Independent Multidisciplinary Science Team
Public Meeting Agenda
November 22 & 23, 2004
Forestry Sciences Lab Room # 200
Oregon State University, Corvallis OR 97331

Please Note: Meeting location is different than usual.
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, November 22, 2004

10:00 Adopt agenda – Carl Schreck
Adopt October meeting minutes

10:15 **Issues in eastern Oregon related to salmonid recovery and watershed functions** – General discussions with Team
Paul Doescher – Forest Resources, OSU
Dave Pyke – USGS-FRESC
Rick Miller – Rangeland Resources, OSU

12:00 Public Comment

12:15 Lunch (on your own)

1:30 **Issues in eastern Oregon related to salmonid recovery and watershed function**– General Discussion with Team
Bill Krueger, Rangeland Resources, OSU
Mike Borman, Rangeland Resources, OSU

3:00 Public Comment

3:15 General Team Business
Set meeting dates for March 2005

Updates and developments

- Oregon Plan Monitoring Team leadership
- Request to DOJ

3:30 Adjourn

Tuesday, November 23, 2004

9:30 Resume meeting

9:45 **Briefings on salmonid recovery efforts in urbanized areas**
Nancy Munn, NOAA Fisheries
Paul Ketcham, Metro
Jim Middaugh, City of Portland

12:00 Public comment

12:15 Lunch (on your own)

1:00 Annual Charter Review agenda—lead by Carl S.

1. Responsibilities of team members
    a. Responsibilities to the appointing authorities.
    b. Responsibilities to other team members.
    c. The voting procedure and the options available to Team members
2. Discuss our conclusions from the September meeting in which we decided to submit this letter to the Governor's Office and Legislature
3. Discuss the focus and objectivity of the Temperature Report
    a. Discussion of concerns about our conclusions and recommendations of the Temperature Report
    b. Discussion of concerns about our assessment of the literature of the Temperature Report
    c. Discussion of concerns about errors or omissions in the report of the Temperature Report
4. Changes required in the letter to the Governor's Office and Legislature
    a. Discussion and adoption of letter.
5. Revision of Charter – discussion and possible revision to allow:
    a. Public release of draft science questions.
    b. Public release of draft table of contents.

3:30 Public Comment

3:45 Adjourn

MINUTES

Independent Multidisciplinary Science Team
November 22 and 23, 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
Nancy Molina
Rich Shepard
Carl Yee

Others Attending:
Kathy Maas-Hebner, OSU
Leah Gorman, OSU
Paul Doescher, OSU
Rick Miller, OSU
Dave Pyke, USGS
John Buckhouse, OSU
Bob Beschta, OSU Emeritus
Bill Krueger, OSU
Mike Borman, OSU
Jim Middaugh, City of Portland
Paul Ketchum, Metro
Lori Hennings, Metro
Nancy Munn, NOAA Fisheries
Jim Paul, ODF

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

November 22, 2004
Co-Chair Carl Schreck convened the meeting at 10:00 AM.

AGENDA
The agenda was adopted as written.

MINUTES
The October minutes were adopted as written.

ACTION: Stan will send a reminder to the agencies that the temperature report responses are due.

WEB/INFORMATION RELEASE TO THE PUBLIC
Leah updated the Team on the website. Stan suggested that there be a discussion of the information released with Jim Myron and the House Subcommittee on Water.

ISSUES IN EASTERN OREGON RELATED TO SALMONID RECOVERY AND WATERSHED FUNCTION
Carl S. invited Paul Doescher (OSU Department of Forest Resources), Dave Pyke (USGS-FRESC), and Rick Miller (OSU Department of Rangeland Resources) to share expertise relevant to the IMST's eastside report. The speakers discussed general issues and answered Team questions.

Paul Doescher pointed out that all three speakers have upland expertise, and emphasized the importance of uplands to salmonid recovery. The speakers commented on each of the science questions and some relevant recent research to answering these questions.

Rich asked about aspects of upland management that would affect salmon population distribution and abundance. Dave Pyke discussed direct impacts on riparian systems, and upland sediment flow and infiltration.

Stan asked about the utility of paleoecological studies to reconstructing salmon runs and vegetation patterns. Rick Miller discussed some of the strengths and weaknesses of these studies.

There was discussion of available information of juniper on hydrology. Paul Doescher explained how juniper has increased the patchiness in soils. He also discussed "hydraulic redistribution" of juniper as it has been reported in an ongoing EPA study.

Dave Pyke discussed the differences between native and exotic species on soil stability and water-holding.

Rick Miller discussed how capture and storage (ex, wet meadows) can be influenced by management, but below-ground flows aren't easily influenced by managers.

Dave Pyke discussed an ongoing study on the impacts of livestock on vegetation. He found that within 300m of an off-channel water source, the greatest effects were observed.

Carl Y. said the he finds that water withdrawals are the #1 issue for salmonids in cropland areas. Rick Miller emphasized the importance of the uplands, considering the large percentage of the landscape that is uplands.

Paul Doescher also brought up the importance of conifer systems, and brought up the issue of fire. Catastrophic fire could quickly eliminate these forest stands. Research indicates that fires have shifted from mostly low and mixed severity to high severity fires.

There was discussion of research on cheatgrass and medusahead, and whether dominance of these plants would affect infiltration and flow.

Stan asked about legacies that need to be addressed in eastern Oregon restoration. Dave Pyke discussed down-cutting as a major legacy.

Carl S. asked whether the guests would be willing to answer future questions or review material, and the guests agreed.

In the afternoon session, Carl S. welcomed Bill Krueger and Mike Borman, OSU Rangeland Resources Department, and asked them to suggest relevant studies and discuss any relevant issues. Mike Borman provided the Team with a handout of issues that he and Bill Krueger thought important for the Team to consider.

Mike Borman provided the Team with a handout of issues that he and Bill Krueger thought important for the Team to consider. The Team asked questions about literature in the outline.

Mike Borman thought a riparian classification system for site potential would be necessary but would need to be done on a reach scale. He agreed that a coarser scale guide (i.e., basin) would be useful. Wayne suggested that ground-truthing the existing classifications would be very useful, rather than reinventing the wheel.

Regarding the outline statement of obtaining and evaluating Condition-and-Trend data where it exists within the Forest Service and BLM, Mike Borman clarified that he was pointing out the value of documenting improvement, even when local. Stan asked what they thought about the statement that riparian conditions are staying the same while upland conditions may be improving. Bill Krueger said that because grazing was so intense up until the 1960s, he does not think riparian conditions are getting worse. The Team requested that the Rangeland Resources department send any good studies they know of about conditions and trends.

Mike Borman felt that historical grazing patterns might have affected fire frequencies but he is not sure that current fire patterns are affected by grazing.

Palouse grasslands are now in wheat, bottomlands are in hay. There is information on the influence of row-crop agriculture on water quality.

Stan questioned Mike Borman about his reservations regarding the Heat Source Model.

There was discussion about the Krueger and Kelly rating system, and its advantages and disadvantages. Bill Krueger agreed that no major scientific evaluations have used the system. Nancy said that because natural systems are so variable and good experimental studies are few and far between, sometimes a knowledgeable expert is more valuable. Bill Krueger agreed and said the system was not intended as a value judgment.

Other topics discussed were the potential of Eastern Oregon systems to improve conditions for fish, and recommendations of technical experts that the IMST could consult.

TEAM BUSINESS
Meeting dates for the first three months of 2005 were set:
January 18 and 19
February 22 and 23
March 28 and 29

Monitoring Team leadership – Greg Sieglitz is the new Oregon Plan Monitoring Coordinator.

PUBLIC COMMENT
No public comment was given.

ADJOURNED
The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 PM.

November 23, 2004
Carl S. reconvened the meeting at 9:35 AM.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE UPDATE
Stan said that Richard Whitman would like to speak to the co-chairs before issuing a final letter on Team concerns to determine if all questions are covered adequately, Stan said he also suggested that R. Whitman could discuss the draft letter to the full team at the December meeting.

ACTION: Stan will speak to him and invite him to the next meeting or arrange a meeting with just the co-chairs depending on Whitman's needs.

LETTER TO LEGISLATURE
Rich will finalize the letter outlining team concerns with budgets and appointments after circulating it again to the entire Team for their final edits.

REFERENCES
Carl S. agreed with Bill Krueger that the wording in context of the reference needs to be clear, but disagreed that IMST should use the system proposed by Krueger and Kelly in the journal *Rangelands*. Rich agreed. The Team agreed to keep these issues in mind when crafting reports.

Nancy raised the issue of scope of inference, noting that the Team has the expertise to make these judgments. Carl Y. agreed. Stan said that addressing explicitly the scope of inference and strength of conclusions will strengthen reports. The Team also discussed how to present case histories.

BRIEFINGS ON SALMONID RECOVERY EFFORTS IN URBANIZED AREAS

Nancy Munn, NOAA Fisheries, does statewide coordination for NOAA Fisheries. She gave an overview of NOAA Fisheries programs and approaches to ESA-listed salmonids in Oregon.

Lori Hennings and Paul Ketchum, Metro, briefed the Team on Metro's natural resource programs addressing fish and wildlife habitat. Paul gave an overview of the program and Lori presented some field validation work that Metro has done. Team members asked questions about their programs.

Jim Middaugh, City of Portland, presented the city's efforts at watershed planning.

Stan asked the presenters if they might be willing to review the report. They said that they would like to review the draft report when it was ready.

ANNUAL CHARTER REVIEW

Carl S. said members need to be prepared for the January meeting when the Team plans to fully consider the annual report and team operations. He introduced the idea that he is concerned that IMST is worrying too much about operations rather than science, but he does want operations to be clear, especially to new members. Carl S. also discussed service and responsibilities to the state and the Team, and that everyone's responsibility to the State is to capture the big picture about science questions, conclusions and recommendations. The same applies to reading and commenting on IMST draft reports, in order to protect each other from major criticisms and needing to read for content not just editing text. He also discussed voting and that when he joined the Team that he was told that nobody would be coerced into voting if they are not ready, or that they couldn't vote contrary to the larger Team opinion. The whole team should have a comfort zone on voting and make sure everyone is ready to vote on the big picture items. The smaller editorial points are usually delegated to the subcommittee or support staff. Members should feel that they can request to delay a vote if they are not ready, and if they are not in agreement with the rest of the Team on big picture points in reports, that they can write a minority opinion.

Rich said he did not feel comfortable at his first, second or third meeting to raise concerns he had about the draft temperature report since he had just joined the Team, therefore he did not want to stop the release of the temperature report when he wasn't involved in its development.

Carl S. pointed out that it is the responsibility of Team members to raise scientific concerns.

Wayne raised a concern about the coincidence in the timing that Rich brought up his concerns, which was after the Farm Bureau and OCA voiced their criticisms of the Team's temperature report.

Rich said that he felt that there was not an opportunity to voice his concerns prior to those groups voicing their criticisms. His reservations have nothing to do with those groups. His concerns are the

same as he has voiced about the urban and eastside reports in progress and why he suggested a revision of the eastside outline. He is not comfortable with any of the science questions in the reports; they approach policy issues on how lands are used and managed; same with land acquisitions and how the state chooses to use that as a conservation tool.

Stan pointed out that the questions in the temperature report cam from the State – from the Governor and legislature. At the adoption meeting, Team members were asked if they supported the conclusions and recommendations. Members were given months to read the report, and to discuss it fully at the meeting. There is a matter of trust; if you have concerns you bring them up. If you vote for it, you support it. Stan feels that it reflects on the credibility of the Team.

Carl S. said looking forward, trust is essential. If anyone is uncomfortable, more discussion is needed. New members need to look at the interests of the Team and the State.

Carl Y. said there will always be a new person because of the staggered appointments. He might have structured the report differently but the temperature report agreed with his understanding of the science. Carl Y. feels that Bill Krueger and others aren't arguing with the basic science. As for voting, you have to take what was written, but can you agree with it.

Nancy commented that this group requires a high degree of mastery of technical information. She feels that there will be opportunity to come in on the ground floor in the future. You need to accept that.

Carl S. said you have to be able to trust the broad range of technical expertise in the report.

Stan said it is essential to voice the "fatal flaws" in the report. To the best of his knowledge, there are no major flaws. He also raised the issue of Rich's email about the report he wrote for the State of Nevada on temperature standards. Rich said that they had specific questions from Nevada to answer and they stuck to answering those in a direct manner.

Rich saw the IMST's report answering more questions than those asked by the State. How does DEQ measure or enforce that standard? What are the human activities affecting water in streams? Any management decision is a policy decision. He feels that it is not related to the questions asked by the state and blends policy and he is not comfortable with that.

Stan reminded Rich that when the report was adopted, time was taken to discuss each conclusion and recommendation and this is in the meeting minutes and tapes. At the time Rich indicated that he did support the recommendations and conclusions. And we stressed that the process was not to be rushed. Questions beyond the single question of the scientific basis of the state were discussed with the State. The question on human activities was to identify the science that separated factors that policy could influence from those natural factors it could not.

Wayne missed the first six months of the Team and had to do catch up work. He was always honored to serve because he is passionate about stream restoration. The **independent** was stressed from the first. The line between science and policy is grey and if it is crossed the Team will hear about it. IMST does not set policy. Technology transfer is a significant part of science. In grazing, it

is the people doing the work – getting information to the people is essential. It is a major part of science. He feels responsibility to the Appointing Authority because the State is trying to restore a resource that people identify with the Northwest from across the country. Responsibility to Team members and honesty are essential. All of his votes were based on being comfortable with the material.

Carl S. said we are almost in a new year. Why is there still public concern about process rather than conclusions?

Rich would have liked an "authorities" section at the beginning. He did not know what the public is asking for. Who defined the scope of the report is also important to define up front. He is comfortable with answering questions, such as the ODFW Coho Report review that was recently requested by the State and ODFW.

Wayne pointed out that the Team had written letter after letter after letter regarding improved monitoring by the state and this assessment in part, is a reflection of those letters.

Rich said the Team should go back to the legislature and ask what they want the Team to do.

Carl S. said that the original Team members got that direction.

Rich wants to see it in writing from the legislature.

Nancy thinks this would be difficult for the legislature. She suggested communicating on a case by base basis. In terms of policy, the Team wanders into policy because it is compiling science to advise policy. The bottom line is that we need to be able to trust each other enough to discuss these issues at the appropriate time. Maybe a "mentor" Team member could help the enculturation of new Team members.

Rich felt intimidated at the beginning when he first joined the Team. He feels that there was a circumstance of timing with the finalization of the temperature report. He feels that he and Wayne are in agreement about monitoring. In reports, he would like to see purpose and need.

Carl S. said this was another discussion.

Kathy Maas-Hebner pointed out that the focus of the Oregon Plan has broadened, which now includes all salmonids and watersheds within the state, not just coastal coho.

Bob feels that most Team members are comfortable with the Team's position, but Rich would like clearer direction from the governor's office and the Water Subcommittee. It's up to scientists to tell the policy makers that policies are needed based on the science, whether it is in rangelands or urban areas.

Wayne wants to see the kids of ranching families still here [on those ranches] in 50 years. That requires sustainable streams and sustainable streams make fish. He feels the technical outreach helps IMST.

Rich said he works in a world of regulation, which is highly structured and constrained. Nobody cares what he personally thinks about where policy should be at. This flavors his view of the difference between science and regulation.

Carl S. said that in research, one is often asked a question when you are not sure the person asking understands the question.

Wayne said he works in that context all the time.

In thinking about the future, Carl S. likes the mentor idea. Perhaps it could be suggested to Representative Jenson that they give guidance to new members.

Rich wants to take out the word “unanimously” from the letter and the word “all”.

Carl part of the dilemma that he saw when it looked like there might be a minority letter [to this one stating that the IMST supports the conclusions and recommendations in the temperature report] is that we are voting for something and then almost the credibility of the IMST is being called into question by someone saying that once they had time to think about it now they do not fully agree with.

Rich said that he did not say that there are [technical] flaws in the report.

ACTION: The letter will be sent with these changes.

Carl S. said that part of the dilemma is to change the wording to say that a member may no longer support a report after it was voted on and adopted affects IMST’s future credibility.

Wayne feels the administrative record is not clear because Rich has changed his mind.

Nancy thought the letter would be fine because it conveys the idea that IMST still supports this report.

Bob feels clarification on policy is needed, perhaps a letter from the Governor’s office and the Water Subcommittee

Carl S. mentioned that the Co-Chairs addressed the Subcommittee and that they will answer any questions regarding criticisms.

Carl Y. thought that these groups should be able to convince the legislature to ask for clarification. But the legislature makes the decision if it is credible and necessary to be addressed by the Team.

Rich feels that each report should include the “authorization” for the questions and reports be included in the report.

Bob and Rich would like to have Jim Myron and the Subcommittee provide information in writing on the intent of the work of the Team.

Revision of Charter
Stan returned at 2:30 and Carl S. recapped the discussion he missed including the Team decision to strike "unanimously" and "all" from the letter being sent to the State.

Stan said that to him if it says "that the IMST supports the conclusions and recommendations" it's straightforward. But that does infer to him that all team members support them. This still does mean, as our previous vote [time of adoption] that the members of the IMST support the conclusions and recommendations; and Rich stated that he did have reservations about that statement that you didn't before. So Stan is just trying to make things clear.

Rich said that with his new understanding of what was requested of the Team way back when, given that was the charge to the Team; he no longer has a problem with the statement.

Team discussion went into further discussion on Charter issues:

Rich would feel more comfortable with the intent and scope of the Team's activities if it is put in writing. He recommended that new members not get hit with a draft document and be told it is done.

Nancy said a mentor could help bring new people up to speed. The new person's responsibility is to come up to speed, and the group's responsibility is to help integrate new members into the Team and to make sure that they are comfortable with the contents and direction of the draft material. Team members are voting on the conclusions and content that there are no flaws or mistakes. If there are, they are responsible to bring these up. If they don't agree, then they have to prepare a minority report. If they have questions, the Team will work to clarify all these. The Team has always worked to determine the area of disagreements and to resolve disagreements. That everyone has ample time to review and be comfortable with the material and that the votes are not pressured or coerced. The votes mean that the individual members stand by the report.

Wayne feels that outside technical experts have helped IMST come to agreement on scientific issues.

Stan would like to get back to the legislature early in the winter, and would like to continue the discussion at the December meeting.

Rich suggested that Team members share their suggested changes in writing.

Carl S. felt that would be fine, but only if Team members are so inclined.

At the January meeting, depending on the availability of the DOJ opinion, the Team can fully review the Charter and make amendments if needed.

Kathy commented that the Team should be careful to not make changes they do not fully support to avoid the appearance of being open to outside pressure and lobbying.

Rich thinks that sharing early information would help build support for IMST reports.

Nancy passed out some thoughts about asking for public comment on IMST reports. Public review would only work if the public could affect the document. Problematic aspect is that products evolve. She laid out some options for discussion:

- Posting of science questions – limited
- Series of meetings with public – expensive, time-consuming, people don't show up

Stan commented that the Team has learned that targeting meetings in a location may accomplish these objectives.

Nancy doesn't think it would be useful unless people can influence it.

Carl S. – appear to not be responsive or disagree

Wayne observed that this is not a decision document, it is a science document and that needs to be added here.

Stan agreed that Wayne's point is important. People need to understand that the IMST does not make policy and is not seeking input on policy.

Wayne shared his experiences in working with the public. He is highly concerned that "not being heard" is a big problem in losing credibility.

Nancy envisions requesting input of a certain type – scientific and technical information on our assumptions.

Wayne discussed some of his experiences with public comment on a scientific document for spotted owl. He feels that by asking the public to comment on science creates false expectations.

Stan said the Team needs to decide how IMST is going to post information on the charges that IMST accepts (i.e., ODFW Coho Assessment), and that the Team needs to balance time and effort and still make sure the process is open and transparent.

Rich commented that to a large extent, legislators and agency heads are non-technical decision-makers.

Stan proposed that there be something in the charter about communication and outreach. This can be discussed at the next meeting.

ACTION: The Team will have a discussion at a future meeting about the aim of the major reports and the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds.

Carl S. summarized the action items for the Team from both meeting days.

PUBLIC COMMENT
No public comment was given

ADJOURN
The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 PM.