Independent Multidisciplinary Science Team
Public Meeting Agenda
October 25, 2004
Forestry Sciences Lab Rm # 200
Oregon State University, Corvallis OR 97331

Please Note: Meeting location is different.
Times listed on agenda are approximate; topics may be added or removed the day of the meeting. Please check http://www.fsl.orst.edu/imst/ for most recent agenda

Monday, October 25, 2004
Public Meeting

8:30 Adopt agenda – Carl Schreck
Adopt September meeting minutes
Set meeting dates for winter 2005

8:45 Updates and developments
- October 5th Core Team meeting
- Letter to Legislature regarding temperature report

9:00 Oregon's coastal coho assessment – Bruce McIntosh, ODFW
Update on progress and request for the IMST to review the assessment

9:30 Preparation for upcoming review – Carl S.
Determine strategy, time line, team members to prepare initial draft review of ODFW's Stock Status Report (Note: if Team agrees to review the coastal coho assessment at 9:00 then it will be discussed here too)

10:00 IMST integration of new member – Stan and Carl S.
General discussion on how well new members have been integrated into Team, changes to approach, setting up contracts, etc.

11:00 Land Use Planning and Patterns – Jeff Weber, DLCD
Briefing and discussion of how land use planning and patterns in the urban/suburban areas and how DLCD fits into the Oregon Plan.

12:00 Public Comment

12:15 Lunch

1:15 2004 IMST Annual report – Carl S.
Discussion on general content and timeline

1:45 IMST web page revisions – Leah Gorman
Discussion on progress and determine content for “Current Projects” and Current Review” pages

2:15 Responses to Recommendations of the 2002 Gravel Mining – Stan

- Team review of responses received from the Oregon Plan Core Team.
- Presentation and discussion of draft responses from the Division of State Lands – Eric Metz, DSL

3:15 Public Comment

3:30 Adjourn

MINUTES

Independent Multidisciplinary Science Team
October 25, 2004
Forestry Sciences Laboratory, Room 200
Oregon State University, Corvallis OR 97331

Members in Attendance:
Carl Schreck, Co-Chair
Stan Gregory, Co-Chair
Wayne Elmore
Bob Hughes
Rich Shepard
Carl Yee

Others Attending:
Kathy Maas-Hebner, OSU
Leah Gorman, OSU
Mack Barrington, ODA
Louise Solliday, GNRO
Ed Bowles, ODFW
Bruce McIntosh, ODFW
Jeff Weber, DLCD
Eric Metz, DSL

AUDIO TAPES OF THIS MEETING ARE AVAILABLE THROUGH THE OREGON WATERSHED ENHANCEMENT BOARD. Please contact Bev Goodreau (503) 986-0187.

October 25, 2004
Co-Chair Carl Schreck convened the meeting at 8:35 AM.

AGENDA
The agenda was adopted with one addition to the afternoon's Annual Report discussion. Carl S. will discuss release of report draft outlines and science questions to invited speakers.

MINUTES
The September minutes were adopted as written.

FUTURE PUBLIC MEETING DATES
The Team set public meeting dates for January and February 2005:
January 18 and 19, 2005
February 22 and 23, 2005

UPDATES AND DEVELOPMENTS
October 5th Core Team meeting
Carl S., Stan, Bob, and Rich met with the Oregon Plan Core Team on October 5 in Salem to discuss the Team's temperature report. They answered questions and discussed future interactions with the Core Team about the gravel and temperature reports. There was also discussion of the statewide riparian policy.

Draft letter to Legislature regarding temperature report
Stan has a draft that the Team can discuss in the afternoon during the Annual Report discussion. Stan also briefly told the Team that he is keeping in touch with the legislative subcommittee through Sandy Thiele-Cirka. Bob suggested that the Team also keep in contact with the Department of Justice regarding the Team's request for a legal opinion on operations. Stan said that he would touch bases with Richard Whitman.

PUBLIC COMMENT
Louise Solliday, GNRO, introduced herself to the Team. She will be working on the Oregon Plan Assessment, the PECE policy, and the Governor's Willamette River Initiative.

COASTAL COHO ASSESSMENT
Bruce McIntosh, ODFW, briefed the Team on the State's progress on the coastal coho assessment over the past year. He distributed a handout on the assessment, "Integration of Biological Status with Factors for Decline". The handout shows the ODFW approach to the problem of assessing coho status both currently and retrospectively.

Bruce told the Team to expect a synthesis of the material ODFW has presented throughout the year, along with biological criteria co-developed with NOAA Fisheries ONCC Technical Recovery Team (TRT). The draft will be presented to the Oregon Coastal Coho Project Stakeholder Team in mid-November. Bruce asked if they could also present the assessment in an interactive forum to the IMST to assist them in a review of the assessment. ODFW hopes to give the draft assessment to the Team in December and would like to hear from the Team by mid-February.

Ed Bowles, ODFW, provided more background on ODFW-TRT interactions that developed the biological criteria used in the assessment. ODFW will also develop specific questions with the Governor's Office for the Team to comment on during the review of the assessment. Likely questions for the Team to consider include:

1. Is this a plausible framework?
2. Is it populated with appropriate metrics?
3. Is the process scientifically credible?

Stan commented on the importance of looking at the future landscape of Oregon, and implications for salmon populations and policy decisions.

Ed described how ODFW is beginning to indirectly model future conditions such as downturns in ocean conditions. He also clarified that the primary purpose of the assessment is to inform a federal listing decision for coastal coho, rather than a progress report for efforts to achieve long-term objectives of the Oregon Plan.

IMST will be asked to review the synthesis report on effectiveness – has/will the State be effective in addressing factors of decline? – including biological criteria and how the criteria were developed. IMST will not be asked to review the 25 sub-reports individually unless the Team chooses to review them.

ACTION: The Team agreed to conduct a review of the State's coho assessment.

TIMELINE FOR REVIEW:
December meeting - ODFW will brief the Team and the Team will receive the draft assessment.
January meeting - Team discussion of draft review and draft responses.
Early February - Finalize formal Team responses.

PREPARATION FOR UPCOMING REVIEW – Carl S.
The Team's review of ODFW's stock status report will be set aside until review of the coho assessment is completed. Bruce suggested that ODFW present the stock status report to IMST at a future meeting.

Team members decided to wait until the December meeting after they have received the draft coho assessment before deciding how to approach and handle the review of that document and the documents that it is based on.

ACTION: Carl S. will contact Charlie Corrarino about the change in timeline for the Team's review of the stock status report.

INTEGRATION OF NEW MEMBERS – Carl S.
Carl S. asked the new Team members to reflect on how well they felt they were integrated into the Team. There was discussion of:

- Disconnects in the process for appointing new members - it is not clear who in the Governor's office and the Legislature are responsible for which steps in the appointments. Rich commented that this process needs to be organized and written down for reference to help the process run smoothly.
- Internal processes - Rich found the internal IMST process satisfactory.
- Contracts/Budget - Stan raised the issue that the budget constraints of the Team also need to be taken into consideration during the appointment process, for example determining if adequate funds for compensation are available and whether new members will need and are eligible for compensation (federal not eligible for compensation vs. independent consultant or university). Right now members with greater seniority are compensated at 0.25 FTE but because of funding constraints newer members on contracts are only compensated at 0.125 FTE, and only for hours billed. Stan suggested that communication with the Governor's Office on this issue would be important. Rich suggested a letter. Stan also indicated that the State needs to consider how budget constraints for adequate compensation may affect the work efficiency of individual team members. Stan said the State needs to give better indications to potential appointees regarding what they can expect in terms of compensation and how to present the State's expectations of new team members in terms of time and service to the State. An information hand out for new members might be useful.

ACTION: Rich will draft a letter regarding the Team's discussion on the appointment process and budget constraints on compensating members for equal amounts of time to the Governor's Office, Senate President, Speaker of the House, and House Subcommittee on Water. Rich will email a draft to Team members for review.

STATE LAND USE PLANNING AND PATTERNS

Jeff Weber, DLCD, introduced himself and described his role in the coastal program at DLCD. DLCD lost dedicated funding for salmonid recovery when the administration changed. He recently revisited the issue working on the PECE policy. He reviewed DLCD's programs that relate to salmonid recovery in urban areas.

2004 IMST ANNUAL REPORT – Carl S.

Carl S. distributed copies of last year's annual report and asked the Team about format changes they might want to see. Stan suggested a section devoted to major issues and questions that arose during the year. Bob suggested more detail on briefings and presentations.

ACTION: Kathy will update the details from last year's report. Carl S. and Stan will draft the Major Issues and Considerations section.

Release of information to speakers

Carl S. invited Dr. Krueger, Rick Miller and others from OSU's Department of Rangeland Resources to speak to the Team at its November public meeting. It was suggested that the Team also hear from Paul Doescher, Forest Resources, and David Pyke, USGS. The Team discussed what material to release to Dr. Krueger and others to inform their briefings. The Team discussed whether it was necessary to change the Team's Charter in order to send speakers the draft science questions from a current project to assist them in preparing to brief the Team. It was determined that it is not necessary to amend the Charter. The Team can release information to technical experts when they

are seeking additional information or clarification on a topic. Team agreed to send the invitees the draft Science Questions indicating that they are not final and may change before the project is completed.

Carl suggested that it might be useful to invite someone to discuss the superfund cleanup site in Portland..

ACTION: Carl will invite Paul Doescher and David Pyke to the November meeting and forward the draft science question to him.
ACTION: Carl will also forward the Science Questions to Dr. Krueger.
ACTION: Carl will contact Jim Middaugh, City of Portland to see if a speaker from EPA or another on the superfund cleanup would overlap his presentation.

At future meetings, progress on each major project (i.e., Urban, Eastside) will be discussed.

LETTER TO LEGISLATURE REGARDING TEMPERATURE REPORT - Stan
Stan presented a draft to the Team for review and discussion. Wayne suggested that the number of workshop participants be included and where they were from. After discussion, the draft was approved with modifications, and Stan was to email the revision to Team members for final agreement.

ACTION: Team members will send any wording changes to Stan. He will send the letter in early November, with copies to Jim Myron, Ken Bierly, and the Core Team.

GRAVEL REPORT - Stan
Eric Metz, DSL, presented the most recent draft of the agency's response to Team's 2000 instream gravel [aggregate] mining report recommendations. He discussed DSL's thoughts on some of the IMST recommendations and asked for Team feedback. Stan suggested that DSL talk to Pete Klingeman about rapid assessment of sediment budget. Rich discussed the need for more data on fish limiting factors in large rivers.

The Team discussed some of the draft Core Team responses to the gravel report with Eric. Stan complimented DSL on their database that tracks permits and gravel removal.

Due to the time left at the meeting, the Team decided to postpone reviewing the Core Team responses to recommendations until the November meeting.

ACTION: When the Team receives the final response, they will discuss the responses at a future meeting and reply back to DSL regarding the adequacy of the responses.

IMST WEBSITE REVISION – Leah Gorman
Leah gave a progress report on the revision of the website to the Team and discussed additional details:

- Current Review page – who requested review, what the document entails and projected timeline.
- Home Page – can add "What's New" on the home page.

- Discussion and adoption of Bob's proposed changes to the Team's "Scientific Conceptual Framework."

REVIEW OF ACTION ITEMS
The Team reviewed action items from the meeting and items for the next meeting agenda.

PUBLIC COMMENT
There being no public comment the meeting was adjourned at 4:02 PM.