

CMER
February 22, 2005
NWIFC
Lacey, WA
Minutes

Attendees

Barreca, Jeannette	Ecology
Butts, Sally	USFWS, BTSAG Co-Chair
Clark, Jeffrey	Weyerhaeuser, UPSAG Co-Chair
Dieu, Julie	Rayonier, UPSAG Co-Chair
Hayes, Marc	WDFW
Hofmann, Lynda	WDFW, SAGE Co-Chair
Hunter, Mark	WDFW
Jackson, Terry	WDFW, BTSAG Co-Chair
Martin, Doug	Martin Environmental, CMER Co-Chair
Martin, Pam	Tetra Tech FW
McConnell, Steve	NWIFC
McNaughton, Geoff	DNR, AMPA
Mendoza, Chris	ARC Consultants
Peterson, 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
Schuett-Hames, Dave	NWIFC, CMER Staff
Smitch, Curt	Thompson Smitch Consulting
Stevie, Michelle	WDFW
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR, CMER Co-Chair
Tonnes, Dan	NOAA Fisheries

An LWAG/RSAG request was added to the agenda

Minutes, Decisions/Tasks Review, General Updates:

Review of decisions and tasks from the January 2005 CMER meeting.

- The SAGE request for Review of Available Literature Related to Wood Loading Dynamics in and around Streams in Eastern Washington Forests was approved.
- The ISAG request for review of Extensive Fish Passage Monitoring Methodology Review and Preferred Study Design was approved.
- LWAG's Type N Experimental study design was forwarded for SRC review.

- The RSAG Hardwood Conversion study – critical questions were approved and the approaches to address temperature on conversion will receive more work.
- SAGs were asked to present a project list and speakers for the CMER conference. An updated list is available today.
- ISAG’s request for CMER review of the Extensive Fish Passage Monitoring Methodology Review and Preferred study design was approved.
- Comments on the PIP critical questions were due on February 18th.
- CMER agreed to review the critical questions for DFC and comment by February 8th.

CMER Consensus: January meeting minutes were not approved as amended. Chris Mendoza offered further amendments to be added during February. January minutes will be proposed for approval in March.

SAG Requests:

- **ISAG:** request for open CMER review of the Water Typing Model Field Validation: Summary of Pilot Project Findings. Martin asked if ISAG had any requests for specific reviewers.
CMER Consensus: Mark Hunter and the other two reviewers identified in the SAG request will review the report. McDonald will be asked who the reviewers are. Comments are due to Dennis McDonald by March 8th.
ISAG Request 2 related to the Water Typing Model Field Validation: Summary of Pilot Project Findings: Stevie said that ISAG is developing a disclaimer for the report and is requesting CMER direction regarding how to draft the disclaimer. Mendoza said that the contractor is not amenable to changing the report based on CMER recommendations so ISAG would like a disclaimer to qualify the documents findings and put them in context. Martin asked if this is a premature request since the report has not been fully reviewed by CMER. Pucci and Mendoza said now is actually a good time to develop this disclaimer. Pucci asked if the CMER co-chairs could draft the disclaimer and format a template for SAGs to use in the future. McNaughton said that when this first came up, he asked Young about a general disclaimer; Young is against any disclaimer on any DNR document. McNaughton said he has been asked to fold disagreements into the document. Martin said he feels this request is premature because most people in the room have not read the report or the disclaimer. Until the report has been revised, CMER should not be asked to do anything about a disclaimer or folding information into the document. Ray said this will come up again and this is a good opportunity to discuss this. McConnell said that folding the disagreements into the document would be a better way to proceed.
CMER Consensus: The topic of disclaimers will be placed on an upcoming CMER agenda for discussion
- **ISAG:** request for authorization of \$10,080 to identify randomly selected end of fish points for the Water Typing Model Field Performance Assessment: Approach and Procedures. Stevie said the request is necessary because after questions were received from potential contractors, it was clear that these contractors did not have familiarity with the data or the expertise to deal with this project. It would take a full year to

develop the study using a different contractor. Instead, ISAG is requesting a sole source contract with Scott Needham who is familiar with the data. Butts asked if this is for a GIS product; Stevie said yes. Butts asked if there is any concern that when the sites are transferred to GIS access will not be granted. Robinson asked if this study will address the problems with the model in Skagit County. Stevie said maybe. Dieu said there are problems with watertyping model everywhere.

CMER Consensus: CMER approved this request and funding will come from project development funds.

- **BTSAG:** Request for project management funding for Eastside Riparian Shade and Temperature Effectiveness Study. Butts said that BTSAG is requesting funding for Toth to continue work on this project. Since Boise has sold their lands, they are no longer paying for Toth's time. The amount of the request is for \$18,262.50. Butts added that this topic is on Policy's agenda for discussion as well in the larger context of project management. Clark asked if this would be a standard request in subsequent years. Butts said maybe and BTSAG will be better organized in the future for this cost consideration. Pucci asked what other options have been explored. Butts said bringing someone else up to speed would cause a delay so BTSAG is not suggesting that at this time. Robinson asked if this exceeds our authority for sole sourcing; McNaughton said no but it will require OFM approval. Peterson said he feels more comfortable when the payment is task oriented rather than hourly. Butts said it will not be a problem to draft the contract in a task oriented way.

Sturhan said that the CMER co-chairs will be meeting with Policy next week to discuss project management issues and whether CMER can pay for those or not and asked if the request could wait until after that conversation. Butts said it could wait but it needs to move quickly. McNaughton agreed; this is a larger issue and said this is a good example of why paid project managers are needed. Butts said she was fine with bringing this request to policy but would like CMER support today. Mendoza suggested a better breakdown of the expenses. Jackson said this is a very complex project and making it over all the process, administrative, and implementation obstacles have been extremely difficult. It's like a miracle that BTSAG has been able to keep this project moving. Too much delay on this funding for Toth could set the project back substantially. Smitch said this raises other issues; for example there is no long term budget for bull trout studies and this project raises that issue. Clark said, for the record, UPSAG is working on a similar request.

CMER Consensus: CMER is not opposed to funding being used for outside project management and supports this request and moving the discussion and this request forward to Policy for discussion. Sturhan and Martin will take this request and discussion of the broader project management issues forward for Policy for discussion and decision in March.

- **RSAG:** Request for CMER review and comments on the Riparian Extensive Status and Trend Monitoring Program. McConnell said RSAG has a study plan out and it is ready for review. McConnell is seeking CMER volunteers and would like comments by March 8th. At the March CMER meeting, RSAG will request SRC review of the document.

CMER Consensus: The following CMER members will review the document: Sally

Butts, Dawn Pucci, Dan Tonnes, Kris Ray, Doug Martin and Marc Hayes. These members will comment to Steve McConnell by March 8th.

- **RSAG:** Request for the report Validation of the Western Washington Riparian Desired Future Condition Performance Targets in the Washington State Forest Practices Rules with Data from Mature, Unmanaged, Conifer-dominated Riparian Stands to be declared final. McConnell said that Policy asked RSAG to restructure the paper, SRC comments have been incorporated and RSAG has approved the document. McConnell said a plan to address the concerns has been carried out and documented. Martin said the critical questions document has been delivered to Policy and he is unsure whether they are happy with the answers.

CMER Consensus: CMER approved this document as a final report. The critical questions document has already been delivered to Policy but will be forwarded to that group again with the final report.

- **UPSAG:** Request for CMER approval of the Type N Stream Demarcation Study Phase I: Pilot Results. Dieu said UPSAG is seeking final approval of the PIP study today. SRC comments have been received and incorporated. There was a plan to address CMER comments approved in November by CMER; that plan was implemented. UPSAG is also requesting approval of the critical questions.

CMER Consensus: CMER approved this document as a final report. The critical questions were also approved. The report will be forwarded to Policy in March or April.

- **PSMWG:** Request for provisional approval of the Protocols and Standards Manual. This request will be considered later.
- **LWAG:** McNaughton said this SAG request is late because he was out ill last week. Hayes submitted it to McNaughton on time, but McNaughton was not able to forward it. Hayes also said that RSAG has not discussed this request. The request is for a \$17,000 budget increase for the Type N Feasibility Study for the 2004-2005 fiscal year. Hayes said that getting to a final point with the feasibility and site selection requires on-site review which is adding to the cost of the study. Clark asked if this was considered in the original budget; Hayes responded that the level of process back and forth with landowners was not anticipated. Ray asked where the money is going; Hayes responded that it would go to WDFW. McNaughton clarified this is an existing interagency agreement. Barreca asked if there is a breakdown of these costs. Hayes said \$12,000 is salary for three months and \$5,000 is for travel. Ray said that this brings up an issue of requesting money the day of the meeting; all agreed that a two-week review time would be better.

CMER Consensus: CMER approved \$17,000 from the Project Development fund to cover this expense.

CMER also asked that CMER requests come out two weeks in advance if possible and that requests be sent to McNaughton, the Co-Chairs, and Rowton to ensure they are forwarded as soon as possible.

SRC Update: McNaughton said the SAGE report has been submitted. An associate editor has not been identified yet but will be soon. For the Type N Experimental, SRC

has identified five SRC reviewers and they are not charging us for one of them. The CTC literature review is still in progress and McNaughton will check on that; Hoffman will submit suggestions for reviewers on this project to McNaughton.

CMER Conference: Martin said there is an updated project reporting list for this conference. All but two SAGs have reported. Martin did add some studies to the list for reporting and all study names have been made consistent with the CMER budget sheet. Martin said he put 20 minutes in for each talk which comes out to 11 hours of presentation time. Thus, the presentations will need to be shortened or combined. Each SAG was asked to explain why each project is on the list. Pleus suggested that a question and answer session be provided at the end of each SAG's talk. Risenhoover added that the people last year were not happy because they did not have enough time for questions and answers.

Suggestions for reducing time needed by each SAG:

- LWAG can complete each talk in 15 minutes.
- ISAG does not need to discuss the Last Fish/Habitat Prediction Model Development as it was discussed last year. 20 minutes total might be enough for ISAG.
- RSAG said that the presentation on Red alder growth and yield will be very short.
- UPSAG offered to do 40 minutes on roads and 40 minutes on mass wasting. They were not planning to present anything on the PIPs study or the evapotranspiration model. (26 and 28 would come off the list). It should be noted that the PIP study was completed.
- Each of SAGE's talks can be 10 minutes rather than 20 but there will be four projects presented.
- WETSAG will only need 30 minutes including questions and answers.

The conference will run 8:30-5:00 with a one hour lunch and two fifteen minute breaks. That leaves 7.0 hours for presentations. Each SAG will have the following amounts of time for presentation: UPSAG 1.2 hours; WETSAG .5 hour; SAGE 1.0 hour; BTSAG 1.0 hour; LWAG 1.25 hours; ISAG .75 hour; and RSAG 1.2 hours.

CMER Assignment: Martin would like a refined program from each SAG by March 8th. Abstracts are required with contact information for each presenter. Abstracts will need to be 200- 250 words or less.

CMER Consensus: The Conference will be April 5th and will be at Sawyer Hall. Abstracts are due on March 22nd to Rowton. Detailed talk information is due on March 8th.

CMER Staff Update: Schuett-Hames said the CMER project manager position has been advertised and 16 applications were received. Four of these applicants will be interviewed. Schuett-Hames would like CMER input on the interview panel.

McNaughton, Sturhan, Ehinger, and Schuett-Hames will participate in the interview panel.

CMER Monthly Report to Policy: Martin said that the co-chairs will be reporting the following:

- Project management
 - Bull trout proposal
 - UPSAG example
 - DFC Project submittal
 - PIP Project submittal – Sturhan and Martin will contact the co-chairs to see if this can get on the agenda for March.
 - Protocols and Standards Manual announcement
 - Workplan status update and budget guidance request
-

SAG Issues:

- WETSAG: Pucci said that, due to health issues, there is only one co-chair of WETSAG at this time. Also, the project manager is on maternity leave. This leaves three active members of WETSAG. WETSAG will be revising its workplan dramatically and is holding a meeting on March 1st. Participation by all SAGs is encouraged for this meeting, as WETSAG is considering trying to tie into other projects. Dieu said March 1st is the UPSAG meeting so they will not be represented but are interested in discussing these issues with WETSAG.
 - SAGE: Peterson said the Forest Health Bill has a number of recommendations to fund a riparian study for the eastside. Some of these may already be underway in SAGE and coordination would be helpful. Martin said that the FFR Policy group should be made aware of this issue. Pleus said that McElroy did recognize there are overlaps. McNaughton will provide an update at the next meeting. The CMER co-chairs will meet with Young before the next CMER meeting as well. Ray said there are two other groups as well; the small landowner workgroup is working on this issue as well as a DNR group working on long dry areas below the Perennial initiation points on streams. Better coordination is highly recommended.
 - SAGE will bring forward the nomograph report for CMER review at the March meeting.
-

CMER 2006 Workplan Update and Discussion and Budget Update: Sturhan, Martin and Schuett-Hames reviewed the CMER budget and updated the budget spreadsheet. Based on allocations, the CMER budget will receive no further funding after 2007 from the federal government. This results in the CMER budget going negative in 2007. Based on this assumption, the co-chairs and Schuett-Hames moved unspent money forward and this resulted in the negative funding beginning at 2008. This means that budget estimates need to be sharpened and additional funding will be necessary. CMER is spending approximately \$1.9 million per year. Martin said that CMER needs to consider what

projects will be moving forward on the budget sheet. CMER will need to look more closely at what studies are actually essential. Schuett-Hames said the committee had difficulties determining the federal appropriations. The other assumption made was that funds could continue to be carried forward. Sturhan offered to be available after the meeting to discuss projects with SAGs and explain the proposed changes to the budget.

Smitch said the FFR Policy group will be in DC asking for additional funding the week of March 6-10. Congressional delegates will ask what happens if the funding is \$.5 million more or \$.5 million less. There will also be difficult discussions about the adaptive management program in general. The delegation believes research should be conducted when necessary, not on an ongoing basis. The workplan will be important in convincing the federal agencies that further funding is needed. The congressional delegation feels they have put a significant amount of money into this program and will want to know why they should support further funding.

Schuett-Hames said CMER is on the verge of launching a number of large programs and studies. This budget argues for clear thought about how to launch these projects given that some of them will take 6-10 and even more years. When the money goes away in 2007, CMER goes from a surplus to having a deficit immediately. Clark said this suggests that any trend monitoring will be delayed or cancelled and only a small amount of status monitoring will be able to be accomplished.

Science Topic: McConnell offered to present his FPA analysis for DFC. The eastside nomograph will be considered for the April meeting science topic. If CMER does not make the anticipated progress necessary on the workplan, the afternoon session of the March meeting will be devoted for discussion of this topic.

Protocols and Standards Manual Presentation: Sturhan said the manual provides a good context for those not involved in CMER and provides good information for those involved in CMER. Sara Grigsby, Ann Colowick, Allen Pleus and the Protocols and Standards Manual workgroup were thanked for their efforts. The manual has been revised according to the approved CMER action plan.

Where to find what you want: CMER was acquainted with how to find the information they need in the Protocols and Standards Manual. Pleus reiterated this was a group effort and in many ways records how CMER has done business in the past and identifies a potential way for CMER to do business in the future. Pleus also said that some of the process items may need to be dropped or streamlined to allow faster progress.

The page numbers on the distributed version were off so it will be redistributed.

Keeping up with needed revisions and ideas for improvement: Martin suggested that at the end of CMER meetings, we put potential changes for the PSM into the minutes. Sturhan agreed the minutes would be a good place to hold ideas. However, the manual

provides guidelines only and CMER may not follow all the steps and may decide while going through a project that changes are needed. Smitch suggested that they be flagged in the minutes, collected by the AMPA, and that the AMPA then report to CMER about how these issues are being addressed. Pleus volunteered to continue coordinating comments on the manual, resulting in McNaughton not needing to track all the changes. McConnell mentioned that the data gathering and documentation procedures in CMER are not well documented. The PSM group agreed that chapter (chapter 9) needs more work. Grisby said people in CMER and SAG meetings need to be aware of issues that keep coming up that may be able to be addressed in the manual. Those people also need to bring those issues forward. Smitch said that Chapter 2 should more fully highlight that this history section is related to Adaptive Management.

Expectations, Guidelines and Strategies for Implementation: Pleus said that CMER has asked that this document be provisionally adopted and be a living document. This document will be a standard way to deal with projects, but is not set in stone. Each step is not required, but SAGs should think about them using them manual as a guide. Looking at the manual as you proceed with your project is suggested, not required. Sturhan added this is a window to our process and a map of the process. It sets up what CMER is expecting when people bring documents forward. Everyone needs to help CMER remember that procedures exist and, while they can be changed, all should be familiar with the manual.

Hunter said he does not plan to go through this page by page but does plan to use it during planning phases and if controversy or confusion come up in his SAG. Pleus said that this is a CMER manual and should be used as such. The PSM workgroup did attempt to organize the manual so that people can go to the section they need and not use the other sections. McDonald said he expects people to use the manual and that all new co-chairs review the manual when they start; there should be some orientation to the manual and maybe it should be a yearly event.

Next Steps, Action Items and Wrap up: Pleus said that he would volunteer to be a lead coordinator and to conduct orientations to the manual. Grigsby said that SAG co-chairs all need copies of the manual. An electronic version of the manual will be posted on the DNR website. Grigsby distributed a document of the human skills needed to make this manual work.

CMER Consensus: CMER provided provisional approval for the Protocols and Standards Manual for a period of six months. In August, the manual will be revised and resubmitted for final approval of the first edition.

CMER PSM Parking Lot

- Data gathering and documentation needs further work.
- Chapter 2 should more fully highlight that it is a history of adaptive management.
- Version numbers should be placed on each PSM.
- A master list of placeholders would be helpful