

## 2017 Annual PTSC Meeting

Attendees: Scott Putnam, Tiffani Marsh, Pat Keniry, Charles Morrill, Jeff Fryer, Brandon Chockley, Courtney Newlon, Sharon, Grant, Gordon Axel, Tom Pansky

PTAGIS Staff: John Tenney, Nicole Tancreto, Craig White, Sebastian Dudek, Daniel Wilson, Don Warf

### 2017 Action Items

- Charlie will draft another letter to the Navy regarding Dixon radio facility
- Nicole will set up online collaboration tool for PIT Tag Specification Document and get draft out to the committee late summer/early fall
- Nicole will email routing table used to address PTSC members for Validation Code Requests and make updates if required by PTSC members
- Scott will continue to work with Jason Vogel on NPT requests for P4 and validation codes
- John and staff will add Scale ID field to P4 and MRR data model
- John and staff will implement method for balance to enter weight values into project defined fields and PTAGIS weight field
- John and staff will convene focus group of instream interrogation site stewards to review and develop standards for interrogation site metadata

### Portland Office Review

#### [John Tenney's presentation](#)

##### **P4 comments:**

- In verbose species pick lists, allow using number codes instead of verbose name
- Is it possible to export date fields without time zone offset? Tiffani had issues importing into Access

##### **Reporting Comments:**

- Limit site selection list to only those sites that have reported recaptures
- Concern about being able to know where passive recaps exist – how do you know a detection has been reported as an observation or as a passive recapture

### Kennewick Office Review

#### [Don Warf's presentation](#)

- The picketed leads were raised at LMA during fall of 2016 causing loss of detections of a number of fish.
  - This issue was discussed at FPOM and Charlie Morrill would like to get some more information about the number of detections that were lost due to this action

- Antennas are being installed in both John Day ladders, but the wiring for the PIT tag room and data collection computers will not be done for some time – the contract for this work is about to be advertised
  - Various entities requested that PTAGIS power the transceivers and collect detections manually
  - COE will run extension cords to power the transceivers and PTAGIS will download transceiver buffers and submit those as Passive Recaptures, not interrogations
- No interference was detected from the Navy Dixon communication facility in 2016
  - Charlie proposes sending another letter to the Navy to thank them for cooperation and reaffirm request for coordination if it will be used in the future

### [Update on Ogee Transceiver](#) [Gordon Axel's presentation](#)

- Initial testing has shown that the transceiver will be able to get multiple detections even at the revised, high estimated elevated velocities over the ogee (60 fps vs. 75 fps)
- If continued testing does not confirm this, we may need to consider moving to a half-message tag
- Alan Brower proposed a way to send message using fewer bits but still include the manufacturer's code
- If we move to half-message tags, firmware updates may be possible to get old transceivers to read them, but some transceivers may need to be replaced. Replacing the CPU board on 17-year-old FS1001 juvenile transceivers may be a lower cost solution than replacement with another new system.
- Planned to install prototype at LGR for 2018 outmigration, but Walla Walla district may propose pushing it out another year.

### [PIT Tag Spec Doc](#)

- PTAGIS will be working on a new Spec Doc for 2017, starting with MRR Field Definitions and Requirements as base of the document
- Planning to make it more of an online/help document format rather than a printed document that needs to be updated every year
- Google Docs was suggested as potential online collaboration tool, but some federal agencies don't have access to google docs.
- PTAGIS will develop draft document primarily with structure and get it to committee summer/fall for comments

### [Validation Codes Request Process](#)

- Validation Code requests are sent to all PTSC members, but addressed in body of email to the person who we have identified as responsible based on requester's organization
- PTAGIS will Email PTSC Routing Table to PTSC for review and potential updates

## Nez Perce Tribe Requests

- Scott tried to get in touch with Jason Vogel about this request, but did not receive any communication from him. Brandon said that they may have been having email troubles.

Proposal 1: add new flag codes to differentiate between existing and applied marks (e.g. AD vs ADE).

- Question about the usefulness of knowing whether a secondary mark was already existing or newly applied. Response that it wouldn't be too useful for AD marks, but others like Jaw tags are placed on recaptured fish. Suggestion that it could be used to look at delayed mortality for these other marks.
- Concern about consistency. If a project doesn't care about this distinction between applied and existing, then they wouldn't be used.
- It would be difficult to enforce or expect consistency from data contributors.
- The PTSC decides that there are too many questions to make this change now, and would like Scott to follow up with Jason about this request

Proposal 2: add codes for incidental species to PTAGIS

- The P4 feature that allows custom validation codes to be used for Tally records solves this problem – projects can add custom species codes for incidental species and still submit those files to PTAGIS (custom species codes will be ignored during file loading into PTAGIS)
- Suggestion to consider centralizing species codes for incidentals so every project is not making up their own codes
  - Many incidental species are counted for SMP, so P4 could incorporate SMP incidental species codes as choices when a user adds a new custom species code.

Proposal 3: Allow brood year to be collected for each fish in a session

- This is already a feature of P4

Proposal 4: load project-defined data into PTAGIS

- This would be possible, but the reporting attributes would be called PDV1, PDV2, etc.
- Each PDV would contain the label and definition as defined in P4 and the value stored in that column in P4
- This would lead to many different data types and definitions being stored in the PDV columns in PTAGIS
- PTAGIS is public data and existing fields are standardized and users can find definitions and know what should be there
- P4 allows exporting PDV fields to CSV for importing into project specific database
- PTAGIS should not be a repository for project's data, it should remain as is

## Weight field Precision

- Mary Moser requested that the weight field precision be increased to 0.01 gram for her work with juvenile lamprey

- Tiffani communicated with her about using a project-defined field instead but would like to know if a digital balance would be able to feed it's measurement to both project-defined weight field and regular PTAGIS weight field
  - This should be possible and we will add this as a modification to P4

### Genetic and Scale ID fields

- PTAGIS received several requests to provide a method for users to increment the genetic ID field using some sort of mask
- Tiffani pointed out the need to increment each SRR separately
- Jeff pointed out that there can sometimes be significant gaps between sequence numbers
- Might be better to focus on the mask for these IDs instead of incrementing.
- User can specify a common mask to be entered into each record and then the tagger can enter the last part of the ID by hand using keyboard or waterproof USB 10-key attachment
- PTSC recommends that a field for Scale ID be added to the MRR dataset

### Interrogation Site Metadata

- PTAGIS would like to know if metadata for in-stream and other small scale sites is sufficient or if improvements can be made to requirements
- Question: can observations from different types of sites be determined in reporting system/
  - Yes, but the user has to choose to include the Site Type attribute on their report
- Question: Can the report notify user if data are returned from instream sties?
  - Possibly
- Suggestion: include guidance in the Data Use Policy about how data users can determine the type of site an observation is from
- Suggestion: include Site Type on each metadata page
- Suggestion: Include Site Type attribute on interrogation report by default.
- Question: Do we need to develop standards for a site before it can be registered as an interrogation site and submit data to PTAGIS? Do we need additional data from stewards before a site is created?
- Suggestion: develop standards that would need to be in contract with any data submission contractor before an organization can register a new site
- Action item: Start workgroup of instream site stewards to develop better metadata and site requirements
- Recommendation from PTSC: Require all new sites to have timer tags
- Suggestion: develop standards for naming antenna groups and sort
- Request: method for getting notifications when a site is updated – have a place for users to sign up for notifications

### PTSC Business

PTSC welcomes Courtney Newlon, USFWS, as a new member, she is replacing Steve Pastor

PTAGIS will update PTSC page with Courtney's info and check into obfuscating member email address from web crawlers

Charlie and Tiffani will remain co-chairs of the committee