

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research
DNR /DOC Compound
April 28, 2009
Meeting Notes**

Attendees	Representing
*Baldwin, Todd (ph)	Kalispel Tribe, SAGE Co-Chair
*Dieu, Julie	Rayonier
Ehinger, Bill	Ecology
Estrella, Stephanie	Ecology
Fransen, Brian	Weyerhaeuser
Hayes, Marc	WDFW
Heide, Pete	WFPA
*Hicks, Mark	Ecology
Hitchens, Dawn	DNR, CMER Coordinator
*Jackson, Terry	WDFW, CMER Co-Chair
Kurtenbach, Amy	DNR, Project Manager
*Martin, Doug	WFPA Contractor
*McConnell, Steve (ph)	UCUT
*Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus Contractor, CMER Co-Chair
*Miller, Dick	WFFA Contractor
Miller, Ken	WFFA
Moon, Teresa	DNR, Project Manager
O'Sullivan, Alison (ph)	Suquamish Tribe
Quinn, Tim	WDFW
Schuett-Hames, Dave	NWIFC
Stewart, Greg	CMER Geomorphologist, NWIFC
Spear, Steve	Washington State University
*Sturhan, Nancy	NWIFC
Walter, Jason	Weyerhaeuser
Whipple, David	WDFW

* Indicates official CMER members and alternates; ph indicates attended via phone & v indicates attended by video conferencing.

Agenda

The agenda was reviewed for updates; moved the journal publication discussion up to the science session and Todd Baldwin asked to add the SAGE request back on the agenda. This will be addressed in the business section.

Science Session

The project principal investigators - Marc Hayes of WDFW, Brian Fransen of Weyerhaeuser, Bill Ehinger of WDOE, and Steve Spear of WSU - presented on the Type N Experimental Buffer Study. The study objective is to evaluate alternative riparian buffers on non-fish bearing streams (Type N) streams with an amphibian genetic component.

Type N Experimental Buffer Project - Amphibian Genetics – WSU –Journal Publication

This was brought before CMER as an FYI due to the fact that this paper has been approved and is published in the journal cited in the handout provided. The paper discusses predicting the variation of life history among Copes giant salamander and Pacific giant salamanders and in-stream and over land dispersal. The co-author pointed out that there is a genetic difference between the 5595 N/S and 6000 blocks; results should help distinguish environmental factors from those influenced by genetics.

Harvest Delay Memo

Project Manager - Teresa Moon shared that 3 of the 18 Type N basins are delayed in their harvest; two delayed for an unknown time and the third is under contract to harvest by December 2009. Harvests were originally scheduled for completion by April 2009. The three basins with delayed harvests are:

Basin	Treatment	Block	Expected Harvest Completion
1236	0% buffer	Olympic	15 Dec 2009
3437	FP buffer	Willapa - Weyerhaeuser	unknown
6000	100% buffer	South Cascade	unknown

The 1236 basin is one of eight study basins (in two blocks with four treatments each) in which Ecology has placed their in-stream flume and associated sediment and flow sampling equipment. The timber in basin 1236 was purchased by Weyerhaeuser and is contractually required to be harvested by 15 December 2009. At this point, Weyerhaeuser anticipates fulfilling the requirements of their current contract and harvesting this basin on schedule.

The technical advisory group met in March to discuss the implications of the delay and agreed to continue sampling at those sites. The TAG is still looking at other options for dealing with the delay of the other 2 sites. The next step is to look at the data already collected to evaluate the inter-annual variability within basins and blocks.

Discussion Points

- An in-house and an outside statistician will be consulted.
- In order to get the post-treatment data, need to add 1 year to follow the Weyerhaeuser site data, open for the other 2 sites
- CMER needs the input of a statistician concerning the implications of not monitoring an extra pre-treatment year: do we need to monitor another pre-treatment year to insure basin to basin comparability in the final study results? The original study design addressed the potential impact of monitoring staggered years.
- The estimate is \$25,000 for continuing to monitor the three delayed harvest basins. What about the environmental/study design costs for not monitoring them? The memo is really about the 4th year of pre-treatment costs, today the project manager and principal investigators are informing CMER about this proposal; they will return to CMER with the statistician input & a write up about the risks associated with skipping a year or dropping delayed harvest sites.

Business Section

CMER 2010 Work Plan

Co-chair Jackson went through the recent changes to the CMER FY10 Work Plan. These revisions reflect the results from the Policy Budget Retreat feedback:

- Extensive Monitoring Projects for Temperature -
 - Status to incorporate future years of trend monitoring (pages 44, 71)
- Hardwood Conversion -
 - Break out case studies from temperature component & annotated bibliography (page 68)
- Eastern Washington Riparian Assessment: Phase I -
 - (ES Type F Rip. Rule Tool Program, page 59)
- Eastern WA Riparian Assessment Project: Phase II
 - (Page 64 – made reference to Phase 1 or 2 consistent between project descriptions & program tables)
- Unstable Landform ID – Accuracy & Bias Project -
 - Corrected project status (page 86)
- Eastside Type F Channel Wood Characterization Project -
 - Corrected Project Status (Page 59- After CMER approval, it goes to ISPR, not after Policy approval)

Discussion Points on the CMER 2010 Work Plan

- Page 11 in work plan – changed the description of rule tool groups.
- A concern was expressed about separating out the phased project descriptions from the budget as often the phase 2 of a project will complete phase 1.
- A budget table will be inserted later in the development of the work plan. CMER needs to continue to work on changes, especially the phase 1 & 2 descriptions of a project in the work plan.

CMER Budget – 2010

Update from the April Policy Budget Retreat:

- An independent outside review of CMER's work to date was contracted through Stillwater Sciences Inc. They gave a presentation to Policy about the contracted work they performed on summarizing what CMER has completed to date, progress made & recommendations for future CMER work and project prioritization. The main recommendations are in section 5 in the report, page 55. CMER will review the recommendations section and respond accordingly.
- The FY10 CMER budget memo from the AMPA outlines outcomes/options based on the Budget retreat with Policy; CMER & Policy co-chairs have a meeting scheduled to further refine budget options in preparation for the FPB meeting on May 20th. The FPB will want to approve a budget that is in the black, and to date, we have a shortfall in FY11. CMER is being asked by Policy to look at the current projects for potential integration and alternatives based on the Policy prioritization process that took place at the April Budget retreat. This process was agreed upon by Policy based on the decision to prioritize CMER projects based on the Clean Water Act assurances and deadlines. The CMER co-chairs will ask for more guidance from Policy about this additional scrub and prepare an outline for CMER's use to adequately respond to this request.

Policy Meeting Update

Co-chair Mendoza gave an overview from the April Regular Policy meeting:

- Delivered the soft rock update, policy wants a scoping document. This is in progress.
- Policy held a discussion about the work plan in conflict with the science conference; CMER changed the date of the science conference to avoid delay of field work.
- Puget Sound Partnership gave a presentation to Policy about their monitoring work.
- Policy continued work on the Strategic Plan for the adaptive management program in the afternoon.

SAG /CMER Items

UPSAG - Stand Age Proposal - UPSAG Co-chair Julie Dieu gave an overview for this request.

In response to the ISPR review, the project's contractor collected field data that show there are stand age differences between what was collected by field crews, aerial photo interpretation, and data provided by some landowners in the strata containing stands less than 20 years of age. Approximately one third of the stands <20 years old were inconsistent. These inconsistencies need to be corrected before the data can be folded into the study. UPSAG proposes is to collect more data to include stand age. The funding for this is in the current contract, which will require a contract modification. UPSAG has revised the field protocol to include stand age. UPSAG developed this request and submitted to CMER two weeks ago before Policy's budget retreat. UPSAG recently found out that some of UPSAG members do not support this. This is an FYI as this data collection is within the study design and does not require CMER approval.

Discussion Points

- Clarification of the data & analysis – in response to the ISPR, UPSAG used frequency histograms to display correlations between stand age and landslide frequency and got some results that were unexpected and inconsistent with other related research. The contractor states that they misidentified stand age in the youngest strata (0-20 years); and have inaccurate estimates as the

field crews looked only at landslides and not the adjacent landform. One third of the polygons had slides, and those landowners need to be contacted. Stand age influences slope stability, hydrology and root strength. UPSAG wants a more accurate estimate of stand age in the 0-20 year strata to use in the final analyses.

- Timing – CMER/UPSAG is under pressure to get the report completed. This analysis would not add more to the contract time. The legislature gave CMER some financial support and that has a level of accountability including a report that is due in June. DNR’s executive management is expecting the evaluation as well and this time table is written in the contract with the contractor.
- The UPSAG request is for a contract amendment; clarification was made that this will be a contract modification as the scope of work remains intact. Some of the balances remaining in tasks completed will be re-allocated to this data collection & analysis, so the overall contracted budget remains intact.
- Clarification of definitions - definition of clear-cut; partial harvest could contain unstable landforms. Landowner contact – they have the data. CMER needs to get permission from the landowners due to changes in use of the data.
- Process issue – there is a very narrow comment timeline but the technical conversation is good. UPSAG does not have consensus to get CMER approval so in terms of process, out of order at this point. One of the UPSAG members is concerned with the rate & speed of this proposal and not following the process. In terms of process, this is a consensus problem – people need to speak up when they are not in consensus; long time before CMER sees the work. CMER can deal with consensus issues as well which has a role in the interpretation of the study design. This is a place for others to identify their differences of interpretation.

Action

Co-chair Mendoza moved to approve the request to complete this study by including stand age as a covariate in the statistical analysis of harvest landslide density with the condition that UPSAG keep CMER informed of their process and the progress of analysis. **CMER approved.**

LWAG - RMZ Resample Data - Steve McConnell shared that the eastside data was found at the time that the final report was submitted to ISPR.

The final report prepared in 2008 for the Resample project had grammatical and editorial flaws. This report was accepted by CMER as final in May 2008 and CMER directed that editorial corrections be made before sending it to ISPR. A technical editor was retained to improve the writing quality, organization, and remove errors and inconsistencies. This was completed in February 2009 and accepted for submission to ISPR. LWAG reviewed three main options as laid out in the request memo at their April meeting and proposed that the report be sent to ISPR as-is. LWAG does not expect results and findings to change substantially if the eastside data are re-analyzed.

Discussion Points

- Approximately \$1M invested in this project; this was one of the first projects that CMER contracted with the on-call editor.
- Look at revising the document to make the eastern Washington and western Washington portions of the report stand alone and send only the portion pertaining to western Washington to ISPR. For the eastern Washington sections hire a contractor to complete an analysis of the full set of data and write a new report (initial cost estimates are ~ \$100k). As CMER funding is currently limited, this option would most likely be delayed. No cost option was suggested – where NWIFC CMER staff conduct the data analysis on the eastside data. CMER and the AMPA do not direct the workload of NWIFC CMER staff.
- Send the report to ISPR now with editorial changes made to distinctly separate the eastern Washington chapters from the western Washington chapters as a stand-alone product with comparisons made against previously collected data but no statistical analyses of differences. Note this option is different from option 1 in that it distinctly separates the eastern and western Washington chapters in stand-alone reports. Option 1 is to send the report as is.

- Not an LWAG request - discussed this at the last LWAG meeting; decided to send it as is, not worth revising the report. The report does state that the data is missing. The LWAG Chair position is vacant right now. The memo from McConnell should go with LWAG proposal. The eastside portion does not meet the study objectives and is not consistent. Hard to see this as a priority due to current funding limitations and the level of active projects underway.

Action

CMER reached consensus to send this back to LWAG and identify what analysis was conducted, what assistance is needed to get this accomplished, and present to CMER about what has been accomplished. Co-chair Jackson will draft up the request to LWAG to complete this.

RSAG - Hardwood Conversion Temperature Review Report - Bill Ehinger shared that DFW made the revisions.

RSAG approved this report at the April meeting after several iterations of review and extensive revisions. This project was initiated and designed by policy. No formal scoping document, study plan, or implementation plan was produced.

Discussion Point

- Clarification was asked if the comments will be addressed by DFW and if they get paid for the response. This will be researched by the RSAG co-chairs.

Action

CMER identified six reviewers for this report: Nancy Sturhan, Mark Mobbs, Dick Miller, Doug Martin, Mark Hicks, and Chris Mendoza. They will review and report on what was done and get comments back to Tim Quinn. CMER reviewer comments are due by May 27th. Please send comments to RSAG co-chairs.

LWAG – Chair Update - Marc Hayes gave an update.

LWAG does not have a chair since Jim MacCracken's departure. –The buffer shade project has field collection this summer and then will be in the report writing stage. Hayes worked with Jim on this project. Hayes is working on finding others within LWAG as options for a co-chair. This will be an agenda for CMER's May meeting.

Soft Rock Scoping Document Update - Co-chair Mendoza provided an update that Policy wants a scoping document. This is being developed by the work group and another progress report will be given to CMER next month.

Landowner Data Sharing Memo Update -

The work group consists of Chris Mendoza, Jenelle Black and Julie Dieu. The goal is to review the draft, have it ready for next month's CMER meeting and share the CMER approved memo with Policy in June.

SAGE - Eastside Type-F Channel Wood Characterization Project –Draft Study Design -

SAGE co-chair Baldwin provided background. SAGE submitted a request for CMER approval of the study design. The request was dropped from today's agenda because the co-chairs thought that all issues had not been addressed and it was not yet ready. The study plan was reviewed by Terry Jackson, Doug Martin, Jenelle Black and Mark Hicks, and SAGE thought that the reviewers' comments had been addressed. SAGE did everything that the synthesis consultant suggested to do in this study design.

This is a time sensitive project and SAGE is not able to push this out another month. CMER does need to decide if this should go to ISPR. The project does not have an assigned project manager. The choice not to have this on the agenda as submitted by SAGE was not fully communicated with the SAGE co-chairs and is unacceptable.

Discussion Points

- Comment Matrix – The submitted study design for CMER review does not include a comment matrix. Some readers have yet to receive responses back based on their comments that were submitted, so the review process is incomplete. The readers did not reach consensus.
- Three different documents were submitted for this CMER meeting. SAGE submitted incomplete work and did not use the requisite template for this request.
- PSM inconsistency among projects - the soft rock project was identified as being held to a different standard; CMER needs to start a list of the PSM changes that need to take place and arrange for training on the PSM & WACs.
- Debate over funding study designs versus projects. CMER needs to continue on the course of identifying projects that need to be researched to set up the pipeline for research and funding.
- The critical questions for this study design are unclear. The current state of the study design needs a lot of work; there are concerns about what we need to do to answer the questions and see how they fit with the rules.
- A suggestion was made for CMER to support the study design & that the document is sent to ISPR contingent on identified changes that need to be addressed.
- A suggestion was made to send this to Policy to engage them early on to find out if this is a project that will be supported. The concern was raised about what kind of document would be sent to Policy; usually send a scoping document and the 6 questions that need to be answered.
- A suggestion was made to send this to ISPR review and Policy at the same time. The ISPR step will decide if this meets the study objective. If this does not meet the study objective, the independent reviewers will let CMER know. Can do this simultaneously; have this as an agenda item for Policy's next meeting. This will answer some of questions surrounding the goals & objectives.
- CMER has a dispute resolution process that could be invoked. The majority of CMER members are comfortable to go forward; CMER does not have consensus.

Action

CMER moved to prepare this for the ISPR process, contingent upon addressing the final comments by the CMER reviewers; use the SAG request form and six question format; and take this to Policy to address the concerns. **CMER reached agreement with this course of action.**

Independent Scientific Peer Review Update

- The Desktop Analysis reports were returned; RSAG is working on how to address the comments.
- Type N Characterization: Forest Hydrology is in review.

CMER Report to Policy: CMER items being taken to Policy for the May 7, 2009 meeting

- ❖ Eastside Type-F Channel Wood Characterization Project –Draft Study Design
- ❖ LWAG – no chair
- ❖ Send out the link to the web site for Science Conference.

Meeting Adjourned.