

**National Marine Fisheries Service Contract for Expansion of
StreamNet Database**

Status Report Number 2

Submitted By
Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission

April 30, 1997

Status Report #2 for NMFS Data Contract 4/30/97

This is the second status report on our progress on the contract entitled *Expansion of StreamNet Database to all Anadromous Salmonid Populations in the States of California, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington*. The first status report (2/4/97) summarized the status of data to be processed as part of Task 1 of the contract. This report will update that status as well as report on the progress made on Tasks 2-4.

Task 1: Expand StreamNet abundance, hatchery, and harvest databases

Sub-Task 1A: Expand StreamNet Abundance Database

Status: Processing of data files submitted to us by NMFS for processing is proceeding smoothly. A summary by state is listed below. Table 1 shows the detailed status of each electronic file submitted to us for inclusion in this contract.

California : NMFS data files contained approximately 140 abundance trends. Of these, 57 were new trends. We have completed the addition of these trends to the StreamNet database. No further action is deemed necessary.

Idaho : NMFS data files contained very few new, or updated abundance trends. The few that are unique are being reviewed by IDFG StreamNet personnel and will be incorporated if appropriate. No further action is deemed necessary.

Oregon : NMFS data files contained 960 trends for various species in Oregon. Of these, approximately 400 were 'new' trends currently not in the StreamNet database (most in the Oregon coastal area). We have completed the addition of these trends to the StreamNet database. No further action is deemed necessary.

Washington: NMFS data files contained nearly 1,500 trends for various species in Washington. Of these, approximately 600 are 'new' trends currently not in the StreamNet database (most in Puget Sound and coastal areas). We have met with WDFW StreamNet staff and they have agreed review these trends and incorporate as appropriate. Review of Columbia Basin salmon and steelhead data are complete and new trends have been incorporated as appropriate. Puget Sound and Coastal steelhead trends have been reviewed and incorporated as appropriate. Salmon trends outside the Columbia Basin remain to be done.

Data Table	# of Records	Data Type	Year Range	States Included	Status
CHINOOK					
CN_TREND.DBF	1,082	Adult Return	Varies	CA, ID, OR, WA	Complete for all except WA
CN_DATA.DBF	20,580	Adult Return	Varies	CA, ID, OR,	Complete for

Data Table	# of Records	Data Type	Year Range	States Included	Status
				WA	<i>all except WA</i>
MARCHIN.DBF	2,018	Marmot Dam Counts	1977-94	OR	<i>Complete (annual only)</i>
NFCHIN.DBF	14,009	NF Clackamas Dam Counts	1957-94	OR	<i>Complete (annual only)</i>
REDDCNTS.DBF	2,969	Redd Counts	1957-94	ID	<i>Complete</i>
CDFGSHIN.DBF	81	Carcass Count	1985-94	CA	<i>Data unusable</i>
NMFS_ALL.XLS	900	Redd/Carcass	1968-94	CA	<i>Complete, included only trends with at least 5 yrs of data</i>
ADLTSPCK.XLS	78	Prosser Dam Counts (Spring)	1983-94	WA	<i>Incomplete</i>
ADLFTCK.XLS	78	Prosser Dam Counts (Fall)	1983-94	WA	<i>Incomplete</i>
GRANDTAB.WK1	2,300	Fall Spawning Estimates	1952-91	CA	<i>Complete</i>
MILLDEER.WK1	850	Spawning Estimates	1940-94	CA	<i>Complete</i>
DDYRCT.WK1	252	Red Bluff Dam Counts	1967-93	CA	<i>Complete</i>
CHUM					
CM_TREND.DBF	432	Adult Return	Varies	WA	<i>Incomplete</i>
CM_DATA.DBF	6,695	Adult Return	Varies	WA	<i>Incomplete</i>
COHO					
CO_TREND.DBF	742	Adult Return	Varies	WA,OR	<i>Complete for OR</i>
CO_DATA.DBF	11,988	Adult Return	Varies	WA,OR	<i>Complete for OR</i>
KLAMCOHO.XLS	175	Adult Return/Redds	68-94	CA	<i>Complete</i>
WCOAUC.ZIP	1,344	Adult Return	81-94	OR	<i>Complete</i>
CUTTHROAT					
CT_TREND.DBF	13	Adult Return	Varies	WA,OR	<i>Complete for OR</i>
CT_DATA.DBF	231	Adult Return	Varies	WA,OR	<i>Complete for OR</i>
PINK					
PK_TREND.DBF	73	Adult Return	Varies	WA	<i>Incomplete</i>
PK_DATA.DBF	1,035	Adult Return	Varies	WA	<i>Incomplete</i>
Data Table	# of Records	Data Type	Year Range	States Included	

Data Table	# of Records	Data Type	Year Range	States Included	Status
SOCKEYE					
SO_TREND.DBF	50	Adult Return	Varies	WA,OR	<i>Complete for Or</i>
SO_DATA.DBF	1,072	Adult Return	Varies	WA,OR	<i>Complete for Or</i>
STEELHEAD					
ST_TREND.DBF	841	Adult Return	Varies	WA,OR,CA,ID	<i>Complete for all except WA</i>
ST_DATA.DBF	9,225	Adult Return	Varies	WA,OR,CA,ID	<i>Complete for all except WA</i>
NMFS_ALL.XLS	See Chinook Section				<i>Complete</i>
MILLDEER.WK1	See Chinook Section				<i>Complete</i>
DDYRCT.WK1	See Chinook Section				<i>Complete</i>
MARSST.DBF	2,606	Marmot Dam Counts	1957-95	OR	<i>Complete</i>
MATWST.DBF	1,910	Marmot Dam Counts	1957-95	OR	<i>Complete</i>
NFSST.DBF	5,489	NF Clackamas Dam Counts	1957-95	OR	<i>Complete</i>
NFWST.DBF	3,381	NF Clackamas Dam Counts	1957-95	OR	<i>Complete</i>
CDFGSTHD.DBF	512	Spawning Ground Counts	1985-94	CA	<i>Complete</i>
ELLSTHD.DBF	180	Cape Horn Dam Count	1933-94	CA	<i>Complete</i>
REDD_CIS.DBF	206	Redd Counts	60-64	ID	<i>Complete</i>
STRESINV.ZIP	59 Excel Tables	Spawning Counts, Harvest Data	Varies	WA	<i>Complete</i>
WASTLD.XLS	44 Excel Tables	Spawning Counts, Harvest Data	Varies	WA	<i>Complete</i>
WASTLD2.XLS	100+	Spawning Counts, Harvest Data	Varies	WA	<i>Complete</i>

Sub-Task 1B: Expand StreamNet Hatchery Database

Status: All 14 files containing hatchery data included in the contract have been pre-processed into 2 consistent databases; hatchery releases and hatchery returns. Data from NMFS files has been re-formatted to meet StreamNet data standards and cross checked with existing StreamNet data trends.

Hatchery Releases: As reported in the first status update, the hatchery release dataset probably poses the largest challenge to us in completion of this contract. The database submitted to PSMFC from the NRC consultants contains nearly 112,000 records for the states of OR, ID, WA, and CA. About 27% of these records came from PSMFC's CWT database which is the primary source for hatchery release data in StreamNet. That leaves nearly 82,000 from 'non PSMFC' sources in the NMFS database that must be processed. It is our basic strategy at this time to use PSMFC's CWT database for the primary source of release data from 1980 on and to use the data from the NMFS contractors to backfill the release data prior to 1980. This strategy varies a little from state to state and is summarized below.

California : Utilize information from the CWT database as the 'official' version of releases for tagged fish. Use data from NMFS files for releases of unmarked, unassociated fish and releases prior to data submitted to CWT database (NMFS data goes back to 1943). Establish liaison with CDFG for verification of data.

Status : Incomplete.

Idaho : Utilize information from the CWT database as the 'official' version of releases for tagged and untagged fish from 1975 through the present. Utilize StreamNet staff at IDFG to isolate and correct inconsistencies during this time period. Use data from NMFS files for years prior to 1975 (data goes back to 1940). **Status : Incomplete.**

Oregon : Utilize information from the CWT database as the 'official' version of releases for tagged and untagged fish from 1975 through the present with the exception of unmarked, unassociated releases prior to 1982. These will be taken from the NMFS files as they have not been submitted to the CWT database. Utilize StreamNet staff at ODFW to isolate and correct inconsistencies during this time period. Use data from NMFS files for any years prior to 1975 (data goes back to 1940). **Status : Incomplete.**

Washington: Utilize information from the CWT database as the 'official' version of releases for tagged and untagged fish from 1975 through the present with the exception of unmarked, unassociated releases of steelhead for all years. These will be taken from the NMFS files as they have not been submitted to the CWT database. Utilize StreamNet staff at WDFW to isolate and correct inconsistencies

during this time period. Use data from NMFS files for any years prior to 1974 (data goes back to 1913). **Status : Incomplete.**

Hatchery Returns: The database submitted to PSMFC from the NRC consultants contains over 13,000 return records for the states of OR, ID, WA, and CA. We have analyzed these records and grouped them into logical trends (defined as a group of a particular stock returning to a particular hatchery). The table below summarizes the status of these data. As you can see, there are a significant number of trends in the NMFS database that are either missing altogether in StreamNet or missing some years.

STATE	# Trends	StreamNet Status
CA	54	Not in StreamNet
CA	10	Missing Some Years
ID	12	Not in StreamNet
ID	17	Missing Some Years
ID	9	Same as Streamnet
OR	152	Not in StreamNet
OR	66	Missing Some Years
OR	49	Same as Streamnet
WA	247	Not in StreamNet
WA	128	Missing Some Years
WA	34	Same as Streamnet

California : Utilize information from NMFS database and update StreamNet database. Establish liaison with CDFG for verification of data.
Status : Incomplete.

Idaho : Utilize StreamNet staff at IDFG and to error check and incorporate data from NMFS database that is missing from StreamNet.
Status : Complete

Oregon : Utilize StreamNet staff at ODFW and to error check and incorporate data from NMFS database that is missing from StreamNet.
Status : Incomplete.

Washington: Utilize StreamNet staff at WDFW and to error check and incorporate data from NMFS database that is missing from StreamNet.
Status : Complete for Salmon in the Columbia Basin, incomplete for salmon and steelhead outside the basin and steelhead inside the basin.

Sub-Task 1C: Expand StreamNet Harvest Database

Marine : Marine harvest data consists primarily of 11 large data files from various sources. We have reviewed this data and are in the process of setting up meetings with the appropriate harvest managers in Oregon and Washington to determine the best route in incorporating this data. The proposal for future updates would be to acquire this data from the PacFin database. **Status : Incomplete.**

Freshwater: Freshwater harvest data falls into 3 broad categories: Columbia River mainstem harvest, tributary sport harvest, and tributary tribal harvest. We have reviewed these datasets and will proceed as follows.

Columbia River: We are in the process of setting up meetings with the appropriate harvest managers in Oregon and Washington to determine the most appropriate way to incorporate Columbia River harvest data and anticipate that this will be fairly easily accomplished. **Status : The meetings have not yet occurred but data for Columbia River harvest is complete and in the system. Format changes may occur in the future but no more action on this item is deemed necessary.**

Tributary Sport Harvest: Washington is in the process of updating sport harvest data for the entire state. We anticipate that this will supersede the need to review NMFS files for Washington. Idaho data files for harvest match StreamNet trends one for one and will be updated only. Oregon is in the process of updating sport harvest data for the entire state. We anticipate that this will supersede the need to review NMFS files for Oregon. All California data for sport harvest was obtained from StreamNet and therefore needs no review. **Status : Data is being updated at the state level and will be incorporated as soon as possible, no more action on this item is deemed necessary.**

Treaty Freshwater Harvest: We will review these on a trend by trend basis and add as appropriate. **Status : Incomplete.**

Task 2: Update abundance, hatchery, and harvest data through 1995

I. Work to be Accomplished

This task will update data holdings through 1995 by acquiring new data from agency contacts and incorporating this information into the StreamNet database.

Specific work items include:

- a. Acquire and incorporate 1995 information for abundance trends in the StreamNet database resulting from the completion of Task 1A of this proposal.
- b. Acquire and incorporate 1995 information for hatchery trends in the StreamNet database resulting from the completion of Task 1B of this proposal.
- c. Acquire and incorporate 1995 information for harvest trends in the StreamNet database resulting from the completion of Task 1C of this proposal.

Status: For all data categories we anticipate the completion of this task by the end of this fiscal year.

Task 3. Establish a mechanism for regular updates of information

CONTRACTED TO: Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMFC)

TIME FRAME: October 1, 1996 - September 30, 1997

I. Work to be Accomplished

The existing StreamNet project provides a mechanism for data updates for the states of Idaho, Oregon, and Washington. Data compilers and coordinators in each state work together with the regional data manager to insure regular updates of information in a standardized format. This infrastructure is not in place in California, however, because California is outside the geographic scope of the current StreamNet project. This task would focus on establishing similar mechanisms in California, as currently exist in the StreamNet states of Idaho, Oregon, and Washington.

Status: We have not engaged in formal talks with representatives from California at this time. However, we have established data contacts. We will continue to explore the options available for continued updates of information from California.

Task 4. Participate in an interagency workgroup on salmon monitoring and harvest management reform.

CONTRACTED TO: Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMFC)

TIME FRAME: October 1, 1996 - September 30, 1997

I. Work to be Accomplished

This task will provide for PSMFC and StreamNet participation in the interagency workgroup on salmon monitoring and harvest management reform. Participation will be especially focused on the information needs of managers and how those needs can be met by the various data activities coordinated through PSMFC.

Status: This group has not been formed (to our knowledge) and we have not done any work on this task.

Summary

Progress on the contract is proceeding as scheduled. We anticipate the completion of the contract well within the timelines specified and, in all likelihood, considerably under the budget for the project. We would potentially like to explore additional data items to examine during this contract period, and would also like to explore the options for some continued level of funding into the future.