***DRAFT MEETING NOTES***

**StreamNet Executive Committee Meeting**

March 7, 2017 (9 AM – 4 PM)

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

**Attendees:** Chris W, Stan A, Tom P (BPA), Russell S (BPA), Doug T (USFWS), Roy E (USFWS), Scott D (BPA), Lance H (IDFG), Bill K, Cedric C (ODFW), Tom I (phone), Brian M (BPA), Jen B (PNAMP), Dan R (WDFW), Nancy L (Council), Tony G (Council), Dawn A (MFWP - phone), Don S (MFWP - phone), Greg S (NOAA- phone), Tom (ODFW), Jay H (Nez Perce- phone)

**Review of FY 17 Budgets**

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

Will review how subcontractors are currently spending their money

**Overview:** 2017 budget expenditures (Major Categories); 96% of money is in Personnel, Indirect, and Sub-Contracts

**FTE Funding by Organization:** WDFW- 25%, PSFMC 23%, ODFW 22%, IDFG 18%, MFWP 7%, USFWS 4%, CCT 1%

**There is no chance of additional funding from BPA**; can we figure out a way to balance the budget to meet the prioritized needs? One option for cost-savings that BPA is considering is to go back to BPA direct contracting with states/ partners and remove PSMFC as an intermediary; will need to hold expenditures to last year’s actuals; if there are FTEs that aren’t contributing to the priority items they need to be carefully considered

Shortfall begins in FY18

**Major Work Elements:** Coordination, Management, Reporting- 46%, Coordinated Assessments- 27%, Enhancing Efficiency and Transfer of Data- , Traditional Data-

WDFW- with level funding they are 20% short of increases incurred since 2011, overhead has gone up, electronic data capture was their solution to support other projects to meet deliverables for other BPA projects because they are so far in the hole; all the money for this type of work has now been stripped out of the budget

ODFW- cannot expect that the same amount of data is going to continue being delivered when cuts are made

**PSMFC**- Staff is fully funded by SN except for Chris, contract with Tom I to coordinate tribal participation, have reduced PSMFC BPA funding by $166,000 since 2014; further reduced Chris W’s time on SN to save money, planning within next 2 year cycle (between FY18 and FY19) to reduce by one position due to retirement

**CCT**- 76% of their budget is contract with Sitka

**IDFG**- 80% of staff effort goes towards CA, retooled some other project budgets to include another data coordinator

**MFWP**- 100% of SN budget is spent on resident species (Bull Trout for CA in 2017) and traditional data (barriers, redd counts, hatcheries, genetics, etc.), subcontract is used for application development for the centralized system

**ODFW**- 60% of SN budget spent on obtaining, managing, and delivering data, need more staff to do what has been planned for CA- have had to pull in non-SN funded staff to help at times, but can’t rely on this consistently

When asked previously by BPA, partners estimated the need for an additional .5-2 FTE per partner to fully implement CA

Can demonstrate historically that adding these additional FTE’s immediately results in an increase in data flow

**USFWS**- looking at databases used for hatchery data to gain efficiencies and improve data reporting, will increase level of representation at regional meetings; want to participate more fully in regional Bull Trout efforts

**WDFW**- 4 FTE funded by SN, 100% of BPA funding goes to specific StreamNet SOW products and to provide data for CA

**Discussion:**

Council would hope to be included in conversations with BPA before any drastic decisions are made; eliminating PSMFC component still won’t be a long-term solution to resolve issues facing the project

Does NOAA have potential funding mechanism to help with CA requirements? They won’t have a budget until late March/ April

PCSRF priorities do not currently feature monitoring. Decisions will need to be made later in the day when 18 – 19 budgets are discussed.

**Guidance and Issues with 2018 and 2019 Budgets**

BPA guidance**,** how to addresslevel funding and likely shortfalls, new SOW

Asked everyone to provide a budget that maintains existing program in FY18 and FY19; budgets need to be into BPA by around June 1

2 year contract proposal for $2.145 million each year; totaling all the requests, we are over budget by $152K in FY18, $112K in FY19; (PSMFC will reduce staff to +/- 3FTE in FY19)

Proposed reduction/ simplification to SOW and elimination of Work Elements

Options to balance FY 2018 budget to get to 2,145,483:

* **apply cuts to FY17 budget** based on percentage of SN budget
* apply an equal % of cuts to what was requested for FY18

Can funds for tribal coordination (Iverson contract) come out of CRTFC tribal data-sharing agreement? $27,000 total with indirect, currently in PSMFC’s budget; **can CRITFC pay for some of the tribal coordination work that is currently paid for by StreamNet (PSMFC)?** Combined with cuts by other agencies, the burden would be shared across the region

BPA would like to know what they are not going to get based on these cuts- if this approach doesn’t get to the priorities that BPA needs, then other more drastic decisions may be made

WDFW extra FTE’s filled upper Columbia data gaps- those would potentially be the first positions to go, which is a concern since those are high priority areas for BPA

Could have savings or around $40,000 in the second year (19) from PSMFC which we might be able to allocate to other partners in FY19 due to potential staff retirement and corresponding FTE reduction; This means once we balance the budget in FY 18, more or less level funding for FY19 with perhaps a little extra. Chris will need to work out the numbers once we make a decision.

Are there other opportunities for funding that have not been identified yet?

* Approach BIA for tribal assistance?
* Need discreet projects/ products for EPA, NMFS grants- need partners to identify those options

Discussed simplifying and streamlining the SOW.

**Consensus; Use the approach of reducing everyone’s FY 17 budget proportionally to get $49,758 in savings in order to balance to BPA’s allocation number of $2,145,483. That results in the FY 18 allocations below. For the second year (FY 19), Chris anticipates savings of $56,658 after PSMFC’s FTE are reduced from 42.5 months in FY 18 to 36 months in FY 19. Allocating these savings to the subcontractors on a proportional basis results in the FY 19 budgets below. Here are the preliminary allocations for the 2 fiscal years (need to check math);**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | FY 2018 | FY 2019 |
| CCT | $87,960 | $91,133 |
| IDFG | $323,779 | $335,393 |
| MFWP | $165,049 | $170,998 |
| ODFW | $463,704 | $480,361 |
| USFWS | $76,474 | $79,194 |
| WDFW | $459,865 | $476,409 |
| PSMFC | $568,652 | $511,995 |
|  |  |  |
|  | $2,145,483 | $2,145,483 |

**The StreamNet Steering Committee members will have to modify their individual subcontract budgets so that they reflect these new totals in each of the fiscal years.**

**Make SOW more transparent and focused on priorities; needs to reflect sub-contractors work on those priorities. Highlight how level funding/cuts are reducing data flow for priorities and/or other impacts. Chris will work with the Steering Committee to simplify, streamline, and eliminate any WE that do not reflect priorities. Chris will be sending out requests for budget detail and SOW modifications very soon.**

**Discuss Predicted Data Flow for FY 2017**

Review survey of predicted data flow by population and indicator,

Next steps?

213 TRT pops in 2016 survey, 201 TRT pops in 2017 survey; changes due to NOAA population revisions, elimination of extirpated/extinct populations in this year’s survey. Available information for extirpated populations was provided as well, just isn’t included here. States and tribes were asked to evaluate CA data flow for all extant TRT populations- can calculate and will provide (yes), calculation theoretically possible but unable to provide (no), cannot calculate (x)

WDFW never intended to obtain data on 90% of the populations

BPA wants to focus on Tier 1 and Tier 2 priority populations. **Bill will run the results by Tier 1 and Tier 2 and send out**

Are ‘no’s’ due to a lack of resources? Lack of priority? Other reason?

* For WDFW it’s definitely a lack of resources
* For tribes- they don’t intend to consider sharing data with CAX until they have the potential to do it electronically

PSMFC happy to help BPA address follow-ups to survey methodology, results

**Van will re-map with Tier 1 and Tier 2 so that BPA can overlay their funded project locations to better identify reporting issues**

Need to split out the ‘not possibles’ in greater detail

Van can share on request; not publicly available

If it’s not possible to calculate indicators at the population level for BiOp purposes than BPA doesn’t want to fund the monitoring. Some discussion about the fact that from a management perspective, if the population is important, yet it’s impossible to calculate the indicator, BPA should be cautious using survey results as justification for cutting funding from projects since their data may be the best available

Fish Passage Center (not included in survey) calculates a lot of SARs; been having positive discussions with them so far regarding automated data exchange with them

Survey is informative; may be able to adjust in the future and ask to document changes from past year, rather than repeating the same survey, or adjust survey when new Tier 1 and Tier 2 populations crop up

Survey informs decisions on whether to push/ pursue the “red” populations vs move on to new indicators; should be clearly documenting to BPA why data cannot be submitted

WDFW strongly hopes that BPA considers superpopulations in their next BiOp

Not doing /= not possible

**Focus on Tier 1 and Tier 2, summarize and map results, follow up on no/ not possible responses for more info as requested by BPA**

Important to note that many of the people we are asking for more information are not funded by StreamNet and we are asking for time and effort from them

Could a pick list be added to the survey to indicate why? Lack of people, lack of funding, etc.?

**Bill will send out link to survey. Chris and Bill will work on a fine-tuned survey follow-up for just the Tier1 and Tier 2 populations. Input on additional information sought is welcomed.**

**Discuss CA Priorities – Hatchery Indicators, Resident Fish, etc.**

Bull Trout Meeting – Missoula, Montana April 12th

Dan R- should stick with existing 5 year workplan; maintain current flow of indicators, then move to hatchery DES finalization, then start on residents; DES development is complex and takes time- anticipates it would take a year to do

Tom- continue with plan for this year but should explore the ‘no’s’ from survey results before taking on new work with hatcheries/ resident fish; in light of continued reduction in funding, need to have a discussion on capacity; doesn’t see regional relevance to Bull Trout efforts in Oregon

Dan R- would have been much closer to the original timeline if they’d been able to stick with original 3 indicators, rather than adding 2 more at BPA’s request; need to identify ‘low hanging’ priority indicators to deliver for new work

BPA had always hoped that data flow would be automated after the first year or two, but that is not yet the case. Discussion that it may not be possible to automate this for several years to come. Still a labor intensive process.

Nancy- those that have made progress on salmon indicators could move ahead to start on hatcheries/ resident fish

Stan- Could also put together a preliminary hatchery workshop to define indicators and begin the process

Lance- bringing in a whole new group of people for bull trout and there will be a bigger learning curve for them versus the hatchery group; hatchery returns to mouth of Columbia by facility would be a good indicator

Tom I- don’t we already have a hatchery DET from last year’s workshop? Weren’t we going to tie in to the FINS database to feed hatchery indicators? What we really need is for the Council and BPA to identify what indicators they want to represent these hatcheries

BPA does not want to fund harvest monitoring efforts; Council wants to evaluate hatcheries from an investment standpoint- for all the money being put into hatcheries in the region, what is the return?

Tony- Council has certain expectations from entering the 2018 BiOp process; partners shouldn’t be chastised for making the attempt to do this work but they have suffered from false expectations for a long time; we all know there is other data out there but it serves other purposes and would take a disproportionate amount of effort to get at it; decisions on the ground are made at the sub-population scale; states and tribes depend on the hatchery production; Council will be doing a major re-calibration of the metrics they are trying to achieve in the not-too-distant future; if we don’t report on hatcheries in a simple, basic way and show better results than we have in getting 60% return on NOSA populations, the entities supporting this investment are going to go elsewhere; **need to focus on setting realistic, producible, reliable expectations for this work in the region**

John- won’t be able to move forward with bull trout without additional funding to support bringing in staff/ experts to assist with these efforts

Jay- validating the existing data would be worthy of work element in next year’s workplan, hatcheries are managed at the facility level not the regional level so finding consensus on regional indicators should be a priority moving forward

**FY18/FY19 CA Priorities- focus on maintaining and improving data flow for existing indicators. Bring FPC SARs data into database; Continue to work on hatchery indicators, in particular making sure to include FPC. Figure out how to keep moving forward on hatchery indicators without negatively impacting other priorities; start by exchanging hatchery SARs (Mike and Michelle work on this, led by Dan R- who will resend his list of indicators), have this smaller subgroup of EXCOMM recommend a small suite of Indicators. Continue with scoping plans for Bull Trout (i.e. meeting in Missoula) but be cautious about moving too quickly - look to MFWP and USFWS to help and take lead on Resident Fish and Hatcheries, respectively**

**Good of the Order/Roundtable**

Jen B- CA Annual Workshop on May 11, partners can provide 5 minute updates if they want a slot on the agenda, Field Tech Conference in the fall that they are looking for speakers for

Tom (ODFW) - working on large information management project, re-thinking agency’s science framework- status and trend monitoring may be re-tooled, actively looking at new technologies for sampling

Stan- there are a handful of existing hatchery databases that can be referenced for the CA effort, depending on the question you are asking you may not get the answer from a hatchery database (may need to go to the dam, etc. to populate that indicator)