

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee
September 25, 2007
United Churches
DRAFT Minutes**

Attendees:

*Almond, Lyle	Makah Tribe
*Baldwin, Todd	Kalispel Tribe, SAGE co-chair
Black, Janelle	NWIFC, CMER Project Manager
*Butts, Sally	USFWS, CMER Co-chair
Cramer, Darin	DNR Forest Practices, Adaptive Management Administrator
Davis, Chase	UCUT
*Ehinger, Bill	Ecology
Hayes, Marc	WDFW
Haque, Sarah	Squaxin Island Tribe
Heckel, Linda	DNR Forest Practices, CMER coordinator
Heide, Pete	WFPA
*Hicks, Mark	Ecology
*Jackson, Terry	WDFW, BTSAG Co-chair
*Martin, Doug	WFPA contractor
*McConnell, Steve	UCUT
*Miller, Dick	WA Farm Forestry Association
*Mobbs, Mark	Quinalt Indian Nation
Moon, Teresa	DNR, CMER Project Manager
Schuett-Hames, Dave	NWIFC, CMER staff
Sturhan, Nancy	NWIFC, CMER Co-chair
*Vaugeois, Laura	DNR Forest Practices, UPSAG co-chair

* indicates official CMER members

Assignments:

From September Meeting:	
Intensive Monitoring scoping document back to CMER in November	Nancy Sturhan
Update Policy on Intensive Monitoring	Sally Butts
Load the 2008 Workplan onto the website	Linda Heckel
Update CMER and SAG Co-chair names on the Website	Linda Heckel
Fix the numbering system in the 2008 Workplan	Janelle Black
Update the CMER membership rosters with phone numbers	Linda Heckel
Amphibian use of seeps report and 6 questions to policy	Darin Cramer
Provide CMER with a document on the FPB Rule Making/APA Guidelines and add document to the PSM	Linda Heckel
Flume study design going to peer review	Darin Cramer
Incorporate CMER edits to the flume study questions and get the	Terry Jackson

technical group's approval and then on to the peer reviewers (comments to Terry by October 2)	
Stream simulation study design – Dick will provide comments by 10/2 – Terry will talk with the author. Design and questions will come back to CMER in October	Terry Jackson
Find a speaker from the Red Alder Coop to speak at a future CMER science session	Sally Butts
Supply a list of articles published by the PNW experiment station scientists	Dick Miller

Science Session: Intensive Monitoring Discussion: Doug Martin

Headwaters sediment study

A year or more ago, Policy tasked CMER with developing a companion study to the Type N Experimental study in basalt lithologies. The companion was to be a similar study overlain on less stable lithologies (called the soft rock study). CMER evaluated what it would take to carry out such a study, but cautioned that this might not be the best approach on softer lithologies. While the Type N Experimental study is laid out to determine effects of the buffers on amphibians and inputs to the stream, the concern on softer lithology was that other erosion factors would overtake the effect of buffers on sediment inputs. A different design would be more appropriate to account for sediment input from various sources.

The current approach involves dividing up the landscape according to types of erosion processes (deep-seated landslide-prone terrain vs. shallow rapid landslide-prone terrain vs. surface erosion-prone terrain). The design would also account for the level of forest practice disturbance on each type of erosion process. This approach would help to compare, within various erosion types, the effects of different levels of forest practices activities.

The CMER sub-group that has been meeting on these issues is in agreement that the Type N Experimental approach is not appropriate for softer lithologies, and also agreed that dividing the landscape according to erosion type was a better approach. A scoping paper that describes this approach will be prepared

The East side Type N Characterization study which examines different Type N stream flow regimes may have information to contribute to design and site selection for the East side.

Critical questions:

1. What are the effects of forest roads and timber harvest on temperature and sediment inputs to and exports from streams? Can we also look at other measures of Water Quality and macro invertebrates?
2. How do sediment inputs/exports differ depending on the dominant erosion type and intensity of management disturbance
 - a. Are the surface erosion targets exceeded?
 - b. What is the contribution of various BMPs to erosion?

3. How does temperature and nutrient exports differ depending on the dominant erosion process and intensity of disturbance
4. Can you detect exports and are the performance targets for sediment being met or exceeded, and if so, what aspects of the rules are contributing to that (e.g. roads, buffers)?

There is agreement to include both sources and export of sediment from Type N streams. For water-quality parameters, macro-invertebrates, litter fall only exports will be measured.

Nancy Sturhan will develop a draft scoping document, working with UPSAG, and bring back to CMER at their November meeting for discussion. Sally will update policy on CMER's progress on this subject.

CMER folks need to update their Policy folks of the general approach of this project.

Minutes from August meeting and action items: Sturhan/Heckel

Minutes from the August meeting were approved with changes. Action item list was reviewed.

Policy Meeting Report: Butts/Cramer

DFC reports and six questions were presented to Policy. A small group was formed to answer the Policy questions (7, 8 and 9 from Appendix B, Table 1 of Board Manual chapter 22). The CMER 2008 Workplan was presented and approved at the FP Board meeting in September.

Steve mentioned that a majority of RSAGs work has been assigned by Policy. It's important for CMER to establish the issue that they aren't getting to some projects because of policy directives, add to the existing workload. What is the purpose of the a workplan? Put in a paragraph – policy prioritization has a significant effect on how CMER is doing their work.

Pete wanted to point out the work that Nancy did on the workplan and asked that it be posted to the website? Linda will get it on the web.

Dick pointed out it would be helpful if we adopted a numbering system for the subheadings in these annual workplans. It would be easier to follow the studies. Then carry over the numbers on the budget spreadsheet. Janelle will fix the numbering and Darin will update the spreadsheet.

Board Meeting Report: Cramer

The FP Board approved the '08 CMER Workplan at their September 11, 2007, meeting. The rule-making proposals for the Desired Future Conditions were moved ahead to the CR 102. Caucuses need to provide DNR with their questions directly to Chuck Turley.

CMER Budget: Cramer

Darin provided an updated 2008 budget sheet and he is working on the '07 expenditures chart.

FYI - There is a Forests & Fish Budget Subcommittee funding workshop on September 27, 2007. This is to look at our spending practices and future revenue streams.

ISPR Update: Cramer

ISP review of the Post-mortem study is nearly complete. Comments from the ISP reviewers have been examined by UPSAG, and a plan to deal with the comments has been developed. The ISP is currently reviewing the response action plan.

Fish passage may be going to ISPR soon.

SAG Requests

LWAG – Amphibian use of seeps – asking for approval of 6 questions to move to policy.
Approved – move report and six questions to policy

LWAG - Amphibians in Intermittent Streams – Comments were received from CMER/SAG, and significant changes to the study were recommended by reviewers. LWAG is considering re-working the study design.

SAG Issues:

Rule-making process – Sturhan

Nancy gave a brief description of the FP Board's rule making process and how items move from CMER to Policy to the Board. Linda provided a chart on the Board's rule making and how it fits into the Administrative Procedures Act (APA) deadlines.

She pointed out that DFC went into the board process and the Board assigned work to Board staff (DNR FP division) and they worked with stakeholders.

Steve felt that CMER should coordinate better with Policy and the Board on the information that is going forward.

Attach the briefing on the APA to the PSM.

Fish Passage

CMER Fish Passage subgroup proposed sending the study plans for both the Fish Passage Flume Study and the stream simulation study, along with potential reviewer questions to Peer Review. The study design was already approved last year by CMER.

Terry informed the group that there are concerns about the number of fish that might be collected (would need to go through the WDFW scientific collectors permit process). Collecting all the fish (1,500) from headwater streams in the Skookumchuck Basin could adversely effect these small populations. Fish may have to be collected further downstream to address this issue. Then there may be questions about not using fish from headwater streams. WDFW is talking with their field bios to get information on how best to collect fish for the study. Will have to work out how best to minimize the impact to the fish during collection period (April-May).

Why cutthroat? Because it is the predominant fish in most headwater streams.

Sally noted Chris' concern about the 1,500 fish also that both the flume study and the stream simulation study designs originated within ISAG but then recently a technical fish passage group composed of some ISAG folks and also other folks got the study designs ready for peer review.

Terry asked that those who have concerns about the approach for capturing fish please write them down and forward them to her during this peer review process.

Janelle commented that the peer reviewer list doesn't have a reviewer with good statistical study design expertise. There are people at the UW that are good at this.

Todd hoped that we could get reviewers that are familiar with both sides of the state. Doug mentioned that there are folks on the list from the intermountain west that would be familiar with east-side issues.

Mark asked if CMER could make revisions to the questions. They need to be rewritten to get to what you want answered. Terry asked Mark to make revisions and send these to her.

Discussion on clarity and good scientific writing. Dick thought the stream simulation study plan is incomplete and could lead to confusion. Should we stop the train now and hold it up? Or go forward.

If the quality of the written proposal is not good enough, it is not clear what CMER should do about that. There aren't any people in this field that are neutral. It would just go around and around.

Pete stated that it is also a timing issue for the flume study; the folks that own the flume may be shutting it down.

Dick thought CMER needed another level of review on a study plan after the SAG and prior to coming to CMER. The reports and plans need to be clearer and less confusing.

The study designs were approved in '06. Changes have been made in the plans since then. If you have specific clarifying edits by 10/2, on the stream simulation plan, send them to Terry, and she will take the edits to the study design author. The author has to be willing to address comments he considers appropriate. It will come back to CMER next month for approval.

It was agreed that the flume study will go forward to peer review. The Flume study comments on the questions are due by 10/2 (to Terry) and then will be sent to the fish passage technical group for their review. It will then go out to CMER via email for approval and then on to the peer review group. Stream simulation study design (Dick will provide comments to Terry by 10/2) and then it will come back to CMER next month along with the questions.

UPSAG Accuracy and Bias Study Design

This study design was sent out late for review so comments are now due 9/26. The response matrix and updated study plan will be coming to CMER in October.

RMZ Resample

Reviews have been received. Over 200 comments. Teresa will be meeting with the contractors to address the comments. Update forthcoming. This project has spent its entire budget, and was awarded an amendment and funds for the ISP review stage. At issue now is whether the document is complete and of adequate quality for CMER to review. The draft that was distributed to CMER was clearly not suitable for distribution. Darin concurred with this and provided a brief explanation of what happened, e.g. LWAG reviewed, sent it back and asked for changes but did not re-read and evaluate changes before sending to CMER.

BTO Add-On Project Memo

Recommendation came from RSAG to go back to 100% sampling. A pilot test of the 50% sampling level proved to be nearly as much work for half the data. Dick urged that this group coordinate with Karen Ripley (imminent mortality) to compare data sets, etc.

CMER Staff Needs

Darin reviewed the history of filling the vacant CMER staff and PM positions.

Last month CMER had a discussion about the vacant CMER technical staff position and how best to fill CMER/SAG needs with that position. There is a large and growing information management need and some technical support needs. There is possibly a way to move these two items forward. Need to scope the information management needs and highest technical need. In the near term we likely have the budget to move forward on both the technical staff position and scoping the info management system. A small CMER subgroup could work with IT staff on the scoping.

Dave Schuett-Hames, head CMER staff person, suggested: #1. A database with a tracking system (sort by geographic region, where data currently is and what type, metadata, connect with GIS functions and study sites, ex.). Possibly the NWIFC could do a pilot to start with. #2. System for organizing the data. We have data in many locations. Where? Archived? Figure out how to manage that data and in formats that are updated before computer hardware/software technologies expire. We could build this over time.

Janelle mentioned that CMER could possibly hire an intern to collect information (data hound).

Dave will send out a note to CMER for volunteers for a small group to focus on developing the CMER database. It would be good to include Dawn Hitchens (DNR contracts specialist) in this group because she has already collected many of the F&F CMER products.

Darin has heard back from SAGE and UPSAG on the vacant position, is there more? RSAG has notes to forward to Darin. Steve said that he had sent proposed revisions to the recently sent out RSAG meeting minutes that included RSAG's discussion on the CMER position. Steve agreed to send this to Darin. Several upcoming RSAG positions would benefit from this skill set. Dave and Darin will determine needs and develop a position description.

Document Classification (CMER Decision Tree) Paper: Butts

Document was presented at Aug. CMER meeting. Verbal comments on the document were expressed, but no written comments were submitted by the Sept. 4th comment deadline. The draft document was presented at FFR Policy in September and it was noted that CMER may have some additional comments. CMER co-chairs decided that additional CMER comments to the document could be provided during the review of the Protocols and Standards Manual.

Quality of reports, role of PM, SAG, and CMER in review: Sturhan

The issue of the quality of CMER reports was raised and that PMs and SAGs need to ensure that documents coming forward to CMER are of satisfactory quality so that CMER's review time is not wasted. The issue of quality of reports will be included in the revisions to the Protocols and Standards Manual. Nancy suggested that each project should have a SAG member contact to serve as the point of contact for the Project Manager to answer questions about the project, to confirm quality of products, and to consult when payments are being approved. This will help tie the SAG to important decisions about the projects they have sponsored.

Cross-coordination with PNW research station: Miller

Dick Miller brought up the idea that PNW researchers may be interested in cooperating with CMER research since they are interested in publishing scientific documents. Dick will provide a list of articles written by scientists at the lab to show the areas of work they are involved in.

Red Alder Growth and Yield Model/Speaker for CMER Science Session: CMER would like a presentation from the Red Alder Coop on the database to see what data was used and how we can use the database in the future for CMER needs. Dave suggested that we need a PM to handle ongoing use of and interaction with Coop and data needs. Sally will contact the co-op.

Project Status Updates: Sturhan

How are we going to provide quarterly updates on the status tracker? Starting in October progress reports would be requested of SAGs. Darin will provide details.

CMER Workplan and Protocols and Standards Manual Updates: Sturhan

Workplan was approved. How do we want to update and review the manual updates? Do we want to go through the manual chapter by chapter? We'll try that process and see if that's doable. We'll start this process at the October CMER meeting.

CMER 2009 Workplan: Sturhan

Darin is tasked with this. Steve questioned whether we need to revise the workplan noting that he was unconvinced by any of the rationale for doing so that Darin had presented so far and that, in his opinion, CMER has other work to attend to that arguably is higher priority. This is more than a revision to the workplan, but rather transitioning into a strategic plan/workplan document

CMER Report to Policy: Butts

Amphibians use of seeps 6 questions.

Fish Passage Decisions

Headwater Sediment and Water Quality Study and Cumulative Effects Progress. Possibly a scoping document for Policy review in late 2007 or early 2008.

CMER website: Heckel

Put 2008 work plan on website. Also, update CMER and SAG co-chair names.

October CMER Science Session: UPSAG

UPSAG will present on groundwater recharge scoping.

'08 Science Conference: Butts

Flyers will be distributed via e-mail within few weeks. SAGs should start thinking about what topics they want to present and who their speakers will be.

Future Meetings

CMER 2007 Regular Meetings: November 27, 2007, NWIFC; December 18, 2007, NWIFC

CMER 2008 Regular Meetings: January 22, February 26, March 25, April 22, May 27, June 24, July 22, August 26, September 23, October 28, November 25th and December 16.

'08 Science Conference: February 20th, 2008, OB2