



# COLUMBIA BASIN FISH AND WILDLIFE AUTHORITY

851 SW Sixth Avenue, Suite 300 | Pacific First Building | Portland, OR 97204-1339  
Phone: 503-229-0191 | Fax: 503-229-0443 | Website: [www.cbfgwa.org](http://www.cbfgwa.org)

**Final**

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

Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead 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 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

Compact of the Upper Snake River Tribes

**DATE:** June 2, 2010  
**TO:** Members Advisory Group - Anadromous Fish Managers  
**FROM:** Tom Iverson and Dave Ward, CBFWA Staff  
**SUBJECT:** Final Action Notes for the May 27, 2010 MAG Anadromous Fish Managers' Workshop on Basin wide Assessments

### Members Advisory Group (MAG) ad hoc Anadromous Fish Managers' Teleconference

Thursday, May 27, 2010

9:00am -12:00pm PDT

@ CBFWA Office Portland, OR

[MAG Webpage](#)

### Final Action Notes

**Attendees:** Elizabeth Gaar and Scott Rumsey, NOAA Fisheries; Cedric Cooney, ODFW; Phil Roger, CRITFC; Erik Neatherlin, Brodie Cox, and Steve Vigg, WDFW; Bruce Schmidt, PSMFC; Steve Rentmeester, PNAMP Contractor; and Dave Ward, Tom Iverson, and Brian Lipscomb, CBFWA

**Phone/WebEx:** Alan Byrne, IDFG; Gene Shippentower and Stacy Schumacher, CTUIR; Bill Bosch, YN; Sebastian Dudek, NPT; Kasey Bliesner, ODFW; Louis Sweeney, PNAMP contractor; and Yuki Reiss, YBFWRB

<b>Time Allocation:</b>	<b>Objective 1: Participation</b>	100%
	<b>Objective 2: Technical Review</b>	0%
	<b>Objective 3: Presentation</b>	0%

### **ITEM 1: Introductions and Approve Agenda**

Elizabeth asked attendees to introduce themselves. Elizabeth also explained that it was not the intention to develop each of the products listed in the agenda for today, but to review and understand them. A proposal was made to end the meeting at noon, which was accepted by the group. Elizabeth pointed out that today's discussion would follow closely the May 20, 2010 draft of the Coordinated Assessments document. The group approved the agenda as written.

### **ITEM 2: Approve April 28, 2010 Draft Action Notes as Final**

The group agreed that the notes captured the discussion from the last meeting. There were no objections to making the notes final.

### **ITEM 3: Review of Coordinated Assessments Products**

Tom provided background and context for today's meeting. Based on significant comments and feedback following the last meeting, the [Coordinated Assessments](#) document was revised to represent a lower level of engagement of field staff during the summer (draft dated May 20, 2010 posted for this meeting). The Council's RME Categorical Review will begin next week and the field biologists will be focused on drafting their proposals until August 1 when they are due. Therefore this work plan relies on significant internal coordination during the proposal drafting phase so that in August, when the sub-regional workshops are convened, each agency and tribe can bring a comprehensive data plan to support

their monitoring proposals.

The purpose of today's meeting is to review the various products that we hope to provide through the data management proposals, and ask this group what the best process is to develop those products. Tom reviewed the May 20 Coordinated Assessments document and discussed each of the products that we hope to complete. Additional comments on this document are welcome and encouraged. A revised draft will be provided at the next meeting.

Tom also mentioned that the agencies and tribes will likely want to coordinate their efforts in filling out the monitoring proposals during the categorical review. The proposal forms include questions that relate to data management. The Council and BPA are urging the project sponsors to demonstrate how the data funded by the Program will be electronically accessible. Coordination will help the project sponsors to articulate a plan for facilitating access to their data. It should be important to the agencies and tribes that those data sharing plans are consistent and supported internally.

The group reviewed the data matrix to help identify priorities for data sharing to support coordinated assessments. The data matrix was created from several key documents, including the NOAA Monitoring Guidance document and the Ad-hoc Supplementation Review Group recommendations. The Data Matrix workbook contains three spreadsheets that represent three different tools. The first spreadsheet identifies the data priorities and demonstrates how the metrics/indicators apply to VSP, habitat and hatchery effectiveness assessments. The second spreadsheet supports a metric dictionary, or definitions, values, and other details about the metrics that will be reported. Finally, the third spreadsheet will capture the schedule of who will report the data and when it will be available.

Tom proposed using data flow diagrams to help understand where data management funding would best be spent to facilitate the most efficient and effective data sharing support services. By mapping the existing data flow, gaps can be identified that limit the development of a data sharing system. These gaps can be used to help prioritize additional data management proposals for the RME Categorical Review. There is approximately \$500,000 of new funding available, in addition to existing data management funding, to help support an organized data sharing strategy for the Fish and Wildlife Program. The intent of this effort is to build a comprehensive basinwide strategy, and the BPA funding can help with coordination of the agency/tribal data sharing efforts. NOAA may also have additional funding in 2012 to support monitoring and data management to support recovery reporting.

The group reviewed the metrics and determined that Abundance of Natural Spawners, Progeny to Parent Ratio, and Smolt to Adult Return Rate were the highest priority indicators that should be shared. This is not a complete set of indicators, but will be the basis for initial development of the data sharing framework. These are the indicators that directly address abundance and productivity. Additional indicators for spatial structure, diversity, hatchery effectiveness, and habitat effectiveness will be added later. As part of the August meeting, the agencies and tribes will identify the supporting metrics and measurements that are necessary to support these indicators.

In this discussion, the issue of developing data flow diagrams continued to surface as an important part of developing a data sharing strategy. As we identified priority indicators, some important metrics and measurements were identified that

may need to be shared to support the indicators.

Although a regional priority exists for population level indicators, the data flow supporting those indicators is important to knowing the availability and accessibility of the data.

**Action:** Dave W will revise the Data Matrix to highlight the indicators identified today. He will include a draft of the necessary measures or metrics to support reporting of these indicators.

**ITEM 4: Discuss Process Steps to Accomplish Coordinated Assessment Products**

Tom reviewed the process for developing the products listed in the Coordinated Assessments document. Everyone agreed that we should not engage the field biologists until after August 1; however, it is important that each of the agencies/tribes coordinate their field biologists during their efforts to complete their project proposals for the RME Categorical Review. The proposal forms include questions that relate to this data sharing effort. We will meet again in June to confirm each agency and tribes' commitment to this effort. Once the monitoring proposals have been submitted, the agencies and tribes could meet at sub-regional workshops to share their data management strategies that support the monitoring proposals. At the sub-regional meetings the agencies and tribes will develop their proposals for supporting data sharing within those sub-regions. A regional strategy meeting would be held in September to put each of the data sharing strategies into context of a basinwide data sharing network. Finally, according to this plan, the data management proposals would be submitted at the end of September (*this element of the plan was changed later in the meeting*).

Considerable discussion ensued about the purpose of this effort. Is it to demonstrate the full size and scope of the problem to providing a true data sharing network for anadromous VSP data, or is it to build a work plan that fits within the BPA proposed data management budget? The group thought that the answer is yes to both. The data management strategy should outline a long term goal of an effective data sharing network, and an incremental work plan for getting there. There is clearly not enough funding, nor agency level commitments, to make this happen in the next year or two. Therefore, an incremental approach should be developed that optimizes all opportunities to improve data sharing in the basin.

**ITEM 5: Review Timeline**

Tom described the anticipated timeline for submitting proposals. The RME categorical review is for 2012-2015 funding. There is a data management placeholder of \$500,000 for FY09-18 for BiOp reporting in the FCRPS BiOp RPA. Therefore, there is an opportunity to access FY11 funds that could help set-up the 2012-2015 proposals. And there may be some unspent funding available in FY10 to help with this effort.

At the end of today's meeting there was considerable discussion regarding long and short term needs for data management. A small group stayed and captured the following timeline and deliverables for developing a systematic approach for sharing data to support ongoing, consistent assessments of anadromous and resident fish in the Columbia River Basin.

**FY10 Proposal** (Submit ASAP, Implement starting mid-July?)

Reconnaissance to support data flow mapping and metadata capture.

- Gather information to support description of existing data flows for priority indicators
- Gain an understanding of existing data sources and status (literature review)
- Develop regional data mapping guidelines
- Develop conceptual plan for a systematic approach for data sharing across the basin

**FY11 Proposal** (Submit by July 1, 2010)

One time funding to map data flows and capture/create metadata for priority indicators.

- Document data flows for priority data
- Capture/create metadata for priority data
- Sharing and comparison of data flows and metadata to guide development of a regional strategy for systematic data sharing

**FY12-15 Proposals** (Submit by November 1, 2010)

Continue the development and begin implementation of a systematic approach for sharing priority indicators of ESA listed anadromous fish across the Columbia River Basin. Begin expansion of the data systems to include non-listed anadromous and resident fish.

- Comprehensive data flow diagrams for priority indicators
- Compile data to support sharing of priority indicator data
- Consistent application of metadata protocols
- Support Action Agency BiOp reporting in 2013
- Support NOAA 5-year check-in in 2015

**Data Management Goal for 2015**

*Develop a systematic approach for sharing data to support ongoing, consistent assessments of anadromous in the Columbia River Basin.*

- Transparency of data collection, analysis and sharing
- Consistency among the agencies and tribes in data sharing protocols
- Deliberate construction of a collaborative data sharing strategy to support BiOps, Recovery monitoring, and state and tribal management requirements

**ITEM 6:****Next Steps**

- 1) Small workgroup will develop a timeline and cohesive plan for data

management for FY10, FY11, and FY12-15. This will be distributed to the group and discussed with the planning subcommittee next week (*captured in notes above*).

- 2) The Members of CBFWA will discuss the most recent description of products and schedule within their agencies/tribes to gain support for the effort.
- 3) Review the Data Matrix and priority indicator list and confirm measurements and metrics that support those indicators.
- 4) All comments will be provided on the Coordinated Assessments work plan to Tom Iverson 3-days prior to the meeting in June (*comments due June 21, 2010*).
- 5) This group will meet again in June to affirm each entities commitment to the Coordinated Assessments work plan and priority indicators (finish the what) and to discuss work plan for the summer (develop the how).
- 6) CBFWA staff will poll the MAG Anadromous Fish Managers and schedule a meeting during the middle of June to approve the Coordinated Assessments for Salmon and Steelhead work plan.

**NEXT MEETING:**

The next meeting of the MAG Anadromous Fish Managers is scheduled for June 24, 2010 from 9 am to noon at the CBFWA offices in Portland, Oregon.

The draft agenda will include reviewing the long term strategy for data sharing and approve the Coordinated Assessments work plan.