Independent Multidisciplinary Science Team
Public Meeting Notice & Agenda
May 18 & 19, 2005

Conference Room 400
Gus Solomon Courthouse Federal Building*
USDA Forest Service, Portland Forest Science Lab
620 SW Main St
Portland, OR 97205

Please Note: 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.

Wednesday, May 18, 2005

9:00 Convene Meeting – Carl Schreck
Adopt agenda
Adopt April minutes
Set meeting dates September

9:15 Updates and developments:
- Ways and Means committee
- Replacement process for Team members
- Other items

9:45 Draft letter evaluating DSLs responses to recommendations – Carl S.
Team discussion, edits, and adoption of letter.

10:00 Review of responses to recommendations – Carl S.
Responses to the 2000 Lowlands report not yet evaluated.

10:15 Eastside project update – Carl Yee

10:30 Urban and Rural Residential Independent Project – Stan Gregory
Team begin review of draft report including introduction and Science Question 1.

11:45 Public comment

12:00 LUNCH – On your own

1:15 Continue team review of draft report – Stan

Continue review of Science Question 1 and begin discussion of conclusions and draft recommendations

4:45 Public comment

5:00 Adjourn

Thursday, May 19, 2005

8:30 **Executive Session**: Closed session to discuss personnel issues

9:00 **Resume Public Meeting**
Urban and Rural Residential Independent Project – Stan Gregory
Team continue review of draft report including conclusions and draft recommendations.

11:45 Public comment

12:00 LUNCH – On your own

NOTE: Order of afternoon presentations may change if needed.

1:15 Doug Drake – Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Briefing on DEQ's approach for determining reference conditions for the state's wadeable streams, and the various options for determining reference conditions for urban streams.

2:00 Rick Hafele – (DEQ)
Briefing on DEQ's approach for stream bioassessment, current estimates of biological condition and major stressors for various populations of Oregon streams, and progress toward numerical biological criteria for algae, fish and benthos assemblages.

2:45 Bob Baumgartner and Holly Schroeder – DEQ
Briefing on policy, management, and fiscal constraints and advantages of bioassessment and numerical biocriteria.

3:30 Bob Baumgartner – DEQ
General discussion on Heat Source model development, sensitivity analysis, and side-by-side model comparisons

4:00 Public comment

4:15 Adjourn

MINUTES
Independent Multidisciplinary Science Team
May 18-19, 2005

Conference Room 400
Gus Solomon Courthouse Federal Building*
USDA Forest Service, Portland Forest Science Lab
620 SW Main St
Portland, OR 97205

Members in Attendance:
Carl Schreck, Co-Chair
Nancy Molina, Co-Chair
Neil Christensen
Stan Gregory
Bob Hughes
Rich Shepard
Carl Yee

Others Attending:
Leah Gorman, OSU.
Glenda Serpa, OSU
Jeff Weber, DLCD
Margaret Naver, Portland Environmental Services
Ry Thompson, Portland Environmental Services
Chris Jarmer, OFIC
Rick Hafele, DEQ
Doug Drake, DEQ
Mike Mulvey, DEQ
Aaron Borisenko, DEQ
Bob Baumgartner, DEQ

Please note: Due to recording equipment malfuntions, audio recordings of this meeting are not available.

May 18, 2005
Co-Chair Carl Schreck convened the meeting at 9:05 AM. He requested that any Team member with a conflict of interest concerning any of the items to declare the conflict before the item is discussed.
No conflicts were declared.

AGENDA
The draft agenda was adopted as written. Stan will be unable to attend tomorrow's session.

MINUTES
The April 2005 minutes were adopted as submitted.

GENERAL TEAM BUSINESS
Brief review of future meeting dates and locations:
June 8 & 9 – Corvallis
July 13 & 14 – Corvallis
August 9 & 10 – Corvallis
September 13 & 14 – location TBA

UPDATES AND DEVELOPMENTS
Carl S. and Nancy met with Representative Jenson and Jim Myron (GNRO) earlier in May to discuss the replacement process for Team members.

Joint Ways and Means Subcommittee on Natural Resources – Carl S.
Carl S. reviewed the Team's budget history and request to restore the Team's budget to fully operational, and his testimony representing the Team before the Ways and Means Subcommittee on May 10th. Carl also reported on questions from the subcommittee members:

Representative Dingfelder asked the Team to provide an accounting of its time, especially the pro bono work for the Team over and above the funded time.

Representative Kropf asked if the Team was doing valuable work. He also wanted to know about correspondence regarding the Team's reports – how much was received, how it was handled, etc. Carl explained that the Team seldom receives correspondence about reports because parties with comments about the reports generally direct those comments to the legislators.

Representative Schaufler asked whether the Team has ever looked at dam weirs and spillovers. He was unaware that the legislature could request the Team to consider topics for reports or reviews. He asked if the IMST participated in the annual review of the Hinkle Creek Paired Watershed Study.

Bob asked if there was any indication as to when the Team's budget would be decided. Carl S. said the goods news right now is that the IMST is in the Governor's budget at the full operational level.

Other Items
Carl S. feels that IMST needs to find ways to let people know what IMST does. OWEB used to provide media notification. He suggested a possible one page article in "Fisheries". He would like to brainstorm ways to publicize the Team other than direct liaison with media because as a state panel the GNRO, OWEB or some office should be contacting the media.

Carl Y. suggested submitting 1 page articles to quasi professional publications. Carl S. agreed, suggesting the members develop a mailing list of publications from collective professional memory. Leah suggested inviting the Oregon Plan Outreach Coordinator to the June meeting. Bob commented that the Oregon Plan is not known outside of Oregon. Carl Y. asked about publicity opportunities through OSU. Carl S. reviewed previous conversations, clarifying that it is the State's responsibility to notify media and publicize the Team.

Agency Interactions
Rich brought up Ray Jaindl's correspondence in response to his questions to Ray about the agency's implementation of the Agriculture Water Quality Program. Ray indicated that agency made three requests a year ago. Carl S. suggested having this discussion under the eastside topic.

Stan clarified for Rich that ODA had not requested responses but had shared the information via Mac Barrington, the official ODA liaison to IMST.

Carl S. provided background on the current discussion. Rich had contacted Ray Jaindl and three issues came up. IMST needs to correspond back to Ray that no requests were made and a request for comments should be made if they are now desired. Stan suggested including Mac Barrington on the correspondence as he is the official liaison to the Team.

Rich asked for a copy of the document Mac sent to the Team, or that a request be sent to Mac to send the latest version. Carl S. said the Team would respond to the three items but not at this meeting.

June Meeting
Carl S. reminded the Team that next month's meeting is Stan's last because his appointment ends June 30. He suggested a slightly longer lunch that everyone could bring something to, or that lunch could be catered. Bob asked what Stan wanted. Stan would like a catered lunch, and requested that an invitation to join the lunch be extended to all prior IMST members.

DRAFT LETTER EVALUATING DSL RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS – Carl S.

Carl S. briefed the Team about the draft letter prepared by Kathy and asked for comments.

Rich is bothered by the recommendations and responses. He feels the Team is dropping the ball as scientists, citing Recommendation 2 as an example. What is meant by the recommendation? The Team should be telling the agency what the basin level is. Rich has talked with others and feels the Team has a responsibility as scientists to tell agencies what to do and how to do it, etc.

Stan commented in terms of advice regarding programs. The Team has discussed many times how much detail to provide in its recommendations. The conclusion is that the Team should not tell agencies how to accomplish but inform them of what is needed. The Team would be happy to discuss specifics if requested. The purpose of the reports and recommendations is to provide context, framework and elements, not detailed instructions. Rich disagreed. He doesn't think the agencies would come to the IMST if they had the necessary expertise.

Bob commented that the original recommendation text does have some background to the recommendations. Perhaps there should be a little more. He then asked Rich if he was saying the Team needed to provide a monitoring plan. Rich said DSL did the best they could given the knowledge they had.

Carl Y. commented that agencies would get pushed the wrong way if the Team told them what to do and how to do it, etc. What the Team is doing is providing support that there should be basin wide plans. Specifics are confining to agencies. Rich feels the agencies need to be told that if they collected this kind of information, this is how they would use it.

Stan cited the original Oregon Water Resources Research Institution (OWRRI) report by Pete Klingeman, and the Team's concurrence regarding sediment budgets. If an agency says they don't know how to accomplish something, the Team can direct them to other agencies with the expertise.

Rich's issue is that non-technical decision makers would be the ones to read the reports and recommendations. In his opinion, the agency gave an adequate response and that the issue is not a crucial one to DSL because it took them so long to respond.

Stan responded that if the Team concurred that the original OWRRI report was accurate and that DSL does not implement recommendations, the Team is obligated to the let the State know the agency's response is inadequate.

Rich insisted that the Team needed to go back and tell the agencies what to do and how to do it.

Carl S. felt the response was inadequate because it did not address the recommendation. The key question is: did the DSL agree conceptually? Carl Y. commented that an agency hiding behind excuses such as lack of authority or funding levels does not indicate whether the agency thought the recommendation was a good idea.

Rich thought the Team may not have communicated its expectations adequately. Stan commented that agencies get the draft recommendations and conversations with the Team before the report is released. This was the case with DSL. The agency now comes back and does not indicate whether it thinks the recommendations are sound.

Rich wants to remove the grading of responses and simply ask agencies if they think the recommendations are conceptually good. Stan clarified that the GNRO specifically requested the Team evaluate agency responses and provide a determination of adequacy for the responses. The legislation requires agencies to respond, but there was no response from DSL for a year. Rich commented that maybe this information should be provided to new members when they join the Team. Both Bob and Carl Y. responded that the information had been provided.

Bob agrees with part of Rich's argument, the "this is what we expect". If we are clearer regarding expectations, agencies may be able to be clearer with their responses.

Stan commented that the recommendations are intended to be constructive and helpful to the State and the agencies, and the Team tries to emphasize that in its reports. That is why the preamble is included in all reports. Perhaps the Team needs to invite the agencies to visit with the Team for 15-20 minutes at the next meeting following the Team submitting its responses back to the agencies.
Rich feels there are two different cultures in the agencies. The reports are written for technical staff, but the decision makers are non-technical. Maybe the Team needs to consider writing the reports for the non-technical decision makers. He feels that going back and grading agency responses is not productive, that the Team is not communicating.

Carl S. said that for him it is whether the agencies implement or not.

Rich insisted the Team was not asking properly.

There was general discussion of what terms the Team used for their evaluations meant, and of sending these definitions to the agency heads and the GNRO. Bob was concerned that agencies might put up defensive barriers, and suggested the Team invite the agencies to conversation.

Carl Y. commented that agencies need to say if they don't agree with the recommendations and why they disagree. If agencies do agree but lack funding or authority, they need to articulate what they will do to get it done.

Stan suggested inviting Jim Myron (GNRO), Representative Jenson, agency heads and Core Team to attend an IMST meeting for dialogue on the whole topic of responses in general. Carl S. thought more interaction with the Core Team was desirable. Rich thought that instead of inviting Stan's suggested attendees to a Team meeting, a meeting with only the Core Team be set up to discuss time lag and find out what the problem is.

Stan said the first year there were no responses; 6-8 months for a response is not so critical. How do we get effective timing? From his experience, the Core Team is not the most effective. The Governor's Natural Resource Cabinet would be better because it is comprised of the agency heads. Since the Governor and legislature designed the dialogue, they should be a part of the discussion.

Carl S. brought the discussion back to the three issues. He suggested the cover letter be modified to describe what the Team is looking for. Carl Y. started describing terms and Carl S. asked if he would draft the revision.

Carl Y. asked what happens when the agencies get Team responses back – are the agencies required to respond? Stan clarified that the Team's responses back to the agencies are copied to the Governor and legislature. The agencies answer to them.

There was review and discussion of Team comments on responses received from DSL for recommendations in the 7-31-02 letter report on the review of OWRII 1995 gravel report. Carl S. recommended wordsmithing to clarify. He agreed with Kathy's comment that DSL's response to Recommendation 4 was adequate.

Bob felt DSL's response to Recommendation 10 was indeterminate, not adequate, because without the details from the previous response, he did not have enough information to decide. It is difficult for new members without seeing the responses.

Neil asked questions to clarify his understanding of Team processes – do the FRAs write the draft documents or does the Team prepare the drafts? Carl S. said it was the Team more often that not. Stan expanded on that by explaining that individual Team members drafted in the beginning. In more recent years, the FRAs capture discussion for the initial draft but the products are products of the Team.

After additional general discussion, it was decided to send the letter after the paragraph from Carl Y. was finished. Anything editorial would be forwarded to Leah.

ACTION: Carl Y. agreed to draft a paragraph for the cover letter explaining what the Team was looking for.

AGREEMENTS WITH OSU – Stan

Stan briefed the Team on the meeting that he, Carl and Kathy had with Hal Salwasser, College of Forestry Dean, Tom Adams, Forest Science Department Head, and Gail Achterman, Director of the Institute of Natural Resources (INR) at OSU. He then gave a little background on the institute.

The Team asked for agreements regarding administrative support from the University. The possibility of the INR serving as the administrative home for the IMST was explored. Gail Achterman did not think that INR was the body to administer the administrative details. She expressed concern that criticisms leveled at the Team when controversial reports are released had the potential to impact the INR, and it was decided that INR would not be the administrative home.

Hal Salwasser and Tom Adams were comfortable with continuing the status quo regarding space, administrative salary, and office rent. The Team will request a continued waiver of indirect costs. Nancy will draft an MOU with the Research Office for signatures from Tom Byler, OWEB, and Rich Holdren, OSU, once agreement in principle is reached.

Newer Team members asked if any formal agreements existed. Stan explained the history of the Team's administrative details. Historically, indirect costs had been waived by the university and Stan hoped it would continue. Nancy clarified that the current arrangements with the College of Forestry would continue and be formalized by the MOU.

Miscellaneous Business – Carl S
Representative Dingfelder's request – Carl S. reminded Team members that they needed to provide an estimate of their pro bono time by close of business tomorrow. Stan commented that the two (2) 0.25 FTE donations of federal employees needs to be reflected in the information forwarded to Representative Dingfelder.

CORE TEAM RESPONSE
Carl S. asked for a volunteer to draft a response to the Core Team. Nancy volunteered to draft the response. Carl S. was not clear what the response to Recommendation 1 was saying. Bob thought the response to Recommendation 2 was inadequate.

Carl S. reminded the Team that Carl Y. had agreed to draft a preamble describing the concept of Team recommendations and the expectations for agency responses. The responses should indicate whether the agency agrees or disagrees with the recommendation(s). If the agency agrees with the recommendation(s), the agency needs to describe what will be done to accomplish the recommendation. If the agency disagrees with the recommendation(s), the agency needs to state why it disagrees.

Nancy thought the response to Recommendation 3 was adequate.

Leah suggested that a person involved with the original report development write the response but Carl S. is comfortable with Nancy writing the response.

Stan commented that whoever writes the response needs to read the original report in its entirety before reading the agency response to effectively determine whether or not the agency response is adequate. In this case, there are two reports that would need to be

read. He is not trying to dump homework on whoever writes the response but it is important to link back to the original reports

Nancy does not have the time to read the two reports before drafting the response and is fine with someone else drafting the Team's response. She observed that the Team will review the draft response before it is sent back to the agency.

Stan commented that some issues of the state (e.g., political decisions and policy difficulties) are the responsibility of the state. The science behind the recommendations stands. Decisions by the state make for inadequacies such as inconsistent policies across land ownership.

Nancy feels the Team response to agency responses should be the end of, and documentation for, oral and/or written dialogue with the agencies.

Stan feels there is a nagging question in the riparian policy – the GNRO/Core Team response was that reports have been generated but there is no evidence of conclusions that guided policy decision. It would be good to get back to Jim Myron and the Core Team for discussion of the Core Team responses.

Nancy read everything but couldn't see how the policy addresses the Team's recommendations. Stan provided a history of the formal riparian policy. It is really a recommendation to move forward to carry out policy that was being developed.

Nancy wanted to discuss each recommendation so she could capture the Team position in her draft. After some discussion of the agency response to Recommendation 1, Stan suggested deferring the discussions so the public attending for the urban report discussion was not inconvenienced. The eastside project discussion was deferred until the afternoon and the Core Team responses were deferred until the next day.

ACTION: Nancy will draft the response to Core Team.

URBAN PROJECT UPDATE – Stan

Stan briefed the Team on the subcommittee's suggestion to start with discussion at the broadest level (questions, strengths, gaps/weaknesses), then move to specific recommendations, then start going through the text, and finish with recommendations again.

Carl S. noted that two Science Questions were not discussed because the subcommittee wanted to know what the Team wanted to do and how to handle them. Nancy asked for clarification as to why the Team was reviewing the report with two outstanding questions. Stan said the questions were minor to the report, and Bob commented that the subcommittee was still trying to frame the questions.

Nancy hopes the discussion will bring a fresh perspective. Without examples of restoration efforts, it is difficult to decide whether Recommendation 1 is adequate and the

report supports it. Question 1 for her is: As a manager, I want to know what is broken and how do I fix it.

Rich's question is why do we want fish in urban areas? If we don't, why are they there? Stan clarified for Rich that there were 4-5 pages in the front section that deals with historical information. Stan asked if it was inadequate and what Rich needed.

Rich said he had extensive comments on the forward section (preamble), page 5. He wants a statement summarizing management practices and policies. He does not want the boiler plate preface but wants it to specifically state how this report applies to the Oregon Plan because there are only two foci in the Plan and that is what the report should focus on.

Carl S. asked Rich what his concerns were. Rich reiterated that he does not like the boiler plate preface and wants a discussion of management practices and policies in the forward section. Stan asked Rich to clarify whether he meant all policies. Rich wants all policies discussed, including who is responsible and what is being done. Carl S. wasn't clear on why Rich wanted this. Rich feels this is the hook on which the science should be based.

Stan commented that the report could show how urban areas are important to recovery but to list every statute, etc., would distract from the purpose of the report: What are urban areas within Oregon's landscape? What is relevant and why should you care at the various scales? What are the effects of urban areas on watersheds and salmonids? The scope of the report is at the landscape level.

Rich does not want the boiler plate preface, but one specific to the report. He did not get any of what Stan said from the text. Really focus on those questions.

Stan described the section on scope and emphasis of the report, which is overall strategic not tactical. Discussion in pages 17-19 includes what are urban areas, changes in land use planning, landscape perspective, why urban areas matter to fish, and Rich's feedback is important if this is not coming across. Rich said he didn't pick that up from the discussion.

Carl S. was concerned that what Rich wanted was too narrowly focused. He wasn't sure why Rich felt he needed a discussion of why fish are desirable in urban settings, as the report was beyond that. Nancy thought a little more discussion on page 8 would flesh out the policy framework in addition to the ecological framework (why we care). Stan said including the relevant overarching policies (ESA, etc.) would be helpful, and then go on to say the purpose of the report was to provide broad guidance.

Nancy asked who the report was being written for. Stan clarified the report was being written for the GNRO and legislature – an Oregon-wide conceptual framework for the Oregon Plan. The report looks at how does the state carry out the Oregon Plan and how do urban areas fit?

There was general discussion of the report audience, policy-makers and technical staff. Stan commented that Oregon has the responsibility to assess recovery at the landscape level and urban areas need to be considered in the landscape. At present, nothing statistically significant is available about urban impact. The Team's role is to advise the state on the Oregon Plan. Carl Y. noted that the Executive Summary was not in this version of the draft but is addressed to non-technical policy decision-makers. Leah reminded the Team that another potential audience for the report are community groups.

Carl S. noted that Metro has done some very good work, perhaps at the expense of everyone else (Metro vs. smaller communities in aggregate). While the work that Metro has done is good, where is the money better spent – one big problem (e.g., Metro) or lots of smaller problems?

Rich feels this is a value judgment of what to focus on, where to put money, basin by basin. Carl S. is more interested in which is better and is there a way to assess single large impact (Metro) vs. cumulative smaller impacts. Another question for Carl S. is whether urban areas have greater or lesser impact depending upon their location within the watershed basin.

Carl S. asked for public comment, and Stan addressed those present explaining the timeframe/process and the Team's long-standing policy of not releasing draft documents.

Jeff Weber, DLCD, asked if the recommendations would include "those who manage lands in urban areas document management effects." Carl S. asked for clarification of what would be documented – monitoring of effects, remediation measures? Jeff commented that effects are so broad when dealt with in an academic manner, but it is almost impossible to talk about urban impacts without geographic specificity. He hopes the language will be couched so practitioners can apply the conclusions to their regional landscapes.

Carl commented that there are 13 draft recommendations and potential recommendations to the urban report. Stan read the recommendations in the report so the public would have an idea of the afternoon's discussion. He then read the potential recommendations after clarifying they were not in the draft report at this time and would not be part of the afternoon discussion.

Nancy commented on the organization of the report, that the summary of science should precede implications for policy. Rich agreed. Stan modified the subcommittee's suggested order of discussion to recommendations, then format and organization of the report, and finish with the text of the report. Carl S. explained the report process to newer members.

Stan led discussion of the draft recommendations in the urban report, cautioning that urban areas are not encouraged to build to 10% by stating substantial impacts have been noted at less than that. Nancy asked the Team to consider how comfortable they would be defending that 10% and observed that after considering the attributes of each area, that

number may not be a good “prescriptive.” She is concerned that people will get hung up on wording (numbers) and the principles will get lost. Stan clarified that the report does not “prescribe,” that greater impervious surfaces lead to greater detrimental impacts and the impacts need to be kept as low as possible. Jeff Weber commented that the 10% is universally recognized and it will be difficult to retreat from that. Perhaps the Team could make note that urban impact could have consequences on policy for compact urban growth.

Stan feels draft Recommendations 1 and 2 are similar in that they deal with current conditions, not future conditions. Carl S. suggested it would be useful to include a guidance % rather than a regulated %.

Stan summarized draft Recommendation 3 as an investment of resources. Rich felt it was a policy statement instead of science, and commented that the state needs more research in urban impacts. After general discussion of the language, it was agreed to modify the recommendation to indicate more information is needed.

Carl S. characterized draft Recommendation 4 as a “survey for effectiveness”. Jeff Weber commented that DLCD has no authority in water corridors and suggested that the recommendation be directed to DSL as it referred to channels. If it referred to channel and floodplain, then both DSL and DLCD would be involved.

There were no comments regarding draft Recommendation 5.

Stan suggested ODOT be the lead agency, and OWEB a collaborator, for Recommendation 6 as it discussed fish passage. The Team needs to get feedback from ODOT to find out how much has been accomplished. Rich commented that the ODOT website has a GIS map with all barriers to fish passage identified.

Nancy wondered if draft Recommendations 6 and 7 were really different. Stan said the recommendations need to stress that barriers are more than physical (e.g., chemical). Rich feels the separation is false and wants to combine the two recommendations. Carl S. clarified that Recommendation 7 was much broader, more holistic than 6 because it discussed chemical, etc. Stan was concerned a single “omnibus” recommendation would make it easier for agencies to push off, and said the subcommittee would consider the two recommendations further.

Rich wants to combine draft Recommendations 3, 6 and 7 into a single recommendation with subsections for each agency. Bob feels that Recommendation 3 is broader, more research oriented, and that 6 and 7 are technical/engineering in aspect.

Stan explained the challenge of assessing urban areas, and that draft Recommendation 8 was to expand monitoring and asked for statistically robust data be included in the monitoring. Nancy thought the area(s) of inference needed to be specified. Stan clarified that the report is regional and that urban areas need to be included in the monitoring program(s). Rich felt the appropriate unit is drainage area. Stan reminded him that the

report was regional in scope. Carl S. commented that monitoring addresses not only what the impact is, but provides comparisons between urban areas. Jeff Weber suggested the Team be careful in how it phrased the recommendation and gave the Willamette as an example. Agency directed monitoring could be focused entirely on the Willamette mainstem but the majority of impact does not occur on the mainstem. Stan commented that scales need to be appropriate for inference.

Stan may have to reconcile draft Recommendation 9 with Recommendation 8. Nancy felt her comments in Recommendation 8 applied to Recommendation 9. After discussion, the Team agreed to combine Recommendations 8 and 9 and add a 4th bullet under the combined recommendation.

There was general discussion of terminology in draft Recommendation 10 – eliminate vs. minimize vs. reduce to the greatest extent possible. Carl S. commented that the target is to reduce to "no biological effect." Neil commented that the "toxic" part of the report was weakest because there is so little data available. Stan explained that the subcommittee was trying to get across that there should be a strategic plan to reduce to the greatest degree possible. Bob suggested eliminating the term "toxic." Carl commented the section needed to do a better job explaining what was being discussed. Stan read revised language and Carl S. wanted to change "extent possible". Stan commented that "extent possible" changes over time. Rich wants "deleterious" in front of chemicals. Nancy commented on Neil's observation regarding scarcity of information. The recommendation needs to be adaptive in that it reflects the current lack of information but can incorporate new knowledge as it becomes available.

In draft Recommendation 11, Rich again wants to change toxic to deleterious. Bob and others suggested reversing the order of draft Recommendations 10 and 11. Stan gave examples of biological assays and explained ambient monitoring. After discussion, it was agreed to change the order of the two recommendations.

Draft Recommendation 12 is directed at the economic development agency. Although it is a politically charged issue, Stan suggested making the recommendation anyway because the politicians would deal with the political issues. There was general discussion of chemical vs. drug, etc., and the need for specificity with regard to chemicals. Stan asked the Team if any of them really believed that chemicals in an urban area were not a problem. If it is a problem, the Team is obligated to say so. Carl Y. asked if the state knows what chemicals are in the environment and how the chemicals got there. Stan referred to spatial information, and led discussion of chemicals on a spatial scale (e.g., source of chemical vs. location of usage). Nancy again felt the knowledge gap needed focus. Stan clarified that the recommendation was saying the state needs a scientifically defensible measure. Jeff Weber commented that it may be more effective to recommend the state encourage alternatives. There was discussion of toxicity of chemicals and risk of exposure.

Stan explained the recommendation regarded aggregate (i.e. sand and gravel) needs – the population in Oregon is projected to double in 50 years. Bob observed that safe

drinking/receiving water would be an issue. Carl Y. suggested that the OWRRI and other reports be included. Bob suggested separating recommendations.

Having completed discussion of the recommendations in the draft report, Stan asked if everyone wanted to work through the additional recommendations. Carl Y. suggested Team members taking an hour without Team discussion.

Stan asked the members to review the additional recommendations because some address topics not discussed in previous recommendations. He asked if there was anything in the report or expertise that should be a recommendation in the report but was overlooked. Bob suggested futures scenarios and analyses needed to be included. Stan commented on Willamette Basin 2050 and asked if the report should make a recommendation regarding future issues. Rich did not want a futures recommendation but thought the paucity of research in urban areas should be emphasized. Bob disagreed with Rich because futures research is based on what has happened and futures scenarios can be projected. For example, urban halos are growing much faster.

Stan commented that calling for futures issues to be addressed in the Oregon Plan because the human population projection is accurate, made assessing impact on resources important. He then showed a model based on Measure 37 policies, which differs widely from the model using conservation policies. Rich is still not certain that futures is appropriate for the urban report. Carl Y. thought it should be included because it could be seen as an oversight by the Team if it wasn't mentioned. It could help explain why there is a problem with some habitats. Bob thought it could help Oregon decide how to deal with Measure 37. Rich does not want to touch futures because, in his opinion, there is no science with the scenarios.

Stan discussed quantitative management, and agreed that anything included as a recommendation needed to be based on science, but it would be like having an elephant in the tent to not say anything about the future. Rich feels if science is the focus, the politicians will make the decisions. He doesn't see how futures has anything to do with the urban report. Bob disagrees with Rich and Carl Y. commented that uncertainty is not stepping on toes but needs to be pointed out.

Stan then ran a model showing a 50 year projection for Eugene urban growth based on conservation policies. Rich asked if current conditions and both scenarios were in the report because they could be used as a specific example.

Carl S. asked for public comment on the urban discussion, and then moved on to the Eastside project discussion.

EASTSIDE PROJECT UPDATE – Carl Y.

Carl Y. updated the Team on the status of the eastside report. He wasn't certain of the progress made on Rich's water quality section, or on Wayne's grazing section. He summarized the work on his sections.

Rich summarized his water quality section. He has contacted ODF, ODA, DEQ, and ODFW, and is gathering information. Leah explained to Rich that the technical support staff may already have much of what he might be looking for. Carl S. expanded on Leah's comment for the benefit of everyone. Broad requests should be a Team conversation. Team members need to be careful about approaching agencies as representing the Team when in fact they are not. Nancy explained that her role as External Chair is to facilitate between the Team and the agencies. Carl S. explained that Team members need to be careful about approaching agency heads, and respecting their time and workloads. Stan suggested that Kathy contact the agencies to get designated liaison names. Nancy wants to contact the agencies to develop relationships.

Carl Y. asked Rich when he would have the first draft of the water quality section. Rich said the same timeframe as last month – he will have a draft ready by the end of May.

Nancy received an email about a workshop next week. Carl Y. is unable to attend but it could be useful for the eastside report to have a Team member present as there is lots of new science. Leah or Kathy might be able to go if no Team member is available.

Carl Y. mentioned that he will be attending an OSU Rangeland Resources event in La Grande. Attending will show an interest in the Rangeland Resources perspective and give the Team a sense of the thinking.

Stan had to leave the meeting but before going he reminded the Team that his appointment ends June 30. He will be glad to provide materials or whatever assistance is needed for the urban report but the Team needs to request his assistance.

CORE TEAM RESPONSES

Nancy needed to leave the meeting and wanted to finish this discussion so she could prepare a draft response. She asked if anyone felt the response to Recommendation 2 was anything other than indeterminate. Bob needs more about why it is or isn't adequate. Recommendation 3 is adequate.

URBAN PROJECT

Carl S. asked what the Team wanted to discuss. Rich felt the report should be organized into four distinct sections, dividing each section into three subsections. The four sections of the report he proposed are: 1. what is the problem; 2. what can we do; 3. what does it mean; and 4. how do we do it. The subsections are: 1. problem; 2. what can be done about the problem; 3. the science behind the discussion.

Leah explained to Rich that Science Question 1 identifies the problem and the two unwritten questions will discuss what can be done, etc. Rich wants a more focused structure that is very concise. Carl S. wouldn't argue against being concise to reduce the size of the report but observed that reducing wordiness in the report is one issue whereas changing the concepts in the report is a very different issue. Leah gave a history of how the physical document developed.

Carl S. asked Team members to skip wordsmithing, sentence structure, etc. and send those directly to Leah so the page by page discussion could focus on substantive issues. Leah suggested not starting with the preface because Stan and Nancy had left the meeting for other obligations.

Carl started the discussion with the introduction, asking members to send objectionable terms directly to Leah. Rich objected to “healthy” in the context of an ecosystem. He wants to get rid of the “DRAFT” watermark, commenting that the members should be trusted. Neil noted a citation on page 12 did not match the reference in the back.

Rich questioned the appropriateness of the DLCD discussion. Leah explained that the introduction has policy background information. Rich wants all policy information out because the agencies and legislature know the land use planning system. Bob reminded Rich that there are multiple audiences for the report and that the information should be included.

Rich wants to move everything out of pages 14-16 and move to appendices for those who want it. He wants everything defined and eliminate all “subjective” terms, and moved to appendices. Neil wondered if the appendices would be useful in other reports.

Rich wants all historical information out. Glenda explained why the boilerplate language was in the reports. After discussion, it was decided to move the boilerplate language (e.g., historical boilerplate language) to an appendix but historical information specific to urban areas would remain in the report body.

There was brief discussion about differentiating between the five salmonid species.

Carl S. observed that many figures reference “from” and he is concerned about copyright issues. He wants to see consistency in how figures are referenced (e.g., directly copied from vs. figure adapted from).

Other Business – Carl S.
Carl reminded everyone to have their pro bono time to Nancy by close of business tomorrow.

PUBLIC COMMENT
There being no public comment, the meeting was adjourned at 4:25 PM.

May 19, 2005
Co-Chair Carl Schreck reconvened the meeting at 9:20 AM.

URBAN PROJECT
Rich wants a different title for the report "Urban and Rural Residential Areas and the Oregon Plan".

Nancy was not here for yesterday's afternoon discussion but has significant comments about the landscape ecology section – that it sounded like a textbook and if used should be more relevant to urban landscapes. She offered to draft a small conceptual framework.

Carl S. recapped the previous day's discussion about moving some text portions to appendices and accepted Nancy's offer.

ACTION: Nancy will draft the urban landscape ecology discussion.

Rich wants life history in an appendix.

Nancy commented that there is a big point in the landscape section to have a landscape perspective but the landscape scale is not really discussed, the remainder of the report is at a finer scale. Carl S. recapped the previous afternoon's discussion of site specific information. Rich suggested Nancy write a 1-2 sentence definition of "landscape" and she agreed.

ACTION: Nancy will write the definition.

Carl S. reviewed the ground rules for today's discussion. Editorial comments go to Leah, conceptual and contextual changes are for Team discussion.

Rich asked if a glossary would be useful. After brief discussion and polling the public observers, it was decided to add a glossary to the report. Rich suggested that all symbols be included in the glossary, and there was a brief discussion of symbols and consistency (e.g., metric vs. English).

Bob commented that only 30 pages into the document and it seemed that much of the content was not needed, obfuscated or was unclear.

Rich volunteered to create a Table of Contents for the document based on how he thinks it should be organized and suggested Nancy do the same.

Jeff Weber commented that there is a continuum of impervious surface/channelization and the report should show this linkage. Nancy suggested that the subcommittee describe the difference between natural vs. urban hydrologic processes. Carl Y. suggested the section be headed "Watershed Hydrology and Changes Effected by Urbanization" and remove all the subheadings (1A, 1B, etc.).

Rich described his Santa Barbara hydrograph model in response to Bob's comment that he was not familiar with the models referenced. Carl Y. commented that there are a multitude of models available to major urban areas.

Carl S. interjected a procedural comment. There are 100 pages to review in two hours. It is important to review the whole document today. Bring up concerns but no lengthy discussions or debates.
Rich thought the study information on page 39 was repetitive and should go in an appendix. Carl S. reminded Rich that yesterday it was decided urban specific information would remain in the report body and generic information would be moved to appendices. Bob doesn't think a lot of specific examples are necessary.

Nancy commented that each section should have a parallel of event/consequence and how to use/respond to the science. Carl Y. asked if a "mini executive summary" at the beginning of each section would be helpful. Leah mentioned that the initial intent was to have a few paragraphs summarizing implications for recovery at the end of each section but are not in this draft version. Nancy liked the idea.

Nancy asked if the Team wanted to introduce new science on factors influencing water temperature. She will go back and look at the section on riparian removal effects. Carl S. commented that pipes can have a cooling effect in addition to a warming effect. After brief discussion, this will be added to the text.

Nancy commented that the overall document has some areas that are judgmental in tone rather than descriptive.

Carl S. mentioned that some of the references seemed old and asked if there were more recent references. He also commented that terms (e.g. toxic, contaminant, etc.) need to be agreed on, and that the terms needed to be defined at the beginning of Stan's section. During discussion of terms, Bob commented that it is a dose-related issue. Carl S. suggested a figure describing routes of entry.

ACTION: Carl will provide information to Leah, and Leah will draft a figure.

There was discussion of whether exotic species should be discussed in the report. Nancy suggested that if it was in the report, riparian invaders should be included.

ACTION: Nancy will provide examples.

Rich suggested including bilge water in the discussion.

ACTION: Carl S. will draft.

Carl S. asked if the report needed to separate acute and chronic toxicity. Neil commented that he looked at this section from the public perspective, and felt that certain groups with an agenda (e.g., no fluoridation) would use the report to forward their agenda. The report

needs to be specific e.g. “above certain levels…” Carl asked Neil if he would help with this.

There was general discussion of toxics and contaminants. Bob suggested a table using DEQ/EPA examples. Carl S. asked if Bob meant giving the actual level in each case. Bob said yes and to limit the examples. Specifying the standards was needed because just saying “toxic” waves an unnecessary red flag. Nancy commented that having the table begs the question of what fish are experiencing in urban areas. Neil suggested deferring to EPA standards in the table. Carl Y. felt that dosage and timing information needed to be included. Neil wondered if the science will need defense (table).

Carl Y. asked if the figure or the message was more important. He thought the message was more important and wanted to put a list in the appendices but feels that the “textbook” information needed to be in the report text. After discussion, the message will be strengthened and the table minimized to only a few examples of toxics classes, etc., instead of trying to be comprehensive.

There was discussion of perspectives of habitat, “over water structures” and figure 3.2. Rich suggested a table instead of figure 3.2 might better and the Team agreed.

ACTION: Leah will take numbers from the figure and convert to a table to explain revetments.

Carl S. wondered how much estuary is lost to agricultural use vs. urban use.

Rich questioned the applicability of NE rivers to this region. If appropriate (appropriate being the geographic/geomorphic conditions) to include in the report, the inclusion needs to be justified.

Carl S. asked if the last paragraph on page 86 needed a reference or brief summary.

Nancy suggested including lessons learned about fish passage and culverts. The Team agreed to incorporate this into Science Question 2. Nancy thought the discussion of strategy should move to either question 2 or have a brief discussion at the end of each section.

Neil thought there were redundancies between the fish and macroinvertebrate tables. During discussion as to whether the information should be one or two tables, Rich suggested only referencing the tables in the main text but moving the table(s) to the appendices. Nancy commented that biota and protections were the bottom line. She felt this section is key and the tables are important.

Rich asked if Bob’s intent was specific to the Oregon Plan or to show trends in general. Bob said both. Rich again want only information specific to the Oregon Plan in the document and everything else moved to appendices.

Bob asked if there should be a table on insects. Rich again wants only Oregon Plan specific information in the report body and all supporting or non-specific information in appendices.

There was discussion of figures and correlations of percentages of impervious surfaces effects. Bob commented that it is a common myth that 10% is the threshold. The reality is that once urbanization begins, effects begin and there is nothing magical about 10%.

Carl Y. felt that in almost every section, the message needs to be clear that in addition to generally applicable information, there are always site specific factors.

Leah asked the Team to send her their additional comments on the monitoring and research sections, and she will incorporate into the draft document for the next round of subcommittee work.

ACTION: Team members will have their comments to Leah within the next two weeks.

Carl S. recapped yesterday's brief discussion as to whether Questions 2 & 3 had merit and should be included. Rich thinks any discussion is meaningless until the report is restructured. Carl S. clarified that Question 2 would focus on case histories of recovery efforts.

Carl Y. repeated his question from yesterday as to whether an *a priori* conclusion has been made that urban areas can be recovered or is it more appropriate to look at the problem as if urban areas can be recovered. If we continue with can, Science Question 2 is essential to document case histories. Jeff Weber suggested directing readers to Question 1 conclusions that are addressed in Question 2. Nancy felt Question 3 was more appropriate for that.

After discussion, the second part of Question 2 will be deleted.

Nancy suggested that there is likely a lot of information buried in governmental reports and not sorted out in the literature that the Team will need to search out and sort through. Carl S. asked Jeff Weber and Margaret Naver if they were aware of anything. Margaret referred to the Metro bottomless culvert and watershed revegetation projects.

Neil reminded everyone to include all effects, not just positive, because it is also important to know what didn't work. Carl S. suggested searching for case histories specific to the topics covered in the report. Margaret Naver mentioned the Portland Green Program; it has several case histories.

Nancy feels the question is to what extent urban areas contribute to the Oregon Plan. Carl S. mentioned a list of questions he found. They were older and Leah reminded the Team that the current iteration of the questions was suggested by Rich and agreed to by the Team.

There was discussion of phrasing Question 3 and what should be included. Margaret Naver said the Risser group report had interesting information.

BRIEFINGS

Rick Hafele, DEQ, introduced himself and set up the presentation for the agency's bioassessment. He briefed the Team in the history of the agency and the bioassessment from the 1970's to present. The DEQ views the bioassessment survey as a stream condition assessment – physical, biological and chemical.

Carl S. asked about the urban area reference sites. Nancy asked if the Team's recommendation regarding urban data would be reasonable.

Rick said that DEQ is reviewing its monitoring strategies, what the agency could do with its current resources and what could be done with better resources.

Carl S. read the draft recommendations directed to DEQ and explained what the Team was looking for in responses from agencies. Rick asked if the Team had prioritized the recommendations. The Team discussed resources available to DEQ and asked how they could frame the questions so the public and policymakers could see its importance.

Doug Drake, DEQ, briefed the Team on the agency's selection/assessment process. Bob Baumgartner briefed the Team on the issues DEQ is grappling with at the program level – monitoring (biological), standard review process, EPA/NMFS and TMDLs. He would like some guidance. Carl S. asked Bob B. to e-mail either him or Nancy with the specifics of the request.

Bob B. said the critical question is how does biomonitoring help with agency decisions, the "so what". DEQ's best work was in the 1980's because the biological was measured with other indicators. It was the biological aspect that brought people into agreement on priorities. The agency is now nearing the end of the TMDLs and may be moving into Use Attainability Analysis.

Is TMDL the best tool? He notes a number of water bodies have demonstrable improvement but is the time spent on TMDLs the best allocation of time and resources? What are appropriate inferences to draw from the biomonitoring?

Carl S. clarified that DEQ would determine what monitoring is necessary, the role of the Team and its recommendations was simply to provide guidance that would inform and hopefully assist the DEQ gain the necessary resources.

DEQ is interested in the research/monitoring portion of the report – what to monitor, inferences, etc.

There was discussion of the agency's responses to the Heat Source model recommendation made in IMST's 2004 temperature standards report. The Team didn't clearly articulate, and DEQ didn't adequately explain the data calibration work.

DEQ desires a valid scientific forum for critique of how the agency is approaching problems. Carl S. mentioned a monitoring conference that would possibly occur in the fall. IMST will involve DEQ staff.

DEQ would like to see policy issues integrated with technical issues. Need to get policymakers involved and engaged. Nancy suggested DEQ send an e-mail with the issues, needs and a designated liaison to her and Carl S.

The Team reviewed action items and agenda items for the June meeting.

Nancy wants the Team to rethink interactions with agencies regarding recommendations. She wants to meet with agency heads to develop relationships so they know about the Team's availability to assist/respond to agency requests.

Rich again mentioned restructuring the report and moving everything to appendices.

PUBLIC COMMENT
There being no public comment, the meeting was adjourned at 4:20 PM.