

CMER
April 26, 2005
NWIFC
Lacey, WA
Minutes

Attendees

Barreca, Jeannette	Ecology
Black, Jeannelle	NWIFC, CMER Staff
Butts, Sally	USFWS, BTSAG co-chair
Ehinger, Bill	Ecology
Fransen, Brian	Weyerhaeuser, ISAG co-chair
Heide, Pete	WFPA
Hofmann, Lynda	WDFW, SAGE co-chair
Knutzen, John	Tetra-Tech FW
MacCracken, Jim	Longview Fibre, LWAG co-chair
Martin, Doug	Martin Environmental, CMER co-chair
McConnell, Steve	NWIFC
McDonald, Dennis	DNR, Watertyping Project Manager
McNaughton, Geoff	DNR, AMPA
Mendoza, Chris	ARC Consultants
Palmquist, Bob	NWIFC, CMER Staff
Peterson, Pete	Upper Columbia United Tribes
Pleus, Allen	NWIFC
Pucci, Dawn	Suquamish Tribe, WETSAG co-chair
Ray, Kris	Colville Confederated Tribes, SAGE co-chair
Raymond, Patrick	ORM
Robinson, Tom	WSAC
Rowton, Heather	WFPA, CMER coordinator
Schuett-Hames, Dave	NWIFC, CMER staff
Stringer, Angela	Campbell Group
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR, CMER co-chair
Vaugeois, Laura	DNR, Landslide Hazard Zonation Project Manager

Incorporate grammatical changes from Barreca to the March minutes

Minutes, Decisions/Tasks Review, General Updates:

- The ISAG Extensive Fish Passage Study will be discussed under SAG issues.
- Jeannelle Black has been hired as CMER Staff and will be focusing on project management. She was welcomed by the group.

- McDonald asked who the CMER staff is. Schuett-Hames said they are: Dave Schuett-Hames, Jeannelle Black, Ash Roorbach and Bob Palmquist.

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

Decisions and Tasks from April were reviewed as follows:

- Disclaimers will not be discussed at this CMER meeting as agreed at the April CMER meeting. The co-chairs and McNaughton will get a draft whitepaper for CMER review ready for discussion at the May meeting. Mendoza asked for assurance that the Disclaimer discussion would occur in May.
- The UPSAG project management request was tabled pending work from the FFR Policy Project Management sub-group.
- The Extensive Fish Passage Monitoring Methodology and Preferred Study Design was remanded back to ISAG.
- The workplan will be discussed this afternoon. Policy is planning a mid-May or mid-June two-day retreat to discuss CMER budget issues.

SRC Update: McNaughton said that review of the Type N Experimental Buffer study is going well. The review of SAGE's Literature Review of Eastern Washington Disturbance Regimes was received by McNaughton yesterday.

Budget Update: McNaughton said the budget discussion will be held this afternoon. In a broader view, the Senate and House passed a \$2.3 million budget for FFR Implementation.

CMER Conference Debrief: Martin said the CMER conference went very well. There were about 118 people from various agencies, organizations and geographic areas attending in the conference. DNR was thanked for providing coffee for the meeting.

SAG Requests:

- SAGE: Ray asked that CMER review the Eastern Washington Nomograph Project. SAGE is requesting reviewers with statistical expertise to look for overall quality and statistical accuracy, and review of the document to determine whether it needs minor edits, major edits or a complete re-write. SAGE reviewers found that some of the graphs and equations do not match. Some of the numbers in the appendices don't match the report but overall the document is very well-written. McConnell asked there was a way to partition the work. Ray said there really is not. Pleus said the review of the statistics was completed already by NWIFC staff; this is one CMER review of the document. Bill Ehinger will review the report and Sally Butts will designate someone to review the report. The review time will be extended to July 12th and an update will

be provided to CMER at the July meeting. Ray said that further SAGE work will be based on what the CMER reviewers say. Sturhan said this is a report where the contract is over and SAGE will be making the edits themselves. Martin clarified that this review is open to anyone. The project manager is Charles Chesney.

Consensus: This report will be reviewed by Bill Ehinger and a designee from Sally Butts and SAGE will report back in July.

- **ISAG:** McDonald requested that the Water Typing Model Field Performance Assessment: Pilot Study be approved by CMER and published as a final CMER study. At this point, it has been reviewed extensively by two CMER members and two ISAG members. ISAG has reached consensus that it should be considered a final CMER document. McDonald clarified that this document is not being recommended for Peer Review because it is a pilot study. Mendoza said he missed the last ISAG meeting and was not there for the consensus and he still has concerns with the document, and he is not prepared to move it forward at this time. Martin said there needs to be a closure on this document. CMER agreed this would not go to SRC because it is a pilot study; ISAG has reviewed and revised it and has consented to approve it as a final document. At the end of this process, CMER generally accepts the study after deciding whether it meets CMER's needs. Pleus said that this is a ground rules issue; if someone does not attend a SAG meeting and there is an action taken, are they forfeiting their ability to bring this forward later. Rowton said that CMER policy has been that if a core CMER member misses a meeting, the policy decisions made in their absence stand. Mendoza said this is the only ISAG meeting he has missed; the changes have taken much time and changes have not been made consistently. The last version removes many things he believes are important. Pleus said the process was followed; ISAG reached consensus. Pleus said at this point we should look at it as a CMER issue unless ISAG agrees to table it again. There was no consensus that this document should be approved as final. Martin requested that Mendoza write up his concerns and send them to CMER. Mendoza's concerns involve the "disclaimer" issue that CMER has tabled. Pleus said this is a non-consensus issue and we may need to identify a dispute resolution process. Martin said we have called special meetings in the past to resolve these issues. Smitch asked who it will inform after CMER approves it. He added that when there are CMER studies that FFR Policy is interested in, and CMER cannot reach consensus the issues are generally forwarded to Policy. McDonald said this study has provided some information about how the formal assessment will take place. Heide said that the study was developed to help ISAG develop a study plan for the formal model performance assessment. That study plan has been completed and gone through SRC review. ISAG was ready to initiate the full blown study and it is interesting that the pilot study has already been used and is now not being approved. If there is a continuing dispute on the results of the pilot, it may have some impact on the other items that have been completed based on this pilot.

Consensus: A special CMER meeting will be scheduled to resolve this issue. Participants will include: Mendoza, McNaughton, Sturhan, Fransen, McDonald, Martin, Jackson, Stevie and Pleus. This group will discuss Mendoza's concerns and attempt to reach consensus.

Pleus suggested that in the future, we need to keep in mind there are people that

regularly attend SAG meetings and SAGs generally know the issues that person will have with the items on the agenda. If a regular attendee is unable to attend a meeting, the attendee should let the SAG co-chairs know their concerns and request the action item be tabled. When an action item does come up that was not on the agenda, the missing person should be approached. McNaughton asked if all SAGs have their meetings planned for the year; most SAGs do have regular meetings but not always. Smitch said that the CMER co-chairs need to resolve whether this is a technical or process issue because it is holding up the process and hindering collaboration and you can sense the frustration in this room. Feedback should be provided to CMER and Pleus if process issues are resolved as a result of this meeting. Martin said there are really two process issues; one is what happens when people miss a meeting and the other is how is the loop closed. Pucci asked if there are some studies in CMER that will just die because we can never reach agreement. Mendoza said he hopes this does not happen in all SAGs and he agrees that people should keep in touch with members; the ISAG agenda did not state there would be a decision made, but rather that ISAG would simply review comments to the Report. Mendoza said that if he knew a decision was going to be made to request CMER to finalize the report, he would have attended the meeting or at least contacted ISAG. Palmquist said that a minority report would also be helpful. Schuett-Hames said that, going back to the PSM, we are operating on a trial run with this manual and we are attempting to capture things that should be changed based on use. He has heard three of four suggestions already this morning. **Items for PSM group:** Agendas for SAGs, review loop and where you break out of it, and what should SAGs do when a member does not attend a SAG meeting. Smitch there is nothing wrong with disagreements in CMER, and minority reports are a good potential solution. If there is a CMER member on a SAG who disagrees, then you definitely will not have consensus at CMER. Rowton said that if the pilot study cannot be agreed to, it may hold up the full Performance Assessment of the Watertyping Model which will concern Policy.

- **UPSAG:** Palmquist said that UPSAG submitted the Roads Sub-Basin Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Design for approval. The statistics, purpose, etc. are the same but what is being reported on has been expanded. If CMER feels this does not merit full review, the design should be approved and the project continues to move forward. Martin said CMER does not necessarily designate reviewers after the report has gone through CMER and SRC review already. CMER has not recommended any further review at this time. Mendoza asked how many people actually read it. Pleus said that, to Mendoza's point, the process was designed so that not everyone at CMER needs to read every document; that is why we designate CMER reviewers. Martin said the designated reviewers are for the formal review and action plans based on this review are approved by CMER. CMER did approve the action plan for this study. After the action plan is approved, CMER takes no further action. Mendoza said that having gone through several of these action plans, that is the time CMER should provide additional review of documents responding to SRC reviews. Pleus suggested that if the CMER review process is unclear in the manual, people write up their concerns and suggest solutions in the manual.

Consensus: CMER approved this monitoring design.

- **UPSAG:** Palmquist said that, based on the study design, an implementation plan for the Roads Sub-Basin Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Design has been developed. UPSAG does not need to submit an implementation plan for CMER approval but decided to so people could see how they are moving forward with the study. Martin said that Palmquist is right, CMER generally does not require approval of implementation plans. Robinson said making them available for review is fine, but asking for approval increases the bureaucracy too much. Pucci said that if a SAG is requesting review and approval, CMER should be willing. Palmquist said it was discussed extensively within the SAG and some outside the SAG said it was politically important for CMER review. McNaughton said maybe implementation plans should be reviewed by McNaughton, the legal managers and the project manager. Robinson said that would allow the opportunity for people to make comments about their concerns to McNaughton. Pleus clarified the PSM does not require approval of the implementation plan but does allow SAGs to bring them forward if they see a need. Palmquist said is a large project involving a lot of money. Pleus said that UPSAG asked early on whether the implementation plan should be submitted. Pleus said it was up to UPSAG; triggers for importance include whether the implementation plan differs from the study plan and whether someone indicates they are interested in seeing the implementation plan. Palmquist said there is no change from the study plan. They have expanded the QA/QC to ensure the data is high quality. Martin said that based on what he heard, this should be an FYI for CMER not an action item.

Conclusion: UPSAG withdrew their request for approval of the implementation plan and instead are providing the implementation plan as an FYI.

- **RSAG:** McConnell requested CMER approval to send the Draft Study Plan for Extensive Riparian Status and Trend Monitoring Program Version 2 to SRC for review. He said this draft plan has been circulated to CMER for review. Changes have been made and summarized. The document has been revised based on reviewer comments. Mendoza said he stated a concern with the use of the watertyping system for site selection. Because that GIS layer has not been tested for performance, relying on it for accurate watertyping could affect the sample. One of the things ISAG has agreed to was that they would use field verified sites only. Ehinger said that RSAG will field-verify the accuracy of the watertyping for each site.

Consensus: CMER approved moving this study plan forward for SRC review with the amendment that sites will be field verified.

Website Postings: Rowton said that CMER agreed early on that SAG minutes would not be posted on the CMER website because it is difficult to follow them if you are not involved in the SAGs and because the minutes generally reflect works in progress. Pleus asked why UPSAG wants to post their minutes. Vaugeois said that UPSAG has been questioned on decisions made by people outside the SAG. She did say she understands the concerns that Rowton brought up. Pleus said when there are action requests, the SAG

should state what they have already done and actions they have already taken. There is a sample tracking form in the manual. McNaughton said he would be concerned with posting because it would result in the need for standards being necessary for those minutes. Robinson said the work is generally underway and minutes would not help the general public very much. Mendoza said it is important to make a distinction between the draft and final minutes. Final minutes should be kept for the public record. Vaugeois said it sounds like there are not always official minutes of SAG meetings. UPSAG may be unique in that they send their minutes through an approval process. **Potential Item for PSM:** standards for SAG minutes.

Unfinished Projects and Documents Residing in SAGs: McNaughton acknowledged the good work Sturhan has done in this regard when she was co-chair of UPSAG. There is a danger in having unfinished documents residing in SAGs. CMER needs to decide what to do with these types of documents. Robinson suggested filing them as data. Sturhan said that many SAGs have lingering documents that have not been completed formally and have already been used. CMER did produce these products and they should try to finalize these documents and post them on the website, or determine of some other fate is more appropriate. McNaughton said Sturhan developed a table listing the documents that UPSAG had outstanding as an aid in keeping completion on track. There are some that would be easy to complete but some would take a lot of effort to complete. We have not agreed on how to handle those documents. Sturhan then asked if CMER would like to come up with a formal process to handle these or just ask SAGs to go through their files and see what they have that can be completed. Butts said BTSAG has a couple of these reports in the grey area. When they become an official CMER document, that indicates that CMER supports the science and will stand behind it. If there are products from SAGs that are not totally complete and agreed to, it would be misleading to have them as official CMER documents. Sturhan said UPSAG had one of those documents and gave it to McNaughton to keep in the files with an explanation as to why it was not completed. Butts asked if it is better to have a separate filing system for these reports. Stringer said that, as someone who is still searching for a dataset due to a recurring purge process that DNR uses, she would strongly suggest that CMER ensure that a process is developed to ensure that documents are not lost. Robinson said he agrees with that but you also have to consider this from the SAGs perspective and if it does not hold significant future value, the SAG should report that and stop the process there. Robinson said that every document in this process is public information and needs to be kept. Sturhan said there are about twelve of these projects. Pucci said they have workshop proceedings from a workshop a few years ago; does that need to go through CMER approval? Martin said it should be a SAG request. McDonald said that ISAG has one report in this category and he is afraid to bring it to this group. McDonald said that ISAG has brought forward documents to this group and contracts have been closed and there is no one to finish them.

Assignment: SAGs will work with Sturhan on these documents and she will bring forward a proposal about how to handle them. SAGs are to identify these documents before the next CMER meeting. **PSM:** if a formal process results from this, it will be documented in the PSM.

Governor's Monitoring Forum Workshop: McNaughton said that he and Martin attended the Status and Trends workshop hosted by the Governor's Monitoring Forum. The Forum formulated a recommendation to the SRF Board for funding and it was funded at a modest level. There is a State of the Salmon Report that is generated on a regular basis to convey to legislators at the state and congressional level what recovery money is going for. If there is money put into status and trend monitoring, it will not serve the State of the Salmon Report well because results are not immediate. Status and trend monitoring is designed to approach things at a basin-scale and over the long term. Martin said both he and McNaughton suggested breaking the report into land classifications and the Forum was supportive. CMER has been getting e-mails about how to better integrate with the IAC on status and trends monitoring. However, CMER is far ahead of IAC on this. The Forum is seeking to have our information incorporated into the salmon report. The Forum does want to generate a data center and CMER may be able to get data stored there. The Forum would like CMER's cooperation and for CMER to contribute data. Ehinger said that even if they do have a database to house this information, CMER may want to consider housing their own data on their own website that would provide draft, interim and final reports.

Protocols and Standards Manual Workgroup Report: Pleus said the PSM group met in April and drafted a proposal for CMER consideration. This is not a CMER action item and is simply to provide information and seek input from CMER. The group discussed that CMER needs a data management system. The PSM is considering forming a data management workgroup to develop specific information for consideration. There are four principles of data management that Glenn Canyon uses. They are integrity, commonality, accessibility, and longevity. These are the four principles the group is using to develop a data management system. At this point, the group is asking that CMER provide feedback to Pleus if they have comments. The PSM is also seeking volunteers to serve on the workgroup. Robinson asked if there is a host for the data system. Pleus said no. Robinson said the technology people of the host need to be involved from the beginning. McNaughton said it may be that the host becomes the Governor's Monitoring Forum. Sturhan said the CMER data management group is also looking at short term data management to track information and data CMER has generated. This will make it easier to locate the material once a home is found for it, and to keep it available until that time. Robinson said going as far as defining what you want the host to do is fine, but involve them when you start designing protocols. McNaughton said if this is contracted out, the data is in contract files. Smitch said Pleus's group should meet with the Governor's resource cabinet and get an update on where the monitoring and evaluation committee is with this. Where this is set up is critical and the infrastructure, management and budget issues are what generally circumvent these efforts. Smitch said the group he worked with concluded that no single state agency should house all the data because of turf battles. The criminal justice system uses an independent data manager. CMER may want to consider staying on their own path and develop their own budget and protocol. The Department of Information Services may be the place to house this data. Due to software

integration it is easier to crosswalk data now than it was in the past. Portals will continue to get more efficient over time. MacCracken said this is developing into a big industry now and that should be checked into. Hayes, Palmquist, McNaughton, Nasland, and Barreca will participate. Smitch added that linking the state and federal data is important (USFWS, NMFS, USFS, BLM). A federal person will also be necessary. ONRC also operates a metadatabase.

SAG Issues

- Intensive Monitoring – Discussion of January Memo – Ehinger said that in January, an Intensive Monitoring whitepaper was drafted that describes opportunities for collaboration and explains what the group is working on. The three basins in the Straits are comprised of trees that are about 25 years old. Hood canal has some forestland but also has residential development occurring so it may not be a good candidate. The Lower Columbia seems like one of the best basins to use. Martin asked when a proposal would be coming forward. CMER has identified some large items that are in need of intensive monitoring and would like feedback. Ehinger said it is likely that a proposal could be brought at the end of the summer. Martin said that from the CMER perspective, a few people should work with Ehinger to flesh the study design out. Ehinger said he could pull together the DNR data and other data and then begin drafting a study design. Schuett-Hames said CMER's questions were primarily related to sediment and LWD input. Expertise in these two areas will be important to the group. Those who agreed to participate in the group include Palmquist, Stringer, McConnell (after he receives permission) and Martin. UPSAG may also send a representative.
- Landslide Hazard Zonation Report Update – Vaugeois said that UPSAG sent a status report on the Landslide Hazard Zonation project to CMER as a courtesy. The report is to fulfill an obligation that at the end of the biennium UPSAG would summarize accomplishments over the biennium. UPSAG agreed it would be imprudent not to notify CMER that the report is going forward. McNaughton has been asked to submit this to Policy. McNaughton added that Policy approved this project with the interim checkpoint built into the approval. This status report is a proof of concept and shows that the project can be completed. Heide said this is more than a biennium report because the project was only funded for the first two years. Policy will make a decision for further funding for the project based partially on this report. CMER representatives should review it and talk with their Policy folks about it. Pleus said that this may be a SAG request and CMER needs to weigh in on whether this project should continue. Pleus asked how this report fits with the CMER prioritization. Vaugeois said CMER approved the project and Policy asked for the status report because of the amount of funding involved. Pucci said that she remembered CMER approving the project but asked CMER to determine whether continuing with the project was necessary. Pleus said he is hearing CMER questioning whether this is a viable screening tool and asking for a report. Vaugeois said it was a Policy decision to put this money under the CMER umbrella and CMER was assigned to provide technical and scientific oversight. Martin said CMER has not seen or heard any

technical review comment about this project; it has been run solely through UPSAG. Thus, CMER will not be able to say they had any input into this project. Vaugeois said that this project was approved at a very early stage in CMER and a Technical Advisory Group (TAG) was formed to oversee it. That TAG has been overseeing it ever since. Their recommendations speak as the CMER voice on this. Her understanding has been that if this project passes muster with the TAG, then it is fine. Martin said CMER cannot say whether this project is meeting technical muster or not. Heide said that project continuance will be based on new money. Funding was for \$800,000 and more funding will need to be approved by FFR Policy. It is now contained within the CMER process. Pleus said that he appreciates UPSAG bringing this forward. Policy will ask CMER what they think about this process. Pleus said that if this is a CMER document, then CMER review is necessary. Smitch said CMER should expect that Policy will ask CMER's opinion of the study. If some caucus says they never saw this and is concerned, that may influence the Policy discussions. Black said that a larger issue may be that Policy assumes this has CMER approval when that is not the case.

McNaughton said this is an inventory using standard methodology. Vaugeois has presented this information to CMER on many occasions, there is data on a website, and she presented information at the CMER conference. Mendoza said he agrees with Vaugeois, CMER knows a lot about this project and has heard about it many times. Whether that serves the role of providing official consensus is a different question. McDonald said this is not about the technical merit, it is about the funding. Robinson said UPSAG is only asking whether there is a reason to stop this project. Martin said that CMER's responsibility is unclear and CMER should ask Policy what they want expect. Sturhan asked if the report could move forward to Policy and Policy can then let CMER know what they want from CMER. Robinson said CMER has no responsibility in this; CMER has already agreed that this is a good way to do this work. The only reason Policy would ask anything from CMER is because they do not remember this history. Smitch said CMER will be asked about whether CMER supports further funding for this effort. Sturhan said this will be part of the CMER budget discussion. CMER approved this two years ago when the management proposal was reviewed.

- Extensive Fish Passage Research – McDonald said there have been a number of e-mails going around in ISAG about this issue. ISAG made a request at the last CMER meeting that the Extensive Fish Passage Study move forward for SRC review. At the last CMER meeting, CMER asked ISAG to review the study before it proceeded for SRC review. While that review was in process, additional issues were raised. There were comments made about not including small forest landowners in the study design. Another SAG has an approach to incorporate small forest landowners and ISAG has agreed to table this until they have an understanding of that approach. That triggered some questions that ISAG believes Policy should consider. This is an FYI and discussion with staff and Policy have resulted in an agreement that the CMER co-chairs should present these questions to CMER. McDonald is in the process of going back through the minutes to find out where this study originated. Sturhan said she

thinks the scoping process on this study was skipped and SAGs should not do that in the future. Mendoza said he believes the project was scoped extensively, and a determination was made that large landowners would require a different study than small landowners. Schuett-Hames said that extensive fish passage monitoring was covered in the monitoring design team process and there was a draft prepared by Rodger Peters. There was also a document that McFadden worked on scoping options for the study design. Mendoza said he is unclear about why this needs to go to Policy. Martin said if small landowners are separated out, it doubles the cost of the study and results in implementation differences.

Mendoza said that each project goes through the limiting factors analysis and not everyone goes to Policy for decision-making. Martin said it is clear that ISAG is requesting that the CMER co-chairs ask Policy these questions. Pleus said this becomes a question of whether this is a Technical or Policy issue. Martin said the technical pros and cons need to be figured out. Barreca said that Policy will have a budget decision to make on this. The disagreement in ISAG is whether the study should proceed without small landowners. Mendoza said he disagrees; ISAG approved this for SRC review and agreed that small landowners will be studied under a different study. The ISAG agenda also did not state that any decisions about going to Policy would be made. Pleus is not hearing that ISAG has consensus on the technical issues. Martin said the trend will be impacted if the larges and smalls are combined because they are operating under different rules. McDonald said that he would rather CMER not take these questions to Policy. He would like to do further homework first; CMER is now questioning the original statement of whether we even want trend monitoring. A scoping paper is needed. Pucci suggested that we discuss this at the next afternoon CMER meeting. Heide said this study was to confirm that fish passage is being improved. The small landowner fish passage program appears to be very successful. Heide said we have anecdotal information about this but no statistical information. He is disappointed that progress is not being made on projects that would show good information. Fransen said there will not be consensus in ISAG about this. Martin agreed with Pucci that this should be the afternoon session of the next CMER meeting.

- LWAG: The Type N Experimental study is not listed as an urgent study on the CMER budget sheet and there is significant concern because people are already working on this study.

CMER Monthly Report to Policy: Martin said that Policy committed to a budget retreat in mid-May or mid-June and Rowton was assigned the role of FFR Policy Coordinator. At the next Policy meeting, Policy will be updated with the following information:

- Standard Updates
 - Fish passage effectiveness guidance questions
 - Presentation of the Road program for approval
-

Science Topic: ISAG Extensive Fish Passage Study; discussion of the technical and Policy questions. Smitch suggested that CMER also revisit why we are doing this study.

Afternoon Session Workplan and Budget Discussion:

Young Presentation: Young said that FFR Policy has resolved policy questions regarding the field performance assessment of the watertyping model. FFR Policy decided on a call yesterday that the field performance assessment will not move forward this year. FFR Policy does want to see movement on the westside seasonal variability study, and wants the field assessment ready to go next year and beginning on March 6th, 2006.

Factors leading to this conclusion include: this year is considered to be a very severe drought year and water levels will be impacted; the suggestion had also been made that CMER would need to do the work again if drought impacted the results and there were concerns with cost; there were also significant permitting uncertainties that bore on this issue in the beginning but were resolved; there were contracting issues and a seventeen week field season; there was a lack of consensus among those selecting the apparent successful bidder; potential conflict of interest issues were also raised because the potential bidder helped shape the RFQ, though DNR did subsequently decide this was not an issue, one caucus did request that OFM review the contracting procedures; shortcuts were taken on some of the contracting that will not occur again. Contracting in the end was not an obstacle, but time had slipped away; there were also scientific concerns raised even after ISAG and CMER approval; and lastly, the most significant issue, was the prospect of a partial field season and the study plan is silent on the timing of data collection. Young is not placing blame on any caucus or group for this. This is not a retreat from doing the scientific work needed to support full implementation of the watertyping model. At the conclusion of the conference call yesterday there was a decision to defer until 2006, the Watertyping Performance Assessment and there was agreement that looking at the processes and administration of this is necessary to avoid these issues in the future.

Heide asked if studies can be held up when concerns are brought up after processes are completed, does that result in the processes become meaningless? If this is an opportunity to de-rail or slow down the process, that will not work well for people. We can never make the process work perfectly, but we need to be cautious of the issue. A final check may get at some of this. There also needs to be a certain level of respect; threatening legal action on SAG decisions is outside the bounds of collaboration. Young agreed that if we allow ex-post-facto noise to impact our process, it will be problematic in the long term. This study did go through the SAG and CMER process and if there are now disagreements, we need to iron those out. What was confusing was why Policy was still hearing concerns about the decisions that were made. McConnell said that we need to separate out what is CMER process and what is not. Heide said the data would not have

been wasted; it seems that if you are collecting good data from streams and you know what the stream flow is, the data is good and can be useful.

Young said we need to come back strong on this assessment in 2006. It needs to be done and done well and it should be ready to go by December 2005. Young said that Sturhan's "make me believe it" document is a good way to get at this. Having signed contracts 60-days before the field season will help us have time to resolve these issues. Young reiterated that he is not lecturing or chastising CMER, and said that CMER does incredible work that he very much appreciates.

Martin said that Young raised an important issue. Scientific disagreement about the study was one reason for delaying the study. Some scientific disagreements cannot be resolved in ISAG. A forum for resolution of those concerns is needed. If we do not have some way of resolving these issues now, then we will not be able to let the contract in December either. Even worse would be if concerns were raised after the study. Martin suggested that we resolve these issues from a Policy and technical point of view. Young agreed that a one-day meeting on these issues is a good idea. Young said that many at the Policy level were not knowledgeable of this work. Some caucuses are making representatives aware, but others are not and there are disconnections between CMER and Policy. Sturhan suggested afternoon sessions at Policy. Young said this will become more important as more studies are completed. Martin said this particular study has a huge hold on the budget and until we decide what to do, we cannot finalize the budget.

Young said he has follow-up work to do in the wake of yesterday's decision. Industry has spoken about their concern regarding the action being taken on this study. They requested assurance that this is not a move away from implementing the watertyping system as envisioned in FFR. He also has work with the conservation caucus on contracting issues.

On behalf of Policy, he appreciates the CMER's understanding and asked that CMER inform Policy if they can be of help. Young then offered to talk about anything else CMER would like to discuss. Heide asked about the budget. Young said that there is a \$2.3 million implementation budget for a full-time HCP implementation manager, compliance monitoring, IT work and the TRANS data layer. On the capital side \$8 million was allocated for Forestry riparian easement purchases and \$4.5 million for small forest landowner culvert repairs. This is the most successful state legislative session we have had. The only funding issue now is the Small Forest Landowner Office. On the federal side, we are looking for different sources of money and we still need to do some research on potential funding sources.

Workplan and budget discussion:

Review Past Program Priorities

Sturhan said she wants to be sure CMER's workplan is real. She is not planning to remove anything from the list but would like to look at how to space the remainder of the work. CMER will look at what needs to get done now and what can be delayed. She mentioned last year's workplan and sent a modified 6-question form for CMER to use.

The number of projects from the FY05 work plan that actually started this year was zero of the six that CMER said would begin. Policy needs to know what CMER can actually do. If CMER had more people, it would help. A realistic work plan will allow Policy to know how much CMER can really do, and can then determine if more help is needed. Sturhan saw no reason to re-rank programs from the original ranking CMER did based on scientific uncertainty and resource risk. CMER suggested that the projects not be ranked again. The real problem is that we cannot get the projects on the ground. The projects were ranked within programs by SAGs.

Sturhan said she is not hearing anyone proposing changes to the original rankings and the budget sheet is arranged according to priority based on the original rankings.

Review of Urgent, second and delay categories

Sturhan said CMER does need to talk about the status of the urgent, second and delay projects. Some of the reasons for projects to be in the delay category is that they are not scoped yet.

Ray asked if there is a methodology to put projects that are not currently on the list onto the list. SAGE has several projects that are not on the list at all and they are in the process of being scoped. Sturhan asked Ray to send them to her and she will include it for the next version of the spreadsheet. Smitch said that one of the overall ground rules will likely be that if a SAG wants to add a project, another one will need to come off the list. If the expenditure stream is \$1.5-2 million per year, CMER will need to operate within those bounds.

Sturhan directed CMER to the scenarios at the bottom of the page. Scenario 1 is to fund all projects and results in a shortfall in 2008 of approximately \$1 million. If that happens, some of the long term projects will die at that time. Scenario 2A is to fund the urgent and finish projects with \$3 million in federal funds for 2007 and results in no shortfall through 2010. Scenario 2B includes urgent and finish with no further federal funding and does not result in any shortfall through 2010. This indicates that some of the second projects can be done within the current CMER budget.

Scenario 3A includes urgent, finish and second projects with federal funding in 2007 and results in a shortfall of \$1.6 million in 2009. Scenario 3B includes urgent, finish and second projects with no federal funding in 2007 and CMER experiences a \$175,000 shortfall in 2007.

CMER's decision space rests with the second projects because some of them can be done and some cannot. Sturhan's analysis indicates that about half of the second projects can be funded with the 2007 federal money.

Martin asked if there is anything listed as urgent that should be removed. Suggestions were as follows:

- Line 73 - CMER contribution to Cooperative Statewide Intensive Monitoring project. Ehinger said the numbers are an estimate but CMER cannot drop this because it is a cause and effect study. Other SAGs (like UPSAG) are counting on these sites to do their cause-and-effect studies and to study cumulative effects.
- Line 32 - mass wasting prescription scale effectiveness monitoring. The request is to keep the development of the protocol as urgent at \$100,000 and delay implementation of the effectiveness monitoring
- Lines 136-145 - Program administration and project management – attempt to reduce
- Line 66 – extensive fish passage trend monitoring. Barreca suggested dividing it into large and small landowners and making small landowners urgent. Martin said the reason extensive is urgent is because it provides a report card on FFR implementation. Heide said we need to measure the results of this work because the industry has a substantial amount of money invested in this. Barreca suggested that some of this can be answered with compliance monitoring and the RMAP database. Heide said that he would support that but has not seen evidence that it is occurring. Martin said CMER could say that all of the extensive projects can be listed as status and trends monitoring. At the same time, the MDT, USFWS, and EPA said they wanted a report card on all of these extensive projects. Heide said that the only thing that tells you whether we are really effective is a broad progress report including the landscape that says whether things are getting better or not. Martin said there is \$1 million set aside for this.

Smitch asked if there are any urgent projects that have not been started. Sturhan said yes. Smitch said that Policy is considering funding CMER at an amount of \$2 million per year which would result in full funding of the urgent and second projects and if they accomplish that, there is no need to go through this exercise of re-prioritizing projects. Vaugeois said the project she is managing does not have an urgent or finish status. Sturhan said the rule tool projects were rated as urgent if you cannot implement the rule without them and delay if you can implement the rule without it. Smitch said the overhead question brings up the project management discussion that is occurring and if the research agenda was done by paid staff with some consultant staff that may be more efficient. Mendoza asked if Policy succeeds in getting \$2 million per year, do we need to do this exercise at all. Smitch said this is where CMER's perspective on what is important is critical to the process. McNaughton said that \$2 million per year would fund the urgent, second and finish projects through 2010.

What projects should be urgent that are marked second right now:

- Line 117 – Landslide Hazard Zonation – Palmquist said that Type N streams directly drain a large percentage of the hillsides on FFR lands. If we are concerned about the downstream contribution of type N streams to type F streams, the most effective way to ensure that these landslides do not occur is to identify the potential landslide areas and that is what this project does and it should be completed and finished.
- Line 6 – Type N experimental buffer treatment
- Line 19 – Buffer Integrity-Shade Effectiveness
- Line 21 – Amphibians in Intermittent Streams

McConnell asked how CMER should consider projects that have matching funding sources. If CMER can get better value for their money, then should CMER go forward with those? Scenario 3B assumes using the money CMER has in the bank now + \$600,000 per year from the state. CMER would need \$2 million per year starting now to fully fund Scenario 3B.

One thing CMER will need to do is explain why these projects are ranked as they are and explain that CMER can actually get the studies going. Sturhan suggested that it is late in the day to continue this budget discussion. The above list is not a complete list of all the projects that the SAGs would have proposed to move from “second” to “urgent”. She intends to continue working on the budget sheet and will work with SAGs. We will let them know that this is not a CMER consensus. Mendoza said he would like to follow-up on the LHZ technical argument that was just made. This is the type of argument that SAGs need to make for their projects in discussions with Sturhan.

Projects that are to start in 2006 have been noted. Sturhan created a list containing the projects, current status, steps to be completed, date steps are to be completed, projected status at end of 2006, etc. and these steps should be noted for every project that is scheduled to begin in 2006. Sturhan said she would work with each SAG on these projects. CMER needs to make this workplan real and it should include only the studies that can actually get started in 2006. Heide suggested that if CMER goes through this exercise then it is likely that the budget will not be an issue. The projects that actually begin in 2006 also need to have the six questions answered.