

Coordinated Assessments Regional Data Sharing in Action

Bruce Schmidt, PSMFC

Tom Iverson, CBFWA

Presented at

Organization of Fish and Wildlife Information Managers

St. Louis, MO

October 18-20, 2011



Columbia River Basin



- Endangered Species Act
- Northwest Power Act

Land Area Affected by Endangered Species Act Listings of Salmon & Steelhead

In the CRB there are-

- 5 listed species
- 13 ESU/DPSs
- ~ 250 listed populations
(another ~150 non-listed)



Overlapping Jurisdictions

3 States

ODFW

IDFG

WDFW

6 Tribes

Colville

Nez Perce

Sho-Ban

Umatilla

Warm Springs

Yakama



Problem:

Local Data Does Not Support Basin-wide Demands

- Data management often overlooked component of monitoring and evaluation.
- Data used at a scale beyond original intent.
- Key need is upcoming reporting under ESA
- Data are requested from multiple sources and reported through various reports.
- Current flow of data un-reliable and inefficient.

Solution: Coordinated Assessments

- Series of workshops to define monitoring strategies
- Included all states and tribes
- ***Agreed on need to share data***
- Initiated the Coordinated Assessments project to evaluate data sharing capabilities

Coordinated Assessments Project

Phase I

- Developed initial work plan
- Limited the scope
- Developed proof-of-concept materials
- Received basin wide buy-in from agencies and tribes
- Developed draft Data Exchange Template
 - Three VSP Indicators
 - Supporting Metrics
 - Metadata
- Developed Data Analysis Flow Diagram template

Coordinated Assessments Project

Phase II

- Hired 10 temporary technicians to assist with assessment of gaps, needs, and priorities
 - Located data in agencies
 - Diagrammed how data flow in agency (DAFD)
 - Snapshot capture of data (DET)
 - Assisted agency with gaps & needs, agency strategies
- Developed Individual Data Management Strategies based on assessments
- Draft Basin-wide Data Sharing Strategy

Coordinated Assessments Project

Phase III

- Completing agency data management plans
- Finalize the Basin-wide data sharing strategy
- Finalize Data Exchange Template
- Begin providing Indicator data as part of routine business practice
- Begin improving agency data systems
- Develop data hosting capabilities

Lessons Learned

- Data are scattered
- Need for IT staffing, infrastructure
- Data not always collected at the population scale
- Inconsistent definition of populations
- DAFDs were eye openers!

Lessons Learned

- Data are scattered
- Need for IT staffing, infrastructure
- Data not always collected at the population scale
- Inconsistent definition of populations
- DAFDs were eye openers!
- Inconsistent terminology
 - Need for an agreed on glossary of terms
 - Include biological terms, IT terms
 - We created problems

Confusion over “DET”

- EPA definition:

A standardized format that identifies the types of information required or allowed in a particular document or exchange.

Confusion over “DET”

- EPA definition:

A standardized format that identifies the types of information required or allowed in a particular document or exchange. Data exchange templates contain no data but instead define the format for exchange according to data standards and trading partner agreements.

Confusion over “DET”

- We combined two concepts:
 - DET to define what data to share
 - Spreadsheet to capture a data snapshot
- Combined spreadsheet was called a DET
- Now everyone thinks it is the spreadsheet we are talking about and that is how data will be shared.

Microsoft Excel ribbon showing tabs: Home, Insert, Page Layout, Formulas, Data, Review, View. The ribbon includes various toolbars such as Clipboard, Font, Alignment, Number, Conditional Formatting, Styles, Cells, and Editing.

F62 Spawner - recruit relationships for spring and summer Chinook salmon populations in several Columbia and Snake

Line Number	Field Name	Field Definition	Expected Value	Data	Comments
<p>Natural Spawner Abundance This is the estimate of <u>natural origin</u> spawner abundance for one population in one year. It is derived from several metrics, the primary one being the estimate of Total Returns (all fish reaching a defined point) which is then adjusted for losses prior to spawning. Such losses include harvest after the return estimate was calculated, removal of natural origin fish for broodstock and natural mortality prior to spawning. Thus, the input metric is Total Returns (all the fish coming back to a specific location) and the output metric is Total Spawners (those returning fish that</p> <p>Section A. Natural Spawner Abundance. This is the specific Indicator of interest. All subsequent information is requested ONLY in the context of explaining the calculation of this Indicator, even if the other information has value on its own for another purpose. All subsequent information is requested ONLY in the context of explaining the calculation of this Indicator for the population and year designated for this worksheet. Report the estimate for the most recent year it is available.</p>					
A1	Natural Spawner Abundance	Estimated number of natural origin (parents spawned in the wild) spawners contributing to spawning. The intent is to provide the estimated abundance for the entire population. If no total population estimate is calculated, provide the available estimate for the largest possible portion of the population, and explain in the Comments.	Number of Fish	177	SPS Database Query: "Natural Spawners with Jacks"
A2	Spawning year	The year in which these returning adults spawn. Same as "run" or "return" year in most cases, except when the population spawns over January 1 (two calendar years). In that case, fall spawners (salmon) should be considered as spawning in the first year, while spring spawners (steelhead) should be considered as spawning the second	Year	2008	

Lessons Learned

- Data are scattered
- Need for IT staffing, infrastructure
- Data not always collected at the population scale
- Inconsistent definition of populations
- DAFDs were eye openers!
- Inconsistent terminology
- Need agreement on data to share

Goal: Data Exchange Network

Model is the EPA Water Quality Exchange Network

- Basin-wide approach: Consistent data sharing protocols for all co-managers
- Distributed network: Agencies post data as web services in DET format
- Agencies own their data and release it via data sharing agreements
- Automated: Where appropriate according to agreed upon formats

Will require incremental steps over time.

Steps

- Organize data within agencies
- Develop agency-wide database systems
- Adjust agency culture
- Finalize the DET
- Build tools
- Initiate data sharing
- Expand DET to additional Indicators

Questions?

