



COLUMBIA BASIN FISH AND WILDLIFE AUTHORITY

851 SW Sixth Avenue, Suite 260 | Pacific First Building | Portland, OR 97204-1339 | Phone: 503-229-0191 | Fax: 503-229-0443

DATE: April 10, 2007
TO: Data Management Framework Subcommittee
FROM: Tom Iverson, CBFWA staff
SUBJECT: Draft meeting notes from April 6, 2007 DMFS meeting

Coordinating and promoting effective protection and restoration of fish, wildlife, and their habitat in the Columbia River Basin.

The Authority is comprised of the following tribes and government agencies:

- Burns Paiute Tribe
 - Coeur d'Alene Tribe
 - Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation
 - Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation
 - Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation
 - Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation
 - Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation
 - Idaho Department of Fish and Game
 - Kootenai Tribe of Idaho
 - Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks
 - National Marine Fisheries Service
 - Nez Perce Tribe
 - Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
 - Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of Fort Hall
 - Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of Duck Valley
 - U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
 - Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Coordinating Agencies**
- Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission
 - Upper Columbia United Tribes

Data Management Framework Subcommittee Meeting April 6, 2007 9:00 to 11:30 am

Draft Action Notes

Attendees: Dick O'Connor (WDFW), Tom Rien (ODFW), Phil Roger (CRITFC), Bruce Schmidt (StreamNet), Dave Ward and Tom Iverson (CBFWA)

By Phone: Janet Hess-Herbert (MDFWP), Cedric Cooney (ODFW), Dale Chess (CDAT), Bart Butterfield and Alan Byrne (IDFG)

Time Allocation:	Objective 2. Fish & Wildlife Regional Issues	%
	Objective 3. Annual Report	%
	Objective 4. RM&E	%
	Objective 5. Other Business	%
		%

ITEM 1: Background and context for today's meeting

Discussion: The Data Management Framework Subcommittee (DMFS) was established by the Members Advisory Group (MAG) to provide short term FY 2007 guidance to the StreamNet steering committee on data priorities for their FY07 statement of work. The committee determined that FY07 should be considered a transition year for StreamNet, with no major modifications in its work plan, and that the committee should continue to meet to define a data management framework for the upcoming program amendment process (which should guide longer term priorities for StreamNet).

At the last meeting of the DMFS it was agreed that the committee should focus on two aspects of data management: 1) the discrete data needs at the regional scale (for Fish and Wildlife Program), and 2) what projects are necessary to support regional (Program) reporting of the data.

The group also discussed the timeline for developing a comprehensive framework for the Program. Clearly FY08-09 will be a transition year to establish a foundation of information and reorganize data management projects to support whatever is developed in the amendment process. The amendment process is not anticipated to be complete for over a year and therefore would likely guide 2010 funding. In the meantime, existing projects should begin restructuring to be prepared to support the revised Program. The Council's FY07-09 recommendations only provided interim funding recommendations for the data management projects, with the expectation that longer term data management needs would be discussed and determined during FY07.

NED is developing a work plan for FY08 which addresses missing elements in the Program that could support better regional coordination of data. Their work plan will be presented to Council in June.

The DMFS should consider developing FY08-09 data management project funding recommendations but would need MAG approval. The CBFWA recommendation should be consistent with NED and PNAMP guidance.

ACTION: **The DMFS agreed that the question should be asked of the MAG whether the DMFS should develop Data Management Project funding recommendations for the Council.**

ITEM 2: **What data do we need for regional decision making?**

Discussion: The CBFWA technical committees have been tasked with identifying the focal populations for anadromous fish, resident fish, and wildlife for the amendment process. They are currently debating and establishing a finite list of focal populations. The Status of the Resource Project (SOTR) created the initial list of populations and abundance indicators with the agreement of BPA and NPCC. This data could be considered a foundation that additional data will build upon.

The final list of data necessary for regional (Program) monitoring will be determined in the amendment process. Until then, the SOTR represents the best comprehensive list assembled. The VSP parameters are another known need for recovery monitoring. Subbasin planning also identified several key data parameters that may feed regional decision making.

The group agreed that the fish data metrics are well developed; unfortunately, the habitat data metrics are not as clear cut. PNAMP has a high level indicators draft document out for review, comments could be provided to that process to help clarify what habitat parameters are a priority for the Program.

ACTION: The committee agreed that they should proceed with two basic steps: 1) validate that the fish and wildlife data called for in the SOTR (population ID and abundance indicators) and recovery plans (VSP parameters) are the base fish data, and 2) work towards identifying a few high level indicators from the PNAMP white paper for identifying the base habitat data necessary for regional reporting.

ITEM 3: What projects do we need to manage regional information?

Discussion: Tom Iverson presented a draft conceptual diagram of the various elements and projects required for regional data management. The charts were attached to the draft agenda for today's meeting. During the Mainstem and Systemwide Review Team (MSRT) review of data management projects, a diagram was developed that showed the relationship of the projects in the context of hierarchical data needs and uses (slide 2 in the attachment). This chart did not provide adequate context to give Council members confidence that the projects were working effectively on prioritized tasks.

The main chart, titled "Conceptual Draft" was created out of a conversation with Peter Paquet regarding the separation of the data management and monitoring frameworks. Although these two frameworks are intricately related, they are applied differently when identifying project tasks and activities. The monitoring framework is determined by the management questions that are being asked in a particular situation. Essentially, there are monitoring frameworks in place to address most fish and wildlife management processes that are ongoing. The question for the Program is what should our monitoring framework look like? The amendment process should answer that question in detail because we currently do not have a monitoring framework for the Program.

The regional data needs are determined by various reports that are being created for specific processes. Currently the Status of the Resource Project is the closest example of a monitoring framework for the Program. Once the data needs are known, the monitoring support projects can help determine sampling design (CSMEP), sampling protocols (PNAMP), and what metrics should be collected to adequately report the required data (Fish population – AFS protocols book, CSMEP, others; Habitat data – PNAMP high level indicators paper, AFS protocols book, ISRP Retrospective report, other; Project Data – PNAMP project effectiveness reporting paper, ISRP retrospective report, PCSRF reporting requirements, others).

With this guidance, the data collectors can insure that when they are collecting data, on the ground, that they collect the data needed for regional decision making in a consistent manner and report the

data to an appropriate data base.

The data management projects are primarily concerned with providing access to the data from the primary collectors. This data must have some level of uniformity in structure to share it. There are several data management projects that feed data into the data management framework. The data management framework will always be larger than the monitoring framework in terms of discrete data needs. The data collectors are collecting more information than is required at the regional scale, and it is often efficient and simple to move all of their available data into a data framework (warehouse or distributed data system), rather than only making specific data identified in the regional framework available. There are projects that help facilitate collecting and transferring data from the primary collectors to a broadly accessible data service. Although these projects serve many functions, their priority should be to insure that the data required by the regional decision makers is accessible.

In order to insure that the data management projects are integrated and working on priorities for the Program, a clear set of monitoring needs has to be defined. The DMFS could provide an initial proposal on data requirements for presentation to the MAG for CBFWA approval.

ACTION: **DMFS members will provide comment and feedback to Tom regarding the draft concepts presented today, both as edits to this narrative and through edits to the attached charts (first two charts in PowerPoint presentation).**

ITEM 4: **Next Meeting**

Discussion: The DMFS will meet during the StreamNet Steering Committee meeting on April 19-20, 2007.

ACTION: **Agenda items will include:**

- 1) Presentation of Status of the Resource web site – current and future data requirements,
- 2) Discuss feedback on action notes and graphs,
- 3) Discussion of how to identify the priority data elements for FY08-09, and
- 4) Bullets for DMFS presentation to MAG on April 24, 2007 (Phil Roger will make presentation).