The Collaborative, Systemwide Monitoring and Evaluation Project (CSMEP)

Dave Marmorek, Marc Porter, **ESSA Technologies** Frank Young, **Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority**

State Agencies

S. Sharr, C. McGrath, C.
Petrosky IDFG
T. Rien, E. Tinus, ODFW
A. Hoffman, P. Hahn WDFW
B. Schmidt, StreamNet

Federal Agencies

- C. Jordan, S. Katz NMFS
- P. Wilson, **USFWS**
- P. Larsen, **EPA**
- K. Hyatt, DFO

Tribal Agencies

P. Roger, E. Weber, S. Hyun **CRITFC**

- J.Hesse, P.Kucera Nez Perce Tribe
- D. Fast, B. Bosch Yakima Nation
- K. Wolf, KWA, Colville Tribes
- J. Schwartz, Umatilla

Consultants

N. Bouwes, Eco Logical Research

1

- C. Beasley, Quantitative Cons.
- C. Paulsen, PER
- L. McDonald, WEST

CBFWA February 23rd, Winter Members Meeting

A Sketch of CSMEP

- What are we doing?
- Why are we doing it?
- Where are we at in the process?
- Policy level input and need for coordination



What are we doing?

CSMEP Vision

A coordinated effort to **collaboratively** improve the quality and consistency of **fish monitoring** data, and the methods used to **evaluate** these data, to answer key **questions** relevant to major **decisions** in the Columbia Basin.

CSMEP Objectives

- Collaboratively serve M&E needs of federal, state, tribal, intergovernmental entities
- Inventory, assess and make available existing fish monitoring data
- Collaboratively design improved M&E methods
- Implement and evaluate pilot M&E approaches
 - Work towards consistent, reliable systemwide M&E



Coordination

- Different RME initiatives need consistency in goals and objectives, but distinctive work products
- Circulate and coordinate workplans
- Overlapping membership
- Joint workshops

Scale:

U.S. side + Okanagan

Species:

- salmon
- steelhead
- bull trout

other
 resident fish
 of concern



Why are we doing it?

CSMEP provides a systematic way to:

- Inventory and make available existing data
- Assess data strengths and weaknesses for making decisions
- Evaluate trade-offs of different M & E approaches (precision, cost, questions)
- Integrate M & E for Status & Trends with effectiveness monitoring (Habitat, Harvest, Hydro and Hatcheries)
- Integrate across spatial scales (project, population, subbasin, Province, ESU, Basin)
- Prioritize future M & E directions in the Basin

Need integrated M&E across multiple scales



Where are we in the process? (see handout E)

Where are we headed? (see handout F)



Metadata are web accessible https://nrimp.dfw.state.or.us/csmep/

CSMEP Application



🗉 View all fields

Tutorials								
Custom Query	Fi	eld	Display	Filter	Filter Definition/Setting			
Discussion Forum	Spatial scale at which data was collected View Spatial Scale							
Contact us	State							
	Sub-Basin							
You are currently signed in as csmep	Province							
	County							
Sign Out	Huc							
	LLID							
		Location where data collection effort occurred						
	Sub-Basin							

Data assessments and other work products on CSMEP website



DATA DOCUMENTS

Documents posted within the last week are highlighted in red.

DOCUMENTS POSTED	FILE Type	DOCUMENT DATE	File Size
TABLE B2			
Table B2. Selway River, Steelhead, by Chris Beasley	doc	6/16/2004	76 kb
Table B2. Data Strengths and Weaknesses Assessment, Imnaha Subbasin, Steelhead, by D. Ward	doc	5/25/2004	72 kb
Table B2. Data Strengths and Weaknesses Assessment, Imnaha Subbasin, Spring Chinook, by D. Ward	doc	5/25/2004	79 kb
Table B2. Data Strengths and Weaknesses Assessment, Lewis Subbasin, Steelhead, by P. Hahn	doc	5/24/2004	183 kb
Table B2. Data Strengths and Weaknesses Assessment, Salmon Subbasin, Spring/Summer Chinook	doc	4/26/2004	134 kb
Table B2. Data Strengths and Weaknesses Assessment, Yakima Subbasin, Coho, by B. Bosch	doc	7/7/2004	54 k b

Design: Pilot for Snake Basin



Data Quality Objectives (DQO) Process

- 1. State the problem
- 2. Identify the decision
- 3. Identify inputs to the decision
- 4. Define the study boundaries
- 5. Develop an "if-then" decision rule
- 6. Specify limits on decision errors
- 7. Optimize design for obtaining data



CSMEP Design Documents

Next steps (see Table F1):

- integrate M&E across species, subgroups, agencies in Snake
- assess tradeoffs for L, M, H cost designs
- extend to mid-Columbia ESUs; WA Salmon Recovery Rgns



Programmatic / Policy Level Input

- Get / analyze remaining CSMEP surveys on M&E priorities (species, scales, questions) – now
- Show managers tradeoffs in different M&E designs ⇒ assess risk adversity, priorities for certainty in decisions (need a lot more dialogue) – fy06-09
- Interact with restoration program managers in Snake
- Interact with PNAMP, NPCC, Fed RME to present products, get feedback
- Will take time to do this systematically, get buy-in across multiple agencies and scales

For more information on CSMEP

- Main website with work products: http://www.cbfwa.org/committees/csmep/
- Metadata by subbasin https://nrimp.dfw.state.or.us/csmep/
- Contacts:

Frank Young (frank.young@cbfwa.org) Dave Marmorek (dmarmorek@essa.com) Marc Porter (mporter@essa.com)

Design Challenges / Implications

- Relative priority of questions differs among agencies (need dialogue to explore tradeoffs among questions)
- Effect sizes, risk adversity not completely defined (explore costs/benefits of wide range of options)
- Long list of potential questions, performance measures (focus on a few critical decisions; intensive / extensive)
- Intensively studied systems not randomly selected (assess what systems represented by intensive sites)
- Costs are a big concern (explore range of designs; cost sharing opportunities across agencies)