a mandatory field it can be left blank.

BPA (Scott or Jody) will provide a list of the currently non-mandatory fields in the DES that they would like to see filled; Starting with Tier 1/ Tier 2 NOSA. Once that list is provided, will discuss with StreamNet steering committee and report back on issues/workload questions that arise.

BPA also giving thought to new indicators and edits to the DES relating to Age data; should add a priority item to Year 3 list relating to addition/ modification of indicators as directed by BPA (note, now on list as item number 3 for your consideration)

2:30 PM Tribal Data Project and Coordination with CAX Denise Kelsey & Colleen Roe

Umatilla have received approval to share their data

ITMD project and EPA grant (2nd year) both building capacity to share data with CAX as a deliverable

CRTFC, Warm Springs, and Nez Perce will get CDMS up and running in next year and hope to be able to send data through exchange node within next year (Yakama are doing their own thing)

Note that the ability to share data does not mean that the tribes have agreed to share data. That is an individual tribal decision and not CRITFC’s call

3:00 PM Discussion of a proposed PNAMP Workshop Jen

PNAMP has offered to facilitate a methods review workshop focused on protocols and methods used to derive NOSA for steelhead. Jen is seeking feedback on interest, scope and timing of such a workshop (assuming sufficient interest).

Handout provided ‘NOSA Metadata Documentation Summary’

Will be hosting workshop for effected contracts and will send out more info once the details are established; want to help people comply with the requirement to provide documentation and learn how to better improve [www.monitoringresources.org](http://www.monitoringresources.org)

Some entities are starting to use a different methodology for NOSA for Steelhead; is this a good time to review the methodology? There has been enough change over the years that it would be a good time to review and it’s a worthwhile discussion to have, especially as it relates to identifying efficiencies. Would have been great to have with the Wall Walla steelhead workshop in March, but too late to get on Agenda.

Jen will send out email with more info soon, will shoot for Jan/ Feb timeframe

3:30 PM Adjourned