

**CMER**  
**December 28, 2004**  
**NWIFC Conference Center**  
**Lacey, WA**  
**Draft Minutes**

---

**Attendees**

Barreca, Jeannette	Ecology
Beach, Eric	Green Diamond Resource Company
Hoffman, Lynda	WDFW, SAGE Co-chair
Jackson, Terry	WDFW, BTSAG co-chair
Knutzen, John	Tetra-Tech
Martin, Doug	Martin Environmental, CMER co-chair
Martin, Pam	Tetra-Tech
McDonald, Dennis	DNR, Watertyping Project Manager
McNaughton, Geoffrey	DNR, AMPA
Mendoza, Chris	ARC Consultants
Peterson, Pete	Upper Columbia United Tribes
Pleus, Allen	NWIFC
Pucci, Dawn	Suquamish Tribe, WETSAG co-chair
Ray, Kris	Colville Confederated Tribes, SAGE co-chair
Rowe, Blake	Longview Fibre
Rowton, Heather	WFPA
Schuett-Hames, Dave	NWIFC, CMER Staff
Smitch, Curt	Thompson Smitch Consulting, CMER Facilitator
Stringer, Angela	Campbell Group
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR, CMER co-chair

---

**Minutes, Decisions/Tasks Review, General Updates:**

**CMER Consensus:** November meeting minutes were approved as amended

**Decisions and Tasks Review:**

Decisions and tasks were reviewed as recorded in the November minutes.

---

**SAG Requests:**

- UPSAG: Request for CMER approval of The Hydrologic Impacts of Roads at Varying Spatial and Temporal Scales: A Review of Published Literature as of April 2004.

**CMER Consensus:** CMER approved this request.

Since this will be a CMER document and there is no clear cover design for CMER reports, there was discussion about which logo to use on CMER reports. Some supported moving to the Forests and Fish Logo and others suggested maintaining the TFW logo. Using both logos was also suggested.

**CMER Consensus:** CMER report covers will continue to use the TFW logo and the standard numbering system. McNaughton will take the lead on developing the cover.

- **UPSAG:** Request for CMER acceptance of the Estimation of multi-season evapotranspiration in relation to vegetation cover for regions with rainy-winter/dry-summer climate as a CMER publication. Sturhan explained that this report is a step toward understanding the effects of vegetation removal on groundwater recharge to deep-seated landslides. The report was peer reviewed and a response to comments was drafted. The comments were not incorporated into the document, but they were attached. McNaughton said that he and Martin met with SRC last week and they were not aware that their comments would be incorporated in this way. Barreca suggested making it more clear how the peer review comments were addressed. Pleus asked how much effort it would take to incorporate these comments into the report. Sturhan said that because certain kinds of data were not available when the model validation occurred the peer reviewers noted this as a deficiency. However, re-drafting the report to address this concern would require a re-analysis with new data, and is not recommended. Martin asked if the University would be contacting these reviewers to get permission to post the comments. Pleus asked if comments from the reviewers could be paraphrased and synthesized by UPSAG.

**CMER Consensus:** Clarifications will be made to the Executive Summary (i.e. spelling out acronyms). SRC will be contacted to ensure that publishing their reviews is approved. If the reviewers agree, the report will be finalized and posted to the website as a final CMER publication. If the reviewers do not agree or suggest paraphrasing, this publication will come before CMER again for approval at a later date.

- **ISAG:** Request for CMER approval of the scope of work for the Assessing the Seasonal Variability of Uppermost Fish Distributions in Eastern Washington Streams. McDonald said ISAG is still gathering information and literature regarding how to improve electroshocking efficiency (ability to detect fish) when in low conductivity waters. Sturhan asked how the data analysis will be conducted. Much of the document says “should” instead of “will”. McDonald said this is a language issue; the contractor is expected to provide this service, and McDonald agreed to correct the wording in the scope of work. Pleus said that the Protocols and Standards manual indicates that a scoping paper will be developed and then a study plan will be developed. McDonald said three years of data has been collected and this is a scope of work is to collect additional data not to design a study. Jackson said this is intended to be the study plan as well as the scope of work, similar to the work previously conducted for annual variability. Sturhan said this is an adjunct of an existing study. Pleus clarified that this is adding new information to an existing plan to look at the seasonal variability.

Jackson said that this study will be using the same protocols as those used for the original data collection , and that those protocols can be appended to the Scope of Work. Pleus said this paper needs to identify how it fits into the original study. Jackson said that when the original data was collected for the eastside, there were concerns that the data was collected during low flow drought conditions, instead of within the established time window (when fish are most likely to be detected). Some stakeholders were not comfortable with the eastside model being built with that data, and that the data should first be validated, with the seasonal variability data, prior to developing the model. However, the eastside model is currently being built prior to the data validation. The seasonal variability study is a critical part of model validation and should not be delayed for another season.

**CMER Consensus:** CMER approved the scope of work for this project with the amendments that McDonald agreed to make to the document. The document will also reference how it corresponds to the existing study.

- ISAG: Request for CMER approval of the Water Typing Model Field Validation Study Design: Approach and Procedures. McDonald said this study design has gone through peer review, a course of action has been approved and ISAG needs to address the sampling design. ISAG agreed with peer reviewers that the sampling design needed work. ISAG has also discussed their response to peer review with the peer review committee. CMER received this less than one week ago but has seen and reviewed it on previous occasions. Given the comments made by Cupp at the last ISAG meeting, Mendoza has not had a chance to review the document and does not want it to move forward at this time. McDonald said any flaws identified will need to be fatal flaws because the contractor believes the document is final.

**CMER Consensus:** CMER approved the document with the caveat that if additional critical flaws are raised by ISAG members, those changes will be incorporated into the document or it will be brought to CMER for additional consideration. Comments are due to McDonald by January 7, 2005. CMER will be notified on January 12, 2005 whether ISAG approves the document.

- ISAG: Request for CMER approval of the study document titled Water Typing Model Field Validation Summary of Pilot Project Findings. McDonald said that ISAG has submitted this document to CMER before for review. The data collected for this document was collected last summer. McDonald is requesting this document be formalized as a CMER document. ISAG has commented and reviewed this extensively and CMER has as well. Barreca said the document is not well written and needs editing, and added that the six questions have been answered and asked if this will go to Policy for review. McDonald said the six questions have been answered because it is a requirement of the Protocols and Standards Manual and is necessary for final CMER approval of any document. Ray asked if ISAG was in consensus with forwarding these requests for CMER approval. Mendoza said they were last minute requests and concerns still exist with the document.

**Note:** This request was withdrawn.

Jackson said that future contracts (through DNR) should specify that final reports would not be considered “final” until they had gone through all required reviews (SAG, CMER, SRC) and the contractor had addressed all comments to the satisfaction of CMER.. This raises legal and ethical questions that need to be addressed. Smith suggested that if CMER gets a product and is not happy with, that should be noted in the final document. Additionally, when the contract is initially drafted, these issues of authorship should be addressed at that time. McNaughton said authors are not free to distribute their reports without permission from DNR because the reports are DNR products.

- **RSAG:** Requested CMER approval to contract the study design for Effects of Hardwood Conversion on Stream Temperature. Martin said that Policy requested a temperature component be added to the existing RSAG study and asked RSAG to develop this proposal. RSAG developed a set of critical questions and a summary of what has happened on the hardwood conversion study thus far. RSAG is now requesting to contract someone to draft a study design for a temperature modeling component of the study. The contract would be for \$5,000 or less. Pucci asked how the stream hardwood conversion length question and temperature interact with the larger hardwood conversion study. Mendoza said that RSAG discussed this at their last two meetings and agrees that other key functional components must also be addressed but this study does not address those questions at this time. Pucci asked if there are plans to address those components in the future. Mendoza said there are no firm plans to address them at this time. McNaughton said this will be discussed at the January Policy meeting.

Jackson was concerned over the appropriateness of developing a predictive temperature model within a study designed for “case studies”. There is a general lack of confidence in predictive models used for management purposes. If development of a predictive model is the target, it should be accomplished through a more rigorous scientific study. Martin said that RSAG is simply requesting authorization for a study design at this time. The study design will go through all CMER processes before being approved. Pleus said that \$5,000 seems like a very low estimate for developing a study design. Martin said the limit is \$5,000 for sole source contracts; if the contract is more expensive than that, a bidding process will be necessary. Martin said that if the design cannot be developed for \$5,000 then the budget request will be amended and the proposal will be put out for bid. McNaughton said there is an intermediate legal requirement for contracts that are under \$20,000 – these contracts simply require evidence of competition. Mendoza said he has concerns with the critical questions and Barreca said she has concerns as well. The questions need to be re-worded and policy expectations need to be made clear to the contractor.

**CMER Consensus:** CMER did not approve this request though suggested an amended budget of up to \$20,000 and evidence of competition, that funding come from the project development funds and that the critical questions be re-worded and

agreed to through consensus by RSAG before the document goes out for bid. An internal meeting with RSAG will be held and arranged by the co-chair of RSAG to address the concerns resulting in lack of CMER consensus for this request; CMER will be notified of the meeting date.

---

**SRC Update:** McNaughton said he and Martin met with Associate Editor Vogt and expressed CMER's concerns. They discussed what goes into an associate editor synthesis report, CMER action plans and how SRC comments will be addressed by CMER. Discussions about including reviewer comments were also had. Other issues were addressed as well. Suggested reviewers are appreciated, but Vogt wondered if the reviewers needed to be from the northwest (e.g. how much local knowledge is needed). Martin added that sometimes people submit reviews in multiple files and they need to be clearly labeled.

---

**CMER Conference:** Martin said only UPSAG has submitted items for the conference. Suggestions and written proposals from other SAGs are needed by January 14<sup>th</sup>. March 7<sup>th</sup> will be the date of the conference. CMER needs a complete list of potential talks before we can organize the conference. Martin will collate the suggested items and will distribute a list of suggested talks so that final decisions can be made at the January CMER meeting.

---

**Budget Update:** McNaughton said that the budget has not changed from the one approved by the Board in November. McNaughton was invited to a Policy budget subcommittee meeting and reported the following: DNR sent in a budget request including CMER research priorities; this request did not get into the Governor's budget. Policy will be looking more closely at the CMER budget as a result of this budget meeting and to determine what is needed for federal assurances. There is much carryover and questions are being raised about CMER's ability to spend the funding being appropriated. Smitch said this is all precipitated by the congressional delegation stating they do not want to fund CMER in the future. A long term budget strategy for adaptive management is needed to present to the congressional delegation if future funding is to be made available.

---

**Project Status Reporting:** Sturhan said that most SAGs have turned in their information and a more detailed report will be provided next month.

---

**CMER Staff Update:** McNaughton said prioritization will continually be occurring and he and the co-chairs are meeting regularly with Schuett-Hames. The vacant staff position will likely be filled as a project manager though the location has not been agreed on yet.

---

**Protocols and Standards Manual Update:** Pleus said the contractor was not able to complete work in December but the contract has been extended. A completed PSM will be available in January. Martin asked whether there will be a presentation on this manual. Pleus said that he was considering canceling the presentation and it may occur after the manual is distributed to CMER. A clear plan will be developed by the January meeting and it may or may not include a presentation.

---

**CMER Monthly Report to Policy:** Martin said that CMER reported to Policy in December with updates. There were no suggested items for the January meeting. Martin and Sturhan will provide updates on the PIP, DFC and Hardwood Conversion projects. Policy will also be informed that there is no agreement on how to proceed with the temperature component of the Hardwood Conversion project.

---

**SAG Issues:**

- UPSAG is making progress on answering the 6 questions for the PIP study. Pleus is intending to work with Palmquist next week on question five. Martin said CMER needs to report to Policy next week on when this will be delivered to them.
  - SAGs need to send SAG requests with contact information, not just a name. SAGs also need to follow the format for SAG requests so the request is clear up front.
  - LWAG provided an update on the RMZ Re-sample project. Stringer said the RMZ resample is a second period of sampling of the original RMZ project, which considered two different buffer widths. Field work has been completed. The project is following the methods of the original project, and time series analysis and comparisons of treatments will be completed. The data entry and analysis is now underway. The final report should be completed in June of 2006; a draft will be available for CMER review prior to that date. This report must be published – it is a requirement of the contract and is due by June 2007.
  - ISAG is planning to bring the Fish Passage Extensive monitoring proposal forward for CMER consideration in January.
- 

**Next Agenda Science Topic:** Sturhan proposed a session regarding how to request and how use DNR data. Sturhan was considering bringing in data experts to explain what is available and what can be accessed by DNR. SAGs should come prepared with upcoming needs, requests and questions.

**CMER Consensus:** The above proposal will be the January science topic.

---

**Water Typing Update:** McDonald said that the model is moving forward for adoption in February. As the time drew closer, numerous issues were identified. The rule, as currently written, is inflexible and there are concerns that the model has not been validated to date. The FPB is now in a position of adopting or not adopting the model in

February. An adoption option was presented by Policy last week. This option is as follows: DNR will recommend continued operation under the interim rule and DNR will request administrative authority to change the map information that is used for water typing as information becomes available. Changing to the S, F, N system will be done incrementally. The FPB will be asked to approve revisions to Board Manual Section 13 as well. Western Washington information will change, but eastern Washington information will not change. This will provide time to collect validation information and other information and will ease the implementation of the new water typing system. Training will be provided incrementally over time.