Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee
June 26, 2006
9am – 12pm
NWIFC
Minutes

Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin, Todd</td>
<td>Kalispel Tribe of Indians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, Jenelle</td>
<td>NWIFC, CMER Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehinger, Bill</td>
<td>Ecology, RSAG Tri-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heide, Pete</td>
<td>WFPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, Terry</td>
<td>WDFW, BTSAG Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kramer, Darin</td>
<td>DNR, AMPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacCracken, Jim</td>
<td>Longview Fibre, LWAG Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Doug</td>
<td>Martin Environmental- CMER Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendoza, Chris</td>
<td>ARC, RSAG Tri-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobbs, Mark</td>
<td>Quinault Nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavel, Joseph</td>
<td>NWIFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterson, Pete</td>
<td>Upper Columbia United Tribes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price, Dave</td>
<td>WDFW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pucci, Dawn</td>
<td>Suquamish Tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risenhoover, Ken</td>
<td>Port Blakely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson, Tom</td>
<td>WSAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roorbach, Ash</td>
<td>CMER staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturhan, Nancy</td>
<td>DNR, CMER Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaugeois, Laura</td>
<td>WDNR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minutes: Minutes from the May meeting were approved as amended.

DECISIONS at the June CMER meeting:

1. CMER approved the document “Annual and Seasonal Variability in the upper limit of fish distribution in Eastern Washington Streams” by ABR as an exploratory report.
2. CMER approved as a study plan the document “Eastside Type F Riparian Assessment Project Workplan” by Mason, Bruce, and Girard. Inc., with a name change from “Workplan” to “Study Plan.”
3. CMER approved the changes to the budget allocation for the Hardwood Converesion Silviculture and Economics.
ASSIGNMENTS from the June CMER meeting:

1. **Darin and Dawn** will follow up on products due this quarter.
2. **ISAG** will produce the appropriate transmittal documents (as described in the PSM, page 7-30) to transfer the ABR report to Policy.
3. **SAGE** will produce the appropriate transmittal documents (PSM, page 7-30) so that the document can be delivered to Policy.
4. **Pete Heide, Dawn Pucci/Joseph Pavel and Nancy Sturhan** were named official CMER reviewers of the Site Class Map Validation and the DFC Plot Width Standardization Scoping Documents. Comments are due to Dave Schuett-Hames, Joe Murray and Chris Mendoza by July 12.
5. **CMER staff** will obtain an estimate from Steve McConnell to complete the DFC FPA analysis and model sensitivity reports package (see below for details).
6. **SAG’s and Project Managers** – review the section on Stephen Bernath’s Water Quality presentation, and consider whether your projects that measure stream temperature and/or turbidity are monitoring in such a way as to respond to the new WQ definitions (see below and Power Point attachment).
7. **CMER and ISAG** review the Fish Passage scoping papers presented by Dave Price. Comments due to Dave by July 12.
8. **Dave Price** will provide a scoping paper on the fish passage proposals.

**Report Back From Policy:** The DFC model recommendation brought to Policy from RSAG (CMER, April) to compare model output with ORGANON and FVS models, was approved. Policy wants this work to commence after July 1, 2006, with $4229 from the FY07 Project Development Fund.

**ISRP Update:** No current activity.

**Status Tracker**
Nancy reviewed the status tracker with CMER and noted several reports that are due this quarter. Nancy said that Dawn Hitchens sent out a letter to each contractor in early May letting them know what is due by June 30. Darin will work with Dawn to go through the contracts and contact people who have products that are due.

**Project Management Update- Darin Kramer**
The Policy Group meeting on project management came up with the following guidance on project management:

- Need to affirm time commitments of “volunteer” project leads/managers
- Scope out project management needs of upcoming projects
- Need to have different people functioning as project manager vs. PI
- Need to carve out project management funds out of project budget
- Goal is to have paid project managers to make sure that the job gets done and there is accountability

Darin is assessing the project management needs and will come up with a plan in the next week or so. Darin will also work on interagency agreements to create clear separation.
between project management and project implementation work, and require progress reports.

SAG Requests:

- **ISAG**: Requests final approval of the report: “Annual and Seasonal Variability in the upper limit of fish distribution in Eastern Washington Streams” by ABR. There was discussion on whether the final document that addressed CMER comments had been sent out for review. **CMER approved the document as an exploratory report.** There was discussion on whether a “six questions” document needed to be prepared and sent along with the final document to Policy. Pete Heide questioned the need to send the final report to FFR Policy. Pete and Dave Price thought Policy needed to have the results put in the context of other studies. Doug pointed out that the document needed to be assigned to a category with an appropriate disclaimer. Nancy said that Policy has told the CMER co-chairs that Policy wants every CMER product to be brought to them so that Policy, not CMER, decides whether Policy needs to do anything as a result. **CMER concluded that ISAG will need to provide the appropriate transmittal materials (described in PSM) before the document is transmitted to Policy.**

- **SAGE**: Requests final approval of the Eastside Type F riparian assessment workplan. There was discussion on whether the final document that addressed CMER comments had been sent out for review. **CMER approved the document as a study design document.** There was discussion of why the title says workplan when it is a study design. **CMER requested that the title be changed from workplan to study plan.** **CMER concluded that SAGE will need to provide the appropriate transmittal materials (described in PSM) before the document is transmitted to Policy.**

- **RSAG**: Requests CMER review and approval of changes to the allocation of contract funds in the vegetation and economic analysis parts of the hardwood conversion budget that reflect changes in methods and number of sites. A budget and implementation schedule was provided. If CMER approves, Ash will work with Dawn to incorporate the changes into a contract amendment. **CMER approved the changes to the budget allocation. This needs to go to Policy because the re-scheduling of work changes the timing of the expenditures, placing a larger amount of spending in the upcoming year.**

- **RSAG**: Requests concurrent review of the Site Class Map Validation and the DFC Plot Width Standardization Scoping Documents. **CMER approved the request.** Pete Heide, Dawn Pucci/Joseph Pavel and Nancy Sturhan agreed to review the documents. Comments will be sent to Dave S-H, Chris Mendoza and Joe Murray by July 12.

SAG Issues:

- **RSAG**: How to go about finalizing the DFC FPA desktop analysis, the DFC FPA field check report, and the DFC model sensitivity analysis. These reports are all
related, but came from different processes. They need to be finalized. Chris Mendoza proposed finalizing the three documents following the guidelines for external science. **CMER approved having CMER staff obtain an estimate from Steve McConnell** to produce a package that consists of:

- A cover memo that provides an overview of the various products
- An updated draft FPA desktop analysis
- An updated draft FPA field check
- The draft DFC model sensitivity analysis
- The memo on suggestions for DFC model/FPB manual fixes

The estimate will include assembling the package for CMER/RSAG concurrent review, preparing a revised version that addresses RSAG/CMER comments, responding to ISRP comments and finalizing the document. No decision to send the report to ISPR has been made as yet, but the budget will include cost for addressing those comments, should they be sought.

• **BTSAG:** Terry Jackson gave a report on the field trip to the BTO temperature study sites. Some problems with the implementation of the harvest prescriptions were identified. At several sites the fallers had not cut all the trees marked for removal to comply with the F&F rules. In order to test the rules, the exact prescription must be applied. Follow-up work is being done to get the remaining trees cut, but at least one site will be delayed a year before post-harvest monitoring can begin. Also found were some trees removed that were not meant for removal. Other project managers should pay close attention to falling activities, perhaps meet with the fallers to make clear that for our projects the trees must be cut as marked.

• **RSAG:** Chris Mendoza reminded folks to keep in mind when changing dates for SAG meetings, give as much lead time as possible, and try to accommodate regular attendees. Also, when holding a meeting where few regular SAG members are present, consider whether decisions should be made without consulting regular attendees.

**Presentation on Water Quality Standards changes** - Stephen Bernath

Steve gave a presentation that provided background on the process for developing and implementing the Clean Water Act water quality rules and standards in Washington State. He then talked about the changes that are being made in the temperature and water quality standards. DOE is moving to a system of “use-based” standards that restructures how the criteria are applied. There are now new 7-DADMax temperatures for specific fish spawning areas during the period when summer or fall spawning is occurring. There are additional narrative standards to protect spawning in specific water bodies. There is a need to determine whether these new temperature criteria are being met in spawning areas during the time of year when the fish are spawning. There is also an anti-degradation provision designed to prevent pollution. This means that waters of higher quality cannot be degraded unless there is an overriding public interest.
Steve asked that the SAGs and project managers review current and proposed studies that will be collecting temperature or sediment data to make sure the studies will collect data in a manner that can be used to evaluate whether the temperature and turbidity standards are being met. Particular concerns are ensuring that temperature data is collected at the right time to determine water temperature during the spawning period in areas identified with standards for salmon spawning. Sampling design and analysis procedures for temperature and sediment data will need to address the anti-degradation rule.

Questions remain regarding to which background level the temperature and turbidity changes are to be compared.

**Afternoon Science Session- Fish Passage Program** - Dave Price and Bob Barnard

Dave Price presented the ISAG proposal for the Fish Passage Capability-culvert test bed study project that would test the passage of cutthroat trout through a test culvert at different gradients and flow conditions. Bob Barnard did a presentation on the proposal-Effectiveness of Stream Simulation Culverts to test the design criteria for stream simulation culverts.

Dave Price will send out the proposals to CMER and ISAG for review. Comments will be due to Dave by July12. If comments can be dealt with by the CMER meeting, Dave will bring the new proposals and a table of how the comments were dealt with. Dave will also bring a brief write-up of the scoping that went into the selection of these projects.

---

**CMER Monthly Report to Policy:**

1. Heads up on documents to be delivered soon
   - CMER approved ABR Annual and Seasonal Variability report (not ready to deliver until all transmittal documents are prepared)
   - CMER approved SAGE Type F Riparian Study Plan (not ready to deliver until all transmittal documents are prepared)

2. CMER approved changes to Hardwood Conversion budget. This changes the amount to be spent by year in the CMER budget, and needs Policy approval.
3. Budget for completion of DFC FPA analysis reports
4. CMER had a presentation on WQ standards changes, and is reviewing projects for implications.
5. CMER is reviewing Fish Passage project proposals.

---

**Science topic for July:**

**Science Session for August: Wetlands mapping project**