

SMC Installation Review Committee (IRC) Meeting  
Heathman Lodge, Vancouver, WA.  
January 13, 2015

Attendees: Sean Garber, Doug Mainwaring, Florian Deisenhofer, John Jayne, Candace Cahill, Margaret Banks, Dave Marshall, Dave Hamlin, Josh Misener, Eini Lowell, Bob Gonyea, Eric Turnblom, Rob Harrison and Greg Ettl.

Eric Turnblom led IRC Meeting

Background: We originally addressed the question of whether or not we should we keep measuring all the installations (July 26, 2012 date of last IRC Meeting minutes). The tradeoff of is for continuing measurements vs. using funds for something else: new installations and/or increasing analyses.

- With phasing out of Type V and also a gap in when we (SMC) will measure Type IV (vs. NWTIC) we have a decrease in total person days from 70 days to 30 days for 4 years, 2016-2019, then back up to 50 days. Overall capacity with current 2-man crew maxes out at around 100 person days; 70 days is a good target.
- Turnblom presented an ordinal scale ranking (after Miller et al. 1995) to assess the utility of our installations (attached handout with plot utility scores).
- Discussion of how we will use the ranking. Want to make sure we don't miss regions based on the ranking. We don't want to lose the low SI sites. Could we add a weighting score for land in a similar management conditions. The scaling is sensitive to plot #/installation and how close they are to a RD trigger point. Let's make sure we are not going to lose any installations. We have the cluster analysis as well that can be used to make sure that we are sampling (maintaining) from installations in each cluster. Consider the relationship of the RD trigger vs. the time the stand will respond.
- We looked at the hierarchical cluster analysis from the January 2014 meeting to see how the ranking matched with the clustering.
- Should we pick a site that is set to be harvested soon for our trial? We need to be planning a couple of years out to work with many harvest managers. Site 735 for example is set to go in 2017, and while the harvest manager might leave the SMC site uncut, there may be degradation if stand around it is cut.
- What treatments are we interested in getting wood quality on. Silviculture vs. wood quality might lead to testable hypotheses that meet each of those objectives. Discussed the relative value of the pruned plots. There was a lot of interest in pruning from Chad Oliver. His students were studying pruning and the landowners were employing pruning. Not as likely to be important now.
- Age may be more of an indication of how close the stand is to being harvested than the date the organization has indicated they will harvest the stand.

## Summary

- The ordinal analysis of Type I plots indicates all are of high quality. Some thought that the total number of plots has more weight than needed
- Need a similar analysis for WH Type I installations and the Type III installations
- Combined analysis of clustering with weighting will be effective in setting priorities
- Maguire students looking to do some destructive sampling out of the buffer zones—want to do this in the next 3 months (as many as 10 trees in each double buffers)
- Three decisions: 1) Do we want to do a buffer study, 2) do we want to fell trees in the buffer, 3) do we want to do one installation as a trial of sunseting protocol (getting the information for a good sample of the study trees)
  - The group consensus was a buffer study so we could examine testable hypothesis and learn as much as we can from the Type Is as quickly as possible (although it was pointed out that the dbh distribution may differ from the actual plot).
- Propose stand ID 722 as a trial of the sunseting protocol—Columbia Weyco; non-destructive measurements and destructive samples. [Some possibility of a hybrid? Full plot vs. buffer study.] [Or plan for buffer study, and if harvested you sample more trees. Minimum is a number of installations and number of trees. We don't know if it is going to get harvested or not, so instead of waiting we are being proactive in getting the data.] Remember for fertilizer that double buffer trees might have part of their roots outside of the fertilizer
- ISPA to ISPA/2, then maybe fertilization, or if had pruned instead of fertilized
- Wood Quality and Silviculture groups can take the recommendation for an RFP