# Meeting notes- Draft

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **StreamNet Executive Committee Meeting Fall/Winter 2015,** 9:30am – 4:00pm | Thursday, 12/17/15 PSMFC - Portland |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 9:30 – 9:45 | **Introductions, overview of agenda, any additional topics?** |

Attendees: Chris Wheaton, Tom Pansky, Pete Hassemer, Russell Scranton, Paul Clayton, Tom Rien, Roy Elicker, Tom Iverson, Tony Grover, Tom Stahl, Stan Allan, Bryan Mercier, Sean Clemens, Henry Franzoni, Mike Banach, Nancy Leonard, Tom Cooney, David Hines, Jen Bayer (phone), Dan Rawding (phone), Sean Connolly(phone), Greg Sieglitz (phone), Bill Kinney

Attachments: CAPG list - Jen would like participant list resent for review by Executive Committee; will be attached to meeting notes; please submit edits to Jen

Lorri Bodi Data Presentation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 9:45 – 10:15 | **Announcements, Updates, Roundtable** |

Pete H-

* NOSA metrics and reporting targets have been submitted (updated figures will be shown later in the meeting)
* hired new staff to work on SARs at population level beginning January 2016

Tom S-

* reorganized ODFW Conservation & Recovery Program, now focused on all things data; pulling together the various regional efforts towards data coordination, utilization, and adaptive management
* also thinking about how to better centralize information management and improve its efficacy

Tony G-

* habitat assessment proposal for Chief Joseph to Canadian border will be reviewed by ISRP (came from Spokane tribe in coordination with other regional groups)
* developed and launched an Objectives Mapper for Columbia Basin and now looking at how to enhance it and link to Coordinated Assessments
  + NOAA’s process has begun, representing all Federal agencies (Tony is not in the Sovereign’s meetings; only participates as an Ex Officio)
  + Need to make sure that the thoughts and concerns of other Federal agencies included
  + Feedback received so far is that the Objectives that have been accumulated should be linked to Coordinated Assessments process
* Critical Uncertainties Report for salmon, steelhead, resident fish, wildlife, ecosystem function, etc. coming out in mid-January; will develop a research plan
* Coordinated Assessments will need to look at Habitat Function and Habitat Qualities in the future; looking at floodplain reconnection and restoration in anticipation of this
* Will develop other resident and anadromous fish Objectives (will start in March); that data will also eventually find its way into Coordinated Assessments; want to establish that linkage early in the process

Roy E-

* In discussions with NOAA on their process (Sovereign’s Meetings); Stakeholder’s Meetings are public; NOAA is committed to using the Federal Caucus for process discussions (includes BPA, EPA, USGS, FS, others)- if it doesn’t work for the rest of the agencies they will revisit the issue
* Working to hire person to help with hatchery data
* A number of staff are retiring
* Looking forward to the CRITFC-hosted lamprey meeting to be held on 12/18/15; strong state and tribal attendance

Tom C-

* Passed along final draft of biological review this morning (uses information processed through CA and StreamNet); full population series have been received and incorporated
  + See some discrepancies where aggregated data (composites of tribal and state data) are used, or where data are insufficient

Russell S/ Brian M-

* would be worth sharing Lori’s talk from technology workshop
* John Day Resilient Habitat Assessment used CA data; working to identify core datasets and data systems needed to make additional progress on habitat assessments
* Working on developing System Lifecycle workflow- will standardize review process for future requests

Henry F-

* Created US v Oregon database- data in it is preliminary and used for forecasting, but can’t be shared outside of that (final data is shared in CA)
* Prepared SARs (not at the population level); don’t have the staff to produce the population estimates, will be sharing it by the end of the year

Tom I-

* CRITFC submitted EPA grant proposal to help Yakama, Nez Perce, Warm Springs, CRITFC build corporate systems and the capacity to share data

Tom P-

* NOAA saved 18 months on the current review over time it took for previous status review due to Coordinated Assessments

Nancy L-

* Posted 2 new Resident Fish Indicators (red band, cutthroat trout) to dashboards

David-

* Have mapping application available for lamprey data

Dan R-

* Received additional funds from StreamNet and were able to hire data steward for east side of Washington to keep data flowing
* Been cost-effective to record data electronically in the field, seeing few errors; key is making sure they have standardized databases to capture the raw data

Jen B-

* Staff working with ODFW and Colville to improve approach for documenting analytical methods
* On-going efforts related to Regional Habitat Indicators project
* What is the need going forward for support of field data collection technologies? Will be sending out a survey soon to solicit feedback

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 10:15 – 11:15 | **Coordinated Assessments (CA) 5 Year Plan Item #1:** **Executive Committee Decision: Should we adopt Additional NO indicators?** |

PowerPoint presentation, reviewed 2015 population reporting figures, 2016 predictions

**Making an effort to get juvenile abundance data in should be a priority (BPA)**

Are population-level juvenile indicators more trouble than they’re worth? Is there a better option?

Where they have the ability to obtain population-level information and are funded to do so, they’ll report on it (WDFW)

If BPA can’t get population-level data through Coordinated Assessments, they need to figure out another way to get whatever data is available at whatever scale is available (they know they’re paying for it); may not be able to “squeeze any more juice from this orange”

Need to figure out how many total populations they can expect to receive information on (which populations actually have data available)

**Devote additional effort to other NOSA indicators?**

Asked StreamNet Steering Committee what data is available for each proposed new indicator

and how difficult it would be to provide data on it- reviewed the chart of their comments

Don’t want Resident Fish to be put on the back-burner for too long

pHOS is already in the database (Idaho) - could elevate it to Indicator status and take

advantage of “low hanging fruit”

Spatial structure and Diversity have different criteria in the recovery plans- have not yet been standardized (these only come into play when you’re close to de-listing)

**If we pick up additional indicators, what need are they addressing? Whose need are they addressing?**

At what point do the proposed indicators become important? If they don’t become

relevant for 20+ years, is it worth working on them now?

Would like to know from NOAA where there are missing population estimates, and if there are indicators that could have saved NOAA additional time in the review process if they’d been available

What’s the next thing they would like? NOAA has to say what is important to them- that should drive the allocation of effort.

Other option is to not pick up any new indicators and just focus on improving what is already being worked on.

**Not ready to make a decision on new indicators at this time**- For this year:

* focus on figuring out the issues with juvenile data to meet BPA’s identified need
  + Are there bottlenecks preventing flow of juvenile data?
  + Is it a scale issue? Should we consider reporting juvenile data at a non-populations level?
* explore feasibility of providing pHOS data
* Until specific needs are identified will not develop other NO indicators
* Report back to ExComm on what we find out about juvenile and pHOS data

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 11:30 – 11:45 | **General StreamNet Business and Discussion** |

Reviewed 2015 budget and spending; currently in 2nd year of two year contract

Resuming updates of traditional data in StreamNet- directing partners to identify and send in specific trends that are associated with Coordinated Assessments High Level Indicators

Steering Committee would like a more in-depth discussion on GIS issues in the future (PSMFC GIS is exploring a GIS-based data submission process for fish distribution)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 11:45 – 12:30 | **CA 5 Year Plan Item #2: Hatchery Data. What is the plan for Hatchery Indicators?****Get Executive Committee input on Process and Timeline for the current year** |

PowerPoint presentation

Today’s goal: begin establishing a process for selecting hatchery indicators in the future

Who needs the data?

Add to list: Dashboard Indicators (Council has specific reporting needs)

Who has the data?

What format is the data in?

What data are needed?

What needs are the data meeting?

These questions were already answered by the managers at the time the indicators were identified; would like to see work continue and move forward (Dan R)

BPA is trying to understand what indicators they need to make program decisions and wanted to slow down on hatchery indicators while they figure it out (may differ from what the managers previously identified as their need); would like to see everyone who needs the data put together their list of what they need so overlap can be identified to set priorities

Release information and Mark information already exist in other places; no need to recreate them. Pete brought up that the Fish Passage Center can provide annual hatchery release and mark information to the Council (memo out there); **what is the reason/ need for those who have this data to come together and share it? What is the data need?**

Henry pointed out that an existing group has worked on the hatchery supplementation question (Jay Hesse, Howard Schaller), and they may need specific data. Mike will call Henry for more information on the Supplementation Work Group

Deferred in 5 year plan because it was thought not to be a good use of the Coordinated Assessment Work Group’s time to continue working on this right now, until BPA/ NOAA/ Council and others can identify the metrics they need; **ultimately need to be able to report on Hatchery Effectiveness**

Council interested in understanding how successful Bonneville funded hatcheries are- got push back from states and tribes that they were the ones to do this, but nothing has happened on it in the year since; States talked about using the CA process to deliver the hatchery indicators to the Council

Have already developed 5 indicator tables, but haven’t gotten any feedback or anyone saying what they need; are they trying to solve a problem that doesn’t exist?

Can the Executive Committee commit to delivering the indicators requested by the Council in the next year? Need to make sure they are of use to others as well

The information needed to make the Council reports is available in RMIS; why is the data being re-aggregated at a different scale?

How to get higher level managers involved in the process of identifying the hatchery indicators they want? Attend NOAA Goals Process meeting to get the feedback needed (Gary Simms convenes group)

For this year: currently still on hold as per BPA. However, the EXCOMM can change the plan at any time. Roy E. will set up an invitation to have a presentation on the CA hatchery indicator development given at a NOAA Goals process group. Mike will investigate the Supplementation Group to determine if they have identified data needs. Need to get clarification from the Council on adequacy of the Fish Passage Center data submission; is additional data needed? If re-initiating of Hatchery Indicators is desired this year, will need to hear clearly from the ExComm prior to an anticipated CAPG meeting this spring. Unless we hear that, will continue background investigation and work plan for re-initiating next year.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1:00 – 1:45 | **Preview and Discussion of CA Data Display and Query System** |

PowerPoint presentation

Added new validations to data; data is flowing well

Source information is attached to all records, will document calculation methods, but do not want to allow users to calculate their own indicators from the data

Need feedback on this specifically from tribes that are not at today’s meeting- want them to be aware of the displays; take this to the tribes and do a presentation for them

Replace ‘Trends’ with ‘Time Series’?

Keep display options simple rather than rolling averages, confidence intervals, etc.; have options to select if user wants to view averages

Hope to have an active tool by mid-January

Will continue development and make versions accessible for ExComm input. Please share with others or put them in touch with us so that we don’t surprise anyone.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1:45 – 3:30 | **CA 5 Year Plan Item #3: Executive Committee Assessment of data availability and flow for the initial 4 NO indictors.** **Evaluate CA data collection relative to regional data needs. Consider recommendations on data collection efforts. Executive Committee review for the NO indicators (this year). Eventual Product: Report to Regional F&W Managers on results/recommendations?** |

Handouts provided

Tried to identify priority (identified as such in a recovery plan, R&R report, 5 year review, BPA priority 1) and non-priority populations and then identify which have indicator data associated with them

Do we want to spend more time collecting data for populations that don’t yet have data associated with them or more time collecting data on new indicators?

Tom C- has issue with how priorities were determined- thinks **better strategy would be a comprehensive review of Skamania document** **and/or a request to the assessment leads with a request to them to identify their priorities**. Identify gaps to be filled from that; start from reviewing the monitoring and evaluation needs across the basin, evaluating the gaps that exist, and identifying populations that are important to key in on. There are also some populations where he knows there is data (Secesh), but it is not in the CA database – why not?

Brian M- Would like to identify the priorities in the populations where there are data gaps

* Some gaps may have data associated with them, but it hasn’t been made available
* Some gaps may occur because no monitoring program exists and thus no data available

Ask data providers about NOSA, get their feedback on whether data is available for those populations where there are gaps

Goal is to establish priorities for where there are limited resources/ staff/ time/ funding to fill all the gaps

Tom S- Would like 3 columns for each indicator (years- data uploaded, years- planned upload, years- data but not scheduled and/or ready for upload)- note, “ready” may entail some discussion, as it could encompass non-population scale data (e.g., juveniles) or assumptions with greater or lesser uncertainty around them (e.g., extrapolating index surveys), etc. Annual updates may not be as important as getting gaps filled (need the data for 5 year reviews, so could update some on that basis and spend rest of time working on other things)

Where do you have data that you could provide given the resources to do so?

Where do you not have data to provide?

Is there a place that lists the priorities for population monitoring? Committee wanted to see where we had data vs where the regionally established priorities for monitoring are. Chris identified that the “priority” columns in the handouts were from the various documents we looked at (Recovery Plans, VSP, etc., but could have missed key ones. Tom C. noted that the best way to get the priorities identified would be to simply ask the recovery leads in the agencies to identify them.

**For this year: 1st priority should be juvenile data (BPA)**- figure out why they aren’t getting the data submitted and then fix it; as the funding agency, not getting this data could impact future funding opportunities. Ask data managers where the juvenile data are being collected to find out what’s possible, then determine what the priorities are to go after (see 10:15 discussion).

**2nd priority- do an inventory**; find out from data providing states and tribes if there are populations where they have data available but it isn’t being submitted, and why that may be. 3 columns for each indicator (years- data uploaded, years- planned upload, years- no data).

* Compare SPS database to our own, address gaps in CA database
* Do the inventory using the assessment biologists rather than the data managers

Determine; what is it that BPA is looking for? What questions are they funding? Are there specific priorities for BPA – funded projects that are not being fulfilled?

Have everyone review the Skamania document before the next meeting, and come back ready to discuss priorities