

## Comparison of Alternate Approaches for Deriving Wet Season Default Distance

Produced by the Type N Technical Subgroup – June 27, 2013

	1. Use quality checked (QC) pre-harvest CMER data to establish defaults	2. Conduct pre-harvest field sampling to strengthen the existing QC'd CMER data set.	3. Conduct a survey of approved FPA's on WFWA member lands	4. Conduct a <u>pre-harvest</u> survey of WFWA member and other willing cooperator lands using the CMER field methods
Summary Description	The existing 2001 & 2002 CMER/Tribal data sets would be screened to identify sites with sufficient data to identify the current rule definition of UMPPF.	The CMER study methods* would be used to expand the existing data set.	WFWA members measure distance from UMPPF to Channel Head.	WFWA members (and other large willing landowners) to allow access for, and may participate in, measuring distance from the UMPPF to Channel Head.
Results of study would be:	CH to UMPPF distance using CMER study methods*.	CH to UMPPF distance using CMER study methods*, but expanded to ensure representation of all Level IV ecoregions under-sampled in the original pilot study.	Distance from CH to the UMPPF identified in approved FPAs.	Distance from CH to UMPPF using CMER study methods*, plus information allowing a comparison to the UMPPF on the approved FPA's for the same streams.
Limitations – geographic	Basins sampled were those with interested cooperators within the default precipitation regions, but not equally from all of the forested ecoregions. Distribution of existing data is geographically biased.	Fills in areas (gaps) not covered by existing CMER data. Limiting to cooperating landowners may create geographic bias.	Limited to WFWA lands. Will be geographically stratified by precipitation and geologic zones within the available sample population. Unknown distribution of FPAs and potential for geographic bias.	FPA's limited to WFWA and other cooperative landowner lands; will be geographically stratified within the available sample population. Unknown distribution of FPAs and potential for geographic bias.
Limitations – Methodology	UMPPF located by CMER study methods*; non-random choice of basins, random choice of streams within basins. Random selection of sample sites within a non-random selection of ownerships/watersheds.	UMPPF located by CMER study methods*; non-random choice of areas to fill gaps, random choice of streams within basins. Random selection of sample sites within a non-random selection of ownerships/watersheds.	UMPPF established through FPA approval process. No standardized field methods used by landowners to select the UMPPF. FPA sample population is FPAs with field work done in dry seasons. Random selection of sample sites within a non-random selection of ownerships/watersheds.	UMPPF initially established through FPA approval process followed by survey using CMER method* and noting approved FPA location of UMPPF. Random selection of sample sites within a non-random selection of ownerships/watersheds.
Limitations – adding to existing data?	All existing CMER data passing QC will be used.	Can be added to QC'd CMER data sets as they will be derived using same methods*.	Different methods used prevent combining results with existing CMER data sets. Rather, survey intended for comparing data sets.	Data based on CMER method may potentially be added to CMER data sets. Data collected on FPA-based UMPPF would be used only for comparison to CMER data sets.
Who collects data?	Already collected by CMER, tribes, WDFW, and industry cooperators.	To be collected by hired team or with aid of volunteer cooperator teams.	To be collected by WFWA foresters – in-kind contribution.	Initial FPA point established by LO; CMER compatible data to be collected by hired team, or with the aid of volunteer cooperator teams.

	1. Use quality checked (QC) pre-harvest CMER data to establish defaults	2. Conduct pre-harvest field sampling to strengthen the existing QC'd CMER data set.	3. Conduct a survey of approved FPA's on WFPA member lands	4. Conduct a <u>pre-harvest</u> survey of WFPA member and other willing cooperator lands using the CMER field methods
Quality Control	QC on field work already occurred; now identifying sites suitable for current application. 2001 Westside and eastside CMER data is done. Work remains to complete 2002 eastside tribal field data suitability review.	Will be part of study design.	Will be part of study design and could include participation of other non-LO stakeholders (e.g., CMER team)	Will be part of study design.
What do we do with results to determine wet season distance from CH to UMPPF?	Use the existing data to determine the wet season default distances from CH to UMPPF. Basic population statistics representing the results will be provided to Policy.	Add the new data to existing CMER data for more state-wide coverage. Use to determine the wet season default distances from CH to UMPPF. Basic population statistics representing the results will be provided to Policy.	Use the post-harvest FPA data to understand how closely approved UMPPF compare with QC'd CMER data set. Basic population statistics representing the results will be provided to Policy.	May be used directly to calculate default distances, and if not statistically distinct may be added to the QC'd CMER database and use for calculating defaults. May also be used to observe any difference in CH-UMPPF distance with approved FPA's. Basic population statistics representing the results will be provided to Policy.
Limitations for results	Existing data set is not evenly distributed across all areas.	Filling gaps may not substantially change regional level defaults. Cannot be used to infer if differences in FPA based UMPPF points likely exist.	Will not know if any difference with CMER data set is due to geographic differences and/or different field methods.	Limited to WFPA and other willing landowners and to new FPA's.
Time to results	Westside results are complete. Eastside 2001 CMER data results are complete. The 2002 eastside tribal data review may be completed by August 2013..	End of 2014	Winter 2013-2014	End of 2014
Level of effort	In-kind work. Westside and eastside 2001 data review is complete. One person 1 month part time to complete review of 2002 eastside tribal data.	Hired or cooperator team to collect data over two late summer periods, QC, analyze and write report.	In-kind data collection, month to screen FPA data base, several months to collect field data, one month to report. Hired team or team of cooperators to conduct QC check of 10% of samples.	Hired or cooperator team to collect data over two late summer periods, QC, analyze and write report.

- \*CMER method refers to Palmquist, 2005, Type N Demarcation Study, Phase I: Pilot Results. CMER methods require dry season surveys of flow and channel conditions.