Draft minutes 5/7/99

MFRC Guideline Implementation Monitoring Committee
Meeting Minutes
May 3, 1999

In attendance: Dick Knoll, Alan Knable, Bob Oswald, Logan Lee (for Jim Sanders), Mike Phillips (staff), Dick Rossman (staff).

Absent: Bob Dunn, Jim Sanders.

Guests: Mike Kilgore.

Introductions were made. Mike Phillips indicated that he was resuming his duties as chief staff person for the MFRC guideline implementation monitoring committee (GIMC). However, due to the workload in a relatively short time, Dick Rossman will continue to work with Mike to move the process forward.

Dick Knoll reviewed the monitoring program to date.

Dick Rossman reviewed the backgrounds of the individuals nominated to serve on the guideline implementation monitoring technical committee. After working through a number of the nominations, further discussion of nominees was deferred until after discussion of the role of the technical committee.

Conference Call with Alan Ek

A conference call was held between the MFRC GIMC and Alan Ek. Al Ek discussed the proposed strategy for developing the monitoring system. The following aspects of the study were presented.

- Data will be evaluated as trends in implementation over time by ownership and by ecosystem. Trends over time will be the most powerful descriptor.
- Existing and future technologies will be used.
- System needs to be as simple as possible, and reasonably priced.
- System will be developed that will fit across the state or will be broken into 3 or 4 landscape regions.
- Look at forested region of the state with special consideration given to the prairie area.
- Primary sampling units will likely be townships or sections. Constrained random sample of primary sampling units within the state will provide the sites for selection for implementation monitoring.
- Need sufficient sampling size to make meaningful comparisons between ownerships.
- Sampling more sites is better than sampling fewer sites more intensively. Al says we should not sweat the small stuff.
- Al Ek thinks we should spend no more than 1 to 2 hours on any site. Mike and Dick indicated that it was often common to spend 3 or more hours on an individual site.
- **$** Best photography will be in May or September (leaf-off). Dick Rossman mentioned that

from a soils perspective the best month would be May.

Mike Kilgore asked Alan Ek what are the biggest challenges. Alan listed the following:

- **$** logistics
- **$** lead time
- **$** field monitoring team relation to photography group.

Alan Knable asked Al Ek how easy it would be to distinguish between years of operations from aerial photographs. Al Ek said it is difficult to distinguish between years, say 1, 2, and 3 years since cutting. He suggested that it will likely take an individual to check and confirm the sites.

Mike Kilgore discussed the budget and the possibility of funding the aerial photo work with the Grand Rapids Resource Assessment unit.

Revisiting Sites

The discussion turned to revisiting sites. Mike Phillips indicated that revisiting sites would mean evaluating fewer new sites. The committee members concluded that revisits would provide one of our best opportunities to measure effectiveness of the guidelines on-site (e.g., water quality, regeneration). Logan Lee suggested that we need to determine how many sites needed to be returned to to adequately measure the effectiveness of the guidelines. Logan also enquired if there are things that the contractors can do to ensure that effectiveness is accomplished.

There was some discussion as to who will do the field monitoring. Logan Lee suggested that one approach would be for the technical committee to develop the model and get independent teams not connected to the process to do the field work.

Mike Kilgore summarized the discussions:

- **T** the committee liked what it heard in the discussions with Al Ek.
- **T** look at site impacts.
- **T** integrate BMP sampling results into data analysis.
- **T** do not stratify beyond ownership.
- **T** focus is on use monitoring but factor in revisits and develop effectiveness measures.

Alan Knable expressed his interest in effectiveness monitoring, Specifically Alan wants to know the effectiveness of the 5% leave tree guidelines.

The members felt that clarification on weighing sites was needed from Al Ek. Mike Phillips indicated that he would contact Al.

Technical Committee

The discussion turned to reviewing the roles of the technical committee. A change was made to the role of the technical committee as spelled out in the background information handed out. Specifically the first sentence of the ARole@ paragraph should read: To provide sound technical

advice to the MFRC Guideline Development Coordinator and develop options and recommendations for the design and protocols of a system to evaluate compliance and effectiveness monitoring that will be presented to the MFRC Guideline Implementation Monitoring Committee for consideration. Monitoring parameters for the technical team were also discussed. The technical team is being asked to develop a program that includes the following, if possible:

- field visits of 1 to 2 hours per site.
- a system that is as quantitative as possible.
- a focus on timber harvesting.
- provide recommendations on addressing the access question, both social and physical.
- final comment from the committee: Aget it done@. Shoot for having all program products done by the end of July 1999.

The recommendations for technical team membership were reviewed. Alan Knable emphasized the need for both practical and technical members. Al supported having Terry Weber added to the committee, although it was suggested that he would not have the time to participate. Bob Oswold stated that he desires a monitoring process that is more general than specific. Mike Kilgore stated his view that the appointed committee is technical, not political. The names submitted were approved unanimously.

Mike Kilgore suggested that the chair of the MFRC GMIC send a letter to all members of the guideline implementation monitoring technical committee identifying the function of the technical committee and the need to keep the process moving forward. Mike Phillips said he would put the letter together for Dick Knoll.

Meeting Minutes

The minutes from the March 18, 1999 MFRC GIMC meeting were approved with two small changes. Mike indicated to Dick Rossman that the authors to the monitoring background paper are MacKay and Phillips. Bob Oswold said that his name was misspelled.

Next Meeting Date

The committee scheduled the next MFRC GIMC meeting for June 14, 1999 for the Sawmill Inn in Grand Rapids. However, the meeting is tentative depending on the progress of the technical committee and whether their will be a MFRC meeting June 17, 1999.

There was considerable review and discussion of the questions on implementation monitoring proposed by Mike Phillips and Dick Rossman. Committee members views on these questions will be incorporated into the document for distribution to the technical committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.