

Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee
August 22, 2006
9am – 12pm
NWIFC
Minutes

Attendees:

Baldwin, Todd	Kalispel Tribe, SAGE co-chair
Black, Jenelle	NWIFC, CMER Staff
Butts, Sally	US F&W, BTSAG Co-chair
Cramer, Darin	DNR, AMPA
Ehinger, Bill	Ecology, RSAG Co-Chair
Fransen, Brian	Weyerhaeuser
Heide, Pete	WFPA
Jackson, Terry	WDFW, BTSAG Co-Chair
MacCracken, Jim	Longview Fibre, LWAG Co-Chair
Martin, Doug	WFPA consultant, CMER co-chair
Mendoza, Chris	ARC, RSAG Tri-Chair
Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Indian Nation
Peterson, Pete	Upper Columbia United Tribes
Pleus, Allen	NWIFC
Pucci, Dawn	Suquamish Tribe, WetSAG co-chair
Risenhoover, Ken	Port Blakely
Stewart, Greg	NWIFC, CMER Staff
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR, CMER Co-Chair
Veldhuisen, Curt	UPSAG Co-chair

Minutes: July meeting minutes approved

Report Back From Policy (Sturhan):

- * CMER is having an impact on Policy's workload. They have developed a workplan subgroup to prioritize their work in response.
 - Policy is not happy about the LWAG request and that the principal investigator added sites without consulting CMER. Policy directed CMER to not rely of USFS sites for manipulative studies.
 - A fish passage subgroup has been re-formed by Policy.
-

Report Back from FPB meetings: (Dawn)

- FPB requested a workshop before they take action on DFC or PIP.

- FPB approved the hardwood conversion and project manager requests.
 - Pleus: Jed reporting back on adaptive management (AM) by himself, without adaptive management program input. Recommends that Darin should be part of that reporting to the FPB since Jed is not actually involved with CMER and doesn't really know first hand what we are doing. Heide agrees. Cramer notes that once Policy makes a recommendation to the FPB, it is essentially out of AM. However, these two projects do need more technical input and so he agrees there is a place for him (Darin) there. Pleus (and Mendoza) feel that it IS important for AM to be on hand, that Jed may not be in a position to provide accurate details. These two projects may not be outliers, but rather are typical. Pleus notes that questions about the science tend to come up and Darin's presence will help ensure that accurate responses are provided to the Board members.
-

ISPR Update (Doug): What is coming up for ISPR?

- MacCracken: LWAG is in process of reviewing the report for the RMZ Resample study. Results are coming in by chapter, but LWAG plans to compile everything before bringing it to CMER.
 - UBC (Dan Moore) is looking for sponsors for a Headwaters conference in February. Subject is management of headwater riparian areas. Is CMER interested in being a sponsor? Moore will be sending more formal information. Mobbs relates the comment that CMER tends to be off in our own orbit and not well involved with other research going on. Veldhuisen notes that the costs they were seeking help with include bringing in invited speakers, as well as the normal costs of putting on presentations.
-

Status Tracker Update (Nancy): This item has evolved into later agenda item of "Project Updates"

Report From AMPA (Cramer): \$133k approved for FY07 to hire additional project mgr and for hardwood conversion project. We are still about \$10k under what was approved by FPB for FY 2007. Darin still has some invoices to submit for FY06 expenses. Expect to begin work on filling the new PM position in September. Darin trying to get complete inventory of projects and status (particularly completed projects) for Policy.

SAG Requests:

- BTSAG (Butts): CMER approval of final reports from previous years studies
 - Project appears to have been dropped after "interim" report, so that is the "final" report for this project. Project dropped due to evolution of F&F and shifts in priorities. Sturhan – need to note this with report on web site. Butts notes that request is to include cover letter with three reports together that would come up when web site link is clicked.

- End goals of habitat models or protocols were never achieved, but no issue with science.
 - Pucci requests that each report has its own disclaimer, that notes the review process each report has been through, in addition to the cover letter.
 - Could just put a letter in a file for these, not necessarily on web site. Martin requests that BTSAG review the established CMER document disclaimers and project type description forms to see if a cover letter is necessary or if the established process is adequate.
 - **BTSAG bring CMER process documents for “Exploratory Report” and proposed cover letter (if still felt to be necessary) to CMER next month for review. Review introductions to ensure disclaimer is consistent with what report authors say.**
- UPSAG (Veldhuisen): Request to allocate \$20k (approved Tier 1) to hire contractor to scope a series of alternative projects to address groundwater recharge to deep-seated landslides, which has been requested by Policy
 - Sturhan suggests UPSAG plan to present that scoping paper to Policy subgroup
 - Heide would like change to wording to include “potential” and to make the questions read in terms of “Is there an impact on glacial deep-seated ...” because it is not clear from existing science that there even is a forest practices impact. It is not clear yet that there needs to be a rule addressing this management issue, even though a rule currently exists Veldhuisen – Is the issue with the wording, or is there an issue with the scoping subjects? Heide – eliminate item #2; change #1 to propose just mapping deposits rather than to assume a rule tool will be developed; Word #s 3 and 4 to reflect that they are investigating “what is sensitivity?” and if so, what are potential areas affected?
 - Veldhuisen would like more input on topics to be addressed in scoping, especially regarding perceived viability of these four proposed topics. Input from Policy subgroup to narrow focus would be especially appreciated.
 - Mendoza refers UPSAG to L1, L2 questions and requests they link proposed studies to those questions. Refer back to Policy subgroup if necessary for clarification, but up to UPSAG to determine best science and to explain how these relate to L1/L2 issues. Pleus notes, for instance, that Item #2 should not be a CMER task. CMER needs to develop the science to inform the development of rule tools and manual chapters.
 - Pucci – we need to clarify with Policy whether or not CMER should be addressing manual updates.
 - Veldhuisen – should we go ahead with scoping and discuss studies after scope written, or should UPSAG shelve this request until studies are clarified and then contract? Heide replied should go ahead, but use revised wording (as above and re-written by Doug) in contract. 1) What is

- known? 2) What do we need to know? 3) What are research options? 4) What is geographic extent?
- Pucci moves CMER requests this money from Policy (and per Pleus) revise project list to eliminate #2.
 - Pleus requests we ask Policy for clarification on importance of this issue and whether we should review FPAs as part of this program. Can we include wording that FPAs be reviewed as a project? Pucci notes that Pleus and Heide can be involved in the contract wording.
 - Veldhuisen notes that an exhaustive lit review will not be included under this funding. Also that interaction with Policy subgroup on this subject and projects to be investigated is needed and expected by UPSAG.
 - Cramer notes that money is already approved (Tier 1). **Therefore, request is for Policy to approve content of scoping project, with #2 and the first three words of #1 eliminated, and for interaction with Policy groundwater recharge subgroup in development of the scoping paper. APPROVED (no objections)**
- SAGE (Baldwin): Request to approve Tier2 \$150k in addition to current \$150k in order to contract Type F Riparian study for \$300k in one contract.
 - Okay to contract for non-approved amount, with note that additional phases “pending approval of funding.”
 - Mendoza notes that the key to making this work is to plan deliverables around FPB meetings in order to ensure no work lags.
 - Martin recommend that SAGE make the Tier 2 request later in winter or spring when they have a better idea of the real budget amount.
 - **No CMER action required.**
-

Project Updates:

- DOE Temperature Sensitivity update (Ehinger): Sturhan - Will require CMER review (Butts, Martin, Jackson); comments back in 3 weeks (Sep 5); Bernath wants for small landowners ASAP; Sturhan send out to CMER listserve; Bring to Sep CMER mtg in order to have for Sep Small Landowner mtg.
 - Martin - Hunter commented that input variables were not very representative; more analysis needed. Will modeler be available for revisions? Ehinger - yes.
 - **Review of this project report was deemed urgent enough to consider as a SAG request, although not brought originally as such. (Consensus)**
- Grotefendt aerial photo study (Martin):
 - Ground truthing (of calibration site) complete; remaining photo interpretation is in progress.
 - Has asked several expert participants, but has not got firm commitments yet. Proposes workshop be held in late October. Date to be supplied by Sep. CMER meeting. Would like to hold workshop in Seattle in order to get several desired experts to attend. UW facilities potentially been

- offered by CFR dean Baer. Could videoconferencing be set up between UW and NWIFC? Martin notes that setting up workshop is not in Grotefendt contract. Stewart will investigate capability of UW CFR videoconferencing. Martin – we need to assign PM (Dave S-H) to the workshop. PM will also need to obtain money for expert travel expenses.
- Sturhan, draft report due this quarter. Martin – report will now be delivered in next (last) quarter.
 - Heide offer to have WFPA person facilitate the workshop arrangements
 - IMW (Martin):
 - Looking at a nested design, based on information from UW roads work. Waiting for input from UW study proposal, which is expected this autumn in order to continue planning.
 - BCIF update (Ehinger in lieu of S-H): waiting on Grotefendt study results
 - SAGE Type F (Baldwin): RFQQ basically ready to move to DNR; Site monumenting proceeding; a number of landowner mailings sent out, some replies received (many positive responses, but not all in agreement!); stream types inaccurate in many places.
 - SAGE Type N scoping (Baldwin): This project temporarily slowed due to SAGE members being busy in field; progressing and expect to pick up pace after field season; Martin – Policy does have PIP subgroup and they are interested in this study, especially the “function” aspects of the study. Therefore, know that there is a larger audience than SAGE may be aware of. Policy group is especially interested in the functional aspects of the spatially intermittent streams.
 - Heide notes that one problem that came up from the beginning of these issues, is the use of rule language, rather than focusing on the scientific aspects of these streams. SAGE shouldn’t get hung up on using FFR and DNR language, but rather should use appropriate technical language and let the rules change their language if needed.
 - Roads subbasin study (Veldhuisen): Field work completed (14 sites); may have some results by September meeting; need to get Phase II contracted and funding approved. Martin – could results be presented at science session? Interested in knowing such things as how protocol working, cost estimates, biases, how is culvert stuff working out, etc. Veldhuisen – yes, **can put something together for Oct CMER mtg.** science session. Martin/Sturhan – interest is high
-

SAG Issues and questions from the co-chairs:

- CMER: FYI - Stewart has set up a CMER site (essentially a bulletin board) at the NWIFC (for review) to facilitate intra-CMER communication, including interim documents. Please check out site and comment. Boards are protected through registration, so items will not be available through site search programs. Registration is not currently restricted, but could easily be.
 - Pleus – 1) do we want such a site? 2) do we want CMER staff to be allocated to maintaining this site?
-

Introducing outside science into CMER (Cramer): Had discussion using Ken Miller's example from a year ago. After looking into it, Cramer feels we have guidance on this already, although we may want to add a few sentences to CMER Protocols and Standards Manual to clarify. Sturhan – some additional updates to the CMER Protocols and Standards Manual are needed.

CMER Staff Report: None

CMER Monthly Report to Policy (Martin):

- Should CMER be considering, recommending, addressing Board Manual updates?
 - Request Groundwater Recharge subgroup interaction with UPSAG
 - Request that Darin have more physical presence at FP Board meetings when rule-making resulting from adaptive management is occurring.
-

Agenda items for September:

- Discuss updates to P&S Manual
 - Edits to DoE Temperature study
-

Science topic for September: None at this time

Afternoon Science Session –

- WETSAGE presented draft scoping plan for Wetlands Data Layer Project
- There was a good discussion concerning information needs and applications for both regulatory and CMER research.
- Anyone who wants to send in review comments must do so by September 5th.
- A revised draft is planned for September CMER meeting.