

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

Attendees:

Baldwin, Todd	Kalispel Tribe, SAGE co-chair
Black, Jenelle	NWIFC, CMER Staff
Cramer, Darin	DNR, AMPA
Dieu, Julie	Rayonier, UPSAG Co-Chair
Ehinger, Bill	Ecology, RSAG Co-Chair
Hayes, Marc	WDFW, LWAG
Heide, Pete	WFPA
Hunter, Mark	WDFW, RSAG
Martin, Doug	WFPA consultant, CMER co-chair
McConnell, Steve	UCUT
Mendoza, Chris	ARC, RSAG Tri-Chair
Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Indian Nation
Rogers, Charlene	DNR, Forest Practices
Schweizer, Jim	Washington Hardwoods Commission
Stewart, Greg	NWIFC, CMER Staff
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR, CMER Co-Chair

Minutes: Confusion corrected about board approval of both the proposal to hire a project manager and approval to rearrange the hardwood conversion study’s budget August meeting minutes approved. Comment that minutes are perhaps too detailed.

Report Back From Policy (Sturhan, Martin): Short meeting; updates from Bernath and subgroups; new Clean Water Act guidelines mean CMER needs to integrate with Ecology more on our projects to ensure we capture all parameters Ecology wants

ISPR Update (Martin): Awaiting the RMZ Resample report (LWAG) for ISPR.

Budget/Project Management Report From AMPA (Cramer): Nothing new in budget; new PM position announcement should go out this week or next. Close to having IAC report on contract expenditures and project reports completed

SAG Requests:

- BTSAG (Sturhan for Butts/Jackson): CMER approval of final reports from previous years studies
 - Proposed cover and explanatory pages presented, along with edits from Darin and Doug. Explanatory paragraph modified as suggested below.
 - Recommended to remove inserted reference to USFW. CMER agreed this was not helpful to readers of the reports.
 - Explanatory paragraph wording as agreed upon by CMER:
 - “This report was prepared for the Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee (CMER) as part of the Bull Trout Habitat Identification Program (see CMER FY07 Work Plan at <http://www.dnr.wa.gov/forestpractices/adaptivemanagement/>) and was conducted under the oversight of the Bull Trout Scientific Advisory Group (BTSAG). This report provides valuable information toward how to determine suitable or unsuitable habitat for bull trout. Additional work is needed to refine a protocol. This document was reviewed by CMER under the guidelines of its Protocol and Standards Manual and was not assessed through the Adaptive Management Program’s independent scientific peer review process. Conclusions, interpretations, or recommendations contained within this document are those of the authors and may not reflect the views of CMER and members of the Washington Adaptive Management Program.”
 - Recommended that CMER staff be expected to edit and wordsmith such things as this rather than using CMER time. **SAGs will review.**
 - Nancy will ensure BTSAG approves revised explanatory paragraph
 - Purpose and intent should be written by SAGs; rest of this paragraph should be stock and in Protocol and Standards Manual.
 - Some documents, such as this one, have three cover pages. Therefore, need to add “Cite As” notation to ensure consistent citations.
 - Martin comments that CMER cover is not as professional looking as it could be. He would like to establish a standard CMER cover. USFS General Technical Report cover given as an example of how it is handled by another agency that publishes similar reports and in a similar situation as CMER. Explanatory paragraph goes on back of cover where USFS puts their disclaimer. Mobbs adds that designating “contact author” would also be helpful. Mendoza brought TFW documents with standard cover, and CMER agreed that an update of that one would be appropriate.
 - Page1: Title; Picture; CMER Logo; DNR Logo; Authors; Publication number; Publication Date
 - Page2: CMER description; Explanatory/Disclaimer; Author box
 - Page3: Abstract (written by authors), keywords(?), and CMER “Cite As” box (no “prepared for...”)
 - Discussion about whether to use and declare our Exploratory/Data/ etc classification on title page (No decision)

- Sturhan and staff will create an example based on this discussion and present it with minutes for approval. Revise existing TFW cover.
- Discussion about retrofitting existing reports? How far back? CMER agreed to have staff go back and generate covers on existing reports, back to 2000.

SAG Issues and questions from the co-chairs:

- RSAG (Heide/Mendoza): Request by Hardwoods Commission for CMER to fund re-measurement of several hardwood plots in order to provide modeling data to the Hardwood Silviculture Cooperative at OSU. HSC intends to develop red alder growth and yield model for use in stand models such as FVS and ORGANON. RSAG intends to make a recommendation on this request and wants CMER to be aware of this project in order to avoid Process delays.
 - \$9800
 - RSAG concerned that tracking CMER money to such a co-op may be difficult.
 - Determine whether this project will provide information useful to RSAG and CMER
 - How to contract something like this? Not a “membership” type of agreement; this is actually work for payment. Darin needs to know how this was done in past, what we got for it, and to see records. Would most easily be done as an Interagency Agreement.
 - Need project manager if they do this since McConnell now gone
 - Critical timeline has not yet been discussed
 - Martin requested Steve McConnell’s input and cooperation on this project; next RSAG meeting October 13, 9-12; Steve’s new e-mail address is **stevem_at_aimcomm.net**. Cramer requested McConnell send him any records he may know of from previous work on this.

Project Updates:

- DOE Temperature Sensitivity update (Ehinger): Received comments. Expect to have revisions completed by end of September. Intend to send out to CMER and Small Forest Landowners 2 weeks prior to next (October) CMER meeting
- McConnell Project Status (McConnell): Cramer and McConnell in process of developing a new schedule. Contract is signed. Would like Heide and Mendoza to work with him and Cramer on revised schedule.
- Grotefendt aerial photo study (Martin): November 1 workshop at UW. This is same as November FPB meeting, may therefore revise workshop date. Conflicted people are Schuett-Hames (who is presenting DFC), Heide, Cramer, likely others who will be interested in workshop. Martin notes issue of changing workshop date at this time is problematic, especially for traveling presenters.

- Heide suggests investigating recording of workshop if conflict is unavoidable (RTI does this). Mobbs suggested we (CMER) go ahead and approve some funding for this now in case it is needed.
- Or, possibly shift time to afternoon/evening rather than day.
- What is total cost? Don't yet know; few thousand dollars
- Doug Martin will investigate possibility of rescheduling workshop, video recording, any other options for avoiding conflict with FPB meeting
- SAGE Type F (Baldwin): Black about complete with locating landowner information; Hofmann in process of sending out landowner letters; Baldwin has validated 24 sites so far and surveyed 8 sites, 10 sites tomorrow for our pilot work. RFQQ released yesterday. Surveying 1-2 sites in one day. Issue with measuring canopy cover in rain.
- SAGE Type N scoping (Baldwin): Discussed comments received and how to move forward. Stewart and Black to discuss with Martin proposed approach and then Stewart/Black to revise document per that discussion.
- Type N Experimental (Hayes): Original plan called for five blocks of four sites; have 4.5 blocks (18 sites) due to unstable slopes preventing application treatment at 2 sites in one block. Completed stream profiles; LWD inventory; found PIPs on 17; setup completed; amphibian surveys on 7 sites. Rest should be completed by mid-October.
 - Ehinger: 2 full blocks (Willapa and Olympics) were suitable for the export work; could not put in flumes in south cascades block because sites are inaccessible for much of the year and the streams were too steep. The other complete block did not contain suitable sites for flow gauging. Of the eight export sites, seven are up and running. the remaining site is inaccessible until some road work is completed. We expect to complete this site in the first week of October.
 - Fish work complete on 1.5 blocks; one site on Block 2 has a confound due to added presence of coho (all other streams have only cutthroat trout); second site on Block 2 has drying issues resulting in intermittent fish use; others should be okay.
 - Sturhan would like to have an afternoon science session on this project, (January). Would like to have many people there, who are interested, and want to have plenty of time for questions, answers, and discussion.
 - Martin wants the revisions documented in a study plan revision.
 - How do these sampling changes affect sampling variability and detectability? Four and half blocks exceeds the desired power requirements for amphibian analysis as calculated in the original study design. The two full blocks should result in adequate temperature and export information since temp and export data are more sensitive than anything that has been done. Eighteen amphibian sites will provide good information on genetic variability. Data show that power is extremely high on genetic data due to extremely low sampling variability among sites.

- At the science session in January, the PIs will describe study plan revisions and the effects on the ability of the study to achieve its stated objectives.
- Hayes notes fish were present downstream of the remaining Type N basins in the study, but fish numbers were found to be too low in many cases to make those sites useful for examining fish response; these sites remain useful for amphibians.
- Mendoza points out that this is an example of the balance of intensively monitoring a few sites rather than being able to monitor many sites at a lower intensity.
- Tailed Frog (Hayes): Issue with meta-analysis. Several data sets originally requested just recently became available, and LWAG decided it was important to incorporate those. Therefore progress report shifted to end of December.
- Dunns & VanDyke Salamanders: Progress report to CMER for November meeting.
- Last ABR report: Mendoza will confer with Dave Price to complete 6-questions document and get report approved by Policy

Public Disclosure Reminder (Sturhan): Remember that if data are contributed to a report that a decision is based on, those data become part of public record. If peer-reviewed report is used in decision, are all those raw data subject to public information act? No. Same true for tribal reports? Yes, if only a report is supplied and is used, CMER only has to provide that report.

CMER Upcoming Staffing Needs: If anyone has need, tell Cramer

CMER Monthly Report to Policy (Cramer):

- PIP subgroup had more PIP questions on the existing data; Cramer will confer with UPSAG to try to get answers; He feels that most current issues are just policy decisions that Policy just needs to make

UBC Conference (Martin): Martin sent out notice to CMER; UBC did not pursue their request for CMER funding, so assume none needed; abstracts currently being requested (Nov. 15 deadline). Discussed potential CMER studies to present, but no conclusions reached

CMER Web Site (Sturhan):

- Wants
 - Project descriptions;
 - Study sites;

- Many reports still not on web site. Dawn has a list of documents and products she was trying to locate. Nancy will see about sending that list out to CMER Staff and co-chairs to help fill in blanks, this week.
 - Discussion about how to get a working web site and what is being done with CMER money. Martin proposes CMER staff prepare all material for web site and provide to DNR web manager. Cramer concurs that he can work with CMER staff to get this work load divided up and done.
 - More work on layout of web site needs to be done in addition to getting documents posted. CMER web site is important communication tool for us.
-

Agenda items for October:

- None noted for meeting
 - **Science topic for October:** Roads Sub-Basin Study update, implementation lessons, and fish passage information
 - **Science topic for November:** UPSAG post-mortem study plan
-

December CMER Meeting: Move to December 19 (Approved). Sturhan will find another room as the NWIFC conference room is in use that day.

Afternoon Science Session – Issues unresolved in RSAG to do with sampling and study design on eastside Buffer Characterization, Integrity, and Function (BCIF) study

Landowners generally not using any alternatives that harvest within 50 ft of stream, therefore, impossible to complete project under current sample scheme (15 sites/year using standard prescriptions). Discussion of possibilities, including change in study focus.

In order to decide on appropriate study design and focus, need to know more about:

- riparian function on Eastside Type N streams
- current characteristics of eastside Type N stream riparian veg.
- past management status of eastside Type N riparian veg

Decisions:

- Hold off on Eastside Type N BCIF study implementation
- RSAG participate in SAGE eastside Type N study development
 - exchange meeting time information and cross-participate
 - Greg and Dave interact informally to start on an approach