



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 | Website: www.cbfwa.org

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 fish and wildlife 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

Compact of the Upper Snake River Tribes

DATE: July 16, 2007
TO: Members Advisory Group (MAG)
FROM: Tom Iverson, CBFWA staff
SUBJECT: Guidance for Data Management Project Recommendations

The Data Management Framework Subcommittee (DMFS) is working on two tasks related to data management for the Fish and Wildlife Program. The subcommittee is developing a background paper titled *A Strategy for Managing Fish, Wildlife, and Habitat Data for the Fish and Wildlife Program*, which will provide the context for project recommendations for FY08-09 and beyond. The paper is scheduled to be completed in August, and a PowerPoint presentation was provided at the July Council meeting that describes the general outline and schedule (see attached presentation - http://www.cbfwa.org/Committees/MAG/meetings/2007_0717/DataMgmt_NPCC_07-2007-finalNED.pdf).

The DMFS is also developing FY08-09 project funding recommendations for two data management projects: 1) StreamNet and 2) Northwest Habitat Institute. The subcommittee will meet on Thursday July 19 to discuss details regarding the two projects' statements of work. The StreamNet project has requested that the MAG address several key questions to help provide guidance for the discussion later in the week (see below). Please review these questions and be prepared to provide input for the DMFS discussion on the agenda.

If you have questions, please call me at (503) 229-0191.

Questions for the MAG regarding StreamNet data priorities

From StreamNet and the DMFS

1. With FY-08 being the fifth year on level funding, expenses being 87% personnel related, and with rents, software licenses and utilities costs fixed or rising, some StreamNet partner agencies have to cut back on staff time for data development work in FY-08. ODFW and WDFW propose to limit data development by specific location (WA dropping eastern subbasins; OR working subbasin by subbasin starting with the John Day and going as far as possible with existing staff). IDFG does not have to cut staff yet, but is adjusting its work by adding and dropping data types to meet DMFS priorities. MFWP is currently able to maintain its existing effort. Does CBFWA have a problem with this inconsistency of approach? If so, which approach is preferred, adjusting by location or data type?
2. StreamNet has, up until now, focused on obtaining and disseminating raw data. We are receiving more requests for abundance and productivity estimates. Given that level funding won't allow everything to be done, what does the MAG think about us

providing derived abundance and productivity estimates where they exist, instead of raw data? Will the CBFWA agencies commit to working with us to provide these derived data for wider regional use? Do they see this as a priority over consistent raw data across the Columbia region?

3. StreamNet works with two basic kinds of constituents: data providers and data users. The management agencies both provide data to StreamNet and are also among the most frequent data downloaders, so they fall in both categories, although the data providers and users are often not the same individuals. Many other data users are federal agencies or regional-scale entities that have different needs than the management agencies, and regional scale data dissemination is a key reason for regional funding of the project. StreamNet attempts to split its efforts evenly between these types of constituents. Does the MAG agree with that approach?
4. Does the MAG see the data sets that feed the SOTR as the highest priority data types for regional reporting by StreamNet? If so, what other long standing data types should we drop?
5. Does the MAG have other specific types of data that they see as top priority for regional dissemination?
6. Should regional funding for StreamNet be used to encourage/promote/support development or restructuring of data systems within the state agencies to better support agency programs and regional data sharing?
7. How would CBFWA respond to attendees of the 2006 Data Summit who might answer the above questions differently and who might express their views to the Council/BPA?