

**Synopsis of first CRAM CT meeting
21 January 2003**

The CRAM Core Team (CT) met for the first time on January 16 2003 at the SCCWRP headquarters. Eric Stein (SCCWRP), Martha Sutula (SCCWRP) and Josh Collins (SFEI) met the next day, 17 January 2003, as contractors to USEPA for CRAM development to summarize the recommendations of the (CT). The complete minutes of the CT meeting are separate from this synopsis.

Purpose of this synopsis: Identify key recommendations of CT and allocate workload to revise the CRAM document for CT review before the first field verification effort scheduled for February 18 at SCCWRP, and as a step toward the next verification exercise being scheduled for early March 2003 at Morro Bay.

1. Key recommendations

- a. Use ORAM as much as possible
- b. Try to build one basic or core CRAM for all HGM classes and regions, perhaps with modules to address spatial and temporal variability.
- c. Do not build GIS into CRAM
- d. Do not build extreme taxonomic expertise into CRAM
- e. Eliminate "habitat quality" metric
- f. Plan for peer review beyond CT and Regional Teams.
- g. Incorporate some of the HGM approach into the "habitat structure" metric.
- h. Separate landscape metrics from site size metric.
- i. Separate biotic metrics from abiotic metrics
- j. Consider separating stressor metrics from state metrics.
- k. For each metric, provide a concise rationale.

2. Workplan (for each task, non-lead parties will review what the lead party produces before the products are reviewed by the CT). Work will proceed from tasks of highest priority to tasks of lowest priority. Low priority tasks may not get accomplished before the 18 February 2003 verification exercise.

Major Task	Sub-task	Priority at this time	Lead Party
Final report	Design	Low	?
	Layout	Low	?
	Printing	Low	?
	Distribution	Low	?
Introduction	Background of USEPA 3-tiered Approach	Moderate	SCCWRP
	Goals/Purpose/Applications	Moderate	SCCWRP
Organization, Coordination, CRAM development process	Roles of CT and Regional Teams	High	SCCWRP
	Schedule	High	SCCWRP
	List server	High	SCCWRP

Conceptual models, Assumptions, and Definitions	Stressor-state-response model	High	SFEI
	Forcing functions model	High	SFEI
	CRAM Model (from Kentula et al.)	High	SFEI
	Assumptions	High	SFEI
	Definitions (calibration, verification, validation, stressor, state, indicator, metric, sub-metric, site, wetland, region, sample frame, rater, etc)	High	SFEI
	Address temporal variability of temperate-arid systems (consider need for field expertise to assess seasonal variability based on site visits during only one season; consider alternative approaches such as either adjusting scores for successional state vs. simple site classification for post-stratification of sites based on succession.	High	SCCWRP
Revise metrics, sub-metrics, and related “look up” tables of things when metrics are scored.	Develop a template for metrics allowing for alternative contents to be reviewed by the CT.	High	SFEI
	Identify “home file” types	High	SCCWRP
	Size metric: Address size classes cf. percentiles cf. value classes (i.e., small, medium, large. Develop site boundary rules (try to adopt ORAM rules and add new rules for intertidal wetlands).	High	SFEI
	Buffer metric: Develop protocol to average width per site (consider adopting ORAM approach). Consider adding minimum width as sub-metric.	High	SFEI

<p>Revise metrics, sub-metrics, and related “look up” tables of things when metrics are scored</p> <p>(continued from previous page)</p>	<p>Hydrology metric:</p> <p>Address natural variability in timing of seasonal wetlands perhaps in relation to latitude, elevation, distance from coast.</p> <p>Address variability in degree of tidal action among systems within potential reach of the tides (i.e., lagoons cf. micro-tidal cf. muted tidal cf fully tidal).</p>	High	SCCWRP
	<p>Abiotic structure metric:</p> <p>Consider incorporating HGM classification approach.</p> <p>Consider including schematic cross-sections in sub-metric or look up tables.</p> <p>Consider structural and architectural roles of vegetation and macro-benthos.</p>	High	SCCWRP
	<p>Biotic structure metric:</p> <p>Consider basic plant community structure parameters such as overall richness, percent cover, percent non-native species, macro-alga, interspersions, etc.</p>	High	SFEI
	<p>Living resources metric</p> <p>Consider how to augment “home files” regarding special status species using field sign of wildlife uses.</p>	High	SFEI
	<p>Special wetland metric</p> <p>The Regional Teams might nominate wetlands of special interest.</p>	Moderate	Regional Teams through SFEI and SCCWRP
<p>Begin to prepare for scoring exercises</p>	<p>Identify needs for existing data and data sets to calibrate the metric scores.</p>	Moderate	SCCWRP and SFEI separately for their regions.

Begin to prepare for scoring exercises (continued from previous page)	Begin to address reference condition concept (one approach for all metrics and all HGM classes or not; historical condition of ideal according to experts of average of all least-disturbed sites)	Moderate	SFEI
	Outline alternative approaches to overall assessments per HGM class (i.e., summing across metrics or not; weighting metrics or not; summarizing stressor metrics separately from state metrics or not; etc.)	Moderate	SFEI and SCCWRP together
	Select verification sites for each region.	High	SCCWRP, CCC, and SFEI separately for their regions.
Prepare for validation exercises (Level III)	Prepare full proposals for next round of Section 104 grants	Very High	SCCWRP, SFEI, State Resources Agency, NWI, ABAG

end