



To: Brian Allee, Executive Director, CBFWA
Bob Lohn, Manager, Fish and Wildlife Group, BPA
Jack Wong, Director, Fish and Wildlife Division, NWPPC

From: Drew Parkin, StreamNet project manager, PSMFC

RE: Proposal for Internet-based FY 99 project tracking system

I am writing to propose that StreamNet work with BPA, the Council and CBFWA to create a series of Internet-based products that depict the findings of the FY 99 project selection process. I propose that we produce three and possibly four products:

1. a "pre-selection" product that displays all proposals currently being considered,
2. a product that displays CBFWA's recommendations for the FY 99 AIWP,
3. (possibly) a product that displays the IRSP's response to the CBFWA proposal, and
4. a product that displays the Council's final recommendations for the FY 99 AIWP.

In actuality it may be possible to merge all of the above into one "rolling" product that combines all of these phases and shows the evolution of the process. Whether one product or four, the intent is to display Fish and Wildlife Program proposals in a simple, user-friendly manner and in such a way that information can be "queried" to meet the needs of a variety of different users. The products would be developed in such a way as to complement (and enhance) existing and planned BPA, CBFWA and Council written reports and Internet products on this same subject.

The proposed products would build upon the Online AIWP prepared last year by the Council with assistance from StreamNet. (This may be viewed at www.streamnet.org -- click the Fish and Wildlife Program button on the main menu bar.) While there were other products that provided information on the FY 98 AIWP -- including CBFWA's June 1997 AIWP document, the Council's September 1997 AIWP document, and BPA's project-by-project Internet product -- the StreamNet product's query, summarization, and links features were not available elsewhere. These online features provided significant benefit to those involved in the selection process and those outside of the process who desire a better understanding of this admittedly complex undertaking.

The project tracking capabilities that are being proposed are of critical importance in a situation such as the Fish and Wildlife Program, where there are numerous users with a

variety of needs and perspectives. A regional decision maker, for instance, may wish to focus on a major project type, for example – hatcheries or watershed projects, or to see the relative amount of funding that is being proposed for one project type as opposed to others. A local resource manager or citizen's group, on the other hand, may wish to understand the range of projects proposed for a given watershed or subbasin, or, having reviewed the projects, view biological data and maps related to the subbasin. Others may wish to view the list of projects being proposed by a given agency or to explore one proposal in detail. Still others may wish to obtain a “global” overview through viewing summary tables and graphs. The anadromous, resident, and wildlife managers' caucuses will no doubt want to view projects from all of the above perspectives and more.

The information sources for at least the first of the proposed products would be 1) current proposals posted to the BPA site, and 2) the spreadsheet created by CBFWA from these proposals. Additional information, including CBFWA recommendations, ISRP findings, Council final recommendations, and modified cost figures, would be added as the project selection process evolves.

StreamNet's role would be to report the information; StreamNet would not become involved in its development and modification. Further, the products would make clear that BPA, CBFWA and the Council (not StreamNet) are the sponsors. The products would be prepared in such a way that they might easily be accessed through BPA, Council, and/or CBFWA home pages as well as the StreamNet home page.

While product content and organization are to be determined, likely components are as follows:

1. appropriate background and technical information,
2. a complete listing of projects and pdf viewing capability via link to BPA
3. a one page summary report for each project,
4. a series of query functions that allow the viewer to sort by major emphasis, category, focus, CBFWA and Council recommendation, sponsor, special conditions, Council measure and NMFS BiOp, and/or subbasin,
5. appropriate orientation maps and subbasin descriptions (from FY 98 AIWP)
6. a series of data summaries at both the Basin and the subbasin levels,
7. links from subbasins to applicable StreamNet biological data and maps, and
8. links to applicable BPA, Council, CBFWA, and IRSP policy documents.

I am confident that those involved in the project selection process – be they resource managers, the ISRP, or agency/Council decision-makers – would benefit greatly from the ability to access the information and query features proposed above. This benefit would also extend to the general public, as the products would be readily available and in a simple, straightforward format. The proposed products offers another advantage. Last year there was concern that cost figures differed between organizations. This was due in large part to each agency having its own database. The series of products proposed here would help to facilitate consistency among participants regarding this important issue.

Why should StreamNet be involved? As you know, StreamNet is a component of the Fish and Wildlife Program and was established specifically to serve data development and delivery functions for the Program. The Program has made considerable investment in developing StreamNet's technical infrastructure and staff capabilities. StreamNet staff have had specific experience in delivering complex data via the Internet and, through developing the FY 98 AIWP product, have gained valuable insights into how a product of this type should be constructed. From a contracting perspective, task 1.5(a) of StreamNet's FY 98 statement of work provides for participation in undertakings of this nature. At this point, we would propose to incorporate this work into our existing contract by reallocating resources. However, if BPA feels that this should be funded under separate contract this is a possibility as well.

While we believe that StreamNet is well suited to undertake this task, we are not proposing to create this product in a vacuum. On the contrary, we see this as a group effort. I am confident that the region will benefit from the unique combinations of skills that BPA, the Council, CBFWA and StreamNet can provide.

I ask that you give serious consideration to this proposal. If you have questions or wish further clarification please advise. Also, please note that time is of the essence if we are to provide meaningful assistance to the project selection process.

cc: BPA: Kasi Beale, Alan Ruger
CBFWA: Tom Giese, Keith Kutchins
NWPPC: Doug Marker, Jim Middaugh
PSMFC: Randy Fisher, Stan Allen, Duane Anderson