**StreamNet Executive Committee**

**July 16, 2014 DRAFT Meeting Notes**

**Action Item Summary:**

**Please review the notes and get any comments back to Chris soon**

**Strategic Plan: Please review & send any edits/ changes to Chris by August 10th. He will distribute a new draft with your comments incorporated.**

**Coordinated Assessments: Chris will draft a plan for review by the Executive Committee. Plan will include direction to StreamNet staff to fully populate NOSA and RperS for all listed populations where data exists.**

**Budget & SOW: Baseline budget approved, for any available funding above baseline, Priorities are to fund FY 2014 enhancements. If substantial new dollars were available full time Data Stewards in E. Washington, another in ODFW, and potentially in IDFG for resident fish would be priorities. ODFW and IDFG will provide Chris with a general outline of the needs and budget amounts for these positions (WDFW has already).**

**Executive Committee Roles & Responsibilities: Group would like to meet 2 -3 time a year. Will invite USFWS representation. Next meeting will be in fall.**

**Device Trials: Chris will send out draft survey to the Executive Committee for comment. Please get contact information to Chris if you have field device users you would like surveyed.**

**10:00 AM Introductions, Welcome, History Randy Fisher**

Attendees: Randy Fisher (chair, PSMFC), Chris Wheaton (PSMFC), Stan Allen (PSMFC), Rich Carmichael (ODFW), Tom Iverson (Coordinated Assessments), Phil Rodger (CRITFC), Russell Scranton (BPA), Tom Pansky (BPA), Tony Grover (NWPPC), Tom Cooney (NWFS-NOAA), Brian Mercier (BPA), John Arterburn (Colville), Brodie Cox (WDFW), Dan Rawding (WDFW), Pete Hassemer (IDFG), Don Skaar(phone- MFWP)

Randy F- Purpose of this meeting:

* keep StreamNet relevant and focused
* begin the process of figuring out how the decision making, data flow, etc. best work together
* identify role of Executive Committee in providing guidance and direction
* identify needs to set up system to track successes and failures, document processes for future use

Tom C- just putting data in StreamNet doesn’t answer the question of what is inferred from that data (StreamNet is a valuable tool for making that information available). Should have a discussion about the use and display of the data

Tony G – Need to remember that StreamNet is not solely for ESA listed species

Chris W- Goal is for StreamNet to be essential but largely invisible, a one-stop shop for certain key Columbia River Basin data, a coordinating body for data issues in the region. Would also like Exec Committee to make sure that deployment of agency resources aligns with agency priorities

Russell – One issue for BPA is that past review indicated that required BiOp data was not coming in in a timely manner

**10:15 AM Review StreamNet Strategic Plan Chris Wheaton**

PowerPoint presentation (copies of presentation and Strategic Plan available from Chris on request)

9 Goals of Strategic Plan, including:

* Focus on supporting regional decision makers
* identifying data needing standardization
* working collaboratively on key metrics
* improving data management capabilities/ security/ accessibility

Revised structure of Strategic Plan to include Executive Committee:

* Do we have the right representation in the committee?
* Do we have the right mission?
	+ Geographic scope, fisheries data focus, other?
* Do we have the right strategies?
	+ Collaborative regional forum with technical assistance and leadership on data management issues
	+ Provide infrastructure support within agencies and tribes
	+ Secure, more focused data repository with linkages to data in other repositories

DISCUSSION

Rich C- Strategic Plan should be for the program as a whole and all aspects of the work done by projects under it- as written it comes across as a document outlining PSMFC’s role in the program. Would like it to be more broadly written to include work done by all agencies/ participants. Looking for a document that provides justification for agency priorities (as defined by their annual work plans).

Tony G- what does a broader strategic plan look like? Rich C- overall concepts don’t change, just the wording to encompass more than just PSMFC’s role; perhaps focus on 3-4 mission oriented goals broken down into a suite of objectives.

Tony G- does group have a clear idea/ shared vision for the purpose and function of StreamNet? Chris W- hope is that it becomes clear by the conclusion of this meeting.

Tom C- by the end of this meeting, would be good to identify the next set of objectives for StreamNet

Dan R (via Tony G) - don’t want to create an insulated system; want to promote open connectivity & a willingness to collaborate

Russell S- keep in mind how regional data systems support this project and vice versa

Brian M/ Rich C- there may be a disconnect between short and long-term needs and how they are met by StreamNet; huge task to deliver what has been committed to under the Coordinated Assessment indicators and it is a hugely important priority

John A- it is important for this group to set the tone for the mission & vision; strategic plan needs to be much more focused if it is intended to be a 5 year plan- pick 1 piece to take through the entire process from data to delivery, and don’t start something new until you’ve finished what you started (this committee’s role is to police that process). No mention in the plan of how to work together with other projects working in the region.

**ACTION: Chris W- will work directly with Rich and any other volunteers to incorporate changes into a revised document that can be reviewed by the Executive Committee. Please review & send any edits/ changes to Chris by August 10th. He will distribute a new draft with your comments incorporated.**

**10:30 AM Priorities for Coordinated Assessments All**

PowerPoint presentation (copies available Chris W. on request). Tom Iverson (Consultant) assisted with presentation

Most of the data collected on the ground already feeds the CA priority indicators (Natural Origin Adult Spawners, Smolt to Adult Ratio, Adult to Adult Ratio, and Juvenile Productivity); indicators chosen for this project are a primary source of information used by NOAA Fisheries for evaluating population level status assessments as well as state and tribal population assessments

 DISCUSSION

Dan R- information collected through CA effort is also important to agency efforts and needed for evaluating management decisions

Tom C- CA project was seen as a way to implement data sharing needs that they had already worked out amongst themselves; figure out collectively how to use CA and SN tools to produce the information they’ve already agreed that they all need; needs to be a way to do this for non-listed stocks as well

Chris W- if you have StreamNet people in your agency, direct how your resources are used to meet the regional priorities

Brian M- sees focus/ mission of StreamNet as working on the mechanics of implementing data flow, not on establishing regional data priorities

CA Project Approach- start small and stay focused, get buy-in from regional biologists and data techs, provide incentives to agencies & tribes, build off success

Current Workplan (1/1/14-3/13/15)- develop exchange network, develop additional indicators, support implementation of Data Sharing Strategies, initiate and manage data flows; Currently at a point where states and tribes are building their systems, will write the Flow Configuration Document this fall

Current Reports from StreamNet Partners- what will be completed in 2014-15 (IDFG, WDFW, ODFW, and Colville all reporting); Chris W- can provide a copy of the DES on request

Reviewed issues brought up by StreamNet Partners in regards to CA indicator data and Recommendations for addressing those issues

 DISCUSSION

Chris W- this is something for Executive Committee to think about in terms of how they are utilizing their SN resources

 Phil R- the issues brought up through the CA process are consuming a lot of their time

Tom C- hope that some of the basis for accepting data as was previously identified through the TRT is maintained

 Rich C- will always be a large conversion process to move past field data collection

Russell- do we need to clarify who is doing that conversion?

Rich C- no, it doesn’t matter who is doing it. What’s important is that it is being done efficiently and that StreamNet resources are used to facilitate it.

Chris W- making sure that we are standardizing and building on past efforts is the way to proceed with CA project; all of the data interpretation is done at the agency/tribal level, StreamNet just archives the information, doesn’t validate it

Reviewed possible objectives for the CA Project in FY 2015- StreamNet Steering Committee would like direction on this

 DISCUSSION

Chris W- what are the quantifiable, realistic objectives that can be set?

John A- sees USGS as model for good data management; hope is that StreamNet can do something similar for fish data (bring the data in and display/ deliver it in a meaningful manner); have a responsibility to the region to provide this service

Chris W- does this group want to provide direction as to what data should be targeted?

Rich C- most agencies are already focusing on fully populating one or two key indicators (NOSA, RperS) for all listed populations that have data, and serving that data out

Pete H- have a lot of populations with data available, everyone has an assessment unit they are interested in to inform management decisions; Are we capturing information in a way that benefits this process?

Tom C- think about value-added efforts and institutionalizing previous successes under CA effort

Tony G- Can you do item #2 (fully populate one or two key indicators)? If so, what extra effort is required to do item #1 (populate BPA priority populations)?

Chris W- StreamNet Steering Committee proposes that a target list be included in the annual work plan

Dan R- template doesn’t have to be fully filled out; should be clear what “complete” means. Chris W- what it means to StreamNet is that the reporting agency Data Steward is deciding when it’s ready to be sent as an indicator

John A- would like to see support for roll-up concept; needs to be done but someone needs to make it their task; Russell S- current scope of StreamNet funding is limited to DES development and storage of indicator data; rolling it up and delivering it has not been addressed; Tony G- the need for roll up/ delivery drives funding decisions

Dan R- Indicators need to be available for display- the question is where and how and by whom.

Brian M- StreamNet should not be a one-stop shop for roll-up/ display; **Core competency should be focused on automated flow of data to those that need to use it for reporting, display, etc.**

**ACTION: Chris will draft a plan for review by the Executive Committee. Plan will include; Executive Committee direction to StreamNet to fully populate NOSA and RperS for all listed populations where data exists. This will be communicated to partner agency StreamNet staff and also built into the CA work plan as an objectives for 2015**

**12:15 PM Review Proposed Budget & Statement of Work All**

PowerPoint presentation (copies of presentation and SOW available from Chris on request)

SOW focus was on simplification of reporting, themes include:

* support data management infrastructure
* provide regional coordination forum for fish data management issues
* help secure data in accessible repositories
* decide what to do about traditional datasets
	+ Proposed in current SOW- PSMFC will lead a review to help determine use and importance of different data types; will report back/ modify next proposed SOW based on prioritization
	+ Proposed in current SOW- initiate additional coordinated assessment-type processes for standardizing data collection regionally, where appropriate

DISCUSSION

Dan R- due to lack of funding (no eastside data steward), CA work will be slow

Rich C- may be informative to talk about how ODFW priorities are being re-allocated; de-emphasizing GIS in this budget, re-allocating resources to help out with Eastern Oregon & to develop means for transferring indicator data to StreamNet (not enough funds in the budget for a full time data steward to do this work); way more challenging to get data in CA format than anyone had anticipated

Budget Issues & Discussion

Have $2,034,576 in 2015; baseline budget proposals from all partners total $2,040,395

* if PTAGIS doesn’t need their extra 50K this year, BPA can reprogram the funds and add back to StreamNet to bring up to 2014 level ($2,084,576)
* Discussion between PSMFC and BPA; if new manager for HEP is not hired, could Chris charge more of his time to the HEP project and re-allocate his savings to meet other StreamNet needs for 2015?
* planning to put in for another round of EPA grant (WDFW lead)

At current baseline, will be able to adjust and fund requested programs but will need to drop the additional support provided to states in 2014 (includes seasonal techs- IDFG, data management specialist- WDFW, LaGrande data steward- ODFW, travel assistance & website development- PSMFC).

**ACTION: Baseline budget approved, for any available funding above baseline (less than 100k), Priorities are (in order) - ODFW/WDFW data stewards, IDFG seasonal techs for device trials, PSMFC & Exec Committee travel, website. For any additional funds > 100k, (Additional needs include: full time Data Stewards in E. Washington, additional Data Steward in ODFW, and potential Data Stewards in IDFG for resident fish) ODFW and IDFG will provide Chris with a general outline of the needs and budget amounts for use in discussion with BPA if additional funds were to become available.**

**1:30 PM Review Committee Structure: Changes or Issues? Randy**

DISCUSSION

Pete H- there is clearly work to be done on the Strategic Plan, defining goals/ objective/ tasks/ overall mission and how to work towards achieving them

Rich C- need to identify key elements to be included in a mission statement

Tony G- group needs to be able to present products that are useful, interesting, helpful for the public and funding entities (i.e., make the website better)

Randy F- If we don’t do what the funding entity (BPA) wants, the money will go away. Right now, we need to solve the current problem.

Dan R- DART doesn’t collect fish counts, but everyone goes there for information. Where is the role of the Council in reporting?

Rich C- would like to see it part of the Executive Committee’s work plan to see how they want the data displayed for the public, how the queries should be made available

Russell S- have to be mindful of how StreamNet is supporting other outputs (SalmonScape, IFWIS, etc.)

Tom C- need to demonstrate success with indicators that are already in use, then build from there

Dan R- important that goals (whatever they are) be as prioritized as possible

Chris W- it would helpful for Executive Committee to prioritize where we go next in terms of hatchery, resident fish indicators for the region, etc.; identify the targets for the data so that StreamNet can craft the systems needed

Randy F- when writing up mission statement, set the priorities by identifying what will be done in each year

Tom C- this is an appropriate group for setting those priorities and what they mean

Russell- do we need different people involved for resident fish?

John A- important to recognize that this group has to represent all the various communities (lamprey, sturgeon, resident fish, anadromous fish) - right now, it’s all anadromous

Dan R- isn’t an issue of importance, it’s an issue of sequencing & prioritization- would love to report on everything, but when can they?

Tony G- need to adjust priorities based on needs & expectations of the region; also manage expectations of the region by setting those priorities

Rich C- talking about developing a process that would apply to ANY type of data sharing. Until they can demonstrate success, they don’t have anything. Sees difference between a Strategic Plan and a 5 Year Work Plan.

Tom C- some effort into thinking about a 5 year work plan will help guide the strategies

Chris W- Should this group include a USFWS rep (from both hatchery and bull trout)? How often should this group meet?

Tom C- yes, and someone who understands the strategic use of the information (not just a hatchery manager). Might also want to include representation from elsewhere in NOAA – Scott Rumsey?

Rich C- if there is a clear strategic plan, would be easier to go back to our agency to identify who is best to be here; should make sure there is enough work identified to justify meeting frequency (will not be a problem in the first couple of years)

Tony G- group should meet often enough to be credible (3 times/ year?)

John A- would be nice if the meetings lined up with the Steering Committee schedule; Stan A- this group will guide Steering Committee tasks

**ACTION: Group would like to meet 2 -3 time a year, at least initially. Will invite USFWS representation on the Exec Committee. Next meeting will be in fall (November in conjunction with Steering Committee?). Discussion topics will include;**

**Review and adoption of revised (5 year?) Strategic Plan,**

**Accessibility, display and uses of CA information,**

**Identifying and prioritizing next phases of CA project, including targets for data (NPCC HLIs and Dashboards, replacement of State of the Resource Report, other?)**

**2:30 PM Hand Held Data Collection Devices: Regional Perspective Chris**

PowerPoint presentation (copies available from Chris on request)

BPA provided StreamNet funding to purchase, deploy, and test devices in various field settings (numerous other projects and applications are being utilized in the field- CRITFC, Sitka/ CHaMP, etc.)

What has been learned so far?

* Lot of interest and excitement in apps and technology
* Developing apps individually is time consuming and not sustainable
* Duplication of effort and opportunity for coordination both exist
* Data upload from the field is practical, even in remote locations
* Data can be lost if battery dies, unit overheats

Wrap up 2014-2015 Plans:

* Coordinate with PNAMP, Sitka, other vendors and projects on a broad survey of device users
* Coordinate on a device workshop in Portland the week of November 17, 2014
* Identify current hardware and software issues and opportunities, bring field staff together to discuss and learn
* In 2015, identify potential projects and types of data that could be standardized for more efficient app development. Private sector role- build and deploy apps, PNAMP & StreamNet role- oversee the coordination and standardization, BPA role- fund device/ application purchases and oversee R, M, & E

DISCUSSION

Rich C- doesn’t want to have to pay private vendors to use tools that we develop on contract dollars or pay them to store data

Pete H- wants to know what internal capacity is to develop the apps

Dan R- should be looking at alternate models of what it would take to develop the apps internally (more cost effective, easier to update); not just about data collection, but also about how easy it is to get the data back into the database; hard to develop electronic data collection methods if you don’t have a database and don’t know where the data is going or what it’s going to be used for

Russell S- standardization & documentation of the method makes it easier for data collection in the field

**ACTION: Chris will send out draft survey to the Executive Committee for comment after it has been refined a bit. If Exec Committee members are aware of field device users they would like to have surveyed please get contact information to Chris**

**3:00 PM Thank you for coming, safe travels, Adjourn**