

**Independent Multidisciplinary Science Team
Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds**

**Public Meeting Notice & Agenda
April 24, 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.

PLEASE NOTE MEETING BEGINS AT 9:00 AM

Monday April 24, 2006

9:00 Convene Meeting – Carl Schreck

Adopt agenda

Adopt April 24, 2006 minutes

Set meeting dates: August 2006

9:15 Updates and developments –very brief:

- Changes at the GNRO
- Other items

9:30 Project and Review updates

➤ Urban & Rural Residential – Bob Hughes

➤ Eastern Oregon Resources – Carl Yee

9:45 IMST Review of the technical basis for turbidity standard revision – Carl Y.

10:15 Review of ODA's draft Monitoring Handbook – Carl S.

Team discussion of ODA's request and questions to cover in review. Ken Diebel, ODA, will join the discussion by phone.

11:15 IMST/OWEB Restoration Effectiveness Monitoring Workshop – Nancy Molina

General Team discussion and debriefing of work group discussions from the April 18 & 19, 2006 workshop.

11:45 Public comment

12:00 LUNCH (on your own)

1:00 IMST Restoration Effectiveness Monitoring Workshop Report– Nancy M

- Team discussion on developing a final product from the workshop.
- 4:00 OWEB Research project proposal and funding process- Ken Bierly (OWEB)
Discussion (and possible formal decision) about possible roles the IMST may
have in the review process of research proposals received by OWEB.
- 4:45 Public comment
- 5:00 Adjourn Public Meeting

A brief public comment period will be 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
April 24, 2006

Richardson Hall, Room 313
Oregon State University
Corvallis OR 97331

Members in Attendance:

Carl Schreck, Co-Chair
Carl Yee
Vic Kaczynski
Michael Harte
Neil Christensen

Member(s) Absent:

Nancy Molina, Co-Chair
Bob Hughes

Others Attending:

Kathy Maas-Hebner, OSU
Tom Rosetta, ODEQ
Ken Diebel, ODA (by phone)
Greg Sieglitz, OWEB
Ken Bierly, OWEB

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

April 24, 2006

Carl Schreck convened the meeting at 9:10 AM and asked anyone with a potential conflict of interest to bring it to the Team's attention for discussion. No one declared a potential conflict.

AGENDA

Agenda modification – Nancy Molina won't be present at today's meeting and Schreck suggested modifying the workshop discussion to be more general and not focused on the IMST's end products.

MINUTES

March minutes were adopted as presented.

FUTURE MEETINGS

May 25 & 26, 2006

June 22 & 23, 2006

July 26 & 27, 2006

August, week of the 21st

ACTION: Schreck will send an e-mail to everyone to determine meeting dates for the week of August 21.

UPDATES AND DEVELOPMENTS

Staff changes at the Governor's Natural Resource Office: Schreck spoke with Ken Bierly (OWEB) who thought that someone has been named to replace Jim Myron but didn't know who.

INDEPENDENT IMST PROJECT UPDATES

Urban and Rural Residential: Schreck mentioned that Susie Dunham, IMST's new Faculty Research Assistant, will work on the urban draft after she starts on May 1.

Eastern Oregon Resources: Vic Kaczynski has been assigned to the subcommittee and is working on the water quality section and determining for which basins to summarize the water quality data. He has requested DEQ to send data summaries on water quality and is looking at indices of biological integrity.

Schreck asked how the Columbia River is covered within the report and suggested that a paragraph could be added identifying issues associated with the Columbia River and stating that they will not be covered in the report. The Team agreed that the issues are too complex to cover and the focus could be shifted away from the other issues in eastern Oregon

ACTION: Carl Yee will prepare a paragraph on issues in the Columbia River and how they are interrelated to eastern Oregon issues.

Technical Basis for Turbidity Standards: Yee drafted a review for the subcommittee. He and Bob Hughes have fairly different opinions but he has not seen Schreck's comments and will have to merge multiple opinions into the review.

Tom Rosetta (DEQ) introduced himself and was present for Team questions regarding turbidity. Rosetta described more about the mixing zones and NTU measurement in small and large water bodies.

Schreck is concerned that the document presents biological response to turbidity levels as a linear relationship but it may be more curvilinear with thresholds. The agency's reliance on Newcombe's model is worrisome because it has not been validated.

Yee commented that DEQ's criteria and approach are inline with other western states. Michael Harte suggested that the Team's review should point out that Oregon's criterion is similar to other western states but the IMST should point out what biological risks may be present if that approach is used by Oregon.

ACTION: Schreck will work with Hughes' comments and incorporate them into the review. In May the subcommittee will meet again and review comments before preparing a draft for the full team. IMST will not respond to specific public comments sent to DEQ.

REVIEW OF ODA'S DRAFT AGRICULTURE WATER QUALITY PROGRAM MONITORING GUIDEBOOK

Ken Diebel, ODA, joined the Team by phone. Schreck related his and Hughes' concern that the document is implicit not explicit. The Team agreed and gave Diebel some examples. Presently the document is written for in-house use and details may not be there for use by a broader audience.

Neil Christensen noted that the document needs to specify what external data and collaborative collections of data will be used by the ODA and how the data will be analyzed. There may be a disconnect between information (e.g. aerial photos) collected by ODA and data collected by other agencies. How will these be used and compared, how will adequacy of the two pieces be determined?

Christensen did not see the connection between the remote sensing approach to the on-the-ground riparian assessment which is very labor intensive. Yee asked if the ground measurements were designed as ground truthing for aerial photo surveys. Diebel agreed that ground truthing is one us of the vegetation intensive sampling.

Schreck asked that effectiveness monitoring be defined as well as the endpoint. It is not clear what ODA's intent is particularly with the use of data from other agencies or groups.

Harte commented that the vegetation is being used as a surrogate for water quality but the document does not explain ODA's assumptions that riparian vegetation cover and condition corresponds to water quality parameters.

Diebel clarified that ODA would like feedback on the riparian assessment protocols and if ODA should focus monitoring efforts on riparian vegetation.

ACTION: Diebel will send clarifications on questions to Kathy Maas-Hebner.

ACTION: Christensen will take the lead on drafting the Team's review. He will prepare a draft for discussion at the May meeting.

IMST/OWEB EFFECTIVENESS MONITORING WORKSHOP

With Molina absent, Schreck suggested that the IMST have a general discussion on the workgroup discussions. Christensen suggested discussing general impressions on what worked, what didn't work and how it may impact the IMST's final product.

General Observations

Christensen indicated that the Riparian/Upland group appeared to be well balanced in perspective, but the OWEB list of activities and objectives had a negative effect on the discussion.

Yee commented that many of the restoration activities dealt with by each group involved hydrology and OWEB may want to focus more on hydrological processes.

Kaczynski – felt that to start from scratch you would look from regional to basin to watershed to determine the problems and how to alleviate them. Projects on the ground could be sampled for a programmatic review and then a well defined strategy and objectives for projects not yet on the ground could be created

The Team expressed concerns about how the end reports will be written and the role OWEB staff will have in the process. Schreck suggested that a synthesis document be prepared that will be reviewed by participants for accuracy and a separate document be prepared and solely authored by the IMST with no outside co-authors or agency approval on the final report.

The Team went member by member to list impressions or conclusions from the workgroups.

Yee – Hydrology workgroup

- Participants determined that most of the restoration objective flowed from hydrologic process changes and affected the other components of the watershed.
- Once hydrological process was identified then objectives, actions and monitoring can be determined.
- Some activities would not need effectiveness monitoring early on since long-term periods are needed to see changes and photo points could be used in the early stages.
- A programmatic effectiveness review at the agency level should be done to determine overall effects of activities. – Use 6th field HUC for monitoring.

Kaczynski & Schreck – Aquatic Habitat Group

- Strategically need to work from top down, State, region, basin etc., to determine limiting factors and restoration objective. Objectives need to be well defined and measurable. Need to define and articulate what effectiveness is for each objective. Nest objectives by scale. A laundry list of individual projects was not the way to start a strategic program.
- OWEB should review State of Washington's monitoring documents.
- Natural variability will confuse data interpretation – reference sites are needed. However, reference sites are difficult to find but control sites are key, and having more control sites than restored sites is preferable to increase statistical rigor.
- For projects already done, projects could be grouped, stratified and statistically sampled.
- Actions/projects being funded need to include a scientific component addressing how they can contribute to future knowledge and future projects and they should be keyed back to knowledge gaps.
- Need both site specific and landscape monitoring. (e.g. downstream effects from upstream activities that may not be monitored with a site oriented monitoring perspective.)
- Agency staff need to look at projects as a whole (larger spatial extent) and not just individually by watershed councils
- Workgroup saw a need for limiting factor analysis and building a restoration plan for them
- Education components need to be included in a monitoring program to show how important monitoring is to restoration activities at the local scale.
- A lot of intensively monitored sites (smolt traps, redds) are already in place. The state may want more moderately intensive monitoring sites but should also include intensive monitoring sites. The monitoring needs to account for climatic variation, wide spread change.
- The rotating panel design ODFW uses is good and includes central sites.

Greg Sieglitz (OWEB) said that projects were not put on the ground randomly. There is a framework to determine how the projects get on the ground including watershed assessments, action plans, and some monitoring plans.

Kaczynski and Schreck – The workgroup recognized that projects are not randomly placed, rather, projects have not been part of a holistic design, often are dependent on volunteer and land owner willingness.

Christensen – Riparian/Upland group

People were primarily process oriented so a project orientated discussion approach did

not work. The group looked for a strategic approach to the questions– what are the ecosystem processes that are not functioning?

- Larger scale criteria - many can be identified but because of long time frames it is difficult to show changes over the short-term. There may be a role for models.
- The state should identify key areas that are good examples for restoration and/or monitoring and include a collaborative process for telling the story.
- Groups can use models to assess the amount of landscape that needs to be treated in order to see changes and to track progress (e.g., stream temperature and the Heat Source model).

Harte – Water Quality Group

- Approach taken by participants was similar to the other groups but began vague as to what water quality is and isn't.
- Participants indicated that restoration effectiveness for water quality would be a positive trend toward the target condition.

The water quality workgroup participants concluded the following:

- Temperature surrogates, like shade, and sediment surrogates, like stream bank erosion, can be used at the project level.
- A probabilistic sampling design is needed to look at the big picture. OWEB would not be able to determine the contributions of individual projects as some will only be detectable at the reach level and not significantly downstream from the project site.
- Data needs to be coordinated and managed by OWEB for larger scale analyses.
- Large scale projects should have effectiveness monitoring built into the project planning and implementation phases.
- Local groups would need guidance for sampling designs and sampling protocols.
- 5th field HUC would be appropriate for monitoring water quality.

Sieglitz indicated that OWEB, the Oregon Plan Monitoring Team, and the GNRO will take the information and recommendations from IMST and begin implementing strategic recommendations to develop an effectiveness monitoring program.

ACTION: Christensen, Molina and Maas-Hebner will meet and discuss a structure for the Workshop Report. The Subcommittee will poll participants on questions 9 & 10 not covered during the workshop and for citations people would like to forward to the Team.

OWEB RESEARCH PROPOSAL REVIEW

Schreck recapped last week's lunch time meeting between Ken Bierly (OWEB), Molina, Schreck and Maas-Hebner and the suggestions that came out of the meeting: i.e., creating a structure for reviewing proposals and helping to create a review process. The Team suggested that OWEB could work with the Institute of Natural Resources (INR) or a similar group to handle the review, the IMST could review the top proposals for relevance to the Oregon Plan. Schreck commented that it is difficult to discuss proposals in public for funding.

The IMST then had a discussion with Bierly.

Bierly proposed that IMST be a vetting group for research proposals, and that OWEB receive help from IMST to create a process for the review. This would provide a peer review for the OWEB Board's decisions. In coming biennia IMST could help to develop a pre-proposal process. He asked if IMST could identify peer reviewers for OWEB? OWEB would then send out the proposal and have IMST determine how the reviewed proposals align with the Board's research priorities.

Schreck did not feel that the Team has the expertise to be referees.

Harte – Institute for Water and Watersheds (IWW) has put in a proposal to do similar work for the U.S. Department of Energy. OWEB may want to consider asking the IWW or Sea Grant to handle the review process.

Bierly indicated that for now the OWEB Board needs to know the IMST's willingness to participate and to what degree that participation may be. IMST indicated that it could help structure a process for review, possibly the structure for proposals, instruct reviewers, and relate the top proposals to the mission of the Oregon Plan and the adopted research priorities to OWEB.

ACTION: Bierly will take the IMST's proposed role to the OWEB Board in May. Afterwards he will work with Harte to prepare the request for funding proposals; including the nature of the proposal, the information required in the proposal, and criteria used to award funds

No public comment was given.

Meeting adjourned at 4:50 PM.