June 20, 2019

StreamNet Executive Committee

PSMFC Office – Portland

**StreamNet Executive Committee Meeting Notes (July 31, 2019)**

Attendees in Person: Chris Wheaton, Tom Pansky, Tony Grover, Jeff Lane, Doug Threloff, Mari Williams, Mike Banach, John Arterburn, Tom Iverson, Jody Lando, Tom Stahl, Jen Bayer, Nancy Leonard, Greg Sieglitz, Joanna Roy, Zach Penney, Chris Kozfkay, George Batten, Dan Rawding

Attendees by Phone: Cedric Cooney, Russell Scranton, Angie Schmidt, Don Skaar, Scott Donahue, Brodie Cox

**NOAA MAFAC Process, New BiOP, Other issues - Greg Sieglitz, NOAA**

***PowerPoint presentation- Columbia Basin Partnership Task Force, Overview of Phase 1 Recommendations***

MAFAC (Marine Fishery Advisory Committee) - nationwide committee able to advise federal agencies. They endorse proposals from the Columbia Basin Partnership/Task Force.

Task Force created in January 2017 from need for more coherent, integrated and efficient means of addressing the complexities of salmon recovery; NOAA Fisheries has convened regional sovereigns and stakeholders to develop common, long-term goals for salmon and steelhead

Task Force participants include Tribe/ tribal entity representatives, states, Council, commercial interests, local leaders, agricultural interests, conservation groups, utility reps; focused on establishing goals for returning adult salmon and steelhead

Phase 1 was to develop framework, guiding principles, vision statement; has wrapped up and are working on a final report

There is no obligation to follow their recommendations

Worked collaboratively to establish Provisional Quantitative Goals for Natural Production. There are low, medium, and high goals for each "stock". The low goals are to meet ESA recovery goals, the high goals represent harvest goals, and the medium goals are half way between the others.

Phase 2 will dig into the details of how to accomplish the goals established in Phase 1

***PowerPoint Presentation- Overview: 2019 Columbia River Biological Opinion***

Consider the effects of the CRS and mitigation programs on 13 species of salmon and steelhead along with other listed species; new BiOp expected to be in place thru 2020 or 2021; draft biological assessment/ EIS by spring 2020. This BiOp will be a no-jeopardy decision, because it will be in effect for only a year or two, because the RPAs have been being addressed, and because the action agencies need to re-do NEPA, at which point they will consult again.

Significant feature of new BiOp is flexible spill operation (negotiated settlement); Continues implementing suite of actions developed through the 2008 BiOp (and supplemental opinions in 2010 and 2014)

Greg also touched on the Tributary R, M, and E strategy discussions, Columbia River Treaty, upcoming 5 year status review. NOAA is “very appreciative” of StreamNet and Coordinated Assessments for making their status reviews easier by providing access to needed data. “Puget Sound region is jealous”

Discussion – lots of interest in capturing all of the great work that went into the integrated spreadsheets that tie NOSA, harvest, and hatchery data to populations (developed by CBP contractor Ray Beamesderfer). Folks hope that there is an eventual home for that information and also that the analyses are repeated so that the region can monitor progress on how things are going. Greg said that NOAA appreciated that, but that it was too early to determine the eventual home of all of that data. StreamNet might be a logical place – but way too early to decide.

**NPCC F&W Program Addendum - Tony Grover, NPCC**

2014 program is still considered to be in good shape throughout the region, so only need to do an addendum to address some outstanding issues with Performance and Implementation

Will vote at July Council Meeting to adopt the updates, can’t distribute specifics until then

**Performance**- indicators will be able to be adjusted as needed without a new addendum process, will not be adopted into the program because they may continue to evolve and allow for quick reaction time

**Implementation**- has to include a climate change component (don’t know what that looks like yet), includes piece on mitigation and blocked areas, piece on ocean/ estuary work, acknowledges need to restore funding levels after years of cuts. Council and Council staff “recognize the value of StreamNet”

Adopted addendum will include goals & objectives from MAFAC; how will that impact StreamNet?

Council will endorse efforts by StreamNet, CRITFC, StreamNet Library, and Coordinated Assessments in the addendum

It’s reasonable to think Council will have a high level of interest in preserving Columbia Basin Partnership projects as important data repositories and distribution sources

Council would like StreamNet to store climate change information- this will need to be specified into data exchange standards. Details/specifics to come after Addendum adopted (planned for December 2019)

Will have opportunity during public comment period to identify specifics of what can be provided, where it can be housed, how it can be distributed – this could be used as an opportunity to clarify StreamNet role.

**New Budgets and SOW – Jeff Lane & Jody Lando, BPA**

***PowerPoint presentations***

Challenging electricity market, non-hydro sources will become increasingly competitive in the PNW. At times in the spring and summer California is now meeting half of total electricity demand with wind and solar.

Don’t anticipate additional budget cuts for 2020 and 2021; level funding for projects.

Will set overall 2022 and 2023 Program budget in spring/ summer 2020 via the Integrated Program Review and next rate case. All stakeholders can weigh in on F&W program budget during this process.

BPA experienced a lot of transition in 2019 (budget reductions, project prioritizations, 2019 BiOp, flex spill, staff changes)

Partners report no issues with FY19 budgets at this time

**2020 BPA Priorities**

* centralized data access (with links to primary repositories)
* timely/ accessible data
* standardized indicators
* collaboration with regional F&W managers to advance data management needs

**BPA Recommendations- CA 5 year plan:**

* Clarify CA scope and intent
	+ Adopt definition of CA, finalize purpose statement, roles and responsibilities (see CA Roles and Responsibilities document)
* Refine implementation tracking and reporting
	+ PSMFC lead CAX documentation for VSP and fish out data (with partners including CRITFC)
	+ PSMFC to maintain a web-based inventory by population of data providers and reporting status
	+ Sponsors are responsible for complete data sets and QA/ QC
	+ Recommended new tabular and visual displays of data tracking and reporting to make it more useful; needs the ability to drill down into the records for more detailed information
		- This type of tabular display is already in the CAX
		- BPA would like to see the date ranges broken out for each indicator on the Priority Population Summary report
* Continue to update priority populations
	+ Focus on Tier 1 and 2 populations and on timeliness of data updates
	+ Would like to prioritize tracking down data records that have 5+ years of missing data
* Explore the potential for additional metrics/ indicators
* Expand data usability
	+ Re-evaluate required attributes/ fields in order to make useful calculations

Also suggested several website improvements and data management ideas that they would like to see/discuss further. They would like to have the populations GIS layer available, specifically to include the non-listed populations.

**BPA Recommendations for use additional funds:**

* $100K available funds in 2020 (see later discussion)
	+ PSMFC to spearhead information tracking with CRITFC
	+ Refinements to CA Reporting website summary
	+ Manage GIS data layers for non-listed populations provided by BPA (Tier 3 populations); describe spatial extent of population boundaries
* Phase 2 Pilot
	+ Populations with “No Data” submitted
	+ Prioritize data records with 5+ years of unpublished data
	+ Complete age data for NOSA and juvenile data
* DES Priorities
	+ Data completeness and QA/ QC
	+ New Indicators
		- Will BPA be open to working on Hatchery Indicator with the new money? Not ready to endorse it at this time.
		- The ExCom group is the one who needs to identify the new indicators, the SC determines how to manage it
		- BPA wants an indicator for Carrying Capacity and wants to work with partners to discuss advancing it further; can’t have a conversation about it now- need more information and details in order to be able to discuss at a future meeting
	+ Adjust DES for Weirs, Smolts, and Redds
		- Moving forward StreamNet should require population reference and methods where available (similar to CA)
* Continue to identify opportunities for increased efficiency

**Uses for Potential 100k in Available Funding**

100K in additional NOAA funds is probable. These are NOAA dollars that would be used to support salmon and steelhead population data flow (CA). Not guaranteed or in place (would be Aug 2019-Aug 2020).

Propose to pay for some PSMFC staff time with this NOAA support, and increase the amount of BPA funding available for subcontracts. This is identical to the approach we have been using for the last five years – PSMFC work on other, non-BPA contracts lowers costs, and savings are allocated out to partners.

100K not a lot in grand scheme of things, and it’s only for 1 year. Suggestion that perhaps doing one thing well with the money, rather than split it up into little pieces.

So make sense to fund some one-time options rather than fund a new on-going effort: gather legacy data (need to define the priorities of what to target- tribal data; need to determine if extra money will allow for getting that data, or if there’s another reason it’s missing), backfill staff funding, small/ focused investments on specific items

NOAA wants the funds to support its goals and objectives, so some sort of product would be a tangible benefit as opposed to backfilling staff pay

Preference expressed to use new money for specific, discrete deliverables that wouldn’t otherwise be possible next year

**ExComm makes the following recommendation (in priority order) for use of these funds.** Contracting via BPA (current approach) or subcontracts using the NOAA money (BPA request that we consider this method) to determine specific funding:

1. Add breadth: Capture data from tribes and others who have data but have not had the capacity to share it. This would provide information for specific populations for which data are desired, but missing. Legacy datasets that could be obtained with a one time commitment of resources.
2. Add depth: Capture missing data (Fill in the data blanks – metrics, years, etc.) from existing (or new) partners. Use funding to obtain data and fill in the gaps.
3. Focused one-time investments that address infrastructure needs (better data display, improve data flow efficiencies, etc.)
4. Allocate dollars to existing partners to make up for lack of funding for COLAs, increased staff costs, etc. due to flat funding.

Subcontracts stable in 2020 and slight inflation increase in 2021 based on PSMFC savings. Shifting some PSMFC staff to one time NOAA funding would allow the following in FY 2020 (if approved by BPA);

CRITFC - $18,500

Sho-Bann- $25,000

Yakama - $21,150

WDFW - $29,000

Total - $93,650 (balance is PSMFC Indirect)

One caveat – this is based on PSMFC successfully getting 100k in additional NOAA allocation. We have submitted the request, it does not look like there will be a problem BUT things in DC are slow and it is possible something could be amiss. If that were to happen, we would go back to a base budget and these grants and increases would go away. Please keep that in mind.

**ISRP Review Items:**

* Quantitative objectives and timelines- needed to provide a measure of program performance. Chris displayed example. Will incorporate into new SOW
* Add numbers and timelines to objectives to better quantify deliverables
	+ Ok for continuous datasets, would be difficult to capture for new data/ indicators; needs language like “routinely reports on”, “at a minimum reports on”, etc.- keep it general
	+ Suggested new SOW language –

D. CA Data – compile data (Deliverable specification): *“At a minimum, data for existing CA indicators and metrics that have been routinely reported over the last two years are obtained, updated, converted to the DES format, and exchanged with the CA database during the calendar year.”*

G. Compile high priority traditional StreamNet data – (Deliverable specification): *“At a minimum, specific high priority data sets that have been routinely reported over the last two years are updated and maintained during the calendar year. Data is compiled for selected metrics. If directed by the Executive Committee other fish metric data may be established via a CA-like process. Managers will be surveyed to determine the availability of such fish metric data to detail the availability, type, and location of data. Integration with state and tribal web-based data systems is implemented where possible to do so.”*

* Request funds from BPA to archive habitat restoration photographs (service already provided by CBFish). Chris said that the comment has now been conveyed to BPA.

**New 5 Year Plan for Coordinated Assessments - Set Current Year Priorities**

Previous 5 Year Plan was very ambitious – move on to new data categories (hatcheries, native fish, etc.) after initial effort. Experience – Current HLI effort not easily automatable, remains labor intensive. Focus has been on maximizing quantity of data for existing HLIs, particularly for priority populations. Level/decreased funding has limited expansion, as has lack of clear consensus and apparent demand for data for these other species/data categories.

Suggested Approach for Next Five Years - Maintain effort for existing HLIs, maintain current population priorities, respond to policy direction as it is forthcoming;

NPCC F&W Program Amendments/Addendum

Columbia Basin Partnership

Federal BiOps, EIS, etc.

Schedule workshop if policy direction and implementation merits. Continue to work with Tribes via coordination with Tribal ITMD Project. Fine tune effort through DES refinement, process improvement, efficiencies, as possible. Review and revise annually with Executive Committee direction

Discussion - Focus on current priorities and respond to new priorities set by addendum, tributary monitoring, etc. Reviewed current HLI’s and prioritizations; need to know if BPA’s priorities are changing

Indicators- add one for Carrying Capacity, needs further conversation with ExCom

Populations- identify Tier 3 populations that have increased in importance; stick with current priorities already being worked on for the first year, recognizing that there might be adjustment in future years

New Data Categories or Efforts- interested in them but more prudent to continue on what’s already being done and wait to incorporate any changes resulting from the new BiOp.

Russell (per Tom P, Jody) needs to send his “list” of additional priority populations, missing data, BPA projects where data is not in the CAX, etc. to Chris

White Sturgeon indicator similar to NOSA- Dan R interested in working on pulling it together

Decision – (Please refer to draft plan) Chris will draft up and send around for review a new 5 Year Plan. As above plus – Add to year one - Carrying capacity – further definition is needed from Bonneville before discussions with data managers. As the proposer, before further action, BPA will better describe the purpose of this indicator and how it would be used. Once described, the Executive Committee will consider a scoping exercise to develop a general outline of a carrying capacity indicator, including the metrics and data that could be used to calculate this HLI. There is a significant concern from some partners about the complexity of this potential indicator, as well as the availability of staff time. The ExComm discussion of any potential carrying capacity indicator will also include discussion of this topic.

Add to Year 2 - Conduct White Sturgeon “NOSA” discussion. . Further definition is needed before proceeding to development. Because of concern from some partners about the availability of staff time, this discussion will be deferred until year 2 of the 5 year plan. Proponents will describe the purpose of this indicator and how it would be used at a meeting of the Executive Committee. If directed to proceed by ExComm, in year 2 StreamNet will facilitate a scoping exercise to develop a general outline of a White Sturgeon indicator, including the metrics and data that could be used to calculate this HLI. StreamNet will then convene a small group of F&W managers to discuss and report back to the Executive Committee on possible adoption.

**Change in data reporting – from “Prediction” to “Annual Report” Mike Banach, PSMFC**

PowerPoint presentation

Will report on what is in the database as of a specific date, submitted at the end of the calendar year

Will report on what is out there and what is able to be obtained

For 2016-2018 we provided annual predictions of CA data delivery. 2018 "predictions" were largely based on data already provided. We propose to no longer do "predictions". We have learned that actual data provided in the past is better predictor of future data delivery, and is more efficient use of our time. Only 61/2086 predictions changed from 2017 to 2018. Fewer still are likely to change in the future. Will be data already delivered, as of some specific date each year. Will compare 2019 to 2018; specify what data are extra / missing. Proposed to not include "not possible" ("X" in previous years) designations done in previous years, but continuing to have that included was requested. Will include maps of 2019 populations with data – BPA would like to collaborate more on development of the maps display. Will use the calendar year as the reporting period.

**StreamNet Library Discussion - Zach Penney, CRITFC**

PowerPoint presentation

Reviewed objectives and goals of the Library, accomplishments and future initiatives

Changing name to Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Library, updating the website and logo

**Roundtable Discussion**

PNAMP working on fall workshop (November) on Smolt Estimation and Analytics, major refresh to Monitoring Methods- simplifying user interface and map explorer

John A- included climate change scenario in their Okanagan modeling (first time working in predictive space)

ODFW- updated recovery tracker website, digitizing documents

Council- upcoming meetings

PSMFC- will have 4 timestamps on all data

Mari- CA heavily used for status reviews

FWS- finalized implementation plan for adopting FINS for 14 regional hatcheries

Batten – share these notes with your data staff as they provide great perspective!

GregS – stick with existing Tier 1 and Tier 2 priorities for now – adjustments can come if/when new agreements are struck

TonyG – take care of current priorities first