

CMER
February 25, 2004
NWIFC Conference Center
Draft Minutes

Attendees:

Barreca, Jeannette	Ecology
Ehinger, Bill	Ecology
Fransen, Brian	Weyerhaeuser
Hoffman, Linda	WDFW, SAGE Co-chair
Hunter, Mark	WDFW
Jackson, Terry	WDFW
MacCracken, Jim	Longview Fibre
Martin, Doug	CMER Co-Chair, Martin Environmental
McConnell, Steve	NWIFC
McDonald, Dennis	DNR
McFadden, George	CMER Staff
McNaughton, Geoffrey	AMPA, DNR
Mendoza, Chris	ARC Environmental Consultants
Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Indian Nation
Peterson, Pete	UCUT
Pleus, Allen	NWIFC
Pucci, Dawn	Suquamish Tribe
Quinn, Tim	CMER CO-Chair, WDFW
Ray, Kris	Colville Confederated Tribes
Risenhoover, Ken	Port Blakely Tree Farm
Robinson, Tom	WSAC
Rowton, Heather	WFPA
Schuett-Hames, Dave	CMER Staff
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR

Decisions and Tasks

Decision/Task	Minutes Section
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAG materials will not be distributed to CMER until CMER review is merited. • Announcements of SAG meetings will be forwarded to CMER. • Meeting minutes from SAG meetings will be not forwarded to CMER but should be kept in such a way as to be able to inform interested parties should they exhibit an interest and 	CMER Distributions

request copies of the minutes.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 2004 CMER budget and workplan were approved by the FPB on February 11, 2004 • Jeannette Barreca was designated as a CMER representative for the Department of Ecology at the February FPB meeting as well 	Budget Update
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A list of those who attended and their affiliation will be put together for CMER distribution. • Abstracts will be posted on the website with a note indicating that they are from the 2004 conference and stating that people who want more information should contact the authors to obtain that information. 	Adaptive Management Conference Debrief
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A decision on the Extensive Fish Monitoring Study Design proposal will be deferred to the March CMER. ISAG will work with WDFW to solicit WDFW interest, capability in terms of time frame, expertise, etc. • The watertyping model field validation SAG request was approved by CMER • The Type N Experimental Buffer Study request was approved by CMER 	SAG Requests
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schuett-Hames and other CMER staff have put together a draft SRC process document and it was distributed to CMER for review today. Comments should be directed to Schuett-Hames. CMER will discuss this framework at the March CMER meeting. 	SRC Update
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The workplan development proposal was approved by CMER. A packet including a cover memo, the schedule, the budget and the workplan will be distributed to CMER. Schuett-Hames will make the edits to the FY04 plan that were recommended by the FPB before the final workplan is distributed to CMER. 	Workplan Development Schedule
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments regarding how the compliance monitoring program, FPARS and RMAPs information could interface with CMER effectiveness and extensive monitoring studies should be e-mailed to Martin or Quinn by March 10th. 	Compliance Monitoring

Minutes: February Minutes were approved as submitted.

CMER distributions: a concern was raised by an individual regarding the types of materials that are distributed to CMER from SAGs. Discussion regarding what SAGs should be forwarding to CMER ensued.

CMER Consensus:

- SAG materials will be kept internal to the SAG until CMER review is merited.
 - Announcements of SAG meetings will be forwarded to CMER.
 - Meeting minutes from SAG meetings will be not forwarded to CMER but should be kept in such a way as to be able to inform interested parties should they exhibit an interest and request copies of the minutes.
-

Budget Update: The FPB approved the CMER budget and workplan as submitted including \$100,000 in project development funds. FPB members did have some suggestions for how to improve the readability and usability of the CMER workplan. Those suggestions will be incorporated into the 2004 workplan.

There is also a delegation in Washington DC lobbying for funding for the adaptive management program. There have been four appropriations from the federal government to assist in funding the program and the group is lobbying for the fifth appropriation.

Jeannette Barreca from Ecology was also designated as an official CMER member at the February FPB meeting.

Adaptive Management Conference Debrief: There were about 130 people in attendance at the Adaptive Management conference. Martin said that this conference provided a good opportunity for outreach and he is interested in hearing what people would suggest for next year's conference. A bulleted list of suggestions follows:

- Make it an annual event;
- More discussion time is needed, especially for the more controversial issues, possibly a panel discussion;
- Presenters should be held to their time limit and time should be allowed for questions and answers immediately following each presentation. It's difficult to cover scientific material in less than 15-20 minutes. Shortening speaking time is not recommended, but lengthening the full time of each speaker to allow for questions was highly recommended;
- Speakers should indicate clearly whether their presentation is regarding work done by CMER or is an outside study;
- Have a poster session for data that is final;
- Include either a presentation discussing upcoming CMER studies or distribute a list of those studies not covered at the conference. CSS had master students present their projects briefly and we could consider this for CMER as well;
- A suggestion was made that the workplan be distributed at the annual science conference;
- A two day conference may introduce per diem issues and other costs which should be considered before CMER moves in that direction. A spring and fall conference (both one day) was also raised as an alternative.

- Concurrent sessions are an option as well to keep the conference to one day. Some were against concurrent sessions as they are interested in all topics. Overall, there did not seem to be broad support for concurrent sessions.
- Less jargon and fewer acronyms are recommended. Better instructions to speakers would minimize this concern. Guidelines for presentations would help reduce the use of acronyms, increase font size so all could read this, etc.;
- Introductions that set a context for the audience is helpful for reducing confusion. The speakers should be informed that context for their presentation will be provided in the introduction.
- One audience member wanted to know what studies have been published.
- Published proceedings were suggested. Presenters will need to know that the information they provide would be incorporated into proceedings;
- Providing background information on TFW (process, history, procedures, goals, etc.) through the registration confirmation would be helpful;
- McNaughton said that it is not too early to think about where we will have the conference.
- More promotion of the conference was suggested. Better advertising is highly recommended.

Tasks

- A list of those who attended and their affiliation will be put together for CMER distribution.
- Abstracts will be posted on the website with a note indicating that they are from the 2004 conference and stating that people who want more information should contact the authors to obtain that information.

SAG Requests:

- ISAG: Extensive Fish Passage Monitoring Study Design Proposal. McDonald presented the request and a number of concerns were raised, as noted below:
 - McConnell asked what happened to the MDT study design. McFadden said this SAG request is to ask a consultant to review the options, including MDT, in terms of practicality, etc. The consultant will then present this to ISAG with a recommendation regarding how to go forward. ISAG has identified some issues with the MDT design.
 - Jackson is wondered whether this proposal will go out for competitive bid. WDFW is preparing a proposal for this and is interested in doing the study design and implementation work. A question is whether WDFW bids with all other contractors or could be exclusively selected to do this.
 - McConnell asked if there is enough information to provide to a consultant to allow them to develop a monitoring plan. McFadden said that ISAG does have an implementation plan that has not come forward yet.
 - Sturhan raised a concern having an outside contractor design the study creates an unfair advantage for that consultant.

- McDonald said that ISAG has debated this for a long time and has not yet found someone with time to draft the study design.
- Mendoza said if a state agency bids on a project, other contractors will likely not bid on the contract.
- When you look at contractors and their participation, it must be weighed against how public agencies do the same thing.
- Regulatory authority and voluntary compliance issues must also be considered.
- Fransen said that ISAG is struggling to move this forward. If the agency has an interest in doing this work, they should come forward with a written expression of their interest.
- Quinn clarified that ISAG is requesting that this be done in two steps: 1) a study design is developed and 2) the study design is implemented.

CMER Consensus: the decision on the Extensive Fish Monitoring Study Design proposal will be deferred to the March CMER. ISAG will work with WDFW to solicit WDFW interest, capability in terms of time frame, expertise, etc.

- ISAG: Water Typing Model Field Validation Study. ISAG is requesting CMER's concurrence with ISAG's recommendation of beginning the contracting process for an RFQQ in parallel with the SRC review of the Validation Study Design. ISAG would like to work with Ron Johnson and begin drafting the study design with the understanding that there will be a great deal of review and discussion. Two primary issues will be addressed prior to any implementation: 1) is it worthwhile (i.e. is there a field season, etc.) and 2) SRC review will be incorporated prior to any implementation.

CMER Consensus: CMER approved this request.

- LWAG: Type N Experimental Buffer Study on Competent Lithologies in Western Washington Emphasizing Amphibians, Water Quality, and Downstream Effects (hereafter Type N Experimental Buffer Study). This proposal is for WDFW to hire someone to scout sites for the Type N Experimental Buffer study design. Risenhoover expressed concern with whether we can provide enough information to landowners to get commitments. LWAG members stated that they do. McFadden said that CMER generally provides landowners with a two page summary of expectations, etc. Quinn proposed that LWAG ensure that McFadden is consulted with and involved in the process. Pucci asked whether not having the SRC review completed will affect people trying to find sites. Ehinger said this information on site availability will feed into the study design.

CMER Consensus: the request was approved as submitted.

SRC Update: McNaughton said there are two reports in SRC review at this time, one is the DFC model validation report and the other is the watertyping validation study design. The watertyping validation study review is not progressing well. CMER has requested an

open review for the watertyping study and all indicators are that this process will cost substantially more than the closed review process that is regularly used. ISAG has also asked the SRC to provide some discussion to help them improve the design.

A suggestion was made that ISAG hire a consultant to discuss improvements rather than ask the SRC engage in open discussion. Cupp helped design the validation study and Cupp has a small amount of money left to incorporate SRC comments; Cupp believes this amount will be sufficient.

Mendoza also raised a concern with the precedent CMER is setting for the SRC to go beyond what we have contracted with them to do. Martin suggested that the SRC complete their review of the watertyping model; if there are reviewers who are willing to assist ISAG with the study design, those reviewers will be contracted separately and under a different contract. All CMER is requesting is a conference call to discuss the review prior to the final draft being returned to CMER. McNaughton, Martin and Quinn will meet with Vogt to discuss this issue. Risenhoover suggested that CMER evaluate whether the committee is getting what it needs from the SRC, especially given that our current contract expires soon.

Mendoza said that ISAG discussed what questions would be submitted to SRC for review. What the SAG submits up front will greatly influence what CMER gets receives as an end product from the SRC. CMER needs to talk about how to submit questions and what context should be provided for reviewers. Schuett-Hames and other CMER staff have put together a draft SRC process document and it was distributed to CMER for review today. Comments should be directed to Schuett-Hames. CMER will discuss this framework at the March CMER meeting.

CMER 2005 Workplan Development Schedule: Rowton presented the proposed workplan and budget development schedule to CMER. Edits to the workplan, according to the adopted schedule, will be submitted by March 23rd. Jackson has submitted edits to the workplan and those will be incorporated by Schuett-Hames. SAGS should consider the project and program descriptions, status changes, and budget updates.

CMER Consensus: The workplan development proposal was approved by CMER. A packet including a cover memo, the schedule, the budget and the workplan will be distributed to CMER. Schuett-Hames will make the edits recommended by the FPB before the workplan goes to CMER for consideration.

SAG Issues

UPSAG: The roads effectiveness monitoring plan will be forwarded to CMER for review and preparation for a discussion regarding whether this plan is ready for SRC review at the March meeting.

Projects Database: McFadden will be distributing information to CMER within the next two weeks.

Compliance Monitoring: Martin and Quinn have been meeting with SAG co-chairs over the last couple of months and it is increasingly obvious that SAGs are having difficulty in conceptualizing effectiveness monitoring programs without knowing how the compliance monitoring program will be designed and implemented. Schuett-Hames said that there is existing information in FPARS and in RMAPs that could be useful as well. McFadden said that DNR is beginning to develop the program and has a tight timeline. One of the next steps is to solicit comments and concerns from stakeholders.

Comments regarding how the compliance monitoring program, FPARS and RMAPs information could interface with CMER effectiveness and extensive monitoring studies should be e-mailed to Martin or Quinn by March 10th.

If you are interested in participating in the stakeholder group to review compliance monitoring please contact Marcus Johns.

Policy Interface: Pucci asked how the Policy committee will consider results of CMER studies, such as PIPs. A small group has been meeting to draft a framework for Policy to consider regarding how to consider results of CMER Studies. CMER has always recommended early involvement and it appears as though FFR Policy understands the need for this type of interaction. CMER will be kept informed by the co-chairs.

Science Topic Agenda: the afternoon topic of the next CMER meeting will focus on prioritization. Sturhan said that she liked the different approaches used during the last prioritization project. It is interesting that, no matter what approach was used, projects and programs did not move much on the priority chart.

CMER business meeting adjourned at 11:55 am