# Independent Multidisciplinary Science Team
# Public Meeting Notice & Agenda
# January 25, 2006

## Richardson Hall, Room # 313
## Oregon State University campus
## 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.

January 26, 2006

8:30 Convene Meeting – Carl Schreck
Adopt agenda
Adopt November minutes
Set meeting dates: May 2006

8:45 Updates and developments –very brief:
- FRA recruitments
- January 3rd Core Team meeting
- Other items

9:15 Independent IMST Projects
Updates on the Urban/Rural Residential (Bob H.) and Eastern Oregon Resources (Carl Y.) project reports
- Discussion and preparation for February 7th Core Team meeting regarding how recommendations are drafted
- Review of ODA's suggested changes to recommendations preamble

10:00 DEQ's request for an independent review of proposed turbidity standards – Bob Baumgartner (DEQ) and Jim Myron (GNRO)

11:45 Public comment (*approximate time depending on discussion with DEQ*)

12:00 LUNCH (on your own)

1:00 IMST/OWEB 2006 Effectiveness Monitoring Workshop – Nancy Molina, Neil Christensen, Kathy Maas-Hebner; update on progress

1:30 ODF's Dynamic Ecosystems steering committee - request for IMST representation

1:45 Federal guidance for evaluating instream sediment removal from Oregon streams – Nancy M.

General Team Discussion on potential roles(s) for IMST in state agencies' reviews of the guidance document

2:00 Team operations (please note that the order is subject to change)

- Nominate and elect Co-Chairs for 2006
- Annual Report – on calendar or state fiscal year?
- Review of IMST Charter
- Review draft operating principles
- General discussion of Team's role in the Oregon Plan and the State
- General Discussion on increasing awareness of IMST work and products

4:45 Public comment

5:00 Adjourn

Brief public comment periods will available at designated times. Written comments may also be submitted at the meeting or sent to Kathy Maas-Hebner, Dept of Forest Science, OSU, Corvallis, OR 97331 or to imst@fsl.orst.edu

Reasonable accommodations will be provided as needed for individuals requesting assistive hearing devices, sign language interpreters or large-print materials. Individuals needing these types of accommodations may call Ryan Hink at 541-737-6551 at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting.

**MINUTES**
**Independent Multidisciplinary Science Team**
**January 25, 2006**

**Richardson Hall, Room 313**
**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
Mack Barrington, ODA
Clair Tcate, Self
Chris Bayham, Assoc. of Oregon Counties – County Road Program
Jim Myron, Governor's Office
Tom Rosetta, ODEQ
Bob Baumgartner, ODEQ
Kay Teisl, Oregon Cattleman's Assoc.
Andrew Yost, ODF
Heather Stout, NOAA Fisheries

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

**January 25, 2006**
Co-Chair Carl Schreck convened the meeting at 8:37 AM.

**AGENDA**
Schreck asked that if anyone has a conflict of interest to declare, no one did.
Agenda adopted as presented

**MINUTES**
The December minutes were adopted as presented.

**FUTURE MEETINGS**
Meeting dates were reviewed:
February 23 & 24, 2006
March 16 & 17, 2006
April 24 & 25, 2006

May meeting dates were set at May 25th and 26th.

**UPDATES AND DEVELOPMENTS**

- FRA Recruitment – The position was offered and has been accepted by a candidate for a short time period (5 months). This position can concentrate on the two large reports (Eastside and Urban). The Team will open another recruitment to find a more permanent staff member.
- Jan 3, 2006 Core Team Meeting with Federal Partners – Nancy Molina briefed the IMST on the activities reported by federal partners and state agencies.
  - Oregon Dept. of Agriculture discussed Oregon's pesticide use reporting. Hearings on the reporting laws will occur this winter. The IMST may want to examine the rigor of analysis possible by the state when using 3rd field HUCS.

ACTION: Neil Christensen will track the hearings on the pesticide reporting laws this winter.

  - The Army Corp of Engineers gave a presentation on their ESA consultations with NOAA Fisheries and USFWS regarding the Willamette Project (including dams and related hatcheries). The Corps expects to have its biological assessment (followed by biological opinions by NOAA Fisheries & USFWS) finished later this year. State agencies will be asked to review the biological assessment.
  - Steelhead and Chinook Above Barriers (SCAB) – The Army Corps of Engineers wants to give a presentation on this project a future Core Team meeting. An IMST member may want to attend that meeting.
  - BLM is revising its western Oregon resource management plan and may take a structure-based forest management approach. In 2008, the State of Oregon will be asked to do a consistency review on Oregon's forest policies and management. The IMST may want to be involved with the review and should get to know what is meant by *structure-based management*.
  - Ed Bowles (ODFW) spoke about the loss of funding for federal Fish Passage Center. Oregon and Washington are working to take over the function.

- The next Core Team meeting is February 7 and the IMST co-chairs are scheduled to discuss the Team's process for making recommendations.

**INDEPENDENT IMST PROJECT UPDATES**

Urban and Rural Residential: Schreck and Bob Hughes met with Ben Clemens to go over the draft and the status of the toxics section and what Ben wasn't able to finish on a specific table. Hughes discussed the table with the Team to decide if it is worth while to continue work on the table (possibly requiring 40 hrs+ of support staff time).

Eastern Oregon Resources: Carl Yee updated progress on the project – not much more has occurred; he mentioned some areas of the text that must be updated because of the length of time that has passed since they were written.

Draft Recommendations: Hughes discussed the progress made on draft recommendations in the draft Urban report. The Team discussed what to present to the Core Team on Feb 7th. Concerns arose regarding releasing draft recommendations to the Core Team instead of using previously released recommendations in another final report. The Team agreed to use previously released examples.

ACTION: Molina will look for good examples of recommendations and of good and bad agency responses to recommendations for presentation to the Core Team.

ACTION: Kathy Maas-Hebner will send some example recommendations and responses with background information to Molina early the week of January 30th, 2006.

**Team Member Replacements**

Schreck asked Jim Myron (GNRO) about new team members. Myron said they are waiting for the Speaker of the House to make a decision. Both the Governor's Office and Senate approved of the two scientists being considered.

**Recommendation Preamble**

Yee integrated ODA's comments and made e-mailed edits suggested by team members.

Hughes moved to adopt the preamble as written. Molina 2nd the motion. IMST unanimously adopted it as written (all five members were present for vote).

ACTION: Mass-Hebner will send the preamble to Jim Myron (GNRO) to distribute to the Core Team prior to the February 7th meeting.

**DEQ TURBIDITY STANDARD REVISION**

Bob Baumgartner and Tom Rosetta, DEQ discussed the background on the state's turbidity standard and why it is being reviewed and the process for revising the criteria. Oregon has had a standard for turbidity since the 1970's. DEQ has the public comment period open and issues have been raised regarding DEQ's turbidity policy. DEQ would like an IMST review of the technical document that formed the basis of the revisions to aid the agency in responding to public comments.

Baumgartner read a list of draft questions DEQ would like the IMST to consider for an independent review:

1. Is the IMST aware of any literature or information the DEQ did not review related to turbidity effects?
2. Does the technical basis provide a reasonable and objective review of the body of available information?
3. Does the technical basis provide reasonable and objective inference on risk of impairment from the available literature?

Molina said the 3rd question may be the most important for the IMST to focus on.

Baumgartner discussed beneficial uses and metrics to measure impact on beneficial uses.

Schreck asked for Team discussion on the review, time frame and IMST's other priorities.

As a side note, Baumgartner mentioned that DEQ has funded a work forum on instream aggregate mining next month in southern Oregon. This may be of interest to the IMST if they do decide to review the federal draft guidance document on removal of sediments from Oregon waterways.

Hughes was concerned about workload and the older reports in progress even though the turbidity criteria are very important for the Team to review.

Yee felt that the Team could address the scientific basis of the criteria, but determining if any literature or other technical information was omitted is difficult. The Team can look at the document and the conclusions DEQ has drawn regarding biological and physical effects on aquatic resources, and measurement processes that are done elsewhere in the western states. Yee suggested that one Team member could look at physical aspects and one of the other team members could look at biological aspects.

Hughes felt that those areas mentioned by Yee would be addressed if the Team focuses on the last two questions presented by DEQ.

Molina asked about timing and at what period would IMST's comments be most useful. Baumgartner thinks July. Yee asked whether or not this would be considered as public comment and restricted by when DEQ can accept the review. DEQ staff has consulted with the agency's lawyer and this falls into seeking advice and intervention from agencies for additional information. If substantial new information is found by the Team, DEQ can reopen the public comment period.

Hughes moved to accept DEQ's request to review the turbidity standards. Yee seconded the motion. The Team unanimously accepted the review request (all five members were present for the vote).

Prior to the next IMST meeting, DEQ will provide a formal request and revised questions for the Team. The agency will also try to provide a compilation of the technical questions brought up during the public comment period.

ACTION: The Team won't begin formal work on the review or determine how to conduct the review until the February IMST meeting.

<u>FEBRUARY AGENDA ITEM</u>: The Team will discuss the requested review and how to proceed, information provided by DEQ staff and Team members' initial impression of the technical document.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**
No public comments were made after the discussion with DEQ.

**EFFECTIVENESS MONITORING WORKSHOP**
Molina updated the Team on date conflicts with PNAMP's workshop in Portland. Greg Sieglitz (OWEB) and Molina have contacted some members of the PNAMP steering committee and there is still considerable confusion going. IMST has sent PNAMP information on the IMST/OWEB workshop and Jennifer Bayer will join the IMST/OWEB steering committee tomorrow in Salem. Hughes is concerned with the time schedule and lining people up to commit to the workshop in March. Yee aggreed. Christensen indicated that the goals are good but the steering committee still needs to refine the workgroup questions.

Molina suggested that if a decision about the dates is not reached tomorrow (Thursday) when the steering committee meets, the IMST should pullout of the venture. Hughes and Schreck agreed with Molina.

**FEDERAL GUIDANCE DOCUMENT FOR EVALUATING INSTREAM SEDIMENT REMOVAL IN OREGON STREAMS –**
The Core Team has pulled together a subgroup (DSL, DEQ, DOGAMI, and ODFW) to review the federal document of guidelines for instream sediment removal in Oregon. Molina didn't make offers at the meeting but thinks there is a lot of technical basis for the guideline. There is also no formal request to the Team but Molina wanted to ask if the Team felt that they should review the document.

Hughes moved that IMST compare the federal guidelines to IMST's letter report. Christensen seconded the motion. All four team members present agreed to review the guidelines. Schreck was not present for the vote.

ACTION: Molina will check with USFWS about a deadline and will let Jim Myron know the Team's intentions on reviewing the federal guidelines.

ACTION: Maas-Hebner will begin comparing the two documents.

**ODF DYNAMIC ECOSYSTEMS**
Andrew Yost, ODF, said that the ODF's dynamic ecosystems work plan has been accepted by the Board of Forestry and the agency is beginning to implement it. Implementation includes a symposium and scholarly paper. ODF is now forming a steering committee and has invited both IMST Co-Chairs, Molina and Schreck, to be part of the committee. IMST members expressed some concern about appearances of being involved in a steering committee that is, in part, funded by a group that is seen as biased toward the forest industry. Team members suggested that ODF may want to make sure that the project (symposium and scholarly papers) is funded by more than one group and include a good balance of timber industry and environmental groups. This could help the agency avoid future concerns about the appearance of a biased process based on funding source.

Yee suggested that it may be more appropriate that Team members are not on the steering committee but rather in reviewing the deliverables. The Team was favorable to this suggestion and Yost said he believed that ODF would be too.

Yee moved that the IMST not be represented on the steering committee but instead be involved by providing scientific advice to ODF and reviewing final documents resulting from the project. Hughes seconded the motion. All four Team members present agreed. Schreck was not present for the vote.

ACTION - Molina will remain the main contact with ODF on the dynamic ecosystem project.

**TEAM OPERATIONS**

2006 Co-Chairs:

Hughes nominated Molina and Schreck to continue as co-chairs. Bob said that even though Schreck was not present for the vote Schreck indicated on Monday that he would be willing to remain as Internal Co-Chair. Nominations were seconded by Yee and Christensen. All four Team members present voted unanimously for Molina and Schreck to remain as Co-Chairs for 2006 (Schreck was absent from the vote).

ACTION: Molina will continue to serve as External Co-Chair and Schreck will continue to serve as Internal Co-Chair for 2006.

Annual Report

Maas-Hebner explained to the Team that the IMST's annual report has always been prepared for the calendar year not the State's fiscal year. This creates a problem with reporting since some annual reports end up including two different fiscal cycles. She suggested changing the annual report to the fiscal year.

Hughes moved to move the annual report from the calendar year to the fiscal year. Yee seconded the motion. A vote was called and all four Team members presented voted unanimously to move the annual report to the fiscal year. Schreck was not present for the vote.

Charter and Operating Procedures

Hughes presented his suggested editorial changes to the Charter and brought up a few questions he had on content. Based on Team discussion, Bob will update his edits and redistribute to the Team prior to the February meeting. The Team will then consider the edits at the February meeting. – No changes were made to the Team operations.

ACTION: Hughes will update his suggested edits and remove changes not accepted by the Team and then redistribute the Charter to the Team.

IMST Guiding Principles

The guiding principles drafted at the December meeting were discussed by the full Team. Discussion centered on what to do with the guiding principles; add to the Charter, keep as an in house document; or to make them a stand alone document that would be publicly available. The Team decided to have them available on–line. Members also agreed that that bullets about conflicts of interest, scientific disclosure, professional integrity and separating personal opinions from IMST were needed.

ACTION: Hughes and Schreck will draft three additional principles for the Team to consider at the February meeting.

Coho and ESA Listing Decision

Molina asked whether the IMST should write a letter to the editor commending the State's monitoring efforts that allowed them to assess the status of coastal coho and to include that assessment available in NOAA Fisheries' coastal coho ESA delisting process. The Team would only comment on the critical role monitoring has played not on the final listing decision. The letter would also point out that the coho effort should serve as a model for monitoring other aquatic species at risk and for monitoring the status and trends of other species where information on populations is lacking.

Yee moved that the Team prepare and distribute the letter commending the monitoring effort on coastal coho. Hughes seconded the motion. All five members present agreed.

ACTION: Molina and Schreck will draft a letter to send to the Team for their approval over email.

**OREGON COAST COHO SALMON WORKGROUP**

Heather Stout, NOAA Fisheries, presented the Co-Manager's draft of the Biological Recovery Criteria for the Oregon Coast Coho ESU. The draft is not yet ready for public distribution but is being technically reviewed by request to specific scientists. The Workgroup recognizes that the Team may not be able to review it prior to NOAA's March 15th deadline, but indicated that if the IMST can make comments on portions of the draft or if individuals can comment on it, the workgroup would appreciate the input. During the process of creating the draft criteria the workgroup did consider all the comments the Team made on the Oregon Coastal Coho Project and tried to incorporate those into this draft. Team members indicated that presently the Team doesn't have time to prepare any type of formal comments on the Co-Manager's draft prior to March 15th. Schreck indicated that the Team could only comment as a Team, which requires Team discussion and approval of the review comments. Individuals could comment as professionals, but not as representing the IMST. Stout proposed that the IMST instead make comments during the open public comment period later this year. Heather will initiate a formal review request this spring for the Team to review the revised draft document released for public review. The discussion was tabled until a formal request is received.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

No public comment was given.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:06pm