

CMER
April 26, 2004
NWIFC Conference Center
Draft Minutes

Attendees

Barreca, Jeannette,	Department of Ecology
Butts, Sally	USFWS
Clark, Jeffrey	Weyerhaeuser
Ehinger, Bill	Department of Ecology
Godbout, Kevin	Weyerhaeuser
Hoffman, Linda	WDFW
Hunter, Mark	WDFW
Jackson, Terry	WDFW
Johnson, Ron	DNR
MacCracken, Jim	Longview Fibre
Martin, Doug	Martin Environmental, CMER Co-Chair
McConnell, Steve	NWIFC
McDonald, Dennis	DNR
McFadden, George	NWIFC
McNaughton, Geoffrey	DNR, Adaptive Management Program Administrator
Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Indian Nation
Pederson, Pete	Upper Columbia United Tribes
Pucci, Dawn	Sugamish Tribe
Quinn, Tim	WDFW, CMER Co-Chair
Ray, Kris	Colville Confederated Tribes
Risenhoover, Ken	Port Blakely Tree Farm
Rowe, Blake	Longview Fibre
Rowton, Heather	WFPA
Schuett-Hames, Dave	NWIFC
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR

The prioritization process was briefly reviewed by the co-chairs. CMER will be looking only at those projects and programs that people believe should be reprioritized. The default assumption is that the ranking remains the same.

McConnell noted that additional sampling may be needed for the DFC project which will result in an increased cost. RSAGs Eastside Type F Experimental study may be able to be combined with the Bull Trout overlay Temperature study. There are sites RSAG can use from the Bull Trout overlay study to get information for their project. That recommendation will be taken to RSAG and then discussed with BTSAG.

Rule tool studies are contingent on Policy understanding the policy implications of these studies. Policy will then decide whether to fund these or not.

New and Changed Project Proposals are as follows:

- The LWAG “Tailed Frogs and Geology” project would become line 22 under the amphibian program. \$70,000 will be allocated in FY 05 and \$70,000 will be allocated in FY 07.
- The SAGE program title will be changed on line 10 to “Eastside Riparian Type F Program”. The “Eastside Riparian Assessment Project – Current Conditions” will be on line 14. It will replace the current project on that line. Funding of \$100,000 for FY 05; \$300,000 for FY 06 was requested as a placeholder that may change when the study design is completed and sites are selected.
- The RSAG proposes that line 28 be changed to “Eastside Type F Effectiveness - Bull Trout Overlay Sites”. This name change reflects adding a riparian vegetation component to the ongoing Bull Trout Overlay Temperature study. Integration will be discussed by RSAG, BTSAG and SAGE. The funding amount will change from \$112,000 to \$60,000 with \$30,000 being allocated for subsequent years through FY 2009.

The budget sheet was changed and changes will be reflected in a new version to be distributed at 4/27 CMER Meeting.

Future Science Sessions were also recommended as follows:

- Type F/Bull Trout Overlay Integration
- Eastside Type F Effectiveness
- Type N Effectiveness Program
- Solar radiation study discussion (proposal to move F to E on budget)

Definitions of the letter descriptions in the budget are as follows:

- P? = Policy guidance needed
- PD = Policy directed
- E = Essential to adaptive management program
- C = completed
- F = proposed but not agreed to be essential
- Blank = placeholder

P? includes: Fish passage, PIPs, DFC, LHZ

PD includes: Hardwood conversion, ~~water typing model~~^[J1]

F includes two former P studies: RMZ resample

CMER Consensus: CMER agreed to the project ranking as recorded on the budget sheet and to the definitions proposed for the budget sheet.

CMER Workplan Discussion: CMER review, with the exception of UPSAG, has not been good thus far. There are also a number of areas on the document that contain gaps where there is very little information on a given project.

Martin suggested that the strategy section of studies and the workplan ~~may be needed~~ to be more detailed than they currently are. Schuett-Hames suggested maintaining the rule group logic path throughout the workplan. There was general support for this approach.

A session on how CMER will consider policy implications of studies will be scheduled for the near future. This type of information would be outlined in the plan. How studies relate to rules may be well addressed in the workplan but study implications may not be. An example of how this would work will be drafted and forwarded to CMER over the next month.

CMER Consensus: CMER will strengthen the strategy discussion concerning rule links and policy implications in their workplan for FY 2006. Schuett-Hames will draft this example and will provide a cover letter to CMER explaining what is expected. Study designs, as of now, should include potential implications and different scenarios for results. See UPSAG's Sub-Basin Roads Effectiveness Monitoring Plan as an example.