

CMER
March, 23, 2004
NWIFC Conference Center
Minutes

Attendees

Butts, Sally	USFWS
Clark, Jeffrey	Weyerhaeuser
Dominquez, Larry	DNR
Ehinger, Bill	Ecology
Heide, Pete	WFPA
Hoffman, Linda	WDFW
Jackson, Terry	WDFW
MacCracken, Jim	Longview Fibre
Martin, Doug	CMER Co-Chair
McConnell, Steve	NWIFC
McDonald, Dennis	DNR
McFadden, George	NWIFC, CMER Staff
McNaughton, Geoff	DNR, AMPA
Mendoza, Chris	ARC Environmental Consultants
Palmquist, Bob	NWIFC
Pavel, Joseph	NWIFC
Pederson, Pete	UCUT
Pleus, Allen	NWIFC
Pucci, Dawn	Suquamish Tribe
Quinn, Tim	CMER Co-Chair
Ray, Kris	Colville Confederated Tribes
Risenhoover, Ken	Port Blakely Tree Farms
Rowe, Blake	Longview Fibre
Rowton, Heather	WFPA
Schuett-Hames, Dave	NWIFC, CMER Staff
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR

Decision/Task	Minutes Section
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CMER approved \$5,000 for the Wetland Literature Review Revisions Project. 	SAG Requests
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rowton will distribute compliance monitoring updates to CMER. • SAGs are asked to provide suggestions for compliance monitoring to Tim Quinn or Doug Martin by March 30th. Quinn and Martin will then approach FFR Policy with CMER's suggestions. 	Compliance monitoring
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAGs that need CMER staff support are asked to request this 	CMER Staff Update

Decision/Task	Minutes Section
assistance by March 30 th . Contact Dave Schuett-Hames of Geoff McNaughton.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAG edits to the CMER 2005 workplan draft are due to Dave Schuett-Hames by March 30th. 	Workplan Update

Minutes and Actions

Minutes from the February CMER meeting were approved as amended. Action items from February were also reviewed. The ISAG Extensive Fish Monitoring Study design proposal will be brought forward in April rather than during the March meeting.

SAG Requests

WSAG: Forested Wetland Literature Focus Project. WSAG requested \$5,000 to complete significant revisions to the WSAG Literature Review document. These revisions are necessary if the document will be distributed as a final product to CMER and to broader audiences. WSAG has a matrix of reviewer comments and have discussed how these comments will be addressed in the revised literature review.

CMER Consensus: CMER approved \$5,000 for Wetland Literature Review revisions.

SAGE: Eastside Riparian Assessment Project: Project Development. CMER Staff time has been requested to help with this project; if CMER staff is unavailable, SAGE requests \$60,000 to contract the development of the Eastside Riparian Assessment project. This project development is an integral part of the eastside riparian program. CMER requested that this request be tabled until CMER has a chance to become more familiar with the project. SAGE agreed to defer this request for \$60,000 for Eastside Riparian Assessment Project Development. CMER staff is available to assist with scoping.

SAGE: Eastside Riparian Assessment Project, Study Site Selection. SAGE requests \$40,000 for site selection to be spent after a study design is approved.

CMER requested that this request be tabled until CMER has a chance to become more familiar with the project. SAGE agreed to defer this request for \$40,000 for Eastside Riparian Assessment Project Study Site Selection.

To approve spending for the two SAGE funding requests, CMER will need to hear about the project during a science session. SAGE will present scoping information at the May CMER meeting. CMER will prioritize on April 26th and placeholders for these two requests will be placed in that budget, based on prioritization outcomes.

SRC Update: An interactive review session for the water typing validation study design will be held this week. The study design was submitted to SRC in the usual manner and reviewers quickly identified concerns and questions that the interactive review session

will address. SAG chairs are cautioned that the interactive review session doubles the cost of the review. DFC comments have been delivered back to RSAG from the SRC.

SRC Process: A draft CMER Scientific Review Process Description was distributed to CMER two weeks ago. CMER participants were asked to review the document and come prepared to discuss it today. Comments are as follows:

- It was stated that scientists have biases and if the reviewers are unknown to the associate editor, these biases may have less effect on the final product. Some participants disagreed; some reviewers will always contribute more than others, making equal weighting of comments by the associate editor impossible. Others thought that the associate editor does have too much control over the process. If people read the other reviews, they may not agree with the associate editor summary of the review.
- CMER participants are encouraged to always read the individual reviews in addition to the Associate editor review.
- Some reviewers would like context and more information about the studies they are reviewing. A cover letter or interactive review would help to provide this context. Many others present agreed with this suggestion.
- SAGs should be able to put forth all questions they have about a particular study. CMER can then decide when questions are appropriate for policy review.
- Addition suggested; the SRC should see how SAGs have responded to reviews.
- A question was raised regarding where this document will go after it is approved. It was suggested that a broad overview would be included in the adaptive management board manual and the details will be outlined in the CMER Protocols and Standards Manual.
- If the AMPA identifies problems with the submissions, those problems should be discussed and resolved within the SAG and/or CMER. Any changes must be approved by the SAG or CMER. A definition of “pertinent information” was also suggested; this information could be the context and would be provided by the SAG.
- Context should be part of the study so that readers who are unfamiliar with forest management and forest practices rules can understand the study and focus on technical and scientific issues.

Additional comments on this document are due to Dave Schuett-Hames within 10 days.

Compliance Monitoring Update: Sturhan discussed outlined issues associated with the compliance monitoring protocol development. Issues identified by DNR include:

- Link between CMER monitoring and compliance monitoring needs to be coordinated.
- External review of compliance monitoring framework will be necessary
- EPA and Ecology need a compliance monitoring protocol to help them decide in 2009 whether forest practices rules are being implemented and whether these standards result in the ability to exempt forested lands from TMDLs
- Sustaining implementation over time

- Time saving survey methods (low altitude aerial photography)

All SAGs and CMER are interested in contributing to the compliance monitoring design. Quinn and Martin asked again for the SAGs to identify where effectiveness monitoring projects could benefit from or be directly linked to compliance monitoring. This list should be tied to the workplan. These comments should be sent to Tim Quinn or Doug Martin by March 30th. Quinn and Martin will then approach FFR Policy with CMER's suggestions.

CMER Staff Update: McNaughton said that he works with Schuett-Hames quarterly to discuss CMER Staff needs. If anyone needs CMER staff support, please let McNaughton or Schuett-Hames know by March 30th. Site selection help will need to be noted as well.

Budget Update: McNaughton said that the budget approved by the FPB is in existing studies. CMER staff support may be needed for implementation of these studies.

Workplan Progress and Content Discussion: Schuett-Hames finalized the 2004 workplan late last month; the 2004 workplan is posted on the CMER website. No additional comments have been received, aside from those already submitted by Jackson and SAGE. LWAG and WSAG will submit information by March 30th. Make sure your strategies are informative.

Landowner Database Update: McFadden said the database will be kept simple. Each bullet in the memo will be one column. Additional information can be included if it is on an 8.5x11 sheet that can be scanned. The purpose of this database is for plot location only; data should not be submitted for the database. Project managers are responsible to submit this information to McFadden. Call McFadden if you have questions.

SAG Issues

BTSAG: a meeting is scheduled for April 29th to discuss the status and needs of the bull trout shade, temperature, solar study. Coordination will be worked out, sites will be discussed, and any other necessary changes will be made to help assure that the study continues on the intended track towards meeting the research objectives. CMER participants are invited to attend. Contact Terry Jackson.

UPSAG: UPSAG will have a SAG request for road effectiveness monitoring but it is not ready yet. They will be submitting it soon.

RSAG: received the review back from DFC. Some comments imply that additional sampling may help to increase the credibility of the results of the study. One to three

more studies also may be necessary. A response to these comments is being worked on by RSAG. There is no deadline on comments on the response from SRC yet.

USFWS does not have external e-mail or internet pursuant to a court order. Sally's contact information is

Sally Butts
Fish and Wildlife Biologist
USFWS, Western Washington Office
510 Desmond Drive SE, Suite 102
Lacey WA 98503-1263
Phone: 360-753-5832
Fax: 360-753-9518

Please call her if you want her to respond to you.

Science Topic for April: the science session will be open that day.

Prioritization Mechanism Proposal

Ideas to consider as projects are prioritized over time

- Resource risk and impact
- Scientific uncertainty
- Provide time for discussion of science
- Just review current ranking and discuss what needs to be changed and why?
- Need to rank value of projects relative to project cost.
- Need to define how to identify essential projects
- Need to rank the potential for each projects results to inform FFR rules
- Identify the big picture sequence that is logical

Two options were discussed for prioritization.

Option A

Review and evaluate existing rank
Ask why change?

Option B

Re-rank all projects and programs.

CMER Consensus: Option A will be the prioritization pathway.

Questions to ask yourself as you review programs and projects for FY05

1. The first step is to review the current rankings for all programs and the list of projects to ask the following question:
 - Is there a reason to change the current program ranking (if yes, proceed to step 2)?
 - Are there any new projects to consider (if yes, proceed to step 2)?
 - Is there a reason to change the project order (if yes, proceed to step 2)?

2. Why change? (Give the reason for change using the following criteria)
 - Essential value (see below)
 - Affordability
 - Sequence timing
 - Other valid argument

Essential is defined as:

- High risk to resources
- High uncertainty in our knowledge or understanding
- High potential to inform rule