

## April Techinar, 4/16/2015

**Attendees:** Kirstin Holfelder (CNHP), Amy Greenwell (CNHP), Dave Speas (BOR), Peter MacKinnon (USU), Andrew Treble (CPW), Tom Czaplá (USFWS), Travis Francis (USFWS), Koreen Zelasko (CSU Larval Fish Lab), Tildon Jones (USFWS), Kevin Thompson (CPW), Julie Howard (UDWR)

**Key:** Question, Action Item

### Review recent release

- Development documentation is now online (features and bug fixes, plus minutes from techinars and beta release are posted on the website)
- Registration page has additional security to keep robots from registering and you now have to request permission from Kirstin to see anything on the database (this is temporary until we figure out roles).

### Critical habitat follow-up

- Kirstin made changes to associate a critical habitat to multiple species
- There will be negative river miles (ex. Lake Powell). Anytime you are on the Colorado below its confluence with the Green River, miles will be negative.
- If folks aren't using the same indicator for river miles, they will have to make adjustments before loading their data into the database. Kirstin will add notes to the online database about criteria for specific fields. Folks will need to know what river mile standards we are using in the database. Right now, this came from Travis.
- We need somewhere to document how the river miles were derived for critical habitat. Right now river miles for critical habitat came from Koreen, Scott and Kevin. We need to document somewhere online how these critical habitat river miles were derived. Add the narrative?  
**Action Item: Add a description field to the hydro areas table.**
- It is probably cleaner to associate studies to river miles instead of reaches.
- White River below Taylor Draw – the critical habitat in the database now includes an area that is unreachable. Do we need to break this into two sections? Folks aren't sure if it matters. Fish can survive the trip over the dam, so it might not need to be split out. **Action Item: Kirstin will follow-up with Kevin on the details of this particular situation.**

### Antennas

- There are a few tables that control the way antennas behave. They are preliminary so we need to review the data structure.
- What types of data do we need to collect? Review of lookup tables.
- If you are going to query detections, you are more interested in hits on the array, not necessarily each antenna. We should dump raw data in to add details if people want it. Then it could be summarized by array later? It seems like both maybe be important (array data and antenna level data). The antennas are all numbered (this is the finest division you can make on the data).
- The PIA can be a set of arrays. Ex. Dolores PIA. The actual antenna number will be in the PIA file

- There can be multiple arrays at one location (think of a location as a tributary or canal).
- Dave thinks of PIAs of 1) where are they geographically? You would have location (XX river), within that there would be xx arrays, within that xx antennas. Type could be cross-stream or fish passage.
- Hierarchy: Location, river mile (or range) type, orientation, array, sub-array, antenna (we need to add a diagram in the metadata)
- Folks will provide mockups of array configurations so CNHP can see the different configurations that are out there. **Action Item: Dave will send an antenna mockup with a diagram to CNHP.**
- We need another term to identify upstream or downstream arrays. This would be useful for queries
- FYI: there is an antenna discussion on Monday with a smaller group.
- On a side note, sonic data will have to fit into this data structure. Perhaps it would just be another type? There are also some portable pit tag readers that are similar (these are more temporary – batteries last about 8 days, whereas sonic can last a long time)
- Perhaps these portable pits are a sampling event? This will probably become clearer when we start importing data.

## April Plan

- Role management features will be implemented so we can assign roles. Need to get the mail set up on the server so password reset, etc., can work.
- We will have sampling events on the website at the next release.
- We will remove the 1,000 record limit.

## Roles

How much data do the public get? Dave hasn't heard anything new on the subject, and the Open Data Policy is not very specific. **Question: How does USFWS deal with locations of endangered species, and data on private lands? CPW?** The state is concerned about it, especially giving out point data. We probably need a coarser level of locational information on the public site. River is ok, but river miles and coordinates will be hidden. Kirstin will develop a broad level home page for the public and will track downloads. We will have mock-ups for this site in June, but if you have ideas now, please send them to us.

More detailed data requests will have to be fielded by a Data Manager. It would be good to think about data use policies – what can people do with the data? Display, publish, manipulation, etc.? This will probably be dealt with on a case-by-case basis by the Data Manager CPW gets about 75 data requests a year for all of Colorado (usually consulting companies).

If folks can send CNHP their data distribution policies, this will help us construct the public portion of the website. **Action item: CPW, Moab, USFWS will look for policies and send them to CNHP.** There is a GIS pit tag database already out there. The site is difficult to use unless you are looking for a specific pit tag

and the organization of the data can be misleading, but they must have consulted with agencies about data use policies and data sensitivity issues. **Action Item: Tom Czapla will see what kind of hoops these folks went through to get the pit tag database online.**

## Roles in STReaMS

	Read	Write	Download	Examples
<b>Public</b>	Limited	None	Limited	Lay people
<b>Researcher</b>	Full	None	Full	Budget manager, researcher
<b>Project/Study Members</b>	Full	Project/Study level	Full	PI, Hatchery
<b>Organization/Office Supervisor</b>	Full	Organization/Office level	Full	Supervisors
<b>Database Manager</b>	Full	Full	Full	CNHP, Data managers, Core users

## Detailed description of roles

**Public** – This user gets generalized access to the dataset. They will have limited read and download access, and no write access. We don’t know yet exactly what this entails, but we know we must allow some form of public access.

We will make a public access page with broad level data for reading and downloading. More specific requests will have to be addressed by the Data Manager. CNHP will try to have a mockup of this site ready in June for review. **Action Item: If you have ideas about what should go on the broad level public page, send them to CNHP.**

**Researcher** – This user gets full read access and full download access to all details in the database, but doesn’t have permission to edit anything. This might be someone responsible for tracking compliance (ex. budget managers tracking projects) or a researcher analyzing data, but not collecting it.

**Project/Study members** – This user has full read and full download access, and can only edit records of projects they PI. There can be multiple PI’s assigned to a project. Anyone assigned as a PI to the project can edit that project’s data, upload data, and delete data. Hatcheries are assigned project numbers and have a Scope of Work, so hatcheries will fall into this group.

**Question: Do we need to add a level of permissions for a Data Technician?** At CPW, a Data Technician can add or edit data but not delete. Once data are “approved”, nobody but the PI can edit it. After some discussion, it sounds like most data technicians will be working outside of the database so we will keep this at a PI-level only for now.

Hatcheries get a project number and scope of work. **Question: Are there cases where hatcheries don’t have a project number?** Not really. San Juan does have project numbers. They don’t use them as freely as Upper Colorado does, but they do have them.

There can be multiple organizations working on a project. This isn't a problem as long as the PI's are assigned appropriately. For projects with multiple PI's, there is the possibility that someone could inadvertently delete or edit data. We will have to think about this.

We will have flags for when data have changed, just in case we have multiple PIs and something is accidentally edited. You will be able to track who changed the data.

**Organization/Office Supervisor** – This user has full read and full download access, and can edit records of all projects associated with their organization or office. This is for anyone at a higher level of trust in an organization, like a supervisor. These users can edit any one of the studies at their organization.

Consensus: this level is helpful. Sometimes you have to cover for other people. This will be important for supervisors.

**Database manager** – The highest level of security. This user has write access to everything, including the controlled vocabulary for lookup values (categorical data). We anticipate six to eight users at this level, including ourselves, the new database managers, and the core users who are most familiar with the data (Scott, Travis, Kevin, and Koreen).

**Question: What do we do with data for the 2015 field season?** Right now, it is business as usual. The batch upload tool will not be ready until spring of 2016.

Thanks Everyone!

ADJOURN