**Spring StreamNet Steering Committee Meeting**

**DRAFT NOTES**

**Wednesday, April 1, 2015**

**PSMFC, Portland, OR**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Time** | **Topic** | **Lead** |
| **8:30** | **Welcome** **Introductions** **Adjustments to Agenda?** | **Chris**  |

Attendees: Chris, Steve, Bob, Bill, Mike, Greg, Cedric, John, Tom P, Brodie, Bart, Paul Clayton

Phone: Evan, Tom I, Dawn, Jen

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **8:45** | **Announcements, Updates, Roundtable** | **All** |

WDFW

* recently completed data updates to SASI, sent to Bios for review and training them on the process so it can be done on an annual basis
* will submit all data for Columbia River at one time
* working to incorporate more real data in SCORE
* exploring mobile deployment; sending some staff to Virginia for training
* have a new director (who wants a mobile regulations app)
* waiting on CMX and AMX grants

USFWS

* Steve has recovery data to provide to Bill for lower Columbia stations and will provide mid-Columbia recovery data when it becomes available
* StreamNet is now on USFWS radar; regional office hasn’t been involved to date with hatchery data but are now talking about hiring a data manager

BPA

* been talking with USFWS and their thoughts on data and new opportunities at the regional level to identify data management needs
* budgets were submitted last week
* BPA has ArcGIS online credits available for agencies to use- just have to ask

CCT

* posted data to NOSA
* have a data steward (Paul Clayton) shared with SITKA

ODFW

* submitted mid-Columbia and Snake River Steelhead data using API
	+ seems to be working pretty well
	+ getting verifications that the data is sent
	+ seeing some issues with rounding taking place in Access/ Excel
* plan on submitting lower Columbia data by mid-April
* continuing to work on methods documentation for Chinook; will submit data once completed.
* finished file naming standard for recovery population data and will evaluate its potential for use agency-wide
* migrating servers to Windows Server 2013 & SQL Server 2014
* completed overhaul of streams table to match NHD implementation
	+ would like to have a separate meeting with Van and anyone else involved in NHD implementation to get a clearer understanding of responsibilities and requirements in the implementation (WDFW and MFWP also interested in this discussion) Arranged for Van’s presence at 9 AM

MFWP

* would like to get to 24K and hoping Jane can assist with that
	+ all data currently tied to river miles so will require some prep work to make the change
* gone to a web-based approach for distribution to allow biologists to update for themselves- will demo it at the next Technical Committee meeting
* updating Yellowstone Cutthroat Trout range-wide assessments
* brought in ESRI trainer for 3 days to get staff trained in ArcGIS online
* State CHAT updates – reran data to send to regional viewer in May. (not StreamNet funded, but uses StreamNet data)
	1. Redoing our web application for 10.1 – also not StreamNet funded

IDFG

* hatchery database moved to PSMFC server and links to FINS re-established; working on reconstructing tools to grab data needed
* updating snorkel survey application- new grid interface developed
* working on a Chinook harvest application- will be pilot program in place this year
* working to address IT salaries within the agency to be more competitive in an attempt to fill and retain position
* IDFG previously charged indirect rate on pass thru; going forward will only charge it on personnel costs- hits personnel heavy budgets (like StreamNet) hard

PSMFC

* Emerging Technologies Workshop scheduled for November 18 and 19 in Portland focus on Forestry community, may include some military technology)
* Facilities Mapper Tool is live
	+ Are there additional facilities that we would like to map in the future?
	+ Could it be tied in with PISCES for project proposals?
	+ If the region agrees StreamNet will maintain it, then it can be provided as a back-end dataset to anyone who needs it (facilities had been dropped when Coordinated Assessments became the priority)
	+ Resulted from internal PSMFC Data Integration meeting; was not StreamNet funded
* Annual reports submitted
* Awaiting decision on next EPA grant
* Coordinated Assessment workshop on April 2
* Mike will email his Roundtable

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **9:30** | **NHD Implementation Discussion** **What are the requirements and responsibilities under the conversion?** | **Van, Brett** |

Event data needs to be migrated first to be used with 24K (currently can provide GPS location codes for data and can associate it with the 100K hydrography); Previous years BPA has said it is not a priority for funding

Need to deal with cross-border information issues and thus are dependent on state timelines and priorities and budgets

Idaho committed to maintain whole-stream identifiers on top of NHD (found the NHD tools to be inefficient so started from scratch)

ODFW- have used outside funds to migrate data to NHD; don’t have sufficient StreamNet funds for alignment or maintenance with NHD; recognize that agency resources will have to be used for this but continued maintenance related to StreamNet requirements will be a challenge without further regional or outside funding support

MFWP- would be helpful to bring up at next Technical Committee meeting to work towards a common approach; want to maintain a 24K hydro layer outside of NHD to meet internal state needs (Idaho is taking this same approach)

As part of the budget discussion, need to identify an enhancement package to address issues of updates to the NHD standard and re-building GIS capacity throughout the region

Support Pisces/cbfish with facilities mapper via web service.

Add locations into the CA DES

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **10:15** | **Break** |  |
| **10:30** |  **Building Next FY Budget****Discussion; StreamNet Base 2016 Budget** **Funding/staffing issues within your programs****Requests for inflationary increases****Potential Budget enhancements** | **All** |

PowerPoint presentation by Chris- will email to partners

Current budget is level-funded (everyone made reductions to their budgets to accomplish this)

Need to identify the priorities for restoring cuts if additional funding becomes available, and make recommendation to Executive Committee and BPA

Identify (separate from inflation) where an agency has had to cut staff time- make that the first priority for restoration, second priority would be to accommodate inflation costs

**Priority #1**- Restore cuts in staff:

* MFWP cut a previously funded position ($17,500) to get to level funding
* ODFW had to reduce staff hours- cut $22,000 in staff time
* USFWS had to reduce staff hours- cut 1 week ($2000) in staff time

**Priority #2**- Inflationary increases (partners can utilize this money as needed based on their internal priorities):

* Incremental inflationary increases for partners (IDFG $3000, WDFW $3000, CCT $3000)
* Incremental inflationary increases for PSMFC ($6000)
* Restoration in cuts to travel, supplies, and vehicle leases, etc.

**StreamNet Program Enhancements**

* WDFW
	+ $117,000 each for Data Stewards in Wenatchee and Snake River Basin
	+ $40,000 for ruggedized tablets, PIT tag readers, and automated data transfers
* USFWS
	+ $130,000 for data manager
* ODFW
	+ $100,000 for data steward for new indicators
	+ $28,000 for data analyst funding
	+ $15,000 for GIS time for whole stream maintenance
* PSMFC
	+ $50,000 for emerging technology device purchases, testing, and applications (there is some support from BPA for this, so may have a higher likelihood of getting funded)
	+ May be of more value for StreamNet to assist in product research and sourcing
	+ ACOE is interested in contracting with PSMFC to manage their websites- this could provide additional sources of funding/ savings
* IDFG & CRITFC
	+ Lack of analytical resources (people) is the bottleneck for Coordinated Assessment data flow- could use funding for this work (Research Biologist or Data Analyst); Bart will get more information to Chris on this

ODFW recommends prioritizing people over devices

If hydrography is being identified as a priority, then funding is going to have to be provided for this work

* could get another PSMFC GIS person to assist with cross-state edge matching
* Is there enough commonality amongst the states where a contractor could be of help?
* Add to the Enhancement Budget list: 1 PSMFC GIS Tech and or support in agencies, plus direct GIS support (whole stream maintenance, hydrography, facilitate training) to help the states that need it to support regional needs, GIS capabilities, updates, problem resolution, and reporting

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **11:30** | **Building Next FY Statement of Work****Work Elements, Deliverables, Milestones** **Continue or change existing? New?** | **All** |

PowerPoint presentation by Chris

SOW is due in July

Basic themes are supporting staff, provide regional coordination forum, secure data in accessible repositories, decide what to do about historical datasets and priorities going forward (most updates stopped in 2013) - previous direction was that Fish Distribution was not a priority for updating, even though it is the most requested data and all agree that region-wide fish distribution should be a priority for StreamNet

Add in Resident Fish Coordinated Assessment work, items that support other regional priorities, data management structures and conventions

PISCES will no longer allow a “none” option for data repository; table of suggestions will be provided; will not be required to go back and fix historical repository information. Send to group for review. Tom P. to include draft letter.

Can we link up the DES and CA efforts with the historical data records to show what is being covered going forward? Jake Chambers (ODFW) has already made a start on this linkage that would allow tracking of which trends feed CA; could also look at updating these indicators with more current technologies (include GPS coordinates for redd counts). Explore further and discuss as part of prioritization project on which traditional data in SN to prioritize. Would allow drilling down into CA data to underlying metric trends.

Fine tune language under J-Coordination (make it more clear what coordination work goes under which element); can we combine or clarify CA Coordination and Coordination; separate WE in SOW?

The report in Appendix B should reflect the SOW that the majority of the work represents; use the contract year with the most quarters to serve as the template for the web reporting tool for appendix B in annual report

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **12:00** | **Lunch**  |  |

Paul Clayton will be working on data flow diagrams for Colville- needs a Vizio laptop/ license from Bill

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1:15** | **Coordinated Assessment Indicators Discussion** **Identifying and Prioritizing Desired Indictors** **(CA Workshop Discussion Preview & Process)** **Reality Check, Data flow** **Display of Data** | **All** |

PowerPoint presentation by Chris ***“Creating a Roadmap for the CA Project”***

Proposing a process for identifying and prioritizing indicators:

* Identify the “bins” (Is it regionally significant? Is it in need of standardization? What is the priority- ESA first, game, non-game? Are the right people involved?)
	+ Locate key documents- need Skamania Workshop document as it may set priorities for indicators; population status assessments of trout species for indicator development
	+ Add precise definitions
	+ Ask managers for review
	+ Finalize list
* Prioritize indicators within the “bins”
	+ Set up survey (should have some open-ended questions to make sure they are surveying the right people)
	+ Ask agencies & tribes for input on priorities
	+ Collect input and prioritization ideas and make preliminary recommendations

Proposed “bins” of indicators

* Natural Origin Salmon & Steelhead
* Hatchery Fish/ Hatchery Programs
* Hatchery Fish Impacts to Natural Origin Fish
* Resident (and other Anadromous) Fish

Are there other “bins” we missed?

Some discussion about whether the “bins” should be the indicators (Abundance, Productivity, etc.) that are then broken up by Natural Origin, Hatchery, etc. - some feel the flow is better

Abundance estimator is equally important for Natural and Hatchery fish, and of primary importance to Hatchery fish

\*\*\*Important Distinction\*\*\*

We are not developing the list of indicators at this point. We are simply developing a process for developing those list of indicators.

Recommend instead:

Fishery Management Bins (Natural Origin, Hatchery Origin)

Hatchery Programs Bins

Asked for predicted data flow for 4 Natural Origin indicators in the current year- Are we on track? Are there issues? The plan was always to submit in large batches, rather than piecemeal.

One of the issues facing is that there is metric data available to calculate the indicators but there is no one available to do the calculations- if the agency approves then it is fine for StreamNet staff to take the metric data and do the calculations themselves

**Coordinated Assessment Data Display**- should be points (with or without a line) rather than a bar graph, there should be recovery target line on the graph, and there should be a trend line on the graph

Has this display criteria been agreed to regionally? Some of it is reporting standards- Tom Cooney is supposed to be providing a list of how it should be displayed; John will look into it as well

Want to make sure that the same data being displayed on StreamNet is the same displayed elsewhere

StreamNet displays data associated with the Columbia River Basin (can see the data in relation to the region in StreamNet, or see it in relation to the rest of the state at the agency’s display)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **3:00** | **Break** |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **3:15** | **Continued CA Discussion**  **Population Naming Protocols, Geospatial Distribution,**  **Non-Listed Populations, , Documenting**  **Analytical Protocols**  |  **All** |

PowerPoint presentation by Chris

Open to discussing alternate methods documentation strategies, such as Tom Cooney’s 2 page documentation (Bob W is sending an example to Chris and Jen)

MonitoringMethods.org is available as a documentation option; would like feedback on what does or doesn’t work; some BPA projects require use of MM.org, so feedback is critical

Russell has specifically said to include non-listed populations; being given the data for those populations because they are already being collected

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **3:20** | **Reminders; CA Workshop, Next Pisces Status Report….** | **All** |

Likely will have another Steering Committee meeting mid to late summer

Tom P may take over COTR duties for the Tribal Data Network and the StreamNet Library

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **3:30** | **Adjourn**  |  |