



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

Draft

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: October 12, 2010
TO: Ad hoc Members Advisory Group (MAG) Anadromous Fish Managers' Work Group
FROM: Tom Iverson, CBFWA Staff
SUBJECT: Draft Action Notes for the September 16, 2010 MAG Anadromous Fish Managers' Work Group Teleconference

**Members Advisory Group (MAG) ad hoc
Anadromous Fish Managers' Work Group Teleconference
Thursday, September 16, 2010
9:00am -12:00pm PDT
@ CBFWA Office Portland, OR**

Draft Action Notes

Attendees: Elizabeth Gaar (Chair) and Scott Rumsey, NOAA Fisheries; Erik Neatherlin, WDFW; Brad Houslet, CTWSRO; Dave Statler, NPT; Phil Roger and Henry Franzoni, CRITFC; Bruce Schmidt, PSMFC; and Tom Iverson, CBFWA.

Phone/WebEx: Lance Hebdon, IDFG; Jay Hesse, NPT; Bill Bosch, YN; Brodie Cox, WDFW; Eric Tinus, Cedric Cooney and Kasey Bliesner, ODFW; Dan Haug, CTUIR; Jennifer Panther, CCT; Jen Bayer and Louis Sweeney (contractor), PNAMP.

Time Allocation:	Objective 1: Participation	100%
	Objective 2: Technical Review	0%
	Objective 3: Presentation	0%

ITEM 1: Introductions and Approve Agenda

The agenda was approved as written.

ITEM 2: Approve June 24, 2010 Draft Action Notes as Final

The action notes were approved as written.

ITEM 3: Review and Approve Draft Work Products

Tom reminded the group that the July Draft Coordinated Assessments Workplan (CA Workplan) is the touchstone for the data sharing effort. The CA Workplan identified several proof-of-concept products for the September/October workshop to be developed over the course of the summer. Tom reviewed several of these with the group, with the intention of confirming their use at the workshop.

Data Flow Example Story – Tom presented a short PowerPoint presentation that addresses how and why to use a Data Exchange Template. The definition for DET came from EPA's website. The intent of developing the DET is to support transferring data through all mediums: internet, email, and disk. If biologists get in the habit of reporting all the information in the DET associated with each indicator at the onset of creating a data file, then sharing the data once or many times requires the same level of effort for the provider.

Summary of existing disposition of data collected by BPA funding – Tom presented a summary of the locations identified in proposals submitted for the NPCC's RME Categorical Review for where data would be published. The information does not represent the importance of any individual location, just where data could be published for each project. Each project could identify multiple locations. This was intended to demonstrate the broad suite of websites where some salmon data is located. The point of the presentation is that if data were provided in a common data exchange template, providers could support multiple websites with their data through one documentation effort. The take home message from this presentation is that the salmon data is going many places and we should ensure that data that is going to multiple locations is consistent and documented; hence, the need for the DET.

Draft Regional Data Management Strategy Outline – This task was not completed in time for today’s meeting. Tom suggested that instead of an outline, maybe a list of principles for a regional data strategy would be better suited to support the CA Workplan. Some principles would include: 1) Local control of data, 2) we are not promoting modifying sampling methodologies at this point, 3) we will only share what is necessary to support regional reporting, etc. Tom will develop a draft with Jay, Scott, and Erik’s input.

PNAMP has been instrumental in this effort over the summer. PNAMP helped fund development of the first iteration DET. PNAMP is also funding the facilitation of the Oct 5-6 workshop and is providing some travel funding for participants. This effort has been closely coordinated with PNAMP and their Data Management Leadership Team.

Action: Comments will be sent to Tom regarding the Data Flow Story and the Summary of Current Data disposition presentations. Tom will work with Jay, Scott, and Erik to develop a document that identifies key principles to support a Regional Data Sharing Strategy. The principles will be sent out for MAG review prior to the October 5-6 workshop.

ITEM 4: Discuss First Iteration of the Data Exchange Template

The MAG Anadromous Fish Managers formed a small group to create the first draft of the Data Exchange Template in July/August. Tom reviewed a summary of the contents of the August version of the DET (see the Data Exchange Template Summary of Contents) and presented an example of an Analysis Flow Diagram. Dave S suggested handing out the actual DET during the workshop, so there was no confusion about the specific details of the DET.

Definition: The DET is a consistent template for sharing indicator level data in a well documented format that associates population level data with the methods, procedures, and derivations that support the indicator.

The first draft DET was applied to four pilot populations plus one bonus population. Bruce provided a summary of the comments received during that effort. The exercise was based in terms of the indicator estimate, not based on the supporting data necessary to derive the indicator.

Several implementers felt that this effort required a large amount of work. One commented that if the agency had an established database, it would be easier to complete the DET.

There were several comments related to the sampling method or biological issues, but not with the DET itself. This emphasized the need for involvement of the biologists in completing this exercise.

Several implementers wanted to see more information in the DET. We have to emphasize that we are starting with a limited amount of information to achieve success; we will add additional information to the DET after we have a plan to support these three indicators.

It was clear in the pilot studies that we need better guidance that allows implementers to modify the DET to fit their populations/procedures rather than trying to shoe-horn their information into the first iteration DET. The DET will be modified as necessary to be useful to the users. Part of this effort is to refine the DET to suit everyone’s needs.

Bruce developed some recommendations for the group’s consideration: 1) The agency and tribes need to support and be supported in development of internal data systems, 2) we need a table in the DET to deal with age data, 3) implementers need to describe what is done with their data even if it doesn’t fit into the DET as it is currently drafted, 4) biologists need to review the DET and ensure that it meets their needs.

There was discussion about the role of the assessment exercise and whether we are trying to gather information for every population using this DET, or are we trying to use the DET to help evaluate current data sharing capacity and infrastructure. The group agreed that we are focused on the latter. However, we need to have the discussion about whether we want to develop a common database/portal/report that accumulates the DET information for all populations.

The DET is a tool that can help identify what information we need to get into a database. Local biologists may not understand the importance of regional data sharing and will need some help in understanding the importance of this.

The agencies and tribes need to determine the most efficient means of filling in the DET information. Using biologists or data technicians is an individual choice. The pilot studies were each done in a different manner.

Action: The definition of DET will be included in the overview presentation for the workshop.

ITEM 5: Review and Finalize October 5-6 Data Sharing Workshop Draft Agenda

Tom reviewed the draft agenda for the workshop. Louis Sweeney will be facilitating the workshop and is on the phone. There will not be a formal registration for this meeting, but the agenda and meeting information will be sent out by next Monday. The group agreed that we should request RSVPs from participants in order to have a good understanding of participation prior to the workshop.

The group would like to see more explicit objectives stated at the top of the agenda. Also, the objective column should be clearer about what we are hoping to accomplish with each agenda item. It currently looks like a list of tasks are included in the objectives column. The group needed help clarifying what would be accomplished at this workshop versus at a February workshop.

The goal of the Coordinated Assessments effort, for the February workshop, is to develop a list of projects that best support regional data management for 1) BPA funding through the Council's Categorical Review process, 2) to provide opportunities for other funding sources that may be available for data management (i.e., NOAA), and to help prioritize efforts within individual agencies and tribes for development of their own data management systems. The ultimate goal of this effort is to have agencies and tribes adopt a common DET and have the capacity to employ the DET for all salmon and steelhead populations where data is collected and analyzed.

In order to develop a regionally accepted list of priorities for the February workshop, the DET will be used by each agency and tribe to perform an inventory of their data management infrastructure for populations they have responsibility for managing. There is some funding available to support this effort, although it may have to be implemented through existing projects (Streamnet, CRITFC, and PNAMP).

Therefore, the October workshop will be primarily focused on developing the workplan for conducting the inventories using the DET. Therefore, the agenda needs to better reflect that outcome. Erik suggested shifting all the background and context information to the morning of the first day, and to allow more time for discussion among the agencies and tribes in developing the work plan for performing the inventory work.

The question was raised "why do we need to use the DET." The DET does not document data management gaps for an agency or tribe, nor identify where data and information are located. However, the DET is the target for what information should be able to be shared for each population, and the data management gaps will be measured based on the ability to provide the information called for in the DET. Therefore the DET is important for the inventory exercise as the definition of the data and information that needs to be shared.

It was suggested that we may include a presentation by the pilot projects to discuss their experience implementing the DET. It would provide good background and understanding for the amount of effort this exercise will require.

It was also suggested that we include a short agenda item to identify possible information resources that could assist this effort such as the CSMEP tables and other sources of information.

Erik asked that the agenda identify specific deliverables or products that would be expected from each agenda item, beyond just objectives. It is becoming clear that this is a hands-on workshop to develop work plans for performing these data management inventories and

more time needs to be made available for group discussions and planning.

Tom was asked to reiterate the ultimate goal of this exercise - Ask the agencies and tribes to apply the DET to the appropriate number of populations in order to identify their gaps in partner capacity (ability to share data internally) and in shared infrastructure (ability to share data externally). The goal of workshop is to develop a work plan to perform that inventory and identify data management priorities to address those gaps.

BPA, NOAA, and the CBFWA members have identified data sharing as a priority for their efforts. This exercise will provide transparency for salmon and steelhead data in the Columbia River Basin.

Action:

Tom will work with Louis and revise the workshop agenda according to the input from the group today. A revised draft agenda will be sent out for review by the end of the day today. Comments will be requested by Monday at noon so that the agenda can be distributed to the workshop participants by the end of the day on Monday September 20.

Meeting Adjourned

H:\WORK\MAG\2010_0916_MAG_AnadFishManagers\ActionNotes16Sept2010MAGAnadromousFishMgrsDraft.doc

H:\WORK\MAG\2010_0916_MAG_AnadFishManagers\ActionNotes16Sept2010MAGAnadromousFishMgrsDraft.doc