

CMER
August 23, 2005
WFPA Offices
Olympia, WA
Minutes

Attendees

Baldwin, Todd	Kalispel Tribe
Barreca, Jeannette	Ecology
Black, Jenelle	NWIFC, CMER Staff
Butts, Sally	USFWS, BTSAG Co-Chair
Dieu, Julie	Rayonier, UPSAG Co-Chair
Dominquez, Larry	DNR
Fransen, Brian	Weyerhaeuser
Heide, Pete	WFPA
Hofmann, Lynda	WDFW, SAGE Co-Chair
Hunter, Mark	WDFW
Jackson, Terry	WDFW, BTSAG Co-Chair
MacCracken, Jim	Longview Fibre, LWAG Co-Chair
Martin, Doug	Martin Environmental, CMER Co-Chair
McConnell, Steve	NWIFC
McDonald, Dennis	DNR, ISAG Co-Chair
Mendoza, Chris	ARC Consultants
Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Indian nation
Pederson, Pete	Upper Columbia United Tribes
Pucci, Dawn	Suquamish Tribe, WETSAG Co-Chair
Ray, Kris	Colville Confederated Tribes, SAGE Co-Chair
Risenhoover, Ken	Port Blakely
Robinson, Tom	WSAC
Rowton, Heather	WFPA, CMER and Policy Coordinator
Smitch, Curt	Thompson Smitch, Facilitator
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR, CMER Co-Chair

Minutes, Decisions/Tasks Review, General Updates:

CMER Consensus: Minutes from the July CMER meeting were approved as amended. Mark Hunter's citation was distributed to CMER rather than noted in the minutes.

Decisions and Tasks from July were reviewed as follows:

- McNaughton agreed to determine the status of the extensive monitoring program.
- Sturhan and Martin forwarded the Document classification draft to CMER for comment.
- The 2003 Last Fish Survey for Eastern Washington Watertyping Model Development report was to be completed for CMER approval at the August meeting.
- WETSAG did not receive CMER approval for the Forested Wetland Literature Synthesis and Bibliography but agreed to bring it for approval to the August meeting.
- LWAG's Type N Experimental (Prescription-Level) Buffer Treatment Study action plan to SRC review was approved.
- LWAG's request for \$51,000 for the Buffer Integrity – Shade Effectiveness Study was tabled.
- ISAG's scoping document for proposed additional questions for the Roads Study was approved.
- CMER approved ISAG's final scoping document for Status and Trend Monitoring for Fish Passage in Washington Forestlands: Methodology Review and Preferred Study Design. The title will be changed from "study design" to "final scoping paper".
- ISAG's request for approval of the Western Washington Seasonal Variability Study Part of the Annual/Seasonal Variability Project received partial approval. CMER will review the scope of work before approving it.
- SAGE's request for approval of the Review and Synthesis of the Available Information on Riparian Disturbance Regimes in Eastern Washington was approved.
- SAGE's workplan for the Eastside Riparian Assessment was approved for review.

SRC Update: Sturhan reported that the Extensive Riparian Study is now in SRC review.

Budget Update: Sturhan reported that the FPB passed the CMER workplan and budget on August 10th.

Disclaimer and Document Classification Proposal – Status Report: Martin received comments from one person on the Document classification proposal. The document is not yet complete and Martin asked for additional comment. CMER agreed that the disclaimer discussion may be encompassed in the document classification proposal. Martin said if the document is internal to CMER; the classification may be different than it will be if the document is meant to be forwarded to Policy and the FPB for decision making. Martin said there should be a statement of what the purpose of the report is so that people understand what they are reading and what the document is intended to convey. Whether the document needs a disclaimer if it is not meant for FPB decision-making, is a question CMER needs to answer. If CMER agrees that different types of reports are okay, then the requirements and content will change according to the type of report produced. Martin is attempting to minimize the number of disclaimers necessary on CMER documents.

Mendoza said the classification system does not address contract conflicts; thus, even though they are related, the contracting conflicts need to be dealt with separately or within the context of this classification proposal. Pucci said the fix for contracting issues is to clearly define contracts initially and ensure that CMER has the ability to make changes at the end regardless of what the contractor believes the report should say. Pucci suggested that CMER will have a wider variety than the five or six types of documents proposed in Martin's document. Heide said that since the audience is larger than the Adaptive Management program, technical reports need to stand out and a clear understanding of the other document is necessary. More publications should be on the website than are currently there and classification will help allow this to occur. Heide said if there is a contractor issue that hinges on the information produced by the study, then a fundamental decision needs to be made by CMER as CMER goes through the CMER approval process.

Pederson said the reports are sometimes instruments that will lead to adaptive management action and when they are not and are just pieces of a larger picture that needs to be made clear by document classification. Pucci said CMER definitely needs to know ahead of time what will be done with the project. Many projects are already in the workplan; do they need to fit into the document classification system now or not since they are already in the workplan. Ray said CMER is already filling out the six questions during the scoping process; so the information is there. Pederson said within CMER, we can easily identify documents and their purposes, but those outside this process will not know that. Ray suggested the website be changed to reflect the classifications. Dominquez said the only concern he has is that all CMER reports are seen as good science, regardless of what their use.

Martin suggested contracting language similar to the language Pucci suggested above. McDonald said it will be difficult to get contractors to agree to CMER changing their work without their consensus. Sturhan said the PSM states the SAG will write a whitepaper explaining the results to Policy and CMER. This is not meant as a disclaimer but it does put the study in context for readers. Pucci said it needs to be clear that the contractor is not the one that distributes the document; CMER does and DNR owns the data. Mendoza said that if the original contracting language removes the ambiguities, there will be fewer problems at the end. Mendoza suggested that CMER may need to deal with the disclaimer issues at they come up rather than in a framework. Jackson said there was one disclaimer suggestion that was as follows: "This document does not necessarily represent the views or endorsement of CMER." This proposal was not agreed to the last time it was brought up, but it may be reconsidered.

Assignment: Sturhan and Martin will develop more categories and then forward the document to CMER again for review. Sturhan and Martin will work on it this month.

CMER Monitoring Lands: Sturhan said that CMER monitoring lands is what UPSAG has been working on for their projects. Next month, the proposed science topic is an

opportunity to discuss site location issues. LWAG, UPSAG and BTSAG all have examples they can provide.

Unfinished Projects and Documents Residing in SAGs Status Report: Sturhan said she has talked with several SAGs and they have brought forward reports for CMER approval. It has been difficult but progress is being made. Some SAGs still have languishing projects, but many have stepped up and completed the projects. Sturhan does have a list and Heide asked if he could have a copy of this list.

SAG Requests:

SAGE: SAGE requested review of the Stream Temperature Nomograph Report. Ray said a document accompanied this request that outlined the possibilities for the nomograph. This has been CMER reviewed and several options included pursuing the data sets and starting over, reconsideration of the nomograph, fixing the flaws in the present report and modeling for temperature were all considered. There are for how each of these could be pursued. Sturhan said the document has serious flaws and the report should end by being put in the contract file without becoming a CMER document. The raw data was not acquired from the contractor. If a place was created to house it, for instance Ecology, collecting it and placing it there will be a valuable resource to everyone. This would answer questions about where the nomograph should be used and what the uses are for the nomograph. Additional temperature data from other CMER projects will also be available over time to add to the database.

Martin asked who the CMER reviewers were and was told they were Bill Ehinger, Shelly Spalding and a NWIFC statistician. Martin asked if these reviews are consistent. Hofmann said they are generally consistent and point out fatal flaws. Martin asked if there has been a request back to the PI about making changes based on that critique. Hofmann said the contract expired and McNaughton said approaching the PI was not an option. Jackson asked if the fatal flaws were bulletized or outlined in summary form from the reviewer comments. Hofmann said no, but that they were contained within the reviewers' comments.

A discussion ensued about Ecology's water quality standard changes and that is recorded below.

CMER Consensus: The document will be retired to the file with the comments and not become a CMER document. SAGE will do a one page summary of why this study is retired. McNaughton will make a request to recover the data; SAGE will make another written request to him. CMER will scope the need for the nomograph when the new temperature standards are implemented and CMER can tell what is needed with regard to the nomograph. Ecology will provide the technical basis for why the nomograph does not work. CMER will approach Policy when they have worked through this issue.

SAGE: SAGE requested that CMER accept the document Review of the Available Literature Related to Wood Loading Dynamics in and around Streams in Eastern Washington Forests as reviewed by CMER. SAGE suggests the report and SRC reviews be packaged together under one cover and put on the DNR website.

CMER Consensus: CMER accepted this as a final document for posting on the DNR website. McNaughton still needs to confirm that the reviewers do not object to their reviews being posted on the website.

WETSAG: WETSAG requested that CMER accept the Pacific Northwest Forested Wetland Literature Survey Synthesis Paper and Pacific Northwest Forested Wetland Literature Survey Annotated Bibliography as final documents to be posted on the website. Corrections have been made as requested and the documents are now ready for finalization

CMER Consensus: CMER accepted these final documents as revised for posting on the DNR website.

CMER Report to Policy: Sturhan said she reported to Policy last month about the projects moving through CMER and mentioned finalization of the Wetlands Literature Review. The 2006 workplan was approved by Policy. Revisions to the CMER 2007 workplan need to start in September. That workplan needs to be ready for Policy consideration in March. Sturhan also commented on the Type N soft rock scoping. Schuett-Hames was thanked for his work on the workplan.

September Policy Report

- General updates
 - Implications for the nomograph based on water quality standards
 - Projects moving forward
 - Type N soft rock funding progress and program progress
 - The model performance RFQQ will be published on September 1st
 - Update on DFC workshop
-

Update on Type N Soft Geology: Dieu said a meeting is planned for September 6th to discuss this and Marc Hayes is setting up the meeting. UPSAG has been asked to attend and Veldhuisen is planning to attend. The meeting is 1pm – 4pm at Weyerhaeuser Corporate Headquarters.

Update on Progress of Intensive Monitoring Plan: Martin said CMER talked about the Intensive Monitoring project last month and there were people interested in participating in a subgroup. Martin prepared a list of literature on this subject for interested parties to review. This includes a list of which organizations are doing what. Martin sent an e-mail to interested subgroup participants for their review. The number one issue for intensive

study is sediment and scoping of this has begun. The purpose of Martin's distribution was to get everyone on the same page and anyone with other information should contribute it to the data pool.

Martin said Pucci raised the issue of why we are not just studying the four FFR goals. Martin said the intensive goals and cumulative impacts go together. Fish and amphibians are the main issues and this Intensive group will focus on water quality. The focus will be first on where this research can be conducted. Martin has begun gathering data about smolt collection data.

Assignment: Rowton will send a request to CMER to find out who is interested in participating in the subgroup and who is interested in being kept informed. Martin's document will be forwarded to CMER via e-mail.

SAG Issues

DFC Workshop: Sturhan said the DFC workshop identified issues with more work to be done. Heide said McConnell has tested current FPAs against standards but additional field work is needed to validate this work. Checking stand age and stream length are important to make sure McConnell's work is accurate. The other issue is whether the stand is dominated by Douglass fir or Hemlock stands. The consensus was the process needs to go through CMER for validation. The DFC workgroup will come back to CMER with a more elaborate study design write-up that will go through RSAG to CMER and through the rest of the process. Sturhan said the DFC plot widths and whether or not additional data should be gathered was discussed, but this work may be set aside. Sturhan supported gathering this additional data.

Mendoza said the purpose of the workshop was to clarify the technical questions for Policy as they try to meet the timeline they are on to produce a rule petition. There was also discussion about short term versus long term issues with the study. There were only three Policy members present at the meeting so there will still be misunderstandings at the Policy level. Policy also asked CMER to scope issues around site class disparity found in the DFC study. At this time, Policy wants to know how and whether it could be done. Mobbs mentioned that they have checked site class on Quinault lands and the cost of that can be estimated for a statewide effort. Policy also wants to know how the original site class maps were established. At this point, Policy wants to know what it would take to determine how bad the site class maps are and whether there are areas of the state where they are worse than in other areas of the state. Policy will need to assign this to CMER at their September meeting. Smitch asked if this is a status update for Policy. Sturhan said yes. Knowing the priority of these assignments will be important. Heide said additional people will be needed to complete some of these projects. Robinson said DOR uses the site class maps for tax purposes so this issue should be acknowledged if site class map changes are considered.

Hardwood Conversion Study Design for Temperature: Barreca said the study plan went to the Forests and Fish Small Landowner Workgroup and to a subset of RSAG for review. McConnell said some comments have been received but more comments will be received soon. Ecology will make revisions based on comments and will then present the study to CMER for approval in late September or in October. The deadline for comments has been missed and a meeting will be held in mid-September. Jackson expressed interest in reviewing the document when it is presented to CMER. Barreca clarified this project is separate from the Hardwood Conversion study and is designed to get at small landowners. Mendoza recommended that people do review this study design.

Web Page Ideas: Martin said that he met with McNaughton and Sturhan and recorded ideas about how to improve the website about four months ago. The list originally put together was redistributed and Black added some suggestions to that document. Black will be working with McNaughton and Scheiber to improve the website and address these ideas. A section outlining current projects is suggested along with contacts for more information. Black said that DNR has been talked about making a separate CMER website, not associated with the Forest Practices Division. She is coordinating with DNR to find out what types of materials can be posted on the website. Black asked what kind of information is appropriate to have on this site.

CMER Consensus: Black will be the main contact between CMER and the DNR for website development and updating. Active projects will be noted on the website. The information will be general.

Data Management: Barreca said that DNR and Ecology technical staff got together and talked about data management. They were thinking about investigating DNR being the primary place to find CMER reports but using the Ecology EIM system to house the data. Ecology and DNR will need to agree about this data management system. The EIM people are willing to give a science presentation in the future if CMER is interested in this data management system. Ecology would need to make some additions to the system to accommodate some of the CMER information which would involve additional costs. This will need to be scoped further. Martin said the IMW group is also talking about collaborative data management; is the Ecology EIM system compatible with that system. Barreca said there is an Ecology representative on the IMW group.

ISAG: McDonald said they will be working with the contractor on the eastern Washington seasonal variability study to address contract needs and supplemental budget requests. ISAG will be requesting these additional funds in September.

UPSAG: Dieu said it took a few weeks to get a review date for the RLIP project and reviewers have gotten their comments back to UPSAG. UPSAG will bring this project forward in September to CMER for approval because they have not had a chance to review comments yet.

September Science Topic: Issues with site selection, lessons learned, CMER monitoring lands.

October Science Topic: EIM presentation

Other Topics for Discussion

Nomograph based on new water quality standards: Barreca said Ecology adopted new water quality standards in 2003 and have been waiting for EPA to approve the standards. Ecology attorneys have advised Ecology to implement the standards now, without EPA approval because the temperature standards that EPA eventually approves will not be less stringent than the 2003 standards. There is also a piece of the standards called antidegradation; this standard states that water that is already above water quality standards cannot be degraded. A change of 0.3 Celsius would trigger an antidegradation analysis on the waterbody. Ecology will be discussing this with Policy next week. This implementation will result in changes to the nomograph.

Heide said that if a change is made in the water quality standards, the rules for the nomograph will need to be re-scoped on the westside and the eastside. This direction will need to come from Policy. Smith said the issue Ecology will bring before Policy will be statewide and will be a debate about antidegradation. Since EPA has not signaled what they will do, everyone who will be impacted by this will be asking questions. With regard to the nomograph, the question will be did the job get done or do SAGE and other SAGs need to work on something else because of the new water quality standards. CMER will need to make these connections for Policy.

Studies that may be impacted by nomograph changes include hardwood conversion and bull trout shade stream effectiveness.

Afternoon Session: Eastside Study Plan Review and Discussion. For details, please contact Doug Martin or Nancy Sturhan.