

CMER
May 25, 2004
NWIFC Conference Center
Draft Minutes

Attendees

Barreca, Jeannette	Ecology
Clark, Jeffrey	Weyerhaeuser
Heide, Pete	WFPA
Hunter, Mark	WDFW
Jackson, Terry	WDFW
Johns, Marcus	DNR
MacCracken, Jim	Longview Fibre
Martin, Doug	Martin Environmental, CMER co-chair
McConnell, Steve	NWIFC
McDonald, Dennis	DNR
McFadden, George	NWIFC
McNaughton, Geoff	DNR, AMPA
Mendoza, Chris	ARC Consultants
Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Indian Nation
Pavel, Joseph	NWIFC
Pederson, Pete	UCUT
Pleus, Allen	NWIFC
Quinn, Tim	WDFW, CMER co-chair
Ray, Kris	Colville Confederated Tribes
Risenhoover, Ken	Port Blakely Tree Farms
Robinson, Tom	WSAC
Rowton, Heather	WFPA
Schroff, Eric	DNR
Schuett-Hames, Dave	NWIFC
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR

Decision/Task	Minutes Section
June CMER Meeting Moved to Ecology Training Room 2S-23.	Minutes
The compliance monitoring concept document and other information will be e-mailed to CMER.	Compliance Monitoring

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LWAG was asked to forward more information to help CMER prepare to consider the SAG requested related to Small Mammal Dissection for Reproductive Condition. CMER will consider the SAG request again in June • BTSAG was asked to explore other options for coordination and site layout for the Shade/Solar Stream Temperature study. BTSAG will also explore the potential to use CMER staff or DNR field foresters to help with the project. CMER will consider the SAG request again in June. 	<p>SAG Requests</p>
<p>The final 2005 workplan will be presented to CMER for adoption at the June meeting</p>	<p>CMER Workplan</p>
<p>CMER and SAGs will review the internal CMER Review procedures recommendation and will submit comments to Rowton by June 8th. The recommendation will be discussed in June.</p>	<p>CMER Review Procedures</p>
<p>CMER Will forward names of potential co-chairs and rank candidates for policy consideration. Institutes that put forth a candidate must agree to support the costs of the position. Nominations are being solicited and should be brought forward at the June meeting. Comments on the trial proposal are due to Pleus by June 8th and the recommendation will be considered for adoption at the June meeting.</p>	<p>CMER Co-chair Discussion</p>
<p>Staff (under Schuett-Hames management) will answer questions posed by Policy relating to the PIP studies. Staff will provide an outline for addressing some of the questions and the outline will be discussed at the June CMER Meeting. There was considerable discussion about how CMER should respond to the newly adopted CMER/Policy Interaction Framework document.</p>	<p>PIP Report</p>
<p>At the July CMER meeting, during the science session, CMER will be asked to prioritize intensive monitoring projects and refine the draft scope of the intensive monitoring effort. Schuett-Hames will forward the draft to CMER soon for consideration</p>	<p>Intensive Monitoring</p>

Minutes, Decisions/Tasks Review, General Updates

Minutes from the March and April CMER meetings were approved as amended.

Decisions and Tasks reviewed.

NEW LOCATION June CMER meeting: The June CMER meeting will be at the Department of Ecology in Training room 2S-23. Please carpool if you can and be sure to check-in with main reception area.

Compliance Monitoring Update: Schroff and Johns provided an update on Compliance monitoring for CMER. Johns said the project will become a program within DNR and will be ongoing. An internal working group of 5 DNR regional staff, one DNR division staff, one CMER staff and a federal assurances project representative have been working to build the compliance monitoring plan. The next step is for an external review team comprised of representatives from the stakeholder groups to review the plan.

A phased approach is being used; each compliance visit will focus on some aspect of the rules, rather than all aspects of the rules being monitored during all site visits. This strategy will help ensure that the survey results are credible and defensible. The Standard RMZ rules for type 1-3 streams will be monitored first. A primary assessment with stratification (east/west) will be conducted over the summer beginning in July; sample size is 100 approved FPAs (50 east and 50 west). These FPAs were approved July 2001 through June 2002. Since FPAs are good for two years, most of these harvests should be completed by now and will be good candidates for monitoring.

The protocols being used are those outlined in the rules and board manuals. Data analysis will be completed by division staff. Field work will be completed by existing DNR staff. Data collection forms will be used for this effort and these forms have been developed. The benefits of the initial assessment for DNR will be a better understanding of staffing logistical, budgetary and equipment needs. DNR must keep the scope focused and manageable.

Hunter asked if there would be a process for determining whether landowners are leaving larger no-cuts to avoid the complexity of the rules. Johns said DNR will look at what the landowners actually did in the area. Several people have indicated that tracking when landowners leave larger no-cut buffers than what is required by rule would be helpful. Hunter stressed the importance of determining whether landowners are using the options.

Heide asked whether the concept has been shared with anyone (i.e. field forms and concept drafts). Johns said he would distribute the concept drafts to CMER and other stakeholders.

Schroff said the target implementation date is July but the plan needs to be clear enough that work done this year will be able to be aggregated with work done in future years. If the protocol is not ready, then compliance monitoring will not initiate in July 2004.

Pavel asked whether DNR is looking at haul routes as well. Johns said this part of the phased in approach. Roads will be the second part of the phased compliance monitoring strategy. Pleus asked about the seasonal aspect of this monitoring (i.e. fire season). Schroff said that most of the work can be done year-round and will not be affected by seasonal difficulties.

Next steps: The preliminary assessment will be conducted beginning in July; the design will be completed in the fall; SRC review will commence; and a formal compliance

monitoring program will begin in 2005. A budget concept paper is also being developed for the legislature to consider this year.

SAG Requests

LWAG: Small Mammal Dissection for Reproductive Condition- RMZ Resample Study.

This request is for \$40,000 to complete necropsies on the small mammals captured during the RMZ resample study. Funds will pay for reproductive necropsies of an estimated 10,000 small mammals, data entry and summary reports. Quinn asked whether the results of the original study dissections have been documented. MacCracken indicated that Steve West does have the data and LGL can compare with that data. There were several thousand animals involved in the original study. The primary information being sought, in both the original and the resample effort, is reproductive rate which is an indicator of habitat quality. This is better related to habitat quality than the number of mammals alone. Pederson asked if there is literature on the relationship between reproductive rates and habitat. MacCracken said yes. Clark asked if this is a one time request; MacCracken indicated that it is.

Pleus said he has been asked if it was known that there would be add-ons for this study. The original proposal did not include a request for additional monies or an indication that those monies would be sought. MacCracken said there were many uncertainties and LWAG decided to wait to resolve some of them before making the request (i.e. freezer space, animal availability, and ability to analyze).

MacCracken clarified this is a request for new money and would be added to the RMZ line on the existing budget.

Quinn said he feels an ethical responsibility to dissect the animals, but the homework was not well done and West should provide some information. Heide reminded the group that this is a ground-breaking study and it is the first time riparian areas have been looked at for ability to support functions other than fish and water quality.

Pederson said the last time we discussed this project, CMER asked for a progress report from LWAG on how this relates to adaptive management. MacCracken said that a progress report was sent to CMER last fall.

A suggestion was made that the original study was directed by Policy and additional funding should be directed by Policy as well.

CMER Recommendation: LWAG will forward more information in preparation for the June meeting and will bring an amended request forward in June for CMER consideration. If the issue is still unresolved, the issue will be taken to policy for a decision.

Specific for LWAG to include is: verification that the original data can be obtained and what the cost will be; habitat and reproductive rate correlation to be illustrated using literature.

BTSAG – Eastside Riparian Prescription Effectiveness Monitoring for Shade/Solar and Stream Temperature – Add-On for RSAG and SAGE. This is a two part request. One piece needs to be initiated immediately and the other part is an update only and a request for action will be made at a later date. The second part has been discussed by CMER and involves a coordinated effort between SAGE, BTSAG and RSAG.

This project originally did not include site selection, coordination with landowners and site layout. Terrapan Environmental has done a great job of locating sites and the 40 needed sites will be obtained by the beginning of this field season in July 2004. The request for \$227,050 is for study coordination to keep this moving, including laying out the remaining sites. Half of the dollars are for site location and the remainder is for working with landowners to layout sites. Most landowners would not harvest to the letter of the prescription due to operational difficulties and economics, many would leave larger no-cut buffers. Thus, laying out sites consistent with the rules, and not overly protective, will require additional assistance. Consistent interpretation of the rules will also be necessary for these sites and Terrapan will help to ensure that this consistency occurs.

MacCracken asked if this request is only for this fiscal year. Jackson said this funding will cover the complete study for six years. The money would be reflected on the budget sheet on the existing bull trout temperature study line. Mobbs asked if the change in landowner cooperation has been an issue, as indicated in the request. Jackson said the false starts have been related to five sites dropping out due to either base flows being inadequate or landowners changing their minds. Mobbs asked if landowners dropping out later will influence the results of the study negatively or make the data unbelievable. Jackson said the study would be adequate even if some sites are lost.

Mendoza asked why half the budget of working with landowners throughout the study is being addressed by Terrapan. Jackson responded that the consistency of harvest unit layout is imperative to credible study results. Mendoza said laying out the site should be done in conjunction with the other work being done and should not cost this much.

Sturhan expressed concern over the growing budget for this program. Is there another way to get landowner cooperation, possibly through WFPA? Jackson said this has been tried but these research studies go above and beyond what landowners are planning to do in the units. McFadden said that contracting issues will need to be addressed; the contract has been sole-sourced and added to numerous times. BTSAG should also explore the availability of CMER Staff to assist with layout.

CMER recommendation: BTSAG was asked to explore other options for coordination and site layout. An audit of the cost over-runs and a history of the contract were also

requested. Exploring the potential to use CMER staff or DNR field foresters is recommended.

The second part of this proposal will have an accompanying study design and will be considered in June.

Budget Update: McNaughton said that the budget has been updated and there are no major changes. Some of the projects were designated as policy question marks and the mark has now been changed to Q. The Q signifies that policy guidance is needed. MacCracken indicated that line 20 should have an E; the budget will be changed to reflect this.

Work Plan Progress Update: Schuett-Hames said that the CMER workplan 2005 was discussed at the last meeting. A list of past CMER projects that have been completed was to be added and obvious holes were to be filled. The 2006 version will contain a better discussion of strategy and organization. Schuett-Hames said he did not receive responses from any SAG on requests for changes (ISAG did submit comments yesterday). McNaughton provided a list of products that have come through from DNR contracts. That list will be incorporated by reference as an appendix to the document.

Martin asked whether the list of completed documents would coincide with website postings. Schuett-Hames said not necessarily; in some cases the SAG will need to be contacted for information. McFadden said the purpose of the workplan is to outline upcoming work and CMER should consider whether the workplan should also be a depository for historical information. McNaughton said demonstrating success is important for policy-makers but the historical documents do not necessarily need to be part of the workplan. Schuett-Hames indicated that some of these past works would be covered in the program information as many studies are leading toward other studies.

Martin asked whether we want to include this information or not. If not, there would be a list of work products from CMER posted somewhere on a website (historical in nature). One solution is that, because there are intermediate products, we should state that on the workplan and suggest that interested parties contact the SAG involved. Sturhan said that, in the historic CMER workplans, there was a status report indicating what has been completed and what has not been completed for each program. As you are then seeking additional money, people can see what you have been doing. Additional discussion of how to address completed CMER work will be needed.

The final workplan will be presented and adopted at the June CMER meeting.

CMER Review Procedures: at the April CMER meeting, a recommendation was made to form a workgroup that would draft a recommendation for internal CMER review procedures. That recommendation was completed and sent to CMER in preparation for

the May meeting. A summary of the recommendation was provided by Rowton. For a full copy of the draft recommendation, contact Rowton.

Mobbs asked how many CMER documents will be produced in a year. There are seventeen ongoing contracts at this time; which could generate about 10 publications each year that require review. This could be a substantial workload for CMER. Questions were also raised regarding how this recommendation would be applied to study designs and literature reviews, etc. Pavel said that this process was designed to get at the neglect of CMER review that has occurred in the past. Pleus said that this process is designed to get at the minimum amount of information that CMER should see before approving a document (see technical review report guidelines). Clark said that UPSAG would like to defer the request to the next meeting so that SAGs can consider the implications of this recommendation.

CMER Recommendation: CMER and SAGs will review the recommendation and it will be placed on the agenda for the June CMER meeting. Comments are to be directed to Rowton and are due by June 8, 2004. A revised recommendation will be forwarded to CMER one week in advance of the June meeting.

CMER Co-chair Appointment Discussion: Pleus said, that in the interest of trying to keep CMER co-chair appointment within CMER, the Tribes have proposed a process for appointing CMER co-chairs. This process outlines the steps from CMER to Policy to the FPB and contains information about the basic skill sets that a CMER co-chair should possess. One question raised in the proposal is whether the co-chairs need to be from different stakeholder groups. For a full copy of the recommendation, contact Allen Pleus.

Hunter indicated that the process would take too long and should be a fall back position. Pavel stressed the importance of keeping this within CMER. Robinson asked if CMER should be appointing leadership without the influence of Policy and agreed that CMER needs to be involved in the process for co-chair nominations, but the nominations must also be supported by Policy.

Heide expressed the following concerns: 1) to build the integrity of CMER, good scientists need to be the leaders of the process and there are no required scientific skill sets noted in the document; and 2) the people who attend CMER meetings are paid by someone to be here; and are therefore, not entirely volunteer, thus, volunteer motivation may not be a necessary component of the recommendation presented. McConnell said that he is concerned about the volunteer reference as well and suggested helping to compensate the agencies that put forth a candidate with extra funding. McNaughton said Ecology and WDFW both get money for implementation. Additional discussion occurred resulting in the consensus statement recorded below.

CMER Consensus: CMER will forward names and rank the candidates for policy consideration. Scientific expertise and management expertise are necessary for the person who fills the position. The institute that puts forth a candidate needs to support the costs

of the position. Nominations are now being solicited and should be brought forward at the June meeting. The tribal proposal will be revised to reflect the discussion at CMER, and will be used as an advisory supporting the argument for at least 50% time allocated for CMER co-chairs. Comments on the tribal proposal are due to Pleus by two June 8th and the recommendation will be considered for adoption at the June meeting.

In the interest of time, Agenda item 11 was moved to the June CMER meeting. The science topic for June is the SAGE workplan.

CMER Monthly Report to Policy: Policy requested a monthly report from CMER on current issues. This is an opportunity for CMER to bring items of concern before Policy. What CMER needs to decide, is what to present to FFR Policy on June 8th: Topics suggested by CMER include:

- DFC study update
- ISAG fish passage research direction. Policy should be informed of the issues in June and asked for a decision in July.
- Bull trout study – express difficulties with site layout.
- Basic information about numeric standards studies.
- The budget items that are significant should be explained to Policy.

Any items that will require decision should be accompanied by a whitepaper. The proposal is to prepare them for decision-making. One meeting would be a presentation of information, the next meeting Policy would be asked for a decision. Martin and Quinn will prepare for the June 8th Policy meeting based on the guidance above.

PIP Report: Martin reported that Policy has directed McNaughton to send the PIP report to peer review along with the Tribal report with each report receiving a separate review. McNaughton will prepare a cover letter to accompany the reports. The introduction and background in the report itself provides the appropriate context and background for reviewers. McConnell said that statistical questions have been raised in the report and CMER may want to consider adding those questions to the letter. Quinn said this can be addressed by ensuring that a statistician is included in the review panel. The same review panel will be used for both studies. Pederson said it should be noted that the 2002 tribal study was basically an eastside supplement to the original study. Heide suggested that the SRC review the CMER report first because the tribal study indicates that it followed the CMER study.

In a cover letter, McNaughton will indicate the two studies should be reviewed independently and the CMER report should be reviewed first and will suggest that a hydrologist and statistician be on the review team.

A Framework for Successful Policy/CMER Interaction was distributed to the group (for a copy of the framework document, contact Rowton). This framework was adopted by FFR Policy on May 5, 2004. CMER has talked about what types of information should be in documents to facilitate interaction between CMER and Policy. Policy is asking CMER to address certain questions for each study presented to them. PIPs and DFC will have these questions answered after completion of the studies and others can address these questions up front. Numeric target studies should be first: roads, PIPs, and DFC. There are six questions that CMER should answer for each study

Four of the six questions are very easy to answer. Questions five and six are more difficult. CMER needs to figure out how best to answer these questions in a timely manner. PIPs must be answered within the next three months. CMER can begin trying to answer these now.

Questions one and two are self explanatory.

Question three gets at whether the CMER process was followed for the study. There was discussion about whether this question was truly a yes or no question that does not need additional explanation. A one sentence explanation of how the protocols were followed may accompany the answer.

Question four asks what the study does and does not tell us. Quinn said this question gets at what the study informs (resource effects, numeric standards, etc.). The PIP study informs us about a rule tool associated with a numeric target but does not inform us about resource effects. MacCracken said the study was not designed to answer numeric standard question fully.

Question five gets at the relationship between the study and other studies that may be planned, underway or recently completed. The response to this question will need to address resource effects and uncertainty. Therefore, answers may vary and in some cases may be a matter of professional opinion. CMER should resist the temptation to break these questions down and redefine every term.

Question six is the most difficult for CMER to answer. The question Policy is asking is what else is in the works and what are the resource effects. What do we know about these resource effects and who else is doing studies to inform the issue. This question is designed to get at a broad range of issues. Policy is asking CMER to work through the philosophy of how we got here and what the rule is designed to protect.

Possible processes to use in answering the questions:

- Science forum to answer questions
- Have each caucus answer them on their own; append the range of opinions
- Have each caucus answer them on their own and then have the opinions summarized by an editor into an easy to read document for policy consideration
- Have each SAG answer the questions and give them guidance on how to deal with dissenting opinions

Heide supported the caucus approach with an editor. Hunter opposed the caucus approach as it does not force CMER to work out differences of opinion. Schuett-Hames said that there may be a perception problem with the outside world if CMER is not forced to work toward consensus. Quinn said that the responses CMER will come up with will be in part science and in part risk tolerance.

CMER Consensus: Staff (under Schuett-Hames management) will answer questions 1-4 for the PIP studies and will provide an outline for questions 5 and 6. Tasks will then be assigned to the appropriate groups to answer portions of these questions. The Schuett-Hames draft will be distributed one week before the next CMER meeting. The document will then be revised and assignments made.

Quinn suggested that in the future, these questions should be addressed, to the extent possible, in the study designs for projects and by SAGs. There was general agreement on this approach.

Intensive Monitoring: a draft CMER Intensive Monitoring Scoping Paper was distributed and outlined by Schuett-Hames in an overhead presentation. Text of the overhead slides follows.

Intensive Watershed Scale Monitoring Presentation

Slide 1: Three types of opportunities for CMER to consider:

1. cumulative effects of forest practices
2. performance target validation
3. data rich setting to conduct focused various cause-effect research projects.

Slide 2: Cumulative Effects of Forest Practices

Forest Practices →	Inputs/Stressor →	Physical Effects →	Biological Effects
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Riparian management • Road construction • Road maintenance • Timber harvest • Site preparation • Planting • Fertilization • Pest control 	<p>Inputs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sediment • Water • Woody debris • Organic matter • Solar radiation • Chemicals <p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blockages 	<p>Channel features</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LWD/jams • Pools • Substrate • Form <p>Habitat</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spawning • Rearing • Refuge <p>Water quantity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stream flow 	<p>Food chain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Algae • Periphyton • Invertebrates <p>Fish populations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growth • Density <p>Amphibian populations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growth • Density

		Water quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temperature • Nutrients • Pollutants 	
--	--	--	--

Slide 3: Performance Target Validation

Forest Practices	←Input Targets→	←In-channel Targets→	←Biological Effects→
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Riparian management • Road construction • Road maintenance • Timber harvest • Site preparation • Planting • Fertilization • Pest control 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MW sediment • Road sediment • Water • Woody debris • Organic matter • Shade 	Channel habitat <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LWD • Pool frequency • Pool depth • Substrate fines • Substrate scour Water quality standards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temperature • Nutrients • Pollutants 	Food chain <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Algae • Periphyton • Invertebrates Fish populations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growth • Density Amphibian populations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growth • density

Slide 4: Forest Research on Cause-Effect and Biological Response

- Road sediment and fish amphibian response
- Downstream WQ and fish effects of Type N management (wood sediment nutrient export)
- Effect of removal of fish passage blockages on fish distribution and populations
- Fish response to eastside disturbance
- Biological response to changes in wood recruitment

Slide 5: Next steps

1. CMER
 - Review
 - Discuss
 - Prioritize
2. CMER
 - Prioritization
 - Discussions with potential collaborators OR
 - Study plan(s) development (SAG or workgroup)

3. CMER approval
4. SRC Review
5. Insert 2006 budget and CMER workplan.

Discussion

McNaughton said that the NW Power Planning and Conservation Council is looking for collaborators for their intensive monitoring efforts. If CMER could share this early draft with that group now, it would be helpful. There was general support for distribution of the Draft scoping paper; McNaughton will note that it is an early draft and efforts are underway to refine the draft over the summer.

Martin suggested that we continue discussions on this next month. CMER members need to review the document and be prepared to refine the draft and prioritize projects at the July CMER science session. Schuett-Hames will send a cover letter and the draft scoping report to CMER for consideration and discussion in July. There is existing CMER money to fund this effort, though the scoped project may cost more.