

CMER
November 22nd, 2005
NWIFC Conference Center
Olympia, WA
Draft Minutes

Attendees

Arigoni, Jim	Tulalip Tribes
Barreca, Jeannette	Ecology
Beach, Eric	Green Diamond Resources
Black, Jenelle	NWIFC, CMER Staff
Fransen, Brian	Weyerhaeuser, ISAG Co-Chair
Hofmann, Lynda	WDFW, SAGE Co-Chair
Hotvedt, Jim	DNR State Lands
Hunter, Mark	WDFW
Jackson, Terry	WDFW, BTSAG Co-Chair
MacCracken, Jim	Longview Fibre, LWAG Chair
Marks, Derek	Skagit Systems Co-Op
Martin, Doug	Martin Environmental, CMER Co-Chair
McDonald, Dennis	DNR, Watertyping Project Manager
McFadden, George	DNR
McNaughton, Geoffrey	DNR, AMPA
Mendoza, Chris	ARC Consultants
Peterson, Pete	Upper Columbia United Tribes
Pleus, Allen	NWIFC
Pucci, Dawn	Suquamish Tribe, WETSAG Co-Chair
Robinson, Tom	WSAC
Rowton, Heather	WFPA, CMER Coordinator
Schuett-Hames, Dave	NWIFC, CMER Staff
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR, CMER Co-Chair
Veldhuisen, Curt	Skagit Systems Co-Op, UPSAG Co-Chair

Minutes, Decisions/Tasks Review, General Updates:

CMER Consensus: Minutes from the October CMER meeting were approved as amended.

Agenda Addition: Introductions will be added to the regular CMER agenda.

Decisions and Tasks from September were reviewed as follows:

- SAGs were asked to update the CMER project tracking sheet and this sheet was sent electronically to CMER for updating.
 - The workplan development schedule will be sent with the agenda each month as will a list of assignments from the previous CMER meeting.
 - CMER agreed to work on a decision tree approach to disclaimers. A revised proposal is ready for review today.
 - CMER agreed to comment on the document classification proposal and get those comments to Martin two weeks prior to the November meeting.
 - CMER approved sending the Eastside Type F Riparian Assessment Project Workplan Phase I for Independent Scientific Peer Review (ISPR).
 - CMER approved withholding the Hardwood Conversion Temperature Modeling Component from ISPR.
 - CMER requested two actions from Policy related to watertyping; one was a request to delay the RFQQ and the other was a request for guidance relating to concerns with moving forward the validation projects.
-

CMER Ground Rules: Sturhan said she has the results from the ballots (filled out last month) today for CMER review and discussion. These results were distributed. The most important rules seem to be A1 and A2 with B coming in a close second. The stars in the second column mean that people put many checks in the boxes (indicating the rule is broken many times or is very important). A6 and A7 were also mentioned as being broken often. Sturhan said CMER will talk about one ground rule each month. This month CMER discussed Ground Rule 1 – speak to educate, listen to understand. There was a brief discussion on the meaning of this rule. Rowton said that to her it means speak to educate, not to force your opinion on others and listen to understand, not to formulate an argument against what the other person is saying. People stated that breaking this rule results in conversations being repetitive because people state positions rather than speaking to educate and stating things one time.

SRC Update: McNaughton said the Riparian extensive monitoring study design review is complete. The associate editor and managing editor are now working on the synthesis and it should come in the mail this week. The eastside Type F Workplan review is in progress and an associate editor has been identified.

Budget Update: McNaughton said there are no changes to report on the budget this month. Projects need to be scoped and contracted as stated in the workplan.

CMER Facilitation Needs: Sturhan said policy approved Heather Rowton to facilitate CMER meetings. Today, CMER is being asked for their thoughts about what is important for a facilitator to do. Rowton will no longer be taking notes at CMER meetings; CMER

staff will take on that task. The list of needs from a facilitator, stated at the meeting, is as follows:

- Make sure agenda items are wrapped up clearly for CMER
- Ensure points are represented and heard but not repeated
- Clarify roles and responsibilities and enforce them (i.e. co-chairs, notetaker, facilitator, timekeeper).
- Sometimes CMER goes into processes that need to be facilitated, but not all discussions are that way. The facilitator should help in instances where assistance is needed to make sure CMER can make a decision but should not needlessly get involved in discussion that are going fine with no facilitation.

CMER was asked to provide any additional input to Rowton over the Month of December to help her provide what is needed in December when official facilitation will start.

McNaughton Resignation: McNaughton said he resigned two weeks ago to take a position with the Utah DNR. His last day of work with Washington DNR is tomorrow, and he thanked CMER for supporting him. Martin complimented McNaughton on a job well done. Martin added that many people do not understand what the AMPA actually does; there are many components and it can get very complex and difficult.

McDonald said CMER has a role in discussing what worked, what did not work, and how the position responsibilities could be improved. There are roles defined in the Board manual and they should be reviewed. Black suggested that McNaughton share what worked for him and what was difficult or did not work well.

Assignment: CMER will be asked to provide their input on this as well. Sturhan and Martin will send out information to get people started on providing input.

Schuett-Hames said that since McNaughton's last day is tomorrow, CMER will need information about how to function until McNaughton is replaced. McNaughton has suggested an interim manager and other ideas are also being considered by DNR.

Assignment: As soon as the interim solution is identified, it will be forwarded to CMER.

Project Status Report: Sturhan said she distributed the latest version of this document to CMER and SAGs should continue updating this sheet as things change. Martin said he sees 5 reports to be completed this quarter. He asked if these will actually be completed. Martin said the purpose of this sheet is to provide focus and pressure to get things done. These reports, that may or may not get done, are an example of plans that are getting delayed. Discussion indicated that some of these reports will be completed, while others will not. It appears that most of the reports will be completed this quarter. Sturhan said

that she will prepare a SAG-sort tracker for the next meeting in addition to the project sort sheet. Changes are accepted at any time.

Black said it would help if the same project title was used in the budget and in the workplan. McNaughton and Sturhan said it is supposed to be that way and if it is not, that will be corrected.

CMER Workplan Development Schedule: Sturhan said that SAGs should be finalizing their changes to the workplan this month. There are some things that need to be decided before ISAG can make their changes to the workplan; if the projects are still on hold when the workplan must be approved, they will be noted as on hold. Martin suggested that ISAG note the reasons the projects are on hold. The mandated date to bring the workplan to Policy means CMER must approve the workplan in January.

Schuett-Hames has heard from UPSAG and BTSAG have responded, RSAG is still discussing changes, SAGE will have quite a few changes, ISAG is waiting for information before they make changes, and WETSAG and LWAG still need to report.

Document Issues - Disclaimers: Jackson said she received no comments in addition to the ones made at the October CMER meeting. The assignment was to work on a decision-tree approach based on option 1 and comments were to be directed to Jackson and Schuett-Hames. Since there were no additional comments, Jackson used the comments made at the meeting to make changes to the proposal. From that, she created a template that follows the decision-tree approach and the document classification proposal. She explained to the group how the document works.

Sturhan said she likes the way paragraph one was put together; paragraph two is also good. She asked if people have concerns with paragraph one.

Assignment: CMER will have a chance to comment on this final draft to ensure it is consistent with the comments made at the October CMER meeting. Jackson and Schuett-Hames will revise the document accordingly and bring a final draft for CMER provisional approval; this will allow time for use and changes if needed. Jackson will send a copy to Rowton to forward to CMER. Comments must be received two weeks prior to the December CMER meeting.

Document Issues – Document Classification: Martin said CMER has agreed on document classification, the titles of the text, and were still working on the wording. Comments were sought; none were received.

CMER Consensus: The table was approved by CMER.

Assignment – Protocols and Standards Manual Work Group: The PSM group will decide whether the text should be incorporated into the disclaimer proposal or not.

Pleus asked how many people will attend the December 27th CMER meeting. Only Pleus said he would miss the meeting.

SAG Requests –

- SAGE – Request for approval to initiate the site selection process for Phase 1 – Eastside Type F Riparian Assessment Project Work Plan – Current Stand Conditions. The study design is not likely to be completed until March or April. In order to implement the project in 2006 site selection must begin now. Sturhan said that Policy approved not waiting for statewide EMAP draw, which is waiting for the new DNR Hydro layer to be complete. Martin said approving initiation of this site selection process also means approving Riparian Extensive site selection. Schuett-Hames said SAGE should present an Action Plan for implementation, labor division, and tasks for site selection. Jenelle will assist SAGE in writing the implementation plan. An interagency co-op agreement and amending Steve Toth's contract will be investigated as ways to assist Jenelle.

Consensus: CMER approved initiation of the site selection process.

- SAGE – Request for CMER guidance and/or strategies to proceed with the Eastern Washington Nomograph Project. Barreca said Ecology recommends tabling questions of nomograph development pending decisions regarding the utility of a nomograph. She also said Ecology could put data into their database if metadata and information about data quality and review are available. Black brought up concerns regarding landowner cooperation if the data goes into Ecology's database. Sturhan suggested capturing the data and putting it on the agency website for storage. Charles should provide data and information to Barreca. Work on the nomograph was tabled.

Consensus: Guidance was provided as noted above and the request was denied.

- SAGE – Request for those who live on the eastside to video conference in for CMER meetings or be reimbursed for travel. McCracken believes Tribes should be able to pay the \$200 to send representative to CMER. Pleus believes there is no cost on the NWIFC side to accommodate televideo conferencing; costs are on side calling in. NWIFC can take three inputs. Also, costs to attend meeting are much greater than \$200. McCracken noted that WSU was planning to have teleconferencing facilities in each county, which may encourage CMER participation by not only Kalispell representatives, but also other eastern Washington stakeholders. Fransen said Policy would have to agree that reimbursement of individuals would be appropriate.

Consensus: CMER approves allowing video-conference attendance of SAGE co-chairs and others at CMER meetings.

- **RSAG** – request for funding of silviculturalist through June 2006. This request is for approval of \$19,800 from the Project Development fund to pay McConnell to prepare a scoping paper for DFC Site Class Map validation. McCracken asked if CMER has compared the true costs of hiring a contractor versus hiring McConnell directly. Schuett-Hames said costs for internal hiring of McConnell, including indirect commission costs and benefits is approximately one half that of hiring a contractor. Fransen said Policy specifically directed hiring McConnell for this work through June, and wanted to re-evaluate the position in June. Martin said Policy also specified tasks that McConnell shall accomplish. CMER must assign tasks in priority order, as assigned by Policy (directly or indirectly). First priority is the FPA analysis (1-office, 2-field tasks, 3-report); second is Site scoping and third is Estimating variable width. Mendoza disagreed that Policy specified priorities. Martin notes that Policy may not have specified priorities, but CMER does understand requirements of those tasks and the priority that must occur to accomplish all specified tasks. Schuett-Hames has an implementation plan to accomplish Policy's DFC follow-up requirements. Martin thanked Schuett-Hames for that work. However, this schedule and plan are not incorporated into McConnell's contract proposal; nor does that proposal contain provisions for a report. Martin would like a schedule of products, including a report, and the schedule of deliverable completion by June 30, 2006. McFadden noted that time provisions need to be allowed in the schedule to obtain landowner permission for site access. Pucci said McConnell has allowed for that in his study design. Martin noted that some landowners will be resistant to this validation, because it seems like Compliance work.

Consensus: CMER approved the use of a new \$19,800 from the Project Development Fund for McConnell. Martin asked that RSAG provide a formal schedule of deliverables by the December CMER mtg.

- **SAGE:** Request for approval of Phase 1 – Eastside Type F Riparian Assessment Project Work Plan – Current Stand Conditions. Martin asked that site selection for the BTO portion, DFC/FPA, RipExt, and SAGE projects be compatible. Schuett-Hames noted that is not always feasible due to conflicting data needs. Martin asked that a subject of the February Study session be an RSAG description of all vegetation sampling site layouts & methods and why they differ.

Consensus: A discussion of riparian sampling protocols and potential for integration among projects will be scheduled for the February science session.

- **RSAG** – request for consideration of study plan for field analysis of FPAs. Schuett-Hames said these projects need to start prior to the next CMER meeting. Sturhan ask who has reviewed the study plan. McCracken was concerned with foresters planning layout and data collection, when those data will then be compared with data collected using a much more detailed methodology used by other scientists for validation. Pucci believes the analyses proposed will be appropriate for assessing how valid FPA data is for office analyses and the results

to be drawn for DFC model/analysis and for improving data collection methodology for model development purposes will be helpful. Pucci noted that we should decide now how these data should be used and what limitations CMER should apply. Sturhan noted that Policy will use data how they will. Pucci believes that CMER should still generate a clear statement of what CMER considers appropriate use. CMER should have this discussion before submitting report and at least have these recorded in minutes.

McFadden noted that all modelers will agree models are inaccurate; some are useful nonetheless. We are therefore testing an intermediate step, rather than the final outcome. Policy requests more “validation” to further clarify accuracies and where those inaccuracies are most influential. McCracken suggested elimination of the t-tests; answers will be trivial. Martin asked for a detailed explanation of why all these additional measurements are necessary, what they will tell us, and how they will be used. Schuett-Hames said one objective is to find out exactly how data were collected. Martin said a schedule of deliverables should allow for a report in advance of June 30 to allow time for CMER review.

Consensus: This project was approved with the recommended change of a schedule of deliverables.

SAG Issues

- **UPSAG:** Veldhuisen said a Geomorphologist replacement announcement is out and asked CMER to spread the word. Schuett-Hames said the public announcement was released and closes on December 9th. NWIFC hopes to have someone hired before Christmas.
 - **RSAG:** RSAG is still in need of a co-chair.
 - **RSAG:** Hayes said there will be a request for extension of the Hardwood Conversion Temperature field study at the next CMER meeting. Barreca asked if it was a delay or money extension. Hayes said it will be a request to add a year to the study for post-harvest monitoring.
 - **ISAG:** ISAG had hoped to complete the third year of work for the Eastern Washington Variability Study before the snow set in, but the snow came on the first day of field work.
-

CMER Monthly Report to Policy Black asked if the report could be segmented into two portions: 1) report from Policy early in the agenda and 2) what CMER asks Policy to do near the end of the agenda, as it is now. Most agreed that that would be useful.

What Policy has provided to CMER

- Policy still wants a Smitch type person, to come to CMER sometimes to help

provide funding expertise. Policy used Curt as an ambassador to the world about adaptive management. Pleus said CMER co-chairs should be able to serve as our ambassadors to/from Policy. Mendoza noted that Policy agreed the ideal facilitator is one that has no connection to any stakeholder. However, all were comfortable with Rowton as facilitator despite her WFPA connection.

- Policy also requested names and representation of all SAG members.
- CMER needs to bring a formal request to Policy to help fill SAG positions. Sturhan said she has created that list.

What CMER will be taking to Policy this month

- CMER needs the name of someone at DNR to use in the absence of McNaughton.
 - List of SAG Co-Chairs
 - FYI on projects
-

Next agenda, science topic

UPSAG to reveal Mass Wasting strategies

Other

- McNaughton said Ken Miller officially submitted a journal article to McNaughton on Adaptive Management process for review under the Board Manual. This must be addressed and a response framed for Policy using a coarse-level analysis recommending the appropriate course of action for the article.
-