

**CMER**  
**January 20, 2004**  
**General Administration Building, GA3**  
**Minutes**

---

**Attendees:**

Barreca, Jeannette	Ecology
Butts, Sally	USFWS
Clark, Jeffrey	Weyerhaeuser
Heide, Pete	WFPA
Hunter, Mark	WDFW
Jackson, Terry	WDFW
MacCracken, Jim	Longview Fibre
Martin, Doug	CMER Co-chair
McFadden, George	NWIFC, CMER Staff
McNaughton, Geoff	AMPA, DNR
Mendoza, Chris	ARC Environmental Consultants
Pederson, Pete	Upper Columbia United Tribes
Pleus, Allen	NWIFC
Pucci, Dawn	Suquamish Tribe
Quinn, Timothy	CMER co-chair, WDFW
Ray, Kris	Colville Confederated Tribes
Risenhoover, Ken	Port Blakely Tree Farms
Robinson, Tom	WSAC
Rowton, Heather	WFPA
Schuett-Hames, Dave	NWIFC, CMER Staff

---

**Decisions and Tasks**

<b>Decisions and Tasks</b>	<b>Minutes Section</b>
CMER 2004 Meeting Scheduled to be revised	CMER 2004 meeting schedule
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• CMER budgeting and workplan development to coincide with the state fiscal year</li><li>• CMER co-chairs to work on a schedule to get a budget and workplan submitted to FPB for approval in June 2004. CMER will consider proposal in February.</li><li>• SAGs should operate under the</li></ul>	2005 CMER Workplan and Budget

assumption that any new projects or significant status changes in existing project should come before CMER in March 2004.	
Concerns were raised regarding the SRC review process used for the watertyping model. CMER agreed to clarify the SRC review process to alleviate these problems in the future.	SRC Update
CMER 2004 workplan finalized and adopted by FPB	Workplan and Budget
McFadden distributed a proposal for a CMER plot location database and requested CMER review and comment. The proposal was e-mailed to CMER.	Creation of a CMER Plot Location Database
Extensive monitoring is the science topic for February	Science Topic

**Minutes:** December CMER minutes were approved as amended. Decisions and Tasks from the December meeting were reviewed.

**CMER 2004 meeting schedule:** The CMER 2004 meeting schedule will be revised to better accommodate logistical needs. Rowton will work individually with people who attend meetings to pick another day of the month that will allow us to continue to use the NWIFC Conference Center as the meeting facility.

---

**January 2004 FFR Policy Committee Update:** McNaughton said that Policy was supportive of the workplan and budget that will be forwarded to the FPB on February 11, 2004.

Martin and Quinn met with Smitch and the Policy co-chairs via conference call to discuss how Policy will consider study results such as from the PIP and DFC study. Smitch will convene the co-chairs of CMER and Policy to formulate a structure that will be presented as a proposal to FFR Policy.

Quinn added that the Policy would like to see intensive monitoring get moving. The Policy co-chairs also requested that DNR look at the RMAP program and coordinate it with the CMER program in terms of effectiveness monitoring.

---

**2005 CMER Workplan and Budget:** McNaughton is planning to seek approval for the 2005 CMER workplan and budget in June 2004. CMER participants raised concerns with how the 2005 budget can be approved in June without CMER prioritization of that work. Quinn clarified that Policy has agreed that all of these projects are important for CMER to do. CMER does not need to prioritize this again. The challenge to CMER is to get the

projects up and running as soon as possible. Schuett-Hames said that we have been through this prioritization a couple of times and it will not get easier in the future. Future CMER prioritization will focus on new projects and projects that have had a significant change in status.

Quinn proposes that we do not need another formal process to prioritize these projects because they will not change over the course of this year. Schuett-Hames and Robinson advocated for a formal prioritization process, but one that would only consider new projects and changes in status of existing projects.

Quinn added that CMER needs to know if there are any new projects coming on board by March of this year. SAGs should come prepared to propose new projects by the March CMER meeting.

CMER Consensus: the budgeting and workplan review process will be changed to coincide with the fiscal year schedule of July to June. The CMER co-chairs will work on a schedule to get a budget and workplan submitted to the FPB for approval in June 2004 and will bring this proposal to CMER for consideration at the February meeting. SAGs should operate under the assumption that any new projects or significant status changes in existing projects should come before CMER in March of 2004. CMER will discuss how we will prioritize the revised plan and projects at the February meeting.

---

**SAG Requests:** There were no SAG requests this month.

---

#### **SRC Update:**

Watertyping Model: McNaughton said the watertyping model is still out for review and the deadline was Friday for the review to be completed by the University of Washington. He is expecting a report soon. When that review is completed, the same reviewers will consider the watertyping validation study design. The reviewers did agree to an open review process for the validation study design because it is not a completed study. The DFC report has also been submitted for review and the University is having a difficult time finding an associate editor to head the review team.

Mendoza said that the review team for the watertyping model review indicated they would not look at the additional questions submitted after the review went in until they were done with the fish model review. Therefore, CMER should be aware that questions put forth to the SRC need to be done prior to submission of the report. A better strategy needs to be designed based on lessons learned from the fish model review. In the case of the fish model review, there were some SAG stakeholder questions that did not get forwarded because there was debate on whether they were technical or policy. That dispute was never resolved at the SAG or CMER level.

Mendoza requested that proposed questions for SRC review get agreed to and resolved at the SAG level unless the SAG cannot agree. If the SAG cannot agree, the dispute will be forwarded to CMER. At all times, questions should be agreed to before a report proceeds to SRC for review.

DFC Review: Schuett-Hames said that, as part of the cover letter in the DFC process, a question was addressed to the University regarding how they would deal with conflicts of interest. McNaughton said that, though there has been no formal communication with Dan Vogt, Vogt has looked for an associate editor outside the University. McNaughton will follow-up with Dan Vogt directly and see what he has done to avoid a conflict of interest and will report back at the next CMER meeting.

---

**Finalize workplan and budget:** Schuett-Hames updated CMER that the workplan has been reviewed by both CMER and Policy at this time. He did receive comments from Terry Jackson that consisted of edits and clarifications on bull trout projects. The primary edit was a suggestion to change the project name on the “bull trout overlay temperature project” to clarify that the project actually addresses effectiveness of temperature, shade, and eastside prescriptions.

The other major update is that SAGE has come up with a consensus addition to the workplan for the eastside riparian program. There are also budget items related to that program which may change some of the prioritization of the workplan. Those budget changes may best be made in terms of the springtime prioritization for fiscal year 2005.

CMER agreed that the comments that were recently submitted on the workplan would be incorporated into the revisions that will be forwarded to the FPB in June 2004 for FY 2005 workplan.

---

**Creation of a CMER Plot Location Database:** McFadden distributed a proposal for a CMER plot location database and requested CMER review and comment. The proposal will be e-mailed to CMER as well. Please comment to McFadden by February 3, 2004.

---

## SAG Issues

- UPSAG: Clark said that the sub-basin scale road monitoring plan is almost ready for CMER review for a second time. UPSAG will be seeking approval of a plan to go to SRC review in February. A feasibility component has been added to the plan pursuant to CMER comments received.
- ISAG: Martin said that ISAG is going with an RFP for extensive fish passage monitoring. That proposal will come to CMER soon for review. This request will come to CMER for the February meeting. An RFQ will be developed for the validation study.

- SAGE: Ray said that the literature review for disturbance regimes in eastern Washington is proceeding.
  - RSAG: the bull trout overlay study plots are being compared to see if those sites can be used for the eastside Type F effectiveness. Groups consulted will include BTSAG and SAGE. RSAG will then seek agreement from everyone about the utility and efficiencies of using these sites for the eastside Type F effectiveness monitoring.
- 

**Intensive Monitoring:** Martin said that the University of Washington, ONRC, and others have been discussing intensive monitoring. These groups are always asking how they could interact with CMER in terms of getting together on a project. Intensive monitoring seems like an area where these groups may be able to get involved. Sediment validation questions will be of interest given the road monitoring plan and other projects that are currently underway. Where in the watershed and resource scale questions are important and these types of questions need to be scoped. This is a complex issue and will take a lot of time to develop.

A number of concerns were raised including:

- The effort should involve the SAGs as well as the intensive monitoring group.
- Funding is collaborative and CMER should not abandon this concept.
- The request should come as an official SAG request
- We need to be sure that the group picked is the best group doing work in this area
- The issue should be further explored during the CMER February conference

Schuett-Hames will send a memo to CMER seeking interested individuals who would like to participate on the Intensive Monitoring subgroup. This group needs to meet and discuss issues and consider the involvement of other parties in scoping and framing questions.

---

**Science Topic:** review the proposals coming forward involving extensive monitoring and discuss what we mean and how we may want to proceed. Riparian extensive and fish passage extensive will be discussed. Martin will talk with Ehinger about the riparian extensive monitoring project and see if he is willing to present at the February meeting.