**StreamNet Steering Committee Meeting Notes**

**March 15, 2019**

**PSMFC Office, Portland.**

**DRAFT Meeting Minutes DRAFT**

**Attendees**

In person: Chris Wheaton (PSMFC), Mike Banach (PSMFC), Greg Wilke (PSMFC), Tom Pansky (BPA), Cedric Cooney (ODFW), Tom Iverson (tribal liaison), Brodie Cox (WDFW), George Batten (CCT), Nancy Leonard (NPCC), Tami Wilkerson (CRITFC), Russell Scranton (BPA).

On the phone: Evan Brown (IDFG), Angie Schmidt (IDFG), Dawn Anderson (MFWP), Michelle Groesbeck (WDFW), Colleen Roe (CRITFC), Tabitha Whitefoot (CRITFC), Scott Donahue (BPA).

**9:00 Budget and SOW**

**(All)**

* Issues or adjustments this fiscal year (FY 2019)?
	+ None mentioned.
	+ If there are major changes to come in the budget, then BPA needs to know and a contract mod may be needed. But relatively small changes within existing line items don’t require a contract mod. Please share information ahead of time as the BPA COR must approve all line item changes via email. Keeping CBFISH updated is good too.
	+ Nobody is expecting significant budget shortfalls or surpluses.
* Preparation of next budget and SOW (FY 2020)
	+ BPA guidance is “flat funding”, which means the same budget number as current year, including the cut we took.
	+ Due 6 months before new contract, so approximately April. Tom P. needs to enter budget number into CBfish by 4/5/19. By 6/1 BPA should publish budget numbers, and we should have final SOW into CBFish no later than 7/1.
	+ Everyone agreed to do a 2 year contract to reduce admin work. There is also the ability to move money around over a long period, which is good. This gives the Program Manager access to the third lever of project management – money (in addition to time and scope).
	+ Chris wants to simplify this year. And reduce the number of work elements. Tom P. says the sentiment is the same at BPA these days.
	+ Tom P. says “helps to” in the first paragraph of the draft SOW is weak. We need something better.
	+ Paragraph 2: Tom P. says stop calling C.A. a “project”. Call it an “effort” or “process” or “initiative” instead. Nancy agreed.
		- Tom says BPA now says SN is system of record for facilities. We should mention that. Also discussed how StreamNet fish distribution is THE regional place to go for this data.
	+ Tom P. said we might want a work element for data requests if this is becoming a large task. Should make reporting on requests more generic, web statistics, etc. Cedric says we already do, though we have another for supporting the F&W program, and he’s never sure which to file a NPCC or BPA request under.
	+ Change “Taurus” to “cbfish.org” and “mm.org” to “monitoringresourcesMonitoringResources.org” throughout.
	+ Chris said it is inappropriate for the PSMFC SN contract to obligate work for USFWS because they are no longer a subcontractor. USFWS line items and work elements need to be moved to their contract.
		- Assignment: Each partner prepare a budget for the fiscal years 20 and 21 (Oct. 1 – Sep 30) in excel spreadsheet format. Numbers not to exceed current amount. Get to Chris by April 30th
		- Assignment: Tom P. asked Chris to send him the USFWS items so he can pass along to Jeff Lane, USFWS COR at BPA. (Completed 3/18)
	+ B-189.
		- Assignment: Align “CAPG” language with whatever replaced it for each task. (Do everywhere. Completed 3/18)
		- Under PSMFC add tribal outreach (to non-StreamNet members Completed 3/18).
		- Assignment: Dawn will work with Chris about what the Colville and MFWP “several workshops” language should be.
	+ C-160 DES
		- Change “DES’s” to “DESs” wherever it is not a possessive. Completed 3/18
	+ D – 159 Compile data
		- Brodie said compiling data is not so much what they do any more. They now mostly create systems and tools to capture data. But this varies by StreamNet partner and by field project.
		- Cedric mentioned QA/QC is important. Tom said that should be in the work plan.
	+ E-160
		- No comments.
	+ F-161
		- Cedric suggested replacing the term “Data sharing agreement”. He doesn’t like the word “agreement”, and suggested “terms” instead. Chris pointed out that what we have developed is called a “Data Sharing Agreement”.
		- Dawn pointed out these should apply to all data in SN, not just CA. These can be lumped. Everyone agreed we should have a single one that applies to everything we provide.
		- Tom P. suggests we should link more explicitly to One Fish Two Fish and the Council’s data viewers. Evan thought it was too explicit, because there can be many data viewers. Tom suggested simple links to the few other key data viewers would be useful. It was generally agreed to, though we want to keep it small so it doesn’t become a maintenance issue.
	+ G-159
		- Brodie asked for the subprojects to be consistent between all the work elements. It was agreed to do them all alphabetically. Completed 3/18
		- Will everyone do more than only CA-associated trends? Sounds like yes. Especially for MFWP this limit seems inappropriate.
		- Remove reference to the CA query system. It’s not needed here. Completed 3/18
	+ H-189
		- Include NOAA in high priority coordination groups.
		- Add non-CRITFC tribes to the PSMFC work.
		- George will send Chris the current correct acronym and name for the Colville Tribes. Note: George has checked and the official name of the Colville Tribes is “Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation”. The tribal council says not to use acronyms such as CCT and CTCR but shortening the name to “Colville Tribes” is acceptable. Chris inserted that everywhere needed.
		- Tom P. said BPA now allows training and meetings again. So those can be put in the budget if desired within existing totals. Line items needed.
	+ I-160
		- No comments.
	+ J, K, removed. The following ones relettered. No comments on any of them.
	+ Tom said we should put together a flat-funded budget. Cedric would like us to put forward a budget that is adjusted for inflation. Tom said we could do that, but don’t expect it. May be time better spent looking at next contract period as new BiOp should be in place by then.
	+ Assignment: Chris would like everyone to look through the draft and identify some specific, identifiable things that will be dropped because of flat (reduced after inflation) funding – such as populations where data will not be available. Can include impacts of other project cuts as well.

**11:15 Roles & Responsibilities of Various CA "Groups"**

**(All)**

1. CA Core Team (Chris W., Tom I., Jen B. Colleen R. Who else?)
2. (Propose to eliminate) CAPG
3. (Propose to rename) CA distribution list (everyone interested in CA)
4. SN tech team
5. SNSC
6. SNEC
7. (Propose to eliminate) Exchange configuration team
8. CA DES Development team (DDT)

* Cedric asked if any of these changes violate an agreement with EPA. Answer is no, that contract is over.
* Chris asked if SN should ask CRITFC ITMD people to participate on any of the CA groups. Colleen thought yes, the DES team at least. Mike should add her to the DES team. They will be invited to participate in other groups too, if desired, by the core team or CRITFC.

**1:00 Yellowstone Cutthroat Assessment**

**(Dawn Anderson, MFWP)**

**Proposal from Dawn:**

YCT assessment to WyGISC ICP System

The status of Yellowstone Cutthroat trout is assessed in a range-wide fashion with input from 4 geographic management units (GMU’s) which includes 5 states. (Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Wyoming & Utah).

Data entered or updated include historic and current distribution, conservation populations, genetic distribution/status, density, hybrid risk, connectivity, conservation activities and barriers. These data are updated annually during meetings amongst GMU staff with a major report every 5 years. Data updates are made in a stand-alone Access database which is connected to an ArcGIS map to allow for viewing the data edits on a map. The updates currently require the assistance of a GIS/Data Technician. The biologist tells the technician the edits/changes to make and the tech then makes the updates in the database and displays them in the map. Depending on the number and complexity of the changes, this can be a very slow and labor intensive process. It requires at least 4 days of time (1 meeting per GMU) plus additional time if there are significant edits or updates. Time to QC the data with the biologists and make additional updates can be an iterative process.

The Inland Cutthroat Trout Protocol (ICP) Web-Editing tool is a multi-state, multi-species web-based database, mapping and editing tool. It currently holds assessment data for other trout species (Colorado River, Greenback, Rio Grande, Lahontan) which is similar (if not the same) as the YCT assessment data. It was created by the Wyoming Geographic Information Science Center (WyGISC).

The ICP allows for biologists to enter the system during an “open period” to update and edit their data. They can do this on their own schedule and include others if needed. The system is map based and contains forms with picklists. The system includes security (usernames and passwords) to only allow access to authorized individuals.

Probable WyGISC Responsibilities

* Integration of YCT data into existing viewer/editor
* Data/database infrastructure/maintenance
* User access set up
* Data reconciliation: edits to production
* Packaging and sending data to state coordinator

Probable Tech/GIS Staff Responsibilities

* Training if needed
* Assistance during update meetings if necessary
* Assist with QC and hydro issues
* Receive data from WyGISC
* create reports
* make dataset available

The estimated cost is $35,000 to integrate the YCT data into the existing web application, any database conversion, hosting of the data and 4 years of annual updates/maintenance. If desired a formal proposal from WyGISC can be obtained.

Justification for use of StreamNet funds

* Range wide effort encompasses 2 StreamNet participating states
	+ In StreamNet SOW for Montana
* Creates efficiencies for StreamNet staff in MT a project that StreamNet is already assisting with
* Creates a more efficient and easier to use process for entering and updating data.
* Enhances consistency of data across a species
* Likely more cost efficient than the current process in terms of MT StreamNet staff time
* If this proves to be valuable to YCT, Westslope Cutthroat Trout data (ID is the steward) could be considered for incorporation
* Value in data for several cutthroat sub species in the same place
* Potential to be valuable if/when Coordinated Assessments are created for resident species
* Montana does not have the capability or capacity to build a similar complex, multi-user web based system with security

Questions

Entering into an agreement – would agreement be between StreamNet or MT and WyGISC?

Can 2019 contract funds be allocated/obligated to this work before the end of the 2019 and work continue after September 2019? Funds would include 4 years of maintenance and WY has indicated they may not have time to complete the data transfer before the end of September.

* Dawn proposes to use $35,000 of StreamNet funds to enter YCT assessments data into online Inland Cutthroat Trout Protocol (ICP) data editing system.
* Should be more efficient than current method of data/GIS techs sitting down with biologists to do this work annually, which is labor intensive.
* If it works well then this could be extended to westslope cutthroat trout assessment data also.
* Doing this would set up data if resident species are added to Coordinated Assessments.
* MFWP does not have the ability to make their own similar tool.
* Nancy says this would work very well with the NPCC HLI work. Nancy will send Dawn a letter supporting this. (Done)
* Tom P. says its fine with him. It seems perfectly consistent with StreamNet work.
* Doing a contract through PSMFC is a good option to make things easier, and so that multiple states and species could be done under one contract. Dawn will let Chris know if that is how they want to do it. Will require re-programming money from MFWP to PSMFC.
* Nancy will send support letter to Dawn for this project

**1:30 BPA Juvenile Indicator / DES Discussion**

**(Russell Scranton, BPA)**

* Russell presented to CA DES team in November. Confirmed today how field For “Spawner Abundance” vs “Escapement” not designated by the method alone. Mike has discussed with DES team and will finalize with them.
* Says outmigrant data should be categorized by where smolt abundance estimate was done relative to the location of the population.
* Russ is asking if DES team or the SNSC or other would be the best place to start this DES proposal. Everyone said the DES team would be the right place.
* Juveniles per Spawner or adult Escapement estimate.  (Add to RPerS) as specific name of data

type or leave as method.  If method it will be hard to find. Mike will discuss with DES team;

* + Population Smolt Equivalent/ NOSA
	+ Trap Estimate/ NOSA
	+ Migratory Smolt Abundance / NOSA
* How can derived HLIs be generated? E.g., juvenile density estimates.
	+ How to come up with habitat estimates for the denominator is the hard part of this. This could be a big work load.
		- Russell says they are doing this, and wondering if these could be added to the existing data.
		- We would need to find who would do carrying capacity estimates for some of these proposed derived HLIs.
	+ DES changes would be needed for habitat amounts linked to the population-level HLIs. A carrying capacity indicator would be needed.
* Decision: Carrying capacity will be brought to the SNEC first. These will then be brought to the DES team, if approved.

**2:00 Update on Annual and BiOp Reports (due today!)**

**(Chris Wheaton, PSMFC)**

* Done and submitted yesterday (3/14/2019).
* BiOp report now due May 15. The next one will be due early 2020. New interim BiOp just being finalized now, so specifics to come later.
	+ Cedric suggested all the SNSC people need to read it, and also the SNEC should read it. That was agreed to.
	+ Chris and Russell suggested that we look at the BiOp and reflect on how we have contributed over the full five years, what we have learned.
	+ Cedric suggested that we distribute BiOp report to Exec Comm to comment on (Done)
* Inventory?
	+ Cedric sent his stuff literally 2 minutes ago.
	+ Tom said it’s really not needed until the next contract is coming due this summer. But it’s good to get it done now.

**2:15 Update on Council ISRP Programmatic Review – F&W Program Amendment Process**

**(Nancy Leonard, NPCC)**

* The first of three category reviews started at the end of 2018 with the Mainstem/Program Support category review.
* Proposals were submitted January 30,2019 for ISRP review .Most project presentations to the ISRP were in February, with the last 3 ISRP presentations being presented March 18, 2018 (NOAA, PNAMP, Realtime Research on avian predation)
* On April 4 the preliminary ISRP report will be completed. Those requested to provide additional information to the ISRP will have until April 30 to provide their responses. Responses may entail a conference call, written response, or edits to the proposal form depending on the information requested. On May 30 the ISRP will provide their final report and present their review to the Council during the June 2019 Council meeting.
* Chris asked what we need to do when we get our ISRP feedback. Nancy said that the you provide the response as requested to provide clarification to the ISRP. To keep in mind that it is the Council’s recommendation on the project that informs what is recommended for funding to Bonneville and that the Council’s recommendation can differ from the ISRP. In drafting the Council staff recommendation, Council staff works with Bonneville staff so there is a reality check as part of it.
* The other big process they are doing is amending the F&W program.
	+ Comments on recommendations were due February 2019, but there are opportunities to provide additional comments up until mid-October when the Council enters the final few weeks of finalizing the program.
	+ Council has started to prepare the draft program.
	+ Discussions during the FW Committee meetings are focusing a lot on the Adaptive Management/Program Objectives sections and the Implementation sections of the Program.
	+ Draft program should be released in mid-July with an expected mid-December date for adoption of the 2019 Program, there is some flexibility with these dates.

**2:45 Data User Request Tracking**

**(Dawn Anderson, MFWP)**

* Dawn asked if we should still be using the user request database that SN made some years ago. Does anyone still use it? Dawn said they have their own system. Evan said the same. They suggested we drop the user request database. Everyone agreed. We can drop the “log and report responded to all requests” language. PSMFC will adjust their way of tracking user requests. Will be more generic, based on web stats, etc.

**Additional non-agenda items:**

* Russell said they have been doing a lot to visualize the trends and CA data on a website called OneFishTwoFish. He could demonstrate to SNSC if desired. Russell to send the URL(s). <http://www.onefishtwofish.net/>

Link supplied by RS 3/18/19 (Thanks Russ!). Here is an updated concept tool that takes more StreamNet data and CAX data to view:

<http://www.onefishtwofish.net/viz/IDFG_Redds_Weirs1b.html>

* Tom Iverson said the tribes are having their annual ITMD workshop next month (April 16-17 in Yakima). They will be looking at visualization software.