

# 2014 PTSC Meeting

Thursday, January 16, 2014

8:14 AM

## Agenda

2014 Annual PIT Tag Steering Committee Meeting Agenda

Please Read: Attached FS2020 Dual Mode Feasibility document written by Kennewick staff member Roger Clark

[<<FS2020 Dual Mode Feasibility.pdf>>](#)

2013 Tagging Software Survey Summary: <http://tinyurl.com/TaggingSoftwareSurvey> (Specifically Item 11. Feedback -- click on Show Replies link to view detail)

8:30-10:15 - 2013 program review and general plans for 2014

A. Systems, SbyC and Program - John

B. PIT Tag Forecaster - John

C. O&M - Don

D. Hydrofoil antenna testing at BCC - Don

10:15 – 10:30 Break

10:30 – 11:00 - Half/Full Duplex lamprey marking and USACE request to enable FS2020 reading of both - Don, Pat

11:00-11:15 - Review mainstem interrogation transceiver redundancy scheme - Don

11:15- 12:00 - P4 and next steps for refining PTAGIS model - John

12:00 - Working lunch (continue morning discussions) Workshops

1:00 -1:15 - Review outstanding issues with reporting and data submission - Nicole

1:15 -1:30 - Tag validation masks and PTSC approval - Nicole

1:30-2:30 - Finalize Marking Manual update - Tiffani

A. Minimum tagging length requirement from NOAA

2:30-3:30 - Instream interrogation site metadata specification -Jody 3:30-4:00

Wrap up - Tiffani

## Action Items

- ❖ Don will coordinate a stick tag test during water-up at MC2 enabling dual-mode HDX/FDX reading on each of the three antennas at the counting window to gauge impact on FDX detection efficiency. The test will be an appendix to the *FS2020 Dual Mode Feasibility* report.
- ❖ Lamprey marking with FDX tags: Steve Pastor will contact Christine at USFW and Charles Morrill will contact Sean Tackley USACE to get feedback from the lamprey folks to help drive the discussion. PTSC will reiterate the stance on a proposed 'Lamprey Tagging Guide' with advantages and disadvantages of using HDX vs. FDX<sup>1</sup> and coordinate with basin lamprey groups.
- ❖ Don will draft a newsletter article on detection efficiency, the history and need for redundancy of transceivers. He'll send it to PTSC for comment/edits before publication.

---

<sup>1</sup> Tiffani Marsh Note: I thought we'd tabled this until we've had a chance to discuss matters with the lamprey folks? And I think it is too early to discuss a lamprey tagging guide at this point in time

- ❖ A PTSC subcommittee consisting of Tiffani Marsh and Scott Putnam will work with Nicole and Craig to devise a process for capturing requirements and review process for evolving the mark data model in March. Staff will initiate the requirements document and send to all of PTSC for their review with the goal of publishing it for public comment.
- ❖ Staff will implement tag mask validation for mark data with email alerting. A validation request will be added to the web site for researchers to request new masks for the PTSC to approve. Craig will analyze existing mark records that fail this validation and report to PTSC for guidance on how to handle them. Staff will create a newsletter article to educate the public about this new validation.
- ❖ PTSC to finalize an update to the Marking Manual; Chair requests all PTSC members review the latest draft and provide edits/comments by the end of January. Nicole will update the first few paragraphs that describe the PTAGIS program. Tiffani will try and have a final draft out by 13 February.
- ❖ Nicole will make an online tutorial video describing how to identify points of contact for getting permission/context for publishing data from PTAGIS reports and link the video to the *Data Use Policy* web page.
- ❖ John will contact Jody White about the interrogation site metadata requesting he recirculate the specification document to the ad-hoc committee authors for comment since it is over two years old. John will coordinate a teleconference with Jody and PTSC most likely later this summer. NOTE: the FY14 PTAGIS SOW does not include updating the existing *Interrogation Site Metadata* web feature with in-stream content described in this draft specification nor does it include implementing the robust request/approval process that is needed.
- ❖ John will work with PTSC and BPA COTR to identify a cost-effective and convenient venue for the upcoming 2015 PIT Tag Workshop. He will also coordinate with them in June/July to identify topics for the workshop and target presentations.

#### **Meeting Details**

- Date and Time: January 16, 2014  
Time: 8:30 AM – 4:00 PM
- Location: Portland, OR
- Attendees: Tiffani Marsh, Scott Putnam, Pat Kearney, Steve Pastor, Jeff Fryer, Charlie Morrill, Nicole Tancreto, Jack Tumoikoski, Craig White, Sebastian Dudek, John Tenney, Tricia Ledgewood; Webinar attendees: Don Warf, Cecilia Brown
- Email Addresses: Charles Morrill <Charles.Morrill@dfw.wa.gov>; Jack Tumoikoski - Contact <jackt@fpc.org>; Jeff Fryer <fryj@critfc.org>; Pat Keniry <patrick.j.keniry@state.or.us>; Scott Putnam <scott.putnam@idfg.idaho.gov>; Steve Pastor <Stephen\_Pastor@fws.gov>; Tiffani Marsh <tiffani.marsh@noaa.gov>; Randy Fisher <RFisher@psmfc.org>; PTAGIS Local <PTAGISLocal@psmfc.org>; Don Warf <dlwarf@psmfc.org>; Jody White <jody@qcinc.org>; Sandy Downing <sandy.downing@noaa.gov>; Cecilia Brown (ckbrown@bpa.gov)

#### **Announcements**

- PTSC and staff will meet again in June to shape the 2015 Workshop in terms of topics, presenters and training.

## Discussion

- John Tenney opened the meeting and presented a review of program activities for 2013, a roadmap for 2014 and an update on the *PIT Tag Forecaster* project.
- The power point presentation:
- [<<2014PTSCPPortlandOverview.pptx>>](#)
  - Steve inquired if there were any major problems with the switch over. John said it had been a challenge but no serious problems. Steve congratulated the team on the move to the new system.
  - Scott Putnam inquired about continued support for MiniMon on the new server. John said MiniMon (legacy interrogation files) will be supported and the legacy interrogation file is converted to M4 before loading into PTAGIS. The MiniMon file is considered source and stored in the raw data folder; a subsequent 'converted' subfolder contains the M4 formatted file. M4 will be revised with a more user-friendly interface and documentation that hopefully will be available in 2015 as a replacement for sites still running MiniMon. Scott expressed his desire to help with beta testing the new M4.
  - Tiffani asked if there were any issues with Biomark loading Zeke's 9mm tags for pre-loaded inventory. Both Don and John responded they hadn't heard of any issues.
  - Tiffani asked about notifications on duplicates. John responded that Nicole will cover that in her 'outstanding server issues' presentation later in the meeting.
  - John went through the Interrogation Site metadata page in the website. Tiffani mentioned that she uses and likes the Interrogation site metadata page. Charlie also says that the page is useful as well as the pictures. Steve asked where the information was coming from and if we are using Streamnet routing system. Nicole replied metadata includes both lat/long and Streamnet id associated with interrogation and MRR sites, however, this page was using a simple lat/long to put the site on a map. John mentioned the creation of a new GIS resource at PSMFC and mentioned Sebastian's strong GIS experience; even though GIS features are not the highest priority right now for PTAGIS good things in this area should be coming down the road. Craig mentioned he is working with the PSMFC staff to integrate a new ESRI adapter with the MicroStrategy reporting system to replace Google Maps and this will provide a new opportunity for greater integration with existing PSMFC GIS system.
  - John talked about O&M at mainstem interrogation sites and Charlie asked if PTAGIS has an opportunity to gather data on the passage of non-tagged fish within the Separation by Code operations, ie. LGR JFF. Tiffani responded this could only be accomplished with nets, gates that have nets, fish counting tunnels, and/or video requiring humans to review -- it would be very difficult to do and could not be done in the same automated fashion as PTAGIS does with tagged fish.
  - John reviewed SbyC projects for 2013 and mentioned overall it was a great year but did encounter two issues at GRJ. Charlie asked if the issues impacted data collection and John replied that it did not, but some SbyC fish were not diverted - all observations were collected successfully when the diversion issues occurred.
  - John presented the *PIT Tag Forecaster* application. Charlie asked what would motivate agencies to complete their portion of the overall forecast. John said the past forecaster relied upon BPA, NOAA and Council to contact agency heads to get participation from the top down. John mentioned they have identified FWP and AFEP projects for the application but it will difficult get HCP and others because

they don't have a similar project tracking system. Steve said that in the future this could become part of the metadata in our dataset. John mentioned metadata would be discussed in the P4 presentation. John's concern is without effective agency coordination, the forecast will be incomplete and useless. Tiffani, commented that she has problems with the forecaster in that she doesn't know what she will be tagging due to funding decisions made at the last moment. John showed the forecast provides a min/max and target amount to identify a level of uncertainty. Charlie asked how valuable is the data if there can be a 0 and Tiffani replied that a 0 minimum amount is ambiguous: does it mean no money for project or no fish are planned to be tagged? John replied that was what the comment field in the annual forecast was for. Charlie asked for an update of the agency Forecaster following a scheduled meeting on the Forecast tool.

- Don Warf gave a power point presentation with an overview of Kennewick O&M efforts in 2013 as well as a 2014 roadmap. Link to Presentation
- [<<O&M.pptx>>](#)
  - Regarding upgrading adult systems to FS2020s, Tiffani confirmed that on Sandy's FWP they will be ordering 15 FS2020 readers.
  - Regarding development of thin-bodied antennas, Charlie asked Don if FFDRWG had approved the systems at The Dalles as permanent. Don said he expected to get the formal stamp of approval in February.
  - Regarding tag testing and the automatic tag sorter, Charlie asked if more issues with tags have been seen. Don said no but that manufacturing issues typically occur in short cycles which are hard to detect with 1% sampling. Increasing to 3 -5% would be more effective for catching these more common issues.
  - Regarding work on a replacement for the BCC transceiver, Charlie asked about issues with the original transceiver. Don said the lack of auto-tune was the primary issue, but that the old transceivers (only 3 are in existence) are wearing out. Need a new transceiver and hope to get one this year.
  - Regarding installation of more thin-walled antennas in adult ladders, Charlie asked whether systems will be completed at Lower Monumental and Little Goose this year. Don replied that they will be, but are somewhat delayed due to USACE contract for electrical work being delayed. Charlie offered to have FPAC write a memo to USACE to help move it along
  - Don talked about the hydrofoil project at BCC and the challenges the antenna presents due to water speed, debris, antenna interference, maintenance, and fish reaction. Charlie thanked Don for his input on the USACE conference calls for this project. Tiffani mentioned that it is a proof of concept system. Charlie asked if there were any live fish tests planned. Don and Tiffani were not aware of any live test at this point.
  - Don discussed USACE request to enable dual mode reading of HDX (half duplex) and FDX (full duplex) tags at sites operating a FS2020 transceiver. Roger Clark completed a feasibility report that indicates a possible loss in detection efficiency of a couple of percentage points. Don suggested this study should be reviewed and confirmed by a fisheries biologist and field tested.

- Tiffani spoke with Sandy Downing about conducting such a field test and agree MC2<sup>2</sup> is a good site but they had concern using the counting window antennas would have too much of an overall impact and should consider testing in the weirs instead. They would prefer using the weirs to conduct a test, to prevent loss of detections at the counting windows.
  - Charlie asked if the field testing could be simulated with sticks tags. Don said the problem with sticks is there is no way to simulate the burst speed of adult salmon and this speed was an unknown.
  - Charlie said based upon a conference call with FPAC Tuesday they were supportive of a field test.
  - Jeff mentioned he had tracked individual fish uses of weir orifices in a 2008 report and that it was not as consistent as expected ([link report to notes](#)).
  - John recommended even though it wasn't ideal at least Kennewick staff could do a short term test at the counting window at MC2 during early water-up and throw FDX stick tests to gauge efficiency impact and add results to the lab report. Don agreed and they will do this stick test at the counting window early when they know there won't be any fish. Tiffani suggested turning on dual mode on the first antenna then the other two to see if one has greater impact than others. The next step would be to upgrade to FS2020s in the weirs at MC2 and perform a longer term test with actual fish passage and this is still TBD.
- As part of the HDX/FDX FS2020 discussion: Pat Keniry mentioned that discussions had come up about using FDX tags in lamprey and whether it was still the PTSC recommendation that only HDX tags be used for lamprey
  - There was discussion about concern of lamprey attaching to an antenna in a ladder and effectively shutting it down for some period of time.
  - FDX tags have already been used in lamprey – Blue Leaf/Biomark at GRJ and Mary Moser on the Umatilla
  - There was also some discussion about the lamprey ladders and HDX detection equipment that have already been installed at multiple locations
  - Steve suggested that the PTSC contact lamprey groups to further the discussion about FDX tagging of lamprey. Steve and Charlie took actions to contact lamprey groups and start discussions, and John commented the PTAGIS team would facilitate a future meeting if needed.
- Don talked about transceiver redundancy standards and concerns as being 'excessive' at FDDRWG and NPCC meetings & discussions in the past few years. John stated PSMFC responded to NPCC's concern with a rationale for redundant antennas that had originally been developed by NOAA.

---

<sup>2</sup> Tiffani Marsh Note: After the meeting, I spoke with Sandy and found I was in error about her believing MC2 was better; she thinks MC1 is the better ladder in which to run tests. She suggests a standardized block type study using the orifice antennas

- Tiffani said redundancy had been discussed at NOAA and Steve Smith, a statistician, was asked to do a study of how much detection efficiency required for BiOp needs and he came up with 85%<sup>3</sup>; we currently target maximum efficiency in the 90+%.
  - Tiffani suggested holes within juvenile system could be filled with redundant transceivers. Don agreed and said they need to be taken on a case by case basis; fish/tag orientation has a lot to do with how many antenna are needed.
  - Jeff commented that he is often trying to determine travel direction and fall back of adult fish so if there are three antennas in a ladder he has more information.
  - Don asked if it is truly cost-effective to reduce the number of existing redundant antennas. The transceivers were already paid for and would be sitting on a shelf if not used. Don stated we have disposition coils now and Don says we have reconfigured some coils and not lost efficiency<sup>4</sup>.
  - Tiffani suggested using existing transceivers for new installations and filling holes in final disposition detections, when possible.
  - John suggests that this might be a good topic for a presentation at the 2015 workshop
  - Charlie suggests that we do a newsletter article describing the historical and current needs for transceiver redundancy
  - Don took an action to produce a newsletter describing the history of transceiver redundancy at the mainstem sites
- John talked about the *2015 PIT Tag Workshop* in 2015. Link to presentation:
  - [<<2014PTSCWorkshop.pptx>>](#)
    - To address BPA's budgeting concerns PSMFC has put an RFP out for bid for 4 venues in the region. Once the bids are complete we'll work with Cecelia (BPA COTR) and PTSC to make a venue decision.
    - Cecilia asked if hosting in Portland would reduce per diem charges. John mentioned 36 of 236 attendees from 2011 workshop were from Portland but the per diem rate is higher in Portland than other areas.
    - Cecilia asked if having attendees pay for their own food is more cost effective. John said maybe but PSMFC coordination experience found that venues charge you much more if you don't use their food options.
    - Cecilia expressed a desire from BPA to have a tiered pricing for BPA contactors and charge the non-FWP attendees more to attend the event since BPA was funding the workshop.
    - Discussed options for dates in January/February and possible conflicts were Willamette USACE meeting the week of February 3rd, IDFG Anadromous meeting is on the week of 27th; MLK day is the 19th so that week is short. Proposed week of January 12th- 15 and the week of Feb 9 - 13th with Feb 3rd as worst case option.
    - Charlie is concerned with the acoustic quality of the meeting rooms.

---

<sup>3</sup> Tiffani Marsh Note: I just spoke with Steve about this, we share an office. It's a little more complicated than just saying 85%. He was asked about adult ladders between Bonneville, McNary, and Lower Granite dams (all of which were expected to remain around 99%+). So, it isn't 85% for each adult site, just the "in between" sites.

<sup>4</sup> Tiffani Marsh Note: I think this had to do with GRJ, the Lower Granite juvenile system.

- Training suggested to be optional and early on the first day.
- PTSC meeting to be on Friday after the workshop
- John presented tagging software and evolving the PTAGIS data model
- [<<2014PTSCP4Tagging.pptx>>](#)
  - P3 software is antiquated and end-of-life
  - The P4 software development will be parallel from the data evolution process; both to meet-up later this year.
  - Ideally P4 would be ready with a portion of data model changes to be demonstrated at 2015 workshop and available for production use later that March.
  - We will be able to support a new class of readers and other devices (USB; non-serial)
  - We are not limited to a DOS formatted data file and will be able to add additional user-defined fields (UDF) as requested by the community. These UDFs are project-specific and would not be uploaded to PTAGIS. Scott asked if the data entry layouts of P4 can be customized and John acknowledged that yes that will be possible. We will have half dozen to one dozen user design fields. A later revision of P4 could tie UDF to input from specific hardware devices. Charlie asked if UDF could be standardized; John replied we could make "pre-baked" UDFs for most users, such as date, numeric entry but Tiffani suggested that defeats the purpose of the UDF. John indicated UDFs would be text data that have regular-expression validation to enforce data entry rules and we can have a library of those regular expressions. Scott said it should be up to the user to standardize their regular expressions as individual groups. Tiffani asked if additional positional comments go into PTAGIS, the answer was no, they do not. John suggested that we may need to revisit the need for 'additional positional' comments. Tiffani suggested that it is hard to program for all of the different ways that people mark. Steve asked the question, if there were standard conditional comments and maybe the list needs to be made more concise. John proposed a spec document be defined to help facilitate the data model evolution process. Above all we need to maintain our current data integrity. We have great data because we have had a very specific model. Ideally PTSC and staff would come up with spec doc to help guide the evolution process and we'd publish it for public comment. Once defined it would then be put in a spec doc or the current data dictionary, similar as the current spec-doc. This document would identify event types, supported use case scenarios, new data researcher needs in reporting, existing field spec, definitions and validations. Charlie asked if the existing spec doc is our starting model which John agreed is what we are starting from. We can look at field usage. After looking at these we can make suggestions for the data model. This would be an internal document for the committee and staff to establish and we could cross reference event types and scenarios with each data field/validation. We'll need to decide how we are going to deal with legacy data --we could still have legacy fields if we determine them obsolete but they will become optional.
  - Steve continued to talk about project metadata needs and John mentioned the metadata currently is expressed in the 76 character session message field. Steve offered that PTSC define a clear set of project metadata. John said that we'd need metadata for different types of projects. Tiffani expressed doubts that project metadata could be effectively defined/acquired for all projects and does not want

to put too much of a burden on researchers. Steve says that we need a way to link the individual tagging files and relate them to existing published metadata so that you wouldn't have to keep reentering the metadata. Tiffani can understand entering the FWP# but doesn't want to put in extraneous information. John remarked that this identifying tagging projects is the challenge with *the PIT Tag Forecaster* project and may learn some things about metadata. We will find a balance we only ask for data that we can maintain effectively. Most likely be more than one rev of P4 and we'll have to identify and prioritize some of the data model changes for each rev. Charlie remarked that makes sense to do things component by component. Steve comments that people are working on regional standards for using data. Charlie asked if there is something the committee can do to reduce plagiarism of data, the answer is no. The current language in the PTAGIS *Data Use Policy* is straight forward. Perhaps if they abuse it PTSC could create a template for a letter that can be sent to editors of the journal. John, thinks this is a great topic for the workshop in 2015. Nicole said she could add a how to contact tag file owners in the FAQ that could make it easier for those willing to do so.

- John indicated that today we will identify a couple of PTSC members [?] to work on the beginning data spec document format, working with Craig and Nicole to get something put in place by March. We would come up with the first draft that will go to the full PTSC, then it would go out for comment and we would solicit comment from the users. Charlie has concerns that May could be a problem for the PTSC review due to timing. John thinks it is at least a 6 month process, but it may take longer. Charlie says if the group gives the document to PTSC component by component they can handle it better than getting it all at once. Scott wants to know how much input will be required for data model evolution. John indicated that we are looking for input more specialized circumstances and not starting over on the entire model. John will announce the P4/data model process at the upcoming *Info Sessions* but will not put specific deadlines or deliverables.
- Scott brought up FINS project for LSRCP as data collection at terminal sites for adult fish. Jason Vogel with Nez Perce expressed his concern to John about the compatibility of PIT tag data format exported from FINS. John had told Jason the export format was not compatible with P3 custom import feature and would still require massaging of the individual data fields, something PTAGIS staff could not do for every project. One problem is they have packed other data around the tag code and they use their own nomenclature for standard PTAGIS definitions for species, run and rearing codes among others. FINS project manager met with PTAGIS staff a few years ago and indicated they would support the standard PTAGIS codes. Evidently, that did not happen. John told Jason then that perhaps after the busy spring field season Nicole may have some time to massage FINS PIT tag data to load into PTAGIS, but this would be a one-off. Steve asked where FINS was based: Boise Idaho.
- John mentioned a few concerns from the community about supporting the established tagging data format (P3) in P4 and we will do our very best to accommodate them. Steve suggested that we build on our present format in response to the community needs, with an emphasis on community.
- John discussed logistics to support the data model evolution using Basecamp and existing online forums. John provided a summary of tagging software survey and

some comments from this survey will be brought up during the *Info Sessions* events.

- Tiffani and Scott who have a lot of direct marking experience will work with Nicole and Craig and John & crew will get them set up in Basecamp. We will get the document started with event types and then send out for review.
- Nicole reported on outstanding issues with reporting and data loading
- [<<KnownIssues.pptx>>](#)
  - Nicole reviewed some of the most requested changes to the reporting system. We plan to split attribute forms into separate attributes, change the default date format, and add Mark Time and Release Time.
  - We do keep track of all requests, evaluate and prioritize them, and implement them if they make sense.
  - There are still some unresolved exporting issues on which we are working with MicroStrategy.
  - Completely new notification system was implemented in September 2013 with the new database system
  - Tag data coordinators can now specify who is allowed to submit tagging data and both the submitter and coordinator receive notification emails
  - Interrogation site stewards can determine how they want to monitor their site's uploads and who receives the notification emails
  - Emails are still bare bones and we have plans to improve them this year:
    - Add file name and status to email subject line
    - Add details about validation and file format errors if any exist
    - Add summary of what was loaded
    - Add link to report, or list of duplicate records, if they exist
  - Scott asked if it would be possible to notify a tagger if a tag code had been previously encountered and then automatically marked as a recapture or, that they could be notified of a record that was a duplicate before submitting. John said that we will look at all of those scenarios for the next generation tagging software.
- Nicole presented proposal for making PIT tag masks a PTAGIS validation code
- [<<TagMaskValidation.pptx>>](#)
  - P3 and Minimon no longer validate that tag code masks match a list of known manufacturer's codes.
  - We currently validate interrogation data against manufacture code and tag mask (if I understand this correctly .. tag mask includes the first three characters followed by a decimal point and then the first 4 characters) on the server and will be implementing something similar for tagging data
  - Charlie asked what a tag mask was. Nicole responded that it is the first three numbers and the next four after the period.
  - If a PIT tag code does not match the list of known manufacturer's codes and tag masks, it is loaded in the database and marked as INVALID.
  - Data contributor will be notified (implementing this year).
  - We are proposing that the PIT tag code mask become a validation code like any other PTAGIS validation codes
    - Requests for a new tag code mask submitted by PTAGIS users
    - PTSC reviews requests and approves or asks for more information
  - Charlie stated that "PTSC recommends using only approved tags" needs to be in the marking manual and the spec document.

- John stated that the concern is that it is impossible for this group to police the river. We can make it a validation constraint. That we will flag it as invalid and won't allow people to report on.
- It was noted that at the last meeting we agreed to publish PIT tag specs for the tags that are currently being sold under the BPA RFO and Sandy who developed the spec was supposed to follow up.
  - There hasn't been any progress. The BPA RFO made it unclear about what lines we could or could not cross over and that is where it is.
- Charlie stated that we were looking for simple language that did not leave anyone liable.
- John mentioned PTAGIS is going to be contracted to test tags for USACE and Kennewick group is working on streamlining the testing process
- Ideally if someone wants to get a new tag on the river they could submit their tags to be tested along with others for the next BPA RFO.
  - We could then report testing results so that even tags that were not selected by BPA could be purchased by others (Cfm note: based on the past RFO ...and team discussions ... maybe .. maybe not ...I think any test Don & staff can develop outside the BPA RFO would provide the guidelines for PTSC to identify as acceptable even if they are not the tags selected by BPA)
  - The idea is to not have inferior tags that don't read well being used in the Basin
- Charlie stated that having a tag that reads well but masks other tags is also a concern
- PTAGIS will publish a news item about tag code mask validation and email notifications when it is implemented for tagging data
- John will be reviewing P3's clip validation feature at the Info Sessions - this can be used to prevent a misread during tagging operations, as well as notifying taggers of recaptures
- Tiffani suggested we add a field to the proposed request form asking if the tag has been tested by PSMFC Kennewick Lab.
- Before we implement tag mask validation for tagging data, we need to determine what to do with tag/recapture/mort records that do not meet the validation. Do we mark them as INVALID, too?
  - Craig will determine how many records failed validation and communicate with PTSC for guidance on how to handle them
- Tiffani went over the finalization of the Marking Manual update
  - Charlie commented about 17 degrees Celsius does anyone have a comment about that?
  - Charlie commented on Concentration and stock solution. What is the most common? Watching the fish behavior instead of the stock solution. Think about what to use as a starting point.
  - Anesthetic bath, wording was softened and everyone was fine with that as it depends on anesthetic concentrations.
  - Jeff had a question about the use of the word "fish", it was decided to put Salmonoids in the title.
  - Tiffani talked about fish recovery and release, asks for comments about wording in the first paragraph.

- PIT Tag Injection. Re: bevel position, was rewritten asked committee members to please look at this and make suggestions.
- Nicole suggested the title PTOC is no longer used and to change PTOC to PTAGIS where applicable, and change to the current logo
- Place in the **\*\*special notice\*\*** not to tag in the dorsal sinus
- Committee members please look at doc make edits and have it back to Tiffani Marsh by the end of January
- Charlie was asked by WDFW staff members about the PTAGIS data use policy and if it needed stronger language about not using other people's data without permission
  - He asked if it was possible to notify tag data coordinators when someone queries their data
  - Tiffani commented that she would not want to receive a notification every time someone queries data she has contributed
  - Nicole commented that this is not PTAGIS's role and that it is easy to get contact information with PIT tag data
  - Cecilia commented that it is not a person's data, but rather public data, funded by the government and available to the public
  - Tiffani commented, "this is not the first time that we have heard about the proprietary nature of data. I have been at meetings where someone gave a paper on data the researcher that collected it was giving later."
  - John mentioned that Streamnet is working on a global data use policy.
    - Steve indicated that this was leaning towards data contributors marking data as available to public or not
  - John mentioned that we had considered flagging mark data by type. The propensity to overuse that flagging was discussed.
  - Steve commented that he sees the data type is part of the metadata.
  - Tiffani, related that there are multiple uses for the data even though the fish wasn't tagged especially for that purpose, therefore using the data type as metadata would not be feasible.
  - Cecilia read and liked the current data use policy that is on the PTAGIS website: <http://www.ptagis.org/data-use-policy>
  - John suggested that Nicole make a video showing how to extract contact information from a large query builder 2 result set and link to it from the Data Use Policy page on the website
- The in-stream interrogation site metadata requirements were discussed although Jody White could not be present to brief PTSC on them.
  - John will contact Jody and have him recirculate the document to the ad-hoc group that defined them more than 2 years ago. Once reviewed by them, he would arrange a conference call with Jody and/or the group to review the specs.
  - John mentioned the FY14 SOW for PTAGIS does not include making significant changes to accommodate this spec because ambiguous status
  - Tiffani asked about the sites that frequently change locations. John commented that they keep the same site code and then the configuration is changed as with the adding/changing of antennas and a new coordinate would be included with configuration sequence number.