**StreamNet Executive Committee**

**Monday, March 16, 2015 1:00 PM – 4:30 PM (Pacific)**

**DRAFT Meeting Notes**

**PSMFC**

**205 SE Spokane Street, Suite 100**

**Portland, Or. 97202**

**1:00 PM Introductions and Welcome**

Attendees: Randy Fisher, Chris Wheaton, Bill Kinney, Tom Iverson, Jen Bayer, Tom Pansky, Nancy Leonard, Dan Rawding, Russell Scranton, Stan Allen, Bryan Mercier, Pete Hassemer, Tony Grover, Sean Connolly (for Roy Elicker), Mike Banach. By Phone: Katie Pierson, Don Skaar, Rich Carmichael, Tom Cooney, Zach Penney, Bart Butterfield, and John Arterburn

Recapped what happened at the previous meeting at the request of Bryan Mercier (formulated the Strategic Plan, discussed Coordinated Assessments, conversation on analysis and display of information), making sure that the StreamNet budget and priorities are aligned with the priorities established by the Executive Committee

**1:15 Building Next FY Budget & Statement of Work**

**Preliminary Discussion; StreamNet funding/staffing within your programs**

Would like to have a preliminary discussion today and get overall recommendations and direction from the Executive Committee. Chris, and Tom P will work with the Steering Committee on the details. The 2015 budget was the same as in 2014 ($2.084 million). Contract and budget run Oct. 1, 2015 – Sep. 30, 2016. PSMFC cost savings which allowed us to re-distribute existing funds to partners remain in effect for this next contract. After that? Received a few recommendations to date from WDFW (Wenatchee and Snake River Data Stewards, equipment purchases to assist with data automation)

Can BPA provide guidance on where budget should be targeted?

Will not be able to add additional funds for this year. BPA is just beginning discussions on FY16 budgets and their funding priorities (will keep the Executive Committee updated as they determine these priorities). BPA would like to continue with regional effort to institutionalize Coordinated Assessments; they also see value in continuing the facility database effort. See the agencies and tribes have the flexibility to propose change in their overall suite of projects; if it’s more important to pause on monitoring and re-prioritize work in order to catch up, that can be up for discussion (for example, bringing in data stewards rather than continuing work on lower priority monitoring projects). Budget is due to BPA by March 27th. BPA would like to see proposals for enhancements that foster progress on data management priorities, so that if money does become available at some point these proposals can be considered. If there are needs for additional expenditures, requests (along with a justification statement) need to be submitted to Chris and Tom P within the next 2 weeks.

Partners should expect to see level funding through FY16/17.

**Direction on Budget from Executive Committee (This will be sent to the Steering Committee for follow-up);**

 Each partner state and tribe should let Chris know by March 25th if they have serious structural costs that we need to talk about in the next budget (i.e. COLAs, unavoidable costs, etc.). We will try to accommodate but will need to build into existing program as per BPA guidance. Chris will submit budget by March 27th.

Each partner state or tribe should propose enhancements (like WDFW) that foster progress on priorities so that they may be considered if funds become available. Format should be fairly simple. Provide these requests by March 25th as well please. Prioritizing these requests in advance would be useful if money becomes available during the budget year; would then already know where the funds should be directed. Exec Comm please provide guidance to your Steering Committee members if you have priority recommendations. Chris and Tom will work with Steering Committee to finalize “base budget” at current funding level and a prioritized list of possible enhancements at the April 1st Steering Committee meeting.

**What changes (if any) should be in the SOW?**

Last year focus was on simplification of reporting, reduction of work elements, prioritization of effort

StreamNet Program Themes: support data management personnel and systems in partner agencies and tribes, provide regional coordination, secure data in accessible data repositories

Need to decide what to do with historical datasets

“Traditional” StreamNet Data has not been updated over the last two years due to Coordinated Assessment prioritization. Suggest that next SOW includes resumption of maintenance of “highest level of importance” traditional datasets;

Need to identify the ‘system of record’ for traditional datasets

Work with Nancy on the legacy datasets for NPCC needs

Look for datasets that will be replaced with the new indicator datasets being developed

Look for datasets that could be linked

StreamNet isn’t the “official” system of record since most partners have the responsibility to maintain their own data; StreamNet is a service to make data more accessible and consistent regionally

Should StreamNet take on the task to identify and maintain standard population names, codes, and locations?

 StreamNet is not a regional decision maker, but could facilitate the discussion of standards

We defer to higher management agency on regional naming that has already been determined (NOAA TRT Populations); this question is referring to those situations where a naming convention has not been established. What’s the method to resolve disputes in naming conventions amongst the states, tribes, and feds? StreamNet approach is from a data management perspective rather than trying to determine the “right” naming convention.

StreamNet support for the development and deployment of emerging technologies by partners?

WDFW saved 1 month of staff time due to StreamNet’s support of technology purchases (Dan)

Are there efficiencies to be found if StreamNet centrally manages those devices and technologies?

How did WDFW put those savings put back into the project?

Dan: They were able to work on other indicators due to the savings in staff time.

Would be helpful if StreamNet could identify vendors of technology that could be of use by

multiple partners in the region

StreamNet provide information to the public, maintain back end databases for NPCC (Protected Areas, facilities, dashboards, HLIs- automate and maintain data flow)

 Aggregating information at StreamNet is especially important for populations and sub-basins that cross

 state boundaries

SOW Input to Date: MFWP recommends that Executive Committee members convey to their respective agencies the importance of contributing to regional efforts

BPA wants to make sure that Coordinated Assessment work does not get delayed in favor of taking on new work or updating historical data; Coordinated Assessments should still be the primary priority in the SOW and budget

**Direction on SOW from Executive Committee (This will be sent to the Steering Committee for follow-up);**

Largely maintain the existing SOW. Focus is on Coordinated Assessments, Secure Data Repositories, and Support of data management staff & programs in states and tribes, and Regional Coordination.

For updates of traditional data sets, will include a SOW section that outlines this will be done, subordinate to other priorities. Resumption of maintenance of “highest level of importance” traditional data will be determined by feedback from StreamNet Steering Committee members and other interested individuals and focus on data that is used by NPCC, has strong demonstrated use by the public, etc.

The SOW will also include work elements that support maintenance of regional datasets and conventions that facilitate broad data management objectives; NPCC programs (protected areas, dashboards and HLIs); GIS clearinghouse (regional fish facility datasets); regional population naming protocols, others?

**2:30  Coordinated Assessments**

**Review and Approve Plans and Priorities for 2015 (Workshop April 2nd)**

**Current Indicators; NOSA, RperS, SARs, Juvenile Abundance**

* + - Data is flowing as of 3/9/15;

**Indicator Predicted data flow % of Pops Reporting status**

 **(3/9/15)**

**NOSA 131/216 60.60% 24**

**RperS 34/216 15.70% 1**

**SAR 3/216 1.40% 3**

**Juvenile 25/216 11.60% 0**

Discussion:

Need another column that identifies how many of the total populations will actually be reporting on a particular indicator; Where is data for an indicator going to be developed and where will there never be data? There won’t ever be data for all 216 TRT populations; what is the correct denominator?

Could also have categories for ‘Extirpated’ and ‘Monitored but not enough to roll up to population level indicators’

 Extirpated

 Data and a population level indicator will be developed

Data but no indicator will be developed, must be extrapolated from smaller or larger unit (i.e. a study or studies or a larger MPG estimated)

Expect that much of the data will arrive in chunks (June 1 is target for full operations)

If the targets are important, then the organizations need to be reminded of their data flow expectations

Projections were for flow by quarter (majority of the data is targeted for 2nd-4th quarter delivery)

Tom I reviewed current and proposed new work plans.

**Objectives and Targets for Newer Indicators; Juvenile fish (almost done) Hatcheries (shown as “almost done”, but did we pick the right indicators?), Resident Fish? , Other? Who needs and uses data? Other players to involve (resident fish managers, hatchery PUDs, etc.)**

NOSA is priority #1

* + - Need guidance on the next priority- is it hatcheries?
		- Want to expand the node to be able to add indicators and to expand geographically
		- More indicators may result in expanded partnerships and need to bring in other participants (PUDs, USFWS, etc.)
			* Some of the items proposed in their next work plan are dependent on additional funding from EPA

RperS is priority #2

 Remember that data flow expectations are cumulative; older indicators need to be updated annually, plus the new indicators need to be developed and data then compiled for them as well.

Hatchery Indicators next?

 Hatchery indicators really can be divided into two types;

Direct Hatchery Information; number of fish released, number of fish returned, etc. Look at the propagation section of the NPCC F&W plan for possible targets of where we should go with these indicators; objectives for adult salmon and steelhead, HLIs and dashboards

Hatchery influences on wild fish (things that influence the regulatory process; pHOs, etc.). Look to NOAA and BPA BiOp requirements for where we should go with these indicators.

Develop a whole list of indicators and then prioritize the totality, looking at the feasibility (where do we have data, what is the need, etc.). “Bin” the discussions, i.e. a NOSA bin, a hatchery bin, a resident fish bin. Discuss at the workshop. Let folks know the agenda in advance.

**Indicators for Populations; When do we want non-population level data in CA database? Do we want this data in CA?**

Use the best data available, even if not at population level. Point to aggregated (MPG) data if pop level not available. Need group to provide direction on when lower or higher level information is acceptable and beneficial to be incorporated into the Coordinated Assessment database

Can we store aggregate data and point to it? Could use this same strategy for SAR.

Concern that we don’t make the CA database a place for a lot of non-population level data that is also already available elsewhere (i.e. MPG SARs that have already been calculated by the CSS project)

**CA Data Display; Plans, concerns or issues?**

We did not get to this issue due to lack of time. The preference of the PSMFC staff is to move towards display of data on StreamNet and support of the NPCC effort to display data for the region. More discussion with the Exec Comm in the future.

**Direction on CA Project from Executive Committee (This will be sent to the Steering Committee and Discussed at the April 2nd Workshop);**

* + - Fine tune data flow reporting methodology to include the likelihood of getting data
		- List and prioritize the totality of all proposed indicators. Identify those where data is available, identify what the needs for the data are. Workshop Agenda should include a discussion of ALL the indicators that are regionally significance, and these should have a proposed priority ranking. Would like to set the priorities at the workshop and then report back to the committee
			* Need members to talk with the meeting attendees in advance to make sure their priorities are represented
			* Ranking of feasibility and priorities will have to be done after the list generated by the workshop
		- Get feedback on current data flow (StreamNet steering committee, Workshop: tribes)
		- Workshop; Approve current DES, adopt work plan
		- Next indicators should be Hatcheries
		- May be some hatchery indicators that could be done faster than others
		- Naturally spawning hatchery fish is included as a sub-metric
		- How do we pick the group to define the hatchery indicators?
			* Nancy will represent the Council
		- We are not done with NOSA (nothing for diversity or spatial structure yet); there are things that are missing from the indicator list and some things on the list that are not as critical
		- Should also include a discussion on Resident Fish indicators
		- Continue discussion and develop proposals for when non-population level data should be put into the CA database
		- Continue discussion and development of CA data display on StreamNet and NPCC websites, but review and get feedback from Exec Comm as an ongoing step.

**4:00 Monitoring Resources**

**Documenting Analytical methods and protocols for CA indicators**

There is a commitment to document the analytical methods used to calculate the indicators in CA at some level. MM.org kills two birds with one stone for BPA projects. Protocol for documenting Coordinated Assessment analytical methods includes description of survey design in addition to a description of the field methods used.

CAX Standard requires metadata- Monitoring Methods makes it easy

If you publish your protocol in MonitoringMethods.org, it is your system of record and you can simply use the URL. MonitoringMethods.org is consistent, free to users, accessible, identifies best practices, and allows for comparison.

Should this be brought to the workshop on April 2, and should its use be encouraged?

It should be brought up for discussion at the workshop.

It is difficult to document analysis each year; have looked at what would be the suite of models for an estimator to consider and then indicate which model was selected that year. Just because something isn’t in MM.org doesn’t mean it doesn’t still fulfill all the methodology documentation requirements.

They depend on narrative summaries so they do not use MM.org; Rich will give Jen some examples of what they are currently producing before the working on April 2

**Direction on Documenting CA Analytical Methods from Executive Committee (This will be sent to the Steering Committee and Discussed at the April 2nd Workshop);**

There is not agreement on the use of mm.org for documentation. States and tribes will continue to work with PNAMP in an effort to streamline and simplify the mm.org process so that it may be used for this purpose. However, documentation of methods may also occur via upload of documents into the metadata fields associated with a particular indicator. Those doing the calculations (Rich, Dan, others) will work with their Steering Committee representatives to make sure that these documents are accurate and made available consistently. The group will discuss this further as project progresses, with the objective of streamlined, consistent and well documented protocols for each indicator.

**4:30 PM Adjourn**