**Fall StreamNet Steering Committee Meeting**

**Draft Notes**

**Wednesday, November 19, 2014**

**PSMFC, Portland, OR**

**Attendees:** Chris, Phil, Cedric, Brett, Bill, Peter, Brodie, Dawn (phone), Tom P, Van, Steve, Greg, Bart, Evan, Jen (phone), Russell, John, Jen, Tom I., Mike, Ben Kwan (consultant)

Peter and Phil are both in the process of retiring, Tom P will be new StreamNet COTR

**Update on the Emerging Technologies Workshop** held on 11/18:

Workshop was initially implemented as a follow up to the device testing done in 2014. Then combined efforts and partnered with PNAMP, Sitka and the CHaMP program.

At the workshop they reviewed device survey results, gave project presentations, device demos, held a panel discussion, and began discussion of where to go next.

* 115 people attended (with a waiting list)
* Would be good to separate out demos in the future (got noisy in the demo area).
* Panel discussion questions- how do we overcome inertia of people wanting to share their data? Can we exploit public/ private partnerships to expedite the process? Create an app store for fish data?
* Need to leverage the developments and energy that already exists
* Next step will be for Sitka, PNAMP, and StreamNet to identify what can come out of this workshop as a tangible result/ product/ next objective
* The devices allowed users to interface with other devices (PIT Tag Readers, GPS, etc.) in real-time which will allow for consolidation of data and may eventually eliminate paper data forms
* Forum for exchanging ideas is extremely valuable
* Approximately 40% of projects experienced some kind of data loss, 25% had device failure, but there was overwhelming support for the devices and the majority reported an overwhelming time-savings from using the devices
* iPad was favored despite its issues (due to intuitive ease of use?), ToughPad was second choice

Need to decide what to do with the deployed devices at this point. StreamNet will send an inventory and survey on future deployment of devices around to the current holders and this group. Likely to be transferred to inventory of current user, but if Steering Committee members are aware of a different deployment they should let us know by the deadline requested.

Summary of workshop will be available, as will the presentations. This should include an inventory of what is being used, by whom, and make it available to the participants

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 8:45 | Consistency of Indicators for Populations  Do C.A. indicators always represent an entire population? Combining/working with multiple stewards for one population. | All |

Questions raised regarding Coordinated Assessment Indicators- do they always represent the entire population? Currently assuming that is does.

If the answer is ‘No’, is there sufficient information in the DES to indicate that, and is this being effectively explained to people using the CA database? Consensus is yes. However, concerns over the use of this metadata and issues with future display of information.

There is a geographic record associated with the data to indicate which part of the population it came from, but could be useful to display it in a more relevant and easily understandable way.

Real question is: If it’s a partial population estimate, should it be added to the CAX? Assumption is that CAX will house population-level indicators. Have the metrics to extrapolate to full population levels, so really talking about full-disclosure with the data (PopFit field).

If people aggregate indicator information into a larger population estimate, will they be able to state that the estimate is based on the best information available for each indicator that the agencies can provide? Yes, that is the intent.

Summary of CA Prioritization charts will be provided to group by Chris- would be good to add information on number of TRT populations for which indicator data will never be collected.

To ask the Executive Committee- What is the maximum number of populations reported on, and what is the optimum number of populations reported on? Is the number of populations currently being reported on a relevant number? Does that number of populations represent the current capacity for population monitoring? Idea: use the CA workplan and reporting exercise as a tool in discussing the adequacy of monitoring. We will now know the number of populations where this HLI information is collected and reported annually.

2 populations where ODFW and WDFW have agreed to report on the same population- need Executive Committee to determine who will be responsible for geographically shared data to avoid duplication. Update: we will send these population questions to WDFW and ODFW to resolve (Columbia gorge populations only ones impacted). A responsible party will be designated.

Currently have: 478 publishable NOSA records for 23 populations in Oregon/ Colville, 14 SAR records in Oregon, 89 RperS for Oregon. Don’t know if NOAA has harvested the data yet.

Whether or not NOAA accesses the CAX will depend on whether it’s easier for them than contacting the agencies and tribes directly as they have in the past. Need to create a ‘negative feedback loop’ to deter a work-around that would allow NOAA to avoid utilizing the CAX and promotes a new business model going forward.

Anadromous Salmonid Monitoring Strategy (ASMS), led by BPA and NOAA for ESA recovery purposes, started this whole process. Need to make sure TRT is aligned with ASMS for a longer term strategy.

Look up ASMS and compare to CA efforts.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 10:15 | Review FY 2015 SOW and Budgets  Work Elements, Deliverables, Milestones  Budget allocations and issues, Devices  Other related topics? | All |

Need pending bills submitted to PSMFC no later than Tuesday, November 25

Substantially modified, consolidated, and simplified SOW for 2015 from previous years

Wants to make sure everyone understands what their work elements/ responsibilities are for 2015

Work Element 159- support transfer of data into secure and accessible repositories; BPA will be sending out letter to projects that do not currently have a repository designated indicating that the Data Store is ready to serve in this capacity. Chris will send out the latest version of the letter for final review/ comment.

Coordination Assessment Work Elements- includes managing existing DES and developing new DES

Resume Updating Traditional Data (including hydrography) as other items allow; hydrography is not currently a high-priority item for BPA

Work Element 189- Data Capture Devices; what should be done with the deployed devices?

* BPA doesn’t want them back.
* IDFG would like to keep them and continue using them for developing data capture protocols and building in-house expertise.
* ODFW would like to know what they actually have and who has the devices.
* Bill will send the inventory list to all agencies; agencies will indicate what they want done with the devices assigned to their projects.

Budget background; remember that PSMFC GIS Team going off StreamNet, plus acquisition of several new projects at PSMFC that pay for some previous StreamNet staff time has freed up additional funds for states. May at some point require funding from StreamNet again. IDFG needs additional funds (approximate $5,500) to cover Evan’s salary for a year.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 10:45 | EPA Grant Funding: Plans and Priorities | Chris & Tom Iverson |

Original EPA grant helped speed up implementation of the CAX

Working with WDFW on new grant to expand the CAX with Hatchery indicators and outside the Columbia River Basin (include Puget Sound, tribes)

CRITFC will also submit two proposals (one to E-Enterprise, one to Exchange Network) to fund programmers at CRITFC, Nez Perce, and Yakama to develop capacity to implement CAX

Will find out in April who gets awarded grants, contracting starts in July, would start work in September

IDFG and WDFW still need to send in their Data Flow Configuration documents

CA Planning Group meeting in two weeks; will look at flow configuration documents, tribal needs assessments, 2015 work plan (Phase 7), planning for next workshop in March/ April 2015 to adopt Hatchery Indicator DES (5 tables currently out for review)- will try to schedule next StreamNet committee meetings for same time

Spring Smolt Equivalents and Summer Parr Numbers focus for the next CA Smolt/ Juvenile DES development; next meeting in December. Update: The meeting will be Monday December 8 at 10:00.

Partners are limited in their ability to develop additional DES and flow data by available staff time; do a similar exercise (as was done with the initial indicators) with new indicators when they are developed to manage expectations as to what will actually be available.

Is it worth creating the receptacle if there won’t be anything to fill it?

May need to re-evaluate the monitoring programs to better line up with the regional priorities and CA indicators

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 11:40 | NPCC Indicators, QW Consulting Contract, Dashboards, Reporting, StreamNet and the CA Project | Chris |

New project for PSMFC to populate high level indicators at NPCC website for Resident Fish; have subcontracted to QW Consulting to do the work

Want to eventually automate data flow from StreamNet to have them continually and automatically updated

Need a better understanding of what is out there and available, and plan is to have those conversations with the managers prior to developing a work plan to implement the project

Want to make sure everyone is aware that this is being done at the request of the Council; would like to see the datasets that inform these dashboards and indicators flow through StreamNet in an automated fashion in future

Partners would like to be notified when people in their agencies are going to be contacted, and would like to be provided with background information in advance so that the can be prepared to answer questions.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1:15 | StreamNet Website | Group |

**http://sndev2.psmfc.org**

Please send all comments, edits, additions to Chris and Amy

Will add in BPA/ CBFish & Council projects to Partner Data Resources; Update MFWP contacts per below

Some still want access to the old query system- we will make it available to those who need it and know how to find it

Clean, modern, intuitive design; overall well received

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1:30 | Announcements, Updates, Roundtable | Group |

Colville:

* hiring a Data Steward in conjunction with Sitka to replace Donna Trott
* Jen is the contact person in the interim

CRITFC:

* Application Developer position still to be filled; slowed field testing
* Tried testing electronic field collection with Klickitat; will try again this year
* Had problems converting to new PIT tag readers which slowed things down
* Productive Tribal Data Workshop in September- working in a common direction for data sharing now; Umatilla made theirs public domain and other three are interested in that as well
* Warm Springs is maintaining individual access to databases; other tribes are talking about centralized access; key is that they are all talking about it
* Renewed Tribal subcontracts; looks like this is the last full year of tribes participating as funding will go away; EPA grant is critical to move things forward

IDFG:

* Evan transferring to Fish Bureau under Lance Hebdon
* High Level Indicator database is ready to be used
* Focused on Coordinated Assessments and Electronic Field Data Capture (will make report available once it is done with review)
* Also working on fish distribution data updates & requests (Where are these fish? What fish are in these water bodies?)- water resources is the lead and only propose edits when they have data on that particular segment of stream

MFWP:

* Jane Horton is new data and GIS person for StreamNet (Bill Daigle was hired as a GIS programmer analyst in the same bureau )
* Completed data exchange in September; working on population trend data to fit into escapement data table
* Got additional datasets into centralized database (barriers, library references, etc.)
  + Added additional barrier fields based on the AFS protocol. Fields may want to be considered for an additional Barriers DES
* Improving QA/QC due to biologists entering their own data
* Moving towards allowing biologists to enter fish distribution themselves using a map interface
  + Group would be interested in seeing any webinar developed for this
  + Very difficult to get edits made to NHD through USGS
* Could do a demonstration at the December Tech Meeting that would cover how biologists will update distribution data/ data entry process rather than the back end side
* Is the Data Store the best place to start storing data layers & GIS? No, but it’s the place of last resort. Should a location/process to store spatial data be brought up at a technical meeting?

ODFW:

* Submitted NOSA, RperS, SAR estimates and successfully updated 3 populations and added new data to those since the initial submissions
* Eastside datasets ready but still working on methods documentation
* Making improvements to overall API system, improve QA/QC, etc.
* Completed migration of whole stream routes, fish distribution, barrier data to NHD but don’t have resources to maintain it on NHD
* Can go to Windows Server 2013 and SQL 2014, trying to get 6 new virtual servers
* Developing mobile applications from other funding sources
* Nadine working in La Grande under Rich Carmichael
* Participated in CCT distribution workshops with Van

WDFW:

* Working on Coordinated Assessment, SPS, SASI update to align them
* Updating SCORE and SalmonScape data; want to update websites
* Submitting grant proposals for commercial database, age database, coordinated assessments
* Signed MOA with NWIFC to keep fish distribution updated and aligned with NHD- difficult to get edits done through USGS (causing a resource issue for everyone)

USFWS:

* Worked through inconsistencies identified by Bill Kinney in data going back to 1981
* Working on Hatchery Returns, Age Compositions
* Does want to be in the loop on the FINS (Fisheries Information System) database being developed in Idaho (formerly Hatchery Database Management System); taken over from IDFG by the Lower Snake River Compensation Plan

BPA:

* Developed templates for snorkel surveys; tools for data entry were a failure for in-field use; working on improvements to it for this year to see if it can be functional
* Agreement with Forest Service on exchange standards; trying to demonstrate how to roll up & drill down through the information from a site, to a reach, to a population, etc.
* Looking internally at how to better manage GIS resources to make them more readily available; ‘Grand Ronde Atlas’

PSMFC:

* Worked on the device trials workshop, website re-design, need exchange documents from Colville, IDFG, CA DES, tablet test results, StreamNet DES change requests

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 3:15 | Naming Protocols and Geospatial Distributions of  Non-Listed Populations | Russell Scranton |

Presentation

Goals

* Standard population names and crosswalk
* Proposed GIS coverage
* Identify agency staff with the authority to provide review of draft final product and approve any changes
* Scope is for the Columbia Basin
* Will be managed by PSMFC for the future, will need development for Coastal Non-listed populations and will maintain links to official NOAA layers

Product would be an updated CA table

Is the final product a comprehensive list regardless of whether or not there is data for a polygon? Yes- wants to be able to show that there is no data

Simple to deal with if we limit it to the populations as data comes in; will have a map that starts to ‘light up’ when polygons are populated with data

Have the CRITFC crosswalk that’s already been developed- don’t waste time resolving differences of opinion that don’t matter because there isn’t data for that area anyway

Russell will provide a draft product (a list with unresolved issues); data providers will try to resolve issues across rows as the data comes in. For populations where data does not currently exist, resolve where possible or set aside for future discussion.

**Related discussion: Who is going to be using the hatchery indicators? Who are they being developed for?**

Missing hatchery information from all agencies- are we talking to the right people to get a comprehensive set of all the information?

Need support from higher up in the agency to address issues with the non-cooperating hatcheries. Colville would need to build new systems in order to participate.

Can’t adequately evaluate a hatchery program without considering off-site recoveries- where does that information come from for CA?

Need further discussion on hatchery indicators to make sure we are talking to the right people, that the people developing the indicators are coordinating with those developing the data, and could be duplicating collection efforts with others like RMIS.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 3:45 | Review Data Store/Data Repository | Greg & Mike |

Greg walked through various aspects of entering datasets into the Data Store

Asked to update Data Store to connect fields that are available in CBFish and Monitoring Methods so it’s easier for people to fill in their data

Russell wants to make all data available 1 year after submission, regardless of whether or not the ‘Finished, Ready to Share’ box is checked to meet federal data sharing requirements

When you sign in to add data to the data store, it shows you a list of datasets you have previously entered or are associated with

Fields are automatically saved as you type

Are data access privileges able to be designated based on the data sharing agreement? No, the provisions are not being implemented because the data store is subject to BPA’s requirements.

Focal species list should be expandable, searchable, sortable, and consistent with BPA’s lists

As stated previously; BPA will be sending out letter to projects that do not currently have a repository designated indicating that the Data Store is ready to serve in this capacity. Chris will send out the latest version of the letter for final review/ comment.