

CMER
July 27, 2004
NWIFC Conference Center
Draft Minutes

Attendees

Barreca, Jeannette	Ecology
Butts, Sally	USFWS
Clark, Jeffrey	Weyerhaeuser
Hayes, Marc	WDFW
Hoffman, Lynda	WDFW, SAGE co-chair
MacCracken, Jim	Longview Fibre
Martin, Doug	Martin Environmental, CMER co-chair
McDonald, Dennis	DNR
McNaughton, Geoff	DNR, AMPA
Mendoza, Chris	ARC Environmental Consultants
Palmquist, Bob	NWIFC
Peterson, Pete	UCUT
Pleus, Allen	NWIFC
Quinn, Tim	WDFW, CMER co-chair
Ray, Kris	Colville Confederated Tribes, SAGE co-chair
Robinson, Tom	WSAC
Rowton, Heather	WFPA
Smitch, Curt	Thompson Smitch Facilitator

Additional Attendees for the PM Session

Beach, Eric	Green Diamond Resource Company
Bernath, Steve	Ecology
Ehinger, Bill	Ecology
Fox, Sherry	WFFA
Hansen, Craig	USFWS
Herman, Jed	DNR
Hollowed, John	NWIFC
Jones, Bruce	Quinault Indian Nation
Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Indian Nation
Moody, Lloyd	Governor's Salmon Recovery Office
Prater, Brian	Campbell Group
Ryan, Joe	WEC
Turner, Bob	NOAA Fisheries
Young, Lenny	DNR, FFR Co-Chair

Minutes, Decisions/Tasks Review, General Updates:

May CMER minutes were approved as amended. June CMER meeting minutes will be forwarded for review with the July minutes and both sets of minutes will be proposed for approval at the August CMER meeting.

June Task Review

- The LWAG Small Mammal Dissection for Reproductive Condition Study budget request was not approved in June. This issue will be discussed during SAG issues.
- A meeting to resolve issues associated with the BTSAG Eastside Riparian Prescription Effectiveness Monitoring site layout request was recommended. McNaughton said the meeting occurred and consensus was reached.
- The SAGE Eastside Review and Synthesis of Available Information on Riparian Disturbance Regimes in Washington was forwarded for CMER review. Reviewers are Steve McConnell, Mark Hunter, and Doug Martin. Comments are due to SAGE by August 5th.
- Recommendations regarding how to proceed with the DFC study based on comments from the SRC were accepted. RSAG will answer the six questions and will bring forward a proposal for CMER consideration in the near future.
- The UPSAG Hydrologic Effects of Roads Literature Review was forwarded for CMER review. Reviewers are Doug Martin, Jeannette Barreca, and Tim Quinn. The deadline for comments is August 27th.
- The ISAG request to analyze fish habitat model data and identify areas associated with error was accepted.
- SAGE received approval for their Eastside workplan during the afternoon science session.

SAG Requests

ISAG – Watertyping Model Field Validation Study Design – Approach and Procedures.

This request is for CMER to accept the course of action developed in response to the SRC comments on the watertyping field validation study design. ISAG has addressed the questions and statements made by the SRC. ISAG's recommendation for responding to the SRC review are available via e-mail, contact Heather. ISAG has already begun work on some of these action steps.

Martin asked if there is full consensus in ISAG for this document as submitted. Mendoza said people who read this will note a lack of detail. Many of the details are not yet worked out and may result in some additional discussion in ISAG. There are also some policy discussion issues that were deferred by ISAG. Martin said that the reviewers identified two types of errors, model measurement error and model performance. ISAG has chosen to address only the measurement errors at this time. Mendoza said there is concern that the model does not address error well. Thus, the study design may change. Martin said that ISAG is making a critical decision on moving forward with moving the prediction error, and is choosing not to address model performance at this time. The approach ISAG is taking is an indication that ISAG believes the model is good and the questions remaining relate to prediction errors.

Plus raised concerns that the actions are very vague as described in this document and requested that the document be brought before CMER before it is finalized. For example in number 5 strengthen the language stating that the data was not of value. For 8, 9, 11 and 12 the explanation of the action is also unclear.

CMER Consensus: CMER requested that the course of action be more detailed to reflect discussions from today. ISAG will edit this and CMER is in consensus with the concepts outlined in the course of action. ISAG is not precluded from moving forward with their course of action.

Budget Update: McNaughton said that a revised budget sheet was distributed this morning. There have been some minor changes. There was consensus reached on the BT study site issue and \$136,200 has been added to line 36. The FY 05 budget has changed to reflect contracts that did not get initiated in 2004 and will instead be initiated in 2005. Money has been added to the LWAG RMZ resample in case CMER reaches consensus on this issue. The money will not be allocated without CMER authority, but FPB authority for spending over the year is to be approved by the FPB in August so this line item needs to be reflected. Verbal approval has been received for an additional year of federal funding for adaptive management.

Smitch said the federal government has committed to a 6th year, but will not necessarily commit to additional funding after that point. As the state develops budgets for the next biennium, they need to be aware of this. It appears as though \$2 – 2.5 million is an adequate funding amount for CMER. Smitch clarified that we need a budget approach that is more pragmatic. Programs and studies that are moved to begin at a later date should remain on the list without funding noted.

CMER Review Procedures: a proposal for formal CMER review procedures was distributed for CMER review in preparation for adoption at this meeting. Plus presented the details of this proposal to CMER.

Martin expressed concerns with the Pre-SRC review of documents being to cumbersome. Ray said that SAGs are already producing most of these documents. Plus clarified that these are guidelines only and CMER can request changes to this procedure as necessary to meet the needs of the particular document.

CMER Consensus: Martin asked for clarification in the document that this is a two-step process (pre- and post SRC review); the committee will add this language. CMER approved these guidelines for review.

SRC Update: McNaughton said there are three documents in SRC review (2 PIP reports and the roads study design). These are all moving forward. The interactive phase of the

roads study design review is about to commence. The interagency agreement is also about to be finalized for the upcoming year. Some of the reviewers are asking what is happening with their comments and CMER should discuss this at a future meeting.

CMER Monthly Report to Policy: Martin said that there was good policy dialogue on the responses to the six questions for the new large studies. There was much policy discussion and CMER has scheduled an afternoon session to address their questions.

- Guidance requests for August are related to the workplan; Policy will be briefed on the watertyping model validation efforts
 - Upcoming guidance needs include: project management issues, budget issues
 - FYI – SAGE workplan
-

SAG Issues:

- LWAG – Small mammal dissections. LWAG wants to pursue this project and will need to begin the dispute resolution process if there is still no consensus in the near future. The freezers must be vacated by the end of September. The original \$40,000 included an estimate to process about 10,000 samples and there are only 6,000 so the cost will be reduced. However, the estimate did not include dollars to fully analyze this data and compare it to the original data; the additional cost of this analysis is \$20,000. McNaughton did put a request of \$65,000 spending authority for this project pending CMER recommendation; the \$65,000 represents the total cost of the request. Pleus said he would check with the NWIFC to see about freezer space. The space needed is three 4x4x12 freezers. MacCracken said that LWAG is still negotiating with Hallett to get the data for the eastside. Hallett has asked for \$170,000 to reconstruct the data. Hayes said that DNR lost the data for this and it will need to be reconstructed to move forward with this study. There will be a cost associated with getting the eastside data but it will be approximately \$2,000.

The dispute resolution process will be initiated with the people involved in the dispute and we will try to work this out in a meeting. If this does not resolve the dispute, it will be taken to Policy for resolution. Pederson said that this is not in the workplan and should be – it is difficult to understand the value. Barreca said that it is good to go to Policy on this. Policy is likely to ask how this relates to the workplan. Smitch suggested that CMER attempt to resolve the scientific issues in a small group and use the August 5th Policy meeting if that process does not work. Quinn proposed reducing the request to \$40,000 and setting up a conference call/meeting to attempt to reach consensus on this issue. Before this issue goes to Policy, the six questions must be answered.

CMER Consensus: A conference call will be scheduled to attempt to resolve the dispute. Participants will include: Pederson, McConnell, Barreca and others who

indicate they are interested in participating.

- LWAG: there will be a request to do further analysis the amphibian relationship to PIPs. LWAG will be requesting about \$25,000 for this.
- ISAG: A report submitted by ABR for eastside data on model development will be sent to the CMER committee for review and potential action.
- ISAG: a preliminary study of validation efforts made last spring will be brought to CMER next month.
- RSAG: Small forest landowners have approach RSAG about adding sites to the hardwood conversion study. Some of these sites would add geographical variability and additional information to the study. RSAG may come forward with a proposal to add sites to that study. McNaughton said that Policy should recommend additional funds for this in the pm session. This study and the add-on should be discussed at the next CMER science session.
- SAGE: the nomograph report is in final SAG review and the wood dynamics study is also in final SAG review and both reports will be forwarded to CMER soon. SAGE is also proceeding with the RFQQ for eastside riparian stand conditions.
- Contracts Specialist: Ron Johnson is resigning as contract administrator for CMER. There is a solicitation on the DNR website recruiting for this position.

Science topic: the next science topic will be discussed by the co-chairs and Schuett-Hames and it will be determined whether the hardwood conversion study can be done in the pm session along with the prioritization of intensive monitoring projects, which was the previously scheduled July science topic.

Preparation for PM Session: Smitch will be facilitating the afternoon session. The session will be interactive and the goal is to approve the CMER workplan and budget. Comments that have come in are from Ecology, some of the caucuses have indicated that they are ready to approve. Policy will want to get to the approval point as soon as possible. They will want to know from CMER whether there are concerns they should be aware of before moving forward. Quinn said that CMER has done some work in preparing for this meeting as well.

PM CMER/Policy Joint Session: Smitch stated the goals for this afternoon as getting Policy approval of the CMER workplan and budget. The issues raised in Ecology's response to the questions are to the point and will get us a long way toward approval of the workplan.

Project 5 – Extensive Fish Passage Monitoring

McDonald said this study is designed to address fish passage and whether it is improving over time. Another ISAG study is designed to measure the effectiveness of fish passage improvements under the forest practices rules. RMAPS may help inform the study and the data being collected under RMAPs can be used in the study design. This study may include small land ownerships and 20-acre exempt parcels.

Smitch clarified that these projects are in the current budget sheet and authorization for spending is being sought from the FPB. This does not necessarily mean that funding is allocated to individual projects and further interaction will occur with FFR Policy before individual projects move forward. Jones suggested that an estimate of when projects will be ready to go would help better inform policy about what is coming up in the pipeline.

Young said that the amount of information provided in the new project summary information falls short of what Policy actually needs. Thus, Policy will need more detail about these projects before moving forward with allocating funds.

Project 1 – Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment

Ehinger presented answers to the questions raised by respective caucuses (in written format) regarding the Type N Buffer study. Copies of these answers are available by contacting Bill Ehinger. Hayes added that this study is not focused solely on tailed frogs. There is overlap between this study and others and this study complements the others. Stream temperature and downstream effects are 50% of this study and will be measured at the confluence of type N and downstream from that point. Policy is being asked to authorize \$669,000 in implementation funds for the study. Policy will be updated regarding budget changes associated with this study as it develops over time. There will be procedural issues associated with this study because it tests treatments that are inconsistent with meeting the minimum forest practices rules.

Project 2 – Eastside Riparian Current Conditions

SAGE submitted the final scoping document to help address questions Policy asked. Copies are available by contacting Kris Ray. This study is to develop baseline information for the eastside.

Project 3 – Tailed Frogs and Parent Geology

Hayes summarized that this project helps capture 1 quarter to one-third of the landscape of type N streams. There are two major conflicting studies. One showed a great disparity in occupancy and abundance of amphibians between basalt and non-basalt geologies. A second study showed the opposite conclusion. One of these studies measured only non-basalt geology and the other one measured many geologies. Tailed frogs are the most sensitive of the stream-associated species. This study is in the design phases and

consultation with UPSAG is underway. The cost estimate for FY 05 is \$70,000. There is a three pronged vision for this project: 1) database of what exists for tailed frogs; 2) field element of the database and 3) in many type N systems, there is a complex geologic situation. Policy is being asked to approve this project at the whole project cost assuming continued funding. The study will be two-thirds complete by FY 06.

Project 4 – Road Basin Effectiveness Monitoring

Clark said the study is to represent the effectiveness of road work in the state of Washington at the scale of the performance targets we find in FFR. The two performance targets are how much road is connected to streams and how much sediment is being delivered per length of stream. The proposal is to take 50 samples representing sub-basin scale (6 square miles) and then systematically evaluate the conditions and attributes of the roads. The model being proposed for use is the existing watershed analysis model. The project has been approved as a study design and is in SRC review at this time. The cost estimate for FY 05 and 06 is \$560,000. UPSAG is hopeful that efficiencies can be found in implementation of the study resulting in the cost being reduced to under \$500,000. UPSAG is seeking Policy approval for the full project. This study is connected with the other roads projects. The 50 samples across the state are proportional to the area of FFR lands in the eastside, westside, and spruce zone. Small land ownerships will be included in the study because sites are selected randomly.

Project 6 – Extensive Riparian Monitoring

Bill Ehinger answered policy questions regarding this study in a handout. For copies, contact Bill Ehinger. The budget estimates for this project will change as the design gets more developed.

Budget – the state agencies will be doing budgeting for FY 05-07 in September and the federal agencies will be budgeting in December and January. Firm budget numbers will be helpful in both those cases. Revisiting this in September and December or as-needed will be helpful.

Policy recommendation: the CMER workplan and budget should be forwarded to the FPB for approval at their August meeting. McNaughton will change the numbers that need revision based on discussions today.

Jones said that a review of whether CMER is meeting its goals would be helpful; this would be similar to the CMER science conference, but maybe not as extensive. This could be done during the check-in in December.

Young complimented CMER for their work on the workplan and budget. This reflects a good trend in organization and communication within CMER.