

CMER
January 25, 2005
NRB, Rm 537
Olympia, WA
Minutes

Attendees

Barreca, Jeannette	Ecology
Butts, Sally	USFWS, BTSAG co-chair
Clark, Jeffrey	Weyerhaeuser
Fransen, Brian	Weyerhaeuser
Heide, Pete	WFPA
Hunter, Mark	WDFW
Knutzen, John	Tetra Tech FW
MacCracken, Jim	Longview Fibre
Martin, Doug	Martin Environmental, CMER Co-Chair
Martin, Pam	Tetra Tech FW
McConnell, Steve	NWIFC, CMER Staff
McNaughton, Geoffrey	DNR, AMPA
Mendoza, Chris	ARC Consultants
Palmquist, Bob	NWIFC, CMER Staff
Peterson, Pete	Upper Columbia United Tribes
Pleus, Allen	NWIFC
Pucci, Dawn	Suquamish Tribe
Ray, Kris	Colville Confederated Tribes, SAGE Co-Chair
Rowton, Heather	WFPA
Schuett-Hames, Dave	NWIFC, CMER Staff
Stevie, Michelle	WDFW
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR, CMER co-chair
Veldhuisen, Curt	Skagit Coop

Minutes, Decisions/Tasks Review, General Updates:

CMER Consensus: December meeting minutes were approved as amended

SAG Requests

- **SAGE:** The SAGE request to send *Review of Available Literature Related to Wood Loading Dynamics in and around Streams in Eastern Washington Forests* to SRC was approved. There is strong consensus in SAGE to put the document through SRC review. There is considerable interest in this document both by SAGE and other

groups working in Eastern Washington, and SRC review will help to ensure that it is a top quality product. This document has been reviewed by CMER. SAGE will send the document to SRC. When all comments have been received (SRC plus CMER) SAGE will develop a plan to finalize the document. This might involve a contract and/or SAG member effort to revise the document. The original document contract with Herrera is finished and the document belongs to DNR. Herrera expected the document to be changed and updated over time, so authorship for revisions is not an issue.

CMER Consensus: This request was approved.

- **ISAG:** The ISAG document *Extensive Fish Passage Monitoring Methodology Review and Preferred Study Design* was accepted for CMER review. Doug Martin and Roger Peters were assigned as reviewers, as suggested by ISAG. Pleus offered a (unnamed at this time) reviewer at the NWIFC with statistics expertise. This is the opportunity for all of CMER to review the document prior to SRC review. Comments need to be returned to Dennis McDonald by FEBRUARY 8 so that the author will have time to incorporate comments and bring the document back to CMER at the February 22nd meeting for approval to submit for SRC review.

CMER Consensus: CMER approved the request for review of this document. Comments are due to Dennis McDonald by February 8th.

- **LWAG questions for SRC review:** LWAG previously sent around to CMER the questions to accompany the Type N Experimental study to SRC review. There were no concerns expressed by CMER members about these questions, so they stand approved.
- **RSAG:** request for approval of the study design to measure *Effects of Hardwood Conversion on Stream Temperature*. McConnell noted that the SAG request as written in the agenda was inaccurate; RSAG was not requesting approval of a study design. Instead RSAG is seeking approval of the critical questions and direction from CMER on how to proceed with developing a study to answer these questions given that there are a number of ways to do this and there are two different proposals, one initiated by FFR Policy of adding SFLO sites along with a stream temp modeling component, and one from DOE that does not require additional sites, utilizing instead data from already completed TMDL analyses. McConnell presented the revised critical questions for this study. Clark questioned the usefulness of the study when the buffer width and lengths were fixed (30' wide and 1500' long, e.g. critical question #1). If the study results showed an increase in temperature, then no further action could be recommended (eg. "no where to go with the study"). McConnell stated that a range of lengths would be examined and analyses using length as a continuous variable would be done. The length was specified because SFLO's are interested in being able to cut along longer reaches and these have generally been considered in 500' segments. Mendoza stated that there are other functions that are just as important as temperature and should also be considered when studying the effects of hardwood

conversion. The critical questions were approved in general. Ecology proposed a different study to address temperature issues associated with Hardwood Conversion. Sturhan clarified that RSAG is proposing to continue their work on developing a project to comprehensively evaluate possible hardwood conversion effects to stream temperature and that RSAG is considering a range of possible approaches. McConnell clarified that this work would include consideration of the Ecology proposal outlined by Barreca. Martin reminded the group that the critical questions have been approved and CMER is now being asked whether RSAG should continue work on a study design for temperature.

It was suggested that RSAG work with Ecology to determine which approach to bring forward to CMER for consideration. Barreca said that Policy will meet next week and will want information on this issue. Palmquist said the Ecology model must be able to address site-scale differences before it can be used to predict temperature effects of hardwood conversion. Mendoza said that many agree with Palmquist on this issue; models can only be used to answer certain questions.

Sturhan said that CMER does not need to do anything further with this request today. The CMER co-chairs will update Policy next week and will inform them that RSAG is working on with Ecology to develop a study plan to address temperature effects of hardwood conversion.

Pleus was concerned that Policy will make a decision about how to do this study at their February meeting. If that happens, RSAG does not need to do additional work. Schuett-Hames agreed and reminded the group that Policy has consistently directed RSAG to take specific actions in the Hardwood Conversion study. RSAG should not be asked to work on this further if Policy is going to make a decision without RSAG's input. Schuett-Hames suggested dialogue with Policy prior to their February meeting to discuss concerns raised within RSAG and CMER. Barreca said she talked with Smitch yesterday and he suggested that if there was no clear message from CMER that CMER get comments to Sturhan and Martin and that Sturhan and Martin then meet with key Policy representatives before the FFR Policy meeting. Palmquist suggested a literature review to determine what we already know.

CMER Consensus: The critical questions were approved by CMER. RSAG will approach CMER with a proposal regarding addressing temperature issues in the Hardwood Conversion study. A conference call with the CMER co-chairs, the AMPA Stephen Bernath, and Curt Smitch will be scheduled prior to the February 5th Policy meeting.

CMER Conference: Martin said that ideas have been solicited during the past two months for the CMER conference. A list of suggestions was distributed to the committee. Some of these ideas are not applicable to CMER and due to the lack of suggestions related to CMER, Martin was considering canceling the conference.

However, Martin suggested an alternative format could be presentations for each project that is currently funded or recently completed. Each Principal Investigator (PI) would present a twenty minute scientific talk that summarizes their project objectives, approach, and current findings. Heide suggested the presentations be organized around progress on the workplan and Martin said speakers should point out how their study relates to the workplan. Organizing by program was also suggested. A suggestion was also made that if a number of studies are related, they should be presented at the same time. Butts suggested that Policy should be strongly encouraged to attend.

Heide asked who will organize this conference. McNaughton said he would organize the conference. Palmquist said with extreme efficiency, 20 studies could be addressed in a day. Martin said that final organizational decisions will be made at the March CMER meeting. Martin added that each SAG should discuss this within and should suggest the presentation format that would work best for their SAG.

CMER Consensus: CMER agreed to provide twenty minute status reports on each project currently underway. The date of the conference will be moved to sometime in April.

SAG Assignment: At the next CMER meeting, SAGs will present a project list and speakers for each project.

Co-chair Assignment: The co-chairs will send an outline out regarding how projects should be discussed, order, format, etc. This will be distributed for discussion at the March CMER meeting.

Coordinator Assignment: Rowton will search dates two months out.

SRC Update: McNaughton said one item is in SRC review – the SAGE riparian dynamics literature review. The type N experimental study design was to have CMER consensus before proceeding. MacCracken said no comments were received and the questions have been finalized. The project will move into SRC review shortly.

Budget Update: The budget has not changed since last month.

Project Status Reporting: Sturhan said the budget sheet will help with project tracking. Studies that are to be starting in 2005 according to the budget should be getting up and running now or in the very near future. Sturhan said that looking at the 2006 budget is also important. If a SAG plans to start something in 2006, that project should be ready with a scope of work now and CMER needs to consider it. SAGs should look at their lists and be aware that planning for 2006 is important now and should be done soon if it is not already underway. Sturhan hopes to develop a database to track projects by SAG, workplan, and in other ways. Ray said that there is no contract specialist to let contracts at this time and it is holding up a number of projects.

CMER Staff Update: McNaughton said CMER staff is meeting with the co-chairs and McNaughton after each meeting to prioritize staff work. The staff vacancy will be filled and NWIFC will be advertising the position next week for a CMER Technical Project Manager. This person will be based in Olympia but proposals by candidates located in other areas of Washington will be entertained. Extensive travel is listed as a part of the job description. *If people have ideas about who would be a good candidate for this position, please contact Schuett-Hames so he can make a personal contact with the candidates.* Schuett-Hames said that priority tasks for the position have also been discussed: eastside riparian studies, riparian extensive monitoring and fish passage extensive monitoring are priorities outlined thus far. Other SAGs with suggestions should submit those to Schuett-Hames as soon as possible.

SAG Issues:

- **ISAG** Fransen said that modifications suggested by CMER have been incorporated. A memo updating CMER on ISAG's response to clarification of the *Water Typing Model Field Validation Approach and Procedures* was distributed.
- **ISAG** is also requesting that CMER review the *Extensive Fish Passage Monitoring Methodology Review and Preferred Study Design*. CMER reviewers have been identified by ISAG. Review information will be distributed to CMER and reviewers will be assigned. Rowton will distribute the document to CMER for review and the reviewers identified by ISAG will be noted in the distribution.

CMER Consensus: CMER agreed to review the document.

- **UPSAG:** PIP 6-questions response discussion. A draft of the 6- questions response was distributed to CMER. Veldhuisen said that UPSAG has worked on this document extensively, with much assistance from Palmquist and Schuett-Hames, and struggled with what to include and not include. A key topic of debate was how information on related studies should be included. UPSAG was unsure how far to go with synthesizing information. The draft distributed was agreed on by the small group and feedback from CMER is being sought at this time. Veldhuisen said the revised PIP report is being reviewed by UPSAG and will be finalized by the next CMER meeting.

Barreca asked if this is going to FFR Policy next week. Veldhuisen said no; it is on the March agenda for FFR Policy. Sturhan said she expects that the SAG will address the relevant studies, for example other PIP studies, but not all possible related studies. Martin emphasized the need to include other relevant studies. Palmquist said that the other Type N studies were discussed in the answers to put the questions into context. The questions address what the potential impacts are if the stream length is not identified properly. Complicating things further, the term "perennial" is interpreted differently in state statute than it is in science.

McNaughton said Policy's intent is not an intensive literature review; they are asking

whether there is other information that may provide additional information. Policy's primary question is whether the study answers one small piece or an entire question. Mendoza said he is concerned that resource effects are not being addressed by the rule tools; they are addressed in effectiveness monitoring projects. The study did not address resource effects and the question regarding this should be answered with a no because the study does not address resource impacts. The intent of the study was to define the point of perennial flow. Heide said the title should be shortened.

MacCracken suggested that CMER not take comments today. Members should submit comments to Veldhuisen in a timely manner. Veldhuisen said the subgroup needs to know if these answers are what CMER is looking for to forward to Policy. Heide said Policy will be looking at the urgency to make rule change recommendations and will need information to help them with this task and this is not necessarily the responsibility of the PIP subgroup. Having more information about what the resource implications are will help Policy make better decisions. Pleus pointed out that much work has been done to date and CMER recommendations to Veldhuisen need to be clear.

the following paragraph is comprised of additional comments on the document. On page 7, the question regarding what additional studies will help us learn covers resource impacts at this time. A suggestion was made that the study was not designed to address resource impacts and the section dealing with resource impact information should be removed. Schuett-Hames said this actually changes only a few passages in the document. The subgroup will address Mendoza's comments. Veldhuisen suggested that a general statement about how to deal with resource impacts is needed from CMER. Heide said that statements about future work that could be done are not necessary because this rule tool study was not designed to address that. Butts suggested removing the last three sentences of paragraph 3 on page 7 to address Mendoza's concerns. Heide said he does not agree that all resource impact information should be removed. If there is information about resource effects in currently available studies, it should be included in the document. Peterson said he does not agree that Policy should only be informed about what the study is designed to do. It is necessary to inform them of known impacts associated with the information.

CMER Consensus: CMER participants will comment to Veldhuisen by February 8th. A revised version of the document will be distributed to CMER prior to the February CMER meeting and CMER will make a decision about whether this is appropriate to send to Policy in March.

- Water Quality: Barreca said that EPA has produced a preliminary decision approving portions of Ecology's proposed water quality standards. The existing Class A and B system was used to define default areas (i.e. Class A was deemed not to be core spawning habitat). The EPA decision expressed concern about the classifications of non-core spawning areas because they believe some of the Class A areas are core spawning habitat. Maps are available on the EPA site of the streams they are concerned about. EPA will work further on this and will provide feedback next year.

To visit the website, click here: <http://www.epa.gov/r10earth/epa-rev-2003-WA-WQS.htm>

- **DFC Review:** Schuett-Hames said that DFC review is ongoing. Policy received a presentation in November and guidance was given regarding how to proceed with addressing SRC review comments. Policy indicated they wanted a final report before more data collection occurs. Policy is expecting a final document in March. The document has been revised and is now at RSAG being reviewed. There was discussion in RSAG regarding a concurrent review between RSAG and CMER with the goal of getting approval of the DFC report at the February CMER meeting so it can be forwarded to Policy in March. This is an ambitious timeline and RSAG is working to meet it. The document is currently out to RSAG with comments due on February 8th. The authors will then revise the document. Two dedicated reviewers have been identified: Mark Hunter and Bill Ehinger. If there is another CMER member interested in being a dedicated reviewer, please let Schuett-Hames know. If not, Hunter and Ehinger will be the primary reviewers. Sturhan said she will review the report as a designated reviewer. RSAG proposes that this study be sent to CMER via e-mail with a solicitation for comments. If it is reasonable, RSAG proposes to use the February 8th date as a deadline for all comments. These comments will then be compiled and taken to RSAG for a decision. If RSAG reaches consensus on the revisions, the report will be forwarded to CMER one week before the February CMER meeting.

CMER Consensus: CMER agreed to this schedule for review with a deadline of February 8th for comments. Designated reviewers include Hunter, Ehinger and Sturhan.

- **CMER Workplan:** Schuett-Hames said it is time to update the CMER workplan again. The process can be streamlined this year. Palmquist and Schuett-Hames will ask the SAG co-chairs for changes with their programs and will revise the workplan accordingly. Schuett-Hames will report in March and will work with Palmquist to identify as many issues as possible for discussion at the February meeting. CMER approval will be requested in March. The proposed plan will go to Policy in April and the Forest Practices Board in May for approval.
- **Intensive Monitoring Paper:** This paper has been distributed to CMER and will be discussed at an upcoming CMER meeting.

CMER Report to Policy:

- Hardwood conversion issues
 - Date for the CMER conference and strong invitation to attend
 - PIP question update
-

CMER Scientific Topic for next month: Protocols and Standards Manual presentation and approval.

The afternoon session of the CMER meeting was run by DNR and participants were provided with information about how to access DNR information.
