

## CMER Meeting Minutes

March 28, 2006

### Attendees:

Todd Baldwin  
Lynda Hoffman  
Pete Heide  
Jim MacCracken  
Ken Risenhoover  
Mark Hunter  
Tom Robinson  
Julie Dieu  
Dawn Pucci  
Pete Peterson  
Mark Mobbs  
Doug Martin  
Nancy Sturhan  
Dave Schuett-Hames  
Allen Pleus  
Bill Ehinger  
Jenelle Black

February Meeting Minutes. CMER approved the minutes from February Meeting

### Policy Meeting Report - Doug Martin.

The Policy Group was introduced to Leslie Lingley, who is in charge of the DNR compliance monitoring program. There was discussion about need for good communication between the compliance monitoring program and CMER.

### ISRP Review

No current action.

### SAGE Requests

LWAG requested for \$35 K for the remainder of FY 2006 because of the difficulty of finding study sites in the Olympic Region. The proposal is to take the money out of the project development fund budget. CMER was uncertain how much is left in the project development fund. The co-chairs proposed that the funding would come from the project development fund if available, if not they will try to identify other money that is available in the budget. CMER approved this request.

### CMER Conference Agenda- Doug Martin

A draft agenda was handed out and discussed. There was discussion about switching the genetics/amphibian session to the morning, but the decision was to leave the schedule as proposed. Abstracts for the talks should be submitted to Doug Martin by Friday afternoon, then he will forward them to Dannette at WFPA who will organize the packets for the conference. People who will be attending need to send an email to Danette at WFPA to RSVP so she can get an estimate of the number of attendees. Jenelle Black will

facilitate the projector, and Greg Stewart (new CMER geomorphologist) will be asked to staff the sign-in desk. Doug will handle the introductions of the speakers.

#### Policy Budget Retreat Report- Nancy and Doug

The Policy Budget Subcommittee had two-day retreat to go over the CMER work plan and budget. The retreat went very well. There was a good, productive discussion about the projects and program, and the policy group is now much more familiar with CMER's program. Lenny Young suggested a change in the CMER budget approval process at the Forest Practices Board. Because there is only one opportunity per year to request approval to spend money on a project, CMER often submitted requests for projects that were not really ready to be implemented, but could be ready by the end of the year. In many cases, the money was not spent, which made CMER look bad. The Policy Budget Subcommittee will propose that they submit the CMER budget to the FPB each spring with the funding for projects in two categories. Tier 1 requests are solid and ready to go, and the FPB will be asked to approve the funds for Tier 1 projects at their May meeting. Tier 2 requests are tentative and the budget numbers are estimates. CMER can bring forward a refined budget request for approval at subsequent Policy and FPB meetings during the year for Tier 2 requests, once the plans firm up.

Next we discussed Policy Budget Subcommittee feedback on the work plan and budget for each rule group.

Wildlife Rule Group- The FPB recommendations for upland wildlife need to be integrated with the LWAG upland wildlife program in the work plan and budget sheet.

Wetlands Rule Group- Need to further scope out options for creating the GIS database and better educate the Policy Group on the need for the wetlands GIS layer.

Pesticides Rule Group- No projects proposed. Low priority.

Fish Passage Rule Group- The Policy Budget Subcommittee wanted ISAG to move ahead with the literature review on fish ecology and movement in FY 2006. They appropriated \$20K from the project development fund to get started on the project this spring. The suggestion was made that the work could be done by Dunham at OSU. ISAG needs to get moving on the contract in order to get a project in place and do the project by the end of June. The other fish passage proposals were designated Tier 2, more scoping is needed. The Policy Budget Subcommittee recommended that the Policy Group designate a working group to define what "fish passage at all life stages" means, to provide guidance to CMER/ISAG in developing these projects.

Roads Rule Group- The road sub-basin scale monitoring project is now under way and is a Tier 1 project.

Unstable Slopes Rule Group- Three mass wasting projects, unstable landform identification, mass wasting prescription-scale monitoring protocol development, and the prescription-scale effectiveness monitoring project were approved as Tier 1 projects. The

Landslide Hazard Zonation project was approved for 400K as Tier 1 in FY 2007. The Policy Budget Subcommittee wanted CMER to take action on a project to help identify Glacial Deep-Seated landslide recharge areas. This is an important regulatory issue, because DNR must make decisions on whether to approve FPAs for harvest that could potentially affect a recharge area and they lack good science to justify a decision. Jed Herman will draft a problem statement to take to the Policy Group. This will be forwarded to CMER to provide guidance for the project. \$20K was approved as Tier 1 for 2007 to conduct scoping on research approaches to address this issue.

Channel Migration Rule Group- No projects are proposed, low priority.

Bull Trout Rule Group- The Policy Budget Subcommittee wanted the budget sheet to display the USFWS money spent on bull trout projects. They also want to see the project results and its applicability to FFR. BTO temperature shade projects are ongoing and are approved as Tier 1 projects.

Stream Typing Rule Group- Approved 50K for CMER technical support to the Policy Group on water typing issues.

Intensive Monitoring- The state caucus proposed to have the SRFB Intensively Monitored Watershed Scientific Oversight Committee develop a proposal for CMER on intensive monitoring. Doug Martin was nominated to be a CMER representative to work with this committee.

Type F Riparian Rule Group- A riparian integration proposal was submitted at this CMER meeting. It applies to several of the Type F projects, and is discussed in detail below, after the budget retreat update. The two DFC-related projects were designated as Tier 2 awaiting the results of the scoping projects and a decision on whether to move ahead from the Policy Group DFC Subcommittee. \$20K was added as Tier 1 to project administration for maintenance and refinement of the DFC model. The hardwood conversion projects are ongoing and approved as Tier 1. The Eastside Riparian Current Condition Assessment will be revisited after the integration discussion. The Eastside Channel Wood Characterization project was pushed out into FY 2008 and 2009. The Policy Group would like to see the results of the Eastside Nomograph project. Extensive riparian monitoring project was designated as Tier 1. Type F Westside had 50K for study design in 2007 as Tier 1, the BTO add-on was tentatively designated as Tier 2 pending the riparian integration discussion.

Type N Riparian Rule Group- The Policy Group would like to see the results of the Type N amphibian response program projects that are being completed. The Type N BCIF-westside project was approved as a tier 1 request. The Type N BCIF-eastside had 50K for study design designated as Tier 2 for FY 2007. The Type N Experimental Treatment Study-basalt lithology was approved as a Tier 1 project and is underway. The Type N Experimental Treatment Study- incompetent lithologies had 50K for study design approved as Tier 1 in FY 2007. The Eastside Type N characterization had 60K for study design designated as Tier 1 in FY 2007.

Other- The Policy Budget Subcommittee highly encourage riparian integration. They are going to take a recommendation to Policy Group to direct CMER to examine what might be missing from the status and trends monitoring, particularly the need for fish habitat parameters. They also requested CMER develop a better terminology to describe the project status and priority.

Riparian Integration Response- Bill Ehinger/Dave Schuett-Hames

CMER discussed a handout that contained proposals for integration of riparian research and monitoring to address the four questions that came out of the CMER session on riparian integration. CMER approved all four integration proposals and the related budget changes as follows:

*1. Explore the potential for blending the Riparian Extensive and Eastside Type F Riparian Current Conditions Assessment Phase I studies as one study.*

The integration proposal is to conduct Eastside Type F Riparian Current Conditions Assessment Study on up to 100 sites in summer of FY 2007 and use the data to determine sample size for both projects and to test field methods. Extensive riparian monitoring project will follow up with a photo interpretation assessment on 50 of those sites. CMER approved the integration plan. CMER approved designating \$150K as Tier 1 for the Eastside Riparian Current Conditions Assessment Project and designating another \$150 K as Tier 2 in case more money is required for data analysis. The 50 K for riparian extensive monitoring in FY 2006 was deleted because thermographs will not be installed this spring. The FY 2007 budget for the riparian extensive monitoring project was left as is. The integration proposal needs to be included in the ISRP response action plan for both projects. Both projects need to provide a report to CMER in the spring of 2007 that will be used to assess methods, sample size, and future plans. Future work on both projects in FY08 is contingent on findings from FY07.

*2. Explore what models and what data are needed to implement the Eastside Type F Riparian Current Conditions Phase II and Bull Trout Overlay Add-on projects. Can the same model or models and data address the study questions? Can the results of either study inform or help answer questions for each other?*

The integration proposal is to proceed with the modeling proposed in BTO Add-on project because it has selected a model and procedures for evaluating risk, whereas the model and procedures for modeling of the Eastside Current Conditions Study data have not been determined. The initial data collected in the summer of 2006 at BTO add-on study sites will be used to test the methods and procedures. This work will be reviewed by a panel of experts in a report that is due in spring of 2007. Then CMER will use this information to decide how/whether to proceed with the modeling component of the Eastside Current Conditions Study. CMER approved the integration proposal. RSAG will evaluate if funding is needed to conduct modeling with the data from the initial set of BTO sites.

*3. Explore how the BCIF and BTO Add-on studies are related and different. What elements of both studies are needed and why (context)? Why is experimental design different for addressing similar questions about RX effectiveness?*

The integration proposal is to proceed with the BTO Add-on proposal and collect data on riparian stands, buffer tree mortality and LWD recruitment at the BTO sites. Then, the stand characteristics of the BTO sites will be compared with the distribution of Type F riparian stand conditions on FFR lands using data from the Eastside Type F Riparian Current Conditions Assessment Study. This data will be used to identify stand types that are not represented in the BTO study sites and to determine how frequently the unsampled stands occur and whether they have adequate basal area to allow the riparian prescriptions to be applied. Then RSAG will develop a proposal to address the gaps that are identified. CMER approved the integration proposal. CMER approved beginning work with the 30K appropriated for FY 2006, and changed the \$102 K for 2007 to Tier 1. The project will produce a report in the spring of 2007.

*4. Explore the potential for implementing a common experimental design for the Type N Experimental Buffer study in Basalt (Type N in Basalt), the Type N Experimental Study in soft lithologies (Type N in soft lithologies), and a Type N study on the eastside (Eastside Type N).*

The Type N Experiment Study- basalt is underway. Discussions need to occur on the approach for conducting the Type N Experiment Study in soft lithologies to address road sediment. The Eastside Type N Downstream Effects Study has not been scoped. The integration proposal is to have SAGE, RSAG and UPSAG define the specific questions which will determine the study design for the Type N Experimental soft lithology and the Eastside Type N Downstream Effects studies. The riparian sampling methodologies for these projects will be informed by the Riparian Methods Test Project currently being conducted by RSAG. CMER approved the integration plan. Greg Stewart, the new CMER geomorphologist, will be asked to provide input on approaches to sediment monitoring for these projects.

Nancy Sturhan will take the budget modification for the Eastside Type F Riparian Current Conditions Assessment Project and the Type F BTO Add-on projects to the Policy Budget Subcommittee and ask that the changes approved by CMER be added to the budget sheet presented to the Policy Group at their April Meeting.

Nancy Sturhan noted that three of the Policy requests for more CMER effort involve UPSAG – The Type N Experimental in soft lithologies, the Intensive Watershed Monitoring, and the groundwater recharge to glacial deep-seated landslides project. Nancy will work with UPSAG on their capacity to meet these needs.

April Science Topic- The topic for the afternoon science session at the April CMER meeting will be Eastside Type N Characterization Scoping lead by SAG E