

CMER
July 26, 2005
NWIFC
Lacey, WA
Minutes

Attendees

Black, Janelle	NWIFC, CMER Staff
Butts, Sally	USFWS, BTSAG Co-Chair
Ehinger, Bill	Ecology
Heide, Pete	WFPA
Hofmann, Lynda	WDFW, SAGE Co-Chair
Hunter, Mark	WDFW
Jackson, Terry	WDFW, BTSAG Co-Chair
MacCracken, Jim	Longview Fibre, LWAG Co-Chair
Martin, Doug	Martin Environmental, CMER Co-Chair
McDonald, Dennis	DNR, Watertyping Project Manager
McNaughton, Geoff	DNR, AMPA
Mendoza, Chris	ARC Consultants
Palmquist, Bob	NWIFC, CMER Staff
Peterson, Pete	Upper Columbia United Tribes
Pleus, Allen	NWIFC
Pucci, Dawn	Suquamish Tribe
Quinn, Tim	WDFW
Ray, Kris	Colville Confederated Tribes, SAGE Co-Chair
Rowton, Heather	WFPA, CMER and Policy Coordinator
Smitch, Curt	Thompson Smitch, Facilitator
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR, CMER Co-Chair
Tonnes, Dan	NMFS
Veldhuisen, Curt	Skagit Systems Cooperative

Minutes, Decisions/Tasks Review, General Updates:

CMER Consensus: Minutes from the June CMER meeting were approved as amended.

Decisions and Tasks from May were reviewed as follows:

- The contract with SRC was signed for next year
- Sturhan and Martin agreed to develop a proposal for disclaimers based on the June Discussion

- Sturhan and Martin agreed to flesh out a document classification proposal and bring it back to CMER
- CMER approved ISAG's Status and Trend Monitoring for Fish Passage in Washington Forestlands: Methodology Review and Preferred Study Design
- CMER agreed to review ISAG's Last Fish Surveys for Eastern Washington Water Typing Model Development
- CMER agreed to review UPSAG's Regional Unstable Land Form Identification Project results.
- Dispute resolution resolved concerns related to the Water Typing Model Field Performance Assessment Pilot Study.

Issues for discussion at a future CMER meeting identified during 7/26/05 meeting:

1. SRC Action Plans – what steps are necessary when action plans are revised based on additional SRC comment.
2. List of issues SAGs have identified in selecting sites in the past and what CMER can learn from them. Suggested to schedule for an afternoon session.
3. Project funding accounting – how do we ensure that we know funding availability prior to CMER considering SAG requests (this issue will be resolved and results reported to CMER).

SRC Update: There are currently no documents in SRC review. SAGE's literature review was recently returned. McNaughton said the Riparian Extensive Study design was approved for SRC months ago by CMER, but the report has not gone forward. McNaughton requested a status update on that project. Mendoza said CMER approved the study with minor changes. Heide said the riparian extensive monitoring program is a study that Ecology has noted as extremely important and it needs to move forward. McNaughton will contact Ehinger or McConnell to determine the status of this project.

Budget Update: McNaughton said the latest budget sheet has not changed from what was approved by the FFR Policy and budget subcommittees and forwarded to the FPB. There is a large carryover of which \$4 million will be spent. Only \$1.3 million of this carryover expenditure is related to new projects. There is already a SAG request to adjust this budget. There were some minor changes made by the Budget Subcommittee to CMER's submission. LHZ was stretched over a longer period. The Effectiveness of Unstable Landform Identification was moved out one year Sturhan suggested UPSAG present the mass wasting program to Policy. The Type N study is being revised to include soft rock geology. The Board will consider the workplan on August 10th. Rowton mentioned the Policy budget retreat; one of the main items on that agenda is future funding. Sturhan asked if that would be a good time for UPSAG to present information on the Unstable Landform projects.

Disclaimer Proposal and Document Classification – Status Report: Sturhan said the disclaimer proposal has not been fully developed but will be presented at the August CMER meeting. Ray asked for a firm date for discussion of these issues. Sturhan said progress will be made but the proposal may not be fully developed. Mendoza suggested that CMER send comments to Sturhan and Martin.

Assignment: Sturhan said that Martin's original proposal on Document Classification will be forwarded again to CMER for comment as a starting point. Martin suggested that SAGs address this at their next meeting and send comments.

Unfinished Projects and Documents Residing in SAGs – Status Report: Sturhan said this item is also tangled in the disclaimer and document classification proposals and progress is being made gradually. Sturhan has talked to SAGs about this but there is no final resolution yet. McDonald said that he has a document in that mix; the 2003 Last Fish Survey for Eastern Washington Water Typing Model Development.

Assignment: Comments on the 2003 Last Fish Survey for Eastern Washington Water Typing Model Development will be completed in time for the next CMER meeting.

SAG Requests:

WETSAG: WETSAG is requesting that the Forested Wetland Literature Synthesis and Bibliography be approved as a final document. Information on the amount of review associated with this proposal was sent to CMER as background information. Rowe, an original reviewer, elected to not review the final edited document. Hunter said he reviewed the document yesterday and is concerned about the bibliography as it has nearly 200 citations and only 30% of those are relevant to forested wetlands. He added that it would be much more useful if the bibliography was pared down to the 50 most relevant documents. Pucci said the synthesis part of the document explains why documents that may not appear relevant were included. It is difficult to find forested wetland specific information as it is usually encompassed in other research. The synthesis survey has a more restricted bibliography. Hunter said he does not want to hold the study up, but the utility is watered down by the number of irrelevant documents noted in the bibliography.

Heide said he is concerned that some of the CMER reviewers chose not to review the edited document. Since Rowe reviewed the first document and did not review to see that his comments were incorporated, the review is incomplete. MacCracken stated the same concern. Pucci said the responses to reviewer comments were addressed in the comment response document and reviewers could look at that to ensure their comments were addressed adequately. Pucci said the review at this point is to conclude either that the document is acceptable or the document will die. Pleus said if people reviewed it and approved the action plan and trusted WETSAG to move forward with the action plan as approved, then additional review is not necessary. Heide said industry cannot consent to finalization of these documents without time for review. Sturhan asked if industry can

provide comments in time for approval of the document by next month. Heide said one month was all they needed to complete the review.

CMER Consensus: These documents were not approved as final publications, but will be brought again next month for approval if substantial concerns are not identified.

LWAG: LWAG requested CMER approval of the LWAG/RSAG response and action plan to SRC review of the revised study plan for the Type N Experimental (Prescription-Level) Buffer Treatment Study. MacCracken said that LWAG has moved forward with part of the action plan already and is incorporating it into the study plan. Site feasibility is now being explored and then sampling will begin. The approval is necessary to say that the SRC review and Action Plan has been reviewed and is acceptable. McNaughton asked if the action plan would be forwarded to the SRC now. MacCracken said it could be sent at any time along with the revised study design. Mendoza said this discussion needs more detail. There have been different SRC responses to action plans based on the project. Pleus said the PSM states that if a document has gone through SRC review, it needs to come back to CMER for approval. Mendoza said that in some cases, when the action plan has gone back to SRC review and changes have been made to the study design that has not come back to CMER. Rowton suggested that topics like this be scheduled for an appropriate discussion point at either the same CMER meeting or a subsequent meeting. McDonald said a compilation of these topics would be helpful for SAGs.

CMER Consensus: CMER approved the response and action plan to SRC review and the revised study plan for the Type N Experimental (Prescription-Level) Buffer Treatment Study.

LWAG: LWAG requested CMER approval of \$51,000 for the Buffer Integrity – Shade Effectiveness Study. MacCracken said LWAG severely underestimated the amount of time necessary to find sites. In the western Peninsula, it took four times longer than anticipated. Approval of the study sites has also been an issue. Sturhan said she does not recall any large study not having this problem; it always takes more money than CMER expects it too. Sturhan asked if there is any problem with cooperation from landowners making this more difficult. MacCracken said it has not been a large problem. Martin asked if this is an addition to the 2006 budget for this study. MacCracken said yes. This is an addition to the \$77,000 that has been approved by Policy. Martin said this is difficult when we reviewed budgets last month and this was not anticipated. MacCracken said he agrees. Pleus said an option is to delay this until next spring when the shortfall will actually occur. MacCracken said the shortfall is actually occurring right now. McNaughton said there is a lot of money left from last year that was not spent.

Jackson said that BTSAG has had a number of issues related to finding appropriate study sites, as well as cooperating with landowners. It might be a good idea to have an afternoon session to share and discuss these issues with other SAG members, so others might learn from what BTSAG had to go through.

CMER Consensus: This item will be tabled and further research into the actual budget availability will be conducted.

ISAG: ISAG requested CMER acceptance of the group's proposal to have fish passage information collected along with the accepted Roads Study. McDonald said because of the study done by WDFW about extensive fish passage and the conclusion to table this study, ISAG would like to move forward with collecting information under the UPSAG roads study. There is a requirement to provide information to the Legislature about RMAPs and this information may help. It is not as statistically rigorous as the information to be collected in the original study, but it will be helpful. ISAG has narrowed this information down to four questions they would like incorporated into the Roads study. This will not add any expense to the study and ISAG is requesting that it be included in the field survey. There will be repeated sampling over time and the four questions may or may not be part of that repeated sampling. UPSAG is open and flexible to adding this to the study but there are people concerned with this add-on. UPSAG wants to keep the option open to remove these questions if this is an exercise that exceeds the expected impact on the roads study. If it will not take more money and seems worth it, UPSAG will likely support it, but if not, they would like the opportunity to change course. MacCracken requested that question one receive more definition.

CMER Consensus: CMER approved ISAG's scoping document and proposed addition to the Roads study.

ISAG: ISAG requested CMER approval to proceed with the Last Fish/Habitat Prediction Model Field Performance Assessment project for implementation of field survey work starting March 1, 2006. McDonald said that he is using this form to notify CMER that ISAG will be using the model field performance assessment for the 2006 field season. This document needs to be forwarded to Young by December for contract signing. Sturhan clarified this was the project delayed due to drought in the spring.

CMER Consensus: CMER consensus was not necessary for this SAG request as it was for informational purposes and has already been approved. Since nothing has changed, CMER consensus is not necessary.

ISAG: ISAG requested approval of the Status and Trend Monitoring for Fish Passage in Washington Forestlands: Methodology Review and Preferred Study Design as a final scoping paper. McDonald said CMER decided this final was final based on contracting requirements but it was delayed. If ISAG is ever to pick this study up again, additional work will be necessary.

CMER Consensus: This document was approved as a final scoping document and it will be made clear that additional work would be necessary if the study were to be re-initiated at any point in the future. The title of the study will be edited from "Study Design: to "Final Scoping Paper."

ISAG: ISAG requested approval of the scoping document and scope of work for the Western Washington Seasonal Variability Study Part of the Annual/Seasonal Variability Projects. McDonald said ISAG is requesting that this project not proceed through SRC review as it is the same study design formerly approved by CMER and currently being implemented in eastern Washington. McDonald said there were previous decisions made in ISAG about using fish “presence” points to develop a model for fish “habitat”. It was agreed upon that in order to adequately validate the model for predicting “last fish habitat”, annual and seasonal variability studies would need to occur. There are some cases that the end of fish presence is not necessarily the end of fish habitat, because of temporal variability. This study will help develop an understanding of how well last fish points represent the end of fish habitat. ISAG is hoping to collect some of the physical parameters to determine where fish habitat actually ends. Jackson said ISAG originally wanted the model performance study to also provide the “spring” season of the seasonal variability study. However, the sampling window for the model performance study is greater than that for the spring survey. Therefore, ISAG has to wait for the performance study to be complete in order to obtain the random sample of sites for the seasonal study. The seasonal study will start immediately afterwards in the summer or fall season of 2006. Pleus asked what CMER is approving beyond the scoping document for this study. Jackson said approval of the scope of work is also being sought. Pleus said that study plans need to go through CMER review unless a waiver is requested. McDonald said they are requesting the waiver. McDonald said that if CMER wants to have three people review a study that is already in progress that is fine. Mendoza said there were minor tweaks to the study design for western Washington, according to the SAG.

CMER Consensus: CMER approved the scoping document and will review the scope of work (study plan) before approving it. Reviewers will be: Pleus or some other tribal representative and Martin. Reviews are due by August 9th in time for the ISAG meeting on August 10th. This request will come back to CMER at the August meeting unless there are significant outstanding issues.

SAGE: SAGE requested approval of the Review and Synthesis of Available Information on Riparian Disturbance Regimes in Washington. Ray said that SAGE would like to finalize this document. Sturhan said this is one of the documents that need to move forward. Ray said that CMER, SRC and SAGE have reviewed and no action has been suggested. SAGE is proposing to add a CMER cover letter and number and a disclaimer if CMER requests it. The document and SAGE edits, SRC review comments, and the SAGE discussion paper were attached to the SAGE request that went out. Two of the documents need to be created, but the rest is complete. Sturhan asked how SAGE will finalize this document. Ray said it will include all portions mentioned above. Martin asked if permission from SRC is required for item seven. McNaughton said yes, and he will check into whether SRC will agree to the individual reviews becoming part of the public document. The public document is generally the associate editor’s synthesis. SAGE incorporated their edits and listed them to reduce any concerns with authorship. Martin said this seems odd. Ray said that since CMER has not decided on the authorship issues, the document is being proposed for finalization this way. McNaughton said the contractor has said they will not review the document any further. Martin said it could be

listed as authored by a contractor with changes made by SAGE, which would eliminate the needs for a list of SAGE edits. Jackson asked if a footnote could be added noting the SAGE edits as an appendix. Black said that if SAGE is added as an additional author, then the list of edits is not necessary. Martin said that the introduction now provides context and history, which is good. Martin then asked about the CMER disclaimer; if there is no request on the table, it should be deleted. Martin then asked why the SAGE discussion paper is included; Ray responded that it is because SAGE members asked for it to be included. Peterson said SRC was very harsh in their review and without a SAGE response, a reader would be misled. Martin said this response may be better placed as a preface to the SRC comments. Heide asked if this package will then become a single CMER document under one title. He likes that concept.

CMER Consensus: CMER approved this as a final literature review with a co-authorship provision if agreed to by the contractor, which would negate the need for the list of SAGE edits. The disclaimer will not be included. The SAGE discussion paper will come before the SRC comments which will include individual and synthesized comments if McNaughton can get approval from the SRC. If approval is not granted, then the synthesized comments will be the only ones in the document. If the contractor does not agree to co-authorship, then the original SAGE edits list will be added back in.

SAGE: SAGE received its workplan for the Eastside Riparian Assessment last week and would like to request CMER reviewers for the study plan today. There is no formal written request for this but the document is small. McNaughton said this came out on Friday and he reviewed it in detail and provided comments today. Any questions developed for the SRC will go to McNaughton unless there are disputes within the SAG on the questions in which case they will come to CMER for resolution. Any changes McNaughton makes to the questions will be shared with SAGE.

CMER Consensus: McNaughton, Pucci, Black, Mendoza, and Heide (may find someone) will review the document. The deadline for comments is August 23rd. A request for approval to send to SRC will be brought to the September CMER meeting.

CMER Monthly Report to Policy: Sturhan said there was a budget subcommittee meeting on July 7th and a Policy meeting on July 19th. The workplan was approved by Policy on July 19th. Policy is interested in expanding the Type N Experimental study to soft rock geology to get at water quality concerns. CMER was asked to scope that issue and LWAG has given the co-chairs and McNaughton an estimate of the costs. CMER will need to have some discussion about this project. Veldhuisen asked if this would involve multiple SAGs. Heide said there was also discussion on the mass wasting effectiveness monitoring project. LHZ was also budgeted at a reduced amount of \$500,000 for FY 2006.

CMER August Report to Policy:

- Report on finalization of projects

- Report on outcome of Intensive Monitoring Discussion
 - Report on plan for scoping the Type N “soft rock” addition
-

SAG Issues

WETSAG: Pucci said that the Literature review was sent to CMER without being converted to a PDF. Thus, please delete the file. Pucci will send a read-only version to anyone who requests it. Pucci suggested that all CMER documents that get circulated are PDF or read-only. CMER was in general consensus that documents for comment should be sent as read-only and changed by the commenter to another name and final documents should be sent as PDF files.

Workplan: Sturhan said that in the adaptive management manual it is noted that Policy will receive the workplan in April and the FPB in May. CMER needs to have the workplan done and before Policy in time for the April meeting and preferably CMER would finish by the end of January. The timeline to reach this deadline means that SAGs need to begin making changes to the CMER workplan now. Next month SAGs will be reminded of this task. During September and October, SAGs need to be working on changes. Sturhan will send the timeline to SAGs for review and use for their own planning purposes.

Science Topic for August: Eastside Riparian Program.

Science Topic for September: SAG meeting on “lessons learned” with a focus on site selection issues
