

## Argenta FY15 Year End Report: Addendum

### ***Process Steps***

February 2016 - Public meeting was canceled, and decision made to complete FY15 Year End Report.

February 25, 2016 – Initial draft FY15 report completed and distributed to CMG for review and comment. Written comments were provided by permittee consultants and Ken Cole (Western Watersheds Project – WWP).

March 9-10, 2016 - CMG meeting where, among other things, the FY15 report and comments/concerns (written and verbal) were discussed and notes posted to web. The FY15 report was revised by NRST.

March 14, 2016 - Final draft FY15 report completed and distributed to MLFO interested parties list and posted to web, with a 15 day comment period. Comments were received from Katie Fite, Jon Marvel and Ken Cole.

- Many of the public comments are addressed in the March CMG meeting notes and the various issue resolution forms (below).
- Formal response and report addendum completed and posted to web.

February-March, 2016 - WWP submitted six issue resolution forms to the CMG between February and March. Completed forms were sent to all CMG members and posted to web, including:

1. public comment period
2. livestock turn-out
3. actual use and within-season data
4. averaging utilization
5. interpretation of upland utilization data
6. interpretation of riparian stubble height data.

### ***Changes to be made in FY16 Year End Report***

1. Report will not label all upland and riparian monitoring sites as KMAs or DMAs respectively. Only those sites that have documentation to ensure that they were properly identified or verified will be labeled as such. The others will be referred to as 'temporary monitoring or study sites.' For DMAs and KMAs located in 2016, the Year End Report will reference the identification/selection process and baseline data collected.
2. Report will include a summary of permittee within-season monitoring data and stockmanship reports (in compliance with settlement agreement section 6.9.5). See CMG March meeting notes (pp 31-32 and 34) for detailed explanation. This information will be provided to the CMG in advance of the November CMG Year End meeting.
3. Report will continue to rely on averaged utilization as an indicator of success, but will retain species specific information for future use. A detailed explanation of this can be found in the signed issue resolution form regarding average utilization.
4. Report will retain the use of confidence intervals. However, the interpretation of CIs will default to 'unknown' rather than 'pass' when situations fall within the (b) and (c) states as defined by Elzinga et al (1998). Sites that are statistically uncertain will not be included in final % success calculations. Based on this interpretation, the following scenario applies to FY15 data:
  - a. For riparian end-of-season use levels (i.e., stubble height), 11% (1 of 9 sites) clearly met riparian use levels (i.e., use was less than the thresholds).
  - b. For upland end-of-season use levels, 69% (9 of 13 sites) clearly met upland use levels (i.e., use was less than thresholds).

A detailed explanation of this can be found in the signed issue resolution forms regarding the interpretation of riparian stubble height and upland utilization data.