Independent Multidisciplinary Science Team
Public Meeting Notice & Agenda
October 19 & 20, 2005

Richardson Hall
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR

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, October 19, 2005
Richardson Hall, Room 313

8:30 Convene Meeting – Carl Schreck
Adopt agenda
Adopt May and June minutes
Set meeting dates: November & December (January 2006 if possible)

8:45 Updates and developments –very brief:

- Changes in Team membership
- Temporary FRA
- FRA & clerical support recruitments (KM-H)
- ODF work plan (NM)
- Other items

9:15 Team operations – Carl S.

- Dealing with workload and only having 5 members
- Update on Budget, MOU and contracts – Carl S.
- Update on Agency/OWEB, Core Team contacts – Nancy Molina
- Update on urban project – Bob Hughes
- Update on eastside project – Carl Yee
- Staffing needs
- Future work plans
- Review and finalize changes to recommendation preamble- Carl Y.

11:15 Oregon Plan Outreach Team – Nicole Charlson (OWRD) and John Byers (ODA)
Briefing on the Outreach Team and general discussion of how the group may be able to help IMST increase public awareness of the IMST and it's work.

11:45 Public comment

12:00 LUNCH (on your own)

1:00 *Please note the order of the afternoon discussion may change as needed to accommodate agency representatives & other agencies may be added if representatives are available otherwise they will be invited to future meetings*

Oregon Plan Monitoring – Greg Sieglitz, OWEB
Briefing and information only on the Oregon Plan Monitoring Team organizations current operations, and future plans.

1:30 ODFW monitoring under the Oregon Plan – Jeff Rodgers, ODFW
Briefing on the current monitoring conducted by ODFW

2:00 Data libraries – Cedric Cooney, ODFW
Briefing on data libraries designed for the Oregon Coastal Coho project and other possible libraries for the Oregon Plan monitoring program

2:30 IMST / OWEB 2006 Effectiveness Monitoring Workshop – Nancy Molina and Neil Christensen

- Briefing on discussions with OWEB, DEQ, and Oregon Plan Monitoring Team.
- General discussion between the IMST and Greg Sieglitz, OWEB, to determine focus of the workshop

4:15 Responses to recommendations made in the Lowland Report – Nancy M.
Review and approve draft response back to the Core Team.

4:45 Public comment

5:00 Adjourn

Thursday, October 20, 2005
Richardson Hall, Room 115

8:30 ODFW's draft Status and Trends Report – Kevin Goodson (ODFW)
Overview of draft report and specifics of review requested by ODFW

Followed by a general Team discussion – Nancy

- how to proceed with the review
- time-line
- initial comments and observations on the draft report.

11:15 Technical assistance needs by Oregon Department of Agriculture – Carl S.
Team discussion with Ray Jaindl and Mack Barrington (ODA)

11:45 Public Comment

12:00 Adjourn public meeting

12:15–2:00 Executive Session – CLOSED to public.

A portion of the Team and the Assistant to the Chair will meet to discuss applications sent for an OSU Faculty Research Assistant position that will provide support to the IMST. No IMST business will be discussed.

MINUTES
Independent Multidisciplinary Science Team
October 19–20, 2005

Richardson Hall rooms 313 & 115
Oregon State University
Corvallis OR 97331

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

Others Attending:
Kathy Maas-Hebner, OSU
Ben Clemens, OSU
Nicole Charlson, OWRD
John Byers, ODA
Greg Sieglitz, OWEB
Jeff Rodgers, ODFW
Cedric Cooney, ODFW
Mack Barrington, ODA
Steve Hanson, DEQ (via phone)
Kevin Goodson, ODFW
Jim Myron, GNRO
Ray Beamesderfer, S.P. Crammer & Assoc.
Nick Ackerman, S.P. Crammer & Assoc.
Ray Jaindl, ODA

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

October 19, 2005
Co-Chair Carl Schreck convened the meeting at 8:34 AM.

AGENDA
Carl S. indicated a change to the agenda; representatives from the Oregon Plan Outreach Team would discuss their activities with the IMST and how the Outreach Team may help increase awareness of the IMST's work. No other additions or changes were made to the agenda. The agenda was adopted as presented.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST
Carl asked that any Team member with a conflict of interest concerning an agenda item to declare the conflict for Team discussion. No one declared a conflict.

MINUTES
The May and June minutes were adopted as presented.

FUTURE MEETINGS
Dates were set for future meetings:
November 29–30, 2005
December 19–20, 2005
January 25–26, 2006
February 23–24, 2006

UPDATES AND DEVELOPMENTS
Carl S. updated the Team on recent changes on membership. In September, Rich Shepard resigned from the Team citing that his business requires more of his time. His resignation letter is available for Team members to read. The current status of replacements for Stan Gregory and Rich is not known but the Team will discuss with Jim Myron, GNOR when he is at tomorrow's session.

Carl S. introduced Ben Clemens to the Team. Ben is an OSU Faculty Research Assistant (FRA) and will be providing temporary support to the Team while a replacement for Leah is being found.

Carl S. noted that the Oregon Hatchery Research Center officially opened October 14 and that he attended the ceremony. Carl noted that he spoke with the Center's new director and discussed the possibility of the IMST touring the center at a later date.

Carl S. indicated that the FRA selection committee (Carl S., Bob, Neil, and Kathy M-H) will be meeting tomorrow to go through applications. Since three IMST members are on the committee he decided to treat it as an executive session. It may be another 4 to 6 weeks before a new FRA is on board to work with the Team. Kathy also mentioned that the Department of Forest Science will soon advertise an announcement to hire a new office specialist to replace Glenda. The IMST will still have 0.25 FTE support from this position and Kathy is serving on the selection committee.

Nancy discussed the draft work plan the Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF) sent to the IMST earlier this summer with a request for a review. She filled in the history of the white paper and the strategic work plan. The work plan was sent to the IMST this summer and she and Carl S. determined that there wasn't enough technical content in it for the Team to review. It mainly described agency operations. However, she felt that the Team should consider reviewing the white paper that was used

as a basis for the work plan. She indicated that to ODF but has not received a reply. Bob agreed that if the white paper describes ecological principles that are used as a basis for the work plan than the white paper should be reviewed. Nancy agreed and that the Team should determine if the white paper has a sound scientific basis. There was full consensus of the Team to review the white paper.

ACTION: Nancy will contact ODF to determine that status of the white paper and indicate that the IMST would like to formerly review it.

TEAM OPERATIONS

Carl S. indicated that this discussion is meant to assess where the Team is and it's workload and how to operate efficiently with 5 members. Carl S. indicated that the draft native fish status report did not seem as daunting as they first thought and that the team needs to accommodate other work in progress. Nancy indicated that it would be helpful for her to have an assessment of how two fewer team members will impact the urban & rural residential and eastern Oregon reports.

1. Budget and MOU- Carl S. said that the IMST budget has been transferred from OWEB to OSU and those contracts with the non-OSU or federal Team members should be in place. He is having trouble finding out the status of the MOU between OWEB and OSU. Nancy suggested asking Gregg Sieglitz, OWEB, when he is at the afternoon session. Carl S. also discussed the status of the overhead that OSU has waived to date. OSU overhead will no longer be waived and the Team will need to include 10% overhead in the next biennium's budget. Nancy also said that she needs to speak with Tom Byler, OWEB, about the next steps to take in requesting the remaining funds for the IMST budget from the E-Board.

ACTION: Nancy will speak with Tom Byler about approaching the E-board for the rest of the IMST budget.

2. Communication with agencies & legislature- Nancy updated the Team on her work to increase communication with state agencies and the legislature. Nancy will speak to the Oregon Plan Core Team on November 1, 2005 about IMST activities and ways to increase communication between the individual agencies, the Core Team, and the IMST. Nancy noted that in conversations with various people she has found that there are a lot of misconceptions, and erroneous ideas about the IMST. She is also working to set up meetings with key state legislators to discuss the IMST. Kathy asked if it would be helpful for Nancy to have an IMST prospectus to take when she meets with various people and groups. The Team agreed that would be helpful. The Team also discussed if it would be helpful for other Team members to join Nancy at some of the meetings. Nancy said it would be.

ACTION: Kathy will draft a prospectus for IMST and send it to Nancy.
ACTION: Nancy will alert the Team to dates and time of meetings and ask if others are able to attend.

3. GNRO Request- Carl S. indicated that he and Nancy were sent a request from Jim Myron to review an e-mail he received from Rich Shepard, suggesting a re-organization of the IMST. In order to save Team members' time, Carl S. and Nancy drafted a reply to Jim and asked that the Team review it for their approval. The Team approved the draft response.

ACTION: Kathy will incorporate changes and Nancy will send it to Jim next week.

4. Urban Project Update- Bob updated the Team on what the subcommittee has accomplished since the May meeting. Leah incorporated Team comments from the May meeting into the current draft. Carl S. has worked on his portion of the water quality section. Bob will contact Stan about completing his sections of the report. Ben will assist the subcommittee where he can. The subcommittee will aim for January 2006 for a completed draft for Team review.

ACTION: Bob will contact Stan about getting Stan's sections finished.

5. Eastside Project Update- Carl Y. updated the Team about progress made on the Eastside report. With Rich resigning and not redoing his section, Carl Y. is the only Team member working on the draft. Kathy will work with Wayne to finalize the grazing section. Carl Y. said it would be helpful to have another Team member working on the draft to increase perspective. The Team discussed how to complete both projects, it was decided to first focus on the urban report to complete a draft for technical review; and then the Team should focus on the eastside project.

6. Staffing Needs- Kathy briefly discussed staffing for the Team. When the Team submitted a draft budget to OWEB for this biennium it included two support staff positions. The Team can not hire two unless the E-Board allocates the rest of the proposed budget to the Team. Kathy would like the Team members to consider what role(s) a second position may have and if the Team can keep a second position busy.

7. Future Independent Projects- Carl S. brought up the need for the Team to discuss future independent work loads and focus of Team operations; revisit possible projects discussed a few years ago; and determine what information is needed for the Oregon Plan to achieve its goals. The Team decided that this discussion was needed and that the December meeting might be a good time to do it.

8. Recommendation Preamble- Carl Y. distributed the current draft for the preamble the Team revised to go with recommendations in IMST technical reports. Discussion centered on whether the information would be better put into cover letters to agencies receiving the reports than within the report itself. The Team agreed to keep the information within the reports and highlighting specifics in the cover letter to allow the public a chance to see and understand the recommendation/agency response process. Some minor editing was done by the team and suggestions made to the final wording. Carl Y. incorporated the edits and suggestions and provided the final language to staff for future use.

Oregon Plan Outreach Team – John Byers (ODA) and Nicole Charlson (OWRD)
John and Nicole briefed the IMST on how the Outreach Team operates, handed out a copy of the Outreach Team's mission, goals, and objectives. They also described current projects they are working on. The discussion moved onto how the Outreach Team might be able to help the IMST increase public awareness of IMST activities and reports, increase visibility within the state and relationships with state agencies and the legislature. There are a lot of misconceptions about the IMST and the Team needs to have efficient communications channels with the various state and public entities involved with the Oregon Plan.

The Outreach Team can help with news items. It may be useful to have a synopsis of reports produced and made available but it would be difficult for the Outreach Team to do the synopses. The next Outreach Team meeting will be held on December 13, 2005 at the Pringle School House in Salem, OR. Nicole and John will add an agenda item to discuss the IMST and how the Outreach Team can assist the IMST.

ACTION: Carl S. and Kathy will attend the December 13, 2005 Outreach Team meeting.

ODFW's monitoring under the Oregon Plan – Jeff Rodgers (ODFW Oregon Plan Monitoring Coordinator)

Jeff briefed the Team on the type of monitoring the agency is conducting as part of the Oregon Plan. ODFW monitoring is driven by the Native Fish Conservation Policy, which meshes well with the Oregon Plan. Monitoring using probabilistic survey design is furthest along with coastal coho salmon and the agency is building its monitoring efforts in the John Day basin and the lower Columbia. ODFW coordinates with the Oregon Plan, PNAMP (Pacific Northwest Aquatic Monitoring Partnership), and CSMEP (Collaborative Systemwide Monitoring and Evaluation Project). Jeff also discussed recovery planning by ODFW for targeted species.

Oregon Plan Monitoring – Greg Sieglitz (OWEB)

Greg briefed the Team on the restoration and monitoring grants OWEB distributes and land acquisitions. Effectiveness monitoring is very important to OWEB and the agency is in the process of developing an effectiveness monitoring program.

Data Libraries – Cedric Cooney (OWEB)

Cedric described the on-line data libraries that were created for the coastal coho project and the north coast portal. He also discussed what possibilities exist for creating a data library for the Oregon Plan, and how information can either be restricted to certain users or be made available to the public.

IMST/OWEB Effectiveness Monitoring Workshop – Nancy M.

Neil, Nancy, Kathy, and Greg Sieglitz reported earlier discussions that have occurred between the four of them, in a meeting with DEQ representatives and at a meeting of the Oregon Plan Monitoring Team. The focus of the workshop and end products still need to be finalized. The aim is to have the workshop in February 2006 at OSU. Greg envisions a three day workshop with a one-day symposium, a one-day work session, and a one-day site visit to local effectiveness monitoring sites or programs. Jeff Rodgers felt that effectiveness monitoring needs to go beyond restoration activities but also include the effectiveness of land management and policies. Team members agreed but it would have to be the focus of another workshop or workgroup.

Discussions also included that the proposed time-line would not be sufficient to determine the agenda, plan the workshop, invite and line up participants, and possibly poll participants ahead of time. Greg mentioned that the OWEB Board does want to get independent assessments from the IMST regarding the outcome of the workshop. Carl S. indicated that he felt that the Team did not agree to produce a report or guidance for OWEB on monitoring but instead should provide oversight for the workshop. Greg indicated that it would be most helpful to OWEB for the IMST to provide guidance on the outcome of the workshop. Nancy suggested that the IMST could provide an opinion about criteria determined by the workshop. Carl S. disagreed saying that the IMST should provide quality control on the workshop report, not provide a separate report or in depth report. No formal decisions were made as a result of this discussion.

ACTION: Nancy, Neil, Kathy, and Greg will meet again and work to determine the focus, agenda, and end products for the workshop and propose them to the Team at the IMST's November 2005 meeting.

Responses to recommendations made in IMST's 2002 Lowland Report – Nancy M.
Nancy presented the current draft of IMST's evaluation of the Core Team responses to recommendations directed to the Core Team in the IMST's 2002 Lowland report. The five Team members unanimously approved the evaluation as written.

ACTION: Kathy will add cover letter and the evaluation prepared for co-chair signatures.

Public Comment
There being no public comment, the meeting was adjourned at 4:42 PM.

October 20, 2005

Carl S. convened the meeting at 8:34 AM.

Effectiveness Monitoring Workshop
Discussions began again on the IMST's role in the upcoming effectiveness monitoring workshop and advice for the OWEB Board. Carl S reiterated that he felt that the Team should only read summaries of the workgroups and check the validity of OWEB's notes of the proceedings. Nancy said that the structure of the workshop is not set yet and end products are still on the table. She added that if IMST provides the Board their (IMST members) notes and reflections then that would be advice. Bob agreed that the product or output from the workshop still needs to be determined.

Replacing Team Members
Carl S. asked Jim Myron (GNRO) if there is any progress on appointing new members to the Team. Jim assured Carl that the appointing authorities are looking into it but as of yet there are no candidates. Jim also indicated that he would try to expedite the process but it will probably take another 2 or 3 months to have someone appointed. Carl S. summarized for Jim the discussion that the IMST had with members on the Oregon Plan Outreach Team on the previous day.

ODFW's draft Status and Trends Report – Kevin Goodson (ODFW)
Kevin made a presentation to the Team on how ODFW approached the status and trends report and the analyses used. He stressed that the agency's analyses and interpretations were restricted to interim criteria adopted by the Fish and Wildlife Commission as part of the Native Fish Conservation Policy. He asked that the Team not spend a lot of time critiquing the interim criteria since they are adopted. The criteria were meant to be starting points until better information was available and the criteria were created by a panel representing various interest groups not a panel of fish population biologists.

Carl S. noted that the criteria used for coastal coho in the State's recent assessment is significantly different from what is used in the Status and Trends Report. Kevin agreed, the metrics are the same but the State's coastal coho assessment was more detailed and included persistence. Nick Ackerman, (S.P. Crammer & Assoc.) added that the Status and Trends Report also evaluated coho over a much

longer time period, the last 30 years rather than the last 5 years. Bob brought up the concern that there are many more fish species at risk such as the Klamath suckers and sticklebacks in the Willamette basin that are not covered by the report. Kevin indicated that the workload was too great to cover all the fish at this time.

Kevin indicated that ODFW would like to address four points in their review of the document:

1. Were the data used in the Status Report appropriate for the analyses?
2. Were wrong conclusions drawn from any assessments?
3. Were there better ways to assess any of the criteria?
4. Did ODFW interpret the intent of the criteria in a biologically appropriate way?

Carl S. asked about ODFW's timeline for deliverables. Kevin said that ODFW has an extension for the OWEB grant and have to have the draft completed by June 2006 and ODFW would like IMST's feedback before January. Nancy said that the original e-mails from ODFW indicated that the agency would like IMST's comments in mid-December. Carl S. asked Team members if they felt that the Team could review and provide a draft response by mid-December. The Team members unanimously agreed. The November meeting would be devoted to the Team's discussion of the document and the drafting of a review. Nancy mentioned that two of the Team members (Carl S. and Bob) have the knowledge to look at the details of the report and the other three can look at the overall picture of the report. The rest of the Team agreed.

ACTION: Carl S., Bob, and support staffer Ben Clemens will meet as a workgroup to provide initial comments to the rest of the Team. The Team will discuss the documents and prepare a draft review at the November meeting.

IMST Interactions with state agencies, legislature and special interest groups.
The Team took a few minutes to discuss other concerns with Jim Myron (GNRO). Carl S. asked Jim if he has heard any other outside concerns about IMST and how the Team operates. Jim indicated that he has not heard any recently, he commented that the Team is independent and in the interim session last year it was good for the IMST to listen to concerns when the Team didn't have to. Nancy and Carl S. also brought up misconceptions they have heard about the Team and asked Jim if he could suggest ways the Team could help to address interested public groups or legislators to prevent misconceptions. Jim suggested that the Team should increase communication with groups and the legislature prior to the release of a controversial report or review and that he may be able to help with updating the legislature.

Technical assistance needs by Oregon Department of Agriculture – Ray Jaindl and Mack Barrington (ODA)
Carl S. welcomed Ray and Mack to the meeting. Ray indicated that ODA would like to improve the agency's effectiveness monitoring for SB 1010 program but to improve water quality but not to duplicate DEQ's data and program. He indicated that presently no agency is evaluating riparian conditions associated with agricultural lands and ODA needs to develop an effectiveness monitoring program to assess conditions.

Ray shared a current draft of ODA's Handbook of Standardized Monitoring and asked if the Team would provide a review to determine if is scientifically sound. Mack Barrington is working on edits

to this version and it would be a couple months before ODA could send the revised version to the Team. If the Team is willing to review it, the agency would like to receive comments in the spring.

The Team voted and unanimously accepted the review request.

ACTION: The IMST will review the ODA's draft handbook of standardized monitoring for SB 1010 in the winter/spring of 2006.

Ray and Mack also discussed the agency's current efforts using site capability to improve agricultural riparian areas. The agency is beginning to develop a GIS based classification model using aerial photography and soil maps. The agency would like to know if it would be useful to do this work, is the agency working at the right spatial scale, and can it be linked to other sections of stream networks under different management.

Bob said that the EPA has done such research reviews where the model is presented to ecologists for feedback and pointed out that even though ODA is not conducting research the agency is asking research questions so a research review format may help the agency's project. Nancy agreed that a workshop format would be appropriate to assist ODA in developing the model.

The Team members unanimously agreed to work with ODA and improving the model but would need to discuss it at another meeting to determine how best to proceed.

ACTION: At a meeting in 2006 the IMST will discuss the development of the model with ODA and determine how the Team can assist in a review or workshop to help ODA.

Public Comments
There being no public comments, the meeting was adjourned at 12:24 PM

October 20, 2005 Executive Session
A brief Executive Session was held after the public meeting for Carl S., Bob, Neil, and Kathy to meet and review applications received for the Faculty Research Assistant position advertised to fill a vacancy on the IMST's support staff. No Team business was discussed.